

some endeavour, to save the souls of men : contrast him with a man professing to do little but shoot the partridges of men."

H. T. ARMFIELD.

Reviews.

The Ministry of the Christian Church. By CHARLES GORE, M.A., Principal of the Pusey House. London : Rivingtons.

WE have here a work of great learning and research, very able, and, on the whole, fair and convincing. We may not be able to accept all Mr. Gore's positions, certainly not all the arguments by which he supports them ; but, with him, we fully believe that the three orders of the ministry have existed in the Church from the earliest days, and are in accordance with the will of the great Head of the Church. At first probably there were no local dioceses, except, perhaps, St. James's at Jerusalem. The first true "Bishops" seem to have had a *roving* commission (if the expression may be forgiven), as the Apostles had before them. This view appears to satisfy the conditions of the case, and to explain the statements of early writers, and it is confirmed by the case of Titus, first appointed to Crete, and then (2 Tim. iv. 10) going to Dalmatia, presumably with the like commission.

Mr. Gore's work is in some parts rather heavy reading, owing to the lengthy quotations from the Fathers which he thinks it necessary to give to establish his argument. This, however, shows his painstaking research into the subject. The three following passages give a not unfair summary of Mr. Gore's views :

(1.) The ministry advanced always upon the principle of succession, so that whatever functions a man held in the Church at any time were simply those that had been committed to him by some one among his predecessors who had held the authority to give orders "by regular devolution from the Apostles" (p. 343).

(2.) That it was by a common instinct that the threefold or episcopal organization was everywhere adopted ; that it was a law of the being of the Church that it should put on this form . . . and that this fact seems to speak of a Divine institution almost as plainly as if our Lord had in so many words prescribed this form of Church government (p. 343).

(3.) The individual life can receive this fellowship with God only through membership in the one body, and by dependence upon social sacraments of regeneration, of confirmation, of communion, of absolution, of which ordained ministers are the appointed instruments. A fundamental principle of Christianity is that of social dependence (p. 94).

Surely in this third passage Mr. Gore goes beyond the teaching both of Holy Scripture and of experience. Surely the latter shows that God has been pleased to bless the ministrations of ministers of non-episcopal bodies, irregular though they be, in the salvation of souls and the advancement of His kingdom, and that the individual life has received fellowship with God, though there has been no recognition of these "social sacraments." We agree that a fundamental principle of Christianity, too often lost sight of, is "that of social dependence" ; but "the wind bloweth where it listeth," and unless all the teaching of experience is to be ignored, many who have never been confirmed, and who recognise no "social sacrament of absolution," have that true spiritual life which is "hid with Christ in God."

We cannot accept Mr. Gore's statement of the power of absolution as we find it on p. 94, nor his statement of the sacrificial nature of the Eucharist on p. 226. We also disagree with his explanation of *ἐκχυρόμενον* on p. 227. This is spoken by our Lord; it cannot in His mouth refer to a future constant celebration of the Sacrament and outpouring of the wine; this must have been a future participle. It must, therefore, point to the blood-shedding *imminent* at that time upon the Cross. To enter, however, upon these controversial topics—to discuss the subject of absolution and the true nature of the Eucharist—is outside our present purpose. We are content once more to record our dissent from views, which the CHURCHMAN has never accepted, while we recognise most fully the ability and the fairness with which Mr. Gore once more advocates them.

Mr. Gore's able work reached us about the same time as the opening address of the truly Apostolical Bishop of Rupert's Land to the Synod of his diocese, which met on October 31st of last year, in which he deals from a *practical* point of view with the same question as that treated theoretically in the work before us. The whole address is full of wise and weighty utterances, and it is especially interesting because the Bishop had recently returned from the Lambeth Conference, and gives his impression of the results and value of the discussions that there took place. The Bishop, as many know well, took an active part in that Conference, and, as a Metropolitan, was placed on no less than four of its committees. The committee, however, in the deliberations of which he took the most active part was that of Home Reunion. It was a subject, he tells us, very near his heart. "Many of the evils and weaknesses of which the Church and its members have to complain are attributable to our unhappy divisions. If we are separated by essential differences, or what are felt as such, then we must remain separated; but if we are separated by what is non-essential, then the question of unity in the body rises to such importance as to demand a first attention."

We need not go into the history of the deliberations of this committee, or the fate of the report which its members, under the presidency of Bishop Barry, then of Sydney, drew up. The story formed the subject of many articles in Church papers at the time, and is tolerably well known. The crucial subject was the historic episcopate. Granted that it should be accepted as the future rule of the United Church, the difficulty remained of bringing those ministers who had not received Episcopal Orders into harmony with it. The greatest care must be taken if ever the problem comes up for practical solution, that it does not form a fatal obstacle to union.

A resolution was proposed in that committee: "That provision should be made in such way as may be agreed on for the acceptance of such ministers (*i.e.*, ministers of non-episcopal bodies) as fellow-workers with us in the service of our Lord Jesus Christ." Upon this we quote the wise and liberal words of the Bishop:¹

"The non-acceptance of this resolution arose in part from a feeling of ambiguity about its terms—a feeling shared by not a few of its supporters themselves. The resolution, while recognising a ministerial character, left it perfectly undetermined, both what that meant and how the ministers of other bodies were to be received as fellow-workers. For myself, I have no hesitation in saying that, if in God's Providence such a blessing were vouchsafed to the Church as the opening of a way to the reunion with the great Presbyterian body, I share the views of Bishop Charles Wordsworth of St. Andrews. That prelate, in a late address to his Synod, said, 'You will all, I think, know how assiduously,

¹ Report of the Synod of the Diocese of Rupert's Land, 1888, pp. 17-20.

“during a long series of years, I have laboured to establish the law of the threefold ministry and of Episcopal ordination, and in advocating, as I now do, a temporary suspension of that law for the sake of union, I believe I am taking the best possible course to prevent it from falling into disrepute; whereas, they who would insist upon the observance of the law without exception, are putting upon it a strain which it will not bear, are exposing the Church to the stigma of assuming an unreasonable “non possumus” attitude, of being unable to see things as they really are, and of violating the spirit, while they worship the letter, of a Divine ordinance.’ I cannot forget that in very early years I became quite convinced that the threefold order of the ministry had been the normal rule of the Church from the beginning. I believe the Church was guided by the Holy Spirit in the establishment of these Orders, and that until the Reformation this rule was practically uninterrupted. But though I hold this very clearly for myself, still I believe God has not withheld His blessing from ministrations not according to the order, which I believe He led the Church to adopt.”

The Bishop then referred to Hooker, Cosin, and Andrewes, proceeding as follows:

“Again at the Restoration, as only one of the old Scottish Bishops survived, four Bishops were consecrated in England. Two of these, who had only Presbyterian orders, were ordained privately deacons and priests very much against their wish. They went down to Scotland and forthwith consecrated other six Bishops. Again it is believed that with the exception of some perhaps in the Diocese of Aberdeen, under Bishop David Mitchell, all conforming beneficed clergymen, who had Presbyterian orders, were accepted as priests. In England itself, indeed, at this time one of the effects of the rebound from the excesses and hardships of the Commonwealth was that the requirement of Episcopal ordination was made in the preface of the ordinal more stringent, but the action of the Scottish Bishops could have hardly been taken without the assent of the authorities of the English Church, who gave them the Episcopate—at any rate we hear of no remonstrance. In making this historical sketch I wish not to be misunderstood. I do not question the irregularity, but a choice has to be made—and the healing of a great schism—the meeting of our Lord’s last wish and prayer—‘That all may be one’—the inexpressible advantages to the Church, as we in this province can readily understand, seems far to outweigh a loss that can be but temporary. Besides, though I hold Apostolical Succession in the Church most fully, I do not think that we are so bound by words and actions, that the Church is not competent to accept such presbyters, if it so ordains, as presbyters or priests. At any rate, there is nothing novel for an English Churchman in this view, nothing inconsistent with the deepest attachment to Episcopacy and belief in its being the order of the Church by Divine guidance. In the words of Bishop Wordsworth, ‘it is not a question of the obligation of the law of the threefold ministry—or of Episcopal ordination—that law has been handed down from the beginning and will continue to exist to the end of time. But the question is of the power and wisdom of the Church to dispense with the law *pro tempore* in a particular case and for a special end, an end unspeakably great and important.’ Our Lord has not bound the Church in the exercise of its authority derived from Him. I believe, then, that it has this power. Many of my brethren, who yield to none as Churchmen, hold these views. I trust I violate no confidence when I tell that dear Bishop Whipple, having to leave the committee-room from his infirm health, placed his hand on my shoulder and said, ‘My whole spirit goes with that resolution.’ Many others, whose hearts yearn for the healing of the divisions that are the weakness of the Church, and

"that almost in these days of gathering doubt threaten a temporary disaster, have much sympathy with them. When the Bishop of St. Andrews put out his pamphlet in support of his views just before the Conference, we learn that the Archbishop of Canterbury requested the Bishop of Salisbury to write to the Bishop of St. Andrews and inform him with his thanks 'that he had read the pamphlet over twice with great interest, and very full and hearty sympathy.'"

We offer no apology for this lengthy quotation: not only the views here enunciated by the Bishop, but also the interesting personal allusion which it contains justify us in giving it a wider circulation than the report of the Synod is likely to have.

The Lambeth letter justly says, "We gladly and thankfully recognise the real religious work which is carried on by Christian bodies not of our communion. We cannot close our eyes to the visible blessing which has been vouchsafed to their labours for Christ's sake." We trust and pray that at no distant day some serious effort will be made to promote reunion *at home*. We trust that while the Church maintains the historic Episcopate as one of her marks, some means may be devised of recognising the position of non-episcopally ordained ministers; if need be, allowing in the words of Bishop Wordsworth "a temporary suspension" of the law of episcopal ordination to be recognised, if so be the great blessing of union may be thereby promoted. As Mr. Bartlett emphasizes in the Lectures recently noticed in our pages, it is absurd to recognise as branches of the Holy Catholic Church the most corrupt and degenerate of Eastern churches, and to refuse to acknowledge Christian communities as rich in good works as the National or Free Church of Scotland, or some of the Nonconformist communities in England.

Surely the great principles for which Mr. Gore so ably contends, and which in the main we accept, would not be violated (care being naturally and properly taken that Bishops in the future, as they have been in the past are canonically consecrated); surely no effort is too great, no sacrifice of feelings too large, which would further the fulfilment of our Lord's prayer "that they may be one," help to restore unity and peace to Christians separated by minor differences, or by past prejudices and animosities, and so make our National Church far more than she is at present co-extensive with the English nation. May God hasten this consummation in His time!

C. ALFRED JONES.

Outlines of Christian Doctrine. By the Rev. H. C. G. MOULE, M.A., Principal of Ridley Hall, and formerly Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge. London: Hodder and Stoughton.

THESE "Outlines," by the able and pious Principal of Ridley Hall, are sure to meet with acceptance from a large number of readers; they are written, as we may well suppose, on evangelical lines, but are by no means narrow. The author divides his work into three grand divisions: (1) The Doctrine of the Godhead; (2) The Doctrine of Man; (3) The Doctrine of the Church.

The first division occupies by far the largest part of the volume, in fact, more than one-half. In it the true orthodox teaching on the doctrine of the Trinity, and the attributes and work of the Three Persons of the Godhead is very powerfully upheld, and a survey of the views which have been dominant in divers periods of the Church is also brought under review. To do full justice to this part of the work is not possible without a careful analysis, which would be necessarily a presentation of the work itself in miniature. We have noted, however, a few passages, which have specially struck us.

On the difficult doctrine of election which has in all ages so divided the

Church of Christ, we find the following remarks, which are worthy of deep attention :

It is only to illustrate this to say that the Scriptural Christian should be, and will be, a "Calvinist on his knees and an Arminian on his feet." For himself and for others he will pray to, and trust in, a God, who has all wills in the hand of His will. To himself and to others he will appeal as to those whose wills and responsibilities are realities indeed. Not that truth lies equally in the systems associated with the names of Calvin and Arminius. But there is that in Scripture which responds from its depth to emphatic points in both. And the full secret of the harmony lies with God.

In a later page a very wide distinction is drawn between the teaching of election in the "Institutes" of John Calvin and in his commentaries. Speaking of the tendency of the leaders of the Reformation "to put the facts of sovereignty into the foreground, and to follow them logically into remoter conclusions," we read :

The "Institutes" (1536) of the great Frenchman, John Calvin (1509—1564), do this certainly beyond Scriptural warrant ; while in his admirable commentaries, written later, he shows a full sense of the solemn mysteries of the subject, and the desire to take practically the plain lines of revealed love and promise.

We are glad to note these words, as there is on the part of many a strong prejudice against anything that bears the name of Calvin, which can only proceed from ignorance of the nature of his writings.

On "the Descent into Hell" our author's remarks are somewhat brief, but the following words specially commend themselves to us :

The substance of the doctrine, then, relates to our Lord's submission to all the essentials of the separate state for our sake. As His human body entered a grave, His human spirit entered hades. Whatever awfulness that entrance had for any of His saints it had for Him.

Had due attention been paid to the truth underlying these words, the notion that the Lord preached to the lost souls could not have been maintained, inasmuch as the saints of God do not enter their abode, but are in paradise ; and our Lord was subject to the laws of our humanity till His resurrection from the grave (1 Peter iii. 18-20). Christ preaching "to the spirits in prison" is brought under review, and some wise cautions are appended. We do not gather whether the able treatise of Dr. C. H. Wright, a late Bampton lecturer, in "Biblical Essays," has been seen by Mr. Moule ; if not, we venture to commend it to his attention as one of the most able and satisfactory we have perused for a long time.

The subject of our Lord's return, and the question of the Millennial reign is dwelt upon in due course. It will hardly yield satisfaction to those who hold strong views on the subject, for the scales are held in a very impartial hand ; yet the presentation of the divers theories respecting the millennium, and the arguments by which each view is supported, is surely not without its merit ; and the following words will be accepted unhesitatingly by all Christians :

Amidst the divergency of interpretation it is an important and happy reflection that all those we have sketched leave possible a profound agreement on those central truths which concern the Person of Christ, His sacrificial and sanctifying work, and the "blessed life" of His personal, glorious coming and triumph.

If we were to take any exception to the above paragraph, it would be to the use of the word *possible* ; for assuredly it is not only possible, but *certain*, that with diversity of views as to the future kingdom, there is an essential unity on all real fundamentals of faith in the case of true Christians.

The second portion of the "Outlines"—The doctrine of man—is well

and carefully handled. On the question of the definite creation of man the remarks are sound and to the point :

What Scripture does none the less assert is a mysterious new departure when the first human pair was produced. There was not a dislocation of immaterial design, but a break of mere material continuity when there was to appear the creature, at once spiritual and material, who should resemble, know, and love the Creator.

A little further on we read :

Another and far more significant certainty is that man, amidst his many variations, is found to be everywhere, even at his lowest, capable of loving and obeying God ; a gulf between him and the highest lower animals which has neither bottom nor bridge. The exceptional origin of such a creature is the reverse of an anomaly.

The phrase *highest lower animals* seems to us not quite happy, but perhaps we may be regarded as hypercritical. On "the fall of man" and "man restored" we have the orthodox view of the Church strongly maintained and enforced. At the close of the chapter on the former our readers will, we think, feel that the following remarks justify our bringing them under their notice :

The greatest force of thought has been spent in the study and discussion of this mystery for fifteen centuries. And in the study and thought of an Augustine, an Anselm, a Bernard, or a Calvin, the student will surely gain spiritual as well as mental benefit. But after all they leave us in the face of the mystery as a mystery still. We need less to analyse than to advise and act. We return to the Scripture and to the awakened soul, and there, as we believe, are found affirmed and confessed the universality of sinfulness, the solidarity of the race in guilt (*reatus poenæ*), and in pollution (*macula*), the totality of the distortion of the fallen being from the holy will of the true God as such ; and so the absolute need of a mercy which man cannot claim, and of a power not his own for his recovery.

The third grand division, "The Doctrine of the Church," including in it the "Ministry of the Word" and "Sacraments," exhibits a wide branch of reading, and will amply repay diligent study. On the question of Episcopacy the opinions of many of the leading Anglicans of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries are adduced as exhibiting a spirit of liberal toleration towards those who were not one on this question ; and here we may add our decided opinion that the more the leading divines of the Church are studied, the less will they be found to favour the teaching of the advanced school of the present day. On the Sacraments we agree with the learned author of the "Outlines" in his statement : "We may put aside, by the words 'beyond doubt,' the discourse of our Lord in John vi., a passage about which wide differences of interpretation have existed in all periods (Waterland, 'The Eucharist'), and which cannot be proved exegetically to refer directly to the Eucharist." We also are completely one with him in his following remarks : "We cannot similarly exclude (as has been done) John iii. as not referring to literal Baptism in the word 'water.'" And the words in which the chapter concludes may well be remembered in these days of so great warmth of opinion.

We conclude our general treatment with the confession of belief that in the whole study two great drifts of opinion are to be watchfully, while in a spirit of holy charity, avoided. One goes towards making them the means of grace *sui generis* for the infusion of divine nature and life. The other goes towards making them mere symbols, illustrations, occasions of recollection. It is not so. They are not creative, but obnoxious. They are not human, but divine.

We must now part with the "Outlines." It has been both a pleasure and a privilege to peruse them, and we can assure all our readers that they will find the work one of the highest value, a very useful one to place in the hands of all those who desire carefully to study the grand doctrines of the Christian Church, and yet have not time or leisure to give to the

reading of more elaborate works, which, whatever be their merits, cannot be more satisfactory in their tone or treatment than the one before us.

W. E. RICHARDSON.

Essays in Biblical Greek. By EDWIN HATCH, M.A., D.D., Reader in Ecclesiastical History, Oxford. Clarendon Press, 1889; pp. x, 293, 8vo.

THIS work is marked by the characteristics which distinguish Dr. Hatch's writings, independent research and original opinions combined with rather excessive ingenuity and confidence. It is, as he tells us in the preface, "almost entirely tentative in its character," and it is, therefore, quite possible that the author himself will be led by further study to abandon some of the provisional conclusions which are here put forward; but meanwhile, even those who are most distrustful as to the soundness of the conclusions will be grateful to the writer for the industry with which he has collected materials, and for the clearness with which he has arranged them. The book will be welcomed by every student of the Septuagint and of the New Testament as affording substantial help, both in suggesting methods of inquiry, and in supplying important items of evidence.

In two particulars Dr. Hatch seems to the present writer to overstate the case: first, in assuming that the amount of difference between classical Greek and Biblical Greek is so immense; and secondly, in treating the condition of the study of Biblical Greek as being so utterly unsatisfactory. It would require a treatise longer than the volume before us to prove the first point; if, indeed, *either* side of the position *can* be proved. But certainly the *onus probandi* rests with those who maintain that the difference between the two forms of Greek is so enormous. As regards the second point, Dr. Hatch's strong language is best interpreted as indicating the very high ideal which he sets before himself and others in the construction of the apparatus of study: otherwise it might appear to savour of arrogance. "The language of the New Testament," he tells us, "has not yet attracted the special attention of any considerable scholar. There is no good lexicon. There is no philological commentary. There is no adequate grammar." These words have probably been read with surprise by nearly everyone who is accustomed to the study of the Greek Testament. The explanation of them no doubt lies in the fact that, rightly or wrongly, most of us are much more easily contented than Dr. Hatch is. We should certainly think that Thayer's Grimm and Cremer might, without exaggeration, be called "good" lexicons; and that at least Ellicott's commentaries, not to mention others which rank still higher in other respects, might fairly be called "philological"; while Moulton's "Winer" is not wholly inadequate as a grammar. Besides these, which are within the reach of everyone, there is that exquisite fragment (would that we had more of it!) Field's "*Otium Norvicense*," and the treasures, from which everyone borrows, which are stored up in the pages of Wetstein; to which some would doubtless add the commentaries of C. F. A. Fritzsche. Trench, in his "*Synonyms of the New Testament*," works on lines which Dr. Hatch disapproves, because of the too frequent appeals to classical usage: but frequent appeal there must be, as the work before us shows; and it remains to be seen whether truer results can be obtained by trusting less to the light which classical Greek affords. Some of the new results, which Dr. Hatch puts forward as the outcome of his own method, are by no means convincing. They are a little too ingenious; and in some cases assume that language is a much less elastic instrument than it is. Language was made for man, and not man for language: and human beings use this great gift, not indeed with caprice, but with a great deal of freedom. Language has its laws; but

they are not mechanical, and do not operate with iron regularity. They are conditioned by man's intelligence and free will. Differences between words of similar meaning *tend* to become less sharp, and metaphors which are trite *tend* to lose their original meaning; but the tendency is not invariably carried out into effect, and it works very unevenly in different cases. Moreover, the processes are sometimes reversed; old distinctions are sometimes revived, and the original signification of figurative expressions is sometimes recovered, *because* experience has taught speakers that "the old is good." Usages expire because they have ceased to be needed, but when the need is felt again the usages may return. Moreover, several shades of meaning for one and the same word may be current at one and the same time. To prove that *πειρασμός* in some places certainly means "trial and affliction" rather than "temptation," and that in other passages "trial" makes better sense than "temptation," is very far short of proving that in Biblical Greek the meaning of trial "will be found to be more appropriate than any other in instances where the meaning does not lie upon the surface" (p. 73). Dr. Hatch would have it that our Lord was led up into the wilderness "to be *afflicted* by the devil," and that in the sixth petition of the Lord's Prayer we ask God to "bring us not into *tribulation*." Is it too much to say that the three recorded solicitations of the evil one are conclusive as to the meaning in the one case, and that the context is conclusive in the other? No doubt the devil did afflict the Christ in the wilderness, but the chief part of the affliction was the prolonged attempt to induce Him to *sin*. And "forgive us our *trespasses*, and lead us not into *temptation*, but deliver us from *the evil one*," seems to indicate that "temptation" means spiritual dangers rather than earthly troubles.

With Dr. Hatch's remarks on the word *παράκλητος* it is much more easy to agree, and without reservation. "This word," he says, "is found in the New Testament only, in the Gospel and first Epistle of St. John. The facts upon which any induction as to its meaning there (*sic*) must be sought in the first instance in contemporary writings cognate in character to those of St. John. They are found in Philo in sufficient numbers, and in a sufficiently clear connexion to render the induction from them free from doubt. They show that Philo used the word (*a*) in a sense closely akin to its Attic, of one who helps or pleads for another in a court of law, and hence (*b*) in the wider sense of helper in general." After quoting instances from the *De Josepho*, *Vit. Mos.*, *De Mund. Opif.*, etc., Dr. Hatch continues: "The meaning which is thus established in Philo must be held to be that which underlies its use by St. John. The meaning 'consoler' or 'comforter' is foreign to Philo, and is not required by any passage in St. John. It may, indeed, be supposed that 'comforter,' in its modern sense, represents the form only, and not the meaning of *comfortator*." (p. 83). He might have added that "comforter," or "consoler," is an impossible meaning in 1 John ii. 1, and therefore a highly improbable meaning in John xiv. 16, 26; xv. 26; xvi. 7. St. John *might* use the word in a sense different from that which it commonly has in Philo; he is not likely to have used it in one sense in the Gospel and in another in the Epistle. But it would require more quotations than can here be given to convey a fair idea of Dr. Hatch's useful book.

A. PLUMMER.

