

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

THE CHURCHMAN

April, 1922

NOTES AND COMMENTS.

Towards
Reunion.

SINCE our last issue there have been many happenings of importance to Churchmen, and we are inclined to place first in interest the further steps taken in the direction of Reunion. It is a mistake to suppose that the Lambeth Appeal is passing into the limbo of forgotten things. It is very much to the fore, and is exerting a quiet but none the less potent influence upon the Churches in all parts of the world. At home there has been a remarkable manifestation of desire for Christian unity shown at the Annual Assembly of the National Council of the Free Churches. When we find the President urging the Bishops not to be discouraged because all had not been accomplished in eighteen months there is reason to be hopeful that Nonconformist leaders will not easily rest until some satisfactory solution of the problem has been found. From the Church of England side the approach was of the most cordial character. The Bishop of Liverpool, supported by several of his clergy, attended to welcome the Conference to the city, impelled, as he put it, by a threefold motive: memory of the past, the needs of the present, and a great hope for the future. The greatness of that hope may be judged by the Bishop's own words. They already had spiritual communion with each other, and they were almost within sight of the unity of a federation of Churches, but, he added, many of us want something more. "We have a greater vision. We want a corporate unity, and never were we more hopeful than now, for the day may

not be far distant when the greatest step will be taken towards the unity of Christendom by a union of the Churches of the Reformation. It has come in Scotland. It will come in due time, I believe, in Great Britain and her Colonies. It cannot be forced ; it must not be hurried ; but organic Christian union is a fragile and beautiful flower for which we are creating an atmosphere in which it may be able to spring up and grow and overspread the world. We who are old and grey-headed may never live to see the dawn of that most glorious day, but many here, I believe, will live to see it." At a later period of the session, the Bishop of Manchester attended and, speaking on " Goodwill in Church Relations," referred to the improved attitude which had taken place on the question of Nonconformists speaking in Church of England pulpits, and pleaded for a stronger effort to be made to understand each other's position, expressing the belief that very often the same words were used by both, but in different senses. He even went as far as to declare that if he felt Establishment stood in the way of Reunion he would be willing to lead a campaign for disestablishment. His words made a deep impression and evoked a generous response. We refer to these incidents as showing that the attitude of the Assembly towards Reunion is full of encouragement. It has sometimes been asked, " Is there among Nonconformists the will to Reunion ? " The discussions at this Conference, both in tone and substance, furnish a sufficiently significant answer.

The East African Example. But the most striking illustration of the desire for Reunion comes from East Africa. The seed sown at the first Kikuyu Conference is bearing good fruit, for, at a second Conference held there quite lately, an agreement was reached on the extraordinarily complex problem of ordination. It was agreed among the Churches and missions represented at the Conference that in future in the ordination of native clergy the presiding presbyters of all the Churches should take part. The Bishop will preside at English Church ordinations, and the Moderator and presbyters of the Church of Scotland missions will assist in the rite ; whilst at the Scottish ordinations the Moderator will preside and the Bishop and his clergy assist in the laying-on-of-hands. This proposal has been referred to the Home Churches and the Missionary Societies concerned, and if consent is given we may see realized in the

mission-field the great ideal of a United Christian Church. It will be a great thing if from the mission-field the Church at home should learn the way to unity. The further progress of the movement will be watched with interest and sympathy and prayer.

But, with so many signs of encouragement, it is ^{An Unwelcome Note.} painful to be reminded that there are still some among us who have very imperfect views of what constitutes membership of the Church of Christ. A pamphlet by Dr. Darwell Stone and the Rev. F. W. Puller, *Who are Members of the Church?* has lately been issued which is of a thoroughly reactionary character. The great conception of Church membership, disclosed in the Lambeth Appeal, raised the whole question into an atmosphere of fellowship and spirituality, but this pamphlet would put us back again into the period when it was the fashion in certain quarters to unchurch our Nonconformist brethren. Its purpose is to upset the Lambeth definition: "We acknowledge all those who believe in our Lord Jesus Christ, and have been baptized into the Name of the Holy Trinity, as sharing with us membership in the universal Church of Christ, which is His Body"; and, recognizing that this definition is fundamental to the whole Appeal, Dr. Stone and Mr. Puller examine the question under two heads. They consider, first, the case of those who have been baptized in communion with the legitimate rulers of the historic Church, but are now excommunicated, and their contention is that the Lambeth Conference "has accepted a principle which contradicts the teaching of Holy Scripture, the immemorial belief of the Catholic Church and a declaration of the English Articles of Religion." Next they consider the case of "those who have been validly baptized as adults in schismatic bodies, whether these bodies explicitly teach heretical doctrines or not, and also those who, having been validly baptized in such schismatic bodies when they were infants, have deliberately adhered to bodies in schism when they have reached years of discretion." It will not escape the notice of those who read this pamphlet that while, in the first case, they appeal to the teaching of Holy Scripture, in the second case they limit their appeal to "Messages from the Fathers which," they claim, "show clearly that the Church has been accustomed to regard all such persons as external to the Church"—and the reason for this limitation must

surely be that they can find no authority in Holy Scripture for the support of their contention.

An Anglo-Catholic Definition. Dr. Darwell Stone and Mr. Puller reject the Lambeth definition and give one of their own. It is in these terms: "The Church Militant is a Society consisting of all those who believe in Christ, and have been validly baptised, and are in fellowship with one or other of those organised groups of Christians which possess a legitimately appointed Ministry deriving its authority through an unbroken series of successive episcopal ordinations from the Apostles, and profess the truth once for all delivered to the Saints; which faith is summed up, so far as its most important articles are concerned, in the Creeds, and is guarded from certain heretical corruptions by the dogmatic definitions of the accepted Œcumenical Councils." It is extraordinary that at this time of day there can be found men who, in defiance of the light of the best scholarship, will yet seriously maintain that episcopal ordination is necessary to the validity of the Christian ministry. It is the old question, which we hoped was dead and buried long ago, whether episcopacy is to be viewed as the *esse* or the *bene esse* of the Church? The Lambeth Appeal takes the Anglican view; this pamphlet takes the Romish one. The authors use many pages to set out the passages from the Fathers bearing on their contention; it would have been better if they had applied themselves to discussing such questions as "What is a 'schismatic body'?" and "What is a 'valid' ministry?" in the light of present day facts. Do the writers seriously believe that their contentions can be accepted? If that were the case, any question of Reunion, except by absorption, would be at an end. But we believe that the higher and more Christian conception of the Lambeth Appeal will prevail.

The Modernist Controversy. Just after our last issue was published it was made known that representations had been made to the Bishop of Oxford, charging the Rev. H. D. A. Major with heresy in connection with his teaching concerning the resurrection of the body. It seems futile at this stage to write about it at length, seeing that it has been dealt with very fully in various sections of the newspaper press, but a brief reference to it may be

permitted. As every reader knows, the Bishop of Oxford, acting upon the opinions of University Professors whom he consulted, declined to proceed in the matter on the ground that Mr. Major's words in the passage quoted did not contravene the teaching of Holy Scripture or the Church. The Bishop of Oxford has published the whole of the correspondence, together with the Opinions of the Professors in a pamphlet, *The Doctrine of the Resurrection of the Body* (Mowbrays); and Mr. Major has published his defence also in a pamphlet under the most unfortunate title, *The Resurrection of Relics* (Blackwell). The Archbishop of Canterbury, to whom appeal was made, found no reason to interfere, and there the matter rests for the present. But it cannot be doubted that the whole discussion has raised considerable alarm, especially among laymen; and the suggested proceedings for heresy revived and deepened the anxiety felt over the views expressed at the Modern Churchmen's Conference last summer at Cambridge. The full text of the papers read thereat has been published and the matter was referred to in Convocation, although the anticipated debate did not take place. It is understood that at the next session a further attempt will be made to get the views expressed at the Conference formally condemned.

But the prevalence of Modernist views is only one phase of the present disorders in the Church. The other phase is the adoption of doctrines and practices which are hardly distinguishable from those of the Church of Rome. It is felt by many loyal and faithful members of the Church that it is impossible to remain silent in face of such a double menace, and the Dean of Canterbury and others associated with him have put out for signature "a solemn public protest against the violation of law and neglect of moral obligations which are now allowed to prevail among many of the clergy of the Church of England." The grounds of complaint are set out with force and impressiveness, and the protest concludes with these gravely important words:— "Thus the whole basis of the Church of England as established by law is being undermined, and in this unjust and injurious state of things we have no resource but to make this protest. We desire only the observance of the doctrine and worship prescribed by the Book of Common Prayer and the Articles of the Church of England, which are formally acknowledged by all clergy to be agreeable to

the Word of God ; and we appeal to the authorities of the Church to maintain the rights of members of the Reformed Church of England in their most sacred interests." A large number of representative Churchmen have signed this protest, and we believe that signatures may still be sent to the Dean of Canterbury at the National Club, 12, Queen Anne's Gate, S.W.1. The protest will do good not only by calling attention to these most serious departures from the faith and practice of the English Church, but also by its solemn witness to the reality of vital truth.

The Memorial to the Archbishop, presented by the **Unity Within**. Bishop of Oxford and other leading Churchmen, asking his Grace to appoint a Commission to endeavour to find a basis of doctrinal agreement on matters which are the subjects of controversy between different sections of the Church of England, has excited interest. Their work, it was urged, should be solemnly commended by authority to the prayers of the Church. The inquiry should extend over a long period, with an interim report in a year or two. It was further suggested that the Commission should be composed of men thoroughly representative of all parties, of wide sympathies, of constructive minds, and, largely, under forty-five years of age. The Memorial was signed by representatives of the Anglo-Catholic, Broad, and Evangelical schools, and the idea presumably was that the proposed inquiry would promote unity within. But the Archbishop of Canterbury has refused to appoint such a Commission on grounds which will assuredly commend themselves to all thoughtful and far-seeing men in the Church. If there is any hope of "unity within" it will be realized not by a Commission seeking to find a formula which all can accept, but by a more general acceptance of revealed truth and a more thorough recognition of the loyalty which is demanded of all members of the English Church. Differences of opinion there must always be, but given honest faith and unquestioning loyalty on all sides a much larger increase of agreement could be reached than at present exists.

A MODERN THEORY ABOUT CONFIRMATION.

BY THE REV. J. M. HARDEN, B.D., LL.D., Vice-Principal of
the London College of Divinity.

I.

A FEW words from Bishop Gore's handbook on *The Religion of the Church* will best show the theory which is fashionable on this subject to-day with a certain section of Anglo-Catholic theologians. He writes, "From the beginning the laying on of hands by the apostles followed baptism. Thus baptism and the laying on of hands taken together (and sometimes called by the one name of baptism) were held in the early Church to constitute the ceremony of initiation into the Christian Society . . . they should still be regarded as the two parts of the one ceremony."

The practical importance of such a theory seems to consist in this, that laying on of hands is made such an essential part of baptism that without it the gift of the Spirit is not given. Now, quite apart from any reference to Scripture, this view is of comparatively recent growth in the Anglican Church.

To see that this is so it is only necessary to consult the chief works on the Articles which have been in use within the last half century. Fifty years ago Bishop Browne's work held the field. He speaks with no uncertain voice. For him one of the blessings of baptism is the "aid of the Spirit of God." Twenty-five years later saw the first edition of Bishop Gibson's work. He writes somewhat more doubtfully, and, after speaking of the work of the Holy Spirit in baptism, adds not very consistently, "It is a further question whether it is right to say precisely that the gift of the indwelling of the Holy Spirit is given in baptism apart from confirmation"; and suggests that the question requires "a fuller consideration than it has yet received in the Church." In Mr. Bicknell's recent work it is significant that there is no separate section on confirmation at all. Even under Article XXV. only two of the "sacramental rites call for special treatment," namely, Penance and Extreme Unction. For him, "Confirmation is really a part of baptism," and he therefore includes what he has to say

about its relation to baptism in his discussion of Article XXVII. He considers it hopeless to decide either by Scripture or the early Fathers the relation of the baptismal gift to that bestowed in confirmation. He honestly states the difficulties, but his own leaning is shown by his last words, "The separation of the two parts of a single sacrament is unscriptural, and the best solution is to see that it ceases at the earliest opportunity."

Whatever may have been the cause of this change of opinion, one curious result has arisen from it, that on this point the position of the Evangelical School in the Church of England, especially of those in it who are ready to accept in their natural meaning the statements of the Baptismal Service and the Church Catechism, is closer to that of the Church of Rome than is the position of these writers of the so-called Anglo-Catholic party. A glance at the decrees of the Council of Trent or the Catechism of Pius V shows that the Church of Rome knows nothing about the identification of baptism and confirmation¹ as two parts of one sacrament.

II.

Advocates of the view above outlined would call our attention to the fact that in the earliest Service books which we have—those books, chiefly, which are often described under the inclusive name of Church Orders—we find that anointing and laying on of hands follow immediately after baptism. But what, after all, does this prove? The most that can be said of these books is that they give us the practice of the Church at a date which, at the earliest, would not be earlier than the middle of the third century. Other evidence would perhaps take us back to the end of the second. We would go back to the New Testament.

Laying on of hands is mentioned six times in the Acts of the Apostles, once in the Epistle to the Hebrews, and three times in the Pastoral Epistles. The references in the Pastorals need not detain us long. Two of these (1 Tim. iv. 14; 2 Tim. i. 6) refer clearly to ordination. About the first passage there is no dispute, and the words "neglect not the gift that is in thee," which occur in it, seem to make it clear (*pace* Dr. Chase) that the words "stir up the gift of God which is in thee" in 2 Timothy i. 6 refer also to Timothy's *χάρισμα* received at his ordination. The third passage is 1 Timothy v. 22, "Lay hands hastily on no man." This has

been taken of ordination, of absolution, or of confirmation. It can scarcely refer to the last of these, for, even allowing that laying on of hands formed the second part of the ceremony of baptism, why should it be mentioned rather than the preliminary baptism? The baptism, on any theory, would be the initiation ceremony.

In Hebrews vi. 1, 2 the writer speaks of six of the first principles of the doctrine of Christ: repentance, faith, baptisms, laying on of hands, resurrection of the dead, eternal judgment. These fall naturally into three groups of two. The two points in the first and third groups are connected but not identical. Repentance is not the same as faith, though intimately allied therewith; the resurrection is not the same as the judgment, though the two are naturally associated together. Is it not, then, a natural inference that the same is the case in the second group, and that it likewise consists of two connected, yet not identical, members? The wording is somewhat strange (why "baptisms" in the plural?) and, as Bishop Bernard says, vague, but probably the writer is referring to Christian baptism and to the Apostolic rite which is the basis of confirmation. We can hardly rise above a "probably," but certainly there is no indication of a unification of the two.

There remain, then, for consideration the passages in the Acts. With three of these we are obviously not concerned, referring as they do to the ordination of the "Seven" (vi. 6), to the setting apart of Barnabas and Saul at the beginning of the first missionary journey (xiii. 3), and to the cure of the father of Publius (xxviii. 8). In Acts ix. 12 ff. we have the story of Ananias' visit to Saul in Damascus for the recovery of the latter's blindness. That this was the purpose of the laying on of hands is distinctly stated in verse 12. Of the sequel Mr. W. K. Lowther Clarke has thus written in a recent (May, 1921) number of *Theology*:—

"Verse 17, describing the coming of Ananias, fulfils the vision of verse 12. The result of verse 17 is given in verse 18. We now give verse 17 in full:—

"That (a) thou mayest receive thy sight, and (b) be filled with the Holy Ghost.' Verse 18 runs: '(a) Straightway there fell from his eyes as it were scales, and he received his sight, and (b) he arose and was baptized.' As 18 (a) answers to 17 (a), so 18 (b) answers to 17 (b). The baptism—following presumably after an interval—consists of a twofold rite, baptism and the laying on of hands."

I quite agree as to parallelism between verses 17 and 18, but

would not make the same inference therefrom. 18 (b) answers to 17 (b), and "the filling with the Holy Ghost" refers to baptism. According to the theory, on which Mr. Clarke's statement of the facts of the case is based, baptism comes first and is followed by a laying on of hands. In Acts ix. no such subsequent imposition of hands is hinted at. The previous act was for the purpose of healing the future apostle's blindness.

Two other passages are left, the story of Peter and John in Samaria (Acts viii.), and that of Paul at Ephesus (Acts xix.). Philip—one of the Seven—preached in Samaria and baptized his converts. The Apostles Peter and John were sent down later and they laid their hands on those who had been baptized by Philip that they might receive the Holy Ghost. Was this, or was it not, exactly the same as our confirmation? It is often assumed that it was. The second story in Acts xix. will help us to answer. St. Paul is at Ephesus. There he finds some disciples of John the Baptist. These men, when they heard of the fuller revelation of Jesus, were baptized into His name. Then St. Paul laid his hands on them, *and they spake with tongues and prophesied*. These last words about tongues and prophecy, though they seem to contain the clue to the whole question, are entirely omitted by Dr. Mason in his account of the incident (*Relation of Confirmation to Baptism*, pp. 23 ff.). The real meaning seems to be that the miraculous Pentecostal gifts were conferred by the laying on of the Apostle's hands. It is true that in the former account of what happened at Samaria there is no direct mention of tongues and prophecy. Something such is surely, however, implied. Clearly there was some external manifestation of the Spirit's gifts, else how could Simon have known what had happened and have wished to receive the power of conferring the same gifts. Tongues and prophecy were the signs in Samaria no less than at Ephesus. Hence the references in the Acts are to something which must not be assumed to be exactly identical with the laying on of hands which was practised later. We are quite in the dark, from lack of evidence, as to when this earlier laying on of hands ceased. .

Besides this it must not be forgotten that there are numerous references to baptism in the Acts, and they are to something complete in itself and not requiring the addition of any other rite. To take but one example, we have St. Peter's words on the Day of

Pentecost, "Repent ye, and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ unto the remission of your sins; and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost" (Acts ii. 38). Here the gift of the Holy Ghost is definitely connected with baptism; the modern exegesis is that it means that baptism prepares the way for the gift of the Holy Ghost which is imparted by laying on of hands.

Outside the pages of the New Testament we have in the *Didache* an early account of the method of the administration of baptism, and there is no hint given that it was followed by any other ceremony. I am not at all sure that this is not one of the reasons why the *Didache* is so often assigned now to some obscure or later community outside the ordinary lines of the Christian tradition.

In the sub-apostolic Fathers baptism is seldom mentioned (Ignatius, *Smyrn.* viii. 2; *Polyc.* vi. 2; 2 *Clement* vi. 9; vii. 6, viii. 6). These, I think, are the only references. In the last two passages of 2 *Clement* the word *σφραγίς*, which was in later times used of the laying on of hands, is applied to baptism. To say, as is sometimes said, that baptism here includes the laying on of hands as the second part of a single ceremony, is, of course, to beg the question.

III.

This is no mere academic question. It is rather one with intensely practical issues in more than one direction, issues with regard to which Evangelicals are called to take up a definite and determined position.

The question is of importance, first of all, because the modern view, in reality though not in intention, depreciates a Sacrament of our Lord's appointment. His command was to "make disciples of all the nations, baptizing them into the Name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost," no word about anything else save "teaching"; no suggestion that the baptism of which He spoke was to be regarded as in any sense incomplete, or requiring anything for its perfection. There is no need to enlarge upon this, not because it is of less importance, but rather because it is more obvious and patent than the considerations which follow.

Again, if this modern view comes to prevail, a large part of the Prayer Book will have to be rewritten. Not to speak of the Confirmation Office, the words of the Catechism and of the Baptismal

Service will need to be altered drastically. The modern view is that the gift of the Holy Spirit comes by the laying on of hands. That is not the view of the Prayer Book. Anyone who will read through the Service of Holy Baptism can see how full it is of the Spirit's work. "Sanctify him with the Holy Ghost," "Give Thy Holy Spirit to this infant," "That all things belonging to the Spirit may live and grow in him," "It hath pleased Thee to regenerate this infant with Thy Holy Spirit." These quotations are not exhaustive, but they are perhaps the clearest. Here, as definitely as words can do it, the gift of the Holy Spirit is connected with baptism and not with confirmation only.

Or take the Catechism. "How many Sacraments hath Christ ordained in His Church?" "Two only, as generally necessary to salvation, that is to say, baptism and the supper of the Lord." If confirmation be a part of baptism, then it also is generally necessary to salvation, but the succeeding questions of the Catechism make no mention of it. So far as these treat of baptism, they are concerned with the due external matter and form, and the inward grace of that Sacrament as well as the requirements necessary in one who is to be baptized. Dr. Gore, in words already quoted, tells us that "they (i.e., baptism and confirmation) should still be regarded as two parts of one ceremony," and goes on to describe the proper matter and form of confirmation. The ceremony on his view ought to be one, and he would no doubt regard it as a Sacrament. So we have the curious result—one ceremony which contains two Sacraments with two "matters" and two "forms." It is perhaps needless to add that this "two parts of one ceremony" is altogether foreign to the formularies of the Church in which Dr. Gore is a bishop, for its rule is that the child baptized "is to be brought to the bishop, so soon as he can say the Creed, the Lord's Prayer, etc." Whatever our opinion may be as regards the age hinted at by these words, they imply in any case a considerable interval.

Further, this modern view will require a change in the definition of what constitutes a member of the Catholic Church. The old doctrine was that it was baptism into the name of the Trinity. It did not matter (so far as the validity of the baptism was concerned) who the ministrant was. There were rules laid down to govern the regular administration of the Sacrament, but baptism

by laymen, or by women was, though irregular, considered valid and was not repeated. The person baptized was "a member of Christ, the child of God and an inheritor of the Kingdom of Heaven." The logical inference from this new idea is that, if baptism is incomplete, its effect is incomplete, and that for membership of the Church something more is required, namely, the laying on of hands. No doubt the reason of the theory is the supposed necessity for bringing each one into direct communication with the bishop either by actual imposition of hands or by the use of unction with oil consecrated by a bishop. No true membership of the Church except in the Apostolical Succession. Such is the idea.

It is not difficult to see some ways in which this theory may be expected to work out in practice. It is quite within the bounds of possibility, some would say it is practically certain, that the disestablishment of the Church of England will be an accomplished fact at no very distant date. What is to be the condition of membership of that Church? Is it to be baptism, or must it include confirmation also? Even as things now are, the effort has been made to make confirmation the basis of franchise in voting under the Enabling Act for such bodies as Parochial Councils, etc. Evangelicals do not belittle the rite of confirmation. It has its due and proper place in the series of Church Ordinances. Would that it were more used, and more intelligently. It must not be exalted, however, to the same, or even a higher, level, with one of the two "Sacraments of the Gospel."

So far I have been thinking most of the Church of England herself. We must consider the matter also as it has respect to the question of Reunion, or that of the intercommunion of the different Protestant Churches now, before any actual reunion or federation comes. I have seen on the Continent godly members of some of the so-called Free Churches refused admission to the Lord's Table, because, though they were regularly admitted communicant members of their own Church, they were as yet unconfirmed and had no desire for confirmation. There were many similar cases during the late war, even on the eve of a battle.

It is necessary to be fair to those who differ from us and to allow that, if they believe that without laying on of hands there has been no complete baptism, they are justified in such a case in excluding those whom they deem unqualified from the Lord's

Table. This may be granted, but it then becomes all the more necessary for every member of the Church of England who thinks differently to do what he can to do away with such an unscriptural and uncharitable idea.

As Dr. Headlam points out in the Preface to the second edition of his Bampton Lectures, confirmation is not a Sacrament which has the authority of our Lord for its institution, and besides this the custom of the Catholic Church with regard to it has varied very considerably. "Therefore," he continues, "I do not see what authority we have for imposing our particular Anglican customs on others." He is speaking against the suggestion that confirmation should be made an essential condition of Reunion, but his words are equally applicable to those cases in which members of Churches outside the Anglican communion are, through no fault of their own, cut off from opportunity of making their communions with their fellow-members, and yet would obey the command of their Master. In such cases His principle of "Mercy and not sacrifice" should hold.

In 1920 the Bishops of the Anglican Communion laid down as one of the foundations of Reunion "the divinely instituted Sacraments of Baptism and Holy Communion." Mr. Lowther Clarke, in a paper already referred to, has suggested that "some, at least, of those who endorsed the Appeal must have mentally included confirmation in baptism." The words "mentally included" have an ugly sound. Mr. Clarke's own view is the right one, when he adds: "If we do not intend to dissociate baptism and confirmation, it would be well to say so frankly, and thereby avoid misunderstandings."

It is, let me repeat, no mere academic question, but one of the utmost importance.

J. M. HARDEN.



THE DIVINITY OF MAN *VERSUS* THE DIVINITY OF CHRIST.

BY THE REV. F. R. MONTGOMERY HITCHCOCK, D.D.

Examining Chaplain to the Bishop of Killaloe,
Formerly Donnellan Lecturer in Dublin University.

Author of *Irenæus of Lugdunum, Atonement and
Modern Thought.*

THE Divinity of our Lord is a subject of perennial and paramount importance for all Christians. At the present moment the attention of many has been concentrated upon this fact, for unless it be a fact, it is a false dogma. It is urged that "a restatement of Christian Christology is obligatory" (p. 199)¹ owing to the weakness and inadequacy of the Chalcedonian formula, which Bishop Temple described as "a confession of the bankruptcy of Greek patristic Theology" (!), to satisfy modern ideas. It is also maintained that it is the duty of Churchmen of the present day to complete or carry forward the work of Greek Christian philosophers which had been arrested by the advance of the barbarians in the fifth century. The question to be settled is, Who is capable of doing justice to this subject or theme? Is this task to be entrusted to those who have shown very strong prejudices and put forward equally strong presuppositions regarding it? Will the Church commit it to those who start with the two assumptions of "a perfectly human and non-miraculous Christ" (p. 197), Whose "Deity is to be seen in His perfect Humanity" (p. 196), the Kinship of God and Man—a third assumption—being based upon a passage in *Genesis* by a Modernist! The Gospel of the Divinity of man is based upon *Genesis* i. 26, "God and man are akin. This thought should not seem strange to those who have read in *Genesis* that man is created in the image of God" (p. 196). Surely it is inconsistent on the part of those who hold that this portion of *Genesis* was the uninspired work of post-exilic priestly scribes (P) to use it in support of their Gospel of the Divinity of man, and to demur to our employing the prelude of the Gospel of St. John in support of our Lord's Divinity. It is quite plain to see that demands are being

¹ References to *The Modern Churchman*, Sept., 1921.

pressed forward on behalf of "the new learning," which includes Biblical criticism and psychology, which cannot possibly be conceded without altering or weakening the foundations of the faith; and also that assumptions are being made which cannot possibly be proved. The fourth Gospel is regarded as a work of surpassing merit, but is set aside as absolutely valueless as evidence or indication of fact or of our Lord's teaching. Devout writers are even prepared to make large concessions to the extreme critical school on this as well as on other subjects, and refrain from referring to the claims of Christ in that Gospel, which maintains with no uncertain voice the Pre-existence, Sinlessness and Godhead of Jesus the Word of God—"My Lord and my God" (xxi. 28). In consequence of this outspoken attitude of this evangelist many who approach the subject with the assumptions that Christ was not Divine, and that no man who had seen Him could regard Him as such, discount the evidential value of his work. "Many," not "all," for Principal Drummond, the well-known Unitarian, whose apologia of the Ethics of Christ against the indecent and absurd attack of Rev. R. Roberts in the *Hibbert Journal* (1909) is the finest essay in *Jesus or Christ*, which is in some ways the foundation of the lectures under consideration, maintained in *The Character and Authorship of the Fourth Gospel* the traditional view. The same position is held in the present writer's *Fresh Study of the Fourth Gospel* (S.P.C.K.), which puts forward an argument based upon its organic unity against the partitionists, and one based upon the development of its thought and action against those who deny it "orderly progress."

It is to be emphasized that in addition to the writer of this Gospel, St. Paul in his epistles and the writers of the Synoptic Gospels had an intense belief in the Divinity of our Lord. They did not regard that Divinity as a debatable subject; or as something that others shared or might share, though perhaps not to the same extent. We do not possess all the evidence that carried that conviction into their souls. Dean Rashdall puts forward in the very forefront of his paper the statement that "Jesus did not claim Divinity for Himself." So "the doctrine of our Lord's Divinity must not be taken to express His own theory about Himself" (279). But surely this is to base arguments upon silence—a very weak foundation. Our Lord's silence—if we grant it—upon this point would not prove anything, least of all that He was

not Divine. He had His work and His mission and the needs of man, and particularly of His own people, always before Him. He was more concerned, therefore, with revealing the Father's character and love and will—as other writers admitted—which He had known as His pre-existent Son, and with inducing men to do that will, and to enter into the Father's Kingdom, than with asserting His claims to Divinity. But He urged other claims which involve it, claims to lead, possess, attract and judge men, and to know and reveal the Father, Who had given such authority to Him.

Here we may remark that the fourth Gospel is pre-eminently the Gospel of this very Fatherhood to which speakers at the Conference attached so great importance. It is also clear that the authority alone with which our Lord spoke and taught—apart from His wonderful life and works—and His emphatic claim, as the Son of Man, to be the final judge of the nations (Matthew xxv.)—a claim accepted and reiterated by St. Paul in 1 and 2 Thessalonians and elsewhere—and His description of His coming or *parousia* described in Matthew xxiv., Luke xvii., Mark xiii., impressed His faithful followers with the sense of His Divinity, while His Resurrection—to say nothing of the gift of the Spirit at Pentecost—confirmed the doubters. It is equally clear that St. Paul, who rejoiced in the fact that he had been converted from a persecutor of Christians to a persecuted Christian, held a most exalted view of the Divinity of his Lord, and did not regard it as something which might in a lesser degree be possessed by man. See his great conception of the Ruling Christ in Ephesians. There the whole universe is depicted as one grand unity, completely controlled by the one purpose which God purposed in Christ Jesus. There is one God and Father of all Who is above all and through all, and in us all, Who by His one Spirit makes one Body of all mankind in Christ; and there in the very centre of the Divinely controlled system “in the heavenlies” we see the Risen Lord, Christ Jesus, enthroned at “God's right hand,” as “the Head” of all, the source of union, love and power, the universal Saviour and Redeemer, Who with the Father possesses the Kingdom, Who with the Father gives peace, faith and love, and in Whom God hath forgiven us.¹ And yet this majestic Divine Being Who “was originally in the form of God,” lived a life of humility, emptying Himself of His glory, and became obedient

¹i. 10, 20-23; ii. 6, 13; iii. 11, 19; iv. 6, 32; v. 5; vi. 23.

unto death, the death of the Cross, and then received back His glory.¹

St. Paul thus sets out His Divinity and His humanity in a manner which has been maintained by the Christian Church ever since in spite of various heresies on the subject. Against the Arians, who held modified views of His Divinity as well as imperfect views of His humanity (being minus a rational soul), the Council of Nicæa (325) declared that Jesus is *truly* God, while that of Constantinople (381) maintained that He was *perfectly* Man against the Apollinarians who developed the latter part of Arius's theory regarding the humanity. The Council of Ephesus (431) against the Nestorians upheld the unity of His Person, while that of Chalcedon (451) disallowed the confusion of His "natures." These dogmas were slowly during the five centuries hammered out by men whose training in philosophy, logic and theology was equal if not superior to any in our day. Who among us, for example, is worthy of a place beside Athanasius? These dogmas have survived empires and philosophies not for the reason given in these lectures—because there were no Christian philosophers until the present time able to draw up a satisfactory formula! Will they be allowed to perish now? We must remember that if the categories of philosophic thought are somewhat different to-day from those employed by Plato and his school that the problems of philosophy and laws of thought are the very same, and that we have constantly to go back to that school for light and help. The claim that the evolution theory has revolutionized the whole subject does not bear examination. We may safely assume that these writers who regard our Lord's Divinity as a matter of debate accept the theory of evolution which involves man's origin from an ape-like ancestor. Now if, as the Modernists assume, "God and man are akin"—which I deny, because it assigns to nature the work of Christ and the Divine Spirit—and if man has evolved from ape-like creatures—which I also deny, because of the many gaps inexplicable by that theory between the moral, rational and spiritual nature of man and the ape—we are bound to regard that ape-like being and his brother apes as possessing divine potentialities, in fact, as a possible deity, or a deity in an embryonic state. Is not this a *reductio ad absurdum* of the whole position? Man is not God. He has, however, a "God-

¹ Phil. ii. 6-12.

like reason." The best modern philosophy has not improved upon the positions of Plato or Shakespeare. We know more about the laws and forces of the natural and kindred sciences, but we have not advanced to any great extent in the principles of ethics, in philosophy, in religion, or theology, beyond the fourth and preceding centuries. How much superior is the view of Athanasius that instead of man being of the same nature as God he is deified or made divine through Christ by the indwelling of His Divine Spirit. "The Word was made flesh in order to offer up this body for all, and that we, partaking of His Spirit, might be made gods" (Decr. 14). "We men are made gods by the Word, as being joined to Him through His flesh" (Orat. iii. 34). "We are sons and gods because of the Word in us." "Because of our relationship to His body, we too have become God's Temple, and in consequence are made God's sons" (i. 43). "He was not man and then became God, but He was God and then became man and that to make us gods" (i. 39). And He is able to do this because He is of the same nature or substance with the Father, being "the deifying and enlightening power of the Father in which all things are deified and quickened" (Syn. 51). Sensible and scriptural statements like the above give a very different meaning to that modern catchword "the divinity of man." We are divine because God in and through Christ has made us so. Through Him and in Him Who revealed the love of God the Divinity of man becomes a possibility. The epigram, "the humanity of God and the Divinity of man," may mean anything or nothing, and certainly proves nothing. If "a dominant characteristic of religion of the present day be its impatience of mere tradition" (p. 301) a like impatience of mere assumptions is a conspicuous *desideratum*. Now the ordinary Christian worshipper is satisfied to know that his Saviour is God as well as man, one who showed the power of God and shared the nature of man—without his sin. He is not interested in attempts to analyse the natures and the Personality of Christ, or to explain how the two natures are united in one Divine Personality. But a sure instinct will at least safeguard him from the modern fallacy of identifying a perfect human nature—the creation of God—with the Divine nature—with the Creator. He knows, too, that our knowledge of Jesus is partial, that such deep matters as His Humanity and His Divinity we see now imperfectly as in a mirror. He

feels that no portrait of Jesus in art or literature satisfies; that every "life of Jesus" but that in the Gospels disappoints. We cannot form a complete mental picture of His human life. There are so many gaps we dare not fill up. Neither can we form an adequate conception of His Divinity. There are so many dark spaces in our star-lit sky. As our faith increases so does our vision. The dark spaces are filled with light, but other dark spaces appear in their turn. So we are baffled in our quest, and yet all the time we are being led on from one glorious aspect of truth to another and a larger, and are receiving preparation the while for fresh vistas and new revelations of the glory and majesty of the Eternal Christ. And as we thus stand and gaze we see how—

"That one Face, far from vanishes, rather grows,
Or decomposes but to recompose,
Become our Universe that feels and knows."

Certain statements,¹ about the date of the last day and the assignment of seats, seem to imply a limit to His knowledge and authority. They are made much of by one party, and are variously explained by the other. It is said that "not even the Son, but the Father" means "not even the Son apart from the Father"; that Jesus was speaking here officially as Head of the Church; that the words were spoken as a sort of accommodation to the audience, i.e. that *relatively to them* He professed ignorance although *absolutely in Himself* He had knowledge. Such explanations do not satisfy others, who would explain them as due to the Lord's *Kenosis* or self-emptying. This theory based on Philippians ii. 7 (He emptied Himself, R.V., He made Himself of no reputation, A.V., *Ἐκένωσεν ἑαυτὸν*) implies that the Divine Word laid aside certain of His essential attributes in becoming flesh. In the Philippian passage the Apostle was speaking of the Lord's great condescension and self-renunciation in assuming the form of a servant. He had just spoken of His essential glory in being originally in the form or essence of God, which glory could not be laid aside without a change in God. He had also spoken of His glory in being "on an equality with God." This latter glory was laid aside. He emptied Himself of it. On the eve of His greatest humiliation He asks the Father

¹ Mark xiii. 32; Matt. xxiv. 36, "Of that day and hour knoweth no one, neither the angels *nor the Son* but the Father." In Matt. "nor the son" may be a scribal addition, not being found in some high authorities. Matt. xx. 23; Mark v. 34 "to sit at my right hand . . . is not mine to give."

“ to glorify Him with the glory He had with Him before the world ” (John xvii. 5), referring to what He had given up voluntarily. In His Incarnation He assumed Manhood in a perfect human nature, in order to heal and save, for the “ unassumed is unhealed ” (Greg. Naz.). It is obvious then that the Kenosis theory does not do full justice to the Divine personality of Jesus.

Others suggest a dual-consciousness theory of a Divine and a human consciousness meeting somewhere in the subconscious or subliminal sphere. But it creates more difficulties than it solves. The Gospels do not represent our Lord as now absorbed in His human experience and now in His Logos-experience. There is no hint of His retiring for a moment into His subconscious sphere, no sign of any movement of His soul from one sphere to the other. Quite the contrary. The dominant note in His life and character is His sense of His continuous fellowship with God, as a Son with His Father. This theory also detracts from the unity of His Divine personality.

The Lord's statements referred to must be taken in connexion with others that mention His tears, His thirst, His weariness, and mark the greatness of His self-renunciation and self-sacrifice, and the reality and completeness of His Manhood. They also indicate the Son's subjection as Son to the Father which St. Paul predicted in 1 Corinthians xv. 28, “ When all things have become subject to Him, then shall the Son also Himself subject Himself to Him that made all things subject to Him, that God may be all in all.” That subjection being the free submission of love to love is not inconsistent with the Godhead of Jesus which the same Apostle had set forth in two previous epistles, 1 Thessalonians iii. 2 and 2 Thessalonians ii. 16, where the Lord Jesus Christ and God our Father are united in a prayer by a verb in the singular. The Apostle, who had more reasons than we know for his statements, saw no inconsistency between them. Such apparently discordant experiences were not really discordant, for they would be merged for him in an inner harmony in the synthetic unity of the Saviour's consciousness.

As we marshal the various scriptural aspects of the Christ together, His Being, His Personality, His humanity, His work and His teaching, we have a catena of proofs which establish the fact that the Christ of the Scriptures, the Christ of history, the Christ of Dogma, and the Christ of Christian experience is the same, Strong

Son of God who became the Son of Man in order to make the sons of men sons of God. As we consider fairly and impartially, unbiased by "scientific" or "critical" prejudices, His entrance into the world and all that it under the circumstances implied; the claims implied and based by Him and by His Church upon the manifestation of the Divine and the revelation of the Father in His human life; upon His attractiveness; upon His sympathy; upon His sinlessness; upon His invitation; upon His mediation; upon His Resurrection, and His Commission of Peace; upon His Ascension and His Advent or Return; His relation to mankind as the source of moral and spiritual progress; and the light He throws upon all the problems of life, we must acknowledge that the Jesus of Christian faith and worship cannot be explained on any natural or humanistic or "divinity-of-man" hypothesis. We shall also see that if men believe that He actually lived—and this is generally admitted by English critics—they cannot decline at the same time to believe that supernatural manifestations accompanied His birth and mission and that stupendous claims were made about His Messiahship, His Authority, His Second Coming and His Divinity without raising greater difficulties than they can solve. Finally, if it is true that "no formula which expresses clearly the thought of one generation can convey the same meaning to the generation which follows"—words of Dr. Westcott quoted at the Conference with reference to the creeds we have, would not the Modernist attempt to formulate a creed be open to the very same objection from the very outset?

F. R. MONTGOMERY HITCHCOCK.

A tenth volume has been added to Herbert Strang's Historical Stories. In *In Stirring Times*, by Walter Rhoades, we have a miniature history of the English Revolution interwoven with fiction, it is true, but fiction which in no way detracts from the historical accuracy of the narrative. This volume, as are all the others in the series, is well written, interesting and contains excellent moral teaching. The portion of the book devoted to the circumstances which led up to the coming of William of Orange is of particular value. The prices are—cloth, 3s.; picture boards, 2s. 6d.; school edition, 1s. 9d.

ON THE "TE DEUM LAUDAMUS."

BY THE REV. W. ST. CLAIR TISDALL, D.D.

THE first words of this sublime hymn are mistranslated, obviously, in our Prayer-Book. Why is the accusative *Deum* employed, and why not the vocative? It is impossible to suppose that the writer and those who first accepted the hymn were ignorant of the rules of Latin grammar and fancied (as some people venture to suggest) that the vocative was "attracted into the accusative" because referring to the accusative "Te." The plain meaning of "Te Deum," "Thee as God," could not escape the understanding of the author (whoever he may have been). He meant to say, "We praise Thee *as* God," and therefore he said it unmistakably. Those at least who first used the words must have taken them in that sense, and doubtless meant something. Our present purpose is to inquire exactly what they wished to say, and to whom the hymn in its earliest form was addressed. This may lead to a result of some interest and importance. It may throw at least some slight light on the history of "this creed in verse," as it has well been called.

The common idea is that the hymn is a Trinitarian one; that the first eleven verses are addressed to the First Person of the Divine Trinity, the twelfth to the Second, the thirteenth to the Third Person, and the rest of the poem to the Second Person. But, if so, why is it deemed necessary to state so solemnly at the very beginning that the First Person is God? When was that ever denied by any Christian? or by any one else? It may have been desirable to declare belief in the Deity of the Son and of the Holy Ghost, for it is well known that certain heretical sects were unsound on these points. But Church History is silent regarding the existence of any sect of any importance that, claiming to be Christian, yet denied the Deity of God the Father. If then the first verse is addressed to the Father, why should the doctrine require such a forcible assertion, made not once but twice, in the very first verse? It is doubtless owing to the difficulty which our translators found, even in the First Prayer-Book of Edward VI, 1549, in answering this question that the accusative *Deum* was rendered "O God" as it has been ever since, contrary to the most elementary rules of

grammar, and that, too, by men who spoke Latin habitually, as easily as if it were their mother tongue.

It is quite clear that the writer made no mistake in his Latin, and therefore in using the accusative *Deum* he meant what he said. But what he said was, "We praise Thee *as* God." Therefore the first verse is *not* an address to the First Person of the Trinity, even though the use of the word *Patrem* in the second verse seems at first sight to confirm the common view. On the contrary, the expression "Aeternum Patrem" seems to me to lead us to the right explanation. This phrase is a translation of the two words אֱלֹהֵי עוֹלָם in Isaiah ix. 6, which literally rendered mean "Father of Eternity." This has been taken as meaning "Eternal Father," whereas it signifies "Father (i.e. *Possessor*) of Eternity." We then perceive that the writer passes on to introduce a number of other phrases, borrowed mostly from the sixth chapter of the same Prophet, Isaiah, and the ascription of praise sets before our eyes the glorious vision which Isaiah relates in that chapter. Hence come the quotations "All the earth" (Isa. vi. 3) and the "Holy, holy, holy, Lord God of Sabaoth." So, too, the mention of the Seraphim comes from verses 2 and 6 of the same chapter. The passage "Pleni sunt coeli et terra maiestatis gloriae tuae" is an amplification of Isaiah vi. 4; cf. Psalm lxxii. 19. Now Isaiah vi. is devoted to a description of Isaiah's vision of the Divine glory, and St. John tells us (John xii. 41), quoting verses 9 and 10 of this chapter, that "These things said Isaiah because he saw His (i.e. *Christ's*) glory, and he spake of Him." Hence we see that the author of the *Te Deum*, in the passages from that hymn quoted above, is referring not to the First but to the Second Person of the Trinity. This is confirmed by the words "Te martyrum candidatus laudat exercitus" referring to Revelation vii. 13 *sqq.*, just as the words "incessabili voce" recall to the worshipper's mind the passage Revelation iv. 8. We thus learn that the words *Te Deum* are correct, because they affirm the Deity of the *Son*, and that "Te Dominum confitemur" is a second declaration of the same great truth, referring to the Divine title *Κύριος*, used both in the LXX and in the New Testament as a version of the Ineffable Name, the Tetragrammaton, in accordance with such passages as Philippians ii. 9, "Gave unto Him the Name which is above every name," and to 1 Corinthians xii. 3, "No man can say, Jesus is LORD, but in

the Holy Spirit." This is why the vocative is *not* used in the first verse of the hymn.

Verses 10 and 11 of the hymn should be read as one sentence and rendered: "The holy Church throughout all the world doth acknowledge Thee *as* the Father (i.e. the Possessor, cf. *v.* 2) of infinite majesty." But the occurrence of *Patrem* here, taken as a reference to the First Person of the Trinity, seems to have led some early reader to think that the hymn could be improved by adding the next two clauses: "Thine honourable, true, and only Son; also the Holy Ghost, the Comforter." This addition made it into a Trinitarian hymn, much as our addition of the Gloria to each Psalm does.

If the thirteenth verse is part of the original hymn, the casual reference to the Holy Spirit in the words "Sanctum quoque Paracletum Spiritum," and no more, is somewhat strange, so much being said (adopting for the moment the common view) about both the Father and the Son. This might, it is true, be compared with the similar brevity of the "Apostles' Creed" on the same subject. But such a comparison would in itself be an argument against the comparatively late date usually assigned to the composition of the hymn. It would be an additional reason for holding, as I venture to do, that the *Te Deum* is very ancient. On the other hand, if verses 12 and 13 are a later insertion, the whole of the hymn would be addressed to Christ alone. The remaining verses, unless we except the final one, which is a quotation from Psalm lxxi. 1: "In Te, Domine, speravi; non confundar in aeternum," are evidently such.

This fact at once brings to the reader's mind a well-known passage in Pliny's Epistles (Lib. x., Ep. xcvi.—otherwise xcvi.—7), in which the writer tells the Emperor Trajan that the Christians of his Province, when the persecution was raging in Bithynia, were accustomed "*Stato die ante lucem convenire, carmenque Christo, quasi deo, dicere secum invicem.*" Is it possible that Pliny is referring to our *Te Deum* in its earliest form? The suggestion is a very tempting one. Can it be that in our Morning Service we are still privileged to use one of the very earliest hymns ever composed? one which was joined in by a part of the "white-robed army of martyrs" whose faith is recorded and whose courageous endurance of unimaginable sufferings even unto death was rewarded

by the granting of their prayer, "Aeterna fac cum sanctis Tuis in gloria numerari (or, better still, munerari)"? It may well be. If we regard the words "Venerandum Tuum verum et unicum Filium; Sanctum quoque Paracletum Spiritum," as a later addition, the great hymn exactly answers to the description which Pliny, or the Christians whom he persecuted, would give of it. A hymn dating from so early a period in the history of the Christian Church would not easily be disused or forgotten.

There seems to be no clear trace of it, however, in Greek, in which it was probably sung in Bithynia, though that would not be strange, since so much of early Christian literature has perished. Yet it would be early translated into Latin. As the quotations in the hymn in Latin are *not* from the Vulgate, it is exceedingly probable that, whether originally composed in that language or translated from the Greek, it is earlier than St. Jerome's time. Tradition ascribes it to St. Ambrose, or to Ambrose and Augustine in common, and it has been very generally supposed to be at least as old as Augustine's time. Some have seen in it a resemblance to certain passages in the Liturgy of Jerusalem, and again to the morning hymn of the Eastern Church which is found in the Alexandrine Codex of the New Testament. Dr. A. E. Burn (*Introduction*) has brought forward valuable evidence in support of his contention that the author of the *Te Deum* was a Dacian Bishop named Niketa of Remesiana, who lived about A.D. 400. But though the Bishop was evidently acquainted with the hymn, and may, perhaps, have added the two verses which seem to have been deemed desirable in order to introduce a confession of the doctrine of the Divine Trinity, it cannot be said that he has been proved to have composed it. In fact, the more attentively we study this "Creed with flesh and blood," as the late Dr. Alexander Stewart well styles it (*Creeds and Churches*, p. 107), this "most glorious of all the hymns of the Church," the more we feel convinced that it was originally a hymn to the Son alone, and probably closely associated, if not in its original form, identical with the ancient "Carmen Christo quasi deo" which early in the second century expressed the faith and set forth the comforting hope of the persecuted Church of the all-victorious Son of the Living God.

W. ST. CLAIR TISDALL.

A PSYCHOLOGICAL PATH TO REUNION.

BY THE REV. H. J. KERRIDGE, M.A. (Cantab.), B.D. (London).

ON every attempt at formulating plans for Reunion among the churches, made either by Anglicans or Free-Churchmen, how often this note is struck in conclusion ; that we must not be in a hurry, or that the times are not yet ripe for the proposed changes. What is meant thereby, presumably, is that although the facts of the case remain the same, the spirit in which hopefully to approach them is not yet born. We have still to wait for the Spirit of God to move upon the waters.

Obviously, the facts are the same. Whatever may have been the political circumstances which gave rise to the secessions from the Established Church which we now call Free Churches, we know that they laid stress on certain " notes " of Christianity, which they felt to be essential to it ; and we are justified in believing that these distinctive points-of-view persist in their descendants to-day. Can these divergent attitudes be reconciled, or transcended, or transformed, so that Reunion is made practicable thereby ? There has been much discussion of every feature of the situation ; appeal has been followed by manifesto, statement by reply and counter-reply, proposals by alternative proposals, while crucial points have been dealt with, in turn, by those who would erect them either into insuperable barriers, or evade them altogether.

All the time, we must maintain, the ultimate facts remain the same. They are either such as to make Reunion possible, or they are not. When people instinctively speak of the time not being ripe for the proposed changes, they are really indicating just where the crux of the matter lies. It is not the basal facts which must be changed, it is rather that the accretions in the way of prejudices and acquired attitudes which have gathered around these facts must first be cleared away. And that, as anyone can see, will take time.

While, however, we wait, there is a possibility that the growth of the desired change of feeling may be hindered, or even stopped. When the glow of inspiration was upon the Lambeth Conference, and the Appeal was accordingly issued, there followed a great wave

of response from all sections of the Church in so far as cordial welcome of the Appeal went. Christian men, on all sides, thought that they were glimpsing the dawn of a better day. But with the inevitable delay in proceeding from a preliminary statement to actual proposals for Reunion, there has arisen a critical spirit, which, springing from the old-time prejudiced points of view, is endangering the cause of Reunion. From the Anglican side the generous sentiment of the Lambeth Appeal has been succeeded by niggardly proposals for a tentative intercommunion of church life, which revive all the old hard situations and which have a desperate facility for hurting sentiment while granting concessions.

Surely, if we were to execute a radical change in the way in which we face the matter of Reunion, and giving over worrying the bone of controversy, were to devote ourselves to the task of creating the spirit among ourselves which would either resolve our difficulties or transcend them, we should see the true position of the facts once for all, and know whether Reunion were practicable or not. William James taught, as is well known, that our passional and volitional nature lay at the root of our convictions: "Our passional nature," he says, "not only lawfully, but must, decide an option between propositions, whenever it is a genuine option that cannot by its nature be decided on intellectual grounds, for to say, under such circumstances, 'Do not decide, but leave the question open,' is itself a passional decision, just like deciding 'yes' or 'no,' *and is attended with the same risk of losing the truth.*"

Let us try to put the matter psychologically: Our judgments are formed largely by prejudice. We are led to accept certain conclusions in most matters, either because we have been reared in an atmosphere congenial to them, or because they are compatible with the way we are accustomed to look at the world, or because they are traditional in our particular class in society, and are so instinctive that we cannot conceive of ourselves violating them. Only thus can we explain why so many worthy men, who habituated to use their minds in the same way, and trained to the full use of their faculties, differ so much in their conclusions. So it is that it is largely a question of psychological considerations, and the study of motives, when one comes to study the problem of Reunion.

How strongly prejudice works! The writer heard a well-known Free Church minister a short time ago, speaking on the subject

of Reunion. After detailing the work which was being done by informal conferences between representatives of the Anglican and Free Churches, he came to the question of re-ordination, and the validity of non-episcopal ordination. "I come of a clerical family," he exclaimed; "both my father and grandfather were ministers, and if you ask me to deny the validity of my orders, you ask me to give away the inheritance of my fathers, and this thing I cannot do." His exclamation may not have expressed a logical, but it certainly voiced a practical objection to the cause of Reunion; and it is just these practical objections and their removal which we must consider at the present time.

He would be a bold man who, in the present unformed state of modern psychology, would attempt to dogmatize concerning the conclusions to which it appears to lead, as though these were the axiomata of a complete and well-grounded science; yet even now sufficient data are available to suggest a "method" which should yield valuable results in the attempt which ought surely to be made, in the interests of Reunion, to remove underlying obstinate prejudices.

Exponents of the New Psychology tell us that the original causes of our prejudices are forgotten by the conscious mind, but are operative in the subconscious, in what seems to us a blind irrational way. We can only say, however, that they work irrationally, because we have forgotten the prime cause, and cannot see the reason for the attitude of mind which we call prejudiced. For instance, it may be irrational for a man to hesitate to commence a new piece of work on a Friday, if he simply follows custom; but it would not have been irrational in the people of that generation in which the custom originated, and who abstained from making any new adventure then, because it was the day of the Cross.

Taking a wider view of mental facts, we are to believe that our character and conduct are mainly shaped by "complexes," which are formed in the subconscious region of the mind. A "complex" is a system or relationship of mental factors, wishes, memories, tendencies, and so on, which have come to be grouped around some dominant idea, so that the whole forms an organic unity, and being highly charged with the emotional element, operates powerfully in giving the feeling-tone to conscious life. Here, no doubt, we do discover a true factor of capriciousness in mental life. Given

the presence of the emotional impulse in sufficient intensity, it will gather around it accretions, which seem at first sight incompatible and incongruous. The burnt child fears the fire, but he may also fear anything which is merely luminous: the man who has made his way in the world may not only be aggressive in attitude, but he will probably be democratical in politics and be insensibly drawn to Free Churchmanship, because it seems to give ampler room to the layman, than the hierarchical system of other religious bodies.

When we bear in mind, therefore, the history of the relationship of the bodies of Christians, whom to-day we know as the Free Churches, with the national Church from Reformation times; the persecution followed by counter-persecution, the admixture of political motives with religious professions, the lapses from righteousness in dealing with discomfited opponents, which have marred the conduct on both sides in this long-drawn struggle for freedom of religious expression; and when, moreover, we realize that all these experiences have left noxious residua in the subconsciousness of the religious life to-day, and that not one out of fifty has any full knowledge of the origin of these vast amorphous "complexes": we can see with a clearness of vision which amounts to despair, that to retrace our footsteps, and to endeavour out of this evil inheritance to achieve reconciliation and Reunion, is a task for angels, and psychologically impossible.

While we may reasonably despair of making anything of the relics of the past, we are led by the positions to which the New Psychologists are arriving, to believe that there is a new way open to us, by which we may so modify these same, that not only may they be rendered innocuous, but, on the contrary, may be made into useful allies. Complexes, we are told, can be modified, and can be broken up altogether. They can be broken up, if it is possible to bring to the consciousness of the individual concerned the circumstances and the occasion, which may have obtained in early childhood, which gave rise to the regnant obsessive thought.

This position has been reached by the actual data which psychotherapy has yielded. Patients suffering from hysterias, obsessive thoughts, or unreasonable dreads, have had these ills removed when they have been able to bring the repressed memory to light, and have been able to face up to their trouble. A complex, on the

other hand, can be modified, by way of sublimation, if it can be suitably attacked. We are familiar with the fact of sublimation; we are not always so cognizant of its cause. The boy, notorious for his dare-devil disposition, matures into the intrepid explorer, or dauntless pioneer: a Saul, exceedingly bitter against the Church of Christ, becomes Her most zealous champion.

Now, such sublimation is not accomplished by the action of the will, nor by the direct operation of the reason. The more we actively attempt to change ourselves, the more we defeat our own ends. There comes into operation what is termed "the law of the reversed effort." The will to do a certain thing, especially if effort is necessary to incorporate it into mental life, most certainly will induce the counter-suggestion.

Until quite recently, psychologists were unable to suggest a cure, though they could correctly diagnose mental aberrations. It has been reserved for the New Nancy School of Psycho-therapy to make the discovery of the manner in which this can be done. The subconscious is under the control of the *imagination* and not of the will, and the method by which the imagination is brought to bear upon it, consists in a combination of auto-hypnosis and auto-suggestion. The patient is taught to thoroughly relax both his mind and his body, until a state is reached which is that of the dreaminess which exists when one lies between the waking and the sleeping state. Then a formula is used, which has been carefully obtained by means of continual alterations in it, according to the results which have accrued from its use, it may be a positive command, or statement, or a mental picture, and this is repeated to himself by the patient, until sleep or the waking state supervenes. It has been found that such auto-suggestion works itself right down into the subconscious, into the region where the complexes are operative, and that when there, it so modifies and re-groups the blindly working factors of the subliminal mind, that the result is that a new mentality, proper to the suggestion used, is progressively built up, which makes possible the realization of the ideal at which the patient aims.

The precise manner in which auto-suggestion works, is not known; but, generally speaking, it brings to pass a releasing of ideas, emotions, and their correlative quasi-instinctive activities, to the action of the intelligence, and so to the control of the will of conscious

life. We must try to conceive of phases of life, based on past experiences of the race, and, coming nearer to human computations, historical vicissitudes, which have become buried in the subconscious, and which, from the point of view of intelligence, have come to occupy a faint place beside it in consciousness, coming into dominance once more by being released into consciousness and being modified profoundly, under the discriminating glance of the intelligence. Instinctive feelings, prejudices, and what people call "points of view" are all states of mind which are controlled by subconscious processes. In all of them the power of forming associations is inhibited, and there is an element of obsession present, by reason of which the attitude persists. Ideas stand stock still, shut up to their one monotonous function of reiteration.

Thus we are led to see the hopelessness of the quest after Reunion which tries to approach it by way of arguments derived from the historical past. The history of the churches, both doctrinally and in matters of church regiment, is such that the more it is examined and discussed, the more luxuriantly the tares of discord grow. Prejudices are revived, and "attitudes" receive fresh strength. Again, to do nothing, on the "times are not yet ripe" principle, is equally fatal to Reunion. For the life of men and societies is always in a state of equilibrium or balance. Such "balance" is a biological necessity, and beyond the control of the reason or will. So it comes to pass, that all the while we dwell apart we unconsciously justify ourselves in doing so. To say that the times are not yet ripe, is really to acknowledge that prejudice is too strong, and that, after all, it is better to let it disappear by the slow and gradual process of time.

The nature of the subconscious mind, and the way in which suggestion works therein, compels us to ask whether there may not be a path to Reunion, which is wholly psychological and experimental.

With the data of the New Psychologists before us we can see thus much; that if there could be held up before the churches a vision, or luminous idea of Reunion, which would sink down into the heart and conscience of believers, there would eventuate such a general re-orientation towards this great matter, that the end would be achieved easily and cheerfully. We, as united, would feel that we had been released from an old bad nightmare of a stubborn

prejudice, and that somehow we felt free, with our feet set in a large place.

How should we proceed, in order to impress the imagination of the churches? Obviously, we are to seek for a formula which shall make the appropriate "suggestion." It must be something clear and plain, and easily understandable by all. It must embody the whole idea of Reunion. The suggestion must not be spasmodically applied, it must be regularly given.

Now, what is there which would lay hold of the imagination of religious people, and which would be so succinct a formula, as that which has been so often advocated; the interchange of pulpits and the practice of intercommunion. From other points of view than that of the psychological, such intercourse between the churches has been advocated; but it has not been largely entered on, because of difficulties of the intellectual order. There have been reasons against such proceedings. We are told that such ways are pernicious short cuts, which only lead to the quagmire of vague undenominationalism; or that they are in the nature of compromises, which, because they do not rest on principle, are bound to retard the movement towards Reunion.

Statements such as these have been made repeatedly, and yet it does not seem to occur to people to ask what justification there is for them.

Surely, it has always been true that the character of society has been according to the social heredity which it has inherited. Hence, intercourse between different nations, or churches, or the groups composing any society, has been the one grand means of building up the idea and ideal of unity, so that, wherever, on other considerations, it was possible, it has been accomplished. When people deprecate any attempt to change our social heredity in this matter of Reunion, they stand confessed as not having understood the nature of the problem. Such people have inherited a social tradition hostile to Reunion, and so long as they go back on the past, or, in the intellectual order of things, argue about positions and principles, they only render the position more hopeless, and themselves to be more outside the stream of the forces making and shaping the world of the future.

But to return to the nature of the psychological experiment which is here advocated. It would be desirable that there should

be an interchange of pulpits at regular intervals, say, four times a year. The idea behind such exchanges, and the things to be hoped from such intercourse would be explained to the faithful, by their respective ministers, some time before the exchange took place. Where definite opposition to the proposal was met, the project could be dropped, temporarily. It would be an outrage, indeed, against every psychological principle to bring pressure to bear upon an unwilling people.

Interchange of pulpits at *regular* intervals would obviate such interchange from being only occasionally made; it would relieve the Bishops of the responsibility of deciding whether any particular interchange were desirable, and it would also relieve the timid incumbent who believes in the cause of Reunion, but who is deterred from asking his Bishop for permission to make an interchange of pulpits, by the fear that he would be looked upon as unsound in churchmanship.

Above all, it would be a sound scheme, psychologically. The presence of the strange minister, his words, and what he stood for, would constitute a powerful suggestion to the congregation that Reunion was desirable. Reunion would be no longer a matter of church-newspaper talk, but a living reality for the time being, a lively symbol of what might be.

The suggestion would occur regularly, before its effect could have waned, and thus over all the country there would be this tremendous psychic impulse delivered, again and again, until an irresistible desire for Reunion would be born in the heart and conscience of believers; and the thing would be done. What had been the ideal for so long, the thing which people had emotionally thought of, and desired, would have been translated into actual fact.

A means, still more effective, is open to us in our endeavour after Reunion. This is, the practice of intercommunion. It is well known that suggestions work most effectually when given to one in the hypnotic state, and that auto-suggestions can best be applied when the experimenter is in that dreamy, abstracted state which happens between the waking and the sleeping condition, or when the mind is given up to contemplation, and is withdrawn from outer things. Hence, those of a mystical temperament are most apt to undergo profound changes of view-point, to receive intuitions which carry so much assurance of their validity that they

are closely followed, as the ends to which life ought to be uninterruptedly directed. As Royce has said: "Mystics are the only thoroughgoing empiricists." The New Nancy School makes much of the importance of the mental state of the patient; and suggestions are made, only when the proper state of hypnosis or of mental vacuity, together with, and induced by bodily relaxation, has been attained. Now, if the practice of intercommunion could be made under appropriate circumstances, we should appear to be making (but from a very different motive) just the necessary preparation which psychologists find so useful for the suggestions which they make to have due effect. If a certain number of church people in each parish, who were in the fullest sympathy with the project, could be got together for a quiet time of prayer and meditation; following the methods of the "Fellowship of Silence," so fruitful in the hands of men like the Rev. Cyril Hepher; then the appropriate mental state would be induced in which the suggestion could work. Such a meeting together might be made at the Nonconformist Church at which fellowship in the Sacrament was to take place, some time before the service commenced. Then the little company would join their Free Church brethren in the sacred building, sitting separately from the rest, and would receive the elements either first or last so that their identity and its significance might not be lost. When worshippers are met together to join in a common act of adoration, and when the rite is a mystical one, where only "faith can touch and handle things unseen"; there, if ever, we have the very conditions which, under God, could be utilized to so drive home a suggestion, that it would be the most fruitful of result.

These regularly-set times of intercommunion might very well coincide with the recurrent interchange of pulpits, and would be reciprocal as between Anglicans and Free Churchmen. A selected band of earnest people from each church or chapel would undertake thus to prepare themselves, and to practise intercommunion, in the spirit of that saying of William Penn made many years ago: "Humble, meek, merciful, just, pious, and devoted souls are everywhere of one religion, and we want to be helped to learn to recognize, and to live in this oneness."

Divergent theories of ordination, and the nature of the sacrament of Holy Communion make the idea of intercommunion an impossible one with many people. Here principle, based on latent

prejudice, comes into view. But we cannot too often insist that, things being what they are in mental life, the cause of Reunion is not primarily concerned with principle and the past, but with faith and the future. We must assume our premisses provisionally, and argue forwards, in order to test them by their consequences.

Mental gestation precedes the birth of every movement. And how can there be this necessary preliminary without such intercourse as is here advocated? We hear much of social psychology in these days, and doubtless it will bulk more and more largely in the future, and influence the ideas of statesman and educationist, social worker, and religious person alike. It would be a notable contribution to psychological science and practice, if the experiment advocated could be put into practice, and brought to a successful conclusion. There is no society on earth to compare with the Church for supplying the conditions which can make such a psychological experiment a possibility. Let us see that the children of this generation shall not be wiser than the children of light. The consonant voice of the united faithful, raised in praise to Almighty God, would for ever form a rhetorical premise to every effort in social- or mass-psychology thereafter.

Religious insight is mainly dependent upon the emotions to which the religious imagination appeals, so that we may say that thought, guided by interest, is the royal road to enlightenment. The profound modification of the subconscious complexes which result from suggestion, may have as cause the tapping of a deeper level of life where the Spirit of God dwells and works. We most aptly speak of the method of His work in the heart, as an "influencing." We believe He is the agent in "conversion," and wherever great psychic changes, whether individual or social, happen.

Especially is He responsive when our heartfelt cry is: "Come Holy Ghost, our souls inspire." Where earnest Christian people long for Unity and stir up their desires, and give them a common direction by meeting together in order to gain a foretaste of what might be, then we believe that a great obstacle to His working in the Church will have been removed. Our present disunity must, indeed, grieve the Holy Spirit of God. For he is a Person, "and it is the essence of personality to include the many in the one as the means of its realization." Yet by our divisions we hinder the work that He could do in the Church of Christ. We,

ourselves, grow and develop by spiritually incorporating others in ourselves. We assimilate persons, who are alien to us at first, in fellowship and friendship; and make use of their capacities, and receive and reciprocate their love. If only the Holy Spirit could so work among the scattered members of the body of Christ, we should not only have a united witness for God to the world, but a new Christian ethos would be created which would be suited to the world-situation as it is to-day.

Whatever we may think concerning Reunion, the situation is such that the intellectual method of approach seems devoid of any hope of its solution. We have debated principles, and "explored avenues" *ad nauseam*. Already a change is taking place: in every pronouncement made in these days, from both sides, the gist of it is this; that we must try to draw more closely together, and must come to understand each other better. Hence, our contention that the approach must be psychological, is virtually granted. Only, instead of letting the gradual process of time work the change, we would effectively apply psychological principles to the task, and seize the present opportunity, when Reunion is a "live" option, of settling the matter once for all.

H. J. KERRIDGE.

CHURCH QUARTERLY REVIEW.

THE CHURCH QUARTERLY REVIEW for January contains two articles on the Modernist position. Both deserve careful reading, for Canon Headlam and Professor Goudge deal shrewd blows at the central defences of the Modernist citadel. It is a pleasure to read argument conducted on so high a level, even if we have to make an exception of Canon Headlam's description of Professors Lake and Jackson as "quite second-rate scholars." The Rev. F. D. V. Narborough gives us an incisive criticism of Schweitzer's argument under the title of "The Messianic Secret." Dr. Pearce astonishes us by the disclosure of the number of ordination candidates in Worcester Diocese six centuries ago. We asked ourselves the question, "Was its Bishop a man to whom all who sought orders and could not obtain them elsewhere had recourse?" The Rev. W. C. Bishop is illuminating in his study of the Early Roman Liturgy, and Dr. Box shows that he never misses any contribution made to the history of Judaism. The Reviews—especially that of Professor Webb on Alexander's Gifford Lectures—are worthy of their setting in this excellent number of a learned and readable quarterly.

EVANGELICALISM AND THE LIFE OF THE SPIRIT.

BY THE REV. HORACE MARRIOTT, M.A., D.D., Vicar of
Eccleston, St. Helens.

IT is the teaching of history that religion, wherever it is a vital thing, is sure to change and develop, to assume new forms and to take on fresh directions, with the passage of time. The impulse of life will never suffer it to become fixed or to remain stationary, but keeps it ever plastic, and moulds it into ever-changing shapes.

Those who speak as though it were a reproach to us that our views and our outlook to-day do not precisely coincide with those of our forefathers are forgetful of this universal law. That the history of Evangelicalism should be marked by continuity, and that there should be in it no break with the past or disavowal of our heritage, is a demand which is both reasonable and right. And it is a legitimate claim which is made on behalf of the older Evangelicalism, when it is contended that it has a contribution of value to make to the newer, inasmuch as there are aspects of truth, which were more clearly perceived, and more deeply felt, by its leaders than they are by the younger generation of to-day. But, when it is asserted or implied that the older Evangelicalism was so perfect a thing that it cannot be improved or developed in any direction, and that our only wisdom is to uphold, without modification of any kind, the theology of our forefathers, then we are bound profoundly to differ. However sincere and well-intentioned those may be who hold such views—that many of them are so to a pre-eminent degree we do not doubt—they do no true service, as we believe, to the cause of religion in taking up such a position. For it is a universal law of the spiritual world that the corollary of life is plasticity and development, and that fixity and immobility are tokens of spiritual death. To demand, therefore, of any body of doctrines that they shall remain absolutely fixed and unchanging is to encourage the spiritual deadness which alone renders such rigidity possible.

It is the conviction of the writer that the present weakness of

Evangelicalism is due, not so much to the fact that our views have suffered some modification from those of the orthodoxy of the past, as to the lack of sufficient development in our theology. And it is his aim, in what follows, to indicate one direction in which, in his belief, development is greatly needed.

Looking broadly at our theology, it can be seen that, speaking generally, it has laid greater stress on doctrines which relate to justification by faith and what precedes and prepares for it, than upon teaching as to what should follow it in the converted life. We have insisted with great emphasis upon Original Sin and the necessity of Regeneration, and we have exalted the atoning Death of Christ and proclaimed the Pauline teaching on justification through belief in the saving efficacy of that death. We have also had much to say on the subject of Conversion. Everything, in fact, in the individual's spiritual history up to the point where he is brought face to face with the Cross, and yields his utter allegiance to Christ as his personal Saviour from sin and its consequences, we have nobly and unswervingly proclaimed. But, when that point has been reached, we have tended to regard our work as mainly done. Not that we have had nothing more to say. We have preached the Holy Spirit, the need of sanctification, and the power of the ascended Christ. We have also insisted on the need of growth in holiness, and of the absolute necessity of prayer. We have not omitted to teach the Holy Communion as a means of grace. Yet, speaking generally, we have not proclaimed these things with the earnestness with which we have insisted on those others. We have filled up our teaching with them, but it is the former that have formed the backbone of our message. We have been more at home in the Pauline theology than in the Johannine; and, within the Pauline theology, we have been more at home in the teaching which centres in justification by faith than in that which centres in spiritual union with Christ by the Holy Spirit. If the reader does not agree, we would beg him—bearing in mind the fact that, when our attention is being constantly directed towards certain texts, they are apt to assume in our minds a disproportionate degree of importance—to seek to forget all the Protestant theology he has ever read, and to read the New Testament afresh, laying aside all preconceptions and prejudices, and endeavouring honestly to weigh the relative importance and promi-

nence of each aspect of the teaching which is there presented. If he, then, brings into comparison with his unbiased estimate of the teaching of the New Testament the usual Protestant presentation of Scripture truth, we believe that he will not fail to perceive the difference of emphasis to which we have referred.

If this difference is a fact, it surely constitutes a defect in our teaching. We have no right to exalt one aspect of Scripture doctrine and to neglect another, out of mere predilection. We ought to be quite impartial. The explanation of our onesidedness is no doubt not far to seek. It has a historical origin, and is due to controversial exigencies in the past. The doctrines on which we lay most stress to-day are those on whose behalf our forefathers had to contend. It may be that, in the atmosphere of heat and strife, it was impossible for those doctrines about which there was no controversy to receive as much attention as they deserved. But, even so, it does not follow that the onesidedness of the past must persist to all time. We believe that the time has fully come for it to be remedied, not by any weakening of emphasis on the great doctrines of our traditional theology, but by a strengthening of the stress laid upon those other doctrines to which we have referred. Our Evangelical theology to-day ought, we submit, to be a faithful and impartial reflection of the entire body of Scripture truth.

The deeper study of the New Testament only serves to strengthen our sense of the importance of those aspects of doctrine which have, in the past, suffered a comparative neglect in our theology. It is clear, on the one hand, that much of the Scripture teaching on justification breathes the atmosphere of controversy. It was St. Paul's contention with the Judaizers which led him to stress and emphasize the doctrine in the manner in which he did. Not that, apart from all controversy, it was not a most vital and fundamental belief of the Apostle, and would not have appeared as such in his letters. It is evident, from what he says, that the doctrine was for him a most sacred and cherished belief, inasmuch as it had brought him the peace and assurance of acceptance with God which his Pharisaism, for all its strictness, had utterly failed to impart. With such a personal experience behind him, he must under any circumstances have earnestly proclaimed the doctrine in his preaching and teaching. But, apart from the atmosphere of controversy, the teaching might have been given in a rather

different way, and the stress laid upon it might not have been such as we have in the Epistles to the Romans and Galatians. It is but reasonable to think that the stress of controversy has made at least some difference in the presentation of the doctrine. On the other hand, the teaching of the mystical union with Christ bears no marks of controversy. There is no evidence that it was disputed or denied. Had it been otherwise, it is probable that it would have been set forth with greater emphasis, and in a more dogmatic way.

Reading between the lines of the New Testament, it is plain that this spiritual union was an intense reality to the Apostles, and to many of their converts. We have some wonderful statements of it—so wonderful that many a Christian preacher has shrunk from expounding texts which describe experiences so far exceeding anything to which he has himself attained—but it is not only articulately stated; it is also instinctively felt to be ever-present in the background. To St. Paul's own inward life we have only brief references, scattered here and there in his writings and in the Acts; but they are enough to show that, after his conversion, he passed through a wonderful course of spiritual experience. And it is plain that it was this inward life of his which was the secret of, and the driving force behind, his extraordinary outward activities.¹ But even St. Paul's Spirit-filled life, wonderful as it was, pales before that of our Lord Himself. And can we rightly assert that in this, His inner relation to God, Christ stands wholly apart from ourselves? Is it not rather the truth that here, as in all else, He has bequeathed us a perfect example, that we might, so far as in us lies, follow in His steps?

What, then, we plead for is, in the first place, that all the Scriptural teaching upon the further Christian life and experience following upon conversion and justification should come to its own in our theology, and receive in our teaching that measure of stress and emphasis which is its due; that we should insist upon the great law of growth, and point to the complete transformation of the individual into the image of Christ by the working within him of the Holy Spirit as the goal of the Christian life in this present world; and that we should follow in the footsteps of Handley Moule

¹ There is an instructive treatment of St. Paul's inward history in Evelyn Underhill's *The Mystic Way*, c. 3.

and others in teaching that that most pregnant phrase, *in Christ*, leads us on into things of which the Sacred Atonement is but the holy threshold, or rather the foundation, while they are the temple built upon it. Such a development of our theology would be in complete harmony with our whole Evangelical position. If it is in the nature of Anglo-Catholicism to magnify tradition, and in the nature of liberal Churchmanship to exalt the intellect, it is in accord with the genius of Evangelicalism—with its stress on the individual's personal relation to God and on the possibility of the soul's immediate access to Him—to magnify the religious experience, in all its forms and stages.

Secondly, we plead for a much fuller use of the writings of the great masters of the spiritual life of all Creeds, as interpreters of the Scripture teaching. These have not, indeed, had experiences which transcend those of which the New Testament speaks. No human experience could transcend those to which St. Paul testifies when he says, "I have been crucified with Christ; yet I live; and yet no longer I, but Christ liveth in me" (Gal. ii. 20); or, "I know a man in Christ . . . caught up even to the third heaven . . . how that he was caught up into Paradise, and heard unspeakable words, which it is not lawful for a man to utter" (2 Cor. xii. 2-4). But these experiences are referred to in the tersest manner; there is no detailed account of them, or of the process by which they were attained. It was reserved for the piety of later generations to fill in the details, to develop and expound all the wealth of significance which these pregnant utterances enshrine, and to delineate the course of the pathway which issues in a full spiritual union with our Lord. When we compare these writings with one another, we can see that there is a certain normal course of spiritual progress, and we are able to construct a chart, as it were, of the soul's upward journey as it advances in accordance with St. Paul's teaching, when he says, "We all, with unveiled face reflecting as a mirror the glory of the Lord, are transformed into the same image from glory to glory, even as from the Lord the Spirit" (2 Cor. iii. 18). We learn, e.g., that the pathway lies through dark valleys as well as up clear and shining heights, and that the pilgrim may expect to encounter the "dark night of the soul" as well as to enjoy the blissful sense of immediate contact with God, possibly accompanied by ecstasy or rapture. All this, and much more that is to be found

in these writings, is of real use to every sincere and aspiring Christian. It provides him with salutary encouragements and warnings, and gives him an insight into what he may expect to experience. It may save him alike from despair and from overweening pride. It gives him a just view of himself, as but a humble follower in the footsteps which have been trodden by far greater souls ; and, on the other hand, it shows him that experiences which he might otherwise have regarded as unique and peculiar to himself, are far from being such, inasmuch as they have been shared by many who have gone before him. It also affords him much valuable counsel as to the way of progress, and the means which great souls have found to be conducive to advance. Here are men and women who have attained, in an extraordinary degree, to the experiences of spiritual union with our Lord, as the Apostles speak of it, telling us in full detail the history of their inner lives. Surely their writings are deserving of greater attention than we have bestowed upon them in the past. We reverence, and with good reason, that wonderful book, Bunyan's *Pilgrim's Progress*. But it is only one of a host of masterpieces on the spiritual life, all of which are accounts of the soul's progress in its Godward journey, and have something to contribute in elucidation of the New Testament.

Thirdly, we plead for a serious study of the whole subject of religious experience. It is a study of great difficulty and complexity, and of vast importance. It is a study which is being keenly pursued by many minds to-day, and is destined to be more vigorously prosecuted in the future. It is a study from which, we submit, we ought not to hold aloof, but in which we should strive to play an honourable part. It is greatly in the interests of religion that the lead in that study should not fall into the hands of those who are unsympathetic or sceptical ; and, as it seems to us, there is no body of English Christians who might, more fittingly than we Evangelicals, make it in a special sense their own.

If these three pleas should obtain a favourable hearing amongst us, the advantages that would follow could not fail to be many and great. In the first place, the reproach would soon be rolled away from us that we harp exclusively and *ad nauseam* on what concerns the beginnings of the Christian life ; that our teaching is solely evangelistic and conversional, that we have little interest in, or insight into, the heights and depths of the various experiences

which accompany growth in saintliness, and therefore have little help or guidance to offer to those who are developing in sanctity and spirituality.

Secondly, we should be drawn closer together. We should be brought to a fuller realization of the smallness of the things which divide us in comparison with the greatness of those which unite us. Even on the great question of the inspiration of Scripture our differences would be considerably lessened. We should all realize that inspiration is primarily of the man, and not of the letter, and we should all attain a deepened reverence for the men whose writings show them to have lived in such intimate contact with God. The true nature of the supremacy of the Word of God would become more apparent to us. The more deeply we study spiritual experiences the more does our unfeigned reverence for the Bible grow. That study leads us to believe in its inspiration, not merely as a traditional doctrine which we are bound to uphold, but from a deep and living conviction borne in upon us in our search. Amongst those who have attained to such a conviction there is not likely to be much disagreement as to the precise nature and limits of Biblical inspiration; and, if we do not quite see eye to eye on this matter, we shall be content to differ.

Thirdly, fellowship would be promoted amongst us. The doctrine of justification by faith does not exercise any powerful influence upon our corporate unity. It makes for individualism, inasmuch as it is entirely concerned with the individual's personal relation to God. But the search for the revelation of the Spirit draws us together. It is a corporate matter as well as an individual. The isolated unit cannot receive the full revelation which is promised to the whole body of believers. We realize that we must have fellowship with each other, and follow after the corporate life, in order to be led into all truth.

Fourthly, we should free ourselves from the reproach that we are anti-intellectual and obscurantist, and that our religion largely consists in reiterating with obstinate persistence certain traditional dogmas. Here we have presented to us a field of study which calls for the exercise of the highest intellectual powers; one, moreover, which is far more directly helpful to the practical work of the ministry than many of those which are commonly set before the ordinand. It is hardly possible even cursorily to read such

writings as those of Tauler, or Eckhart, or Walter Hilton or William Law without being personally edified and made a better minister of God. Indeed, it would be hard to name any department of study which is so useful and helpful to the practical work of the ministry as this.

Lastly, the whole tone and spirit of Evangelicalism would be greatly elevated. There is no study like this for making one feel the poverty of one's own spiritual life and experience. It is only as we have ourselves experienced something similar that we can even understand the accounts which others give of their experiences. At every turn we are made conscious of our lack of insight and sympathy and understanding because of our poverty of personal experience. There is thus a constant stimulus given to the desire within us after a deeper spirituality and a closer relation to God. In elevating our inner life, this study could not fail also to elevate our whole preaching and teaching. It would make it impossible for us to preach the Atonement, or any other doctrine, in a hard, unloving and legal way. Our teaching would of necessity assume a more spiritual and experimental character; its helpfulness and power of appeal would be strengthened, and the contribution of Evangelicalism to the common life of the Church would be greatly enhanced.

HORACE MARRIOTT.

LITTLE BOOKS ON RELIGION. London: S.P.C.K. 2d. each.

The venerable S.P.C.K. is anxious to get back to the time of cheap literature, and with this end in view is bringing out with commendable courage and enterprise a new series of booklets. What further issues are contemplated we are not told, but the first four are sufficiently various in character to give promise of a thoroughly comprehensive series. Canon Peter Green is at his best on *Christian Ethics*, Miss Willink writes on *The Law of Moses*, and Archdeacon Gardner, a musician of no mean repute, contributes *Everyman's Guide to Church Music*, while fourth in the series comes a short biography—*St. Basil*, by Mr. Lowther Clarke. We are warned that it will be impossible to continue the publication at the price unless there is a large circulation.

MEGILLATH TAANITH.

"SCROLL OF FASTING."

ENGLISHED, FOR THE FIRST TIME,
FROM THE ARAMAIC AND THE HEBREW.

BY THE REV. A. W. GREENUP, D.D.

[Continued from the CHURCHMAN of January.]

V (AB).

1. **T**HE fifteenth of Ab is the Feast of Wood-offering, when one must not mourn ;

Because when they came up from the first captivity without bringing wood-offerings it was ordained that these should be brought on the ninth of Ab. The sages said, Some future time when the captives come up they too will need to bring some. So the sages ordained the fifteenth of Ab for bringing the wood-offerings. And every one who brought an offering to the sanctuary, even if it were only wood, was freed from the mourning of that day : and it is not necessary to say that such was the case when they brought sin-offerings, trespass-offerings, vows, freewill-offerings, first fruits, tithes, thank-offerings, or peace-offerings. Therefore it is said, Every man who brings wood-offerings or firstfruits.^a

But what is the meaning of " the time of the wood-offerings of the priests " ? It is what is meant by saying ^b that on the fifteenth of Ab the sons of Zethuel b. Jehudah, and with them the priests and the Levites and the Ishmaelites, the sojourners and servants, the Nethinim, and the bastards, and whoever had forgotten to what tribe he belonged, and the sons of Gonebe-Eli, and the sons of Kotsi-Ketsioth, and the sons of Salmal of Netofa (were appointed to bring the wood).

^c And who are these sons of Gonebe-Eli, and these sons of Kotsi-Ketsioth ? Once upon a time the Kingdom of Greece decreed against the Israelites that they should not bring up firstfruits to Jerusalem ; and the kings of Greece set guards on the routes, just as Jeroboam b. Nebat had done at the borders to prevent any

^a Jer. Pes. IV. 1 ; Jer. Hag. I. 4. ^b Taan. 26 a ; Jer. IV. 5.
^c Taan. 28 a ; Tos. Taan. iii. 7.

from among the ten tribes going up to Jerusalem. What then did those who were worthy and who feared sin in that generation do? They took firstfruits and put them into baskets, and covered them with figs (*ketsioth*). They then lifted the baskets on their shoulders. When they approached the guard, who asked them, Are you going up to Jerusalem? they answered, No, but we are going to make two cakes of pressed figs in this mortar we have here with the pestle (*eli*) which is on our shoulders. So when they had passed by them they decorated their baskets and brought them up to Jerusalem.

And who are the sons of Salmi of Netofa? Once upon a time the wicked Kingdom of Greece decreed that the Israelites should not bring wood for the altar; and the kings of Greece set guards on the routes, just as Jeroboam b. Nebat had done at the borders to prevent any from among the ten tribes going up to Jerusalem. What then did those who were worthy and who feared sin in that generation do? They brought two pieces of wood and made them like ladders. Putting these on their shoulders they began their journey. When they came to the guard, they were asked, Are you going up to Jerusalem? They answered, No, but we are going to get pigeons from yonder cote with this ladder (*sullam*) which is on our shoulders. So when they had passed the guard they undid the boards, took them apart, cast them from their shoulders, then took up the pieces of wood and carried them to Jerusalem. ^a And since they had exposed their lives to danger in fulfilment of the commandments a good name is written of them in this scroll and a good memorial for all generations; and of them and all like them it is said, The memory of the righteous is blessed ^b; but of Jeroboam b. Nebat it is said, But the name of the wicked shall rot.^c

But why should the sons of Zethuel b. Jehudah have a good name and a good memorial for all generations, since not every one who wishes to obtain a good name can do so? ^d Because when the captives returned and found no wood in the chamber, these men offered wood willingly of their own store, and handed it over to the congregation, so that by means of it they offered the congregational sacrifices. So the prophets amongst them decreed that, even were the chamber full of wood derived from the congregation, yet, since these men had willingly offered the wood at that time,

^a Jer. Taan. IV. 4.

^c *Ibid.*

^d Cf. Ber. 17 b.

^b Prov. x. 7.

no sacrifice should be offered unless the wood were first taken from them, as it is written, And we cast lots, the priests, the Levites, and the people, for the wood-offering, to bring it into the house of our God, according to our fathers' houses, at times appointed, year by year, to burn upon the altar of Jehovah our God, as it is written in the law.^a And it says, For Ezra had set his heart to seek the law of Jehovah, and to do it, and to teach in Israel statutes and ordinances.^b See how that on account of these things the great ones of Israel agreed to make that day a festival.

And on those days^c it was forbidden to mourn and to fast, both before and after the destruction of the temple. R. Jose says, After the destruction of the temple it was allowed, since that was a grief to them. ^dR. Elazar b. Zadok said, I am of the grandsons of Sanuah b. Benjamin, and when the ninth of Ab happened to be on a Sabbath we fasted, but not the whole day, because it was to us a festival.

2. On the twenty-fourth we returned to our Law.¹

In the days of the Kingdom of Greece they were judging by the laws of the Gentiles. ^eBecause the Sadducees said, The daughter should inherit with [the daughter of] the son, Rabban Johanan b. Zakkai disputed with them, saying to them, How do you dolts prove this? There was none amongst them who could answer him a word, except a garrulous old man who said, If the daughter of my son, who was born of the strength of my strength, obtain my inheritance, should not much rather my own daughter, who is born of my own strength, obtain my inheritance? Rabban Johanan b. Zakkai read to him this passage, These are the sons of Seir the Horite, the inhabitants of the land, etc.^f; and another passage which says, And these are the children of Zibeon, Aiah and Anah^g; whence you learn that Zibeon had intercourse with his mother (sister?) and begat Anah of her.^h The old man said to him, Rabbi, with this would you dismiss me? He replied, You most foolish person in the world, is our perfect Law to be compared

^a Neh. x. 34.

^c R. H. 19 a; Tos. Taan. iii.

^e Bab. Bath. 115 b; Tos. Yad. ii. 9.

^g *Ibid.* xxxvi. 24.

^b Ezra vii. 10.

^d Erub. 41 a; Taan. 12 a.

^f Gen. xxxvi. 20.

^h Pes. 54 a.

¹ See *Revue des Étud. juiv.* lxiii. 51-62. Zeitlin is of opinion that this section was not in the original text of the Megillah (*Op. cit.* x. 279).

with your own vain meditation? The old man said, With this would you dismiss me? He replied, If the daughter of my son succeed, it is because she has a stronger legal right than where there are brothers; but you would say of my daughter that the legal right to share with the brothers is impaired, and so the judgment is that she should not succeed to my inheritance. When the Asmonæan house overcame them and abolished their teachings, judgments were again given after the laws of Israel; and that day on which their teachings were abolished was appointed a festival.

VI (ELUL).

1. The seventh of Elul is the day of the dedication of the wall of Jerusalem,¹ and on it one must not mourn;

Because the Gentiles had destroyed it; but when the power of Israel prevailed it was rebuilt. So it says, So the wall was finished on the twenty-fifth of Elul.^a But though the wall was rebuilt, yet the gates were not set up, as we read, Though even unto that time I had not set up the doors in the gates^b; and again, He built it and covered it, and set up the doors thereof, etc.^c; and again, And the porters and the singers and the Levites were appointed^d: since they cannot add to the city or to the courts of the temple without the presence of a king, a high priest and prophet, Urim and Thummin, and the great sanhedrim, accompanied by song and with two thank-offerings,^e since it is said, And the other thank-offering went in the opposite direction and I after them.^f² And the court was moving slowly after them, as it is said, And after them went Hoshaiiah and half of the princes of Judah.³ The inner bread was eaten by the priests, and the outer burnt.³ And if the city had not been sanctified by all these things, whoever came there was not held guilty.⁴ ^b Abba Saul says, There were two ponds in

^a Neh. vi. 15.

^b *Ibid.* vi. 1.

^c *Ibid.* iii. 15.

^d *Ibid.* vii. 1.

Shebuoth 14 a.

^f Neh. xii. 38.

^e *Ibid.* xiii. 32.

Nid. 24 b; Shebuoth 17 a; Tos. San. iii.

¹ The reference is to 1 Macc. xiii. 10; the glossator's reference to Nehemiah's time is incorrect. See Derenbourg, *op. cit.*, p. 75.

² R.V. "and the other company of them that gave thanks went to meet them, and I after them." Many Jewish writers take the passage as our text does. See Maimonides on Shebuoth.

³ The Gemara disputes as to the meaning of this. It may mean that the one thankoffering was eaten by the priests, the other was burnt.

⁴ Even though he were unclean.

the Mount of Olives, one above and one below. The lower one had been sanctified by all these rites ; but the upper one only by those who came up from the captivity, without king and without Urim and Thummin. The lower one, which had been completely sanctified, the ḥaberim and the common people assembled there to eat holy things of comparatively minor importance, and as a matter of course the second tithe. They assembled at the upper pool, which had not been completely sanctified, but ate neither the holy things of secondary importance nor the second tithe. But why was it not completely sanctified ? Because it was the weak point of Jerusalem ^a ; and thither they brought all the refuse of Jerusalem. So when they had finished the rebuilding of the wall they made that day a festival.

2. On the seventeenth the Romans withdrew from Judah and Jerusalem ; ¹

Because they oppressed the inhabitants of Jerusalem,^b so that they could neither enter nor leave the city by day, but only at night. How did the kings of Greece oppress them ? They placed quæsitores throughout the cities to carry off their brides, who were afterwards married to their men ; so they prevented the Israelites from rejoicing in their wives, that what is said might be fulfilled, Thou shalt betroth a wife and another man shall be with her.^c So no man was seeking to marry a wife because of the quæsitores (yet they afterwards introduced them secretly), as it is said, I will take from them the voice of mirth and the voice of gladness, the voice of the bridegroom and the voice of the bride, the sound of the millstones and the light of the lamp.^d ^eWhen they heard the sound of the millstones at Burni they said, It is the feast of circumcision, it is the feast of circumcision ! And when they saw the light of the lamp in Beror Ḥayil (?) they said, There is a marriage feast there, there is a marriage feast there ! Matthias b. Joḥanan, the high priest, had an only daughter ; and when the time came for her to be married the quæstor came to defile her, but they did not allow him to do so. Matthias and his sons were provoked to jealousy, and they prevailed against the Kingdom of Greece, and

^a Shebuoth 16 a.

^b Cf. II. 3 ; XI. 3.

^c Deut. xxviii. 30.

^d Jer. xxv. 10.

^e San. 32 b.

¹ The army of Agrippa was allowed by the Jews to withdraw. Josephus, *Bell. Jud.* ii. 17, 8.

the men thereof were handed over to them and they slew them.¹ So they made a festival of that day in which they subdued them.

3. On the twenty-second we again condemned to death the wicked ;

Because when the Gentiles were occupying the land of Israel the Israelites could take no action against the heretics in their midst ; but, after they had gone, three days were granted to the heretics for repentance, and if at the end of that time they had not repented they were slain. The day on which they slew them was made a festival.²

^a R. Eliezer b. Jacob said, I have heard that the court punished with lashes and killed some contrary to the Law. R. Simeon said, I have heard that the court fined and whipped some contrary to the Law, not because of what is written in the Law, but from what is said, And thou shalt put away the evil from the midst of thee.^b There is a story of a man who had intercourse with his wife publicly under a fig-tree. They brought him before the court, and he was flogged. Not that he deserved such punishment, but at the time it was necessary for the sake of example to others, because they imitated a custom of harlotry. Again there is a story of a man who rode on a horse on Sabbath in the days of the Greeks. They brought him before the court, and he was stoned. But had he deserved such a punishment ? No ! but at that time it was necessary for the sake of example to others. ^c Simeon b. Shetah hanged eighty women at Askelon. But had they deserved the punishments of slaying and hanging ? No ! but at that time it was necessary that other women should learn from their example, that all Israel might hear and fear.

VII (TISRĪ).

On the third of Tisri was abolished the use of the Divine Name in legal documents ;

^d Because once the wicked Kingdom of Greece decreed a persecution against Israel, saying to them, You have no part in the God

^a San. 46 b.

^b Deut. xiii. 16.

^c San. 45 b.

^d Rosh. H. 18 b.

¹ See Midrash Maaseh Hanuka (ed. Eisenstein, p. 190).

² The glossator's interpretation is "not acceptable" (Zeitlin). The "wicked" are the Roman soldiers of Agrippa who would not withdraw on the 17th of Elul (see above). Josephus, *Bell. Jud.* ii. 17, 8.

of Israel, and you must not make mention of the Name of God. But when the Asmonæan house prevailed and conquered, it ordained that the Name should be written even in legal documents. And thus did they write, In such and such a year of Jonathan the high priest, servant of the Most High God.¹ When the sages heard of the matter they said, If mention is made of the Name in legal documents, afterwards when anyone is tearing up his document the Name of God will be found cast away on a dung-hill. So the day when this was abolished was made a festival.²

VIII (MARḤESHVAN).

1. On the twenty-third of Marḥeshvan the Sorag³ was broken up in the court of the Temple ;⁴

Because the Greeks built a place in the court, in the midst of which they set up goodly stones. These were hidden by the Israelites till Elijah should come and decide whether they were impure or pure. They numbered them and hid them ; and the day when they hid them they made a festival.

2. On the twenty-fifth the wall of Samaria was taken.⁴

What is " the taking of Samaria " ? When they came up from the first captivity they went to a strip of land occupied by the Samaritans ; and when these were unwilling to receive them they came to Sebaste,^b where they settled. They surrounded the city with a wall and joined with it many cities of Israel, and were calling it the city of Nibraḥta.^{c 5}

^a Cf. 1 Macc. iv. 43-46.

^b *Al.* " the sea of Baste."

^c Cf. Nah. ii. 9 (8) and Targum.

¹ Cf. *Yad.* IV. 8, where it is said that on documents of divorce the Pharisees insisted on the insertion of the words " according to the Law of Moses and of Israel."

² Zeitlin thinks the glossator is wrong in ascribing this to the Asmonæan period. He assigns it to the Revolutionary period, when the Jews threw off the Roman yoke on the third of Tisri, A.D. 65, by exterminating their enemy ; from that time the names of Cæsar and Agrippa were removed from public documents. See Josephus, *Bell. Jud.* ii. 17, 8.

³ The Sorag was the latticed wall of stone that enclosed the Ḥel, a place within the fortification of the Temple (*Midd.* II. 3). Here it refers to the stone altar set up by the Greeks in the Azarah, and on which sacrifices were offered. Cf. 2 Macc. x. 2, 3. See Derenbourg, *op. cit.*, p. 61.

⁴ By John Hyrcanus, 108 B.C. See Josephus, *Antiq.* xiii. 10, 3 ; *Bell. Jud.* i. 2, 7.

⁵ On the text and interpretation of this paragraph see Derenbourg, *op. cit.*, pp. 72 ff.

3. On the twenty-seventh they offered again flour on the altar ;¹

Because the Sadducees were eating the meal-offering connected with the animal offering.^a Rabban Joḥanan b. Zakkai disputed with them and said, You fools, how do you justify this? None of them could answer a word except a garrulous old man who said, Because Moses loved Aaron his brother he said, Let him not eat the flour alone, but the flour with the flesh, like one who says to his fellow, Here you have a soft cake, here flesh. Rabban Joḥanan b. Zakkai read to him this Scripture, And they came to Elim, where were twelve springs of water, and seventy palm-trees.^b He said, Rabbi, you are laughing at us! He replied, You most foolish person in the world, is our perfect Law to be compared with your own vain meditation? The old man said, With this would you dismiss me? He answered, No! adding, the Scripture says, They shall be a burnt-offering unto Jehovah, with their meal-offering, and their drink-offerings, even an offering made by fire, of a sweet savour unto Jehovah.^c

A. W. GREENUP.

(To be continued.)

^a Lev. vii. 13.

^b Exod. xv. 27.

^c Lev. xxiii. 18.

¹ Zeitlin rejects the glossator's explanation, and finds one in 1 Macc. iv. 42, 43, where, however, there is no mention of the meal-offering. It is possible, he thinks, that this is alluded to in 2 Macc. i. 8.



THE TRAINING FOR SERVICE.¹

BY THE REV. J. GORDON HAYES, M.A.

“ To learn, and yet to learn, whilst life goes by,
 So pass the student's days ;
 And thus be great, and do great things, and die,
 And lie embalmed with praise.

“ My work is but to lose and to forget,
 Thus small, despised to be ;
 All to unlearn—this task before me set ;
 Unlearn all else but Thee.”

WHILE the cultivation of the spiritual environment, with its action and re-action upon the spiritual organism is the final stage, yet the inception of the process, being the conception of the higher nature, must usually take place much earlier. The knowledge of God, merely objective until the great crisis of the soul, becomes increasingly subjective from the time when God's Spirit enters, “ until Christ be formed ” in us.

There is nothing new to be said, though a great deal remains to be done, in the matter of the spiritual training of the minister of Christ. Let us contemplate the position calmly and dispassionately. If we are overwrought or feel pressed for time, it were better to put it aside until we get normal. For we shall never be right until we remember that this is business which cannot be hurried. Time must be taken to assume the right attitude, to find and to breathe the proper atmosphere. The result will be regulated by our care in preparation. We must compose ourselves by separation from everything else, and by prayer, for the soul to meet its God. They must commune, but they cannot unless the mind be free. Time and place must fade as we approach the spirit's rest.

“ Now from Thy rest within the veil
 My spirit looks on passing things.”

It is written “ All power is given unto Me . . . Go ye therefore ” —the Risen Lord to His devoted followers. And He continued “ Lo ! I am with you always, even unto the end of the age,” speaking to all who serve Him up to this day. Yet, dare the greater number

¹ Being the third and final section of the paper on “ The Agent of God,” the first and second sections of which respectively appeared in the *CHURCHMAN* of October, 1921, and January, 1922.

of Christ's servants assert that His power is manifest and His Holy Presence felt amongst us? What we most deplore is the pronounced absence of His power; are we not therefore without His Person? We have wandered away from Him. We do not the things that He said. Indeed, we do not realize that He has told us all we need to know in His written word, and is waiting for us to do it. He has identified Himself so intimately with His own revelation of His Will that the Word Incarnate and the word written are inseparable—"In the volume of the book it is written of Me." The word of God is all-sufficient, and hence final: even more, for into this world of death no life can come, but "by the word of God, which liveth and abideth for ever." ¹

But we have not that personal acquaintance with Holy Scripture which is necessary to learn God's will, and so our lives are not in that profound subjection to our Lord which they should be. When we are obedient we shall feel His power.

"He that rejecteth Me and receiveth not My word hath one that judgeth him; *the word that I have spoken the same shall judge him at the last day.* For I have not spoken of Myself; but the Father which sent Me, He gave me a commandment, what I should say, and what I should speak. And I know that His commandment is life everlasting." ²

To begin with, there must be receptiveness for God's will as already revealed. We are then responsible to Him for carrying it out. "To him that knoweth to do good and doeth it not, to him it is sin." ³

Not having a scientific basis for the mind prevents the clergy from seeing the vital importance of the scale of truth, though without the "single eye" all must be distorted, and there is no knowledge without obedience. ⁴

We need to feel the force of truth. If it were not for sin we should do so naturally. As it is to-day the fundamental facts, of sin and salvation from it, are rarely heard from our pulpits. Many of the clergy are quite oblivious to the fact that those who would worship God have no choice, but must worship Him not only "in spirit" but also "*in truth,*" or not at all. The one thing required in a steward is that he be found faithful, yet how many

¹ 1 Pet. i. 23. See Mauro, *Life in the Word.*

² St. John xii. 48-50. ³ St. James iv. 17.

⁴ St. John vii. 17.

sermons are faithful to Christ? And if a man is not so he is no Agent of God's, though he be Archbishop or Pope.

The Master waits. We wrestle and strive in His service, we say. Ostensibly so, but He is not manifest. We have never waited until we were endued with power from on high. He waits until we do. "There is no substitute for your act of surrender. When God states a condition of blessing, no other condition, however good elsewhere, can be substituted. This is why all your crying, and waiting and petitioning—yea, even agonizing before God—have accomplished naught, but to leave you grieved, disappointed and dazed at lack of answer. You have been praying instead of obeying. Prayer is all right *with* obedience, but not instead of it. 'Obedience is better than sacrifice.' So is it better than prayer, if it is the thing God is asking. . . . We turn to and begin to pray, for, we say, is not prayer a good thing? Forsooth it is, but *not well spent if used to dodge obedience.*"¹

The second stanza at the head of this article states our present task, "What things were gain to me these have I counted loss for Christ." Our former task included the beginnings of the spiritual life. Here it must be assumed to be a reality, though not without misgivings. For, being the crucial point, it is the great objective of Satan's offensive. His agents cannot serve God, and there is no third alternative. Two kingdoms, and two kings, compete for our allegiance. Unless men are converted from the power of darkness to the kingdom of God's Son they remain the servants of sin, whatever else they may be.

But we have reached the more advanced stage. Progress now appears to require the demolition of all we have patiently built up. By one of those spiritual paradoxes, which seem so remarkable to us, the pathway to the higher life begins by leading us downward. And we strain our mortal faculties, sometimes in vain, to understand. It is not by sight that he who follows Christ can walk :

" Let Him lead the blindfold onwards,
Love needs not to know;
Children whom the Father leadeth
Ask not where they go."

If we turn to the gospel we find our Lord very largely engaged in training the founders of His Church. And we may not be far

¹ *The Threefold Secret of the Holy Spirit*, J. H. McConkey.

wrong in saying that this training mainly consisted in the eradication of the old sinful nature, and the imparting of a new character which Christ alone could give. The old nature could be expressed in the word "self"; all that appertains to it is anti-christian. The Christ-life consists, on the preparatory or negative side, in the denial of "self," and in positively, as its name implies, receiving and living upon Christ Himself by faith.

"If any man would come after Me let him deny himself."¹ This is the root-principle of discipleship, known but neglected. And as long as neglected our work is not Christ's but our own, as it seems to be. If we wish to follow Him He will tell us to go and sell all that we have. He chooses His servants on the basis of those who are willing to lose their life in this world. Carnal Christians cannot serve, they will only be saved "as by fire." Surely it is obvious that God must have obedient servants, or none at all.

In spite of their Master's recent teaching we find the "Twelve" striving for greatness.² This showed they were fundamentally wrong, so Christ solemnly said that they would have to turn completely round and become as children before they could even enter His Kingdom. We have not yet exhausted the meaning of this. Children are simple both in intellect and emotion. Short of perfect knowledge, impossible to man, unsanctified thought is a hindrance to spiritual progress.

"We have but faith: we cannot know;
For knowledge is of things we see."

The salvation of the soul is a practical not an intellectual matter; it is something to be accepted by faith. We live in an age of intellectual activity, but of poverty in the higher emotions, when few, as Christ foretold, seem likely to choose "the narrow way" and simply trust the Heavenly Father. But how could He appoint Agents who are otherwise? We need to see, and to enter into, the spiritual order of things, the first principle of which is humility. This is the antithesis of the spirit of the world, which magnifies "self." As the unconverted crave to become great, we should desire to be good. These two are mutually exclusive. Greatness is human, goodness Divine. A sight of ourselves in the light of God's Holiness is necessary, to put us in our place, the only place where God can use us. It is thus that the path to higher things

¹ St. Matt. xvi. 24.

² St. Matt. xviii. 1.

must first lead us "downward." There is a continual need for self to be dethroned and Christ to take its place, His rightful place, as King of our lives. Nor, till life is done, shall we have fully accomplished our task of unlearning all else but Him. The more perfect the preliminary education the greater the need for self-sacrifice, for there is the more to be laid upon the altar. Abnegation rather than effort is the great need here.

A friend of the writer on meeting the Rev. W. Haslam, many years ago, remarked, "I know you through your books," to which the great evangelist at once said, "Do you know *my Master?*" This is great. The Agent must be *a man* with a *message* from *His Master*. You may build up the man, but his message will depend upon his right relationship to his Lord. And he must not be absorbed even in his message, but in the Lord Himself. Our greatest danger is that we forget our Blessed Master in our zeal for His work. The result is that the work ceases to be His and becomes merely our own. The Master must be everything, He will then look after His own work, and His workers. "I take, He undertakes." We get broken down over difficulties that are nothing to Him, but if we will surrender the charge into the hands of the Head of the Church and act as His assistants, we shall see a marked improvement. "Apart from Me ye can do nothing."

An old verger once said to the writer, "Keep right with God, and the work'll be all right." His simple and obvious advice has often been helpful. We know it, but do it not.

The true environment of the soul is God, but do we live in Him? We need to pray for a healthful spiritual appetite, for that blessed "hunger and thirst after righteousness"; then we shall feed our souls upon "The Living Bread" which is ever coming down from Heaven to give life to the world. But "without holiness no man shall see the Lord"; it is the condition of communion, for God is Holy. A holy life is only possible in Christ, but He can purify the mind and will until it is of maiden innocence and is shocked by the slightest thought of evil.

By following our Lord's methods of selection and training the ministry to-day might be greatly strengthened. Christ chose unimaginative, practical men, probably because nine-tenths of mankind are the same, certainly that they might be the more credible witnesses of Himself. We should select likewise, remember-

ing that witness for Christ is the great end of our existence. We must let our light, which is the Light of the world, shine before men; there is no other means for its diffusion. We preach the gospel perhaps, and wonder why it has so little effect; but we have not been able to testify for Christ, or tell what He has done for our souls. This failure is not humility, but "self," as nervousness is "self." The old nature will persistently turn up, and in more subtle forms, to the end of the chapter.

As in the selection, so also in the training, of the twelve, our Lord left us an object lesson we have been slow to learn.¹ Whatever God does, in Nature or in grace, He produces great effects by simple means. Just as Christ chose quite ordinary men, thus, for the main part of their training, the most natural methods are employed: to which is simply added this, *that they everywhere followed Christ*. The divine arrangement was for ordinary men to follow Him every day and every hour. It is certain that those who do this most consistently are His best agents. The greatest factor in the training of the Twelve would be the constant presence of their Master, His perfect personality gradually transforming theirs. We should teach as Christ taught. But chiefly should we let Him train His own agents Himself. At present we place obstacles in the way of the realization of such an ideal. This is a subject for the serious consideration of those who are teachers of the agents of Christ. Such teachers need above all things to exhibit the Christ-like life, for the inculcation of this must be their ultimate object. Mental knowledge of holy things is not fit for those whose lives are not in obedience to Christ. Our instructors must live the "Christ life" before their pupils, as some do so well, and not merely lecture on theology, and then disappear. This was not our Saviour's method. But we are involved in a difficulty that is fundamental, and one which, at present, it seems impossible to surmount.

In spite of some attempts to avoid such a predicament we are reduced to dealing with divinity students entirely upon the mental plane, although we have no Divine Authority for any such course. A great gulf seems fixed between the study of theology, which alone is considered or tested, and actual knowledge of God, or real personal religion. This is a tremendous matter, and the

¹ See Dr. Latham's *Pastor Pastorum*.

crux of the whole question of clergy training. For, without personal knowledge of Christ, God calls no man to the ministry. We seem to stand helpless before the very citadel, and see it held by the enemy. For the days are come when Satan is an angel of light and his ministers are ministers of righteousness.¹ It is always at points of strategic importance that one finds the adversary entrenched. He knows what matters most, and with his perfect wisdom deceives the whole world, letting men do whatsoever they will, except when it is vital to their soul's salvation. Unless this citadel can be won, and official training be made actual, whatever may be done in christianizing our civilization, comparatively few souls will be reconciled to God. Are we to rest satisfied with the relegation of vital truth to unofficial channels? Or is it possible to work patiently to the end that our teachers may all be filled with the knowledge and love of God in all wisdom and spiritual understanding?

Lastly, as in order due, we come to PRACTICAL CONSIDERATIONS.

Lord Acton said, in his lecture on "Luther," "to the bulk of ordinary Christians reform meant morality in the priesthood." We are better than that to-day. But do not let us too hastily assume that therefore we are perfect. The writer was astonished to find at the University a type of elder men who were absolutely impervious to certain obvious facts. And there are men everywhere, not least in the ministry, who are equally blind to objectionable truths. They will not face the facts. This may be cowardice, but it is certainly mental dishonesty. Some prefer a fools' paradise to the strenuous path of truth, in the train of those who—

"Climbed the steep ascent of Heaven
Through peril, toil and pain."

Thus at the present time, we might paraphrase Acton and say that "to the bulk of ordinary Christians reform means *mental* morality in the clergy." The basis of any profitable reformation must be intellectual honesty. Unfortunately a form of spiritual ophthalmia is very prevalent: and as our knowledge of nature is impaired by defective visual organs, so that of God's revealed will is seriously affected by the lack of the "Single eye," or honest and clear moral

and spiritual sight. As life proceeds and the energy of youth declines, there arises in many a constitutional tendency to self-deception. We become less disposed to face unpleasing facts as our power of combating them diminishes. And then, the wish being the father of the complacent thought, we take the other view that "all's right with the world," comforting in our old age, but false. Sin is still in the world, though the Saviour is still able to save. We must have perfect intellectual honesty. Unless we have a clear vision for truth our whole outlook is warped, and we cannot see things as they are, in the world or in Holy Scripture.

The first fact we are faced with is that the Church of Christ is not holding its own. The statistics show that church membership is falling behind the increase in population. And the second fact is the cause of this: that is, the decay of spiritual life. Seek, as the writer has done, in parish after parish, for men of prayer, and you seek them almost in vain, for they are nearly extinct. How many individuals, among the hosts which flock to our communion rails, have even an elementary knowledge of Christian Truth? How many can find their way into the Bible? And how could their souls live without the word of God and prayer? How many Sunday school teachers profess to know Christ as their Saviour? Yet what are they doing with their classes if they know Him not? We must assume that they are laying the foundation for confirmation, I suppose; the result of which is seen in their compliance with our religious customs, blindfold.

Hence, we must not be afraid of originality. Unless somewhat drastic experiments are tried the Church will be in danger of degenerating into a venerable monument of historic interest, inhabited by the caretakers. Perhaps the greatest hindrance to reform is "officialdom." In Church as in State the efforts of a few, even highly placed, officials are quite inadequate to the removal of this great incubus, which seems to crush out all life. Nature never propagates in straight lines and rectangles outside the inorganic kingdom, so that if life is to be cultivated we should do better to look to the botanical nursery, the farm and the forest for our models, rather than to the rigid geometrical forms which at present hinder progress. As Dr. Latham points out, "The training of the Twelve was quite a healthful process, very different from our artificial

cultivation of clergy to-day. Official agencies tend so often to become inefficient. When the Gospel had to be taken to the nations a most original personality was raised up, and equipped by quite unconventional training. And as St. Paul was the greatest apostle, so to-day if "red tape" could be abandoned men might arise capable in God's hands of converting thousands. Our present training is too intensive in its narrow intellectual groove, and too short. The main "desiderata" are spirituality and business, both being practical; the one the end and the other the means. We need men who understand the world, but who live beyond its power. But how are we to get them?

It is certain that no church can expect to so much as exist unless it make provision for its own maintenance. The Church of England should provide for the supply of its clergy. This is admitted, and in some dioceses clerical education societies have already been started, for the selection, assistance and training of candidates for Holy Orders. Something of this kind might be instituted with advantage in every diocese, if the diocese is the most suitable basis to work upon. But it would not be well to close the door entirely upon the present voluntary system, though it needs supplementing. The Church requires a much larger nucleus of those it has itself nursed and equipped. One obvious difficulty in practice would be that arising from the different schools of thought, but this should not prove insuperable if any kind of reconstruction is possible.

There is a peculiar danger incidental to the payment of members of Parliament which should be carefully guarded against in the Church. Searching investigations should be made to prevent men taking orders merely as a livelihood. To the upper classes the Church offers no special worldly advantages, at least apart from its positions of dignity. But to the lower classes it offers the great inducement of social position. A curate earns a similar income to a secular clerk, or draughtsman, and sometimes he gets it; his tenure is more certain, his calling more "respectable," and preferment is at least possible. But the whole question of selection needs careful consideration.

Some characters are constitutionally fitted, and others as unsuitable for the ministry. The majority, probably, do not readily reveal any strong bias either way. We shall return to these

points. But the initial difficulty is that of forming a correct estimate from an undeveloped personality. This is a dilemma, for while on the one hand it is important that the training for a holy calling should begin while the mind is receptive, on the other hand how can one know what the character will become until it is reasonably mature? A solution may perhaps be found somewhat on the lines indicated herein, by the cultivation of the character required, but a policy of most patient searching and watching should be pursued. And in our searching for the right men let us not hesitate to firmly eliminate those radically unfitted for the ministry, by want of self-control, or disorderly minds, or above all by that aversion or "deadness" to spiritual things that one sometimes meets with. A few of these might be interviewed occasionally as years go by, if otherwise deemed likely to develop well, but there must not be much sentiment about the business of selection. Many seem so strongly fitted for the struggle of life in the hard world, by natural selfishness or other qualities, that they can be left alone without any regrets. Others have just as clear a natural aptitude for following Christ. And these, while carefully watched and tended, should give little trouble. They would need their general education to be very complete, especially in knowledge of men, where they would find a severe schooling, but after which their course should be simple. Probably with the greatest number of boys, however, a great deal of watching and "nursing" would be necessary, lest some, and perhaps many, who might eventually turn out to be excellent material, should be neglected, and vice versa. The warden of a clerical education society entrusted with the sacred duty of selecting candidates must have the "infinite capacity for taking pains" of a genius. Indeed if devoid of genius for this kind of work, he is out of his place. He must set no limits of age or social standing, that the Master may choose whom He will. Not all will be chosen in their "teens," some whom God selects need many years of preparation before they are fitted for their special training. None should be pressed into Christ's service, however suitable they may appear to us. We may reason with them, but the decision must be their own, and God alone knows their hearts. Let them take up their business or professional career, and then, should God call them, they can come out in His good time. "God is great," and if we will not hew such narrow

channels will show us marvels. "Where the spirit of the Lord is there is Liberty."

The assumption is that all whom we are prepared to look upon are Christian boys, and preferably of Christian parentage, and even ancestry. Our object should be to get and keep in touch with those who seem likely to be suitable, to prevent their becoming warped out of recognition; by assisting their development as men and Christians,¹ and finally, to add the special training of the Agent of Christ. To swerve from the main stream of life too soon is to run in a separate channel ever afterwards. While with some, to go too far in general education will have the effect of their becoming too fond of secular studies. The age of enthusiasm should rarely be lost before actual work begins. But one cannot fix a definite year for such a thing as ordination, except to say that the present limit² is low enough, and in most cases rather too young. Personality must have time to mature, character to form, before taking orders. So many men awaken in after years to the awful fact that they are not suited for the ministry; a fact perhaps long known to others.

In these days the proportion of our clergy who need practical experience before ordination should be that of urban to rural parishes, or even higher. For the work of the Church, humanly speaking, fails chiefly from bad management such as would ruin any mercantile concern. Waste of time and money means waste of temper too, and general inefficiency. It is these things which are turning men away from us to-day. The practical difficulty at present is how and when to fit in the business training.

It is obvious that only those who have had both University and business experience are qualified to judge of their relative merits, as preparation for Holy Orders. But an assembly of such men, lay as well as clerical, should be convened to thoroughly sift the matter. The advantages of a University career are too well known to need enumeration. But like everything human it has corresponding disadvantages for those whose life-work is to be that of reconciling man to his Maker.

Turning to business, one finds at once that it is less pleasant, more arduous, and would appear to be a far less ideal life than the

¹ That is by providing suitable conditions for growth, etc.

² Twenty-three years.

other, when regarded theoretically. But in practice, it is the writer's opinion a business life is the better school of the two for an Agent of Christ, other things being equal. Given the same religious knowledge and desire for Christian activity to begin with, a business career is more favourable for their natural development. Six or seven hours a day at the office leave an equal time for reading and Church work.

Space forbids an exhaustive consideration of the subject. Each case should be judged upon its own merits, for elasticity is essential to life. But the writer would not advocate sending a man to Oxford or Cambridge until his character was fairly matured. To their parents all boys are pure and good, but the number who live double lives is considerable.

As throughout nature a small proportion only of seed reaches maturity and fruitfulness, so a much larger number should be selected for general training and supervision than can be expected to endure to the end. To allow for disappointments a wide margin should be left over, that the unfit may drop out before ordination.

The demands of a town parish deny the leisure necessary for adequate attention to such an important subject. The writer, however, felt it his duty to contribute these notes towards its discussion. In trying to regulate our own lives we are in danger of becoming far too intellectual. We are forgetful that unless knowledge is perfect the whole life will be vitiated: forgetful also how little effect reason has upon conduct if the will be adverse. We should begin by the surrender of the will to God. Our lives would then be directed by Him Who alone is omniscient, and Who has said that "we are His workmanship, created in Christ Jesus for good works, which God afore prepared that we should walk in them." ¹

"Our wills are ours, we know not how;
Our wills are ours, to make them Thine."

J. GORDON HAYES.

¹ Eph. ii. 10.



REVIEWS OF BOOKS.

CHURCH HISTORY.

AN INTRODUCTION TO THE HISTORY OF CHRISTIANITY, A.D. 590-1314. By F. J. Foakes Jackson. London: *Macmillans*. 20s.

Professor Foakes Jackson recognizes that comparatively little interest has been displayed in recent years in the Middle Ages. We are all more or less prejudiced on the subject and the greater our ignorance the stronger our prejudices. Some find them to be excellent subjects for the peroration of addresses devoted to the evils of the papacy and show that when Rome was supreme morals were bad as bad could be and darkness covered the earth. Others whose imagination, getting the better of their common sense, leads them to think that an ideal condition in thought means its realization in actuality, sigh for the return of those glorious days in which saints deserved to wear the halo, and worship was so pure that it naturally found expression in the best possible manner. We have spent a good deal of time in the study of books that were vitiated by the presuppositions to which we have referred. We have even dug out from a great library some of those contemporary volumes in order that we might judge for ourselves whether things were as bad or as bright as described. Not being specialists in the periods, we came to the conclusion that we needed a readable book, as free from bias as an historical volume can be, which would give us in broad outline a view of Church and national life that would enable us to see the ages in their environment and to come to a sane opinion on the whole subject. We have no hesitation in saying that Dr. Foakes Jackson supplies the work we needed and students can trust his skilled guidance into the many recesses and obscurities of the seven and a half centuries under discussion.

No one must think that this is an ordinary history book in the form of a chronicle passing from century to century in chapter after chapter. It is rather a succession of essays dealing with various aspects of life and government, knit together by an intellectual thread. In one respect we are specially grateful to our author, for he has grasped the fact that human nature was much the same through these centuries as it is at present. As he says in his Preface, "The more we know of the conditions of these times, the plainer does it become that our problems are often the same under different names, and that even modern views, which pass for being advanced, have their counterpart in these days. After all, we are the inheritors of the Middle Ages, and they have bequeathed to us many of our hardest problems. The story of the Crusades is enough to convince the most sceptical that the Near East was one of the difficulties which our ancestors faced; and if they failed, can it be said that we have succeeded?" We turn to the chapter on the

Crusades and find an acute analysis of the causes of the advance of Islam which in the early days refused to impose itself by force on any one. "Mahommedans respected the convictions of all their subjects, and orthodox and schismatical Christians enjoyed equal privileges, whilst the Jew was tolerated and even honoured. Nor was it to the interest of the Moslems to convert all men, as by accepting Islam the convert ceased to play the indispensable part of a taxpayer." Popular opinion attributes the preaching of the Crusades to the fervent eloquence of Peter the Hermit, who went throughout Europe proclaiming the suffering and degradation to which the Christian pilgrims to Jerusalem were subjected. That he was a preacher of the holy war is certain, but nearly half a century had to elapse before he was generally credited with having originated the plan to deliver Palestine from the infidel. The idea was due to Gregory VII, and took shape ten years after his death under his next successor but one. Dr. Foakes Jackson thus sums up the character of the Crusades: "The noble spirit of the Crusades was by no means universal, nor was the folly everywhere apparent. The Crusades were the outcome of the awakening of Western Europe in the eleventh century. It was not senseless fanaticism which made men realize the importance of Palestine. True, they were attracted by the thought that it was the scene of the Saviour's life, but it was also the key to the Empire and commerce of the East. It was the base also from which Egypt could be won back for the Christian world, and this prospect seemed at times capable of being accomplished. The Crusades were, in short, an attempt to solve the problem of to-day—the settlement of the question of the Nearer East. They failed because the powers of the West could not be brought to co-operate: each feared the other's success. When the Papacy seemed likely to be the chief gainer, the Empire intervened; when the German sovereigns appeared to be in the way of establishing themselves as the Christian masters of the Mediterranean, France stepped in to secure the prize. Properly conducted the Crusades might have saved Europe untold suffering. The chances of success were often of the brightest. But all was marred by the disorganization of the armies of the Cross, and the anarchy of the Christian states in the East. Not for the last time did the Crusades show the futility of the concert of the powers, the joint action of Christian armies, spheres of influence, and leagues of nations. If they succeeded better than some modern attempts and had more durable results, they failed for very similar reasons." We have quoted this long passage as an excellent illustration of the modernness of Dr. Jackson's outlook and the unexpected parallelism between mediæval and present-day conditions. Because failure dogged the paths of men in the past who sought a united Christian victory over a common foe, that is no reason why we, having learned lessons from their failures, should not make similar attempts to settle on Christian principles grave international problems. We must however be on our guard against any idea that we are so superior to our ancestors that we cannot fall into their

mistakes and are so much wiser that we can afford to take risks which were fatal to their high enterprises. We do not think the whole story of the Crusades is anything but the narrative of the perversion of an unselfish ideal into personal and national aggrandisement.

We can but consider one other subject treated by our author. The Inquisition he discusses is the mediæval, not the Spanish, Inquisition, although the latter derived its main features from the former. The chief distinction between the two is the close union of Church and State in the Peninsula, where Torquemada was as much from one point of view a State as a Church official. Dr. Jackson here writes: "As is natural Protestants have been loud in their condemnation of the whole system of the Inquisition and have dwelt upon its many undoubted abominations. Roman Catholics have, on the contrary, pointed to its constitution and have endeavoured to show that as a legal tribunal it was rather more than less merciful than others of former days. The number of deaths it inflicted has certainly been greatly exaggerated; and in the thirteenth century, in which it originated, it must have caused less misery than when it was employed against the Reformers in the sixteenth. Assuredly, then, neither Catholics nor Protestants can bear the blame of being the only persecutors, nor can cruelties in the name of religion be said to have been worse than those more recently perpetrated for or against vested interests. The whole question can now be subjected to an impartial discussion; and only those who still persist in maintaining that intolerance of opinion ought to be practised in order to restrain the right of men and women to think for themselves, are to be condemned." On this we remark, the Church has not the excuse of the State for being a persecutor, and the mercy of the Church to a poor heretic was as rare as that of the State to a poor criminal. We do not know what crimes committed for or against vested interests in modern days had anything like the plotted wickedness of the Inquisition. We agree that those now living who still hold that intolerance should be shown to restrain the right of private judgment are to be condemned by their contemporaries as holding wrong views, but we cannot agree with the contention that ecclesiastical persecution organized into a system does not deserve the strongest condemnation from all Christian men and women. Probably Dr. Jackson will agree with this, even if his words imply dissent.

The book has excellent summaries prefixed to its chapters as well as a good index, but it has no preliminary list of chapters and the subjects treated therein. This may seem a small point, but as some days had elapsed after reading the work before our writing this review, we missed the friendly help of a table of Contents. In spite of its price we trust this Introduction will find many readers who will follow up their studies by looking for themselves into the books that lie at the back of the conclusions at which Dr. Jackson has arrived.

TWO BOOKS ON REUNION.

THE CALL TO UNITY. By W. T. Manning Bishop, of New York. London: S.P.C.K. STEPS TOWARDS INTERCOMMUNION: Sacrifice in the Holy Communion. By Douglas S. Guy, B.D. Cambridge: *Heffer*. 3s.

Bishop Manning is the most prominent figure in the Protestant Episcopal Church of America, and Mr. Guy is a young man who has the gift of making his thinking clear and attractive. Both feel deeply on the subject of Reunion, and these two books are written with the sole desire of enabling those who are separated from one another to draw closer together. The Bishop chose as his subject "The Call to Unity" for the Bedell Lectures delivered on the eve of the Lambeth Conference. He is naturally pleased to find his views accepted by the Conference, and is especially thankful to see the adoption of his suggestion for mutual or added authorization for the work of the Ministry. "Every Christian in his heart thinks of the Church as differing from any other organization on earth, as having some supernatural character, as speaking and witnessing and ministering in the name of God. Every Christian regards the Church as something more than a social Club or an Educational Agency. The Catholic feels and stresses the Divine character of the Church. He stands for the principle of authority, of continuity, of order, for the importance and necessity of corporate faith and life. He emphasizes the fact that fellowship in the Church is necessary to spiritual life and development. The Protestant, on the other hand, feels and stresses the importance and Divine character of the individual soul. He stands for the principle of liberty, of spontaneity, of full individual expression. He stands for the fact that spiritual development is possible only through personal faith and individual experience. But there is nothing in these two principles that is incompatible. So far from being mutually exclusive or destructive they are necessary to each other." We entirely agree. The difference arises when men so interpret them through wrong emphasis that what is complementary becomes contradictory. The Appendices to these Lectures are valuable, as they supply a number of Reunion documents that are not easily discovered on this side of the Atlantic.

Mr. Guy endeavours to expound the doctrine of the Sacrament of the Death of Christ in such a way as to make it the sacrament of unity. His own point of view may be described as that of the letter of Archbishops Temple and Maclagan to the Pope on the subject of Anglican Ordinations. He has no sympathy with the contention of Bishop Knox in "Sacrament or Sacrifice," but he puts forward his own thoughts in such a way as to disarm criticism. We find ourselves drawn to his spirit although on one point we are not prepared to endorse his chief contention. He tells us that the sacrifice of the Eucharist includes "the offering of bread and wine as of the fruits of the earth, being the elements chosen by Christ Himself to represent His most precious Body and Blood, and which

He, the great High Priest, will return to us infinitely enriched, to be the effectual instruments of conveying the great gift to us." Where in the Holy Communion do we "offer" the Bread and Wine? Bishop Dowden has made it plain that the Church Militant prayer refers to the alms. Mr. Guy quotes Dr. Burkitt with approval. May we also quote him? "The English Reformers rejected Transubstantiation. In Cranmer's view the bread remains bread and the wine remains wine even after consecration. Yet to the faithful 'the Bread' which we break is a partaking of the Body of Christ. What was Cranmer to do? First let us notice one thing which he did not do. He did not turn the Eucharist into a real, but Pagan sacrifice of bread and wine. . . . Where is the sacrifice in the English Communion Service? Surely in this, that the congregation, having confessed, been shriven, having 'assisted' at a due consecration of the bread and wine, and finally having received their own portion, do then and there offer unto God themselves, their souls and bodies, to be a reasonable sacrifice. But what has gone before, so far as ritual both of words and actions can effect anything at all, the congregation have been hallowed into the Body of Christ." We have given this long passage as one of the best and clearest statements of Eucharistic sacrifice. It satisfies us, and we believe will be agreeable to the vast majority of devout Nonconformists. We shall never walk together unless we are agreed *in sacris*, and the great value of Mr. Guy's delightful pages is the recognition of this fact and his effort to bridge the differences between brethren who are one in heart and life, but are temporarily separated.

THE TEMPTATION OF OUR LORD.

THE TEMPTATION OF OUR LORD. By the late Right Rev. H. J. C. Knight. London: S.P.C.K. 5s.

A man whose work made a deep impression on Bishop John Wordsworth, Professor Swete and Bishop Montgomery cannot be considered a negligible personality. We may differ, and we do respectfully differ from the estimate formed by Bishop Montgomery of the wisdom of much that Dr. Knight did when Bishop of Gibraltar, but we cordially accept his testimony to the devotion, scholarship and consecration of the man. Dr. Knight was not made to be a Bishop. He could not understand why anyone, who could not give him in syllogistic form the basis of his difference from him, had any right to take an opposite view. He had the academic mind which throws everything into categories of thought and is astonished when it discovers life is much more than logic. He fought disease bravely. He worked when he should have been resting, and during the Lambeth Conference, when the shadow lay upon him, he wrote long letters to the Bishops. How far these letters contributed to right conclusions we do not know, but there is always an element of sympathy for a sick man, who feels enough to write at length, which does not always attribute the right weight to the arguments advanced. His earnestness was undoubted, his

self-denial self-evident to all who met him, and we thank Bishop Montgomery for the panegyric with which this re-issue of a famous volume of Hulsean Lectures opens.

The book consists of four chapters, "The place of the Temptation in the Life of Christ," "An Interpretation of the Three Temptations of the forty days," "The Principles of the Ministry, the Issue of the Temptation," and "The Person of Christ as seen in the Temptation of forty days." We are impressed by the scriptural knowledge of the Bishop and the range of his Old Testament quotations. He teaches us that it is impossible to ignore the Old Testament in our efforts to understand the life of Christ. It will be a revelation to many to open anywhere such a book as Moulton & Greenup's "Revised New Testament with Fuller References," and to see how the Greek reflect the Hebrew Scriptures. Dr. Knight knew this, and therefore he made his discussion of one of the least understood episodes in our Lord's life centre on the meaning given to it by its environment. That environment was as much spiritual as physical, and the spiritual portion came from the Old Testament. Dr. Knight held that in the first Temptation our Lord dealt with Himself—as He directed His energies and conduct. In the second he had His eyes on His work, His Kingdom, its range, character and the means of establishing it. In the third temptation the object He had in view was the law under which He should enter into the moral and spiritual life of men and apply His work to men. The whole exposition is fresh and thoughtful, and no one who reads it can fail to gain much food for reflection, and many seed thoughts to be passed on to others. There is a vigorous robustness about the book which cannot avoid being noticed.

CHRISTIAN PHILOSOPHY.

STUDIES IN CHRISTIAN PHILOSOPHY. Being the Boyle Lectures, 1920. By W. R. Matthews, M.A., B.D. London: *Macmillan & Co., Ltd.* 12s. net.

It is a mere commonplace for clergy whose work calls them to deal with educated men and women to find how often there is a tacit assumption that science and philosophy are antagonistic to revealed religion. It is not that the minds of men and women of to-day are still immersed in the rigid scientific theories of two generations ago, but rather that the increasing discoveries of the world of science and the probing of the complexities of man himself are tending either to pantheistic views or to mere agnosticism. To meet the needs of those who are feeling after a rational basis for their belief, the recently published book by Bishop Gore on *Belief in God* will be found very helpful, and it will commend itself to that wide circle whose minds are concerned with historic or objective reality. There is another circle, however, whose thoughts are not so much concerned with, say, the historicity of Genesis or the Synoptic Problem as with the question whether the Christian Religion is not opposed to philosophy, and it is to face this latter issue that

these lectures were delivered. Mr. Matthews starts out to rebut the assertion "that the fundamental Christian affirmations are incompatible with modern knowledge—that the human mind has transcended them and left them behind." In his first lecture he supports the view of Croce "that there is no inherent and necessary distinction" between religion and philosophy, and goes on to argue that the two are indissolubly united. From this he proceeds to examine the Christian view of the world, and discusses such subjects as the completion of Judaism in Christianity and the distinctive notes of Christian civilization. This opens the way for the consideration of Theism, with the alternatives Absolute Idealism, Naturalism, Vitalism and Pluralism. The last two lectures are devoted to the consideration of Divine Personality and the Idea of Creation, and these chapters will repay close study in view of current speculation on the Personality of God and the question how far there is incompatibility between the idea of an Infinite God and a created world of free men.

The book is an able contribution to the defence of Christian philosophy, and well worth the consideration of every thoughtful reader.

T. W. G.

ST. MARK IN COMMON SPEECH.

MARK'S ACCOUNT OF JESUS, being a version of St. Mark's Gospel in Common Speech. By T. W. Pym, D.S.O., Head of Cambridge House, Camberwell. Cambridge: *Heffer & Sons, Ltd.* 1s. net.

The Rev. H. R. L. Sheppard observes in his Foreword that "the actual language of much of the Bible—however graciously it falls on the ears of the faithful—is not familiar to the ordinary man," and the object of this free translation, which sometimes descends to paraphrase, is to provide for such "a faithful rendering of the actual sense of the Gospel." One can only hope that it will prove useful in directing the attention of the man in the street to the more familiar and more preferable English Bible. To tell the truth, we look with disfavour upon the growing tendency to produce such translations which might be prepared in the interests of some party or denomination. How would it be if the Baptists were to issue a translation which gave colour to their opinions? And what if the Anglo-Catholics produced a version with an occasional paraphrase which favoured their views? There are several excellent translations of the New Testament in modern speech, and for these we are grateful, but we dread the multiplication of works of this kind in which there might be, even unintentionally, a bias. It may be, in the opinion of some, an unreasonable prejudice, but we feel that we share it with a good many Christian people. However, Mr. Pym's rendering of St. Mark is well done—arranged in paragraphs with suggestive headings and prefaced by a brief but useful Introduction,

CHURCH BOOK ROOM NOTES.

82 VICTORIA STREET, S.W.1.

Miracles in St. John's Gospel.—The Rev. T. W. Gilbert, B.D., Rector of Bradfield, has just published a specially useful little book entitled *The Miracles in St. John's Gospel: Their Teaching on Eternal Life* (2s. 6d. net). The book shows how the Gospel of St. John is really built up round the seven miracles selected by St. John, and that there is a definite sequence in the selection; also that the teaching connected with each of the miracles is so arranged as to bring out the truth of which the particular miracle is a "sign." Miracle and teaching go hand in hand, so to speak, to explain how Eternal Life is possible through Christ, and the development is explained from the first miracle at Cana, with its application in our Lord's words to Nicodemus, until the complete confession in Christ by Thomas in the Upper Room. The Bishop of Oxford contributes an introduction.

The Holy Communion.—The Rev. T. W. Gilbert has also just written a little manual, *The Holy Communion: What it is*, which is published by the Book Room, price 1d. or 7s. per 100. The pamphlet is meant for distribution to Confirmands, and is a useful companion to *Preparation for the Holy Communion* and *At the Holy Communion*, by the Rev. H. M. Lang in the English Church Manuals Series, which are now unfortunately only obtainable bound together at 6d. paper cover, and 1s. cloth.

Spiritual Revival.—The London Meeting of Lay Churchmen has just held its ninth meeting and a record of its proceedings has been published (1s. post free). The subject selected was "Spiritual Revival—Its Nature and Expression," and the papers which were read and which are given in full in this report are of exceptional value and interest. The Chairman, Professor Beresford Pite, gives a general introduction. "The Source of Revival" is dealt with by Mr. R. R. Webster, a nephew of the late Preb. F. S. Webster; "The Way of Revival," by Mr. W. Guy Johnson and Mr. H. Morgan Veitch; "The Mental Processes of Revival," by Mr. A. G. Pite, M.C.; "The Hindrances to Revival," by Dr. Tom Jays, and "The Hope of Revival," by Mr. H. C. Hogan, the Editor of *The Record*, Mr. H. C. Perrott and Mr. C. E. Caesar.

Non-Communicating Attendance.—Many inquiries have reached us during the last few weeks for some pamphlet or book on the question of non-communicating attendance at Holy Communion. It may be of interest to those who read this column to be reminded that the National Church League published some years ago, at the suggestion of the late Bishop of Bath and Wells, a valuable essay entitled *The Communion of the Laity*, by the Rev. W. E. Scudamore. It can be obtained in paper covers at 6d. net, and in cloth at 1s. The essay, which is chiefly historical, is on the rule and practice of the Church with respect to the reception of the sacred elements. The present edition was reprinted under the personal supervision of the Dean of Canterbury, who contributes a Preface.

Another book which contains useful information on this subject is *Primitive Church Teaching* by the late Dean Goulburn (1s. net). This work is an

appendix to the author's commentary on *The Office of the Holy Communion*. Dean Goulburn enjoyed during his life-time the reputation of a helpful devotional writer.

A High Churchman, he had a strong realization of the Church as Reformed and Protestant, and felt it his duty to write and speak plainly on the introduction of practices and doctrines that are mediæval and were deliberately rejected by our Reformers. *Primitive Church Teaching on the Holy Communion* was written by him, because, as stated in his Preface, "Since the original publication of the work (*The English Office of the Holy Communion*) two or three practices, which seem to me wrong in principle, and to have a tendency to undermine the true doctrine of the Holy Eucharist, have shot up with an amazing rapidity, and are gaining every day a greater foothold among the members of our Communion," and he felt that readers of his book on the Holy Communion had a right to expect from him some guidance on the practices to which he refers—Fasting Communion, Non-communicating Attendance, and previous private Confession.

Church and Faith.—*The Lord's Supper* by Dr. Drury, late Bishop of Ripon, *The Confessional* by Canon F. Meyrick, and *The Reformation Settlement* by J. T. Tomlinson, are three reprints from *Church and Faith*, a valuable collection of Essays on the teaching of the Church of England collected and published some years ago under the editorship of Dr. Percival, Bishop of Hereford. These three pamphlets are now issued at one penny and three-pence each. *The Lord's Supper* is written in a simple style, and is well suited for distribution among the more intelligent lay workers, Sunday School teachers, etc. The first portion consists of a description of the earlier development of the Eucharistic service, and Dr. Drury then considers the Holy Communion in its various aspects, i.e. as a service of remembrance, as a covenant sign, as a sacramental feast, as a Eucharist, as a service of fellowship.

Canon Meyrick's pamphlet is a severe condemnation of the practice of Confession on the grounds alike of Scripture, of primitive custom, of history, and of its practical consequences. Those who read it with unprejudiced minds will probably be convinced that few greater injuries can be done to the English Church and the English people than the re-introduction for general adoption of a practice so inconsistent with ancient example and so adverse to the cultivation of the best manly and womanly character. The value of the reprint is enhanced by a preface written by the Dean of Canterbury.

The Reformation Settlement is one of Mr. J. T. Tomlinson's most valuable productions. He has collected some very useful and interesting historical information. He deals with (1) the struggle of the laity (as represented by the Crown) to throw off the yoke of a "spiritual," i.e. clerical judicature, and (2) the casting out of the Mass and the Confessional in the sixteenth century. He thinks that to get rid of these last and to vindicate for the laity a right to speak in the name and on behalf of "the Church" with a recognition of the paramount authority of Holy Scripture over the Church, constituted the real essence of what is known in English history as "The Reformation."

The whole book has been out of print for some years, but a few second-hand copies are still obtainable at the Church Book Room at 2s. each post free.