

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

Colonial Secretary encouraged the Deputation to hope for international reconsideration of the whole question at an early date. Our part lies in using the best of all known social weapons—that of prayer to the righteous Lord Whose balances are equal, Whose hand is with the weak against the strong, and Who is wont to turn loss, or risk faced bravely for His sake, into unending gain. G.



Discussions.

“ORDERS AND REUNION.”

(“*The Churchman*,” June, p. 418; July, p. 490.)

MR. BLUNT makes it clear that the only solution of the question from the “Catholic” standpoint which he takes is the literal Reunion—the coming back of the sects into the old Church. To this no exception can be taken. But he invites criticism when he bases his argument in support of this standpoint on the strange axiom that “no difference can appear in conclusions unless it was already latent in the premises.” This may be true in syllogisms or algebraic equations; but we cannot apply logic or science to developments in which human opinions and the human will are guiding factors. He makes the idea of Christianity to be the “idea of a system of revealed truth progressively apprehended.” As a fact, in history this is, alas! too true. But it does not follow that it is the right idea, even of the doctrinal element, which occupies so large a space in the system. He continues: “If the line of thought which forms, as it were, the main artery of the system ends—*e.g.*, in the Sacraments—then we can say that it virtually began in the Sacraments.” Let us compare the Sacrament of the Lord’s Supper as it now stands at the “end” of the line of thought, fully developed in the sacrifice of the Mass, with that which we find in the New Testament and the records nearest to the beginning. It is hard to recognize even one element common to the two, and impossible to conceive that the essential differences between them could be latent in the rite of the early Christians—a simple feast of fellowship with their Lord and with one another, coupled with the renewal of the oath (*sacramentum*), which was then the bond of their brotherhood, to obey His command to love one another, and hurt nobody by word or deed. Rather does the comparison furnish the strongest evidence that these differences are parasitic growths and not true developments. This, however, is only a part of the fully-developed Sacramental system.

Take another artery of "the system of Christianity," which has a greater claim perhaps to be called the main—that which ends in the absolute hierarchy of the Church. Trace it back to the beginning—to the "heart of the system." We find no semblance of an hierarchy there, but a specific and absolute prohibition of it. The Lord, speaking directly on the subject, declares: "The rulers of the Gentiles exercise lordship over them. *Not so shall it be among you.*" They—the Apostles themselves—were to be ministers and bond-servants, even the greatest of them. And one of them who heard this prohibition exhorts the elders of the Church to lead their flock like a shepherd (of the East), and not drive them or "lord it over them." Here, also, we have no true development. It began in the intervals of rest from persecution, and grew till in the end the Church deliberately bowed down in worship to Mammon, receiving in return the glory of the kingdoms of the world—even surpassing their rulers in her power and pomp and in the cruelty with which her lordship was exercised over her members. The Vatican became as full of intrigue and corruption as any Court in Europe or the world. And it was in the midst of this wickedness that Catholic tradition was finally developed—largely shaped by political and personal motives of the Church's rulers, and supported by a simultaneous development of the Sacramental system, which bases the power of the hierarchy on the superstition of the people and calls it divine. It is well to note also how, throughout the growth of this tradition, the doctrinal element of the system has predominated more and more over the ethical—creeds usurping the place of our Lord's moral teaching as a test of discipleship. The strictness of this doctrinal test branded men as heretics, to be persecuted even to torture and death, because they could not contract the fulness of their life in Christ into the narrowness of some incomprehensible dogma of man. A sin against morality, however great, could be atoned for in the Sacrament of Penance, but for the conscientious heretic there was no admission to this unless he made a definite and public recantation, whether true or false was of no account. Yet the first recorded offence punished by the Church in the beginning was an act of hypocrisy—a lie unto God.

As to Orders, the Apostle Paul lays down the rule that a Deacon must have a wife and a well-brought-up family to qualify him for the Order. In the modern Deacon, entering but a year's probation for the Priesthood at the age of twenty-three, there is a total absence of this qualification. Can we say that this absence lay already latent, alongside of the presence, in the Order at its institution? At all events, it throws doubt on the extreme value of structural continuity as "an element in spiritual continuity"—an element which Mr. Blunt contends is essential to the true representation of Christianity on earth. Yet, strangely, he finds that the most "scientific" structure, with unbroken continuity, has reached a stage when it is no longer capable of

preserving the true elements of Church life. On the other hand, he condemns equally the Nonconformist systems because they are unscientific, and consequently "their wonderful fruits of piety and philanthropy can never be more than individual." Here he exposes the fundamental error of the Catholic standpoint—viz., that the Holy Ghost resides in a particular "scientific" system, and not solely in the hearts of those who are God's children and Christ's brethren. Yet he admits that a system so blessed may err, and that the Churchmanship of the sects embraces the social fellowship of the Apostolic age at least as fully as the Church of England.

It would be well to face the real facts, and note that the main arteries which have corrupted the life of the Church of Rome are still the historic arteries of the Church of England, and to inquire closely and honestly how much corruption was left in them after the Reformation, and what further heresy and schism we need to effect a complete cleansing. Maybe it will need the cutting them "right down to the heart" of the system. Then can we hope that a National Church may rise up with new life and purity, with a structure of true Apostolic simplicity, wide enough to admit all Christians of the nation into one Communion and fellowship. It will need faith—yes, strong unwavering faith—in the continuing presence of Christ among His people, unrestricted by systems or structures made with hands.

F. A. LE MESURIER.

("The Churchman," June, 1911, p. 407.)

There is a review in the June number of THE CHURCHMAN of an article of mine in *The Interpreter* of last April. I had maintained in it that St. Luke gives a threefold account of Christ's last journey to Jerusalem. The reviewer takes exception to this view, and asks, if it be so, why does St. Luke confine himself to the account of only one visit to Jerusalem, whilst St. John speaks of *several* visits to the same city?

This very question is practically asked and replied to in the opening pages of my article. The undoubted fact is therein mentioned that St. Matthew and St. Mark only mention one visit, and the explanation is suggested that, "as the Synoptic Gospels lead up to the great event for which Christ came—to die for our sins—the circumstances connected with His death are narrated much more fully than any other event. In order to die it was necessary that He should go up to Jerusalem (Matt. xvi. 21, xix. 1, xx. 17-19; Mark x. 1, 32-34), as He Himself had pointedly said. Hence it appears, in the Gospels of Matthew and Mark, that going up to Jerusalem during His ministry is associated with the thought of His death, to which very special attention is drawn by giving an account of only the last fateful

journey to the Holy City, and by studiously avoiding mention of any other visit."

It was further suggested in my article that the Gospel of Luke follows the same line of drawing special attention to the death of the Lord, as do the two other Synoptic Gospels, by giving an account of only the last visit to Jerusalem; but in Luke's account the emphasis on the last visit to that city is intensified by the threefold narrative of the journey thitherwards.

On the second page of my article it is mentioned that St. John gives accounts of *several* visits to Jerusalem during Christ's ministry, and reasons are suggested which may have induced this Evangelist to adopt a plan which differed from that of the three Synoptists.

G. MACKINLAY,
Lieut.-Colonel.



Notices of Books.

THE KINGDOM AND THE MESSIAH. By Professor E. F. Scott, D.D. Edinburgh: *T. and T. Clark.* Price 6s. net.

Professor Scott recognizes that the message of Christ was related, in some degree at least, to the Apocalyptic Jewish teaching of His own day; but he does not allow himself to drift into the extravagance of Schweitzer and of Modernism. He refuses to admit that the permanent validity of the Gospel is affected by the eschatological framework in which it was first preached. His book deals with the two great subjects of our Lord's teaching which are naturally most likely to be influenced by Jewish Apocalyptic, the Kingdom of God and the Revelation of the Messiah. He believes that Christ hoped, by the sacrifice of His life, to bring in the kingdom which He had proclaimed, but he does not believe that He looked for the consummation to follow immediately. He refuses to admit that the revelation of Jesus was dependent on those Apocalyptic ideas and beliefs in which it was first embodied, but he does believe that they have a real and abiding value for Christian thought. The book is a little more sympathetic to the new theory than Mr. Emmet's volume, recently published, but Professor Scott quite definitely declines to be a party to the view that our Lord's life was inspired by a hope which proved to be utterly mistaken.

On p. 232 he discusses the phrase *λύτρον ἀντὶ πολλῶν* and finds an exact analogy in Josephus, where a golden beam of the temple was given up to Crassus as a *λύτρον ἀντὶ παντῶν*. He comments, "One item of priceless value was surrendered in order to save the remaining treasure. The import of the phrase in Josephus is perfectly plain, and we are not to encumber it with the imaginary difficulties when we find it in the Gospels." Exactly so.

F. S. G. W.