

We may be doubtful as to the authorship of the closing verses of St. Mark's Gospel, and may therefore not feel quite sure whether the promise that outward miracles are to continue to distinguish the career of true believers comes to us with the full authority of a Divine utterance. Or, again, we may be disposed to question whether, if this be so, the promise was for all time, or whether these special gifts were only designed to meet the special needs of that early period, when Christianity had all the world against it. But no such doubt can rob us of the testimony that runs through the whole New Testament as to the supernatural phenomena that we have a right to expect to flow from faith, through the whole course of our life's experience.

Let us boldly claim our birthright privileges in this respect, remembering that to have a form of godliness, but to deny the power, is one of the features of the final apostasy. We hail with no small satisfaction the revival of interest in the ethical side of Gospel truth, that is a characteristic of our time, and our hearts respond to any and every call to walk in the steps of our great Exemplar; but we will not let our sympathetic appreciation of teaching of this kind modify, in the slightest degree, our estimate of the supreme importance of what we may well name the dynamics of Christianity. Remembering that what we call the supernatural is only the natural with God, we will dare to expect it of Him that He shall still be true to His own nature in fulfilling His own promises of Divine head and personal intervention. So shall we be able to re-echo with equal confidence the Apostle's exclamation: "I can do all things through Christ, who strengtheneth me."

W. HAY M. H. AITKEN.



ART. II.—THE LIMITS OF THE OXFORD MOVEMENT.

UNLIKE other great religious revivals, the Oxford Movement was at first purely academic, or "aristocratic," as W. Palmer called it. The men who originated it were among the acutest intellects of the University, and the questions raised were such as could be adequately discussed only by professed theologians. Keble himself was a brilliant scholar; Pusey was the most learned man of his time in Oxford; C. Marriott is described by Dean Church as "naturally a man of metaphysical mind, given almost from a child to abstract and even abstruse thought"; Hurrell Froude, Isaac Williams, Copeland, J. Mozley, Ward, and, above all, J. H. Newman, formed a small but remarkable group of men far above the

average in intellectual gifts and force of character. Under one aspect the Movement was a reaction against the prevalent utilitarian philosophy of the day; under another it was a political protest against the Liberal measures of a reformed Parliament, and the attacks openly made upon the Church of England:

“Not as yet
Are we in shelter or repose;
The holy house is still beset
With leaguer of stern foes.
Wild thoughts within, bad men without,
All evil spirits round about,
Are banded in unblest device
To spoil love's earthly paradise.”

KEBLE: *Christian Year*
(*Second Sunday after Trinity*).

The first effort, then, of the leaders in the Oxford Movement was to reform the Church of England, to re-examine its credentials, to place it on a firm historical and doctrinal basis, to free it from abuses, to restore its spiritual influence, and to reclaim its rights as a dominant force in the country. In this way alone it was felt could a firm stand be made against the revolutionary tendencies of the age. It was a scheme which precisely suited the character and acquirements of men who “could not bear a bad argument,” but one which placed the Movement in its first stages on a plane far removed from popular sympathy or comprehension. The validity of Anglican orders; the Apostolical Succession; the claim of the Anglican Church to Catholicity, and its relations to the Eastern Church and to Rome; the precise meaning and effect of the Holy Eucharist, are all points of deep interest and importance, needful also to be determined, but had no immediate or direct effect on popular religion. For some years the Movement was almost confined to Oxford, and, indeed, to a limited number of Oxford Common-rooms. It was not till after the angry protest against Tract 90, the condemnation of Pusey's sermon, the degradation of Mr. Ward, the secession of Newman, and the collapse of the Tractarian party in Oxford, that the Movement passed into the dioceses and country parishes.

But in carrying its influence into a wider sphere the Movement bore with it traces of its academic origin. From the first the aim of the Oxford leaders in giving a practical turn to the Movement had been to instruct and stir the clergy. The need was deeply felt. “The fortunes of the Church are not safe in the hands of a clergy who take their obligations easily. It was slumbering and sleeping when the visitation of days of change and trouble came upon it,” says Dean

Church ("The Oxford Movement," p. 4). And the student of the "Christian Year" will recall many passages in which this source of danger to the Church's life is deplored :

"Oh! grief to think, that grapes of gall
Should cluster round thy healthiest shoot!
God's herald prove a heartless thrall,
Who, if he dared, would fain be mute!"

Thursday before Easter.

And again :

"Chiefly for Aaron's seed she spreads her wings,
If but one leaf she may from thee
Win of the reconciling tree.
For what shall heal when holy water banes?
Or who shall guide
O'er desert plains
Thy loved yet sinful people wandering wide,
If Aaron's hand unshrinking mould
An idol form of earthly gold?"

Fifth Sunday after Easter.

Consequently it was to the clergy of the Church of England that the appeal was first made. And on them the principles of the Movement had an immediate and profound result. The stirring arguments of Tract No. 1, and the continuous counsel given to the younger generation of clergy by Dr. Pusey and the other Oxford leaders, at once raised the level of the clerical life, deepened the sense of responsibility, and enhanced the dignity of the calling.

The most effective argument in this revival of clerical life and energy used by Newman in Tract No. 1 was the principle of the Apostolical Succession: "If you have the spirit of the Apostles on you, surely this is a great gift. 'Stir up the Spirit of God which is in you.' Make much of it. Show your value of it. Keep it before your minds as an honourable badge, far higher than that secular respectability or cultivation, or polish, or learning, or rank which gives you a hearing with many. Tell *them* of your gift" ("Tracts for the Times," No. 1, p. 3). This principle was indeed the basis of the Movement, and the impression it has made on the clergy has been deep and lasting. Under its inspiration men like Hook in Leeds and Butler at Wantage effected great things. But, notwithstanding the magnificent work achieved by these and hundreds of like-minded clergymen throughout the country, it is more than questionable whether the principles of the Movement have even yet reached the masses, either in town or country, so as to influence their lives or their religious ideas. The average rustic in a "High Church" parish would find it very hard to express the theological differences between himself and his Low Church neighbour, although their respective

pastors would be at no loss if the need came. One happy result of this is that, so far as the bulk of the population is concerned, there is little or no feeling of antagonism, or even active disagreement, to interfere with efforts made for reunion. On the other hand, it must be confessed that the subjects which interested the originators of the Movement, and which still chiefly interest many of the clergy and the more educated laymen, are not of practical concern for the town or country labourer.

The sacramental teaching, revived and deepened by the progress of the Oxford Movement, has changed the aspect of Church life in all places where the upper middle class is largely represented. The crowded congregations and the large number of communicants in the West-End churches, in the suburbs of London, and in seaside resorts, are evidence of this fact. But the same teaching has failed to be effectual in the rural populations. It is not that religion is non-existent in country villages: religion exists, but it is of a different type. No one can read Tract No. 29, recounting the conversation between John Evans and his Rector, Dr. Spencer, without being conscious of a certain air of unreality about it. What has happened, then, is that the energetic and earnest High Church clergyman influences his flock, but he has not drawn it into the religious life of the Oxford Movement.

2. The Oxford Movement almost from the first parted into two streams of tendency. On the one hand, it was an Anglican revival, a genuine effort to reproduce the seventeenth-century type of English Churchmanship, the Churchmanship of Ken and Andrewes and the Non-jurors. On the other hand, it was the movement of men who felt more and more acutely the evil condition and scandals of the existing Church of England, and who were increasingly fascinated by the grandeur and teaching of the Church of Rome.

The first party claimed some reconsideration of the Reformation settlement. They contended that, while in the vast religious movements of the sixteenth century many and salutary changes had been effected, it was quite certain that the reaction against Rome had carried men too far in some directions, and that practices and institutions good in themselves had been swept away with the abuses which had sprung from them indeed, but were not their natural and necessary results. On the other hand, they found some aspects of the devotional and religious life existing in full and beautiful perfection in the Roman Church. These were claimed as the rightful heritage of Catholic Christianity. Others advanced far beyond this position. With a group of Newman's disciples what was Catholic became identified with

what was Roman.¹ The *British Critic*, now dissociated from Newman's control, began "to run riot in distinctly Roman articles." When the more sober members of the party protested, Ward responded by publishing "The Ideal of a Christian Church." This book contained such sentences as: "In subscribing the Articles I renounced no Roman doctrine, yet I retain my fellowship, which I hold on the tenure of subscription, and have received no ecclesiastical censure in any shape." In his defence before the University, Mr. Ward said: "I believe all the articles of the Roman Church."

The inevitable result followed. Ward, Oakley, and others followed their convictions and were received into the Roman Church. The secession cleared the air, and though it was followed by the complete collapse of the Tractarian party in Oxford, as those who remember Oxford in the fifties and early sixties will testify, the Movement itself proceeded with undiminished energy and success in the country.

What is important for us to note in the present crisis of Church life is that both these streams of thought and doctrine are still represented in the English Church, one section of the High Church party firmly upholding the Anglican position of protest against Rome on the one hand, and the invasions of Puritanism on the other; another section aiming without disguise at the reintroduction into the Anglican Church of Roman doctrines and practices as essentially Roman.

3. The Oxford Movement has had great results. It has revived Church work in manifold directions, opened fresh avenues for the spiritual energies both of men and women; it has widely extended the episcopate and revolutionized its work; it has infused fresh life into ecclesiastical architecture; it has added to the beauty and solemnity of Church services, and increased the frequency and variety of them; it has raised the sense of duty among the clergy and stimulated their zeal. The work of men like Charles Lowder at the London Docks, and of the brothers Pollock at St. Albans, Birmingham, are grand instances of zeal fired by the spirit of the Oxford Movement.

Again, it has certainly influenced Nonconformity. The Free Church Catechism bears witness that Church and chapel are much nearer doctrinally than they were a generation ago. There is a social *rapprochement* and friendliness between the Vicar and the Dissenting minister which would formerly have been considered impossible. The value of such social ameni-

¹ "Ward identifies what is Catholic with what is Roman. . . . He could hold the whole cycle of Roman doctrine and yet remain in the Anglican Church" (Church, "Oxford Movement," pp. 306, 326).

ties lies in the openings which they offer to "dispassionate controversy" on the subjects which have tended to separation.

It must, however, be confessed that one lamentable error in the course of the Movement was the needlessly abrupt and even offensive way in which the teaching was in some cases promulgated. The Evangelical party was then dominant in the Church. As a party it lacked the intellectual power and research of the Oxford Movement. Notwithstanding the contributions of the two Milners to Church History, the records and teaching of the early Church were all but ignored by its leaders. The history of doctrine, the beautiful examples of saintly life, the victories won by martyrdoms, even the struggles of our forefathers against Papal oppression, and, above all, the full force and reality of sacramental teaching, had well-nigh ceased to enter into the experience of the Christian life. There was a tendency to regard the Reformation period as the beginning of the English Church. The antagonism to Rome was carried to an unreasoning excess, and, as a consequence, the conception of the Church as a whole, the idea of discipline and of the authority of the Church, were set aside in the teaching of the Anglican Church. On the other hand, love of the individual soul, the need of conversion, of unworldliness, even of asceticism, marked the best type of Evangelical religion, and produced saintly lives and great results. If that revival was to be known by its fruits, it could point to an outburst of missionary zeal, to effective preaching, to abolition of slavery both abroad and in English labour centres, to Sunday-school work and the education of the poor. If it was less academical and learned than the Oxford Movement, it was more in touch with the people.

It only needed tact and generosity on the part of the Tractarians to instruct and supplement what was lacking in the Evangelical system. Where each party was engaged in a common quest for truth there was no need of antagonism. But there was no attempt to conciliate by the recognition of the deep and genuine religious feeling and the devoted lives which could be numbered in the Evangelical ranks.

Some acts were calculated to create distrust and fear, for which there was no real occasion. As, for instance, when Dr. Pusey issued a series of Roman Catholic books of devotion at a time when men's minds were nervously alive to the fear of proselytism. The new doctrines were even ostentatiously paraded; the manner and dress of some of the younger and less considerate adherents of "the Movement," and unnecessary innovations in ritual, naturally provoked opposition. After the condemnation of Tract 90 feeling began to run

high, controversy was embittered, and there was no longer a struggle for union. On the contrary, divisions were intensified. The Tractarians became to the Low Church party what Rome had long been to the English Church as a whole. Everything that came from that quarter was viewed with suspicion and dislike. How unnecessary this was, and how much might have been done by conciliatory and persuasive methods, is shown by the gradual influence of the Movement both on the Evangelical party and on Nonconformity, as already mentioned.

This influence, without friction, has produced in the ranks of the English clergy—perhaps one of the best results of the Movement—a type of men who are Evangelical in their preaching, and in the highest sense of the word Catholic in their teaching and practice. And the same force is beginning to unite in common action the most sincere and religious men of both parties. The most hopeful omen for the future is that this move is being made among the junior clergy of the two great parties of the Church of England. An ardour of co-operation is showing itself in missionary effort, which promises the happiest results. At one of the recent conferences of delegates from the Junior Clergy Missionary Association in connection with the S.P.G., the chairman, in supporting a resolution, “That meetings of the S.P.G. and C.M.S. should be held throughout the country in order to promote (a) mutual sympathy and co-operation between the clergy, and (b) joint efforts of intercession to cover the whole mission-field,” said: “Do not let us be content with passing resolutions. The way we are to carry this out is for one man in this town, and for another man in another town, to make real friends with a C.M.S. man, and get him to say: ‘Why can’t we stand together in connection with the mission-field? Why can’t we pray together in the principal church of the diocese or of the town?’ The only way it can be done is by individual work here and there.”

This is precisely the spirit which is needed at the present day, and precisely that which was lacking in the earlier stages of the Oxford Movement. For the divisions which arose out of that Movement, and were accentuated by it, were for the most part divisions among the clergy and the educated people whom they influenced.

This is indeed a welcome gleam of reunion within the Church itself, which may broaden out into a fuller glow under the influence of dispassionate controversy on disputed points.

Of these points it may be remarked generally that the contention has been most fierce where the impossibility of a certain conclusion has been most decisive. The crucial

instance of this has been the dispute as to the precise mode in which the grace and benefit of the Holy Eucharist are conveyed to the recipient. For error, or supposed error, on this point tens of thousands have been slain by fire and sword. The dispute has separated, and still separates, nations as well as Churches.

Of so vast a controversy it is impossible here to touch the fringe. But with a view to removing this cause of disunion three questions may be asked: Is it possible to recast the form of the controversy, and to state the argument in terms which are not those of a philosophy which but for this particular controversy would never have survived? Is it possible to agree that this dispute can never be determined definitely by human reasoning, and that the revelation of our blessed Lord in regard to it is limited? Is it too much to hope that the Church in this day might be content with what Dr. Swete tells us was the position of the ante-Nicene Church? "She was satisfied with the knowledge that in the Holy Eucharist she had an unfailing provision of the Bread of life . . . the banquet of fish and bread which so often appears (in the catacombs) indicates the assured belief that our Lord gave Himself in the Eucharist, but does not imply more" (*Journal of Theological Studies*, February, 1902, p. 176). The words which follow may well be taken to heart now: "Whatever view may be taken of this attitude, it certainly made for peace."

The famous answer of Elizabeth when questioned on the subject of transubstantiation still holds good:

"Christ was the Word that spake it,
He took the bread and brake it;
And what His words did make it,
That I believe and take it."

Bishop Creighton's comment on this quatrain deserves to be laid to heart: "It was a saying the theological truth of which has become more apparent as controversy on the point has progressed" ("Queen Elizabeth," p. 37).

Another of the chief among the crucial questions which exercised the leaders of the Oxford Movement was, as we have seen, that of Apostolical Succession. It forms the basis of Newman's impassioned appeal in Tract No. 1, and it is pressed home in several others of the series. As an argument and stimulus for work in a great cause it has had an enormous influence. The settlement of the question, therefore, was one of critical importance. Its investigation was suited to the great ability of the Oxford movers. And yet, considering the great issues which hang upon its determination, and the results which have followed the view taken at the inception

of the Movement, the first decision may well claim re-examination. It is a question precisely suitable for dispassionate controversy by students of history and theology, as it is unsuited for popular treatment.

There are at least two reasons which make the discussion of this doctrine very important at the present moment. One is the tendency of the doctrine, as interpreted by Newman, to separate the clergy into a caste by themselves, and to a large extent to alienate the laity. For one of the undoubted "notes" of the day is the lack of a thorough understanding between the clergy and laity of the Church of England. A second reason for a reconsideration of the question lies in the fact that it forms in its present position an insuperable bar to any real reunion with Nonconformists. And what ultimately all true Christians are aiming at is the unity of the Church of Christ, and the removal of all unnecessary obstacles to that unity.

In view of this, the deliverances at the recent Fulham Conference in regard to the interpretation of John xx. 22 are of great importance. And Dr. Sanday, in his sermons on "The Conception of the Priesthood," exhibits the right temper and method in which the discussion should be carried on. As, according to the unanimous decision of the Fulham Conference, the words of John xx. 22 were addressed to the eleven and those with them—*i.e.*, to the whole Church—so Dr. Sanday shows that at the Council in Jerusalem (Acts xv.), although the Apostles "act as leaders of the Church and give shape to its resolutions, those resolutions go forth with the authority of the Church as a whole" (p. 45). Nor does it appear from any passage in the New Testament that special powers were conferred on the Twelve as such. The Church is described as built upon "the foundation of the Apostles and prophets"—*i.e.*, probably the New Testament prophets, not the Apostles alone (p. 50). Moreover, it is clear that the laying on of hands did not, at least in all cases, "denote the transmission of a power or energy from one who had it to one who had it not" (p. 57). Lastly, an important citation is made from St. Augustine to the effect that "none of His disciples gave the Holy Ghost. They prayed, indeed, that He might come upon those on whom they laid their hands, but they did not give Him themselves. A custom which the Church in the case of its officers retains to this day" ("De Trin.," xv., 26, § 46). On which Dr. Sanday raises the question whether the creation of a new ministry, different from the regular and established order with prayer invoked, and not without signs that the blessing prayed for has followed, should prove a permanent cause of division, especially when

that new ministry was the result of a reaction for which the established order was largely responsible.¹

These are questions which thoughtful minds are already discussing. It would be a mistake to press conclusions or to forestall practical results. These will come as the inevitable consequences of convictions formed outside the heat of party conflict, as in the case of many other once burning questions, which have been silently determined by an unwritten consensus, and thereby revolutionized modes, of religious thought.

But these also are academical questions, the discussion and decision of which do not touch either of the two pressing demands of the day, both of which lie beyond the strict limits of the Oxford Movement.

These two demands are concerned, one with the attitude of the Church towards agnosticism and scientific unbelief, the other with the evangelization of the masses. As regards the first, there is need of a school of philosophy, Christian by conviction, whose task it will be to restate and reaffirm the foundations of belief. For the second there is need of a revival, and, therefore, of some great teacher-prophet who shall have power to stir the latent Christianity of the masses, and to create disciples who will follow in his steps. It is from the people, and not from the Universities, that we may hope for the new revolution, for, as Bishop Westcott has taught us, "the movements which have changed the world have drawn their forces from the poor."²

ARTHUR CARR.

ART. III.—A POINT OF TECHNICAL ACCURACY IN THE GOSPELS—*πλοῖον* AND *πλοιάριον*.

IN an illuminative article on "St. Luke's Gospel and Modern Criticism" in the *CHURCHMAN* for February, 1903, Mr. Jennings makes the following statement. On p. 256, footnote 2, he writes: "John vi. 22-24 shows that there is no distinction in his use between *πλοῖον* and *πλοιάριον*." This is the *prima facie* view, and it has tradition to support it. But writers of commentaries, transcribers of the New Testament who introduced into a margin running in parallel columns with the text their own conjectures of what the author meant, and compilers of lexicons, have not generally as practical a knowledge about boats as they have about

¹ "Ministerial Priesthood," p. 58.

² "Lessons from Life," p. 56.