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

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

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

THE EXPOSITORY TIMES.

Notes of Recent Exposition.

SOME years ago a distinguished clergyman, addressing a group of theological students, urged them to read the big books—not popularizations, or outlines, or summaries, but the 'big books.' Like most compendious counsels this stands in need of modification. Among the books which have most profoundly influenced the world have been small books—the Psalter, for instance. But the big book is coming into its own again; witness the unusual length to which some recent novels have run, and there are signs that theological books may have their share in this process of expansion. The recently published Bampton Lectures for 1928 by the Rev. Kenneth E. KIRK, D.D. (Longmans; 25s. net), point in that direction; it is a book of five hundred and eighty-three pages, with an average of five hundred words to a page, and there is scarcely a page without elaborate footnotes.

But this is not only a big book, it is a great book. The writer has had the advantage of a great theme, *The Vision of God*, and the execution is altogether worthy of the theme. Man's chief end, once defined in famous words as 'to glorify God and to enjoy Him for ever,' is here considered as the Vision of God. The book, which Dr. KIRK modestly hopes may be a contribution to the revival of moral theology in the Church of England, is really very much more; it is an exhaustive examination of the multitudinous implications of that fine phrase; it is a comprehensive sermon on the text, 'Blessed are the pure in heart, for they shall see God.'

The title of the book would scarcely suggest to the tyro in theology the number and the difficulty of the problems which it evokes. It is a phrase whose primary implications are ethical, but it teems with theological problems; as Dr. KIRK puts it, 'bewildering divergences of theology and ethics accompany the beatific vision in its more representative forms.' And, as 'the history of the phrase is the history of Christian ethics itself,' the book might be not unjustly described as a book on the Nature and History of Christian Ethics. As the argument is conducted not in the abstract, nor even with the New Testament alone in view, but on the basis of the expositions of the Christian ideal presented by the great teachers of the Church, the book might be described, from another angle, as a History of the Christian Church on its more personal side, or at any rate as a series of sketches of the personalities who counted for most in the development of Christian doctrine on its ethical side.

Here, for example, are vivid expositions and searching criticisms of Augustine, Thomas Aquinas, Ignatius, and many others; and incidentally one learns a fresh respect for the schoolmen. In their intellectual warfare, which often seems to us little removed from pedantic trifling, they were contending for issues of the highest importance. Dr. KIRK's glowing appreciation of Thomas Aquinas helps us to realize how significant and vital was that thinker's contribution to the problems with which

he was dealing. Here it is: 'If we take from him two thoughts only—that honest intellectual endeavour (impossible, be it remembered, without moral effort of the highest kind) is no less a service of God than any other, and that ordered discipline is the condition of success in all things, even in the pursuit of the vision of God—and add to them the lesson of his life, that he counted the world well lost if he could bring those two truths home to men in a time of wild and fantastic imaginations, we shall not think any place too high for him in the roll of Christian heroes.'

The complacency with which men cherish conventional opinions is rudely shattered by some of Dr. KIRK'S *obiter dicta*. Good Protestants, for example, will find food for reflection in the following sentences, which occur in a discussion of 'the dissolution of historic Protestantism.' 'In the main Protestantism has settled down to a steady proclamation and inculcation of a sane and sober type of Christian behaviour. In sheer unconsciousness perhaps, but none the less definitely, it has emphasized the law and overlooked the promise, thereby breaking away completely from the theological revolution which gave it birth.'

The history of Christianity on its ethical side may be described as a struggle between the humanist and the rigorist ideals of conduct. Both have their roots in the New Testament. Jesus was genial, but He was also supremely severe. He had the Old Testament appreciation of the world as the great and spacious house of God, but He could also speak of cutting off the offending foot and plucking out the offending eye. The same writer, who says that the Christian is not to love the world, neither the things that are in the world, can also say that God so loved the world that He gave His only-begotten son. Again, while many of Paul's sayings are tinged with a fundamental apathy towards this present world, with all its interests, order, progress, and joys, 'it is to him we owe the great Christian truth that the most ordinary and secular employment can and should be regarded as a mission directly laid upon us by the Omnipotent God Himself.'

Other-worldliness, as represented by monasticism —to say nothing of the incredible privations and tortures which not a few hermits inflicted on themselves—seems far enough removed from the teaching of Galilee; yet undoubtedly Dr. KIRK is right when he says that 'the emergence of monasticism in the fourth century as a feature in world history finds no explanation except in the genius of Christianity itself. Even Protestantism,' he reminds us, 'despite its revolt from all that savoured of "monkery," retained, at least in its earlier days, the rigorist element in ethics.'

Yet it is good to be recalled from these extremes, which seem so alien to the modern outlook upon the world, and to be reminded that the vision of God is open to all, at any rate to all that are pure in heart. We cannot resist the temptation to quote the eloquent words of Dr. KIRK, which carry their own reassurance to humble souls who may have despaired of seeing the vision. 'Wherever a man's mind has been uplifted, his temptations thwarted, his sorrows comforted, his resolutions strengthened, his aberrations controlled, by the sight of purity, innocence, love, or beauty—indeed, wherever he has, even for a moment, recognized and responded to the distinction between good and evil, between better and worse—such a man has had in part the mystical experience. Dim though his mirror may have been, he has yet seen God. Where he has seen God once, there he may see Him again. Purity, innocence, love, and beauty are to be seen no doubt most fully in the gospel. But they are to be seen elsewhere as well; and seeing them elsewhere we can discern their delicacies and refinements in the gospel better than ever before.

'So far, then, from being rare, the mystical experience is at once the commonest and the greatest of human accidents. There is not one of us to whom it does not come daily. It is only carelessness or custom that prevents one realizing how Divine it is in essence; only timidity which checks us from proclaiming that we too at such moments have seen God, even if as in a glass darkly; only folly which blinds us to the fact that these moments

of vision are our surest safeguard and our best resource in every temptation, sorrow, or selfishness. In every such contact with whatever is true and honourable and just and pure and lovely and of good report, the true Christian tradition allows, and indeed constrains, us to recognize the first traces of the vision of God. There is therefore no need for us to ask whether we are psychologically capable of seeing God; we have already seen Him.'

From the stores of his vast learning, Dr. KIRK lights up his discussion with much concrete and memorable detail. Here, for example, is a lurid illustration of what self-discipline meant to some of the fourth and fifth century hermits. Of such discipline prayer naturally formed an important part; and 'the daily or weekly record, in this particular, of the athletes of Christ was noticed as sedulously as the scores of modern competitors in more mundane conflicts. Paul, a hermit of the Sketic desert, improvised the first known rosary by carrying with him three hundred pebbles, with which to reckon the three hundred prayers which were his daily toil; but lost heart when news reached him of a neighbouring virgin who accomplished seven hundred a day, in spite of fasting five days in the week.'

But no brief notice can give any adequate idea of this valuable book, remarkable alike for the massiveness of its learning, the clearness of its thought, the vigour and penetration with which it discusses the ethical ideal, and not least for the religious spirit which pervades it. Dr. KIRK well says that 'Jesus, though He spoke little about "seeing God," brought God more vividly before the spiritual eyes of His contemporaries than any other has ever done. He *gave* a vision of God where others could only *speak* of it.'

The Church, like every other institution in our time, is the object of remorseless criticism. 'The plowers plowed upon my back: they made long their furrows.' So the Church may well say, and with little hope of greater ease in days to come. It would be difficult to find more weighty, well informed, and trenchant criticism than is contained in *World Revolution and Religion*, by Mr. Paul HUTCHINSON (Abingdon Press; $2.00). It is, however, criticism which is not hostile but friendly, written in a spirit of desperate earnestness and not of superiority; criticism, therefore, which will not merely irritate but will stimulate to thought and action. The writer may be counted by some to be alarmist, but his reply would doubtless be that when the house is on fire it is high time to ring the alarm bell. His pessimism he would defend on the ground that the immediate prospects of organized religion are indeed dark. 'There is nothing but present foolishness and future defeat in closing our eyes to the unwelcome realities of our situation.'

The book is a serious attempt by a competent observer to look the world facts in the face, to indicate the trend of the political, social, and racial revolutions which are taking place the wide world over, and to estimate the effect they are now having, and will increasingly continue to have, on organized religion. Mr. HUTCHINSON's special concern is with the Christian Church, but he speaks of organized religion as recognizing that the world revolution is essentially inimical to every form of religious faith. 'It is my belief that organised religion, which is now having a bad time, is going to have a much worse time before it has a better.'

In the realm of political revolution the most stupendous fact is Russia, which has not only broken with the Church but is the sworn enemy of every form of religion. Apart from this portent there is little difficulty in showing that the same forces are at work in other and widely different lands. The breakdown of Islam in the Near East and of Confucianism in republican China has not opened the door for the Christian missionary, but has led to a rapid drift towards secularism, materialism, and agnosticism so that the generation educated under these new conditions may be expected to 'become apathetic toward all religion within another half-century.' In Christian lands, not

least in Britain and America, there is an ominous and widening gulf between the churches and the masses. The fact is attested on the highest authority that whereas the Church was the principal formative influence in the lives of the older leaders of the Labour Party in Britain, and while the party still retains, at bottom, the inspiration and impulse of a religious crusade, yet 'the younger generation of leadership in the party—the men and women who have come to the front since the war—is almost totally out of touch with organised religion.' 'So it appears that, in widely separated lands, in non-Christian as in Christian regions, organised religion is not faring well at the hands of the contemporary political revolution. The obvious reason for this, of course, is to be found in the alliance which organised religion so frequently makes with the ruling order.'

Deeper than the political revolution is the social, which is rapidly bringing about changes which go down to the very roots of human life. It is unnecessary to enumerate these, for in general they are known. The justice of the whole existing social order is called in question, the sacredness of marriage is denied, home life means little to multitudes in the great industrial centres, and the new generation is at many points breaking through and trampling down the moral fences which were wont to restrain the passions of men. In this situation it is found that 'the authority and influence of the Church varies in proportion to the distance from the hot-spots of social development. If you go where the industrial revolution has made little progress, you will find the Church the most important of all social organisations. . . . But the further you come away from these undeveloped regions, the feebler grows the influence of the Church.' There are some evidences that religious leaders are awaking to the desperate situation in which religion finds itself in industrial areas. But to deal with the social revolution the Church must determine the positive and transforming ends which the revolution seeks, and it must specifically free itself from association with social conditions which the revolution justly denounces. If it does not, then when the revolution has succeeded, and proceeds to adopt its own institutions, the Church will not find itself among the chosen.

The race question also darkens the future for the Church. The dominance of the white man is every day more bitterly resented and more impatiently borne. Professor Du Bois has said, 'Wild and awful as this shameful war was, it is nothing to compare with that fight for freedom which black and brown and yellow men must and will make unless their oppression and humiliation and insult at the hands of the white world cease. The dark world is going to submit to its present treatment just as long as it must, and not one moment longer.' On the other side, the majority of whites are not ready to admit the idea of racial equality and will not give up their privileged position without a struggle. Indeed, it is difficult to see how they could, even if they would. In these circumstances the white man's benevolence is offensive, the pacifist talk is derided as the 'pacifism of the gorged lion.' In the bitter words of an educated Indian, 'Having all that you can possibly choke down in the way of spoil, and fearing the coming attack, you begin to preach peace and goodwill to us. Well, we are not fooled.' The influence of this upon the Church is seen in two ways—in an increasing disposition among native races to reject the gospel as the white man's religion, and in the hostility of many white men towards mission work, due to the shrewd idea that 'it is the missionary, with his preaching about equality before God and about the value of the human soul, who makes the trouble.'

Perhaps the most serious of all is the revolution in religious thought which has taken place within the Church itself. This revolution is painfully apparent to every thoughtful Christian. Religious authority is subtly undermined, through fear of anthropomorphism the figure of God is dissolved into thin air, the old assurance of faith is gone, and multitudes find themselves in an impenetrable fog. 'But the intellectual issue is not nearly as devastating in its final effects as the ethical issue. For one man who leaves the Church because it cannot resolve his doubts, there are ten who are

slipping away because it has not asserted and established a moral control over the industrial civilization which is grinding them into anonymity. . . . It is because the Church has not yet found the way by which to give him a new lease on a sense of his own meaning that the ordinary man of to-day is, in increasing numbers, losing concern as to the Church's fate.'

Yet the outlook is not wholly dark. Religion, we know, will survive in some form, for the religious instinct is too deep rooted in human nature to be destroyed. Scepticism is leading in many cases to an appalling pessimism, and the generation which has revolted is beginning to find itself disillusioned with the results of the revolt. Man's need of God persists, as well as his need to find somewhere a spiritual passion which will sustain humanitarian effort. Also, there are always the eternal values—goodness, truth, and beauty—which do not pass, whatever else may change. These must ever seek fuller and more perfect embodiment, and so we may look for the appearance of a new and greater Church than we have so far known, not a Church of one continent, or one race or one creed, perhaps not called by any of the titles that we know. 'But it will be composed of those seeking and courageous souls in all lands who, in response to man's deepest and immortal urge, go out to do battle with all that is false and inimical to human development and who likewise go out passionately to find God.'

In Mr. J. H. BADLEY'S recent outline of psychology entitled *The Will to Live* there is a useful chapter on 'Conflict.' He points out that from the first dawn of mental life there must always have been an element of conflict, one part of experience competing with others for attention. A simple example is to be seen when something arouses in an animal two instinctive impulses which normally lead to responses of an opposite kind; the one, such as curiosity or the desire of food, prompting it to approach, while fear at the same time prompts it to shrink away.

When we come to a higher stage of mental development, we have such a case as the arousing at the same time of two sentiments, involving emotions of affection and anger, or the emergence of two contradictory ideas or two contradictory solutions of a problem. In such cases the conflicting elements may be of the same kind and at the same level of psychological development, and it is comparatively easy to avoid acute or prolonged mental discomfort.

It is otherwise when conflict arises between elements that are not at the same psychological level. For example, a primitive instinct or appetite may come into conflict with a sentiment of duty or with an ideal that we recognize as essential to our higher self and incompatible with the lower impulses of our nature. In the context of religion and the language of St. Paul, it is the strife of the flesh against the spirit. Such conflicts are more painful than the previous kind and fill a larger place in our conscious life.

Now in seeking to escape the acute pain of open conflict, the mind has established for itself certain 'defence processes,' as they may be called, and these operate along various lines. In other words, there are various ways of avoiding or resolving conflict. Four such ways may be more or less clearly distinguished from each other. They may be classified under the headings, repression, dissociation, reconciliation, and diversion.

In the first process of defence, that of repression, we treat the conflict as a fight to the finish, entirely repressing, or suppressing, one of the opposing elements and giving free play to the other. In the second process, that of dissociation, we allow both conations to find their outlets in separate action, keeping them so rigidly apart that the sense of opposition does not arise. In the third process, that of reconciliation, we let both act together, possibly in some sort of harmony like that which produces complex emotions. In the fourth process, that of diversion, the conflict may be resolved without resorting to subordination or compromise,

by turning the energy of the lower complex into some other channel.

These various methods of resolving mental conflict may be illustrated by the various ways in which we may deal with the commonest and most painful conflicts in experience, those arising in connexion with sex. The most frequent way of treating sex-impulses that cannot, for whatever reason, find their natural outlet is that of repression. But if resorted to alone, repression is seldom completely successful and is fraught with serious dangers. Psycho-analysts, following Freud, are inclined to trace to sex-repressions most of the nervous and mental disorders from which people suffer. Without yielding its whole claim to psycho-analysis, we may allow that in ordinary life such disorders are more frequently due to sex-repression than to any other. Here Mr. BADLEY cites the legend of the temptation of St. Anthony, the Egyptian hermit.

Another way of escaping, or seeking to escape, the conflict in question is that of dissociation. When this is resorted to, the sex-impulse is kept apart from any other complex, social or religious, with which it would conflict. In this way an individual can lead a double life, with different codes of behaviour, and even of thought, for different occasions. Or if complete dissociation is not possible, there is always 'rationalization' to bring a sense of relief. 'In his study of Jason and Medea, Euripides long ago set forth the sophistries by which a man abandoning the old love of whom he is tired for the attractions of a new can persuade himself that he is acting honourably and in the best interests of all concerned.'

But if dissociation and rationalization tend to involve those who employ them in intellectual or moral dishonesty, more satisfactory ways of dealing with this as with other forms of conflict can be found in reconciliation of the opposing elements and in diversion of the sex-impulse into other channels.

In the first way, the sex-life is fused with the personal ideals and group-loyalties with which it might otherwise come into conflict. It is reconciled with them in a larger integration. Yet it is not enough for it to find its expression only in companionship, and home, and children, and all the interests that centre round them. It must be made to subserve higher and wider aims and to add to the worth as well as the happiness of life. This is still necessary whatever degree of integration may be achieved. For 'when the direct and immediate satisfaction of an instinct cannot be found, its energy is only too likely either to be dammed back until it bursts the barrier in a harmful flood, or else to spend itself in painful conflict which may lead to serious harm to mind and body, unless it can find an outlet through some other channel in which it can be useful to the individual and the community.'

The finding of such outlets is the process of sublimation. Thanks to this process, man has advanced beyond the animal, not merely in mastery of his surroundings but in spiritual growth. The process has been largely subconscious. Where conscious, it depends upon the degree to which the mind can be occupied with some overmastering interest or purpose of emotional intensity sufficient to absorb the disturbing impulses. Without accepting all the teaching of the psycho-analysts on this point, we can yet recognize how much of the outpouring of the spirit of man in the various arts, in religious fervour and devotion to an ideal, and in the various forms of social service, is due to the sublimation of the sex-impulse.

In a volume reviewed in our last issue, *Why I am and Why I am not a Catholic*, we have arrayed against one another the Protestant and the Roman hosts, like Israel and Philistia of old, and one after another the Goliaths and Davids come out and utter their defiance, more or less truculent, of one another. We have already indicated, very briefly and generally, the character of this unusual volume. But it will be interesting to listen-in a little more

at length to the various champions. Let us watch them as they arm themselves and shoot their arrows into the air. Let us choose from the Roman side one who has been an Anglican and is therefore a convert, Father Ronald KNOX, and one who is a born Roman, Hilaire BELLOC. On the other side, let us choose one who is an Anglo-Catholic and therefore predisposed to be tolerant of Rome, Professor TAYLOR of Edinburgh University, and one who is an out-and-out Protestant, or (as he would probably say) a New Testament Christian, Professor OMAN of Cambridge.

Father KNOX disappoints a little. Intellectually, *i.e.* as an advocate, he is somewhat feeble. But let him speak for himself. There must be a body, he thinks, that is the legitimate continuation of the one hundred and twenty in the Upper Room. And the promises of Christ are made apparently to this body only. 'I am with you always,' 'ye are my friends,' 'He shall guide you into all truth'—'such promises were made to me, if I could but be certain that I was one of the people addressed; was I?' Is it credible that any one can believe that nobody has a right to accept such words but the members of a particular body, a 'legitimate continuation' of the one hundred and twenty? It seems incredible, but Father KNOX believes this.

And there is only one body who can make the Faith sure to us. Father KNOX rejects any idea of experience being the ultimate authority. And in this connexion he makes an extraordinary confession. We must quote it verbatim. 'There are those who would tell me that if I had ever really "laid hold of Christ" I should know, with an unmistakable certainty, that His promises were meant for me, independently of any attachment I may profess for this or that religious body. I have commonly a great respect for the people who seem to enjoy this certainty; but I cannot imagine myself as sharing it.' This sentence does indeed fully explain why Father KNOX fled to the shelter of the Roman Church. For the Protestant at least does believe in the *Testimonium Spiritus Sancti*, and the 'inward assurance' wrought by Him in the soul.

Then, further, there must be only *one* true Church. All the others (Eastern, Anglican, and the rest) are therefore schismatical. A very simple test disposes of the Anglican. The Anglican Church began in Elizabeth's time. It goes no farther back. The result of this is that it is outside the Body. There is a further test: where is the final authority in religion? There must be one to preserve tradition from error. There must be an infallible authority for our faith. And it is found only in the Roman Church.

If Father KNOX is disappointing, Mr. Hilaire BELLOC is even more so. Indeed, when one reads over the essay, even a second time, one finds it difficult to extract anything of importance. For example, Mr. BELLOC deals with two arguments against Rome thus. One is that while Christ founded a Church it afterwards went wrong, got on to wrong lines. Mr. BELLOC'S reply is simply that he despises such an argument. A second assertion that Rome destroys freedom of thought is likewise exposed to his scathing derision, but not to any reasoned reply. And this derision would be more impressive if Mr. BELLOC had not written in the same essay: 'Any chance words in this poor essay are wholly subject to authority. If I misstate a point in theological argument, I accept its correction at once at the hands of authority.'

Mr. BELLOC'S main argument for Rome is that it solves (and it alone solves) the great problems What? Whence? Whither? 'It is not true that the Church is but one of many warring creeds and varying religions. There is but one Authority on earth which claims to reveal to men their nature and their destiny.' Most of us would subscribe to this last sentence, but we should be thinking of a different Authority. We had imagined that it was in the Lord Jesus Christ, and in Him alone, that we read the final answer to the questions: What? Whence? Whither?

Now let us turn to the champions of the other side. Professor TAYLOR holds that men should abide in their ancestral Church unless there is a com-

pulsive reason for change, and that the onus lies on Rome to say why we should join her. The only valid reason for my becoming a Roman Catholic would be a proof that outside Rome there is no Christian Church at all, *i.e.* that those who are without the Roman fold are actually cut off from the practice of the specifically Christian life. 'That *extra ecclesiam nulla salus*, and that the *ecclesia* outside which there is nothing but death to God is the Roman Catholic Church, would be an excellent reason for conversion to it, and, to my mind, the only fully sufficient reason. Satisfy me that the society which Jesus Christ lived and died to found, and did found effectually on the day of Pentecost, is conterminous with the Roman Catholic Church, and I hope I should have the honesty to become a Roman Catholic to-morrow.'

The only proof of this would be an experimental one. If you could say: 'Look at Rome. All the saints are in her fold. Look at Canterbury or Geneva. They have no real religious life.' If you could say that with truth, then plainly the Church of Jesus Christ is to be identified with the Roman Church. But only on that supposition. And it is obvious that the supposition is entirely untrue. What makes the Church is a living connexion with its one Head and Root, and this is by no means exclusive to Rome.

But apart from that the real issue at bottom is the difference between authority and infallibility. Authority is a reality. But there never has been in man, or in body of men, anything like infallibility. The drill-sergeant conception of authority in Rome is inconsistent with personal religious integrity. How can a man's belief be his own unless it is held with a personal conviction? We are not asked by Christ to believe anything except for the reason that it is true. Rome says: 'Here is the truth. You must take it or leave it. And that's that.' This is an invasion of the soul's real sanctity. And it is unacceptable whatever be the subject dealt with. It is wrong in principle that an ecclesiastical authority should decide, independently of the relevant evidence, how or when the Pentateuch or the Synoptic Gospels were composed. The proceeding would be wrong even if the ecclesiastical conclusions were right.

Perhaps the ablest essay in this volume is that of Professor OMAN. Its simplicity and intellectual power are immensely impressive. He deals with the nature of the true Church, something after the manner of Professor TAYLOR, and says, 'surely there must be something seriously wrong when persons Jesus would have welcomed to His heart are excluded from His Church, and that for external reasons He never used, and which would have made a very different division between His disciples and His enemies, if He had.'

Professor OMAN gives three reasons for not accepting the Roman view. The first and most important is that it contradicts views and truths much more certain and more precious. He takes three points. One is the Roman view of authority. He has no difficulty in showing that the authority of any truth is that it convinces us and proves itself true in our life. And he has no difficulty in showing that the Roman claim is (*a*) historically unfounded, and (*b*) utterly contradictory to the Gospels. A third point is the 'shelter' the Roman Church gives, and he has no difficulty in showing that God never meant us to lead sheltered lives. Our real security is on the high seas. If God had meant us to rest in a sheltered submission, it is impossible to see any Divine hand in man's chequered and troubled career.

A second reason for rejecting Roman claims is that they are unproved. The assertion that Jesus founded the Church as a hierarchical, sacerdotal state, with the Apostles as rulers in His stead, and Peter as the chief, who became Bishop of Rome, and handed down his supremacy to all future bishops of that See—with our present knowledge we might say this is disproved. It is against all we know, and, moreover, the rise and development of the conception are clearly explained by political influences that are very well known to us. In any case, the Roman claim is entirely unproved.

The third reason for rejecting any idea or truth

is that it is incredible, and Dr. OMAN gives as an example of this, Transubstantiation. It is curious that this point is never referred to by either Father KNOX or Mr. BELLOC. Yet it is probably the one thing in Roman belief that seems wholly beyond belief. Dr. OMAN points out the figurative nature of our Lord's teaching, and says that even as late as Tertullian it was assumed that Jesus was speaking figuratively when He said, 'This is my body.' The development of the simple rite into the mystery of Transubstantiation has been traced with extraordinary clarity by Harnack. And it is well known that the Roman view was based on a philosophy of substance and accidents which has long since been given up. Probably Roman apologists are wise in saying nothing of this. If any soul can accept the Roman claim, no demand presented to him will seem too hard, because he has already done what Mr. BELLOC has done, submitted his intellect on religious matters entirely and utterly to Roman domination.

National Contributions to Biblical Science.

X. Great Britain's Recent Contribution to New Testament Study.

BY THE REVEREND N. P. WILLIAMS, D.D., LADY MARGARET PROFESSOR OF DIVINITY IN THE UNIVERSITY OF OXFORD, AND CANON OF CHRIST CHURCH, OXFORD.

IN the continuous flux of human affairs it rarely happens that the end of a century in our conventional system of measuring time coincides with the end of a natural epoch in history and a fresh start in the spiritual or intellectual activities of a nation. Nevertheless, the beginning of the present century may be deemed to have marked such a turning-point in the history of the British people, not least in respect of the restricted, though to the Christian and the student supremely interesting and important, field of New Testament studies; for the same year, 1901, which saw the death of the great Queen who has given her name to the 'Victorian' era, with its monumental achievements in all departments of human thought and endeavour, witnessed also the passing away of Westcott, the last survivor of the illustrious constellation of Cambridge scholars of which the other two luminaries were Lightfoot and Hort, and which for more than a generation had dominated this particular era. The last thirty years, more or less, seem therefore to constitute for our purposes a chronological whole, and the adjective 'recent' will be deemed to be applicable to any works produced within this period. It should further be premised that in this article the expression 'Great Britain' will be interpreted quite literally, no account being taken of work produced by American or Colonial scholars. Finally, by the word 'contribution' we shall understand what may be regarded as positive, massive, and relatively lasting achievements, though we shall not consider ourselves debarred from making mention of isolated works which have notably stimulated or assisted thought and research, even though their conclusions may not have so far attained to general acceptance.

A large element of subjectivity must necessarily enter into the attempt to decide what recent intellectual constructions are likely to be permanent. Nevertheless, the present writer is bold to believe that posterity, when it comes to review the period of New Testament study in Great Britain with which we are concerned, will single out the progress which during this time has been made in the elucidation of the Synoptic Problem as its most valuable and abiding legacy. I do not forget the works of Professor F. C. Burkitt and of the late Professor V. H. Stanton; but, if the writings of these scholars be momentarily left aside, it is perhaps not too presumptuous to claim the chief credit in respect of advance in this field for Oxford, and more particularly for the 'seminar' which for many years met in the house of the Lady Margaret Professor of Divinity, its best known members being Professor Sanday himself, the late Sir John Hawkins, and Canon Streeter.

Three books stand out as the products of the labours of this group—Sir John Hawkins' *Horae Synopticae* (first edition, 1898; second, 1909), the