

icism; and here shows admirably the inadequacy of Arnold's views. Arnold held that the Hebrew conception of God was that of a "Power that makes for righteousness." Of his arguments the author says, p. 231, "The most obvious comment . . . is that his argument here is not merely inconclusive, it is not even persuasive." Arnold picked and chose his texts at will, so as to suit his own case, in a method that was neither scientific nor judicial, nor, let it be added, literary," p. 232. "Arnold contends that the Bible should be criticised as every other book is criticised, yet in fact he criticises it as he would have criticised no other historical book. . . . To pretend that this conception represents unmistakably the ideal and intent of Israel is to make a claim which no fair weighing of evidence, no impartial reading of history no true understanding of the workings of history will support," p. 240. The author maintains that Arnold's conception of God and religion was at least as metaphysical as the one he discarded, that its adoption would be disastrous to popular religion. His attitude is due to his ignorance of man, especially the masses whom he professed to love but never touched, and to his characteristic lack of precision when discussing philosophical questions." The author's conclusion is, "The man who is able to receive, and live by, the religion which Arnold offers him is no longer in need of its help and stimulus," p. 256. "It will fail because it possesses no initial power; it may preserve, but it cannot build up," p. 257.

With Arnold's criticism of miracles and certain phases of Christian doctrine the author shows more sympathy; and yet more with his criticism of the churches, Established and Non-conforming. Still he offers criticism here. If there is to be a recrudescence of Arnold it is well that we have this brilliant and searching criticism of his views from so ardent an admirer. W. J. MCGLOTHLIN.

Lux Mundi: A Series of Studies in the Religion of the Incarnation.

Edited by Charles Gore, M.A., Canon of Westminster. Twelfth Edition. New York: Thomas Whittaker, 2 and 3 Bible House. Pp. lx. and 452. Cloth, \$1.40 net.

The following extract from the preface explains the origin and subject of this now famous book.

“This volume is primarily due to a set of circumstances which exist no longer. The writers found themselves together at Oxford between the years 1875-1885, engaged in the common work of university education, and compelled, for their own sake no less than that of others, to attempt to put the Catholic faith into its right relation to modern intellectual and moral problems. Such common necessity and effort led to not infrequent meetings, in which a common body of thought and sentiment and a common method of commending the faith to the acceptance of others, tended to form itself. We, who once enjoyed this happy companionship, are now for the most part separated. But at least some result of our temporary association remains which, it is hoped, may justify and explain the present volume.”

“We have written,” they add, “not as ‘guessers at truth’ but as servants of the Catholic Creed and Church, aiming only at interpreting the faith we have received—yet with the conviction that the epoch in which we live is one of profound transformation, intellectual and social, abounding in new needs, new points of view, new questions, and certain therefore to involve great changes in the outlying departments of theology, where it is linked to other sciences, and to necessitate some general re-statement of its claim and meaning.”

The aim, therefore, is to succor a faith distressed by the problems raised by “the modern growth of knowledge, scientific, historical, biblical;” problems moral, intellectual, political, ethical. This is to be done “not by compromise—for compromise generally means tampering with principle—but readjustment, or fresh correlation of the things of faith and the things of knowledge.”

The twelve essays are from eleven different pens and deal with the following topics: “Faith;” “The Christian Doctrine of God;” “The Problem of Pain;” “The Preparation in History for Christ;” “The Incarnation in Relation to Development;” “The Incarnation as the Basis of Dogma;” “The Atonement;” “The Holy Spirit and Inspiration;” “The Church;” “Sacraments;” “Christianity and Politics;” “Christian Ethics.” The first appendix is an addendum on “Some Aspects of Christian

Duty;" the second, a sermon on "The Christian Doctrine of Sin."

That the demand for some such work was not over-estimated seems proved by the fact that while the first preface bears the date "Michaelmas, 1889," that to the tenth edition is dated "July, 1900."

The new knowledge, of which the author speaks, gathers around the evolutionary hypothesis and its various applications. The authors accept it and have satisfied themselves that so far from undermining faith in the Church and its Creed, the new view of the world confirms and enriches it. They are quite sure, at the same time, that some of the dogma of theology—not the central as contained in the Creed, but the outlying ones on which the Church has not formally pronounced—must be either modified or abandoned. They are not, however, so committed to evolution that they and their teaching must stand or fall with it. They admit—nay, one of them even expects—that it may some day be superseded, but such a possibility they survey with comparative unconcern, convinced that no actually demonstrated knowledge will ever conflict with the teachings of Christianity as found in the Bible and formulated by the Church.

The object is a worthy one. To disentangle revealed truth from theories, scientific, philosophical or theological, with which it is not identified, to permit unnecessary conflicts with science or philosophy and so allay alarm, to do this is to promote freedom and independence in men's thinking and to render a genuine service, not for to-day but for to-morrow also.

The spirit in which the essayists approach their task is admirable. It is reverent, believing, earnest. They are scholars, as you might expect. Their thought is fresh and vigorous, their style graceful and clear. They are not skeptics, much less are they destructive critics. At least they do not mean to be. As loyal Churchmen, they hold steadfastly to the Church Creed. Whatever suspicions one may have of the tendency of their teaching on Inspiration, and many feel that it inevitably leads toward Unitarianism—they certainly are not Unitarian. It is expressly repudiated. The deity of Christ is asserted in the most emphatic terms. And Mr. Moberly shows that

that doctrine resting on the certain fact of His actual resurrection from the dead practically carries with it, at least the full contents of the Apostle's Creed. And whether one agrees with him or not Canon Gore's object in the essay on Inspiration is not to undermine the authority of Scripture, but to show a standpoint for asserting it, in full view of what some of the critics are saying and so calm the fears of faith and hold to it wavering souls. The Holy Scriptures are "the highest expression of the mind of Christ," "the undying type of apostolic teaching," "an undying fountain of life from which the water of pure doctrine can be drawn," and by which "tradition and development can always be checked." So they are "the ultimate authority." Notwithstanding their attitude to evolution, they believe in the reality of the Fall, recognize the influence of degeneracy in religion, and, what is specially gratifying, have not the slightest doubt about the finality of Christianity. Their conception of the person of Christ and of our relation to Him settles that. When present social problems, such as the struggle between capital and labor, are faced, solution is wisely sought along the lines of personal responsibility and actualized brotherhood.

Nor is the reader impressed with the idea that these men are dealing with Christian truth in a coldly intellectual or purely external fashion. Their repeated references to human sin and helplessness and the oft-expressed conviction that only divine grace can meet our need and save, make one feel that they know by experience the central truth of the Gospel. The book pulses with spiritual life. The Christian temper and spirit in its humility and hope are manifestly present.

As one notes such facts he is amazed at some of the charges which have been made against the author. One critic, for example, has it that they deny both the personality and transcendence of God, whereas Christianity is defined as "a personal relation of trust in a personal God," and the statement is made that "Religion demands as the very condition of its existence, a God who transcends the universe." It would be easy and pleasant to multiply quotations on these and other points equally satisfactory and refreshing. The fact is there is a goodly

body of doctrine and experience which the writers believe and know and which they seek to expound and defend.

Why then the fusilade of criticism which has been directed against the book? Is it all as unwarranted as that just referred to? By no means. When a company of High Churchmen undertake to harmonize their Creed with the evolutionary thoughts of the day we may expect to meet statements in both directions that will call forth dissent. And so it is.

The title and, especially, the sub-title are enough to cause suspicion. When the death of Christ is regarded as incidental and subordinate to the incarnation, we may well distrust the system of which that is practically a keynote. Whether the incarnation would have taken place had there been no Fall, is, at best, a speculation. Certainly there is nothing in the Bible that teaches it. On the contrary apostolic emphasis is on the death of Christ. Even the Gospels treat the birth very scantily, and give a very large proportion of their space to the events that cluster around the Cross. This, in our judgment, is the first great weakness of the book—making that fundamental which not only lacks positive Biblical support, but puts your thinking out of the Bible perspective.

The effect is seen, for example, in the treatment of the Atonement. Admirable as it is in many respects, it fails to do justice to the cry, "My God, my God, why hast Thou forsaken me?" and to Paul's strong expression, "He made Him who knew no sin to become sin for us." And just because his view is inadequate, Mr. Lyttleton can say, "The atonement undoubtedly transgresses the strict law of retribution;" and Mr. Moore can speak of "the forensic fiction of substitution" and "awful and immoral system of Calvinism." We are not inclined to make light of the various theories of the atonement that have been propounded. There is probably something of truth in each of them. They come far short, any or all of them, of exhausting its fulness. But of one thing the common man may be sure—that the Biblical view does give substitution as practically the heart of it and Paul's language as well as the Saviour's cry suggest depths too deep for our poor words, more awful than most theories assume. Many a sin-burdened soul, all crushed with the sense of sin, has

caught some glimpse of his own need and God's demand, and has found rest in God's righteous grace as it has gazed into the abyss into which that phrase, "become sin," seemed to open.

Similarly we cannot but feel that Canon Gore's doctrine of sin is too shallow, when he assures us that "there is no positively sinful nature," that sin is "not nature, but failure or disorder of will." If the nature be right, why this universality of sinning? Through inherited tendency as the Canon implies? But in what does the tendency inhere? And is there any way of restoring the disordered will except through the new birth?

Of a piece with this is Canon Holland's dictum that "we are all equally sons of God." With him faith is the response of sonship and the deepest thing in us. The discussion is much improved in an addendum in the fourth edition when he assures us that on account of the incoming of sin that response is impossible apart from the enabling act of the Holy Spirit. It becomes then a question of the wisdom of using the term son to indicate our natural relation to God. To that the Bible gives little countenance.

We might expect to see frequent indications of the influence of evolution on the theology of these essays. It is quite marked, for instance, in Mr. Illingworth's reference to "the rash orthodoxy that is over eager to accept any result that tallies with its own preconceived opinions, as, for instance, the belief in a primitive monotheism." Therein the author seems more ready to hearken to the hypothesis of these scientists than to receive the natural impression which the Bible would make upon him. The same influence has helped to determine Canon Gore's view of Inspiration. The early chapters of Genesis may be mythical; historical errors may be found in the sacred writers; even Christ himself may not be an authority on the authorship of Old Testament books. This view is probably more widely accepted in this country now than it was fifteen years ago. It is a conceivable one. But is it true? Is it Paul's, or Peter's? Or is it in harmony with the character and practice of Him of whom Mr. Moberly says "The Man Jesus was Himself the Eternal God," and who says with His own lips "I am the

truth." Surely no mere hypothesis, nothing short of absolute demonstration of such error on the part of inspired writers or of such accomodation on the part of Christ, should lead us to accept that view. He who is convinced that there is such error is bound to accept it or abandon everything. The former alternative is of course the wiser and as such the Canon commends it.

One other point just here. Canon Holland, in his desire to save the faith from anxiety due to changes in scientific or historical opinions, follows the line of thought started by Schleiermacher and widely accepted to-day and dwells too exclusively on the subjective side of things and unwisely underestimates objective evidence. Rom. I. :19 and X. :17 declare positively that in the works of nature and the words of Christ we have a knowledge that mothers faith. Mr. Illingworth more properly shows how a larger view of the world gives us "a crowning proof of purposeful design."

Honest High Churchmen could not write of the Christ and sacraments without running counter to Baptist views at almost every turn. It is amazing to see how even such bright and learned men get confused here. It is another proof of the influence of early training. Not one jot of High Church teaching is here abated. The Church is one, visible, and made up of those who submit themselves to Baptism. It takes the individual at his birth and incorporates him into its own life. "Baptism, with its gifts of grace, gives as some security that the man's real self is on the side of unselfishness." "The sacramental principle is the regular employment of visible means for the achievement of divine mysteries." The Episcopate is the guarantee of unity and of truth as well. Priestliness is the prime element of her being, but this does not militate against a special order of priests. "A national Church alone can consecrate the whole life of a people." All this in the face not only of their own repeated declarations of the intensely personal nature of religion but also of the history of Christianity.

This book can be especially commended to two classes of people. It will be helpful to those who are beset by difficulties raised by current thought touching the fundamental truths of revelation; and even the articles on

Church and Sacraments might suggest some helpful reflections for Christians who hold aloof from all Churches and ignore all ordinances, and for all who read with discrimination there is much that will prove suggestive, stimulating and strengthening.

J. H. FARMER.

Taufe und Abendmahl bei Paulus; Darstellung und religionsgeschichtliche Beleuchtung.

Von W. Heitmüller. Göttingen, Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht. 1903.

This brochure of 56 pages is an address delivered before an association of ministers at Hanover and again at Brunswick in the spring of 1903. The argument goes to prove that the sacramental view of the ordinances of Baptism and the Lord's Supper is taught by Paul. With this remarkable thesis to maintain the author indulges in some remarkable reasoning, as might be expected; but he has produced a clever and vigorous presentation of his case. As is customary for a German, he takes his start by attacking the position of another, who had written on the question, Whether the Reformatory estimate of the Sacraments still exists? Or whether the present Lutheran church has not departed from the Reformation ideas of the Sacraments? The author prefers to state his problem thus: Whether the Biblical estimate of the Sacraments still prevails? This brings up the deeper question whether the Biblical view is still accepted as authority? Waiving this, however, he presents his attempt to find out what Paul teaches as to the efficacy and meaning of the two ordinances.

In regard to baptism Herr Heitmüller takes up first the great passage in Rom. 6:1-4. It is almost needless to say that the author has no thought of anything else than immersion as the act of baptism, and his exegesis proceeds on that accepted basis. He also rules out infant-baptism, as having no place in the New Testament teaching. His problem is to discover what efficacy Paul attached in his writings to the baptism of believers. He holds that in the passage cited, and others, Paul teaches ("baptized *into* Christ") that baptism either signifies or actually effects incorporation into Christ. He takes his stand for the latter view and plainly says (SS. 14, 15): "Baptism was