

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, 1941

Vol. LV., No. 2, New Series

Contents :

| | PAGE |
|--|------|
| EDITORIAL | 74 |
| THE CHURCH MILITANT. | |
| The Rev. Hans Ehrenberg, Ph.D. | 76 |
| THE EVANGEL OF EVANGELICALISM : WHAT IT IS, AND HOW IT WORKS. | |
| The Rev. A. E. Hughes, M.A. | 90 |
| REUNION : AN AMERICAN CONCORDAT. | |
| The Rev. A. W. Parsons, L.Th. | 99 |
| THE HOLY COMMUNION IN THE EARLY CHURCH. | |
| The Rev. F. R. Montgomery Hitchcock, D.D. | 109 |
| CHRISTIANITY AND EDUCATION : A CALL TO CHURCHMEN. | |
| A. F. Wallis | 123 |
| THE EPISTLE OF TRUTH. | |
| The Rev. Edwin Hirst, M.A., A.R.C.M. | 127 |
| BOOK REVIEWS | 138 |

PRICE : ONE SHILLING NETT

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

Editorial

IN our January issue we stated with pardonable pride that with that number was commenced the sixty-second year of issue of THE CHURCHMAN. The Principal of Ridley Hall has since very kindly sent us for review a copy of Dr. Bullock's book *The History of Ridley Hall, Cambridge*, Volume I—a most fascinating book which (D.V.) will be adequately reviewed in a later issue. Meantime, mention is made of it now because of its reference to the history of THE CHURCHMAN. On page 66 we read :

“The Evangelicals realized the importance of the Press. *The Christian Observer*, a monthly review, was started in January 1802, with Zachary Macaulay as its first Editor. *The Christian Advocate and Review* was founded in 1861. In 1875, these two Journals were united under the title *The Christian Observer and Advocate*.”

And in a footnote on page 80, the following :

“*The Christian Observer* had been founded as long ago as January 1802, as an Evangelical monthly review—its first editor being Zachary Macaulay. In 1875 and 1876 it was united with *The Christian Advocate and Review* (founded in 1861), under the joint title *The Christian Observer and Advocate*. In 1877 the two journals became separate again. *The Christian Observer* ended as a monthly in December 1877. In that issue it was stated that it would continue publication in 1878—but as a quarterly. In October 1879 a new Evangelical monthly magazine was started; though without any mention of *The Christian Observer* in its early issues, in effect THE CHURCHMAN is its successor.”

Thus can THE CHURCHMAN reasonably claim direct succession from the great Evangelical revival and allowing for a lapse of two years (1878–79) one hundred and thirty-seven years of publication.

This realization of our princely lineage is humbling but inspiring, and challenges us to endeavour faithfully to

attain the high standard intellectually and spiritually which such an ancestry presupposes.

In all its long history, THE CHURCHMAN has never, we feel, contained an article written from a deeper experience than the article entitled "The Church Militant," by Professor Hans Ehrenberg, which is given first place in this issue. Professor Ehrenberg is a personal friend of Pastor Niemöller, and faced with him the issues which confronted the Confessional Church in Germany with the rise of the National Socialist party to power. These persecuted brethren have indeed a vital contribution to make to the Christian Church in these days.

An article from the pen of one of our members, Mr. A. F. Wallis, on the very important subject of Education and its relation to the Christian Faith, will be appreciated as this is a subject which ought not to be shelved indefinitely. The article has already made at least one parson realize afresh the paramount need of spiritual qualifications for those to whom is committed the privilege of training and educating our future citizens.

It is a pleasure to include an article from our old friend, the Rev. A. E. Hughes, containing as it does Evangelical truths which cannot be emphasized too often.

Dr. Montgomery Hitchcock contributes a most helpful research study on the "Holy Communion in the Early Church," and we are fortunate in having a further MS. in readiness for the next issue.

By special request, the Rev. A. W. Parsons, Vicar of St. John's, Boscombe, has written an article dealing with the proposed Concordat in the United States between the Presbyterian and Protestant Episcopal Churches there. It will be deplorable if yet another scheme for Christian reunion is wrecked on the untenable theory of the mechanical transmission of Grace which has been raised in connection with this proposed scheme.

Many readers will welcome the second section of the Rev. E. Hirst's thesis on "The Epistle of Truth," and all will find it a profitable study.

ERRATUM

In the January issue, page 13, line 36, instead of "It is a natural" read "It is a natural consequence."

The Church Militant

A BIBLICAL MEDITATION.

THE REV. HANS EHRENBERG, PH.D.

I

NORMALLY the Church does not fight. I was recently talking to two dignitaries of the Church of England and I said, "Your Church possesses a beautiful prayer in the liturgy of the Holy Communion for the Church militant, but where is your Church militant?" They laughed and agreed with me. But when in spite of all that the Church really fights, and it does, even though it may be very seldom, the world is first disappointed and then soon exasperated. It is bound to discover that the Church does not fight to help the world in attaining its so-called high aims, but that it gets drawn into the fight itself, sometimes because it is attacked, sometimes because the Church is trying to save it—and the latter annoys it more than the former.

The reason is that the first assertion of a fighting Church must be, "All of us, you and we alike, are standing under the judgment of God." If the Church normally does not fight, it may be due to worldliness and selfishness, but it is much more often due to the fear of preaching the judgment of God on others and itself. In fact the judgment of God has been the sole means of stirring up the Church to the fight. The judgment of God has been passed on *the world*, and so the Church *ought* to fight. The judgment of God begins at *the house of God* (I Peter iv. 17), and so the Church *must* fight.

The judgment of God is the advent of the Church militant. If the Church of Christ does not witness to God's judgment, it loses itself in the mysteries of God, or even in the secular affairs of the world. In the former case it will perhaps preserve itself for a future fight, even if it has failed in the present one; in the latter case it surrenders itself to and loses its identity in the world, its enemy, which by great

cunning and skill with flattering words has tempted it, led it astray, and ruined it. There are always more hirelings in the Church than wolves (John x.).

The judgment of God calls the Church to the fight. No servant of Christ can fight without this call, and even if he did, it would be no true fight. It is only when *God* calls that the Church becomes the Church militant. But surely God is always calling. Certainly He is, but His call becomes particularly insistent at certain times. A Lutheran teacher of the Church said in 1855, "Longer delays may be granted in other times and to other generations; in our time and to our generation only a short delay and no consideration are granted."

That is why the first assertion of the Church in preaching the judgment of God must be, "The Lord is at hand." This must not be understood in the way the man in the street says it in evil days, e.g., 1919 in Germany, or in London now; to him the answer of the Church should rather be, "The terrors of judgment you are now experiencing are nothing compared to what will be in the last days." But even so such events speak in no doubtful tones. God wants to rob us of all certainty both external and internal. The Church is no life-insurance society, not even where eternal life is concerned.

We give evidence of the holy sobriety of the Church, when we not only preach morality and seek to edify, but also proclaim the nearness of the Lord. The Church so seldom speaks of it because it is sleeping and dreaming, or because it is sleeping and not even dreaming. Is there anything harder than saying the five words, "The Lord is at hand?" Can we say them unless it be out of our knowledge of the judgment of God? So long as we are hardened against the fact of the judgment of God, we shall not awake out of sleep; but "the night is far spent, the day is at hand." Perhaps the ministers of the Church have called often enough, "Watch and pray," but surely it was but the cry of sleepers in their sleep. Not all prayers of the Church have been prayed, when we were awake. However, "now is high time to awake out of sleep." Why? "For now is our salvation nearer than when we first believed." God has put on His clock. He is at hand. "The night is far spent, the day is at hand." The Lord Christ is at hand.

II

That this is so, that God has wakened us, that our salvation has come nearer, that we no longer stand where we stood, when we first believed, is grace and only grace.

Slowly but ever increasingly are we hearing the tremendous NO that God is saying to us and to His whole world. Only those that no longer drink milk can know the abyss of sin. Only those that have long been treading the path of faith can know the abyss of their own and the world's sin. Why have all the Church's saints in later life had to pass through those dark hours, those deep temptations, those terrible struggles of conscience and faith? All believers, awakened by the warning call of divine judgment, grasp the full measure of that judgment but slowly, and little by little. At first we wanted to save something, anything, both in us and in the world, in which after all our dearest also are. But everything is torn away from us. The moment comes, but does not come at once, when he who has arisen out of sleep realizes that he is standing before Nothing—from the human standpoint he is without hope. His only hope—and this is no empty phrase or rhetorical turn of speech—is God and His Saviour. This is not brought about by our being threatened by some outward danger, but by our being wide awake and looking into the depths of judgment. That witness, already quoted, from the year 1855, said, "The Lord lit up as by a lightning-flash, shining from East to West, the abyss before our feet, so that even the short-sighted and the blind could measure its depth and could see what the abyss held. And what have we seen in this abyss? Many thousands upon thousands of souls lost through the fault of the clergy, and above those heads there was written in fiery letters, 'I will demand their blood from your hand.' Still to-day these words stand there to be read, and the abyss is still lit up by the lightnings of the Lord, and the heads of the lost are still to be seen by everyone who does not hold his hands before his eyes and does not refuse God's punishment to his own everlasting destruction."

The disciples of Jesus had looked into this abyss, when the Lord was crucified. That is why before the struggle had broken out, they could with a peace that was not of this world declare war, saying, "Be it known unto you all, and to all the people of Israel, that by the name of Jesus Christ

of Nazareth, whom ye crucified, whom God raised from the dead, even by Him doth this man stand here before you whole. This is the stone which was set at nought of you builders, which is become the head of the corner. Neither is there salvation in any other ; for there is none other name under heaven given among men whereby we must be saved." That was how the apostles spoke, after they had healed the lame man at the gate of the temple. They were able to heal just because they knew that there is but one hope, He the Crucified and Risen one. There was a time, while they were with the Lord in His life time, when they could not heal. The spirits were not subject to them (Matt. x. 19) because they were just beginning to believe and had not yet abandoned all other hope. They had not yet looked into the abyss of the judgment of God, and they had not given up building on the world. They were not yet able to fight, for they slept while the Lord prayed. Do we and the Church of our time stand exactly where the disciples were, when they were with the Lord, and He with them? Do we not possess the Lord of Lords exalted in heaven? Are we not members of His body? Do we not receive our life from the Head through the word and sacraments? Have we not been justified by grace alone? Can we not then fight and be ministers of the Church, which is built on the foundation of the prophets and apostles, and say with them, "Neither is there salvation in any other ; for there is none other name under heaven given among men, whereby we must be saved?"

We have the call to the fight. We have not only God's judgments but also the words of the apostles. It is a sign of God's grace that not only what He said directly to His servants is His word, but also what His servants said, i.e., the words of the apostles of Jesus Christ. In them we are given our message, if we will but hear it ; when we have heard it, we believe it ; when we have believed it, we preach it, proclaim it, and testify to it. Verily, to use Luther's saying, our despair should be a "confident despair." What do you want to cling to, you of little faith? The fight is beginning, and you cannot hold on to the peace that is given by this world. You cannot even delay the beginning of the fight. God fixes the hour, not we ; He always declares His own wars. The apostles knew it, when they were still allowed to worship in the temple at Jerusalem in complete

peace alongside Israel, the crucifiers of the Lord. That is why they delivered the message, "Neither is there salvation in any other." So it must be with us. We know there is a fight. We are still allowed to live in peace with our nearest ; state, society and Church are still at peace. We are still in the temple of those that crucified the Lord, and for a very short time we are still worshipping the Lord together with them, but it will be only a very short time. We have already heard the call to the fight ; now we must proclaim it in our turn. We do not desire the fight ; God wills it, and He only wills it because the world does. The world only desires it because it will not surrender, will not accept the judgments of God as a summons to the fight. It says, "No ! no ! no ! never !" It resists God's call with all its pride, and stubbornness.

If war has broken out, who began it ? If asked, men will say, No one. We can answer them, "You are quite right ; it started with God's Word, His Word of condemnation of you and us. But then it was you that wanted the fight—you rejected that Word and crucified It and you will go on crucifying It ; you stumbled on the corner-stone rejected by you, builders. You will not receive Him, when He is among you speaking to you, nor when you have crucified Him and He deals with you from heaven as the crucified one. You do not want to have anything to do with Him at all. It is you who wanted the war ; you are responsible for it. None the less, God is not angry with you, for His anger is already passed. He only asks that you should bow before Him. Bow yourselves in confident despair ; bow yourselves in the only name, in the name of Jesus Christ."

III

"Be sober, be vigilant ; because your adversary, the devil, as a roaring lion, walketh about, seeking whom he may devour." And "put on the whole armour of God, that ye may be able to stand against the wiles of the devil. *For* we wrestle not against flesh and blood, but against the principalities, against the powers, against the world-rulers of this darkness, against the spiritual hosts of wickedness in the heavenly places."

Here it is clearly stated that the war has begun. The transition from peace to war is always very sudden—yester-

day deep peace, to-day already a raging battle. It is even worse in the war of the Church than in the world wars of the nations. Who is the enemy of the Church militant? Four hundred years ago the answer was, the Pope; he was the Antichrist. Last generation said, the Marxist, the Bolshevik; he was the embodiment of Satan in their day. To-day the answer is, the Nazi is Antichrist. There has always been much truth in these judgments. In any case we must never water down our condemnation of the enemy just because we know from the experience of the Church of Christ that the devil knows how to change and can assume many different incarnations. No, never, for we know where the devil sits enthroned to-day. But it is just when we know that, that we must make sure that we make Satan our enemy and not some of his human puppets. It is equally important to realize that whenever we condemn the devil and his servants, the thing that matters is God's judgment of them, the same judgment that concerns us all. All we can do is to explain that the incarnation of Satan at any given time is simply the clearest and most visible embodiment of the evil powers between heaven and earth. And so it must be to-day. The one we wage war with at any given time, and who wages war with us, is one we never really see. We who have lived through the fight of the German Church have a tale we could tell about that.

What sort of a fight was that? We fought against forgers, false teachers, wolves and hirelings, who attacked or betrayed the flock of Christ. Hardly had we driven them back, when the enemy had disappeared, and a new one stood in his place, viz., the political party, the state, with which the Church ought never to have directly to deal. Thus the beaten foe was saved and could recover his strength. We were prevented from following up our victory successfully. A little later there was another change; the political power disappeared, saying sanctimoniously, What have we to do with religion? The defeated foe, the teacher of false doctrines, faced us again refreshed and strengthened. Exactly the same thing happened again and again. So it was we began to grasp what it meant not to fight with flesh and blood. Once we understood this, we began to recognize our true opponent, and we shouted aloud, "We wrestle against the principalities, against the powers, against the world-

rulers of this darkness, against the spiritual hosts of wickedness in the heavenly places." That is a completely new experience. Till then the words of the apostle had been merely words. Now they were filled with reality, with suffering, with toil, with hard fighting, with courageous willingness for sacrifice and bravery, with obedience and hardness towards oneself, but also with comradeship, with pain for defeats sustained, with moments of despondency and overwhelming occasions of victorious certainty, with attacks and counter-attacks.

Thus we find ourselves right in the midst of war, and there is real warfare there. Therefore "above all, taking the shield of faith, wherewith ye shall be able to quench all the fiery darts of the evil one. And take the helmet of salvation, and the sword of the Spirit, which is the word of God."

That is why we, "old soldiers" of the German confessional fight, say, "We as individuals are extremely unimportant, but we bring you experiences, and they are important."

For the other Churches in other countries the question is first of all, whether they wish to have to do with these experiences. At first they are never ready for that. They may perhaps be interested in "ecclesiastical cannibal stories" (because they have taken place far away), and they may with most exquisite brotherly love care for the wounded in these wars of the Church on distant battle-fields, but they never believe that their own Church could become the battle-field for such a fight or even for similar ones.

The Church militant is never really honoured in the Church itself. The abnormal conditions in which a fighting Church has to live and work are considered to be a good reason for not treating it as "a normal part of the Church universal." We could now tell a tale about that, but we are not going to accuse anyone.

None the less there is one thing we are doing; we are preaching the war with evil spirits under heaven to the whole world. We are teaching all Christendom never to think that we, or some day they, can ever have to do with flesh and blood. We are warning them not to look for flesh and blood even now in the small fights that may come their way. They should forget to consider as important characters and those circumstances in which characters meet in Church matters. Do not concern yourselves with psychology,

through which you only give Satan an enormous advantage, but "stand having girded your loins with truth, and having put on the breastplate of righteousness, and having shod your feet with the preparation of the gospel of peace."

Resist! Withstand! The devil does not wait till he is attacked. Whether we wish it or not, the Church begins its fight on the defensive. If we are involved in it, there is at first but one consolation for us; we are not alone, we are not forsaken, we belong to a great people, to the people of God in all lands, and they are fighting the same fight together with us, the fight against the devil, "whom resist steadfast in the faith, knowing that the same afflictions are accomplished in your brethren that are in the world."

The Church universal in all its branches cannot prevent the Church militant, that abnormal expression of the Church, despised by the other Churches, from being in fact the secret leader of the Church universal; nor can it prevent its finding fellow fighters everywhere, volunteers, to enrol in the fighting Church and fill up the gaps in its ranks as irregulars out of all lands of the cross. The Lord said to Paul in Corinth, "I have much people in this city." Paul could not have known it, but he afterwards found that it was so. When the clergy of the Confessional Church gathered together at the beginning of the fight, they could not venture to hope that one day a fighting Church would stand behind them, yet one day the Church stood there. So it always is with the Church militant. He who has fought for the Lord has never been alone. Even Elijah discovered seven thousand who had not bowed the knee to Baal.

That is how the army of the Church militant grows from small beginnings. The mobilisation of the Christian army for the defence of the sanctuary goes steadily forward in the midst of the fighting and in the midst of the heavy losses which can never be avoided. The Lord Himself fetches His soldiers.

IV

To-day all earnest men of good will complain that we no longer possess the necessary authority for bringing up the young, drawing men together, ordering society, and building up the community. Where is this missing authority to be found, without which all efforts at reconstruction will be useless? It can only be found wherever the Church militant

may be waging its wars. Every earthly army has a morally upbuilding and educative influence. We need only remember the centurion's words to the Lord Jesus about commanding and obeying among soldiers. So in the Church militant, too, there is a real spirit of authority.

Therefore "consider Him that hath endured such gain-saying of sinners against themselves, that ye wax not weary, fainting in your souls. Ye have not yet resisted unto blood, striving against sin." Have we really not striven as yet? Was all that lies behind only child's play? Does the decisive fight still lie before us?

That is the word, DECISION. The Church militant experiences and knows decisive hours. They come again and again. "Finally, my brethren, be strong in the Lord and in the power of His might." The spirit of the army of the fighting Church depends on this exhortation being heard. The last of all fights has never yet lain behind us. The decision always lies in front of us. However often the Church militant may have been victorious, it has never been granted a victory which was final and decisive in the eyes of the world. That is why the world always minimizes the Church's fight, and so do those Churches that still serve the world. "Where is your victory?" is the mocking question asked the soldiers of Christ. The true spirit of the Christian army is seen in its ignoring such mockery, for they know that Christ, the Crucified, never allows anyone to conquer, except in the way He conquered, i.e., through His cross. The cross can conquer, but never the man who fights with it and for it. The fighting Church is always the suffering Church. "But God forbid that I should glory, save in the cross of our Lord Jesus Christ, by whom the world is crucified unto me, and I unto the world."

What a remarkable saying! The world crucifies Christ's warrior, and by the same cross is itself rejected. Now we can understand better why any Church allied with the world tries to keep far from the Church militant. It is indeed prepared to take a little share in the fight for God, but only a little share, and above all, no cross. The cross! The cross! The cross! That is the vital point. The world grasps at once that it has only to bring Christians to the point where they will do anything "lest they should suffer persecution for the cross of Christ." "Peace, peace, and again peace"

proclaim the false prophets of the Church, "when there is no peace" (Jer. vi. 14). Let us not hurt brotherly love, is another such lying word of peace. But the spirit of the Church militant is stronger. There will always be some seduced to leave the ranks. No war concerned with fundamental principles can ever be waged without desertions. The Church militant, however, can bear it; its ranks are filled up again, and even if they should not be, the small company will be stronger than the larger was. "But we are not of them that shrink back into perdition; but of them that have faith unto the saving of the soul." Are we saying this about ourselves? Is it an expression of our pride as fighters? Oh! we know the danger that fighting may make proud and suffering vain. So let it be but something overheard; something we would never dare to say, but which has been said to us. Thus we say it ourselves. We can say it, because cowardly, weak, and vain though we are, we believe in the cross of the Lord Christ. Then the cowardly become brave, the weak strong, the vain steadfast, and the word runs along the ranks of the fighting men, "We are weak, cowards and vain, but we will not give way."

It is always the same miracle, and the world is always amazed and does not understand it. Think of all the things men are saying about Martin Niemoeller. Is he really the greatest of heroes? No. Is he really the greatest of martyrs? No. What is he then? He is one who has not been led astray in all his temptations, a saint resisting the might of temptation, which Satan uses for his attacks. Niemoeller too has his hours of weakness, and yet he does not become weak. He withstands; he resists unto blood. We, the other fighters, experienced that we were called out of tears and deep depression to stand around our man, and that the word was given us which our Lord once promised His disciples, when He sent them out among the wolves. We were able to make use of the word that had been given us not because we were men of strong character—that may sometimes be a help, but it may sometimes be a hindrance, too—but because we believed we could call Jesus Lord, not through our own strength, but through the power of the Holy Spirit. Behind all true warfare stands grace, the grace of forgiveness, the grace that is given freely, because it has already won everything we need in the fight. Ye men

of the Church, preach atonement through grace, preach belief in the word, and you are preaching the Church militant. "For the word of God is quick, and powerful, and sharper than any two-edged sword, piercing even to the dividing asunder of soul and spirit, and is a discerner of the thoughts and intents of the heart."

V

Simeon said to Mary in the temple, "A sword shall pierce through thy own soul also, that the thoughts of many hearts may be revealed." The sword of the Church, which is the sword of the word of God is two-edged. It cuts both him against whom it is wielded and him who wields it. The Church militant knows no fight in which the fighter has not to fight himself. That makes it a strange fight indeed for the politicians and generals of this world.

The Church militant cannot fight without calling itself to repentance. The call to repentance is its war-cry and even its shout of victory. And so it knows no pessimism, because it begins with the call to repentance. On its knees it calls aloud to its fighters, "*You* are the conquered," and as the conquered they march to the fight. They have already passed through the judgment of God, when they fight their first battle with the powers between heaven and earth. Before they fire their first shot, they have once been completely conquered. They know defeat before they get to know the fight itself. They cannot hope for victory till they have been humbled to the dust. They cannot wield their sword until it has been beaten from their grasp. They cannot attack before they have been taken prisoner.

As prisoners they are free for the fight ; as the defeated they are mighty for victory ; as the disarmed they are strong for the attack.

That is why they call one to another, fighter to fighter, "Fight the good fight of faith, lay hold on life eternal, whereunto thou wast called, and didst confess the good confession in the sight of many witnesses." Confession is the spiritual weapon with which the Christian army fights. The Lord Himself stressed confession, when He was preparing His disciples for the coming fight ; He said, "Whosoever therefore shall confess Me before men, him will I confess also before My Father, which is in heaven."

But the Church forgets just this again and again. The Church, its ministers and its members, think they have done enough when they are "religious," which means, when they go to church and let an edifying sermon be preached at them. They want to believe in a pious way ; but they lack both the courage and the joyous desire to confess before men. They even lack all understanding for it. The word "confession" possesses no attractive ring for them. They have never noticed that this word conveys something special that goes beyond that which we generally call faith. They seem to have forgotten that Paul, speaking from experience, tells us, "For with the heart man believeth unto righteousness ; and with the mouth confession is made unto salvation." Confession is essential. You can believe before you confess, but you can never reap the fruit of your faith, eternal salvation, unless you confess before men. That is why the Church militant is essential ; it is not only a product of the needs called forth by the confusions of the world, it is indeed essential for the salvation of the world, for the real redemption of those that believe.

Have you not noticed the joy that awakens there ? If you keep your God to yourself, you show neither obedience nor love, and you are but "sounding brass or a clanging cymbal." Have you not noticed how Satan wants to deceive you ? Allegedly in the name of love he wants to hold you back from the fight, and thus doing holds you back from love itself. If you are not willing to fight in the ranks of the Church militant, you are abandoning the world, you are abandoning your neighbour to the Destroyer.

So you will learn in very truth that it is a power other than your strength that fits you for the fight. It is wonderful how grace is able out of the most unsuitable people to make warriors for Christ. During the fight many have been a disappointment, of whom it was thought that they would hold their own ; others of whom nothing was expected have caused surprise by resisting and fighting unmoved and firm.

Firmness and faithfulness are both gifts of grace. Accept that grace, and with it you will receive faithfulness, and constancy, and firmness ; and none will be able to conquer you. No power of this world will be too strong for you. "The gates of hell shall not prevail against it" (Matt. xvi. 18), and they shall not prevail against you either, if you are a

living member of the Church, a living member of the body of the Lord.

VI

The Church expects of us "that we stand fast in one spirit, with one mind striving together for the faith of the gospel." That "together" is decisive. The true decision to which Christ calls men is always a decision to strive together for the faith of the gospel. Anyone that has ever been a soldier knows the beauty of true comradeship. Now the call is to comradeship in the Church militant.

Are you sitting alone by yourself thinking over the needs of the Church and of the unredeemed world? When your brother comes, you can think over the same things together. Do you want to confess, every man for himself, and are you looking for the right words for the purpose? When your brother joins you, you can sit down together and work together with great blessing and profit. How blessed was the fruit of the common work of confession, which the German confessional fight gave us through the grace of God. This fellowship of the Church militant redeems each and every one of us from the distress of his loneliness. It is only in the fight that Christians become comrades and find living and active fellowship. This experience is wonderful and unique.

It is then that the depths of Christian fellowship really open up to us. How very much it means that Christians can mutually affirm that they have true "fellowship in the faith!" He who will not fight separates himself from that fellowship and stands—outside with a life devoid of blessing. He who is willing for the fight is always in that fellowship and blessed is his life.

Fellowship gives knowledge. Fellowship brings humility. Fellowship begets joy.

We close this, the first half of a meditation on the Church militant, with some words of Paul, the apostle of the fight, "Now I beseech you, brethren, for the Lord Jesus Christ's sake, and for the love of the Spirit, that ye strive together with me in your prayers to God for me." What humility the apostle shows! He cannot live, cannot manage, cannot work, cannot fight, cannot conquer without the help of the prayers of his brethren. O praying Church! let each pray for the other; pray all together; let each pray for his brother as for himself; let each pray for himself as for his brother.

But there is not only humility there. What courage he shows! It is not easy to ask for prayer, when one is leader, to solicit prayers, when one is their spiritual father. What strength he shows by allowing himself to be so weak and by speaking so openly of his needs!

But not only humility and courage are there. What love he shows! The love of the Spirit is invoked, and in its name the apostle asks his brethren in the faith for their help through prayer. He knows, that without his request they will not be able to love one another.

But not only humility, courage and love are there. How much trust and faith he shows! He is sure that he can expect it from his brethren; he knows that the Lord wills it and the Spirit gives it. He knows that his faith will bring him this fruit. He believes in his request for help through prayer.

Lastly, how much gracious comfort he shows! Where there is comfort, there is the Gospel. For many years I have been allowed to use these words in varied needs. Ever and again they brought me comfort, and they bring me comfort to-day, as I think of the fights that are past, or as I look forward to battles yet to be. Our fight is never over. It is true that peace is always beckoning us and passes through the whole fight of the Church militant like a breath of eternity, but we never attain the peace which is never broken by following war. And if we, hardened through the fights that are past, forget to be afraid in this world, then the desire for peace passes through our soul and makes it sometimes weak and fearful. But it is then we hear that great word of comfort from the Paraclete, the Holy Spirit, again, "Ye will strive together with me in your prayers to God for me." The only result of this fight can be salvation. There is but one fight that we all fight, though it may assume so many different forms and may break up into so many different single combats. In the forced calm of imprisonment which results in the hardest of all fights, the Apostle writes to his Church in Philippi, "Ye have the same conflict which ye saw in me, and now hear to be in me."

One fight, one Spirit, one Church, one Lord and Saviour of the world!

(This ends the first half of the meditation on the Church Militant. The second half deals with its suffering and victory.)

The Evangel of Evangelicalism: What it is, and How it Works

*Simple thoughts on a great subject, humbly written by a
Minister of the Gospel to his brother Ministers.*

THE REV. A. E. HUGHES, M.A.

THE Evangel, the Gospel, is indeed a great subject. The word simply means good spel, good news, good tidings. Each of us can think of many pieces of news, each one of which would be good, and so a Gospel. But there is one news so pre-eminently the best possible news, that for nearly 2,000 years it has been called not merely *a* Gospel but *the* Gospel. It is rightly so called, for it as nothing else meets man's deepest need. That need is God Himself. Sin has separated man from God. Man needs something that so deals with sin that he and his God may be brought together again, that he may come to know God. The news of such is to him *the Gospel*. Through it he learns to know the living God as his God; God the Son as his Saviour, God the Spirit as his Sanctifier, God the Father as his Father.

Concerning this Gospel we note five things of importance.

(1) It is revealed in *a great Book*.

Our Lord said, "Search the Scriptures; for in them ye think ye have eternal life: and they are they which testify of me."

The Apostle Paul wrote, "The Holy Scriptures are able to make thee wise unto salvation."

It is the Gospel which makes us wise unto salvation, and shows us the way of eternal life. We are assured by these texts that that Gospel is found in the written Word of God. The writers were men moved by the Holy Ghost. They were so inspired that what they wrote was God's message rather than their own. The Scriptures referred to by our Lord and His Apostle were the Old Testament

Scriptures. Our Lord endorsed them as the Word of God. Indeed we have the Gospel in them. In familiar Chapters we have the Gospel according to Moses, the Gospel according to Isaiah, the Gospel according to Ezekiel. But the fuller revelation, the clearer Gospel message is in the New Testament. Here we have no mere types and prophecies, but their fulfilment. The Spirit of Truth, as promised, guided the writers into all truth. John xvi. 13.

(2) The Gospel centres in a *Great Person*.

The New Testament commences with the Gospel according to four different persons. It is the one and only Gospel, while given with the additional testimony of four men, all inspired while personally independent. And they are alike in this that before we reach the end of the first Chapter in each we have our attention fixed upon one central Person, Who is unique among men. While perfect man, He is at the same time more than man. He is *God of God*.

Thus the Gospel centres in a great Person, Son of God and Son of man, the Saviour.

Matthew describes Him as "*Emmanuel, God with us.*" Mark writes, "the Gospel of Jesus Christ, the *Son of God.*" Luke gives us the words spoken to the blessed virgin, "That holy thing which shall be born of thee shall be called the *Son of God.*" John writes, "The Word was *God*. The Word was made flesh." And by that One so made the word of Nathaniel was accepted, "Thou art the *Son of God.*"

Again, Luke gives us the first Gospel Sermon preached when Christ came into the world. The audience was the shepherds of Bethlehem. The preacher was the angel from heaven. His words, "I bring you good tidings of great joy," might be translated, "I preach the Gospel." Then he told what that good tidings, that Gospel was. It was no mere tidings of a Religion, a Doctrine or a Church. It was tidings of a Person, and that Person a Saviour.

(3) The Gospel is founded upon *Great Facts*.

The Birth of Christ was a Gospel. But it was that because of what was to follow. The Incarnation was a needful step towards Redemption. Salvation was not won by the Incarnation, but by the atoning death. So the Apostle describes the Gospel he had received, and preached at Corinth, "Christ died for our sins, and was buried, and rose again according to the Scriptures."

We notice also that all the four Gospel stories lead up to the crucifixion and resurrection of Christ as the great climax of His birth and life.

Thus the Gospel is founded upon the great historic fact of our Lord's death on the cross and rising from the tomb.

(4) The Gospel sets forth *Great Truths*.

The words just quoted link with the historic fact the doctrinal truth: "Christ died *for our sins*." His was no ordinary death. It was the bearing of sin.

The truths of the Gospel are most clearly set forth in the Epistle to the Romans, which might be called a Sermon on the words *The Gospel of Christ*, Romans i. 16.

That Epistle recognises the great underlying fact, universal sin, guilt and condemnation, iii. 23. But for the sinner the Gospel tells of wonderful blessings provided. These are some :

(a) *Justification*. The sinner can stand reckoned righteous by God, and that, not for any merit of his own. It is given by grace iii. 24, obtained by blood iii. 24, 25, v. 9, accepted by faith v. 1.

(b) *Freedom from condemnation*. viii. 1.

(c) *An indwelling Christ*. This living power within is the secret of the new life. viii. 10, 4.

(d) *Adoption*. The one-time stranger and enemy is thus brought into God's family. viii. 15, 17.

(e) *God at work*. God makes all things work together for good to those who love Him. viii. 28.

(f) *The eternal bond*. God's love in Christ never fails. The Chapter which begins with *no condemnation*, ends with *no separation*. viii. 35-39. (Thus the Gospel sets forth *Great Truths*.)

(5) The Gospel effects a *Great Experience*.

It is the power of God unto Salvation. Romans i. 16.

To the trusting soul the truths just mentioned are no mere items of true doctrine ; they are matters of living experience. Christ Himself is One definitely and personally known : "I know Him in whom I have put my trust."

In Him to stand before God justified, accepted, adopted ; to use His enabling power through His indwelling presence for the new life ; to rest in the assurance of His everlasting love ; to be kept in His perfect peace ; all these, and many more, are blessed realities. The Epistle to the Romans is

indeed the Gospel according to Paul. It is a message of life.

Religion without truth is a jellyfish Religion ; no bones, no stability.

Religion which is only truth is a skeleton religion, only bones. Ezekiel xxxvii. 1, 2.

Religion which is only activity is a dead Religion ; movement, organisation, but lifeless. Ezekiel xxxvii. 7, 8.

But, when the breath of God is breathed into the dead all is changed. There is life. Ezekiel xxxvii. 9, 10. Bones and body, truth and activity are needful. The Gospel leads to these. But it also gives life.

What life there was in one who wrote, "I am crucified with Christ ; nevertheless I live ; yet not I, but Christ liveth in me ; and the life which I now live in the flesh I live by the faith of the Son of God, who loved me, and gave Himself for me !"

So we sum up.

The Gospel

Is revealed in a Great Book ; the Bible.

Centres in a Great Person ; Jesus Christ.

Rests on a Great Fact ; Christ Crucified.

Sets forth Great Truths ; Epistle to the Romans.

Effects a Great Experience ; Salvation.

It is indeed "the good tidings of the glory of Christ." And it is a message for all. The order is "Preach the Gospel to every creature." The time is the everlasting Now.

The Evangelical is the man who holds this Gospel, or Evangel. He believes its truth. He has proved and knows its power. He gives to the crucified, risen, living Christ His right place as centre of heart and life and work. Doing so, all other things fall into their right place. There is nothing in his faith and conduct and ministry that is detached from, or outside the influence and control of this living power. We see its work in every department of life and ministry.

(1) *Preaching.* The true Evangelical cannot keep to himself the good news of the glory of Christ. With a firm conviction of the truth of every word he utters, and with an urge that cannot be restrained, he preaches the Gospel. "We cannot but speak the things which we have seen and heard," so said Peter and John. "I am ready to preach the gospel to you that are at Rome also. For I am not ashamed of the gospel of Christ," so said Paul. The true Evangelical

cannot but be an Evangelist. Again and again he sets forth the way of salvation, and calls, pleads with, and beseeches men to be reconciled to God through faith in Him "who His own self bare our sins in His own body on the tree."

The Gospel is present in every Sermon. That does not mean that every Sermon is entirely a message to the unsaved. The Gospel includes far more than the forgiveness of sin and salvation as sought, found and realised by the sinner in his first acceptance of the Saviour. The unsearchable riches of Christ contain much that the most advanced of His disciples has yet to appropriate. The Gospel, while simple enough for a child to understand, has depths which the ripest saint has not yet fathomed. The preaching of a full Gospel requires exposition as well as exhortation. But in every case Christ is lifted up, Christ as revealed in Holy Scripture, Christ as experienced in personal life.

(2) *Defence.* Like the Apostle, the true Evangelical stands, not only for the proclamation, but for the defence of the Gospel. The faithful pastor must guard his sheep, watching against errors that would find entrance within and injure the flock. Those errors must be exposed and resisted. In the same way that the Apostle was, the Gospel preacher must be a controversialist. He is pledged "to banish and drive away all erroneous and strange doctrines contrary to God's word." But this will be no mere negation. The resistance to every error is needed just because error detracts from the great positive message, and from the glory of Christ. Every false view of other priesthood and sacrifice than that of Christ, every unscriptural and exaggerated faith in the Sacraments, every doubt in the authority of Scripture, inspired by God's Spirit, and endorsed by Christ, everything that weakens faith in the Person of Christ as *Very God of Very God*, is a dishonour to Christ, and for Christ's sake must be resisted. A full Gospel has no room for error.

Yet such contention for the faith must always be carried on in the spirit of Christ. To be at war against error in no way means to be at war against those who hold it. The same chapter that says, "Endure hardness as a good soldier of Jesus Christ," says, "The servant of the Lord must not strive." The Gospel Minister speaks the truth. But he speaks it in love.

(3) *The Church.* The true Evangelical recognises in a common Gospel a true bond of union. Far deeper is his union with all others who hold it than anything that can be effected by uniformity of organisation. *All one in Christ Jesus* overmounts the fences which divide one Denomination from another. The Evangelical recognises in all who belong to the same Saviour other stones in the same spiritual house of which Christ is the Foundation, other sheep in the same flock of which Christ is the Shepherd, other members of the same body of which Christ is the Head, others forming the same Bride of whom Christ is the Bridegroom. The Church to him is something vaster, deeper and more alive than any organised body.

At the same time he does not think lightly of the outward and visible expression of that spiritual body. He recognises that that expression may take different forms. It may be Episcopal, Presbyterian, Congregationalist, Methodist, etc. These differences do not concern the fundamentals of faith.

While this is so, as a Church of England member and minister he takes his place as such without hesitation. He may well doubt if some, whose faith is unscriptural, have any legitimate place in the Church. For himself as an Evangelical there is no doubt. He is loyal to his Ordination vows, to the faith expressed in the Creeds and to the interpretation of the Scriptures in the Articles of his Church and underlying its worship as prescribed in the Book of Common Prayer, and that to a degree which none but an Evangelical can be. He does not regard Evangelicalism as making its contribution to the Church along with other different isms which make theirs. He takes his stand in a Church which he knows in all its doctrinal standards to be distinctly Evangelical.

(4) *The Ministry.* The true Evangelical recognises that from its earliest days there has been the appointment of certain men to be Ministers in the Church. This has been "for the perfecting of the saints, for the work of the ministry, for the edifying of the body of Christ; till we all come in the unity of the faith, and of the knowledge of the Son of God, unto a perfect man, unto the measure of the stature of the fulness of Christ." He recognises that it is for each section of the visible Church, seeking God's guidance, to have one form of ministry or another. It may be episcopal,

or presbyterian, or otherwise. To all such ministers he gives their true place and purpose. They are there for order and administration, for teaching and preaching. There is no idea of a special nearness to God conferred in ordination, or of a priestly position between the people and their God. The minister's calling is not to a sacerdotal office. The priesthood that does exist in the Christian Church is that of all believers alike. The offering of spiritual sacrifices is common to all. There is no priest between the worshipper and his God, or between the sinner and his Saviour.

(5) *Sacraments.* The true Evangelical accepts the Scriptural value, no more and no less, of the two, the only two, Sacraments given us by our Lord. They are to him no mechanical charms or conveyances of life and grace, but precious means of Grace as creating or increasing that faith which claims and receives grace. He sees in them no miracles, but simple and helpful parables, picturing and, where conditions are fulfilled, assuring blessings of regeneration and redemption and sanctification and dedication. He sees in them nothing mysterious, but simple illustrations helping him to grasp the great mysteries of the new birth and union with Christ. The Lord's Supper is to him not a sacrifice but the memory of a completed sacrifice once for all offered and accepted. It leads his faith to Calvary, and is itself a Gospel Sermon, showing the Lord's death till He come.

(6) *Church Ritual.* The true Evangelical realises that doctrine is taught not merely from the pulpit, but in the practices and observances connected with worship. So in his Church his Communion Table will never have the appearance of an altar. Nor will he ever adopt Eastward Position, or wear Mass vestments, or allow anything in his ministry signifying a priestly office. His practice at the Communion Table will conform to his preaching from the pulpit.

(7) *Daily Life.* The true Evangelical remembers that his life day by day is seen and read. Many who hear no sermon and read no Bible see his daily conduct. So he seeks that in all things his life be of one piece with the book he loves. His joy is in all things to adorn the doctrine of God his Saviour, to show forth the beauty of Jesus Christ and the joy of His Service, never repelling from but always attracting to Him. His message and ministry is for the glory of Christ.

Here is his great test. He refrains from everything, he allows no self-indulgence which is not for the glory of Christ. Following in his Master's footsteps, he would himself be an example to the flock. To all in their manifold needs he is a loving sympathetic friend. Thus through him the Evangel is not only heard but seen.

(8) *Parish Work.* The true Evangelical realises that a crowded Church, with elaborate Services and eloquent ethical discourses may yet be a failure in the sight of God. Services which some praise as dignified may in reality be utterly formal and lifeless. He is not content with such. He recognises the twofold business of his Church.

It is the spiritual home of God's children, where they offer united worship and together feed upon the Bread of life, and receive spiritual help. It is also a lighthouse, shedding its light upon the dark seas of human life, and making known in the Parish and as far as possible throughout the world, the good tidings of the glory of Christ. It is no mere society for those within. It is a Mission to those outside. His own calling at his Ordination was "to teach, and to premonish, to feed and provide for the Lord's family; to seek for Christ's sheep that are dispersed abroad, and for His children who are in the midst of this naughty world, that they may be saved through Christ for ever." He was not ordained, nor is his Church called, to entertain. He and his Church have a far higher purpose to fulfil. All that would weaken his Gospel Ministry or damp the true life of his Church and zeal of its members he avoids. He welcomes indeed innocent recreation among his Church's activities but only in so far as it promotes and does not hinder spiritual life and gospel witness.

(9) *Citizenship.* The true Evangelical does not think that the Church as such is to take the place of the State. His Master's teaching leads him to be loyal to the rules and laws of the State, rendering to Cæsar the things that be Cæsar's. When and where possible he uses his influence in the State to promote all that is Christian in spirit, and resist that which is contrary to righteousness, purity and peace. Taught to fear God, honour the King and love all men, he takes his stand against such evils as slave trade, and national vices and sins, realizing that God is no respecter of persons, and

that Christ died for all. All his public conduct springs from and is hallowed by the Gospel.

(10) *The Lord's Coming*. The true Evangelical is nerved to earnest prayer and effort in his Master's service by the blessed hope of that Master's return. He recognises that, while interpretations of some prophecies differ, the fact of his Lord's coming admits of no difference. He who was taken up into heaven shall so come in like manner as he was seen to go. His Gospel teaches him to look forward with confidence. He has the right to be an optimist. The prospect is certain. The Lord's coming is sure.

As writer or reader lays down this paper let each devote himself afresh to a Ministry of which *Christ crucified* is the great theme and message; "God forbid that I should glory, save in the cross of our Lord Jesus Christ, by whom the world is crucified unto me, and I unto the world."

WE WOULD SEE JESUS

By the Rt. Rev. C. F. Garbett. (Longmans, Green & Co.). 2s. 6d.

The Bishop of London's Lent Book, written by the Bishop of Winchester, is both apt and timely. Throughout its eight chapters and epilogue there is the atmosphere of the Gospel story of Christ's life and work. Much of what the book presents has been written previously and in various ways, but there is a freshness and a virility about this presentation of the subject which grips and holds, for it is brought into the atmosphere of contemporary life and needs. Perhaps the most helpful parts of the book are the concluding paragraphs of each chapter where the Bishop repeatedly "puts his finger on the spot" of human needs. Of these instances may be cited the following: "The men and women of our time in their desperate need want to see a Christ who will lead and deliver them." (p. 5). "One of the greatest needs . . . is a revival of the sense of evangelistic responsibility, by which clergy and laity alike recognise that Our Lord intends them to exercise their discipleship by bringing others to the feet of God" (p. 45); "The preaching of Christ as Saviour has not been of recent years as strong and uncompromising as once it was. Man has become so confident of himself and his mastery over nature that he is inclined to think that a Saviour is superfluous. He has lost the sense of sin; and until he knows he is a sinner he feels no need of a saviour" (p. 70). The last chapter, "The Risen Christ," shows how the Resurrection has revealed a living Christ Who can meet the human needs of every age, including our own, as He met them in the days of His flesh.

E. H.

Reunion : An American Concordat

THE REV. A. W. PARSONS, L.TH.

(*Vicar of St. John's, Boscombe.*)

AT the present moment our eyes are turned towards America in connection with the "Aid for Britain" Movement. The need for material help in connection with the war effort has driven from the minds of many Christians all other considerations. We are pre-occupied with our own special problems and probably know much less than usual of the problems and opportunities which face other nations. This is one of the special dangers confronting Christians in this country. The urgency and magnitude of the issues which are before us in the present war ; the insecurity of our own personal tenure of property and of life ; the upheaval of society through evacuation ; the destruction of churches and the expectation of invasion all conspire to rob us of leisure and inclination to pursue those very subjects which are most vital to Church reconstruction. This is especially true of the problem of Christian Reunion. We should all agree that the rebuilding of Europe cannot now be accomplished by political faiths alone. As Richard Russell wrote in the *Christian Newsletter* (No. 51) : "A moral and religious foundation is essential to the construction of any order which shall be stable and permanent. Our civilisation is Christian and cannot continue unless animated by a revival of Christian faith. The only hope for Europe appears to lie in those small communities of Christians, both Catholic and Protestant, who live in the world and who are attempting to leaven it as the Christian Church the Roman Empire. They are the only persons whose faith remains untroubled in the bankruptcy of liberalism, the bankruptcy of nationalism and the bankruptcy of dictatorship. . . . The Europe of the future

will be built up upon these little communities or brotherhoods."

The underlying assumption of that statement is probably that these little communities give their witness, keep their patience and hold fast their faith because they are members of the Universal Christian Society which transcends the bounds of nationality. But would not their witness be more powerful and pervasive if instead of being "little" brotherhoods they were more organically linked in the larger brotherhood of the Church of Christ? Can we go on supporting the League of Nations (if we still do) and fail to work for a League of Churches? Can we talk of Federal Union and fail to promote it in connection with "our unhappy divisions?"

The Lambeth Conference (1930, *Report*, p. 110) gives two reasons which should lead all Christians to desire Reunion and seek to promote it: "First and deepest is loyalty to our Lord: for the Church is His Body, and its divisions must needs be contrary to His will and hindrances to the fulfilment of His purpose. Second, and not essentially different, is the perception that only a united church can be the means of bringing to Christ and that unity in Him a world torn by divisions—economic, social, national and racial." These words seem to take on a deeper meaning in view of the broken Brotherhood of the World to-day. The Edinburgh Conference (*Report*, p. 36) stated that: "A principal hindrance to Christian and Church unity is the widely prevailing ignorance, apathy and inertia on the whole subject of unity." In one of his more recent letters (No. 53) Dr. J. H. Oldham tells us of a conversation which he had some years ago with an official of the State Department at Washington. He told Dr. Oldham that the Federal Council of Churches in America was in the habit of sending deputations to the State Department to present resolutions on international questions, claiming to speak on behalf of eighteen million members of Protestant Churches. "Well," he went on, "the curious thing is that we sometimes meet some of those eighteen million Church members ourselves and they somehow do not seem to have the ideas that the Federal Council say they have."

This ignorance is widespread amongst the rank and file of all the Christian Churches. One of the reasons why we

have supported the National Church League is that it does seek to educate the Evangelicals of the Church of England. A recent united week of prayer in Boscombe was very well attended but in comparison with the membership of the affiliated Churches only a small proportion of the local christians evinced any interest in the christians of the other denominations. Too many think of their own Church "as if it were simply a provision for the religious needs of the individual worshipper." (*Unity in the Truth*, A. G. Hebert). The same Anglo-Catholic author, whose book is an examination of the *Outline of a Reunion Scheme for the Church of England and the Evangelical Free Churches of England*, goes on to speak of the way in which people think of the Church service almost as a species of religious entertainment provided by the clergy for the laity to listen to and also complains justly that there is a parochialism which sees nothing at all beyond the life of the local congregation.

We began this paper, however, under a title from which we seem to be digressing. Actually we have been justifying ourselves for attempting the task of contributing something to Evangelical opinion in England regarding the proposed Concordat between the Episcopal and Presbyterian Churches of America.

The theory upon which this proposed Concordat is based is that advanced by an English theologian, Canon Oliver Chase Quick, in *The Christian Sacraments*, p. 141. He points out that from the second century onwards the duly appointed bishops of sees were looked upon as the organs and guardians of the outward unity of the Church. Thus the unity of the Church depended upon the universal recognition of a validly constituted hierarchy. This, it is hardly necessary to point out, is the theory behind Apostolic Succession, the doctrine which has proved to be such a stumbling block to reunion. In the West, however, from the time of Augustine the harshness of this doctrine was modified, "at some cost to logic." The validity of Orders was made to consist in the use of due form and matter by any validly ordained bishop, whether or not he was still in communion with, and still authorised by, the whole Church. This opened the door to schism within the Church itself, "inasmuch as those schismatic bodies which possessed valid sacraments could not be *completely* excluded."

We must pass over any discussion of this position. We might ask : What is the due form in Orders ? Is it correct to say, as we believe, that it is not a Sacrament ? And what is the matter ? The *traditio instrumentorum* is too late to be a vital part of ordination and in the Anglican Communion we do not use this ceremony. However the theory which emerges from Dr. Quick's able discussion may be briefly summarised as follows : In ordination the candidate receives both power from God and authority from the Church. Since the Church is at present in a state of schism all such authorisation is defective ; consequently all orders are defective in this respect. This is the basis of the proposed Concordat and there are many in America and England who believe that this theory may well point the way to the ultimate solution of the difficult problem of Orders. The theory, however, is not without its difficulties. It may be understood in such a way as to suggest that the ministry of the Episcopalian and Presbyterian Churches are merely local or denominational ministries. This is denied by both Churches. The Presbyterian Department of Church Cooperation and Union (*Syllabus*, p. 35) declares roundly : "We find these proposals at variance with the doctrinal teachings regarding the nature of the Church as contained in the Westminster Confession of Faith and in other sections of our Constitution. We believe in the 'holy Catholic Church' as set forth in The Apostles' Creed. We believe that the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America is an organic part of the holy Catholic Church. When we ordain men, we ordain them not as Presbyterian ministers, but as ministers of the said holy Catholic Church."

This claim, on the other hand, does puzzle many Episcopalians who have been brought up to believe some form of Apostolical Succession. They cannot see how a ministry which was newly set up in the sixteenth century can be regarded as a ministry of the whole Church. Even if they were to admit Bishop Lightfoot's finding that the original ordaining authority was the presbytery they would feel that between the second and sixteenth centuries the Church was guided to restrict the power to ordain to the bishops.

Free churchmen would point out that the troubles which produced the Presbyterian Churches arose when Episcopacy degenerated into Prelacy, and when the bishops ceased to be

Overseers and Pastors and became "Blind mouths." They would add that the so-called Apostolical Succession could not of itself guarantee rightness of conduct on the part of the presbyter-bishops. Christ appointed St. Peter one of the Twelve, but that did not guarantee either the truth of his teaching or the rightness of his conduct, when Paul withstood him to the face at Antioch! As Dr. C. A. Simpson points out in the *Anglican Theological Review* (October, 1940): "Sacerdotalism of the worst type was rampant so that it was popularly held that a man for his eternal salvation was dependent upon the capricious goodwill of a priesthood more concerned with its own prestige than with the well-being of those committed to its charge." Again he writes: "The abuses and superstitions which had popularly reduced the Mass to a form of magic, and had, in the minds of the people, practically vested the priest with the supposed powers of a magician, had resulted in an idea of the priesthood as a caste standing between God and the laity, and preventing the free access of the individual to his Creator. This conception of the ministry the reformers were concerned to break down. Hence their insistence upon the priesthood of the laity, upon the representative character of the ministry, upon what was common to minister and layman alike. Hence the vital part taken by the laity in the government, both spiritual and temporal, of the Presbyterian Church."

The Concordat, then, presupposes the partial invalidity of all orders. Dr. George Stewart of Stamford, Conn., an able Presbyterian, admits that the basic difference between the two Churches "is not a conflict on major doctrinal matters. We are rather legatees of a historical dispute, centuries old, as to exactly what happened in the first century and a half of the Christian era. This dispute has issued in a drawn battle. Those who assert that there was a complete system of church administration drawn up from the beginning including bishops, priests and deacons cannot be conclusively refuted. In like manner those who assert that in the first century and a half church affairs were largely in a fluid and experimental stage, that the terms deacon, presbyter, and bishop were used interchangeably in a loose manner cannot be conclusively denied their position." He quotes Bishop Lightfoot's well-known words that "the episcopate was formed not out of the Apostolic office by

localization but out of the presbyterial by elevation, and the title, which originally was common to all, came at length to be appropriated to the chief among them." He declares further that neither Presbyterians nor Episcopalians know for certain the early administration of the primitive Church and adds the arresting observation: "In a profound spiritual sense, the successor of the Apostles is the New Testament itself. . . . The ministry is in the Apostolic succession, but it is always the ministry plus the Bible, the ministry of the Word which is the major channel of spiritual grace."

We feel with regard to our own country that the whole future of the Church of England after the war might be altered for the Christian good of England if Anglican Evangelicals and Free Church people would act courageously in the spirit of the straightforward words of the late King George V., quoted by the Bishop of Gloucester in *The Doctrine of the Church and Christian Reunion*. He said: "Wholeheartedly I join in your expression of thankfulness for that spirit of union which has animated us through years of common effort and common sacrifice. I trust that some spirit may remain with us *to strengthen our hands for the work of peace* and to soften the remembrance of old differences. May we see its fruits in the brotherly co-operation of all in the service of the commonwealth and in the closer ties of all religious bodies."

Dr. Headlam's book, from which we have just quoted, was published in 1920 by John Murray. At the end of his second lecture—he is giving the Bampton Lectures—he declares that not one of the rival systems of Church policy which prevail at the present day can find any direct support in the New Testament. There is no Biblical Authority for Episcopacy. The government of the Church is not Presbyterian. Each local church derived its life and authority from the Universal Church, therefore it was not Congregationalism. There is no support for Romanism and there is no evidence that the Apostles ever gave any directions about the future government of the Church. On page 128, writing of one of the crucial differences between ourselves and Anglican Catholics, he remarks: "I have, I think, read everything from the Fathers which is quoted in favour of Apostolical Succession, and I do not know any passage which speaks of succession by ordination in this sense." Again he

writes lower down: "There is no hint of transmission. The spiritual gifts come as a direct gift of God in answer to the prayers of the Church." It is the insistence by Anglican and American Catholics upon Apostolical Succession which is the real crux of the whole situation. The late Bishop Charles Gore in *The Church and the Ministry* did much to promote this view in the Church of England. His position is expounded on page 94 of his book as follows: "The individual life can receive this fellowship with God only through membership in the one body and by dependence upon social sacraments of regeneration, of confirmation, of communion, of absolution—of which ordained ministers are the appointed instruments." With this may be contrasted the Presbyterian point of view as set forth by Dr. Henry Sloane Coffin in an excellent article in *THE CHURCHMAN* (of America), June 1st, 1940, pp. 12f. Writing with special reference to the suggested Concordat he declares: "We insist on ordination by the laying on of hands of at least three presbyter bishops. . . . We have, therefore, a succession through the continuous action of the Church by her accredited leaders; but we think more of God's continuing gifts of ministers, whom He appoints, age after age. His living presence in and provision for His Church is the all-important succession." The stress is here on the charismatic element at the expense of the institutional, on the prophetic rather than the priestly, on God's Grace as directly mediated from above rather than on His Grace mechanically passed on from below. Bishop Gore wrote on p. 65 of his book (*op. cit.*) of "once for all given grace." But where is there the slightest evidence of this? "Once for all given faith" is scriptural, but where is the other idea thus expressed in Christianity? As Dean Lefroy wrote in *The Christian Ministry*: "The finality of revelation is an incentive to fidelity, a preservative against imposture, and an aid to certainty of conviction. The finality of grace is either a declaration that God Almighty has done with His Church, or, the grace being conserved as the revelation has been, that He has entrusted it to the keeping of another "depositorium dives." . . . Must we sue, on bended knee, to those who claim possession of the treasury of Heaven's grace 'once for all given'?" Does the late Bishop Gore state the mind of the Church of England when he writes: "The various Presbyterian and Congregationalist

organizations, however venerable on many and different grounds, have, in dispensing with the episcopal succession, violated a fundamental law of the Church's life"? The fact is that the Church of England is silent on this doctrine in her official formularies and her creeds and articles. This was noticed long ago by Cardinal Newman. He referred to it in his letter to "My dear Father Coleridge," dated August 5th, 1868. He says: "Apostolical succession, its necessity and its grace is not an Anglican tradition, though it is a tradition found in the Anglican Church. By contrast, our Lord's Divinity is an Anglican tradition, every one, high and low, holds it. It is not only in Prayer Book and Catechism, but it is in the mouths of all professors of Anglicanism. . . . Not such is the apostolical succession, and, considering the Church is the *columna et firmamentum veritatis*, and is ever bound to stir up the gift that is in her, there is surely a strong presumption that the Anglican body has not what it does not profess to have."

On the other hand seventeenth century Presbyterian scholars tried to work out a definite doctrine of Apostolic Succession for presbyters to which Lord Balfour of Burleigh in 1911 attached the term *perpetua successio presbyterorum*. In his able article in the *Anglican Theological Review* (October, 1940) Dr. George Stewart points out that the early Presbyterian Church in Scotland repudiated Apostolic Succession and he finds a more cogent argument for the validity of Presbyterian Orders, and for the assertion that they lie in the direct continual stewardship of the ministry in the words of St. Thomas Aquinas, *Cuius potentia sacramentis visibilibus non alligatur*. God is not bound. "There is a huge company of men and women of every age and clime who were never ordained by any church body, who nevertheless, have been united by what St. Thomas Aquinas called 'an interior act of God,' and who were God's true ministers and channels of His Grace. *Deus non alligatur!*" The Lambeth Conferences of 1920 and 1930 recognize this undoubted fact in Christian history. "We do not call in question the spiritual reality of the ministries now exercised in the non-episcopal communions. . . . These ministries have been manifestly blessed and owned by the Holy Spirit as effective means of grace."

After all, our Master's test is still applicable: "By their

fruits ye shall know them." An American negro, Cal Clay by name, was one day asked by a missionary to what denomination he belonged. The old fellow replied, "Bress ye, sah, dah's fo' roads leadin' from hyah ter town—de long road, de hill road, de sho' road, and de swamp road—but when Ah goes ter town wid er load er grain dey don't say ter me, "Uncle Calhoun which road did yo' come in by?" but "Cal, is yo' wheat good?"

At the present moment, however, this kind of test has little chance of being applied in America, and it seems probable that the Concordat will break down where the discussions held after the 1920 Lambeth Conference collapsed. After the Appeal to all Christian People which acknowledged "all those who believe in our Lord Jesus Christ and have been baptised into the Name of the Holy Trinity, as sharing with us membership in the Universal Church of Christ which is His Body," the Anglicans felt that they must insist on a fresh ordination for Free Church Ministers or possibly a new commission with laying on of hands by a Bishop. The Free Church leaders could not agree to this, because they felt that it would imply that something was lacking in their Orders; that their present ministries are not valid and that the Sacraments administered by them are deficient.

At the last Lambeth Conference in 1930 the Bishops declared: "The vision which rises before us is that of a Church, genuinely Catholic, loyal to all Truth, and gathering into its Fellowship all 'who profess and call themselves Christians,' within whose visible unity all the treasures of faith and order, bequeathed as a heritage by the past to the present shall be preserved in common and made serviceable to the whole Body of Christ. Within this unity Christian communions now separated from one another would retain much that has long been distinctive in their worship and service. It is through a rich diversity of life and devotion that the unity of the whole fellowship will be fulfilled." This seems to pave the way for what might be called: "The United States of the Church." In 1938 the Student Christian Movement published the *Outline of a Reunion Scheme for the Church of England and the Evangelical Free Churches of England*. This has been welcomed by the Evangelical and Moderate men in the Church of England but not by the Anglo-Catholics and the chief difficulty seems to be this: "Is

Episcopacy of the *Esse* or *Bene Esse* of the Church?" This is the crucial difficulty but it is not the only one! Let me prove this by quoting a personal experience. In one of my parishes I was on good terms with the local Wesleyan Church. They invited me to address their men's service. When the day dawned I was ill with influenza, and, at very short notice a substitute was obtained from a neighbouring parish who was a newly ordained Anglican curate. He began by saying: "This is the first time I have been in a Nonconformist place of worship—much against my will!" He then attacked the Salvation Army, spoke of the value and beauty of incense and concluded by denouncing the sin of John Wesley in leaving the Church of England! Father, forgive us, for we know not what we do.

THE KINGDOM OF GOD

By C. A. Alington, D.D. (*The Centenary Press*). 3s. 6d.

This present study, included in "The Christian Challenge Series," deals with an ever-present subject in the Christian Scheme. The Dean of Durham is thought-provoking throughout, and whilst he carries the reader away with him as he deals with the central part of his theme, many will probably lay down the book with a measure of disappointment. The Dean is aware that his emphasis on the present aspect of the Kingdom will lay him open to criticism; but it is not on that account that disappointment will be experienced, for he has made his readers indebted to him for his clear exposition of that point of view. Moreover, his exposition gives a balance to the view of the Kingdom, particularly in these days of war, when the future view might easily gain over-emphasis. Again, the Dean refuses to confuse the Church and the Kingdom, for he is aware that much harm has been done by such confused teaching: "It is the kingdom which the Church exists to proclaim" (p. 112). His emphasis on the Gospel as Good News is timely, for one wonders where is the Good News in much of the contemporary preaching in one section of our Church. The comparison which is made between the attitude of St. Augustine and William Law toward the Kingdom is most helpful, and these chapters will be appreciated by all who read the book with the care which is its due.

The chapter on "The Christian attitude towards sin" is disappointing. The Bible has stronger words for sin than "hamartia," the only word for sin considered in this chapter. God's remedy for sin in the Atonement is not even outlined. Although no one can charge the Dean with holding a light view of sin, one could have expected some exposition of sin in its aspect of transgression or rebellion against God. Apart from this aspect, the book is most admirable, as is to be expected from the pen of one who is able to add to scholarship a wide knowledge of men and affairs.

E. H.

The Holy Communion in the Early Church

EARLY LETTERS AND TRACTS.

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

IGNATIUS OF ANTIOCH.

THIS Bishop of Antioch on his way to martyrdom wrote seven letters, the genuineness of which has been established by Zahn and Lightfoot. He sent these from Smyrna and Troas. As he suffered under Trajan, he cannot have perished later than 117 A.D., probably in 115 A.D.

The Lord's Supper holds a central position in his letters, and it is described in various ways. In his letter to the Ephesians (20) he speaks of "*breaking one Loaf*" (*hena arton klontes*) in connection with this service. Here we have, as in the *Didache*, the "*breaking of the Loaf*" (*he Klasis tou artou*) of Acts ii. 42. The word *Eucharist* is still used in the general sense of thanksgiving. See Ephesians 13. "Be eager to assemble more frequently for God's *thanksgiving* and for praise." The expression here "*eucharist of God*," from the order of the Greek words appears to mean the general service of thanksgiving to God. There may be an indirect allusion to the Holy Communion, as Lightfoot said. But the emphasis is on the gathering together, "for when you frequently meet together the powers of Satan are destroyed."

The Ephesians are simply directed here to have more church services, which, doubtless, would include the Communion, but not necessarily (see 1 Cor. xi. 18). In Phil. iv. the word is used of the Communion. "Be earnest in your use of *the one Eucharist*, for there is one flesh of our Lord Jesus Christ, *and one cup of His Blood* unto (our) unity." (*hen poterion eis henosin tou haimatos autou*). It is also called "*Eucharist*" in Smyrnaeans (vii). "These passages in Ignatius are the earliest instances of *Eucharistia* applied to

the Holy Communion, except perhaps the "*Teaching of the Apostles*, 9," is Lightfoot's comment. We shall say more about this when dealing with Justin Martyr's references, Apol. i. 64, 65.¹

In this passage Ignatius rebukes the Philadelphians for their divisions and the act of separating from the Bishop, the Presbytery and Deacons. That is why he spoke of "One Eucharist," to mark their unity. In that undeveloped stage of Church life every small district had its own clergy. There seems to have been no common church life, no such officer as a Diocesan Bishop. The Bishop in these epistles is simply like the Rector of a parish. Furthermore, the Communion is apparently not yet separated from the Love Feast or *Agape*. In Smyrnaeans viii, he writes, "it is not permitted to baptise or to make a Love Feast (*agapen poiein*) without the Bishop."²

Here the reference appears to be to the Communion as the other sacrament is mentioned, at least the Communion must be here included in what is known as the *Agape* or Love Feast already discussed. It is possible that Ignatius wished the *Agape* to be kept more under the control of some central authority. The Deacons, he says in Trallians (21) are not "Deacons of meats and drinks" (used at the *Agape*) but of the Church of God." His use of the expression "to make an *Agape*" is not consistent with any sacrificial notion, as is seen by the attempt to render it "sacrifice an *Agape*"! but implies that it was a feast of fellowship. In Smyrnaeans 7, Zahn with Pearson translates in a strained manner, "It were expedient for them to hold a Love Feast (*agapan*)," but the verb to love (*agapan*) here seems to govern an object understood from the previous sentence, viz. "the gift of God," or, as Lightfoot renders, "to have love."³ In a number of passages Ignatius interprets the Communion spiritually after John vi. 27: "Work not for the food that perisheth," e.g., Romans 7, "I rejoice not in the food of corruption, nor in the pleasures of this life, but I want the loaf of God which is the Flesh of Jesus Christ, Who is of the

¹ Cf. Irenaeus iv. 18, 5. Clement Alex. *Paed* 11, 2. Origen c. *Celsum* viii. 57.

² Cf. Tertullian (*de virg. vel.* 9). It is not permitted to a woman to speak in the church, nor to baptise nor to offer (*nec tinguere nec offerre*).

³ "To be content" or "to acquiesce," are weak findings.

seed of David, and I want as drink His Blood which is love incorruptible."¹ Here we have John vi. 33, "the Loaf of God," and the mystical potency and sense given in vi. 54, to the "flesh and the blood" of Christ, while to guard the statement from all carnal associations, he defines that "Blood" as "love incorruptible" (that never perishes). The same view is expressed in Trallians (viii). "Recover yourselves in *faith, which is the flesh of the Lord, and in love which is the Blood of Jesus Christ.*" Here again we have the spiritual teaching of John vi. 54, while at the same time the humanity of Christ is asserted against the Docetics. The following passages are evidence of the spiritual view Ignatius held of the Communion. (1) "Faith and love are everything, to which nothing is preferred." (Smyrnaeans vi). This combination is also in Ephesians xiv. "Faith and love which is the beginning and end of life. Faith is the beginning, but love is the end. The two in unity are God." Again he says "*The blood of Jesus Christ which is joy eternal and abiding.*" (Philadelphians, Inscr.). (2) "If one be not within the precincts of the Altar he is deprived of the *Bread of God*" (Eph. v), meaning that if one absents himself from the Church service he is without the *Bread of God*. This is a spiritual term for the Communion. (3) "*Breaking one loaf, which is a medicine of immortality, an antidote to death, that we may live in Jesus Christ continually.*" (Eph. 20).

Lightfoot remarks: "The reference will be to the *Agape*, more especially to the eucharistic Bread, in which the *Agape* culminated and which was the chief bond of Christian union." He refers us back to Acts ii. 46, xx. 7, II, I Cor. x. 16, "where it occurs as a synonym for celebrating the eucharistic feast, apparently in all cases in conjunction with the *Agape*." Accordingly, we have two primitive titles of the Communion, "the breaking of the loaf" and "the loaf of God" in Ignatius. And in *Smyrnaeans* vii. the Eucharist or thanksgiving is mentioned along with prayer. "They abstain from eucharist and prayer."

Against these spiritual interpretations of the Communion based on John vi. is to be set *Smyrnaeans* vii. Here the heretics or schismatics are described. "They abstain from eucharist (thanksgiving) and prayer, because they do not allow the Eucharist to be the *Flesh of Our Saviour Jesus*

¹ *agape aphihartos.*

Christ which suffered for sins, and which the Father by His goodness raised again, and they speak against the gift of God." At first sight this seems to be a material explanation of the sacrament. But circumstances alter cases. Ignatius is here contending against Docetics who denied all reality to the man Christ Jesus, and regarded His person and flesh as phantasmal or imaginary. In this very letter (C. 6) he had just said, "If the Angels do not believe in the blood of Christ they too shall be judged. The whole matter is faith and love."¹ The meaning here is that those who deny the reality of the humanity or flesh of Christ have no right to share in the Eucharist, because it implies that Christ had a real not a sham body, and do not share in it, and that the service they hold is not a valid Eucharist, because it is without the sanction of the Bishop, and because they do not assemble at the "one Altar"—the Lord Jesus Christ (*Magn.* vii.). He does not identify the Bread with the Body of Christ or the Wine with the Blood, but his controversy compelled him to lay stress upon the "flesh" and "passion," and to assert that our Lord was really man and really suffered, when speaking of the Eucharist, which (we hold) was instituted for the "continual remembrance of the Sacrifice of the Death of Christ," in other words of His Cross and Passion. For if there is no real passion, only a phantasmal one, and no real body, only a semblance, it would follow of logical necessity that there would be no Sacrament at all. As Lightfoot says, "The Eucharist implies the reality of Christ's Flesh. To those who deny this reality it has no meaning at all, to them Christ's words of institution are false. It is in no sense the flesh of Christ." As Tertullian said, "the words 'This is My Body' meant this is 'the figure' of my Body, but if there is no Body, there is no 'figure,' i.e., no semblance when there is nothing to be a semblance of (*Adv. Marc.* iv. 40.).

One must also take into account the condensed style of Ignatius, who called the Ephesians "the Martyrs' passage (*parodos*) to God" (C. xii.) because men on their way to martyrdom had to pass through their city. The context means that those who deny that there is any representation or symbol of the flesh of Christ in the Eucharist do not partake of it. The spiritual benefits that come through Christ

¹ See Trall. 8, "the bread is faith, the wine is love."

are so deeply connected with the reality of His Passion—His Flesh that suffered for us—that those who deny the latter, i.e., that the Flesh of Christ suffered for us, cannot obtain the former. Here “the flesh which suffered for us” stands for the Christ Who suffered in human nature for us, by the figure of speech called *Synecdoche*, putting the part for the whole, as “keel” (*carina*) in Latin stands for “ship,” and “roof” (*tectum*) means “house.” Otherwise, of course, it would be an incorrect expression, as it would violate the hypostatic unity of Christ. Similarly, in his controversy with the same Docetics he said: “Taking refuge in the Gospel as in the Flesh of Jesus” (Phil. 5), that is, as containing a true account of the life of Jesus, and therefore truly representative of the humanity of Jesus, just as the Eucharist is. Accordingly, we would have a parallel to the statement, “the Eucharist is the Flesh of Christ” in the other, “the Gospel is the Flesh of Christ” (Phil. 5.), and we must therefore equate the Eucharist with the Gospel if we must be literal! But his poetical and metaphorical style is against this, e.g., he says “the new leaven which is Jesus Christ” (Mag. x.), and he calls his guards “leopards.” The spiritual meaning of the Lord’s gift, and the real sacrifice of His Life are brought out in John vi. 51—“The Bread which I shall give is my flesh for the life of the world.” There would have been no real gift, if there had not been at one time real flesh. But this the Docetics denied in the days of Ignatius, and still earlier.

Again, union with Christ is the text of Ignatius. The Eucharist is the means of such union (see Phil. 4. “*one cup of His Blood unto (our) unity*”) but without “faith which is the flesh of the Lord and without love which is the Blood of Jesus Christ” (Trall. viii.), there is no union with Christ. So he brings us back to the ethical and the spiritual. How remote the mind of Ignatius was from material things is shown by his description of the “Blood” of Christ as “love incorruptible” (Rom. vii.). This spiritual explanation of the Flesh and Blood as Faith and Love is against any materialistic interpretation of the sacrament. The two parts of the sacrament, the “Flesh” or matter, and the “Spirit” were kept distinct by Ignatius, who uses this antithesis frequently. St. Paul’s words in 1 Cor. x. 16, “the Bread which we break is it not a communion of the Body of Christ?”

proves that the position of the Docetics of a later day who denied the reality of the Body of Christ, was actually antagonistic to the principle of the Lord's Supper as a means of communion with the Divinely exalted humanity of Christ. And so, logically, Ignatius denounced the Eucharist, which the Gnostic sects held, as invalid, seeing that it was unauthorised, and their theory of Christ's humanity was unsound.

In conclusion, his use of the term "within the altar"¹ (*thusiasterion*) must be noticed. It occurs in Eph. v. (and Trall. vii.), unless one is "within the altar." The expression is based upon the arrangement of the Jewish temple and tabernacle, and is suggestive of the Court of the Congregation where the altar stood, but obviously has no reference to the holy Table, as one cannot be "within a table." Unlike the classical word for altar (*bomos*) which means a stand, a raised place, it signified "the place of sacrifice." This meaning "is supported by examples of its use as applied to the Christian Churches" (Lightfoot). The words in Phil. iv., "One Eucharist, one flesh of the Lord, one cup (for our unification) of His blood, *one altar*, as there is one bishop" emphasise the unity of the Church. Those in Magnesians vii., "hasten together, as it were to one temple, even God, and as it were to *one altar, to one Jesus Christ*," gives a spiritual sense to the expression.

Polycarp in his letter to the Philippians (4) described the "widows, a portion of the Church, as an 'altar (*thusiasterion*) of God.'" Chrysostom, on the same principle, described the Church as a "living altar" (*thusiasterion empsychon*), and Clement of Alexandria (*Strom.* vii. 6, 848) said "our earthly *altar* is the assembly of those who are devoted to the prayers, having as it were one common "voice and mind." The argument is that because the Church is an altar of God her prayers are sacrifices, her good actions are oblations. And the Church is an altar because the people who form it should be ideally so many altars on which their living sacrifices are offered (*Romans* xii.). The idea is a logical development of St. Paul's thought, and is inconsistent with material sacrifices. This oneness of worship and faith and organisation is the great text of Ignatius. It is stressed also in Pauline manner in Mag. 7, "one prayer, one supplication, one

¹ (*entos tou thusiasteriou.*)

mind, one hope, etc." Compare Ephesians iv. 2.ff, "One body, one Spirit, one hope, one Lord, one faith, one baptism, one God and Father." It is very clear then that he who does not stand "within the Altar," which is Christ, is deprived of the "Bread (loaf) of God," which is the grace of Christ (Eph. v.) or Christ Himself.

To sum up. Ignatius is not conscious of any change in the elements of Bread and Wine. The Lord's Supper is still connected with the *Agape* or Love Feast, which would be inconsistent with any such change, and he did not identify the bread and wine with the body and blood of Christ. He never speaks of consecration in this connection. The word "Eucharist" is not confined to the sacrament, being used in the general sense (so Lightfoot) of thanksgiving in Eph. xiii, "gather yourselves together for Eucharist of God and praise of God," although in Phil. iv. of the Communion. As "the Loaf of God" (Eph. v.) it is the symbol of unity, and as such is "the gift of God" (Smyrn. 7), and "the medicine of immortality" (Eph. 20). It is also the assurance of the reality of the humanity of Christ, denied by the Docetics, for otherwise the Bread and Wine would be symbols of shadows, things that never existed. But in a wider sense, faith is the flesh and love is the blood of Christ, and faith and love sustain the soul.

It is clear that Ignatius drew both his symbolical interpretation and his spiritual teaching of the Lord's Supper from John vi. Although he did not identify the consecrated bread and wine with the Body and Blood of Christ, he employed language in his perfervid zeal for the safeguarding of the reality of the Lord's humanity against the Docetic Gnostics which was used by theologians of a later age for the express purpose of this identification. We may, on the other hand, justly argue that Ignatius is the first to expound that dynamic symbolism which we claim is the sacramental teaching of the New Testament and the Early Church. At the same time we must acknowledge that he has supplied the realist school with terms, especially with his formula, "The Eucharist is the flesh of our Saviour Jesus Christ which flesh suffered for our sins" (Smyrn. 6) yet without any intention of doing so, as he was engaged in a different controversy. Roman writers, however, seize on this point and find a realist theory in him. J. Hoffmann (*Abendmahl*

p. 179) well sums up: "an identity of the elements with the flesh and blood of Christ must have been an impossibility to Ignatius, but he employs the terms "body and blood." Réville (*L'Eucharistie*, p. 36) says that he does not expressly declare that the bread is flesh, and that the cup contains the blood. He calls the Eucharist itself the flesh of Christ. He understood his language to be metaphorical. F. Loofs says it cannot be proved that he believed in an actual presence of the flesh and blood of Christ. A. Andersen maintained that the flesh and blood of Eucharist are not taught by him. Rückert finds nothing definite in him.¹ His perfervid mentality and controversy with the Docetus caused him to lay an unreal emphasis upon the Flesh of Christ, and yet he did not identify the sacred elements with the actual Body and Blood.

CLEMENT OF ROME.

There are some notes in the epistle of Clement which bear upon this service. They show us what the Church of Rome thought about it in the first century. Bishop Lightfoot dated this letter about 95 A.D., assigning the persecution it mentions to the reign of Domitian. Of the letter itself he wrote: "Very few writings of Christian or classical antiquity are so well authenticated as this letter." The following quotations have a relation to the subject, direct or indirect.

In chapter xviii: "A sacrifice to God is a contrite heart" (Ps. li, 17), and in chapter xxxv we have "the sacrifice of praise," and Christ the "high priest of our oblations." "A sacrifice of praise will glorify me, and there is a way by which I shall show to him the salvation of God" (Ps. l. 23). This is the way in which we found our salvation, Jesus Christ, "*the high priest of our offerings*" (*prophorai*) (ch. xxxvi.).

In chapter xl. we are told that the service is to be conducted as our Lord commanded, with care and in order: "We ought to do all things in order, all that the Master commanded us to perform at appointed times. The offerings (*prophorai*) and the services (*leitourgiae*), He ordered to be made with care, and not rashly or carelessly, but at stated times and seasons. He defined in His high purpose where and by whom He desires them to be performed, in order that

¹ See A. J. MacDonald, *Evangelical Doctrine of the Holy Communion*, p. 49

all things, being done holily in His good pleasure, may be acceptable to His will. Then those who make their *offerings* at the appointed occasions are both acceptable and blessed. They cannot err when following the Master's customs. For the high priest had his own services; the priests their own place, and the levites their own ministries." (This is not a list of Jewish but of Christian officials. The levites would correspond to deacons or any other subordinates).

Here he emphasises order. Everything is to be done seemly and in order, and especially in the Holy Communion. But that is quite compatible with extreme simplicity. There is to be no confusion. Each man knows his own place and observes it, so that everything is in accordance with the regular rule. He proceeds to say (C. xli): "Let each of you *give thanksgiving* to God in his own rank: without transgressing the appointed routine (canon) of service."

In this appeal for order and regularity Clement refers to the order and system of the Jews only as illustration, not to insist upon, or to indicate any correspondence between the Christian presbyters and the Jewish priests. For the Jewish priests did not recognise Christ (the high priest of *our* offerings), but in His day Annas and Caiaphas, worldly men, as their high priests. So the parallel or analogy fails in its most important point. Clement, indeed, used certain words of the Old Testament, but he found them in the New Testament in a new sense. And in that sense he used them, e.g., *offering* (*prosphora*) used by Paul three times, of alms or a collection (Acts xxiv, 17; Rom. xv. 16), of Christ's sacrifice of Himself (Eph. v. 2), and in Hebrews (five times); (2) *service* or *leitourgia* (of the fund for the poor Jews, 2 Cor. ix. 12, of faith, Phil. ii. 17, or financial help, Phil. ii. 30). Hebrews used this word of the priestly ministry of Christ (viii. 6, see ix. 21). But it is to be noted that both words were frequently employed in the Old Testament of priestly functions, but are used by St. Paul without any thought of *priestly* duty.

Clement also orders Christians to give thanks (*eucharistein*) to God. Here Lightfoot remarks (p. 130) "The allusion is here plainly to the public services of the Church where order had been violated." This *eucharistia* will refer chiefly, though not solely, to the principal act of Christian thanksgiving, the celebration of the Lord's Supper, which at a

later date was almost exclusively termed *eucharistia*. The usage of Clement is probably midway between that of St. Paul, where no such appropriation of the term appears (e.g., 1 Cor. xiv. 16 ; 2 Cor. ix. 11, 12 ; Phil. iv. 6 ; 1 Tim. xi. 1, etc.) and that of the Ignatian epistles, Phil. iv, Smyrn. vii, and of Justin, Apology i. 66, 97, *Dialogue* 41. 26, where it is so applied, but not exclusively.

No argument regarding Clement's views of the Christian Ministry can be founded upon the Jewish Ministry and its officials. It only served him as illustration.

The next question is, did Clement use the term "offerings" of the bread and wine of the Lord's Supper, or of our thanksgiving, alms, praise and offering of ourselves? The answer is to be found in our first quotation from chapter xviii, "a sacrifice of praise." This is the Christian Sacrifice, shown in thanksgiving, service and charity especially. Furthermore, he calls Christ, as the writer to the Hebrews does (ii. 7, iii. 1, iv. 15), the "High Priest of *our* offerings," and therefore he would not regard Him as being offered by us in that or any service. The High Priest always was offerer and was not offered. This is made still plainer in chapter xlv: "Our sins will be great if we cast out from the episcopate those presbyters who have blamelessly and holily *offered the gifts (dora)*." This and the previous passages in which sacrifice is mentioned, Lightfoot illustrated by Heb. xiii. 15, 16: "Through Him then (our high priest Jesus, iv. 11, 12) let us offer a sacrifice of praise . . . Benevolence and distribution forget not, for with such *sacrifices* God is well pleased." To that epistle Clement is largely indebted elsewhere. The sacrifices, offerings and gifts, therefore, are the prayers and thanksgiving, the alms, the material offerings, whether in Church or Agape. Clement does not mention bread or wine, body or blood, nor does he quote "This do, etc."

Lightfoot (p. 134) gives quotations of Clement from the *Apostolical Constitutions* ii. 25, 27, 34, 53, the last reading—"The prayer and thanksgiving (*eucharistia*) of each person is a gift (*doron*) to God." These passages show in what sense the presbyters might be said to "offer the gifts." They led the prayers and thanksgiving of the congregation; they presented the alms and contributions to God, and asked His blessing on them in the name of the whole body." Clement

is particular that all these things should be done at the right time, in the right way, and by the right person. On the first day of the week the collections were made (1 Cor. xvi. 2) and the presbyters received them. As to the procedure in the service we have it stated in Justin, *Apol.* i. 65, "The president having finished the prayers and the thanksgiving, the people say Amen." Dr. Pusey did not find any reference to the Real Presence in this epistle, which he does not notice.

Lightfoot does not find in this letter any parallel between the orders of the Jewish priesthood and the Christian. He holds that presbyter and bishop are synonymous terms in Clement. (They are distinguished some years later by Ignatius.) This fact alone shows the simplicity as well as regularity of the service in the days of Clement.

THE "TEACHING OF THE APOSTLES" (DIDACHE).

We now come to the "Teaching of the Apostles" (*Didaché*). As Clement of Alexandria¹ used this tract it would appear to be an early document. A well-known scholar² suggests a date before or about 100 A.D. The very primitive character of the Church life and organisation in which the episcopate is still undeveloped supports this view in some degree. In C. xv. an order is given about the election of bishops and deacons, the local officials of the Church as distinguished from the "apostles and prophets," C. x. the itinerating ministers. Dr. Gwatkin assigns it to a very early age of Church government before the rise of the monarchical episcopate. Bishop Lightfoot also regarded the terms Bishop and Presbyter as synonymous in the *Didache*. The passages on the "Eucharist," as it is called, are absolutely free from all material and pagan (hellenistic) associations and conceptions. In chapter ix. we have: "As regards the Eucharist (*eucharistia*) give thanks thus: First for the cup: 'We thank Thee, our Father, for the holy vine of Thy son David, which Thou didst make known to us through Jesus Thy Son. Thine is the glory for ever.' Then as regards the broken bread: 'We thank Thee, our Father, for the life and the knowledge which Thou didst make known to us through Jesus Thy Child. Thine be the glory for ever.' Then

¹ *Journal Theol. Studies*, July 23, 1922, by present writer.

² *Journal Theol. Studies*, April, 1921. V. Bartlett, D.D.

followed the prayer, "As this broken bread (*Klasma*, cf. Jn. 6. 12f.) was scattered upon the mountains, and when gathered together became one, so may thy Church be gathered together from the ends of the earth into thy kingdom, for thine is the glory and the power through Jesus Christ for ever." After this the baptised ate and drank, and after they "*had been satisfied*" (*meta to emplesthenai*) there was another thanksgiving and supplication.

This expression "had been satisfied" cannot refer to the Eucharist, but shows that the *Agape* or Love Feast was combined with it, as in 1 Cor. x and xi., just as the *kiddush* (the Sanctification) preceded the Passover feast.¹ The thanksgivings here resemble the *Eulogiae* or Blessings of the Passover, in which thanks are given for the fruits of the earth. The thanksgiving "after they had been satisfied" is as follows: "We give thanks, Holy Father, for Thy holy name, which Thou hast caused to dwell in our hearts; for knowledge, faith and immortality, which Thou didst make known to us through Jesus Thy Child. To Thee be glory for ever. It is Thou, Almighty Master, who didst create all things for the glory of Thy name, and didst give to men food and drink to enjoy in order that they might render thanks to Thee, but didst graciously give to us *spiritual food* and drink, and eternal life through Thy Son."

We shall find this spiritual food (*pneumatike trophe*) again in Athanasius. The *Didache* is so far from dwelling on carnal feeding and drinking that it looks beyond such, as Sanday well said,² to "the spiritual food and drink," and to the eternal life bestowed through the Son. And when it speaks of the "Holy vine of David," there is at least an allusion to the Jewish doctrine of the Messiah, if not directly to the "Johannean allegory of the Vine." There is a quaint allusion to the sources of both wine and bread; the Vine which was a symbol of the Vine of David, the Messiah, and the seed

¹ Hastings H.D.B. ii. 637.

² Lightfoot's view of these passages is that the *Agape* and the Eucharist are here combined, the *Agape* coming first, as in the Lord's Supper, and in 1 Cor. xi. Ermoni sees the whole reference to the *Agape*, Batiffol to the Lord's Supper. Others to both. Mr. Box believes that certain words fell out. But this is not obvious. Another expression for the *Agape* is in this tract, e.g. xi. 9. "A prophet who by the spirit appoints a *table* (*trapeza*) shall not eat of it." In Igratius the Communion and the *Agape* are combined. In Tertullian we have the Love Feast by itself (*Apol.* c. 39).

scattered upon the hills which was gathered together into bread, a symbol of the gathering together of the Church. The thanksgiving is altogether symbolical, and, instead of dwelling on any change in the elements in the service, discusses the process by which the grape and the seed corn became changed into the wine and bread, and concludes by calling them "spiritual food and drink."

Furthermore, we find here directions for Sunday worship. In C. 14, "Coming together on the Lord's day, break a loaf, and give thanks, after confessing your sins that your *sacrifice* (thusia) may be pure." Here the *sacrifice* is the "living sacrifice" (Romans xii) or offering of the bodies of the worshippers, their "spiritual service." No one who has any dispute with his brother shall come to it "lest your sacrifice be polluted." This would be absolutely inconsistent with the offering of Christ *upon the altar* by priestly consecration, or as a repetition of Christ's sacrifice on Calvary, for such could not be defiled by the presence of people who were not friendly with one another. Whereas, want of harmony among themselves would spoil their own offering of themselves to God.

In C. xv. he used the expression "for they (the bishops, presbyters, and deacons) *perform the service*" of the prophets and teachers, which is used of the work of the Levite priests in the Old Testament¹ and in Hebrews x. 11; but always in the applied sense of the sacrifice of almsgiving and faith by St. Paul.² The writer of this tract in connection with the "Pure Sacrifice" quotes Malachi i. 11, which, in the original Hebrew, referred to the *Minchah* or meal offering. It was from that passage that the notion of presenting the bread and wine as an oblation was taken. But the emphasis is laid by this writer on *pure* which, of course, being an ethical quality cannot be an attribute of matter. And so one cannot press the connection of the Sacrament with the meal offering, which was partly burnt and partly eaten by priests, and did not include wine, but oil and frankincense (Lev. ii. 2) and was the concomitant of animal sacrifices (Num. xv. 4). Accordingly, the "sacrifice" of Malachi i. 11 is in no sense a prototype of the Bread and Wine of the communion, there being a special wine offering, which was also used of other

¹ Num. viii. 22. (*leitourgein leitourgian*, "liturgise the liturgy.")

² 2 Cor. ix. 12; Phil. ii. 17, 30; Rom. 15. 27.

sacrifices, but was poured out as a libation. Through ignorance of this Hebrew ritual and language, some of the early Greek Fathers saw in the communion service a presentation of the first fruits to God. And this idea was helped forward by their understanding "pure" sacrifice to be one "unbloody," not animal. The "pure sacrifice," however, if understood in the New Testament sense, is the offering not of a ceremonially clean sacrifice, but of a pure conscience, a pure heart, of which nothing can take the place, and than which nothing less is demanded.

This writer's terms "break a loaf" (*Klasate artou*) C. 14, and the broken loaf (*Klasma*) C. 9 are connected with the early expression for the communion, "the breaking of the Loaf" (*Klasis tou artou*) Acts ii. 42, 46, and incidentally confirm the early date of this document by the semi-domestic character of the Eucharistic meal. The order in C. xi. 9, "The *Prophet* who appoints a *table* (*trapeza*) shall not eat of it" is absolutely inconsistent with any priestly work, even if it refers here to the *Agape* which was followed in those days by the communion. Moreover, prophets were allowed to make as many thanksgivings as they desired (C.x. *eucharistein hosa thelousi*), which refers to prayer meetings, not to the Holy Communion. The *Didache* seems to indicate a fellowship meal of thanksgiving. It does not mention wine, nor the words of institution. In it man does not offer gifts to God, but thanksgiving for gifts received. Some writers, Nock and Andersen, deny that there is any reference to the Eucharist in this tract. Others, Rauschen (R.C.), F. Loofs, Goguel and Réville (Protestants)¹ deny there is any trace of the Real Presence in it. Dr. Pusey, in his work on that subject, passes over it in silence. The meal had a religious character. Only the baptised could partake of it, and no one who had a dispute with his neighbours was permitted to do so, until reconciled. It is more of the nature of a holy communion of the baptised than of a sacrament of the Body and Blood of Christ. The cup symbolises the fulfilment of prophecy in the line of David, the bread broken symbolises, not the broken Body of Christ, but the life and knowledge imparted by Him, and the unity of the Church.

¹ See *Evangelical Doctrine of Holy Communion*, A. J. Macdonald, p. 43, for references.

Christianity and Education: A Call to Churchmen

BY A. F. WALLIS.

THE Bishop of Rochester has stated that since 1918 we have, as a nation, failed to cultivate our spiritual resources or transmit them to our children, and that we have been content to rely upon religious experiences of the past. It is a fair criticism. The causes are varied, but one in particular can be laid at the door of our Educational system for which public opinion cannot escape its own share of the responsibility. No apologist for the present methods employed in our Junior and Senior State Schools could maintain that the religious training of the young receives attention commensurate with that given to mental development. It is also true to add that the public generally is indifferent, being, on the whole, well satisfied with the material benefits accruing from Education. So long as a boy or girl is equipped with a stock of knowledge sufficient to make a material success of life, without regard to moral and spiritual issues, the general attitude is to leave such matters for organized Christianity to deal with, although the Churches receive scant support from the majority who shirk their individual obligations. Most parents desire that their children should become good citizens, forgetting that one of the most important foundations is Religion. Neither has the body of Church opinion been fully alive to the seriousness of the situation, with the result that there has grown up in this generation a vast army of young men and women who care little, if anything at all, for the things of God and His Laws.

Can we, therefore, as Churchmen view with equanimity the type of public opinion which the next generation may produce, if it is not founded upon a more Christian basis? The existing world situation gives proof of the folly in believing that Education alone can shed much light upon its

intricate problems. Whilst it has made great strides in mental training and in specialization, there is an appalling lack of knowledge as to how personalities can be trained to live as Living Souls. Honest and upright citizens are not produced on the application of mass production principles because it is impossible to mechanize human beings which God has made in His own image, and the sooner the experts in the educational realm realise this, so much the better for everybody.

The cure, of course, is in the hands of the people of England, but it is the duty of professing Christians to show them how that cure can be effected. Applied Christianity to every department of human relationships is the cure. We have heard that said many times already, but all too often it is overlooked that Christianity is authenticated by the Holy Scriptures, wherein we learn that their main theme has less to do with maintenance of institutional religion than with the revelation of "God in Christ reconciling the world unto Himself." It is, therefore, the next logical step in our reasoning to say that any satisfactory system of national education must include Bible teaching in such a manner, and with such thoroughness, as will leave an indelible mark upon the children whose privilege and obligation it will be to determine British policy in domestic or international affairs of the future. "Government of the People, by the People, for the People" are merely high-sounding empty words unless democracy rests upon Christian truths. Neither is it stretching a point to suggest that as the machinery of government will increase in proportion to the growing magnitude of the demands of the masses, just so do we expose ourselves to the danger of having to choose a Dictatorship in preference to a godless Democracy.

It is high time that members of the Church of England should appropriate their special privileges and mobilise their existing machinery whereby this question of a more intensive Religious Education in the schools may be brought within the realm of reasonable politics. Public opinion and the ruling authorities must be aroused to the danger of the future spiritual life of Britain standing in jeopardy, and that the failure to put it right is to court the disaster of succumbing to those very forces we are now out to eliminate. We Churchmen can make full use of the Parochial Church

Councils, and it ought not to be impossible to utilise them as channels whereby the Church Assembly be called upon to bring the matter before the Board of Education or, if necessary, Parliament itself. Because the question is a national one, the fullest possible co-operation of Nonconformity should be assured by seeking for a similar move from the National Free Church Council. Here lies a grand opportunity for the united voice of Protestantism to be heard upon a matter affecting the inner life of the people and one which touches every individual. Only let us avoid unnecessary controversy by clearly stating that in using the term Religious Education we mean the reading and understanding of the Old and New Testament Scriptures, leaving denominational teaching to the individual Churches themselves.

It is urged that early action be taken. To leave the matter over until the end of the War is to let the opportunity slip away. Statesmen will be too pre-occupied with other affairs, and moreover, at the moment the subject of reconstruction is in the air. There is nothing like striking whilst the iron is hot and when men are in a questioning mood. Let us, therefore, arise and be doing, never failing to remember the promise in Daniel xi. 32, "the people who know their God shall be strong, and do exploits."

Since the above lines were penned the Archbishops' Statement, entitled "Christian Education" has appeared in *The Times* for February 13th. Whilst the Statement is of a general character it nevertheless makes reference to an "Agreed Syllabus" of Religious Teaching drawn up by representatives of Christian Communities, the Teachers and Local Education Authorities. According to the *Surrey County Herald*, the Education Committee of that County has already approved a syllabus for use in Church and Council Schools in Surrey, intended for all children between the ages of 3 and 15, and provides for *daily* instruction in every school by teachers willing to give it, whilst those who are unwilling can be relieved of the obligation. This particular syllabus has the approval of the Bishops of Guildford and Southwark.

It is to be hoped that other counties have acted in a similar manner, but if not, Church members would be doing a national service in ventilating the matter through their Parochial Councils. The writer has not seen details of the

“Agreed Syllabus” appertaining to Surrey, but judging from recent utterances, Evangelicals would do well to be on the alert lest a Christian Education be turned into a medium whereby doctrines and practices alien to our Reformed Church of England are presented to the future generation as the proper interpretation of Christianity.

THE ACTIVITY OF GOD

By A. A. David, D.D., Bishop of Liverpool. 3s. 6d. net.

In this volume of the Christian Challenge Series the Bishop of Liverpool essays to meet the perplexities of those who are troubled by the apparent inactivity of God in the world to-day.

The keynote of the Bishop's argument is Human Freedom. God made man a Free Being. He cannot intervene to rescue man from the consequences of his wilfulness and folly by some dramatic stroke. Rather will He patiently and lovingly work out His purpose for man by Himself accepting in the person of His Son humiliation, pain and death. “If mankind is to be free to grow with God's help to its best, it must be free also to sink to its worst.” So far as it goes this is surely right, but is full justice done to the teaching of Scripture as a whole?

Does God never intervene decisively in human affairs? He did intervene decisively in the coming of Christ into the world. What of His Second Coming?

Will that not be a decisive and final intervention? At chapter 8 the Bishop reaches the War and he discusses the many difficulties arising out of it.

His treatment of them is sane and helpful. War is an “ever recurring fruit of sinfulness.”

“Is it ever right to fight.” Christ did not give us precise instructions upon specific difficulties of this kind. He gives us principles which we are to apply. He gives us ideals which we are to seek earnestly to live up to. We have to supply the answer to many of our questionings ourselves. It is pointed out that again and again our Lord did not answer directly questions addressed to Him. But He went beneath the surface to the root of the matter. In dealing with Pacifism a very telling quotation is introduced from Prof. Raven's “War and the Christian.” Some parts of the Bishop's argument seem to fall below the level of others, but he offers serious considerations which go to show that God is exercising control over the world that He has made. But that control is, in a way, indirect, and not to be gauged by our limited and finite understanding.

May a further question be put? How can a Bishop find time to write books?

H. D.

The Epistle of Truth

THE REV. EDWIN HIRST, M.A., A.R.C.M.

(This is the second instalment of the Rev. Edwin Hirst's Studies in the Second Epistle of John. The first article appeared in the January issue and further articles will follow (D.V.) in subsequent issues.)

THE ELDER.

UNTO THE ELECT LADY AND
HER CHILDREN, WHOM I LOVE
IN TRUTH ; AND NOT I ONLY,
BUT ALSO ALL THEY THAT
KNOW THE TRUTH ; FOR THE
TRUTH'S SAKE WHICH ABID-
ETH IN US, AND IT SHALL BE
WITH US FOR EVER :

GRACE, MERCY, PEACE SHALL
BE WITH US, FROM GOD THE
FATHER, AND FROM JESUS
CHRIST, THE SON OF THE FA-
THER, IN TRUTH AND LOVE.

I rejoice greatly that I have found certain of thy children walking in truth, even as we received commandment from the Father. And now I beseech thee, lady, not as though I wrote to thee a new commandment, but that which we had from the beginning, that we love one another. And this is love, that we should walk after his commandment even as ye heard from the beginning, that ye should walk in it. For many deceivers are gone forth into the world, even they that confess not that Jesus Christ cometh in the flesh. This is the deceiver and the antichrist. Look to yourselves, that ye lose not the things which we have wrought, but that ye receive a full reward. Whosoever goeth onward and abideth not in the teaching of Christ, hath not God ; he that abideth in the teaching, the same hath both the Father and

the Son. If any one cometh unto you, and bringeth not this teaching, receive him not into your house, and give him no greeting : for he that giveth him greeting partaketh in his evil works.

Having many things to write unto you, I would not write them with paper and ink : but I hope to come unto you, and to speak face to face, that your joy may be fulfilled.

THE CHILDREN OF THINE ELECT SISTER SALUTE THEE.

(The text is that of the Revised Version arranged as in The Modern Reader's Bible).

THE MEANING OF TRUTH

(2 St. John, verses 1, 2)

“**W**HAT is truth ? ”¹ This is perhaps the most famous question which history records. It is also one of the most searching of questions, for truth has ever been the object of man's quest, and the aim of his sincere desires. On asking the question Pontius Pilate awaited no answer, so perhaps he spoke either carelessly or even cynically. Yet, in view of the peerless sincerity and crystal clear innocence he noted in Christ of Whom he asked the question, it might be that he betrayed a wistful longing which had crept into his soul. Seeing falsity and treachery about him, and perceiving it also in his own heart, it may be that he gained a momentary glimpse of ultimate truth as he faced our Lord. How near was he to The Truth ! But like many more, he feared to be confronted by it.

The Greek word meaning truth has a fundamental content, for it means *reality* as opposed to the false and to what is mere seeming and pretence. Thus it serves as a sure guide for the life that finds expression in thought and action. A moment's reflection will reveal its supreme value as a reliable guide in a moral universe such as ours. This being so, the search for truth is an absolute necessity. We cannot escape it. Even though such a search may involve labour and toil, perhaps even suffering, these trials are to be counted but of small cost in comparison with the treasure of truth. Just as testing and temptation are necessary in the formation of

¹ St. John xviii. 38.

character, so is toil necessary in the quest for truth. The primary aim of such searching toil is the illumination and instruction of the mind, so that by the exercise of true knowledge and judgment, the true might be embraced and the false refused. That the ultimate aim in the quest for truth goes much deeper than this we shall presently see. The question is of supreme importance. As health of body depends largely upon the rightness of its foods, both as to quality and quantity, so does health of mind depend upon its vital food, which is truth. We may be sure that God does not mock us. He gave us the capacity both to apprehend truth and to follow it in our daily lives. So, in endowing us with both the need and the desire for truth, He encourages us to pursue the path of our quest in the assurance that truth can be found, and being found, we may treasure it as a gift from Him Who is "the way, and the truth, and the life."

The apprehension of truth depends upon the exercise of moral judgment, and therefore upon God's moral character ; and a knowledge of the truth involves the obligation to act upon it. St. John says : " If we say that we have fellowship with Him, and walk in the darkness, we lie, and do not the truth."¹ We see, then, that within, the truth has a moral urge, and that without, it involves a moral mode of life.

Some knowledge of the truth is given to all men. Were it otherwise, it would be impossible to live with even a fraction of success. It is by our knowledge of the truth that we check one idea with another on a basis of comparison. That we might do this, some knowledge of the truth is given to us all ; for just as conscience is the endowment of all men, so also is some knowledge of the truth. It is by conscience that men judge character and conduct both in themselves and in others, making comparisons with an ideal formed from their sense of absolute goodness. In a similar manner, some standard of truth operates in men by which the true and untrue are discriminated. This knowledge of truth is capable of more and more development, just as other aspects of human knowledge may be developed. Hence, a full and satisfying knowledge of the truth is inevitably the pursuit of true men. " Truth is the end of the intellect ; man does think, and he may think right or wrong ; to think right is to

¹ 1 John i. 6.

attain truth so far as this thought has gone. Men always desire to reach some truth, for their plans will break down if they are calculated on a basis of error ; but this is to desire truth as a means, not as an end. To desire truth as an end is to desire the perfect correlation of mind to Reality. And this is a good in itself, so clearly a good as to impose upon all who have understood its nature an obligation to seek it. The end is not to acquire masses of information, though that may be a means to the end and must be included in it, if it is perfectly attained ; the end is perfect intellectual correlation with Reality."¹ If this is so, no one will deny the supreme value of truth. Anything short of this must inevitably militate against successful living. Even misleading ideas can do this, for thought, creed, and conduct are closely connected. Whenever any concept is revealed as untrue, moral judgment demands its adjustment, whilst deliberate falsification is condemned as a gross injury against the deceived.

When we apprehend truth, whatever form it may take, we realize that there must be an ultimate truth. Further, as truth is observed and understood as truth only by those who have possession of a moral faculty, which in turn demands personality, it seems that the ultimate truth can only be found in a perfect personality.

This argument may be illustrated in several ways. A negative implies a positive. The "No Road" notice does not necessarily imply that progress is stopped. It may mean, and usually does, that another way is open. Our forefathers probably thought that the Atlantic Ocean was an impassable barrier to the West, and that it was foolish and dangerous to court unknown dangers by attempting to cross it. The Ocean seemed to say : "So far, and no farther." Yet human ingenuity, expressed in coracle, boat, sailing-ship, steamship and aircraft, has found a way.

Again, untruth is known to be untruth because it can be tested by a standard of truth. Untruth, then, by its very existence, and by being apprehended as untruth, implies the existence of truth. Conscience offers its support to this thought. By its standards of obligation expressed in terms of "should," "ought" and "must," the right is seen as true and the wrong as untrue.

¹ Archbishop Temple, "Christus Veritas," p. 27.

These considerations would seem to imply an ultimate truth. This Ultimate Truth we believe to be God.

It must be remembered that in our finite state we are not able to know the entire truth. As attempts have been made to reach and know it, much labour has been expended in making comparisons which have been checked, and then checked over again. Accordingly, some have thought that truth is always in the making rather than something which is fixed and complete. But is it not more accurate to say that it is man's knowledge of the truth which is always in the making? Truth must first be there to be known at all, for it is not made as man develops his knowledge. Scientific research shows this. The colours of the rainbow were there before the prism revealed the spectrum. As men examined the spectrum, knowledge of the truth about light was increased, but that knowledge did not make the light. Perhaps the writer of the Epistle to the Hebrews had a thought similar to this in his mind when he wrote "He that cometh to God must believe that He is, and that He is a rewarder of them that seek after Him."¹

It seems, then, that truth must have an eternal embodiment in a personality which, to be true, must be perfect. In God alone is this to be found, for His character has neither contradiction nor untruth in it, but constitutes the perfection of all true values in Goodness, Truth and Beauty.

Truth is a characteristic word in the Johannine writings. In the Gospel it occurs twenty-five times, and in the Epistles twenty times, of which no fewer than five occur in the Second Epistle. For the Apostle, "the truth" meant the absolute Divine reality. Nothing short of that was or could be the truth. One of the outstanding instances of this is to be found in the First Epistle: "My little children, let us not love in word, neither with the tongue; but in deed and truth. Hereby shall we know that we are of the truth, and shall assure our heart before him, whereinsoever our heart condemn us; because God is greater than our heart and knoweth all things."² In commenting on this passage, Dr. Plummer says, "by loving in deed and truth we shall attain to the knowledge that we are morally the children of the Truth."

¹ Heb. xi. 6.

² 1 John iii. 18-20.

To be of the Truth "is to have the Truth as the source whence the guiding and formative influences of thought and conduct flow."¹ In St. John's thought it is evident that here he personifies "the Truth," using the words almost as an equivalent for God. This is in conformity with Christ's words to the Pharisees when they objected to His teaching, for He maintained that His speaking and teaching of the truth was a standing proof that He was of God. "If I say truth, why do ye not believe Me? He that is of God heareth the words of God: for this cause ye hear them not, because ye are not of God."² The same line of thought is to be found in Christ's witness before Pilate, which called forth the question with which we began our considerations. "Pilate therefore said unto Him, Art Thou a king then? Jesus answered, Thou sayest that I am a King. To this end have I been born, and to this end am I come into the world, that I should bear witness unto the truth. Every one that is of the truth heareth My voice."³

The Apostle claims that it is out of a definite regard for the recipients of this letter that he writes to them. "The elder unto the elect lady and her children, whom I love in truth; and not I only, but also all they that know the truth; for the truth's sake which abideth in us, and it shall be with us for ever."⁴ That abiding love had in it some character of the truth of God, for it bore no tinge of insincerity nor any trace of hypocrisy. Only the man who has found the truth of God could cherish such sentiments, for they are born of God only, the source and embodiment of both love and truth.

TRUTH REVEALED

(2 St. John, verse 3)

Belief in God as the source and embodiment of truth is of little use unless we are convinced that God communicates His truth to men. It is the desire to know more of His mind and will which lies behind all attempts to reach Him in

¹ "The Epistles of St. John," p. 87.

² St. John viii. 46, 47.

³ St. John xviii. 37.

⁴ 2 John 1, 2.

prayer and worship. The psalmist's cry is the expression of humanity at its highest level—

“As the hart panteth after the water brooks,
So panteth my soul after Thee, O God.
My soul is athirst for God, for the living God :
When shall I come and appear before God ? ”¹

Love of God inspires this longing, for as God is love, it is natural that love should be the expression of the soul made in His image. Even when fear has been the inner urge, as it has been in the heart of primitive peoples, the desire for God is there.

In giving men this desire for Himself, God does not make a jest of His creatures. He seeks to satisfy their needs, and all through the ages there is evidence to prove that God has never left Himself without sufficient witness to lead men to Himself. This truth may be read in the book of nature, the book of humanity, the book of history, in the story of the Church, and in the Book of Books—the Bible itself. But God gave a supreme revelation of Himself to men in a manner that they might best understand. That revelation stands as the lasting communication of His truth to men. “God, having of old time spoken unto the fathers in the prophets by divers portions and in divers manners, hath at the end of these days spoken unto us in His Son, whom He appointed heir of all things, through Whom also He made the worlds.”² These words stress the striking contrast between the partial revelation of God through the prophets and the perfect revelation through His only-begotten Son. Bishop Westcott has aptly emphasized this: “That which is communicated in parts, sections, fragments, must of necessity be imperfect; and so also a representation which is made in many modes cannot be other than provisional. The supreme element of unity is wanting in each case. But the Revelation in Christ, the Son, is perfect both in substance and in form.”³ This statement is very true, for growth in grace and knowledge cannot but be progressive. This does not mean that God could not have given a complete revelation of Himself, but that the human medium of communication was not able to grasp His whole truth. God did indeed use,

¹ Psalm xlii. 1, 2.

² Heb. i. 1.

³ “The Epistle to the Hebrews,” p. 4.

and still uses, men as His instruments. He used them as living agents, as each in turn learned something of Himself. But being imperfect men, they could neither know nor utter the entire and complete truth of God. Yet through them, He did speak to mankind, fragmentarily indeed, by means of laws and prophecies, by types and pictorial methods of teaching, each agent thus contributing to the knowledge of the truth. But Christ, being the Son, could speak to men with a tone of authority and finality. His message was not fragmentary, but complete and final.

As we turn to His teaching, this authoritative tone is impressed clearly upon our minds. Perhaps one instance will serve as an illustration, *viz.*, His teaching about worship. We all share the instinct and urge to worship, but it needs some form or order for its expression. At once, the question of the God Whom we are to worship, as also the question of how we are to worship Him, become subjects of vital importance. Worship must be something more than mere formality if it is to be true. Moreover, it implies a measure of knowledge regarding the object of worship. Christ stressed this fact in His talk with the woman at the well. "Ye worship that which ye know not: we worship that which we know."¹ The true worship of God thus assumes the existence of a revelation of the character of Him Who is worshipped and its expression is seen as the human response to that revelation. Job felt this in his own heart as he said:

"Then call Thou, and I will answer;
Or let me speak, and answer Thou me."²

The same thought is uttered by Samuel: "Speak; for thy servant heareth."³ The life of religion expressed in worship must be the response of man to a responsive reality. In this connection it has been well said that "the unique feature of a religious attitude to reality, that feature which distinguishes it from a scientific or philosophic attitude to reality, is the implicit assumption that reality responds to such claims upon it from the human side as are consistent with its own inherent nature. But this attribution of responsiveness to the object of religion carries with it a necessary corollary. Response is a kind of attitude or relation existing

¹ St. John iv. 22.

² Job xiii. 22.

³ 1 Sam. iii. 10.

between two terms. That which issuing from the one is response, on reaching the other is receptivity. And what is thus received by the second comes as an answer to a previous request."¹ In worship, that responsiveness reaches a lofty level, aiming at the cultivation of a life centred in God. Thus, "instead of asserting the necessity for reality to respond to the claims which we make upon it, we submit to the necessity that we should respond to the claims which reality makes upon us. Our religion becomes our response to God, more than God's response to us."² Worship thus becomes communion, and for communion to be a really worthy thing, it must have truth as its base and foundation. "God is a Spirit," said our Lord, "and they that worship Him must worship in spirit and truth."³ Hence, whether we consider Him Whom we worship or our attitude in worship, that worship must be true and conditioned by the revelation which God has given of Himself to men. St. John knew how supremely important was this fact, for he seems to emphasize it at the outset of his letter by associating himself with "all they that know the truth."⁴ Untruth was being spread abroad in false teaching. This would inevitably issue in false worship, proceeding as it did from a false idea of God. Such circumstances are ever fatal to true worship; for when worship becomes severed from truth the danger of degeneration into mere superstition is always present, superstition being but worship divorced from truth. To worship God in spirit and truth, some knowledge of the truth is a necessity.

God willed that men should know of Himself, so He revealed Himself fully in the Incarnate Son. In this connection, Christ claimed to be "the truth." There is little wonder, then, that the Beloved Disciple used that term, "the truth," for the revelation which God gave in the Son. This he had obviously learned from his Lord. "I am the way, and the truth, and the life; no one cometh unto the Father, but by Me. If ye had known Me, ye would have known My Father also: from henceforth ye know Him, and have seen Him."⁵ These words are Christ's answer to Thomas when he

¹ Valentine, "What Do We Mean by God?" p. 44.

² Valentine, "What Do We Mean by God?" p. 45.

³ St. John iv. 24.

⁴ 2 John 1.

⁵ St. John xiv. 6, 7.

asked : " Lord, we know not whither thou goest ; how know we the way ? " ¹ The wish to know the way finds its answer in " I am the way." The manner in which they were to know is indicated by His claim to be " the truth." The wish to know whither He was wending His way (which He said was to the Father ; so that where He was to be they might also be) finds its reply in His claim to be " the life." Here is a splendid summary of Christian doctrine, and by faith, the faithful follower finds the fullness of each claim amply fulfilled in his experience. Even the Pharisees recognized the truth in Christ, though they were not willing to be led by it. " Master, we know that Thou art true, and carest not for any one : for Thou regardest not the person of men, but of a truth teachest the way of God." ² It was a tremendous admission which they made, even though a snare was secreted in the soft words of their speech. But St. John plainly sets out from the first to reveal his Lord as " the truth." " The Word became flesh, and dwelt among us (and we beheld His glory, glory as of the only begotten from the Father), full of grace and truth." ³ Up and down the Gospel, this truth is substantiated. Its witness is heard and demonstrated before the Jews, the Pharisees, the crowds which congregated to hear Him, the disciples, and even before Pilate. It was to bear witness to the truth that He came into the world. His followers were to know the truth which should make them free. On His withdrawal from the world of time and space, He promised the gift of the Spirit of Truth, Who should lead them into all the truth. Perhaps we gather the urgency and importance of all this most of all as we listen to Him praying His High-Priestly Prayer, interceding for His followers. " Sanctify them in the truth : Thy word is truth. As Thou didst send Me into the world, even so sent I them into the world. And for their sakes I sanctify Myself, that they themselves also may be sanctified in truth." ⁴

Being the Son of God, Christ could reveal the Father as the ultimate Truth, and the God He so revealed to men is no theoretical God, as is the creation of some philosophical systems, but a Living, Loving Person, Who can and will

¹ St. John xiv. 5.

² St. Mark xii. 14.

³ St. John i. 14.

⁴ St. John xvii. 17-19.

respond to the call of those who seek after Him. To bear witness to Him and to make Him known to men by His teaching and His death, was the purpose of His mission, for by these, eternal life is obtained. Christ gave expression to God's character in a human life and so answered the request: "Shew us the Father."¹ Christians have known and still know Him as the Truth of God. Their experience all down the ages demonstrates the truth of His own witness concerning Himself. "Every one that is of the truth heareth my voice."² If we would know of the Father, the source of all truth, we must turn and listen to Him who came to reveal the Father. This is the Father's will endorsed by His own words: "This is my beloved Son: hear ye Him."³

¹ St. John xiv. 8.

² St. John xviii. 37.

³ St. Mark ix. 7.

THE DECLINE OF RELIGION

By Cecil P. Martin. (George Allen & Unwin, Ltd.) 10s. 6d.

The present study, offered by a layman who has an abundance of both scientific, medical, and philosophical knowledge at his disposal, will command attention, and not least the attention of the clergy. It is not to be expected that all will accept his conclusions. His approach to the subject reveals a strong bias of dissent from organised Christianity under Episcopal leadership, and at times both impatience with and a lack of understanding of the history and genius of our Episcopal Churches. This is particularly emphasised in the chapter Ecclesiasticism. The decline of religion is attributed to the rise and progress of modern science, the feeling of unreality of which some are conscious in the contemporary presentation of Christianity, and to the difficulties of reconciling the existence of pain and evil with the belief in an all-good and all-powerful God. It is clear that the author is in close touch with those who question the Christian Gospel. As a result of such contact he says: "The modern rejection of the Bible is not therefore due to a lack of evidence or to inconsistencies in the available evidence, but arises either from an insuperable conviction of the absolute impossibility of some Biblical events or to an aversion of admitting them" (p. 193). He has a hope for the future, but, as stated on p. 239: "The fact of Jesus Christ therefore stands to-day as clear, as distinct, and as insistent as ever, and each one of us has to settle for himself where he stands in relation to it."

E. H.

Book Reviews

THE BETRAYAL OF CHRIST BY THE CHURCHES

By J. Middleton Murry. (*Andrew Dakers*). 5s. net.

At the same time there came to hand Sir Robert Vansittart's *Black Record*, and this book from the pen of Mr. Middleton Murry. That both can be published and read side by side is a striking tribute to the freedom of expression permitted to writers and thinkers even at a time when the nation is engaged in a life-and-death struggle against a bitter and unscrupulous foe. The one holds the essentially barbaric nature of the German race to be the *fons et origo* of the European upheaval. Mr. Middleton Murry in the other book appears to lay the blame for the present war catastrophe mainly upon our own country, and upon the failure of the Christian Church to control and influence the political and international situation, and of Christians generally to be true to their discipleship of Christ.

Mr. Middleton Murry is regarded by many as a prophet of our times. His ability, courage and sincerity at once arrest and challenge the attention, and his longing to see the spirit of Christ prevail in all human affairs stirs the sympathy. No more than many others does he find faith easy. It is "an unending, though intermittent, struggle against a profound doubt," yet he knows that "doubt and despair were overcome, once for all, in the death of Christ upon the Cross." He reckons himself, "in a modest way," a Christian, though he neither believes in the Church, nor believes as the Church believes.

He has at least this mark of a prophet—he does not prophesy smooth things. He is impatient, and impatience is only rarely a wise guide. He is a lover of paradox, and unless it be carefully used, paradox can distort as well as express truth. He proceeds to make a slashing attack upon the Christian Church and its leaders in this land, and upon organized Christianity as a whole. He finds them terribly wanting in this supreme hour of crisis. "The common man," he says, has by them "been intolerably let down."

Where shall we look for proof of this? We are asked to consider Lord Halifax as a representative Christian statesman; and arguing from a single action over twenty years ago, and from his Oxford speech with its "monstrous conclusion," Mr. Middleton Murry arrives at the astonishing results that "the origins of contemporary German youth are to be sought in Lord Halifax's own past; their spiritual progenitor is Major Edward Wood, M.P., of the Yorkshire Dragoons," and concludes that all Christian Statesmen have failed. Ecclesiastical leadership is in no better plight. An address of the late Bishop of Ely to his Clergy is made typical of the subservience of the whole Church of England to the dictates of the State. A brief analysis of the general condition of Western Christendom to-day, in which the Protestant position is scarcely treated with justice, leads to the confident and reiterated assertion that the Spirit of Christ has left His Church, and the spirit of nationalism has entered in. "This

surrender of the Christian Church to the rising powers of nationalism is the major betrayal of Christ" (p. 92). So, "the Christian Church has betrayed man utterly" (p. 150).

The relation between Church and State is, and always has been, very difficult to settle and to define. That it has produced many scandals, and much spiritual tragedy, no student of history would deny. We know that the Church has often failed and given way to temptation to gain wealth and power. But it has had, too, its spiritual triumphs, and its Christian influence has been at work unceasingly, and in its darkest hours, in the leavening of Society and the building up of the faith of its individual members. There is a great deal to be said for the relationship with the State that characterizes the Established Church in our country. It by no means implies that the Church is the tool and servant of the State, or that it has so degenerated that the Spirit of Christ has left it and the spirit of nationalism possessed it instead. It does imply that the Church has an unique opportunity of influencing the nation, and of ensuring the supremacy of Christian standards in its life and laws, whilst it throws back upon its leaders and members the supreme responsibility of keeping ever alight the flame of personal faith, and undimmed the vision of the worldwide Church of its Master.

All the Churches of Christendom, which in the opinion of Mr. Middleton Murry have thus betrayed their Lord, are doomed now to perish, so it seems to him. He looks forward tentatively and gropingly to "a new Christianity." He becomes suddenly aware at the end of his book that "thus to generalize about the Christian Church is manifestly unjust to thousands of devoted souls within it." He sees the opportunity and the need to-day. "Never perhaps in history has there been a greater accumulation of religious potentiality, of religious responsiveness to the tragedy of a vast human situation, than is now pent up in the heart of mankind" (p. 189). He thinks the obstacle between the common man and Christ is the Christian Church. He sees clearly it would be "a disaster for mankind if ever there were established a new universal Christian Church of which the Head was believed to have in his keeping the Keys of a Heaven and Hell in whose reality men believed. With such absolute authority no man is, or ever will be, fit to be trusted" (p. 69).

We are one with him in much that he writes. We, too, long to hear Christ speaking to our modern need, saving our modern world, though unlike Mr. Middleton Murry, we think it matters everything "whether he be, or be not, God." We, too, long for a Church purified and strengthened for its gigantic task, standing for the things of Christ amid all the conflicting elements of modern life. He is surely right in saying that only as the Church has the vision and the courage to follow the pattern of its Master will men turn to it again. We know also, and Mr. Middleton Murry may perhaps for his own help and inspiration yet discover, that the Spirit of Christ has not forsaken His Church on earth, and that in its fellowship the words of Christ, which he quotes so touchingly, are being constantly fulfilled. "Where two or three are gathered together in My name, there am I in the midst of them." We do not think "the small communities of pacifists

now being formed by the compulsion of circumstances to work on the land " are the only nucleus of the new form of the Christian Church. This will consist of those Churches and their members that are now turning afresh to Christ in their " fiery trial," and are renewing their Evangelical life and fervour, and that, however imperfectly, have yet the true marks of discipleship in their work and witness. There is not enough Christianity in the Churches, but there is a great deal more than the writer of this challenging book thinks.

S. NOWELL-ROSTRON.

EUROPE'S APPRENTICESHIP :

A Survey of Mediæval Latin with Examples.

By G. G. Coulton, pp. xi. + 288. (Nelson & Sons.) 8s. 6d. net.

It is always a pleasure to review any work by Dr. Coulton, for everything that he writes is not only well worth reading but is stamped with the hall-mark of exact scholarship. To the many books with which he has enriched historical learning must now be added one more on a subject with which he is peculiarly capable of dealing. It is now many years since he delighted us with the way in which in case after case he caught the much " boosted " Cardinal Gasquet tripping over his Latinity—blunders which in spite of Dr. Coulton's exposures, were reprinted in subsequent editions! So much then for Roman Catholic historical scholarship, never a strong point of that Communion.

Dr. Coulton now deals definitely with mediæval Latin in a charming study in which he exposes the old and popular fallacy that Latin was well understood by every educated person in the Middle Ages. It is the kind of generalization which is very easy to make and takes a lot of trouble to expose. But it is not the first popular fallacy to be destroyed by the devastating criticism of one who knows the facts and can substantiate, by documentary evidence of unimpeachable worth, every one of his contentions. But the process by which popular superstitions become well-established truisms by means of constant but uncritical repetition, even by those who should know better, must be extremely irritating to a scholar with so trained a mind as Dr. Coulton's. Hence he finds no difficulty in demonstrating by many examples that the contention that Latin was the *lingua franca* of the Middle Ages in Europe requires very serious modification. Naturally the Clergy would be expected to be better equipped in this respect than the laity, but unless the laity were better equipped than many of the clergy quoted by Dr. Coulton that contention must have been of a very limited character. For interesting examples of all this the reader must consult Dr. Coulton's book for himself. One aspect of the volume worth notice is the manner in which quite incidentally Dr. Coulton throws much light on what might be termed side issues. One of these has reference to the preservation of the Classics which, awkward as it may be for the champions of the old view of mediæval Latin, owed their survival in a comparatively exact and uncorrupted form to the ignorance of those clerical scribes whose Latinity was not sufficient to enable them to understand what they were copying. Much that the volume contains will be familiar to

those who are well acquainted with the author's larger works, but even so it is useful to have the evidence brought together into so compact a form; and some of his discussions, such as that on the well-known phrase *major et sanior pars* are peculiarly illuminating.

The third section of the book, however, marks quite a new departure for Dr. Coulton. Hitherto, what might almost be called his "source books" have consisted of translations without the originals. Now Dr. Coulton has given us an Anthology of mediæval Latin, small in extent but most useful to students. These extracts are taken from such varied sources as the Roman Missal, Augustine, Ambrose, Giraldus Cambrensis, Gregory of Tours, Matthew Paris, and many others, not forgetting the chatty and informative Salimbene. And they are accompanied by translations in an adjoining column. Hence it is easy to see that once more Dr. Coulton has laid us under a debt of gratitude for a most interesting and instructive volume.

C. J. O.

THE FAITH OF GOD.

By Andrew Glendinning, M.A. (Allenson & Co., Ltd.) 5s.

"Three hundred millions of Europe's population have reverted to paganism. That is the outstanding fact of the modern world." The Preface goes on to add that this book is written "to show that the theological background of the Church's teaching is responsible for the debacle." No one can read these pages and not admire the virility the minister of the parish of Broughton, Peebles-shire, puts into his Barthian thesis. There are points to be made and our author can make them. "To lie in bed on Sunday and listen to the wireless is *ipso facto* a sacramental act. So why should the Church complain when its instruction in divine immanence and the sacramental theory of nature is so literally carried out." This Barthian manifesto is expounded in such chapters as "The Religious Situation," "The Supreme Question," "The Christian Life," "Unconscious Goodness," "Christian Experience," "Authority in Natural Religion," "Authority in Revealed Religion," "Christian Freedom," and "The Wider Providence," and throughout the author never loses touch with the grim realities of the modern world.

While we are innocent of even any desire to defend the all too immanentist tendencies of the theology of the recent past—and liberalism as such has been increasingly out-moded by the tempo of the modern world—at the same time we are entirely unconvinced that so violent a swing of the pendulum as Barthianism has the quality of permanence. The robust Evangelical note in our Anglican theological tradition reminds us that there is no ultimate contradiction between the "kergma" (message) of New Testament Revelation and the full, free, exercise of the ever-questioning spirit of man. One happy result of the Barthian reaction has been to give the Supernatural that place in religion from which it has been too slickly dismissed. We need a theological theology as well as a philosophical theology, but in these days of political reaction we dare not add the theological reaction which denies the opening verses of the Gospel of St. John.

A. B. L.

HONEST RELIGION

By *John Oman, D.D., F.B.A.* (Cambridge University Press.)
7s. 6d.

Dr. John Oman, formerly Professor of Theology in Westminster College, Cambridge, was a great gift of God to the Christian Church. As might be expected from a Presbyterian divine of such sapient originality his conclusions are of the utmost importance to the cause of modern Evangelical Theology. No theological thinker in modern times has built with more consistency or with profounder insight upon the major premise of all Evangelical thought that man's response to God is primarily a personal response and that "reverence, freedom and sincerity" are not only ultimate categories for religious experience but also for theological thought. With a scholar of such penetration there was little popular appeal. It is therefore a happy chance that this posthumous work, based as it is on various addresses, approaches the integral massiveness of Oman's theology by the relatively easy and practical approach of *Honest Religion*.

From an acute analysis of "The Situation" to-day we pass to chapters on "Finalities," "Prophetic Revelation," "Inspiration and Criticism," "The Father," "Faith and Freedom," "Jesus and the Kingdom," "Salvation by Faith," "Power to Forgive Sins," "The Fellowship of the Spirit," "Wisdom and Understanding," "The Catholic Faith and the Confessions," "The Church and the Churches," "Outward Freedom." It is difficult to do justice by a book of this scope but we can best illustrate its spirit by the following quotation :

"Theology should be systematic thinking, not to force everything into a system, but to set forth in order the relations as well as the significance of our highest intuitions. For this, Jesus is the ultimate authority because the truth is so manifested in Him that it needs no other appeal, and not because we should set Him among outward authorities, even if it were over them."

At a time when Anglican theology is swinging between the non-committal liberalism of the Doctrinal Report and the austere intellectualism of modern Thomism, this small work is of real significance. "All Oman's distinctive teaching is here," and an Introduction by the Rev. Frank Ballard and a Memoir of the author by the Rev. George Alexander and Dr. H. H. Farmer do much to enhance that commendation. Not everyone will agree with its contentions. Though less than two hundred pages it is in its own way a seminal work and worthy of the author of "Grace and Personality" and "The Natural and the Supernatural." It should not be missed.

A. B. L.

CITIZEN AND CHURCHMAN.

By *William Temple (Archbishop of York).* (Eyre & Spottiswoode.)
3s. 6d.

This is the Archbishop of York's Lent Book for the present year. There is, however, no reason why it should be regarded as a book which is only suitable for Lenten reading. The matters of which it

treats are vital to the whole of Christian life and more especially to that vast and important part of it which concern the Christian in his relations with the State. As is well known the Archbishop does not subscribe to the slogan so popular in certain quarters: "Win the World War and build the New World afterwards." He has put forth an amazing amount of creative thought in this and in other books, lectures and sermons. His knowledge is profound and this is noticeable in the present volume. On the very first page many readers will ask: "Who is Bodin and what did he say about the Church?" Others may recall that Hobbes, who is also casually mentioned on the same page, insisted on the subordination of the Church to the State. The Archbishop knows these things and assumes that we all know them. There are times when a great intellect must condescend to the less gifted. We are not enamoured of "notes" in a book but we think this book would be greatly improved for the average Churchman if some explanations had been added. There is an admirable summary at the end of Chapter I, on "The Medieval Experiment." The book deals with the inevitable problem of the State and the Church, their close relationship and interlocking and their meaning for the Christian who is citizen as well as Churchman. Canon A. E. Baker has contributed a valuable Appendix, containing questions for Group Study which will make it possible for study circles to discuss the book in about five weekly gatherings. The Archbishop believes that for the Christian, human personality has a status, worth, and dignity quite independent of the State, and superior to that of the State itself, but that the right of the State over the Christian is limited only by his conscience and his obligation to live in the spirit of fellowship with God. It is not possible to divide human interests into two categories—the material and the spiritual—and to assign the former to the State, the latter to the Church. He draws attention to four main theories which have been held concerning the relation of the Church to the Kingdom of God, and his last chapter in which he discusses the contrasted yet related functions of Church and State may prove to be the most helpful and informing to many readers. This book is a worthy successor to Dr. A. D. Lindsay's book, *The Two Moralities*, which he wrote as the Archbishop's Lenten Book last year. It should be read eagerly by the clergy and by all Churchmen.

A. W. PARSONS.

THE WEAPONS OF A CHRISTIAN

By Bernard Clements. (S.C.M.). 1s. 3d. net.

These twelve Broadcast Talks are models of what such talks should be. They are happily phrased, aptly illustrated, and pointed with brevity and directness. They contain simple teaching designed to catch the ear, to hold the attention, and to edify. We cannot endorse everything that is said (e.g. about sacraments) but matters of doubt are dealt with in a way which shows restraint and understanding. We are sure that much practical good must come from these messages.

H. D.

MAN ON HIS NATURE

By Sir Charles Sherrington, O.M.. (Cambridge University Press.)
21s.

Theology has often been accused—and in our judgment rightly—of an aloof ignorance of science, though we hasten to add that such a relationship is reciprocal! Be this as it may, we are now without excuse or pretext if we do not know something at first hand—and the latter qualification is crucial—of the modern biologist's philosophy of Nature and of Man. Let us say at once that the book which gives us this is a notable one, as delightful to read for its scientific interest as for its literary grace and one that must have a place in the library of those who know the adequacy of the Christian faith to front the challenge of modern thought and science. It is no hazard of prophecy to say that it will long be regarded as a classic in its own field of survey.

It is interesting to find another Gifford Lecturer underlining—as Professor John Laird did so incisively on philosophical grounds in his Gifford Lectures "Theism and Cosmology"—the limitations of Natural Religion. It is worth while to quote the words:

"If religion has to stir the world, let alone to stir man to conflict with the world, the appeal to a Deity which is personal can go far to harness for its purposes the whole dynamism of the psyche. It is equivalent to establishing a 'value' which for its followers resumes all other 'values.' But this source of emotional strength Natural Religion is without, for it sublimates personal Deity to Deity wholly impersonal. In a manner the *Theos* of Aristotle is that which it re-approaches."

This clear recognition by a noted philosopher and a distinguished scientist of the limitations of the candle light of reason should do something to clear away that woolliness of mind which so far from recognizing the distinction between religious experience and theology, is not yet able to distinguish between theology and science or theology and philosophy!

His scientific temper leads Sir Arthur Sherrington—following closely the trend of Hume's *Dialogues on Natural Religion*—to criticize teleology on the ground of such facts as the plasmodium of malaria and the tubercle bacillus. "True, life is the supreme blessing of the planet; none the less it is also the planet's crowning curse." At the same time he gives us solid ground for his prophecy that 'predaceous man' should neither be man's final destiny as it need not be Nature's last word." "It would seem that *homo præadorius* is in a backwater unreached by the tide which set in some millennia since. The great revealed religions bringing their altruism are evidence of that new tide. It may be that the reason why the tide of altruism set in, was as a step toward a re-ordering of life upon the planet. The ascendancy of *homo præadorius* would spell ruin to man's prosperous leadership here. And man must lead or go."

It is difficult to do justice by the timeliness of this book for modern apologetics, we have clearly indicated that it is no present for Dr. Goebbels!

A. B. L.