

write, lecture and teach for her and for her God; and lastly, Whether these scribes will organize themselves for efficiency and mutual improvement and support.

L. V. BIGGS,
Hon. Sec. Enfield Church Sunday-School
Teachers' Association.

ART. VI.—CURRENT FALLACIES IN THE CHURCH.

A PAPER READ TO THE CLERGY AT MAIDSTONE, JULY 18, 1893.

THERE are certain fallacies by which we are in the present day beset, and about which it would be well for all true adherents of Reformation principles to be perfectly clear in their own minds.

The first is that there were doctrines not taught by Christ, and unknown by the Apostles before the Day of Pentecost, which were to be disclosed by the Holy Spirit. The maintainers of this fallacy are much given to quoting the words of St. John xvi. 13: "When He, the Spirit of truth, is come, He will guide you into all truth." They do not go on, however, to quote the rest of the utterance in the words which immediately succeed, and which would at once set them right. They are these: "For He shall not speak of Himself; but whatsoever He shall hear, that shall He speak; and He will show you things to come. He shall glorify Me; for He shall receive of Mine, and shall show it unto you." The idea that the Holy Spirit would produce anything not taught by Christ is most perverse. It is entirely precluded by these words. If any additional light on our Lord's meaning is needed, it may be found in the parallel passage in chapter xiv., ver. 26: "But the Comforter, which is the Holy Ghost, whom the Father will send in My Name, He shall teach you all things, and bring all things to your remembrance, whatsoever I have said unto you." As Luther said: "He imposeth a limit and measure to the preaching of the Holy Ghost Himself; He is to preach nothing new, nothing other than Christ and His Word—to the end that we might have a sure sign, a certain test, whereby to judge false spirits." Thus the Spirit is conditioned by the Son, as the Son is by the Father. More than once we are told that the disciples needed interpretation of our Lord's words: "They understood not that saying, and were afraid to ask Him." "They understood not the saying which He spake unto them." "They understood not that He spake unto them of the Father." "This parable spake Jesus unto them; but they understood not what things they were which He spake unto them." "They understood none of these things; and

this saying was hid from them, neither knew they the things which were spoken." "These things understood not His disciples at the first, but when Jesus was glorified then remembered they that these things were written of Him, and that they had done these things unto Him." The office of the Spirit was to be that of an interpreter. He was to bring the innumerable words of our Lord back to the minds of His disciples; He was to interpret them, show their ground in the Old Testament, and their application to their existing circumstances. But in the most important period of the manifestation of the Holy Spirit, from Pentecost to Revelation, there is not one single trace of any shred of teaching different from the teaching of our Lord. It is the law of Christ that the Christians are to obey. It is the word of Christ which is to dwell in them richly. It is the Word of the truth of the Gospel that they have heard. The Word is something already known—they are to preach it in season and out of season. A bishop is to hold fast the faithful word as he hath been taught. Our Church is abundantly apostolical in this point, when we are taught that "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." The Apostles taught nothing that Christ did not teach; the Church can teach nothing but what was taught by the Apostles and by Christ.

The second fallacy is that during the forty days after the resurrection our Lord communicated to the Apostles a number of new doctrines which do not appear in the Gospels, Acts, or Epistles. This fallacy is grounded on the simple words at the beginning of the Acts of the Apostles: "The former treatise have I made, O Theophilus, of all the things that Jesus began both to do and teach, until the day in which He was taken up, after that He through the Holy Ghost had given commandments unto the Apostles whom He had chosen: to whom also He showed Himself alive after His passion by many infallible proofs, being seen of them forty days, and speaking of the things pertaining to the kingdom of God." Never was tremendous inference laid on less solid foundation. The point here is that all that Jesus did and taught till His ascension St. Luke has already recorded. He maintains that in all necessary particulars his account of the life of Jesus is full and complete. Of the precious words which He spoke of the things pertaining to the kingdom of God, St. Luke has already given the most important and characteristic specimen in his account of the walk to Emmaus: "Then He said unto them, O fools, and slow of heart to believe all that the prophets have

spoken: ought not Christ to have suffered these things, and to enter into His glory? And beginning at Moses and all the prophets, He expounded unto them in all the Scriptures the things concerning Himself." And again in the same chapter, in his account of the interview with the Apostles, St. Luke gives another specimen of what he means: "He said unto them, These are the words which I spake unto you, while I was yet with you, that all things must be fulfilled which were written in the Law of Moses, and in the prophets, and in the psalms, concerning Me. Then opened He their understanding that they might understand the Scriptures, and said unto them: Thus it is written, and thus it behoved Christ to suffer, and to rise from the dead the third day; and that repentance and remission of sins should be preached among all nations, beginning at Jerusalem, and ye are witnesses of these things." No shadow of a hint is given of new doctrine, or sacerdotal teaching, or the foundation of institutions. If there had been, the passage at the beginning of the Acts would have been the very place in which St. Luke should sketch them. No hint of such a thing is given in St. Matthew, St. Mark, or St. John. No authority of our Lord is invoked for any of the adaptations of Christian institutions to circumstances, where, had the fallacy been true, such citation would have been inevitable. Nothing is attributed to our Lord in all the Acts and Epistles that is not taught in the Gospels, except some well-known phrase of His, "It is more blessed to give than to receive"—words which, after all, only summarize a large portion of His recorded teaching. Nothing can be more obvious than the meaning of St. Luke. Our Lord's visits to His Apostles after His resurrection are few and far between; the chief of them are recorded by St. Paul. Had He given any new directions, these could not have failed to appear in the text of the New Testament. If once you suppose that Christ, during His brief appearances, gave instructions not recorded in His life, and not alluded to in the Epistles, you may just as easily believe that He prophesied of the invocation of saints, the worship of the Virgin, the doctrine of purgatory, indulgences, the Mass, the celibacy of the clergy, the five sacraments, auricular confession, the Virgin's Immaculate Conception, the worship of images, and the Infallibility of the Pope.

The third fallacy, which at the present day meets us, is that there were a number of matters so important and so sacred in the eyes of the Apostles, that they were afraid to mention them for fear of the Jews and pagans, or even to give any hint of them in their Epistles. It is in this way that audacious and uncritical writers explain the fact that the mentions made in the New Testament of the Lord's Supper are not so numerous.

or important as they would wish, the comparatively minor stress that is laid upon it, and the total silence about any liturgical service, or any transfer of the Aaronic vestments to the Christian presbyters. But if that was really the case, or anything more than the most gratuitous fancy, it would follow that the Lord's Supper would not be mentioned at all; whereas St. Paul gives an explicit account of its institution. It is sometimes, in the same prejudiced manner, argued that when St. Paul rebuked the Corinthians for abuses, he could not have been alluding to the Lord's Supper, but to the Love Feast. Then, why should he bind up his rebuke of the excesses inextricably and fundamentally with his account of the institution? And again, the breaking of bread is constantly and frequently mentioned. This argument, that Scripture was silent about matters either too familiar for explanation or too sacred to be mentioned, will not bear an instant's examination. Scripture is not silent about them at all, but frequently mentions them, and gives them their due place and proportion. If there had been any real sacrificial teaching in connection with the Holy Communion, the Epistle to the Hebrews would have been the place of all others for such doctrine. If such doctrine had been in vogue, and yet the Epistle to the Hebrews remained silent, it would have been most incomplete and misleading.

The fourth fallacy I wish to mention is connected with the word "Romish." There is an ambiguity about it which is a most disastrous and unfortunate circumstance in our present controversies. The most extreme of the innovating party declare that they are not Romanizing, because there are just two points in the present condition of Rome after which they have no hankering. They do not accept the Infallibility of the Pope and the Immaculate Conception of the Virgin Mary, which are recent additions to the Romish Creed. And they lay great stress on the fact that before the Reformation the Church of England sometimes tried to declare its comparative autonomy and independence of the Romish See. But the real point is that, from the time of St. Augustine downwards to the Reformation, the Mediæval Church of England did follow the developments of the doctrines of the Church of Rome, and was as thoroughly Romish in her teachings and practice as any other portion of Christendom. The appeal of the Reformation, by which we of the Church of England are all bound, was most distinctly not to the time of St. Augustine, but to the authority of Holy Scripture itself, considerable importance being attributed to the witness and evidence of the first three centuries. This ambiguity, which gives occasion to assert that the doctrines of the Mediæval Church were not Romish, gives rise to this very grave fallacy, which has momentous

consequences at the present day amongst the younger clergy. The Use of Sarum, to which they appeal, was not identical with the Use of Rome, but it taught the same doctrines. It is the doctrine which is of importance, not the mere phrases, or varieties of ceremony by which it is expressed. The laity at large have no conception of the gravity of this fallacy. They are constantly told that things, practices, and doctrines are not Romish, because there was some variation in the national customs of the unreformed English Church. When the extreme innovators are accused of moving Romewards, they declare they are not moving to Rome, but to Sarum. They mean that they do not propose to accept the Infallibility of the Pope or the Immaculate Conception of the Virgin; and they also mean that they are not going to adopt Romish colours, or distinctively Romish ceremonies, as apart from the ceremonies of Sarum. This is in reality only a quibble, although no doubt it represents some important distinction to their own minds; for the doctrines of the Church of England during the ascendancy of the Use of Sarum, towards which these men are desirous to move, were most distinctly Romish. Sarum merely means Rome minus the Infallibility of the Pope and the Immaculate Conception of the Virgin. But the protest of England against Rome was three centuries before the Infallibility of the Pope and the Immaculate Conception of the Virgin were thought of or invented. It is Rome in the guise of Sarum that we have thoroughly and once for all repudiated, and that we have once more to repel.

The fifth fallacy commonly in vogue is in the use of the word "Catholic." Its true use is to distinguish the Church or Churches which hold to the simple teaching of the New Testament from those which are heretical, and which, as holding some peculiar view of their own, are not universal. As regards institutions or doctrines, its proper meaning is that which has been held always, everywhere, and by everybody. The great truths of Christianity taught by the New Testament, and the simple institutions of Bishop, Priest, Deacon, Baptism, the Lord's Supper, and the weekly meeting for Prayer, are therefore Catholic. Little else is worthy of the name. To usurp it for the mere usages, customs and doctrines of a Church calling itself Catholic, whether they themselves have been held always, everywhere, and by everybody, or not, is an abuse of terms. It is a good, useful, and important historical word, and should be vindicated from the slavery to which it has been subjected.

Against a sixth fallacy I would ask you to protest with all your hearts and souls. It is in the application of the word "Churchman" or "good Churchman." "What sort of a

Churchman is he?" is a question that is asked every day. Those who ask it generally mean that they wish the subject of their inquiry to be one who puts the mediæval doctrines of and about the Church above the plain and simple teaching and authority of Scripture; one who places so disproportionate a value on the outward body and its developments that he has become out of harmony with the balance of Scriptural doctrine; one who thinks more of the mediæval Church of England than of the principles of the Reformation; one who thanks God that, in spite of much that was to be deplored at the Reformation settlement, certain unexpected treasures have been handed down the existence of which has in modern times been rediscovered. Now, in the early Church a true Churchman was one who, while holding, of course, to the great principles of Catholic truth, obeyed the customs of his own Church, and was guided by his own bishop. If a man wished without authority to copy the customs of other Churches, and disregard the example and advice of his bishop, so far he was not in harmony with Catholic principles. Much was left to be settled by the taste and feelings of individual Churches. That is a principle on which our Church has claimed full liberty. Her own principles are expressed with abundant clearness. It is those who are loyal to those principles, who, according to the rules of the primitive and Catholic Church, are the true and genuine Churchmen. It is those who, under some strange mediæval hallucination, adopt the principles, teachings, and customs of other Churches, which are not really Catholic, but Roman, and which our own Church has by its own inherent authority distinctly repudiated, who incur the censure of faulty and imperfect Churchmanship.

Another mistake I may be permitted to mention. It is that of taking up some name or phrase characteristic of the other movement, and using it in a new sense as if it were perfectly harmless. It is supposed that, by the fact that you use it yourself, you have taken all the sting out of it. You perhaps hear it said: "I am a sacerdotalist. You are sacerdotalists. We are all sacerdotalists. The sacerdotalism we all believe in is the sole priesthood of our Lord Jesus Christ." Well, of course that is very true in the sense in which it is used; but if we all go about calling ourselves sacerdotalists, in some peculiar esoteric metaphorical sense, we shall only succeed in being considered to agree with those of whom the name is really and truly characteristic. The name sacerdotalist belongs to those who insist on the delegated sacrificial vicarious priesthood. The name Catholic, in its proper sense, belongs to us. The name Protestant belongs to us. But the name sacerdotalist is obviously misleading, and we have no reason to meddle with it.

One more fallacy before I conclude. The use of the adjective High-church is full of ambiguity. In its application it is a very relative term. In Queen Anne's days it meant something very different from what it means now. But we must not allow its concentration upon the most extreme or ritualistic section of the Church to persuade us that against those who are not ritualistic we have no point of argument or disagreement. I think we should say that all those who put the authority of the Church above the authority of Scripture, who teach that the Lord's Supper is an expiatory sacrifice, who hold apostolical succession as a doctrine, and not merely as a historical fact or probability, and who teach a real local presence of Christ in the elements, whether they are given or not to ritualism, are, in a conscientious and straightforward way, High-churchmen. But there are many among these who wish to persuade us that only the men who wear vestments are High-churchmen, and that they themselves are plain members of the Church of England. Now, we do not wish to multiply differences, but at the same time we cannot consent, by any shifting of recognised historical terms, to have our minds confused and the teaching of our Church obscured. Otherwise, every succeeding generation would be going further down the scale, until the old framework of the Reformed Church of England would be left like the ark on the top of Ararat.

My brothers, you have a glorious position to vindicate, and an unrivalled opportunity of making its establishment sure and certain. The country is waiting to hear what you can say for your attitude and your belief. You have on your side the Bible and the Prayer-Book. Of this the innovators are conscious, for they have now made definite proposals for the Prayer-Book's alteration. You have on your side the great mass of the laity, who dislike ritualism, the confessional, the sacrifice of the Mass, and the sacrificial priesthood. You have the Archbishop condemning disparagers of the Reformation, and declaring it to be the greatest event since the publication of Christianity. You have the Bishops pronouncing that fasting communion is not obligatory, and that evening communion is under circumstances permissible, whereas the contrary propositions have been for years earnestly taught by the mediævalists. Oh, make use of this great opportunity. Establish your Pastorate at Oxford. Build your own theological college in the provinces. Maintain Reformation principles in every assembly of the clergy. Prove to the Nonconformists that the Church is still what for three hundred years she has been intended to be, the bulwark of an intelligent and truly Catholic protest against Rome. Support Reformation literature. Distribute wise and well-grounded Reformation pamphlets throughout

the country. The ceaseless vigilance of Rome never slumbers; she uses the mediævalists for her own vast, far-sighted, patient, and comprehensive purposes. Have the courage of your opinions. Recommend them by the earnestness, devotion, and self-sacrifice of your lives. Win the working classes by the true brotherliness of your sympathy. And may God Himself continually shield us from pride, presumption, and error, and give us a right judgment in all things!

WILLIAM SINCLAIR.

AN ASPIRATION ON JULY 6TH, 1893.

SEND Thy blessing from above,
O Lord, on Bridegroom and on Bride;
Be their morning bright with love,
Crowned with peace their eventide!
Be their glory less to trace
Kings and princes in their line,
Than to prove in gifts of grace
That their hearts and hopes are Thine!
Born to glad a reign whose light
Shines with undiminished ray,
In its evening hour still bright
As in its glad opening day.
Crown of all their life be Thou,
Let Thy blest acceptance seal
Every prayer and every vow
Raised for their eternal weal!
Give them grace unharmed to bear
All that highest lot below
Brings with it of fear and care,
Smile of joy or tear of woe!
In the brightest hour of life
May they never leave Thy side,
That in time of darkest strife
They may find Thee near to guide!
Then, when every storm is past,
And Thy peace shall reign alone,
Crowned in glory they shall cast
Their earthly crowns before the Throne.

R. C. JENKINS.

Lyminge Rectory, Kent.