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

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_expository-times_01.php

pdfs are named: [Volume]_[Issue]_[1st page of article].pdf

Paul's Personal Religion.

By Principal Alfred E. Garvie, D.D., Hackney and New College, London.

1. It has been the common rule to treat Christ as the object and not also as the subject of religion, and Paul as a theologian and not as a believer. (*a*) Deissmann in his recent volume on *The Religion of Jesus and the Faith of Paul* challenges this procedure; and we may acknowledge that he is right in so doing. As the author of a book entitled *Studies in the Inner Life of Jesus*, I may claim to be in cordial agreement as regards his treatment of the religion of Jesus. In another book, *Studies of Paul and his Gospel*, I have dealt with *the man* before I have treated *the message*; and thus fully recognized the truth of his insistence that the experience is primary, and the theology secondary. (*b*) But as regards Paul, he seems to me to carry his contention further than an adequate recognition of all the facts allows. Whether the influence of Greek culture upon him was much or little, he was influenced by it. He had been trained as a Jewish scribe, and the Jewish scribe survived in the Christian apostle, and affected his interpretation and exposition of his faith even in his letters. Granted that these were the letters of a missionary to churches that he had founded, he was not in them concerned merely with an edifying communication of his gospel, but he was defending that gospel against Jewish or Gentile objections, and the weapons he used were necessarily intellectual weapons, arguments for the mind as well as appeals to the heart. He not only bore the testimony of experience, but developed on the basis of that experience with the intellectual resources of his environment a philosophy of the world and life as well as a theology of God and man and their mutual relations. He was not himself indifferent to that intellectual exposition and vindication of his faith. Doubtless he sought primarily religious satisfaction and moral potency in his faith, but his own intellectual vigour as well as the discipline through which his mind had passed forbid the assumption that he felt no need in himself to meet the claims of his intellect for the certainty of truth. (*c*) However occasional and unsystematic the contents of his letters generally may have been, that does not exclude an implicit continuity and consistency in his thinking. Do Deissmann's words apply strictly to the Epistle to the Romans as contrasted with the Epistle to the Galatians? 'We ought,' he says, 'to read the letters of Paul as unliterary letters, not as literary epistles, not as carefully-thought-out pieces of a system that was being elaborated; we must read them as confessions, inspired by particular situations. It is not necessary for us to suppose that these separate special expressions can be, or were meant to be, combined into a systematic doctrine' (*op. cit.* p. 160 f.). That Paul ever intended to elaborate a system we may, with Deissmann, confidently deny; but that there was an immanent logic in his confessions, inspired though they were by particular situations, seems an inevitable inference. The expositors of Paul have not been quite so far astray as Deissmann would make them out to be in their endeavour to give an orderly presentation of his teaching. I have recognized in my commentary on *Romans* that even behind that Epistle we can trace the particular occasion; but that Epistle is something more systematic than a confession. (*d*) We may cordially endorse Deissmann's words about Paul, 'to this great religious genius communion with Christ was the constant vibrating energy of life' (p. 159). Ro 6 is nearer the heart of Paul than Ro 3. Nevertheless we may refuse to dismiss as *doctrinaire* those who show 'very little recognition of the synonymity of the various Pauline expressions,' and decline to regard Justification, Reconciliation, and Redemption as simply variant terms for Communion with Christ. The solution is always Christ; but each of these terms does stand for a different problem in the mind of Paul; and Deissmann, while asserting the synonymy of Paul's religious confessions himself, recognizes these differences. 'In all these figurative expressions (justification, reconciliation, forgiveness, redemption, and adoption),' he says, 'man stands before God each time in a different guise before the same God, first as an accused person, secondly as an enemy, thirdly as a debtor, fourthly and fifthly as a slave. In all these uses man is in an abnormal and bad position. Then, in Christ, he comes into the normal and good position' (p. 208). But were these expressions

only different figures for the same moral and religious reality, or did they express differences in the complex human personality in its relation to God? (*e*) It seems to me that Deissmann attempts to simplify Paul's experience much more than the facts allow. His experience of Christ was a complex of varied capacities, necessities, purposes, and influences from his environment, which cannot be exhaustively stated in one simple formula. While we shall be concerned here with Paul's personal religion, his theology was not merely a confession of it, but, as is inevitable, there was a reaction of his theology on his experience; for an experience expounded and vindicated as was Paul's, in answer to the challenges of the thought of the environment, is not the same unchanged experience, which it would have been, had the implicit not been made explicit; since the articulation is the development of an experience.

2. In his insistence on the experience of Paul as the decisive factor in his theology, Deissmann, however, is right as against a current type of scholarship, which resolves a great religious personality into the mere resultant of the varied religious influences of his environment, and minimizes, if it does not altogether exclude, the originality of genius in the realm of religion as in other regions, and the reality of the Divine activity to which religion is responsive. (*a*) One finds it hard not to be impatient with and even irritated by a learning which has no insight, and which, having little or no religion itself, cannot appreciate religion in others. It is true that 'spiritual things can only be spiritually discerned'; and there must be some spiritual affinity with Paul in him who would understand, and offer an interpretation of Paul. Hence such a book as Morgan's *The Religion and Theology of Paul* explains by the influence of the environment what a finer discernment would trace to the experience, while admitting the influence of the environment on the mode in which the experience found expression. (*b*) What we must postulate, unless we are to dismiss Paul's experience as illusive, is the reality of his experience of the living Christ; he was assuredly one of 'the greater works' of Christ after His resurrection; he had an intimate communion with Christ, and knew the immediate action of Christ in his inner life. But even his experience was limited and conditioned, as all human experience must be, by the receptivity and responsiveness of the medium, his complex personality, made what it was by many factors.

3. Before we attempt to interpret the experience we must examine the medium. (*a*) As the religious consciousness is not unaffected by the organic conditions, it may first of all be observed that he was small, sickly, and sensitive and with a fear of death as physical dissolution, and yet possessed a vitality which enabled him to sustain a strain before which others would have succumbed. Although we may regard as unproved the suggestion that he suffered from epilepsy, his 'stake in the flesh' seems to have been some form of disease which not only endangered his life but which he himself felt as a humiliation, and to the endurance of which he was reconciled only by a definite assurance of the sufficiency of the Divine grace. He was of an intensely emotional temperament, and under the stress of emotion subject to those abnormal psychical conditions which are included in the New Testament among the *charisms*, and which have been characteristic of many mystics; he saw visions and heard voices, spoke with tongues, and his dreams were significant for his religious life. He was nevertheless keen in intellect, and sane in judgment. While he used the methods of reasoning which he had learned in the Rabbinic schools, and may have followed in the form of his presentation of his thought the *diatribe* of the Greek philosopher, his mind was essentially intuitive rather than ratiocinative; he saw *truth* in *pictures*. The presentation is figurative, as for instance in that passage about the Incarnation, on which abstract theories of kenosis have been unwarrantably based. Or again, his representation of the negative and the positive aspects of Christian life — renunciation and realization — as crucifixion and resurrection with Christ. His figures are not merely illustrations, analogies; they are the necessary modes of his visualizing of his thought. It is a characteristic declaration 'we *look* not at the things which are seen, but at the things which are not seen' (2 Co 4^{18}). In this connexion it may be observed that while he was keenly interested in the ways and works of men—the builder, the gardener, the soldier, the athlete—he was indifferent to the sights and sounds of Nature. His imagination did not find any sustenance there.

(*b*) He had the realizing imagination which made the invisible as real as the visible. He had prob-

ably a more vivid consciousness of the presence of the living Christ than any other Christian believer has had. For his *mysticism* Christ was never a ladder up which he climbed to an ecstatic experience of the indefinable and ineffable Deity, and which could be left behind; but for him God always was in Christ, and he sought no immediate contact with God above and beyond his intimate communion with Christ. But his statement in 1 Co 15^{28}, 'then shall the son also himself be subjected to God . . . that God may be all in all,' does suggest the question: Did he anticipate a relation to God transcending such mediation? This, however, is a solitary utterance. (*c*) His mysticism was not sustained by human discovery and achievement, but by Divine disclosure and communication. In it faith received and responded to grace. I am in entire accord with Deissmann in the distinction which he makes between the two types of mysticism. 'The one type is everywhere present where the mystic regards his communion with God as an experience in which the action of God upon him produces a reaction towards God. The other type of mysticism is that in which the mystic regards his communion with God as his own action, from which a reaction follows on the part of Deity' (p. 195). Rightly he regards Paul's as a Reacting Mysticism, a religion of grace and not of works. (*d*) May not the difference between the two types be due to a more or less sensitive conscience, a more or less acute experience of moral struggle? Speculative mysticism, which seeks the answer to a question of the mind, will tend to self-sufficiency: practical mysticism, which strives for the solution of the problem of the disquieted conscience or the enslaved will, will realize man's insufficiency, and depend on God. For Paul, morality no less than religion was a problem. His references to the flesh have led some to assume that he was specially beset by sensual temptations; but this assumption is not necessary to explain the account of the inward struggle in Ro 7^{7-25}. A sensitive conscience may no less intensify the inward struggle than a clamorous appetite. A man of so intense emotion and passionate affection, as we know Paul to have been, we must admit, may have been subject to the temptations of the flesh. What is certain is that the inner conflict in him was severe and tried him sorely. His was not a passive, but an active, nay, even an *explosive* nature; his experience was likely to be not evolutionary but catastrophic, not gradual development but violent crisis. So much the available evidence allows us to say about his complex personality, the raw material of his religious experience and moral character.

4. The development of that personality was necessarily affected by his environment. (*a*) As one who was brought up as far as was possible in the ways of strict Scottish piety and conduct in a foreign land uncongenial and even hostile to them, I can understand better what the Jewish boy in Tarsus passed through. As far as possible isolated from, and even taught to distrust, fear, and avoid the ways of his environment, he could not altogether escape its influence. It does seem to me that Sir William Ramsay, with a pardonable zeal for, and pride in, what his researches can contribute to the understanding of Paul, has exaggerated the extent of that influence, and has ascribed to the earlier years of boyhood what may have affected his mind, when more readily opened to that Gentile environment in after years, even after he became the apostle of the Gentiles. Or possibly when his Jewish exclusiveness was transcended, the memories of his boyhood, suppressed in his Pharisaic period, may have returned, and exercised a more potent influence than even in his early years. His recoil from Pharisaic Judaism made him more responsive to his Gentile environment. Undoubtedly he had a wider horizon than the apostles who knew only Galilee and Jerusalem. His Roman citizenship, of which he was proud, and which could be useful to him in travel throughout the Roman Empire, was undoubtedly afterwards one of the reasons for and motives to his choice of his fields of labour. His violent reaction against the Pharisaism which had not brought him satisfaction or deliverance was also a factor in this decision. He himself ascribes his choice to a direct Divine command after his conversion (Ac 22^{17-21}); but as in that record there seem to be, if we may use the phrase, subsequent experiences telescoped, we cannot be absolutely certain that he did not read in his retrospect later into earlier experiences. If there was a conscious Divine command, it came, and could not otherwise have come, to a prepared mind, in which we may recognize the memories of his earlier life in Tarsus as a factor. But I do not believe that his religious thought was to any appreciable extent determined by Greek philosophy, or his religious life by the pagan mystery religions.

His exposition of his experience may have been affected by these influences, which probably came into his life at a later stage. At least we must avoid rashly explaining by external borrowings what may be understood as inward gains. On these matters more will need to be said at a later stage of the discussion.

(*b*) As a boy or youth Paul went to Jerusalem to be trained in a Rabbinic school (Ac 22^{3}); and I am absolutely convinced that he was most potently influenced by his Jewish environment. It seems to me a safe rule to prefer a Jewish to a Gentile derivation of any element in his religion, morals, or theology. For instance, I should not hesitate to insist on the derivation of his use of the term Lord for Christ from Septuagint usage rather than from the use of the term in Gentile cults. In view of all the Old Testament has to say about God as Saviour, it is not necessary to seek the source of Paul's view of Christ's Saviourhood in a mystery religion. In his sacramentalism (Ro 6^{1-11} and 1 Co 11^{23-34}) he may have been influenced by what he knew of the mystery religions; but he did not merely adapt to the Christian ordinances borrowed ideas; ultimately, what he thought was based on what he himself had experienced. His own baptism, especially when he read back later developments into the content of his experience then, had been truly an inward crisis, 'a new creation, old things passing away, and all things becoming new' (2 Co 5^{17}). His own participation in the Supper of the Lord was to him not only a commemoration of a past event, but a communication of a present gift of grace. His experience was what it was in its main features because he had been a Jew, and not a Gentile, before his conversion; and Jewish traits survived in him after he was converted.

5. We can now address ourselves to an examination of his experience. (*a*) From Ph 3^{4-6} we may infer that for a time, at least, he was a contented Pharisee, self-righteous; but Ro 7^{7-25} seems to prove that his satisfaction did not continue long. Whether v.^{7} refers to a distinct moral crisis, in which he discovered that while his outward life was blameless he did not, and could not, conform to the law in his desires, or the process of self-discovery was gradual, we cannot confidently determine. What is certain is that he tragically experienced his bondage to sin, and consequent misery. His problem was not primarily how sin can be forgiven, but how its bondage can be ended. But it may be that the law's demand for a righteousness which because of this bondage he could not render, intensified the distress of his soul; the sense of guilt may have been joined to the feeling of enslavement.

It is only by this distress of soul that his fury as a persecutor (Ac 26^{9-11}) can be explained. He was a man of tender heart, passionate but not cruel. Why did he do violence to his nature in his zeal against the Christians? Did he hope thereby to win some merit that might compensate for his failure to keep the law perfectly? Was he outraged in feeling by the declaration of the Christians that the long-promised and much-hoped-for Messiah had died an accursed death, as the law declared such a death as Jesus had suffered on Calvary to be (Gal 3^{13})? Was he tormented by the doubt or fear that this awful calamity might have befallen his people, and so the hopes placed on the Messiah's coming had proved vain? Did he persevere in his fury despite some misgivings, as the words about kicking against the ox-goad suggest (Ac 9^{5} 26^{14})? Had the bearing of the sorely tried Christians so impressed him as to raise the question in his mind: Might not this affirmation be true? Even sudden and striking crises in life are in some measure prepared, and so Christ appeared to him in the fullness of time.

(*b*) What he experienced was not a subjective vision, a hallucination of sense resulting from his desire or expectancy, for there is no evidence of any such condition. He describes his conversion as an abortion, an unnatural and violent birth (1 Co 15^{8}); it was no normal, moral, or religious process. Of the reality of Christ's presence he was convinced, even although his accounts of that experience blend with it what may have belonged to a later date. I at least assume that this experience was not of the same subjective kind as those described in 2 Co 12^{16}; for on it he rests his claim to apostleship as he does not on them. This experience was something more than the visions or the voices mystics have claimed to enjoy. (*c*) The first result was the certainty that Jesus was risen, and that He was the Christ. The second result was his conviction that the death could not have been accursed, but must have some meaning and worth in relation to His work as Messiah. It must have taken him time for thought before he worked out such a theory as is formulated in Ro 3; but I do not believe that he did not find a solution of the

problem of the death till after his ministry had begun. The call to find a solution was too clamorous for any such delay. His mind was, as I have said, explosive, and so his thought was very rapid. He was an instructed and intelligent theologian, with abundant material of knowledge, and decisive movement of judgment enabling him to find the desired solution swift and sure. I do not believe that for a time he had not advanced beyond the common eschatological view as presented in 1 and 2 Thessalonians, although his preaching may for a time have been mainly in accord with the common apostolic tradition. I hold strongly that the Epistle to the Galatians was his first epistle, and that it was separated by a considerable interval of time from the Epistle to the Romans with which it is usually associated. In the one we have the vehement assertion of truth reached in a great upheaval of the inner life; in the other the deliberate exposition of truths that had by meditation been wrought out in their manifold bearings. Not years, but only months of intense inward life were necessary for him to reach his distinctive gospel as it is presented in Galatians. What the law had pronounced an accursed death was the death that removed the curse on the transgressor of the law, who by faith and faith alone received the grace of God in the forgiveness of, and deliverance from, sin. (*d*) Paul himself soon experienced the relieved conscience and the released will. I believe that for Paul both aspects of salvation from sin were essential to complete satisfaction; but I cannot escape the impression that the exposition of how forgiveness is provided in the death of Christ is more objective, and the confession of how there is deliverance from sin by union with Christ is more subjective, the one more a doctrine, the other more an experience. We are nearer the core of Paul's personality in Ro 6 than in Ro 3. Gal 2^{20} takes us into his holy of holies: 'I have been crucified with Christ; yet I live; and yet no longer I, but Christ liveth in me: and that life which I now live in the flesh I live in faith, the faith which is in the Son of God, who loved me, and gave himself up for me.' But, as the last clause shows, the two aspects are not separable; he died and lived with the Christ who had died for him, and his life in Christ was a life in which he was ever experiencing both deliverance from sin and the forgiveness of his sin. Compare with this early so late an utterance as that in Ph 3^{8-11}, 'Yea verily, and I count all things to be loss for the excellency of the knowledge of Christ Jesus my Lord: for whom I suffered the loss of all things, and do count them but dung, that I may gain Christ, and be found in him, not having a righteousness of mine own, even that which is of the law, but that which is through faith in Christ, the righteousness which is of God by faith: that I may know him, and the power of his resurrection, and the fellowship of his sufferings, becoming conformed unto his death; if by any means I may attain unto the resurrection from the dead.' In this remarkable statement he weaves into the pattern of his communion with Christ, inward death and inward life in Him, two elements which do not seem to be so close to the heart of his religion—his doctrine of justification by faith, and the expectation which he continued to cherish, despite occasional moods of despondency when the hope grew dim, of his survival to the time of witnessing the Second Advent in power and glory, and the resurrection of the dead at Christ's Coming (see vv.$^{20, 21}$). This personal union with Christ is the constant dominating factor in the religious experience and moral character of Paul. It was surely the certainty of the vision of Christ on the way to Damascus, and the inward revelation which it so speedily brought about in him, which explains the continuance and potency of this factor in him, as it has not been experienced, or at least confessed by any other.

(*e*) Because this relation to Christ was so creative the old things passed away, and all things became new. For the earlier apostles there was room for Christ as they conceived and experienced Him alongside of the law, and the beliefs and rites of their Judaism. Christ so filled Paul that there was no longer room for all that had been even more to him than to them. For the excellency of the knowledge of Christ he not only could, but must count all these things but loss. Not only so, the law had been to him a burden, and had threatened him with a curse; instead of bringing deliverance, it had only intensified the miserable bondage of sin. He recoiled from it, as he was attracted to Christ; he revolted against it, as he submitted to the Lordship of Christ. The Judaism of which he had been once so proud, and made a boast, was now refuse to him (Ph 3^{8}). As a Pharisee, Judaism was to him all, now it became nothing as a satisfaction of his soul, for he was not a man who could

do things by halves. While he did cherish the memories of the great things God had done for His people (Ro 9^{1-5}), while he was ready to conform for love's sake to Jewish customs and observe Jewish rites, while he did first address himself to the Jewish synagogue to win, if it were possible, some of his kinsmen according to the flesh, for whom he cherished so passionate an affection that he was willing to be anathema from Christ for their sakes, it was inevitable from his own experience that he should become the apostle of the Gentiles, even if the Divine call had not come to him. May not the call have been not so much one single event, as the only possible result of what he had passed through; his break from Judaism in his attachment to Christ as Saviour and Lord altogether and alone sufficient for the soul's need?

(*f*) This was his distinctive experience: he did grow in truth and grace; he did adapt himself to his Gentile environment, 'becoming all things to all men if by any means he might save some' (1 Co 9^{22}); he was influenced doubtless in his presentation of the gospel by current modes of thought, such as Stoic philosophy, or the Gentile mystery cults; with the insight of genius he sought the points of contact and the lines of least resistance; and his sympathetic attitude reacted upon his own experience, as in his sacramentalism, which is his own experience coloured by the more intense religious life with which he came into contact among his converts. It was a process of living assimilation, and not of external borrowing of this or that Gentile patch to put upon his Christian garment. There can be no doubt that the Judaistic controversy compelled him to formulate his doctrine of the righteousness of God, and justifying faith; and in so formulating it the experience that lay behind it was necessarily modified, the latent was made patent. That doctrine, though it has roots in his experience, as formulated, is not so intimate a confession of his own inner life as is his *faith-mysticism.* Again, speculations about the place of Christ among angels in the churches of Asia Minor compelled him to supplement his soteriology with a Christology; but the cosmic significance he assigns in the Epistles of the Captivity is a secondary element, while the moral and spiritual value of Christ in his own experience is primary. To say that Paul passed through an eschatological, soteriological, and cosmological stage of development seems to me to misrepresent the essential continuity and consistency of his Christian life as determined in its main features by his conversion. The change, such as it is, is in the circumference of expression and not at the centre of experience, although, as has already been conceded, expression does and cannot but react on experience.

(*g*) These seem to me two respects in which not his distinctive experience, but the Christian tradition he received, the eschatology of the primitive community, was modified. As a reference already given in Philippians (3^{21}) shows, he never consciously abandoned the expectation of the Second Advent. But sometimes he desponded as regards his own survival to that great day. He found comfort in the assurance which came to him that to be absent from the body was to be present with the Lord, and that he would not be left unclothed, but clothed upon, that what is mortal might be swallowed up of life (2 Co 5^{1-10}). Although he did not draw the conclusion, his present experience of Christ threw into the background the Second Coming of Christ. Again, his experience as an apostle to the Gentiles brought him the vision of the Church, the body of Christ, the fulfilment of Him that fulfilleth all in all (Eph 1^{23}), in which Jew and Gentile should form one community. The horizon of the Epistle to the Ephesians and of Ro 9–11 is far wider than that of the Second Advent hope, and presupposes a far longer historical prospect. It is lamentable that the Church has from time to time revived a temporary phase of Christian, inherited from Jewish, thought which the apostle himself outgrew, although he was not himself aware of the change. For him 'to live was Christ, and to die was gain' (Ph 1^{21}).

(*h*) How far can we, and need we, desire that our own experience should be of the same type as his? It is a legitimate question to ask, as both in the New Testament and in the history of the Christian Church other types have emerged, the claim of which to the Christian name cannot be denied. While we must not do violence to our own capacity and disposition, two reasons why we should desire to have an experience such as Paul's may be suggested. *First of all,* is it not in itself attractive, giving to Christ a significance and value such as other types do not? *Secondly,* is it not this type which has exercised a potent influence in the thought and life of the Church? We need think only of the Pauline succession of Augustine, Luther,

Wesley. We may at once set aside the hope of the Second Advent which Paul himself outgrew; but his desire for the preservation or restoration of complete personality, with an appropriate organ of expression and activity in more intimate communion and in increasing resemblance to Christ in the future life in the unseen world, I hold to be altogether one to be shared by us as the consummation of all here and now that gives life its highest value. As has been already indicated, his doctrine of the Atonement seems to me not to be so central to his experience as it is often represented as being. What does seem to me central, however, is the sense of guilt, removed by the assurance of the Divine forgiveness conveyed in the Cross of Christ, as well as the feeling of bondage, which through union with Christ was ended, the deliverance being effected by a new motive and a new power. To me at least it seems no less necessary that the distressed conscience should find peace in a forgiveness which does not annul, but confirms God's judgment on sin, than that the enfeebled will should be renewed in strength. Forgiveness of sin seems no less essential to the Christian experience than deliverance from sin. The Pauline theology has been misunderstood and misrepresented in any statement of it in abstract terms. The personal experience of the personal presence, interest, and activity of Christ as Saviour and Lord in an entire dependence, intimate communion, and complete submission —that is the distinctive Pauline experience, which we may well covet for ourselves: to be crucified to sin, and raised to a life unto God with Christ, to suffer that we may also reign with Him, to know the fellowship of His suffering, and the power of His Risen Life.

Literature.

THE FATHERHOOD OF GOD.

Professor J. M. Shaw, M.A., D.D., of Halifax, Nova Scotia, has given us his Elliott Lectures in an excellent book, *The Christian Gospel of the Fatherhood of God* (Hodder & Stoughton; 6s. net). It is Dr. Shaw's expressed aim to restate the essentials of the Christian Faith, and he has carried out his purpose with conviction and clearness. Having in his first lecture declared the differentia of the Christian conception of God to consist in the centrality of God's Father-love, he shows, in other five lectures, how that central fact is unfolded in the efficacy of Prayer, in the Incarnation, in the Atonement, in the Resurrection of Christ, and in Regeneration. He thus preserves a fine unity in his treatment without sacrificing comprehensiveness.

Much might be said in praise of Dr. Shaw's philosophical grasp, his lucidity, his sense of the magnitude of the gospel. But what gives his book its chief distinction is that it reproduces the New Testament emphasis and tone as few books, even on the Christian religion, succeed in doing. Every page testifies to his instinct for getting to the heart of things.

We earnestly commend this book, not only to professional students of theology, but also to those who are at a loss to know how the great Christian verities stand in relation to the best modern thought. Were it only for the lecture on Prayer, the book is worthy of a wide circulation. But the whole is so admirable that it is not fair to single out any part from the rest. In Dr. Shaw the Church has a true teacher.

ASPECTS OF THE WAY.

The sub-title of *Aspects of the Way*, by Mr. A. D. Martin (Cambridge University Press; 6s. net), is 'Meditations and Studies in the Life of Jesus Christ.' Mr. Martin tells us that his primary object is to interest the general reader rather than to attract the theologian, but many a preacher will thank him for this volume. These studies of The Way (the author mourns that this earliest and most suggestive name of the Christian religion was so speedily dropped), practical and devotional as they are, are full of flashes of insight such as are given only to one who is both student and poet. The beautiful chapter on the shepherds of Bethlehem ('elect shepherds' he calls them) is a fitting