

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

Lord in His own special ordinance in a cathedral or a church rather than in a sick room, a hut, a wigwam, or a ship, a fishing vessel, a barge, or a light vessel. But no man receives the Holy Communion for himself alone. It is also a witness, just as public prayer is a witness, an epiphany. We "show the Lord's death" to our shipmates better openly on board our own ships in the usual place "where prayer is wont to be made" rather than in a hole-and-corner way in a private cabin, or by going ashore to a landsman's church. He is equally present to the individual believer wherever He is approached in prayer. But the witness to the whole crew is more feeble when individual seamen go ashore to meet their Lord than when they witness for their Divine Master amongst their comrades afloat on board their several vessels at the anchorage.

Equally to the Lord's Supper applies the Apostle's injunction: "I desire, therefore, that the men pray in every place, lifting up holy hands, without wrath and disputing"; and the Psalmist's words: "If I take the wings of the morning, and dwell in the uttermost parts of the sea; even there shall Thy hand lead me, and Thy right hand shall hold me."

"We are as near heaven by sea as by land."

A COMMANDER, R.N.

(To be continued.)

"CHRISTIAN CHARACTER."¹

WHAT doctrine must be the fruit of experience and the motive or inspiration and guide of conduct was a favourite thesis of Bishop Westcott. To-day the attempts to separate Christian principles from a belief in the facts of Christian history, or the contents of the Christian revelation, and to divorce Christian conduct from a belief in Christian dogma, are manifold and of various kinds. One result of a study of this thoughtful book will be, we trust, to show that such attempts are not only illogical, but are doomed to failure. As Dr. Illingworth says in his preface, one result of a study of history is to show that "the fundamental nature of the Christian character, as exhibited by its best representatives, has always remained the same. And that character has been essentially dependent upon belief in the cardinal doctrines of the Christian Creed."

¹ "Christian Character," being some Lectures on the Elements of Christian Ethics, by J. R. Illingworth, M.A., D.D. London: Macmillan and Co., Ltd., 1904.

And to-day we have to meet a further charge, namely, that “Christian ethics are inadequate to modern needs”—in other words, that the ethical principles of Christianity, as these are found in our Lord’s sayings in the Gospels, or as they are explained and expanded in the apostolic epistles, while no doubt excellent for the conditions which evoked them, are altogether insufficient to meet the much more complex, and in every way different, circumstances of to-day.

Here, then, are two great objects: (1) to prove that Christian ethics can no more be accounted for apart from Christian doctrine than fruit can be accounted for apart from the tree (with its life) which produced it; and (2) to show that Christian principles, if studied with care, are a sufficient guide to conduct under all conceivable conditions. These are the objects of Dr. Illingworth’s work—“to recall the continuous claim of Christianity to be the adequate goal of all human desire, and this only on account of its further claim to be a Divine revelation” (p. vi).

“Life the End of Christian Ethics”: such is the title of the first chapter; and by “life” is meant “the life which is the practical outcome of belief in the Incarnation.” So the assertion of Christ “I am come that they might have life,” finds its echo in the words, “I live; yet not I, but Christ liveth in me”—the typical Christian experience. And this “life” is continually contrasted with “death.” “As in Adam all die, even so in Christ shall all be made alive.”

But besides life and death there is a third great entity, whose presence and power in human nature is confessed in the words, “The sting of death is sin.”

If now we look within ourselves we feel that death in any form is not only abhorrent, “there is something in it which is unnatural.” Our instincts and our aspirations are for a richer, larger, fuller life.

Dr. Illingworth then proceeds to show that so far as by repentance and the power of the Christian spirit sin (*vide* especially pp. 10 *ff.*) is overcome, the body, instead of being an enemy, becomes “a spiritual organ, an instrument of righteousness.” There comes a consecration of the whole nature, and human life is “the condition in which a person (and personality is ultimately spiritual) can exercise his energies in the fullest degree.”

Further, true life involves a development of the two aspects of personality, the individual and the social. As an individual, man must “fulfil his function,” which is that which he alone can do, or can do best. As a social being, man has not only a duty towards others, he is dependent on other persons, and “when we probe the need of dependence upon other persons

to its utmost depth, we are carried in the last resort to the infinite Personality of God" (p. 8). So the essential condition of man's realization of himself is in union with God. From this it follows, that as "life" consists in union with God, who is Eternal, this life is itself eternal. But this life is not only eternal in time, it is eternal in *quality*, and from this conviction issues the corollary that man cannot neglect this world for the other, because "eternal life is operative within him here and now."

Such is, very briefly, the argument of the first few pages of this extremely suggestive and, I venture to add, eminently practical book, which in one sense is a treatise on Christian ethics, while in another, and equally true, sense it is a treatise on the Christian philosophy of life. But this philosophy is based on the *facts* of human experience, which a deep study of human nature show to be in exact correspondence with the assertions of revelation as found in the teaching of our Lord.

To the teacher and the preacher this book will be extremely useful. The true work of the teacher is to set men to investigate, the chief work of the preacher is to produce conviction. There is no more important subject of investigation than human nature, or human personality, including, of course, its capacities and aspirations. One of the chief evils of to-day is a conscious or unconscious acceptance of a materialistic philosophy of life, in one or other of its various forms; and the practical result of this evil is in the materialism which has invaded every class of life, and which tempts men to believe that life *does* depend upon the abundance of the things possessed, whence we have the frightful competition, as well as the seeking after luxury, which in different ways are making any higher or true life impossible.

This book will enable the teacher to show quite scientifically that the materialistic philosophies are false, because they do not account for all the facts of human nature: they do not account for its highest faculties and capacities; and if we would judge correctly of anything, we must surely judge it where and when we find it at its best.

We have briefly indicated Dr. Illingworth's philosophy of life; it would be an instructive study to show how far it is in agreement with the *final* philosophy of the late Professor Huxley, as outlined or foreshadowed in his last lecture, upon "Evolution and Ethics." For materialism, or, rather, its exposition in conduct, is very nearly akin to the "Cosmic" process of the survival of the (materially) strongest, which Professor Huxley admitted is not only insufficient, but must actually be overcome, if the best and highest natures and conduct are to be produced. They demand not only the

recognition, but the exercise, of another force in the world—viz., the "ethical." They demand actually more, for they demand a recognition of some source, and constant means of supply, of this ethical power.

It would also be instructive to show how entirely Dr. Illingworth's philosophy leads to the conclusion of the late Dr. Hort, that "the Christian life is the true human life, and that Christians become true men in proportion as they live up to it; and also that the right relations between members of the Christian society are simply the normal relations which should subsist between members of the human race."¹

Chapter II. is upon "Character the Condition of Life." Here, again, the Christian teacher will find a very useful refutation of a false idea which, at the present time, is producing a rich crop of evil. During the first half of last century Christianity was preached almost exclusively as a message to the individual. Since then there has been a reaction, and the "social" side of Christianity has been, possibly, over-emphasized. This may be one wave of an influence which has in varying degrees come over civilization—I mean the "socialistic." Now, an exclusively "socialistic" philosophy of life loses sight of *all* the facts of life as much as does a materialistic philosophy. For experience teaches us that "the Christian life must begin with the reformation of the human will"; hence the futility of the action of those "secular philanthropists who appear to think it possible to renovate society in the mass by the improvement of its education, or the amelioration of its conditions of existence" (p. 23). Those who are trying to work for Christ in our large towns know only too well the evil results of that popular hallucination—that true and thorough social reform can be effected otherwise than through the reformation of individual lives. As Dr. Illingworth says, "Christianity is fundamentally and essentially social. But society consists of individuals, and those individuals are sinners, and sin has its seat in the central function of our personality—the will. Any attempt, therefore, to improve society which does not begin with the will, and consequently with the individual, is either ignorantly superficial or consciously hypocritical" (p. 24). Thus a true and adequate view of sin—and the clearness and thoroughness of Dr. Illingworth's teaching upon sin is one of the many excellent features of his book—will not regard it, as there is at least some danger of its being regarded to-day, "as the breach of an impersonal law." For "behind the moral law there is, in the Christian view, a person, and a person who

¹ "The Christian Ecclesia," p. 228.

loves us ; and sin, therefore, in the last analysis, is a wounding of love, and as such must, when realized, involve emotional¹ regret " (p. 26). The presence of this emotion " cannot fail to accompany the conviction that God is love, and its presence is intimately connected both with the humility and the intensity of the Christian character. For humility has a more important place in the Christian than in any other scheme of life . . . it is not primarily connected with our relation to other men, but with our relation to God, and springs from an intellectually true view of that relation " (p. 27).

I have given this somewhat lengthy extract as an example of what readers will find throughout the book—*i.e.*, not merely a description of the Christian virtues as factors in the Christian character, but clear and intelligent reasons why the essential Christian virtues are the product of an essentially Christian Power, inspiring and ruling life. The whole of this chapter will repay the closest study, but I must pass on.

At the opening of Chapter III., which is upon "Discipline the Means of Development," our attention is called to the fallacy in the contrast which is often drawn "between self-sacrifice and self-development as ethical ideals," and thus we are led to investigate the true place of asceticism in Christianity. From the important place, and rightly so, which the body occupies in Dr. Illingworth's treatment of personality, and from his strong teaching upon Christianity being for the whole man, this subject naturally occupies a prominent position in his argument. He rightly lays stress upon the usefulness of a wise measure of asceticism, which, "in Christianity is never an end, but always a means to an end."

In this chapter, as in the last, we have some striking deductions of the necessity of the practise of certain virtues—*e.g.*, prudence and love—simply from the right conception of the Christian's relation to God. After speaking of voluntary self-discipline, Dr. Illingworth goes on to treat of "that other discipline which comes to all of us without our seeking—sickness, pain, bereavement, and sorrow," which he regards as "an indispensable means towards our real end, which is the formation of a character in union with God," and he rightly points out that their value for this purpose will, to a great extent, depend upon the spirit in which they are borne.

Chapters IV., V., and VI., upon "Faith and Hope," "Love," and "The Cardinal Virtues," which together describe

¹ The meaning of the word here is explained by the entire context, which I have not space to give.

“the positive content of the Christian character,” we must not stay to examine, though in each will be found an abundance of helpful teaching. The same may be said of the following chapter upon “Prayer.”

Chapter VIII. deals with “Sacraments.” We notice at once the absence of the definite article, and this absence must be constantly remembered as we read the chapter. Dr. Illingworth commences by pointing out that “prayer in the Christian religion is further assisted by Sacraments; and that not accidentally, but essentially, because it is the religion of the Word made flesh, and therefore necessarily sacramental (p. 145). He then proceeds to show how our increasing knowledge both of the history of religion and of comparative religion has revealed to us “how very prominent a place Sacraments and sacramental rites have occupied in the earlier and simpler religions of the world, especially in the form of sacred ablutions and sacred meals. . . . Thus, the sacramental principle is as old as recorded religion, and Christ, whilst simplifying its application, consecrated it afresh” (pp. 145, 146).

What is the reason for this universal sacramentalism in religion? It is because our body is a part of our personality; in fact, even prayer—the most spiritual of all exercises—“can only find expression through the agency of nerves and brain”—part of the material of which our bodies are composed. Then it must be recognised that the body is not only the *minister* of the spirit; the condition of the body *affects* our spiritual condition. This “intimate implication” of body and soul proves “the fitness, not to say the necessity, of the Incarnation.” We think Dr. Illingworth is quite right when he says that “no increase in the spirituality of our religion can supersede its necessity for sacramental expression and support.” There is a proof of this in the way in which efforts after the purely spiritual have, in certain Christian bodies (*e.g.*, Quakerism), shown a tendency to pass into the purely intellectual (*e.g.*, Unitarianism).

We are then reminded, and quite truly, that “all union with God must start from the side of God. We can only respond to a Divine invitation. This, therefore, is the significance of Sacraments. They come to us ordained by Christ as man, and administered by the human society which as man He founded. They appeal to each individual as a Divine commandment, coming from without and from beyond himself. And though their object is to convey to us spiritual grace, it is to convey it by bodily means, as to beings whose bodies have an essential part to play in its acceptance, as well as an essential need to be consecrated by its effect” (p. 149).

We have quoted this paragraph at length because in it, as in a great part of this chapter, we think that in his treatment of "Sacraments" Dr. Illingworth has, at least, laid himself open to serious misinterpretation—to being charged with maintaining views which we cannot think that he really holds. He is so anxious to lay stress upon the sanctity of the human body, upon its importance, upon its effect on the spirit, that we think he fails to emphasize sufficiently the other side of our nature. We are not unaware of the recent "trend" of science to assimilate "matter" and "force"; and the effects of this tendency may, we think, have led our author perilously near being held to attribute to Sacraments an efficacy in themselves which probably he would really repudiate. We do not like the phrase "ordained by Christ as man"; there is a suspicion of its being equivalent to "that which is material being ordained by One who is material," a suspicion which seems to be also suggested by the words which immediately follow—"administered by the human society which as man He founded."

He next considers "the place which Sacraments occupy in the development of the Christian character," and he assumes that "the vast majority of Christians have always been, and still are, agreed in regarding Sacraments as means or instruments of grace, and in using them as such. It is when we attempt to define what may be called the secret of their operation, the precise degree or kind of grace which they convey, or the precise method in which they convey it, that divergent theories begin to arise" (p. 149). We do not wish to be hypercritical; but, again, we think the terms "precise degree" and "precise method" are not wisely used, especially when we remember the following words (which occur on the very next page): "The Christian Sacraments are practical things; they exist to be used, and their importance for us consists in their use and not in their explanation." The antithesis here suggested does not seem to be either true or fair; there surely may be a sound explanation which yet does not necessarily define the *precise* method, still less the *precise* degree, or, more probably, which may define the method without presuming to define the *degree*.

But more than this: these last words we have quoted seem to suggest something perilously near the doctrine of the *opus operatum*, and that in a form which even the Council of Trent did not venture to insist upon, since it felt the need of explaining the phrase as not abolishing the necessity for personal faith (p. 150).

For the same reason the words, "though their object" (*i.e.*, that of Sacraments) "is to convey to us spiritual grace, it is

to convey it by bodily means,” are open to at least serious misunderstanding. If these words mean that God has attached a spiritual blessing to certain actions (*e.g.*, devout reception of the elements in the Lord’s Supper), of which actions personal obedience (to a Divine commandment), springing from a real and true personal faith in the goodness and wisdom of God, is an essential factor, then I agree. But would not this truth have been better thus expressed, that, through personal faith, certain Divinely ordained materials (the sacramental elements) are made the means—*i.e.*, the channels—to their recipients of the communication of a blessing? We may also note in passing how inimical under any interpretation is Dr. Illingworth’s teaching to “non-communicating attendance.”

It is very difficult to compress further Dr. Illingworth’s already more than sufficiently compressed writing; but had we possessed the requisite space we should have liked to examine the whole of the long paragraph on p. 151, where he deals with the “appropriate spiritual context” of Sacraments—a phrase whose meaning he does not make sufficiently clear. We believe that had he simply retained the well-known words of the Catechism—that a Sacrament is a means whereby we receive an inward and spiritual grace, guarded by the two definitions about personal requirements (of those who come to be baptized and to partake of the Lord’s Supper), he would have found, we feel sure, that the sacramental teaching of the English Church was quite in agreement with his own excellent teaching in the earlier chapters of his book.

One more criticism: On p. 149 he uses the term “divergent theories” (*sic*), and on p. 150 he says, as we have above noticed, “their importance for us consists in their use and not in their explanation.” But, firstly, would not “doctrines” have been a more appropriate word than “theories” to use in connection with “Sacraments”? And surely “whatsoever is not of faith is sin”? And does not the whole of his book show that Christian conduct is bound up with a right doctrine of human nature? Secondly, had Dr. Illingworth continued his long quotation from Hooker, “E.P.,” lvii. 5 (pp. 153, 154), into the first words of the next section—“there have grown in the doctrine concerning Sacraments many difficulties for want of distinct explication what kind or degree of grace doth belong to each Sacrament”—he would hardly have written, “their importance for us consists in their use and not in their explanation.”

Had we not already exceeded the space allotted to us, we should have wished to point out many useful thoughts in

the two remaining chapters, upon “Mysticism” and upon “Christian Life Supernatural.” If we cannot commit ourselves to agreement with everything in the first—an adequate criticism of which would demand a lengthy excursion into the psychology of Religion—we can, at least, strongly advise our readers to make a careful study of it. What Christian mysticism is at its best is admirably thus described: “A man may desire God, and even endeavour to keep His commandments or do His will, without having as yet attained thereby to any consciousness of a Divine response. But as soon as that consciousness comes, whether in prayer, or sacrament, or sense of providential guidance, and faith begins . . . to be confirmed by experience, the resulting state may be called mystical, since it involves a conviction of personal communion with God, of contact, in one degree or another, with Divine reality” (p. 180).

The final chapter, upon “Christian Life Supernatural,” is one of the best in the whole volume, and to the preacher, who has to combat and to show the insufficiencies in the materialistic and naturalistic philosophies of the day, it should prove extremely useful. Dr. Illingworth points out the “tendency in the modern atmosphere to regard man’s ethical development as simply natural, in the sense of being due to the normal operation of his ordinary faculties,” and, further, that “naturalism, strictly speaking, is neither more nor less than materialism . . . but it has widely overflowed its banks, with the result that many Theists, and even Christians, are unconsciously biassed by naturalistic tendencies, which they have not consistently thought out” (p. 193). On the other hand, “the term ‘supernatural’ appropriately describes the Christian life and character as being grounded on the Divine forgiveness of sin, sustained by the indwelling presence of the Divine Spirit, and guided to a union with God, which can only come about as a Divine grace or gift” (p. 192). These extracts are examples of the good things which this chapter contains.

As I close this short notice I am conscious that I have done but scant justice to a very valuable book, a book in which the Christian minister, who has, by the help of the Divine Spirit, to deal with the many present practical difficulties of “life,” will find immense help. To those who may be induced to read and study this book I would give one word of caution—it seems to be much easier to read and to understand than, I believe, is really the case. I began by a quotation from Bishop Westcott: I would conclude with another—viz., his warning as to the difference between writing which is “lucid” and writing which is “simple.” The

admirable clearness of Dr. Illingworth's style may tempt all but the most careful readers to fancy they have far too easily mastered all he has to teach them.

W. EDWARD CHADWICK.

SOME EARLY CHRISTIAN ORATORIES.

IN the sixth century a party of Christian missionaries from Ireland landed on the Cornish coast, either at Pendinas, where the town of St. Ives now stands, or on the banks of the Hayle Estuary. They began to preach in the neighbourhood, and their memory is perpetuated by the churches they founded and consecrated, churches whose direct successors remain to this day.

One of these early evangelists was Gwithian, who built near Godrevy Point, within sight of the waves breaking on the shore, a tiny place of worship, and bestowed his own name upon it. Probably he ministered within its walls to the simple people who gathered round him until a tragic end came to his career.

Tewdwr, the heathen chief who ruled over that part of Cornwall, put him and several of his companions to death, but speedily a dire vengeance befell the tyrant. As an old writer explains: "This is a parish much anoyde with the sea sande which flyeth at a low water with the winde out of the choaked hauen into the Lande, swallowinge vp much of the lande of the inhabitants to their great impoverishment." Tewdwr's low-lying territories, unprotected by cliffs, and his royal castle were overwhelmed, and have never been seen again.

At a later period Gwithian's church shared in the general desolation of the coast, when houses and pasture-lands were buried in the sand, but it was not forgotten; its site was well known, but it was confidently believed that there were no remains of buildings. As a fact, the buildings were in existence, but they were hidden by the towans. In 1834 the sand was dug out, and the little church again brought to light.

Let us recollect that the spot was a hallowed one; those drifts of golden sand had preserved it from desecration. It was the nucleus of the parish, for the church then in use was the successor to Gwithian's own little temple, only removed to another site for convenience and safety; yet the ancient stones claimed no reverence from their discoverer, and he degraded them to the purposes of a pig-sty. In the vestry