TWENTY-FIVE YEARS OF THEOLOGICAL STUDY.¹

By F. C. BURKITT, D.D., F.B.A., NORRISIAN PROFESSOR OF DIVINITY IN THE UNIVERSITY OF CAMBRIDGE.

It would be impossible for me to begin my discourse on this very important and interesting celebration of the Silver Wedding of the University of Manchester with Theology without expressing my deep sense of the honour done me in being invited to deliver it, and also of the difficulty and complexity of my task. During the past twenty-five years the study of Theology has been prosecuted with considerable success in all its various branches, and in attempting a general view it is difficult not to lose oneself in a maze of detail. It is indeed a chief characteristic of modern study of all kinds to be specialised. That is necessary; it is impossible to doubt it. But if real progress is to be attained the specialists must not lose interest in all parts of their subject, even if they cannot be specialists in all parts; and besides this it is most important, in my opinion, that they retain a vivid sympathy and interest in their subject as it appeals to the average man, to the general public. Otherwise a gap, at last a great gulf, is fixed between the specialist and the average man, with the result that the specialists’ investigations grow less and less intelligible and interesting to the average man, who eventually becomes more and more ignorant; while on the other hand the specialist himself becomes unaware of the ignorance of the average man, and there is a danger lest the discoveries of scientific learning become the property of a coterie, without real influence on the thought of mankind in general.

I am able to make these remarks before this Faculty of Theology without offence, because they do not apply directly here. But this brings me to another matter, on which I must touch. This celebration of a happy twenty-five years of useful and successful activity meets

¹ A lecture delivered at the University of Manchester on the occasion of the celebration of the Twenty-fifth Anniversary of the Faculty of Theology.
under the shadow of loss. I suppose every man and woman in this assembly feels the loss of Arthur Samuel Peake. And yet perhaps there may be many who hardly realise the debt which we all owe him. For the twenty-five years about which I have to speak to you he has been a guiding and persuasive voice and a consistent personal example, saying in an era of transition and changing values, "This is the way, walk ye in it!" It is unfortunate that the word "peace-maker" in English is habitually confined to those who patch up quarrels and controversies which have already broken out. In reality the value of the peace-preserver is as great as that of the peace-restorer, and it was well observed in the excellent obituary notice of Professor Peake in *The Times* that it is greatly owing to his teaching and influence that we in England have been preserved from a public Fundamentalist controversy. A great part of Peake's life's work was devoted to bridging over the gap of which I spoke, the gap between the specialists' views about the Bible and Bible Religion and the views held by plain men and women brought up on the old uncritical beliefs they had inherited from their parents. Without Peake's eirenic and enlightened guidance that gap would have been much wider to-day: "Blessed are the peacemakers, for they shall be called sons of God."

I think also that it is not inappropriate specially to name here that work, known to you all, called "Peake's Commentary," which came out so opportunely in 1919. It was a book designed to lessen the gap between specialists and non-specialists, and it has been most successful in attaining its aim: I should feel that I had failed in my duty both to myself and to the late Professor Peake, if I had not directly mentioned this excellent work at the very beginning.

But I have also in mind something of even wider import. During the last twenty-five years the chief event, as we all know has been the Great War. I am not going to consider the rights and wrongs of that War, but only some of its after effects. As I see things, the War had a far-reaching influence on Theological study, of which it behoves us to take account. In one sense, of course, it made no difference at all. The date of Daniel or the historicity of Jonah is not really affected by present-day European catastrophes, nor again did the War introduce to philosophers, whether Christian or agnostic, the problem of why the innocent suffer and whether God has any care for men. These are very old problems to thoughtful persons. But
the mass of mankind are neither thoughtful nor philosophers, and the 
old problems came home in the War to tens of thousands who had 
ever thought about such things seriously before, or if they had, had 
accepted with facile docility the conventional answers offered to them.

The War and its special problems came at a very critical time for 
the old presentations of Religion in this country. For a whole genera-
tion the old sanctions, the traditional theologies, had been seen by a good 
many persons to be breaking down. But they were the minority: they 
were supposed to be "advanced"—generally a term of reproach 
among Englishmen—and minister after minister of religion used to 
assure one, from the pulpit and in conversation, that the old conflict 
between Religion and Science had died down, that very few of their 
congregation came to them with intellectual difficulties, that the dearth 
of candidates for Holy Orders was caused entirely by financial 
obstacles, and that neither they nor their flock had any use for 
Modernists and the "Higher Criticism." Then came the War: people 
were confronted with old problems in a poignant form that could not 
be ignored, and the very weak hold that theological considerations and 
arguments had upon all sorts and conditions of present-day English 
men and women was revealed.

During the last ten years the Churches have, it is true, recovered 
some lost ground, but the theological state of things is different from 
what it was before, and is likely to remain so. I place this great fact 
in the forefront of my discourse, partly because it seems to me in itself 
of the greatest importance, though it must be familiar to you all, but 
partly also because it is beginning to have a most definite repercussion 
upon the study of Religion.

The new thing with which we are confronted is not exactly what 
is called a spirit of unbelief: what it is is a loss of respect for mere 
authority, and especially the authority of tradition. What is the result? 
The result upon many of our more brilliant and intelligent students is 
that they tend to turn away from the methodical study of the Past. 
In former days theological study was to a great extent a study of the 
Past. It was supposed that the Past would give us direct guidance for 
the Present. Students, of course, have to take the courses of study 
prescribed for them, but formerly mature theologians studied the Church 
Fathers, the Apostolic Age, the Epistles of the New Testament, the 
Prophecies and the Legislature of the Old Testament, in order to find
a pattern and an example for the ordering of their own lives and the Churches to which they belonged.

We have moved and are still moving away from this attitude of mind and this direction of our studies. It means that ordinary men and women—sometimes, I fear I must say, ordinary clergymen too—study the Bible less and less. On the other hand, the study of these ancient documents, being now mainly in the hands of those who take an interest in the Past for its own sake, not for what they can get out of it for themselves here and now, has immensely advanced. Let us take a short survey of the progress of the last twenty-five years, following a roughly chronological order of the various branches of our subject.

Assyriology and Egyptology.—The separation between the studies of Assyriology and Theology is now complete. Assyriology is no longer a sort of appendix to Old Testament lore. It may be that recent excavations have unearthed tangible traces of a great Mesopotamian inundation, out of the memory of which have grown both the Gizdubar Babylonian Epic and the Bible tale of Noah's Flood. But it is at best only a question of the growth of legend and the moralisation of folk-tales. It is no impious boast but the plain fact, that we know more about the early history of Man and the beginnings of human civilisation than the writers of Genesis knew.

Meanwhile, what a wonderful panorama of early human history has been unfolded to us in the last five-and-twenty years by the Assyriologists and the Archæologists! We see the dynasties of Mesopotamia stretching back one behind the other to about 4000 B.C., accustomed to writing, skilled in gold and copper work, and above all acquainted with the wonderful process whereby man can fertilise the date-palm. The writer is Sumerian, but behind the Sumerians we must infer yet another race, more ancient still, who invented writing, for even Sumerian cuneiform is an adaptation. The making of pottery—and very fine pottery, too—goes back a long way behind this; so does the domestication of flocks and herds for food. Thus working back we are carried by what seems to be a continuous ladder of civilisation right into the middle of what for Europe is called the age

1 Peake's own remarks in his Commentary (Peake's Comm., p. 143a) are very sound, and are quite unaffected by Mr. Woolley's splendid excavations at Ur in 1928.
of Neolithic Man, i.e. 5000 to 10,000 B.C., and so within sight of the hunting-folk who lived before these, who had no metals, no agriculture, no domestic animals, but who drew on the walls of their caves pictures of the animals they hunted and ate almost as well as we can draw now—15,000 or 16,000 years ago.

As I say, all this range of subjects is no longer an appendix to Old Testament study. Rather it is the task of the Christian theologian to attempt to stretch his inherited theory of Religion so as to cover what we have come to know of the long history of civilisation.

Of Egyptology I am hardly competent to speak. I will only mention one striking publication. For years we have known the somewhat boastful account that Rameses II. gave of his wars with the Hittites, at the end of which he gives the terms of the treaty he made with them in 1280 B.C. In 1906, just within our period, Hugo Winckler discovered the archives of the Old-Hittite Kingdom at Boghazkoi (due east of Angora), but it was not till 1916 that the full text of the Hittite version of this treaty was published. In 1920 Professor Langdon and Dr. Alan Gardiner edited both texts, the Egyptian and the Hittite-Babylonian, side by side in parallel columns.¹ Thus, just at the time of the present European settlement, when the echoes of our Great War had hardly died away, there was published the first known treaty of peace between two nations. Before this there had been wars of conquest, successful and unsuccessful, but the Hittite-Egyptian treaty is the earliest known instance of two great Empires trying after a fight to shake hands and be friends.

Old Testament Study.—I must now turn to landmarks in the study of the Old Testament itself. The last twenty-five years has been a period of consolidation and popularisation rather than of epoch-making discoveries. The great revolutionary principle, which we in this country associate with the names of Robertson Smith and Wellhausen, that the prophets came before the Written Law, has passed victoriously into our elementary text-books. It has transformed the features of Old Testament Religion and its development. There are outstanding questions of great moment, which are still under discussion by competent scholars, notably whether the Book of Deuteronomy be not posterior to Jeremiah, but in a sense these are matters of detail. The great point is that a

¹ Journal of Egyptian Archaeology for July 1920, pp. 179-205.
new generation has been brought up trained to look at early Israelite history, and the wonderful outburst of ethical Prophecy associated with the great names of Amos and his successors, with a free open view, not through the blinkers of a neglected but existing Pentateuch.¹

The new trend of study during the last twenty-five years has been towards post-exilic Judaism, to the history of Jerusalem under the High Priests.² On the beginning of this period indeed a new and unexpected light has been cast by the discovery of a bundle of Israelite documents which came from far up the Nile and are known as the Elephantine Papyri. It appears from these documents, which are contemporary with Nehemiah, that a colony of Israelites had been settled on the southern Egyptian frontier from some time before Nebuchadnezzar, and that they had there erected a Temple and offered sacrifices to their God, whose Name they called Jaho (YHW). This Temple had lately been destroyed in a riot, and the documents include petitions for help, addressed to various dignitaries in Palestine, including one to the sons of Sanballat. It appears that the community at Jerusalem under the High-Priest Johanan (mentioned in Neh. xii. 23) took no notice of the appeal. Indeed the whole settlement at Elephantine lies outside the Bible story. Its chief value to us is a demonstration that not every development of Jewish religion or life was destined to survive, or even find mention, in official Jewish records of the past.

But the awakened interest in post-exilic Judaism which I mentioned above is not only concerned with extraneous episodes, like the history of the settlement at Elephantine. It is concerned with the main body, its reformed Religion, its hopes and ideals. For Christians, at least, this is surely the most natural attitude, if we are to regard Christianity as the legitimate outcome of Judaism. If it be the outcome of Judaism at all, it is the outcome of post-exilic, fully-developed Judaism. And when we examine this post-exilic Judaism more closely we find that it

¹Conservative and literary persons sometimes complain of mechanical symbols like J and E and D and P, and it is true that as Wellhausen himself observes (Einl. in die drei ersten Evangelien, ed. of 1905, p. 57), “literary analysis can degenerate into child’s play.” But let anyone read old works like Milman’s (e.g. the accounts of Amos and of Josiah’s Reform, in bk. viii.), and he will feel the difference the new view has made.

²“Jerusalem under the High Priests” is the title of E. R. Bevan’s excellent lectures published in 1904 and still unsurpassed as a popular Introduction. I am glad to know that it has now reached a fifth impression.
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is not a mere soulless ritualism, controlled by unspiritual and formal priests, but an unique blend of ethical and ritual principles enthusiastically cherished by a whole community, and not by officials alone, so that when the Greeks first made acquaintance with their way of life, the Jews seemed to them to be a race of philosophers.¹

The peculiarity of the Jews consisted not only in what they were, but also in what they hoped to be. They believed themselves destined to a glorious future, and their hopes of the future found most characteristic expression in the series known as the Jewish Apocalypses. Never have these strange, enthusiastic, somewhat uncouth writings been so scientifically studied as during the last quarter of a century. They had been long neglected. One of them, it is true, had been accepted by the Jews as Canonical Scripture, but the very isolation of the Book of Daniel led to mistaken views of its origin and meaning. Another, what is known as Second Esdras in the Apocrypha, but now is generally called 4 Ezra by scholars, secured a precarious hold on the very edge of what is reckoned as the Bible. The rest of the series, after having had a great popularity among the Jews, from whom in turn the Christians received them, fell into disrepute and ultimately into more or less complete oblivion. The glowing anticipations of the glorious future had not been fulfilled, the End was not yet, as the Apocalypses had seemed to promise. They were rejected by the Rabbis, and if they survived among Christians it was among half-barbarous and isolated Churches, such as those of the Armenians or the Abyssinians.

During the last quarter of a century the Apocalypses have been examined afresh, not in order to extract from them the secrets of the future but to elucidate the hopes and aspirations of their writers and of the Jewish people for whom they were written. For this purpose the Apocalypses are invaluable. We see in them the growth of the ideas of the Kingdom of God and of a near-approaching Judgment to come, to come for all the world. In this connection we see also the mould in which the earliest Christian Hope was cast, and the main-spring of that misdirected enthusiasm which resulted in the bringing to an end of the Jewish State by Titus in A.D. 70. “They thought that the Kingdom of God should immediately appear”—these familiar

¹ Quoted by E. R. Bevan, House of Seleucus, ii. 167 (Jerus. under High-Priests, 42).
words of the Gentile Evangelist summarise the earliest Christian expectation and also the mental attitude of the Jewish People for half a century before the Destruction of Jerusalem.

So much for the interest and significance of these Jewish Apocalypses. They are all now available for the English student in the second volume of the work called *Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha*, brought out in 1913 under the editorship of Dr. R. H. Charles. I name this edition, because it is a standard book of reference, likely to be in the library of any properly equipped Theological institution. It is not perfect, but that it was possible at all is due to the long labours of various scholars, particularly of Dr. Charles himself, whose edition of the Book of Enoch in Ethiopic, published in 1906, with a full collation of all the known MSS., is a noble monument of British scholarship.

*New Testament Study.*—When we turn to the New Testament it is difficult to express in a few words the difference between the present state of things and that which prevailed five and twenty years ago. This has not been produced by some outstanding discovery or exposition, but by a gradual infiltration into religious and conservative circles of views once thought extravagant and incompatible with reasonable orthodoxy. Bretschneider’s *Probabilia*, which gives a summary of the chief reasons against regarding the Apostle John as the author of the Fourth Gospel, was published in 1820. Lachmann set forth with the utmost lucidity the main reasons for the priority of Mark to Matthew and to Luke in *Studien und Kritiken* for 1835. The texts which say “Ye shall not have gone over the cities of Israel till the Son of Man be come” and “This generation shall not pass till all these things be done” have stood plain and clear in the Gospels from of old. But it is only during our period that English students of theology have taken these things into serious consideration. This is not the occasion for discussing details of controversy. The point to be noted here is the weakening of tradition and the change of attitude, even among scholars who are reckoned conservative. Notable examples of what I mean may be found in Dr. A. E. Brooke’s treatment of the Gospel of John in *Peake’s Commentary* (1919), or again in the

---

1 On the text of Enoch and on that of the Ascension of Isaiah see the two Appendices to my book *Jewish and Christian Apocalypses* (1914).
general chorus of approval which welcomed Canon Streeter's learned work called *The Four Gospels* (1924).

It is idle to say that questions of date and authorship and of manner of composition do not affect religious values. It might be true of some religions, but Christianity is far too deeply connected with History, with certain happenings in the Past, not to be affected by a change of view about the documents which tell us all that we know about its first beginnings. The old ship may come to safer moorings in due course, but while the anchorage is being shifted both crew and passengers have an anxious time. Moreover, the direction which critical study of the Gospel has taken during the last twenty-five years has involved difficulty not only for ultra-conservatives, but also for some who at the beginning of this century felt themselves to be in the van of liberal progress.

Many of my hearers will recall the publication of Harnack's *What is Christianity?* The lectures were delivered in the winter of 1899-1900, and the English translation appeared in 1901. That is not so very long ago, and Adolf von Harnack is still alive in an honoured old age. At the time of publication the picture of the Gospel presented in *What is Christianity?* seemed "advanced" indeed to many a traditionalist, but though much had been given up the Portrait of Jesus Christ there sketched and the account there given of His message could be claimed to be in accordance with the most enlightened ideas, to be in fact so uninfluenced by "contemporary discords"—that is to say, contemporary Jewish hopes and fears and prejudices—that these "sink into the background." The Gospel, then, according to Harnack and the school of "liberal" thought of which he was one of the most learned and accomplished exponents, was essentially timeless and general. As one may perhaps put it, it had been a mistake to enshrine the name of Pontius Pilate in the Creed.

The next stage in the study of the Gospel was startlingly different. In 1907 Dr. Sanday of Oxford published a book called *The Life of Christ in Recent Research*, the chief part of which consisted of a set of Lectures delivered in the previous spring at Cambridge. I well remember them! These Lectures introduced the English public to a book called *From Reimarus to Wrede*, written by an Alsatian

1 P. 17.
Privat-dozent called Albert Schweitzer. When I got Schweitzer's book itself, it was indeed both instructive and exciting! And this in two ways. From Reimarus to Wrede (called in the English translation by W. Montgomery, 1910, "The Quest of the Historical Jesus") was a history of the attempt to write a Life of Christ during the nineteenth century, and it was animated by the general principle that the difficulty which was always confronting these learned and well-meant attempts lay in such Gospel texts as those I quoted above. "This generation shall not pass away"—and by now, in the twentieth century, how many generations have passed away! The End, so confidently expected, did not come.

The problem, in a sense, had always been there, but (as Schweitzer pointed out) it had become acute for the liberalising theologians of last century. Their aim had been to draw a portrait of Jesus which should be both strictly historical and at the same time directly edifying for the very different modern age in which they lived. As I said, Schweitzer's book was instructive in two ways. To begin with it revealed, as no other work I know of has revealed, the nature of the limitations under which German historical theology had been working. Then further, one saw in it the great historical dilemma clearly put: if Jesus Christ be historical He belongs to His own age; if, on the other hand, we persist in asking for a Jesus Christ who is up-to-date we can only get it by constructing a Jesus who is not historical.

Much more might be said on this topic, controversial and un-controversial. The Eschatological School, as Schweitzer and his supporters are called, often hear that their point of view was narrow and one-sided and that their time has passed,—characteristics that we share, it may be remarked, with the followers of Darwin,—but I feel sure that so far as such judgments are true it is because the general considerations, drawn by the Eschatologists not from conjecture but from the Gospels themselves, can no longer be shirked or explained away by those who study the earliest Christianity. And, above all, I feel that any review of the past twenty-five years would be most inadequate, if it did not lay stress upon Schweitzer and the questions which he forced into the foreground here in England as well as in Germany.

I pass by various interesting developments and speculations connected with my own favourite studies of Textual Criticism and the
Synoptic Problem as not really suitable for the present occasion, though indeed such things in the end do have a very appreciable influence upon Theological notions in general. I need only remind you that just as Dr. Sanday's studies in the African Latin texts of the Gospels and the discovery of the ancient Syriac Palimpsest of the Old Syriac Gospels were the outstanding events in New Testament textual criticism in the period immediately before ours, this last year has been signalised by the publication of a textual work almost as important as the Sinai Palimpsest itself, viz. Professor R. P. Blake's edition of the Old-Georgian text of Mark, to be followed by the other Gospels in due course. This work deserves special mention, because it is almost the equivalent of a third MS. of the Old-Syriac in addition to the Sinai Palimpsest and Cureton's MS. I should add also that our period has seen the publication of the MSS. of the Gospels known as W (1912) and Θ (1913), each of which is of exceptional importance in its way.

The Mystery Religions.—If the announcement of the Gospel and the earliest form of the Christian Hope be intimately linked with the expectation of the near approaching End, and of the last Judgment that will set all wrongs right, then the Jewish Apocalypses about which I spoke just now acquire a special interest. New Testament phrases like the Wrath to come, the Consummation of the age, even "Thy Kingdom come" in the Lord's Prayer, take on new and vivid meaning. Nevertheless, the lines on which the main current of Catholic Christianity has developed are somewhat different. Catholic Christianity comes before the general student of the history of the Roman Empire, in somewhat marked contrast to the ideas suggested by these phrases, as an organisation into which newcomers are admitted singly by a ritual bath or sprinkling, and in which the members acquire and maintain the expectation of a happy immortality after death by partaking of a sacred common Meal. I do not wish for one moment to suggest that this description of Catholicism is more than superficial, but these features of it have struck many observers, none perhaps more forcibly than M. Solomon Reinach, who wrote a well-known general history of Religion, entitled Orpheus, from this view-point. According to Reinach, the Gospel, the Message of Jesus, His Life and Death, are mere accompaniments of a single line of Christian traditional lore, the essence of the Religion being in the Sacraments, by participation in
which the worshipper attains present purification and future bliss. That essence, in his opinion, is Greek and pre-Christian.

Something like this, something more or less like this, was really exemplified in what are called the "Mystery-Religions," the cults of Isis, of Mithra, and others, which flourished during the first three centuries of our era. During the last twenty-five years the Mystery-Religions have been much studied on the Continent, very often with the implication that in them we shall learn the true nature of Christianity when freed from its Jewish swaddling-clothes. Or again, the religion of the Church has been regarded as a Hellenisation of the pure Galilean Gospel, though the critics who maintain this are by no means agreed by whom this was effected, whether by S. Paul himself or by the men of a later generation.

These inquiries have not raised so much interest in England, unless we include the works of Sir James Frazer. No doubt a great deal of what has been written on these Mystery-Religions is fanciful and unfounded. If anyone needs to be put on his guard in this matter, let him read the sensible and well-documented chapter on Mystery-Religions by Dr. Edwyn Bevan in the book called Christianity in the Light of Modern Knowledge, published this year. At the same time the problem is real and deserves attention, particularly from those who are not content to regard sacramentalism as a wholly legitimate development of the Religion of Jesus. For the thoroughgoing sacramentalist, of course, there is no problem here at all. I would only say now, with reference to the question of the Hellenisation of the Gospel, that if we are to locate a gulf or innovation in the way of regarding the Christian Religion I would not put it between Jesus and Paul, or between the Apostolic and the post-Apostolic Age, but between the mentality of Paul and that of his own Gentile converts at Corinth and elsewhere. I know no place where this contrast is better put than in Kirsopp Lake's Earlier Epistles of S. Paul (1911).

A word must be said in passing on the Religion of the Manichees—the New Christianity, as it was sometimes called in the fourth century. In no department has so much fresh light been thrown by archaeological discoveries during the past quarter of a century as here.

1 Christianity in the Light of Modern Knowledge, a collective work (Blackie and Son, 1929), pp. 83-115.
2 P. 437.
Fragments of Manichean MSS have been discovered in Central Asia by A. von Le Coq, by Sir Aurel Stein and others, and we are now able to study this singularly interesting Religion from utterances of the Manichees themselves, and not only from more or less orthodox refutations of them. The Church founded by Mani has died out, very largely through persecution, but we are discovering that some of the ideas that were championed by the Manichees are so deeply bound up with the facts of life that they tend to reappear in full vigour in unexpected places. I do not myself believe that our world is a Smudge, the result of a regrettable accident, but there are those who feel driven to explain the evils around us by this drastic doctrine.¹

Church History.—Time would indeed fail me, were I to attempt this afternoon to pilot you through the developments of the study of Church History in recent times, together with that of the movements of Christian Thought and Philosophy. Who could sketch, unaided, an Outline of Christianity? I hope there are many in this audience who know that my question is rhetorical, and that the thing has been done, done first of all in America, and re-edited to suit English conditions by men of whom the Theological Faculty of Manchester University will always be proud. The name most intimately connected with the American edition of the five volumes of the work called An Outline of Christianity is, I think, that of Professor Foakes Jackson, once of Cambridge, and now of Union Theological Seminary, New York. The editors of the English edition—you know their names and their work: one was the ever-regretted Professor Peake, the other is Bishop Parsons.

Christian Worship.—As I say, I am passing over the great department of Church History and Christian Philosophy. But I must devote a few words to one department of Theological study, viz. Liturgiology. What dreary visions are conjured up by this word! Albs, dalmatics, orphreys, aumbries—let us then get rid of it altogether, and speak of the study of Christian Worship. In the last quarter of a century the serious study of the history of Christian Worship seems to me to have entered on a new phase, symptoms of which may be seen in works such as Messe und Herrenmahl (1926) by that eminent

¹ See F. C. Burkitt, The Religion of the Manichees (1925), especially p. 69.
Protestant theologian, Professor Lietzmann, whose interest in the history of Liturgy has also been shown by his admirable edition of the Gregorian Sacramentary (1921).

But the mention of the Gregorian Sacramentary brings to mind the name of Edmund Bishop, who did so much by his writings and personal influence to give to the study of Christian Liturgy human, not to say racial and nationalistic, interest. It was not enough for Bishop to know that such and such a prayer or liturgical custom can be placed and dated: he was not satisfied till he could make real to himself and others what was the mental attitude, the feelings, of those who made the prayer. He brought before us the enthusiasm and chivalry of the Gothic and Frankish barbarians, their lack of mental balance, their superstition; and on the other hand the dignity and simplicity and "rationalism" of what is locally Roman—perhaps a rather mechanical and cold precision, constitutionally averse from change. And all this to illuminate and explain the development of liturgical forms. "He being dead yet speaketh," not only in the stately volume of Liturgica Historica (1918), but in his Benedictine disciples at Downside Abbey and above all in the impulse he gave to the historical study of the forms of Christian Worship.

This surely is a matter which in the nature of things ought to be more seriously considered in our Universities. The Bible, of course, has a unique position in Christian study. But Church History as taught is too often a record of Christian quarrels than of Christian aspiration; while on the other hand the forms in which Christians have embodied their Worship, whether written or deliberately left unwritten, are worthy of the closest and most sympathetic study by all students of theology, for they exhibit Christian aspiration most clearly. We may retain our private judgment as to the objective success of these efforts: the sympathetic study of Christian Worship will not produce faith, but it may remove prejudices. To put the matter in a concrete form, I am sure that a study of the Didache and of the Hippolytean Church Order is as important to the theological student as a knowledge of the Arian Controversy, and an acquaintance with medieval forms of prayer as important as acquaintance with the strife about Investitures or the career of Hildebrand.

Comparative Religion.—There is one other subject upon which I must say a few words before I close and that is what is called Com-
parative Religion. Here again our first thought must be a consciousness of loss. Professor Rhys Davids and Dr. Farquhar each in their several way made excellent use of their Chair. Of the services of Rhys Davids to the study of Buddhism it would be impudent for me to speak: it will always be a pride to the University of Manchester to remember that for the first eleven years of this Faculty of Theology he was Professor of Comparative Religion. Dr. J. N. Farquhar was but a short time teaching here: had he lived longer I am sure his lectures would have had a notable influence upon the students, for he possessed a rare knowledge of Indian Religion and a great gift of sympathy with it, notwithstanding—or should I not rather say, because of—his own strongly religious beliefs.

I put the matter in this way, because I find among many people, who are certainly not serious theologians themselves, a vague notion that Theology, Christian Theology, is a dull study in itself and very "narrowing" in its effects, and that what is wanted in a new and progressive University is Comparative Theology and plenty of it. And I fancy also there is an idea in this that Comparative Religion will tend to show that all religions are very much alike, in their origin, in their practices, in their ultimate authority. Perhaps indeed this is the case when the Professor of Comparative Religion is someone with a second-hand knowledge of two or more Religions, so that his pupils acquire only a third-hand knowledge.

What is wanted in our world is first-hand and first-rate knowledge, and this requires both time and application. I have attempted to give you a sketch of some of the main movements in theological study during the twenty-five years that the Theological Faculty of the University of Manchester has been in being. How much, how many sides, I have altogether omitted, many of those here present must know. But so many-sided a study, a study which touches so many sides of human life and thought, cannot really be narrowing to those who pursue it, even if they confine themselves to the study of Christian religion alone.

Time—I am well aware that the difficulty is in the time, the very inadequate time that most students can afford to give to their education. Yet the medical students somehow find time to learn how to pass their exacting examinations, and a not all too insufficient number of those who have been medical students find time to obtain the
knowledge and skill that makes their advice sought as consulting Physicians. Not everything can be done by what is called practical work: there is a pressing need of theoretical knowledge also.

This is what Universities exist to supply. I started by pointing out the dangers of too great a gap separating the knowledge of the specialist from the half-ignorance of the average man. One of these dangers is that the specialist may cease to direct public opinion in his own subject. In a healthy state of things, for instance, in medicine and hygiene and the study of health, the specialists—that is, the Medical Profession—guide public opinion. Do the Ministers of Religion now really and truly guide public opinion in their own subject? Not, certainly, to the extent they did so in former days. My conviction is that the remedy is to be found neither in the clergy following popular opinion, nor in their continuing to be satisfied with old conventions, whether of ritual or of theological formulation, but in more intensive, more extended, more intelligent and courageous study, so that they may apply to the Present the well-digested lessons of the Past.