

Theology on the Web.org.uk

Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible

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

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



Buy me a coffee

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



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

[PayPal](#)

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

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

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

The Churchman

JUNE, 1946

Vol. LX. No. 2. New Series.

Contents :

	PAGE
EDITORIAL : LAODICEAN CHRISTIANITY	50
HOW MOSES COMPILED GENESIS	
Rev. J. Stafford Wright, M.A.	53
JOHN COSIN	
Rev. C. Sydney Carter, M.A., D.D., F.R.Hist.S.	65
SOME LITURGICAL CONSIDERATIONS	
Rev. E. J. G. Rogers, B.A.	72
THE AUTHENTIC WORD	
Rev. R. E. Higginson, M.A.	82
BOOK REVIEWS	
F. D. Coggan, <i>The Ministry of the Word</i>	87
M. A. C. Warren, <i>Strange Victory</i>	88
D. E. W. Harrison, <i>The Book of Common Prayer</i>	89
F. W. Camfield, <i>The Collapse of Doubt</i>	92
J. Windrow Sweetman, <i>Islam and Christian Theology</i>	93
A. H. Oussoren, <i>William Carey</i>	94
Cyril Alington, <i>Good News</i>	94
Mildred Cable and Francesca French, <i>The Book which Demands a Verdict</i>	95
Stanley Cook, <i>An Introduction to the Bible</i>	95

PRICE : ONE SHILLING

"The Churchman," 1s. quarterly. Annual subscription, 4s. 6d. post free.
Church Book Room Press, Ltd., Dean Wace House, Wine Office Court, E.C.4

Editorial.

LAODICEAN CHRISTIANITY

IT is always necessary to guard the eternal Gospel from becoming unduly subordinated to what is transitory, and to-day it is to be seen against a setting of peculiar transitoriness. We cannot and must not do that very thing that will most surely be demanded of us and our refusal to do which will be most deeply resented. We cannot preach as the Gospel that which is not the Gospel. Yet human devices have a way of claiming that they are the Gospel, the essence of the Gospel, the Gospel brought up to date, and this will be no less true of the pale ideology proposed for England than of the full-blooded ideology which took Germany by storm. We shall be expected to preach what is inadequate and sub-Christian, just as the German Church was met with the demand to preach what was arrogant and anti-Christian. Already there are whispers of this. They will become more clamorous."

The quotation is from one of the most striking pamphlets produced recently and one which certainly carries a prophetic message for the Church of to-day.* Its author, Frank Bennett, brings us realistically face to face with the situation with which the Church—and more particularly the Church of England—is confronted in this humanistic and totalitarian age. In doing so he says many things which Evangelical Churchmen have felt for some time, and perhaps increasingly within the last year or so. It is scarcely necessary to remark that the things said are no mere platitudes or pleasantries. They are uncomfortable things—mercilessly honest, deeply disturbing. But they are things which needed to be said and they have been said well by one who has rightly discerned the signs of the times.

Beyond doubt the gravest danger of this hour is that the Church in our land should abandon her God-given mission, and in doing so should compromise her message and lower her standards. The temptation to do so will become increasingly strong in order to gain the approval and blessing of a State which, at the moment, is in a mood to recognize the desirability—and even the necessity—of "religion" of a sort, in order "to bolster up the tottering human fabric." Such "religion" has lately been accorded official approbation as part and parcel of our new educational system. But what is its character and content? Certainly it is not the religion of the New Testament, but something far more mild and colourless. Our author designates it as "British Christianity" and rightly identifies it with Latitudinarianism of a former generation—"Christianity with the Incarnation, the Atonement and the Sacraments left out." It is not, in fact, Christianity at all, but merely a modern substitute for it. Thus the Church in our land will be faced with the same peril as confronted the Church in Nazi Germany—with the differences inherent in our

* *Laodicea in the Twentieth Century* (S.P.C.K., 1/6).

situation—viz. the peril of being wholly dominated, and dictated to, by the State. Mr. Bennett envisages the sort of thing that will happen. "The first attempt will be to take over the Church, and only if and when the Church refuses to be taken over will it be thrown over. Already the demand arises for a Church cut to the measure of twentieth century doubt, attuned to the swan-song of a declining civilization. . . . The demand will be that we become, not Nazis, but Pelagians; that we abandon Paul, not because he was a Jew, but because he was a theologian; that we take into a pantheon, not Woden and Thor, but Buddha and Mohammed and any other founders of religions of whom the Englishman may happen to have heard."

The faith by which the Church lives—and perhaps, more important, the faith for which it lives—is the faith of the New Testament: the faith which is truly Catholic because it is truly Apostolic. There is, as Mr. Bennett says, a crucial distinction between faith in the Incarnate, Crucified and Risen Lord, and a religion that is nothing but high principles and good example. This latter is, in relation to the eternal Gospel, heresy. "For it is based upon a different set of doctrines. It is set over against the faith of the Bible and the Church. We must not base our evangelism upon it, we must not frame our policy upon it, above all we must not see it for what it is not. We must abandon this facile talk of there being 'a lot of religion about.' There are religions and religions, there are false religions, and the question is not whether there is religion, but which religion."

That is the question. Which religion? Vital Christianity is a long way removed from a vague, sentimental humanism, even though it labels itself Christian. Labels count for little in these times. Indeed, it is significant that it is apparently necessary nowadays to append some such adjective as "vital" in speaking of Christianity (as we did above) in order to make clearer what we are talking about. And this lends support to Mr. Bennett's suggestion that the time may have come when it is desirable that we should abandon the use of the very word "Christianity" as having gone beyond recall and lost its real significance. Admittedly few words have been so perverted and abused as this. All manner of sects and systems to-day claim to be "Christian." We have Christian Science, Christian Modernism, Christian Democracy, even Christian Spiritualism, to mention but a few examples; yet what relation, if any, do these bear to the apostolic faith?

The Church must hold fast to the one Gospel and reaffirm, as in Paul's day, that "though we, or an angel from heaven, preach any other Gospel unto you than that we have preached unto you, let him be accursed." For the Church to pronounce such an anathema in this age of easy-going tolerance and broad-minded charity will not be easy, and assuredly will not be popular. But we might as well make up our minds that a Church that is loyal will never be popular in the world which we know. The Church has no concern with popularity, only with fidelity. Her business from first to last is to "hold fast" and to "hold forth" the faith of the Gospel as Christ's witness before the world.

What would be the effect if the Church in our own land were "to take a firm, unequivocal, challenging stand upon the elements of the original Gospel"? Mr. Bennett assures us that the result would be "extremely devastating" as far as large sections of the rank and file of our people are concerned. Undoubtedly he is right. It is more than unlikely that by taking such a stand we should immediately gain large numbers of new adherents; what is certain is that we should straightway lose a great many of the old ones. The true Church would become a mere minority among the mass of those who still professed and called themselves Christians, very much like the Confessional Church in Germany. Possibly it would not be persecuted in the same way as the German Church: Mr. Bennett thinks not. He suggests that the loyal minority who are not willing to be "brought up to date" will simply be cold-shouldered by the State—ignored, undermined, whittled away. That is what will make the ordeal so difficult to bear. We shall be provided with no dramatic issue, no opportunity for heroic action. We shall simply be the Church in the wilderness saying "No" to the totalitarian demands of the Nation and refusing to be "planned."

If such be the prospect before us, what is the voice of the Spirit to our Laodicean Church of to-day? Undoubtedly it is, as of old, a call to "be zealous . . . and repent." The Living Christ, whom we have well-nigh banished by our faithlessness and unbelief, must be re-admitted and re-enthroned. "Behold, I stand at the door, and knock: if any man hear My voice, and open the door, I will come in to him, and will sup with him, and he with Me." There alone lies the salvation of the Church in the twentieth-century as in the first. We have made the mistake of thinking in terms of new plans and programmes—of new methods and a new message—when what is required as the prime necessity is a return to the old well-beaten paths and a recovery of the old well-tried faith. The Church must be the Church—and the Gospel must be the Gospel. That is all. Nothing more is needed. But nothing less will suffice.

How Moses Compiled Genesis¹

A SUGGESTION.

BY THE REV. J. STAFFORD WRIGHT, M.A.

THE battle of the Pentateuch has been long and arduous. It has not yet been won by the hosts of Wellhausen, nor lost by the die-hards of the Conservative camp. In recent years the Conservatives have been treated like a by-passed city. The other side has felt itself to be in secure possession of the field, and is prepared to ignore the stubborn defences of the city until in process of time the defenders die out. But for the moment the defenders have no intention of dying out, and they are quite prepared to join battle again at any time.

I have likened the Conservative position to one of defence, and so it is. But a battle cannot ultimately be won by defence. Similarly we cannot be content merely to reply to attacks on the composition of the Pentateuch. To argue against the late date of J, E, D, H, P is a useful and vital part of the defence. But unless we can show from a positive standpoint that the differences, which have caused people to believe in the existence of these documents, are fully to be expected if Moses was the author or compiler, we are left with the feeling that after all there must be something in the modern theories. This is a great pity, for I believe that if it were possible to wipe the slate clean and to start our investigation of the Pentateuch afresh without seeing the books through the spectacles of Wellhausen, we should, on intellectual grounds, decide that Moses was the author.

It is obviously impossible to deal with the whole Pentateuch here, so I have chosen Genesis in order to show that its form and contents make it likely that Moses was the author. If you ask me why I should be concerned to prove the Mosaic authorship of Genesis when neither the Old nor the New Testament asserts it, I should reply, first, that the Jewish tradition of Mosaic authorship is unanimous; and secondly, that it is obvious that Genesis is closely linked with the rest of the Pentateuch. The Documentary Theory does not separate J, E, and P in Genesis from J, E, and P in Exodus and the Law. This means that the same hand, or hands, is found in both Genesis and the other books. Since then the Law claims to be given (and in some cases written) by Moses, I feel that it is at any rate worth exploring the possibility of the traditional Mosaic authorship of Genesis being correct.

In what I shall say I am not proposing any new theory. I am merely working upon what others have suggested, but am giving it a presentation of my own.

I.

Our story begins a little before 1500 B.C. in the household of Pharaoh. Here is one of the centres of education in the civilised world of the day.

¹ A paper read at the I.V.F. Theological Students' Conference at Cambridge, January, 1946.

Under the XVIII Dynasty, in which Moses lived, no pains were spared to secure the highest possible education for the royal princes and for others who were brought up with them. These others were frequently the sons of chiefs from various parts of the empire, and it was regarded as a high honour to be brought up in Pharaoh's court. It was no coincidence, but the direct hand of God, which accounted for the presence of a young Hebrew there. If we believe in divine providence at all, it is clear that God had a special purpose in securing this education for Moses. And since the education would be not only for leadership but also in reading and writing, one might hazard a guess that God's future plan for Moses would be one in which reading and writing would play an important part.

The New Testament description of Moses is that he "was instructed in all the wisdom of the Egyptians; and he was mighty in his words and works" (Acts vii. 22). If this is a true picture of him—and there is no reason to doubt it—we can imagine him as one who loved learning and scholarship for its own sake. If you have a love for scholarship, put yourself in his place for a minute or two and imagine what you would do. As a member of the royal household you would have access to the best teachers in Egypt, and to foreign teachers from that other centre of civilization, Assyria and Babylon. At the court and in the temples there would be libraries in which you would read the literature of the world. Queer old records would be there, stories, hymns, proverbs and histories, written sometimes on clay but more frequently on papyrus, wood or skin. If the Egyptian libraries were like those of Nippur and Ras Shamra, there would be translations and dictionaries to help the reader. I fancy that you would have a longing to read these languages for yourself, and I believe that Moses took steps to become a master of languages.

What languages would he learn to read and to write? I should think that he knew three well. *Egyptian* would be the language that he normally spoke and wrote. He would learn to read and write both the formal hieroglyphic pictures and also the simpler hieratic script, which was easier to write. Then he would learn the *Babylonian* language with its cuneiform script. Like Greek at a later date, this was the language and script of international communication. That Egypt also used this language and script is proved by the Tel-el-Amarna tablets. These were found in Egypt and are part of the official Egyptian correspondence of about 1400 B.C. But to the Egyptians this cannot have been an easy language to study, since cuneiform can only be printed on clay or, with some labour, engraved on stone, but cannot be printed on papyrus or wood, which were the writing materials chiefly used in Egypt. None the less, the educated Egyptians did know it, and Moses would have known it too.

But from boyhood Moses had heard another language spoken too. His nurse had been his own mother, who by permission of the princess had brought him up during his first few years in the home where he had been born (Ex. ii. 9, 10). Here he would have picked up the *Hebrew* language, though the Hebrew of those days must not be thought of as the developed Hebrew of our present Bible. Perhaps we can

regard it as bearing the same general relation to the Bible Hebrew as Langland's *Piers Plowman* bears to modern English.

We are not told the age at which Moses' mother finally handed him over to Pharaoh's daughter (Ex. ii. 10). Moses' Hebrew vocabulary was probably not large by that time; but two things would have helped him to keep up his knowledge of the language. First, he would undoubtedly have visited his mother and his home from time to time. Apart from the family tie, there would be nothing strange in this. The old nurse was regarded with the greatest respect in the ancient world. When Rebekah goes to be the bride of Isaac, her nurse goes with her (Gen. xxiv. 59); and Gen. xxxv. 8 even records her death and the place of her burial. Secondly, it is quite likely that, as Hastings' *Dictionary of the Bible* says, "the Hebrew language may be appropriately termed the Israelitish dialect of Canaanitish" (Art. Language of the Old Testament). There are certain glosses on the Tel-el-Amarna tablets, in which the writers add a Canaanitish equivalent for some Babylonian word, and these glosses, written in cuneiform, resemble the Hebrew in sound. The Moabite Stone of a later date is in a dialect resembling Hebrew. We may suppose then that during their time in Palestine the patriarchs had gradually dropped the Sumerian language of Ur, and adopted the speech of Canaan. This is what normally happens after one or two generations of living in a foreign country. It was this language of Canaan that the Hebrews were now speaking in Egypt, though during their three or four centuries there they must have produced their own dialectical version of it.

But you will remember that I mentioned earlier that at this period the sons of foreign chiefs were educated in the royal household in Egypt. These included young men from Syria, and presumably from Canaan too. And as they spoke to each other in their own tongue, Moses found that it was almost identical with the language that his parents and brothers and sisters spoke at home. And I have no doubt that Moses soon learned to join in their conversations.

II.

I have spent some time on these preliminaries because it is essential to see the background against which Moses grew up. But now we must turn to the writing of Genesis.

Part of Moses' education was history. His teachers taught him the history of Egypt. The Pharaohs had left records in their own praise, and other stories were written down on papyrus rolls. Amongst them Moses was particularly interested in the story of a certain Hebrew, Joseph, who some 350 years earlier had become prime minister and had saved the land of Egypt from starvation. His body was embalmed in a coffin in Egypt, and an outline of his life was written down. It was of course in the Egyptian language. How much of our present story was in the Egyptian records I am not prepared to say, but that a part of it was originally in Egyptian has been demonstrated by Prof. A. S. Yahuda in his book *The Accuracy of the Bible*, and elsewhere. Personally I should not be in the least surprised if the greater part of

the story of Joseph in Egypt was written down by Joseph himself, in Egyptian.

Now Moses was quite well aware of his parentage and ancestry, and here was the story of a man who was the son of Jacob, from whom Moses himself also claimed descent. Who was Jacob, then? Certainly he was a great man, since the story was told of the way in which Pharaoh had honoured him (Gen. xlvii). But great men generally kept some record of themselves and of their ancestors. Had Jacob left any records? Moses began to make enquiries. And amongst the chiefs of his own people he came across what he was looking for. Here were old records. Some, it is true, were more recent than the story of Joseph that Moses knew already. In fact Moses gathered that Joseph himself had set down some personal matters that could not very well appear in the public documents. He had, for example, set down the blessings that his father had given to his sons and grandsons; and here Moses was interested to see that, in place of the general name for God that had appeared in the public records, a new title occasionally appeared. Thus the title *Shaddai* was used twice (xlviii. 3; xlix. 25), and the name *Yahweh* appeared (xlix. 18). Some other writings also helped to fill out the life of Joseph by telling the reactions of the brothers and their father in Canaan. Here also the title *El Shaddai* occurred (xliii. 14). In all probability Moses had learnt of this God from his parents. This was the name under which He had revealed Himself to Moses' ancestors in the dim past.

Moreover, in addition to these records there were others as well, some of them apparently very old. One cannot say in whose possession they were, but probably they would be kept by the chief man of one of the tribes. The most likely would be the head of the tribe of Reuben or Judah. Personally I should say Judah, for this reason: in Gen. xxxvii-1 Judah is the most prominent of the brothers after Joseph. One whole chapter, *i.e.* ch. xxxviii, is devoted to him and his descendants, and he plays an important part in the dealings with Jacob and with Joseph. Thus from internal evidence I should hold that while a large part of the Egyptian story comes from Joseph, the story from the Hebrew point of view comes from Judah. In that case the records were probably in the keeping of the tribe of Judah.

Now let us see what we have assumed so far. We have assumed that the Hebrew patriarchs followed the practice of great men and kings in other races and kept records of their doings. I want to emphasise this point, because we are inclined sometimes to think of these early civilizations in a somewhat patronising way and fail to visualise the tremendous quantity of writing and literature that were produced. In Babylonia hundreds of thousands of clay tablets have been discovered dealing with all manner of things; and yet a Professor of Assyriology (Edward Chiera) has estimated that only one per cent has yet been found. Ninety-nine per cent are still awaiting the shovel and pick of the archaeologist. As Prof. Chiera says in his book *They Wrote on Clay*, "In spite of the immense wealth of Latin and Greek literature, we do not know nearly so much of the aspects of daily life

in Greece and Rome as we know about similar phases of life in a little corner of the Mesopotamian plain."

These, however, are clay records only. There were other materials in use as well, though these have perished. For example, we have the record of the import of 500 rolls of papyrus into Syria in the 12th century (Kenyon, *The Bible and Archaeology*, pp. 166, 211). Babylonian inscriptions show scribes writing on rolls, which were probably leather. But these other materials have long since perished, except in Egypt where the climate has allowed the papyrus records to survive. But I want you to see that the civilised world from 3000 B.C. onwards was full of literature and records, and that if the Hebrews had no records they were exceptional. But if they did have them, Moses must have seen them; and if Moses saw them his training had fitted him to put them together into a coherent whole.

I have up till now purposely used the neutral term "records", because I do not think that we can say for certain what material they were written on. The Babylonian practice was to have clay records and to store them on a shelf or in a jar. The latter was often buried under the floor of the house. The patriarchs do not appear to have settled in one place for any length of time, so that they would not have buried their records; but one can imagine that they might have been kept in a stone jar.

The records may not all have been on clay, though there is very little doubt that some of them were. Those that Abraham brought from Ur would certainly be on clay and written in cuneiform. But some of the records made in Palestine may have been on wood or papyrus, or even skin. In that case they would not have been in cuneiform but in some script that later developed into the Phoenician script and the old Hebrew.

III.

Now at some time in his life I maintain that Moses was moved to blend these records into a continuous history. It may have been while he was in Egypt, or it may have been during the 40 years in the wilderness. In Egypt he had greater facilities in the way of dictionaries and foreign teachers. On the other hand, since he was doing other literary work during the wanderings, and recording the laws and the journeys, he might easily have compiled Genesis in addition. Forty years is a long time for a scholar to go without considerable literary production. We might combine the two ideas and suppose that Moses drafted the work in Egypt, and revised it during the wilderness wandering.

Prof. Naville suggested that Moses originally compiled Genesis on individual clay tablets in cuneiform script, and that Ezra was responsible for combining these into a book. I see no reason why Moses should not have combined either the original clay records, or his own first drafts, into a book-roll during the wanderings. I think a leather roll would have been the most likely material to use in the wilderness. The difficulty is that it is uncertain when leather rolls were introduced, though some think that the Egyptians were using

them before 2000 B.C. If so, the sacrifices in the wilderness would have provided an abundance of skins. Whilst it is true that the Ten Commandments were inscribed on stone tablets, and another part of the Law was written on stone covered with plaster (Deut. xxvii. 4; Josh. viii. 32), other references to writing in books show that leather was in use. Thus in Num. v. 23 the priest has to write curses in a book and blot them out in water: this could not be done with clay or stone tablets.

All this may seem an unnecessary digression, but its importance will appear in a minute or two. In the meantime we will return to the records that Moses had in front of him. Unless one of the patriarchs had already done some editing (and this is possible), Moses was faced with a collection of old writings, probably in several languages and dialects. Added together they formed a chain that ran back from Joseph to Adam. Prominent among them were genealogies. A genealogy is a very precious thing in the East, and is carefully kept. Then there were stories, some written fully, some more sketchily, according to the author. Upon these Moses set to work, translating, editing, and combining, so that the nation of Israel might have its records to place alongside those of the other nations of the earth.

Israel's records, however, were different from those of the other nations. Through them ran a revelation of God, His character and His will, that was absent from ordinary records. The nation of slaves that was coming out of Egypt was the heir of certain promises of God, and the means of God's manifestation of Himself to mankind. This became clear to Moses as he studied the old records, and he determined that his history should concentrate on this theme. Other nations must be included too, for the people needed to feel that their ancestors, who knew God, were real men and women. And brief facts must be set down about the other races whose names they knew. So, under the guidance of God, Moses set to work on his history.

Perhaps he started first on the more recent records. At any rate I propose to start there. There was an Egyptian record of Joseph's public career, which furnished the bulk of ch. xl-xlvii. Moses translated this, and blended it with a record left by Judah, which told the story briefly from the brothers' point of view. Ch. xlviii-1 appears to be a Joseph account, and ch. xxxix, with its story of Potiphar's wife, may also belong to Joseph's private record rather than to the Egyptian account. If Moses is using some records of Judah, we can see why ch. xxxviii, with its rather unpleasant story of an incident in Judah's life, comes in here, even though it interrupts the story of Joseph. The Judah and Joseph records may also account for the well-known difficulties of ch. xxxvii. There is not the least necessity to split this chapter up into snippets and evolve two contradictory stories out of it. The story as it stands at present is a far finer and more complete picture than either of the two stories that are supposed to go to make it up. But it is possible that one of the brothers spoke of the travellers as Midianites and the other described them as Ishmaelites, and Moses has woven both names into his final narrative. That one

and the same people could be called Ishmaelites and Midianites is clear from Judges viii. 24 and context.

Will you notice how the names for God are used in this section. In the Egyptian section the general *Elohim* is used exclusively. Jacob uses the Covenant name *El Shaddai* in ch. xliii. 14; xlviii. 3; and xlix. 25; and *Yahweh* in ch. xlix. 18. In what I have called Joseph's private account in ch. xxxix—the incident of Potiphar's wife—*Yahweh* is used eight times in describing God's special care of Joseph; But when Joseph addresses Potiphar's wife he uses the general word and says, "How then can I do this great wickedness and sin against God (*Elohim*)?"

The next block of records came from Joseph and Esau. P. J. Wiseman believes that the phrase "these are the generations of—" is, in Genesis, intended to mark the close and not the beginning of a section, and that the person named is the one who closed the record of this particular section. I propose to follow this theory here, though its acceptance is by no means essential to what I shall say. But according to this theory the Jacob and Esau section runs from ch. xxv. 19 to ch. xxxvi. 9 (Esau) and ch. xxxvii. 2 (Jacob). Let us take Esau's account first, since it is the shorter. It seems that Esau's record was almost entirely genealogical. I should ascribe to him the account of his own marriage in ch. xxviii. 5-9, and the table at the beginning of ch. xxxvi. I do not think that we can say for certain how much of ch. xxxvi was actually in the document that Moses had. It is perfectly possible that these tables were brought up to date after the time of Moses. In fact, verse 31, referring to a king over Israel, implies that the final additions were made in the time of the Monarchy. To say this does not invalidate the essential Mosaic authorship of the book. It merely indicates that genealogical lists were sometimes brought up to date by means of additions.

The bulk of ch. xxviii-xxxv is clearly by Jacob. They are a courageous record of his own folly, impulsiveness, astuteness, and humiliation. In this section, which begins with Jacob's flight into Syria, the title *Elohim* predominates. It is used some 49 times in comparison with 14 times for the name *Yahweh*.

IV.

This raises the whole question of the use of the names of God in Genesis. How far are they due to the original writer, and how far to Moses? And again, how far was the name *Yahweh* in use in the time of the patriarchs? Did they know it at all? Or did they use as their Covenant Name only *El Shaddai*, for which Moses, in his translation, has substituted the Covenant Name of his day, *i.e.* *Yahweh*, except where there is deliberate stress on the older title? Exodus vi. 3 can be interpreted in two ways. God says there, "I appeared unto Abraham, unto Isaac, and unto Jacob, as *El Shaddai*, but by My name *Yahweh* I was not known unto them." This may mean that God did not previously make a covenant on the basis of His name of *Yahweh*, though *Yahweh* was even in patriarchal times a known title of the true God. Or the words may be interpreted absolutely literally in the sense

that God was never known previously by the name *Yahweh*. In this case the occurrence of the name in Genesis is due entirely to Moses, who has substituted the newer Covenant Name *Yahweh* for the older Covenant Name *El Shaddai* wherever this occurred in the documents, except in the places where there is the actual record of the making of the Covenant or a reference to it.

Personally, I find it difficult to suppose that the name *Yahweh* was a completely new name at the time of the Exodus. Otherwise I think that the people would have gathered the impression that this was some new God, whereas all the emphasis is upon the continuity of their God. But at the same time I think it quite likely that Moses did frequently substitute the newer name for the old, chiefly to impress upon the readers that this was one and the same God. However, whether *Yahweh* or *El Shaddai* stood in the original documents, we see that there is a variety in the use of the two names in Genesis. Whether the original writers or Moses were responsible for using now one name and now the other, it is undeniable that there is a general method behind the usage. It is the instinctive method that we employ ourselves. When we are speaking about the deity worshipped by non-Christians, we almost always speak of "God." But when we are speaking to Christians and about the Christian God, we frequently use the warmer word "The Lord." Similarly if we are regarding Jesus Christ from the aspect of His humanity and speaking of Him as a Man for whom all nations must feel some respect, we speak of Him as "Jesus." But amongst Christians we use at least the title of "Christ," and commonly "the Lord Jesus Christ."

Likewise in Genesis the general title "God" or *Elohim* is used when dealing with foreign countries, while "The Lord" or *Yahweh* has close association with the Covenant relationship. We have already seen the consistent use of *Elohim* in the Egyptian narrative. Here, too, in ch. xxviii-xxxv *Elohim* predominates, since Jacob is an exile in Syria and, when he returns, is wandering about among the Canaanites. At the same time the fourteen *Yahweh* references are significant. Four come in the Bethel vision (ch. xxviii), when God makes a Covenant-promise to Jacob. Four more come at the end of ch. xxix, when the story is concerned with the birth of Jacob's three eldest sons, Reuben, Simeon and Judah. It occurs again at the birth of another important son, Joseph (xxx. 24). Four more uses refer to the fulfilment of *Yahweh's* promise of blessing at Bethel (xxx. 27, 30; xxxi. 3; xxxii. 9). The final one is at the agreement made between Jacob and Laban, where a Covenant Name is very fitting (xxxii. 49). If you will observe carefully the different uses of the names of God, you will generally find the reason for the particular name in any place, though we must sometimes allow the writer a little latitude for the sake of variety, such as we commonly use ourselves in writing. The Bethel vision in ch. xxviii is a clear instance of this.

V.

I have separated the bulk of ch. xxviii-xxxv from ch. xxv. 19-xxvii, which I previously said belonged to the Jacob and Esau records. The reason is that ch. xxvi, the story of Isaac's pretending to Gerar that

Rebekah was his sister, makes sense only if it took place before the birth of Jacob and Esau. So presumably although it now forms a part of the Jacob and Esau records, it was incorporated there by Jacob from some memoirs of Isaac and Rebekah. In that case the story of the birth of the two boys (ch. xxv), and even the story of the blessing (ch. xxvii), may belong to the same memoirs. In any case we are here in close connection with the Covenant and the line of blessing again, so that it is not surprising to find that the name *Yahweh* occurs some fourteen times as against the four occurrences of *Elohim*.

If now we continue to work backwards, we have a set of records that have the names of Ishmael (xxv. 12) and Isaac (xxv. 19) at the end of them. The phrase "These are the generations of" does not occur between ch. xi. 27 ("the generations of Terah") and ch. xxv. 12 (Ishmael). If this phrase is intended to mark the divisions of authorship or possession, we must suppose that Abraham left the compiling of the incidents of his life to his sons. But it is not of any great importance whether Abraham wrote down the incidents himself, or whether he told the stories so frequently to his sons that they knew them as well as he did.

In most of this section the name *Yahweh* predominates, but there are a few interesting exceptions. In chs. xx and xxi *Elohim* is used sixteen times and *Yahweh* only four times, two of the latter having reference to the birth of Isaac in the line of promise. The rest of the two chapters is concerned with Abraham's stay at Gerar amongst foreigners, and with the turning out of Hagar and Ishmael. The use of *Elohim* in the first case is consistent with the general method of Moses, and in the second case Moses is marking the breaking away of Ishmael from the line of promise.

Ch. xvii is specially interesting in view of the possibility that Moses frequently substitutes the later Covenant Name *Yahweh* for the older *El Shaddai*. This is the record of the institution of the Covenant of circumcision, and here we should have expected the name *Yahweh* to predominate. Instead of that, *Elohim* occurs nine times and *Yahweh* once only. I have no doubt that there is a psychological reason for this. Here we have the revelation to Abram of God as *El Shaddai*, and Moses is concerned to emphasise two things. First, he wants to focus his spotlight on this great Covenant title; so for the rest of the chapter he uses the general title *Elohim*. "I am *El Shaddai*" stands in solitary state. But secondly, he wants to keep the theme running through and to show the Israelites of his day that the appearance to Abram was only one in a succession of appearances that culminated in the appearances to Moses himself. Hence he makes one exception to the use of *Elohim*, and begins his chapter, "When Abram was ninety years old and nine, *Yahweh* appeared to Abram, and said unto him, I am *El Shaddai*."

In this group of records there is the extremely interesting ch. xiv. It is clearly old, but from the way in which Abram is introduced in v. 13 as "Abram the Hebrew"—as though he was a new character—I do not think it can be regarded as part of the family records. I suggest that it comes from records made by Melchizedek. In that case this chapter may have been added after the time of Moses. When David finally captured the citadel of Zion, he would have found old

records there. It was doubtless at this time that God let him see that his son, the true Messiah, would be a priest-king for ever after the order of Melchizedek (Ps. cx), into whose throne David had now stepped by conquering Jerusalem. This story of how Melchizedek met and blessed David's ancestor, Abraham, would then be of special importance, and may have been added to Genesis at this time. The place names are brought up to date with the equivalent of modern footnotes in vv. 2, 3, 7, 8, 15, 17. Incidentally, the only other place in Scripture where the King's Vale of v.17 is mentioned is in David's reign. It is the place where Absalom set up his memorial pillar in 2 Sam. xviii. 18.

VI.

We must now leave these records and go back further into the past. There is a genealogical section from ch. xi. 10-27, with Terah's name at the end. Before this there is the section ch. x. 2-xi. 9, which describes the re-peopling of the earth and the spread of the nations after the Flood. This has Shem's name at the end of it, but one wonders how much of these records came from him, and how much is due to Moses' knowledge of a later time. Possibly Shem recorded the incident of the tower of Babel and left some family genealogical records. But the details of the origins of the nations are probably due to Moses, and we cannot dismiss the possibility of later additions to bring the lists up to date. At the same time there are very early elements in this record. For example, ch. x. 19 must have been in writing before Sodom and Gomorrah were destroyed, since these cities are there referred to as well-known landmarks. I do not see that we can be dogmatic about the origin of ch. x; but I would suggest that Moses' contact in Egypt with the literature and wise men of the chief countries enabled him to build up an outline of the relationship between the different nations.

These compressed records are preceded by the fuller story of the Flood. At the end of the story stand the names of Shem, Ham and Japheth (x. 1), and the story itself runs from ch. vi. 9 to ix. 29. If these names indicate the source of the Flood records, we have an indication that more than one hand was involved. The story itself bears this out, and it is likely that Moses himself, or some earlier writer, wove together records that were kept by two or three of the sons. The records, however, are not contradictory. Thus although one of the sons kept the dates of the events of the Flood by means of a calendar, the other adopted the rougher method of notching the days on a stick from the beginning. So we have the two methods together in the text, one telling us the day of the month on which some event happened, the other telling us how many days elapsed between one event and another. But the two harmonise perfectly. Incidentally, one son may have used the name *Elohim* and the other the Covenant Name; or Moses himself may have alternated the names for the sake of variety. Ch. vii. 16 would appear to be an obvious example of literary variety: "They went in as *Elohim* commanded him; and *Yahweh* shut him in."

The previous records run from ch. v. 1 to ch. vi. 9, and here Noah's name is at the end. Apart from the short narrative about the sons of

God and the daughters of men, and the threat of the Flood, this record, like Terah's, is a detailed genealogical list. These lists demand a special note to themselves. Their detailed figures suggest that they are to be interpreted literally as complete records of everyone in the line from Noah to Abram. If so, we are led to a date between 4000 and 6000 B.C. for the creation of Adam, according to whether we follow the figures of the Hebrew, Samaritan, or Septuagint MSS. Now these records may be absolutely accurate if Adam was the first of the true modern civilised men. Some of you may have heard the B.B.C. Brains Trust in the spring declare unanimously that modern civilised man began in the Mesopotamian region about 6000 B.C. Prof. A. D. Ritchie speaks of this civilization beginning six or seven thousand years ago (*Civilization, Science, and Religion*, p. 15, Pelican Series); and Prof. Gordon Childe says it was "perhaps not more than 10,000 years ago" (*What Happened in History*, p.22, Pelican Series). This would mean that there were manlike creatures before Adam, but that they lacked the vital spiritual faculty which makes man truly man. This new civilization, which began in the Mesopotamian region, is distinguished by the first signs of the knowledge of cultivation, and possibly domestication of animals. Certainly the story of the Garden of Eden stresses that the plants in the garden were of a type suitable for cultivation. Moreover, Sir Richard Paget in a recent article in *Nature* gives it as his view that language also originated at about this date. Modern discovery and theory, therefore, tend to support the view that Adam was the first real man, and that he came into being some 6000 to 8000 years ago.

On the other hand, this solution of Genesis ii may be too simple, and the date of Adam may have to be pushed back many thousands of years. If so, the genealogical tables cannot be regarded as complete. Other tables in the Bible certainly are not given in full (e.g. Matt. i), and it is perhaps significant that the Genesis record does not attempt to add up the totals of the figures that it gives in order to show how many years elapsed between Adam and Noah. The fact is that the evidence of anthropology, archaeology, and of Biblical research, is still too scanty to enable us to do more than suggest how and where Adam comes into the record. None the less I accept the records as true, and believe that the genealogy in ch. v gives, if not all the names, at any rate the key names in the line of Adam; and if the figures are not to be taken literally as ages, they probably represent dates at which a new branch of the family started, which later produced the next name mentioned in the list.

We have now come right back almost to the beginning, and ch. ii. 4-v.1 probably represents the Adam record, though items in ch. iv. 16-24 may be drawn from other sources. It would be fascinating to speculate how these earliest records were written. They may not even have been written, but drawn. Writing has been discovered as far back as about 3000 B.C., but it was not alphabetic writing then. It is of the hieroglyphic or picture type. Writing may go back to the time of Adam, though if it was written on perishable material, none of it will ever be discovered. But if it should be discovered, I think we might be able to understand it, because it would resemble drawing. Did Moses handle these actual records made by the man who lived

in Eden? Or had they been carefully copied by some other hand when the originals became worn and old? Again, how many of the words were drawn in some ancient script, and how often did one picture stand for a whole sentence? Who can tell? But I firmly believe that as Moses pored over this old writing, praying for wisdom to interpret it, he was divinely guided to give us the beautiful story that we now read in our Bibles. And Moses gives God here the distinctive title of *Yahweh Elohim*, to indicate that the Creator of ch. i is the same as the Covenant God of the burning bush.

There remains one more chapter, the first, together with ch. ii. 1-4, which closes with the words, "These are the generations of the heaven and the earth." Who wrote this chapter originally? No eyewitness could have written it, for there was no eye to witness all that is there described. Yet the order of creation there is absolutely accurate by modern scientific standards. There must have been some eyewitness: coincidence is a feeble explanation. Well, of course there was an eyewitness: there was God. And God had someone to whom He spake "mouth to mouth, even manifestly, and not in dark speeches" (Num. xii. 8); one whom He "knew face to face" (Deut. xxxiv. 10); one to whom He spake "face to face, as a man speaketh unto his friend" (Ex. xxxiii. 11). That one was Moses. And if those three testimonies are true, then God spoke that majestic first chapter of Genesis to Moses. If that is too sweeping, then I would say that God showed Moses those seven pictures of the steps in His creation of the universe and the world, that in vivid picture language they might form the preface to his book—and not to one book only, but to the whole Bible. For when the stream of revelation began to flow, God planned that the river which began in Genesis with the making of the heavens and the earth should end in the Book of Revelation with the new heavens and the new earth. Two pens wrote the records, but one Mind planned the contents.

VII.

Here, then, is a reconstruction of how Moses wrote Genesis. We have accounted for the tradition that Moses was the writer or compiler. We have seen a reason for God's causing him to have the best education possible in his day. We have accounted for the different styles in Genesis by realising that Moses was only a compiler, though at the same time he has imposed a definite unity upon the whole. We have accounted for the varying names of God, partly by seeing a certain method that Moses employed in their use, partly by the fact that the authors of the original records may have preferred one name rather than another, and partly by remembering that all of us tend to use a certain amount of variety. We have accounted for a certain Egyptian flavour that some scholars have detected, by recognising that Moses spoke Egyptian, and in one case probably transcribed records from the Egyptian language. We have accounted for certain Babylonian parallels that other scholars have found by accepting the fact that up to the time of Abraham the first records of the race were kept in the region of Babylon. The structure and contents of the book point to one man as the author, and that man is Moses.

John Cosin.

BY THE REV. C. SYDNEY CARTER, M.A., D.D., F.R.Hist.S.

THE Church of England which I honour and reverence above all the other Churches of the world, for she bears upon her, more signally than any other that I know does, the marks of Christ which, when all is done, will be our greatest glory." 2

Such was the definite testimony which one of the most outstanding churchmen of the seventeenth century made in 1656 when he was in exile for his faith in his Mother Church. Its author—John Cosin—was the eldest son of a wealthy tradesman of Norwich, where he was born on November 30th, 1595. Both his parents were devout churchpeople and they educated him at the local Grammar School. From there, at the early age of fourteen, he went up to Gonville and Caius College, Cambridge, where he showed such diligence and ability in his studies that he was elected a Fellow of his College. Such a promising student attracted the notice of Bishops Overall and Andrewes, and although only twenty he was appointed by Overall both as Secretary and Librarian at Lichfield. He was a diligent reader and collector of books and by his great industry he soon won the esteem and full confidence of his Patron, Overall, who as Professor of Divinity at Cambridge had done much to counteract the strong Calvinistic teaching which prevailed there, and who exercised a profound influence over young Cosin, who always affectionately referred to him as his "lord and master." But Overall died in 1619, and in 1624 Cosin became Domestic Chaplain to Richard Neile, Bishop of Durham. From this time his promotion was rapid. The same year he received a prebendal stall at Durham and in 1625, before he was thirty, he was appointed Rector of Brancepeth and Archdeacon of East Riding. The next year he married Frances Blakiston, daughter of a brother prebendary, who died in 1643. He secured his D.D. in 1628.

He was very active in his Archidiaconal Visitations in enforcing discipline on the clergy, and he soon discovered great laxity in the Church services and life. He found many clergy who were ministering without episcopal ordination. Others had anticipated the very prevalent modern custom (or "irregularity") of omitting nearly all the opening Exhortation, and also chose what psalms and lessons they desired. Fully aware of Puritan prejudices, Cosin made special inquiry about the use of the Sign of the Cross in Baptism and also whether the surplice was always worn for weddings, funerals and Holy Communion—an incidental evidence of Cosin's practical interpretation of the requirements of Elizabeth's 1559 "Ornaments Rubric" regarding Eucharistic vestments!

Although Puritanism was strong at this time, there was also a definite reaction towards Popery, influenced largely by the King's marriage to a Romanist Princess—Henrietta Maria of France. The frequent ornate Roman services in the Queen's Chapel provoked adverse criticism of the simpler English rites, and so the King was anxious to make the Anglican Service as attractive as possible. In

response to a Royal request Cosin in 1627 published his book of "Private Devotions," containing special "Hours" Services and introducing a few ancient liturgical features, including prayers for the departed; and this book was widely circulated. It at once aroused the intemperate denunciation of the Puritans as a "Romanising" book of "Cozening" devotions. This attack was mainly of a captious, cavilling character and nothing definitely popish was discovered in the book, although the Puritans actually declared Mattins and Evensong to be so! Cosin in this manual had reaffirmed the Reformers' principle, enunciated by Cranmer in his Preface "Of Ceremonies," when he said: "Our Church, at the Reformation, cast not away her good customs with her bad, nor forwent her religion and Christianity with her Popery, but let pass the one that was new, and preserved the other that was old."² A year later, an elderly Prebendary of Durham, Peter Smart, in a sermon, made a most vituperative, libellous and extravagant attack on Cosin, accusing him of introducing popish ceremonies and practices in the Cathedral. He affirmed that Cosin had changed the position of the Holy Table, calling it an "altar," that he had worn *embroidered* copes and had lit numerous candles during the service, had sung the Nicene Creed and taken the Eastward position, although Smart, rather singularly, admitted that it was not "material which way a man turn his face when he ministers and prays, if it be left a thing indifferent without superstition."³ Smart specially denounced the "worshipping" of the Lord's Table "with ducking to it, though there be no communicants nor any man there." He declared that such a practice made the "altar" an "idol." Cosin denied that "he bowed at all at the said Table, and holdeth it altogether unlawful to be done", but he admitted "bowing on going out and coming into the Church in reverence to God Almighty."⁴

It was an unardonably unchristian attack, only too typical of the current methods of religious controversy. In it Cosin and his friends were denounced as "seditious and schismatical Arminian sectaries, and blind guides and rotten members of the Church." But similarly Cosin's party had condemned Smart and the Puritan preachers as "Judases, seditious and disobedient persons."⁵ Smart was unable to substantiate many of his specific charges. Cosin declared that he had never worn an "embroidered" cope and that he was not responsible for the lighted candles which, however, were needed for artificial light. He also said that he had not interfered with the Communion Table and had always stood at the North Side of it to perform all parts of the Service there, although he admitted that he had occasionally taken the Eastward position for the Consecration prayer only. The Bishop of Durham supported Smart's indictment and was preparing to censure Cosin and his friends, when the King intervened and refused to allow the prosecution to go forward. The overzealous Prebendary was punished most unmercifully for his uncharitable attack. The formidable and tyrannical High Commission Court imprisoned him and fined him £500, and also excommunicated, deprived and even degraded him. But ten years later, when the Long Parliament was in power, the ill used prebendary was reinstated, and in his turn he petitioned the House of Commons against Cosin

for his superstitious and popish innovations at Durham. An M.P. also accused Cosin of seducing a scholar to Popery. This latter libel was easily refuted, since Cosin had used every effort to reclaim the youth and had obliged him to read a public recantation and then expelled him from the University.

But in January, 1641, the Commons passed a sentence of the sequestration of all Cosin's many ecclesiastical benefices. Several years before Smart had pointed out that Cosin, besides his Mastership of Peterhouse and the deanery of Peterborough, held his prebendal stall at Durham and four other lucrative benefices.⁶ The Commons at the same time impeached Cosin in 21 articles to the House of Lords, although his trial there came to nothing. Meanwhile in 1635 Cosin had been appointed Master of Peterhouse, Cambridge, and also Vice-Chancellor in 1640. In the same year he was preferred to the deanery of Peterborough and made Chaplain to Charles I. His active help to the Royalist cause in 1642 cost him his Mastership of Peterhouse and Cosin felt it prudent at this critical stage in the civil struggle to retire to France. He went to Paris in 1643 and officiated as Chaplain to the English Protestants in the exiled Queen's household. He had lodgings given him in the Louvre and was allowed a small pension. But his privations during his seventeen years exile were very real. He lived with his servant on 6d a day and was grateful to accept "tips" from English travelling visitors. The iron must have entered into his royalist soul when in 1657 his eldest daughter was compelled to accept a pension of £1 a week from the "Usurper" Cromwell in order to maintain herself and her sisters.⁷

The hardships he endured and the real dangers which Cosin faced in his Exile were a severe test to the sincerity of his Protestant convictions and they totally disproved the accusations of Prynne and other Puritans of his popish leanings. In Paris the Jesuit controversialists made every effort, including tempting offers of preferment, to convert Cosin, but in spite of threats, even of assassination, he stood firm and stoutly defended the Anglican position. He vigorously attacked transubstantiation as a corrupt doctrine utterly unknown to primitive times and the ancient Church. In his tract on the subject he gives evidence to prove that transubstantiation, as defined at Trent, was quite unknown to the Fathers, to Bertram, the Abbot Aelfric, Peter Lombard and even to Paschasius Radbert.⁸ This courageous attack kept many Englishmen abroad from turning Papists and Cosin later expanded this tract into his comprehensive "History of Transubstantiation." He makes it clear that the Reformed teaching of the Real Presence in the Eucharist is a *spiritual* one—"The bread is not the body of Christ any otherwise than as the cup is the new testament. We maintain our eating of Him to be true, but not carnal or natural." Christ, he affirms, is present only to the worthy Communicants and therefore "He ought not and cannot be kept and preserved to be carried about in the consecrated bread." Cosin's view would seem to be not far distant from the Lutheran theory of Consubstantiation when he says "the body and blood is neither sensibly present nor otherwise at all present, but only to them that are duly prepared to receive them and in the very act of receiving

them and the consecrated elements together, to which they are sacramentally in that act united."⁹

There is no doubt that Cosin did most signal service in defence of the Reformed position while in exile. His biographer truly says, "While he remained in France he was the Atlas of the Protestant religion, supporting the same with his piety and learning, confirming the wavering therein, yea daily adding proselytes (not of the meanest rank) thereto."¹⁰ But we can imagine with what relief and joy Cosin returned to England in July, 1660, to resume his decanal duties at Peterborough. Less than six months later—on December 2nd—he was consecrated Bishop of Durham. He was soon diligently engaged in his diocese with Confirmations, and although he was active in suppressing Conventicles and in suspending clergy who refused to read the Prayers, he was most anxious to heal the past wounds of the Church without recourse to harsh recrimination. If only other Church leaders had pursued this moderating policy the course of our Church history would have been happier. He only silenced one preacher in his diocese because "he had neither episcopal nor presbyteral ordination."¹¹ It is therefore clear that, before the passing of the Act of Uniformity, 1662, Cosin was not prepared to eject a presbyterially ordained preacher in his reorganising of the work of his diocese, where he found the Church life in a very decadent state.¹¹

As might be expected he took a prominent part in the Savoy Conference, and as Richard Baxter declared, "If all had been of his mind we had been reconciled."¹² In March, 1661, he was put on the Commission for the revision of the Prayer Book in which he took a large share. It is a tribute to the remarkable liturgical genius of Archbishop Cranmer that the prayers he adopted and composed and the doctrine enshrined in his Prayer Books were acceptable to the Evangelical Calvinist of the Elizabethan period and were also patient of an interpretation which in the main satisfied the Arminian theology of the Caroline divines. For even after over a century of use the 1662 revision did not effect any change in the *doctrine* of the 1552 Prayer Book. Cosin had been keenly interested in Prayer Book revision since his early years, although he was never a learned or specially accurate liturgical scholar. Some "First Series" of Notes on the Prayer Book, made in 1619 and published forty years after Cosin's death, were all inaccurately fathered on him. But as James Parker in his *History of Revisions* admits, "few of them seem to be original,"¹³ and as he also conjectures, the Notes which Cosin made were probably collections of contemporary divines "rather than an original series compiled by himself." For they contain serious historical blunders, as in stating that the Act of Uniformity, 1559, restored the **1549** Prayer Book! They also contain long extracts from the Jesuit Maldonatus. The youthful Cosin may at first have been impressed with these Notes, but on further study he often corrects them, as when he declares that the title "sacrifice" cannot properly be applied to the Lord's Supper, since "there was never sacrifice nor never shall be any but Christ's alone."¹⁴ But in an interleaved Prayer Book of 1638, there are genuine Notes made by Cosin, although they frequently only expose his ignorance of Prayer Book history, as when he attributes the authorship of the Black Rubric to Martin

Bucer. But in these Notes Cosin relies on the illegal Elizabethan "Ornaments Rubric."¹⁵ and so declares that the "ornaments" of the 1549 Prayer Book, including the "vestment" for the Communion Service, should be used by the clergy, although in his "Considerations" in 1641 he admits that such "ornaments" were then practically unknown and were "neglected by most ministers."¹⁶ Moreover, he had previously admitted in 1619 that only the surplice and hood were then in use according to the 58th Canon of 1603.¹⁷ We have evidence that Cosin continued his suggestions for Prayer Book revision from 1640 to 1661. His "corrected copy" was carefully considered by Convocation in November, 1661, and several of his additions accepted, such as the insertion of the first Ember Collect, the Collects for St. Stephen's day, the Collect, and Epistle and Gospel for the 6th Sunday after Epiphany, and the Thanksgiving for Restoring Peace at Home. But most of his proposed alterations, especially his re-casting of the Prayer of Consecration, on the lines of the 1549 Prayer Book with the inclusion of the *Agnus Dei*, were rejected. He wished to incorporate an Epiclesis and also a definite "memorial", the language of which has been followed in the Alternative Consecration Prayer in the 1928 Prayer Book. He wished the Prayer of Humble Access immediately to precede the actual administration. On the other hand Cosin made the rubric quite definite concerning the "North Side" by adding "North Side or End." But his addition of the words "Offer up" and place the Bread and Wine upon the Table, in the rubric before the Church Militant prayer was rejected, as was also his addition to the post-Communion rubric to allow the use of wafer bread. Probably most clergy to-day will regret that his proposal that half of the Communion Offertory money should be given to the priest "to provide him books of divinity" was not accepted!

Cosin composed a very long historical Preface to the Confirmation Service, explaining its objects and blessings and the reason for its separation from Baptism. Declaring that Confirmation is corrupted by the Church of Rome with "many errors and novelties" and "held to be a sacrament," he adds that "we who by the grace of God are numbered among the Reformed Churches, whereof this Church of England is both for doctrine and discipline the most eminent and the most pure, the most agreeable to Scripture and Antiquity, of all others we hold it to be a sacred and solemn act of religion, which being accompanied with fervent prayer will be a special means to convey the graces of God's Holy Spirit upon those persons that have duly prepared themselves to receive it."¹⁸ The Revised Prayer Book has followed Cosin in the Marriage Service in altering "With my body I thee worship" to "With my body I thee honour."

His episcopate was specially notable for his great efforts in restoring Church buildings, especially the beautiful episcopal Chapel at Auckland Castle. He built a Public Library at Durham, and also two hospitals which he endowed, and he supported charitable and needy causes most liberally. He founded five scholarships at Peterhouse, Cambridge, and endowed its Library. It was estimated that before his death in January, 1672, his benefactions in these ways amounted to about £42,000. He made an allowance to Richard Hooker's grand-

daughter and also gave a pension to a Greek Archbishop who was too poor to return home. As Dr. Basire testified in his funeral oration, Cosin "was no dwarf, neither in stature, dignity nor bounty."¹⁹

As a Churchman Cosin must be classed with other prominent Caroline divines like Andrewes, Laud and his great friend Bishop Montague, as definitely "High." Unlike the great Elizabethan Churchmen, Parker, Whitgift and Hooker, who held that Scripture required no one obligatory form of ecclesiastical polity, Cosin followed Andrewes and his "lord and master" Bishop Overall in asserting the *jus divinum* of episcopacy "where it is established and may be had free from superstition," although he admitted that "we must not cry down and destroy all the Reformed Churches where it cannot be had."²⁰ But Cosin regarded it as a "great presumption and fault for any particular Church to recede" from episcopacy—"the apostolical practice and perpetual order of God's Church"—"without any invincible necessity to do so." Yet he admits that learned men, Roman Catholics and Protestants alike, such as Bishop Jewel, Dean Field and Richard Hooker, admit that "presbyters possess an intrinsic power of ordination *in actu primo*,"²¹ and although he does not quite subscribe to this view, he would not like "to condemn their judgment openly." In fact he declares that "if Bishops become enemies to God and religion, in case of such necessity, the duty of ordaining such as are to succeed them in the work of the Ministry pertains to the presbyters remaining Catholics,"²² since he affirms: "I conceive that the power of ordination was restrained to bishops rather by apostolical practice and the perpetual custom and canons of the Church than by any absolute precept that either Christ or His apostles gave about it, nor can I yet meet with any convincing argument to set it upon a more high and divine institution."²³

Consequently, during his long exile in France, Cosin stressed the solidarity of the Reformed Churches and maintained most friendly relations with the Huguenot ministers at Charenton and fully recognised the validity of their presbyterian orders.²⁴ He attended their services and sermons and strongly urged all English churchmen, when abroad, to do the same and "make no schism between their Church and ours." He also enjoins them, in order to declare their "unity in professing the same religion," "to communicate reverently with them of the French Church," since "there is no prohibition against communicating with them as there is against communicating with the Papists."²⁵ But like other Caroline divines, he strongly condemns the English presbyterians for rejecting episcopacy where it was established in a Scriptural form and he makes a clear distinction between them and the foreign Reformed Churches. It was especially with these "Protestant and well reformed Churches" that Cosin declared in his Will, that "he always joined in Spirit, mind and affection."²⁶

He was particularly distressed by the defection of his son, in spite of all his efforts, to the Romish faith and his eventual ordination to the Roman priesthood. At first he determined to disown him altogether, but in his Will he leaves "to my lost son one hundred pounds, having already settled on him a life annuity of £50. I give him no more because he hath dealt very undutifully with his indulgent

father and twice forsaken his Mother the Church of England and the Protestant, being the true Catholic religion therein professed."²⁷ We get here a valuable incidental confirmation of the High Church Caroline view of the "Protestant" Catholicity of the Anglican Church held by leaders like Laud, Sanderson and Bramhall.

From his "Correspondence" and from the records of his career, we can form a fairly clear picture of this great XVII century divine. Surtees tells us that Cosin was tall and of a "commanding presence, in which frankness and dignity were mingled."²⁸ He was from the first an active and prominent member of the Arminian or "High" Church School of divines led by Archbishop Laud, Bishops Montague, Wren and Morley. In his ardent youthful and almost "Tractarian" zeal, he was keenly anxious to revive as much of ancient ritual and ceremony as might be in any way compatible with the Protestant and reformed character of the Church, and the Court favour and patronage of the new Arminian party greatly assisted this design and the accompanying campaign to overthrow Puritanism. His later experiences and the lessons of adversity, although not changing his convictions, somewhat modified his earlier partisan outlook; while his courage, unbending rectitude, and sincere piety won him the respect and esteem of all parties. Although he certainly showed no love for the Puritans, Neal, their great historian, praises his charity and moderation and describes him as "a learned man, of an open, frank and generous temper, and well versed in the Canons, Councils and Fathers."²⁹

¹ Cosin, Correspondence, 1. 287 (1869).

² *Ibid.*, 1. 133.

³ Parker, History of Revisions, cccxxix.

⁴ *Ibid.*, cccxci.

⁵ Cosin, Correspondence, 1. 184.

⁶ *Ibid.*, 1. 185.

⁷ *Ibid.*, 2. v.

⁸ *Ibid.*, 1. 270.

⁹ Cosin, Works, v. 345. (A.C.L.)

¹⁰ *Ibid.*, 1. xxx (1874).

¹¹ Cosin, Correspondence, 2. viii.

¹² Kennet's Register, 507.

¹³ Parker, Hist. of Revisions, p. cccxv.

¹⁴ Tomlinson, Prayer Book, Articles, &c., p. 175.

¹⁵ Parker, Hist. of Revisions, ccclxv.

¹⁶ *Ibid.*, cxxxvi.

¹⁷ *Ibid.*, cxxx.

¹⁸ Cosin, Correspondence, 2. 69.

¹⁹ *Ibid.*, 2. xlviii.

²⁰ *Ibid.*, 1. xxxvii.

²¹ Letter to Mr. Cordel, Works, IV. 401.

²² Quoted Fletcher, Some Troubles of Archbishop Sancroft.

²³ Letter to Mr. Cordel.

²⁴ Cosin, Correspondence, 2. xliii.

²⁵ Letter to Mr. Cordel.

²⁶ Works, 1. xxxii.

²⁷ Cosin, Correspondence, 2. xxxi.

²⁸ *Ibid.*, 2. xlvii.

²⁹ History of Puritans, iii. 99.

Some Liturgical Considerations.

BY THE REV. E. J. G. ROGERS, B.A.

TODAY we are conscious of widespread criticism levelled at the Book of Common Prayer and much of this is directed against the Holy Communion service. Many Evangelicals are sympathetic with some measure of revision so long as the doctrinal balance of the 1662 rite is preserved. Nevertheless, whatever our attitude, our criticism must be well-informed and we must be prepared to specialise in liturgical studies and to understand the development of the rites. Only thus can we make a positive contribution to the discussions which must inevitably arise: it is in this way that our opinions will command respect, when it is understood that we speak with authority and sympathy from a deep understanding of the development of the traditional forms in which Christians have worshipped.

The study of liturgical worship is not an archaeological study of museum pieces: it is the realisation of how men and women have come face to face with the living God. For these are living rites: they are the pathways which men have traversed in their answering response to God's search for them. Here is holy ground, and we shall never appreciate liturgical study until we see it related to the hopes and aspirations of the worshipping communities. These are the pathways that the saints of other generations and communions have trod: they are the rites which enabled them to serve God, the routes along which the spirit of man has travelled on his journey to the Celestial City. Detached from the life of the worshipper they become academic and antiquarian, and we miss the reality of the spiritual truths to which they are attempting to witness. If we are not careful we are left in the hands of the liturgical expert who frequently misses the spirit of the rite through being obsessed with the minutiae of liturgical criticism. Here we need deep human sympathies, a spirit alive unto God, an informed historical perspective and a natural humility which is prepared to learn not only from the faith of the past, but which will approach the subject dispassionately and free from prejudice. It is a very difficult thing to achieve, but a discipline we must undertake. If we wish to make a positive contribution to the discussions that are bound to arise, it is necessary for us to know something of that process of development and reform which brought our rite into existence. Not only must we be prepared to stand firm by the principles of the Reformers but we must understand something of the origins and growth of the early liturgies, and approach them with sympathy and a desire to appreciate their form and expression.

I.

Most of us are familiar with the Roman Mass and we realise how, in the Canon, there is the emphasis on oblation and sacrifice. Some of us will have a superficial acquaintance with the Eastern liturgies

with their atmosphere of mystery and awe. Few of us know much about the way in which these rites have evolved; yet it is desirable that we should appreciate their origins and early forms, for without such a background of knowledge we are unable to assess properly the values of our own liturgy. From time to time it is worth while examining the evidence of the early rites and we must regard them, not as a scientist looks at specimens in his laboratory, but as fellow Christians of those who, in earlier generations, attempted to give expression and form to God's revelation in Christ and of their own deepest understanding of the Christian mystery of life, death, resurrection and judgment—and, too, of communion through the use of simple objects like bread and wine.

The first thing we need to remember is the poverty of the evidence: there is very little that has survived. The early centuries of the Christian era do not supply many details of the worshipping life of the community. There are hints and allusions, a fact which can be understood when we realise that until the conversion of Constantine our religion was proscribed. Christians were in constant danger of persecution, and so there was a natural secrecy about their meetings and worship. "The Apostles and Fathers, who from the beginning gave prescriptions about the Church, guarded the dignity of the mysteries in secrecy and silence."¹ The *disciplina arcana* of the Church meant that no details of creed or ritual could be published for apologetics or propaganda. These were the private, secret information of the brethren: "it is not allowed to describe the mysteries to those who are not initiated";² and this accounts for the scarcity of our materials. Nevertheless, it is possible on the evidence we possess to see an outline of the early service and also to understand more fully the groundwork of our own rite, for though reformed its roots go far back to these early days and we are conscious of an affinity both in thought and order. We err if we imagine that our 1662 Service is a completely new form. It "is not the work of one man, of one society, or of one age: it is like the British Constitution, a precious result of accumulative and collective wisdom."³

In other realms, to appreciate the significance of anything, we turn to its finished end: it reveals its true nature in its final achievement. Here we must turn to origins, and we find it in the action of our Lord in the Upper room when He took Bread and Wine, and blessed them, and said, "Do this in remembrance of Me." All rites are an interpretation of that action and a response to that command. There we find its roots; but as it emerges into flower we find that centuries of devotion and worship have played their part in its maturity. We need to study the evidence of these formative centuries and the rites of other communions so that we may obtain a better understanding of our own, and perhaps we may be enabled to make positive contributions to the enrichment of our liturgy so that succeeding generations may be grateful for our insight. At the least, we need to be able to speak with as much authority as any other strand of the Anglican communion. Until recently almost all the research and detailed study has been done by other sections; it is time that Evangelicals made their contribution to the study of worship,

for it is essential that our point of view be represented with scholarship, and with the authority of knowledge.

II.

While we naturally turn for guidance to the Reformers, it must be remembered that research has made available information and knowledge which they did not possess. In appealing to the evidence of the first centuries of Christian faith and practice, the Church of the New Testament and the early Fathers, we are being true to the mind of the Reformers, for they too turned to those same sources. Their appeal was always to the Scriptures and the ancient Fathers. In the Book of Homilies, in the "Sermon against the peril of idolatry," we have an instance of this double appeal: "Aganst the which foul abuses and great enormities shall be alleged unto you; first the authority of God's holy word. . . . And secondly, the testimonies of the holy and ancient learned Fathers and Doctors, out of their own works and ancient histories ecclesiastical." The high regard in which they held the Fathers is evidenced by Cranmer's "Articles of Inquiry at the Visitation of the Cathedral Church of Canterbury" in 1550, when he asks "Whether there be a library within this Church, and in the same St. Augustine's Works, Basil, Gregory Nazianzene, Hierome, Ambrose, Chrysostom, Cyprian, Theophylact, Erasmus and other good authors and works."⁴ Or we might cite Jewel's celebrated appeal to the Fathers in a sermon preached at Paul's Cross, the second Sunday before Easter, 1560. "If any learned man of all our adversaries . . . be able to bring any one sufficient sentence out of any old Catholic doctor, or father, or out of any old general council, or out of the holy Scriptures of God, or any one example of the primitive Church, whereby it may be clearly or plainly proved that there was any private mass in the whole world at that time, for the space of 600 years after Christ; Or that there was then any Communion ministered unto the people under one kind; . . . if any man alone were able to prove any of these articles by any one clear or plain clause or sentence, either of the Scriptures, or of the old doctors, or of any old general council, or by any example of the primitive Church; I promised them that I would give over and subscribe unto him."⁵ We find that writers like Becon, Pilkington and Jewel appear to have knowledge of the liturgies of St. Basil, St. Chrysostom, the liturgy of Armenia and the "Liturgy of the Ethiopes." However, it was always a critical appeal, the final authority was the Bible.

As we have previously stated, the evidence for these early centuries is slight. We are in a realm of conjecture and speculation and no liturgiologist can afford to be dogmatic in his conclusions, for he is building on slender foundations. It is possible that the future discovery of manuscripts might quite easily involve the modification of contemporary theories. It is a study where we must be humble in our claims, and certainly we cannot afford to be speculative in our deductions. There is much upon which we can speak with confident assurance, but there are still fields in which it is wiser to suggest rather than dogmatise.

There seems to exist a widespread impression that the only specific Christian rite of the early Church was the sacrament of Holy Communion. It is true that this is and always has been the characteristic Christian rite; but it is doubtful whether it was the only service of the early Church. The primitive form of the liturgy can be divided into two parts—the Synaxis, and what we might call the Anaphora. They are, in the words of Maxwell, “The Liturgy of the Word” and “The Liturgy of the Upper Room.” Originally these two parts were not necessarily performed together: they could be, and were, held separately. In the earliest detailed description we have of Christian worship, “The Apology of St. Justin,” there are two distinct accounts of the Holy Communion service: in one, it is preceded by baptism, in the other by the synaxis. In the “Apostolic Tradition of St. Hippolytus” the accounts of Communion are preceded by the consecration of a bishop and by baptism and confirmation. The evidence suggests that Christians gathered not only for eucharistic worship but for services of instruction and preaching. The early converts were mainly Jews and proselytes gathered from the ranks of the “god-fearers”. They were people who were familiar with the worship of the Synagogue, for at this time this was the real home of the Jewish religion; and “it was the liturgy of the Synagogue rather than the worship of the Temple which moulded the services of the early Christian community.”⁶

It is natural to suppose that the early Christians would value and assimilate those distinctive elements of Synagogue worship which had enriched and sustained the lives of the Jews of the Dispersion. The heart and centre of this worship was the reading of the Law, and later readings from the prophetic books, accompanied by an exposition. Around this nucleus there gathered the singing of psalms and the saying of prayers. It is precisely these elements which are found in the Christian synaxis: it is “the liturgy of the Word.” We gather from incidental references in the Epistles that these elements seem to be parts of services, and as they do not appear to be attached to “the breaking of bread,” it is a fair inference that they refer in all probability to services which are separate from the eucharistic rite, a service of preaching, of exhortation, of prayer. Here the emphasis is on the ministry of the Word. From the fourth century the synaxis became gradually fused with the “Liturgy of the Upper Room” and they were regarded as “inseparable parts of a single rite.”⁷ Even much earlier, probably in the second century, it was usual for the Eucharist to be preceded by this service, marked by its emphasis on the preaching of the Word and the reading of the Scriptures. It would be a mistake to imagine that the ministry of the Word was a mere imitation of the Jewish service. The latter served only as a pattern, for the Christian rite developed its own ways of expressing its message and worship. “There was a new emphasis and content to accord with the new revelation and to express the new spirit.”⁸ Maxwell suggests that it was the Prophetic books rather than the Law which became the chief centre of interest, and there would be an added emphasis on those passages which seemed capable of bearing a Messianic interpretation, or those which appeared to find their fulfilment in the life and teaching of our Lord. Later the emphasis changed, for

soon the letters and writings of the Apostles began to circulate, and eventually, too, collections of the teaching and life of our Lord which were to have the primary place of honour. When we study the developed forms of the liturgies, the Gospel lections hold a supreme place, and it is clear that the reading of the Gospel is a high moment in the action of the Liturgy.

III.

Through the mists of antiquity, which hide the history of the development of Christian worship, we are aware of these two services, ultimately to be united into one corporate rite. It was a true insight which made them join together these two strands and make them part of one rite. It is impossible to exaggerate the significance of this development, and it supplies us with a great liturgical principle—the indissoluble unity of the ministry of the Word and Sacrament. In our first piece of real liturgical evidence, the Apology of St. Justin Martyr, we are already aware that in the Sunday worship these two elements have been combined. The Apology, written in Rome, probably in 145 A.D., is evidence for the kind of rite celebrated there. He writes, “ And on the day which is called Sunday all who live in the city or in the country gather together in one place, and the memoirs of the Apostles and the writings of the Prophets are read as long as time permits. Then, when the reader stops, the president instructs and exhorts those present to the imitation of those good things. Then we all stand up together and offer prayers, and as we have said before, when our prayers have finished bread is offered and wine and water, and the president in like manner offers prayers and thanksgivings as much as he is able, and the people assent, saying, ‘ Amen.’ And there is a distribution to each and a participation in the Eucharistic elements, and some is sent by the deacons to those who are not present.”

This interesting extract is of great importance, for in this primitive form of the rite we see what is substantially the core of the more developed services; for most of them, when they emerge from the obscurity surrounding their early development, have much the same outline. From Justin’s account we have the following order :

1. Lections.
2. Sermon.
3. Prayers.
4. The Offering of bread and wine mixed with water.
5. The Prayers and Thanksgivings with Amen.
6. Communion.

This is in the main the plan of our present 1662 rite and we may claim that it does preserve the essential elements of the primitive service of the Church.

The first complete extant Liturgy which we possess is the so-called Clementine Liturgy preserved for us in Book VIII of the Apostolic Constitutions (c.375-80 A.D.). Unfortunately its historical value has been weakened considerably because it was compiled by the same person who edited the Epistle of Ignatius, and the Liturgy reveals marks of his individual style. Yet there is no doubt that it is based

upon a living rite and it has the advantage of being free from the modification and changes which are characteristic of a developing rite. It enables us to obtain a glimpse of the kind of service that was used in the East, and here again we are conscious of the unity of the ministry of the Word and Sacrament. Before the deacon begins the litany of the faithful, the service starts with Bible lections and sermon.

It is interesting to realise that we have no details of the *Anaphora* or consecration prayer earlier than that contained in the Apostolic Tradition of Hippolytus, written in Rome about the year 217 A.D. The evidence suggests that there was at first no definite prayer of consecration; the phrase *δοση δύναμις αὐτῷ* in Justin's Apology seems to indicate extempore prayer. There is other positive witness to corroborate this fact. Thus in the Didache the prophets were to be allowed "to give thanks as much as they desire," and the words *δοξα θέλουσιν* certainly seem to indicate extempore prayer. Further, Tertullian, speaking of prayer, can write, "We pray without a monitor because we pray from the heart."⁹ The First Church Order is even more dogmatic. "It is not altogether necessary for him to recite the same words which we said before, as if learning to say them by heart in his thanksgiving to God; but according to the ability of each one he is to pray. If indeed he is able to pray sufficiently well with a grand prayer then it is good: but if also he should pray and recite a prayer in due measure, no one may forbid him, only let him pray being sound in orthodoxy."¹⁰ We might expect that this liberty of expression would result in all kinds of divergencies and variations. It would seem that we should traverse a tortuous desert arid with men's prejudices and idiosyncrasies. This was almost an invitation for subjection to run riot. But when we examine the emerging rites there is much agreement in the main features of the prayer. This can be appreciated when we realise that they have a common origin in the command of our Lord, they aspire to reproduce the essential meaning of that holy hour. One thing is clear from the evidence of the earliest anaphora we possess, there is no moment or formula by which the elements were consecrated. It is only later, and is typical of the West, that the words of institution are regarded as a consecrating formula. This is of vital importance for it gives us the mind of the primitive Church about this matter.

One other principle must be emphasised—that the striking feature of the Church's life in the pre-Nicene period is the *corporate nature* of its worship. It is one of the things which Dom Gregory Dix in his important study, "The Shape of the Liturgy", emphasises that the service is a Liturgy of the whole Church. Undoubtedly, the fellowship of the Worship was maintained by the act of communion, which is the proper climax of the service. There is no indication of a communion service where those present did not communicate—such a practice would have been regarded as a travesty of our Lord's intention. Even in the fifth century "Liturgical Homilies of Narsai," in Homily 17 ("An exposition of the Mysteries"), we read: "Again, another proclamation is made in different order: 'Let every one that receives not the Body and Blood depart from hence'."¹¹ This

act was the basis of their fellowship in which the Christians realised their fellowship with Christ and through Him with each other. "We, being many, are one bread, one body: for we all partake of the one bread" (1 Cor. x. 17). It is quite evident that the Church regarded this as the true fulfilment of the Service, and the growth of non-communicating attendance is alien both to the mind of Christ and to the practice of the early Church. We have seen that two fundamental principles of early liturgy were the uniting of the ministry of the Word and Sacrament in one great corporate act of worship, finding its completion in the act of Communion.

IV.

It is outside the purpose of this essay to examine the work of the Reformation Fathers to see if they appreciated the significance of these two ideas: this would require a separate study. However, we must examine briefly our present rite in the light of those principles to see if it fulfils these two basic liturgical conceptions. We can appreciate their achievement only when we remember the background of medieval doctrine and practice, for worship is always dependent upon doctrine. During the Middle Ages alien ideas of priesthood and sacrifice had distorted the action of the liturgy. The emphasis lies on sacrifice which has become the central theme of the rite. There had developed also an individualistic piety, and the Roman mass is "deficient in the sense of corporate fellowship." The development of national language meant that few people could follow the words of the service and so take their rightful part in the worship. The growth of the idea of the sacrifice of the mass also undermined the corporate nature of worship, for communion is overshadowed by this conception, and the mass becomes a repetition of the sacrifice of Calvary. The growth of votive masses and masses for the dead undermined congregational worship, and individualism became rampant. Maxwell quotes Heiler, who says that these private masses became a cancer feeding upon the soul of the Church. The doctrine of transubstantiation also weakened worship, for the communion of the people ceased to be an integral part of the service, and the central act was the elevation of the host. It is little wonder that the worshippers ceased to be a congregation but were a group of disassociated individuals.

Quite obviously, the first task of the Reformers, after the repudiation of the doctrine of transubstantiation and sacrifice, was to provide a service which would be congregational and which would emphasise the heart of the Christian Gospel—justification by faith. We may claim that Cranmer succeeded in achieving this.

The first step to make the services congregational was the introduction of *English* as the language of worship and devotion. This was done gradually, and in 1549 we have our First Prayer Book in our mother tongue. The principle is laid down in the Preface, "And moreover, whereas s. Paule would have suche language spoken to the people in the church, as they mighte understande and have profite by hearyng the same; the service in this Church of England (these many yeares) hath been read in Latin to the people, whiche they

understoode not; so that they have heard with theyr eares onely; and their hartes, spirits, and minde, have not been edified thereby." In the Communion Service the communion of the people was restored and erroneous ideas of sacrifice removed. In their emphasis on communion the English reformers were guided by the primitive practice of the Church. On the Continent Luther had done the same at Wittenberg. They had rediscovered "the Pauline conception of the mystery of fellowship."¹² In all of Luther's Church Orders the principle is laid down, "No mass without communicants."¹² We do not realise what a revolution this was in Church practice, both on the Continent and in England, and the Reformers' intentions were defeated only by the conservatism of the people; for during the past centuries they had been used to infrequent communions. Calvin, too, wished to introduce a weekly celebration of communion at Geneva, but the magistrates of the city would not accept this. Though Calvin had to yield to their wishes, he frequently expressed his dissatisfaction with the arrangement whereby the Lord's Supper was celebrated only four times a year. "Indeed," he writes, "this custom that enjoins that men should communicate only once a year is certainly an invention of the devil. The Lord's Supper should be celebrated in the Christian congregation once a week at the very least"; and again, "I have taken care to record publicly that our custom is defective, so that those who come after me may be able to correct it the more freely and easily."¹³ Communion thus became an essential part of our rite, and the custom that has grown up in some churches of having a sung service without communicants is foreign to the mind of the Book of Common Prayer. The balance of the service is upset, and in the words of Bishop Gore, it "represents a seriously defective theology."¹⁴

We are conscious in our service that Cranmer gave new emphasis to the ministry of the word. This is natural, for it was the rediscovery of the Bible that gave birth to the Reformation. During the latter part of the Middle Ages there had been a decline in preaching, and Cranmer reintroduced the sermon in the first part of the service. Christ, God's Word, was to be presented in all His glory to the congregation. Here, those who were ordained "to preach the Word of God, and to minister the holy Sacraments," were permitted to exercise their dual ministry together. There is no antithesis between these two functions, they are meant to be united in our ministry. Sunday by Sunday in our lections God's message is read and is to be followed by the Sermon, and this is in accordance with the Reformer's conception that "there is no true sacrament without the prior word of promise." The same Word which is preached audibly from the pulpit is preached visibly from the holy table.

The Anglican Reformers did all they could to encourage preaching. Schools for preachers were established in many of the parish churches. The Books of Homilies* were published because of the poverty of the preaching, but they were regarded only as necessary substitutes and their reading "is nothing comparable to the office of preaching. . . .

* The writer is aware that the Homilies were also issued to avoid controversial subjects being treated in the pulpit, but the main reason for their use was the lack of true preachers.

Besides, homilies were devised by the godly bishops . . . only to supply necessity for want of preachers ; and are by the statute not to be preferred, but to give place to sermons, whensoever they may be had."¹⁵ Hooper, among others, did all he could to re-establish preaching. "The true preaching of God's Word hath been so long out of use, that it shall be very difficult to restore it again. . . . When the Bible and true preachers thereof be restored into the church, God shall restore likewise such light as shall discern every thing aright. . . . The preaching of God's Word is of all things most necessary for the people."¹⁶ From the earliest days the Sermon had been an essential part of the service, and now it is again to take its true place.

V.

We began this essay with the plea for liturgical study and we have seen that our rite fulfils two important liturgical principles : in it is united the ministry of the Word and Sacrament, and its true climax is in Communion. There are wide fields we might have explored. We could have made a detailed study of the consecration prayers, or considered the theology of the Epiclesis, or the place of the offertory in the action of the service. There are numerous points which need investigation and research. We must prepare carefully so that if a demand for revision arises we shall have a carefully thought-out plan. Liturgy is not static : if it is living it must develop. Evangelicals have been accused recently of liturgical obscurantism, and it is necessary, by our interest and studies, to show that this criticism is unjustified. It is impossible to ignore the fact that in many parishes experiments are being made in public worship ; in many churches changes and modifications are being introduced into the services ; we are lapsing into congregationalism. We must think out our worship in terms of doctrine and theology. We are not concerned merely to defend the *status quo*, although most of us are content with the 1662 rite. Some feel that in certain directions it could be enriched, but we do not wish the structure of the service to be altered, or any innovations introduced which would change its doctrinal emphasis. Many of us would be glad to see the inclusion of an *anamnesis* which would recall not only our Lord's death but His Resurrection and Ascension. In some of the older liturgies this feature is very full and has the merit of not confining the thought merely to one moment of the Passion, but brings before us the triumph of the Easter morning and the joyous Victory of our faith, and the mention of the Second Advent brings an added and needed eschatological note into our Eucharist. "Therefore we also who are sinners, remembering His life-giving passion, His saving cross, His death, His tomb, His resurrection from the dead on the third day, His ascension into Heaven and the session on the right hand of Thee, the God and Father, and His glorious and terrible second coming, when He shall come with glory to judge the quick and the dead"¹⁷ (Liturgy of S. James of Jerusalem). Some feel that the collection has tended to obscure the real meaning of the offertory and would like it to have the position it held in the early Church, and the bread and wine become again the offerings of the congregation presented by their representatives to the minister.

SOME LITURGICAL CONSIDERATIONS 81

These are improvements which would leave the 1662 structure unchanged.

We have inherited a rich legacy, which it is ours to use and guard. For nearly three hundred years our present service has been a source of inspiration to countless pilgrims, pointing them to Heaven and revealing to them the resplendent figure of Christ. It is a rite full of sacred associations, and there is danger that in an anxiety to be up-to-date, we short-cut the purposes of God and attempt to achieve too much by our own deliberations and cleverness instead of being led by the Spirit of God.

1. S. Basil, *De Spiritu Sancto*, 27.
2. S. Athanasius, *Ap contra Arianos*, 11.
3. Bishop Jebb, *Thirty Years' Correspondence between John Jebb and Alexander Knox*, vol. i, p. 368 (quoted by Haléry, *A History of the English People in 1815*, vol. 3, p. 12).
4. *Parker Society*, Vol. 2, p. 161.
5. *Works, Parker Society*, Vol. 1, pp. 20-1.
6. Dugmore, *The Influence of the Synagogue upon the Divine Office*, p. 7.
7. Dix, *The Shape of the Liturgy*, p. 37.
8. Maxwell, *An Outline of Christian Worship*, p. 3.
9. Tertullian, *Apology* 30 (*cf. De Oratone*, 9).
10. *First Church Order Sabid*, version § 34.
11. Dom R. H. Connolly, *The Liturgical Homilies of Narsai*, p. 2.
12. Brioth, *Eucharistic Faith and Practice, Evangelical and Catholic*, p. 133.
13. Quoted in Maxwell, *op. cit.*, pp. 117, 118.
14. Gore, *The Body of Christ*, p. 276.
15. Grindal, *Works, Parker Society*, p. 380.
16. *Works, Parker Society*, Vol. 1, p. 205.
17. Linton, *Twenty-five Consecration Prayers*, p. 42. The Greek text in Brightman, *L.E.W.*, 52, 30.

The Authentic Word.

A Study in P. T. Forsyth's attitude to the Bible.

BY THE REV. R. E. HIGGINSON, M.A.

THE significance of the writings of Dr. Peter Taylor Forsyth has at last dawned upon our generation, although it was largely unrealised by his own contemporaries. Dr. J. D. Jones, writing of him as his dearest friend in "Three Score Years and Ten", describes Forsyth as "a great gift of God to our churches." He says he *was*. The realist of this present hour would change the tense and declare he *is*. He began his ministerial life as an extreme Left Winger, and ended it as a pillar of orthodoxy, but the orthodoxy was his own! This "prophet of the Cross" had an authentic word to deliver about the Cross. His chief contribution to theology lies there. But indirectly he made a valuable contribution to the question of Biblical criticism and the Evangelical reaction toward it. In his own denomination he is best remembered as an uncompromising critic of the "New Theology." To him Christianity was at the crossroads and he brought the churches back to the central fact of the Historic Faith—Christ crucified as the demonstration of redeeming, recreating activity by God. He magnified the Grace of God, as a powerful, perennial personality dealing with the awful calamity of a fallen humanity through the Cross of Jesus Christ. And yet, strange as the union may seem, he was an exponent of critical views with regard to the authorship and documents of the books of the Bible. In him the critic and the fundamentalist were united. On the one hand, he preached a positive Gospel which aimed to recreate men and women through unreserved faith in Jesus Christ as Saviour and Sovereign Lord. With what passion of soul he declared by lip and pen the crucial evangel! On the other hand, he accepted the views of the scholarship of his day. In principle he was with the critics. This paper is an attempt to reconcile these apparently divergent views.

"Fundamentalism is next door to Atheism," so he affirmed in his epigrammatic way. This might well be the key to his position.

A true understanding of the Forsyth dialectic will only come as the magnetic north of his theology is grasped. In many respects he applied the principle of Martin Luther to the doctrine of the Word of God. As the Reformer writes in *A Treatise on Christian Liberty*, "You ask, 'What then is the Word of God, and how shall it be used, since there are so many words of God?' I answer, 'The Apostle explains it in Romans, chapter i. The Word of God is the Gospel of God concerning His Son. . . .'" In a Gospel sermon he writes again, "How can we know what is God's word? . . . You must determine this matter for yourself, for your very life depends upon it. Therefore God must speak to your heart: This is God's Word. . . ." Just as the Scriptures had vindicated their Divine character in Luther's experience and recreated him as a new creature in Christ Jesus so with Peter Taylor Forsyth. He too advocated that the Written Word must be interpreted by the Gospel which it discloses. All the Written

Word bears witness to the Gospel. The bare written word of Scripture was not sufficient for the human soul, the Spirit of God had to take that word and apply it to the heart. This Spirit-applied Word was the Gospel, the recreative power of Divine Grace operative in the heart of the believer. This word achieved the new creation. Therefore, it was this Evangel of Grace, active, redemptive, and recreative which gave the Scriptures their peculiar value. Apart from it they had no real worth, other than as historical documents. This Gospel became the criterion for the testing of the various parts of the Bible.

Forsyth followed the Reformers in setting the Bible over the Church and over the individual. But he stressed the fact that it is for the sake of the *Gospel* that the Bible and the believing preacher exist. The Gospel was prior to the New Testament. The Gospel created the church as a community of believing, worshipping, and faith propagating men and women. The Gospel created the New Testament. Christ did not come to bring a Bible. He himself never wrote a word, except in sand, and that He erased to prevent the curious from reading it! Christ came with a Gospel. He is the Gospel of God's Redemptive, Revealing, Recreative action through the Cross and Resurrection. The New Testament arose afterwards *from* the Gospel *to serve* the Gospel. "The Bible, the preacher, and the Church are all made by the same instrument—the Gospel. For the sake and service of the Gospel, preacher, Bible and church exist" (p.15, *Positive Preaching and Modern Mind*).

The Bible was not produced like "St Paul's Library." There was no human editor; no committee of reference who framed "the fixed magnitude" of the canon (unless it be the experience of the believing Church down to A.D. 200); no "Canterbury Press" to arrange for the publication and circulation among the scattered Christian communities. The various books were occasional productions. In the case of the New Testament (and indeed in principle with the Prophets of the Old Testament) "applying fundamental Christianity to particular situations in the believing church" (*vide, The Person and Place of Jesus Christ*, lectures V. and VI.). "The occasion of writing was some *providential* juncture in the affairs of the Church; and the Apostles managed and directed that juncture as men writing of final truths in which they habitually lived, truths given them to see by an Indwelling Lord" (p.140 and p.164, as above).

How then would Forsyth answer the question which arises so frequently, Where is the permanent element, and what relates only to the local situation?

The core is the Gospel. Just as the Gospel created the Bible and the Church, and just as the Bible and the Church exist for the sake of the Gospel, so every part is measured and assessed by the Gospel. The Gospel is the Authentic Word of God in the Bible. This principle is the *Highest criticism* of all: it judges both men and methods in their approach to Holy Scripture.

I.

Revelation is "the manward movement of God", whereas religion is "the Godward projection of men," which feels and hopes that

eventually it is "bound to get to God." Forsyth, while accepting the conclusions of the Higher critics and the evolutionary theory of the formation of the Old Testament, yet asserts most definitely and incisively that there is such a thing as Revelation. It is nothing less than the historic, actual, invasive, recreative action of the Hidden God breaking into the ordered Universe. God took the initiative in order to redeem and restore man to the pattern of the Divine Image. Even in the evolutionary process the invasion of God in revelation had a teleological purpose. He ordered the progression of the stages of religious development. He also culminated the movement by invasion through lawgiver, or prophet, or Messiah.

Forsyth thus held a belief in "General Revelation." The Hidden God, (to use a phrase of Karl Barth, who seems to have been anticipated by P.T.F. and at many points saved from the Barthian extremes), has given partial gleams of light within nature; within the religions of men; and even within man himself. But the whole weight is laid upon "Special Revelation." The Hidden God has revealed His character unmistakably through the living voice and the creative utterance of the prophets. Selecting a single nation as a unit, and selecting men within that nation, He has progressively in stages and in different ways unveiled His character and Purpose of Redemption. This movement culminated in the person and work of Jesus Christ, the Divine-Human Saviour.

II.

This Divine Revelation is intended for all ages. The fact and the act needed an authoritative interpretation which would be a full and *final record*. The factual Revelation could not be left to tradition, nor even to a static narrative of the events. Something more was required. There was the double danger of the Revelation being misunderstood, and the message mutilated.

In what relation does the Record stand to the Revelation? In approaching the vexed question of Apostolic Inspiration there is the peril of trying to define the indefinable! The New Testament is the mouthpiece of Christ. The Apostles spoke as men in whose experience Christ dwelt. On matters of Faith, their voice was His voice. It is no more possible to describe the inner psychology of inspiration in the Apostles than it is in the Prophets. And yet, anyone in close contact with the New Testament records feels that the ascended Christ was really *acting upon* and *within* these specially chosen instruments from the Divine Glory. "The Apostles were the posthumous pen of Christ. The Apostolic inspiration is the posthumous exposition by Christ of His own work." These specially selected men did not echo the Cross and the Christ, they were anointed by the Spirit of the reigning Lord to decipher and declare. Christ is His own interpreter through the men in Whom He dwelt. The Church is Christ's Body, and the Bible is Christ's Word, His own interpretation of Himself.

This position was an attack indirectly upon the Higher Critical assertions of his day that the men were inspired, but their words were not. He denied that the Record of Revelation was man construing: that it was merely a commentary by fallible men upon the action

of God in history : and in the transfer to writing much of the reality or authenticity had vanished. Such an assertion was unwarranted in Forsyth's opinion, especially in regard to the New Testament. It was an unwarranted separation of Record from Revelation. The New Testament is not a product of Revelation, but an integral part of it. Christ not only unveiled God's character in His crucial action but He also interpreted it from the Unseen World through special men. In His earthly life it was not possible to interpret the whole of His Mission, because it was not yet fully achieved, the Cross had not been endured. But from the Throne He reigned in men's hearts and by the Spirit unveiled to them the meaning of His person and work. There was not just the bare fact of redemptive revelation, but in addition and essential to it the word which interpreted the fact. The Revelation could not possess recreative power unless the record of it was also an integral part of it. "The fact without the word is dumb ; and the word without the fact is empty." "The Apostles translated Christ, the text, who without the translation would have been a *dead letter* so far as history is concerned."

This raises an important point in any appreciation of Forsyth's doctrine of the Word of God : did he regard the Record as infallible and inerrant? Forsyth is careful to state that on the cross and related events these inspired men were *infallible*. This central fact of the Faith is unassailable. The region of infallibility and finality lies in the Gospel. On the circumference of the Faith the Apostles *may* have been mistaken.

The details may have been open to the possibility of error, but the central features are above criticism. There is a criticism higher than the Higher Criticism! Any attack upon the Holy of Holies of the Faith is invalidated if it cannot stand the test of the Gospel. For instance, the Resurrection can be verified in experience and therefore the documents which relate the event are not the only data available. The *experience* of the Resurrection authenticates the *fact* of the Resurrection. A mere literary criticism cannot nullify the experiential testimony. "It is only the accidents of the sacred records which will respond to methods of ordinary secular research." The corrosive acid of an excessive literary criticism cannot reach the core of the Word. There is a peculiarly inherent quality beyond the analysis of the critic, which speaks only to the believer.

This claim to finality is not a claim to *inerrancy*. Full scope is allowed to Lower (Textual) Criticism. No textual variation has affected the Gospel one iota. It cannot. The weakness of Forsyth's position lies here. Too much is granted to the subjective experience of the one who reads. In many respects Forsyth limited the application of this principle overmuch. For instance, he questions the connection between sin and physical death, (*cf. p.155, Person and Place*). These matters he considered as lying further from the centre and, therefore, from the region of inspired certainty. "Inspired men have been wrong on points and modes of argument, just as, even with Christ in them, they sinned. They have not always been right by the event. But they were right in the interpretation of the Gospel, in Christ as a final work of a holy God for the race" (*ut supra, p.179*).

III.

Despite the seeming weakness of his position on inerrancy, Forsyth nevertheless affirms with all the power at his command that the Bible has a living authority. "The authority of the Bible speaks not to the critical faculty that handles evidence but to the soul that makes response." "The true region of Bible authority is therefore saving certainty in man's central and final part—his conscience before God" (*ut supra*, pp. 178-179).

This authority is personal, living, internal and decisive. Any critical proposition which undermines any part of the Bible which forms an essential element of the Gospel must be rejected. The highest criticism of all is the Gospel which can be verified in the region of believing experience. This is the fundamental principle for the assessment of all critical theories. They deal with the human parentage of the Word, but fail to analyse the Divine Inspiration. Faith responding to the Holy Spirit alone can do that. The great sacrament is the Gospel. This sacrament gives value to all the other sacraments. It is the sacrament of the Living Word. This word must overmaster the preacher. The Bible makes men into preachers in proportion as it lays hold of them. Preaching can only flourish where there is more than a formal respect for the Bible. The Bible is the living source of preaching. The preacher's greatest need is an ever fresh immersion in this Word, an immersion both scholarly and experimental. "I do not believe in verbal inspiration. I am with the critics, in principle. But the true minister ought to find the words and phrases of the Bible so full of spiritual food and felicity that he has some difficulty in not believing in verbal inspiration", (p.38, *Positive Preaching and Modern Mind*). "If Christ died to make a Church that Church should continue to be made by some permanent thing from Himself, either by a continuous Apostolate secured in the *charisma veritatis* as Rome claims, or by a book which should be the real successor of the Apostles, with a real authority on the vital matters of truth and faith. But, we discard the supernatural pope for the supernatural book. And so we come back, enriched by all we have learned from repudiating a verbal inspiration and accepting an inspiration of men and souls; to a better way of understanding the authority that there is in the inspiration of a book, a canon. We move from institutional authority to a biblical; and from Biblicism we advance to Evangelism. But it is an Evangelism bound up with a book because bound up with history" (p.171, *Person and Place*).

Forsyth has taken up the mantle of Martin Luther and with the same fearlessness and creative genius. His contribution toward the understanding of the Bible is not without weight and value. It was born in faith amid crisis. It is a tentative answer.

Book Reviews.

THE MINISTRY OF THE WORD.

By F. D. Coggan. The Canterbury Press. 6/-.

This is the first of a new series of books to be called the St. Paul's Library. The General Preface by the Bishop of Sodor and Man indicates a need that has been long and widely felt of a fresh expression of the distinctively Anglican interpretation of Evangelical theology, and a welcome is assured to such an enterprise as this. The general line of approach to the subjects chosen endeavours to avoid on the one hand the vague humanitarianism of Liberal Protestantism and on the other the obscurantism of "unreasoning Conservatism", and to combine the advantage of both in loyalty to the Apostolic Faith with "boldness to examine and faith to trust all truth." There is no doubt that considerable attention and weight will be given to the series, which is being planned to cover a wide field of Anglican teaching, and that the issue is significant of the vitality of the Evangelical school of thought in the Church of England today.

The first subject on the list is naturally and properly the Ministry of the Word. Unfortunately there has grown up in certain circles a tragic separation between the two parts of the ministerial commission in the Ordering of Priests. Of these the Ministry of the Word is *primus inter pares*, but there ought surely to be no antagonism, or exaltation of one above the other. The Ministry of the Word is in a true sense sacramental, as Dr. Coggan affirms (p.91), and that of the Sacraments is, as the Prayer Book indicates, a definite and inseparable Ministry of the Word.

The Ministry of the Word is more than preaching; it touches all pastoral work; but preaching is its main function. That is in itself a vast subject, with many aspects. Dr. Coggan has chosen one, and given to us a study of what he describes as "the New Testament concept of Preaching and its relevance for to-day."

Bishop Phillips Brooks in his classic "Lectures on Preaching" defines preaching as "the communication of truth by man to man," or as "Truth through personality." Dr. Griffith Thomas in his less well-known, but most suggestive and able treatment of the same subject interprets it as "God's word to man through man," Dr. Coggan's purpose is to help the preacher to master the art, "at which the New Testament preachers were such experts, of proclaiming the truth of God in the language of the common man" (p.101), through a fresh consideration of New Testament teaching.

The plan he adopts is to ask and answer the four questions, Who? What? How? and Why? In other words, What should be the character of the preacher? What should be the content of the preaching? What should be its hall-marks? What should be its purpose?

The first question is answered by a study in turn of Our Lord, John the Baptist and St. Paul as the Preacher. These brief studies are packed with good points and apt quotations. Each provides an outline for the reader that could with great profit be filled in through further thought, and each provides for every preacher a searching test and a humbling standard of his own ministry of the Word.

The second question—the content of the preaching—demands for answer a close examination of the New Testament use of the word, and of the sermons recorded in the Acts and contained or suggested in the Gospels. The reader is throughout the book encouraged to "lexicon" work, and of this there are many and illuminating illustrations in this section. A concise summary of the chief points of the primitive *kerygma*, including that of St. Paul, draws out the fundamentals of the Christian message as first proclaimed, and infers that these must have like place in the preaching of our time.

What then are the characteristics, as distinguished from the content, of Christian preaching of every age? Dr. Coggan singles out seven, drawn from the New Testament. There are others, but many of them will be found to be included in his arresting and stimulating treatment of these. As we read these pages we are carried from point to point with a wealth of supporting and ex-

planatory references, ranging over a wide field of literature but ever turning to the New Testament for the main source of knowledge and inspiration, and ever insisting on the spiritual qualifications of the preacher.

A short chapter on the purpose of preaching, as exemplified by the teachers of the early Church, brings this little volume that contains so much to its close. The last note to be struck is that of Fellowship in the Body of Christ, which was to St. Paul so vivid a reality, and, as Dr. Coggan says, underlay his preaching activity, giving it power and passion.

We hope this book will be read and re-read by Evangelical preachers, teachers and students, and by many of other schools of thought and practice. No one upon whom rests the responsible and heart-searching duty of the Ministry of the Word can fail to open it without profit, or without hearing through its pages the voice of One Who gives to His disciples of to-day the same commission as of old. We are glad that these Lectures, which have already helped many in Canada and here in England, should now appear in this permanent form, so that they may continue and extend their usefulness. S. NOWELL-ROSTRON.

STRANGE VICTORY. A STUDY OF THE HOLY COMMUNION SERVICE.

By M. A. C. Warren. Canterbury Press. pp. 124. 6/-.

This is a striking and unusual book, and difficult to review. The present reviewer has read it through twice, carefully, before attempting the task. It is not a theological thesis, but it contains very much sound Evangelical theology; it is not a liturgical study, but the author is imbued with the liturgical spirit; it is not an historical essay, but it has an historical background. It is primarily devotional, with a strong mystical tone. Two books have greatly influenced the author: *Christus Victor*, by Gustaf Aulén, now Bishop of Strangnäs, and Edward Bickersteth's century-old *Treatise on the Lord's Supper*; and he shows, and in places acknowledges, indebtedness to other writers. The hardest chapter to read (as the author warns us) is the first, and he indicates that it was the hardest to write.

He accepts Aulén's nomenclature and calls the interpretation of the Atonement that dominates his book the "classic view", as Aulén phrases it. Readers of *Christus Victor* (which the present writer reviewed in *The Record* when it first appeared) will not forget that this classic view is both Pauline and in general agreement with English Evangelical thought. "It is the very core of the Gospel that the atonement is made by God Himself" (Warren). Our author is clear as to the Substitutionary character of Christ's death, and he does not confuse it, as so many do, with its Vicarious aspect. In one or two places he divides the word "atonement" into "at-one-ment." Although philologically this is how the word came into being, yet the hyphenated form does not express anything like the full content of the word, as is witnessed by the common use of our language. But our author seems quite to recognise the fuller meaning of the word as used in Holy Writ and in the Liturgy. It is true that the R.V. translates *katallage* as "reconciliation" instead of the A.V. "atonement"; but it must always be remembered that the reconciliation was not a coming together of mutually offended equals, but the healing of an estrangement caused by rebellion, and that the Atonement, made by God Himself, includes the idea of redemption: "God was in Christ, reconciling the world unto Himself."

It is impossible in a review to do justice to Part I of the book, which expresses the doctrine on which it is based. All I can do is to say that it duly emphasises both the Cross—the death—and the Resurrection—the victory. Was it not Alivsasatos who said that the theology of the West centred in the Death of Christ, but the theology of the East centred in His Resurrection? Dr. Warren tries to give full force to both attitudes, and therein he is true both to the New Testament and to our Liturgy of 1662, to which he has enthusiastic devotion; nor does he desire to see any change in it.

Part II passes nominally from doctrine to liturgy, but really they cannot be separated. In four chapters he works through the Order of Holy Communion, taking the Preparation, the Adoration, Memorial, Communion, Sacrifice, and the Mystery. Whatever may be thought of these headings, the substance of the chapters is fully Evangelical, although the liturgiology is slight. In Preparation he emphasises the Ministry of the Word, and regrets any separation between Word and Sacrament, and would have a Sermon with every Administration.

He returns to this point later at pp.114 and 120. He shows that the Preparation ends with the Comfortable Words. Adoration commences with the *Sursum corda*, and culminates in the *Ter sanctus*. He puts in a plea for "liturgical silence" at this point before we pass to the Humble Access, which he treats as the proper close of silent worship. Then he reminds us that "the prayer called the prayer of consecration, the Communion, and the sacrifice of praise and life which follow are all part of the same action," and that "the Sacrament is fulfilled only with the act of Communion and with" what he speaks of as "the prayer of Oblation" (a title not used in the Prayer Book). While he uses the word "Memorial" instead of the more precise word "Remembrance" he seems to make it clear that it is manward—"effected before our eyes"—"made known to us"—"the remembrance of the Cross"; and he insists that "it is of primary importance that the action of the Upper Room shall be visible and the 'manual acts' of the celebrant be seen by the people"; so he rightly says that "the communicants should attend to this prayer with their eyes open, intently watching" and that "it is a mistaken form of devotion at this place to have the eyes closed." Logically this affects the position of the Minister at the Table. His quotations from Cranmer are good, although strangely enough he cites through Bickersteth. He seems to recognise that the following Lord's Prayer belongs to the actual Communion, but his words are a little doubtful. But he well says that the Reformers of our Church were right in moving "this prayer of our sacrifice away from the Memorial of Christ's Sacrifice": and he fully vindicates the alternative use of the two post-communion prayers and almost seems to show a preference for the second prayer; but this is not quite clear. Then he passes to the Mystery—the great hymn of triumph, the *gloria in excelsis*, which in two places he indicates should preferably be sung. He says nothing as to posture, but the writer would add that it should be sung (or said) standing.

In the rest of the book (Part III, A Goodly Heritage) he accentuates the emphasis placed upon the Sacrament by the early Evangelicals, and shows that increased use of and reverence for the Sacrament was a fruit of the Evangelical Revival. Here he instances Grimshaw, and Wesley and cites from Simeon, Daniel Wilson, Basil Woodd, and others beside Bickersteth. But his emphasis is upon regularity rather than frequency of communion, and he pleads for serious preparation. This reminder of the place of this Sacrament in the teaching and practice of our Evangelical forbears leads the author on to plead for a re-discovery of emphases which in later days "have too commonly been lacking," and "for humble exploration together of the Victory of Christ our Lord." He reminds us that we Evangelicals "have a rich heritage to safeguard, and a great tradition to enshrine, and it must not go by default."

The strength of this book is in that it is wholly positive in its approach and teaching, and not negative: and it is a valuable addition to Evangelical literature on "the most comfortable Sacrament" from this point of view. If it has a weakness—if the word may be pardoned—it is that it may be fully appreciated and understood only by those who are already familiar with the history of the Sacrament and the controversies that have gathered about it during the centuries. The serious student will need to supplement it by other more fully liturgical studies. But our author has given us of his best: and it is a very good best; and thoroughly and explicitly Evangelical. ALBERT MITCHELL.

THE BOOK OF COMMON PRAYER.

By D. E. W. Harrison. The Canterbury Press. 6/-.

Evangelicals have many commentaries on the Prayer Book to their credit. We recall at once such names as R. P. Blakeney, N. Dimock, Bishop Drury and A. R. Faussett, and more recently W. P. Upton, Dyson Hague and Albert Mitchell, not to mention text Books like the *Tutorial Prayer Book*.

It is therefore somewhat of a bold venture to add to this number, but I think those who read this concise outline by Archdeacon Harrison will at once agree that he has furnished us with a fresh, up-to-date history which is certainly needed. It is the fruit of many years careful study and lecturing on this very important subject. He states that his aim is "to set the main contents of the Prayer Book against the historical background of the development of worship in the Church of God"—in other words to relate them to the early worship of the

Primitive Church. There is little doubt that he has achieved his purpose. In a valuable opening chapter the Archdeacon clearly and concisely expounds the meaning and basic principle of worship, which he asserts is "dependent on revelation." And "Christian Worship is dependent upon the revelation of God in Christ." But he is careful to add that the Word of God "must first be proclaimed before the true response of the worshipper can be called forth." "Freedom of worship," the Archdeacon declares, was at first safeguarded by the "common faith known to all through the Apostolic ministry"—and he shows how the Lord's Supper came naturally to take a pre-eminent place in Church worship because it was through this unique fellowship service that "witness was borne to the saving acts of God," and "grace and faith, love and grateful response together constitute our communion with God."

In chapter two we get a short but very useful summary of the nature and development of early Christian Worship as illustrated from the Didaché, Justin Martyr and Hippolytus, and Archdeacon Harrison reminds us that fixed forms of worship were not normal till the end of the 4th century, and that before this date the heart of the Eucharistic service is a prayer with no special formula for consecrating the elements. He also shows the clear distinction between the practical prayers of the Western liturgies and the more theological and ornate services of the Eastern Church. He points out that Cranmer based our English rite on the Latin Service, while he recalls the fact that the primitive position of the celebrant was Westward—facing the people.

The interest in these early liturgies for the ordinary Anglican Churchman is mainly concerned with their contribution to our own Prayer Book services, and Archdeacon Harrison sets this out very clearly. He notices the long and careful preparation of the early catechumens before baptism, which should be paralleled to-day by similar care with Confirmation candidates. He traces the development of our daily Morning and Evening Prayer and declares that the liturgical principle of all this early Christian worship was "the setting forth of the saving acts of God." In a most careful account of worship in the Medieval Church the Archdeacon shows the harmful effect of the *Latin* services which prevented congregational worship and tended to separate the clergy and laity, leaving the central Mass Service as the virtual monopoly of the priest and so practically destroying the corporate character of Christian worship. As a medieval writer expressed the prevalent view, "God is more compassionate and generous through the priest than of Himself, for He does more kindnesses through him than through Himself." At the same time preaching had largely died out. As Archdeacon Harrison points out, with the general ignorance of the Scriptures the sacramental channels of grace were controlled by the priesthood, while in the West exclusive emphasis was laid on the sacrificial aspect of the Mass, which by the 9th century had developed into a definite doctrine of a miraculous transubstantiation of the elements, which were offered as a propitiatory sacrifice for the living and the dead. This involved the serious loss to the worshipper of the sacramental aspect of the rite, and the communion with the Risen and Living Christ. The Archdeacon declares that by this significant change "men had come to worship a different God and a different Christ from that of the Early Church." The Eucharist had been changed to a propitiatory offering of man to God rather than being a precious gift of a loving heavenly Father to His reconciled children.

The Reformation restored the early and truly Catholic view of the Lord's Supper, and the Archdeacon pays a glowing tribute to the wide learning of Archbishop Cranmer, declaring that "he was probably the greatest liturgical scholar in Europe." He justifies the revolutionary changes made by the first two Reformed Prayer Books and also the need for the abolition of the medieval superstitions and unscriptural practices and ceremonies which these new Liturgies effected. And our Author rightly stresses the fact that in the liturgical and doctrinal formularies of the English Reformation Cranmer's appeal was primarily to Holy Scripture, because "on the supremacy of Scripture and the doctrine of justification by faith the whole work of our Reformers stands or falls." He also shows that the Prayer Book worship is based on the doctrine of the priesthood of all believers and the rejection of a mediatorial conception of the Ministry, since for the Reformers worship is "essentially the response of faith to the Word of God." The doctrine of the Sacrifice of the Mass contradicted the New Testament doctrine of justification. Consequently Cranmer restored the Communion as

an *anamnesis*—a “bringing to remembrance before men,” and “not a memorial before God” (p.61).

Archdeacon Harrison emphasises the conservative character of the English Reformation in contrast to the Continental, the radical character of which he certainly exaggerates when he asserts that “The Continent produced a new doctrinal structure . . . and within a few years the liturgical structure of the worship progressively disappeared” (p.64). Oblivious of the fact that the Finnish Liturgy retained a daily divine service and most of the Canonical Hours the Archdeacon declares that “nowhere else (except in England) has a daily office survived”! Again, the Swedish Communion rite closely resembles the Anglican. The Calvinistic French Church also strictly observed its prescribed Liturgy and as one of its Professors declared, “set forms of Liturgy were prescribed by the several authors of the Reformation as in Germany, France, England, Belgium, etc., varying as little as might be from the *ancient forms of the Primitive Church*.” (See Carter, “Reformation and Reunion,” ch. vi.) It is therefore scarcely accurate to assert that “Geneva and Zurich sought to establish Scriptural rites without reference to existing forms” (p.76). Again, it is difficult to find confirmation for the Archdeacon’s statement that our Articles “represent a slightly different phase of the English Reformation” from the Prayer Book, because in the Elizabethan revision they were altered in a Calvinistic direction” (p. 66). But, as Archdeacon Hardwick points out, for the changes made in 1562, “Parker and his friends, instead of drawing hints from ‘Swiss’ Confessions . . . had recourse to a series of Articles of ‘Saxon’ origin,” and thus the additions then made to our Articles X, XI, XII, and XX were drawn from the *Lutheran Confession of Wurtemberg* (*Hist. of Articles*, p.123)!

The Archdeacon does well to point out that our Prayer Book does not contemplate compulsory auricular Confession “as a normal means of grace.” But when he adds that “it is available for all who need it” (p.84), he is surely confusing the medieval system of Confession and Absolution with the offer in our First Exhortation of “spiritual counsel and advice” for the disturbed conscience! In commenting on our Consecration prayer our author is careful to remind us that the “Prayer Book properly understood has no moment of consecration,” and “has neither oblation of the elements—the heart of the Mass—nor memorial before God.” He well adds that “there is no warrant that Our Lord willed us to make His memorial before the Father,” while he insists that “our whole Consecration prayer has in view a manward and not a Godward action” (p.87). He also stresses the fact that “it is neither a historical accident nor of negligible doctrinal importance,” but rather “the essential character” of our Reformed Service that in it “the prayer of oblation follows Communion,” since “we offer ourselves because we have first received the Body and Blood of Christ, we present our bodies a living sacrifice enabled by God’s self-giving to us” (p.18).

Archdeacon Harrison’s comments on, and explanation of, the chief Prayer Book Services are very instructive and helpful. Most Evangelicals, at least, will agree when he pleads for a revision of our Baptismal Office and when he condemns the practice of indiscriminate baptism as “lowering the Sacrament to a semi-magical rite” (p.109). He explores carefully the thorny question of a modern revision of the Prayer Book and he makes several suggestions which will invite criticism. He apparently would like our present Morning Prayer to be superseded by a Parish Communion, and he thinks our present Consecration prayer needs enriching by the mention of the Resurrection, Ascension and the gift of the Holy Spirit.

We congratulate Archdeacon Harrison on the production of this treatise, which is a most valuable scholarly exposition of the Evangelical teaching and worship of the Church of England. “St. Paul’s Library” will fulfil a real need if it succeeds in publishing books of a similar learned type, which like our authors’ are, as the Bishop of Sodor and Man puts it, very “readable alike to the intelligent amateur and to the trained student.” The latter may not find in this short comprehensive treatise so much detailed information on the medieval Liturgies as Dr. O. Hardman’s *History of Christian Worship* provides, but he will escape the partisan treatment of the post-Reformation period which so mars the value of Dr. Hardman’s most useful text book.

We forecast a wide circulation for Archdeacon Harrison’s contribution to “St. Paul’s Library.”

C. SYDNEY CARTER.

THE COLLAPSE OF DOUBT.

By F. W. Camfield, D.D. Lutterworth Press. 108pp. 5/-.

That we are living in a day of widespread disbelief in religion, its dogmas and its sanctions, needs no elaborated proof. Disbelief rather than doubt is a prevalent mood of our time. It is, indeed, probable that there is less religious doubt abroad than was the case a quarter of a century ago. But we do well to reflect that doubt will die for either or the other of two quite opposite reasons. Paradoxical as it may seem, it dies when men surrender a belief in God. The tragedies and anomalies of human experience no longer challenge the spirit and may cease even to perplex the mind. And it dies in proportion as it is resolved in terms of a sound and assured faith in the living God. The ultimate question, therefore, is not so much whether doubt will collapse as the direction in which the collapse will take place.

To the consideration of this question Dr. Camfield has turned in the very thoughtful and stimulating book now under review. Its concern may be said to be twofold, diagnosis and prescription. How do doubts arise, or, more correctly, what is the origin and cause of religious doubt? And how is doubt to be resolved?

Dr. Camfield contends, with vigour and conviction, that a primary cause of doubt is the wrong kind of belief. "The root of the trouble, in regard to the doubts of the average man about God, is that the god in whom he believes, or half believes, or imagines he believes, is not the true God." He is, in fact, anything but "the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ", the God of Biblical revelation. On the contrary, he is "the god of our natural reason", a being whom we have conveniently, and perhaps inevitably, created in our own image, even though the image may be magnified to as near infinity as the human mind can conceive. Trouble arises when he disappoints us, when he seems to behave in a way that we could not suppose ourselves to behave were we in the position in which we have placed him! The point may be exemplified, and amplified, in a variety of directions. It is most common and most crucial, as the author indicates in more than one passage, when we come to grips with the idea of divine omnipotence. If omnipotence in relation to God is what we mean by power raised to the *n*th degree, the door is wide open for doubt, of a finally fatal intensity! It is no accident that such a conception of divine omnipotence so frequently leads to the denial of any kind of real personality to God. Nor is it insignificant that so many who frequently speak of "The Almighty" have already, consciously or unconsciously, taken up this position. "It is difficult to resist the impression that men often use this designation because they do not want to give real and personal attention to God. He is for them just there, and they want to leave Him just there. He can apparently be left out of account until He is wanted. When He is wanted He must, of course, be called in, and if He does not show Himself as 'The Almighty' He can justifiably be refused all credence."

The development of Dr. Camfield's distinction between a wrong and a right conception of "The Almighty" may be said to provide the turning point in his argument. The closing chapters of his study put their chief emphasis on prescription and indicate both the nature of, and the way to, a true and triumphant faith in God. The God in Whom man is called to put his trust is a God Who is concerned with the radical issues of life; a God Who deals with causes when we want Him to be content with tackling symptoms; a God Who is characteristically active and manifest in Atonement. And whatever else Atonement means, it means the ability of God to deal with the past, the sinful past which both challenges His holiness and conditions every moment, and every aspect, of the present. Dr. Camfield is clearly right in his assertion that nothing less than the kind of redeeming activity which we can describe in some such phrase as "objective atonement" will avail to meet the situation which actually exists in respect of human sinfulness. The thesis ends with the closely argued contention that to be met by the redeeming love of God in Christ is to know also the secret and the meaning of a sure and certain faith.

The book abounds in stimulating aphorisms. "Men exercise true power when they have come to the end of their ability." "The laws and forces, the motives and decisions, which determined the history of Jesus were those which determine the life and being of God." "In the atonement we are confronted with a power which demonstrates that God is verily Lord of evil, even of that

kind of evil which nothing that we know as power, even if it were extended to infinite dimensions, could meet." It is this capacity for crisp statement that sustains interest even when the argument is closest. That it is close will be evident from the merely spatial fact that some paragraphs in the book are two pages in length!

A provocative and positive argument will always present even the most sympathetic reviewer with points of detailed disagreement, and lest critical capacity should seem entirely suspended we mention one of them. It is an over-simplification which finds man "differentia" solely in the fact that he has a "past". Not less fundamental is the fact that he has been made for, and can only truly live in, fellowship with God and fellowship with his fellow men. And the implications of this fact have their relationship to some of those problems of faith and doubt which Dr. Camfield tackles so courageously. But of the value of the book as a whole there can be no question. There is every reason to expect that the writer's own hope will be fulfilled—"that some may be helped to find a faith which will not be dependent on the changing fortunes of life and the vicissitudes of history." To this end an appendix providing "Questions and points for discussion in study circles and discussion groups" is a valuable help.

T. W. ISHERWOOD.

ISLAM AND CHRISTIAN THEOLOGY: A STUDY OF THE INTERPRETATION OF THEOLOGICAL IDEAS IN THE TWO RELIGIONS. PART I. VOLUME I.

By J. Windrow Sweetman. The Lutterworth Press. 215pp. 16/-.

Most people are content to specialize in one subject. Mr. Sweetman in this book shows an expert acquaintance with Oriental languages, Philosophy, Christian Theology and Islamic Theology!

The work is published under the auspices of the Department of Missions, Selly Oak Colleges. The Author is a lecturer at the Henry Martyn School of Islamic Studies, Aligarh, India.

There are to be three parts to this work. The first part (2 Volumes) deals with Origins; the second will deal with the Scholastic Development; and the third with Critical Reconstruction.

The Foreword or the Preface of a work of this kind is usually the easiest part to read. Mr. Sweetman in his most interesting foreword gives his reasons for writing a book of this nature. "Why compare light and darkness?" he says. To any one working among Moslems the arguments brought forward in this preface are very strong indeed. A book of this kind is really needed. As the author says, "The Moslem thinks that the Church holds many superstitions." Very rarely in a book written by a Moslem do you see a correct appreciation of the theological position of a Christian. The gravest philosophers attack a Christian doctrine, beliefs which Christians themselves would repudiate.

The book is very well written and one admires the result, bearing in mind all the difficulties. Most of the work for this volume was done in India and one can well imagine the busy time spent in theological libraries by the author when on furlough in England. A non-missionary may find it hard to appreciate that tantalizing feeling one has on realizing that the book one wants is only a few thousand miles away! A missionary often knows this feeling. We understand from the preface that the international situation added to the difficulties, and the first manuscript lies at the bottom of the sea.

In this first volume of Part I Mr. Sweetman has a section on the introduction of Philosophy into Islam. Here the author includes a translation of *The Shorter Theology of Ibn Miskawaih* ("Al Fawz Ul Asghar"). This occupies ninety-two pages of the book and is given so that the reader may form an independent judgment on the subjects which were discussed by the philosophising theologians in the early period. Ibn Miskawaih died in A.D.1030. With this translation there are footnotes indicating parallel ideas to be found in early writers.

We shall look forward to the other parts of this work. To an Evangelical it is pleasing to read that "it is in the hope that the Evangel may become the power of God unto the Muslim that this book is written"; and again, in the final words of the Preface, "Lastly it is hoped that this book in spite of faults may stimulate the assistance of theologians in the task of presenting the Evangel to Islam."

CECIL GREEN, Casablanca.

WILLIAM CAREY : ESPECIALLY HIS MISSIONARY PRINCIPLES.

By Dr. A. H. Oussoren. Leiden (Holland). Fl. 7.50.

For the last twenty-five years missionary method has more and more come to be discussed in the Councils of the Missionary Societies and among missionaries themselves. Dr. Oussoren has given us a most comprehensive and valuable addition to the available literature on this subject. The Protestant Churches should be especially grateful to him for this study in missionary approach. The Church in Holland has done a remarkable work in the Dutch East Indies, the only field where there has been any marked response to the Christian message among Muslims. So this book is especially welcome. To have collected and sifted all this mass of material in an enemy-occupied country under war conditions is a notable feat, and we congratulate Dr. Oussoren on the result.

The book is a detailed comparison of the methods adopted by William Carey and those adopted by the Moravian Missions, and incidentally, too, of the Reformed Church in Holland. It commences with a sketch of Carey's life. This is followed by a detailed inquiry into the missionary principles on which Carey founded his work. This is followed by a study of the principles adopted by the Pietists in their missionary work, and especially of the Moravians. The two outlooks are then compared. There are some valuable appendices at the back of the book.

The impression gained from reading the book is the great breadth of Carey's outlook and the phenomenal industry shown in the lives of him and his two friends in the work. While his outlook was broader than that of the Moravians—for he hoped to alter the whole basis of Indian life—he owed a great deal to their influence and he was one with them in the great essentials of missionary work, especially in the intense zeal which he and they showed for the salvation of those without Christ, at any cost to themselves. Both were agreed, too, in their emphasis on the atoning death of our Lord as the basis of Christian life, and in the reliability of the Holy Scriptures and the urgent necessity that they should be translated and given to the new converts.

Some astonishing facts emerge from the book which perhaps are not so clear in the biographies of Carey. That he should have been able, during his lifetime, not only to support himself but to pay £40,000 into the Society's accounts, seems to-day almost incredible. That he was himself responsible for the translation of the whole Bible into six different Indian languages, and the New Testament into twenty-four other languages, will seem a complete impossibility. Yet this is what he did. The missionary of to-day will be equally surprised to find that Carey (and, seemingly, the Moravians, too) permitted divorce and remarriage to those who became Christians and whose wives refused to follow them, though, of course, polygamy itself was condemned.

The book is a large one of three hundred pages. The printing is good and the English surprisingly so, though we would have preferred the author to avoid "don'ts" and "can'ts" in his writing.

The book is a mine of information and should be studied by all who are leaders in missionary work or interested in its problems. It will fill the average missionary with a sense of shame that we have attempted and accomplished so little in comparison with this man.

WILFRID STOTT.

GOOD NEWS.

By Cyril Alington. Blackwell. 7/6.

Dr. Alington rightly stresses the fact that Christianity proclaims a Gospel, good news of what God has done for us in Jesus Christ, good news that what we could not do, He has done, good news that through Him we are right with God. So it is that the true Christian, as he more and more realises the amazing depth of the love of God, must constantly be expressing his thankfulness for all that God has done for him in Jesus Christ. "... The first result of believing such good news," writes Dr. Alington, "must be that we should endeavour to show God's praise, not only with our lips, but in our lives." The author argues in this book that in our presentation of Christianity we have not stressed sufficiently this fact that it is good news. He thinks that we have been too preoccupied in

mphasising first the fact of man's sinfulness. "If our evangelists are right," says Dr. Alington, "and Christ spoke of Himself as a bringer of good news, the conclusion seems unavoidable that many so-called Christians have failed to accept it. We shall suggest that this is due to Christian preoccupation with sin rather than with its remedy."

Dr. Alington argues his case attractively, but it is difficult to agree with him. Surely the trouble with so many people to-day is that they have so small a sense of sin. They are satisfied to say that they are as good as their fellows. This lack of a sense of sin is one of the main reasons why it is so difficult to bring home to modern man the saving truths of the Gospel. If you have no sense of sin, you can feel no need of a Saviour. There must be conviction of sin before there can come home to the human heart the full knowledge of Him Who can save us from its power. Yet while we cannot agree with Dr. Alington's main thesis there is much in his book for which we can be grateful. He is right to remind us of the place of joy and thanksgiving in the Christian life, and that "an unhappy or gloomy Christian is a contradiction in terms." O.R.C.

THE BOOK WHICH DEMANDS A VERDICT.

By Mildred Cable and Francesca French. S.C.M. Press. 6/-.

Every one of us in the Christian Ministry experiences a sense of failure and despondency from time to time. On these occasions it is good to remember that responsibility for results does not rest solely with ourselves. There is an inherent power in the Word of God that we are commissioned to preach. Even with little or no preaching to accompany it, the Bible has repeatedly done a work that stamps it as indeed the Word of God.

In this new book Miss Cable and Miss French give what may well be a tonic to discouraged Ministers, though they have probably not written with this aim in view. But they present, in their usual vivid fashion, the story of the impact of the Bible on the different countries of the world. Here will be found illustrations of the world's reactions to the Bible—sometimes accepting, sometimes rejecting, sometimes persecuting, but always feeling obliged to give some active verdict on this unique Book.

This book is well worth buying for ourselves and circulating amongst others. Besides speaking of the past, it faces the present and the future in its last two chapters, and pictures in terrifying form the needs of a world that is fast becoming literate. In many countries it will be a race between the Bible and atheist literature, as new readers clamour for books. The point is, will the Church be sidetracked into secondary channels, or shall we be moved by the desperate spiritual need into sending the Book that has already proved its unique worth? The Book "demands a verdict" from us as well as from the heathen.

J. STAFFORD WRIGHT.

AN INTRODUCTION TO THE BIBLE.

By Stanley Cook. Penguin Series. 1/-.

The title of this book might easily prove misleading. It is not one to put into the hands of the ordinary reader to help him in his Bible study, but is rather a statement of the contents of the Bible as seen from the point of view of liberal criticism, and a statement of the author's reflexions upon its place in the religious literature of the world, and in the development of religious thought generally, past, present and future.

Prof. S. A. Cook is an expert in Hebrew, in Old Testament archaeology and in comparative religion, and possesses an extraordinarily wide range of knowledge; at the same time he is intensely interested in the Bible and in all the philosophical questions which surround its interpretation. In consequence of this he treats more fundamental themes than can receive adequate treatment in so small a space, and raises more questions than can be answered. In presenting the contents of the Bible he succeeds in his attempt to be objective, once the critical approach is conceded, and it is interesting to note in passing that he frequently observes how "scholars differ seriously" as regards their critical conclusions.

In presenting his own views, there is an interesting admixture of reverent admiration, of wide-ranging comparisons, and of philosophic questioning as to the ultimate meaning of words and expressions. He can speak of the Bible as "The Word of God," and believe that "a Divine Spirit moves through it," and he concludes that "in it men have found that which answered their deepest needs, and it has something to say for every crisis." But he is careful to add that these statements apply to the spirit of the Bible and not to the letter; and there is little in the book to which the extremest modernist would take exception.

G. T. MANLEY.