

Theology on the Web.org.uk

Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible

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

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



Buy me a coffee

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



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

[PayPal](#)

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

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

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

THE STUDY OF CHRISTIANITY.

A Review by the Rev. F. R. MONTGOMERY HITCHCOCK, D.D.

AN INTRODUCTION TO THE STUDY OF CHRISTIANITY. By Frank Dodd.
George Allen & Unwin. 308 pp. 10s. 6d.

This would have been an invaluable work had the author supplied references to his more important quotations. What it lacks, however, in documentary value it gains in literary form, for it is most readable, interesting, and instructive. It covers a great space and always has something worth while to remark. It is not really intended for scholars—although it is scholarly—but for the man in the street. The book belongs to a category of its own. It is not by one or for one who assumes an unquestioning belief in the authority of divine inspiration; nor yet by or for a hostile critic. The former might study but would not be likely to criticize; the latter may criticize but has no obvious reason for studying. On page 288 he says: "There are to-day thousands of people who are unable to believe that the New Testament ought to be interpreted in a certain traditional manner, and that if they fail to interpret it so, God is no longer their Father and they are cut off from Spiritual life." He marks out for the especial object of this incursion into historical Christianity the Roman Church. The methods adopted by Russia to propagate Bolshevism enable us to understand the general lines on which medieval Christianity was imposed on the bulk of the people. He quotes a Russian professor on the methods of Lenin—"Creative philosophical thought cannot flourish in such an environment, and it amply accounts for the shuffling, the limitedness of Soviet philosophy, its petty sophistries, the reciprocal accusations and denunciations, the fundamental necessity of lying: neither talent nor genius can make any headway." And he applies this language to the Church of Innocent III and of Torquemada. The parallel, indeed, is remarkable, for in neither Russia nor in the Roman Church, wherever it holds sway, is there liberty of thought or action. The initial error in these and other totalitarian States, is the demand that all individuals should think alike. While members of the Christian Church should tend to think on the same general lines concerning religious matters, holding the faith in unity of spirit, in the bond of peace and in righteousness of life, "enforced unity of thought, so destructive of personality and intellectual advancement, is no desirable characteristic of the Church of Christ" (*see p. 293*). We note that this author, who deals with many controversial subjects, does not write to make converts, but to initiate a certain train of thought in the reader's mind. He suggests to those looking for exact information in the New Testament regarding our Lord's nature and the future life, that such exact information is not

necessary to men's happiness in the life to come, but that the New Testament does give a vast amount of instruction as to the method of Jesus, and it is this method that the disciple is called upon to follow. His inheritance as a son of God is not lost because of any erroneous idea he may hold about the Founder of the Faith, or the status of any ecclesiastic residing in Rome or elsewhere, provided he takes up his cross and follows Jesus. It is easy to teach children to repeat the statement that Jesus Christ was conceived of the Holy Ghost and born of the Virgin Mary, but not so easy "to explain how the indwelling of the Christ Spirit may affect their souls." This *apropos* of a hymn of Phillips Brooks: "O holy Child of Bethlehem . . . be born in us to-day." It is a fact that union with God through the indwelling Christ—one of the great Pauline truths—is overlooked to-day; but it is reasonable to believe that "as a result of the complete union between God and man, effected in the person of Jesus, the union (albeit less complete) between other human beings and God became in some transcendental manner greatly facilitated" (see p. 291). Dodd sometimes lapses into Adoptionism, as when he speaks of "one specially chosen human being who by divine ordinance and by *his own superlative merits* attained perfect union with the Godhead." But this is a small fault in a fine book.

The writer gives a rapid survey of the basic facts connected with the origin and growth of Christianity from the commencement of the public ministry of Jesus to the early thirteenth century, after which an examination is made of the principal factors which eventually brought about a decline in the power, spiritual and secular, of Christianity (he refers to Roman Christianity), considered as a formal institution. Finally, he suggests that the blemishes confronting the truth-seeker are due to human imperfection and to misunderstanding of the real teaching of Christ and his people rather than to any shortcomings in the Christian teaching itself. In the first Chapter, he discusses early Christian documents; in the second, the Pauline epistles—the earliest of these; in the third, the Synoptic Gospels; in the fourth, the fourth Gospel; in the fifth, the Christians as a Jewish sect; in the sixth, Christian propaganda and the crystallization of dogma; in the seventh—the best chapter of all—Christianity as an institution; in the eighth, Christianity of to-day. There are some appendices, the best being on the Albigenses, and toleration towards non-Roman (he writes "Catholic") bodies, which Pius VII regarded as a fatal blow to the Roman Catholic religion. The Pope wrote an apostolic letter in 1814 to the French Episcopate deploring the 22nd Article of the Constitution drawn up by Louis XVIII. It "causes us an extreme torment," he wrote, that this article not only "permits the *liberty of cults and of conscience*, but promises support and protection to this liberty and the ministers of what are called cults." By this liberty of the cults "truth is confounded with error and the Holy and Immaculate Bride of Christ, the Church out of which there can be no safety, is placed in the same rank as the heretical sects!" by which he meant Protestants. This he said could cause the Roman (he wrote "Catholic"!) faith an incurable wound. By a curious coincidence the reviewer of this work

copied out the above outburst on Guy Fawkes Day! Guy Fawkes admitted that he had tried to assassinate the King because the Pope had excommunicated him. The terrible fate of the Albigenses at the hands of Innocent III is glanced at. It is a pity that we only know of their doctrines from their enemies. But Dodd quotes a Roman, Dom Butler, on them. They were charged with Manichæism, a belief in two principles, one good, one evil, matter being evil, therefore marriage was to be avoided, meat was not to be eaten, and the possession of material goods was sinful. Dom Butler admits that Innocent III called on the Christian princes to suppress them by force, and "for seven years the south of France was devastated by one of the most bloodthirsty wars in history, the Albigenses being slaughtered in thousands and their property confiscated wholesale." Dodd points out that certain orders of the Roman church could be charged with the same offences. And as for dualism the R.C. religion is more exposed to the indictment as it maintains eternal punishment and the kingdom of Satan, whereas the Albigenses believed in the ultimate extinction of evil.

To return to the early chapters, on p. 16 he refers to the fact that the four evangelists "give what purports to be the Greek form" of the inscription on the cross and that it is different in each case. The differences are trivial and cannot establish that the passages are not genuine. Had they all given the same report, it might have been regarded as a case of collusions. The reviewer would note that there are similarly four forms of the inscription on the partition wall of the Temple. Josephus, B.J. v. 5. 2; B. J. vi. 2. 4 (Titus makes an appeal); Ant. xv. ii. 5; and the inscription on a stone found by M. Ganneau by the side of the Via Dolorosa in Jerusalem (*see* Lewin's St. Paul II, 135 and the British Museum). There is one important sentence to the effect that *no stranger should enter the enclosure*, and it is expressed differently in all four; there are three different words for "stranger," four different words for "enter," and four different words for "enclosure"! And yet all four statements are true. On the other hand, all four inscriptions in the Gospels have the one phrase: "The King of the Jews" which Pilate would have written himself. And compared with the other inscription the writers of this did attain a certain measure of verbal accuracy. They preserved the one formula that mattered; whereas the records of the other inscription did not.

Dodd has some interesting remarks on miracles. "We should not affirm categorically that events could not have taken place merely because we do not understand by what means such events could have been brought about." He deals with Dean Inge's statement that "the Catholic saints did not fly through the air," in view of the alleged phenomena of levitation performed by one D. D. Home. If genuine, such phenomena would not show a violation of nature but the use of a principle of nature of which we are almost ignorant. He refers to such extreme Roman statements as that of Newman's regarding the motion of the eyes of the picture of the Madonna in the Roman states, and the translation of the "Holy House" from Nazareth to Loreto. The Pope, Leo X, published a bull in 1518 formally recognizing the

legend. No wonder he regarded the Roman form of Christianity as "*une fable convenue*." On p. 140, Dodd points out that the Virgin of Loreto lost her popularity when the papal troops were defeated there in 1860, and that "our Lady of Lourdes" took her place! And he compares the worship of the one Virgin under many different forms by the Roman Church with the worship of the Trinity! This is really absurd. The doctrine of the Trinity is metaphysical, as well as scriptural; but the cult of the Virgin under various forms is superstition without any philosophical or scriptural basis.

Discussing the Pauline Epistles he rightly emphasizes the mysticism of the Apostle, the dominating note of whose writings is union with God—"He who is joined to the Lord is one Spirit" (1 Cor. vi. 17). "I live, yet not I, but Christ lives in me." His longing for union with the Divine Christ is expressed in his oft-repeated phrase "in Christ." Paul has frequent references to initiation and the mysteries (*see* Colossians). He describes himself in an ecstasy in 2 Cor. xii. 1-6. The reviewer remarks that Philo gives us the word and thing. He describes four types of ecstasy, the fourth being divine possession, when the Divine Spirit takes possession of the personality and in that ecstasy the soul reaches the true end of its being—the pure apprehension of God. "For the goal of bliss is the advent of God who draws near, filling the entire soul with all his incorporeal and eternal light." When such a thing happens to a man he is truly a man in Christ, a man of God, as Paul was.

There is much in the Pauline epistles that recalls Philo, who was familiar with the mystery-cults, and his yearning for "a clear vision of the Uncreated so as to apprehend Him for himself." That Paul was a student of Philo's writings before his own conversion is a possibility that must be considered. The language of the Paulines and also of the Pastorals is 80 per cent Philonian even to the particles and unusual terms, and use of allegory. All this is the reviewer's suggestion. A fine appreciation of St. Paul's work as missionary and organizer, concludes with this well-merited tribute: "It was the writings of Paul which survived as the chief witness to the fundamental principle of the indwelling Christ in the individual soul" (p. 32).

The Synoptic Gospels are next considered. Some interesting remarks are made. He well says that "the narrators have not taken any pains to compose an artificial and plausible story" (p. 47). There was no collusion among the writers, as fair-minded critics must allow. Papias (p. 140) gave an account of St. Mark's Gospel. Dodd's summary of it is very inaccurate. He writes: "Papias tells us that Mark, who was a follower and interpreter of Peter, recorded after the latter's decease the words of Christ and the narratives of his deeds that he (Mark) had heard the Apostle deliver." Now Papias said: "Mark having become the interpreter of Peter wrote down accurately everything that he remembered, not however, recording in order what was said or done by Christ." He did not say "*after Peter's decease*." The origin of that phrase is a misinterpretation of Irenæus (iii. 1. 2. *Adv. Haer.*). "Peter and Paul preaching the Gospel in Rome and founding the Church. After the departure (exodus) of these men, Mark handed down to us in writing what Peter preached." The *departure* is not

death in this case. Paul was not executed at the end of his imprisonment in Rome. Clement of Alexandria (in a fragment of his *Institutions*, Potter 1004), states that "Peter knew what was done and was pleased and authorized the writing for reading in the Churches." Eusebius vi. 14. 6, says the same thing, that Peter "when he heard of it did not prevent it." In II. 15. 2, he published the above extract from Clement. Accordingly, we may argue that it was not after Peter's decease that Mark wrote the Gospel. Eusebius takes Babylon in Peter's first Epistle to be Rome. "The joint-elect church in Babylon salutes you and Mark my son."

Dodd allows the fourth Gospel to be the work of an eye-witness, but says, "the author was probably not one of the twelve apostles, and was almost certainly not John the Son of Zebedee" (p. 68). "One fact is clear and that is that the writer deliberately withholds such information as would enable us to identify him with certainty. A reason can be suggested why Lazarus should have done so, but why should John have so acted?" He suggests that Lazarus is the disciple Jesus loved, because his sisters spoke of him as "(he) whom thou lovest" (*phileis*); whereas "the disciple whom Jesus loved" (*egapa*) is the expression generally identified with John the disciple. See xix. 26; xxi. 20; xiii. 23, where a different word for "love" (*agapan*) is used (in xx. 2 ["the other disciple whom Jesus loved"] *philein* is employed), but we have to take into account the fact that Lazarus is not called anywhere a "disciple" in this Gospel and that our Lord used these terms *philein* and *agapan* (which is not used of Lazarus) with a difference. See his questioning of Peter in xxi. 15: "Do you love me (*agapas*)?" "Thou knowest that I love (*philo*) thee." "Do you love me (*agapas*)?" "Thou knowest that I love thee (*philo*)." "Do you love (*phileis*) me?" "Thou knowest that I love (*philo*) thee." Peter would not claim the more exalted form of love (*agapan*), which our Lord cherished for the unnamed disciple. This reviewer maintains that an excellent case can be made out for the Johannine authorship. All the authorities of the second century and later, Greek and Latin, are unanimous in holding it. Both external and internal evidence are so strong in its favour, that it would require the discovery of a first century authoritative document to shake it. Nowhere else is the link so clear as that between John the Apostle, Polycarp his pupil, and Irenæus his pupil, who frequently mentions the Johannine authorship. Irenæus is followed by Origen, Clement of Alexandria, the Gnostic Acts of John (second century), Hippolytus, Tertullian, the Muratorian Fragment. Dr. Bernard (I.C.C. i. lx.) holds that the Gospel and the Johannine epistles were written by John the Presbyter. So does this reviewer, and so doubtless would Papias, who called the Apostles, presbyters. It is Eusebius who goes wrong and says Papias mentions two Johns. What he does is to mention John a second time. Papias wrote: "When one appeared who had followed the presbyters, I would inquire about the discourses of the presbyters, what Andrew, or Peter, or Philip, or Thomas, or James, or John, or what any other of the Lord's disciples said, and what Aristion and the presbyter John, disciples of the Lord said." Eusebius alters

this to : " Papias confesses that he received the words of the *apostles from those who had followed them*," altering the " presbyters " of Papias into " apostles." Again he called Philip " the apostle," Papias called him presbyter. Thus the elders (presbyters) are identified with *apostles* by Eusebius. Accordingly, John Presbyter is really John Apostle. Had they been different persons, it would have been known to Origen, Clement, Irenæus, and Tertullian. Papias also adheres to the Johannine order Andrew, Peter, Philip. Eusebius quotes the very words of Papias, substituting " apostles " for " elders," showing that he believed both words indicated the same persons. The internal evidence points to a disciple who deliberately withheld not only his own name from the very beginning where it is implied in i. 42, but his mother's and his brother's, and preferred to be known as " the disciple whom Jesus loved." We gather too, from the fact that he called the Baptist simply John, not John the Baptist, as the Synoptists do, that his name was John, not feeling as the Synoptists did, the necessity of distinguishing himself from his former Master, so sure of his identity was he. Why did he withhold his name? He evidently preferred the more intimate description—" the disciple whom Jesus loved." Thirteen times in his Gospel he refers to himself as " *the* disciple!" and to none of the other apostles in the same direct way. This explains why Papias referred to him among *the disciples* of the Lord, after mentioning him with six other " presbyters." (Compare the " seven " disciples fishing on the lake in c. xxi. Both lists have Peter, Thomas, James and John; " the two other disciples " were probably Philip and Andrew, also here.)

He preferred to be like his former Master, the Baptist—" *a Voice* " only. Even if his brother apostles wished him " to write everything in his own name, the others revising (or certifying)," (Muratorian Fragment), he had learned by the stern but loving discipline of the Cross to efface himself, and to surrender whatever claims he and his brother and mother might have had to precedence owing to their blood relationship with the Master, which they had foolishly pressed in his younger days to the great annoyance of the other apostles. This is " Why John acted so."

Many high authorities, Salmon, Zahn, etc., hold that there were not two Johns in Ephesus. Irenæus knew of only one John of Ephesus, the disciple of the Lord who reclined upon his shoulder (III. I. I). Polycrates of Ephesus does not know of two. Origen, the Acts of John, Clement, and Tertullian only knew of one John, the Apostle. Bernard, in support of his theory ventured upon the wild interpretation of *grapsas*, as " dictated " ! " This was the disciple who ' *dictated* ' these things ! " (2I. 24). This absurdity has been confuted by the present reviewer in *J. T. S.*, April 1930. The Muratorian Fragment supports the Johannine authorship adding that all the apostles certified (or revised), *recognoscere* having both meanings. Dodd drags up the old exploded argument that there was an attempt in this Gospel to belittle Peter in favour of the unnamed disciple. See Westcott's Introduction, which shows the falsity of it (p. xxiii.). Dodd would have us believe that Lazarus was the unnamed disciple. We can hardly

believe that our Lord on the Cross said to him : " Behold thy Mother." Words which might, however, well have been said to John, whose own mother, Salome, the sister of the Virgin was present, and with whom she, the devoted adherent of the Master, was in perfect sympathy. Neither was the apostle John the ignorant fisherman Dodd would have him to be. He was connected with a priestly house ; hence he was known to the high priest. He was a keen observer—sharper witted than Peter, but always allowing the older man to make the first move. A young man that was bound to go far if he got the opportunity of study and leisure, and who was as his interview with Cerinthus in later days proved, the John, the Son of Zebedee, one of the Boanerges of the Synoptists. Dodd would explain the miracle of Lazarus as due to the exercise of psychic power (p. 62). We know that on another occasion our Lord remarked that power had gone out of him. We note certain errors in translation, e.g. " God was the Word," where God is predicate, not subject ; " God is a Spirit," which should be " God is Spirit " (not a Spirit, one of many) ; " *the* beginning of the Gospel of Jesus Christ," which should be " *a* beginning " as there is no article. He also has a wrong rendering of " he that is joined to the Lord is one Spirit " (i.e. with Him). But these are small things which do not disfigure in any way this fine book. What one might regard more seriously is his saying : " It seems fair to conclude that there must have been on the part of the disciples an *a priori* disposition, doubtless largely sub-conscious, to believe that Jesus would be restored to them." " They were apparently disposed to welcome any allegation of the Master's presence." But see Luke xxiv. 11. The news the women brought was regarded as a *silly tale*, and they did not believe them. John xx. 8 : " They understood not the scripture that he must rise from the dead " (cf. Peter and John), " Some doubted " (Matthew xxviii. 17). Thomas, who took a leading part towards the end had no predisposition of the kind. And his was the grandest confession of all, and with it the Gospel concluded originally.

Dodd's explanation of our Lord's personality is gnostic rather than patristic. The Gnostic heretics taught that the Aeon Christ descended on Jesus in his Baptism as a dove (Iren. *Adv. Haer.* I. 7. 2 ; also I. 26. 1). This Irenæus says was the teaching of Cerinthus, to whom John said : " I recognize thee for the firstborn of Satan," and against whose teaching he is said to have written his Gospel. Irenæus says (III. 17. 2) : " The apostles could have said that Christ descended upon Jesus, but they did not say it or know it, what they said was, ' the Spirit of God descended as a dove upon him ' " (cf. Isaiah xi. 2). Dodd writes (p. 291) : " It seems to be something more than a tenable hypothesis that in the fullness of time the Almighty Father specially chose one human being, who, on account of his superlative merits became the vehicle of the Christ Spirit, and to borrow the language of Paul of Samosata : ' coalesced with God, so as to admit no divorce from him,' etc." Now Paulus was condemned by many synods for heresy against the divinity of our Lord, for holding that he was a mere man, who developed a divinity out of manhood. The theory of the

Adoptionists that Jesus was specially selected to be the Son of God, was also frequently condemned. Eusebius says that Paulus did not like the idea of a pre-existent Soul of God. Paulus prohibited the singing of psalms to Christ being hostile to his divinity, and ordered that they should be sung to himself!

Again, when discussing Origen's teaching, Dodd says he believed that "the Logos who is co-existent with the Father from all eternity, accomplished union with a specially selected human soul" (p. 177). But surely something requires to be added here as our Lord had a perfect human nature, according to Church teaching. "The God Word was so united with the man Christ Jesus through the human soul as to be one person." This is Westcott's summary of his teaching. (D. C. B. Origen, p. 136). "No one has done so much," Westcott says, "to harmonize the fullest acknowledgment of the perfect humanity of the Lord and of his perfect divinity in one Person. His famous image of the 'glowing iron' made an epoch in Christology." Discussing our Lord's Baptism, Dodd prefers the reading in Luke iii. 22—"Thou art my beloved Son, this day have I begotten thee" (cf. Ps. ii. 7) stated not to be found in the oldest MSS, (Augustine *de cons. Evang.* ii. 4), to "in thee I am well pleased" (the correct reading), following Moffat's erroneous translation—"Thou art my Son, to-day have I become thy Father." He says, "The version of St. Luke is specially noteworthy because it indicates quite unmistakably that the author regarded Jesus as having been reborn on the occasion of his Baptism." But it is distinctly against Church teaching—not that Dodd would mind—to understand "Thou art my Son," as signifying: "Thou art my Son from this hour." The voice did not make him either Son or Messiah. It was like the proclamation of or anointing of a King, who was already king. It came to Jesus as the seal of his Messiahship, the final and convincing proof of his Sonship, which sent him forth on his public ministry. Dodd well observes with regard to our Lord's miracles of healing that "few really educated people to-day would affirm that the events described are absolutely incredible" (p. 41). "It is not unreasonable to expect that a man specially illuminated for an unique divine mission would be endowed to a superlative degree with such powers over the physical and mental health of his fellow beings." His remarks on the Baptism are not consonant with the Scriptures or the Creeds, but are nevertheless interesting. "Jesus," he says, "became in virtue of his Baptism, a new creature, in that he was thereby definitely endued with the Spirit, or in other words he became 'in Christ.'" This is to assert either a double personality—the Nestorian error; or Monophysitism—the error of Eutyches. "*Es klingt falsch.*" (Nestorius has been rehabilitated).

Many other remarks in the course of this work are open to criticism; but we have to pass on to some of his statements in "Christianity as an Institution," where he deals effectively with the Petrine claims. He refers to the fact that the same powers, as Origen points out, were promised to all the apostles; that "upon this rock I will build my church," as John Chrysostom maintained, means "on the faith of Peter's confession." Dodd himself says well, "the truth that Jesus is

the Christ is the Rock (*petra*). Peter himself being only a stone (*petros*)." Augustine, in his later days held that. Dodd remarks that "it would be less misleading to say that Jesus founded his Church on the Baptist than that he founded it on Peter." An intelligent man hearing for the first time that our Lord built his Church upon Peter would understand that Peter was the earlier and greater teacher and that Jesus borrowed his teaching. The absurdity of saying that our Lord built his Church upon Peter is at once realized when we visualize the relation of a builder to his foundation. Certainly such an idea is not reconcilable with the Revelation of St. John, or the Pauline Epistles (Galatians iv. 11), or Acts xv. But Roman theologians have been led, in their misguided zeal for the aggrandisement of their own See to take up the position that the pastorate of souls was given to Peter alone; and that whatever authority the apostles and other Christian officials possess, they derive directly through Peter. Leo (Bishop of Rome 440—461) expressed that idea. Mr. Dodd subjects that claim to a thoroughgoing analysis in a legal manner and exposes its falseness and the injury it has inflicted on Christianity through the exaltation of the temporal power of the popes into a sort of super-kingdom of Christendom. This reviewer would lodge a protest against the use of the words "Catholic" and "non-Catholic" of which even the writers of a recent evangelical compilation have been guilty. What do they mean when in the Church of England Services they say, "I believe in the Holy Catholic Church"; and "We pray for the good estate of the Catholic Church"? They should read the article "Catholic" in the recently revised Protestant Dictionary. The word means universal. At an early stage it was used interchangeably with orthodox; and is employed of the Apostles' and Nicene creeds, as contrasted with Arianism, and in the Athanasian creed of the Church doctrines of the Holy Trinity, and Incarnation. In the early Church the catholicity of a particular Church was tested by its conformity with the teaching that was held, "*semper, ubique et ab omnibus*" (the Vincentian Canon), but in the Roman Church by its readiness to conform with its traditions and its ever-increasing claims, inventions, usurpations, and novelties of doctrine; and by certain Anglo-Catholics the word is used of any mediæval doctrine or practice they can introduce. It is distinctly wrong to call a man Catholic, or to allow him to claim the title against others who may have a better right to it because he belongs to one section rather than to another of the Church universal. We must not surrender the word Catholic to the Roman Church. Its proper title, according to Father Murray, Professor of Dogmatic Theology, at Maynooth (writing to Dr. Pusey in 1846) is "Roman Catholic." See also Di Bruno, *Catholic Belief*, 6th edition, p. 240. In the Creed of Pius IV, the Roman Church is Holy, Catholic, Apostolic and *Roman*. The Church of England is at once Catholic because it holds the Catholic faith embodied in the Creeds, and is part of the Universal Church, and Protestant because it holds the faith in its purity free from the corruptions and novelties of the Roman Church whose doctrine of papal infallibility, to mention one out of many, is distinctly anti-catholic and sectarian.

To return to Mr. Dodd, he also used the word Christian in a way we challenge. On p. 216, he remarks "Gregory VII argued that the Pope is to the Emperor as the sun is to the moon, and Innocent III similarly affirmed that the priest is as much above the King as the soul is above the body. *The history of the Christian religion is largely an attempt to apply these theories to practice.*" On p. 214 he used the expression "Roman Church" correctly and asserted that the Albigenses, while becoming anti-sacerdotal fully retained their Christian beliefs! With some revision the chapter (VII): "Christianity as an Institution," which is largely an interesting and learned account of the growth of papal power and its setbacks, and also of Mahometanism and its conflicts with Christianity, and of mediæval philosophy and scholasticism, might well be published as a separate volume. On p. 270 he wrongly represents Protestant ministers as trying to make their flocks believe in the literal truth of Genesis I, and the creation of the world in six successive days. The force of this grand creation film lies in its caption—"In the Beginning God." Its climax is the creation of a God-like creature, man. The order of the scenes that pass before us is not contrary to the order of science. Genesis i. must be taken as a poem and a sublime one (see Longinus). Protestantism is by no means synonymous with obscurantism. The most erudite men of the Empire are Protestants. While free to accept or reject the Darwinian theory of man's origin, the majority of Protestants, educated ones I mean, believe in an orderly progress and growth under the direction of the guiding Spirit of God. It is however, a matter of regret that Protestants of the Church are so casual about their religion. The devotion of the Roman Catholics to their religion puts us to shame. There may be an explanation for this not flattering to the sincerity of the Roman See, but the fact remains that Churchmen must take a keener interest in their religion and their Church, unless they are prepared to surrender their place in the sun to others much less worthy of it.

GOWANBRAES. By Margaret P. Neill. *Thynne & Co., Ltd.* 3s. 6d.

In producing a story which carries the reader on in anticipation, Miss Neill has shown us that a Christian novel need be neither dull nor heavy. The book has a connected plot which steadily unfolds itself. Just as Stevenson in *Treasure Island* made the villainous Captain Flint the dominating personality of his tale, although he never appears in person, so Miss Neill has made the crafty and cunning old Fraser the power behind the plot, although he appears upon the scene only to set the plot in motion and to die.

The characters are well drawn, although the conclusion of their lives is fairly obvious from the first. Yet our authoress reserves a surprise for the last chapters. Mrs. Westlake and Mirren are delightful studies; their naturalness and common sense go straight to human hearts. The scenes which are laid in India have a distinctly authentic local colour which make them pleasant reading. The one illustration, which also appears on the jacket, is not calculated to give the best introduction to the novel. The book should have a wide appeal and a good circulation.

E. H.