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

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_churchman_os.php

REVIEWS OF BOOKS.

PSYCHOLOGY AND RELIGION.

PSYCHOLOGY AND GOD. By the Rev. L. W. Grensted. *Longmans.* 10s 6*d*.

The Bampton Lectures for 1930 discuss the implications of recent psychology for religious belief and practice, and they do so in a thoroughly helpful manner. In our opinion this is the best book on Religion and Psychology that has yet been published in English and we are glad to find that our opinion is shared by those who have written on the subject. The old Psychology was looked upon as a branch of philosophy and dealt with the mind in action and the interrelations between Thought, Emotion and Will. It might be Christian as in the case of Hamilton, or definitely materialistic as in the case of Bain. But it did not aspire to be considered a science that dealt with ultimate reality or a method of explaining the existence and character of God. It was simply descriptive, and when it endeavoured to pass beyond what was known as its legitimate sphere it was taken up by philosophy which kept it in its place. To-day the New Psychology believes itself in the hands of many of its teachers to be the key that unlocks the mysteries of thought and belief, and reduces everything to mechanical processes that take place in the Unconscious and manifest themselves in the conscious mind. God Himself is a projection of the mind, and instead of His being the Creator He is the created Whom man worships after having made Him.

The real battle-ground is found on the differences between subjectivism and objectivity—the presuppositions that are maintained by the New Psychology " must if pressed to their logical conclusion, tend either to the weakening of the grounds of faith or to a lowering of the level of Christian conduct." We are forced to meet our enemy at the gate and discover what is true in his contentions and see how far they are compatible with Faith and reject what is false. Mr. Grensted enables us to tread our way through the maze of thought and he does so by insisting on the fact of freedom, the reality of otherness and the differences in the value of our judgments. The fault of the behaviourist schools—so common in America and now becoming domiciled here—is their neglect of fundamental facts and their building a philosophy of life and thought on only a partial foundation, which is seen to be unable to sustain the superstructure. The anti-Christian Psychologists attack the mental processes on which our fundamental arguments for faith depend, and they can only do so successfully by ignoring the reality of the processes and the persons in whom they take place, by non-recognition of historical facts that cannot be reduced to mental processes, and by going back to what has been inherited by the race as the source of what thought and religion teach. All this is expounded with clearness by Mr. Grensted, who goes on to deal with the questions raised by Faith and Worship. Prayer is not merely a cry of grief that finds relief in

utterance—it is communion between the human person and the Divine. In an extremely interesting chapter he deals with mental and spiritual healing and his remarks on Lourdes are characterized by a finely balanced appreciation of all the factors. In discussing sin he is forcible and illuminating, and incidentally he informs us that the original view of the Anglican Reformers is that the function of the priest is to declare God's forgiveness. The exhortation inserted into the Communion Service is an intentional reply to the claim of the Council of Trent that the priest not only confers a benefit but acts as a judge. The conception of the Church is reviewed and the objectivity of God is insisted upon as in accord with sound psychology, reason and experience. Christian Theism is vindicated in pages which assert that "in history the crucial case stands obvious for our choosing. Jesus of Nazareth holds a place unquestionably supreme, and we make no unnatural choice when we see in Him the test-experiment by which we may hope best to read the full significance of our human life, and its relation to that creative reality, from which, as we must needs suppose, we have sprung." The Lecturer is definitely Christian in his outlook, he knows where he stands, and no unprejudiced student can read his book without being impressed by the breadth of his reading and the strong personal conviction that is behind his arguments.

BISHOP GORE'S GIFFORD LECTURES.

THE PHILOSOPHY OF THE GOOD LIFE. By Charles Gore, D.D. *John Murray.* 10s. 6*d.*

Dr. Gore gives us in this book a real contribution to Christian ethics. He does not write an apology for Christianity, but he surveys the history of conceptions of God and shows that all that is good in the great world religions is embraced in the Christian thought of God, and that the Revelation of God in His Son Jesus Christ our Lord, once and for all makes clear the character of God to those who seek to know Him. If man is to live the good life its character will be determined by the highest thought of goodness he possesses. The appeal to human history as to what constitutes goodness and how it is attainable must be made. Wherever man believes himself to be in communion with a Power not himself to Whom he owes allegiance, we have to discover what the ultimate basis of the attitude connotes and see whether or not it meets the needs of human nature. We can never afford to forget that man was religious before he became a philosopher, and the philosopher deals with the data given him in religious experience, and strives to co-ordinate it and bring it under categories that are intelligible and interrelated.

The necessarily brief surveys of Parseeism, Buddhism, Confucianism and Mahommedanism are extraordinarily comprehensive, for Dr. Gore has a masterly gift of summarizing his conclusions and giving them in a balanced form. Many will be surprised to find him giving such high praise to Zarathustra, but readers of Dr. Moulton on the

subject will find him just as warm as the Bishop in commendation. " If Christianity be taken as the fulfilment of Judaism, Judaism is a strictly national religion, which at last expanded to be universal, but Zoroastrianism is at starting a universal religion for man as man which ultimately narrowed into an intensely national form in the Persian religion and Parseeism. But both are alike in making the essence of the good life for man to be correspondence with the purpose and character of God, and in finding the knowledge of his character and purpose to depend not on the labours of the human intellect but on his own self-revelation." It is remarkable that the Parsees are to-day a small Indian people whereas Christianity is a world-wide religion.

We see Bishop Gore at his best and, may we say so, at his worst, in his strange exclusiveness in the noble chapter on Jesus the Christ. In a note he modifies by insistence on the careful distinction between the idea of the Covenant of Salvation and the acceptance of the individual in the judgment of God, the exclusiveness, and, we venture to say, non-Scriptural ideal when he writes : " We should notice that so deeply was it impressed upon the mind of the primitive Church that Jesus (if the expression may be pardoned) staked His all on the Church, that there does not appear the least suggestion in the New Testament that His great salvation or His covenant of grace is to be found outside it. There is, in other words, no idea to be found there of a membership of Christ which is not also membership of the Church which is the New Israel." This is perfectly true, but is there to be found anywhere in the New Testament the ideal of a sacerdotal Church with a caste Priesthood who alone have the power of admitting to the Church and consecrating a valid Eucharist? Is not the New Testament ideal that union with Christ constitutes membership of the Church and that this makes the Christian partaker of the Covenant blessings and a member of the New Israel ? When Dr. Gore deals with our Lord and His ethical teaching as well as His Gospel of salvation we find ourselves in agreement with him. " Morally speaking, the value of right action and the guilt of wrong action lie simply in the will in ' the heart of man.' In the regard of Jesus humanity is undoubtedly a fallen being needing in every individual specimen repentance and a new birth. But the sin which binds him and dooms him lies not in the body or anything which properly belongs to his nature as God made him (there is not a trace of dualism in the teaching of Jesus), but it lies simply in the perverted will—in ' the heart of man.' Let that turn to God—to the Father—and all will be well ; for the redemption which Jesus brought was redemption of the whole man." We cannot do more than point out the emphasis laid by Bishop Gore on the need of a rational faith. In an age when we are advised to consider religion as something that has not to do with the intellect, but with that which is outside intellectual apprehension, it is good to find him writing as he has written. We must not be considered whole-hearted followers of the Bishop when we say that this book deserves the serious consideration of all those who are struck by the contrast

between the morals of popular teaching and the ethic of the Gospel. Dr. Gore gives us firm ground on which we can stand and weapons with which we can defeat the modern godless moralists.

DEAN INGE ON CHRISTIAN ETHICS.

CHRISTIAN ETHICS AND MODERN PROBLEMS. By W. R. Inge, D.D. *Hodder and Stoughton.* 15*s.*

Dean Inge tells us that this will probably be the last considerable book that he will have time to write and his many readers will regret the fulfilment of his thought, for however much they may disagree with the lightning flashes of epigram and satire from St. Paul's, they know that they are in touch with a vigorous mind that is never afraid to say honestly what it thinks. Contemporary ethics are, to say the least, in a tangle, and the straight line which our fathers believed they should follow in obedience to Christian teaching has lost its authority for teachers, who have other ideals than doing the will of God and following what is true though it may involve self-sacrifice and hardship. They preach the duty of self-expression and find reasons for wiping off the list of wrong doings, much that Christianity in its most characteristic teaching believes to be prohibited. This has invaded the Church and the protests against a religion of taboos have founded themselves on the current thinking that repression is wrong, expression is right. Of course other reasons are given for the placing of the Ten Words on the list of antiquated pronouncements, as all true ethical teaching must be positive. But then human nature is anything but a practical exhibition ground of the motto, " We needs must love the highest when we see it," for " we see and approve what is good, we follow what is worse."

The Dean rightly tells us that the battle-ground to-day is the relation between the Gospel of Christ and conduct. " If the authority of Christ were rejected in this field, what would be left of Christianity would not be worth quarrelling over. For the Christian revelation is of a standard of values resting on an unveiling of the character of God and of our relation to Him ; on this alone depends the whole scheme of Christian Ethics, which in their turn postulate the truth of the revelation in Christ." The Dean appeals to the New Testament as the standard by which conduct must be judged, and he strives in all his discussion of morals to bring everything to the test of the Gospel. " The Ethics of the Gospel set up a most exacting ideal of conduct. They appeal to those who are children in malice, but full-grown men in understanding. '*Ego sum cibus grandium*' ; as St. Augustine heard the Lord saying to him ; ' be a man and thou shalt feed upon me.' " There is no attempt made by the Dean to soften the sternness of the teaching of the New Testament, and although he protests against the extremes of asceticism, he sees that life needs discipline.

With that deadly logic and breadth of view which we associate

with the Dean, he attacks the Theocratic Imperialism of the Roman Church and shows how it has done much to lower the real standards of Christian Ethics by its exclusiveness and its claims that are unhistorical. He briefly describes the work of the Inquisition, and the story is simply terrible. " These examples are selected from a vast number which might be cited. Even now there is very little sign of any change of heart." He instances the Ferrer case in Spain, which he considers the last time any coup of this class will be made. " Public opinion was quick to recognize that the priests had claimed another victim and in the twentieth century." He is frank in his exposition of the intolerance which early Protestantism had taken over from the spirit of the age. Few students of history and the Scriptures will be found to disagree with his contention. " There is not the smallest reason to think that Christ ever contemplated the evolution of His little flock into a theocratic empire. The universal Church and the universal Empire are parallel ideas, which belong to a state of society that has long passed away."

The greater part of the book is occupied in the discussion of Problems of Social and Personal Ethics, and here we find ourselves in disagreement with the Dean on a number of points. He defends suicide under certain circumstances, but " at the same time I hope, inconsistently perhaps, that if I were attacked by a painful illness I should have patience to wait for the end, and I do not think I should wish any one dear and near to me to act otherwise." A memory of Kant's Categorical Imperative might have saved the Dean writing some things which give his readers a painful shock. And much as we sympathize with a good deal of his reasoning on hard cases we should be indeed sorry for the State and the Church to have two kinds of marriage. Nothing would be more injurious to Society generally than a conflict on vital points in connexion with marriage. It may come, but it is the duty of both Church and State to see clearly what the Law of Christ is and what the needs of the community demand. We believe that both are reconcilable, if the extreme demands on both sides be left out of account. The whole book deserves close attention. It may not be as systematic as other Ethical treatises, but it loses nothing on this account, for the ground to be covered is so wide that systematic treatment is frequently more dissatisfying than the honest convictions of a good and wise man frankly expressed. And we have these in the Dean's pages.

THE CHURCH AND THE PEOPLE.

THE CHURCH AND THE PEOPLE. By Canon T. Guy Rogers. *Sampson Low. 7s. 6d.*

Canon Guy Rogers tells us that he has written this book at white heat, but he does not scribble unadvisedly with his pen. Some books are all the better for coming from a full heart apart from the checks and hesitations inseparable from work in a Library. But the white-hot books, as a rule, do not live. They have their

day and soon cease to be, only to be rescued from oblivion by the historian who knows when an author reflects a dominating thought of his day and is not merely a tight-rope performer attracting attention by his dexterous use of words and phrases. Whatever some may think of the Rector of Birmingham no one can deny that he is deadly earnest and that he speaks for a very great number of Churchmen. And herein lies the real value of the book, whose occasion is the Lambeth Conference and whose spirit is that of a man who expected greater things and failed to obtain them. We are not now concerned with the chapters that are the republication, or the first appearance, of Essays written some time back. We wish to face the fresh messages of the volume.

He has a vision of unity, which is not far removed from that of Dr. Carnegie Simpson. " If the Church of England is in any sense to be the Bridge Church of the Future, some one at least must pass over it. At present it resembles too much a road under repair blocked at both ends. Nor is it very sensible to say that the Bridge cannot be used unless there is equal traffic from either side ; in other words, that unless Catholics and Protestants in equal numbers are baptized into the Anglican tradition, the *status quo* must be preserved. . . . So long as the ' Bridge ' idea dominates the mind, we shall instinctively think in future in terms of Anglicanism, and, although we may not actually insist on other Churches passing over it, we shall certainly be tempted to set up toll gates and exact tribute from passengers on the King's Highway." There is much wisdom in these sentences. He would have the Establishment broadened and hopes that the Report of the Archbishop's Commission on Church and State will be held back until some progress has been made with Home Reunion. We wish we could think that the present temper of those responsible for English Church policy will so change as to secure this end, but we fear that the joint result of the silences of Lambeth concerning what the Nonconformists expected and the utterances on the Greek and Old Catholic Churches are at present obstacles in the way.

A good many pages are devoted to the discussion of Sex Problems and we neither agree with the insistence on them nor with some of the conclusions reached. We have to face the questions raised, but we believe that the large slice of the book given to the subject might with advantage have been decreased. As is to be expected, when we pass into the definite discussion of Home Reunion we find ourselves in hearty accord with the author, who plainly tells us that large numbers of loyal Churchmen cannot accept the statement as it stands that " after communion the consecrated elements remaining are regarded sacramentally as the Body and Blood of Christ." Here and elsewhere the Canon speaks with an emphasis that rejoices his many old friends and we can overlook the comparatively few statements with which we disagree in his definite assertion of principles for which the Church of England stands as Catholic, Apostolic, Reformed and Protestant—for he recognizes that the National Church has these four characteristics.

BISHOP KNOX'S LIFE OF LEIGHTON.

THE LIFE AND TIMES OF ARCHBISHOP LEIGHTON. By E. A. KNOX, D.D. (Bishop). Forewords by Mr. John Buchan, M.P., and the Rev. Professor Main, D.D., Regius Professor of Ecclesiastical History in the University of Glasgow. *Messrs. James Clarke & Co.* 12*s.* 6*d.*

Bishop Knox's literary activity since his retirement reminds of Dr. Plummer's. His new work on Archbishop Leighton not only gives a full account of his life and a careful study of his writings, but sets forth clearly the successive stages and movements in Scottish Church history from the Reformation down to Leighton's death, showing the origin and the greatness of the difficulties confronting him in his episcopate. The early course of the Reformation was so different in England and in Scotland, that the aim, shared by both sides in turn, to establish one form of Church government in both, was bound to fail unless very carefully modified and limited in one case or the other. England was largely Erastian; Scotland, following Calvin, Knox and Melvil, held strongly to the independence of the Church. In practice, the General Assembly was the most representative gathering of the nation. James I, by his persistent policy, did indeed something to assimilate Scotland to England, especially by the re-establishment of Episcopacy (1610) and the Articles of Perth (1618). But these were only partially observed and little enforced; James knew where to stop! This earlier history is not generally familiar to Englishmen, but it explains the later.

Under the Long Parliament it was the turn of Scotland to force its form of Church polity upon England. The support of the Scots in the war against the King was only secured by the acceptance by the English of the "Solemn League and Covenant." This was ordered to be taken everywhere; we still find it in some parish registers; many clergy were sequestered for refusing. In the Westminster Assembly the Scots Commissioners had, like the Independents, influence out of all proportion to their numbers. Of this Assembly the Bishop says, "This great ecclesiastical council is as epoch-making in the history of the English-speaking world as Nicaea in the Eastern and Trent in the Western Church."

Robert Leighton is by consent of contemporaries and of later times in the first rank of British saints. As scholar, minister, principal of a university, and bishop, he strove to serve his generation while whole-heartedly walking in communion with God. "If saints are infallible, his story is unintelligible. If we admit their fallibility, the record of their mistakes as well as of their virtues is profitable to us who have still to serve God by trying to translate ideals into working principles."

Robert Leighton was born in 1611, second son of Alexander Leighton, who was cruelly punished in 1630 for writing *Zion's Plea against Prelacy*. After graduating at Edinburgh in 1631, he seems

to have lived abroad for nearly ten years, possibly at the Scots College at Paris. In 1641 he became minister of Newbattle, near Dalkeith, Midlothian. In 1652 he was nominated by Cromwell Principal of Edinburgh University. In 1662 he became Bishop of Dunblane, and for a few years held the Archbishopric of Glasgow. He retired in 1674 and lived with his sister at Broadhurst Manor, Horsted Keynes, Sussex; he died in 1684.

His position during the various political changes from 1650 may be described as that of a Pietistic Erastian. Erastianism means the subordination of the Church to the State; this is Pietistic when its supporters advocate it with a sincere desire for the promotion of true religion. Leighton's Erastianism was a readiness to submit to the civil government as having the authority of God at least by permission; in order that the soul might concentrate its attention on spiritual life. In his action at the Restoration he may fairly be charged with two great errors: (1) "He was not sufficiently sensitive of the character of the political agents with whom he was associated, and of his inability to restrain their misconduct; (2) He had not the political discernment to be aware of the deep seated evils of arbitrary power." Further, the two sides of his character struggled with one another:—his love of meditation and retirement with his desire to serve his own generation, and a "love of Utopian experiments." This last led him, greatly against his personal inclination, to accept a bishopric; the other led him to choose the smallest and poorest one. But by so choosing he lost opportunity of influencing the Government, or of setting an example in an important diocese. Dunblane might be peaceful, but it was only a backwater. His Glasgow episcopate came far too late. His great misfortune was the reckless misgovernment of Scotland after the Restoration, largely at first by a group of drunkards.

It is not easy for an Englishman to appreciate the bitter opposition of the Covenanters. They were not required, as the Puritans were in England, to declare their unfeigned assent and consent to everything in a new service-book; nor to use or allow the use of "the ceremonies"—the surplice, the sign of the Cross in baptism, kneeling at Communion; nor to submit to reordination. But they were, as in England, called upon to repudiate the Covenant, which had been much more a religious matter in Scotland. But their great revolt was against the interference in Church matters by King, Privy Council or Parliament, particularly against the Royal claim to have absolute control of the Church. Bishop Knox draws the lesson that the history and ideals of the Churches of England and of Scotland are so different that the Scottish example of self-government is no precedent for England, especially as the "Episcopal idea" is opposed to the popular government of the Church.

Leighton left his library to the Cathedral Church of Dunblane, where it is still preserved. From his writings we can determine his favourite authors: they are Seneca, St. Augustine, St. Bernard,

Thomas à Kempis. But he is also strongly influenced by St. Francis de Sales, who represents 'devout Humanism'—belief in the essential goodness of man combined with an earnest desire for personal holiness and likeness to God in Jesus Christ; also by the Port-Royalists, St. Cyran and Arnauld. He has also great affinities with the Cambridge Platonists, especially John Smith and Henry More. Puritan writers are not at all strongly represented in his library, which bears a marked resemblance to that of his friends the Scougals of Aberdeen—Patrick the Bishop and his son John, author of *The Life of God in the Soul of Man.*

The book closes with a full account of Leighton's teaching, especially devotional and practical. It should be read by all who have found help in Leighton's writings, e.g., his *Commentary on the First Epistle of St. Peter*; and by all interested in the Church history both of England and Scotland. It is based upon extensive reading and is well documented.

THE EUCHARISTIC CANON. By John Blomfield. *S.P.C.K.* 7*s.* 6*d.*
THE STRUCTURE OF THE LITURGY. By H. T. Knight, M.A. *S.P.C.K.* 1*s.* 6*d.*
THE FULLNESS OF SACRIFICE. By F. C. N. Hicks, D.D. *Macmillan.* 15*s.*

The " science of liturgiology " is a phrase which has come into a wide currency of late years, partly, perhaps, because so many investigators are without much science in the broader sense. The more capable writers on art and literature have not set up a " science of art," or a " science of literature," because, no doubt, they understand better the borderland between science and art. If science were concerned solely with the classification and comparison of phenomena, no doubt we might justly speak of a science of liturgiology. But science is more properly occupied with the investigation and apprehension of the laws controlling phenomena and there are no laws operating behind the liturgies. The development of the liturgies took place in response to local needs, and in their variation they express local feeling and temperament. Liturgiology, therefore, is an art like literature or painting or music, which are the expression of individual and national genius, not the manifestation in phenomena of the operation of law.

The late Rev. John Blomfield wisely did not use the term. He has written a book for the expert, but the compact chapters and ample tables do not place *The Eucharistic Canon* beyond the reach of the man who demands a small book. The text amounts only to 141 pages, and these are followed by 40 more pages devoted to suggestions for the reform of the Communion Service, beautifully printed, as though taken directly from an Oxford Prayer Book. With true historical insight and knowledge Mr. Blomfield did not place the appearance of formal liturgies too early. We have, indeed, no evidence of them before the third century, although Justin Martyr showed what was coming. The inclination, current in Anglican Catholic circles towards Eastern rather than Roman

usages, is pronounced both in this book, and in that of Canon Knight, and Mr. Blomfield is abreast of modern opinion when he states that " the actual words and deeds of our Blessed Lord when He consecrated the first Eucharist have not been preserved to us." Passing notice is taken of the influence of Augustine, whose " teaching held in check for some centuries in the West the newer developments which from the fourth century onwards tended to emphasize the conversion of the elements and a ' localized ' view of the eucharistic presence." This should have been expanded, and Batiffol's work up to 1905 should have been quoted. His interpretation of Chrysostom in a similar manner is reminiscent of Loofs,[1] and even the Gregorian Canon can be read in a " symbolical sense."

Mr. Blomfield's book has been written with the desire for reunion, and he rightly turns to the Holy Spirit as the agent of harmony. " Cannot we all accept the primitive oblation (*The Apostolic Tradition*) of ' this bread and this cup ' as a memorial of our Lord's death and sacrifice, and cease to argue as to its nature and mystical meaning "? . . . " If those who call themselves ' Evangelicals ' can rise to this ideal, and if those who claim to be Catholics will emphasize the truth that the Holy Spirit is the Consecrator . . . by their loyal acceptance of the Epiclesis . . . our ranks will be closed up, our disputes will be silenced. . . ." But this is not the real difficulty. Anglican Catholics are not opposed to the adoption of an Epiclesis of the Holy Spirit, but they are influenced by the desire to move the defence of the " real presence " on to new ground. On the other hand, there is some misunderstanding of the true motif of the Epiclesis in the minds of Evangelicals. It is not always realized that an appeal to the Spirit to undertake whatever consecration means, lifts the mystery on to an altogether higher spiritual level than that maintained by Latin medieval theories of consecration, provided that the caution already suggested is observed. Of course the Epiclesis is not primitive, as Mr. Blomfield shows. There is no clear evidence of its use before the *Apostolic Tradition* (earliest form *c.* 225) although an invocation of the Word is to be found so early as Irenaeus. But this probably reflects the confusion between the functions of Word and Spirit, and the Binitarian notions of early theology. Again, the Epiclesis is unknown in early Western Fathers save, possibly, in one passage of Augustine (*De Trin.* III, 4) and in Fulgentius. It appears in the Gallican and Mozarabic rites, but these were influenced by the East. The Roman Canon receives heavy criticism from Mr. Blomfield: it is " altogether out of proportion, ill-balanced and top-heavy with tradition." We may add that the canon of the Prayer Book of 1559 is derived from this usage, and the clearest breach with medieval antecedents would be effected if we could introduce an Epiclesis with proper safeguards. This was apparently Cranmer's wish, but he was over-

[1] Yet if Mr. Blomfield does not support his statements from Continental authorities, nothing but praise can be offered for the work of one, who until late in life was a layman, and then took up pioneer work in Australia.

borne. Mr. Blomfield accurately appreciates the present situation when he asks whether " the English Church can hope for reunion with the East, or indeed, with any other part of the Church," while the present English rite is so closely dependent on the Roman ?

Like the late Mr. Blomfield, Canon Knight is a busy parish clergyman, and if his little book of sixty-two pages is not accompanied by the scholarship of the former writer, it offers a creditable survey of the history of our Liturgy leading up to the Revised Prayer Book of 1927. Yet this little work, *The Structure of the 1928 Liturgy*, shows the defects as well as the merits of the " day of the small book." The surrender to the demand for the small book, which, by the way, the Anglican Evangelical Group Movement is fostering, reacts on scholarship, and a class of writers is developing, who are not, like some of their leaders and forerunners, able to pull the cream off the deeps of their knowledge; they have little cream at all to offer, and show that they have themselves only looked over the edge of the well of knowledge.

Canon Knight thinks that there was a daily breaking of the bread by the Apostles. Later Eastern custom, especially in the monasteries, where the Eucharist was celebrated only once, or at the most twice weekly, suggests the contrary. He finds a trace of the use of " lights " in St. Paul's time. By manipulating Jewish and Roman rules as to the first hour of the day, he is able to contend " the Lord's own service has thus always been held at the beginning of the day." St. Paul, he says, separated the Eucharist from the Agape at Corinth, and yet has to admit that the title " Lord's Supper " in St. Paul's writings means the combination of both. He hints that Romans xiii. 11, 12; Eph. iv. 14 and other passages, may have been liturgical hymns. " The significance of Consecration, as effecting some kind of real change, was clearly recognized from the beginning." We must disagree with most if not all of these statements. Indeed a study of the Evangelical trend of eucharistic teaching in early centuries, coming down from primitive New Testament sources, would have made some of them impossible.

Canon Knight is not aware of the Binitarian confusion between the Logos and the Holy Spirit during the first three or four centuries, and he accounts for the vacillation between the two in the Invocations of the mid-fourth century, on the ground that dogmatic controversy had not yet arisen ! Nor has he noticed that the withdrawal of the cup from the laity began in the twelfth century, long before it was regularized at Constance in 1415 (not, as he says, at Florence in 1439). He refuses to see that if we are to have reunion with our Free Church brethren, we shall have to take notice of the Puritan demands of 1660. It is not everyone, even in his own circle, who will agree that " our churches . . . have been erected for one dominant purpose—viz., to house the Action of the liturgy."

Yet, it is a lucid and well-phrased little book. He admits that the phrase " primitive liturgy " is misleading, that the original forms were many and various, and accompanied by extempore prayer. Possibly a too keen desire to popularize the Book of 1928 deflected

him from this sound beginning for a well-balanced interpretation of the history, which, in the main, he recounts accurately.

The Bishop of Gibraltar's book is entirely different in character and method. It is an extensive discussion of the idea of sacrifice in practice and worship from Old Testament times to the present day. One quarter of the book is devoted to the Old Testament, but the somewhat cumbersome transit through the records makes that section seem longer than it is. Emphasizing the fact that in the Hebrew conception of sacrifice, the stress is not laid on the death of the victim, but upon the life released for the benefit of the offerer, and the fact that the priest did not actually perform the act of sacrifice, he builds up the superstructure of his thesis with conclusions which are certainly fresh, even if not entirely new. The sin-offering was concerned with atonement, the burnt-offering with the work of self-dedication, and the peace-offering with the enjoyment of God's gift. Sacrifice was always accompanied by feeding. Thus, when he says that the Epistle to the Hebrews shows that the Christian sacrifice involved Communion, he is able to trace a direct connection between the Old Testament sacrifices and the Holy Communion, and to prove his contention that Christ came not to destroy but to fulfil the temple sacrifices. "The rule is that the work of the priest does not begin until after the death. . . . The sacrifice indeed begins before the work of the Priest. But the Cross is not itself the Sacrifice. It stands in its place—and that an essential place—in the whole course of the sacrificial action, but is not either its beginning or its end."

There is much in all this to which we can give assent. The Bishop has certainly released the notion of sacrifice from its medieval associations. He points out that the range of the sacrificial idea was wide in early Christian centuries, but that it was hardened by later definitions, so that to us, if we believe that the words pronounced over the elements "produce an 'objective effect,' we are nearer magic than we sometimes realize." This hardened conception of sacrifice was followed by a materialist notion of the Presence. "It is inevitable . . . that where belief in the Presence is fully and unquestioningly accepted there should be danger of materialism"; the Reformers were justified in the attitude which they adopted; and "men shrink—and rightly shrink—from believing in a Presence bound up with the Elements."

But having abandoned so much, and having, by separating it from death, given so entirely different a meaning to the term sacrifice, it is difficult to see why the Bishop has not discarded the notion of sacrifice altogether in his theory of the Eucharist. The Epistle to the Hebrews teaches that sacrifice ended with the completion of the offering on Calvary. Dr. Hicks admits that Christ's priesthood is now Melchizedechean and not Aaronic, a priesthood of intercession and not of sacrifice, indeed in one place he confuses prayer with sacrifice. Why, then, retain the term sacrifice at all for that which is a fellowship meal, a memorial of a sacrifice completed once for all, and a channel of the communication of the divine

life to the worthy recipient, in fulfilment of the words of Him who said, in this connection, "the words that I speak unto you, they are spirit, they are life"? The normal feeding of the soul is on the Word, which is the bread of life. The feeding in the fellowship meal of Holy Communion is only a specialized form, recalling the great drama of sacrifice, which, in turn, was the medium by which the Word was made available for our nourishment, and by which the teaching was sealed. Christ came not to fulfil the temple sacrifices, as Dr. Hicks contends, but to destroy the necessity for them, and the sacrifices with the necessity. What He came to fulfil was the law.

Some minor statements need adjustment. If the *Didache* was not a liturgy, it is hardly true to say that it was a book of private devotions. It clearly indicates development towards a liturgy. Nor is it accurate to confine early ideas of the Eucharist to offering and thanksgiving. There was the Ignatian medicine of immortality derived from St. John, and always the notion of the fellowship meal, accompanied by the symbolism of feeding on the Word. Radbert's doctrine appeared in the ninth century, not the tenth, but this error, which is stated again, is corrected elsewhere by a quotation of accurate dates for Paschius Radbert. The epoch-making controversy raised by Berengar in the eleventh century is not noticed, and we have the old suggestion that Transubstantiation was first formulated by Thomas Aquinas, whereas it sprang directly and immediately from the Berengarian dispute. Zwingli did not teach bare symbolism, he was not a mere memorialist, and Harnack's theory of Greek symbolism has been displaced for a decade or two.

Yet this book is a magnificent piece of eirenical writing. In no modern work on the Eucharist, issuing from Catholic circles, does the Evangelical attitude receive such sympathetic treatment. Moreover, it is abreast of modern investigation. It takes note of the uncertainty as to the actual words used by Christ at the institution. It emphasizes the importance of the teaching of St. John's Gospel, and of the necessity for relating the function of the Holy Spirit to the sacrament. It is a book which places every reader under a debt of gratitude to its author.

THE HISTORY OF THE CREEDS. By F. J. Badcock, D.D. *S.P.C.K.* 12*s.* 6*d.*

This is a book for students, and it is full of good and new things. It makes obsolete the historical sections of all previous works on the Creeds. Dr. Badcock presents a new theory of the origin of the Apostles' Creed, which has been developed in the last few years. Its final form, the "Textus Receptus," consists of an expansion of an already enlarged Roman baptismal creed, which took place at or near Lake Constance before the year 615. It was accepted at Rome before A.D. 900.

In his account of the Nicene Creed, Dr. Badcock takes a knowledge of Arianism and of the Christological controversies for granted.

The creed drawn up at Nicæa (325) was not derived solely from the Creed of Cæsarea, but from the creeds of all the leading Eastern churches—Cæsarea, Alexandria, Jerusalem and Antioch. The most revolutionary suggestion here lies in the inclusion of Arianizing Antioch as a source for orthodox creed-making. At Constantinople (381) not the Creed of Jerusalem, but a revised Creed of Constantinople was amalgamated with the earlier Nicene symbol, in order to meet the teaching of Apollinarius, Macedonius and Marcellus. Chalcedon (451) was content to confirm the Constantinopolitan symbol, which thus became our Nicene Creed, after certain clauses like the " filioque " had been added or amended in later times. The Nicene Creed was not officially sung in the Eucharist at Rome until 1014.

The author of the so-called Athanasian Creed was not Vincent of Lérins, but probably Ambrose. It could not have been drawn up much later than Ambrose's time because there is no reference to Nestorianism in it. But is this so ? If Nestorianism defined two persons in Christ as well as two natures and two essences, is there not a direct allusion to Nestorianism in the phrase " by unity of Person," and in the earlier phrase " yet he is not two, but one Christ " ? Moreover, may not the phrase " not by confusion of substance " reflect the influence of Eutychianism, which set up the one-nature doctrine, although, of course, substance did not mean nature ? If these suggestions are allowed, then the " Athanasian " statement, which may well have issued originally from Ambrose, was revised later, and perhaps in South Gaul at Lérins. It was not used at Rome until the eleventh century.

The book closes with a learned explanation of the phrase " the Communion of Saints." This means not communion with the saints, nor the fellowship of the church militant with the church triumphant, but the communion of the saints round the table of the Lord, and so with the reference to baptism in the Nicene Creed, brings the sacraments within the credal statements. No serious student can afford to overlook this book, although for devotional purposes Dr. Harold Smith's book on the creeds must still be read.

THE EVANGELICAL DOCTRINE OF HOLY COMMUNION. Edited by the Rev. A. J. Macdonald, D.D. Pp. vii + 330. *Heffer, Cambridge. 7s. 6d.*

This is a volume of historical and doctrinal essays of unique value and importance. The work has the marks of true scholarship. The reader is directed to first-hand sources of information, both in general at the close of each essay, and in detail in footnotes. The clearly expressed Evangelical view of each contributor is balanced by statements and examination of other views.

The first Essay (39 pp.), upon the New Testament evidence, is by the Ven. J. W. Hunkin, D.D., Archdeacon of Coventry. The writer examines afresh all the material. He shows the progress from the idea of a fellowship meal in the Synoptists and in Acts to the " sacred drama " in St. Paul by which is proclaimed the Lord's

We have here a strictly scientific study of Hebrew Religion, and no less than one hundred odd pages are devoted to its background, where the animistic and the polytheistic stages of religious development are discussed and their remnants in the Old Testament pointed out. The influence of Totemism, Ancestor Worship, Demonology and other primitive ideas is also debated. Much that is here written is disputed by various critics, but for further information we are referred to the standard treatises on the subjects dealt with.

In the second part of the book (pp. 131–224) we have an exposition of Israelite Religion from Moses to the Exile. This might well have been amplified, the treatment being disproportionate to the rest of the book; but the footnotes will help the student to sources which will supplement the slight sketch here given. Dr. Robinson is cautious in his treatment, a fair sample of which caution may be seen in his remarks on the Book of Deuteronomy (pp. 213–15). The final portion of the book deals with Judaism, and is mainly the work of Dr. Oesterley, who is thoroughly at home in his treatment of the subject to which he has devoted so long a study. The chapter on "The Priest-Prophet Ezekiel" is illuminating and makes us wish that he would contribute a long-wanted commentary on that prophet's book for English readers. His remarks on the results of Pharisaic influence and of the development of the Law as shown in the New Testament are singularly apt (pp. 363–66).

We recommend the book as a useful introduction to the study of the problems it deals with as well as those, not few in number, which it raises; and we are confident that the writers' hope that it may help to an understanding of the process of divine revelation which culminated in Jesus Christ will be fulfilled.

A. W. G.

The value of Fellowship has been increasingly recognized in recent years. Its systematic use has been tested by a body of thinkers and workers, and the result of the experience is given in the volume *Fellowship Principles and Practice*, by a Fellowship Group. Edited by Malcolm Spencer and H. S. Hewish (*George Allen & Unwin, Ltd.*, 7*s.* 6*d.* net). The volume has been in course of construction for three or four years, and has been submitted to rigid tests and criticisms by many friends and collaborators. It, therefore, presents what we may regard as the latest and best guide on the theory and practice of Fellowship. It embraces Fellowship of various kinds, but treats more particularly of the Fellowship of Christian Workers in dealing with problems of Church life and social progress. In a valuable series of Appendices, useful hints are given which serve as a guide to those who are anxious to adopt the Fellowship method in any Church or Community. It is recognized that through Fellowship far greater results can be achieved than in any other way, and the value of this book will be recognized by those who desire to adopt the Fellowship method.