

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

America; and the painful racial antipathies which have perhaps their worst manifestation in South Africa. The Gospel which saves the souls of men must also save their lives. Then, too, in the light of fuller knowledge in this year of grace, we are called to face our organized missionary work in all its bearings and relationships both at home and abroad; the need for comity and co-operation; for administrative reform so as to avoid restricting the growth of indigenous Churches; for the better equipment of missionaries, especially in language study; for the development of a science of missions as the background of effective work.

* * * * *

The year 1813 lies far behind us; the sands of the year 1913 are sinking fast; the year 1914, charged with a rich potentiality of service and of sacrifice, is at hand. The record of that year should be great. G.



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.]

CANON LAW.

(The "Churchman," October, 1913, p. 756.)

IN the article on "Canon Law" in the October number, Mr. E. F. Emmet refers to Mr. Ogle's book on "The Canon Law in Medieval England," saying that its object is to controvert the conclusions of the late Professor Maitland. Mr. Emmet writes as follows:

"If we may judge from the comments on the book of those who are entitled to speak with authority, it would seem that Mr. Ogle has clearly made out his case. On the assumption that this is so, it is clear that there is no need, in considering the sources of the English Canon Law, to differentiate between such law before and after the Reformation."

I do not know who Mr. Emmet may have in mind as "those who are entitled to speak with authority," but perhaps I may call attention to the following points. The *Spectator*, in reviewing the book, said that "Maitland at present has the last word." In your own columns

for September, 1912, that capable scholar, Mr. G. G. Coulton, showed that Mr. Ogle has made some bad blunders, and that his theory of continuity is "quite untenable"; that Mr. Ogle's "gravamina against Maitland rest upon a misunderstanding either of text or of evidence." The *Nation* for August 3, 1912, said that Mr. Ogle had "not gripped the position that he would assail, either historically or theologically."

The *Church Intelligencer* had a review by an authority, whose identity may fairly be assumed, written to the same effect. And in the *Church Gazette* for August, 1912, a similar conclusion is drawn, including a quotation from Mr. H. A. L. Fisher, the historian, who, in his "Biographical Sketch of Professor Maitland," says: "So far as a case can be demolished by argument, the case for the local continuity of the Church of England was demolished by Maitland." I have not yet had the opportunity of reading the book just published by Mr. A. L. Smith, of Balliol, on "Church and State in the Middle Ages," but I notice that the *Guardian* speaks of his taking "a diametrically opposite view to that of Mr. Ogle." And the *Spectator* of October 4, in reviewing Mr. Smith's book, says that the author, having to choose between the authority of Bishop Stubbs on the one hand, "and a cloud of contemporary witnesses on the other," ranges himself with Lyndwood and Maitland. Reverting once more to Mr. Ogle, Mr. G. G. Coulton has a notice of the book in the July *Hibbert Journal* with these words: "The reader who takes the pains to check references on both sides will probably be confirmed in the general impression that Maitland's thesis is, as a whole, unassailable." I submit, therefore, that until these various criticisms are met, it is at least premature to say that "Mr. Ogle has clearly made out his case."

W. H. GRIFFITH THOMAS.

THE PRESENCE TO BELIEVERS.

(*The "Churchman," November, 1913, p. 858.*)

I have read, more than once, the Bishop of Edinburgh's paper, "The Presence to Believers," in which he endeavours to show that our Lord's Presence to Believers now is, or may be, just the same as His Presence was to the disciples during the forty days from His Resurrection to His Ascension. As I read and re-read his paper, I could not help thinking of Article IV., and asking myself, Is Dr. Walpole's view in harmony with the teaching of Scripture as to the true Manhood of Christ as given to us in this Article? The Article reads: "Christ did truly rise again from death, and took again His body, with flesh and bones, and all things appertaining to the perfection of man's nature, wherewith He ascended into heaven, and there sitteth, until He return to judge all men at the last day."

I call special attention to the words "*all things appertaining to the*"

perfection of man's nature." Is Dr. Walpole's view in harmony with this statement? Let us see. When our Blessed Lord was on earth, before His Resurrection, we never read of His being, in His human Body, in two places at the same time. This was impossible, if His Body was a real human body in all things like ours. Again, during the forty days, we never read of the Risen Saviour appearing to two or more persons, at different places, at the same time. He appeared to one, to two together, to a number in one place, but never to two or more in different places at the same time. And why? Because it was impossible, if His risen Body was a truly human body, which cannot be in two or more places at the same time. We now ask: If during the days of His Flesh, Christ could not, as regards His human Body, be in two places at the same time; if during the forty days the Resurrection Body of Christ could not be in two places at the same time, can the glorified Body of the Lord be in two places at the same time? The only answer can be: It is impossible, if, indeed, the Lord's Body, though glorified, is still a truly human body, and this it assuredly is, for on this fact depends our eternal Salvation of spirit, soul, and also body, as is implied in the words of St. Paul, "For our citizenship is in heaven, from whence also we wait for a Saviour, the Lord Jesus Christ; Who shall fashion anew the body of our humiliation, that it may be conformed to the Body of His glory, according to the working whereby He is able even to subject all things unto Himself" (Phil. iii. 21). From this, and other portions of Scripture, we learn that our glorified body will be like Christ's present glorified Body, and just because Christ's glorified Body is still a human body, "having all things pertaining to the perfection of man's nature," it cannot, any more than the body of His humiliation, or the risen Body, be in more than one place at one time. Where is that place? We can only answer in the words of Scripture: "When He had made purification of sins, sat down at the right hand of the Majesty on high."

The foundation fact that the Body of Christ, in all its three stages—before His death, during the forty days, and now and for ever—is a real human body, and has now and ever must have, therefore, a definite locality in which It is, must never be forgotten, for on this foundation is built our salvation of the whole of our nature—spirit, soul, and body. The statement, therefore, of Dr. Walpole, and his quotations from eminent men on pp. 862, 863, must all be tested by this foundation fact, and, so tested, I cannot but think that they will be found inadequate as conveying all that the Ascension and Glorification of Christ really means.

There is another fact which must never be forgotten in considering "the Presence of Christ to Believers," and which is quite ignored by Dr. Walpole, and that is, that however real and personal is the Presence of Christ now to each Christian, and with His Church, it must be

compatible with, at the same time, His real Absence. There is as much, if not more, in the New Testament concerning the real Absence and near Coming of Christ as there is about His real Personal Presence. "The Presence to Believers," whatever it is, must be, therefore, compatible with the Absence to Believers.

The institution of the Lord's Supper is, perhaps, the clearest illustration of the paradox, that the Presence of Christ to Believers is a Presence during His Absence. The words, "Where two or three are gathered together in My Name, there am I in the midst," and "Lo, I am with you alway, even unto the end of the world," imply the Presence of Christ; while, just as clearly, "As oft as ye eat this bread and drink this cup ye do proclaim the Lord's death *till He come*," and, "Behold, I come quickly," imply the real Absence of Christ. We see, therefore, that the Presence of Christ now with Believers must be a Presence of Christ compatible with, and qualified by, His Absence, and therefore no statement concerning the Presence of Christ to Believers can be a full statement that ignores His Absence to Believers. The real Absence began at the Ascension of Christ, and continues to this present moment, and will continue "till He come"; while, at the same time, His real Presence to Believers, as now experienced, began and was made possible by the gift from the Throne of the Holy Spirit. Whatever this Presence of the Absent Christ is, it must be more full than His Presence to His disciples during His humiliation, and more full than His Presence to the same disciples during the forty days, or else He would not have ascended for His own sake as well as ours. What this Presence is, or may be, there is no space to consider, but, whatever it is, it is the blessed privilege of every Believer (see Gal. ii. 20).

ANDREW GIVEN.



Notices of Books.

CONSIDERATIONS FOR THE CLERGY. By an Old Presbyterian. London: *Robert Scott*, Paternoster Row, E.C. Price 2s. 6d. net.

These Considerations, which are described as "counsels of moderation," are arranged under three heads: (1) Reading and Preaching in Church; (2) Pastoral Work; (3) Personal Character and Conduct. They embrace subjects as varied as those of Voice Production, Church Bells, Choirs and Organs, the Use of the Cross, the Inspiration of the Bible, the Practice of Auricular Confession, the Eastward Position, etc. We should like all candidates for Holy Orders to read the author's remarks upon reading and preaching and pastoral work. With evident approval, he quotes Bishop Gore as saying that the recitation of the Athanasian Creed in public worship "does more harm than good," and he considers the Eastward Position "unobjectionable." At the same time he condemns fasting Communion, non-com-