

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-JUNE, 1944

Vol. LVIII. No. 2. New Series.

Contents :

	PAGE
EDITORIAL	50
<i>t</i>	
THE ATONEMENT IN ST. MARK'S GOSPEL	
The Rev. J. P. Hickinbotham, M.A.	51
EVANGELICAL THEOLOGY	
The Rev. F. J. Taylor, M.A.	59
THE PLACE OF THE LORD'S SUPPER IN EVANGELICAL WORSHIP	
The Rev. J. Stafford Wright, M.A.	68
A PURITAN BISHOP	
The Rev. C. Sydney Carter, D.D., F.R.Hist.S.	76
A VALID MINISTRY	
The Rev. E. Hirst, M.A., A.R.C.M.	81
CALLED TO SERVE IN THE SACRED MINISTRY OF THE CHURCH	
The Rev. R. J. Cobb, M.A.	86
BOOK REVIEWS	90

PRICE : ONE SHILLING

"The Churchman," 1s. quarterly. Annual subscription, 4s. 6d. post free.
Church Book Room Press, Ltd., Dean Wace House, Wine Office Court, E.C.4

Editorial.

“WHO knoweth whether thou art come to the Kingdom for such a time as this?” This challenging question to Queen Esther urging her to realise the responsibility of her position is suggestive of the position which faces Evangelical Churchmen to-day. So vital are the questions now under discussion that subsequent events may justify the statement that this is an historic moment in the story of the Christian Church.

Discussions raised by the Scheme of Union in South India are by no means settled, though at the moment the centre of interest has moved to India. Even a postponement of the Scheme may have tragic results for the cause of Jesus Christ in India; on the other hand a decision to go forward and put the Scheme into operation may equally have big re-actions both at home and in the foreign mission field. The Church in South India needs our constant prayer that she may be guided by the Holy Spirit and have the spiritual faith and courage to follow whatever may be the revealed will of God.

The Education Bill now approaching its final stages in Parliament opens up the whole field of Christian Education. If the Christian Church has big enough vision and bold enough faith to accept the challenge, how far reaching may be the spiritual blessings for the post-war generations! It is an opportunity which demands the mobilisation both of man-power and all our spiritual resources.

Then there is the urgent question of supply and training for the Christian Ministry. The report just published on the “Training for the Ministry,” concerning which we have been able to include in this issue of *The Churchman* a short article, reveals the greatness of the problem and the urgency of the task. It is imperative that all Churchmen should read the report and give it the careful study it deserves. Many of its suggestions are extremely good, though sometimes revolutionary in character; but there are others which are bound to cause serious questioning, especially when read in the light of the present day tendency, in the official circles of the Church, towards centralisation, and regimentation towards a position in belief and practice in which there is no place for men of strong and definite convictions.

It is true that these and other great questions are of vital interest to the whole Church, but to Evangelical Churchmen they are of supreme importance. We cannot be otherwise than concerned as we witness the spiritual emphasis moving more and more away from what has been the dynamic of Evangelical Churchmanship, *viz.*, the personal experience of the Crucified Saviour, the individual response to God's redemptive love finding expression in personal surrender to the will of God and conscious obedience to a definite Divine call. Consecration of life as a sequel to God's wondrous redeeming grace, “Lord, what wilt Thou have me to do?” we believe is still fundamental in the matter of Christian vocation.

The whole situation calls for fervent prayer, spiritual vision and constructive action. With no desire to be uncharitable towards others we do, however, contend that it is in the realm of Evangelical experience that an adequate answer can be found to the challenge of this historic moment. If we believe it is so let us not be wanting in accepting our responsibility, “For if thou altogether holdest thy peace at this time then shall there enlargement and deliverance arise . . . from another place.”

The Atonement in St. Mark's Gospel.

BY THE REV. J. P. HICKINBOTHAM, M.A.

THE present unpopularity of the traditional Evangelical theory of the Atonement, that of Penal Substitution, and the tendency to dismiss it as something peculiar to St. Paul, makes it worth while to re-examine our oldest extant record of the life, teaching, and death of Jesus Christ, St. Mark's Gospel. If, as the writer holds, the theory underlying that Gospel is such as can only be rightly described in terms of penal substitution, then it is a theory which (while not necessarily the whole truth) cannot be discarded without unfaithfulness to the central tradition of the New Testament Church.

Before turning to St. Mark it will be convenient to summarise the principal characteristics of the theory of Penal Substitution, and its two chief rivals, the Moral theory of Dr. Rashdall, and the vicarious Penitence, or Representative, theory of Dr. Moberley. The penal theory has four essential features. (1) *It asserts that sin requires judgment.* Forgiveness is not possible on a basis of repentance alone : God's righteousness demands that His condemnation of sin be not only declared in word but actually put into effect. This is a necessity required by God's character : sin remains a fact even when the sinner has repented, and were God *simply* to ignore it, as He does ignore it when He forgives, He would be less than perfectly Holy. (2) *The judgment on sin must be death.* Sin is judged when the sinful organism is exposed to the direct action of God upon it : that action, since God is holy, must be "wrath", *i.e.*, complete antagonism. The effect of such antagonism must be a complete absence of well-being, which implies either annihilation or extreme torment. Since it is the whole personality, and particularly the soul or spirit, which is the seat of sin this "death", as it is called, affects the spiritual part of the sinner even more than his body. In the Bible bodily death is commonly regarded as the result of, and outward symbol of, this spiritual desolation. (*cp.* St. Paul's exegesis in Romans 5 and the conception of 'life' in St. John's Gospel). (3) *This judgment has been borne by Christ instead of sinners who are saved from it by faith in Him.* On the Cross Christ was identified with men not *qua* men but *qua* sinners : God judged our sins upon Him as though they were His, and therefore He need no longer treat us as sinners. Christ's death was therefore a spiritual desolation even more than a physical mortality ; it was an acceptance of God's condemnation. We shall suffer bodily death, because our redemption is as yet only complete in the spiritual sphere (Rom. viii. 23), but it has been emptied of its significance as symbolic of spiritual death : Christ has borne that so that we may never bear it. (4) *This judgment was borne by Christ as Incarnate Son of God.* A transference of penalty by God from the guilty to a third innocent party would be a-moral if not immoral. Therefore, like St. Paul, we must stress the One Divine Person of Christ rather than His Human Nature : it was *God Himself* Who was in Christ reconciling the world

to Himself. It was, of course, necessary that God should be made man in order to identify Himself with sinners ; but ultimately it is the Judge, not a third party, who pays the penalty which His own justice demands should be exacted.

A comparison of the alternative theories with these four characteristics will reveal their principal differences. The first point is denied alike by the Moral and the Representative theories. They hold that God can rightly forgive on a basis of repentance alone. But the Representative theory adds that repentance must be perfect, *i.e.*, there must be a complete abhorrence for sin, and that this is impossible for a sinner. By having sinned he has corrupted his nature, and given it a proclivity to sin which he cannot, by the power of that nature, cure. To the second point both theories would assent, with the proviso that only unrepented sin needs this judgment. Both, however, would deny the interpretation of Christ's death which is the third point. They are forced to do so by their denial of the necessity of judgment. The Moral Theory sees Christ's death as the culmination of a life of love to mankind : it is the supreme demonstration of God's forgiveness offered to men as they do their worst. Hence it stirs men to repentance and thus makes them forgivable. This is the Atonement. The Representative Theory treats Christ's Death rather as the culmination of a life of perfect obedience to God : Christ as Perfect Man offers to God that complete obedience and abhorrence for sin, even at the greatest cost, which is perfect repentance. Moreover, He is not *a man* but *Man* ; and His offering is made on behalf of the human race which He sums up and represents. On the basis of this perfect repentance God can forgive the sinner who by faith identifies himself with Christ. Because he is one with Christ, Christ's offering can be regarded as his : it is what he would now offer if he could ; it is what he will one day be able to offer as he becomes progressively like Christ in virtue of faith-union with Him. Thus in neither theory is made an identification of Christ with the sinner *qua* sinner ; there is no taking of the sinner's place, no experience of God's condemnation. His death is the death of the perfectly Righteous One and therefore can only be a bodily death ; spiritually He remains in perfect fellowship with the Father. He does not stand in the sinner's place, so that we may never stand there ; He stands in His own place of perfect obedience and love, so that there we may join Him. In the Penal view, the Death of Christ is an experience from which we are saved ; in the other views it is an experience with which we must identify ourselves. On the fourth point, the Moral Theory generally takes the same attitude as the Penal. It is the forgiving love of God which the Cross displays : therefore His Divine Person must be stressed. But the Representative Theory emphasises the Human Nature of Christ : it is as Representative of men, and therefore as Himself Man, that Christ offers His sacrifice of obedience to the Father. Certainly, only God Incarnate can be Perfect and Representative Man ; but the emphasis is on the movement from penitent man to God not from God to sinful man.

We now turn to St. Mark's Gospel, to consider whether it exhibits the characteristics of the penal theory, or diverges from them along the lines of the other two. In doing so we shall remember that it is a Gospel, *i.e.*, a narrative of God's saving acts in history, not a doctrinal

treatise. We shall not find a clear-cut theory: the theory must be deduced from the facts presented to us. But we shall also remember that it is a Gospel, not a biography; it is written with a theological and religious purpose; the facts are selected and narrated because they proclaim a theological and religious message; the writer does not intend us to treat them just as facts, still less to explain them away or separate the facts from his interpretation of them. Therefore we shall treat them seriously, and expect to find a doctrinal position emerging from them.

Four main characteristics, all of importance for our study, confront us in St. Mark's Gospel. (1) *Jesus is presented as a Divine Person.* The reality of His Human Nature is, of course, essential and it appears with a naïve vividness. But it is something assumed and taken for granted: the emphasis is on His Divinity: the thought is not that "it behoved Him to be made in all things like unto His brethren" but that *this* Man is different from all other men, the Messiah, the unique Son of God, Whose divinity is witnessed by the things which separate Him from other men, His acts and words of power. This is the theme of the first half of the Gospel (i. 1-viii. 30, with ix. 2-8, as an epilogue). We are confronted with it in the title "The gospel of Jesus Christ *the Son of God*" (i. 1). It is clarified and developed in the Introduction (the Witness of the Fore-runner, and the Consecration of the Messiah, i. 2-13). The Messiah is heralded in the words of an Old Testament prophecy about Jehovah Himself "make ye ready the way of the Lord": the coming of Jehovah is fulfilled in the coming of the Messiah, and the coming of the Messiah is fulfilled in the coming of—Jesus. That this is so is attested by God Himself: the Messiah is according to Scripture the dispenser of the Holy Spirit, so the Spirit descends as a dove on Jesus, and the voice of God Himself declares "Thou art My Beloved Son". There follows the Ministry of the Messiah in Galilee and its environs (i. 14- viii. 30). Through it all, drawing all the varied incidents into a real unity, runs one theme: the revelation of Jesus as Messiah and Son of God through His words and deeds of power. To this His works of healing, His exorcisms, His miraculous power over nature, His teaching with authority all bear witness. True, the majority do not read the signs aright: for Jesus deliberately avoids direct statements about Himself and speaks in parables 'That seeing they may not see'. Nor does He do the mighty works *in order* to reveal Himself: they are done rather through compassion and because evil cannot withstand the presence of the Son of God; but rightly understood they *are* signs of His Divinity and so the Evangelist intends his readers to understand them. Hence even among the most obtuse they cause "astonishment", "amazement", "fear"; hence the ascription to Him of supernatural powers, whether good or bad (John the Baptist risen from the dead, Elijah come again, Beelzebub). The demoniacs, as is natural to men supernaturally possessed, recognise Him from the first; and the section comes to its climax when the disciples get beyond their first awed question, "Who is this?" to the insight of faith: "Thou art the Christ." In the Epilogue God Himself confirms this verdict: Christ is seen in Divine glory, in the place of honour between Moses and Elijah, the supreme representatives of Law and Prophecy, both

of which He fulfils ; and the Voice comes again " This is My Beloved Son."

In the second half of the Gospel the theme changes to the Suffering of the Messiah ; but Christ's Person is still viewed from the same angle. It is the Son of Man who suffers ; but the Son of Man is a title of divinity rather than humanity, and the Sufferer is that same Son of Man Who will " come in the glory of His Father with the holy angels," Who will judge men, and award them eternal life or death according to their attitude not to God but to Himself. This section, also, reaches its climax in a human recognition of His Divinity, a recognition at the moment of His greatest humiliation : the centurion's " Truly this man was the Son of God." The recognition is once again confirmed by God Himself : on the third day He rose again. We have assumed that St. Mark gives to his typical titles for our Lord, ' Christ ' ' Son of God ', ' Son of Man ', a maximum content, *i.e.*, that they imply the unique Representative and Agent of God enjoying a unique metaphysical relationship to Him, whatever their varying meanings in the O.T. and contemporary Judaism. That this is so is *a priori* likely, both because it is the customary usage of N.T. writers, and because of the tremendous supernatural character of the events connected with the Holder of the titles. This is confirmed by further indications in the Gospel. The title Son of God is explained by the Voice from heaven " my beloved Son ", where ἀγαπητός has the connotation " unique " even more than " beloved," and by the parable of the Vineyard, in which our Lord compares Himself to the " yet one, a beloved (ἀγαπητός) son," as contrasted with the servants who symbolise the prophets. The title Christ implies, as we have seen, One to Whom prophecies about Jehovah can be rightly applied. The title " Son of Man," connected as it is with predictions of His coming in Divine glory, must be taken from Daniel 7, interpreted, as in the Book of Enoch, of a Divine Supernatural Being.

(2). **The Messiah is presented as One Whose Mission it is to suffer.** The secondary theme of the first part of the Gospel, the growing conflict of the Messiah with the Jewish leaders, is a prelude to this. It becomes the dominant theme immediately after Peter's Confession. Three solemnly repeated predictions of the Passion, the journey to Jerusalem heavy with foreboding and sayings about self-abnegation, the anointing beforehand for burial, lead to the Passion Narrative which is the climax of the Gospel. The suffering is neither accident nor the inevitable result of circumstances, even that most significant circumstance the meeting of the Son of Man with sinful men. Rather *it is an essential characteristic of the Messiah* : that is implied by the fact that immediately after Peter's Confession, and as a commentary on his words " Thou art the Christ," Jesus begins to teach that He must suffer. Because the Messiah acts for God, His suffering is the direct will of God : it is a smiting of the Shepherd, not by men but by God : it is the Father's will that He should drink the cup. For the Messiah as God's Agent it is therefore a Divine theological necessity : " the Son of Man *must* suffer ; " " the Son of Man goeth as it is written of Him " ; " this is done that the Scriptures might be fulfilled." But for the Messiah as sharing the Divine Authority and Will it is a free choice, independent

of men : He deliberately chooses to court death by going to Jerusalem, despite His disciples' forebodings ; He challenges the authorities by the Triumphal Entry ; at the Trial He makes a claim which must lead either to worship or to condemnation for blasphemy, and then keeps silence, refusing either to explain or defend Himself. Moreover, *the suffering is presented as an end in itself*. In the three Predictions it is linked with His future glory, which clearly has value in itself, not by the purposive 'in order that' but by the co-ordinating 'and.' There is no suggestion that it is the spirit in which He accepts the suffering that matters rather than the suffering itself : that the suffering is only the means whereby He may demonstrate in its fulness His forgiving love to men or His obedience to the Father. So in the Predictions it is always "the Son of Man must suffer," "they shall kill Him," not "the Son of Man must be obedient even to death," "He shall forgive even His murderers." So in the story of the Passion there is no reference to love, one only to obedience, and even there it is upon the fact of His actually drinking the cup of suffering rather than His obedient attitude that our attention is focussed. "Remove this cup from Me ; nevertheless not what I will but what Thou wilt." The story of the Cross is told objectively, almost brutally : the scourging, crucifying, the reviling and mocking, the death of Jesus, these are the things stressed : and the only recorded Word of Jesus is that of intense suffering, "My God, My God, why hast Thou forsaken Me ?" The Word of forgiving love, "Father, forgive them", and the Word of obedient trust in God, "into Thy hands I commend My spirit", are conspicuous by their absence.

(3). The Messiah's Suffering is Death, and Death in a more than physical sense. "The Son of Man must suffer . . . and be killed." Indeed His Death is itself the purpose of His Mission : "the Son of Man came . . . to give His life," and this is reflected in the structure of the book : after convincing us that Jesus is the Messiah, and then showing that the Messiah must suffer, we come to the climax—the story of the Cross. There are some hints which prepare us to interpret His Death as something more than physical. Since, as we have seen, physical death is often taken in the Bible as symbolic of spiritual desolation, it is not surprising to find the Evangelist treating it in this sense. Thus in the story of the Paralytic, disease, which is the beginning of death (cp. iii. 2, 4), is taken as the outward sign of sin. "Life" is habitually used in this Gospel as a synonym for spiritual well-being, the membership of the Kingdom which is fellowship with God. Thus the attempt to save (physical) life is the way to lose (spiritual) life ; the opposite of entering into life is something more than physical dissolution—it is being cast into hell fire. So Jesus refuses to admit that in the case of Jairus' daughter (a little child like those of whom He said "of such is the Kingdom of God") death is a proper description of physical mortality : so, too, He refuses to describe as dead the patriarchs long since in their tombs : God is the God of Abraham, of Isaac and of Jacob ; but "He is not the God of the dead but of the living." Were the death of Jesus merely a physical death we should expect it to be thought of in a confident and even joyous spirit, as a glad home-coming to the Father. This is the spirit in which many a Christian disciple, even many a pious Jew, has faced physical death and,

even the most painful martyrdom : like St. Paul " they have the desire to depart. . . for it is very far better". How much more the perfect Son of God ! Yet precisely the opposite is the case. The predictions of the Passion are charged with tragic tension, even with supernatural awe. Our Lord's repeated words have a solemn significance ; they terrify and puzzle His disciples. " They understood not the saying and they were afraid to ask Him." They hang back in alarm and wonder : " Jesus was going before them and *they were amazed*, and they that followed *were afraid*." In the Garden of Gethsemane the tension deepens : it tears the heart of Jesus Himself in mysterious agony : " He began to be greatly amazed and sore troubled. And He saith unto them, My soul is exceeding sorrowful even unto death. And He fell on His face and prayed that if it were possible the hour might pass from Him." Unless Jesus is less brave, less confident in God, than many a weak and sinful man, what He is facing here is not only physical death : we must interpret " death " in terms commensurate with the Agony which it caused to the Son of God. We are therefore prepared for the climax in which St. Mark puts beyond doubt the meaning of this death : the one recorded cry of Jesus from the Cross : ' My God, why hast Thou forsaken Me ? ' We have already insisted on the impossibility of separating event and interpretation : unless we are to say that St. Mark is both a false historian and a false theologian we must accept both his facts and the meaning which he attaches to them ; for history is events shewn in their true meaning, and historical theology, a Gospel, is events shewn in their true meaning which is seen to be their relationship to God and His purpose. Therefore, just as we are not free to explain away the nature miracles, or the raising of Jairus' daughter, as natural phenomena misunderstood, so we are bound to take the Cry of Dereliction as seriously as the Evangelist intends it to be taken. A cry so liable to misunderstanding would probably not be recorded at all, certainly would not be recorded in splendid isolation, unless it were charged with theological meaning. To dismiss it as the cry of a delirious man is to make it trivial : to argue that because it is the beginning of Psalm 22 which ends with a recovery of faith Jesus must have repeated the whole Psalm and experienced the suffering and the faith of the later verses but *not* the forsakenness of this verse, is to introduce unwarranted speculations which make the Evangelist, not to speak of Our Lord, mean precisely the opposite of what he says. It was *this* verse, and this verse only, that we are told Our Lord spoke : and He spoke it not at the beginning of the Hours of Darkness but at the end. We cannot doubt that St. Mark intends us to understand that the Three Hours of Darkness symbolise a real darkness in the soul of Jesus : a real consciousness of being forsaken by God which finds its expression in the Cry of Dereliction. It is this spiritual desolation which makes plain the significance of His Death.

(4). **It is through this Death of the Messiah, and only so, that sins are forgiven.** Contemporary Judaism thought of the Kingdom primarily as the reward of the righteous : the Baptist, and Jesus after him, revived Jeremiah's emphasis on forgiveness by making Repentance the condition of membership : for repentance presupposes sin, and sin implies the need of pardon. Now Repentance was possible for those

who heeded John's preaching : but the assurance of forgiveness came only with Jesus. John's baptism was a baptism "of repentance unto, *i.e.*, with a view to, remission of sins," but the gift of the Spirit, the sign of the Kingdom, of fellowship with God, and therefore of forgiveness, depended on the One "who cometh after me." Jesus proclaims that His Mission is to sinners ("I came not to call the righteous but sinners," implying that all men *need* forgiveness); and He actually forgives them. "The Son of Man hath power on earth to forgive sins." Yet this power is used surprisingly sparingly in His ministry : The reason becomes clear when, at the approach of the Passion, we learn that such pardons are, so to speak, proleptic, and that forgiveness depends upon His Death. "The Son of Man came not to be served but to serve and to give His life a ransom for many." The references to 'serving' and 'for many' make it plain that this saying recalls Isaiah liii. 10-12 and that therefore it is from sin that His death ransoms men. The words at the Supper "This is My blood of the covenant which is shed for many" clinches the connection of His Death with forgiveness by a double O.T. reference : first, they again recall Isaiah liii ; secondly, they announce the inauguration of a Covenant in which His blood shed is the sacrifice which puts it into effect just as the blood sprinkled on the altar and the people validated the Mosaic Covenant : the word "New" is not used, but obviously it is a new Covenant, not the Mosaic ; and must refer to that foretold by Jeremiah, a Covenant based specifically on forgiveness, "I will forgive their iniquity and their sin I will remember no more." The new thing added by Jesus is that it requires His Death to bring that covenant of forgiveness into being. Finally, the rending of the Temple Veil at the moment of Christ's Death means that from that point on there is free access into the Holy of Holies, the Presence of God : an access hitherto barred by sin.

These four themes make it impossible to hold that St. Mark presents us with a Moral or Representative view of the Atonement. Christ acts as a Divine Person, not as Representative Man ; Christ suffers, and the sufferings are important in themselves not as the background against which love or obedience is displayed ; Christ suffers a spiritual desolation which is unnecessary and indeed impossible if His Death is only the crowning act of love or obedience by One Who is perfectly loving and obedient and therefore in perfect union with God ; and it is only through this Death that sin is forgiven, though some repentance at least is possible even before His Coming. But these four themes are perfectly consistent with the theory of penal substitution. That theory says, "In order that sin may be forgiven the Son of God must bear the spiritual death which is its penalty, instead of the sinner." St. Mark says "Sins are forgiven because the Son of God has borne that spiritual death." Two further links only are needed to complete the chain. First, that the desolation Christ suffered *was our penalty transferred to Him*. This can hardly be disputed, since the only alternatives are that it was a penalty due to nobody, which makes God arbitrary, or a penalty due to Christ which makes Him a sinner. St. Mark implies the transference of penalty by stressing the identification of Jesus Christ with men *qua* sinners, though not *qua* men. The acceptance of John's baptism of repentance by Jesus is set in the

forefront of the Gospel : it can only be interpreted as an identification of Jesus, Himself sinless, with His sinful people. The mission to sinners, and the stress on His habit of companying with them point in the same direction. The point is clinched by the two references to the Suffering Servant ; whatever the contemporary Jewish view of sacrifice may have been (and there is reason to doubt the modern assumption that it always meant the symbolic offering by man of a perfect life rather than the acceptance by God of a substitutionary death), in Isaiah liii. it is impossible to avoid the conclusion that sins are forgiven through the Righteous Servant's identification of Himself with sinners, and His substitutionary acceptance of the penalty due to them. The final link is *the necessity of this substitutionary penalty before God can forgive*. Here St. Mark goes no further than to say that God does forgive on the basis of the substitutionary penalty suffered by Christ, and only on that basis ; and that it was His Will that Christ should suffer it. But to say more is needless : God does not will suffering unnecessarily ; the fact that He has willed to forgive in this way means that this is the way demanded by His Holy Love. The Evangelist tells us what God has done in Christ ; it is from His acts in history that the character of God is known, and if the record of those acts shows that He sent His Son to bear the penalty of sin instead of us then we must frame both our conception of God's character and our ethical theory upon that foundation.

Evangelical Theology.

BY THE REV. F. J. TAYLOR, M.A.

IT is deeply significant that the subject of theological thinking should be discussed in successive issues of this journal; and moreover, that these discussions should be provided with the same title. For it shows that evangelical churchmen are affected by the currents in the church universal at this hour and are aware of the need for a living theology which shall not be a mere recitation of ancient phrases used as solemn incantations for keeping at bay the insidious advances of secularized thought. Perhaps also it bears witness to a subtle sense of inferiority which haunts Anglican evangelical thinking at the present time, since precisely those things which are generally supposed to be characteristic of evangelical Christianity are the things which have lost repute in the last two generations. Evangelical faith is commonly represented as individualistic, excessively Scriptural if not fundamentalist, introverted and puritanical in ethics and pietistic in outlook, whereas the tides of sentiment and thinking are running strongly in the opposite direction. A good deal of modern Christian thinking, influenced as much by the secular situation as by the study of the Bible, has been laying emphasis upon the essentially corporate nature of Christianity with the consequent importance of the church as an institution, and upon the power of reason, through philosophy and natural science, to provide an adequate intellectual basis for theology. One typical example of this approach can be seen in the recent book by Dr. Charles Raven entitled 'Good News of God.' Written under great physical and mental strain there are many things in it which are finely expressed and this is due to the fact that in a number of places Dr. Raven stands within the orbit of Evangelical faith and experience, but the theological basis of his writing is not evangelical at all as that word has been previously understood.

Here we may observe that this book illustrates, perhaps in an extreme form, the particular crisis which has overtaken evangelical theology during the last half century. The unquestioned authority ascribed to the Scriptures in earlier evangelical writing has been undermined by the pressure of scientific thought and the adoption of critical methods of Biblical Study. The message of the Bible and therefore of essential Christianity had to be elucidated by means of these new tools already applied with great success in other fields of study. The apparent reasonableness and indeed inevitability of this procedure obscured the decisive fact that the criterion of evangelical faith had been altered. Instead of a revelation given by God in history and in a Person, testified through the written accounts transmitted by the first witnesses, the assumptions of modern thought and critical methods provided the real basis of this liberal theology. The change was further obscured by the fact that most of the leaders of liberal evangelicalism had been nourished in old fashioned evangelical homes and schools, had passed through a real experience of conversion and knew that the Bible was a divinely ordained means of grace.¹ They claimed to be in the true

Evangelical succession and that their teaching, however different in form from that of their predecessors, preserved the substance of genuine evangelicalism set forth in a dress more suited to the needs of the twentieth century. It was not possible to deny that the pattern of their religious experience conformed to the characteristic evangelical experience, while most of their spiritual emphases were laid in the same places as those of traditional teachers, but they owed these things largely to the circumstances of their upbringing.

Nevertheless this attempt to commend Christianity to the modern secular man by presenting it in the light of modern knowledge or on the basis of assured results of criticism was in the end to present a Christianity which was not historic Christianity. The whole situation was paradoxical since the liberals laid great emphasis on history and the historical facts without which Christianity could not for one moment be Christianity. The attempt to discover the Jesus of history was bound up with a misunderstanding of the nature of historical writing, due to the uncritical acceptance of the methods of natural science by workers in the field of history. It was naively assumed that fact and interpretation were easily distinguishable in the sources which a historian was obliged to handle and that it was his duty to give an impartial, that is a factual, but uninterpreted account of what was supposed to have taken place.² When applied to the New Testament this method was supposed to enable investigators to differentiate between the facts, between what actually happened, and the doctrine of the Apostles or the interpretation which early Christians gave to the gospel facts. This attempt to get behind the Apostolic witness to Jesus, to a Jesus as He really was, only succeeded at the cost of being unhistorical, for it ignored an important element in the evidence and created a picture in harmony with the preconceived ideas of the critics. It is only possible to have a record of facts, because facts have meaning. The quest of the historical Jesus undertaken in this way to commend Him to modern thought and culture only produced an unhistorical figure. This could only have happened because in effect scientific method and modern thought were being treated by these theologians as a new source of revelation to be set alongside the revelation of the Bible in the same way that the Roman Church regards tradition as a source of revelation of equal importance with the revelation of the Bible.

It was at this point, not always clearly understood by the disputants themselves, that conservative evangelicals parted company with the liberals. They took their stand, as their forefathers had done, upon the Scriptures as the unique source of revelation. They accepted the Apostolic testimony to the significance of Jesus and could claim to be expositors of historic evangelic Christianity. But they cannot be absolved from blame for the lamentable confusion into which evangelical theology has fallen. They failed to understand that Biblical criticism was a necessity, not only from the contemporary movement of thought but also from the nature of the Biblical documents themselves. Their reaction to historical criticism and the scientific attitude was negative. They met the crying need for a living theology with the repetition of old shibboleths and outworn phrases. They failed to perceive and to teach their brethren the legitimate uses and the true limits of critical

research. In part, this profound distrust of criticism sprang from an equally profound reverence for the truth of the Gospel given by revelation of God, but if naturally, if undeservedly, involved its professors in the charge of obscurantism. They were in fact working with an intellectualised concept of revelation which identified it with the words of Scripture and the impartation of knowledge unobtainable in any other way, instead of understanding it as the free action of God in His sovereign grace.

This unresolved tension in evangelical theology in the Church of England continues until the present moment with accusations of obscurantism and countercharges of liberalism freely bandied about. Meantime the current of theological thinking has flowed steadily on, leaving some of both schools stranded high and dry further back along its course. The tocsin which was sounded by Barth amid the ruin and despair of 1918 has reverberated throughout the Christian world, and no part of the Western church has escaped its influence. Even Roman theologians who normally have ignored the work of Protestant thinkers as unworthy of their steel, have paid serious attention to the theological revival of Barth and Brunner. It is important to realise what this transformation means. It cannot be comprehended in terms of a simple dialectic which would see the liberal movement as the antithesis of traditional Christianity and the present trend as the emergence of a synthesis. Nor can the theological revival of the last twenty years be dismissed as an inevitable swing of the pendulum in the other direction largely caused by the distress and upheaval of the years between 1918 and the present time. No theology which approached its task in such a self-conscious spirit would be likely to achieve a worth while success. But the very fact that the present trend of theology is towards a reassertion, or more correctly a revival, of the theology of the Apostles and Reformers is evidence that we have begun to pass out of that period when theology fell into disrepute and emphasis was placed upon worship and Christian action. When the basis of theology is ignored, and when it seems impossible to be sure of its content, so that emphasis is placed upon the externals of Christian life, and the importance of modern thought, then in effect, the church becomes like a sign post pointing in all directions at once and theologians have lost their criterion of thought.

This revival of a concern for theology is of special importance for evangelicals since evangelicalism was born in theology and has been nourished in it ever since. The great epochs of evangelical history have also been the moments of evangelical theology. Even at its lowest levels, evangelicalism has borne witness to this fact not simply by its resistance to German liberalism but also by its resistance to the Anglo-Saxon heresy of an undogmatic Christianity. The action of Luther was a theological protest against a false theology which had obscured the faith of the gospel and the meaning of grace. He recovered for Christendom what his successors so soon lost, a true understanding of revelation as the free action of the living God in Christ and not the impartation of knowledge in the form of propositions. "The concept 'truths of revelation' in the sense of Latin propositions given and sealed once for all by divine authority in wording and meaning, is theologically impossible, if it be the case that revelation has its truth

in the free decision of God made once for all in Jesus Christ."³ Barth goes on to point out in the same context that even for Calvin the practical meaning of his great work "The Institutes" was to "direct Christian thought and language to its own responsibility in the present."⁴ Again in the eighteenth century the Evangelical Revival was a theological revival. Nothing is more significant in the work of the Wesleys than their care for theology. The hymns which played so large a part in the progress of the movement were written from faith to faith. To examine their language, their rhythm or their metaphors is to undertake a fascinating Bible study. John Wesley took immense pains to see that his lay preachers were equipped theologically for their task of spreading 'Scriptural Christianity' and compiled from his own reading, which was extensive, a work which he called 'A Christian Library.' Its range can be estimated when it is remembered that the 1819 edition was published in 30 volumes of 'extracts and abridgments of the choicest Pieces of Practical Divinity.' It was in fact a treasury of all that was best in patristic theology translated for the benefit of those engaged in evangelistic work. In like manner some of the leading evangelical fathers in the English Church during the later part of the eighteenth century and the early nineteenth century were distinguished for their scholarship and theological writing. The works of Newton and of Richard Cecil, whom the critical judgment of Bishop Samuel Wilberforce was later to designate as the one clerical genius of his party,⁵ the Biblical commentary of Thomas Scott and the church history of Dean Milner were all solid contributions to theology which were destined to outlive in usefulness the life span of their authors. It is evident that evangelical churchmen stand in a tradition of theological learning and writing, which is now being made again a direct Christian responsibility for us by the circumstances of our time both within and without the Church.

It is the Gospel itself by which the evangelical lives and which he is bound to serve by proclaiming it in all the world, which lays this obligation of theology upon us. By this means the Church cross-questions itself about its faith and makes concrete for itself the meaning in life of the gospel of grace. The task has to be fulfilled in a two-fold manner—positively by expounding the riches of Christ so that the hungry sheep are fed, and negatively so that misinterpretations of the gospel which would limit its range and distort its meaning may be excluded. This does not mean that the task of the evangelical theologian is to produce a philosophical basis for theology to be set over against the Catholic philosophy. There is no such thing as a Reformed *philosophia perennia* and the introductory words which Barth prefixes to the first part of his Church Dogmatics serve as a salutary warning. "In practice," he writes "*philosophia christiana* has never yet taken shape; if it was *philosophia*, it was not *christiana*; if it was *christiana* it was not *philosophia*."⁶

Reformation theology in its origin was a protest against the power of the heathen doctor Aristotle and evangelical theology has been true to its profound insights when it has kept guard against the importing of alien speculative ideas into the doctrines of faith. The fact is that evangelical theology parts company with catholic theology a good deal further back than is commonly admitted, in the doctrine of primary

importance, of God Himself. The framework within which the evangelical works and the categories of thought he employs are those of a disciplined hearing of the Word of God in the Scriptures.

This thinking is undertaken out of a deep sense of responsibility, for the theological thinker, whether lay or clerical, is a committed member of the Church of Christ and in practice is usually an accredited teacher. Theological writing is never truly the work of a free lance but one of the functions of the whole body, which like ministering the Word and Sacraments is undertaken by a few members of the body commissioned by the Spirit in the church to do such work. For this reason, which is involved in its own essential nature, theological work is related to the whole of the church's life and especially to its proclamation and to its worship. The preacher may not be in a technical sense a theologian and the theologian may not be committed to the task of proclamation but it is quite plain that these two functions cannot really be separated but must be united at the deepest level of church life. The preacher has no right in the pulpit unless he be a theological preacher, unless he has the Word of God to proclaim, and the professor has no right in the class room unless he is serving the Church in explicating the content of faith and thereby enabling it to hear the Word of God. "I have not the faintest interest in any theology which does not help us to evangelize" James Denney once declared⁷ indicating from another angle that theology is not a science to be pursued for its own sake but a responsible discipline of faith.

It is for the recovery of the sense of theology as a necessary function of the Church and theological thinking as a responsible discipline of faith that evangelicals must now contend. This is what we have lost in the last fifty years with the result that to members of other confessions the only audible voice from the English Church has been the Anglo-Catholic voice. How then will an Anglican evangelical seek to fulfil the theological task of the hour? The primary need is for us to know what evangelical theology in the Church of England really is, for most of our contacts with other theological traditions are rendered fruitless by our ignorance of our own position. There is already a good deal of evidence to show that a concern for sound theology and for the integrity of church teaching is widespread, but this goes hand in hand with considerable incoherence on the content of that teaching. Until this situation has been remedied, at least in a measure, it will not be possible to enter into real discussion with men of other traditions or to take the place that we ought to have in the œcumenical conversation which has already been opened in our time.

In the first place our theology will be grounded in the revelation of God given in Jesus Christ, in that final and decisive Word which has been spoken to us in an act of history. Here we take our stand with Lutherans and Calvinists, with our own Anglican reformers, with the Evangelical fathers of the eighteenth century and indeed with the constant Anglican tradition until recent times. Evangelical theology is Scriptural theology and evangelical Christianity is, in John Wesley's constant phrase, 'Scriptural Christianity.'⁸ By its faithfulness to the Word of the Bible it stands or falls. It was on this basis that our English reformers carried through their work. The supremely important test for theology was its faithfulness in exposition of the

Scriptures and its evident congruity with their message. This was enshrined in the Articles of Religion which proclaim the sufficiency of Scripture in providing the content of saving faith and deny that anything necessary for salvation can be found anywhere else. Another article further defines the content of saving faith by saying that "Holy Scripture doth set out unto us only the Name of Jesus Christ whereby men must be saved."⁹ This is not to assert that there is no knowledge of God to be received from extra-Biblical sources but it is to say that unless He is first known at the definite point where He has revealed Himself in Christ He will not truly be known at all. It is to assert the Scriptural knowledge of Christ made possible by the testifying work of the Holy Spirit, as the sole source both of the doctrine and of the preaching of the Church. To the English reformers as to Luther and Calvin, by force of circumstances, was committed the responsible work of theological definition and they fulfilled their task in substantially the same way as the Confessional Synod of Barmen in May, 1934, when it declared that "Jesus Christ as He is testified to us in Holy Scripture is the one Word of God which we have to hear and which we have to trust and obey in life and death."¹⁰ So our articles give to us a clear starting point for theology—the revelation of God witnessed in the Bible and this is the key to a right understanding of history and of nature.

The Articles do not attempt to prescribe the interpretation of the Bible or the relation between Old and New Testaments. No doubt it is true that for the men of the sixteenth century the Bible was unquestionably accurate in all its statements and in subsequent years revelation was regarded as knowledge about God contained in the Biblical revelation. But we do well to remember that some reformers, of whom Luther was the most important, looked upon the Bible as testimony to the Word and argued that Scripture which was undoubtedly apostolic in authorship (*e.g.*, Pauline) might nevertheless fail to be apostolic in the sense of bearing testimony to Christ. The Bible for Luther was "the cradle of Christ" and this gave him a principle of criticism of Scripture itself, in Christ. This critical understanding of the Scriptures was soon overlaid in the growth of a new scholastic orthodoxy. However we live in the post-critical epoch and it is not possible to go back to the pre-critical stage. The atomistic criticism of the past sixty years is now a part of theological history with which we have to reckon and if our predecessors erred in ascribing too much importance to its methods and results, we must learn to put it in its right place as part of the prolegomena to a Biblical divinity. The tendency of New Testament study at the moment is towards interpretation and the understanding of its central message and the unity of its witness.¹¹ All this means that we are called to grapple afresh with the "riddle of the New Testament," to expound its real message, and to let its testimony again be heard. It follows that the Bible in a new and serious way will be the starting point and criterion of all our theological thinking and also that the Church will be more firmly under the discipline of the Word than in recent times. Moreover we are reminded that creeds, confessions, church authority and doctrine itself have only a relative authority and can be tested by an appeal to the Word of God.¹² Important as this work of theology is, it can never have the

authority that the Thomist theology possesses in the Roman Church because it is continually open to the critical judgment of the Word testified in the Scriptures. There is appeal from doctrine or creed or church decision to the Word of Scripture and this is not the written word only but the Word which we hear by the power of the Spirit when we listen and obey.

In the second place our theology will be a reassertion of Reformation theology. It is a mere truism to say that the Church whether Roman or Reformed has been profoundly affected by the events and theology of the sixteenth century, but for us it is significant as the re-assertion as apostolic Christianity, the rediscovery of the meaning of grace and "the historical locus where the Christian conscience became most fully aware of the persistence of sin in the life of the redeemed."¹³ It was a time when men grappled with the problem of God's speech with men and saw deeply into the meaning of His self revelation. We shall then learn to give heed to the writings of the English reformers as those to whom, all unconsciously perhaps, we owe a great debt. Already through the impact of Barth and Brunner we have begun again to listen to Luther and Calvin. But these are still for most of us strange voices and if we are to begin this vital task of the definition of evangelical faith we have first to hear in our own tongue those who have a right to speak. The recent biography of Darwell Stone points out that he would have nothing to do with the "widespread agreement that those particularist elements in the Anglican tradition which distinguished the Church of England from the rest of Catholic Christendom, so far from being a limitation were to be valued as the expression of a distinctive mission and vocation."¹⁴ One is sometimes tempted to feel that there has been a similar repudiation of all that is distinctively evangelical in much that passes for evangelicalism to-day. There have been borrowings from many sources, theological and secular, but the writings of the evangelical fathers have lain undisturbed upon the shelves as the dust has accumulated over them. Forty or fifty years ago writers like Dr. Moule or Dr. Drury were familiar with the teaching of Jewell and Hooker, of Cranmer and Latimer and brought this sixteenth century witness to bear in the discussions of their own time.

To turn afresh to the English reformers is not mere antiquarianism nor a refined form of ancestor worship, but a task laid upon Anglican evangelicalism, second only in importance to the study of the Scriptures. They will teach us what it means to listen to the witness of the Bible to faith. "It is because the Fathers of the Evangelical Succession continually resorted to Holy Scripture as at once the ultimate source and the one criterion of all religious truth that we reverently hail them as the restorers and witnesses of the faith in their own and succeeding generations."¹⁵ The reformers themselves gave an important place to patristic study but the results were not used in such a way that tradition took the place of the Word of God. In so far as the fathers bore witness to that Word and illuminated the meaning of Christian faith, the results of their work could be used in later centuries. Our attitude to the Fathers of the sixteenth and eighteenth centuries should be governed by the same considerations. Only then shall we begin to learn what evangelicalism truly is and until we have done that we can neither discuss its validity nor engage in theological conversa-

tion with men from other traditions. But, on the basis of the Scriptures and these Fathers, we *may* learn, albeit in fear and trembling, what we ought to be saying now.

To honour the memory of older theologians and to learn from their work should not blind us to their faults or to their limitations. We can never allow ourselves to imagine that the reformers have done our work for us and that all we need to do is to discover and set forth their answers to their problems. Reformation is not something which is achieved once and for all. Perhaps our habit of speaking of 'The Reformation' is misleading since it is apt to make us suppose that a position has been gained and that all we have to do is to defend it. The truth is that in each generation the work of theology has to be done afresh. Reflection on the meaning of the Gospel of the grace of God must be a constant activity of the Church. Like the Reformers we have to learn to listen to the voice of the Spirit leading us, in a situation very different from theirs. This gives us the third factor in the theological task of evangelicals to-day, which is to expound the relevance of evangelical faith to the present situation. We can only claim to stand in true succession to the Fathers if we adopt their fundamental principles and apply them to the urgent needs of the present time. It is only possible here to indicate certain places where the contemporary situation requires a fuller and more developed theology of the Word than was given in the sixteenth century.

The oecumenical movement, the pressure of war and recent New Testament study have combined to make necessary a restatement of the evangelical doctrine of the Church in such a way that the false antithesis of Church and Gospel which has done so much harm in modern evangelicalism, will be rendered impossible, while the Reformation protest against the false Catholic understanding of the Church will be maintained. The social chaos of our time can only be met and overcome by a theology which is much more comprehensive in its treatment of social and economic issues than classical evangelicalism, which came to birth in a state of society very different from ours. This will also raise the question of the relation of faith to culture where it is plain that the work of definition is urgently needed. Here again modern evangelical failure to discharge its responsibilities for faith has been demonstrated not merely by the absence of a theology expounding evangelical insights in these fields but also by the fact that it has been left to men of another tradition to tackle the question of law and grace with materials drawn in no small measure from evangelical sources.¹⁶

Here then are three specific ways in which evangelicals should now be discharging the responsibilities which are theirs. Their concern for the world is genuine and profound and finds expression in the unremitting work of evangelisation. But this concern for the world, if it is to bear fruit, must drive us to a concern for theological renewal. This is the greatest need of evangelicalism in the Church of England to-day and its immediate responsibility.

1 See for instance 'Vernon Faithfull Storr' (1943) by G. H. Harris and 'Theodore, Bishop of Winchester' (1933) by E. S. Woods and F. B. Macnutt.

2 'History and the Gospel', C. H. Dodd, pp. 24-30.

3 'Doctrine of the Word of God' (E.T.), K. Barth, p. 16.

- 4 *ibid.*, p. 17.
- 5 'The Later Evangelical Fathers': M. Seeley, p. 93.
- 6 'Doctrine of the Word of God', p. 5.
- 7 'Why Did Jesus Die?': J. G. Riddell, p. 19.
- 8 See the preface dated October 20th, 1779, by John Wesley to "A Collection of Hymns for Use of the People called Methodists."
- 9 Article XVIII compare Article VI.
- 10 'The Significance of the Barmen Declaration for the Ecumenical Church' Theology Occasional Paper, No. 5, p. 18.
- 11 See for instance, C. H. Dodd's inaugural lecture at Cambridge in 1936 on the Interpretation of the New Testament and "The Unity of the New Testament" by A. M. Hunter.
- 12 Articles VIII, XX, XXI, XXXIV.
- 13 'Human Destiny' (Gifford Lectures) Reinhold Niebuhr, Vol. II, p. 191.
- 14 'Darwell Stone—Churchman and Counsellor': F. L. Cross, p. 61.
- 15 'Essays in Ecclesiastical Biography': Sir James Stephen—Vol. II (Silver Library edition) p.131.
- 16 'Christ's Strange Work': A. R. Vidler (1944).

The Place of The Lord's Supper in Evangelical Worship.*

BY THE REV. J. STAFFORD WRIGHT, M.A.

IT would be difficult to discuss the place of the Lord's Supper in Evangelical worship without first considering the place that it has held in the Christian Church in the past. Next must come a consideration of the demands of present day experience. And finally there must be a review of any practical steps that we can take to ensure that as Evangelicals we give the Holy Communion the place that history and experience show to belong to it. This article therefore falls into three well-defined divisions.

1. The place of the Lord's Supper in the past history of the Christian Church.

There is little in the New Testament that throws light on the forms of Services in the earliest days of the Church. The reading of the Old Testament, prayers, Psalms, and exhortations, evidently formed a large part of any gathering for worship. But in addition there was what is called in the Acts "The Breaking of the Bread," and in Corinthians "The Lord's Supper." There is a tendency to-day to hold that the Lord Jesus did not institute the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper, and the references in Acts are regarded as references to the common fellowship meals that the early Church carried on as Jesus Himself had conducted them when He was with them. St. Paul, on the other hand, under the influence of what he believed to be a revelation from the Risen Lord, brought into this fellowship meal the special sacramental significance of the bread and the wine that the Church has preserved ever since.

But a careful examination of the use of the phrase "The Breaking of the Bread" in the Acts, shows that there is still something to be said for the older view. It will be noticed that the definite article occurs in Acts ii. 42, "They continued . . . in *the* breaking of *the* bread and the prayers," and again in Acts xx. 11, "When Paul had gone up and had broken *the* bread . . ." The article does not occur in Acts xxvii. 35, where Paul on the ship took bread and brake it, purely to satisfy hunger. Hence it seems that we are justified in drawing a distinction between the special Breaking of the Bread and the ordinary meal when bread was broken. This distinction is probably to be maintained in Acts. ii. 46, "Breaking bread at home," where the article is absent in the Greek. The following words suggest that the reference here is to ordinary meals. One apparent exception is in Acts xx. 7, "When we were gathered together to break bread." There is no article here (contrast verse 11), but the verb "to break" is in the Aorist Infinitive, which may convey the idea of a special service rather than an ordinary meal, since it denotes a single action and not a series of actions that would take place during a meal.

* Originally read as a paper before the West Midlands Evangelical Clergy Union, but slightly rewritten.

Those who hold that the Breaking of Bread is not the same as the Pauline Lord's Supper, stress the point that no mention is made of the Cup in the Acts. But just as the Brethren to-day always call their Morning Service "The Breaking of Bread," so the early Church may have done the same. We always tend to abbreviate a title. The argument would tell equally well against the view that this was a fellowship meal, since the fellowship meal would normally include wine as well, and yet this is not mentioned in the Acts.

In any case there is no trace of any opposition in the Church to St. Paul's teaching, as there would certainly have been if it had been an innovation. And although Matthew and Mark do not record any command by Christ to perpetuate His action with the bread and the wine in remembrance of Him, yet their manner of recording His actions suggests that they were consciously describing the original institution of what was observed in the Church as something more than a fellowship meal.

So, assuming the identity of the Breaking of Bread with the Lord's Supper, we find in Acts ii. 42 that the early Christians "continued steadfastly in the apostles' teaching and fellowship, in the breaking of the bread and the prayers." The words imply frequency. In Acts xx. 7 we find the Church at Troas gathered together on the first day of the week to break bread. In 1 Corinthians xi. St. Paul speaks of eating the Lord's Supper "when ye assemble yourselves together," (verse 20), and the whole context suggests that he is dealing with frequent gatherings.

There is no need to labour this point, for it is undeniable that, when we leave the New Testament times and come on to the next stage in the Church's history, the Lord's Supper is an integral part of the Sunday Service. I need not enumerate the references in early Christian writers. One thing however is worthy of special notice. While catechumens could attend the preliminary part of the Service, only the baptized could remain for the actual Communion, and all who remained partook of the Elements. No such thing as non-communicating attendance was ever known, and later, when the practice began, Chrysostom, at the end of the 4th century, spoke in the strongest terms in condemnation of it. (Homily on Ephesians. III). But every baptized Christian, unless he was under excommunication, normally took part in the whole Service, which included the Lord's Supper as an essential part of it. It is not correct to say that the Communion was the central Service, but it was an essential part of the central Service, which was made up of confession, prayer, praise, singing, preaching, and the reception of the Elements.

But, as the centuries go by, the history of the Communion takes a strange turn. An ever increasing veneration of the Elements resulted in an ever diminishing regard for the Communion itself. Mystery and dread replaces sacramental fellowship. The whole balance is shifted from the command of our Lord, "Take, eat!" and "Drink ye all of this!" to the attendance of the worshipper at a ceremony that is completed by others on his behalf. The significant phrase "Hearing Mass," came into use as something distinct from receiving Communion. Finally, the Mediæval Church laid upon Christians the minimum obligation of receiving the Communion once a year. This is still the

rule of the Roman Church, though at least one Pope has expressed the wish that members of the Church should receive Communion far more frequently.

We are accustomed to think of the Reformation from a negative viewpoint as regards the Communion. But one of the tasks that the Reformers set themselves was the restoration of frequent Communion. Their minimum requirements of three times in the year, as laid down in the rubric, are a slight advance on the Roman once a year. But they contemplated a weekly Communion Service wherever possible, and they abolished non-communicating attendance.

A few facts about the views of the Reformers would not be out of place here. Luther wished for a weekly Communion, but gave way before the popular reluctance to communicate frequently. Zwingli was an exception to most of the leading Reformers, in that he advocated a Communion Service no more than four times in the year. Calvin fought strongly for the restoration of the primitive practice of the Lord's Supper as an integral part of each Sunday morning Service, but the Genevan magistrates and people overruled him, and the practice in the Calvinistic Churches became that of Communion three times in the year.

As regards our own Reformers, the general index to all their writings included in the Parker Society volumes shows that a number urged weekly Communion. The Prayer Book rubrics contemplate a weekly Communion for Cathedral clergy, but anticipate that in a Parish there may not always be a sufficient number of parishioners to communicate with the Minister, so that a weekly Ante-Communion may be all that is possible. Probably the situation in England was similar to that on the Continent, and the majority of people continued the practice of infrequent Communion, to which they had grown accustomed under the Church of Rome. But it has been worth while noticing the belief and intention of those spiritually enlightened men who took the lead in the Reformation.

By the middle of the 17th Century the Communion had fallen into considerable neglect, and in many Churches was celebrated only rarely. But, in actual fact, at this time and later the neglect was not solely a neglect of the Communion, but of Church Services as a whole. The High Church party in the 17th century might have brought about a greater respect for the Communion, but it failed in its object, probably because Laud stressed the ritual accompaniments of the Service rather than the reality of the Communion, and these ritual accompaniments suggested ideas of the Service which were not those of the Prayer Book. But about the end of the century Bishop Beveridge of St. Asaph wrote a most helpful tract on "The Necessity and Advantage of Frequent Communion," in which he calls attention to the practice of the primitive Church and the mind of our own Church on this subject.*

Bishop Beveridge says that in his day there were many thousands who had never received the Sacrament at all, and but very few who received it above once or twice a year.

* A large part of this tract was reprinted as No. 26 of the famous "Tracts for the Times". But its doctrine of the Communion is very different from the modern Anglo-Catholic doctrines.

Things became no better in the years that followed. In 1741 Bishop Secker of Oxford urges the clergy in his diocese to have at least one Communion between Whitsuntide and Christmas. In 1800 on Easter Day there were only six communicants in St. Paul's Cathedral.

A new regard for the Holy Communion came in with Wesley, Whitefield, and the Evangelicals. Wesley urged weekly Communion. And in reading the lives of some of the Evangelical stalwarts, we find that they certainly drew people to the Lord's Supper. It was the Evangelicals who encouraged early Communion, though I cannot discover whether the Communion at this time was ever entirely a separate Service. Thomas Scott had his Sunday morning Service at 6 o'clock, with Communion following. Romaine had weekly Communion. Thomas Jones of Creaton in Northamptonshire for years had never less than eighty-five communicants on the first Sunday in the month, that is, the whole adult population of the village. Grimshaw of Haworth found twelve communicants when he came to the parish. After a few years he could tell the Archbishop that in the winter he had 300-400, and in the summer nearly 1200. On one occasion at least in his Church thirty-five bottles of wine were needed for the Communion. These facts show that a revival of love for the Communion began with the Evangelicals before the Oxford movement.

Evening Communion was not started by the Evangelicals, but it was welcomed by them, not because of any doctrinal significance, but, to quote from one of them, because "it has enabled so many to come to that blessed Ordinance who could never come before." Actually Evening Communion was first advocated in 1851, when a Committee in Leeds, under the chairmanship of a High Churchman, Dr. Hook, recommended it on the ground that only in the evening could the humbler classes, with their wives and mothers, easily attend the Service.* The practice rapidly spread, until in 1879 in the London Diocese 262 Churches had it, and in 1881 out of the 291 Churches in the Diocese of Rochester 100 practised it. And it became a regular Service in all Evangelical Churches.

In the meantime the Oxford Movement was exerting its influence in the Church. The early Tractarians were more moderate than their successors. They valued the Communion, but deprecated additional ritual. Pusey and Newman regularly took the Northward Position. Pusey spoke against the introduction of vestments. Keble never adopted vestments, and he always opposed non-communicating attendance. But there has been a steady advance in the Anglo-Catholic viewpoint, until once again we have arrived at what is almost the Roman outlook of a Presence of Christ in the Elements that is independent of the reception of the Elements. Once again we have the unprimitive custom of non-communicating attendance, or hearing Mass, and other Services that centre round the Elements apart from their reception.

This summary would not be complete without a reference to two differences of practice outside our own Church. The Brethren, both Open and Exclusive, have adopted the primitive custom of having the Breaking of Bread every Sunday. They are followed in this by most

* Balleine "History of the Evangelical Party" Chap. ix.

Undenominational groups and by the Pentecostals. The Salvation Army, on the other hand, definitely hold that Christ did not institute a Sacrament to be perpetually observed, but Christians should remember His Death whenever they take food together. The Society of Friends also dispenses with the Sacrament.

This review of the position of the Lord's Supper throughout the history of the Church shows that the early Church practised weekly Communion, and that many earnest Christians since that time have advocated either a weekly Communion or one at frequent intervals. But historical tradition by itself is not conclusive. Something more is needed.

II. The demands of present day experience.

Our present practice as Evangelicals is towards a minimising of the Sacrament. This is probably due to two causes. The first is the reaction against Anglo-Catholicism. Anglo-Catholics magnify the Sacrament; therefore we must minimise it. If we magnify the Sacrament, we shall be suspected of moving towards Rome. This is pardonably human, but may be spiritually disastrous.

The second cause is more important. It arises out of the nature of our spiritual experience. We are conscious of an immediate experience of God and of the blessings of the Gospel, and we cannot see that the Sacraments can give us anything that we do not or cannot obtain without them. As has frequently been pointed out, there are two types of religious experience, which can be described as the Priestly and the Prophetic respectively. We Evangelicals belong to the second, the Prophetic, and stand for immediate contact with God, with no person or thing to be a necessary channel of His grace to us.

Now the human mind loves consistency. When faced with what is apparently inconsistent, we are bewildered, and tend to seize hold of one truth to the exclusion of its apparent opposite. One mind seizes one truth; "The Sacraments are means of grace; hence, if I want the grace, I must find it in the Sacraments." The Evangelical mind seizes the opposite truth; "Faith gives me direct contact with God and Christ, and gives me all the blessings of the Gospel; therefore, as long as I have a living faith, what more can the Sacraments give me?"

There is no doubt that the Evangelical has the easier case to maintain. For it is undeniable that there are really godly Christians who seldom if ever go to the Holy Communion. Many of us have probably found great blessing from the writings and life of Commissioner Brengle of the Salvation Army. He was a man of the deepest holiness, and yet, as a member of the Salvation Army, he would have taken no part in the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper. A clergyman who does a great deal of speaking in Conferences and Conventions has said on more than one occasion that he has never received any special blessing at the Communion, and he cannot understand how people find help in it.

This quite understandable Evangelical attitude makes it extremely difficult for us to preach about the Communion, or to hold any really helpful doctrine about it. If we are content to tell our people that at the Lord's Table we commemorate the Death of the Lord, (which is perfectly true), they understand and appreciate what we mean, but do

not feel inspired to repeat the commemoration very frequently. In fact there is something to be said for the views of the people of Geneva and of the Scottish Church, that a celebration of the Lord's Supper three or four times in the year is better than a weekly celebration. For the Sacrament is not then a weekly formality, but a serious and solemn occasion for which the whole Church prepares itself. No one who has read "The Doctor" books, by Isabel Cameron, will forget the description of the quarterly Communion. In fact, starting from one aspect of the Communion, it is possible to build up a powerful argument for infrequent Communion, just as the Roman Catholic, starting from another aspect, can build up a powerful argument for Hearing Mass or for the Adoration of the Elements. But if your irrefutable arguments lead you to a conclusion and a practice contrary to the custom of the early Church, the probability is that there is something wrong in the starting-point of your argument.

It may be that our problem as Evangelicals is just another instance of the existence of apparent contraries which cannot be reconciled by precise theory, but only by experience. The old problems of Predestination and Free Will, of our eternal safety in Christ and the possibility of falling away and being lost, are of a similar nature. The champions of each side can build up irrefutable theories, and demonstrate that the views of the other side are untenable. There can be no absolute harmony of the two things from the logical standpoint. Yet I believe that the Christian, who can look on both sides calmly, finds that he can see the possibility of a harmony in the mind of God, and can find a blessed harmony in his own experience.

If I take up this position with regard to the Sacraments, and seek the harmony in experience before I find it in logic, it follows that I cannot expound a theory of the Sacraments that is completely logical. I cannot, for example, say how I can be saved through faith alone, and yet saved by Baptism. I cannot say how I can feed fully on Christ by faith without the Communion, and yet need the Communion to feed fully upon Him. If this sounds illogical, I believe it is a New Testament illogicality or paradox. If however I am forced to decide definitely for one side or the other, abandoning the apparent inconsistency, then I am bound to take the side of faith as against the Sacraments. And this is what our Church of England does also, in its rubric in the Service for the Communion of the Sick. Where the sick man cannot obtain the Sacrament, by true repentance and faith and thanksgiving "he doth eat and drink the Body and Blood of our Saviour Christ profitably to his Soul's health, although he do not receive the Sacrament with his mouth."

We are not however concerned with sick people who cannot receive the Sacrament, but with healthy people who can. What should the Lord's Supper mean to them? Is it merely a proclamation of an already existing union with Christ, or is it the receiving of something that is not normally received by other means? Only if the second thing is true can we urge people to come more frequently to the Lord's Supper.

To me the key to the meaning of the Lord's Supper is the realisation that the Cross in all its aspects is vital to the development of the Christian life, and that the Communion is the reception of Christ

crucified. The whole symbolism of the Service speaks of death. To bring in a primary reference to the Incarnation or to the Ascended Christ is to miss the symbolism. The Bread and the Wine are Christ as He was once, giving His flesh and His blood for our salvation. They are not Christ as He is now. Hence the question of any Presence in the actual Elements does not arise. At the original institution the Elements stood for something that was future; now they stand for something that is past; past, but timeless. And my Christian development depends upon my present reception and apprehension of the timeless Cross.

The reception of the Elements should be a fresh reception of the Cross, or of Christ crucified. "The cup of blessing which we bless, is it not the communion of the blood of Christ? The bread which we break, is it not the communion of the body of Christ?" (I Cor. x. 16). Here at the Lord's Table the reality and inner meaning of the Cross may unfold itself more deeply than ever it does even in our quiet times. Here faith is stimulated to grasp greater heights than it normally comprehends elsewhere. Faith cannot create what is not there. But faith alone can see what is there, namely the perennial freshness of Calvary for me. I may receive the reality as certainly as I receive the symbols.

Now if all this is true, we can see how we may miss the blessing of the Holy Communion simply because we are not prepared to receive it. The unbeliever naturally receives no blessing. But even the believer may be unprepared. It may be our faith that is deficient. Then the bread and the wine are no more than symbols. It may be our hearts that are unprepared. We eat and drink unworthily, bringing our sins casually to Calvary as though Christ's death were no concern of ours; and so we are guilty of the body and blood of Christ, and we do not discern the Lord's body; the bread and the wine are barely even symbols. (I Cor. xi. 27-29). But when we come with sincerely repentant hearts, and faith irradiates the Elements, then we receive not the symbols only, but the reality. All the blessings of the Cross are implanted in us, and through the gateway of the Cross we find ourselves linked to Christ on the throne, and Christ dwelling within, as we "feed on Him in our hearts by faith with thanksgiving."

If the Communion means this, then let it be frequent. We strive to make Christian people realise the meaning of the Cross, and perhaps the Communion is a means that we have neglected to advocate. This brings us to the third division of our subject. Here I write under a disadvantage, since I am not in Parish work, and only those who are can be competent to speak.

III. How can our people be encouraged to make a fuller use of this means of grace?

It will perhaps be best to summarise a few points.

a. We must teach a positive doctrine of the Holy Communion, and, whilst we warn those who are not true Christians of the danger of attending a ceremony which is meaningless for them, we must encourage sincere believers to look for a special blessing at the Lord's Table.

b. There should be at least one Communion Service every Sunday. If the conditions of the Parish demand it, there should be two. The

Vicar will naturally study the wishes and conditions of his people in fixing the most suitable times.

c. A great difficulty is the length of the whole Service when Communion follows Morning or Evening Prayer. We have to accept the fact that the majority of people to-day do not like long Services, and will not stay to the Communion after a Service of normal length. At present, of course, we have no legal right to curtail the Services, however much the people desire it. But in practice many Churches do shorten either the Morning or Evening Prayer, or else the Communion itself. Once the Service is to be shortened at all, it seems to me to be immaterial which of the Services is abbreviated, as long as there remains the primitive form of Service with Confession, Scripture, Psalms or Hymns, Preaching and the Lord's Supper.

d. But since nothing of this sort will conquer the reluctance of many of the congregation to come to the Communion, I should propose two or three big Communion Services in the course of the year. On these occasions the Communion would definitely be made central, and the whole congregation would be encouraged to take part. One special value in a Service of this kind would be the realisation of another aspect of the Communion that I have not dwelt upon, namely the Fellowship aspect, when all unite in the one meal. "We being many are one loaf, and one body : for we are all partakers of that one loaf." (I Cor. x. 17. R.V. margin).

e. Finally, all these plans will be more or less useless unless we conduct the Service in a reverent and helpful manner. Like all the other Services, this Service demands our very best. Slovenly reading and theatrical tricks of elocution must alike be avoided. Natural and unhurried simplicity must direct the heart and mind and faith of the worshippers to our Lord Jesus Christ and His Sacrifice. We do not discharge our duty as Ministers simply by delivering the bread and wine to the people. The Lord's Supper from the night of its institution has been a blend of the Word and the Thing. The Elements are the Thing : and with them goes the Word proclaimed and read and sent up in prayer to God. It is for us to make the Word a living reality that the Thing also may become really living.

A Puritan Bishop.

BY THE REV. C. SYDNEY CARTER, D.D., F.R.Hist.S.

Principal of Clifton Theological College.

PROBABLY, apart from the General Confession, there is no other feature of our Prayer Book so well known and so highly prized as the General Thanksgiving. It has been well described as "a marvellous compendium of thanksgiving and a marvellous standard of consecration." It has, with a remarkable compression of language, inspired the devotion and deepened the practical piety of many generations of churchmen and Christians in all lands. And yet even few churchmen know more of its author than the bare fact that he was the only Puritan who accepted a bishopric at the Restoration. It is true that the records of the life and career of Bishop Edward Reynolds are singularly few for a man of such a prominent position and outstanding merit, but certainly this Thanksgiving prayer alone entitles him to a permanent place in the Church's Calendar of saints and scholars.

Born in 1599, the same year as Oliver Cromwell, we know practically nothing of his parents except that his father is styled 'One of the customers of Southampton.' He was educated there at King Edward Vith's Grammar School,—the school that later on trained the famous Independent divine Dr. Isaac Watts,—and in 1615 he went as an Exhibitioner to Merton College, Oxford, and in due course took his B.A. in 1618. Owing to his special proficiency in Greek he was made a Probationer Fellow of his College in 1620. Unwisely, like many others of his day, he eschewed all relaxations and studied so diligently and assiduously that in consequence his health suffered seriously in later years. He read widely and his ability was so well known that when only 23, just at the time of his ordination, he was chosen to succeed the celebrated Dr. John Donne as Preacher at Lincoln's Inn. In 1631 he was appointed to the living of Braunston, Northants, and therefore felt obliged to relinquish his post at Lincoln's Inn. Here he faithfully and conscientiously ministered to his flock for over 10 years until the outbreak of the Civil War and the accompanying overthrow of the Church. By nature, disposition and temperament Reynolds was unfitted for an age of war, revolution and bitter ecclesiastical strife; and the harsh and intolerant controversies of this constantly changing period were most repellent to his kindly pacific character. His personal sympathies and his preferences in Church worship and ceremony were with the Puritan insistence on a pious and disciplined life and on a simple Scriptural and unsymbolical form of worship. He therefore disliked the use of the surplice, kneeling at Communion and the sign of the Cross in Baptism, but he had accepted episcopal Orders without question and did not differ at all from the doctrinal teaching of the Church. He was in no sense a 'party' controversialist and it was the accident of those unquiet times which led him to throw in his lot with those Puritans who for political reasons only,

accepted the presbyterian platform and signed the Solemn League and Covenant.

The harsh, coercive, persecuting policy pursued by the bishops towards the Puritan clergy under the Laudian régime had provoked a strong reaction against episcopacy as then tyrannically exercised. But even after the outbreak of the Civil War, when the Royalist members had withdrawn, the major part of the House of Commons were, as even Clarendon testified, "cordially affected to the established government" of the Church. The adverse fortunes of War, however, compelled the Parliament to seek aid from the Scots who with their recent unhappy experience of episcopacy in Scotland insisted, as 'part payment,' on the acceptance of the 'Covenant,' and also a virtual promise to conform the English Church to the Scotch Presbyterian model. So in June 1643 Parliament summoned an Assembly of Divines to meet at Westminster to discuss matters concerning the liturgy and government of the Church of England. This famous Assembly of 120 Divines and 30 M.P.'s sat for four years with an average attendance of 60, and in that time it compiled a Larger and Shorter Catechism and a Confession of Faith which is still the standard teaching of the Church of Scotland. But the 'Scots Commissioners,' sent to England with a 'watching brief,' would be satisfied with nothing less than the establishment of Presbyterianism, and the Parliament was most reluctantly compelled to pay this 'price' for their military aid. Several prominent churchmen were nominated as members of this Westminster Assembly but scarcely any attended its meetings. Reynolds was also a member and was put on a special Committee to revise the 39 Articles and to review the later Confession of Faith which superseded them. By staying 'in the country' he avoided the unwelcome 'Covenant' test as long as possible but at length had to conform. As he was regarded as one of the most eloquent preachers of his age it was only natural that he was put on a Committee for the examining and approving of candidates chosen by their parishes for Livings, and Parliament in 1646 also nominated him as one of the Ministers who might preach in any church in Oxford.

Although he wrote a very moderate preface to the new 'Directory of Public Worship' which the Scotch Assembly had approved for use in England, he would certainly strongly disapprove of the harsh persecuting clause in it which penalised the use of the Prayer Book even in private families. In fact Reynolds never became an orthodox Presbyterian and he resolutely refused to concur in the assertion of the *jus divinum* of Presbytery, or in a Resolution of the Assembly that "Christ himself hath appointed a Church government distinct from the Civil magistrate." Instead he followed Whitgift in affirming that no special form of Church government is laid down in Scripture and it may vary as occasion requires.

In June, 1647, Reynolds was included in the Parliament's Committee for the 'Visitation' of Oxford for the purpose of compelling the members of the University to take the 'Covenant,' but he took no prominent part in what must have been to him an objectionable and intolerant proceeding, although he reaped the fruits of it, since Dr. Fell refused to acknowledge the authority of Parliament and was therefore displaced as Vice-Chancellor and also ejected from the deanery of

Christ Church. Reynolds was appointed to succeed to both these offices and awarded the D.D. degree. As Vice-Chancellor, Reynolds pleaded for example and counsel rather than severity in reforming the University and he avoided as much as possible all share in the subsequent ejections, and Anthony Wood, the strong royalist and Church diarist, admits that "he was loath to nauseate his reputation by actions so much repugnant to his profession till baited with Cheynell's execrations of his detestable neutrality." Reynolds, like other charitably minded souls at that time, thus discovered to his sorrow that persecuting intolerance was not confined to Laudian prelates and that "new presbyter was but old priest writ large." As a result of this stern Visitation twelve Heads of Colleges and eight Professors were expelled, but their successors were men of "unquestionable learning and high personal character," three of whom, including Reynolds, later on became bishops.

When the Commonwealth in 1650 substituted for the Solemn League and Covenant the 'Engagement' with the promise 'to be true and faithful to the Commonwealth of England as it is now established without a King or House of Lords,' Reynolds, who in common with the Presbyterian party had opposed the overthrow of the monarchy, refused to take this new oath and even passed a petition against it in Oxford Convocation, although he declared his intention to live peaceably under the existing régime. For this fidelity to his convictions he was evicted from his University offices and the Independent, Dr. John Owen, succeeded him as Dean of Christ Church. Reynolds returned to his cure at Braunston but was soon after given the living of St. Lawrence, Jewry, in London, which he held till the Restoration. In this central position he was regarded as the "pride and glory of the Presbyterian party," and he frequently preached before different public bodies. When the expelled presbyterian M.P.'s were restored to their seats in March, 1660, another attempt was made to enforce Presbyterianism, and Reynolds, Manton and Calamy, were deputed to edit a new edition of the Westminster 'Confession of Faith' for the Church of England, and soon afterwards, on the ejection of Dr. Owen, Reynolds was again appointed Dean of Christ Church, Oxford. But by this time the Nation was obviously tired of military dictatorship and ecclesiastical chaos, and in April, 1660, Reynolds preaching before Parliament rehearsed the evils and confusion of the past years, and looked forward with hope to the restoration of the ancient forms of constitutional government. In May, Parliament deputed him with four other ministers to present an address to Charles II at Breda, in which they advocated a moderate episcopacy and liberty for tender consciences in indifferent matters of ceremony. On his Restoration, Charles included Reynolds in a list of 10 presbyterian divines as his Chaplain, and Reynolds was asked to preach at Court. In June, he joined with other ministers in submitting for the King's acceptance, Archbishop Usher's Scheme of modified episcopacy, consisting of suffragan bishops and diocesan Synods, which had been proposed to the Long Parliament in 1641. They also asked for a revision of the Liturgy and for the optional use of the surplice, the sign of the Cross in baptism, and kneeling at Communion. The Bishops refused to consider such concessions, but as a result of a

conference of the two parties before the King, when some concessions were allowed, Charles issued a Royal Declaration in October in which he agreed to summon a Synod of Divines "to give us such further assistance towards a perfect union of affections as is necessary," declaring that the Presbyterians had been falsely reported as 'enemies to the Liturgy.' Meanwhile he promised that no bishops should ordain or pronounce Church censures without the advice of presbyters and that tender consciences should be relieved of offending ceremonies. The prospect of this amicable settlement was accompanied by the offer of high preferments to the leading presbyterians, and Baxter, Calamy, and Reynolds, were offered bishoprics. Baxter and Calamy declined the honour, doubting the sincerity of the King, or, at least, his ability to get this Declaration legalised. But rather inconsistently Baxter urged Reynolds to accept the offer and he was supported by Sir Matthew Hale. Reynolds consented after making a clear declaration of his belief that a bishop was only a chief presbyter and should only govern with the assistance of his co-presbyters.

As one of the presbyterian members of the Savoy Conference, Reynolds pleaded for a moderate and conciliating policy, but with no effect, since the majority of the Church party had no desire to placate the presbyterians, and nearly all their suggestions were rejected. Moreover, the new Parliament definitely refused to legalise the concessions outlined in the 'Royal Declaration' and Reynolds was therefore regarded by some as having surrendered his principles by retaining his office as bishop. But he had not the rigid fanatical convictions of a fiery leader of a great crusade and, as we may gather, he was naturally of a timid and compliant rather than of a resolute character. Perhaps Baxter well sums him up when he calls him "a solid honest man, but through mildness and excess of timorous reverence to great men, altogether unfit to contend with them." Others at the time, ungallantly credited his continued conformity to the ambition of his wife to act as hostess in the episcopal palace! But Reynolds remained puritan in his outlook and conduct. He did not meddle in affairs of State, but led a retiring life, spending all his time and energies in most diligent and faithful work in his diocese of Norwich. He restored the ruined palace and built a new chapel almost entirely at his own expense. He was most benevolent and charitable and gave largely to the poor and specially in support of needy clergy widows and children. He also remained true and faithful to his former friends, as he was most considerate and indulgent to the Nonconformists in his diocese, and even allowed on occasions ejected ministers to preach in vacant parishes. One such minister—John Cromwell—was specially befriended by Reynolds. Once when dining at the bishop's table, on leaving, the bishop courteously accompanied him to the door, to the scornful and ill-mannered hilarity of some clergy present. Reynolds sternly rebuked such unchristian conduct, declaring that Cromwell "had more solid divinity in his little finger than they had in their whole bodies." His episcopate at Norwich lasted for 16 years till his death in 1676, and he must have exerted a truly reconciling influence in that harsh persecuting period as even the strong churchman, Anthony Wood, eulogises him as a "person of excellent parts and endowments, of very good wit and fancy and

judgment, and much esteemed by all parties," while Sir Thomas Browne calls him "a divine of singular affability, meekness and humility, of great learning, and a frequent preacher." Ill health, however, seems to have prevented him from exercising this preaching ministry for some period during the Commonwealth, since in 1658 he laments that he has "owing to a long infirmity been unable 'to preach the Gospel,' so he was revising and publishing his sermons that he might bear his Christian witness by the 'pen of a ready writer.'" A perusal of these sermons, even after nearly three centuries, gives ample evidence that he must have been a very moving and practical preacher, with a clear evangelical message. In a powerful sermon on 'the life of Christ in the Believer,' Reynolds stresses what Article XVIII states as the 'Obtaining of eternal salvation only by the name of Christ,' when he says "There is but one name, but one sacrifice, but one blood, by which we can be saved, perfected and purged for ever, and without which God can have no pleasure in us." This, as Reynolds knew experimentally, was the one divinely provided 'means of grace and hope of glory.'

Reynolds preached no narrow exclusive Calvinistic doctrine of 'particular election,' but a free gospel to all who will turn to a Father God of love and mercy—"Adam," he says "looks on Him as a judge, and hides," "the prodigal looks on him as a *father* and returns." But he insists that this 'return' must be a "full, thorough, and continued conversion." In his expositions and exhortations, Reynolds lays great emphasis on sin as a curse, and then as a burden, which will, as Christian discovered, lead men to repentance and to the Cross of Christ for pardon and deliverance. There is a very necessary modern note in his pertinent application in the conclusion of one of his exhortations, when he says "We would fain have things well in our country . . . we would fain have better times, but have we yet laboured for better hearts?" "Let," he concluded, "our chief prayer be 'Lord, make us a happy people by being *our* God.'"

We can therefore remember the Author of our General Thanksgiving as being in the words of his biographer "a profound scholar, an eloquent and sound divine, and a man whose character and works were highly esteemed by all parties during his long and useful life."

A Valid Ministry.

BY THE REV. E. HIRST, M.A., A.R.C.M.

BEFORE His ascension, when His mediatorial work had been completed on the Cross and vindicated by the Resurrection, Our Lord commissioned His followers to their great tasks in His name. "As the Father hath sent Me, even so send I you" (St. John xx. 21). Here is the Charter of the Christian Church. In these words, Christ's followers received no new commission; their task was to carry out Christ's mission in the world He had come to save. This command is of the same character as two other commands: "Go ye therefore, and make disciples of all the nations, baptising them into the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost: teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you"; and, "Ye shall be My witnesses both in Jerusalem, and in all Judæa and Samaria, and unto the uttermost part of the earth" (St. Matt. xxviii. 19; Acts i. 8).

This task of witnessing to the truth as it is in Jesus is the task of the entire Body of Christ,—the Church militant here in earth. We cannot think of it otherwise, for all believers are one in Christ. Distinctions are done away in Him. Every believer is joined to the Lord by faith. All have entered into the Christian Fellowship by the same door, having heard the call: "Repent . . . , 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). This body of believers has entered into possession of all the privileges and responsibilities which Christ came to secure for His own. All the yearnings of humanity for reconciliation with God are satisfied in Him. He came as prophet, priest, and king. Being the Son of God, He could present God to man as did no other; being the Son of man, He could, as the representative man, present man to God. He consummated both sacrifice and priesthood in Himself when He offered Himself on the Cross and entered into the Holy Place "through His own blood . . . having obtained eternal redemption" (Heb. ix. 12). He now reigns as King, the vicegerent of the Father. Because of all these facts, and the union of the believer with his Lord, St. Peter could speak of the body of believers as "an elect race, a royal priesthood, a holy nation, a people for God's own possession" (I Pet. ii. 9). That body of followers, commissioned to take the news of salvation to the whole world, is the Holy Catholic Church.

Early in the Acts of the Apostles, we read of the Church fulfilling its Divine mission, even in spite of persecution. "There arose . . . a great persecution against the church which was in Jerusalem; and they were all scattered abroad throughout the regions of Judæa and Samaria, except the apostles. . . . They therefore that were scattered abroad went about preaching the word" (Acts viii. 1, 4). It was as the Church grew that the tasks of evangelisation and organisation had to be distributed. The Eleven, to whose number had been added Matthias, would naturally take the lead, but clearly all the Church

recognised the duty of witnessing ; so while it is true that all Christians are God's servants, it is plain that the New Testament recognises different kinds and forms of service. In one epistle (I Cor. xii .28), eight classes of ministers are given ; in another epistle (Eph. iv. 11), four classes are named. We have here a clear recognition and acknowledgment of a special Christian Ministry by which the Church is able to express and perpetuate its life and witness.

In considering what is meant by " a valid ministry " in the Christian Church, it may be well to define our terms. By the Christian Ministry, we mean the exercise of a spiritual gift within the sphere of an ecclesiastical office. It is well to recall that the New Testament never names the Christian Minister by the Greek " *ιερευς* "—" a sacrificer ". This term is used of the Church in the plural : " He made us to be a kingdom, to be priests unto his God and Father " (Rev. i. 6). Elsewhere, the Church is designated as a priesthood ; " Ye also, as living stones, are built up a spiritual house, to be a holy priesthood " (I Pet. ii. 5). This is the natural outcome of Christ's consummation of priesthood and sacrifice in Himself, and His priesthood in both " intransmissible " and " undelegated " : " Because He abideth for ever, hath His priesthood unchangeable " (Heb. vii. 24). It may, then, be truly said that Christianity is, rather than has, a priesthood. The priestly acts of the Church belong to the Body, but if the Church has no sacrificing priesthood, for as Hooker says " sacrifice is now no part of the Church ministry " (Ecc. Pol. v. lxxviii. 2), she assuredly has a ministry ; and that ministry is the exercise of a spiritual gift within the sphere of an ecclesiastical office. There is another side of the matter, however, for those who receive the ministration have a right to the assurance that the exercise of such a spiritual gift is valid so that it might be received as a means of grace, that the gift is God-appointed, and that such a ministry is recognised not merely by the individual, but also by the whole Church as a God-given gift.

Our Church has spoken her mind on the subject of the Church in which the ministry is exercised, and also on the ministry itself. Yet in these matters, she makes it plain that she speaks for herself alone. The principle applies which has been laid down in the preface " Of Ceremonies ", in the Book of Common Prayer : " In these our doings we condemn no other nations, nor prescribe anything but to our own people only." Article xix. says : " The visible Church of Christ is a congregation of faithful men, in the which the pure word of God is preached, and the sacraments be duly ministered, according to Christ's ordinance in all those things that of necessity are requisite to the same." In these words we have a plain statement regarding the Church. Equally plain are the statements regarding the ministry in Article xxiii, Article xxxvi, and in the Preface to the Ordinal. " It is not lawful for any man to take upon him the office of public preaching, or ministering the Sacraments in the congregation, before he be lawfully called and sent to execute the same. And those we ought to judge lawfully called and sent, which be chosen and called to this work by men who have public authority given unto them in the congregation, to call and send ministers into the Lord's vineyard." " The book of Consecration of Archbishops, and Bishops, and ordering of

Priests and Deacons . . . doth contain all things necessary to such consecrating and ordering." "It is evident unto all men diligently reading the Holy Scripture and ancient Authors, that from the Apostles' time there have been these Orders of Ministers in Christ's Church; Bishops, Priests, and Deacons."

Article xxiii. refers to public ministry in the Church, and has no reference to any private or unofficial ministry for Christ. Its aim was twofold. First to assert the validity of Anglican Orders in the face of the Roman charge of invalidity. Secondly, to refute the error of the Anabaptists who denied the need of public order, authority, or commission for the exercise of ministry. Their claim was that Divine illumination alone was needed for the ministry. The notes of a valid ministry laid down by the Article according to New Testament principles are three—first, the Divine call; secondly, the Church's recognition of that Divine call; thirdly, the Church's public commission to a sphere of ministry. Each of these three are important, for, as Bishop Gibson says: "If only the call were necessary different ministers properly ordained might assert rival claims to execute their office in the same place, and the whole principle of Church order would be destroyed" ("The Thirty-nine Articles", p. 576).

All Christians will agree that a call from God is necessary before a man can presume to teach or minister in His name. The questions put to those who are to be ordained to the Diaconate and to the Priesthood recognise this fact. "Do you trust that you are inwardly moved by the Holy Ghost to take upon you this Office and Ministration?" "Do you think in your heart, that you be truly called, according to the will of our Lord Jesus Christ, and the order of this Church of England, to the Order and Ministry of Priesthood?" We are reminded of words in the Epistle to the Hebrews: "No man taketh the honour unto himself, but when he is called of God, even as was Aaron" (Heb. v. 4).

Whilst the inward call to ministry in the Church must come first, it is necessary that such a call must be answered by a recognition on the part of the Spirit-filled Body that he to whom the call is given has the Divine equipment and enabling for his task. As Dr. Griffith Thomas pertinently remarks, "This, of course, involves spiritual perception on the part of the Church" ("Principles of Theology" p. 314). That the inward call should be answered by an external call is a principle which has the distinct support of the New Testament and of antiquity. Whilst God sends His messengers at His own will, as in the person of St. Paul, who claimed that his apostolate was "not from men, neither through men, but through Jesus Christ, and God the Father", He supports such actions by evidence of His will which men can recognize. We know from the New Testament that it was necessary for the Church to prove and check the claims of men. St. John writes: "Believe not every spirit, but prove the spirits, whether they are of God" (I John iv. 1), and "Whosoever goeth onward and abideth not in the teaching of Christ, hath not God" (II John 9). The normal course adopted in the New Testament is that shown in the appointment of "The Seven" where the Church selected and the Twelve appointed: "Look ye out therefore, brethren, from among you seven men of good report, full of the Spirit and of wisdom, whom we

may appoint over this business." (Acts vi. 3). That same spiritual perception is still expected of the Church of Christ.

Turning again to the New Testament, we find that the existing ministry ordained and commissioned to their tasks those who were recognised as having the Divine equipment for the ministry after they had responded to the inward call. "The Seven" were chosen by the Church but appointed by the Apostles. Paul and Barnabas appointed Elders in the Churches which they founded (Acts xiv. 23). Timothy was commissioned by the then existing ministry (I Tim. iv. 14 ; II Tim. i. 6). Titus was instructed to "appoint elders in every city" (Titus i. 5). There can be little doubt that the New Testament thinks of the Ministry first as a spiritual gift and secondly as an office.

The closing passage of Article xxiii. deals with the manner in which the ministry has been perpetuated throughout the ages. "Those we ought to judge lawfully called and sent, which be chosen and called to this work by men who have public authority given unto them in the congregation, to call and send ministers into the Lord's vineyard." This principle of succession is part of our great heritage, and is emphasised in the preface to the Ordinal which has already been quoted. The Church of England has held tenaciously to this principle of Episcopal Ordination, for we have good reason to believe that our Church has been under episcopal order from its foundation and that there has been no break in the laying on of hands from the days of the British Church to our own age. Yet in maintaining the value of succession, we assert that of itself, episcopal ordination is no substitute for truth of belief and holiness of life. Moreover, it is clear that the unity experienced in the early Church was one of spiritual content rather than of ecclesiastical organisation. Within this unity of the Spirit, the ministry found its sphere of work, it being recognised that spiritual equipment came from God and that ordination gave ministerial authority to use and exercise those spiritual gifts within the Spirit-filled body. We have no warrant from the New Testament to believe that ordination conferred spiritual gifts and powers, and we cannot presume that ordination is different to-day from New Testament examples. We must be apostolic in truth and life as well as in Order.

Recognition of these truths seem to have inspired the words of the "Appeal to all Christian people from the Bishops assembled in the Lambeth Conference of 1920." This appeal has a statement on Episcopacy which reads as follows : "It is not that we call in question for a moment the spiritual reality of the ministries of those Communion which do not possess the Episcopate. On the contrary, we thankfully acknowledge that these ministries have been manifestly blessed and owned by the Holy Spirit as effective means of grace." It seems that we have here a statement on what is a valid ministry—"ministries that have been manifestly blessed and owned by the Holy Spirit as effective means of grace." Wherein, then, lies the difference between these ministries and our own? It cannot be in the principle of succession in ordination, for the so-called Free Churches ministries have their own succession, and these orders of succession can be traced to their origin. It must lie, then, in the method of succession which we maintain, and it is more than probable that the differences and difficulties about it arose in the course which the

Reformation took in different parts of Europe. Our Church was able to retain the Episcopal order because the Episcopate was willing to tread the path of reform. On the Continent, the Episcopate would not accept reform, so reform had to proceed without them. It is clear that the Continental Reformers had no desire to part with Episcopacy had they been able to effect the Reformation with its retention. This fact is proved by the words of the Augsburg Confession, and those of Melancthon, Calvin, Bucer, and Beza.* Yet their hopes were dashed to the ground. In our Ordinal, we upheld the threefold ministry as the lineal representative of the apostolic order in the Church. We do not claim that episcopacy is of the "esse" of the Church, so that without episcopal ordination any ministry must be invalid; but we claim that it is of the "bene esse" of the Church. "The Form and Manner of Ordering of Priests" in our Ordinal combines the essential principles of both Episcopal and Presbyteral ordination which are exemplified in Timothy's ordination. Thus we follow the New Testament examples for the perpetuation of the Ministry. The inward call of the Holy Spirit is answered in the soul of the individual; the Church recognises the bestowal of the spiritual gift; the existing ministry ordains and commissions for service. We recognise the responsibility of the Church to "prove the spirits"; and so full opportunity is given to express assent to, or dissent from, the fitness of the candidate to be ordained to this Divine calling. Encouragement, too, is expected in corporate prayer for those who are to be ordained.

Whilst we do not condemn those Churches which are not under Episcopal government, we assert that we ourselves have kept to the "old paths". In all kindness and Christian charity we assert that for ourselves our course is clear and our decisions are made. We feel that it cannot be right either for an individual himself, or for a number of individuals, to break off from the body of Christians who have such a history as is ours, and form a separate body. Such an action is of the very nature of schism which divides the unity of His followers for which Christ prayed.

We express a very hearty dissent from any mechanical claims for an apostolical succession which would make a valid ministry dependent upon Episcopal ordination. Yet we feel that ours is the best system of Church order, as being in accord with New Testament principles, as having the support of antiquity, and as having the cumulative approval of Church history throughout the ages. As such, we believe that the progress of re-union will best be served as Episcopacy is adopted by the whole Church as a rallying point in the future.

* These opinions are quoted in "English Church Teaching," Moule, Drury and Girdlestone, pp. 187-188.

Called to Serve in the Sacred Ministry of the Church.

SOME REFLECTIONS ON THE FINAL REPORT ENTITLED 'TRAINING
FOR THE MINISTRY.'

BY THE REV. R. J. COBB, M.A.

THE Archbishops' Commission has rendered a service of first importance to the Church in the publication of this 88 page booklet (Press and Publications Board of the Church Assembly 2s. 6d.), with its remarkably full survey of the whole range of problems connected with the selection and training of our Clergy. The careful study of the Report gives a real appreciation of the immediate situation which the Church faces, of the full consideration which is given to all matters which may aid in meeting that situation, and a definite indication and recommendation of means which it is proposed to adopt for the equipment of Ordination Candidates and younger Clergy for their Ministry. One important aspect of this report is the opportunity it gives to the Church at large to understand something of the mind of those who are largely responsible for the recruitment of our Ministry. While the whole of the matter is of immediate interest, some of the recommendations are of revolutionary character and it is of the utmost importance that all who have this matter at heart should make a point of studying them for themselves. We need to have a well-informed body of Evangelical opinion with regard to them.

These notes are not intended to be a Review of the Report itself, but to draw attention to one or two matters of special interest, the scope of the Report being sufficiently outlined in our first paragraph. The thorough nature of the work which lies behind the Report is indicated by the publication of an Appendix "A" which consists of a Note on the Responsibility for Ordination and draws together the Documentary Evidence from all periods of Church History. It is limited in that it proceeds from 'the settled establishment of the monarchical episcopate in the Church (behind which it is unnecessary for our present purpose to penetrate)' and this is worth noting as the first point which an Evangelical will be inclined to criticise in the whole Report. For there seems singularly little in the Report as a whole to relate the conception of the Ministry to the New Testament ideals: it is true that the analysis of the New Testament conception is not essential to the argument of this Appendix, but it would have been the more welcome here in view of the fact that it is wanting elsewhere in the Report. On the other hand it is interesting to find included an explicit reference to the practice of the Church in America where the function of the Bishop is limited to that of a 'constitutional executive' with his action in ordination subject to the recommendation of a Standing Committee in his Diocese whose independent approval of each candidate is essential. This contrasts, of course, with our position where the final responsibility rests with the Bishop alone: the recognition of which fact lies behind the whole recommendations of the Report.

In those sections which deal with Recruitment and Selection, the Commission faces the fact that 'the thought of ordination is utterly remote from the minds of the vast majority of men of the kind which in earlier days normally at least considered, and often went forward to ordination,' and proceeds to make a call for positive and vigorous action in the matter of presentation of the claims of the ministry. They suggest that information about the ministry should be available and accessible, a picture given of the vocation, and so forth, while it is good to notice the caution 'In all that is done to suggest the ministry of the Church as a vocation or to encourage boys to consider it seriously, nothing must be said or done which tends to disguise its difficulty and gravity, or treat it merely as an attractive form of life or even a life of social service, rather than as a life based wholly on a deep and sincere devotion, a love of God expressing itself in a love of human souls for whom Christ died.' We should be glad to see this expressed a good deal more strongly, the great lack of the Church to-day being that of the true sense of Vocation, and the general temper of our time being far too much inclined to that form of 'direction' which inclines to regimentation and conformity to certain ideas and standards, rather than the full conception of the outworking in life of the Life and Power of God which is ours through the New Birth. There seems no suggestion of seeking evidence of such an experience and indications of the Working of God's Spirit through the prospective candidate, but it is a relief to read the warning 'Precocious devotion to ecclesiastical observances is not seldom taken for more than it is really worth.'

The main body of the Report is concerned with the provisions for and problems of the Training of the various types of candidate. Inevitably the discussion is largely concerned with the intellectual equipment of the men, and also to supply as wide an experience and training as is possible. It is recognized that recruitment from widely varied ranks is essential; the boy who comes straight from school may be in mind where many of the recommendations are concerned, but there is also recognized the wisdom of the calling into the Ministry of men who have wide experience in business and professional life before they contemplate taking Orders. While in this Report stress is laid on the desirability of a University Degree, with the widened contacts and experience that University life provides, there is special consideration to be given to the more directly vocational approach which can only be found through the Theological College, and the Commission recognizes the fundamental importance of such training. It is here of course that the Evangelical is most intimately concerned with the provisions of the Report. On the whole the review of the difficulties and drawbacks of our present system are very fair: we fully appreciate the way in which there has been a tendency for the syllabus to become overloaded, and are grateful for the stress that is laid on the need for slowing down the demands, so that there may be less of an atmosphere of cramming for examination in the work of the Theological College. No one knows better than the staff themselves the way in which the present system tends, in the words of the Report, to 'too much lecturing in the Colleges.' But, at the same time, there is a heritage of tradition which must not be surrendered lightly. Many will have a feeling of uneasiness about the way in which the Colleges may become

in practice secondary in their influence to the newly-proposed Regional Committees and Directors of Training to be appointed by the Bishops.

In the press attention has been drawn to the proposal that there shall be special training in teaching, taken at a Teachers' Training College, as part of the normal course of preparation. But that is simply part of a very wide scheme of plans for providing specialised training—or opportunities for such—for many who have particular gifts. It is acknowledged that such practical experience and knowledge of the Theory of Teaching will be of undoubted benefit to all, but there is a danger if specialisation is allowed to become the order of the day that the fundamental task of the Ministry in discharge of Parochial responsibility be somewhat over-shadowed. The Report does remark that the work of specialists—such as those engaged in co-operating with the medical profession, in the social services, in approach to students, and so forth—may be to some degree undertaken by lay people, and this appeals to us as a very important suggestion. There could, and should be, means of linking definitely the work and gifts of laymen in these aspects of the work of the Church, leaving the Clergy the more free to concentrate on discharge of their primary responsibility. The Evangelical will certainly welcome proposals of such a nature.

With regard to the first years in Orders, the Report makes provision for continued training, and in so doing follows the line which has been adopted in some Dioceses and proved valuable. There is no doubt that the difficulties of the first years are better faced and solved where the newly ordained man is conscious of working in closest fellowship with others like himself, and with opportunities for study and discussion together. The idea of Refresher Courses also is not new, but in all this there is an impression given of an approach to the problem which may tend to a type of 'conformity to type' among the clergy that will not be welcome. At the same time the suggestion of such courses is a definite approach to a very real problem, that of the meeting of the need for opportunities of withdrawal for a time from parochial work for definite study.

Inevitably the final word is concerned with the Financial implications of the proposals: the Commission is not afraid to demand that the training of clergy should be a first charge on the resources of the Church. That certainly is a sound point, but it is rather interesting to note that the last page of the booklet is devoted to a table showing 'Monies Contributed for Training 1918-1937' and a little puzzling to know just what conclusions are to be drawn from the tables presented. Why these particular Funds are selected is not clear; they serve to indicate that certain special Funds of Anglo-Catholic and Evangelical organisations provided 10% of the total for this period, but they seem to take no account of other funds utilised by these parties or of donations and other money given by Evangelicals and Anglo-Catholics through the Central Board and Diocesan Boards. It is difficult to see just what reliable information is given here in regard to the way in which the financial burden of training has been borne: but of more value in this respect is the hint given in the Report in speaking of Theological Colleges 'which owe their establishment to private sources, but which constitute at present the most considerable aggregate contribution towards the training of the Clergy of the Church.' That

is sufficient to remind those who have the responsibility of implementing the suggestions of this Report that a very great deal of support for training and provision of facilities has come from those who would desire that it should be used for the maintenance of a definite type of Churchmanship.

From all this the far-reaching implications of the publication of these recommendations are obvious; we need as Evangelicals to examine them and be ready to exert our influence when the time comes for discussion preparatory to setting in motion the schemes of training here envisaged. A wholesale reorganisation is contemplated with the concentration of a great deal of influence in the hands of Regional Committees. The status and place of the theological college and its actual scope may be very different from the present system. We may feel it specially necessary to re-assert our conviction of the value of the parochial system and a parochial ministry, we certainly shall want to see a more definite recognition of the fact that the Church's primary task is that of the presentation of Christ, and the fulness of His Salvation. This will only effectively be accomplished when the first desideratum in the candidate for Orders is the personal experience of the Grace of God in Jesus Christ our Lord, and the consciousness that he is 'inwardly moved by the Holy Ghost to take upon him this Office and Ministration.'

Book Reviews

CHRIST'S STRANGE WORK

By Alec R. Vidler, B.D. *The Bishop of London's Lent Book.* Longmans. 2/6.

The author is described on the title page as Warden of St. Deiniol's Library, Hawarden ; Priest of the Oratory of the Good Shepherd. He is also, we believe, Editor of *Theology*. The title comes from one of the Articles of the *Formula of Concord* (1576). The Bishop of London in his foreword tells us that the purpose of the book is to help us to live "under a more practical and strict obedience to the Law of God—first, by taking our political responsibilities seriously as our duty to God, rather than as our ideals for humanity ; secondly, by hearing and proclaiming God's summons to repentance ; and thirdly, by seeing that our new life as Christians and as a Christian community is one in which God's law is our standard and guide, while Christ's righteousness alone is our justification."

When we read that last sentence we felt cheered. Until then we were afraid that the book was written by Mr. Worldly-Wiseman who directed Christian to the village of Morality, to the house of Legality, and his son Civility. We remembered that he spoke to Christian "contemptuously of the Book in his hand and ridiculed the burden on his back." But Mr. Vidler would say with Toplady :

" Not the labour of my hands,
Can fulfil Thy Law's demands."

Here and there the book would be improved by more concise definition. The author is fully aware that God's covenant with His people is not a bargain. It is not an agreement, but we think he fails to say clearly that it is "an arrangement whereby God promises certain blessings to mankind." Perhaps too, the discussion on the meaning of the word "Law" might have been clarified by the definition that "Law is something laid down by a superior to guide an inferior." But these criticisms must not be taken too seriously. This is a book which was sorely needed. The Antinomians are still with us ! Lent is a season of discipline and we think that it is time that we were called back to the keeping "of God's holy will and commandments." The author makes excellent use of the Homilies. We think that Evangelicals will welcome and profit by this book.

A. W. PARSONS.

THE WOOF OF LIFE

By I. Harris. Longmans. 7/6.

Dr. Harris is the Hon. Director of the Liverpool Institute of Research for the prevention of disease. As a working doctor he is anxious to see the fight against sickness and disease conducted with greater skill and force. He lays great stress on the preventive side of medicine. Much serious illness could be prevented if people were willing and able to go to the doctor regularly for examination, and not simply when the symptoms of some disease occur. The intake of men into the army has shown that many have been suffering from minor complaints, which could have been remedied if they had visited a doctor earlier. Dr. Harris is very critical of our present hospital system. He believes that there should be a much greater emphasis upon research, and that this should be properly planned, and not left to the enthusiasm of the individual working alone. One suggestion that he makes for the improvement of the hospital system is this : "The teaching hospitals should become part of the University and the heads of the various departments become professors and lecturers of that body ; and these in turn would be appointed exactly under the same conditions as other members of the staff of the university. . . ." There is much that is provocative and stimulating in this book, and there are passages with which we cannot agree. In his chapter on Christianity, Dr. Harris unduly minimises the sinfulness of man. We want better conditions for all, and we must work for them, but these in themselves are not enough. Man is a sinner, and it is only in Christ that he is saved. There is much, however, in this book for which one is grateful. One is glad to read Dr. Harris' criticism of the mentality, so characteristic of the age, which is continually seeking pleasure for pleasure's sake.

O.R.C.

THE DOCTRINE OF THE TRINITY (CROALL LECTURES, 1942-1943)
 By Leonard Hodgson. 273pp. 15/- Nisbet.

Dr. Hodgson has already contributed worthily to Christian thought in his previous books—"The Grace of God in Faith and Philosophy", "Essays in Christian Philosophy", and "Towards a Christian Philosophy". He has strongly maintained that the data given by revelation should be seriously taken as part of the material which philosophy should use. His previous work in this field quite obviously underlies his treatment of the doctrine of the Trinity. In the first lecture, he lays down the basis for his consideration of the doctrine as a reasonable belief, by pointing to the acts of God in history as recorded in the Bible and in church history as the true *revelatum* from which we infer this doctrine rather than propositional statements in the text itself. He dispenses with the scholastic theory of the separate spheres of reason and revelation as an unreal differentiation between the actual experience of the receivers which is involved. On this point Dr. Hodgson has an interesting discussion which is continued in an appendix on the human responsibility in "seeing" the meaning and the truth of the Christian revelation and argues that all men are judged on their response to what they believe to be true, wherever it may lead, rather than as traditional Christian thought has held, that they are judged by their response only to Christian truth, the seeing of particular truths in a particular way. In honest response to whatever truth is seen by the individual as truth, lies justification (*i.e.*, avoidance of damnation) holds Dr. Hodgson, after which it may be hoped that at some subsequent time he may receive the "saving" faith in Christian Truth, by what seems like a work of congruous merit. The old problem of Divine grace and human responsibility which underlies this discussion has little assistance by being transferred to a future plane with all the weaknesses of the "second chance" theories, and the implied condemnation of the divine revelation in this age as inadequate; or from the Thomist definitions of grace *de congruo* or *de condigno* which appear to underlie the different rewards of "justification" or "salvation" in this theory. Nevertheless, the facts of the Christian revelation are established as the necessary "key-feature" by which the universe may be interpreted in a Christian philosophy. From this position, the "key-feature" of God's revelation is itself studied, in the New Testament for the next two lectures, to see what can be found about the being of God. Dr. Hodgson traces the growing awareness of the Apostolic band of the meaning of Christ and of their relationship with the Father, later summed up in the Pauline thought of "adoption". The Christian life—"in the Spirit", has its meaning in reproducing in the Christian the same way of life as of Christ here on earth especially as doing the Father's will, by the indwelling companionship of the Son, through the guidance and power of the Spirit. Hence the nature of the eternal life of God is founded, as a formal statement, upon the fundamental experiences of the Christian life. This developing conception in the early church brought a conviction of the Deity of Jesus Christ lived in a genuine human life, by which a new era was brought in. Yet the accidental conditions must be "thought away" from what must be considered the essential features of God's self revelation in the Incarnation when seeking for a true interpretation of the eternal life of God. Similarly with regard to the New Testament references to the Holy Spirit, the same method is involved and the facts of the revelation so resolved must be reckoned with by any thoroughgoing philosophy. For the purposes of theology, Dr. Hodgson in the fourth lecture seeks a line of inquiry from the nature of human personality, as Dr. John Laird had analysed it in its threefoldness. Parallels are striking between the history of thought on the nature of the self and of the Trinity. Especially is this instructive on the interpermeation between the "Knowing, willing, feeling" activities and the doctrine of *περιχωρησις*; the inadequacy of explaining the whole by one activity, and the historic rejection of subordinationism; and the ultimate mystical unit which is nevertheless founded on a rational approach. Dr. Hodgson brilliantly exposes the error of thinking of unity from mathematical conceptions and the subsequent limitations that this has had on Christian doctrine.

Having so far elucidated the doctrine for the purposes of theology, Dr. Hodgson applies it as a "key feature" to contemporary philosophical positions, notably that of idealism, and the attempt of Dr. Temple in his Gifford Lectures to meet its obvious weaknesses from the Christian point of view. While acknowledging the temporary assistance of idealism, the support so derived was at the cost of

injury to the Christian revelation on creation and personality. Hence Dr. Hodgson holds that empiricism is the present need for Christian philosophy from which the doctrine of the Trinity can be approached, as has been shown, as an "internally constituted unity" yet whose ultimate mystery is not an unphilosophical admission.

The sixth lecture is an investigation of the empirical approach to the doctrine shown in the writings of Augustine, Aquinas, and Calvin, though the struggle is evidently to reconcile the uncriticised mathematical idea of unity which is shown in their adherence to the doctrine of the *principium* of the Father with the acceptance of the Biblical revelation conceived of in the form of propositions. Finally the last lecture shows the practical relevance of the doctrine as arising from practical experience and so leading to a clearer expression in the life here of what we believe is eternally the life of God (e.g., possession by the Spirit and sonship). Aspects too refer to Christian unity, future hope and the reconciliation of all empirical knowledge with the outlook that holds God and man closely related.

Appendices, some of great interest, complete this able and intensely interesting discussion, which should be read for its value to the preacher and teacher in presenting the great doctrine of the Christian revelation that it may be understood and be a spiritual incentive in Christian life.

THE LETTERS OF EVELYN UNDERHILL

Edited with an Introduction by Charles Williams. Longmans. 10/6.

Evelyn Underhill died on Sunday, June 15th, 1941, and is buried in the churchyard of St. John's, Hampstead. Born in 1875, her father was Sir Arthur Underhill, Barrister-at-law. She was educated privately, and at King's College for Women, London, though in his most admirable introduction, Mr. Williams does not mention that she became Honorary Fellow, in 1913. She married Hubert Stuart Moore, Barrister-at-law in 1907, one of the Jew companions of her somewhat lonely childhood. She was Upton Lecturer on Religion in Manchester College, Oxford, 1921-22, and Fellow of King's College, London, in 1927. She was a mystic. As we read this interesting and vivid book the favourite lines of the late Sir William Robertson Nicoll kept recurring to us :

"Now I hear it not, but loiter
Gaily as before.
Yet sometimes I think, and thinking
Makes the heart so sore—
Just a few steps more
And there might have dawned for me
Blue and infinite, the sea."

It was that prince of journalists who wrote, we remember : "Miss Underhill has given us, on the whole, the best English work on Mysticism." She formed in 1911 a firm friendship with Friedrich von Hügel and almost joined the Roman Church, but in 1921 she became a practising member of the Church of England. She loved the Retreat House at Pleshey and towards the end of her life joined the Fellowship of St. Alban and St. Sergius, largely owing to the interest in the Orthodox Churches and their Liturgy which her studies for her last large book, *Worship*, aroused in her. She joined the Anglican Pacifist Fellowship, and wrote for it an uncompromising pamphlet, *The Church and War*. Her general attitude is indicated in many of the really beautiful letters in this book. Evangelicals will find much in them with which they must disagree but the sympathy, sincerity and the deep love of our Blessed Lord make this book an outstanding one. She had undoubtedly "that burning sense of God which can set the spirits on fire." A. W. PARSONS.

JESUS THE MESSIAH

*By Prof. William Manson. The Cunningham Lecture. pp. ix. + 200.
8/6 net. Hodder and Stoughton.*

This extremely satisfying work can best be described in the Author's own words: "It is not the primary intention of the book to handle afresh the problem of the Messianic consciousness of Jesus, but rather to show how, on the basis of the confession of Jesus as Messiah, the early church built up the structure of its distinctive witness to the Christian revelation of God." To achieve this purpose has involved the consideration of a number of subsidiary aspects of the Synoptic tradition, in the course of which Prof. Manson has some extraordinarily good

things to say which alone make the book of great value to the student of Biblical theology. As a book it is difficult to summarise as the Author treats a number of different subjects grouped round his main theme. He has a good deal to say about our Lord's teaching which he examines with meticulous care in the light of the claims of the Form critics. His attitude to these latter is not uncritical. He examines the main claims of these critics of the Gospel tradition in ch. ii with great fairness and we commend particularly what he has to say on ps. 21, 28-9. In this connection it is interesting to observe Prof. Manson's stress on the value of St. Mark's Gospel for the teaching of Jesus as well as for an account of His life. "For Mark the teaching of Jesus is essentially a sign, a Messianic phenomenon. . . . So Mark thinks of the words as well as the acts of Jesus as signifying a manifestation of God in history." In this he agrees with Prof. Vincent Taylor in his *The Formation of the Gospel Tradition* (cf. p. 88, and see also p. 113). So also with regard to the miraculous. "Miracle," he writes, "is not a late importation into the tradition of Jesus but constitutes the primary stratum" and he effectively illustrates this with a reference to Mark ix. 26 on which he comments, referring to the words "the boy became like one dead". "If there was an ungoverned tendency to the miraculous in the tradition, it is difficult to explain how a story with such features escaped being turned into a record of an actual raising from the dead. Plainly, it was not a case of the Church being in absolute control of the tradition. We see that at many points the tradition was in control of the Church."

When Prof. Manson comes to a consideration of the Parables of Jesus he agrees with Hoskyns and Davey in their *The Riddle of the New Testament* as to the "Christological significance" of the Parable beyond even what "the redactors of the tradition have perceived." But he only very cautiously endorses their contention that even the details of certain of the Parables contain a hidden significance, the clue for which must be sought in the Old Testament. (Incidentally, his reference to that work should rather read p. 157 ff instead of 168 ff, which misses this section on Parables). It is, as he says, possible that such metaphors as seed and lamp "possessed this significance on the lips of Jesus, but it is not to be presumed as certain."

These are but specimens of Prof. Manson's method in dealing with his main problem which, put very simply, is to demonstrate that the Form critics have not destroyed the trustworthiness of the synoptic record of the life and teaching of Jesus. The problem is a vastly important one and a contribution such as this which goes far to vindicate a more conservative (if one may use that word) approach to the whole problem of the Christian tradition and its authenticity is greatly to be welcomed at the present time. It would be disastrous from every point of view if the idea became widely disseminated that Form-criticism had robbed us of the possibility of acquiring any really authentic account either of the life or the teaching of our Lord. Such criticism has no doubt thrown much light on many New Testament problems but it must not be allowed to undermine the authentic content of the Synoptic tradition, else the whole historic basis of Christianity would be destroyed. No doubt we are learning much concerning the form and content of the primitive tradition out of which arose the later compilation from which again our gospels were constructed. In all this the Community must have played a decisive part but that is very far from saying that the Community in any way was the source or origin of the tradition. The early Christian Community may have done much to select, approve or reject from amongst the authentic Christian accounts but that is very different from any attempt to invent them. Hence we welcome this work and hope that its technical discussions, some of which are relegated to appendices, will not prevent many ordinary readers from a careful perusal of it. It is a book to read more than once, particularly by those whose function it is to proclaim the historic Gospel.

CLIFFORD J. OFFER.

REDEEMING THE TIME

By Jacques Maritain. pp. 276. 12/6 net. Geoffrey Bles. The Centenary Press.

The writer of this work can be numbered amongst the few contemporary authors who in the realm of philosophy have established for themselves an international reputation. Therefore, anything that they write is always worth reading whether we actually agree with them or not. One can think of quite a number of men—Niebuhr, Berdyaev, Brunner—who, writing from very

different standpoints, are making valuable contributions to an age which needs all the spiritual guidance and illumination which it can get. And it has to be admitted that hardly any of them come from the ranks of the Roman Catholic Church. There are probably good reasons for this. Trained as most Roman Catholic thinkers are within somewhat stereotyped limits, dominated by one school of theology, they are not prone to explore new realms of thought. They are seldom speculative, and if so then it is well within the limits of the established philosophy. Jacques Maritain constitutes in many ways an exception. Though writing very definitely as a Roman Catholic and always remaining loyal to the traditional Thomist position, he yet finds himself able to approach many contemporary problems with a freshness and breadth of view which one does not normally find in writers of that school. Hence readers who, under ordinary circumstances, might hesitate to read a Roman Catholic production as having nothing very new to contribute, can put their fears aside and enjoy this stimulating work. But one comment is necessary. Parts of this book are not easy to read and they are obviously addressed to readers versed in the technicalities of modern philosophy. These chapters may be omitted and even then much will remain of real value and interest.

One interest of this book for non-Roman readers will be to note the opinion of a writer who obviously claims for himself a good deal of freedom. One notes at once the absence of the customary *nihil obstat* of Roman Catholic books. He claims to be heard not by virtue of the authority behind him but by the intrinsic excellence and value of his contributions to thought. This is refreshing and accounts, perhaps, for some of the attractiveness of Maritain for modern readers. He appears to believe in the almost unlimited capacity of the philosophy of Thomas Aquinas to adapt itself to the requirements of modern thought. "I hope," he says in his Preface, "that the essays I have gathered here may give evidence that Thomist philosophy, which is grounded on tested principles, yet does not slumber comfortably, offers us an equipment enabling us to extend more and more the boundaries of this philosophy itself, and to advance farther into the problems of our time."

Most of our readers will almost certainly turn to those essays which seem not only less speculative and philosophic, but most relevant to the circumstances of our time. And the very first essay is in this category for it deals with Human Equality. He sees the danger of the modern tendencies towards the "mass man" which is really the submergence of the individual at the cost of his personality. "The error," as he sees it, "has been to seek equality in a regression toward the basis set up by 'nature', and in a levelling down to this base. It should be a progressive movement toward the end which is composed of the good things of national life becoming in so far as possible and in various degrees accessible to all. . . ." In other words in so far as equality in human life is a possibility, it should be equality attained by levelling up rather than by a process of levelling down. With this should be compared the writer's statement towards the end of the book in a different connection: "The gospel and the Church (the reader will observe the Author's discrimination in the use of capitals here or elsewhere) taught men respect for the human person and respect for human life, respect for conscience and respect for poverty . . . the infinite worth of each soul, the essential equality of human beings of all races and of all conditions before God."

This latter quotation occurs in another essay to which many will turn with interest, *i.e.*, that on the Catholic Church and Social Progress. Here the writer boldly claims that the democracies can only avert disaster for civilization by following the teaching of the Roman Church as, presumably, embodied in successive papal encyclicals, quotations from which at some length he embodies in Appendix I. And here one would just like to enquire how much the content of these encyclicals owes to the pressure and pronouncement of Evangelical Christianity? If Rome were sincerely attached to these ideals as are set forth *on paper* then why does she exercise so little influence in those directions in countries such as Spain where she has real supreme power? There seems to be some inconsistency here.

A considerable part of the volume is taken up with the Semitic problems or, as Maritain puts it, The Mystery of Israel. The writer has much to say in two essays which we venture to think will be new to many readers. He ascribes a high place to the Jew in the economy of God. "For . . . the people of Israel remains the priestly people. The bad Jew is a kind of bad priest; God will have no one raise his hand against either"—a dictum which many will dispute.

Yet there is some truth when he says, making allowances for the Roman doctrine involved, "It is no small thing for a Christian to hate or despise, or to wish to treat in a debasing way, the race whence issued his God and the immaculate Mother of His God. That is why the bitter zeal of anti-Semitism always at the end turns into a bitter zeal against Christianity." This is an interesting and arresting book from a very definite standpoint by a capable and independent mind.

CLIFFORD J. OFFER.

THE CHRISTIAN IN THE WORLD OF TO-MORROW

By the Rt. Rev. H. A. Wilson, Bishop of Chelmsford. (London, Church Book Room Press, Ltd. 3/6).

The Bishop of Chelmsford deserves our warmest thanks for this timely, helpful and stimulating book. It is simple and unpretentious; but it goes to the root of the matter and has in it the note of the old Hebrew prophets. The Bishop surveys the world of to-day, stricken and torn by war, pulsating with hatreds and strife, and dominated by the love of money, of pleasure or of power, with the natural consequence of declining moral standards and the loss of all that makes for what is strong and good in character and conduct; and he asks "why is all this?" The ultimate reason he, like the prophets of Israel, finds in the fact that men and women have ignored God, or have turned away from Him, or have, as the Bishop puts it in modern phrase, "by-passed" Him, with the consequences we see all around us. The favourite belief of the latter part of the nineteenth century that with further education, improved social conditions and more leisure for rational enjoyment and recreation, a brighter and better era would dawn, has gone beyond recovery. It has been killed by the cold, hard fact of an era desolated by a world-war more horribly wicked, devastating and wide-spread than any that has gone before. To this has the "evolution" of the race brought us. An unclean thing cannot come out of a clean; and, as Bishop Butler reminded the people of his day—"Things and actions are what they are, and the consequences of them will be what they will be: why then should we desire to be deceived?"

Having diagnosed the disease and traced its cause, Dr. Wilson proceeds to consider the remedies which are being propounded, most of them good so far as they go; but he warns us that unless they take account of God, they will, like others that have gone before them, fail to heal the sickness from which the world is suffering mortally. Man is not merely an animal needing food, warmth, clothing, shelter, etc.: he has a spiritual life with other and higher needs which God alone can supply, for he has fallen, and it is not improving but redeeming that will meet his case; and this can only be found in the Gospel of the grace of God manifested in the atoning death of Christ. It is this Gospel which is the mission of the Christian Church to proclaim. The Church itself, however, seems stricken with weakness and a sense of futility in the face of this great task. It has been on too easy terms with the world and too deferential to it. After all, the world is manifestly alienated from God and appears to be moving still further away, and it needs to be told so in clear and unhesitating terms. But it must see in the Christian the living example of a better way if it is to be convinced and converted; and it does not always see in Christian people any very striking difference from others. It is here that the Bishop calls for self-examination and for penitence. He puts ignorance as spiritual enemy No. 1. "It must be confessed that the average worshipping Christian is quite shockingly ignorant of what his religion teaches. If the Christian is to play his part in the world he must know what are the teachings of his faith and he must know how to defend them" (p. 31). And he must really believe and know that God is an actual living Person; not a vague, intangible Providence, but a Heavenly Father Who cares for and watches over those who diligently and earnestly seek Him; Who hears and will answer our prayers; and Who, moreover, invites and encourages us to make our requests known unto Him. "Thus saith the Lord God; I will yet for this be required of by the house of Israel to do it for them." A belief in this truth that God is among us and around us, will steady and fit the Christian to meet all trials and to face all tasks, however difficult, for the power is of God. A Christian Church composed of such men will not have to confess its impotence to deal with the tragedy of the present world situation, but will be strong and able to take a leading part in solving the problems which post-war reconstruction will bring if a new and better order is to arise.

The book concludes with three chapters on Prayer, Public Worship and Bible-

reading, three primary and essential elements of a progressive spiritual life, and on each many wise and searching things are said. Though specially suitable for Lent and for these days of war, it is not less suitable for any time. No one can, we think, read it without gaining profit and encouragement from it. "The grace of God in the heart of man," wrote Archbishop Leighton, "is a tender plant in a strange, unkindly soil"; and the Bishop of Chelmsford has in this book given much practical help in caring for and nurturing this precious plant of the Lord's sowing. W.G.J.

ENGLISH PRAYER BOOKS : AN INTRODUCTION TO THE LITERATURE OF CHRISTIAN WORSHIP

By Stanley Morison. (Cambridge University Press. 6/- net.).

This is the first of a series of books planned and edited by the Deans of St. Paul's and of Liverpool, to be written by members of various Churches, in order to provide a survey of 'the facilities provided for public prayer'. At first sight such a subject seems remote from the immediate problems of the war to the urgent demands of practical life. But, as this book shows, the purpose is not merely historical, bibliographical, or academic, it is also to conserve spiritual values in the worship of the future and to make that worship more truly expressive of religious aspiration.

This slight volume of 142 pages covers an immense ground in order to set English Prayer Books in their correct framework historically. It is packed with information succinctly given and most carefully arranged and documented, the Chapters dealing with the four 'periods', Apostolic times to the 5th Century, the 5th to the 10th Century, the 10th to the 15th Century, the 16th to the 20th Century, and concluding with a 'present-day Summary'. By far the largest section is naturally the fourth, in which we find an able, learned and dispassionate account of the liturgical development since the Reformation, in the Church of England, as well as outside its borders. The history of Prayer-Book Revision is shortly recorded, with that of the 1928 Book. Is it, however, quite accurate to say that on the second attempt to pass that Book through the Commons it had been "amended as the Commons specified"? Had this been the case it would not have been again rejected. The emendations did not meet the objections so widely felt, or the result might have been different.

Mr. Morison's work was handicapped at a critical time by the destruction on May 10th, 1941, of so much of the liturgical section of the British Museum: but the loss is certainly not obvious to the general reader, and he has had access to other services and collections. It is inevitable that there should be some omissions in so wide and yet detailed a survey, but it may be truly claimed that the account he gives is remarkably full and informing, and that it points helpfully and constructively to possible developments in the future. Of these perhaps the most interesting are the suggestion of the modern revival of vocational services (of which he gives in perhaps somewhat disproportionate detail, one for the Royal Navy, and another for the Royal Air Force), and the idea of a cathedral, preferably a new foundation, to be chosen to be the centre of experiment.

The '*obiter dicta*' with which the historical summary is lightened and characterized are both shrewd and humorous, though not everyone would agree with their judgments of persons and movements. But together they do provide a valuable text-book on a subject far too much neglected, not least amongst Evangelicals. The student, as well as the ordinary reader, will find much of quite fascinating interest in its pages, and the book as a whole sets in its matter as in its format a very high standard for the series it commences.

S. NOWELL-ROSTRON.