

## Discussions.

[The contributions contained under this heading are comments on articles in the previous number of the CHURCHMAN. The writer of the article criticized may reply in the next issue of the magazine; then the discussion in each case terminates. Contributions to the "Discussions" must reach the Editors before the 12th of the month.]

### "REORDINATION AND REUNION."

("The Churchman," December, 1911, p. 910.)

THE loyalty to ancient practice, combined with true "breadth" of view, which characterizes this article, will appeal strongly to such as are open to conviction respecting the value of Canonical ordination and are not unduly held by preconceived theories. For this reason, the criticism which I venture to offer is not based on disagreement with a suggestion which must, in the main, be recognized as tending to lead us a long way towards the solution of a grave difficulty, but is rather by way of supplementing it in the one particular in which it appears to me, at least, to be defective. This defect seems to lie in the use of the rather curious term "extended ordination." Since there can be no such thing as *restricted* ordination, Nonconformist ministers (I do not include Scottish Presbyterians) are either "ordained" or "not ordained." That they are not ordained in the *Catholic* sense is, of course, obvious, but, as the writer suggests, it does not inevitably follow that their ministry has no validity for Nonconformists—which amounts to this, that validity of orders is not, under all circumstances, inseparable from the observance of traditional usage. God *does* work outside ordinances—even those of his own appointment (*cf.* Acts x. 44-48), and it is difficult indeed to believe that He does not "supply" what, owing to a variety of circumstances, may be wanting, or that a mere defect of ritual observance can be responsible for the severance of millions from the ministry of grace.<sup>1</sup> May we not say that the Nonconformist minister has, in the sense of St. Paul's words (1 Cor. ix. 1, 2), the "seal" of his ministry in the manifest presence of God's Holy Spirit with himself and in the results of his labours? We cannot call upon such men to deny their Divine commission; we *dare* not question work which bears evidence of Divine acceptance. But we can plead the desire for unity manifested in the Lord's great intercessory prayer, and we can justly point to the Catholic heritage of ministerial succession—whether maintained by Episcopal or Presbyteral ordination. They themselves will understand us when we uphold the common practice of Christendom which for centuries has distinguished the Catholic Church as a lover of order in Divine things. I would suggest,

<sup>1</sup> See Hooker, "Ecclesiastical Polity," book vii., chap. xiv. 11.

therefore, that *conditional*—not a vague “extended”—ordination is what is wanted to meet the difficulty. Conditional ordination involves no *denial* of orders, but it admits a doubt which may exist on either side—or on both. This doubt concerns the validity of the *form*. We baptize conditionally when there is uncertainty as to the validity of a previous baptism, and conditional ordination is not unknown in the practice of the Church. We dare not say of Nonconformist ministers that God has not consecrated them, even though the Catholic rite may not have been fully performed. Nor need it be felt by them to be derogatory were they to admit the possibility—even the probability—of a defect in the form of their outward commission and, therefore, to submit, in the interests of Christian unity, to a venerable, ancient, and universal ordinance. Cornelius and his companions willingly submitted to the outward and visible form of baptism even though the inward and spiritual grace had been already granted.

ALEXANDER HENDERSON.

### “THE SCRIPTURAL ARGUMENT FOR THE TIME OF COMMUNION.”

(“*The Churchman*,” December, 1911, p. 903.)

CANON PAIGE COX is so courteous and so considerate in his tone towards the benighted believers in evening Communion that I shrink from controversial argument, always unpleasant, and specially so in matters concerning our Divine Faith. I must leave to others more competent than myself a careful answer (which is surely not far to seek) to the Canon’s elaborate paper. I attempt no more here than to draw attention, without exposition, to two or three of the assumptions, omissions, and misconceptions which seem to me to underlie, or rather to undermine, his argument.

First, we are told that the only Communion service described in the Acts of the Apostles (xx. 7) was held after midnight—that is, in the early morning. But this was quite contrary to the intention of the Apostle and of the Church at Troas. The service (as Dr. Lumby reminds us) was protracted beyond the intended time. It was to have been an evening *agape* with the Holy Communion. The length of St. Paul’s discourse pushed the Holy Communion service on to a much later and (by my supposition) unscriptural hour. It is constantly overlooked that the directions and usage prescribed in our Prayer-Book (which, and not even other long usage in Christendom, is the guide for Churchmen) presuppose always a sermon before Communion. If, therefore, the Prayer-Book is supposed tacitly to take sides, and lean in permission to early or evening Communion, it is obviously in favour of evening Communion, for in the case of evening Communion a

sermon is both possible and the rule. At early Communion, even as an exception, it is, I imagine, unknown.

Secondly, in the Article which I am considering, there is no allusion to the first administration of the Holy Communion after the Resurrection. St. Luke describes it. Our Lord was the celebrant, and it took place on Easter evening at Emmaus. St. Paul's words, further, are significantly explicit, and are quoted in the words of consecration: "Our Lord Jesus Christ, the same *night* in which He was betrayed, took bread." Scriptural teaching, therefore, in the Gospels, the Acts, and the Epistles, is all for the evening hour.

Thirdly, it is assumed, and Canon Cox seems to adopt the view, that our Lord instituted the sacred Supper at the beginning of the day deliberately, and in the evening, not because it was evening, but because the Jewish day began in the evening. This is pure assumption. It was evening, and not early morning; and the evening because He was betrayed and sorrowful unto death in the evening, and because the Passover hour was evening and in haste, and not emphasizing the quiet beginning of a new day. No subsequent change of the dawn for the gloaming, as the beginning of the day, at all alters the hour of the institution and observance of the Holy Communion to the dawn.

In immediate connection with this, What Scriptural sanction is there for the view that the Passover feast was designed in any sense to prepare and strengthen the Jews for their long pilgrimage? And who can conceive so feeble an application of this fancy as to teach that early Communion refreshes the half-awakened early riser, not for the rest of the Sabbath, but for the weary toil of prayer and praise, and hearing God's word read and preached, at 11, 3.30, or 6.30 (those "other services," as they are called nowadays on service-boards and in parish magazines).

Further, we are told that this early consecration of the Lord's Day by early Communion sanctifies and consecrates the rest of the day, and ensures its observance. One can only reply in brief. It does not do so for multitudes of priests and people. It is notorious that early Mass absolves from the duty of attending later services. In the Far East, a clergyman, fresh from the teaching of advanced leaders, tells the members of his congregation that naturally enough they like the fresh air of the country after the fatigues of the week, and that if they will only be with him at seven in the morning to break the bread at Christ's own hour and in Christ's own way, and endure a slightly longer service by the addition of the Litany, they may go where they please for the rest of the day. Early Communions and early services for golf and lawn-tennis players are fashionable now, and the Lord's Day is thus broken and despised, instead of being sanctioned and revered, by such early celebrations. This, I know, is (thank God) not the rule, but it is the very frequent exception.

The contrary plea is treated, I fear, with too much scorn, yet it is

a true one—namely, that instead of receiving the Lord's Supper very early for tired clergy and tired worshippers, often only half awake and without preparation, the benefit and the help to faith and the spiritual life are much greater if the services of the morning and afternoon have preceded an evening celebration, lifting the heart into a higher atmosphere. It is a simple matter of experience that for very many, whatever physical weariness there may be at the end of a long Sunday, the mind is clearer and the spiritual sense in every way more awake and more ready for spiritual exercise than in the early morning. At any rate, the claim that it is a sacred and holy duty to yield to God the freshest hours of morning, and to receive the spiritual food into bodies untainted as yet by natural food, is really preposterous in its assumptions. The Jews, surely, were as tired as we are at the end of a day. They were affected as much as we can be by the natural food of the body. Yet our Lord chose the evening hour, and while supper was going on, for the administration and institution of the Supper.

Surely the change of hour in early times from evening to early Communion is sufficiently accounted for by the suspense of the *agape* for a time, to avoid misrepresentation and possible scandal. Evening Communion continued for a long time in the great Egyptian Church; and it is mentioned by St. Cyprian. If long-continued observance of a habit is considered a sure mark of Divine guidance, this plea is urged (we must remember) by the Roman Church for the inception and continuance of some of her greatest errors—Mariolatry, for instance, enjoined and observed now for nine centuries and more; and more recently, the Immaculate Conception, Papal Infallibility, and the adoration and deliberate worship of the Blessed Sacrament, so Catholic, so ancient.

I do not write these paragraphs as one who is prejudiced by having acquired the habit of which Canon Paige Cox speaks so strongly—the habit of evening Communion. My experience is otherwise. I have been otherwise accustomed all my life long, and in my ministry I have generally observed other hours, early or midday. The late Bishop of Salisbury told me once that he believed nine o'clock in the morning was the very early canonical hour. When I have had the opportunity, I have always welcomed evening Communion; but what moves me now, and has always moved me, to indignation and deepest sorrow is to hear the hour and time prescribed by our Lord Himself and so early followed, denounced either as a crime or as a hindrance to Christian unity.

A. E. M.

## "REORDINATION AND REUNION."

(*The Churchman, December, 1911, p. 910.*)

MR. MALAHER'S interesting suggestion towards the solution of the problem of Home Reunion is based entirely on his conception of the Catholic Church, which may be briefly summed up as follows: "The sign of membership in the Church of God, or body of Christ is baptism, but the Catholic Church (apparently with Mr. Malahar a more exclusive society) was intended to possess, in addition, a corporate life preserved by a definite form of organization. This organization in the New Testament implies the possession of Episcopal Orders, and therefore the members of non-Episcopal Churches are not Catholics." This hypothesis is certainly ingenious, but it starts with a fallacious *petitio principii* method of argument, for it begs the main question of what constitutes the true notes of the Catholic Church, by assuming that in the New Testament its definite organization, necessary, as Mr. Malaher rightly states, for the preservation of its corporate life, included of necessity the existence of Bishops possessing the exclusive functions of transmitting the grace of valid Orders. It is, however, scarcely a matter of dispute that in Apostolic times the office and functions of Bishops and presbyters were interchangeable, and that only after a considerable time they became distinct, and monarchical Episcopacy universally established in the Catholic Church.

Where is there any Scriptural warrant for Mr. Malaher's assumption that Nonconformists are "self-deprived of the fulness of covenant blessings" simply because of their lack of Episcopal Orders? Mr. Malaher's whole conception of the Catholic Church as consisting in "continuity with the original society founded by Christ" *solely by means of Episcopal succession* is fundamentally wrong. The notes of a true branch of Christ's Catholic Church in the New Testament are stated simply as "One Lord, one faith, one baptism" (Eph. iv. 4-6), while in the Early Church the true profession of the Nicene Faith was the sole guarantee of orthodoxy, the Council of Ephesus even anathematizing all who should presume to add to this requirement. Thus all sections of Christians who hold the unity of this Faith form essential parts of the true Catholic or Universal Church, which in the language of our Prayer-Book consists of "all who profess and call themselves Christians." Accordingly, our Church has never regarded Episcopacy as "the principle of Catholic unity," and is, therefore, silent as to the precise office of those who have "authority given them in the congregation to call and send ministers into the Lord's vineyard" (Art. xiii).

The teaching of our Reformers also makes it abundantly clear that Apostolical Succession is not, as Mr. Malaher affirms, "an essential part of the Catholic side of our heritage." Bishop Hooper declared that "the true Church is known by these two marks—the pure preaching of

the Gospel, and the right use of the Sacraments. Such as teach people to know the Church by the traditions of men and the succession of bishops teach wrong," while Cranmer condemned as "gross ignorance" the Romish theory that "no Church could be the true Church of God, but that which standeth by ordinary succession of Bishops in such pompous and glorious sort as now is seen." Mr. Malaher also implies a false antithesis of terms in stating that "the heritage of the Church of England has both a *Catholic and a Reformed* side," as the main object of all the changes effected by the Reformers was to reassert and restore a pure and primitive Catholicity. As Dr. Jackson (whom Dr. Pusey eulogized as "one of the best and greatest minds our Church has nurtured") said in 1627, "We Protestants of Reformed Churches are the truest Christians and *the most conspicuous members of the holy Catholic Church.*"

Mr. Malaher's proposal of "extended ordination" for "non-Catholics," as he terms Nonconformists, involves a specious distinction between "Catholic" and "non-Catholic" Orders not likely to be acceptable to any sincere Dissenter, for if his previous ordination was not "Catholic" or orthodox, the only logical conclusion is that it was invalid. He is right, however, in his main contention that in any successful scheme of Reunion it is essential to retain historic Episcopal Ordination, for it would be impossible to surrender what so large a part of the Catholic Church regards as, at least, the most Scriptural, ancient, and divinely blessed form of government. But this does not involve the obligation of reordination, at least, of those Churches possessing a "regular" ministry, as it is impossible to prove Episcopal Orders to be the sole guarantee of Catholicity. There is a certain irony in the fact that just as Mr. Malaher calls the Nonconformist a "non-Catholic" because of his want of Episcopal Ordination, so the Romanist terms him a "non-Catholic" because of his refusal to accept the Papal Supremacy.

C. SYDNEY CARTER.

### "SPADE AND BIBLE."

(*The Churchman*, November, 1911, p. 819.)

MR. TREMLETT'S courteous, if drastic, criticism of the first portion of my article raises a good many points on which I should be tempted to follow him did space and time allow; in fact, it covers most of the debatable ground between the traditional and the critical schools of thought; but I must confine myself to the issue raised by the article, the bearing of archæological research upon the question.

May I begin by asking what evidence I have "disparaged"? Every fact that bears upon the point is of the utmost value, and I should be the last to "disparage" it; it would be foolish to do so, for facts are

stubborn things and "chiels that winna ding." For facts and evidence I have a great respect; but my respect for the conclusions which have sometimes been based upon facts is considerably less; and if Mr. Tremlett will refer to my article, he will see that my protest is made against certain conclusions which seem to be unsupported by the premises, and certain claims which are not borne out by subsequent performance. For instance, if Professor Sayce in his article had promised to tell us what the cuneiform inscriptions have revealed about the *days* of the patriarch Abraham, his subsequent contribution would have amply fulfilled what he claimed to do; and the evidence which he alleges is of real value in deciding the question whether the patriarchal narratives contain historical elements or are mere fiction; and Mr. Tremlett will have seen from the second half of my article how unjustifiable I hold the latter position to be. But the claim that the information tells us something "about the Hebrew patriarch Abraham" is one which, with one doubtful exception, has not been made good. It does not add to the strength of the traditional position to base conclusions upon evidence insufficient to support them; the claim is constantly being made that no archæological evidence has been discovered which is inconsistent with the traditional position; it might with equal truth be alleged (and here I am confining myself to the patriarchal narratives dealt with in the article) that no archæological evidence has been discovered which is inconsistent with the critical position as a whole. The evidence has been misused by partisans on either side; what is needed is the attempt dispassionately to weigh the evidence, and see what conclusions can safely be based upon it; this attempt, however imperfectly carried out, was made in the article.

I am in full agreement with Mr. Tremlett that the important question with regard to the Hexateuch is not that of authorship, but that of historicity; but I fear that I know of no evidence which would be accepted in any ordinary historical inquiry, to prove that all the contents of these books are of equal historical value. The evidence, as far as I know it, goes to show that, while they probably do contain "myths and folklore" (I use Mr. Tremlett's expression), they also still more probably contain a good deal of matter which can be relied on as historical—the broad outlines of the national movements, the chief actors in the story, and a nucleus of incidents which upon the face of them are probable, and do not appear to lend themselves to explanation as personifications of tribal relationships, or as later attempts to account for the origin of rites or customs, or the sacredness of certain shrines; but, beyond this I cannot see that the evidence will carry us at present.

I should explain that my delay in reply was due to a wish to give Mr. Tremlett an opportunity of dealing with my article as a whole, should he so have desired.

M. LINTON SMITH.