

Theology on the Web.org.uk

Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible

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

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



Buy me a coffee

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



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

PayPal

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

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

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

The Churchman

JANUARY—MARCH, 1940

Vol. LIV., No. 1, New Series

Contents :

	PAGE
THESE SIXTY YEARS	3
THE TEACHING OF THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND Rt. Rev. The Lord Bishop of Gloucester, D.D.	6
THE EVANGELICAL INTERPRETATION Rev. H. K. Banks	18
THE CHURCH CONFLICT IN GERMANY "Epaphroditus"	25
A SCOT SEEKS GOD Arthur N. Prior, M.A.	34
INTER-COMMUNION Rev. Mark Salisbury, LL.D.	43
NECESSARY REFORMS IN THE CHURCH ASSEMBLY Rev. J. W. Augur, M.A.	52
MAN IN REVOLT A Survey by the Rev. F. R. Montgomery Hitchcock, D.D.	57
BOOK REVIEWS	67

PRICE : ONE SHILLING NETT

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

THE CHURCH HYMNAL for the CHRISTIAN YEAR

The **HYMN BOOK** which contains an exceptionally good selection of National Hymns suitable for use at the present time.

ASK TO SEE THE "WORDS ONLY" EDITION RE-PRINTED IN CLEAR MODERN TYPE
at 2s.

(This new book will eventually replace both the 2s. 6d. and 1s. 6d. words only edition.)

OTHER PRICES:

	MUSIC	s. d.
Complete Indexes. Cloth...	...	7 6
For Choir use	6 0
WORDS		
Large Type, Persian Morocco	6 6
" " Pluviusin	4 6
" " Cloth	2 6
Small " Persian Morocco	6 0
" " " "	4 6
" " Pluviusin "	3 6
" " Cloth	1 6

SEPARATE

CHILDREN'S SUPPLEMENT

Music. Cloth	2 3
Words Only. Limp Cloth	0 6
Paper	0 3

Special grants are made to Churches for the purpose of introducing this book for general use. Application and further inquiries should be made to the Secretary, National Church League, Wine Office Court, London, E.C.4.

NATIONAL CHURCH LEAGUE

7, WINE OFFICE COURT, FLEET ST., E.C.4

“THE CHURCH HYMNAL for the CHRISTIAN YEAR”

Words Only Edition 2/-

Our offer of a 33½ discount on all orders for this splendid hymn-book must close when February closes. This offer is only made to help you to replace your present hymn-books with copies printed in a clear modern type.

Take your opportunity as many others have done.

At this time when pressure is being brought to authorize

RESERVATION

you should read

DR. SIDNEY CARTER'S

booklet of that title, a reprint from THE CHURCHMAN—
It is a subject for Clergy and Laity alike.

ORDER SOME COPIES TO-DAY. 3d. each.

Send one to the Clergy around you.

THE CHURCH BOOK ROOM

7, WINE OFFICE COURT, FLEET ST., E.C.4

1940



THESE SIXTY YEARS

“THE CHURCHMAN. A monthly Magazine. Conducted by Clergymen and Laymen of the Church of England.”

Such is the frontispiece of the first volume of THE CHURCHMAN : and as the page is turned we find the date of the first number, “October 1879”.

THE CHURCHMAN therefore reached its Diamond Jubilee with our last issue, October 1939. In humility we only claimed that to be the fifty-third year of the New Series. But, however that may be, we are glad that it was under the able editorship of the Rev. G. F. Irwin, D.D. that the sixtieth milestone was passed. Considering that he has guided the message and policy of THE CHURCHMAN for over thirty years, that is for half its life, this was most appropriate.



AND NOW as we take up the task, the frontispiece of that first volume cheers us, “Conducted by Clergymen and Laymen”. We are grateful to the godly and able men who have offered to assist in carrying on the high standard which has been set. In this first number of the sixty-first year, we are particularly grateful to the Lord Bishop of Gloucester (and the Baptist Board) for the use of his valuable paper on “The Teaching of the Church of England”. We are proud too, to include the paper by “Epaphroditus”, who, as his great predecessor has “gambled with his life” for the Gospel, this time in Germany.

We crave the prayers of all readers that by the wisdom and guidance of the Holy Spirit THE CHURCHMAN may still continue to be for the Glory of God, the blessing of the Church and the spread of the Kingdom of Christ.

SIR SAMUEL HOARE, when addressing the men of an Oxford College in his capacity as Chancellor, chose for his subject "The Balance of Life". The conclusion drawn was that the balance of life can only be maintained if a man keeps in view the inevitable end, which we call death. The thought reminds us of Belshazzar, "Thou art weighed in the balances". He was found wanting because he had lived wholly in the physical realm without thought for the spiritual. A life "lighter than Vanity" has no purchasing value in heavenly riches.

No one will deny that self-examination and re-collection are a wise safeguard of the soul. It is equivalent in the spiritual sphere to that simple advice, "Try your weight". Weight is the index of health, and health is the measure of life. In this number we present the self-analysis to which a Scottish pastor subjected himself. In this matter our fathers were wiser than we are. In these days of hurry, because we do not make time for this, are we not losing our intimacy with God and our ability to help others?



WHAT IS GOOD for the individual is good also for the corporate life of the Church. When was that corporate life last weighed? When were the various activities, the magazines, the committees, the services, the societies, the correspondence, the differences, the divisions, the campaigns, the finance, the machinery, the faith and the unbelief the love and the hate, the hope and the fear—when were these last put into the pan of Time and weighed against the pan of Eternity? What lasting value has each? Has our Church life become mere paper money or is the Church still on the gold standard?

The articles which follow will help to assess this. They are not intended simply as food for the intellect but as a sword for the conscience and fuel for the heart. To bring these thoughts to a practical issue, we urge you also to study, "Evangelicals at the Cross Roads," which will appear in the February number of the *Church Gazette*, where it has been put, in the hope that it will be a wider challenge. It is written by One-of-them, particularly to the Clergy.

The last Book of the Bible begins with the seven-fold warning to the Churches, "I know thy works"; and it ends with the warning to the individual, "My reward is with me to give every man according as his work shall be". In both cases the works are weighed to test whether they are hay or gold.

Is our teaching and our evangel found wanting when put in the balances against the eternal Word of God? Is a love wanting which cannot break down the wall of partition between brethren so that they may partake together of the Lord's hospitality? Does the loyalty to Christ about which we talk tally with the reproach we are willing to endure? Do the advantages we get through being Christians and clergy outweigh the cross we carry? Do we value our respectability more than the mud of the trenches?



WORKS NOT DONE PRIMARILY for the Glory of God, not linked in faith to the Saviour, not wrought in the Power of the Spirit can neither justify the Church nor the individual. Such works do not bear the hall-mark of the Grace of God and they will not abide the fire.

What then is the hall-mark of all true Christian work? If the Master came into the world to save sinners, and the Apostles were sent into all the world to do the same, surely all God-inspired activity must always be planned with that objective.

This is a practical question. It has eternal importance for ourselves and still more for those to whom we are sent. It should be constantly faced by the Church, her committees and societies. What better moment than this, the start not only of a new year but also of a new decade? If but a few will embrace the truth we have tried to express then the Church may once more regain the proofs of her Apostleship. Those proofs will bear the very marks of the Lord Jesus. We shall be a loving, praying, battling, suffering Church: a mighty instrument in the hands of Almighty God. Where are those few?

The Teaching of the Church of England

RT. REV. LORD BISHOP OF GLOUCESTER, D.D.

A Paper read before the Baptist Board : December 1939.

I MUST begin by thanking you for your kindness in allowing me to have the opportunity of explaining to you to the best of my ability the teaching of the Church of England. I feel sure that discussions such as this will do a great deal to clear away misconceptions. But the task is not an easy one, because, as you are no doubt aware, there are various schools of thought in the Church of England, and although there is, I believe, a much greater underlying unity than is often realized, yet undoubtedly the teaching is presented in great variety, and there is sometimes a tendency to emphasize and exaggerate the differences and to ignore the unity. I will do my best to make clear the points on which there is agreement and to estimate the extent of the differences.

I think that the easiest plan to pursue will be to take as our guide what is called "The Lambeth Quadrilateral." That is an authoritative statement issued by the Lambeth Conference with a view to Christian unity, emphasizing just those things which the Anglican community as a whole and the Church of England look upon as essential. I will read them in the form originally adopted in 1888.

"In the opinion of this Conference, the following articles supply a basis on which approach may be by God's blessing made towards Home Reunion.

"(a) The Holy Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments as 'containing all things necessary to salvation' and as being the rule and ultimate standard of faith.

“(b) The Apostles’ Creed, as the Baptismal symbol; and the Nicene Creed, as the sufficient statement of the Christian faith.

“(c) The two Sacraments ordained by Christ Himself—Baptism and the Supper of the Lord—ministered with un-failing use of Christ’s words of Institution, and of the elements ordained by Him.

“(d) The Historic Episcopate, locally adapted in the methods of its administration to the varying needs of the nations and peoples called to God into the Unity of its Church.”

THE HOLY SCRIPTURES.

I will begin with the Holy Scriptures, and I think you may take it as certain that the whole Anglican communion accepts the “sufficiency of Scripture” as a fundamental belief. Its belief is stated quite clearly in the Sixth Article, and in somewhat different language in the response in the Ordination of Priests.

The Sixth Article is as follows:

“Holy Scripture containeth all things necessary to salvation: so that whatsoever is not read therein, nor may be proved thereby, is not to be required of any man, that it should be believed as an Article of Faith, or be thought requisite or necessary to salvation.”

This statement I think you may be confident would be accepted quite universally among us, and we are ready to show that it was the general belief of the undivided Church. But I must point out clearly what it teaches and what it does not. It teaches the sufficiency of Scripture but (1) First, it does not teach any belief in the infallibility or inerrancy of Scripture. There are some in the Church who would believe those things, but they are not taught by any accepted formulary of the Church, nor are they believed by the great majority of thoughtful Christians among us. (2) Secondly, it does not exclude but admits the right use of Christian tradition. Here I am touching upon a more debated point, but I think that what I am going to say represents the opinion of the great majority of our divines. The words speak of two different categories of truth:

(1) those things read in Scripture;

(2) those things that may be proved thereby.

In the second category I would put, to give an instance, the doctrine of the Trinity. It is certainly not stated

explicitly in Scripture. Equally certainly as I believe it may be proved by Scripture, and admirably sums up its teaching, but it is from the teaching of the Christian Church that we learn it.

Christian tradition, as I hold it, implies two principles. The first is that the Christian Faith was preached, and the Christian Church was being built up many years before the New Testament came into existence. The earliest book in the New Testament was not written before the year A.D. 50. There was no New Testament in our sense of the word before the end of the first century. The New Testament was the creation of the Christian Church, it did not create it. Christianity as we know it in writings of the second century was only partially derived from the Bible.

The second principle is that we believe that the Holy Spirit has taught and is teaching the Christian Church, and that therefore the teaching of the Church, especially that of the undivided Church has for us real authority. The Church of England divines have always appealed to the Christian Fathers, and to the authority of the Creeds and Councils of the undivided Church as supporting its position.

If I may sum up briefly what we learn from Christian tradition as thus defined :

(1) We have in the independent witness of Christian tradition strong corroborative evidence of the truth of Christianity as we teach it.

(2) It has given us the proportion of the Christian Faith as contained in the Creeds.

(3) It presents us from the beginning with a Church built up from the beginning on the two Sacraments of the Gospel, whose central act of worship is the Holy Communion.

(4) It presents us from the beginning with a Church, Catholic in its outlook, based on an Apostolic ministry.

To sum up : The Christian Church is built on a double tradition, a written and unwritten tradition. While the unwritten tradition taught the world and us what Christianity is, we know how untrustworthy what is not written is, and we believe that the rule and ultimate standard of the Christian Faith, are the Scriptures, so that nothing should be imposed on any one as necessary for salvation which cannot be proved thereby.

THE CHRISTIAN CREEDS.

The doctrinal teaching of the Church of England is the Christian Faith as contained in the Christian Creeds.

This may be a useful illustration of the value and limitations of tradition.

We accept the Creeds because, as our Articles tell us, "they may be proved by most certain warrants of Holy Scripture," but it is the Creeds which are based upon Christian tradition that tell us what the Faith is that we teach. The Faith that the Creeds teach is the belief in the Incarnation and the Trinity, and that is and has always been the Christian Faith. It is what all Christians who are orthodox believe. In addition, the Creeds emphasize the belief in the Catholic Church—of that I shall speak later.

Now the importance of the Creeds as giving to us the contents of the Christian Faith, may be seen most clearly by its negative implications. During the Middle Ages there were large additions made to the things that it was required to believe, for example a belief in Transubstantiation was made a necessary dogma. This was still more the case at the Reformation. Every Church enlarged the number of doctrines which must be believed and embodied them in Articles and Confessions; for example, the Decrees of the Council of Trent, the Augsburg Confession, the Formula Concordiæ, the *Confessio Helvetica Prima et Secunda*, the Westminster Confession, the Thirty Nine Articles. These contain dogmatic statements on many subjects, on Justification, on Grace and Election, on the Atonement, on the Sacraments. Now by making the Apostles' and Nicene Creeds the basis of our Faith, we rule out dogmatic statements on all these things as necessarily part of the Christian Faith. We believe that it is our duty to try to form correct opinions on such matters, and that they are a proper subject for Theological thought, but we do not think that dogmatic statements about these matters should be enforced upon anyone as necessary to be believed. What the Christian Faith is, is taught us in Creeds. No Church should add anything to that belief, and in that Faith we might all unite together, for it expresses what, as a matter of fact, we all believe.

It may be asked then what is the position of the Thirty-Nine Articles. The Lambeth Quadrilateral was drawn up by the Lambeth Conference, which contained representatives of

all the different branches of the Anglican Church, and many of them have discarded the Thirty-Nine Articles. As regards the Church of England there are two views. The great majority of clergy and theologians would point out that subscription to the Articles is no longer verbal. A clergyman expresses his belief in the teaching of the Church of England as contained in the Articles, the Prayer Book, and the Ordinal, that the Articles were even originally intended to be Articles of comprehension, that they are susceptible of very various interpretations, and that they deal with questions which were more interesting in the sixteenth century than in the twentieth century. We would, therefore, maintain that they have only a subordinate authority, that their interest is very largely historical, and that we have no desire to impose them on anyone else.

A section of the Evangelicals would lay much greater stress on the Articles, and value them as guaranteeing in their opinion the protestantism of the Church of England. I do not think that they do this very effectually and I think that those who claim to value them lay stress on just the parts that appeal to them, and are inclined to insist on their own particular interpretation.

At any rate this is true. On the Atonement, on Justification, on Election, there is no standard teaching accepted by the Church or imposed by the Church. And I would put it to you that this belief in God, in Jesus Christ the Son of God, who for us men and for our salvation came down from heaven, in the Holy Ghost, a belief summed up and formulated in the doctrine of the Trinity, represents the teaching on which the whole Church of England is agreed, and which it puts forward as the basis for Christian Unity.

THE SACRAMENTS.

I now pass to what we shall probably consider more difficult questions—those relating to the Sacraments.

I will begin with two general points. The first is the nature of a Sacrament, and with regard to that I will quote from the *Report on the Ministry and Sacraments* of the Committee of Faith and Order. That Report speaks as follows (pp. 24-25) :

- “ 1. It is our Lord Jesus Christ who accomplishes every Sacrament, and the action of the Ministers of the Church is only instrumental.

- “ 2. God is not bound by His Sacraments.
 “ 3. The Sacraments are efficacious, because by means of them, Christ through his Holy Spirit, effects His Grace in the soul.
 “ 4. The Sacraments are celebrated by the Minister not in any right of his own but as the minister of the Church.”

I do not quote these statements as being the doctrine of the Church of England. They are good theology. They represent the theology of all good theologians, Roman Catholic, Orthodox, Anglican, Protestant. There are many in all Churches who make statements about Sacraments inconsistent with them, and they are bad theologians. Most of the attacks which I read on Sacramental teaching are directed against the bad theology which is not the monopoly of any single Church.

The second point I would speak about is the number of the Sacraments. On that point the Church of England has a very clear statement in the Catechism :

How many Sacraments hath Christ ordained in His Church ?

Answer : Two only, as generally necessary to salvation, that is to say, Baptism, and the Supper of the Lord.

This, if taken with the necessary implications, would represent, I think, an agreed statement. The words “ generally necessary to salvation,” may be taken to mean, “ necessary as the normal and proper means by which God gives men salvation,” and must be taken with the limitation that God is not bound by his Sacraments, and the form of the question clearly does not exclude other rites of a Sacramental character. Many theologians of the Church of England would hold that the term Sacrament might be used in an extended sense of other rites, such as Ordination and Confirmation, for in them we believe that Grace is given to us in answer to the prayers of the Church.

The following statement made by the *Report on the Ministry and Sacraments*, which, as a matter of fact, was drawn up by an Hungarian Calvinist, would, I think, express the normal Anglican attitude :

“ The number of the Sacraments largely depends upon the definitions of the term Sacrament as given by the various Churches, and it does not necessarily represent their devotional life: In most of the Protestant Churches there can be found such devotional acts as correspond to the five other Sacraments

which are taught by the Roman, Orthodox and Old Catholic Churches. Thus Confirmation (in some form), Penance or Discipline, Visitation of the Sick (or Sacramental service to the sick), Ordination, and the Blessing of Marriage can be noted as customs of almost every Church. And even though they are not called Sacraments, nevertheless they are regarded as *instituta Dei utilia*, as the Second Helvetic Confession puts it."

While there are some in the Church of England who would dogmatically say there are only two Sacraments, most theologians would say that there are two Sacraments ordained by Christ himself, and other ordinances which may be called Sacraments, for in them Grace is given in answer to the prayers of the Church, and there is an external act or sign.

BAPTISM.

I now pass to the Sacrament of Baptism, and I had better, I think, come directly to the chief point at issue. There can be no doubt at all. The Church of England believes wholeheartedly in Infant Baptism, and that is true of every party in the Church. The only doubt as far as I know which has ever been expressed is, whether it is right to baptize all the infants brought to Baptism in large understaffed Parishes where there is grave doubt whether the children will be brought up in any proper way. We believe that our Lord bid us bring children to him, and baptism is the way appointed by him.

As I understand it, the first objection that is made is that it requires faith to receive the benefits of a Sacrament, and that therefore the only baptism which could be valid would be a believer's baptism. There is, I think, a good deal of confusion of thought in this. It is not our faith which makes a Sacrament valid, it is our faith which makes it effectual for our own spiritual life. The faith is twofold. It is the faith of the Church as represented by those who bring the child to be baptized and the faith of the baptized as his undertaking increases. In response to this we believe that the child becomes, in the words of the Catechism "a member of Christ, the child of God, and an inheritor of the Kingdom of Heaven." He becomes a member of Christ's Church. He therefore grows up under the influences which that implies. He receives the gift of the Spirit, and as he grows in faith and knowledge, he makes the gift

his own. The teaching of prevenient Grace shows that it is believed that God must work in us before we can respond. We believe that the baptized child receives the gift, and his faith is the response to the gift.

The second objection that is, I understand, raised is that the Church is not a Church of believers. That seems to ignore Confirmation. When anyone is confirmed he publicly confesses his belief in Christ, and until he is confirmed—or ready to be confirmed—he is not admitted to communion nor considered a full and responsible member of the Church. We know that for the greater number of those confirmed, confirmation is a very real religious experience, and means a definite resolve to try to be a good Christian.

I would put it to you then, that the rule of the Church of England, which is the rule of the Catholic Church, is one well fitted for the training of the Christian life, and harmonizes with the best Christian theology.

The parents and God-parents bring the new-born child to be received into Christ's Church. We believe that, as we say in the service, Jesus Christ "will favourably receive this present infant: that he will embrace him with the arms of his mercy, that he will give unto him the blessing of eternal life, and make him partaker of his everlasting kingdom." In the Church he will receive the gift of the Holy Spirit. He will be taught as he grows older the meaning of his baptism and the obligations of the Christian life. His growing faith will respond to the divine gift and make it effectual for himself, and in due time at his Confirmation he will openly confess his faith, and the Church will pray that he may be strengthened with the Holy Ghost the Comforter and daily increase in the manifold gifts of Grace.

I think that this course of life is a good training for the Christian, and where the system is wisely carried out makes good Christians.

THE HOLY COMMUNION.

The teaching of the Church of England on the Holy Communion is expressed clearly in the Catechism.

"What is the inward part or thing signified?"

The Body and Blood of Christ, which are verily and indeed taken and received by the faithful in the Lord's Supper."

And in the Articles :

“ To such as rightly, worthily and with faith, receive the same, the Bread which we break is a partaking of the Body of Christ ; and likewise the Cup of Blessing is a partaking of the Blood of Christ.”

I think these statements would be accepted by everyone in the Church of England who confessed to its teaching. Where there are differences of belief it is as to the definition of the divine presence. On that there is considerable diversity of teaching—some teach the doctrine of the Real Presence, some hold what are called receptionist theories. The Church of England condemns Transubstantiation and condemns Zwinglianism, but gives no further definition. I think that the intention of the Church is to look upon the words of institution as a sufficient statement, to interpret them spiritually, and if asked for a further statement to say that the gift comes from our Lord, and that the manner we cannot understand and need not enquire into.

What I teach my people is that in the Holy Communion our Lord Jesus Christ gives us the spiritual food of his Body and Blood.

THE MINISTRY.

The fourth point in the Lambeth Quadrilateral, is the Historic Episcopate.

The teaching of the Church of England is contained in the Preface to the Ordinal, which states that it is the intention of the Church of England to continue the ministry of Bishops, Priests, and Deacons as it has existed in the Christian Church from the time of the Apostles. That means that Ordination is by laying on of hands with prayer ; that every Bishop should be consecrated by at least three Bishops, and every Priest and Deacon ordained by a lawfully consecrated Bishop. This is and always has been the rule of the Church from a very early period. It says that no one shall officiate as a Bishop or Priest in the Church of England who is not thus consecrated or ordained. The functions and duties of a Christian Minister may be seen from the Ordinal. Most theologians of the Church of England also believe that it is only on the basis of the Historic Episcopate that any effective Christian union can take place.

This is the teaching of the Church. Now I will come to what is not its teaching, and I would speak of the Apostolic Succession. You will see it stated that the Christian ministry is based upon the Apostolic Succession, that from the time of the Apostles, Bishops have been consecrated and have received the Grace of Orders, that thus as through a golden conduit Grace has been handed down from generation to generation, that all those thus validly consecrated receive the grace of orders, and their Sacraments are valid, that those Churches whose ministers are not Episcopally Ordained have neither Orders nor Sacraments.

Now I believe this teaching to be entirely wrong. In the first place, it is not the teaching of the Church of England. It is not contained in any formulary of the Church. There is no reference to the Apostolic Succession in any such formulary—neither in the Articles nor the Prayer Book. In the second place it is not the theory of Apostolic Succession held in the early Church. That taught that the open succession of Bishops in all the different Churches, but especially in those of Apostolic origin, was a guarantee of the authenticity of the tradition which had handed down the Scriptures, the teaching and the customs of the Church. No theory of Succession by Ordination was known at least to the time of St. Augustine. In the third place it implies an erroneous theology of the Sacraments. At an Ordination it is Jesus Christ himself who Ordains. He himself confers the Grace of Orders and the gift of the Holy Spirit. The Bishop is only the instrument. The gift comes from God through Christ in answer to the prayers of the Church and not through any human succession.

I believe, on the other hand, that the Apostolic Succession rightly held is a fact of great value. It is true that there has been a succession of Christian Ministers from the Apostolic times, it is true that they have been ordained and appointed in the Christian Church, according to the rules of the Church. This orderly succession of ministers is a strong guarantee of the unity and continuity of the Church.

The Church of England teaches then that the right form of ministry is the Historic Episcopate, that only on that basis can there be a true Christian unity, but it never condemns the Orders and Sacraments of those religious bodies which do not possess it.

THE CATHOLIC CHURCH.

I postponed speaking on the belief in a Catholic Church because it comes I think best at this point in our discourse. When we say the Creeds we express our belief in the Catholic Church. That means that our Lord founded a society to unite together in one body all his followers. That society is called the Church. It is an organic body. It is based on certain great principles—discipleship, brotherhood, ministry, sacraments. It is called in the Creeds Catholic, Apostolic, Holy, One. It is Catholic because it is intended for the whole world. It is Apostolic because it strives to teach the faith of the Apostles. It is spoken of as Holy because that is what it strives to be and is intended to be. It is spoken of as One, because there can be only one Church in the world, and all Christians should be united in it. We believe that this doctrine is an essential part of Christian teaching, and that the failure to grasp it is one of the causes of Christian division.

We may now try and answer the question whether the Church of England is Catholic or Protestant. The answer that I would give is that it is fundamentally Catholic, and incidentally Protestant. It uses the word Catholic in its formularies, it never uses the word Protestant. The word Catholic means that it claims to be an integral part of that Church which our Lord Jesus Christ came to found, and to possess everything that is essential to the Church. It is incidentally Protestant because it is obliged to protest against the improper claims of the Church of Rome. But that is a negative attribute and would cease to be of any value if Rome renounced her errors.

CONCLUSION.

There are many other points that I might discuss, but I think that I have spoken sufficiently. I shall, however, be very glad to answer any questions that you may ask.

I should like in conclusion to sum up shortly what I believe to be the teaching of the Church of England.

First as to Faith. We believe that Jesus Christ, the Son of God, for us men and our salvation, came down from heaven and became man. He was crucified for us. He thus revealed to us the love of God for man, and taught us that love and

sacrifice must be the principles of the Christian life. This is the Gospel of Jesus Christ.

Secondly, he founded the Christian Church, that it might be the instrument for spreading this Gospel throughout the world, and gave it a ministry. To the Church he gave the command, Go ye unto all the world and preach the Gospel, baptizing them in the Name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost.

Thirdly, for the individual Christian the Church has laid down a rule of life, according to which through Sacraments and Sacramental ordinances his spiritual life is guided and strengthened, Baptism, Confirmation, the Holy Communion, Penance,¹ the Visitation and Communion of the Sick. We believe this system admirably adapted, if it be properly used, for training good Christians in their spiritual life and preparing them for Christian salvation.

¹ From the exhortation in the Communion Service: "Therefore if there be any of you, who by this means cannot quiet his own conscience herein, but requireth further comfort or counsel, let him come to me, or to some other discreet and learned Minister of God's Word, and open his grief; that by the ministry of God's holy Word he may receive the benefit of absolution, together with ghostly counsel and advice, to the quieting of his conscience, and avoiding of all scruple and doubtfulness."

The *Evangelical Interpretation*

REV. H. K. BANKS.

A Paper read at a Clerical Group.

EVANGELICAL Churchmen found their doctrine on the teaching of the Lord Jesus Christ and they appeal in everything to the Scriptures. They do not so much inquire as to what the "Fathers" of the Church have said, but rather as to what is written in the Bible. They would quote Article VI. "Holy Scripture containeth all things necessary to salvation so that whatsoever is not read therein, nor may be proved thereby, is not to be required of any man, that it should be believed as an article of the Faith or be thought requisite or necessary to salvation."

Evangelicals of course are one with all Churchmen in holding the Cardinal doctrines of the Christian Faith.

We do not claim a monopoly of the principles we profess or the doctrines we hold, yet we contend that our system, in its harmony and completeness, is distinctive. Evangelicals are not a corporate body in the sense of having a central office or headquarters, but we are only bound together by the things we believe and our common inheritance.

"Evangelical Churchmen trace their pedigree to the Puritans, the Reformers and the Lollards, to all within the National church who have learned to love a simple worship and a spiritual religion, but as a party their existence dates from the Great Revival of the eighteenth century" (Ball-eine). The name Evangelical was then given to those who, sharing in the blessings of that revival, did not leave but remained faithful to the historical Church.

John Wesley, the son of the rector of Epworth, and himself a priest of the Church of England until his death, had been

influenced from his birth (1703) by a saintly mother and later by Law's "Serious Call to a Devout and Holy Life." William Law was perhaps the greatest of English Mystics, and outstanding as a theologian, but his faith must have been quite a simple matter. He is reported to have said to Wesley, "Religion is the most plain, simple thing in the world. It is only 'We love Him because He first loved us.'" When elected Fellow of Lincoln College, Oxford, Wesley formed a society for the promotion of spiritual life. From the rules and methods of life adopted by its members Wesley and his followers were stigmatized "Methodists." Failing, however, to find by rules and regulations the peace and power he sought and anxious to win peace he sailed for Georgia (1735) and there worked as a missionary among the settlers and natives. Three years later in 1738 John returned from Georgia haunted with a sense of failure.

It is one thing to admit a doctrine to be exegetically sound and quite another thing to experience it personally in the life. Through much study of the Greek New Testament he had an intellectual knowledge of Christianity yet he had no heart knowledge. On May 24th, 1738, Wesley went to a little religious meeting in Aldersgate Street. Someone was reading Luther's Preface to the Epistle to the Romans: and as Wesley sat and listened, for the first time he really grasped the central doctrine of Reformation theology. "I felt my heart strangely warmed," he writes, "I felt I did trust in Christ, Christ alone, for salvation, and an assurance was given me that he had taken away my sins, even mine, and saved me from the law of sin and death!"

This is rightly called his conversion, for it was the turning from Self to Christ. Hitherto in spite of his study of the writings of St. Paul, he had been trying to save himself.

"By my continued endeavour to keep His whole law, inward and outward, to the utmost of my power, I was persuaded that I should be accepted of Him." But now the centre of all things was Christ, not himself and his puny efforts; salvation was not something to be worked and striven for, but a gift to be received from God.

This acceptance by faith of Jesus as a personal Saviour, this knowledge by faith that one's sins are forgiven, which sends a warm glow through the life and heart, this *assurance* is the first and the fundamental mark of an Evangelical.

“ The wind bloweth where it listeth and thou hearest the sound thereof but canst not tell whence it cometh or whither it goeth, so is every one that is born of the Spirit ” (John iii. 8).

Wesley had to wait until he was 38 years of age before he knew that he was saved, but a child can have that same experience. Somewhere about the age of twelve feeling miserable because of sin, striving hard to be good, but failing badly and being very conscious of that failing which was as a burden borne on my shoulders, I heard while at Evening Prayer the Evangelical message of salvation by faith. The Vicar of our Parish asked all in the congregation who felt that they wanted their sins forgiven to kneel and accept as a gift that salvation which was already wrought out by Christ, when on Calvary the Lord laid on Him the sins of us all. I knelt and others knelt around me and I accepted by faith that my sins were forgiven, I accepted Christ as Saviour, I had such an assurance and joy as Wesley experienced and I have had it ever since. From that day I began to be an Evangelical.

“ But salvation includes more than deliverance from the wrath of God, due to sin. It is *the possession of a new life* which involves growth.” It is the possession of Jesus Christ Himself in the soul. At the call of faith He comes and dwells in the soul, to make the soul grow. “ As the babe is born to grow, so the regenerated soul lives to develop.” In both cases the life expands and unfolds as it is nourished within and cultured without. This process of growth or development in the spiritual life is sanctification. The secret efficacy of this process is due to the Holy Spirit’s gracious in-working by which, through the actions of our own wills, Christ is more and more formed in us.

But the inward process has necessarily *an outward expression*, so that sanctification is also the inward Christ more and more manifesting Himself in and through our mortal bodies. Thus sanctification which springs from regeneration and involves justification—the state of perfect acceptance in which we are accounted righteous before God, because of the merits of Christ—issues in service by the consecration of all life’s powers to God. (Denton Thompson : *Central Churchmanship*.)

Those who in the eighteenth century were nicknamed Evangelicals were so named because they had an Evangel, *a glorious message to give*. . . . Unlike the Methodists who in their spiritual zeal and devotion came to disregard all ecclesiastical law and order, the Evangelicals remained in the Church of England and revived it.

As Green in his *History of the English People*, says, "A religious revival burst forth which changed in a few years the whole temper of English Society. The Church was restored to life and activity. Religion carried to the hearts of the poor a fresh spirit of moral zeal, while it purified our literature and our manners. A new philanthropy reformed our prisons, infused clemency and wisdom into our penal laws, abolished the slave trade, and gave the first impulse to popular education."

Because these men knew, in the joy of being saved, the love of God, they loved others: they not only said, "We love because He first loved us," but they were full of zeal not only in all philanthropic working but in making known to others this love of God. This salvation, they themselves received from Him, and self denial and sacrifice was their watchword. One Society after another was founded in rapid succession, as the years rolled on, for the conversion of the world to Christ.

In 1799 the Church Missionary Society at a time when the S.P.G. would not be stirred, The Bible Society in 1804, The Jews' Society in 1809 undertook the task of trying to win the whole Jewish race at home and abroad; and the Colonial and Continental to provide for our people overseas.

In 1780 Raikes started the first Sunday Schools in Gloucester, Wilberforce was converted in 1785 and gave his life in attacking the slave trade which was abolished in 1807.

Later, when the aftermath of the Napoleonic Wars and the Industrial Revolution brought degradation and crime into terrible prominence, a Royal Commission in 1835 emphasized the need for churches and ministers in the large towns and centres of population. Immediately the Evangelicals founded the Church Pastoral Aid Society (1836) for the staffing of parishes, so that the Gospel could be taken to "everyman's door." It is necessary to give these bits of history to show the Evangelicals' stand for Evangelism and the value in God's sight of lost souls which they hold.

Evangelicals further emphasize *the liberty of man's access to God* through Jesus Christ. This access is free and unfettered. It is not confined to time or place. It is not conditioned by the priest, nor is it limited to the Sacraments. At all times and in all places, all may draw nigh to God and hold fellowship with Him, through our Lord Jesus Christ.

We exclude from our minds, as we cannot find it in our Bible, any thought of necessary intervention or mediation by others, e.g., angels or saints, or priests, "Come unto Me" said Jesus. A constant and abiding communion with God is the Christian ideal, and like all true ideals, it is one which is increasingly realizable.

This free and unrestricted liberty of the soul's access to God through Jesus Christ is related to the *ministry*. We do not ignore the sanctity of the ministerial calling nor despise the dignity of its office, but regard the ministry as a divinely-ordered institution. The ministers of the Church in the New Testament are called by many names but the word *ιερευς* is never used. The priesthood is not a sacerdotal order, the Christian ministry is not in any sense a succession of the Temple priesthood.

The word *ιερευς* is not even found in the Christian writings before the close of the second century. There is but one English word for two Greek words *ιερευς* and *πρεσβυτερος* i.e. Priest. Priest is simply the abbreviated form of "Presbyter" or "Elder." The Priest is appointed to act for and with the priesthood of the whole Church. Every layman who belongs to Jesus Christ is a Priest of Christ. "The Priest" is he who is appointed to represent the priesthood of the Church.

We cannot, therefore, regard the clergy as being necessary for the soul's approach to Christ nor as indispensable for forgiveness of sins or fellowship with God. The normal method by which the sinner obtains pardon and peace is by direct and immediate confession to the Lord and by receiving from Him, directly and immediately, forgiveness and absolution.

Evangelical Churchmen emphasize, probably more than do their brethren, the *Covenant aspect of the Sacrament of Baptism*. While recognizing the reality of the regenerating grace on the divine side, we lay becoming stress on the necessity for the co-operating will on the human side. God

will always give, if man will only receive, but for the possession of any gift reception is necessary. It must be remembered that the administration of the Sacraments presupposes faith on the part of the recipients. They are intended for Christian believers only. Although we believe that the Lord "for His part will most surely keep and perform" the promises made and sealed to us, we must see to it that the corresponding conditions on our side of the Covenant are duly observed.

Where those baptized in infancy exhibit no signs of renewal, Evangelicals appeal to them to come to the Saviour. He is already theirs, and they were in fact given to him in Baptism, but they must claim the cleansing which was then covenanted to them: for although signed and sealed by His authority on their behalf they have hitherto failed through lack of faith to possess the promises.

Such beliefs explain *the ritual of the Evangelicals*. We desire to exalt Christ, not ourselves. Evangelicals generally take the North end when administering the Holy Communion, which emphasizes the right of each person to have direct access to God through Jesus Christ alone as mediator.

Evangelicals believe in the "Real Presence" at Holy Communion but not in or under the bread and wine, which still remain bread and wine, but Christ is present in the hearts of those who truly seek Him in that Sacrament. We have Evening Communion. We do not emphasize fasting communion for Christ is not received in the stomach but in the heart, and our Lord instituted the Lord's supper after an evening meal. Only those who receive the Holy Communion rightly, with right desire, receive Jesus Christ. We emphasize the federal or covenant aspect of both of the Sacraments of the Gospel.

There is no mention in our Church of England formularies of *Prayers for the dead*. The Roman Catholic Church teaches and practises Prayers for the dead, but only for those who have died in the faith of the Church, apparently a prayer for their perfecting. Evangelicals look upon Prayers for the dead with grave suspicion. They minimize the need for repentance and faith now; and the solemnity of Judgment after death without further opportunity (Luke xvi. 19-31).

In spite of this, at such times as the present, when hundreds are daily being killed, there is liable to be as in the

last war a revival of this practice. Twice in the forms issued for the day of National Prayer there is such prayer, but there is not a single prayer for all these young conscripts that they may accept the Lord Jesus as their Saviour and enter into that assurance that if they die they shall ever be with the Lord. Such indiscriminate prayers for the dead are an insult to the Saviour who died on the Cross to offer living men full and perfect salvation. "How shall we escape, if we neglect so great salvation" (Heb. ii. 3). To do little or nothing to win men to Christ while they are alive and to emphasize prayers for their souls after they are dead is un-Scriptural and so untrue to the Church of England.

As to *our attitude to Christian people* who are not members of the Church of England, we claim kindred with all who are children of God having a like faith in Jesus Christ with us. They may be called Roman Catholics or Anglo-Catholics, Presbyterians, Methodists, or other Free Churchmen, Salvation Army or any other society, the essential to us is that Christ lives in them and they in Christ. All are one in Christ Jesus. Bishop Crotty writes, "It was on the rock, surely of the plain man, shot through with sin and weakness, as Peter certainly was, and yet redeemed and dedicated—on the foundation simply of the ordinary man, and his confession to God, that Christ chose to build His Church. And that must have shocked a Jewish audience. It is of course, the only rock on which Christ ever could have built his earthly Church. On such as ourselves He builds the only Church He can ever have among us; that it is to such that He alone can look for the earthly building of a better world."

The true Church consists then of the "Peters," justified and sanctified by the grace of God, and consecrated to His service regardless of the body to which they outwardly belong.

That devout churchman, Lord Hugh Cecil, once said, "The glory of Evangelicals lies in their vivid sense of the reality of the relation between man and God, in their strong faith in the Divine mercy, in their passionate devotion to the person of our Lord, in the abundant love of others they display—in short, in the vital character of their Christianity—a good Evangelical deserves the sincere reverence of Christian people. He ranks high among saints."

The Church Conflict in Germany

“EPAPHRODITUS.”

An exiled Member of the Confessional Church.

CONSIDERING how far reaching is this topic I feel I should not give you mere facts although they are important to know: nor yet my own experiences in the Church Conflict: nor yet the theological point of view. I feel there is something still more important and therefore still more interesting underneath all these. I shall try to say something about the innermost things behind the facts and in so doing I hope that you will be enabled to grasp the fact that the German situation concerns also all other Churches throughout the world.

Before the last war the German religious situation did not differ so very much from the English. May be your Church tradition has been a stronger one. But we, too, had an established Church, a so-called Christian State, a so-called Christian Society, Christian Education, etc. Unfortunately, however, all that was more nominal than really Christian, more a bourgeois tradition than a dynamic force. In Church affairs it was more and more only the women and the children (during their confirmation lessons), who were interested: and these only from the middle classes. When about 1913 the Freethinkers started a movement to leave the Church this had no great success, for most people were too indifferent even to leave. The Church became a negligible quantity. Only two millions out of 66 millions actually left the Church. But out of the remaining 64 millions only a small figure attended Church services, very few took the Communion, and still fewer prayed and lived the Gospel.

The Great War brought a change. Not that most people

really found Christ in the war—on the contrary most lost even the little faith they had. But a minority met the living Lord and began to bring others into contact with Him. Then during the last years of war revival began, at first among the Theologians. They led the Church back to face the original questions of the Reformation and to the whole unadulterated New Testament. This return from all surface questions (historical, philological, etc.), to the message of the Gospel itself brought a revolutionary change in the clergy, and through the clergy to the whole Church. We experienced a real revival starting not in the country among the farmers who had the best religious traditions; but in the big towns among the well-educated people and among the labourers; even some of the former socialists and communists became Christian Evangelists. Thus I do not agree with the claim of the Nazis that they saved Germany from Communism. I believe that the climax of the Communist movement was before 1933.

Into the middle of this promising though slow development Hitlerism burst, like a bombshell. Perhaps you will ask, how could so many Germans and even German pastors be impressed at all by the Nazi movement? I do not speak here about policy. But please keep in mind that this movement started as a reaction against the treaty of Versailles. And as regards the Church many of the younger pastors, Niemoeller included, thought at first that the new political wind would blow upon the nominal Church also, and bring new life to the indifference of the sleeping people. The party promised that the decay of culture and of morals should be stopped. Some hoped all Roman-Catholics would join in a united Protestant Church. And as a matter of fact, the Nazi movement has been a very vital power to break down all that was not genuine, all that was mere tradition, all bourgeois customs.

In the beginning it was not clear at all what Hitlerism really was—a purely political movement, or a “weltanschauung,” or a religion? The programme spoke about “positive Christianity” which “the party as such stands for.” It claimed “liberty for all religious denominations so long as they are not a danger to the State and do not militate against the moral feelings of the German race.” What does all that mean?

The answer has been so extremely difficult because the whole Nazi movement seemed so contradictory. It seemed to have, like the old Roman God Janus, two faces each looking in opposite directions. They like to speak (in a confusing manner) about "the victory of faith" or they say, "Never was young Germany so full of faith as our German youth is now." But they use the word "faith" in quite a different sense from the Church. The Nazis used to say, "We leave religion to the Churches, we have no religion of our own, we have only a 'weltanschauung.'" Unfortunately, the word "weltanschauung" cannot be translated (literally, outlook on life and the world) and is not a clear expression in itself. We in the Church knew that it was impossible to have a weltanschauung without touching the religious background. Recently all masks have been dropped. A few quotations from the leaders out of many similar ones will make this clear. Rosenberg writes, "To-day a new faith is awakening, the Mythos of the blood, the belief that it is by blood that the Divine nature of man is to be manifested, the belief that Nordic blood represents that Mystery which has replaced and overcome the ancient Sacraments." Again Hauer says, "For Germans there is no higher revelation of eternal reality than that which has sprung from German soil and the German soul." B. V. Schirach says, "I simply believe in Germany."

"Positive Christianity"? What does it mean? Some idealistic pastors thought at first that it meant real Christianity as the Church has always taught it. But Goebbels said: "No, you in the Church have only taught it, we practise it, see our winter relief." And Rosenberg (whom Hitler appointed the leader of all educational work on the foundation of the Nazi-Weltanschauung), writing in his well-known book, *The Mythos of the Twentieth Century*, in which he mingles paganism, intellectual enlightenment, and a nebulous mystic view, comes to the conclusion that Positive Christianity is just the opposite to all that the Christian Churches have ever preached and taught, namely a new (or old) paganism.

What of Hitler himself? There are many Germans and I suppose also people abroad who prefer to think, Hitler himself does not want all that. In 1933 in three Berlin churches there stood on the Holy Communion Tables instead

of the Cross, pictures of Hitler, but he let us know that he did not agree. In his book, and in his public speeches he is very reserved in regard to religious questions. He sometimes mentions the Almighty or Providence. But why, since January 1934, has he given Rosenberg full power to educate youth? Does he really not know what his followers teach? In the last year one of the old fighters, K. Luedicke, edited a book—*I Knew Hitler*. The writer is not a Christian. He reveals in this book, as far as I know, for the first time, that Hitler was already in 1932 a definite enemy of Christianity. Hitler said to a small circle of friends that it was not political tactics to fight against Christianity in public at that time, for the masses cannot stand having too many enemies at once. At the beginning it was enough that they should fight against Marxists and Jews, later against reaction, and finally against Christianity. He left no doubt that with his coming to power Christianity would be overcome by the German Church—a Church without a spiritual Head and without a Bible. He even accused Christ (or at least the Christ of the Church), of having spoiled the German race by weakening it and the whole world. The highest standard of the party is not Christ but the German race.

According to this doctrine Kerl, the so-called State Minister of Church affairs, says: "A new authority has arisen as to what Christ and Christianity really are—Adolf Hitler." It is from such an estimate of Hitler that the greeting, "Heil Hitler" (which all Germans are obliged to say wherever they meet one another), gets its real meaning; it is the imitation of the *Ave Caesar* of the pagan Romans. This Totalitarianism is a religion and therefore it claims a new worship. Ley, the leader of the German Labour Front, consequently says: "The Party claims the totality of the soul of the German people. It cannot and will not suffer another party or point of view to dominate Germany. We believe that the German people can become eternal only through National-Socialism, and therefore we need every German, whether Protestant or Catholic."

Thus this new paganism is different from and worse than the primitive paganism in Africa or the Far East. For the Nazi leaders have been christianized and they should know what real Christianity means. They are anti-christian.

Either the Christians are right in saying as we all do, "Hitler's revolution took place in A.D. 1933 (after Christ)—or Jesus Christ was born 1933 B.H. (before Hitler). That is the point. It was not the Church which began to say: Christ *or* Hitler. The Church didn't think of such an alternative. It was the Nazis who did it and forced the Church to answer.

Thus the Church in Germany had to face a very difficult situation. (I speak here of the Protestant Church. But in some way, I think, it applies also to the Roman Catholic Church, although her inner position has not been touched and changed as much as the Protestant Church. The Catholics had not German Christians in their midst but rather a wing who tried to be both—Nazis and Catholics.)

But what could we do? What has been done? As a matter of fact all possible ways have been tried.

Firstly, there were Yes-men agreeing to National Socialism, either out of conviction or out of mass suggestion or out of opportunism. Political fanatics put the State above the Church, and National-Socialist weltanschauung above Christianity, some of them without a clear consciousness. They built up a new theology as an apology for National Socialism at any cost, partly denying all that they had taught before. The German Christians (Hitler himself gave them this name), underlined the first part of their name "German" so much that the other part "Christian" scarcely was to be heard. They did not or could not realize that they are not as they pretend to be a Church party, but nothing else than the lengthened arm of the political party within the Protestant Church, a means of introducing paganism into the Church and to identify ("gleichzuschalten") the Church with National-Socialism as all other institutions and corporations had been identified.

The idealists among the German Christians hoped that their Christianity would influence the party. Their eyes were holden that they should not know. . . . They trusted Hitler and his words without the least doubt, although his real meaning was clear to all who could see.

Secondly the majority of the clergy belong to a group who prefer to remain neutral. Some certainly because they thought it safer not to make a decision, but to wait and see. Some are as idealistic as those of whom I spoke among the

German Christian front. It is not natural for them to fight as others do. They are more "pacifists," not simply out of cowardice but also out of piety. Most of them probably stand behind the Confessional front in their hearts. But they don't show their hearts, and therefore outwardly they are no weight in the conflict. They preach the Gospel, but in a harmless way, ignoring the present situation. They speak the language in the pulpit which has been spoken for many centuries, timeless, without any challenge to the hearers. Actually they give assistance to those who say (in Germany as well as in Russia), "Faith is only a matter of the inner life, or the soul: it must have no expression and no contact with daily life, for that belongs to the State."

Thirdly, there is the so-called Confessional Church. They feel that the situation in Germany is a challenge, that neutrality is impossible. They feel the inevitable task is to fight and to confess.

We have to admit that this front is not absolutely united. There are different sections, each understressing a special side of the one front. Naturally the different sections touch each other. Some of the younger clergy, to be quite honest, are or were fighting because they enjoy it. Some are idealists who have previously been National Socialists and were disappointed by the development of the movement. They may not be quite free from resentment. Some are fighting very bravely indeed, but sometimes more in the way of the Old Testament than of the New Testament, influenced by the rigorous Calvinistic theology. They feel the necessity of rebuking the authorities in public for their wickedness. They resemble the prophet Nathan blaming King David for his immorality.

Why do they call themselves the "Confessional Church"? This expression is perhaps misunderstood. Goebbels' propaganda has for six years tried to make both the German and other people think that it is more or less a mere wild struggle of theologians for their particular dogma. The theologians are, that is true, responsible to see that the basis of Christ's Church is not changed by any power of the world. All confessions of the Creed, even those in the Old Church, were formulated against some special heresy in order to make clear (so far as the mystery can be cleared), what Christianity is and what it is not. Thus the German Confessional Church

had to form a new Creed against the new heresy of State Totalitarianism, that is against the claim that there could be any other fact in the course of history either alike or more important than the coming of Jesus Christ to earth.

The original name was not "Confessional" but "Confessing" Church. That means that they are confessors, confessing their faith by deeds as well as by words. They did so, and so they do still.

May I tell you briefly about one instance. There was a place about a hundred miles from Berlin. The excellent pastor had been imprisoned for a long time because he refused to leave his congregation. The Confessional Church of the whole Province decided to have an intercession service in this little town. From almost all the Confessing congregations delegations came, pastors and laymen, hundreds and hundreds: by train, bus and car. The Police did not allow us to enter the Church. So the clergy, about three hundred, changed into their robes in their cars, and suddenly they were all standing in the market place in their cassocks. The market was crowded with people. In the presence of the whole town and of the authorities, who did not dare to destroy us, an improvised service began in the open air. We sang our old hymns of the Reformation time, we prayed and listened to the words of Holy Scripture.

You can hardly imagine how glorious such a meeting was. We realized in some way what the early Christians must have experienced, as the "Acts of the Apostles" describes it.

The Confessional Church tried to manifest her confession by words and deeds and—by suffering. It was not easy to watch the influence of the Church restricted more and more in our country, although Hitler had said in March 1933: "The National-Socialist Government thinks that the two Christian Churches are the most important auxiliary agencies for the preservation of our National individuality. Their rights shall not be touched." They were not only touched but cut away, one after another. A German Christian Church Government was forced upon the Church by the State. Their finances were taken over and the Church could not collect funds for her own purposes. It is true that until now the State has left us most Church buildings, though not all: but one stone after another has been taken from the Church. It was not easy to yield the historical forms of our

Church (though perhaps this had to be), but to see the influence of the Christian Churches on the commonsense of the country, especially on that of youth, replaced in every way by the new paganism, that was heartbreaking indeed, and could not be given away without any protest or struggle.

You can imagine what all that cost in fighting and in suffering for a man like Martin Niemoeller. There was in 1935 a very remarkable meeting of Church leaders with Hitler. It was the only time that Hitler met Niemoeller. Unfortunately, Niemoeller could not say much to Hitler. But when Hitler, in his address said: "Look you after your Church, I shall look after the State." Niemoeller replied: "You cannot take from us the responsibility we have for our people and the State." Surely Hitler has never forgotten those words.

Just two years ago I wrote to Martin Niemoeller. He was in prison, but not yet in a concentration camp. I compared him with John the Baptist, who was also imprisoned because he ventured to speak the truth. You all know how for nearly three years this brave man has suffered. Let us not, however, forget others, who are less known. For instance, the Bavarian pastor Steinbauer and several laymen. I know of a clergyman and a layman, who were both killed in a concentration camp after a terrible time of torture.

What has happened since the outbreak of War I do not know. But one thing I do know. The old word is still true to-day: "Ye thought evil against me, but God meant it for good." I can say that never have the Church and clergy in Germany been respected so much as they are now, even by their bitterest enemies. In the prison in which I was for a short time, I met a simple man who had been in a concentration camp for nineteen months. He had left the Church, as he told me, because the Church, at first, did not speak the truth about Hitlerism, but having met nineteen pastors in his prison he promised to re-enter the Church. Likewise a Danish labourer who had had no contact with his Church for years and years, read the life of Niemoeller, and came back to his faith. These are only examples.

When I spoke recently on the German Church Conflict, an English minister asked me if there were real prayers within the Confessional Church. I must confess that I was shamed .

by this question. How could there be such a fight in the Church without prayer? I am glad to be able to say that never since the Reformation have so many Christians prayed so earnestly as they have now for six years. For instance, in the Church of Niemoeller in Dahlem, there has been an intercession service for him every day since July 1937, and the praying congregation has been large every evening. All Confessional congregations have their prayer circles. Because large meetings are not allowed they gather together in small meetings of ten to thirty people in private houses to read the Bible and to pray.

These prayer circles are, I suppose, the last and certainly the most important section and work of the Church. You do not see very much of them. They are hidden, and people from other fronts may be part of this section too. These small hidden circles are the very heart of the Church and of the German people. They wait for the Kingdom of our Lord, knowing that the sufferings of this present time are not worthy to be compared with the glory which shall be revealed.

The sufferings of the real Christians in Germany can be neither useless nor fruitless, any more than in Russia. We share the experience of the "little flock." The big battalions do not count in the presence of God. There is a layman who has all along been the soul of godly resistance in our district. He strengthens even the pastors and their wives to stand, when temptation is assailing them. One really faithful man (or woman) can hold the whole front. This last section of the German Church is not bound to any country. It should be supported, we claim, by the prayers of the whole militant Church. Nobody can wish other countries a similar conflict between State and Church as we are experiencing. Nevertheless we would not miss it in spite of all the troubles and temptations! It has awakened our Church out of her long continued secularization. Ought not the true Church to be suffering and fighting much more than our usual Churches? Is not the Gospel power, i.e. dynamite—causing an upheaval—a convulsion of public opinion in its attitude to the eternal things of Truth and Love!

A Scot Seeks God

ARTHUR N. PRIOR, M.A.

THOMAS HALYBURTON was born in 1674, and died in 1712. He was thus fourteen years of age—at the beginning of his adult life—when the “Glorious Revolution” of 1688 put an end to the persecutions under which Scottish Presbyterianism had suffered. He came, as it were, at the tail-end of the Covenanters (he spent part of his boyhood as a refugee in Holland), and was one of the first figures of the new period—the century of theological “rationalism” and also of pietist and Methodist “enthusiasm.” His writings, though they breathe the spirit of the earlier period, also bear the impress of both aspects of the new time. On the one hand, in his controversial writings, his main enemies are not Roman Catholics, as was the case with the Reformers, or Armenians and Episcopalians, as with the Covenanters, but Deists and Atheists. He is one of Scotland’s first “apologists.” On the other hand, he appears in his *Memoirs* as one of Scotland’s first religious autobiographers.

Earlier Scottish Calvinists were not complete strangers to “religious psychology,” to the introspective study of “religious experience.” The letters of John Knox, and later of Samuel Rutherford, beside countless passages in their more purely dogmatic works, indicate their familiarity with the intimate work of God, and of the devil, in the human soul, and their skill in handling such “psychological” material. But they did not concentrate on this aspect of Christianity so much as to write religious autobiographies. They quoted Augustine even more frequently than they did Calvin, but his dogmatic and controversial works rather than his “Confessions.” Halyburton’s *Memoirs* definitely mark the beginning of something new in Scottish Christianity.

Halyburton was sufficiently steeped in the thought of the Reformers and Covenanters to be wary of making the progress of his own religious experience a standard for that of

others. He believed that he could trace in his own life a divine guidance and a divine education, but he also believed that it was specially adapted to his own personal needs which were not necessarily those of others. He regarded his childhood as having been passed in alienation from God, but he admitted that among Christians there were "instances of the early efficacy of sanctifying grace," though he believed them to be "few and rare"¹ I do not know how strongly he would have protested if we had disputed with him the "few and rare" part of this statement, and had suggested that the frequency of cases such as his was largely due to wrong ways of presenting God's claims to children; but the important fact is that he did not make his own experience a universal rule. At a later period he had such a vivid conviction of God's love towards him that he was for days like one in a dream; but this too, he did not take for granted as something universal and "normal," but looked for what special "gracious designs," suited to his own needs at the time, God had in giving him such a conviction in such a form.

At the same time, he did not simply attempt to produce a literary or psychological document that would be of interest to persons of a particular "type" but not to anyone else. In his Preface to these *Memoirs*, Dr. Isaac Watts the hymn-writer says: "Every transcript of the Gospel in the heart of a Christian is a new argument to confirm it." Precisely because Halyburton saw so clearly what was individual in his religious experience, he saw what was universal, and knew how to extract the universal from the individual, and to find in *his* pathway things that would be illuminating even for those who might travel by quite a different road. And he was able to do this because he looked at his whole life in the light of the Bible, because he read the Bible as a book about himself, "God's truth" about himself.

In the nineteenth century, F. D. Maurice protested against the way in which orthodox Protestants of his day tended to put the men of the Bible "at an immeasurable distance from us," and pointed out that "Augustine, and Luther, and Knox, delighted to read their own temptations into the temptations of Noah and Abraham."² Knox, indeed, quite

¹ *Memoirs of the Rev. Thomas Halyburton*, 1824 Edition. p. 65.

² F. D. Maurice, *The Patriarchs and Lawgivers of the Old Testament*, p. x.

bluntly described it as the devil's work to put the men of the Bible "at an immeasurable distance from us." "Yf we desire," he wrote, "to be delyverit frome trubill and anguisse of conscience, with David and Job, suddenlie can the Devill object, What apperteneth thair exempil unto thee? They had many notabill and singular vertewis whilk thow lackest. . . . By these meanis can he who is the accuser of us and of our brethrene, ever find out sum craftie accusatioun to trubill the weak conscience of the afflicted."¹ In Halyburton the kind of "dry rot" of which Maurice complained had certainly not yet set in. Hardly a single experience, and hardly a single "lesson" from an experience, is set down in his *Memoirs* without being followed by a Biblical quotation, almost always a singularly apt one.

Maurice was particularly anxious that the story of the *Fall* should not be subjected to this treatment of being "put at a distance from us," and saw an especially strong temptation in orthodox theology to believe that "Adam, in his paradisaical state, must have been under a law so different from ours, that to bring our knowledge of ourselves or of others to bear upon the subject, is scarcely reverent or safe." Halyburton's views on Adam's original state of innocence were certainly orthodox. In some notes included in his *Memoirs*, he compares Adam's original state to a happy life around the fireside of a home, and our present fallen state to a journey outside in the dark and the cold. But when he warms up to his essential subject, he is sufficiently forgetful of any deductions that may be drawn from this, to use the story of Adam's fall to illuminate his own life-story without hesitation. When any divine command was revealed "that I could not evade, nor pretend to, then I was ready to question, whether he that offered it were not mistaken, 'and secretly questioned the truth'; following the measures Satan took with Eve, 'Yea, hath God said, Ye shall not eat of every tree of the garden.' And again, 'Ye shall not surely die.'"

The actual story of the *Memoirs* begins with Halyburton's early childhood, of which he speaks in the same harsh manner as Augustine. "The bent of my soul, from a child, was set against the Lord." It is hard not to feel something strange and unnatural about this; but we should remember that

¹ *The Works of John Knox*, Laing's Edition, Vol. III, p. 148.

Halyburton died when he was not yet forty, that he seems to have been very precocious, and above all that he was conscious—and why should we not believe him about this?—of an essential continuity between the earliest time he could remember and his later boyhood and youth. He looked back and saw himself at the beginning of manhood, living with alternating periods of moral indifference and futile attempts to live rightly on a wrong basis, and of this state of mind he saw no definite beginning—certainly his early childhood was not *radically* different.

During this period he was essentially a “man under the Law.” Sometimes he tried to obey the Law, and failed; sometimes he did not even try, or glossed over his failures by means of one sophistry or another. Brought up in a strictly Evangelical household, he could hardly help hearing of “justification by faith,” but faith itself was but a “Law” to him. He was much troubled by doubts of God’s existence, and of the divine inspiration of the Scriptures, and spent much time in attempts to prove these things to his own satisfaction. And above all, his “faith” and his obedience, such as they were, sprang out of selfishness. “Self was the animating principle of any form of religion that I had. So much of it, as would save me from hell, or take me to heaven, and no more I desire.” “Self was the spring of all. My only aim was to be saved, without any regard I had to the glory of God, or any inquiry made, how it might be consistent with it to save one who had so deeply offended.”

Then, to “pull himself together,” he made a personal “covenant” with God. “I found this way of covenanting with God recommended by ministers, mentioned in Scripture, and the people of God declared they had found the benefit of it.” But not much good was done to him by it. He fell again and again, from his high resolves, and desperately repeated the making of “covenants,” and wondered why it was so useless. Looking back, he saw his fault in the fact that “‘Being ignorant of the righteousness of God, I still went about to establish a righteousness of my own.’ And though in words I renounced this, yet indeed I sought righteousness and peace, not in the Lord Jesus Christ, who ‘is the end of the law for righteousness to everyone that believes,’ but in my own covenants and engagements; so that I really put them in Christ’s stead.” We cannot overcome

Self by a technique, even by an "evangelical" technique.

How and when did Halyburton rise from this morass? He says, he does not know. "I cannot be very positive about the day or hour of this deliverance, nor can I answer many other questions about the way and manner of it. But this is of no consequence, if the work is in substance sound: For 'the wind bloweth where it listeth, and thou hearest the sound thereof, but canst not tell whence it cometh, and whither it goeth: so is every one that is born of the Spirit.'" Are not people eager to know "the day and the hour" of such happenings, only because they wish to use the findings of "religious psychology" to evolve a technique for receiving the Spirit? Halyburton had no interest in helping forward such enterprises. The one thing his experience had taught him was their utter futility.

One thing alone was clear, that Christianity had come quite suddenly to mean something completely different from what it had meant before. The root of everything else was "a discovery of the Lord, as manifested in his Word." He was able to approach God as a merciful Father, because he saw that God did not look upon him as he was in himself, but as he was "in Christ." "He who had before rejected all that I could offer, was well pleased in the beloved." The mercy of God became real to him because he saw in the work of Christ the answer to a question which before he had hardly been humble enough even to ask—how God *could* be merciful to him in consistency with His own glory and honour. In the work of Christ "full provision was made for all the concerns of God's glory, and my salvation in subordination thereto."

"All these discoveries," he continues, "were conveyed to me by the Word." Not by some single striking text, as in the case of Augustine, but "by the concurring light of a great many of the promises and testimonies of the Word seasonably sent home." It was the main "drift" of the whole Bible rather than merely an arbitrarily-selected part of it that thus impressed him as such a message of mercy. Nor was the actual letter of what he read strange to him—on the contrary, it was only too familiar—but now it was lit up by the light of God Himself speaking through it. He describes this "light" in some detail; not the least interesting element in his description is his statement, "It was

composing : it did not, like a flash of lightning, suddenly appear, and fill the soul only with amazement and fear ; but composed and quieted my soul, and put all my faculties in a due posture, as it were, and gave me the exercise of them." This particular aspect of " God's way with man " seems to have always impressed Halyburton very deeply ; for example, even in the long period of stumbling in the darkness which another man might have thought completely wasted, he saw a sign of the " astonishing patience of God," Who " did not seek, as it were, to entangle the affections, and by them carry my mind away in a hurry, as sin and Satan are wont to do, who guides sinners as the Philistines did Samson they first put out his eyes, and then made him grind their mill."

Detailing the aspects or fruits of this changed attitude, he mentions what an entirely different meaning " repentance " came to have for him. Previously it had been fundamentally a result of fear, but it was now the kind of shame that goes with a gratitude which fails to express itself worthily. " In its rise, sorrow formerly flowed from discoveries of sin, as it brings on wrath ; now it flowed from a sense of sin, as containing wretched unkindness in one, who was astonishingly kind to an unworthy wretch." And such " sorrow " he found considerably more fruitful in real amendment of life. God " made me see with wonder, how one view of forgiveness and pardoning mercy alienates the soul from sin, more than twenty sights, nay, tastes of hell, which Pelagians cannot understand." Calvinism has often been charged with making the fear of hell the basis of morality. But to Halyburton's remarks on the right and the wrong kind of repentance, parallels may be found in countless writings of the period that preceded him. John Knox, for example, says that the difference between the spurious faith which the " reprobate " sometimes have and the genuine faith of the " elect " consists precisely in the fact that the former merely " in a feare and terror, do seke some meanes to please God, for the avoiding of his vengeance."¹

Further, there arose in him " an humble, but sweet and comfortable hope, and persuasion of my own salvation." This " gospel-assurance " did not arise or remain when he contemplated himself or anything within himself—how

¹ *John Knox, Works*, Vol. V. p. 255.

could it?—but it was an assurance of the complete dependability and trustworthiness of Christ, whenever His work was contemplated. “Whenever the glory of the Lord was revealed, and he spake peace, I was hereon filled with shame, and the deeper this humiliation was, still the humble confidence of my safety increased.”

Where would a religious autobiography—especially one of the “twice-born” type of person which the Calvinist is commonly assumed to be—come to an end, if not here? But Halyburton does not end here. For a period, indeed, his whole soul seemed filled with nothing but this new “discovery of the Lord.” But this period, as he realized when he looked back upon it, was something abnormal, which God had given to him for His own reasons. “I was sore wounded and broken before, and the Lord did this in tenderness.” “I had been plunged into grievous and hard thoughts of him, as one who had ‘in anger shut up his tender mercies, and forgotten to be gracious’; and I was not easily induced to believe good tidings, for I had forgotten prosperity; and though it was told me, I could not believe, partly for joy, and partly for fear, till I got a clear sight of the waggons and provisions (as with Jacob), and then my spirit revived; and the Lord satisfied me in deep condescension, that he was real, and in earnest.” “He knew what a wilderness I had to go through, and therefore led me not into that long and weary journey till he had made me eat once and again, as did Elijah.”

“But, alas! I understood not this, and by my ignorance I was cast into sad mistakes. I fancied this world would last always; I ravingly talked of tabernacles, with the disciples on the mount.” “I dreamed no more of fighting corruptions; but thought that the enemies that appeared not were dead.” “I resolved to impose such restraints upon myself, and confine myself to such a course of walking, as neither our circumstances, temptations, nor our duty in this world allow. I remember, I could not endure to read these books which were really proper and necessary to be read, and all the time employed in them I reckoned as lost. . . . Yea, I began to grudge and feel compunction about the time spent in necessary refreshment of the body by meat and sleep. . . . The devil secretly drove me from one extreme to another; and he knew full well that I would not hold here,

and that he would easily get me cast into another extreme, to assume a latitude beyond what was due. Thus I was well nigh entangled in that yoke of bondage which the Lord had so lately broken." Worst of all, the moral change for the better which accompanied his new religious attitude, he began to regard as "more mine own than really it was."

Rapidly, and naturally enough, his exaltation gave place to a certain "flatness," and he wondered why. He accused God of unfaithfulness, and then cursed himself for doing so. But he had, fortunately, learned enough to pass beyond such feelings, and to trust in the God who was "educating" him, even when He "hid his face." From his very despondency and "flatness" he learned many things. "By this the Lord taught me the nature of that state in which we are here, that it is a wilderness, a warfare, and that we must all be soldiers, if we mean to be Christians." Later on he confesses to having been able to learn something from St. Francis de Sales, so he would probably not be greatly shocked if his observations on this part of his life were compared to a passage in one of the "Spiritual Letters" of the late Abbot Chapman of Downside, who says: "There are two states in which the soul can be; consolation and aridity. . . . Let us be satisfied with either; whatever God gives is best. But if we are to choose, I should say perhaps that the last is better . . . ; it keeps us humble."

What Halyburton also learned in and from his "aridity" was that "the grace that is sufficient for us, is not in our hands, but in the Lord's; and that therefore our security with respect to future temptations, is not grace already received, but in this, that there is enough in the promise, and the way patent to the throne of grace for it." If Calvinism has any special contribution to make to religious psychology, I should say that it lies exactly here—unless, indeed, this "contribution" is the negation and end of all religious psychology. One finds the same idea expressed in the sermons of the nineteenth century eccentric Hermann Friedrich Köhlbrugge, who has influenced Karl Barth, and has also helped to make "Barthians" of many modern Dutchmen. Preaching on a text in the first Epistle of Peter, Köhlbrugge says, "You may perhaps ask why the apostle here says, 'Grace and peace be multiplied unto you'; as if grace and peace were not enough in themselves . . . or as

if we could be partakers of grace and peace, without partaking of them abundantly. We must not forget, my beloved friends, that . . . such an apostolic epistle comes to us at a time when the heart is exposed to all the darts of the wicked one, to unbelieving, yea, even to rebellious thoughts; and alas! how are we then a prey to uncertainty! . . . We have grace and peace, but when we are under trouble and trial, how is the grace already received obscured by the clouds of sin, and the soul's peace, the peace of God, disturbed through suffering! How could we be delivered from this state, if God did not cause *abundant* grace to flow to us? . . . If we were always faithful in using the grace already received, if we walked in continual peace with God, through the strength of the peace already enjoyed, we should have no need of such an epistle as this to be written to us. But such an epistle is greatly needed by us."¹

I suspect that it is in fact very common for Calvinists to learn this truth in exactly the same way as Halyburton learned it—by undergoing a fairly definite religious "crisis" or "conversion" and then falling "flat" and even feeling revulsion towards what has happened. "Rabbi" Duncan, for example, Scottish missionary to the Hungarian Jews, wrote: "That moment, when I was conscious of a revulsion against my renovation, has entered as a *fact* into all my subsequent theologizing."²

He knew too, however, that men might learn what he had learned in other ways. "When men come to adopt a stereotyped manner of recognizing God, or of conversion to Him, you may be sure there is some human conceit in it." In the words of one of the main text-books now used in Scottish divinity schools, we cannot "confine the Spirit of God to one stereotyped method of bringing men into living fellowship with Himself."³ With this, as has already been pointed out, Halyburton would certainly have agreed; but the experience of such men as he and Duncan is perhaps "crucial" for Calvinism, in so far as it is one of which nothing but the Calvinist doctrine of "grace all along the line" seems to make sense.

¹ H. F. Köhlbrugge, *Sermons on the First Epistle of Peter*, 1856, pp. 15.

² *Colloquia Peripatetica: Being Notes of Conversations with the late John Duncan, LL.D.*, p. 77.

³ J. Dickie, *The Organism of Christian Truth*, pp. 386-7.

Inter-communion
or
Shall the Family Feast Together ?

REV. MARK SALISBURY, LL.D.¹

I

THE meaning of the term Inter-communion is, I take it, liberty to members of two or more churches to participate as recipients at the Holy Communion services of the other churches, either freely, or subject to certain conditions. The term might conceivably be used to include participation as officiant also, but seems ordinarily not to bear that more extensive meaning.

The implication of the term is clearly that the churches concerned are separate churches, each one acknowledging the others more or less stiffly or cordially as true churches, i.e., as really part of Christ's Body. This position amounts to a federation of separate churches each of which is a distinct entity.

Such a position is quite different from, e.g., the position of the proposed S. India Church, which is intended to incorporate the uniting churches into one regional church, every member of which, both ordained and lay, is to enjoy full rights as such in the one united church, although uniformity of worship and of mode of ordination of the original ministry will not prevail at first. There will therefore be full communion, not inter-communion, from the very outset in the S. India Church and this will apply to officiants as well as to recipients.

¹ The Anglican Evangelical Group Movement has provided outlines for the study of this subject. Corporate sense suggests that we should use them, and the writer gratefully acknowledges the valuable guidance they afford.

Picture next three possibilities :

- (a) One Church like the future S. I. Church in which there is communion as an inherent right to all within the one church, officiants as well as recipients ;
- (b) a federation of churches permitting inter-communion to recipients ;
- (c) a number of churches within the same area, e.g., England, not allowing inter-communion at all.

The last and poorest of the three is the lamentable position still prevailing in England while the young churches of India are about to exemplify to us the first and best.

Before we turn to the theological differences (odious term !) which still hinder Inter-communion in this year of grace, let us notice a refreshing and simple matter. Most Free Churches welcome to Holy Communion any professing Christians who desire to come. That seems to the writer the only sound Christian attitude to adopt as between men and women who expect to meet in the life of the world to come, and are already practising members of Christ's Church Militant here on earth. Our rule that we may not actually refuse anyone who presents himself unless he is an open and notorious evil liver, or is in hatred and enmity with another, or is a member of a recognized heretical body, but that we may not invite members of other churches, is much stiffer and colder. In fact, it is in a totally different category and must be an offence and hindrance to the church unity so urgently needed.

II

We will now consider the theological differences which hinder Inter-communion, and the viewpoints of different parties within our own Church.

The main hindrances appear to be :

- (1) the contention that a priest with " valid orders " is essential to the administration of Holy Communion ;
- (2) contentions as to what is requisite for what are called " valid orders," sub-dividing into further contentions

- as regards (a) what is either "the" or "a" true church and (b) the mode of ordination ;
- (3) contentions as to the meaning and effect of the Consecration Prayer.

Incidental and temperamental hindrances exist too, of course, e.g., the type of service, posture of recipient, hour of service, and the plea for fasting attendance.

The Free Churches of England are not trammelled by such proud claims as those just mentioned, and are therefore in a favourable position for negotiation towards Union as well as Inter-communion. Many of us think that such a beginning at home is the natural and best practical policy, and we do not fear that relations with these churches would prejudice later negotiation with the older churches, for no negotiation with them can succeed till they are ready to abandon their arrogant and exclusive claims.

Points of view within our own church are in great contrast. The Evangelical delights in Bishop Lightfoot's *Dissertation on the Christian Ministry*, the opening paragraph of which runs :

"The Kingdom of Christ, not being a Kingdom of this world, is not limited by the restrictions which fetter other societies, political or religious. It is in the fullest sense free, comprehensive, universal. It displays this character, not only in the acceptance of all comers who seek admission, irrespective of race or caste or sex, but also in the instruction and treatment of those who are already its members. It has no sacred days or seasons, no special sanctuaries, because every time and every place alike are holy. *Above all it has no sacerdotal system.* It interposes no sacrificial tribe or class between God and man, by whose intervention alone God is reconciled and man forgiven. Each individual member holds personal communion with the Divine Head. To Him immediately he is responsible, and from Him directly he obtains pardon and draws strength."

The Evangelical believes, too, as Article 29 puts it, that the Church exists where the pure Word of God is preached and the Sacraments be duly administered. He believes Our Lord's words, "By their fruits ye shall know them," and that a church producing Apostolic fruits, as all

the great Free Churches are evidently doing, must be part of the Apostolic Church. He believes, as Dean Inge said, that the Apostolic Succession is in the Saints, the whole church, not only in a part of it. He places no reliance upon a physical continuity of the Ministry "as it were in a golden channel," nor does he cling to any such thing for the future, but rather believes, as Archbishop Whately put it (*Apostolic Succession Considered*, p. 95), that in rough ages, irregularities vitiating strict legal succession, are certain to have occurred from time to time, so that in fact no formal Apostolic Succession of Orders is likely to exist and certainly could not be relied upon. He welcomes too, the words of the judicious Hooker, "Neither God's being Author of laws for the government of His Church, nor His committing them unto Scripture, is any reason sufficient wherefore all Churches should be forever bound to keep them without change . . . Matters of ecclesiastical polity are not so strictly or everlastingly commanded in Scripture, but that unto the complete form of Church Polity much may be requisite which the Scripture teacheth not, and much which it hath taught become unrequisite, sometime because we need not use it, sometime also because we cannot (Ecclesiastical Polity, Book III, chapters x, xi).

To sum up the Evangelical's point of view—while fully recognizing the need for a duly authorized ministry, he smiles at the idea that any particular form of it—a *fortiori* that any special mode of transmitting it—is of the *esse* of the church, and so is in a favourable position to negotiate with other churches.

The Anglo-catholic adopts quite a different point of view, leading to quite different results. Though unable any longer either to deny that the Preface to the Ordinal goes too far or to claim that the threefold ministry can be traced back to New Testament times, he still clings to the idea that Episcopacy is of the essence of the Church and that consequently a non-episcopal body is not part of the Church, and that its sacraments cannot be valid. He cannot see that the Levitical Priesthood failed and that the High Priest, who offered Himself on the Cross as the one full, perfect and sufficient sacrifice, oblation and satisfaction for the sins of the whole world was not of the Levitical Order at all, but was of the Order of Melchisedec, as the author of

the epistle to the Hebrews magnificently expresses it. His splendid zeal for solidarity and continuity mis-leads the Anglo-catholic into a craving for a physical connection with the Jewish Church. So he adopts a simple and logical conception, devastatingly fascinating and easy to understand, fatally divisive in its effects, serving no useful purpose at all, definitely without a particle of support from anything in our Blessed Lord's recorded teaching or even that of any Apostle, and seeming to many wholly inconsistent with and miserably repugnant to the spiritual nature of Christ's Kingdom and all He taught.

This type of churchmanship has gone much further. Completely passing over Our Lord's teaching, and example in action, that they that are whole need not a physician but they that are sick, it firmly refuses to admit even well-meaning and good-living members of what it deems imperfect churches to that fellowship which would most help them! This error is surely clear in another way. In the Prayer of Humble Approach we acknowledge in the course of every Holy Communion service that we do not come trusting in our own righteousness. This surely includes all technical, legalistic claims about Orders, and reveals once again the completely false line adopted.

The Central Churchman, I suppose, while not holding the legalistic ideas of the Anglo-catholic as to Church and Priesthood quite so strongly, nevertheless believes in some analogy of the Levitical rule for the Jewish Priesthood, that Episcopal ordination creates a sort of Priestly caste, certainly that Apostolic Succession is in the threefold ministry, that our orders are valid in that sense and should by all means be preserved by insistence upon Episcopal ordination.

Abstention from Inter-communion by a Liberal Anglo-catholic as an act of penance for division might perhaps be respected as a noble scruple. On the other hand it would tend to perpetuate the very division it rightly deplors.

III

We turn next to a consideration of the above differences with reference to the possibility of Inter-communion under certain geographical and other circumstances.

- (a) In a town, several denominations of Free churches are usually represented as well as different types of

Anglican parishes. The present restriction of Inter-communion in such a town inevitably emphasizes the church divisions and the cold and exclusive attitudes of the churches one to another and tends naturally to harden them. In addition, those outside the churches are put off by the obvious lack of brotherly love indicated. Another effect is the hiding of the truth that those Evangelical Anglicans who occasionally communicate in Anglo-catholic churches, but never at Free Church services, are nevertheless in closer spiritual fellowship with the Free churches than with the other branch of what is officially their own church. Inter-communion, if permitted in a town, would unquestionably draw nearer together in spiritual fellowship and practical co-operation individual members of divided churches and the churches themselves, and thus would be a practical step towards the reunion so urgently needed. It would also be a far better witness to the world of brotherly love than at present prevails.

- (b) In a single parish area there are often members of the Free churches who use some of our services because distance prevents attendance at their own. Inter-communion under such circumstances would, if permitted freely, often lead to Free Churchmen becoming members of our church for all practical purposes, and where it did not lead to so much as that, it would certainly draw the individuals, and to some extent the churches concerned, into closer spiritual fellowship. Refusal of inter-communion has the opposite deplorable result. I have even known in the Mission Field non-conformist ladies of the Zenana Bible and Medical Mission who regularly prepared their women and girls for confirmation in our church, but were themselves not allowed to communicate, although the C.M.S. missionary would have welcomed them. The Bishop took on himself to forbid it, well knowing they had no church of their own within reach to attend and could not communicate at all for months on end. These ladies none the less with great grace continued preparing girls for confirmation which admitted them to Holy Communion from which their teachers were

debarred. Of course Indian Christians, and probably other nationals, knowing the vast difference between Christians and Muhammadans, Heathen, etc., are completely unconscious of different types of churchmanship within the Church, and use whatever Christian church is available without asking questions when they move from one area to another. The Mission Comity plan ordinarily leads to areas, often the size of two or three English counties or more, being entirely Anglican or Baptist or Methodist-Episcopal, etc. If Indian Christians did not act thus they would often be practically excommunicated for years or even for life. The way they act and are accepted is a very practical example of the beneficent effect of Inter-communion.

- (c) Inter-communion on special occasions such as the Kikuyu Conference and many other inter-denominational Conferences since, up to Tambaram last winter certainly call for mention. Men and women who on such occasions discuss together the world-wide needs, privileges and possibilities of Christ's Church, naturally realize that in Christ there cannot be Greek or Jew, circumcision or uncircumcision, barbarian, Scythian, bondman, freeman, but Christ is all and in all, and they act accordingly. At Tambaram on Christmas day almost all the delegates representing seventy nations joined in a memorable Holy Communion service. The celebrant was the Bishop of Dornakal assisted by five bishops whose respective homelands were: West Africa, China, Japan, Great Britain and the U.S.A. Real spiritual unity attained in the Conference led naturally to this. No Frank Zanzibar has asked the Archbishop of Canterbury to institute a heresy hunt this time! The Anglican rite was used on this occasion just as it was at Kikuyu. The grace shown by other churches in assenting to this might well shame our Church into their Christlike humility. The responsibility of the clergy in the inter-communion question seems infinitely greater than that of the laity. The laity, except a very small percentage indeed of ecclesiastically minded persons, would readily welcome freedom in this matter,

although temperamental differences and habits would probably cause many to prefer the rite as administered in their own churches for a time.

IV

The fourth question "Is Episcopal authority binding in this matter?" seems a little unhappily expressed. No *Jus Liturgicum* or anything else can give a Bishop of our church jurisdiction to abrogate our statutory P.B. or any rubric contained in it. Equally, or *a fortiori*, private judgment cannot justify anyone else doing so. Unquestionably when the rubric at the end of the Confirmation Service was drawn up in 1662 members of our church alone were thought of by the framers of the rubric. Its ancestor, the rubric in the Sarum Manual, prescribed that no one should be admitted to communicate, *save when dying*, except he had been confirmed or had been reasonably hindered from receiving Confirmation. This, the intermediate 1552 rubric, and the present 1662 one, were plainly meant to refer only to Anglicans. There was no such thing as a non-conformist church in 1552 and none were "recognized" in 1662. In fact in 1662 non-communicants were liable to imprisonment for their failure, and some say it can hardly have been intended to frame a rubric to debar persons from doing what general law required them to do, with imprisonment as the penalty for failure. The present writer prefers to avoid so complicated an argument as that.

Professor Gwatkin's exhaustive examination of the history and meaning of the rubric points out (*inter alia*):

- (1) Prefixed to the Prayer Book is this general declaration:

In these our doings we condemn no other nations, nor prescribe anything but to our own people only.

- (2) The Reformers of 1549-52 both admitted unconfirmed Calvinists to Holy Communion, and when abroad, themselves received Holy Communion in their churches.
- (3) In 1662, when the rubric was put into its present form, there had been no Episcopal government in England for twenty years, many were not baptized and hardly any below middle age can have been confirmed. To meet the double situation a form of "Baptism of

such as are of Riper years " was provided, and " or be ready and desirous to be confirmed," was added to the Confirmation rubric.

- (4) This rubric was never understood to exclude non-conformists till long after Tractarianism arose.
- (5) Archbishops Tait, Maclagan and Benson, and Bishops Creighton, Stubbs and Wordsworth refused to accept the Tractarian interpretation.

Happily the rule about not excluding those who come, removes much of the difficulty.

v

Experiments towards securing inter-communion may or might be made in at least two ways :

- (a) By encouraging it at S.C.M., Youth Movement and other Inter-denominational Conferences. This is happily already being done to some extent and seems likely to be extended. To reach the further step of having ministers of other churches as officiants at such services instead of exclusively our own ministers, and not always being tied to the Anglican rite seems very desirable.
- (b) Another experiment would be for a particular parish, or preferably rural deanery, or diocese to arrange with say the Methodist or Presbyterian Church for inter-communion of recipients on the Sunday following Remembrance day each year, and/or on the first Sunday of the year or on say the second Sunday of every month.

Necessary Reforms in the Church Assembly

REV. J. W. AUGUR, M.A.
Vicar of St. Giles, Northampton.

THE Church Assembly came into existence after the passing of the Enabling Act, 1919. This was preceded by an intensive campaign throughout the country under the auspices of the Life and Liberty Movement, directed by such men as the present Bishop of Lichfield, the present Dean of Lichfield (F. A. Iremonger), the late "Dick" Shepherd and men of that ilk—mainly ex-Army Chaplains who during the war became thoroughly disgruntled with the state of "C. of E." religion as revealed in the army. They were determined not to let sleeping dogs lie, and they began a crusade which was undoubtedly helped by the publication of the Five Reports, issued after the National Mission of 1916. They dealt with The Teaching Office of the Church, The Worship of the Church, The Evangelistic Work of the Church, Christianity and the Industrial Problem, and The Administrative Reform of the Church. They make interesting reading even to-day, and they provoked much discussion when they first appeared. The last one is particularly important for it not only dealt with the hindrances and difficulties in the Church's administrative system, but it also clearly laid down the general principles of reform.

The recommendations which have been put into operation include the Reform of the Sale of Advowsons, The Formation of Diocesan Boards of Patronage, The Legal Establishment of Parochial Church Councils and the Right of Women to vote for and serve on all councils and committees of the Church which include representatives of the laity. The recommendations which have not yet been adopted are: A Greater Cathedral Chapter in every Diocese to act as an official Council of Advisers to the Bishop, Institution to a Benefice to be for a term of years (ten was recommended),

the Bishop not to hold Patronage in any other Diocese, a Minimum Stipend for every Incumbent of £400 per annum to be obtained partly by a compulsory union of some benefices and partly by a re-arrangement of the larger incomes, the Amalgamation of Queen Anne's Bounty with the Ecclesiastical Commission, an Advisory Council for the Appointment of Bishops and, lastly, that Bishops as well as Clergy should retire at 70.

Some of the members of the Committee made reservations in signing this Report. One member objected to Archbishops, Bishops, Deans and Chapters making any appointments to Parochial Cures, and he also suggested that the Primate should be elected by the Bench of Bishops. Another, held strongly that "the Parson's Freehold" is held on the tenure of regulated legal service, which can be terminated if the conditions are not fulfilled. A well-known layman (Sir Charles Nicholson) thought that a Bishop's pension should not be a direct charge on the funds of the Ecclesiastical Commissioners. "Is it more important that a Bishop should have a pension provided in this way, or that the stipends of incumbents should be raised?" He had no doubt a satisfactory Bishop's pension could be provided by contributory insurance.

The memorandum of the then Dean of Carlisle (Dr. Rashdall) is concerned with his reasons for not assenting to most of the recommendations in this Report. He is entirely against interference with the existing system of appointing Bishops and other dignitaries. "What is wanted is not more caution, but more boldness in such appointments." He dissents *in toto* to a time limit for incumbents—"The independence and security of tenure possessed by the benefited clergyman, when once a benefice is secured, constitute one of the chief attractions which, in spite of the great and increasing deterrents to the clerical career (not all of a pecuniary or worldly nature) still attract some men of high education and strong character to the ministry of the Church." He further states—"The wish that the Church should at the earliest possible moment recover freedom of legislation through its own representative assemblies, seems to involve the very questionable historical assumption that the Church of England ever possessed such powers of legislation as are contemplated. . . . Nor do I sympathize

with the desire to increase the powers of the Episcopate as a whole (as distinct from those of the individual Bishop in his own diocese) and to abolish the jurisdiction of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council. . . . That jurisdiction has been the great security for the comprehensiveness of the Church of England in the past and its retention was never more necessary than at the present moment. The distinctive views of each recognized party in the Church in turn have been condemned by the purely ecclesiastical Courts . . . and in every case their condemnation has been reversed by the Judicial Committee. . . ."

It will be seen from these quotations (which are not altogether out of date to-day) that when the Church Assembly came into existence, it had the advantage of much information in regard to the urgent reforms which were necessary, and some solutions had been offered of problems which needed immediate attention.

The Assembly has now been at work for twenty years, and we are justified in asking whether it has fulfilled the high hopes centred in it at its inception. There is no doubt about its financial success, for last year its income amounted to £121,329, nearly all of which came from Diocesan Quotas. The expenditure steadily goes up from year to year and the objective is a minimum income of £145,000 per annum, which is to be allocated for Central Office Expenses, Commissions and Special Committees, Convocation Expenses, Organization, Training for the Ministry, The Missionary Council, Press and Publications Committees, Legal Board and Parliamentary Expenses, and Statistical Returns of Parochial Work. We cannot fail to be impressed by the size of the machine which has come into existence. Are we getting value for the money which is being spent? Of course it is absurd to say that all the money is being wasted, but we must face the question whether it is being used in the best possible way. There is an obvious danger of bureaucratic control. The permanent officials are well dug in with good offices and with salaries fixed and regular, in line, that is, with the Civil Service generally. Their policy therefore will always be one of very cautious progress and officious centralization. The elected members of the Assembly have little opportunity for independent action and in the House of Clergy they are overwhelmed by the weight of the ex-

officio members who, because of their position, will not favour any too drastic a disturbance of the *status quo*.

There are clear signs of a general uneasiness at the growing burdens and restrictions which are being placed on the parochial clergy. One of the most serious challenges to their personal independence and to the religious privileges of the laity is to be seen in the Clergy (National Emergency Precautions) Measure. We all have a high regard and respect for the Episcopate, but all the bishops are over-worked and liable to make mistakes, and any further extension of their power and authority must be closely scrutinized. It is now decided that in the event of "a period of emergency" the Bishop will have power to give directions as to the use or disuse of any church, chapel or other place of public worship in his diocese, and to require any clerk in holy orders serving in any parish or place, to serve in some other parish or place where in the opinion of the Bishop, his help is most needed. It will be noted that the change in the original title of this measure really enlarges its scope and gives additional power to the bishops in any kind of national emergency.

There was very little discussion in the Church Assembly on this Measure of such far-reaching importance. It is true that the Archdeacon of Dudley (all honour to him), moved that the Bishop should seek the advice of a duly appointed Committee of parochial clergy before acting on these regulations, but his resolution was not accepted by those in authority, and the supposed safeguard which *has* been inserted, does not interfere with the bishop's absolute discretion to act as he thinks best.

It has been suggested that if any curb is put on the bishop's power, the principle of episcopal authority is challenged, but for good or for ill that has already been done in regard to their Patronage, by the appointment of clerical and lay advisers under the Benefices (Exercise of Rights of Presentation) Measure.

The fact that it is possible for Measures of great importance to pass through the Assembly almost without discussion and free from amendments, has given rise to much comment throughout the country. There are many who think that the method of election to the House of Laity needs drastic revision, and that *all* the members of the House

of Clergy should be elected. If this latter suggestion is not yet possible, the ex-officio members who at present constitute more than a third of the House, should be reduced in number. Moreover, it is not unreasonable in these democratic days, to ask that a rule be made forbidding ex-officio members to introduce measures and to vote for or against them. Their advice can rightly be given in the discussion on any Measure, but the elected members alone, who are answerable to those who have elected them as their representatives, should decide its fate.

Another reform long overdue is in connection with the Church's financial system. It is a truly gigantic task. Much has been done in recent years to remedy some gross abuses, but much still remains to be done. When the Church Assembly really becomes the Parliament of the Church, I suppose it will have full control of the Church's revenues. In the meantime is it too much to ask that the parochial clergy should be represented on the governing bodies of the Ecclesiastical Commission and Queen Anne's Bounty?

The provision for the retirement of the clergy should be carefully re-considered and improved, and the Clergy Pensions (Widows and Dependents) Measure, 1936, is not an entirely satisfactory solution of a problem which has existed for many generations.

I do not wish to end this paper on a pessimistic critical note. We have great cause for thanksgiving in the fact that during the past forty years great progress has been made in material prosperity. It is, however, much more satisfactory to notice the great awakening of new spiritual forces. The Church of England is going on from strength to strength. Its bishops and clergy are now drawn from every section of Society, and curiously enough, from every denomination. At a recent Ruri-decanal Conference in a provincial town, when a somewhat controversial issue was being discussed, several clergy, one after the other stressed their Free Church ancestry and gloried in it! Who can say what the future holds in store for us? Perhaps afar off, one Great United Church, with the "Free" Churches properly incorporated within it, and not so far off, the Church of England at last universally recognized as the body which is the religious expression of the national life and fully authorized to state it publicly.

Man in Revolt : *A Christian Anthropology*

A Survey by F. R. MONTGOMERY HITCHCOCK, D.D.

EMIL BRUNNER'S great work¹ took many years to write and takes in many topics. It begins with "The Riddle of Man." A number of the various views of man are set forth in the Introduction. The main section deals with foundations, and the presuppositions of the Christian doctrine of man. In this the Word of God is discussed as the Source of Knowledge, and the Source of Being. The latter discussion deals with the Being of God ; the Trinity ; the Will of God, the Decree of Election ; the Work of God ; Creation and Redemption. These are interesting chapters if somewhat difficult to follow. They frequently challenge contradiction. Then follows "The Origin: the Imago Dei" (c.v.). "The Word of God, which is itself the Origin, allows us to perceive that of which every human being is dimly aware ; at the same time this light shows us that our 'dim perceptions' are merely a groping in the dark. Hence the Christian doctrine of man is threefold : the doctrine of man's origin, the doctrine of contradiction, and the doctrine of the actual state of man as life in conflict between his origin and the contradiction. The Christian doctrine of man is therefore quite different from all other anthropologies, because it alone takes this conflict seriously and does not explain it away or try to neutralize it in any direction" (p. 83). Then he passes on to the scientific solution from "the parabolic expression of the Christian narrative ; namely that man has been created 'in the image of God,' and the

¹ " *Man in Revolt : A Christian Anthropology* " by Emil Brunner, translated by Olive Wyon. (Lutterworth Press) 15s.

view of Augustine," which he calls "the classical doctrine," although it was contrary to the more sensible view of a greater theologian, Irenæus, in whose opinion the protoplast or primitive man was in a childlike undeveloped condition. Whereas Augustine regarded him as a mature, highly developed being, with a soul endowed with *original righteousness*, endowed with the *liberum arbitrium*, a perfect creature. "This whole historic picture of 'the first man' has been finally and absolutely destroyed for us to-day. The conflict between the teaching of history, natural science, and palæontology, on the origins of the human race, and that of the ecclesiastical doctrine has led all along the line to the victory of the scientific view; he remarks, "Two alternatives alone do not conflict with historical research, naturalistic evolution (Darwin), and idealistic evolution (Hegel). Schleiermacher in his reformulation of Christian doctrine substituted for the Christian view an idealistic evolutionary theory with a strongly naturalistic bent." Other philosophers also, e.g. Hase, Rothe, Pfeiderer, Troeltsch consider that it is the future goal of evolution not the lost past that the *Imago Dei* refers to. Brunner abandons the historical form of the doctrine of the origin of man as a necessary purification of the Christian doctrine for its own sake. The real core of Christian doctrine, apart from its historical form, differs from both the idealistic and the naturalistic evolutionary theories. It consists in the truth that man is in conflict between his divine origin in creation, and his opposition to the latter, that is sin. This is Brunner's statement of the problem of man which he discusses with vigour and acuteness in *Man in Revolt* upon which he has been at work for many years. He tells the story of his studies in his Foreword, "More than fifteen years ago it became clear to me under the deep impression made by the anthropological work of Kierkegaard, that the distinction between modern Humanism and the Christian faith must be made at this point in the understanding of man. Acquaintance with the thought of Ebner, Gogarten and Buber helped me further along the path which I had begun to follow. Here, too, however, I learned still more from the new light thrown on the teaching of the Reformation; I learned most from Luther, for I came to see that in this question, of all the Reformers his teaching is the most Scriptural and the most profound."

He says, however, that he does not merely reaffirm the Reformation position, for in this central anthropological question of freedom versus unfreedom, in particular, the inadequacy of the Reformers was evident. "There is a great deal to learn from Augustine the thinker which escaped the notice of Luther the fighter." He says that the fundamental idea of his book is that even the unbeliever is related to God and, therefore, that he is responsible, and that this responsibility is not put out of action even by the fullest emphasis upon the generous grace of God, but, on the contrary, that God requires it. He illustrates this fundamental idea frequently through the book. In his conclusion (p. 558), he says that man can never be understood apart from his relation to God. In Christianity this relation takes the form of responsibility, the response in faith and obedience to the Word of God. Man's relation to God as such can never be lost; but the *right* relation is lost by sin. He points out how that right relation may be recovered by man and restored by God. The closing words give a clue to the author's meaning, a clue that may also serve to gather into one the many diverse threads of thought in this massive, amazing, and most confusing volume. "Man is not divine in virtue of his nature; but God has given him from the beginning the divine destiny, which if he acts against it, becomes his curse, but which is given to him once more now in faith and later in sight, now as something imperfect and later as a perfect 'being like unto Him' through Him Who is equal with God from all eternity, through the eternal Son Who restores to us our lost Sonship and perfects it." What has been said is intended to give the reader of *THE CHURCHMAN* some idea of the reason why the book was written and of the author's purpose and intention. There are too many subjects discussed in it even to glance at a quarter of them. He has a great deal in this voluminous tome on almost every subject connected directly or indirectly with philosophy and religion. It is rather a book of reference than an essay. To fix on one subject for more detailed examination we shall take the chapter entitled "The Contradiction" (c. vi.), which means the conflict between good and evil, that ever-present problem which is fundamental in scientific anthropology, in moral philosophy, and especially in Christian doctrine. The origin of evil baffles man; but no one can deny

its existence. Evil, he says well, "is the destructive action of a responsible being." (We remember in a recent broadcast the words "that evil man"). This subject introduces us to many debatable matters—the traditional Adam, and the Fall, original sin, Pelagianism and Augustinianism, solidarity in sin, freedom, necessity, and responsibility. A very neat explanation of solidarity in sin, was given by Kierkegaard: "The Word of God shows us that the man whom God created, is always both this individual and humanity." The actual words in that writer's *Der Begriff der Angst* are: "The essential determination of human existence, that man is individual and as such is both himself and the whole race, so that the whole participates in the individual and the individual in the whole race." A corollary of this is that "the perfecting of the individual in himself, is at the same time, and in so doing, the perfect participation in the whole." At all events this conception is the presupposition of the fact that we are able to understand one another. St. Paul put this much more simply and effectively in his famous dictum about the Body: "Whether one member suffereth, all the members suffer with it; or one member is honoured, all the members rejoice with it." As one would naturally expect the Scriptures are the supreme authority for Emil Brunner. He tests his doctrine of sin by the Scriptures. He says that the Augustinian doctrine of original sin, in its narrower sense, was based upon the questionable exegesis of *eph 'ho* — in quo — in lumbis Adami. Of course, this is absolutely wrong; *eph 'ho* cannot mean *in quo* in whom, but "for that." Death passed upon all men *for that* "on the ground that" all have sinned. This is the correct rendering.

As this reviewer has stated in his book on the Atonement¹ (p. 9), which will now be switched on, "The Scriptural warrant at present of the ecclesiastical doctrine seems to be an erroneous rendering of two Greek words. For the Church professedly does not apply the Apocryphal Books to establish any doctrine. And it seems that it was in 2 Esdras iv. 30, that Augustine found it—"A grain of evil seed was sown in the heart of Adam from the beginning, and how much

¹ *The Atonement and Modern Thought* (Donnellan Lectures: 1912). See chapter "Sin and Atonement" (pp. 1-60), an exhaustive examination of the subject of Sin.

wickedness hath it brought forth unto this time." Neither do the Scriptures reveal anything of the state of original righteousness. Adam is nowhere represented as perfect in canonical or patriotic writings.

Irenæus described him as *nepios*, *infans*, and Clement of Alexandria said that he was not made perfect in respect of his constitution, but in a fit condition to receive virtue. Job xxxi. 33: "If after the manner of man (*k'adam*, not like Adam) I covered my transgression" does not refer to any such inheritance as original sin. "In sin did my mother conceive me" (Ps. li. 5), has no thought of such either, but refers to a sexual relationship which many considered and still consider unclean. Eph. ii. 3: "Children of wrath by nature" refers to *actual* not *original* sin (Abbott). St. Paul in Rom. v. and 1 Cor. xv. does not say how Adam's sin is related to our sin or nature, neither is he concerned to prove the origin of human sin and death its penalty, but to illustrate our moral solidarity in the righteousness and life of Jesus Christ. While the New Testament regards all men as sinners, it throws no light on the method whereby they became such. Our Lord referred to a hostile spiritual power. "I saw Satan fall." He did not speak of a fall of man. The apostle John knew nothing of original sin in the sense of a humanity depraved and impure from birth. His summary of the Incarnation: The Word became flesh (*sarx*) is unqualified. And the doctrine of original sin as Du Bose saw, must affect the doctrine of the Incarnation, so he explained "in the likeness of the flesh of sin" as equivalent to "our identical nature" not without sin. He was "humanly without sin only because He met and overcame and abolished sin in Himself." So this doctrine of original sin requires the sacrifice of the sinless nature of Christ. The Roman Church, seeing the weakness of the position found it expedient to invent another doctrine, the Immaculate Conception, in order to save the sinless nature of Christ. Professor Caird skilfully turned the position of Augustine, whose dark and pernicious doctrines have been an incubus upon Christianity, that "in Adam we all were at that time in the idea of God and in the seed of humanity, and therefore his disordered and vitiated nature has been propagated to us" (*De Civ. xiii. 14*), by remarking "That the conception of seminal guilt, or of a sin which contains

or involves all future sins, would imply that Adam was guilty of all the sins of his descendants, rather than they of his." The justice of his criticism is evident when one considers that the blossom is not responsible for the seed or for the intermediate stages. The Manichæan studies of Augustine, who was the first to treat this subject scientifically, led him to his view of human depravity. The New Testament does not teach the Fall of Man. St. Paul speaks of a fall (*paraptoma*) of the Jews, but not of a fall of Eve. Her sin was a *parabasis* (transgression). In these days when the modern religious mind is compelled in its self-defence to test the bases of its faith, it will not allow us to build upon foundations which are liable to be destroyed by science or discredited by criticism. And science repudiates the doctrine of a Fall as untrue, while criticism regards it as unnecessary. This doctrine, which does not belong to the body of Christian truth, having no place in the creeds, has weakened the sense of responsibility for sins we have actually committed, but has, on the other hand, extended our responsibility to a state or condition of things, for which we cannot be held responsible under any ethical system, and which would render us objects of Divine compassion rather than of wrath. For if the evil that is in us can be even partially traced back to some one universal moral catastrophe, moral evil which is thus attributed to an inherited bias, is extenuated. And if the consequences of sin be thus transmitted from man to man, why should not the consequences of righteousness be so transmitted? It would be a sad thing for the human race if its moral inheritance were altogether bad. It may also be urged that the doctrine that we have inherited from Adam, whether we mean one individual or the original ancestors of the human species, a depraved or deprived nature supports pessimism, and the feeling that evil must prevail. For if one single offence could so vitiate the nature that God is represented as seeing "very good," even though it was a test case, it would augur ill for the final success of good. Again the idea of the transmission of a sin imputable to man from the earliest times and bringing down the wrath and condemnation of God even upon those who cannot possibly have sinned in thought or deed, throws sin into the external world, gives it an objectivity it has not, treats it as a thing apart from one's personality, supports

those legal and forensic views of the Atonement which sound theology and psychology alike reject. It also assumes, on the one hand, what cannot be proved, that there may be an inheritance of sinful tendencies derived from sinful acts in the reign of the spiritual personality, which is something like traducianism; and, on the other hand, makes that which is an affair of the whole personality due in a large degree to one's physical descent.

Without entering into a discussion on the transmission of acquired characters, which can only lead to useless argument, it is certain that congenital tendencies to indulge certain instincts, may, like predispositions to certain physical diseases, be handed down. In this sense the modern Christian might interpret original sin. But to assert that such tendencies can carry guilt with them, unless deliberately indulged in, is open to the objection that guilt (*Saxon, gyldan*: to pay) which originally meant liability to punishment but now moral blameworthiness, can only exist where there are conditions that make for responsibility such as freedom and knowledge. And as the individual cannot be held accountable for the condition in which he was born, or for the character of his parents, he cannot be regarded as answerable for the nature he is given, whether it be good or evil, vitiated by inherent tendencies to badness or strengthened by predispositions to virtue. "Sin" is allowed by theologians to bear a different connotation when used in the term "original sin" from that implied when actual sin is concerned. After all is said, "Sin or holiness cannot be in mere nature or condition, they can only be in what *we* are or do in the nature or the condition." On the other hand, we must reject the atomistic view of life and personality; we must not overlook the influence of sinful habit on the will. We are against Pelagianism, for we are not in the same position after as before with regard to evil. Neither are we separate units, but members of a body, so that as Schleiermacher has well said, "Sin is in each the work of all, and in all the work of each." For we are deeply, if unconsciously, connected with the past life, the present condition, and the future hope of the race. To the physical or organic unity of the race we owe our instincts, appetites and passions in stronger or weaker form. This is our universal inheritance—the material out of which the will makes good or evil,

and which are not in themselves good or evil until they have been made so by the will. Here is ground both for individual freedom and for universal sinfulness. Personality is spiritual and subjective. That which influences or injures the personality is something that the will has appropriated, and made its own, such as a maxim, a desire, an impulse. Heredity in the sense of inheritance by descent cannot be made responsible for what takes place in this sphere, if psychology and physiology are to be kept distinct. But, on the other hand, the consequences of human sin, physical and moral, are transmitted from generation to generation. There is an inheritance of trouble and trial and sorrow. Furthermore, the moral environment—that great complex of surrounding influences which is in a measure the product of inherited tendencies and previous conditions of life—has an untold influence upon the human soul. The moral history of man is largely the record of his struggle with the circumstances, surroundings and conditions of his life. For there is a social, moral, and religious atmosphere, as well as a physical one. Moreover, the human race being one organism there is a racial evil in which the race as a whole is involved and in the effects or liabilities of which it shares. This solidarity of man in sin seems to be the contradiction of personal responsibility. But these truths are reconcilable. They emphasize different aspects of human life—the solidarity of the human life in its relations to others, and the individuality, or singleness, of the human life in relation to its own soul. St. Paul emphasizes the solidarity of man in ruin in order to show how much more glorious is the solidarity of man in redemption. But neither are our very own until we have made them ours by personal identification, by an act of will. The freedom of the human will explains the apparent antinomy between personal and inherited responsibility. On the other hand, an atomistic conception of personality, which considers humanity to be divided into water-tight compartments, incapable of influencing or being influenced by each other, is opposed to the idea of an Atonement which presupposes the unity of human life and its solidarity, and accordingly a common and universal responsibility. But the doctrine of Atonement is not affected by any theory of the origin of sin. Whether we regard our present sinful state as a chaos not yet fashioned into order,

or the ruin of a once fair creation, the Atonement is an independent fact and doctrine. It is independent alike of the theory of "a mysterious seed of sin implanted in the human race" and capable like other racial characteristics of transmission (Sanday and Headlam, Romans, p. 146), and of all theories of the Fall or Evolution as explanations of our condition because it is concerned with our moral condition as it is, not with explanations of it. The existence of the universality of sin and sinful habit is sufficient basis for a Gospel of redemption, a redemption of our wills and souls, quite apart from the further question—into which the Redeemer never entered—how sinfulness arose. Thus far I have given a short summary of the argument in my own work on the Atonement (pp. 11-17) with regard to the doctrine of original sin, because it deals more fully and simply with the matter than the volume before us, and also because it serves as an introduction to a discussion of the cardinal doctrine of the Atonement, regarding which Brunner says little or nothing. A search through his book of 560 pages brings to light this solitary sentence: "The most meaningless event in world history, the death of Christ, through the divine wisdom has become the most meaningful" (p. 453). There may be other passages, but as there is no index of subjects—a great drawback to this fine book—they cannot be found. It is a remarkable fact that out of ninety-nine sections, only two short ones refer to Redemption. From one of these sections the above sentence is taken. Notice its crispness. Many such crisp and printed sentences are to be found. They are among the best things in the book. Here are a few: "Man is the only being who lives in conflict with himself" (p. 495). "The self-destroying use of freedom is that which the Bible calls sin." "Through sin man has become ec-centric, and through his eccentricity he has fallen into confusion" (p. 166). "Love which is self-imparting is the content of that Primal Word in which we have been created, and in which we have our life" (p. 495). "Neither in pantheism nor in materialism is there any responsibility left to man" (p. 431). "We are not yet living in the eternal Now; even as believers we are still living in the time-era where the past, the present and the future fall apart" (p. 495). "Man's apostasy from God is not simply something which has happened once for all, and is

over and done with ; man is doing it continually ” (p. 149). “ Everyone knows that we are responsible, but not everyone knows the content, the basis and the meaning of responsibility ” (p. 159). “ Even the cynic, or fanatic, who denies God does not escape from God, in so far as he is always forced, in some way or other to recognize the fact of responsibility ” (*ibid.*). Brunner deals at length with Humanism, the Greek attitude to the problems of life, viz. self-sufficiency ; and makes use of Luther’s clever description of the self-centred heart—the “ *Cor incurvatum in se ipsum* ” (p. 272). The heart doubled-back upon itself. The work the author set out to accomplish has been well—nay, brilliantly done, although not easy reading, for the writer’s knowledge is encyclopædic, and his style is corresponding. The translation has been worthy of the work.

Book Reviews

MAHATMA GANDHI :

Essays and Reflections on his Life and Work.
Presented to him on his Seventieth Birthday.

Edited by S. Radhakrishnan (George Allen & Unwin Ltd.)
7s. 6d.

This book, as the title indicates, is not a life of Gandhi, but a series of deeply interesting and instructive expositions of his philosophy of life, and evaluations of his spiritual and political significance to his own and future generations. The writers, for the most part, are outstanding men of letters, learning, religion and politics: sixty in number, representative of many countries and faiths, and presenting a cross section of the world's reaction to his message. Familiar names, such as General Smuts, Professor Einstein, George Lansbury, Gilbert Murray, Lawrence Binyon, Rufus Jones, Maud Royden, are to be found amongst them. Some contribute only a few lines of respect and congratulation.

The large majority, however, are thoughtfully written expositions of those aspects of his life and teachings which have most impressed each writer, the net result being to cause the interested reader to pass eagerly from essay to essay in expectation of some fresh food for thought from some fresh mind and pen. To a Christian reader with an open outlook, ready to probe to the roots all the implications of the Christian way of life, the book brings heights and depths of illumination, challenge and fundamental truth. A few of the contributions, sparkle with gems of spiritual and philosophic thought.

To the majority of writers, as to the general public, Gandhi's devotion to and use of *Ahimsa*, "non-violence," as the very heart of truth, "the central teaching of the Bible, as I have understood the Bible," is the theme of special interest. It is made clear that the meaning of *Ahimsa* is "not merely the negative virtue of abstaining from violence, but the positive one of doing good." It is the twentieth-century proclamation of the truth of that revolutionary

saying of Christ, in which are hidden the seeds of a new world order, "the meek shall inherit the earth." To Gandhi belongs the historical uniqueness of being the first to attempt the application of it as a national and political weapon. "It is the principle of the eternal Cross," writes J. S. Hoyland, "the principle which says with Paul, 'I fill up the sufferings of Christ' . . . Mr. Gandhi had had the genius to bring out into the open once more a world-principle which the selfishness, hot-water bottle luxury, the profit hunting of western civilization has obscured from our eyes. . . . Under the drive of an all-permeating spirit of competitive selfishness the Cross has in reality receded into the background, to become a mere dogma or instrument of purely individual and personal salvation. The great task of our generation is the rediscovery of the Cross as a living and eternal principle for the ending of wrong, warfare, violence. . . . God Himself works in this way, the way of non-violence, the way of the Cross."

All the writers testify to the transparent sincerity and genuineness of Gandhi's personal life as the embodiment of his own message to the world. As a young lawyer on a visit to South Africa, shamefully insulted as a result of the colour bar, Gandhi fought it out through a night till "the light dawned on his soul," and he knew he was "to go through to the bitter end, suffering what his own people had to suffer." Through the years he has trodden an undeviating pathway, embracing poverty, for "to be one with the poor and outcast is to be his equal in poverty and to cast oneself out": learning non-attachment "to be free to say or do the right, regardless of praise or blame." To-day, the revered leader of India's millions, destined perhaps to be regarded as her greatest saint since Buddha, he lives in a remote little village, dressed in his homespun khaddar and living on the plainest of diets.

Scattered through the various articles, are to be found many a wise word from his own lips ("spiritual aeronautics as one writer calls them) on such subjects as the use of silence, prayer and guidance, self-discipline, spiritual economics.

One problem, however, remains unhandled and one omission glaring from the point of view of evangelical readers. No mention is made of the Atonement as the funda-

mental basis of communion with God and a life in the Spirit. Many of the writers point to Gandhi in the words used by Maud Royden when she says, "The best Christian in the world to-day is a Hindu." But no writer, not even Bishop Azariah, of Dornakal, who is the one outstanding evangelical contributor, attempts to grapple with this contradiction in terms—a man who rejects the substitutionary work of our Lord on the Cross and yet appears to give many evidences of a life lived under the control of God's Spirit. Some, maybe, would refuse to admit the validity of such a spiritual experience. Others would prefer to agree with Gandhi's own words in an address to Christian missionaries, "If I have read the Bible correctly, I know many men . . . who have even rejected the official interpretation of Christianity, but would nevertheless, if Jesus came in our midst to-day, be probably owned by Him more than many of us." The parable of the Good Samaritan, Peter's words concerning Cornelius, Paul's statement in Rom. ii. 15, may have a bearing on this.

With this reservation, and making due allowance for the varied outlooks of the essayists and therefore of their contributions, this book will be found both instructive and illuminating.

N. P. GRUBB.

THE TYNDALE COMMEMORATION VOLUME

Edited by R. Mercer Wilson, M.A. (R.T.S.—Lutterworth Press) 7s. 6d.

Substantial parts of Tyndale's Revised Testament 1534, are admirably reproduced in this well-printed volume. In addition there is an account of the life of Tyndale by his Biographer, the Rev. J. F. Mozley, and an account of Tyndale's influence on English literature by the Rev. John R. Coates. Lovers of the Bible and of English Literature will delight to possess a copy.

The translator's spelling and paragraphing have been reproduced, as well as his marginal notes. The authorities of St. Paul's Cathedral have allowed the reproduction of woodcuts from the copy of the Revised New Testament of 1534, which is one of their prized possessions.

H. DROWN.

THE PRIEST AS STUDENT

*by Various Writers. Edited by Herbert S. Cox, B.D., Ph.D.
pp. vi., 380. (S.P.C.K.) 8s. 6d. net.*

This volume of Essays by twelve different writers deserves very special attention at the present time. For inevitably in great national crises there is a very real danger that the young priest will be attracted away from the more orthodox and less exciting studies towards topical subjects more popular in their appeal but ultimately disastrous to mental equipment and indirectly to ministerial efficiency. To any such tendency the book will provide a useful corrective.

At the outset one thing can at least be said of it, its aim is high. There is no pandering here to superficial learning. Throughout it makes an appeal to the consecrated intellect. The right note is struck in the very first Essay on "The Importance of Study." "Christian scholarship," the author of it says, "is at bottom neither more nor less than the solemn consecration of the mind to the service of God." The Essay deals realistically with some of the objections with which busy clergy at all times have tended to quiet their consciences whenever their studies have been neglected. For this reason it is to be commended to all candidates for Holy Orders. In this age of hurry and rush, with its ever-increasing demands on the time and energy of the parish clergy, opportunities for serious study seem almost impossible to some, and they take refuge in small books and the Church papers to the permanent detriment of their intellectual efficiency.

Following the introductory Essay comes a series of what may be termed introductions to the study of most of the subjects with which the clergy are presumed, however inadequately, to be acquainted. Thus to some extent the book covers much ground that should have been well traversed in the curriculum of the theological college—with one or two possible exceptions. Nevertheless, to some of the older clergy the volume might well come as a kind of "refresher course."

It is obviously quite impossible to refer to each Essay individually. No doubt some Essays will make a stronger appeal to a particular reader than others. Many will appreciate the very attractive Essay on "The Study of the Old

Testament," while others will enjoy some of the rather pungent *obiter dicta* to be found in the Essay on "The Study of Church History," without in the least necessarily endorsing them. Incidentally, we are interested to see that historians generally are waking up to acknowledge the "incurable slovenliness" of Cardinal Gasquet, which is after all a mild and charitable description of numberless perverse intellectual delinquencies. The author of this Essay might read again the first clause of *Magna Carta*.

The book, taken as a whole, is open to one or two rather serious criticisms. We should have liked to have seen recorded the position in the ecclesiastical world of the various writers. There is no indication in most cases even of the Communion to which they belong, though presumably they are all Anglicans and of a very definite type of Churchmanship. In one or two cases the extreme high Anglican standpoint is assumed as being that of the Church of England without any possibility of doubt.

A more serious criticism is that some of the writers seem wholly out of touch with those for whom the work is primarily planned, i.e. the young parish priest. For no one who knows the limited opportunities of the average busy parson could design a Five-year Course of Spare Time Reading at the rate of one book a month and put down (actually for the third month of the third year) Lightfoot's *Apostolic Fathers*! The same criticism is to some extent applicable to the Editor's Syllabus on pp. 150-2. Such syllabuses can only be rather frightening to the young minister and in consequence disheartening. For however much these subjects may appeal to the writers, every effective minister to-day ought to be acquainted with quite a number of general subjects, including the best that is written about Missions. That all means time. In these respects therefore the volume tends to be unpractical.

However, it is a volume that needed writing, and if it acts as an incentive to the young minister to make himself efficient in at least one department of study in an age when intense practical activity is too often regarded as indicative of efficiency, then it will not have been written in vain.

THE FEAR OF HELL AS AN INSTRUMENT OF CONVERSION

by the Rev. Clement F. Rogers, M.A. (S.P.C.K.) 3s. 6d.

Professor Clement Rogers is well known for his open-air activities, and he tells us that a stock weapon in the hands of controversialists is to argue that hell-fire was the main argument used to enforce Christianity on the ignorant peoples of Europe. With great erudition and a wealth of quotation, together with many excellent reproductions of frescoes and carvings, he seeks to overthrow this contention. He covers a wide field, and calls to witness a great number of Christians, some illustrious, others more humble. It is doubtless true that many of the crudities of medievalism and of other ages leave us wondering that anyone could have been moved by them at any time. But it is not perhaps quite so clear that the notion of Hell in some form has not played a more important part than the Professor would have us believe. Readers must judge for themselves the force of his argument. We do not think he is quite fair to Scripture. The reason underlying the persistence of the doctrine of Hell is the sense of judgment, and of the absolute difference between right and wrong. Bernard Shaw is adduced: "In rejecting all this imagery we are apt to make the usual blunder of emptying the baby out with the bath. By all means dismiss the scenes painted by Tintoretto. But do not think that you have got rid of the idea of judgment to which all human lives must finally come, and without which life has no meaning."

H. DROWN.

THE DESCENT OF THE DOVE

by Charles Williams. (Longmans) 7s. 6d.

The gift of the Holy Spirit is associated with all the distinctively Christian claims on humanity and its ethical revaluations in human society. We believe implicitly that the Church is the community in which the Holy Spirit dwells but it is generally realized that we have not yet discovered the full meaning of this stupendous fact. We are sure that the Church is not static in its life and doctrine

and its intense vitality is the direct result of the working of the Holy Spirit in groups and individuals. When men are possessed by the Holy Spirit a new heart is fashioned within them and they are made partakers of the Divine nature. This is both the explanation and the power of all revival movements within the Christian Church which, in the words of Canon Barry is "God's act at each point of time. . . . It is continuous yet it is never finished—it is not a tradition merely but a growth, an adventure rather than an institution."

Mr. Charles Williams in the book under review, professes to give "A Short History of the Holy Spirit in the Church," but his achievement falls far short of what has been accomplished by theologians with a more accurate scholarship and a deeper spiritual insight. What he has accomplished is the continuance of a series of pseudo Christian books which he has written with the evident design of challenging the orthodox and startling the simple. In *The Descent of the Dove* he seems amongst other matters to favour the revival of some doubtful experiments in the polarization of the senses. Thus, in the chapter on "The Definition of Christendom" he laments, "the loss of a tradition whose departure left the Church rather over-aware of sex, when it might have been creating a polarity with which sex is only partly coincident."

The chapter on "Consummation and Schism" is concerned mainly with a close examination of the mediæval work called the Cloud of the Unknowing and the works of Dante. It is an interesting and illuminating study for the historian but we cannot commend it to those who are anxious in simple faith to live "in the spirit." In fact our main criticism of the book is that too much space is given to sex problems, the consideration of which is neither profitable to the student nor necessary for the average Christian. It must be admitted that it is cleverly written by a man who has an accurate knowledge of most of the ecclesiastical controversies throughout the ages. It is dedicated, "For the Companions of the Co-inherence," and we suggest that it be read by these people whoever they may be, and these alone!

J. W. AUGUR.

THE DOCTRINES OF MODERN JUDAISM CONSIDERED

by *A. Lukyn Williams, D.D.* pp. xii., 169. (S.P.C.K.) 5s. net.

In attempting to set before Christians, for whom this volume is more particularly intended, a clear statement as to the doctrines of modern Judaism, Dr. Lukyn Williams undertook a greatly needed task, for which he is peculiarly qualified. At the outset he had to face one or two special problems, in trying to place side by side Christian and Jewish belief. Judaism is divided between moderns as liberals, and orthodox. Equally the Christian Church is not at one in its belief and teaching. For the latter the author adopts the only possible course by writing of Christianity as he apprehends it. For the former he allows both views to appear, giving special attention to the liberal section of Judaism. Following very closely to a plan suggested in the Preface, he gives a careful and scholarly review of Judaism's conception of God as revealed in nature, in the Old Testament, in human personality and in the Messiah. Of more than usual interest is the chapter which deals with Jesus of Nazareth. Modern Jewish leaders are increasingly attracted by the character and teaching of Jesus though Judaism generally continues to ignore opportunities to read and study the records. Indeed, as the author points out, even careful study of the Old Testament is confined to a very few Jews. Naturally, by reason of the part which it occupies in Jewish doctrine, four chapters are concerned with the Torah which is to the Jew what the word "Jesus" is to the Christian. To assist the reader, the author gives a very helpful summary, setting out article by article the points on which Jew and Christian agree and those concerning which they are at variance. Not least valuable are the appendices on the arrangement of the Books of the Hebrew Bible: *Marinonides as the Messiah*, the Incarnation (The Virgin Birth), and the Atonement. Appended too, for the student, is a fairly extensive bibliography, indicating the extent of Dr. Williams' own reading. He has, not for the first time, given to others besides students, a valuable and helpful book. All Christians must perforce be interested in Judaism. Judaism should be prepared to dispel some of its ignorance concerning the actual teachings of Christianity. This book would help them.

THE PARTNERSHIP OF NAZARETH

by the Rev. C. D. Hoste, M.A. (Longmans) 6s.

What an amazing number of books there are which essay to plumb the depths of Our Lord's personality. This attempt to do so deserves study. It is full of matter and requires close attention. Full value is given to the humanity of the Lord's nature. The author believes that the moment is ripe for a move forward towards a better understanding of the Incarnation. He develops his theme boldly but reverently in thirty-three chapters.

It is a sequel to another study, *The Achievement of Nazareth*, a book which received high commendation from many quarters.

H. DROWN.

THE BOOK OF AMOS

explained by the Rev. T. H. Sutcliffe, M.A. (S.P.C.K.)
1s. Paper. 1s. 9d. Cloth.

No one can fail to find help in this very lively exposition of the prophecy of Amos. Without endorsing everything that is contained in the Commentary we recommend the book as a fresh and interesting example of how to make an Old Testament's prophet's message clear and helpful to the modern reader. And the price places it within the reach of everyone.

H. DROWN.

THE MYSTERY OF THE FATE OF THE ARK OF THE COVENANT

by the Rev. Cyril C. Dobson, M.A. (Williams & Norgate, Ltd.) 3s. 6d. net.

How many people have ever thought of the fate of the Ark of the Covenant? Perhaps some will be awakened to pursue the matter by this study of Mr. Dobson. His thesis is that the Ark was by far the most significant and valuable ornament of the Temple, and when Jerusalem was burnt in 584 B.C. it was not destroyed, nor was it carried to Babylon. Jeremiah secreted it, and it still exists—somewhere. Nehemiah knew something of its whereabouts, and his thoughts

were preoccupied with it when he took his famous midnight ride round part of the city of Jerusalem. Three traditions give Mr. Dobson his clues. (1) 2 Maccabees xi., 4. (2) A cryptogram or cypher in one of the writings of Jeremiah, which led to excavations being carried out by an expedition just prior to the Great War. (3) Irish records. Very interesting, but opinions may differ as to the cogency of the argument. The illustrations and maps are good.

H. DROWN.

RADIANT FREEDOM

The Story of Emma Pieczynska

by Olive Wyon, R.T.S. (*Lutterworth Press*) 3s. 6d. net.

This is the pathetic story of a life full of disappointments, and yet in spite of them, after an unhappy childhood, Emma Reichenbach developed into a great worker for the welfare of the people. She married a Polish Count, but her stay in Poland was short. She studied medicine, but was unable to finish her study. Afflicted with deafness she was shut out from much human intercourse, but she developed a deep religious experience and exerted an extensive influence upon the life of Swiss workers, "Cut off from so much of the outer world by her deafness, she turned all the more gladly to 'that inner world which opens to us if we seek it.' With failing sight and the constant menace of complete blindness, she turned her gaze towards the unseen, and contemplated with joy the Light of Eternal Reality."

REMINISCENCES OF COUNTRY LIFE

by James George Cornish. (*Country Life*) 10s. 6d.

Mr. Cornish was the son of a Suffolk Vicar, who took orders in 1892 and was later Rector of East Lockinge and Vicar of Sunningdale in Berkshire. He retired in 1919 to the family residence near Sidmouth and took an active interest in the local life. He was a keen student of natural history, an antiquarian and a sportsman devoted to shooting and fishing. His close contact with the conditions of various parts of England give a special charm to his account of the

life of all classes of the people. His graphic style enlivens his account of many of the interesting personalities with whom he came in contact. His practical work led him to take an active part in educational work, and in the changing agricultural conditions as they affected the workers.

The volume shows the country parson as a valuable contributor to the welfare of the people in the country districts.

THE FRAMEWORK OF FAITH

by *Leslie Simmonds*. (Longmans) 8s. 6d.

This is the first volume of a new series of which Canon Roger Lloyd is the General Editor. He is the able Canon Missioner of the Diocese of Winchester. He has planned "The Teaching of the Church Series" because he believes that so far as England is concerned the work of the parish churches is vital and crucial. We are convinced that he is right. He also says that every book in the series is intended no less for the Enrolling Member of the Mother's Union, the Scoutmaster of the Church Troop, the Day and Sunday School Teachers, than for their parish priest. The aim is to cover in these six volumes, at least in outline, the battleground on which the evangelist of to-day must fight.

Leslie Simmonds is Assistant Priest of All Saints, Margaret Street, London. We should expect very extreme Anglo-Catholic teaching from such an author. But Mr. Simmonds has declared his conviction in a recent paper that the secret of all right thinking is balance, and with a very few exceptions this is a singularly balanced and carefully thought out book. The "fixed points" of the Christian system are well stated. Nevertheless his attitude to the Bible leans to the Modern rather than the traditional Catholic position. He appears to accept the statement that man himself has evolved through an ape-like stage and is "only a monkey shaved" as W. S. Gilbert said. However, we have greatly enjoyed the book and have found it both helpful and stimulating, even though, as is natural, we are unable to agree with all the writer's statements. It is a very useful contribution to Evangelistic thought. We are not sure whether it will be really grasped by all the classes of lay workers to whom the Editor hopes to appeal. It is often

too profound and advanced in its thought. At the same time we recognize that even working men can understand a philosophical argument if it be stated in language which they can understand. It is one of the merits of the author that he writes easy, simple and clear English, and that many of his sentences are epigrams packed full of thought and understanding. This series meets a real need. It must help the Evangelistic witness and warfare of the Church. We commend this first volume to the earnest and careful attention of the Parochial clergy and their workers and join the Editor in his prayer that by God's grace bestowed upon readers and writers alike, the series may be of some real use to the Christian cause to-day.

A. W. PARSONS.

THE PSALMS FOR EVERY DAY

by *Jane T. Stoddart*. (Hodder & Stoughton) 10s. 6d. net.

There are many books designed to illustrate the Psalms, but Miss Jane Stoddart's will stand out as unique in the originality and character of the "thousand illustrations from life and literature," with which her book is enriched. She has drawn her material from the biography, fiction, belles-lettres and newspapers of our own day and she adds "I venture to hope that my collection, which is based entirely on personal reading and owes little to standard anthologies, may be helpful, not only to preachers but to all who love the Psalms." The Psalms are arranged in the daily order for Morning and Evening in the Prayer Book, and several illustrations are appended, so that the volume is an admirable companion for daily reading.

The illustrations on such a favourite Psalm as cxxi., to take one example, contain references to Jean Paul Richter, George Borrow, David Livingstone, Bishop Hannington, St. Columba's, Pont St., Ralph Connor, A Highland Lady, Bishop Knox, from whose *Reminiscences of an Octogenarian* a touching reference to his mother's prayers for him as a schoolboy is given; a sermon preached by Dr. Keller at the Jungfrauoch in July, 1938, the Hills of Wales; Helen Keller, a novel, *Burmese Silver*, and Sir Frank Fletcher's retirement from the Headmastership of Charterhouse School. This wide

range of selection which it is possible thus merely to indicate, serves to show the interest of the book and its suggestiveness.

As was to be expected in a book by Miss Stoddart there are excellent indexes. An Index of Psalm-Texts Illustrated and a General Index which gives the authors and the passages quoted from their writings.

IN THE BEGINNING

Compiled from the writings of the Rev. and Hon. W. E. Bowen (Hodder & Stoughton) 6s. net.

The Rev. and Hon. W. E. Bowen came into notice towards the end of the last century as a sturdy opponent of the excesses of the Anglo-Catholic School. His publications were among the chief revelations that led to the appointment of the Commission on Ecclesiastical Discipline. In 1900 he retired to Totland Bay in the Isle of Wight, where he died in 1938. To this memorial volume compiled from his sermons, the Rev. E. G. Pace, of Durham University, contributes a brief account of his life, and gives a just estimate of his characteristics as a preacher. He was a careful and critical student, well versed in the classical work of literature and theology. He was well acquainted with the latest works of the philosophers and Scientists. His sermons were enriched by his quotations from and examinations of these great writers. He was at the same time a keen and ardent student of all that concerned the interpretation of the Bible, and his sermons indicate the soundness of his views on all subjects that came under his review. He was a whole-hearted supporter of the orthodox faith of the Church.

The sermons will appeal specially to educated people who wish to know the bearing of modern thought upon the old truths of our Faith.

OTHER BOOKS RECEIVED :

- THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND. *Bishop Hensley Henson.*
Cambridge University Press. 7s. 6d.
- THE CHALLENGE OF CALAMITY. *S. Nowell-Rostron,*
M.A., B.D.
R.T.S.-Lutterworth Press. 7s. 6d.
- THE CONFLICT OF THE CROSS. *O. E. Burton.*
James Clark & Co., Ltd. 3s. 6d.
- THE NAZARENE. *Sholem Asch.*
George Routledge & Sons, Ltd. 8s. 6d.
- A LIVING FAITH. *Frederic C. Spurr.*
Messrs. Allenson & Co., Ltd. 3s. 6d.
- GANDHI'S CHALLENGE TO CHRISTIANITY. *S. K. George.*
George Allen & Unwin Ltd. 3s. 6d.
- VISIT TO UTOPIA. *J. Howard Whitehouse.*
Oxford University Press. London. 2s.
- THE RISING WATERS. *Eric S. Loveday, M.A.*
S.P.C.K. 1s.
- THE HEREAFTER IN JEWISH *Charles Venn Pilcher,*
CHRISTIAN THOUGHT, with special reference to THE DOCTRINE OF RESURRECTION. *D.D.*
S.P.C.K. 7s. 6d.
- THE POTTER'S WHEEL. *Canon J. O. Hannay.*
(Thoughts on the Ways of God with men.)
Longmans, Green & Co. 3s. 6d.
- THE ENGLISH LITURGY, in the *W. K. Lowther Clarke,*
Light of the Bible. *D.D.*
S.P.C.K. Cloth, 2s. 6d. Paper 1s.
- FOLLOWING CHRIST. *W. R. Matthews*
(The Bishop of London's (Dean of St. Paul's)
Lent Book.)
Longmans, Green & Co. 2s. 6d.
- TORQUEMADA, SCOURGE OF *Thomas Hope*
THE JEWS. A biography.
George Allen & Unwin, Ltd. 8s. 6d.