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

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

The Churchman Advertiser.

JANUARY—MARCH, 1939.

CONTENTS.

THE CHURCHMAN

January—March, 1939.

NOTES AND COMMENTS.

"The Churchman."

ONCE more, as a New Year opens before us, comes an opportunity of thanking our readers for the continued support which they have given to us and for the many messages of appreciation and encouragement which we frequently receive. We look forward with confidence to a continuance of that support and encouragement during the years that are to come, and especially hope that our readers will help to increase the influence of THE CHURCHMAN by making it known among their friends and inducing them to become subscribers. Each section of ecclesiastical and theological opinion has its organ or organs in the Press, and THE CHURCHMAN is the only quarterly magazine which affords an opportunity for the expression and exposition of the principles of Evangelical Churchmen. It, therefore, fills an important and, indeed, a necessary place in current Church literature. The principles of the Reformation and their manifestation in the contemporary life of the Church of England are being challenged and attacked in all directions, and their best defence is to make them known and understood. The Commemorations of 1938 were, at their first inception, intended to give a large place to the Reformation and its great value in the religious and national life of this country. By degrees, however, attention became focussed upon the Bible in our mother-tongue as the noblest achievement of the Reformation, and its greatest legacy to posterity, and the movement itself received only a small share of attention. It was, probably, on the whole, the better course to concentrate upon one thing at a time. But the debt of both Church and Nation to the Reformation is so great and of so enduring a character that this side of the Commemoration must not be allowed to drop out of sight. In the present number of THE CHURCHMAN we give an article by the Rev. P. H. Scott on the influence of the Bible on the Reformation and we hope during this year to give further articles on the movement as a whole, its principles, its chief promoters, and its contribution to the cause of true religion and individual liberty.

The International Crisis.

The beginning of another year always suggests a twofold ground for reflection. We may look forward with hope and resolve afresh to avoid the mistakes which so often have marred our best endeavours in the past ; and we may glance backward to note the many occasions of thanksgiving for the way in which we have been guided in the year that has now gone from us. And one of these occasions for thankfulness is that we have been spared the iniquity and horror of another European war, and that we, in this land, have enjoyed in peace, the season which is given to the thought of glory to God in the highest, and on earth peace, goodwill towards men. As time passes, the greatness of Mr. Neville Chamberlain's achievement does not grow less. It was not so much that he earnestly desired peace. Others, as *The Times* reminded us recently, had desired it with equal intensity before him. It was more that he showed that peace must be actively worked for if it was to be attained. And the strength of the welcome with which he was received by the people of Germany showed how little the great mass of them desired war and how eagerly they hailed the prospect of averting it. A few years ago Sir Philip Gibbs made a tour of the countries which had been involved in the last war. He avoided official circles and great personages, confining his intercourse to the common people—the middle classes, tradesmen and working folk. Everywhere he found but one sentiment expressed, whether it was in France, in Germany, in Italy or in Eastern Europe, no one desired another war. Mr. Chamberlain's reception at Munich and elsewhere brought this fact into the light of day and showed that so far as the people of Germany are concerned there is no real antagonism to England, in spite of the propaganda of suspicion and distrust to which they have been subjected.

Religious and Racial Persecution.

The evidence of many people who have visited Germany is that outside extreme Nazi circles there is little sympathy with what is being done there against the Jews and against the Confessional Church, but the avenues for freedom of expression are closed, and outsiders know only what is officially stated through the Press and by other means. With every desire to promote friendly relations with Germany, the barbarous treatment of which the Jews have been the unhappy victims, seriously strains the situation. The nature of evil is to destroy itself in the end ; and such treatment will bring a stern retribution to those who are its authors. In the meantime, it is our bounden duty to extend all the sympathy and help we can give to relieve the sufferings of those who have been so grievously afflicted. The most serious aspect of the situation, in which Christians of every country are deeply concerned, is the overthrow by the ruling caste in Germany of the Christian ideal of love for all men and of the equality of all men before God, and the setting up of a racial and paganized form of religion, which recognizes no agency but brute force for the attainment of its

ends. If civilization is to be saved from destruction, it is for the members of all the Christian Churches to find a means of restoring the belief that it is only by spiritual and moral influences that a people or nation can become great in any real sense. It is still true that righteousness exalteth a nation and that sin is a reproach to any people.

The Bible Commemoration.

The year which has just closed has witnessed a serious attempt to bring the Bible to the notice of the people of this country. That so considerable an effort should have been needed is a strange comment on the statement of the historian J. R. Green that in the reign of Elizabeth, England had become a people of one book and that book the Bible. And yet it is very largely true that while much lip service is rendered to the greatness and value of the Bible, it is practically an unknown book to the great majority of English people. All competent observers unite, from many points of view, in deploring this. Not many years ago a Government Department, the Board of Education, issued a lengthy Report on "The teaching of English in England" which contained a section of several pages on the value of the Bible as a medium for familiarizing young people with great English writing. It is true that the Bible has other purposes than this, but it has so much power that it will effect those purposes if it is only really known and read. The Commemoration of 1938 was very successful in concentrating a large amount of general attention upon the Bible, and much literature on the subject was produced, not all of it equally good, but on the whole excellent. But to draw attention to the Bible is only a beginning. If the movement is to have any permanent value, it must be followed up by a further movement with the object of encouraging the clergy to preach more from and about the Bible so that their congregations may desire to read it for themselves. Their curiosity and interest must be aroused before they can be led to do this. Exhortations to read it as a duty or on general grounds will rarely attract or influence people. But if their minister shows that he himself knows his Bible and finds it the most interesting and vital book in the world and will familiarize them with its contents, they will soon seek a closer acquaintance with the treasures it contains.

The Neglect of the Bible.

From whatever cause it arises, we cannot doubt the fact that except in a limited circle the Bible is comparatively little read and consequently little known, even by Christian people. A kind of general acquaintance with the more prominent incidents and teachings of Scripture, most congregations possess, but this knowledge, largely second-hand, has little vital force and produces little effect in their daily life. We have it on the testimony of the late Dr. Peake that "One of the most ominous signs in the life of the churches at the present time is the ignorance of Scripture which meets us on every hand"; and he says further,

" The consequences of this neglect are disastrous. It is unquestionable that neglect of the Bible is coincident with a lowered spiritual vitality. Even those who are members of the Church, and take their profession with some measure of seriousness, are too often tempted to imagine that their spiritual growth will largely take care of itself. At any rate, they are not keen and eager to foster it, hence their Bible reading tends to become perfunctory. Their ' daily portion,' if they have one, is something to be got through rather than embraced as a precious opportunity of storing new force and winning new insight." The consequences of this are not merely those which affect the individuals themselves. " The preacher is largely paralysed when his people have given up the habit of Bible study." This testimony could be strengthened indefinitely by utterances to the same effect from a multitude of preachers and students of Scripture of all shades of opinion. In recent times there have been many expressions with regard to the need of a revival of religion in this country. The Archbishop of Canterbury's recall to religion, of two years ago ; the stimulating book of the Rev. W. Thompson Elliott, entitled *Back to God*, and a great cloud of witnesses in the last few years, by speech and pen testify to the need of revival if religion is even to survive the hindrances and antagonisms of modern life. But we have all the means for such revival at our disposal and we cannot reasonably expect that God will work a miracle to make up for our neglect of them. He has spoken to us through His Word and has no other or different message if we put that on one side and fail to read or to use it. It has a vitality and energizing power which will soon make itself felt if it is only given the opportunity. It is for this reason that the clergy will do wisely if in 1939 they follow up the Commemoration of 1938 by devoting a large part of their preaching to this pressingly urgent question. " It is not a vain thing for you, because it is your life."

GRIMSHAW OF HAWORTH.

By the Rev. JOHN C. HIRST, M.A.
(*Rector of Haworth*).

"LET us now praise famous men, and our fathers that begat us . . . men renowned for their power . . . leaders of the people . . . wise and eloquent in their instructions . . . all these were honoured in their generations, and were the glory of their times." A successor of William Grimshaw may be expected to remember him specially on recalling these words; and to praise one who is unquestionably the greatest, even if not the best known, of his predecessors is something of a pious duty.

Grimshaw's greatness is obscured for two—perhaps more—reasons: first, to most people he is only known from casual mention in Mrs. Gaskell's *Life of Charlotte Brontë*, as the biographer gives a short account of the surroundings in which the famous sisters lived, and second, the current traditions about Grimshaw are mostly concerned with oddities of method and behaviour, as for example his use of the whip to "whip in" the loafers and truants of his parish while his people in church sang Psalm cxix. to allow the parson to make his round of the inns and places for loitering. In this respect, the writer may have been fortunate in having made his first acquaintance with Haworth through Bishop J. C. Ryle's sketch of Grimshaw in *Christian Leaders*, though this must be the exception, not the rule.

Nearly two hundred years have passed since Grimshaw came to Haworth in 1742, so no "living memories" can be called into service for our purpose, nor have we much written material that Grimshaw prepared for publication, he himself saying, "I have as little leisure for writing as for anything I do." There are certain entries that he made in the church registers—over and above the record of baptisms, etc., which are all made carefully, and in a very legible hand—to these "extra" entries reference will be made later, though they do not provide much material for this modest account of his life and work. The scarcity of material is embarrassing, yet inevitable, since Grimshaw was primarily a man of action; and a successful evangelist is not likely to leave much of a tangible memorial behind. Still a man who was honoured with the confidence and affection of the two Wesleys, Whitefield, John Newton, and many other worthies was no ordinary man, even though his sphere for nearly twenty-one years was a rather remote village in the West Riding of Yorkshire.

Grimshaw's Youth and Education.

It is easily forgotten that this man who left his mark on the rough and rustic life of eighteenth century Haworth was a man who had had the benefit and discipline of a course at Cambridge: his college was Christ's, but Newton[1] hints that the proficiency he acquired was not in

[1] The references are almost entirely to Newton's *Life of Grimshaw* (1799).

good and sound divinity, but in wickedness. Newton's further comment is perhaps noteworthy : " while a college testimonial, in which more regard is paid to literary attainments than to principles and morals, is considered as a sufficient prerequisite for admission to holy orders ; we cannot wonder that many young men undertake the cure of souls, without being duly aware of the importance of the charge " (p. 8).

Under the date, May 18th, 1742, Grimshaw records his entry into office at Haworth, and gives a short sketch of his previous career. The following entry is made twice in the registers—in different volumes: " The Revd. William Grimshaw, A.B. of Xt's Coll : Camb : succeeded the Revd. Mr. Isaac Smith, A.M., last Incumbent deceas'd in the Parochial Curacy of Haworth, having been Minister of ye Parochial Curacy of Todmorden in ye County of Lancaster 10 years and 9 months. He was born in Brindle near Preston in the County aforesaid—and was educated at the Free School of Blackburn by Mr. George Smith, Headmaster thereof for some years : but was afterwards Removed to the ffree School of Heskin and put under ye care of Mr. Thomas Johnson, Headmaster thereof and from thence he was sent to and admitted Member of ye University and College above mentioned.

" Witness my Hand,
" William Grimshaw,
" Min : de Haworth."

Lancastrians will note with some satisfaction that it was one of themselves who really mastered the sturdy and stubborn folk of eighteenth century Haworth. More to our purpose is the fact that Grimshaw evidently thought his youth and early education worthy of mention in detail. Spence Hardy, his Methodist biographer, quotes him (p. 4) as saying, " I think it concerns all people to take notice that the Holy Ghost begins with us in our infancy, to draw us by His convictive influences towards conversion. This I can bear witness to, and am persuaded that if any man will but carefully recollect himself, he can date, as far back as his infancy, the remembrance of many sharp rebukes and upbraidings . . . for having done amiss. He can very well remember several awful and heart-affecting thoughts about a God, and judgment, death, and eternity, etc., in those tender years." It will be noted too, that he makes no reference to his ordination to the Curacy of Rochdale in 1731 ; still, he was there but a few months, going thence to Todmorden in September of the same year.

This, however, is even more to our purpose, that it was a very different Grimshaw who began his ministry at Haworth from the Grimshaw who went to Todmorden. The difference comes out, incidentally and quaintly, in an entry in the Haworth register under the date January, 1742 (3) : for after seven months his congregation was so large that the church was found too small to hold the numbers, and something needed to be done to meet the situation which had arisen. Grimshaw began a record in the register, which he broke off for a fresh start, thinking the wording needed improvement—" In a Vestry whereof Notice was given in our Church of Haworth . . . we, the Minister, Church Wardens, Freeholders and other inhabitants of

Haworth Parish aforesaid, do for the more open and orderly attendance of the publick Worship of Almighty God" (the first entry here continues, 'wherein we are greatly interrupted and disturbed by out commers from Divers parishes,) wherein we are in the said Church greatly interrupted by too exceeding a Congregation of people, agree consent and determine yt ye said Church be enlarged to (*sic*) Bays eastward . . . and we do permit William Grimshaw ye Minister to undertake ye Accomplishing of ye said Enlargement . . . provided and upon Condition yt ye said Whole Undertaking be accomplished without any Manner of Lay Tax or other Imposition whatever being laid upon any person . . . within the said Parish of Haworth, excepting what proceeds from the Generosity of the said People. . . ." This entry reveals the pastor, the very cautious character of his new flock, and the deep impression he had soon made on an unimpressionable folk, even beyond the limits of his district, for it must be owned that he entered into no spiritual heritage from Isaac Smith, who had been involved in trouble with the Vicar of Bradford, and in litigation with his parishioners, on which he had spent considerable sums recorded in the register. Still, that was not the worst thing by any means. The roughness and brutality of the people needed to be matched by the physical and spiritual strength of a Grimshaw.

Grimshaw's Spiritual Development.

The question must be asked, and answered, regarding the great change that had come over Grimshaw between 1731 and 1742. For some time Grimshaw was no different from the average parson of the time ; he had a certain regard for his character, so as to guard against profane swearing and excess in drinking when in company with those who disliked these practices, but he was under no restraint with respect to the more decent modes of dissipation, and went on, unconcerned for his own salvation or that of his people for three or four years. Newton (p. 11) mentions 1734 as the date at which he was "powerfully awakened and alarmed, and . . . began to be concerned in good earnest for the salvation of his soul." In 1738, we find him solemnly entering into covenant with God and doing so *in writing* : a practice which he seems to have found helpful all through his life to the very end. The dates should be noted, for Hardy claims that only after he had come into closer union with the Methodists did he enter into the fulness of the privilege of the sons of God. Bishop Ryle disagrees with this as claiming too much ; for Grimshaw's spiritual development was begun long before John Wesley's conversion in 1738, and though he doubtless profited much in later years from fellowship with the Wesleys, his conversion seems to have been somewhat prior to that of John Wesley, but independent of it.

At the same time, we must notice that there were further stages in Grimshaw's continuous growth in grace. He himself refers to "that wonderful manifestation of Thyself unto me, at Church, and in the clerk's house, between the hours of ten and two o'clock on

Sunday, September 2nd, 1744." There is some difficulty in discovering the precise nature of this revelation, and Newton (p. 32) is quite reluctant about accepting a description of it given in the *Evangelical Magazine* for November 1794. Indeed, Newton says, " I have had several long and interesting conversations with Mr. Grimshaw, but never heard him mention it," while his intimate friends surviving in 1799 were unacquainted with the details of the description in question. His " covenants " are more definite indications of his growth, and are dated August 8th, 1744, and December 4th, 1752. This 1752 covenant was most solemnly renewed on June 5th, 1760, and every quarter after that with fasting.

Many things were used in God's providence to bring about this growth in grace, which seems to have been largely independent of human ministry, partly because " he had no liberty in his mind to speak " of his troubles and partly because " he did not know that his case was far from singular," but rather assumed that it was unique. Sorrow and bereavement, the loss of his first wife, inability to help men in their distress, but above all the study of the Scriptures and perseverance in prayer, with a readiness to receive God's revelation of His truth through the Word, brought to the seeker slowly but very surely an experience like St. Paul's. After careful observance of " duty," he came to know what it was to trust Christ as Saviour, and to be freely justified by faith in Him.

This ever-growing experience gave the new minister of Haworth a Gospel such as his people had never before heard ; hence the striking response from them, and from people of neighbouring parishes.

Grimshaw : Evangelist and Pastor.

It is a striking thing that Grimshaw fulfilled his ministry so worthily. A man like him might easily have become an evangelist to the relative neglect of pastoral work, but he became an " all-rounder." He was called to evangelize a rough and independent people, and a method suited to the needs and circumstances of his charge had to be found and adopted. " Many of my hearers who are wicked and careless, are likewise very ignorant, and very slow of apprehension. If they do not understand me, I cannot hope to do them good : and when I think of the uncertainty of life . . . I know not how to be explicit enough ; . . . I express the same thought in different words, and can scarcely tell how to leave off lest I should have omitted something, for the want of which my preaching and their hearing might prove in vain " (p. 64). To be homely, plain and understood was his aim in preaching the Gospel which became " his " in experience, and this led him at times to say and do things which with our present standards of taste may be thought open to criticism. In these things Grimshaw was an inspiration in his originality, rather than a model for imitation. The length and manner of his discourses cannot be imitated to-day, but his aim remains the same for all time, and " his subject matter was calculated to affect the hearts of all, whether high or low . . . learned

or ignorant, and they who refused to believe were often compelled to tremble" (p. 67). In any case, in Newton's words, that is the best cat which catches most mice.

The "vestry minutes," quoted above, show that his witness affected the neighbouring parishes, and his regular congregation seems to have been drawn from a wide area; unfriendly critics would quickly say that his success may have been less in his own parish than outside. This all led naturally to developments closely related to his pastoral ideals and methods.

He visited his parish "in twelve several places monthly, convening 6, 8, or 10 families in each place, allowing any people of the neighbouring parishes that please to attend the exhortation. This I call my monthly visitation. I am now entering into the fifth year of it, and wonderfully has the Lord blessed it." The chapelry of Haworth covered a fairly wide area, and the population was not so small (even in the eighteenth century) as many readers of Mrs. Gaskell's *Life of C. B.* imagine. The extension of Grimshaw's evangelistic and pastoral ministry came quite naturally when neighbours in "dead" parishes asked the minister of Haworth to "come over and help" them. The institution of Methodist classes after Wesley's pattern was also to be expected, and so was Grimshaw's co-operation with Wesley in the work, when the two men found how much they had in common.

Nevertheless, this wider ministry brought Grimshaw opposition and persecution, e.g. in 1748 from the mob at Colne, incited by the perpetual curate of Colne, and from clergy who made complaints to the Archbishop of York. This extra-parochial work covered a large part of the Province of York in his later life.

Two features of this pastoral ministry are very noteworthy. One is the *immense authority* which he soon obtained. Many illustrations might be given. In his ministry, observance of the Lord's Day was emphasized, and his people were urged to faithfulness in this point so solemnly that a traveller whose horse needed a shoe could not get the smith to do the work without the minister's approval. (This was given when the traveller was known to be in search of medical aid.) Again, the minister was credited with power to prevail with God when he was concerned about the evil of the village races, an occasion of riot and debauchery. Not prevailing with men by persuasion, he turned to plead with God; and such torrential rains came for three days that no races could be held, and none have been held since. The other feature is the *detailed knowledge of his people*, and the very original (if according to our standards, questionable) methods by which he watched over, and dealt with, his flock. "I know the state of their progress in religion. By my frequent visits and converse with them, I am acquainted with their several temptations, trials and exercises . . . almost as intimately as if I had lived in their families" (p. 102). "When he suspected hypocrisy, he sometimes took such methods to detect it, as perhaps few men but himself would have thought of. He had a suspicion of the sincerity of some persons, who made great pretences to religion, and being informed of their several dispositions, he applied to one, as a poor man, and begged for a night's lodging; and this person,

who had been willing to pass for very charitable, treated him with some abuse. . . . Thus he was confirmed in his apprehensions, for he had no good opinion of the religion of those who were not, at least, gentle to the poor, or of those who did not bridle their tongue" (p. 117).

Thus was he watchful over those of his flock who made an open profession of religion, to see if they adorned the doctrine of God our Saviour in all things; and he visited inconsistency with a homely severity. A tradesman was once described as "hard and honest," but Grimshaw said, "I suppose you mean to say, 'hardly honest'" (p. 116).

Grimshaw's Churchmanship.

The career of Grimshaw and the work which he started developed in such a way that his Churchmanship has inevitably been depreciated; yet his love and loyalty towards the Church of England are beyond question.

To begin with, his evangelism did not cause him either to belittle the liturgical worship of the church, or to turn the building into a mere preaching house. His conduct of the services would, beyond doubt, compare more than favourably with the average of the eighteenth century, specially that of his critics and opponents. "At church, in prayer time, if he observed any careless behaviour, he would often stop, rebuke the offender, and not proceed till he saw the whole congregation upon their knees. For with him, the reading of prayers was not a matter of custom or form, to be hurried over merely as a prelude to preaching; he really prayed, and the solemnity of his tone and gesture induced the people, at least apparently, to pray with him" (p. 109). He entered fully into the spiritual significance of the Prayer Book, and was faithful to the formularies of the Church. Year by year, he expounded the Church Catechism and the Thirty-nine Articles, and read the Homilies, "which in substance I think my duty to do in some part of the year annually."

Judged by the standard commonly applied to-day, viz. number of communicants, Grimshaw must be pronounced both a good Churchman and a successful pastor. Often the communicants reached four figures, and the large pewter flagons dated 1750, now in the care of the Rector of Haworth, reprove our present slackness as compared with the past. The big numbers do not seem to have been confined to the visits of Whitefield and Wesley, but were usual in summer at one period of Grimshaw's ministry at Haworth, according to the answer given to the Archbishop of York who inquired into the difference made by his ministry in this respect. Grimshaw's answer was that he *found* communicants twelve in number, and had raised the number to 1,000 or 1,200. It should be remembered that this was in the eighteenth century, long before all the emphasis on sacraments which we are assured was the special contribution of the Oxford Movement. After all, the Evangelicals did—and do—value the Sacraments.

Grimshaw's Position on Points of Controversy.

It may be easily forgotten that there was fierce *political* controversy at the time when Grimshaw came to Haworth. Jacobite feeling was still strong, specially within the Church, and three years later came the '45 rebellion. Though other clergy might be opposed or lukewarm, Grimshaw (as might be expected) was a strong supporter of the House of Hanover and the Protestant succession. "I am informed that soon after he came to Haworth, I suppose about the time of the rebellion, he encouraged the recruiting service, by countenancing the officers, and exhorting proper persons to enlist and fight for their God, their king, and their country" (p. 152), for he was firmly attached to the constitution, laws, and government of his country.

Respect for the Parochial System. It seems strange to us that a minister with a parochial charge should enter, without permission, the sphere of another: but however irregular this may seem, two things must be kept in mind. First, Grimshaw had a keen sense of the value of souls in God's sight, and this sense prevented undue fear of breach of the ecclesiastical order. "I want no more of you than your souls for my God, and a bare maintenance for myself," he would say to his parishioners (p. 145), and the principle was capable of wide application. Then, the clergy generally were "low and slow," and acted the part of dog in the manger; they neither evangelized and shepherded their people themselves, nor allowed others to do what they neglected.

This extra-parochial ministry made great demands on his time and strength, and he reckoned it an idle week when he preached but twelve or fourteen times; more usually he would speak near thirty times, and he was not given to undue brevity! It was this roving ministry that nearly brought him into collision with the Archbishop of York, but happily he was left in his charge undisturbed, though ready for the worst if need be. Bishop Ryle (*Christian Leaders*: p. 128) gives a moving account of this episode. "I did expect," said Grimshaw, "to be turned out of my parish on this occasion; but if I had been, I would have joined my friend John Wesley, taken my saddle-bags, and gone to one of his poorest circuits."

Separatism became an urgent issue in Grimshaw's days, but he would have none of it, in spite of the closeness of his association with Wesley—"For my part, though I do not approve of everything in our Liturgy, yet I see nothing so materially amiss in it, or our Church constitution, as to disturb my conscience to that degree, as to justify my separation from her. No: where shall I go to mend myself? I believe the Church of England to be the soundest, purest, and most apostolical well-constituted Christian Church in the world. Therefore I can in good conscience (as I am determined, God willing, to do) live and die in her" (Hardy: p. 174). In 1755 a Conference met at Leeds to discuss separation: but Charles Wesley writes, "Mr. Grimshaw (whom the Separatists claim as their own) designed coming to the Conference, only to take his leave of us, if we did of the Church."

Still, it must be admitted that Grimshaw's activities had in them the possibility of separation from the order of the Mother Church.

Even his own incessant activity did not always prevent it during his life, and once his restraint was removed the apparently inevitable happened in other cases.

The *great* controversy among Evangelicals was that between Calvinists and Arminians, with Whitefield on one side, and Wesley on the other. Much bitterness entered among Evangelicals, to their grievous hurt, through this dispute : but Grimshaw kept close friendship with both Whitefield and Wesley. Perhaps he was not of a very speculative turn of mind, and was so busy in proclaiming the good news that he had not time for refinements. " Though he preached the doctrines of grace, he avoided the discussion of some high points which . . . perhaps too much engross the attention of minds of a speculative turn." The suggestion may be ventured that in this he was more typically English than even John Wesley.

Newton (p. 97) writes : " I think Mr. Grimshaw was a Calvinist . . . But I am not sure that he thought himself so " and Newton knew Grimshaw's mind well. " The sense he had of the evil of sin, the worth of souls, the nearness of eternity, and the love of the Saviour, filled his heart, and raised him far above a scrupulous systematical accuracy : and therefore though a preacher of free grace, he was not numbered among the Calvinists. But judicious . . . hearers of various denominations, who were not biased by a favourite shibboleth, were ready to acknowledge him a scribe, well instructed in the mysteries of the Kingdom of God : and the Lord himself bore testimony to his doctrine . . . by giving him many seals to his ministry " (p. 100).

Akin to this controversy is that regarding Christian perfection, but Wesley's position here seems to have satisfied Grimshaw.

Grimshaw's Inner Life and Character.

Those who would understand Grimshaw must read his written " covenant," which he expected would come into the hands of others in due course *to be made their own.* According to Hardy, there was also a shorter covenant (written in a Bible that was extant in 1860, but now lost) dated 1754. " Often have I, and once more do I, totally devote, most solemnly surrender, by this sacred Book of God, and for ever, up to God in Christ my Head and Lord, my body, soul and spirit, and all I am and have, and may be, in the fullest sense of St. Paul's exhortation, Romans xii. 1, 2. And I nothing doubt, but that, as I have hitherto found by many years experience in Christ, His grace is sufficient for me, so I always shall be enabled to do all things through Christ which strengtheneth me.

" So help me, O Triune God !
" William Grimshaw,
" Minister of Haworth."

Newton refers to the " solemnity of his manner ; the energy with which he spoke ; the spirit of love which beamed in his eyes and breathed through his addresses " (p. 66). One thing, however, is possibly more eloquent than any description ; it is the frequency with

which we meet the text, " To me to live is Christ, and to die is gain." This text appears on the old sounding-board of his pulpit at Haworth ; on the tablet commemorating the enlargement of Haworth Church ; and on the stone work of the window of the building which he erected in 1758 for the meeting of " classes," in case his successor cared little or nothing for them. It was also inscribed on his coffin, and was the text of his funeral sermon. Nothing seems to express Grimshaw's inner life so fully and simply as this short passage, which must have been his constant theme for meditation and his constant inspiration.

Grimshaw also wrote a statement of his belief in twenty-six paragraphs which Newton prints as an appendix to his " Life." Those who are interested in the more detailed expression of Grimshaw's convictions are referred to it.

Death and Burial.

In 1763, " Haworth was afflicted by a putrid fever, of which many persons died. Mr. Grimshaw had a strong presage upon his mind that someone of his own family would be added to the number, and he repeatedly exhorted them all to be ready. . . . The fever was highly infectious, and in visiting his sick parishioners, he caught the infection. From the first attack of the fever, he expected. . . . the approach of death " (p. 162). He suffered, and passed away, as he had lived, knowing Whom he had believed. " Never," he said during his great suffering, " had I such a visit from God since I knew him." His bodily strength had been immense ; otherwise he could not have continuously carried out his regular itinerant ministry for so long. So was God's workman called away by his Master, while still in his full strength, in the fifty-fifth year of his age, on April 7th, 1763.

His burial arrangements had all been carefully made, and he was buried in Luddenden Church, near Halifax ; Henry Venn of Huddersfield—his friend—preaching the funeral sermon which was later printed. In the sermon, he said, " At his (Grimshaw's) departure a general concern was visible through his parish. Hence his body was interred with what is more ennobling than all the pomp . . . of a royal funeral ; for he was followed to the grave by a great multitude who beheld his coffin with . . . many tears ; who cannot still hear his much loved name without weeping for the guide of their souls, to whom each of them was dear as children to a father " (pp. 165-6).

In the Haworth register a shorter, but not less expressive, tribute appears. " The Revd. William Grimshaw died April 7th, 1763, at Sowdens, near Haworth, after 20 years spent in preaching early and late with great success." If this entry had been written by himself, the wording would certainly have been different. It is said—though Newton doubts it—that his last words were, " Here goes an unprofitable servant " ; but Newton adds that he spoke to the same purport frequently during his illness. Yet whatever Grimshaw, in his humility, thought about his success in his work, it is certain that he left behind a great and noble tradition, and through him Haworth was known

throughout England long before the birth of Patrick Brontë, and longer still before the birth of his more famous daughters now usually connected with the fame of Haworth.

Grimshaw Relics.

In closing this short sketch, mention may be fitly made of the relics which still remind us of Grimshaw. The house in which he lived still stands, with many of its features still the same as in his days. It ceased to be the parsonage in 1774 when the house, afterwards occupied by the Brontës, was built by the Rev. John Richardson, Grimshaw's successor. Now and again Methodists make a pious pilgrimage to this house of memories, which deserves to be better known.

The church in which Grimshaw ministered was demolished in 1879, and though the Brontë association was much urged as a reason for its preservation, the Grimshaw association does not seem to have been even mentioned. This is rather amazing, to say the least.

The actual pulpit (part of the three-decker) from which Grimshaw preached is still in use in Stanbury district church ; and the sounding board, which bears Grimshaw's name and the date 1742, is now in the baptistry at Haworth Church. On the sounding board, in addition to Phil. i. 21, there is the text, " I (am) determined to know nothing among you save Jesus Christ and Him crucified." Grimshaw's font was removed from the Church in 1880, but was recently restored to the Church on condition of being placed in the Churchyard. The two flagons of rough pewter, dated 1750, and obtained for Communion use, are now in the care of the successive Rectors of Haworth. Each flagon is inscribed with a verse of four lines :

Blest JESUS, what delicious Fare :
How sweet THINE entertainments are :
Never did Angels taste above
Redeeming Grace or dying Love. A.D. 1750.

In JESUS we live, In JESUS we rest,
And thankful receive HIS dying Bequest—
The cup of Salvation HIS Mercy bestows,
And all from HIS passion our Happiness flows !

The Christianity expressed in these lines is first rate ; it is to be wished that their poetical character had been on the same level, but Grimshaw seems not to have had such poetic taste as either Charles Wesley or John Newton. It will be noted that the lines are not assigned to any writer. Other church relics cannot be traced, though there is a small portrait, of no special merit, kept in the vestry of the church. The Methodist minister at Haworth keeps a chair said to have belonged to Grimshaw. The first building erected for Grimshaw's " classes " is now demolished, but a window with its stonework has been incorporated in the present Methodist Chapel at West Lane, Haworth.

Grimshaw is also mentioned, if only casually, in Brontë literature. Reference has already been made to Mrs. Gaskell's mention of him in

her *Life of Charlotte Brontë*. There is also an interesting reference to him in a letter from Miss Mary Burder to Rev. Patrick Brontë, in which she rejected overtures made by him after the death of Mrs. Brontë. He was thought to have dealt rather shabbily with Miss Burder fifteen years earlier, and she wrote her rejection with some tartness.

Part of the letter is here transcribed :

" Finchingfield Park, near Braintree.
" *August* 8, 1823.

" May [the Lord] enable you to be as faithful, as zealous, and as successful a labourer in his vineyard as was one of your predecessors the good old Mr. Grimshaw who occupied the pulpit at Haworth more than half-a-century ago, then will your consolations be neither few nor small."

In Halliwell Sutcliffe's novel, *Ricroft of Withens*, set in the Haworth neighbourhood in the time about the '45 rebellion, Grimshaw appears as Parson Shaw, and is easy to identify. He is there a man who calls people to prayer in a way that brooks no refusal : even men on horseback are liable to be pulled off their mounts if not quick in obeying the call, for he is a very muscular Christian. Parson Shaw is also very loyal to the House of Hanover.

Still, apart from relics and from mention in literature, Grimshaw was a great and humble man of God, and one of those whose " name liveth for evermore."

NOTE.—It is unfortunate that both the " Lives " of Grimshaw, by Newton the Anglican, and Spence Hardy, the Methodist, seem to be obtainable only second-hand. Newton wrote from personal knowledge and friendship, and was able to collect material from people who still remembered Grimshaw at the time he wrote his story. (See Newton's note, p. 161).

RULE OF THE ROAD. By Anne Byrd Payson. *Putnam*. 3*s*. 6*d*.

The Rev. Pat McCormick tells us in his foreword that a chance reading of *The Christ of the Indian Road* led Mrs. Payson to write, *I Follow the Road*. The publication of that book led to correspondence and contacts with many people to whom she has been able to give spiritual help.

With the permission of the persons concerned Mrs. Payson describes her experiences in dealing with some of them. She introduces us to a young dancer ; a rancher ; a wealthy woman who was attached to a church and yet unhappy in her membership ; a young man who gave way to drink ; an elderly business man ; and others. The impressiveness of the stories depends perhaps upon the way in which we are affected by a typically American production.

Mrs. Payson has evidently exercised a remarkable influence upon many people. She also has the gift of " writing up " her experiences.

THE HOLY COMMUNION: ITS ORIGIN ACCORDING TO ST. PAUL.

By the Rev. H. J. BURKITT, M.A., T.D.

Late Rector of Drayton Beauchamp, Bucks.

"*For I received of the Lord that which also I delivered unto you*" (1 Cor. xi. 23, R.V.).

HAVE these words of St. Paul obtained in recent years the attention they deserve?

The question is asked because the writer has been studying the origins of the Eucharist. In particular he has consulted the essay of the Bishop of Truro in the volume *Evangelical Doctrine of the Holy Communion*, and the translation by the Rev. A. G. Herbert of Dean Brilioth's *Eucharistic Faith and Practice*. And it seems to him that many modern scholars have not given the weight to St. Paul's account which is its due.

The writer, it must be admitted at once, has only been a parochial parson, and unable therefore to keep abreast of much modern criticism. But have such as he no claim to be heard on critical problems and their supposed assured results? Are not many of us entitled to the position of jurymen in an English court of justice? May we not be allowed to bring the experience of ordinary religious life, and our practical intelligence, to bear on questions which are raised by experts? Problems of critical theology are not capable of exact measurement such as are many of the facts of natural science. Inference and hypothesis follow upon the often meagre facts which alone are undisputed. When it comes to inference and hypothesis the reasoning of the ordinary student, provided he has some true logical sense, may surely be as valid as that of the expert.

The writer begs leave therefore to approach the question of the origin of the Eucharist as a juryman in a court of law, and he asks, Why is St. Paul's account, the earliest we possess, held, as it would seem, in such slight esteem? For if accepted at its face value where is there room for some of the theories which are put forward? St. Paul plainly states the fact of the institution by "The Lord Jesus," and His command to repeat it. Why seek for its origin in the Kiddush, or other theories?

That the "Breaking of Bread" in the Acts of the Apostles may have been of the nature of a fellowship meal; that the Agape of

1 Corinthians may have grown out of the Last Supper, seems to be quite consistent with the account of the Institution as given by St. Paul. But that our Lord and His disciples were accustomed to hold fellowship meals such as the Kiddushim is surely a pure hypothesis. Is there any such meal recorded in the Gospels?

Our Lord and His disciples, of course, had meals in common; it is an obvious deduction from the Gospel narrative, but that they were of a special religious character out of which the Eucharist took its origin is a conjecture, to my mind, quite unnecessary as an explanation, in face of St. Paul's words, "In the same night that He was betrayed The Lord Jesus took Bread. . . . Do this in Remembrance of me."

Why should not this statement be conclusive? It is the earliest account of the Last Supper we possess. The Epistle from which it comes was written about A.D. 58. It records the instruction on the subject given by the Apostle during his first visit to Corinth some six years earlier. Putting the date of the crucifixion at A.D. 30, less than twenty-five years had elapsed since St. Paul gave his account verbally to the Corinthians. How short a time this really is! How easy it is to remember important events less than twenty-five years ago! What time is there for an uncertain "tradition" to grow up? It is almost contemporary history that St. Paul gives us.

True, St. Paul was not present at the Last Supper, but he claims to have received his knowledge of what transpired "from the Lord," the most authentic source possible. "For I (emphatic) received of the Lord that which also I delivered unto you." St. Paul claims to be in this respect, as in others, "in no way behind the very chiefest Apostles."

The Bishop of Truro's comment on this is "St. Paul himself had received *the tradition* which he believed *traceable* to the Lord Himself." Why a tradition? Why a "belief traceable"? To my mind it is an assertion the Apostle makes, a claim of supreme authority for his account of the Last Supper.

In a footnote the Bishop sees support for his view in the use of the preposition *apo* rather than *para*, and in the use of the verb *parelabon* which, he says, elsewhere is used of receiving instruction from a Christian Teacher. Let us examine these points a little more closely.

First in regard to *apo* not *para*. It may be said that *para* would more certainly have expressed *direct* reception from the Lord, though even this, as the invariable meaning of *para* has been questioned. But does *apo exclude* such reception? This preposition lays stress on the *source* of what we know, receive, possess, the point St. Paul is chiefly concerned with. Does it do more? Does it *exclude* direct transmission,—from the source to the recipient? What shall we say of 1 John i. 5. "And this is the message which we have heard of him"; (*ap'autou*); or of 1 John iii. 22: "Whatsoever we ask we receive of him" (*ap'autou*); or of Rom. i. 7. "Grace to you and peace from God our Father and the Lord Jesus Christ" (*apo Theou tov patros hēmōn*). Surely here are direct receptions, without any suggestions of intermediaries.

And does *para* always imply direct reception? Bishop Lightfoot (Gal. i. 12) says, No. "It is true that while *apo* contemplates only the giver, *para* connects the giver with the receiver, denoting the passage from the one to the other, but the links of the chain between the two may be numerous, and in all cases where the idea of transmission is prominent *para* may be used in preference to *apo*, be the communication direct or indirect." He quotes Phil. iv. 18, "Having received of (*para*) Epaphroditus the things which came from you (*ta par' humōn*)." Thus, according to Lightfoot, if we had *para* in the text it would not in itself certainly have meant direct reception. But St. Paul is laying stress not so much on the transmission as on the source—that his statement to the Corinthians had the authority of the Lord Himself; and therefore he used *apo*.

In regard to the use of *parelabon*, which is also in the Bishop of Truro's note, Lightfoot says it may be used either (1) to receive as transmitted to oneself, 2 Thess. iii. 6, or (2) to receive so as to transmit to others. "In the latter sense it is used of the Apostles, *who receiving the Gospel directly from the Lord* passed it to others, 1 Cor. xi. 23, xv. 1, 3" (My italics). It would appear from this that Bishop Lightfoot understood by our passage that St. Paul, in some way not specified, owed his knowledge of the Institution, as he did the rest of his "Gospel," through a revelation from the Lord (*di' apokalup-seōs Iēsou Christou*), the sense for which the present writer is contending.

Many of the older commentators seem to have found no difficulty in so understanding the words. Thus Canon Evans, who was one of the foremost Greek scholars of his day, in the S.C. says, "Meyer here quite wrong . . . 'of' means 'straight from.'" He quotes with approval Olshausen, "This authentic narrative given by the Risen Christ, how calculated to shock into sobriety the frivolity of the Corinthian Agape."

The oldest account then, that we have of the Lord's Supper clearly states the dominical institution of the Eucharist, and also the command to repeat it. It is urged that the latter is not found in Mark, and therefore we must look upon it with suspicion or at least not build anything upon it; that the Eucharist grew out of Fellowship meals, or that, as a secondary theory, the ideal of commemorating Christ's death was brought in as an addition by St. Paul (*see* Brilioth, p. 7). But is omission prohibition? Mark's Gospel it is supposed owes much to the teaching of St. Peter. There were adherents, or at least professed followers, of St. Peter at Corinth. There were parties there not loyal to St. Paul. Would St. Paul have ventured to make assertions about the Last Supper which these parties could have easily contradicted had they conflicted with the account of St. Peter? The argument *a silentio* is a very unsafe one. That Mark does not fully record the words of the Lord is no proof that they were not spoken. We are surely entitled to rely on the earliest account, written when we know and by whom we know, quite as much as on a Gospel which bears in itself no name and is only attributed by tradition (however reliable we may believe it to be) to the companion of St. Peter.

The Bishop of Truro says that modern scholars on the whole are inclined to date the Crucifixion, on the authority of the Fourth Gospel,

as taking place on Nisan 14th, and that therefore the Last Supper was not the proper Passover Meal. Most modern scholars, I suppose, reject the Zebedean authorship, and place the date of the Fourth Gospel comparatively late. It would be interesting to know if these two classes more or less coincide. If they do the statements of a late and uncertain author are preferred to those of an earlier and fairly certain one. But do the statements in the Fourth Gospel contradict those of the Synoptists?

This much debated question was exhaustively considered by the Rev. J. B. McClellan in his book on the Four Gospels published in 1875—a long while ago, it may be said. But have his arguments ever been answered? The Rev. J. B. McClellan was a double first at Cambridge (Wrangler and First Class Class. Trip. 1858), Scholar, and later Fellow, of Trinity College. He shows, the present writer thinks convincingly, that the language of the Fourth Gospel, rightly understood, so far from being contradictory of the other Gospels, supports and confirms them. But this book seems to be little known, and it is now probably hard to obtain, except in libraries.

With all deference to the far wider reading and greater scholarship of the writers quoted it is suggested that much of what they have put forward is beside the mark. It is urged that we have in St. Paul a reliable account of the institution of the Eucharist derived from our Lord Himself, with a command to repeat it; and a warrant for the use in it both of the Bread and of the Cup.

Since this paper was written the writer has met with Prof. Percy Gardiner's treatment of the phrase discussed. He appears to agree in general with the view advocated above, and in particular quotes Col. iii. 24 to show that *apo* can include direct transmission.

GUIDANCE FROM THE MOUNT. By J. B. Lancelot, M.A., Vicar of St. James', Birkdale, and Hon. Canon of Liverpool Cathedral. *The Church Book Room.* 2*s.* net.

Canon Lancelot's special gift of making practical application of the words of Scripture are well exemplified in this little volume in which he deals with the lessons of the Sermon on the Mount. After an introductory chapter explaining the scope and general purpose of the Sermon he goes on to consider the most important passages. A special section is given to the "Poor in Spirit," and then the other Beatitudes are considered. Their contrast with worldly maxims of prosperity are indicated. The place and position of Christian men in the world is set out in a chapter on "Salt and Light." Two sections are given to the contrast between "The Old Law and the New." After treating of "Rewards and Motives," attention is given to "Prayer and the Lord's Prayer," and the main points of our Lord's teaching and example are summarized. Man's Chief Good and the Golden Rule are fully explained. The final chapters deal with "Warnings and Admonitions," and "The Authority of Christ." Although the treatment of each section is naturally brief the book will be found most helpful and suggestive.

TYNDALE AND MORE.

A LITERARY BATTLE.

By A. ATKINSON.

AGAINST the south-east wall of Chelsea Old Church is the tomb which More built for his first wife, Jane Colt, and in which he had designed to rest with his second wife, Mistress Alice Middleton. *Dis aliter visum.* The tablet of black marble with the lengthy Latin inscription composed by More himself has been the subject of controversy. The words originally ran : " *neque nobilibus esset invisus, nec injucundus populo, furibus autem et homicidis hæreticisque molestus* —a terror to thieves, murderers, and heretics. More had submitted the inscription to Erasmus, but that humane scholar had objected to the word *hæreticisque.* It has been alleged that in deference to this suggestion More erased the word, but there is evidence to show that the inscription remained unaltered for more than 100 years after his death.[1] About the year 1644 the lettering had become decayed and Sir John Laurence caused it to be re-cut omitting the word *hæreticisque,* so that a gap in the inscription is clearly seen. Thus is history falsified, for the original wording undoubtedly suggests that More accounted heretics in the same category as thieves and murderers.

The older school of historians have spoken of More in disparaging terms, holding that when he wrote " Utopia," he had views on toleration which he afterwards abandoned under the pressure of Henry VIII. More, says Burnet, became the tool " of the blind and enraged fury of the priests." In him the " genial philosopher " according to Froude, " was transformed into the merciless bigot." Under the " sinister influence of Henry he had allowed his sentiments to be moulded by the official theology of the Court " ; such is the verdict of Acton ; and Creighton forms the same judgment : " He deceived himself by putting his principles aside " ; and, again, Henry applied to More " the same measure of justice as himself applied to others."

It is not surprising that the fashion of whitewashing the less worthy characters in history should have led, especially since his canonization, to attempts to reverse the unfavourable estimate of More's character formed by older writers, particularly with reference to his attitude towards those of the reformed religion. Here the inscription on the memorial tablet already cited, written some three years before his execution can hardly be ignored.

There is a significant passage in Roper's *Life of More* where More foresees that England may cease to be a Catholic country when toleration in religious matters may become unavoidable, but he looks forward to such a time with horror : " Son Roper, I pray God that some of us, as high as we seem to sit upon mountains, treading heretics under our feet like ants, live not the day that we gladly would wish to be at league and composition with them, to let them have their churches quietly to themselves so that they would be content to let us have ours quietly to ourselves." This was another More from the author of the

[1] The letters may be found in Leclerc's edition of Erasmus : *Opera Omnia,* Vol. 3, Epistolae 426, 466, in app. Leyden 1703.

Utopia, who, in 1516 had written : " For this is one of the ancientist lawes among them ; that no man shall be blamed for resoninge in the maintenance of his own religion." And again : " Utopus made a decree that it should be lawfull for everie man to favour and folow what religion he would. If he could not by faire and gentle speche induce them unto his opinion yet he should use no kind of violence."

By 1526 the bishops were thoroughly alarmed at the spread of Lutheran teaching in England. Tyndale's New Testament was being surreptitiously distributed notwithstanding proclamations and burnings and Tunstal, a stalwart defender of the old religion, saw that he must meet argument with argument and have recourse to the Press. He applied to Sir Thomas More to help him and could have chosen none better, for More, by his scholarship, wit and the grace of his literary style had achieved a European reputation. Tunstal, in his letter to More dated March 7th, 1528, says : " There are certain sons of iniquity who by translating Lutheran books and printing them in great numbers are trying to infect the land with heresy. You can play the Demosthenes both in English and Latin. You cannot better bestow your leisure hours, if you have any, than by writing an English work to show to simple-minded people the crafty malignity of these impious heretics." He concludes by granting More permission to read the prohibited books. It is strange to reflect that within twelve years Tunstal's name should appear authorizing the fourth edition of the Great Bible which was mainly Tyndale's work, as is our own Authorized Version. " Overseen and perused," runs the title page, " at the commandment of the King's Highness by the Right. Rev. Father in God Cuthbert (Tunstal), Bishop of Durham, and Nicholas (Heath), Bishop of Rochester. More set to work and in June 1529 produced his *Dialogue*, " touching the pestilent sect of Luther and Tyndale," a volume of more than 180 pages and of about 170,000 words. Thus began the greatest literary battle in history which lasted for five years. In July 1531 Tyndale's *Answer* was published from Amsterdam ; by the time it was received by More he had become Lord Chancellor. More found it necessary to reply, and published in May 1532 the first three books of his *Confutacyon* of Tyndale's *Answer*, and a year later put forth six more books making in all with similar writings a portentous work of 1,300 folio pages. In these three volumes there is the record of the controversy.

In the *Dialogue* a messenger the " quod he " questions More as from a friend, but acting in effect as a spokesman of the Lutheran party. All those points which still remain the ground of controversy between papists and protestants, the mass, the confessional, ceremonials, rituals, pilgrimages, prayers to the Virgin and the saints, dispensations and indulgences are passed in review, but it is Tyndale's New Testament that is specially aimed at. More supports the persecution of heretics who " he kept but for the fire first here and after in hell." Burning is " lawful necessary and well done." His attitude is that of " Giant Pope " sitting in the mouth of his cave hissing at Christian : " You never will mend till more of you be burned." Tyndale appeals to Scripture : " Judge whether the pope with his be the Church, whether their authority be above the Scripture, whether they *have* erred and

not only whether they can." Holy days, ceremonies, pilgrimages were once a help to religion, now they had become engines of priestly tyranny blinding the people. Although there is much hard-hitting on both sides, yet having regard to the controversial methods of the time, More in his first work perhaps does not surpass the common form. What that was may be learnt from many contemporary writings. It would hardly do in these days for one bishop to call another in print "a beastly belly-god and dampnable donge-hill," yet these are the words which Bishop Bale addressed to Bonner, who deserved them. The *Dialogue* is a skilful and ingenious defence of the doctrines and practices of the Church of Rome. But there are some hard words: "Luther and all his offspring with all those that favour and set forth his sect be very limbs of the devil and open enemies of the Faith of Christ." Tyndale's New Testament was full of heresies and errors, and many passages were wrongly translated. The bishops and More desired "church" where Tyndale translated "congregation," "priest," where he used "elder," and "penance" where he wrote "repentance." Tyndale is not backward in his complaints of More's language: "he biteth, sucketh, gnaweth and mouseth Tyndale." He introduces a little of More's humour. More had differentiated in the scholastic manner between different forms of reverence, doulia, hyperdoulia, latria. "Which," asks Tyndale, "was the worship done by More and others to my Lord the cardinal's hat"? alluding to the obeisance paid to Wolsey's hat when carried in procession through the streets and placed on the altar in Westminster Abbey as he had described in the *Practice of Prelates*. More's humour sometimes carries him away into indecorous stories and jokes, and Tyndale rightly censures him for the tale of the pilgrimage to St. Valeri, too indecorous to be repeated here.

But it is in his second work the *Confutacyon*, a dreary waste full of scurrilous language, that More loses all control over himself and, even allowing for the controversial standards of the day, it must be adjudged as Billingsgate. Tyndale is "a beast discharging a filthy foam of blasphemies out of his brutish beastly mouth." He is one of the "hell hounds that the devil hath in his kennel." "Of all which ever sprang in Christ's Church the very worst and most beastly be these Lutherans as their opinion and their lewd living sheweth." And, most dreadful of all: "After the fire of Smithfield hell doth receive them where the wretches burn for ever." It is melancholy that the mind of More in the maturity of his age and judgment should have been so deformed and darkened as to become the impassioned advocate of all that the most conscientious and enlightened men of his day were regretting or forsaking.

It is natural and perhaps fitting that More, though himself a bigamist, should have reproached Luther for breaking his vows and marrying the nun Catherine von Bora, but he repeats the abuse in every chapter with tedious reiteration. "Luther not only teacheth monks, freres and nuns to marriage, but also being a frere hath married a nun himself, and with her liveth under the name of wedlock in open incestuous lechery without care or shame." Again and again, probably more than one hundred times Luther is denounced for "his open

living in lechery with his lewd leman the nun." It is strange that More should have failed to see that Tyndale could hardly be blamed for Luther's fault and that these frequent twittings were indecent and irrelevant, since Tyndale remained unmarried and was of irreproachable life. More was constrained by adverse criticisms to put out an *Apology* in 1533, and to confess that men had complained of the *Confutacyon* as being " overlong and therefore tedious to read." Some of his friends, he averred, had read it three times ; but these stout fellows can have had but few successors. It is indeed, doubtful if any man hereafter, will ever read again the whole of the *Confutacyon.* Tyndale's arguments are better than his literary style, but enough has been quoted to show that More's was none too polished and a great declension from the *Utopia.* Some excuse may be made for the exile whose life was in daily peril, but the same latitude can hardly be extended to those in the seats of authority.

More denies the stories of cruelty to which Foxe afterwards gave currency, as that he had a tree in his garden to which heretics were bound and whipped—a story which Froude accepts. " And of all that ever came into my hands for heresy," More says, " as help me God, saving the safe keeping of them, had never any of them any stripes or stroken given them so much as a fillip on the forehead." Nevertheless he admits that " there was no man that any meddling had with them (heretics) into whose hand they were more loth to come." " None of them had wrong but that it were for they were burnt no sooner." The sentiments are in accord with the inscription on his tomb.

The spectacle of two good men railing at one another with a sad lack of Christian charity is unpleasing. More's apologists have advanced in his defence the argument that he conscientiously believed that heresy led to sedition and disorder in the State. To apportion praise or blame is always an agreeable task : if a moral is to be drawn it surely is that history records that many evil deeds have been done by excellent men from conscientious motives, but that this does not make them right. The New Testament has been appropriately styled Tyndale's " Noblest Monument " ; but he claimed no finality for his work. " If any man find faults either with the translation or aught beside, to the same it shall be lawful to translate it themselves and to put what they lust thereto. If I shall perceive, either by myself or by the information of others that aught be escaped me or might more plainly be translated, I will shortly after cause it to be mended." He would not have objected to a revised Revised Version.

The pedestrian leaving Chelsea Old Church and strolling eastward will presently find in the Victoria Embankment gardens a bronze statue, eleven feet high, by Boehm, R.A., erected in 1884 by public subscription at a cost of £2,400. Tyndale stands erect in doctor's robes with his right hand on an open copy of the New Testament resting on a printing press, copied from one in the Plantin museum at Antwerp. On the front the pedestal bears an inscription : " First translator of the New Testament into English from the Greek. Born A.D. 1484. Died a martyr at Vilvorde in Belgium, A.D. 1536. Thy word is a lantern unto my feet and a light unto my path."

THE EVIDENCE OF 1 SAMUEL TO THE TRUSTWORTHINESS OF THE HEXATEUCHAL RECORD

By the Rev. G. W. BROMILEY, Haverigg, Millom, Carlisle.

IN modern times the critical theory of Hexateuchal history has been so widely adopted that few have undertaken to dispute it on purely critical, i.e. non-doctrinal grounds. Dr. Orr, it is true, put up a masterly defence for the Conservative view in his *Problem of the Old Testament*, and more recently the scientific research of Dr. Yahuda has severely shaken some of the erstwhile unquestioned assumptions of liberal scholars, but nevertheless the weight of opinion amongst scholars still favours the newer theories and favours them on the grounds mainly of the historical and literary evidence of the documents themselves.

This being the case it is obvious that to argue disputed passages on the one hand, and to research minutely into the history and formation of the Hebrew language on the other, can never of themselves suffice to overthrow the present supremacy of Radical opinion. Not that these methods are valueless by any means. Indeed as regards linguistic research it is probable that therein lies the key to a really scientific understanding of the Scriptural narratives. But at the present moment it is not so much the language as the facts enclothed in the language which are primarily called into question, and that on the serious ground of incoherence and inconsistency. It is then upon this question that Liberal opinion must be met if its ascendancy is to be shaken. The books themselves must be consulted ; their testimony to the general truth of the Old Testament narrative sought after and evaluated, and if upon that question alone the modern theories fail to maintain themselves, then the field will be open for a truly scientific research along more conservative lines.

Now in dealing with the Pentateuch from this point of view one very obvious difficulty strikes us right at the outset. The books of the Hexateuch have been so badly mauled and tattered by recent investigators, that their evidence in their own favour can never be accepted by advanced writers. It will be remembered, however, that the trump card of the Radical scholar has always been the supposed ignorance of Mosaic institutions on the part of the Prophetic and Historical writers. If this ignorance accords with the facts, then at once there is a strong historical case established against the trustworthiness of the Hexateuch. If not however, then one of the main props of the modern theory is withdrawn. It is the investigation of this question with special reference to the book of 1 Samuel that is the object of our present study.

To state then first of all the Radical case, it is maintained that the Book of 1 Samuel does little or nothing to support the authenticity of the Mosaic documents. The existence of an elaborate Temple or Tabernacle, with elaborate fittings and an equally elaborate ritual: the existence of a thorough going priestly and Levitical system centred around one foremost and Central Sanctuary : the existence above all of an intricate code of laws concerning every conceivable branch of political and religious life : all these the writer or writers of 1 Samuel are supposed to a greater or lesser extent to ignore. The Israel of which they speak is an ignorant conglomeration of superstitious and heathen tribes, portrayed at an early point in their evolution out of political and religious chaos into that nation, unified in worship and government, which later historical idealists would like them to have been from the first. Whether the book of Samuel was written early or late (and most critics agree that it is substantially [at least] fairly early), this is the historical situation which it portrays ; and the tragedy of the whole affair is this, that this picture so poignantly portrayed by advanced scholars has been allowed with scarcely a single effective protest to capture the imaginations of modern Old Testament investigators. What its basis is in actual fact it will now be our business to consider.

In the first place then let us study the question from a purely historical standpoint, and here at once we must be struck by the amazing way in which the historical books do upon close examination testify to their own historical accuracy. To take one very minor point, in the very first verse of 1 Samuel (1 Sam. i. 1), we are told that Samuel was a man of Ephraim. Now in Chronicles it expressly states that Samuel was a Levite (this agreeing, of course, with his ministry in the Temple—as we shall see later). Here then is a supposed discrepancy upon which some commentators have pounced. But already in Judges 17, the Biblical record has referred us to a man who was at once a Levite and a Bethlehemite ; and more than that, in Joshua we read that Levitical families were established in the hill country of Ephraim (mainly in the neighbourhood of Shechem). None of this, of course, argues well for the Radical assumption that the Levitical order was a late Priestly invention. The further fact too that Samuel ministered to the Lord in Shiloh at the tabernacle or temple there, corroborates amply the narrative in Joshua xviii. 1, where we have a clear statement that the Tabernacle was pitched in Shiloh—even stronger independent testimony being borne by Jeremiah vii. 12, and Psalm lxxviii. 60. Indeed, the very fact that the Tabernacle existed at all under Samuel or rather Eli has forced a majority of scholars into accepting the existence of at least some sort of a tent of meeting even in wilderness days, this being usually identified with the tent which Moses pitched outside the camp in Exodus.

A further significant fact in the narrative of 1 Samuel is this, that the ark of God not only lies in the temple at Shiloh, but is also carried into battle as prescribed in the law of Moses in Numbers x. (cf. too, Joshua iii.). Like the Tabernacle, the Ark is something which no theorist has yet been able completely to dispense with. It has been made into a fetish chest, the tables of stone within it have been transformed

into mere lumps of Sinaitic rock; but none the less the Ark itself remains (and with the Ark the Cherubim); for it is impossible to believe that every reference to the Ark, and especially in these wonder-stories of its adventures in Philistia, is merely the invention of a late and credulous scribe. The Ark remains, and in it we have the guarantee of at least one Mosaic institution.

In 1 Samuel vii. 12, again, we have a slight but important reference to the memorial stone at Ebenezer—this bearing witness to the antiquity of the custom of marking historical sites by memorial cairns. The significance of this reference is that where in the Hexateuch mention is made of the erection of such memorial stones, Radical scholars immediately suspect a hidden reference to ancient heathen Massebah or stone altars. When, however, the same customs appear in the later days of Samuel, and even Isaiah (Isaiah xix. 19), and are sanctioned even by opponents of heathen worship, there can remain little point in attempting seriously to maintain such hypotheses. Not of course, but that in the days of blatant national apostasy under the Judges these historical sites might not have been used as centres of heathen worship—thus far we can have no quarrel with our Liberal friends. But that they were centres of heathen worship from the very beginning, that is in our view an unwarrantable assumption in the light of such later references to the custom. The only possible explanation which can be offered by such theorists, i.e. that Isaiah sublimated an earlier heathen custom, is in violent conflict with the usual method of the prophets, which was not to sublimate but to root out and to overthrow all idolatrous practices.

A further interesting point in connection with Bethshemesh is that when the Ark was returned to that place by the Philistines it was immediately taken charge of by the Levites. According to modern writers this is, of course, merely a late theory of the editor, since the Levites at that period did not exist as a separate order. The absurdity of this editorial theory is, we are told, fully exposed by the miraculous rapidity with which the Levites appear to take charge of the Ark in true Mosaic style. Unfortunately for this contention however, the works of modern writers seem to ignore the fact that since the days of Joshua, Bethshemesh had been one of the Levitical cities.

Samuel's abbreviated history of Israel's past in Chapter 12 is, of course, so well known that it hardly needs mention here. As an important testimony to the accuracy of the earlier books, it has, naturally, been assigned by advanced scholars to a much later age. Into the reasons for this later dating it is not at the moment our business to inquire, but it is noticeable that here as elsewhere in Scripture the sequence of Israel's history is given as Revelation, Apostasy, Repentance, and not, in accordance with modern theory, as Heathenism, Baal-worship, and a slowly evolving Yahweh worship (N.B.—For the testimony of the Prophets, *see* Hosea, Amos, and even Ezekiel). As to the general credibility of the Scriptural as opposed to the critical theory, it may suffice to point out that the optimistic view of history as a long progression—a view so prevalent in the eighteenth and later nineteenth centuries—is one for which history as a whole affords little

proof, at least within so small a period as 600 years. A cyclic view such as we have in the Scriptures does seem to accord better with the general facts of history—and if a slow drift of progress can be discerned over a long period, it is rather of that Goethean spiral nature, which does not in any way conflict with the narrative as we have it either in 1 Samuel or in the so-called Judges framework. But that by the way.

One further important point in connection with the speeches of Samuel is that in his call to the people to repent (1 Samuel vii. 3), Samuel uses almost exactly the same words as those used by Joshua (in Joshua xxiv. 23) when he delivered his parting charge to the people (cf. too, Genesis xxxv. 2). From this significant fact we are just as much at liberty to conclude that Samuel was familiar with the words of Joshua (perhaps through a study of the sacred books when at Shiloh) as are more advanced scholars to argue a paucity of imagination on the part of a later writer or writers.

The sacred record receives confirmation again when we study the disposition of the tribes at the time of Samuel. Thus for example, reference is made to the tribe of Gad in Gilead, which agrees well with the account of Moses' assessment of Gilead to Gad in the thirty-second chapter of Numbers (cf. too, Joshua ii.). In connection with this question of the tribes again the status of the Kenites would appear to be much the same at the time of Samuel as it was in the days of Moses and Joshua, Saul's favouring of the Kenites in xv. 6, agreeing well with Moses' alliance with and honouring of them in Exodus xviii. The correctness of the dating of the Philistine menace, as confirmed by modern archæology, is, too, not without its significance in view of the generally assumed muddled-headedness of later compilers.

One final point of historical evidence : in Samuel x. 25, reference is made to the writing down of the transaction then concluded in a book, a reference back to the book of Joshua (xxiv. 26) here being unavoidable. Not of course, that the two books are necessarily the same, or necessarily the history books of the period. But they do lend weight to the conviction that the Biblical record is based upon contemporary sources and not merely upon floating traditions; the conclusion being inevitable that the Jews were in the habit, even at this time, of leaving written documents for transmission to posterity. Indeed, now that the ability of Moses to write has been so fully demonstrated, there can be no point in denying Scriptural evidence upon this important question. It is up to the Liberal scholar to produce the very strongest of evidence if he would have us believe that the direct statements of sources in 1 Samuel x. 25, and Joshua xxiv. 26 are false, and that whether piously so or otherwise.

Historically then we have seen that 1 Samuel does in many significant if minor points, confirm the records of Israel's national development as we have them in the Hexateuch and not in present-day text books. It now remains to examine whether or not the same can be said in the religious sphere, and here it must be remembered that the Liberal claim is far more challenging and serious. Is there any direct evidence that the worship of the Lawbooks was in force, or even known at all, in this period ? or must we conclude that after all that worship

was but a late creation of priestly scribes, transporting back their laws, etc., into an obsolete wilderness setting in order to invest them with a more ancient and weighty authority? That is the clear issue which must now be decided, and upon that issue hangs our whole conception of the religious history of God's people and of the history of God's dealings with them on the behalf of mankind.

In the first place then reference must again be made to the Tabernacle. Already we have seen that the Tabernacle did exist at Shiloh in the time of Eli, and although no description of it is given, yet to judge from the presence of the Ark within it and the nature of the references to it (*the* tent of meeting) there can be no reasonable doubt but that this was the identical tabernacle used during wilderness days. Wellhausen's absurd hypothesis of a multiplicity of tents, based solely on 1 Chronicles has been completely demolished by Baxter[1], while as for the theory that this was merely the "crude" tent of Exodus xxxiii. 7, that theory may be held, but the onus of proof rests upon those who hold it. In any case however, whether the tent be elaborate or "crude" this central sanctuary, the focus of Israel's worship, the repository of the Ark of God, still remains.

And central sanctuary, that is precisely what the tent of meeting at Shiloh was. Argue how men may about the date of the Deuteronomic Code, the records bear ample testimony to the existence of a Central Sanctuary at least as early as the time of Samuel. Do we not read for example that Elkanah went up from year to year to worship and to sacrifice to the Lord of Hosts in Shiloh? Do we not read (1 Samuel ii. 22) that all Israel came up likewise? And where is the direct evidence to contradict these historical assertions? The altars during the period of the Judges? The altars set up by Samuel himself at Ramah and Gilgal? But these have little or no bearing whatever upon the existence of a Central Sanctuary. On any showing the period of the Judges was one of tumult and apostasy, but the frequenting of heathen Canaanite shrines at such a period does not by any means disprove the existence of a Central Sanctuary for Yahweh worship. As for the altars of Samuel, there seems to be little doubt from a study of Jeremiah and Psalm lxxviii, but that the sanctuary at Shiloh had been destroyed by the Philistines before Samuel was established as a Prophet and Judge. The Central Sanctuary law may at times have been in abeyance; it may never have worked well, through the opposition of heathen groves (cf. 1 Samuel xv. 23); it may finally have been rendered completely inoperative for a period; but the fact that a law is in abeyance or that it does not work well or that it becomes in certain circumstances inapplicable, is no proof whatever of its non-existence.

So far however, it must be admitted that little testimony has been given to the existence of an elaborate ritual in connection with this Central Sanctuary. The Tabernacle itself is there, but what of its furniture and ornaments, what of its servants and ministers, above all what of its sacrifices? These are questions which must now be dealt with; and in each case we shall find that 1 Samuel does not fail to support the Hexateuchal narrative.

[1] *Sanctuary and Sacrifice.*

Little reference it is true is made to the fittings of the tent of meeting, but then there was little occasion to make mention of them. Indeed, meticulous description would only have led to scepticism and suspicion amongst our more Liberal friends. Where, however, there are references made in the course of the narrative, we have every reason to believe that they can be trusted. And more than that, they embolden us to infer, not, as by the precarious silence argument, that the fittings were rude and simple, but rather that there were far more ornaments, ceremonies, etc., than those specifically mentioned. Thus for example, when we read in 1 Samuel iii. 3 of the lamp of God, or in 1 Samuel xxi. 3-6, of the shewbread (this at Nob), we may be sure that these are but samples of many institutions dating from wilderness days. Again, the mention in iii. 14 of pots, cauldrons, kettles, pans, hooks, etc., presumes a whole array of Temple instruments, whilst the very fact that sacrifices and incense (ii. 28) are mentioned makes inevitable the existence of altars, censers and the like as laid down in the Mosaic Code.

Again, the service of the Temple, although admittedly corrupt under Eli's sons, appears to conform in many details to the Mosaic pattern. Mention has already been made of the Levites and of their especial care of the Ark of God, but apart from the Levites we also read of the service women (1 Samuel ii. 22)—details of this office being given in Exodus xix. 21. The fact too, that the Shiloh Sanctuary was in the charge of an hereditary Aaronic priesthood is surely not without significance, and that the priestly establishment was on a large scale is suggested by the number slain in the slaughter at Nob (1 Samuel xxii. 18, and cf. Psalm lxxviii. 64). The mention of the linen ephod as a priestly vestment (ii. 18, and ii. 28) also accords well with the provisions of Exodus xxviii. 6.

Finally in the matter of sacrifices, although this field has been well covered by Baxter, it is interesting again to notice how the Book of Samuel by many incidental references testifies to the conducting of sacrifices according to Pentateuchal regulation. Building precariously upon the corrupt practices of Eli's sons, Wellhausen and his followers have maintained that regular daily sacrifice was unknown in pre-exilic Israel, and that in any case sacrifices were boiled and not roasted. In more recent years a further attempt has been made to rob sacrifices of any propitiatory significance (Robertson Smith)—propitiation being, of course, at the very heart of the Mosaic institutions. How groundless these theories are, as applied at any rate to the period of Samuel, will be proved by an examination of the text itself.

But first of all let us concede one point : no mention is made of any daily sacrifice at this epoch. Indeed during the ministration of Samuel, that is to say after the fall of Shiloh, it is more than probable that the daily sacrifice lapsed altogether—the Central Sanctuary law now in any case being in abeyance and altars being constructed in accordance with the ordinances of Exodus. Even whilst Eli was priest it is just possible that there was much slackness about the daily offering, although we must not forget that in the story there is no real occasion to mention it (and would it not have been a late gloss if mentioned ?). The text of 1 Samuel i. 3 does at least however, seem to imply regular

and not just haphazard offerings, and it is surely significant, as will appear later, that the offering of which we hear most in the course of the Book is the regular burnt-offering.

And now to come down to the specific references themselves. In 1 Samuel sacrifices are referred to (whether generally or particularly) in the following verses or passages, i. 3, ii. 13, ii. 29, iii. 14, iv. 3, vi. 14-15, vii. 9, ix. 12, x. 8, xi. 15, xiii. 9, and xx. 6. The burnt offering is mentioned on at least four different occasions, once at Shiloh (?), once at Bethshemesh, once at Mizpah, once at Gilgal. At Bethshemesh it is offered in conjunction with the peace-offering, according to Mosaic institution—and the peace-offering is again referred to in xi. 15, when Samuel sacrifices at Gilgal. This reference is particularly significant as belonging organically to the "early" account of the foundation of the Monarchy, although of course, it has had to be ascribed to a later hand in view of this mention of the peace offering and in view of the national prominence given to Samuel. Of the three other main offerings, two are never mentioned at all, the trespass and the sin offering, whilst the third, the guilt offering, occurs in iv. 3, where, however, it is a Philistine parallel and not the Mosaic institution which is in question.

Now what of the details of these sacrifices? Were they conducted in a primitive and heathen manner or after the careful provisions of the Mosaic Code? As regards the minute details we have of course no evidence, since it is obviously not the historian's task to furnish elaborate descriptions of the sacrificial system then in vogue, but one or two details have come down to us which seem to point to an observance of the Pentateuchal ritual. In the first place there seems to be little doubt but that these were roast and not boiled sacrifices if all the evidence is taken into account.[1] Again we notice that provision is made for the priest (ii. 12 ff.), whilst it is expressly stated that the fat is holy to the Lord and must be burned before him (cf. Leviticus iii. and iv where this is prescribed for the peace and especially the sin offering). The offering at the presentation of Samuel is again very important—and it is curious how often scholars have failed to understand this offering through supposing that Samuel was presented solely as a Nazarite (on the strength of course of i. 11). The fact of the matter is that Samuel was dedicated to the Lord primarily as a Levite—(this explaining his service in the Temple)—and the details of the offering, the bullocks together with fine flour and oil (wine !), agree almost exactly with those laid down for the presentation of Levites in Numbers viii. Surely here is strong enough evidence for the antiquity, not only of the Nazaritic order (which is admitted) but also of the Mosaic Levitical order. The only other conclusion is that here again the hand of a Redactor has been busily at work—and an extraordinarily skilful hand in this instance.

One further question : What was the meaning of all this sacrificial slaughter? According to the law, propitiation ; but recently the view has held sway that the propitiatory formed but a small element in the early Jewish conception of sacrifice. In pre-exilic, i.e. pre-Levi-

[1] On this detailed question see Baxter.

ticus Israel a sacrifice was, we are told, primarily a communal meal, a meal that is to say shared by all the members of a clan in company with their tribal God. Only later did the idea of propitiation creep in and oust the earlier theory. Now in 1 Samuel it must be admitted that sacrifices were accompanied by communal meals, and times of jollification and feasting always followed upon the offerings to Yahweh. But this fact we need not even trace back to the decay during the period of the Occupation, since it was laid down in the Mosaic legislation itself (Deuteronomy xii., etc., speaking of times of eating and rejoicing upon the occasion of the annual sacrifice). The question is, however, Does that exhaust the Jewish conception, or has the Propitiatory teaching of the Leviticus Code also its parallel in the historical literature? In answer to this question it is almost sufficient to point to such a title as guilt offering as proof of the presence of a propitiatory element, whilst in confirmation of this presence we have the striking words in Chapter iii : " That the iniquities of Eli's house shall not be purged with sacrifice nor offering for ever." If these words do not teach propitiation, then it is idle to ask what words of Scripture do.

Finally, a few scattered points which support our main contention i.e. that worship in the age of Samuel was generally conducted after the Mosaic pattern. In x. 19, reference is made to the casting of the Lot, a further Pentateuchal institution. The sin of eating blood, too, is mentioned in xiv. 32-36, and for this we have legislation in Leviticus iii. 17, etc. Saul's suppression of familiar spirits in xxviii. 3 is a fulfilment of the command of Moses in Leviticus xix. 31, etc. The feast of the New Moon is celebrated in xx. 5 as laid down in Leviticus xxiii. 1, whilst finally the devoting of the Amalekites in Chapter xv. seems to be in accord with the provisions of Leviticus xxvii. 28-29. All these are minor points no doubt, but significant if we remember that the writer of 1 Samuel was clearly not writing a thesis upon the functioning of Mosaic Law at this period, but merely recounting the general history of the age, both official and biographical.

Two last points which we must touch upon before bringing this subject to a close, and those the two objections which can be raised against the obvious results of this examination. Of these objections, the first is clearly futile—and that is the objection that the passages in question are all the late interpolations of a priestly hand. This of course, amounts to nothing more or less than taking away the evidence in order to protest volubly that it is not there—a childish and unscholarly trick with which we can have nothing to do. For what are the grounds upon which such passages are rejected? Simply that they do not fit in with the new theory of Israel's history. And the proof of that theory? Why simply that such passages are not to be found in the Historical Books. A vicious circle of an argument indeed—and one vicious alike on critical and we venture to suggest moral grounds. If this is all the evidence which can be produced for post-dating these references, then the references remain and the things referred to remain, and not until the most solid proof to the contrary is advanced, both linguistic, stylistic, and historical, will we concede to scholars the right so to play about with the text.

And now for the second and more serious argument, the theory that, as regards our second class of references at least, we have allusions to customs of worship already observed but not yet codified—customs that is to say which were being gradually assimilated and developed from the already existing Canaanite Baal-worship. The strength of this argument is, of course, that it does not rest upon any subjective treatment of the text and yet adequately covers the facts from an advanced point of view. And yet even this objection is based upon an assumption for which there exists not a scrap of historical evidence ; the assumption first of all that Israel was not capable of creating a worship of her own before entering the Promised Land (and that after Egyptian tutelage) ; the assumption that amongst the Hebrews there did not exist a man able to codify such a worship (and that despite the Moses tradition) ; the assumption that the Hebrews were crude and uncultured desert tribes, veritable *enfants de la Nature* ; the assumption finally that God is not able to reveal to man how He would have man direct his worship towards Him and direct his conduct towards his fellow-man.

In contrast to these unprovable assumptions, evidence exists to show that already before the day of Moses codes of law and regulations of worship had been drawn up. Granted then a man of culture and learning like Moses and there is nothing improbable in the Scriptural account. If we prefer a modern hypothesis, well and good, but 1 Samuel does at least bear witness to the truth of the Biblical record and is in no way inconsistent with the codes and regulations of the Law. The Scriptural story is at any rate a tenable alternative to the critical reconstruction—so much our Liberal friends must admit in the light of the evidence from the books themselves. Which of the two we prefer must depend largely upon our understanding of the Ancient World in general, our view of the moral standards and reliability of the writers of Scripture (whether contemporary or otherwise) and our belief or disbelief, in the reality of God's revelation to and working through, the hearts and minds and actions of His servants.

WINDOWS. Amy Carmichael. *S.P.C.K.* 3*s.* 6*d.* and 5*s.*

" The outlook from these ' Windows ' is altogether lovely, and one loves to linger beside them."

A sentence in the introductory paragraph seems to sum up the dominating thought which has inspired the book. " As we have been heartened by the stories of others, we take courage to ask that our story in its turn may hearten our comrades on their battlefields." The book is calculated to encourage the downcast and inspire faith in the hearts of doubters. There is a thread of mysticism running throughout the whole book. But, as is explained, " you cannot live longer in the East than in the West without becoming a little Easternized, and the East thinks in parable still, just as it used to do." The book is a delightful publication, and the illustrations are a feast in themselves. It is a most suitable book to give to a friend. E. H.

THE INFLUENCE OF THE BIBLE UPON THE REFORMATION,

AND UPON THE LIFE AND CHARACTER OF THE ENGLISH NATION.

By the Rev. P. H. Scott, B.D.

The Medieval Church.

THE Medieval Church embraced within its scope the whole of human life, religious, intellectual, political and economic. Its theory was that all secular life should be under religious control : in practice it resulted in all religious life becoming secularized. The abuses to which the Medieval doctrine of the Church as an *imperium in imperio* led made the demand for a Reformation of the Church increasingly strong during the fourteenth, fifteenth, and early sixteenth centuries. The causes which gave rise to this demand were varied. Englishmen objected to the economic impoverishment of the country through the constant drain of wealth which flowed into the Papal coffers from the proceeds of Peter's Pence, annates, fees and tribute of one kind and another. The abuse of justice in ecclesiastical courts became proverbial. The maladministration of the parishes and dioceses was continually increasing through the numbers of absentee ecclesiastics, and the practice of Papal " provision." The monasteries were becoming centres of idleness and corruption, and by the end of the fifteenth century were definitely past any further usefulness to the country. Men also resented the attempts of the Church to gain political control of the country. It is probable that, had it not been for the Lancastrian monarchs and their support of the Church for political reasons, the Reformation would have come at least a century earlier than it did.

The Bible and the Medieval Church.

Owing to the difficulties in the way of a common language consequent upon the Norman Conquest, no attempt was made between 1,000 and 1,200 A.D., to translate any portion of the Scriptures into the language of the common people. The monks and some clergy possessed copies of the Vulgate, but such MSS. were necessarily somewhat rare owing to the high cost (some £1,000 of our money). Where they were accessible to clergy or monks they seem to have been little read. Bishop Grosseteste, of Lincoln, Bishop Hugh of Lincoln, Friar Bacon and

others urged upon the clergy the duty of reading the Bible for themselves, but their advice does not seem to have evoked much response. It is probable that only a very small proportion of the clergy could read sufficient Latin to get them through the Daily Offices intelligently. As far as the common people were concerned their knowledge of Bible stories was such as could be gained from religious manuals, mystery plays, etc.

There appears to have been no desire on the part of the clergy to provide the Scriptures for the people in their own tongue, and as the gulf between the Christianity of the Gospels and that of the Church grew greater, so the danger of allowing the laity to read the Bible for themselves became more and more apparent to the clergy. Nothing more than the Psalter appeared in English before the time of Wycliffe.

Wycliffe and the Lollards.

The anti-clerical feeling during the fourteenth century, which was based rather on political and economic causes at first than upon religious ones, was greatly strengthened and put upon a higher basis by the work of John Wycliffe and his itinerant preachers. Wycliffe was himself a great student of the Scriptures and was the first to realize the benefit which would ultimately accrue to both Church and people if all men were able to read the Bible for themselves in their own tongue. The translation of the whole Bible into English was made for the first time in history by Wycliffe and Nicholas de Hereford, and was later revised by Wycliffe's disciple, John Purvey. For over a century the Lollards, though driven underground by persecution, kept alive the knowledge of the English Bible through their secret meetings, where the Scriptures were read to the illiterate, who learned long passages by heart. In this way a foundation of true spiritual religion, and of love for the Bible, was laid amongst the humbler classes in the great cities, and in the Eastern Counties, on which the structure of the Reformation was later to be built.

The Renaissance.

In the fifteenth century intellectual Europe began to awake out of her long sleep, and to cast off the fetters of medieval scholasticism. The study of Greek, Latin and Hebrew brought about a new knowledge of the wisdom of the ancient Greeks, Romans, and Hebrews. In Italy this resulted in a Neo-Paganism in which even the Papal Court was submerged, and statues of Plato were set up and accorded something like divine honours. Men like Savonarola, and Pico della Mirandola, however, began to turn their attention to the study of the Scriptures in a new way, studying them rather as a whole, than as a museum of isolated texts which might be used quite apart from their contexts. Their spirit was caught by John Colet, who in 1496, on his return to England began to lecture at Oxford on the Epistle of St. Paul, which he expounded on the historical principle.

The Bible and the Individual.

Colet's expositions of the Epistles of St. Paul caused a sensation at Oxford, and influenced many scholars to study the Scriptures. Through his influence Erasmus, the Dutch scholar who had recently come to England, was encouraged to turn his attention from the study of the classics of Rome and Greece to that of the Scriptures. In process of time he produced the first printed Greek New Testament, with a new Latin translation of his own, so that henceforth scholars might read the New Testament in its original language. When this New Testament came to Cambridge, a copy of it was purchased by Thomas Bilney, who was converted through studying it. It formed also the basis of the belief of Thomas Cranmer and William Tyndale, both of whom spent several years studying the Bible before proclaiming in public the great religious truths which formed the foundation of the Reformation theology and worship. Thomas Bilney, in his turn, was instrumental in converting the bigoted College cross-bearer, Latimer, who was later to die for the faith at Oxford.

Thus the first great effect which the Bible had upon the Reformation was the part it played in the spiritual preparation of those who became leaders of the movement in this country. These leaders were not ignorant, or ill-educated men, but were scholars of high standing in their day, and each was a man who had steeped himself in the study of the Bible before beginning his public ministry. Through this study they were led to go much further in their aims than the mere rectification of abuses. They struck at the source of all these abuses, the corrupt doctrine which gave rise to them, particularly the doctrine of Transubstantiation and the Mass. They sought to return to the doctrine taught and practised by the Apostles. The rubbish of ages was cleared away so that the life and worship of the Church might be built anew " on the foundation of the Apostles and prophets, Jesus Christ Himself being the chief corner stone." To these men the new centre of authority in spiritual things was the voice of God speaking to them in the Scriptures, and not the tradition of the Church alone. All the teaching of the Church had to be brought to the touchstone of the Bible before it could be accepted.

The Bible and the Nation.

The vital part, however, which the Bible was to play in the English Reformation was the creation of a popular opinion which valued and loved all for which the Reformation stood, because of a deep conviction that the doctrines of the Reformation were those of the Christ and His Apostles.

While Henry VIII lived, he was at times drawn into a more hostile attitude towards the New Learning owing to the force of public opinion being against innovation in matters of doctrine and worship. The people generally were more incensed against the abuses in the Church than conscious of the corruption of its doctrine. Men like William Tyndale were wise enough to see that the general desire for a purer

worship and a more Apostolic doctrine could not come until the people themselves could read the Bible in their own tongue and judge the current doctrine of the Church by that standard. After the publication of Tyndale's New Testament, and the authorization of the Great Bible, this Book of books began to fill an important place in the daily life of the nation. This was greatly increased after the publication of the Geneva Bible in 1557. This, being handy in size and being somewhat helpfully annotated, became the accepted family Bible of the nation for about a century, and was only displaced by the superior merits of the Authorized Version after a considerable struggle. As the knowledge of the Bible spread amongst the humbler classes, and the doctrine of Justification by Faith and the high standards of morality gripped men and women, those around them were able to see the results in daily life of this New Learning. During the Marian persecution many of these men and women suffered for their faith in the districts where they had been brought up, and their sufferings and heroism in the face of death burnt into the nation a mistrust and horror of Rome which is still evident to-day, while it established the Bible and the principles of the Reformation in the heart of the people. From that time until the days of the Stuarts the practice of Bible reading grew more and more prevalent, and the Bible took the place of the religious dramas and mystery plays of the Middle Ages.

The Bible and Worship.

The services of the Medieval Church were largely dramatic in character, appealing rather to the eye than to the reason and intellect. What Scripture they did contain was largely in the form of scattered versicles, except in the case of the Psalms. Being conducted in Latin, it was understood neither by the bulk of the congregation nor even in many cases by the priests themselves. At the Reformation all this was altered. Thomas Cranmer, who was himself one of the greatest Bible students of his day, and a man of vast erudition and learning, revised the worship of the Church on Biblical lines. Acting on the Reformation principle that all worship must be intelligent, and that public worship should be corporate in the fullest sense of the word, he employed the English tongue. He himself was one of the greatest masters of dignified English, and the grand cadences and expressive phraseology of his liturgical work have never been surpassed. He was, at the same time, a man of truly Catholic sympathies, and sought material for his Books of Common Prayer from all possible sources of historic Christian worship. All that he used, he brought to the touchstone of Holy Scripture so that there should be nothing in the services of the Church which should conflict with Scripture, yet so that whatever was of value in the old Service Books might find a place in the new. Cranmer was likewise a man who was not afraid to alter what he had written when he found with increasing knowledge of the Scriptures that it was misleading or untrue. Thus the history of the Book of Common Prayer up to 1552 is largely the history of the growth of a human soul.

The Bible and The Clergy.

For the clergy the study of the Bible meant a new standard of living and a new standard of preaching. Hitherto the Bible had been used merely as a mine of isolated texts, the Latin of each of which might be interpreted in four different ways, the most obvious of which, the literal sense, was the most unimportant. This process rendered the Bible, if read at all, more or less unintelligible to anyone. The preachers of the Reformation used the Bible as a whole, and instituted a method of expository preaching which paid due attention to the context and to the natural and historical setting of the text. As a result, the Bible became a new Book to their congregations. This popularity of Bible study also necessitated a higher standard of education for the clergy, who could no longer rest content with knowing sufficient Latin to enable them to mumble the words of the daily Offices, and to carry out the pageant of the Mass. It is a matter of history that the continual study of the Bible has tended to sharpen the intellect, and to develop the talents of the student to a remarkable degree.

The Bible and English Literature.

The rise of English literature was subsequent to the translation of the Bible into English by Tyndale and Coverdale. Except for the Tales of Chaucer, and the half-forgotten tracts of Wycliffe, there existed no popular English literature at the commencement of the fifteenth century, and it was upon minds unoccupied by any serious rival that there fell from the lips of the public readers of the " Chained Bibles " in the churches of the land from 1538 onwards, the matchless phrases of Tyndale's English New Testament, or of the Old Testament books. The result was that the stately language of the English Bible became almost at once the standard of the English tongue, and exercised a profound influence upon the great writers of Elizabethan and Puritan England. The works of Shakespeare, Spencer, Bacon, and Milton, for example, show the widespread influence of the Scriptures, which broadened and deepened men's intellect, and led them on to a higher standard of education. English literature, therefore, may be said to have found its basis and its inspiration in Holy Scripture. In like manner the stateliness and rhythm of the language of the Book of Common Prayer owes much to the standard of English set up by William Tyndale, and the early translators of the Bible. Only the best was good enough for men whose minds were saturated with the humble reverence for holy things inspired by constant study of the Bible.

The Bible and the National Character.

Far more important than the influence of the English Bible on literature was the influence of the Bible upon the national character. Whereas the paganism of the Renaissance issued in a revival, to some extent, of the carelessness and loose living associated with the paganism

of Greece and Imperial Rome, and is exemplified in the deliberate cunning and deceit of the political code of Machiavelli, the insistence of the Reformers on the paramount authority of the Scriptures resulted in the prevalence of a manly purity and respect for law, order, and justice. Out of the Book of books, prophet and apostle spoke to simple men and women in their own homes of " righteousness, temperance, and judgment to come," and blended the holiness of an Almighty God with the story of His unconquerable love as expressed in the Death of Jesus Christ. The people were brought into constant touch with the ethical standards of the Gospel, coupled with the power of the Cross of Christ. The result was an uplifting of the standards of moral and spiritual life. This movement came to its head in the rise of the Puritans who were not by any means as a whole the canting, Psalm-singing hypocrites so frequently pictured by biased writers. They were men whose gravity, frugality, and industry, coupled with their religious attitude, was a standing rebuke to much of the extravagance and licentiousness of the early Stuart period. It is true that in face of the character of higher society around them, some went to excess in their sternness, and the rigidity of their outlook on life, but in the main their influence made for a wholesome strength and purity of character, which penetrated the lower ranks of society in a manner impossible before the publication of the English Bible. Since the time of Henry VIII, England had become the " people of a Book, and that Book was the Bible."

From that time onwards every movement towards the purifying and uplifting of the national character has always been associated with a return to the Scriptures, e.g. the Methodist Revival of the early eighteenth century, and the Evangelical Revivals of the late eighteenth and the nineteenth centuries, which changed the religious outlook of the whole of England.

Now that the widespread scepticism and mad rush for pleasure which characterized the years following the Great War show signs of breaking down, because men are discovering that their spiritual needs remain unsatisfied, it is for us as a nation to return to the only source of spiritual strength and satisfaction—the Scriptures of Truth. The Fourth Centenary of the Open Bible in England is a fitting opportunity for us to re-open and to re-read the Book which above all others has fashioned the national character.

THE THINKER DIARY. Fairview Way, Edgware, Middlesex. Paper Covers, 1s.

Mr. J. R. Constance has compiled an interesting and unique Pocket Diary for 1938, which beside the usual postal and other general information contains a collection of varied facts relating to astronomy statistics, natural history, together with some paragraphs of a spiritual and moral kind at the end of each week which should prove most stimulating and helpful. But we hope that in later issues it may be possible to reduce the price.

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. 10*s.* 6*d.*

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. 1. 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. 1). 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 ! " (21. 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.* 3*s.* 6*d.*

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.

REVIEWS OF BOOKS.

UNION OF CHRISTENDOM. Editor : The Bishop of Brechin. *S.P.C.K.* 8*s.* 6*d.*

The subject of Christian Union is one which must demand the attention of Christian people. This is of prime importance in a world which is witnessing the challenging of the Christian programme. The present volume of essays, edited by the Bishop of Brechin, is published for the International Committee of the Church Union. Its separate chapters can also be obtained in pamphlet form.

The book is divided into five parts. They are " The Demand for Union," " The Causes of Disruption, " The Present grouping of Christendom," " The possibility of a united Christendom," and " Essential principles of Catholicism." Whilst many of the contributors are members of the Anglican Communion, others who are members of different churches write from their own point of view. Of these, contributions come from the Eastern, the Scandinavian, the Lutheran and the Free Churches. As is to be expected, the volume has no representative from the Roman Church. Yet the writer who examines the matter of " the Union of Christendom which Roman Catholics visualize," plainly says that " it is not his fault that he, and not one of them, is the author of this essay."

A number of assumptions are made by certain of the contributors which Evangelicals will not find at all congenial. The Protestant character of the Church of England is ignored. Yet whilst emphasizing her place in the Catholic Church, our Church distinctly states her Protestantism. Reference is made to " Gregory's gift of Christianity to England," yet we know that the Celtic Mission was the agency by which our Faith gained its hold for the second time upon the people of these islands. Writing of the view of " The Possibility of a United Christendom from the Standpoint of the Anglican Communion " the Archbishop of Brisbane enlarges upon the view of a Church that should have " the same faith in the same Lord, the same sacraments, the same ministry, and that it would represent in the future as it was intended to do in the beginning the visible and organic unity of redeemed mankind." From the standpoint of Non-Episcopal Communions four contributors speak for the Presbyterians, the Methodists, the Congregationalists and the Baptists. These know their own mind, even as do those who speak for the Church Union.

It is passing strange that from the same quarter should emerge the passionate desire for union which is expressed in this volume, and the almost equally passionate objections to the scheme for union in the Church of South India. Yet this second scheme is the most positive and the most promising in the field of re-union.

A perusal of the book leaves the impression that its promotors desire union first of all on the Catholic side, in spite of the fact that Rome remains remote in its attitude. The most obvious course for us at home would be to seek re-union amongst our own brethren in our midst. If that were realized, the Church of at last one part could speak with an united voice.

E. H.

THE BIBLE DESIGNED TO BE READ AS LITERATURE. Edited and Arranged by Ernest Sutherland Bates, with an Introduction by Laurence Binyon. *William Heinemann Limited.* 10*s.* 6*d.* net.

The neglect of Bible reading has often been said to be due to the actual form in which the ordinary Bible is printed, to the lack of any indication of what parts of it are prose and what are poetry and to the neglect of any chronological order in the books of the Old Testament. There is an earnest desire that this year of the Commemoration of the Fourth Centenary of the Reformation of the English Bible should be marked by a revival of Bible reading, and if this well-printed and excellently produced volume can help to this end its production should be heartily welcomed. Others have attempted in some measure what has been done in this volume, but not with the same attention to the style of production. A special type has been used, and, although the volume is large to handle the excellence of the printing will compensate.

There may be some criticism of the Editor's selection of the portions of the Scriptures to be included and perhaps still more of those omitted, but it must be admitted that he has given good grounds for his choice. He has aimed at presenting a consecutive narrative from the creation to the exile adding portions from the Apocrypha to complete the story down to the time of Jesus. The basic biography of Jesus is given from St. Mark, with additions from the other Gospels where necessary to supplement the teaching and incidents. The treatment of the epistles has been more drastic. The utterances of St. Paul have been restricted " to those only that have immortal value," while " the unimportant pseudonymous epistles " have been omitted. The use of the Authorized Version has been adopted except in the case of some of the books where the Revised Version is admittedly far superior. The antique spelling and cumbersome punctuation and paragraphing of the traditional text have been modernized and, to help the reader's full understanding, all the divisions and sub-divisions have been clearly and helpfully captioned, to give each book and section its correct setting and identification.

Sir Arthur Quiller-Couch in his book *On the Art of Reading*, dwells in one lecture on the reading of the Bible, and he describes the Authorized Version as " at once the most majestic thing in our literature and by all odds the most spiritually living thing we inherit," and he advised his hearers to read and re-read it, for as he points out there is no such thing as " mere literature." This important fact must be borne in mind, for it is impossible for any one to read such a selection

as is provided in this volume without in some measure being brought into close contact with the spiritual lessons which the Bible has for us all, and in this way many may be led to a further study of the sacred writings and induced to lay to heart the message of God's Revelation of Himself to man.

THE WORK OF WILLIAM TINDALE. By the Rev. S. L. Greenslade, M.A., with an essay on Tindale and the English Language by G. D. Bone, M.A. London : *Blackie & Son.* 8*s.* 6*d.* net.

The author of this welcome book tells us in his Preface that he had begun work on a new Life of Tindale when that by Mr. J. F. Mozley which was published last year, seemed to make another unnecessary, at least for the present. There did, however, seem room for a book which while giving briefly the essential facts of Tindale's life, should be devoted mainly to the illustration of his thought and language, and this, Mr. Greenslade has produced in the volume before us. The work is so admirably done that, notwithstanding the excellence of Mr. Mozley's " Life," we should have been glad to have one by Mr. Greenslade as well, for his competence to produce it will be obvious to all readers of this volume.

The book is divided into two parts, the first containing a brief biographical sketch of Tindale ; a discussion of Tindale's moral and religious teaching ; and the essay on Tindale and the English language by Mr. G. D. Bone. The biographical sketch is brief but sufficient and incorporates the latest information. The article on Tindale's moral and religious teaching is valuable as showing how important a part his writings, other than the translation of the Bible, played in their influence on the Reformation. In the case of many of the Reformers their development in the direction of Protestantism was gradual and we can note the stages by which they advanced. But Tindale seems to have emancipated himself from the fetters of medieval belief early and completely. It is true that we have very little information regarding his earlier years, and it is probably true that he owed something to Luther for the strengthening of his views in regard to justification by Faith and to other points of doctrine. But he had a clearness and vigour of mind which betokens the originality which is strong enough to borrow as well as to reject from the thought of others without sacrificing independence.

The essay by Mr. Gavin Bone on Tindale and the English Language well deserves Mr. Greenslade's description of delightful. It is a very learned and discriminating study of Tindale's style and vocabulary and makes a valuable addition to the book. He shows that Tindale's style was his own and derived little help from the traditions of contemporary English prose. His verdict is that " if we look at still earlier translations of the Bible, Tindale's seems miracle enough."

The second part of the book consists of extracts of moderate length from Tindale's writings. The passages cited represent the most characteristic of his views. They are long enough to give a clear

perception of the author's meaning and of his style, and are furnished with a few explanatory notes. The spelling is, except in the examples of Bible translation, modernized, a distinct advantage in a book of this kind. The passages extracted are taken mainly from the three volumes of Tyndale's Works, published by the Parker Society, and give a good idea of all that is specially important in his teaching. The book is finely produced, the printing, binding and paper being all excellent. It would make a very suitable present to a vicar, curate or other appreciative friend for the New Year or at any other time.

W. G. J.

HYMNODY PAST AND PRESENT. By C. S. Phillips, D.D. *S.P.C.K.* *7s. 6d.*

A vast amount of research, a desire for the highest order of hymnody, cultivated musical taste, and a love for his task, have been combined by Dr. Phillips in the production of his book, *Hymnody Past and Present.* The book is fully worthy of its title.

There is a wide field for research in the Greek and Latin hymns of the past. Translators have brought them into present-day use. By the same means the German Reformation hymns are our present possession. Yet English hymnody came into its own under the Evangelical Revival. Dr. Phillips is unstinting in his recognition of the debt owing to such men as Watts, Wesley and later evangelicals. When the period of a rather grudging reception of hymn-singing had been overcome, the author shows how the tractarians contributed to sacred song from their own point of view. The closing chapters of the book with their practical counsels are amongst the most valuable parts of the work. It would be well for both Clergy and Organists to study them.

To us, it seems strange that the hymn should have been held suspect in our own land by certain of our religious leaders. One wonders why the Reformers did not adopt Luther's methods when he gave his followers a song. It seems that the theory of the preponderating influence of foreign reformers upon our Reformation receives another fatal blow when hymnody is considered. The author attributes the rather barren period of the Metrical Psalm to what he calls "the tyranny of the Genevan principle of the Bible and the Bible only." Yet that cannot be held of the Carolinian period of our Church's history, which was as unproductive in this sphere as any other sterile period. Surely Dr. Phillips is nearer the mark when he says that these psalms were "the war-songs of a rebel army in its fight against Rome."

As is stated on p. 215, "Hymnody never stands still, because of this, the last hymn-book will never be edited. Some ancient hymns have stood the test of time, but the favourite hymns of any people will ultimately be the product of their own genius. The greater majority of translations will thus be the interest of students, but not of the common people. For this same reason, one would suggest that the straining after old modes and plainsong effects so noticeable amongst certain

modern composers of hymn tunes, will " date " just as much, if not considerably more than the so-called " Victorian " hymn tune. Perhaps Barnby's setting of " For all the Saints," in spite of its defects, will outlive the setting of our contemporary, Dr. Vaughan Williams. Time will tell.

The hymn is the possession of the people, and whilst it remains, weaving itself into the texture of human life, it will be the medium by which worshippers will follow St. Paul's direction—" Singing with grace in your hearts unto God."

E. H.

A PLEA FOR A PLAN. By The Very Rev. C. Alington, D.D. *Longmans.* 5*s.*

In putting forward his plea Dr. Alington has faced one of the pressing problems of education. Whilst he is primarily concerned with the Public Schools of the country, the subject of his book must necessarily affect both the teaching of the Preparatory Schools and the examination standards of the universities. His proposed changes will also affect the Secondary Schools.

The main problem is stated plainly on p. 29. " Too many subjects are being taught to too many boys in much too short a time." As a remedy it is suggested that two types of education should be provided, each suited to the particular bent of the pupils, because " boys (and, I imagine, girls too) can be, for educational purposes, divided into two main classes—those whose interests are primarily literary and those whose tastes may be described as scientifico-mathematical " (p. 42). A scheme is then worked out in some detail concerning what should be included in a common programme for both types and what should be reserved for specialization. His suggestion for " intensive " teaching of certain subjects is most arresting and should command due consideration from educationalists.

Throughout his discussion of the subject, Dr. Alington has always the aim of education before him and quotes with approval the late Bishop Creighton's views on the subject. Regarding his own plan he says, " the suggestions which I make are put forward in no pontifical spirit, but merely as a rough draft capable of indefinite improvement." However, as a former head of a Public School, Dr. Alington has both the knowledge and experience which qualify him to utter his plea.

E. H.

PAROCHIAL SERMONS OF BISHOP CHAVASSE. *S.P.C.K.* 5*s.*

A wide public will doubtless welcome the publication of some of the parochial sermons preached by the late Bishop of Liverpool. Those who knew and loved him will be first amongst that public. Yet added to them will be others who wish to take as an example and inspiration, the work of one who evidently did not despise " the foolishness of the preaching." Dr. Sweetapple speaks for the first section of this public in a Preface which he has contributed to the volume. Next follows an

extract from Canon Lancelot's *Life of Bishop Chavasse.* This extract deals with the Bishop as a preacher. From this extract comes this magnificent testimony: "He was not a great preacher like Magee or Liddon, but excellent for an ordinary parish congregation, and his sermons went home to men's hearts" (p. viii.). The Bishop of Rochester next contributes a foreword. Here, the Bishop says: "None who listened to him could fail to be impressed by the fact that they were listening to one who spoke of the things that he did know, to one who had sought his message upon his knees, to one who was a true man of God" (p. xii.).

The sermons themselves are arranged so as to give one for each Sunday of the year from Advent to Whit Sunday. Besides these there are sermons for Christmas Day, Ash Wednesday, Good Friday, Easter Even and Ascension Day.

It is not easy to pick out any particular sermon from so fine a collection, but the one for Good Friday certainly speaks to the heart. Is it too much to hope that a companion volume might complete the cycle of the Church's year?

E. H.

A PRIEST FOR EVER: A Study of the Epistle entitled: "To The Hebrews." By J. P. Alexander. With Foreword by The Very Reverend Principal W. M. Macgregor, D.D. Price 6*s.* net.

The book is the substance of the Bance Lectures, delivered in Trinity College, Glasgow, in 1933.

Mr. Alexander displays a mastery of the relevant literature on the Epistle to the Hebrews as well as a sturdy independence in estimating the opinions of his predecessors in the field. The author's full consideration of the problems raised by the epistle will commend itself to all thoughtful readers.

The Chapter VII entitled "A Priest for Ever," gives a masterly survey of the claims and qualifications of Our Lord as the Apostle and High Priest of our Faith; to quote one sentence only in proof: "So far as Hebrews has any doctrine of Atonement, it would be nearer the mark to describe it as 'Atonement through Obedience,' rather than through sympathy; or more strictly 'Atonement through sacrifice, in obedience to the Will of the Father'."

The book is one which can with confidence be placed in the hands of theological students of our colleges.

T. SMITH.

RELIGION: Institutional and Personal. By Rev. W. Bryn-Thomas. *Allenson.* 2*s.* 6*d.* net.

The book contains a series of living Sermons on some of the most vital problems of Christian life to-day.

The author seeks to lay bare the essential difference between *Faith* and the *Form* and has much outspoken language on the principles

of applied Christianity affecting both the Church of England and also the Nonconformists' churches. The book is intended, therefore, for all alike, and seeks to foster a better understanding between the different branches of the Christian Church. The author's freedom from the conventional is well illustrated by a quotation on p. 15, when dealing with the question of the administration of the Sacraments: "It is universally recognized that Baptism can *validly* be administered by a *layman* in an emergency, such as, for instance, in the case of extreme illness. Canonically, the Church has always allowed the same latitude to a layman with regard to the Holy Communion. This, however, is not recognized by its present-day leaders. The sooner it becomes recognized the better it will be for all concerned. It cannot therefore, be argued, as is nowadays done, that the *validity* of the sacrament is at stake if celebrated by a minister who has not been *episcopically* ordained. What is at stake is the *regularity*, not the *validity*. Admittedly it would be *irregular* to allow laymen to celebrate the communion within the episcopal church. *Irregularity*, however, is one thing, *validity* is quite another. Whether the reader will agree with the author in every particular or not, he will admire the fearless spirit with which the author faces the situation of our own times.

T. S.

THE EARLY BRITISH CHURCH AND THE ROMAN OCCUPATION OF BRITAIN. By the Rev. F. G. Llewellin, B.D., D.Litt. Published by the *Protestant Truth Society*. 2*s*. 6*d*.

The subject of the introduction of Christianity into England is one which is in need of emphasis to-day in view of the tendency for propaganda purposes to over-emphasize the importance of the "Italian Mission" to England under Augustine in A.D. 597.

Dr. Llewellin traces the story of Britain from the times of Julius Caesar through the events of the Roman occupation, showing how the history of these islands points to the introduction of Christianity at an age long before the coming of Augustine. The early British Church produced its saints and heroes, some of whom laid down their lives for the Faith. The presence of British bishops at the Council of Arles, A.D. 314, of Ariminium, A.D. 389, and possibly Sardica, A.D.374, together with the adherence of the British Church to the Nicene Creed in A.D. 363, all point to the settled state of the Church at that time.

The book gives an interesting account of the Faith, worship and organization of the early British Church, and is a book that young churchmen should take up to read. T. S.

A LITTLE BOOK OF RELIGIOUS VERSE. By the Rev. G. Lacey May. *S.P.C.K.* 2*s*.

We heartily commend this anthology. Most of the extracts are familiar, though there are a few less well-known modern pieces included. To have such a collection in a single volume is most useful.

H. D.

NOTES ON RECENT BOOKS.

FEW men in recent years were so well known in Evangelical circles throughout the world as Bishop Taylor Smith. In the last few years he had visited many parts of the Empire, United States, and some of the countries of central Europe to attend conferences, to preach sermons, and in many ways to advance the cause of Evangelical religion. It was on a voyage returning from one of these tours that he died on board the steamer *Orion* early in the present year. His death was lamented by a very wide circle of friends and by the members of the various societies with which he was connected. The Lutterworth Press has issued a biography written by Mr. Maurice Whitlow who describes him as "Everybody's Bishop" (2*s.* 6*d.* net). This popular account of the Bishop's life will be widely read. It goes to the root of the Bishop's character and shows that to do the will of God was the sole motive that inspired him. He was a student of St. John's Hall, Highbury, and was ordained to a curacy at Upper Norwood, and was there until he accepted a call to undertake work in Sierra Leone under Bishop Ingham who was at that time in charge of the diocese. In 1894 there was a war in Ashanti, and Prince Henry of Battenberg, husband of Princess Beatrice, Queen Victoria's daughter, took part in the expedition. He contracted fever and died. Messages were intrusted by him to Taylor Smith for the Queen, and he became an honoured and welcome guest with the royal family, being appointed an Honorary Chaplain to the Queen. He became Archdeacon of Sierra Leone and was appointed Bishop. He remained there until he was made Chaplain General, a post which he held till 1925. During the strenuous years of the war he had an onerous task which he carried out with conspicuous success in spite of the criticism of churchmen of another school, who thought that they could carry out the duties better than an Evangelical. He showed, however, that Evangelical principles met the deepest needs of the soldiers on the battlefield. Since his retirement he has been a conspicuous figure on Evangelical platforms, and a frequent speaker at Keswick and other Conventions. He was President of the Children's Special Service Mission and was actively associated with other Evangelical organizations. Mr. Whitlow has presented a vivid and forceful account of the Bishop.

Although the Society of Friends constitutes a comparatively small body of Christians, their influence far outweighs their numbers. This is due to many causes, but more particularly perhaps, to the enthusiasm which they display in many philanthropic and humanitarian enterprises, and to the generous contributions which they make to such

work. Their history is an interesting one, and an account of it written by Mr. A. Leave Brayshaw, B.A., LL.B., under the title *The Quakers : Their Story and Message*, has reached a third and considerably enlarged edition. (George Allen & Unwin Ltd., 5*s.* net). Every aspect of the Quaker movement is set out and the whole account is well documented. An adequate account is given of George Fox and the origin of the name " Quaker." An explanation is given of the true meaning of the " Inner Light " which is one of the chief characteristics of Quaker teaching and experience. An account is given of the extension of the movement to Ireland and America, and of the work of William Penn. Much persecution was suffered in the early days of the movement, but with the eighteenth century quieter times came and the Society encountered other dangers. The organization of the Society and the history of the Quaker Ministry are explained, the break with traditional observances in the nineteenth century is indicated, and the closing chapters tell of the important services rendered during and after the Great War. Many will be glad to have this interesting account of the Quaker Movement.

The Rev. Arthur Cleveland Downer, M.A., D.D., has spent a long life in the service of the Evangelical cause in the Church of England. He is already well known as the author of *The Mission and Administration of the Holy Spirit*, *The Principle of the Interpretation of the Epistle to the Hebrews*, and a *Memoir of Thomas Scott, the Commentator*. He began his career at Brazenose College, Oxford, in 1866, and he is now the senior member of the College. He has compiled a book about Oxford and the religious influences there largely based upon his own reminiscences. It has been issued by The Church Book Room, under the title, *A Century of Evangelical Religion in Oxford* (2*s.* 6*d.* net.). After a brief exposition of the principles of Evangelical Religion, and the meaning of Evangelical Churchmanship, he goes on to show that Evangelical thought has influenced the University more than many would allow. He gives a brief account of some of the outstanding Evangelical figures connected with the University and the chief churches of the city. Canon Christopher of St. Aldate's was a familiar figure on Evangelical platforms in days gone by. He was followed in 1905 by the Rev. G. Foster Carter, who was succeeded by the Rev. T. W. Ketchlee, and in 1922 the Rev. C. M. Chavasse, now Master of St. Peter's Hall, occupied the important post. St. Aldate's has been for some years the principal centre for promoting Evangelical religion. Brief accounts are also given of the ministrations in other churches. Among some of those of whom a special account is given are Canon Christopher, Canon Linton, the Rev. E. P. Hathaway, of whom Dr. Downer says : " Few, if any, have left a greater mark upon the Oxford of to-day. He was a first-rate organizer " ; the Rev. H. C. P. Bazely, who first began the open-air preaching at the Martyrs' Memorial, where Dr. Downer frequently joined him ; Bishop Heber of Calcutta, Provost Cotton of Worcester, Robert Aitken, and William

Hay Aitken, the well-known missioner, C. P. Golightly, at one time curate to Newman, but later one of his chief opponents, T. Valpy French, afterwards Bishop of Lahore, Lord Radstock, Bishop Chavasse, Bishop Knox, H. G. Grey, Principal of Wycliffe Hall, Dr. Griffith Thomas—his successor, Temple Gairdner of Cairo. In addition to these, many others who played a more or less important part in University life are mentioned. The closing chapters contain an account of Wycliffe Hall, the Oxford Pastorate, the O.I.C.C.U., and St. Peter's Hall. Dr. Downer's account of Oxford should appeal to a wide circle of readers.

THE MASTER. By the Rev. Guy H. King, A.K.C. *The Church Book Room.* 2*s.* 6*d.*

It is a fault of this modern age that the great majority of books are out of date within three months of publication, and forgotten within twelve. *The Master* is one of that small minority which may, with justice, be regarded as of permanent value in its statement of the Christian Faith. It is in every way a praiseworthy book, for here Mr. King succeeds in giving us a book in which not a word is wasted, while remaining very readable ; a book which deals with the greatest Truths of our Faith without being beyond the understanding of the most humble Christian.

The Master consists of seven studies of our Lord, each dealing in a convincing manner with a different aspect of the Lord Jesus. For example in the study " Did He rise from the dead ? " we have the whole question of the Resurrection considered from the historical, Biblical and Prayer Book points of view, the various critical theories are discussed, the evidence weighed, and the truth vindicated.

It is very heartening too, in these days of widespread unbelief, to find the Second Coming the subject of a careful study.

Churchmen will find in this book a help to their spiritual growth, a stimulant to their faith, and a constant reminder that our Redeemer is not only risen, but returning. R. F. R. G.

JESUS SHALL REIGN. By Wm. H. Auret Pritchard. *Thynne.* 3*s.* 6*d.*

The author in his book gives a readable survey of the teaching of the Bible on the subject of prophecy, specially in relation to the Second Advent of our Lord. The book comes with a message for our time and is a real tonic for Christian people of to-day. The author takes the pre-millennium view of the coming of Christ, and is convinced that the signs of the times indicate the near approach of the end of this present age. The book has a running commentary on world movements up to our own times. The Bible student and Sunday School teacher will do well to read it. The reading of the book impresses the reader with the evidence of an over-ruling Providence directing events to the final scene when our Lord shall reign. T. S.