

## 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.]

(As the CHURCHMAN for January had to go to press at an exceptionally early date owing to the Christmas holidays, the two following articles, which, according to our rules, should have appeared in that number, are being printed in our present issue.—EDITORS, CHURCHMAN.)

### "REORDINATION AND REUNION."

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

MR. MALAHER'S article seems to me admirable in its spirit, and it offers a fair solution of a perplexing problem. Mr. Henderson's criticism of the term "extended ordination" does not affect the principle of the proposal, of which I understand him to approve. Even Mr. Carter, although he rejects Mr. Malaher's premises, accepts (*mirabile dictu*) his main contention. But when one asks if Mr. Malaher's proposal is likely to be approved by Nonconformists, I fear that the reply must be in the negative. Mr. Malaher thinks that if union were achieved in England it would only be reasonable to require Nonconformists to receive Episcopal ordination in order to exercise their ministry in the wide sphere of the historic Catholic Church, but that this "extended ordination" would not deny that such orders as they already possessed were valid in the narrow sphere of non-Catholic communities. Mr. Henderson prefers "conditional ordination," as not involving a denial of Orders, but merely throwing doubt on the validity of the form of ordination. Mr. Carter wishes to retain historic Episcopal ordination while not requiring the reordination of Nonconformist ministers; but as he gives no hint of how this can possibly be done, he may be left out of account. I am afraid that if either Mr. Malaher's or Mr. Henderson's proposals were brought before any company of Nonconformist ministers they would unanimously reject them both.

There is one fact which does not seem to be noticed by any of the three writers on this subject, although it is of the greatest importance. There are large numbers of Nonconformists who look upon ordination in any shape or form as savouring of superstition, or at least as being needless and valueless in these progressive days. Dr. Robert Horton is by no means the only Nonconformist minister who has refused to submit to any kind of ordination, and, as baptism is not always insisted on as a condition of membership in some Nonconformist bodies, it is

quite possible that some of their ministers are unbaptized as well as unordained. Men who refuse to be ordained according to the customary form of their own denomination are not at all likely to accept Episcopal ordination as a condition of union with the Church of England.

Mr. Henderson's article on "The Kirk of Scotland and the Experiment of 1610" brings into the field a community which lays the greatest stress on ordination, and rigorously confines the administration of the sacraments to those who have been "lawfully ordained." Of this a remarkable proof was given at the last General Assembly, which decided that a Wesleyan minister who had applied for admission into the Kirk could not be allowed to exercise his ministry therein, unless he was reordained according to the Presbyterian form. Here, surely, is common ground on which Presbyterians and ourselves may meet. Supposing that the Established Church of Scotland and the Church of England were to unite, would it be necessary for the ministers of the former to be reordained?

Mr. Malaher's answer is that it would, for, although Presbyterian Orders were valid in the Kirk before the Union, they would need to be superseded by Catholic Orders when the ministers became part of the Catholic Church. Mr. Henderson would also require reordination, but he would qualify it by the formula, "If thou art not already ordained." Permit me to say emphatically (and, as one reared in Presbyterianism and still in close touch with it, I speak of what I know) that reunion on such terms is impossible.

Both ministers and people amongst the Presbyterians are quite assured of the validity of Presbyterian Orders and the correctness of their form of ordination. The subject, indeed, gives them no concern, and they have considerable difficulty in understanding our position. The Presbyterian minister believes that he has been duly ordained "*juxta laudabilem Ecclesiæ Scotiæ Reformatæ formam et ritum*" (to quote the words of an Archbishop of Canterbury); he can trace his Orders through ordained presbyters to the times of the Reformation, when they merge into Episcopal Orders, and he is persuaded that the Episcopal power of ordination is inherent in the presbyterate. If, as the price of union with the Church of England, it is required that Presbyterian ministers must undergo "extended" or "conditional" ordination, we shall be told by them that our terms are too high.

There is an alternative, however, and one with which I expect Mr. Malaher and Mr. Henderson to agree. In the event of union, the Orders of Presbyterian ministers might be recognized as valid for all purposes in the sphere in which they had already been exercised, but as not valid for all purposes in the united Church. To take a particular case in order to make my meaning plain: If a union took place on the terms I suggest between the Church of England and the Kirk of Scotland, then Dr. Wallace Williamson, the minister of

St. Giles, Edinburgh, would not be required to undergo Episcopal ordination. He would continue as at present to exercise every function of his ministry, with this exception, that in any ordination at which he assisted a Bishop must preside. In addition, he would be allowed to preach in any English church when permitted by the Bishop. If he wished for the further privilege of celebrating the Holy Communion in an English church, he would then require to be Episcopally ordained.

This solution might be accepted by all the parties concerned, for none of them would be called on to recant their opinions or deny their convictions. The Presbyterian minister would not be required to admit that his ministry was invalid, and in being allowed to preach in our pulpits he would gain a recognition which he greatly desires. Our own people would, as now, be assured that no one would preach to them without Episcopal permission or administer the Holy Communion without Episcopal ordination. In the course of some years the ministers who had been ordained according to the Presbyterian Order would die out, and as, after the union, all ordinations would be conducted by a Bishop with his presbyters, the men thus Episcopally ordained would gradually take the place of the others.

A solution such as this has already been proposed both in Scotland and Australia, and, indeed, wherever union proposals have taken definite form. It has this great advantage, that Presbyterians consider it to be a fair proposal, and one which they might accept without any feeling of humiliation. As such, it deserves our serious consideration, and I venture to commend it to Mr. Malaher and to your readers.

J. T. LEVENS.

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

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

CANON PAIGE COX’S article deals with my paper on “The Time of Communion at Troas” in the *CHURCHMAN* for last June. He has given us, with the greatest possible courtesy, the clearest statement of the view which it was one main object of that paper to examine.

He asks what are the other indications in Scripture which I claimed to be all on the side of the evening hour? He says there are none except the institution, which he explains in accordance with his theory. But it is surely impossible to exclude Corinth; and if surprise be expressed at the choice of such a precedent, it is important to point out that it provides one of the most striking of all instances, from the fact that St. Paul recommended no change of hour even for abuses which might be argued to arise then from the time of service, but apparently urged that any necessary personal meal should be taken at home *first* (see “*Expos. G. T.*” on 1 Cor. xi. 34, and other authori-

ties). Moreover, I used the word "indications" to cover the case of Emmaus. It cannot be quoted as a direct instance, but the sacramental associations of the scene and the phrase "the breaking of bread" are sufficiently suggestive; and it is often rightly used as an "indication." And this, at any rate, was on the *Sunday* evening. Add the original institution and the service at Troas (which is certainly a case in point, though I cannot now repeat my reasons), and it becomes clear that, whatever day is signified, all available Scripture guidance points to the evening.

I may explain that it was the view that the Sunday began at sunset, after the Jewish fashion, which I granted to be reasonable in itself, if it contradicts no other *data*—not, as might appear from Canon Cox's reference, the view that the service at Troas was designed so that the actual Communion took place in the morning. His words do not really imply this, nor do I think he meant it; but I wish to make the point quite clear. However reasonable that other view may be, apart from other considerations, it would appear at least to be incapable of proof. Canon Cox replies to one of my suggestions against the view, but his reply does not seem altogether to cover the second appearance eight days after; nor is it appropriate to suggest a possible wish to commemorate *two* such remarkable appearances, both presumably on the *Sunday* evening. And he does not deal with the strongest point—the language of Acts xx.—which was examined in § 3 (ii.) of my paper. He lays great stress upon continuous Church practice. But Bishop Lightfoot said that there were evening Communion for 150 years (see Dr. Griffith Thomas's "Catholic Faith," p. 421). Even Cyprian refers to them without condemnation. And Canon Meyrick thought that the change to early morning was not due to ecclesiastical authority, but to an imperial rule against club meetings. The later strictness of rule had probably much more connection with fasting than Canon Cox admits. In purely or mainly Gentile Churches, before the change was universal, would a Jewish mode of reckoning time be enforced against all their former Roman usage? I have already shown that this Roman reckoning may have been operative even quite early at Troas. It is much more likely in later cases. Similarly, we ourselves have Jews in our midst; but we have our own reckoning. Under all these circumstances, no disrespect to Church practice is involved in a return to more primitive custom—rather the reverse. Is our Church, in purely administrative matters, ever to stand still—and to stand still, moreover, in ways which, if these things are true, are not strictly primitive? Doctrine and principle are unchanging; in administration we not only can, but ought to move.

I do not follow the argument about the preparatory aspect of the Passover. In what sense was it preparatory, except at its institution? Its later observance illustrates the memorial and other aspects of the Lord's Supper; but had the annual Passover any preparatory signifi-

cance for the day on which it was held? One could understand better if its institution in Exodus were taken as a type of the need for spiritual strength on life's journey; but that would be equally applicable to Holy Communion at any hour.

The theory as a whole seems to rest upon a series of increasingly doubtful assumptions—the Sunday beginning at sunset, the preparatory aspect of the service, the change to morning by Roman reckoning, the unbroken custom from early time till sixty years ago, and, finally, the presumed necessity of telling those who cannot come in the early part of the day that we will not let them come at all till we have effected an altogether Utopian change in modern social life. One is reminded rather of the list of unprovable assumptions in the plea for Papal supremacy. If the first two or three links be granted, a good deal will follow (though even then not all), but when the argument begins by begging several questions the conclusion is less convincing. Is it credible that if the matter were so vital we should be left to uncertain inferences, and that what inferences can be drawn from Scripture should, to the unsophisticated mind, favour the evening?

Canon Cox ignores one most serious difficulty, though I mentioned it in my paper, and his article now only emphasizes its importance. If he is right, our Church has not been true to Catholic usage, as he claims. Much of his argument will prove nothing unless it establishes that we must *begin* the day with this service. At the very utmost, "the earlier hours" cannot cover 12.30 or 1 p.m. Is he prepared to lead a campaign against *midday* Communion? Nay, further, has our Church, leaving the door open for these late services by the arrangement of her own Prayer-Book, committed a breach of Catholic usage of which she must repent? It is well known that early Communion were regarded as an innovation not so long ago, and that the Prayer-Book contemplates Morning Prayer first. And the significant excision of the words "afore noon" which stood in the First Prayer-Book (Communion of the Sick) seems to show the mind of the Reformers to assert Scriptural liberty. Late evening services of any kind were of course then not thought of. But they are now.

The spiritual profit of early Communion is mentioned. That appears to be a matter of temperament. Equally devout Christians say exactly the same of the evening. And physical freshness accounts for much. For example, stress is often laid upon early morning prayer and Bible study; but that does not mean that they are neither acceptable to God nor profitable to our souls at any other hour. And against any such advantage must be placed the tendency in some quarters to think that an "early celebration" sets the day free for golf or cycling.

Everyone will appreciate the earnestness of the plea to reconsider the whole subject, "argument by argument," for unity's sake. Canon Cox at the same time announces himself open to conviction. May we therefore, on our side, earnestly plead that he and others will them-

selves reconsider the arguments? The Upper House of Canterbury Convocation, in 1893 at any rate, did not feel able to condemn us. And may we also earnestly ask those with whom we plead to give due weight to the feelings of that large number who, for the sake of Christians practically excommunicated by the cutting off of evening Communion, seek to vindicate what they consider rightful and scriptural liberty against the bondage of a one-sided tradition?

W. S. HOOTON.

### “REORDINATION AND REUNION.”

(See “*Churchman*,” January, 1912, p. 66.)

Mr. Henderson’s kindly criticism evinces considerable agreement with the main lines of my paper, but he wishes to substitute the term “conditional ordination” for that of “extended ordination,” on the ground that there can be no such thing as “restricted” ordination, and that, therefore, Nonconformist ministers are either “ordained” or “not ordained.” But what are they ordained *to*? That is the question. They are not ordained to ministry in the Church of God as a whole, but avowedly to particular sects; their ordination is therefore “restricted,” to use Mr. Henderson’s term. And yet this is fully compatible with the validity of that ordination *so far as it goes*. Mr. Henderson would have Nonconformists reordained conditionally—conditionally, apparently, on the possible invalidity of the *form* of their ordination. Such a suggestion might be feasible, but is surely less satisfactory than mine, since it throws a greater amount of doubt on the validity of Nonconformist Orders, and would therefore be less acceptable; for my own proposal is not a negative one—of reordination in case of possible previous invalidity, but a positive one—of Apostolic order, practical expediency, and the definite need of “extending” the authority of the previous ordination, since it is now to be exercised in a wider sphere. And so one cannot but feel that “extended ordination,” or “supplementary ordination,” is a better term than “conditional ordination.”

Turning to Mr. Sydney Carter’s criticism, I find he has misunderstood me in more than one important point. In the first place, he misunderstands the sense in which the word “Catholic” was used. The article spoke of the “Historic, or Catholic Church,” in distinction from the “Church of God” (or “Body of Christ”), which “Church of God” includes both the “Catholic Church” and certain “non-Catholic” elements as well. Mr. Carter takes exception to this nomenclature, and understands one to deny to Nonconformists all Catholicity in any sense whatever. But this I would not do. There is a sense in which even Nonconformists are Catholic, for they are a part of the Church of God; but this is the *evangelical* sense of the word—descriptive of the “evangel” of Christ, to which they bear witness, and which

is Catholic in the sense of being a revelation complete and sufficient for all people for all time.

But there is another sense of the word—the *ecclesiastical* sense—which is surely sufficiently established to require no apology for using. This sense of the word was in use for many centuries to distinguish the historic society (in all its local branches) from the various sects of heretics or schismatics who stood outside the original and orthodox society.

In England the National Church is the local representative of this Historic or Catholic Church, and may therefore well claim the title of Catholic in the ecclesiastical sense, to distinguish herself from Nonconformist bodies. This unique relationship of the National Church to the Historic Church being a matter of fact and of history, *some* word or other would have to be used as expressive thereof, even were the word "Catholic" confined solely to its evangelical sense. That the word was being used in its ecclesiastical, not its evangelical, sense, when one spoke of Nonconformists as being non-Catholics, ought to have been evident from the fact that I expressly included them in the Church of God, and also gave a definition of what I meant by the Catholic Church. This use is further justified by the fact that Nonconformists themselves generally fight shy of the word "Catholic," on the very account of the firm establishment of the term in its ecclesiastical sense, which sense is, therefore, one well known.

Incidentally it may be observed that this use of the word, in application to what is historic and approved, justifies the description of the heritage of our own Church as being both Catholic and Reformed, to which Mr. Carter objects as presenting a false antithesis of terms, for it points to the undoubted fact that our Reformation was conducted on the principle of reverence for and preservation of all that was good in the past—a principle largely disregarded by *other* Protestant bodies; so much so that, as a matter of fact, even in regard to the evangelical sense of Catholicity, though it is an undoubted part of a Nonconformist's heritage, it is doubtful if his Nonconformity always allows him so fully to enter into the *spirit* of this Catholicity as does the Churchman. For instance, in regard to the Catholicity of the Gospel message as they actually *preach* it, it is oftentimes mutilated by the omission of all sacramental teaching, or by a belief that definite official adherence to the historic Creeds is optional. Again, the Catholicity of that Gospel's appeal is sometimes partially obscured by the belief that the Visible Church is to include only men whose true piety has officially run the gauntlet of some fallacious human test, or by the confining of Church membership to believers in certain theories—*e.g.*, baptism by immersion alone. Or, again, the Catholicity of the Gospel in respect of time is distinctly impoverished if the verdict of Mr. Clark, the latest historian of Nonconformity, be indeed true. He defines Nonconformity as the spirit which exalts Life above Organization to such a degree

that the duty of the religious man is not only to secure life for himself, but to let that life work itself out into an organization—all this regardless of such religious organization as he finds already existent. But if the Christian faith is never able to express itself in any but a highly transient form of organization, can it be indeed for all time? and will not religion tend rather to degenerate into a perpetual negation—a negation of all existent expressions of the truth? Thus, even in the evangelical sense, the Nonconformist might gain by Reunion and contact with the Historic Church a deepening and enrichment of his Catholicity, while in the ecclesiastical sense he will gain something he never had before.

But, secondly, Mr. Carter has misunderstood not only what was meant by Catholic, but also what was predicated of that Catholic Church. He sums up, incorrectly, my conception of the Catholic Church, by stating that the organization of that Church in the New Testament “implies the possession of episcopal orders”; and he speaks of my whole conception of the Catholic Church as consisting in continuity with the original society “*solely by means of episcopal succession*” (his italics), which conception he proceeds to demolish. After all this, would it be believed that throughout the article neither the word “episcopal” nor “Bishop” was even so much as mentioned, while “Apostolical Succession” was defined simply as “the corporate preservation of historic and organic continuity with [the] original society.” Provided this corporate preservation of historic and organic continuity has been maintained, and the ministry ordained regularly, my position remains unaffected by the controversy as to the exact origin of episcopacy. For supposing the forerunners of Bishops to have been not prophets or Apostolic delegates, but a body of presbyters, it must be remembered that these men acted collectively, and in a recognized and lawful way (as what might in fact be called “Bishop-priests”). They would have been the first utterly to have repudiated acts of schism or unlawful and unauthoritative ordinations.

In short, unity is one of the notes of the Church. According to the Creeds the notes are four—the Church is One, Holy, Catholic, Apostolic. In its aspect as the Church of God, the Church is One by reason of being the Spirit-bearing Body; but in its aspect as the Catholic Church, it is One in a further sense also. The different branches are corporately and organically descended from a common source; we earnestly look for the day when this further unity shall mean something even more complete and valuable than it does already—something more of real fellowship. Mr. Carter refers to Ephesians iv. as showing things alone requisite to the note of unity; but why does he quote only one half of the sentence (“One Lord, one faith, one baptism”), leaving out the crucial words, “There is one body and one spirit”? Dr. Armitage Robinson remarks on this passage: “By a mischievous carelessness of expression, ‘unity of spirit’ is commonly



spoken of in contrast to 'corporate unity,' and as though it might be accepted as a substitute for it. Such language would have been unintelligible to St. Paul." Was it, then, wrong after all to declare that Apostolical Succession (defined as above) is an essential part of our heritage? Did not our Reformers, by striving earnestly after the ideal of verses 3, 4, show plainly that they held it to be so? and may we not find somewhere here the answer to the question as to where there is any Scriptural warrant for the "assumption" that Nonconformists are "self-deprived of the fulness of covenant blessings"? Those who have failed to keep the Apostolic injunction surely suffer, though it is not for us to pronounce in what way. And be it remembered that, in so far as we Church-people are responsible for their schism, we suffer too: "Whether one member [of the body] suffereth, all the members suffer with it."

We Church-people are surely right in insisting upon "regular" ordination, but we need to insist upon it very humbly.

H. T. MALAHER.



## Notices of Books.

STUDIES IN THE PSALMS. By Joseph Bryant Rotherham. *Allenson*.  
Price 10s. 6d. net.

Mr. Rotherham is the translator of "The Emphasized Bible"—a translation "made from corrected Hebrew and Greek texts, distinguishing narrative, speech, parallelism, and logical analysis," and reproducing by certain simple signs the emphatic idioms of the original texts. It was at the Westminster Bible School, conducted by Dr. G. Campbell Morgan, that Mr. Rotherham received the impulse to "make an attempt on the Psalms." The present volume is the outcome.

In an interesting introduction the author discusses the Psalms as literature, as lyrics, as a summary of sacred learning, and as a stimulus to holy living. He cordially adopts Dr. Thirtle's theory about the titles of the Psalms. According to this theory, we ought to distinguish the strictly *literary* titles from the purely *musical* instructions. The headlines describing (1) the nature of the poem, such as psalm, song, or michtam; (2) the name of the author, as "David," "Asaph"; and (3) the occasion when the Psalm was written, are *literary* titles, and ought to stand at the *beginning* of the Psalm, as they do at present. On the other hand, all the *musical* or liturgical instructions, as "to the chief musician," "upon" such and such instrument, or "for" such and such choir, rightly belong to the *conclusion* of the immediately *preceding* Psalm. As a justification for this theory, we are referred to the prayer or Psalm in the third chapter of Habakkuk, where the *literary* inscription stands at the *beginning* and the *musical* assignment at the *end*. Let us apply this rule to Psalm lvi. The full title of this Psalm is: [a] "For the chief musician; set to the dove of the distant terebinth;