

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

February, 1920.

THE MONTH.

Islington Clerical Conference. "CONFERENCE," not "Meeting." The change may not seem to mean much, but in reality it stands for a great deal. During the years of war, the "Meeting" was held in Islington Parish Church, and was arranged to fit the hallowed environment. By no stretch of imagination could the gatherings thus held be called a Conference. Yet in pre-war days the "Meeting" was essentially a conference, and there was a general desire that, with the coming of peace conditions, it should resume its former characteristics. To emphasise, therefore, the fulfilment of this desire, the name of this historic gathering was changed, and henceforth we shall know it under the title of the Islington Clerical Conference. With the change in name came also a new departure, or rather the revival of an old custom—the inclusion of "discussion" on the programme, but, frankly, it was not a success in spite of the fact that the subject assigned for consideration—"The Catholicity of the Church of England"—almost provoked debate. Three speakers volunteered their contributions, but it may fairly be said that none of these rose to the occasion, and it is at least doubtful whether general discussion can really be profitable at a gathering of this kind, whether it is called a "Meeting" or a "Conference." One of the three speakers, however, performed a useful service, as his comments upon the proposed changes in the Communion Service drew from the Dean of Canterbury a very effective statement of his own position in regard to that important question. Dr. Wace said :—

He was no advocate for the introduction of the words agreed upon by the recent Conference into the Prayer of Consecration at all. It must be borne in mind that their adoption by the Conference gave them no authority whatever. They had to come before Convocation, where they would be fully debated. Whether he would vote for their insertion or not he did not

know, because it depended upon various considerations that might be introduced. If he voted for them it would not be because he liked them, but because it might be—or at any rate, it was said it might be—a means of making peace. But one thing he would like to say with respect to the speaker's association of those words with transubstantiation. There was one very striking fact about them. Those particular words had never held a place in the Roman canon of the Mass. It was absolutely the characteristic of the Roman canon of the Mass that it did not call the Holy Spirit down upon either the elements or the worshippers. He could not get out of his mind the idea he had had for a very long time—that the omission of that reference to the Holy Spirit in the Prayer of Consecration had had something to do with the purely material, corporate conceptions out of which transubstantiation had grown. It was possible—though he was not laying this down positively now—it was quite conceivable that a proper reference to the Holy Spirit might be, not a means of leading to transubstantiation, but the best guard against it.

This reply gave great satisfaction to those who heard it. The attendance, it should be added, was very large, and there was a "go" about the proceedings which augured well for the future of the Conference.

What is "Catholicity"? The papers at the Catholicity. Islington Conference, strong and able as most of them were, did not supply any one clear definition of the term. The phrase was variously interpreted by different speakers, and it would seem almost to defy an absolute definition. There is a certain advantage in vagueness, so long as there is no uncertainty on questions of principle, and in this respect the Islington papers rang as sound and as true as a bell. The Rev. J. Gough McCormick (whose recent nomination to the Deanery of Manchester was referred to with pleasure at the Conference) analysed four points in Canon Lacey's vol., *Catholicity*, and said that "if this is Catholicity we are Catholics all the day and all the way." But he went on to point out that when we came to deal with the practical developments of this common Catholicity differences sprang up. He referred, for example, to the question of worship:—

You see an elaborate system of ceremonial and so on in operation in some of our churches, and you will hear that worship described as "Catholic." In other churches you will find a simplicity that is even severe, but the *Church Times* at least would never dream of calling the worship of those churches Catholic. And yet when I look back to the original deposit I see no warrant for this distinction. I base myself upon no particular texts, I accept to the full Canon Lacey's description of this deposit, that it is the total impression that Jesus Christ made on His day and generation. And when I ask myself with regard to this matter, "What was that impression?" I am driven to

the answer not that He said that ritual and the rest of it were wrong, but that they were comparatively immaterial. If you give to this elaborate system of worship, and to this alone, the enormous title of "Catholic," then you have reached a point at which you do, in an essential particular, contradict the total impression which Jesus Christ made upon His day and generation. To call it Catholic is to make it truly universally applicable. Observe, I am not arguing in the least against an elaborate practice of religion. It is in another quarter that we must look for the sanction for that or for simplicity too. It is in the diverse needs of human nature which will lead different kinds of men to offer different kinds of worship. It is the exclusive appropriation of the biggest word we know to one particular form of service which seems to me to make "Catholic" un-Catholic. We must claim for every type of worship which is in accord with the deposit of faith and owned by the Holy Spirit of God that it is Catholic worship.

The Rev. G. D. Oakley, who followed, dealt, as Mr. McCormick had done, with the "Ideals" of Catholicity, and enumerated three—spirituality, liberty, and unity. Canon E. A. Burroughs read an able paper on the "Boundaries" of Catholicity, which seemed as difficult to indicate as the word "Catholicity" is to define. He was against an "exclusive policy":—

Instead, what we need to look out for and exclude is that which is itself, in its working, exclusive. Exclusiveness—especially exclusiveness on principle—is the only irremediably un-Christian and un-Catholic thing. Especially in a time of transition and confusion and creation like the present, it is far more dangerous (both for ourselves and for the Kingdom of God) to exclude what may be partly true, because we know it is partly false, than to admit provisionally—note the word—even what we know to be partly false, because it shows signs (by its fruits, for instance) of being partly true. That is where inspired sympathy and faith come in; the first to feel for and want to welcome any particle of Christ—His truth, His beauty, His love—which we light on anywhere; the second to believe that such particles need not be rejected because they are mixed up at present with much that is "of the earth, earthy," since He Who is the Truth, is still here to guide us, gradually, "into all the Truth," if, abiding in love, we abide in Him.

The Rev. H. B. Gooding, the new Principal of Wycliffe Hall, Oxford, who followed in a speech which showed something of the strength of his keenly analytical mind, referred to the Lambeth Quadrilateral as furnishing four corner-stones, "and if, in imagination, we draw lines to connect up these four we get a fairly clear and definite picture of what we may call the boundaries of our catholicity." But his examination of these four corner-stones showed that "there is what we might call a narrower and a more liberal view, and of course the amount of space or the number of people whom we can include within our quadrilateral varies according as we take the one or the other of those views." Indeed any and every examination of the question raises difficulties. There must be some

limit, and the old problem recurs, "Where are we to draw the line?" If the Islington papers had any weakness it was to be found in the failure to indicate precisely where the line should be drawn, or—and this view found expression in some circles after the Conference—in the desire to draw it too low down. The result of the proceedings at the morning session was to leave one with the impression that "Catholicity" is a very great word, but that its "Ideals" are very difficult to interpret, and that its "Boundaries" are somewhat uncertain.

The afternoon session brought to our notice the **The Catholic Message.** "Purpose" of Catholicity, and we were at once transported to a different atmosphere. Here, certainly, there was no room for vagueness or uncertainty, and the personal appeals made by the several speakers made a profound impression. First came the Rev. W. E. S. Holland, who, declaring that "the Church is Catholic in order that it may manifest the complete glory of the Son of Man, and that it may inform the entire life of all mankind," gave one of those eloquent rousing addresses so characteristic of the Director of the Church of England Recruiting Campaign for Service in the Kingdom of God. He was followed by the Bishop of Chelmsford, who at very short notice took the place which should have been occupied by Prebendary F. S. Webster, so suddenly taken from us just eleven days before the Conference. In an address of great power, which manifestly "gripped" the clergy present, the Bishop urged that the purpose of the Church—the purpose of each clergyman and each member of the Church—must be the same as that which actuated, occupied and dominated the mission of Christ. And what was that? "It was surely the determined will of God, it was surely the purpose of Christ when He left heaven to come down on earth, to win the world into right relationship with God, and, by so doing, to bring it into right relationship with itself." This purpose the Bishop applied to the facts of the world to-day, and he appealed to the clergy even as he appealed to himself "to go back from this Islington Conference determined that we are going to leave little things alone and concentrate on the biggest job that ever any men undertook, the conversion of men through the power of the Holy Ghost by preaching and living out the Cross of Jesus Christ." Prebendary Burroughs in a wonderfully impressive

summary dwelt upon the relation priest and pastor holds to his Lord and Master; and then the Bishop of Truro, in an impromptu speech which touched all hearts, urged that the Catholic message is and can only be the simple Gospel of the Lord Jesus Christ.

So, he added, after all, I am going to dare to say, at the end of our day's discussion, that what we mean by the word "Evangelical" we also mean by the word "Catholic." The Catholic message is the Evangelical message—the message of the Christ. The Gospel of the Saviour gives us pardon and power also to fulfil the function of the Church of God. God send us forth in the splendid power of that message to get rid, as the Bishop of Chelmsford has suggested, of those smaller things which worry the lives of our parishes and fill the post-bags of our Bishops, and to preach over again in all its largeness and its power the Catholic message, believing that if this is preached it is still, as it has always been, the power of God unto salvation!

It was a fine ending to what had been a really great meeting. Viewed as a whole it may safely be said that the Islington Conference of 1920 was a triumph, and, unless we are altogether mistaken, it will make history.

An announcement of the utmost significance has appeared in the public press:—“By the invitation of the Dean of Durham (Bishop Welldon), Dr. J. H. Jowett, minister of Westminster Chapel, will preach in Durham Cathedral at evensong on Sunday, February 15.” The announcement is the more notable in that it comes at a time when the proposal for interchange of pulpits has received something of a setback, since the Archbishop of Canterbury's suggestion that action upon such questions should be deferred until after the Lambeth Conference. It will not come as a surprise, however, to those who heard Bishop Welldon's speech at the Leicester Church Congress. He is one who holds that no corporate union with the Free Churches is possible except upon the condition that Nonconformists should accept the principle of episcopal ordination, but he holds also that it is essential that something should be done *now* to show that the Church is one. In his Congress speech, therefore, he suggested that the Church, without waiting for the great step of re-Ordination which must be a good while delayed, should meet the great desire of Nonconformists for reunion by some conciliatory measures, including the admission of Nonconformist ministers to the pulpit on special occasions. This invitation to Dr. Jowett is, therefore, a practical illustration of his desire, and we hope he will be strongly supported.

Of critics there will be many ; let those who sympathize with Bishop Welldon not fail to make their voices heard. It may safely be assured that his own Diocesan is at one with him in this matter, for, in a recent letter to *The Times*, the Bishop of Durham said in regard to the suggestion that the full consideration of Interchange should be deferred till the Lambeth Conference that he " cannot think that that counsel lays it as an almost injunction upon diocesan Bishops to allow no occasion, however great or special, or however otherwise appealing, to be used for the promotion of Fellowship in the great mission of the Christian prophet." For himself it would be impossible to take such a course. It will be a great event—a distinguished Nonconformist preaching from the pulpit of one of the Church's historic Cathedrals ; and we trust that Bishop Welldon's courageous example may be followed by Dean Inge at St. Paul's, and Bishop Ryle at Westminster Abbey.

National Church League. One of the most interesting, as well as one of the most important, London gatherings in " Islington week " was the Reception held at the Church House by the National Church League. The President, Sir Edward Clarke, K.C., received the guests, and at the subsequent meeting gave an impressive address from the chair. Excellent speeches were made also by the Rev. W. Stanton Jones, Vicar of Bradford, the Rev. H. A. Wilson, Rector of Cheltenham, and the Dean of Canterbury. Reference was made during the meeting to the great work accomplished by the National Church League—especially in connexion with the Memorial against the proposed changes in the Communion Service—and also to the many opportunities for further service which are opening out so wonderfully before the League. It was, however, very clearly pointed out that if these opportunities are to be taken advantage of, the League must receive a much larger measure of support. It is of the utmost importance, therefore, that the appeal for £10,000 should receive a generous response.



OUR ATTITUDE TO THE REFORMATION SETTLEMENT (DOCTRINAL).

BY THE REV. C. H. K. BOUGHTON, B.D., Vicar of Calverley,
near Leeds.

IF any one wishes to see Mount Snowdon, he must decide whether he will look at it from Carnarvon or Llanberis or the top of Gwynant Pass or the neighbourhood of Aberglaslyn. He will see a different view from each place, and unless he be the fortunate occupant of a good motor-car he cannot see all the views on the same day. Similarly the Reformation Settlement is a very large thing, and any one who sets out to define his attitude to it will be wise if he selects some aspect of it and is therewith content. Now without making any attempt to compile a complete list of the aspects of the Reformation Settlement, I think we may at once pick out three which deserve ample consideration. Let me mention them in a rough historical order.

Firstly, there is the Constitutional aspect. In the mediæval period the Church of England had to some extent lost its national character and, in spite of frequent protests, had come under the power of the Papacy. The first stage of the Reformation was the abolition of the usurpations of Rome, and the establishment of the King as Supreme Head on earth of the Church of England. This was done by a long series of important Acts of Parliament, first passed under Henry VIII, then repealed under Mary, and finally re-enacted in substance in the early years of Elizabeth. Secondly, there is the Liturgical aspect. With few exceptions, the pre-Reformation services in England had belonged to the Western type, and had been in a language not understood of the people. The two Prayer Books of 1549 and 1552—the latter followed by slightly altered new editions in 1559, 1604 and 1662—gave us a new thing. In them we have a type of service distinctively Anglican. It is liturgical, but it is based upon Eastern models as well as Western, and it is throughout in the vulgar tongue and intended to be thoroughly congregational. Thirdly, there is the Doctrinal aspect. This was more slow in its development. All through Henry's reign there was a conflict of opinion between the advocates of the

old and the new learning ; and although the new learning attempted to establish itself in popular esteem through the publication of the Ten Articles of 1536 and the Institution of a Christian Man or Bishop's Book of 1537, yet Henry was to the end loyal at heart to the old learning, and the anti-Reformation party triumphed when they secured the passing of the Statute of Six Articles in 1539 and the publication of the King's Book in 1543. It was not until the very close of Edward's reign that the publication of the Forty-two Articles sealed the success of Reformed doctrine, and even then Anglican Theology was not finally settled until the Forty-two had been reduced to Thirty-eight in 1563 and expanded to Thirty-nine in 1571, under the inspiration of Elizabeth and Archbishop Parker.

Of these three aspects the one which has been most present to our minds in recent years is the Liturgical. That has been forced into prominence by the issue to Convocation some ten years ago of the King's Letters of business to revise the Prayer Book, and every one of us has his own opinion of the revision proceedings now happily or unhappily drawing to a close. The Constitutional aspect has also suddenly forced itself upon our attention. The very centre of the Constitutional settlement is the close control exercised by the State over the Church through the Royal Supremacy and all which it involves, and that control will necessarily be considerably modified now that the Life and Liberty movement has succeeded in accomplishing its programme, and the Enabling Bill has passed into law. The Doctrinal aspect has not come into the arena of public controversy in quite the same way as the other two, but the growth of the Modernist movement as well as of the Anglo-Catholic movement testifies to its profound importance, and I wish in the present paper to suggest some thoughts on the attitude which Evangelicals should adopt towards it. I take the Thirty-nine Articles as the accepted official description of this aspect.

There is, perhaps, a previous question on which a few words ought to be said. We are to consider our attitude to a Settlement. That means that we may accept it, or reject it, or accept it in part and reject it in part. Are we justified in doing any such thing ? There is at the end of the Prayer Book a very fearsome-sounding paragraph in the King's Declaration prefixed to the Articles, which is probably less frequently read by the average hard-working Parish Priest than even the Articles themselves. Let me quote it. " In

these both curious and unhappy differences, which have for so many hundred years, in different times and places, exercised the Church of Christ, we will, that all further curious search be laid aside, and these disputes shut up in God's promises, as they be generally set forth to us in the Holy Scriptures, and the general meaning of the Articles of the Church of England according to them, and that no man hereafter shall either print, or preach, to draw the Article aside any way, but shall submit to it in the plain and full meaning thereof: and shall not put his own sense or comment to be the meaning of the Article, but shall take it in the literal and grammatical sense." It is added that if anybody disobeys this injunction, the King will see that due execution be done upon him. On what ground are we to escape this due execution for venturing to discuss our attitude to the Settlement? The answer of course lies in the present form of the Declaration of Assent to the Articles and Prayer Book which clergy subscribe at their Ordination and on subsequent occasions. It will be remembered that this was the outcome of a long agitation which led to the appointment of a Royal Commission on the subject of Subscription in 1865, and that it replaced an earlier and much more stringent form of Declaration which had become intolerable. There can be no doubt that the purpose of the alteration was to relieve us all from bondage to the "literal and grammatical sense," and to give us a much wider liberty of thought. The significance of the present Declaration is very well put by my friend Canon Battersby Harford in the Prayer Book Dictionary. He says, "A careful study of the Articles and the Prayer Book reveals the fact that Anglican Theology moves along certain definite and distinctive lines. These lines of doctrine distinguish it from Romanism on the one hand and the extreme forms of Protestantism on the other. Subscription to the Articles should imply loyalty to these distinctive principles. It is not compatible with adherence to those opposing principles and practices which are distinctive of Rome on the one hand or Anabaptism on the other. But within its own lines there is scope for a genuine evolution of Anglican Theology in the light of present day knowledge. Theology is a living science. The immense progress made in other departments of thought in the nineteenth century could not fail to show itself also in Theology. Biblical criticism and natural science have thrown new light upon the problems of Theology.

Men think in new categories, and it is inevitable that the definitions and propositions of the sixteenth century should be inadequate to express the best theological thought of our own day. But it is one thing to recognize the need for restatement and quite another to put forth any restatement which would command universal assent. This may be possible some day. When that day comes, let the task be taken in hand in humble dependence upon the guidance of the Spirit of God. Meantime subscription to the Articles must be regarded as made, subject to such qualifications as are necessitated by the new light thrown upon certain doctrines in recent times."

With that interpretation of the Declaration I take it that almost everybody will now agree. Differences between us will begin to arise when we begin to consider where to draw the line between those subjects upon which a definite position was deliberately taken up at the Reformation in face of opinion to the contrary, and those subjects upon which no particular discussion then took place, but upon which an opinion was pronounced in an incidental manner and upon which, accordingly, departure from the sixteenth century view is possible in the light of later knowledge and discussion without any stigma of disloyalty. There are certain subjects which we shall all agree to place in the list of those upon which no serious divergence of opinion is consistent with loyalty. There are other subjects where some will regard the received opinion as fundamental, not merely to Anglicanism, but even to the Christian faith itself, while others will prefer to keep an open mind about them. There are still other subjects upon which, at any rate, many will say that the view expressed or implied at the Reformation is proved untrue or inadequate in the light of further research and discovery.

Differences between us will reveal themselves. They will reveal themselves all the more because we are Evangelicals ; because, therefore, we cling tenaciously to that right of private judgment which is more or less correctly regarded as a fruit of the Reformation Movement ; because, as I firmly hold, we are a school of thought in general agreement with each other and not a party with a rigidly uniform set of views. These differences must be seriously faced, and all of us must patiently and diligently search for Truth under the guidance of the Holy Spirit. Meanwhile we ought to dwell in charity with one another, and join together as heretofore in work for the extension of the Kingdom of God.

It remains for me to give a few illustrations of the application of the principle which has been thus enunciated. I cannot examine the whole of the Thirty-nine Articles with a view to classifying them under this heading or that, or this paper would run to a very undesirable length. It will, I hope, serve the purpose if I make a selection in order to elucidate and justify my principle.

i. Let me begin by naming three subjects where the Articles undoubtedly lay down a definite position, outside the limits of which it is not possible to go without disloyalty.

(a) Take the very fundamental Sixth Article. "Holy Scripture containeth all things necessary to salvation; so that whatsoever is not read therein, nor may be proved thereby, is not to be required of any man, that it should be believed as an Article of the Faith, or be thought requisite necessary to salvation." This asserts that Holy Scripture, and It alone, is the final resting ground of what doctrine is or is not necessary to salvation. It was framed in deliberate opposition to the decree passed at the Fourth Session of the Council of Trent in April, 1546. I quote the important words in an English translation, "The sacred . . . Synod of Trent . . . keeping this always in view that . . . our Lord Jesus Christ . . . first promulgated [the Gospel] with His own mouth and then commanded [it] to be preached by His Apostles to every creature as the fountain both of every saving truth and also of the discipline of morals; and perceiving that this truth and discipline is contained in the written books and in the unwritten traditions which, received by the Apostles from the mouth of Christ Himself, or from the Apostles themselves, at the Holy Spirit's dictation, have come down even to us, transmitted as it were from hand to hand: [The Synod] receives and venerates, with equal affection of piety and reverence, all the books, both of the Old and also of the New Testament . . . as also the said traditions, both those appertaining to faith as well as those appertaining to morals, as having been dictated either by Christ's own word of mouth or by the Holy Spirit and preserved by a continuous tradition in the Catholic Church." Here is a perfectly definite issue. Are the ecclesiastical writers, ancient and mediæval, of equal authority with the primitive Scriptures, or do they occupy a position, useful indeed, but strictly subordinate? An affirmative answer must be given to one half of the question or the other, and his choice stamps a man as a Romanist or a Protestant. He cannot be both.

(b) In the Seventeenth Article we are precluded from an error coming from precisely the opposite direction. Augustine, in his dispute with Pelagius over the questions of divine grace and human freedom, had, partly by what he said and partly by what he implied, emphasized one side of a rather complex and difficult truth in a very dangerous way. Augustine's views were taken up by the great Frenchman who became the leading Reformed theologian, John Calvin, and were by him worked out with a remorseless logical precision to a thoroughly one-sided result in the style which we have now grown accustomed to associate with theses for German divinity degrees. Calvin's Institutes were published in 1536, but the treatise *De Predestinatione*, which summed up the great Genevan discussion on the subject, only came out in 1552. This was the year in which the Articles were first drawn up, and it has therefore been doubted whether Calvin's views were distinctly in mind when the Seventeenth Article was framed. However that may be, there is no doubt that there was a strong current of Calvinistic thought in this country, first among the Edwardian Anabaptists, and then among reputable Church theologians of the Elizabethan period. The Seventeenth Article, both by the things which it says and by the things which it carefully leaves unsaid, directs us to abandon any attempt to secure logical consistency if thereby we may return to the illogical but far more true and satisfactory theology of the Epistle to the Romans.

(c) Let me take one more illustration. It shall be from an article which, like a famous character in the Pilgrim's Progress, faces both ways. It guards us at once from an error first associated with the name of the mediæval theologian, Paschasius Radbert, who taught that after the consecration prayer in the Eucharist there is "nothing else save the Body and Blood of the Lord," and from an opposite error, rightly or wrongly associated with the name of the Reformed theologian Zwingli, that sacraments are mere ineffective signs. I refer, of course, to Article XXVIII on the Lord's Supper. You will remember that the first paragraph says that "The Supper of the Lord is not only a sign of the love that Christians ought to have among themselves one to another; but rather it is a Sacrament of our redemption by Christ's death": while, on the other hand, the second paragraph tells us that "Transubstantiation . . . in the supper of the Lord, cannot be proved by

Holy Writ; but is repugnant to the plain words of Scripture, overthroweth the nature of a Sacrament, and hath given occasion to many superstitions." There is room for considerable difference of opinion on the precise character of the Eucharist within the limits here laid down. There would seem to be a place for those Evangelicals whose views approximate to Calvin's as well as those High Churchmen whose views bear close resemblance to Luther's. What is clear is that while the English Church officially admits variety of view on this subject, she has drawn two clear frontier lines, and to pass beyond them in either direction is not consistent with loyalty or honesty.

2. We must now leave that list of subjects on which there is plainly a distinctively Anglican theology, and pass to that other list of topics upon which no considered polemical opinion was pronounced. Here, I venture to think, we may, without disloyalty, diverge from the position expressed or implied in the Articles if we are constrained by new discoveries of truth or new modes of thought to do so. Sometimes this divergence may not amount to more than a preference for another mode of expressing a doctrine with which substantially we are in agreement. Sometimes it may be of a more serious character. Again let me illustrate what I mean.

(a) I will begin with a case which can truthfully be described as a case of divergent expression rather than of divergent opinion.

Article VIII asserts that the three Creeds "ought thoroughly to be received and believed: for they may be proved by most certain warrants of Holy Scripture." This is tantamount to putting the Athanasian Creed as a Schedule to the Articles. Now the Athanasian Creed consists of two parts, a central section containing an expression of belief about the Holy Trinity and the Person of Christ, and the warning clauses at the beginning and end about the results of rejecting that belief. Questions arise under both these heads. The warning clauses are of course very misleading in their English dress, and must be corrected by reference to the Latin. But even when they are taken in Latin, and even when we remember all that Bishop Dowden¹ has so ably and convincingly said about the historical origin of the Creed and its reference not to intellectual belief but to moral fidelity, there are still those who think that the clauses go beyond anything which Scripture warrants. For these

¹ See his *Further Studies in the Prayer Book*.

people there is a conflict between a definite doctrine of the sufficiency of Scripture in Article VI and a doctrine implied in Article VIII. They can only reject the latter in loyalty to the former.

But I really referred to the Athanasian Creed in order to call attention to its doctrines of the Trinity and of the Person of Christ. With the essence of those doctrines nobody who fairly reads the New Testament can disagree. But the language in which they are expressed is quite another matter. It comes from the fifth century. It has its background in the metaphysic of that age, and cannot be properly understood apart from it. It deals in terms like substance and person. The modern mind does not appreciate that metaphysic, and is not much helped by the expression of Christian truths in terms of it. This is particularly so in regard to Christology. Quite a stream of modern writers agree in finding the old Christology unsatisfactory, and in seeking to construct a new theory of the Person of Christ which shall be at once true to the basic facts of the New Testament and intelligible to modern thought. Professor H. R. Mackintosh's *Person of Jesus Christ* is a case in point. Theology as a living science cannot do otherwise than thus seek to restate.

(b) My next illustration shall be in the human sphere instead of the Divine. Article IX is an attack upon the Pelagian theory of sin. The Pelagians asserted that every child starts with a pure soul and falls exactly as Adam did by his own fault. The Augustinians asserted the existence of a taint in the race due to transmission of the effects of Adam's fall, and the Article ranges itself on their side. Now two scientific positions are implied in what is said. The first is that the whole human race goes back to a single progenitor, or rather to a single pair. The second is that the effects of sin are transmitted from parent to child. Both positions are matters of scientific controversy to-day.

The acceptance of the theory of the evolution of man from lower orders of being opens out at any rate the possibility that mankind as we know it is not descended from a single progenitor, and that the tremendous differences between the races of men are best explained by supposing that there were many progenitors instead of one. In this case the Article would be unhappily worded in assuming the existence of a single Adam. Again, scientific opinion is acutely divided over the possibility and method of the transmission from

parent to child of acquired characteristics. It is well known that a great scientific authority like Weissmann totally denied such transmission, and that Dr. Tennant of Cambridge wrote what is practically a new theology of sin upon the basis of Weissmann's scientific results. The latter says in his book on the *Origin of Sin*, "It cannot be said that man inherits a bias to evil" (p. 101 note); or again: "If the upholder of the doctrine of a fallen nature sees in an exhibition (of selfishness, passion, etc., in a young child) . . . one of the marks of inborn depravity, the naturalist reads there only a sign of future sanity and vigour. The young child is for him a sentient automaton, admirably suited by nature for self-preservation and development under the conditions of its early nurture. . . . The apparent faults of infantile age are in fact organic necessities" (p. 100). Here again, if Dr. Tennant is right, the Article is sadly wrong.

Personally I am inclined to disagree with the views to which I have been referring. I understand that there is ample scientific opinion in support of the view that the human race does go back to a single pair. The subject is discussed in that sense in Chapter VII of Professor Keane's *Ethnology*, published in 1909. Similarly, in spite of Weissmann's scientific difficulties over the method of transmission of acquired characteristics, there are not wanting equally eminent scientists who agree with popular opinion about the reality of the fact. But the point is not, for the moment, which side is right in the controversy. The point is this. A dispute exists involving the truth of the Article. That dispute has arisen in consequence of scientific research and discovery since the date of the Article. The Article merely says what everybody believed to be a scientific fact at the time it was written. It is no more characteristic of Anglican theology than of any other type. Is a man, then, disloyal to the Articles if he holds Dr. Tennant's views? I feel bound to answer in the negative. He must abide by the results of his researches, and he and we who disagree with him must have faith that some day the real truth will emerge more clearly than it has done at present.

(c) I should like to give one more illustration. It is of the same type as the last, but it is less obscure and much more thorny. It arises partly out of Article VIII on the Creeds, but more directly out of Article II, which asserts the Virgin Birth of Christ, and Article

IV, which asserts His bodily resurrection in very explicit terms. Now, once again, let me say, to prevent misunderstanding, that I accept as facts the Virgin Birth and the bodily Resurrection. But why do I accept them? Not because the Creeds and the Articles affirm them. Nobody disputed them when the Articles were written, and the assertion of them does not belong to distinctive Anglican theology. I accept them, in accordance with Article VI, because I believe that they can be proved from the Holy Scripture when that is examined in the light of modern criticism. I accept them on no other ground than this; though no doubt I am delighted to find that most people through the Christian centuries have been in agreement with me in my conclusion. But it is idle to deny that the very same Biblical criticism which seems to me to justify these beliefs seems to certain other people to condemn them. What am I to do? Am I to hurl the Creeds at their heads? Am I to deny the lawfulness of criticism? I cannot do either. Neither can I accuse them of disloyalty to the Articles. They must abide by the results of their criticism until they see reason on critical grounds to change their opinions.

Difficult situations will no doubt arise. They have already arisen, and much distress has been caused here and there. All this is very regrettable, but it is almost inevitable in an age of new discovery and progressive thought. It is the task of statesmanship to use all possible consideration and tact so that the existence of divergent views shall cause as little distress as possible. But whatever the distress may be, it does not seem to me to invalidate that principle of freedom of thought in searching out new truth for which I have been arguing. Where new light comes, the rigidity of the Declaration of Assent must be relaxed; though how far the relaxation should go is a question more easily asked than answered: our Fathers in God have here much need of patience and wisdom. Happily, however, the number of subjects involved in restatement is comparatively small, and we can be thankful that we have such an excellent and comprehensive summary of distinctive Anglicanism as our Thirty-nine Articles.

C. H. K. BOUGHTON.

INSPIRATION.

BY THE REV. G. ESTWICK FORD, B.A.

I AM going to deal with this subject from the point of view of human experience, and not from that of theological speculation. If there is such a thing as Divine inspiration, of Scripture or otherwise, it must of necessity be a fact of human experience, and can, I believe, be most helpfully discussed from that standpoint. I shall, therefore, begin by stating the following personal experience, the account of which is a verbatim copy of the report of the occurrence referred to, which I wrote within an hour of its happening.

"THE PRIORY VICARAGE,

"SHIREHAMPTON.

"On Sunday morning, September 29, 1901, Miss B., a former member of the Holy Trinity, Bristol, congregation who is engaged to Mr. M. of Johannesburg, walked over to Shirehampton, where I was preaching that day, in order to see me and tell me something.

"She said that some years ago, before I left Holy Trinity, she was in very great trouble that seemed to be absolutely crushing. She had not been to church for three or four Sundays on account of the distress in which the whole family was plunged; but on the particular Sunday to which she referred she resolved to go, and before starting for church she went upstairs and prayed that God would give me a message to help her.

"That evening as I gave out my text I said, 'I had not intended to speak to-night on this subject, but had prepared something altogether different. *There is some one in the church to-night for whom God has a special message.*' She had been able to pay no attention to the service; but these words (words which I had spoken under an impulse that I could not explain) at once laid hold of her, and she listened whilst I described in detail the circumstances in which she was placed, and spoke words of guidance and encouragement.

"Her lover was by her side, and as they left the church he asked her when she had told me all the details of the family trouble; but she begged him not to say anything to her, for her heart was

too full for words. When they had reached home, however, and she was more composed, he repeated the question, and she replied that she had never said a word to me and that I knew nothing whatever of the circumstances—a statement which was quite true.

“This morning she asked me if I remembered having some years ago begun a sermon with the words she had repeated, and when I replied that I remembered the fact quite well but could not remember either the text or the subject, she told me the story that I have now related, and went on to say that she was the one for whom the message I gave was intended, and that she could not tell me all that that message had done for her. She had wanted to tell me of this incident long ago, and had had no opportunity, but as she was hoping to go out to S. Africa to be married early next year and might not see me again in this life she felt she must come and tell me to-day, and therefore she had made the appointment with me last Friday night at the Harvest Festival [in Bristol] and had come over this morning. She could never forget that sermon in which God had made me alter my subject, and had put into my mind the details of her trouble, and had given her a direct message through my lips in answer to her prayer. 29. ix. 01.”

The question arises, How are we to account for this experience? Is the supernatural explanation which commended itself to Miss B. the true account of the matter, or is there a natural explanation?

The idea of telepathy at once occurs to the mind, viz., that the thought occupying the woman's mind was conveyed to the mind of the preacher by the familiar, though unexplained, process of thought transference, and that it translated itself into his subsequent action. This at first sight appears probable, but it will not stand investigation. In the first place there was no *rapport*, no mutual contact, between her mind and the preacher's. I did not personally know her, for the regular congregation was a very large one and she had never made herself known to me. Moreover there was no attempt on her part to concentrate attention upon me so as to convey an impression upon my subconscious mind. She was a young woman utterly unacquainted with psychology whether new or old; but she believed in God and in the power of prayer, and so she prayed that He would give me a message for her. Her thought of me in this connection is wholly inadequate to account for the events that followed; for consider what these were:

i. A conviction occurring in the midst of the Evening Service that I must not preach on the subject I had contemplated, growing into the feeling that it was impossible for me to do so.

ii. The coming into my mind of a fresh subject coupled with an appropriate text, and the shaping of the subject into the form of a sermon—all going on more or less subconsciously whilst my upper consciousness was occupied with the conduct of the service.

iii. The arising in my mind, as an integral part of the sermon, of an illustration which proved to be so accurate and detailed a description of the circumstances that were distressing the young woman and her family that her fiancé could only conclude that she had told me the whole story.

Now telepathy might certainly account for producing upon my mind a more or less vague impression of distress, vague because I knew of no one with whom to associate the distress; but it could not explain *the imperative impulse* to alter the whole sermon at such an awkward moment, nor could it account for the new sermon with its arresting illustration and the words of help and guidance, all of which constituted just the memorable message that was exactly adapted to the need, although to the messenger that need was quite unknown. In this case the supernatural explanation is more reasonable than the natural, unless indeed one has proved that there is no Divine Spirit to inspire the mind of man with specific thoughts and with the impulse to definite action.

Inquiry might disclose experiences of this character as striking as this or even more remarkable; but, however this may be, I suppose there are very few of us, ministers of Christ, who have not frequently experienced the uprising of thoughts in our minds for which there has been no natural cause, and still more of the impulse to do particular acts, arising *à propos* of nothing, but singularly and amply justified by the event—all these things illustrating St. Paul's meaning when he speaks of men being "led by the Spirit of God," and shedding light upon the spiritual experiences which led him down to Troas in order that he might bring the Gospel over to Europe.

Now, what I want to suggest is that in all these experiences we have examples of the kind of inspiration which the Lord Jesus Christ experienced, in so high a degree and to so remarkable an extent, whilst He was here on earth. He was not a superhuman Being

set quite apart from the rest of mankind, even though there was in Him the Divine nature, but was made in all things like unto His brethren. We should, therefore, naturally expect that although the degree to which He was inspired was exceptional because of His exceptional capacity for inspiration, yet the inspiration was of the same kind as that granted to apostles and to us.

And, indeed, whilst certainly claiming this, He claims no other. He tells us that His teaching, the words that He spoke, was given Him by the Father ; He also declares that the impulse to perform the miraculous deeds which were His ministerial credentials came likewise from above. The question of vital importance, therefore, for us is to what extent we can rely upon the inspiration of Jesus ; how far it raises His teaching above the level of that of a Jewish rabbi of His day ; how far, if at all, it constitutes Him a criterion for the inspiration of Holy Scripture in general.

There are two conflicting theories of our Lord's position as a teacher. The one represents Him as infallible by reason of His Divine nature ; the other regards Him as being so really and thoroughly human, because of His incarnation, that He knew and taught just what a well-informed and transparently sincere thinker of His day would know and teach ; and that He made the same mistakes on such subjects, for example, as eschatology and the authorship of Old Testament writings as might under such circumstances be expected. On this latter view of the matter the teaching of Jesus Christ, so far from being the test of the truth, must itself be tested before it can be accepted as true ; and it is claimed that in certain particulars He has been definitely convicted of error. The passage in the Epistle to the Philippians which enunciates the doctrine of the *kenosis* is naturally cited in support of this position. This passage is as follows :—“ Who being originally in the form of God did not regard His being on an equality with God a thing to be held fast, but emptied Himself, taking the form of a servant, being made in the likeness of men ” (Phil. ii. 6-7).

The late Archdeacon Gifford, in a book entitled *The Incarnation* which has recently been re-published by Longmans, has, I think, established the point that the thing of which our Lord is here said to have emptied Himself is not “ the form of God,” i.e. the Divine nature, but, rather, that which He did not regard as a thing to be held fast, viz. His being on an equality with God. The Archdeacon's

interpretation of the passage as a whole appears to me, nevertheless, to be defective because of the exceedingly limited meaning which he quite arbitrarily assigns to this latter phrase, "His being on an equality with God." "We have seen," he says in summing up the conclusions at which he has arrived, that *ἰσα Θεῷ* denotes the manifold circumstances of glory and majesty, or the particular modes of manifestation, which were an adequate expression of the Divine nature of the Son, but not inseparable from it." But why glory and majesty only? Dr. Gifford, relying on a statement of Bishop Pearson; distinguishes between essential attributes and relative attributes, the former assumed to be inseparable from the Divine nature, the latter relative to the perception of God by angels and by men, such as glory and majesty, and capable of being laid aside. This argument, or rather assertion, is singularly unconvincing. Who are we that we should decide between what is and what is not inseparable from the Divine nature? The interpretation of St. Paul's words must be sought in the recorded history of the life and work of Jesus Christ; and, in this connection, whilst we have on the one hand the awe-inspired utterance of St. John, "and we beheld His glory, glory as of the only-begotten of the Father," we have on the other hand the record of an infancy of utter helplessness and ignorance, a boyhood of natural growth in wisdom as in stature, a manhood and a ministry characterised by the frank confession, "I can of mine own self do nothing," "of that day and hour knoweth no one, not even the angels of heaven, *neither the Son*, but the Father only." It would therefore appear that whilst the Divine glory was not so wholly laid aside but that apostles could behold it, there were two attributes of which the incarnate Son had completely emptied Himself, viz. the Divine knowledge and the Divine power.

Must we then abandon our confidence in Him as a perfectly reliable teacher, an infallible guide to the truth in the things of which He speaks? No! for side by side with His admission of personal ignorance and lack of power there goes continually the most unqualified claim to a perfect inspiration both as to His teaching and also as to the works that served as signs of the source of that teaching; and Almighty God has endorsed from heaven that claim, as Jesus said He would, by raising Him from the dead. The experiences that we intermittently and imperfectly enjoy, of utterances given to us and of impulses to action, were for Him regular

and perfect, an integral factor of His ministry. Let us consider His assertions on this point.

1. *His Teaching*.—"My teaching is not Mine, but His that sent Me. If any man willeth to do His will he shall know of the teaching, whether it be of God, or whether I speak from Myself" (St. John vii. 17). "Then shall ye know that I am He, and that I do nothing of Myself, but as the Father taught Me I speak these things" (St. John viii. 28). "For I speak not from Myself; but the Father which sent Me, He hath given Me commandment what I should say and what I should speak: the things therefore which I speak, even as the Father hath said unto Me, so I speak" (St. John xii. 49, 50). "The words that I say unto you I speak not from Myself" (St. John xiv. 10). "The word which ye hear is not Mine, but the Father's who sent Me" (St. John xiv. 24).

2. *His Works*.—"The Father abiding in Me doeth His works" (St. John xiv. 10). On two special occasions, when He worked His first and His last miracles, we see this waiting upon the Father, this watching and listening for the signal, for the impulse to act, and His restraining of His own desire to do the required work until the inspiration from above should come. The Virgin invites His help when the wine fails; but all that He can answer is, "Lady mother, I cannot heed thee; My hour is not yet come." But Mary's intuition was not at fault. In a little while He performed the beginning of His miracles and manifested forth His glory. Similarly, when summoned by the anxious sisters to the sick-bed of Lazarus—a summons to which He would gladly have responded, for we are reminded that He loved Lazarus and Martha and Mary—He lingered where He was; and it was only when the knowledge came to Him that Lazarus was dead that there came with it the inspiration to awake him from that sleep of death.

Here then we have the fact of inspiration in its most marked manifestation. Jesus Christ bears witness to it as an habitual experience, and as the essential element of His ministry both of teaching and also of working miracles. Coming from One who was so singularly humble in heart, so utterly sincere and so clear-minded, this testimony would for most people be convincing as to the reality of the personal experience in question. Being such as He was, He would never have made this claim to Divine inspiration if He had had any doubt as to the reality of the experiences;

and the fact that they were habitual entirely eliminated for Him the possibility of chance coincidence. So firm, indeed, was His conviction of the Divine origin of His teaching that He declared that though heaven and earth might pass away, His words would not pass away.

We have, however, a still stronger witness to the truth of His claim. When challenged by the Jewish rulers to show them a sign in attestation of His authority, He foretold His resurrection on the third day; and this sign has been given. St. Paul, in his address to the Athenians, evidently refers to this fact when he says that God has given assurance that He will judge all men by Christ in the fact that He has raised Him from the dead. There is nothing in the bare fact of Christ's resurrection to indicate that He is to be the judge of mankind; but if we remember that Christ declared that God had appointed Him to be judge of all, and if His resurrection is God's attestation of that claim, St. Paul's argument is clear.

Jesus Christ is thus the perfect example of the inspired teacher. As John the Baptist expressed it, the Spirit was not given by measure to Him. In other words, He had by constant habit developed a practically unlimited capacity for receiving and faculty for recognizing the Divine intimations that were granted Him.

From this fact there flow the following inferences:

In His own words concerning God, revelation, the human spirit, sin, forgiveness, the hereafter, duty, we have certainties to deal with, not speculations that have to be verified. He was not an exponent of the mind of His age and environment, but of the mind of God. 'As He could challenge the men of His day with the question, Which of you convinceth Me of sin? so now He can securely challenge all the ages with the question, Which of you convicteth Me of error? Charges of error have indeed been made against Him, but they break down on examination. To take one case for instance, the first Evangelist could not have recorded in all solemnity as a statement of Jesus the assertion that heaven and earth should pass away, but His words should not pass away—a statement made with reference to His second advent—if the interpretation given by some critics to an earlier statement of Jesus recorded by the same Evangelist is what that Evangelist understood Him to mean. The passage to which I refer is, Ye shall not have gone through the cities of Israel till the Son of Man be come. Whatever

this passage may mean, it could not have been understood to mean by him who recorded it that Christ then committed Himself to the assertion that His glorious advent was to take place without fail within a few weeks at the outside!

If the line of argument which I have here pursued is sound, it follows that the teaching of Jesus makes us in a very real sense independent of the rest of the Bible. It contains, as a matter of fact, all that we need for this life and the next, and it is endorsed by the Almighty Father Himself. The rest of the Bible, however valuable it may be to us, is therefore not indispensable. Opinions may vary concerning the authority or inspiration or authorship of this or that book: the matter is of deepest interest, but it is not vital.

If, however, the rest of the Bible is thus relegated to a secondary place in comparison with the teaching of our Lord, it is nevertheless on His teaching that we have ultimately to depend for our belief in its inspiration. Apart from Christ's testimony there is practically no external evidence in support of that inspiration. The early chapters of Genesis, for example, on which so much of the scheme of the Old Testament depends, come to us without the faintest suggestion of origin or authorship. The internal evidence that they themselves afford points to their being a varied collection of exceedingly ancient records, of singular loftiness and freedom from polytheistic superstition, carefully edited by a very sure hand; but how they first came into existence no one may know. Prophet after prophet claims to have received from God the message that he delivers; but who is to attest his claim? How can we be sure that he was not mistaken? So, too, with the New Testament Epistles: what is the ultimate test and measure of their validity; what is the meaning of their inspiration? To take this latter question first, is it not self-evident that the Epistles have their value for us in the fact that they apply, interpret and expand the teaching of Christ, and the facts concerning Christ in their relation to us? No higher or other inspiration than this is needed, nor is any claimed. It is but reasonable to suppose that if men were called by God to a special work of ministry as St. Paul was called, they would be divinely guided and helped in the discharge of that work; and that inference is abundantly confirmed when we find the letters they wrote to the Churches reflecting so faithfully the teaching of Christ.

In the case of the Gospels, the help of the Holy Spirit was specially promised to remind and to guide (St. John xiv. 26, xvi. 13-15).

The testimony which our Lord bears to the Old Testament is more direct and is of two kinds. In the first place there is a general endorsement of the Old Testament as the Divine witness to Him. Consider, for example, the following statement of our Lord after His resurrection, recorded by St. Luke:—"These are My words which I spake unto you while I was yet with you, how that all things must needs be fulfilled which are written in the law of Moses, and the Prophets, and the Psalms concerning Me" (St. Luke xxiv. 44). And St. Luke also tells us, with reference to our Lord's conversation with the two disciples on the way to Emmaus, that, "beginning from Moses and from all the prophets, He interpreted to them in all the Scriptures the things concerning Himself." Nowhere does He discuss the authority or the inspiration of particular books of the Old Testament, but His whole attitude towards the book implies an acceptance and endorsement of its various parts *as being what they profess to be*. Its history remains history, its proverbs are a collection of proverbial sayings, nor does a special inspiration claimed for this or that particular psalm necessarily imply that every psalm is more than sacred poetry. We are still left to form our own opinion as to the character of certain portions of Scripture: whether, for example, the story of the Fall is literal fact or allegory; whether the prologue and epilogue of the Book of Job are actual history or simply a framework for the discussion of the problem of pain; whether the Book of Jonah is a record of facts or a sacred allegory, like a chapter out of the *Pilgrim's Progress*; and the like. But the testimony of our Lord to the genuineness of the Law, the Jewish book of the Torah, which we call the Pentateuch, is clear and definite; it was for Him one book, and that the work of Moses. On this point His teaching appears to me to be in direct conflict with the higher critical views as to the character and origin of the Pentateuch; and that teaching is the same after His resurrection as it was before. (Luke xxiv. 27, 44; John vii. 19-23.)

In the next place His testimony is specific as to the genuineness of certain sections of the Old Testament and the definite inspiration of others. For example, in His teaching concerning the sanctity and permanence of the marriage tie He seems to endorse the doctrine of Genesis that mankind is a special creation of God, and that

the first human pair were united by Him. To any who may be startled by this suggested conflict between the teaching of Jesus and the doctrine of evolution I would put the following problem : Certain eminent men of science, thorough-going supporters of the doctrine of evolution, have arrived at the conviction that by the scientific method of observation and experiment the fact of continued existence after bodily death has been established. *What then is the origin of that which survives death, and how comes it to be associated with a mortal body so as to constitute a man ?* It cannot be a function of body, for a bodily function would cease with the death of the body of which it was a function : nor can it be a product of bodily evolution, for then it would be itself bodily and mortal like that from which it was derived.

But we will not press this. Let us take another incident, the story of the Flood. St. Peter tells us that when Christ was put to death in the body He went and preached to the " spirits in prison who had been disobedient " in Noah's time. From what source could St. Peter have obtained this information except from the Risen Lord Himself ? If therefore Jesus after His resurrection told St. Peter that He had preached to the people who perished in the Flood, does not that fact take the Bible story of the Flood out of the region of legend and make it actual history ? How that story was first recorded, or by whom, it is impossible to say ; and we can but hazard a guess as to how so ancient a record, if indeed it is a genuine record, can have been preserved and handed down till it reached the hands of the editor or compiler of Genesis. But if Jesus Christ, between His death and resurrection, met and taught the men who perished in that catastrophe, and if He describes them in terms which suit exactly the Bible story, it makes all the difference in the world to that story, however little we may know of its origin. And this verification is certainly not without its effect upon our attitude towards the rest of those primitive records of which it forms a part.

To take one other reference to the Pentateuch, our Lord regards as historical fact the manifestation to Moses at the burning bush, and bases on the Divine words spoken there a proof of continued existence after death—a proof so striking and so original that it completely silenced the Sadducee materialists who had attempted to question His resurrection doctrine. But if this record is sober

history, accurate even as to the very words uttered, who will venture to deny the general historical character of the Exodus narrative of which this is the introduction?

In His reference to the 110th psalm the Lord asserts not only the Davidic authorship but also the inspiration of the psalm: "How then doth David, in the Spirit, call him Lord"; and on the fact of the psalm's Davidic authorship and inspiration He based an argument for the divinity of the Messiah, i.e. of Himself. Incidentally it may be mentioned that the effect of His argument upon His learned audience shows that they at all events had never heard of any doubt concerning the authorship of that particular psalm.

It is to be remembered that it was not in casual conversation that our Lord made these references to Old Testament Scripture, but in His authoritative teaching, that teaching of which He asserted that it was not His but the Father's. Here then we may find ground for our belief in the Scriptures of the Old Testament, sharing that belief with Him.

G. ESTWICK FORD.



RESERVATION OF THE SACRAMENT : A PLEA FOR RECONSIDERATION.

BY W. GUY JOHNSON.

IN an article on "Benediction and its Advocates" which appeared in the *CHURCHMAN* for October last, the present writer stated that there was a close connection between the practice of Reservation of the Sacrament and such services as Exposition and Benediction, in the sense that it is practically impossible to have the former and yet to prevent the latter, together with many other corruptions connected with superstitious ideas of the Eucharist, from following upon it. And in support of the statement a passage was cited from the Rev. A. H. Baverstock's book, *Benediction and the Bishops*, where on page 13 he tells us that "the increase of opportunities of access to the Blessed Sacrament led inevitably to the demand for something in the nature of Exposition and Benediction." There is no doubt upon the matter. It is simply a question of fact to which the whole course of Church History testifies, and it has been fully verified by the events of recent years. Mr. Baverstock is himself as competent a witness on the subject as we could have. It is not, of course, meant that every one who desires to reserve the Sacrament for the use of the sick will make use of it for adoration or similar purposes, or will wish to do so. But the very knowledge that the Sacrament is reserved in a particular church is an encouragement to those who believe, in whatever sense it is not necessary now to define, that our Lord is present in the consecrated bread and wine, to seek opportunities of worshipping Him there. This again is simply a matter of common experience, and has more than once been expressed in recent debates on the subject in Convocation. It is quite obvious that if there is no Reservation there cannot be any such services as Benediction, Exposition, "Ten Minutes with Jesus in the Tabernacle," or others of a similar kind. This being the case, we are surely entitled to ask the Bishops to reconsider the whole question. The Bishop of Chester (Dr. Jayne) shortly before his resignation is known to have made such a request on the ground that so much which would have modified the earlier decision of the Bishops had transpired since it was arrived at. We ask this, not on any grounds of party or of mere opinion, but for grave and

substantial reasons which appear more weighty the more the matter is looked into.

The question of a new rubric permitting Reservation of the Sacrament for the Communion of the Sick has been debated with considerable fullness by all four Houses of Convocation in the course of the discussion on Prayer Book revision arising out of the issue of the King's Letters of Business, and very great diversity of opinion has been manifested. In the Upper House of York there was an interesting and instructive debate in February, 1914, upon a Resolution moved by the Bishop of Durham and seconded by the Bishop of Chester which read as follows:—"That the present rubric forbidding the consecrated elements to be carried out of the church be so far modified as to allow them to be taken *forthwith, and without ceremonial*, to known and intended cases of special urgency, and if any of the bread and wine that was consecrated for any such intended cases remain over it shall be reverently consumed in the house of the last sick person so communicated." This Resolution did not make any provision for the case of such invalids as might prefer to be communicated in the manner at present provided by the Prayer Book; but the point was very strongly emphasized during the discussion, and a rider supplying the omission was adopted, and the principle has been embodied in the proposed Rubric agreed upon at a Conference of members of the four Houses of Convocation which was held in October, 1918. The point is an important one, for there are great numbers of Churchpeople, without doubt the majority, to whom Holy Communion means the entire service, at least as set out in the Office for the Communion of the Sick, and who would strongly object to having it mutilated and to being communicated with the Reserved Sacrament, more especially if, as is sometimes the case, the bread alone were given. The Rev. Edgar Lee, in giving his evidence before the two Archbishops during the course of the Lambeth "Hearings" in 1900, admitted that he never administered Holy Communion to the sick except with the Reserved Sacrament, and declined to say what he would do if the sick man desired it otherwise. If there is a case in which the communicant's wishes should be considered it is surely here, for the service is intended for him and not (except incidentally) for the minister. But a difficulty at once arises. It has been made quite clear throughout the

course of the discussions upon the subject that Reservation is asked for, not so much in the interests of the sick person, but to meet the case of those clergy who feel that they cannot partake of the Holy Communion unless they are fasting. If, however, it is left to the sick person to decide in which form he shall be communicated, and if he desires the present form of service, then there is no relief whatever to those clergy who say that they cannot go through the service after they have broken their fast.

There is another point which should be borne in mind. It is expressly referred to in the Resolution of the Upper House of the York Convocation quoted above. The Resolution states that the consecrated elements to be carried out of the Church "be taken forthwith, without ceremonial" to the sick person's house. In this connection there is a significant note in the Report of a Committee of the Upper House of York:—

"Reservation for the Sick. If allowed at all great care must be taken to define the words suggested by the Lower House of Canterbury "without ceremonial." Serious evasions are likely. Robes, processions and lights should be expressly forbidden."

During the debate the Bishop of Manchester reminded them that their Resolution was not the final form which the rubric would assume, and they might find themselves committed to a rubric with which they could not agree. He said further that while the rubric, whatever its form was to be, would remain, the explanations and qualifications with which they had guarded their Resolution would be forgotten. The Rubric as proposed by the joint conference in 1918 has indeed travelled far from the Resolution of the Northern Bishops. It reads as follows:—

But when the Holy Communion cannot reverently or without grave difficulty be celebrated in private, and also when there are several sick persons in the Parish desirous to receive the Communion on the same day, it shall be lawful for the Priest (with the consent of the sick person), on any day when there is a celebration of the Holy Communion in the Church, to set apart at the open Communion so much of the consecrated Bread and Wine as shall serve the sick person (or persons), and so many as shall communicate with him (if there be any). And, the open Communion ended, he shall, on the same day and with as little delay as may be, go and minister the same. . . .

If the consecrated bread and wine be not taken immediately to the sick person, they shall be kept in such place, and after such manner as the Ordinary shall approve, so that they be not used for any other purpose whatsoever.

The Holy Sacrament shall be taken to the sick person in such simple and reverent manner as the Ordinary shall approve.

Here we find an express provision for the Reservation of the Sacra-

ment in the church, for no Bishop is likely to "approve" of its being kept elsewhere; and an opening is given for a very considerable amount of ceremonial when it is carried from the church to the sick person's house. In the light of recent experience, in the face of the minatory Memorial of 1,000 clergy of the Province of Canterbury, and in view of what has already been permitted by some Bishops, we are justified in quoting the words of the Bishop of Liverpool with reference to the far more moderate Resolution of the Northern House. "I am afraid the result of the alteration will be that while the permission which we give will be gladly accepted, the conditions which we make will be forgotten."

The permission to carry the consecrated elements direct from the celebration in church to the sick person, who may quite possibly have been following the service in his Prayer Book, which was at first proposed by the Bishop of Durham in the Northern Convocation, does stand upon a different footing from the rubric now submitted for acceptance by the Church. It is in harmony with the practice described by Justin Martyr, though that may have been more a local and occasional custom than a general practice of the Church; and it cannot properly be called Reservation at all. The Archbishop of York, in giving his "Opinion" or "Decision" in 1900, described it as a "continued ministrations." Bishop Westcott, who gave permission in certain cases for this form of communicating the sick, did so on the express ground that it was a means of meeting the difficulty which had been felt, *without resorting to Reservation*. But even if this were all that is now proposed, there would still be considerable objection to it, and the Bishop of Liverpool, who at one time favoured the plan, expressed his own objections, during the discussion, in words which have already been quoted. The circumstances of Justin Martyr's day, when Christianity was a proscribed and persecuted religion, and when Christians had no churches or buildings other than private houses in which to worship, afford no example for our own times. The arrangement which Justin records had no special reference to the sick, and it would not meet the wishes of those who now desire Reservation.

But what we are now asked to accept goes very far beyond this. It is a reversal of the position taken up by the Reformers in the compilation and revision of the Prayer Book. The Bishop of Manchester, to whom the whole Church is indebted for the energy with which he

has devoted his great learning and unrivalled ability to the defence of the principles maintained at the Reformation, pointed out that the Reformers deliberately rejected the practice of Reservation for good and clearly ascertainable reasons. One of the Bishops, in the course of the debate, asked if the Church was always to be bound by the rules and rubrics of the sixteenth century. That is not the point, and the Bishop of Manchester certainly did not suggest any such attitude. The point of his contention was that in the presence of certain errors and superstitions connected with the Holy Communion the Reformers adopted certain safeguards which, so long as they were observed, left no room for these abuses. Those safeguards have of late years been relaxed by the unauthorized action of some of the Bishops, or ignored by some of the clergy in defiance of the Bishops, and since then the abuses have revived. This being the case, the Bishop of Manchester very reasonably urged that we should retain the safeguards which had proved efficacious in the past. This is really the explanation why so strong an opposition has been offered to many of the proposals for Prayer Book revision. The Prayer Book was drawn up to maintain a particular doctrinal position and to exclude certain erroneous teaching, and it was drawn up with very great care and skill. If the errors which it designedly excluded had no longer any existence among us we should perhaps not scrutinize too closely changes of language or rubrics which might on general or even antiquarian grounds be desired by some Churchmen. But since all the distinctive errors of Romanism are being actively and avowedly propagated in our midst, we are not inclined to assist in pulling down the bulwarks which were erected against them, and we are not controversially embarrassed because they happen to have been built so long ago as the sixteenth century.

Moreover, the reasons which are given for the proposed change are very unconvincing. It is urged that on account of the crowded and insanitary condition of certain parts of large cities it is not possible to celebrate the communion in the homes of the sick poor. But against this we have the positive testimony of those who have worked in slum parishes that they never found any difficulty in this respect, or found any need for Reservation. The Bishops of Manchester, Chelmsford, Liverpool and Winchester, to mention no others, spoke to this effect from their own experience. The Bishop

of Chelmsford reminded his hearers that our Lord condescended to be born in the manger of a stable, and there could be no incongruity therefore in His presence amidst even the humblest surroundings. Moreover, he added, it was not true that the homes of those among the poor who desired to receive Communion were kept in a state which would preclude a celebration. If there were any of this kind, they would, as Bishop Maclagan said, be equally unsuitable for any kind of administration. Again, it is sometimes urged that the patient is so far advanced in illness as to be unable to follow or to bear the strain of the service, but as Archbishop Temple said, "The administration of the Holy Communion to those who are too ill to understand fully what they are doing is certainly not to be desired under any circumstances. The Holy Communion is not to be treated as if it worked like a magical charm without any co-operation on the part of the recipient." There is something unsubstantial about these reasons. There may be occasionally exceptional cases which if treated in an honest spirit can be dealt with on the principle *necessitas non habet leges*; but these represent no such widespread and pressing need as is represented. And against such exceptional cases we have the real and positive danger that the Sacrament, when reserved in the church, with whatever limitations and restrictions individual Bishops may see fit to impose, will be the centre of acts of adoration, and will be a continual cause of demands for "access" and for special services such as Benediction. And it will be much more difficult to resist these demands when once a change has been made in the rubrics, for the very fact of the change will be taken as a sign that the Church has relaxed her position in regard to the Holy Communion, and as an augury that further pressure will yield further concession. Even under existing circumstances, the Bishop of Salisbury stated that the regulations issued by the Bishop of London as to the manner in which the Sacrament if reserved was to be kept, had broken down and proved futile as long ago as when he was a Suffragan in the Diocese, and the Bishop of London himself testified to the continued impossibility of enforcing them.

It is not, therefore, unreasonable to fear that if there should be a new rubric authorizing Reservation, a great impetus would be given to the pro-Roman party, and the Bishops would have lost the one instrument put into their hands best fitted for resist-

ing its advance. We cannot but feel that in their own interest, and in the interest of the Church of which they are the responsible ministers, the Bishops will do well to consider afresh the whole question. The best solution seems after all that which has many times been suggested during the last few years, namely, to exclude the service of Holy Communion altogether from the sphere of Prayer Book revision. Agreement upon the other points ought not then to be very difficult.

W. GUY JOHNSON.

THE HOLY ANGELS: THEIR APPEARANCES AND MINISTRATIONS.

BY THE REV. JOHN R. PALMER, Litt.D.

IN these days we need to bear in mind that true faith in the reality of the unseen world, and of a future life, does not necessitate any prying into the "secret things that belong unto the Lord our God," and which are not "revealed" unto us in His holy Word.¹ But the present subject is one which has always possessed a genuine and reasonable interest for Christian students and believers.

St. Matthew closes his account of the temptation of our Lord with the words—"and behold, angels came and ministered unto Him."² How full of comfort are these words! Is it not matter of rejoicing to know that at the end of our blessed Lord's forty days' fast and temptation He was strengthened and refreshed by the ministry of angels? They had looked down with wonder from their bright abode upon the mysterious conflict between their Lord and the Prince of Darkness, and now it is ended, they hasten to supply His wants. These holy spirits, St. Paul tells us, were witnesses in a special way of the mysterious Incarnation—"God manifest in the flesh was seen of angels."³ They sang at His birth.⁴ They ministered to Him after His temptation. They strengthened Him in His Agony.⁵ They announced his "glorious Resurrection."⁶ They "desire to look into"⁷ the mysteries of man's Redemption.

¹ Deut. xxix. 29.

⁴ St. Luke ii. 9-14.

⁶ Ib. xxiv. 4-8.

² St. Matt. iv. 11.

⁵ Ib. xxii. 43.

⁷ 1 Pet. i. 12.

³ 1 Tim. iii. 16.

They witness the trials and the triumphs of the servants of their Lord.¹ And the writer of the Epistle to the Hebrews asks: "Are they not all ministering spirits, sent forth to minister for them who shall be heirs of salvation?"² Our eyes see but the visible framework of the universe and this only partially, and those who share with us a common nature. We see not the holy spirits from a brighter world who throng our daily path. They are not the less real because our hands may not touch them, our eyes may not see them. And how often do we fail to realize that they are united with us in one Great Society. How often we grieve these loving friends who silently and invisibly watch over us in our earthly pilgrimage! And yet there is joy in their presence³ when the wanderer returns to Him whose will it is their glory to fulfil, and Who sends them on their gentle ministrations. How many sudden changes in untoward circumstances we may owe to their timely intervention we cannot tell. How often they have shielded us from harm and danger, and guided our steps in life's rough way, we may never know. How often they have desired, it may be, to comfort and strengthen us in the sorrows and afflictions of this life, we cannot relate. And they are in a very special sense the guardians of the "little ones" of Christ's flock. "In Heaven," said our blessed Lord, "*their* angels do always behold the face of My Father which is in heaven."⁴ Precious words spoken of two classes—the childlike in heart, and the tender in years—the "little child," and the saint of maturer age. There is often a "wondrous intimacy" between these guileless souls and the Holy Angels. From Genesis to Revelation the gentle, active ministry of angels is brought before us in a multitude of ways, and under circumstances the most varied—in the history of the Patriarchs, in the visions of the Prophets, in the sacred songs of the Psalmists. They "sang together"⁵ at the creation, they appeared amid the tent-life of "the Friend of God,"⁶ to the sorrowing outcast in the lonely wilderness, to the aged priest amid the incense of the temple worship, and to the last surviving Apostle "in the isle of Patmos"⁷ Indeed, as we pass from the Old Testament to the New Testament, "fresh light from heaven discloses more of the invisible world," and shows

¹ 1 Cor. iv. 9.² St. Luke xv. 10.³ Job xxxviii. 7.⁴ Gen. xvi. 6-14, xxi. 14-21; St. Luke i. 5-25; Rev. i. 9.⁵ Heb. i. 14.⁶ St. Matt. xviii. 10.⁷ St. Jas. ii. 23; Gen. xviii.

us that we "stand towards it in new and unsuspected relations." Without entering into the domain of mediæval error as to "worshipping of angels,"¹ or seeking their intercessions, it would be well if we oftener and more thankfully meditated on the teaching of Holy Scripture so faithfully set forth by our Church, and dwelt upon the loving ministry of these bright and happy spirits, and if we endeavoured to realize our fellowship with them in offering that true worship which the Most High accepts. On the contrary, there are many in these days who systematically put them out of sight, who so frame their teaching and theology as to exclude all reference to their very existence. Such treatment of the blessed truths concerning these holy beings is in no sense agreeable to the mind of the English Church, as it is reflected in her Book of Common Prayer. In proof of this statement we would point out a few of the clearest intimations contained in that book of the faithful regard the Church has shown for this important branch of revealed truth. We would instance the Collect for "St. Michael and *all-Angels*" in which is set forth their *two-fold* "service" before the Throne "in heaven" which is the only part of their service that is thought of by some who occupy the place and office of teachers in the Church of Christ—Who Himself condescended to receive their ministrations at the close of His Wilderness Temptation—and their service in "succouring and defending us on earth." Again, how beautifully do those noble words of the Ter-Sanctus, or Thrice Holy, in our Communion Service, which are not only directly grounded on the words of Scripture² but have been used from Apostolic times before the Prayer of Consecration, set forth the worship offered by the Holy Angels, and certify our fellowship with them in that worship: "Therefore with Angels and Archangels, and with all the company of heaven, we laud and magnify Thy glorious Name; evermore praising Thee, and saying, Holy, holy, holy, Lord GOD of hosts, heaven and earth are full of Thy glory: Glory be to Thee, O Lord most High"; to say nothing of references to the same subject in the Te Deum, Benedicite,³ and Collect of the "Annunciation of the Blessed Virgin Mary," and in other parts of the Prayer Book. It may, however, be said that such references are few and not to be compared with the rest of the book in which they are found.

¹ Rev. xix. 10, xxii. 8, 9; Col. ii. 18. ² Isa. vi. 1-4; Rev. iv. 8.

³ Ezek. i. 15, 26.

But what they may lack in point of *number* they more than make up for in clearness and conclusiveness of statement. And would it not be well, if objectors allowed these lessons as to the nature and employment of the Holy Angels to bear in their instructions the same proportion to the rest of their teaching as they do in the Book of Common Prayer? Moreover St. Paul speaks of the presence of the Holy Angels in our Christian congregations, intimating that they take part in our worship. Such was also the belief of the eminent scholar and commentator, Bishop Christopher Wordsworth (Lincoln). An able writer has well said of their appearances in Scripture, and of the way in which they are themselves ignored in thought and teaching: "There must be something of fitness in the times of their manifestation, and in the persons to whom they make themselves known. In a material age they cease to appear. There must be a certain saintly second-sight—a something angelic in the angel seen. With us they are conveniently put out of remembrance. We almost speak with the Sadducees, who believed in no angel or spirit.¹ Their name is used to fill up the syllables of a line, or to round off a fantastic compliment. Their figures appear above a column or a spire. We think of beings more than half fabulous draped and winged, the griffens and wyverns of the heraldry of a gentle mythology. How few *meditate*, with holy Hooker, upon their nature, order, and blessed obedience to GOD'S will! We may believe if we will that mechanical law is all in all. . . . If it be so, there is no unseen world, and, *therefore*, no veil to hang between it and us. Then the accounts of St. Luke—that there appeared unto Zacharias an Angel of the Lord, standing on the right side of the altar of incense; that the angel of the Lord was sent from GOD unto Nazareth; that suddenly there was with the angel a multitude of the heavenly host—are simply so many fairy tales." And, giving us a specimen of the way in which a sceptical criticism has dealt with the subject, he adds, "Paulus has explained the appearance to Zacharias by an intensity of emotional excitement, which made of the incense-smoke, when its dense folds were irradiated by the lamps of the sanctuary, a floating image of a winged spectre!"² Is not the subject of these created intelligences, their nature, and employment, a part of GOD'S revelation?

¹ Acts xxiii. 8.

² Bp. Alexander, in *Poems of the New Testament*, see *The Quiver*, Jan. 1880.

If so, is it right either to ignore their existence, or to allow the truth to be cast into the crucible of a criticism, which is doing all it can to overthrow the supernatural in the Word of the Living God? At the Reformation some of the principle changes made in the Service-books of the Church consisted in the cutting away of "uncertain stories and legends," and expunging from the Litany long lists of invocations of saints and of angels; but while the Church no longer sanctions the invocations of angels, she still retains her Collects, the Ter-Sanctus, and other passages setting forth the nature and employments of angels in heaven and on earth. Therefore, if we are to hold that she has omitted what she no longer sanctions, what are we to say about what she has retained? There is reason to believe that *some* of the omissions were due to the superstitious use which was widely made of things otherwise harmless, and so it was found advisable in the judgment of the Reformers to omit them altogether. Clearly this must strengthen the claim of what is retained. What excuse have we, therefore, for ignoring anything *retained* relative to the subject under consideration? What real excuse can be pleaded why it should not have all due attention given to it in teaching professedly based on the Word of GOD and in accordance with the mind of the Church, as it is expressed in her formularies?

II

Shall we not endeavour to gain comfort and strength from the truths revealed concerning the bright and happy beings, who not only encircle the Throne of the Eternal but move though invisible to us in our earthly path, succouring and comforting the faithful in their dangers and sorrows? Shall we ignore them and their gentle, loving ministry on earth, and yet all the while hope to enjoy their society in a better world? Are they not the holy messengers ever speeding between earth and heaven? Do they not carry the faithful at last to their rest? ¹ Are we not told that "The angel of the Lord encampeth round about them that fear Him, and delivereth them"? ² Was it not permitted to Elisha and his servant to *see* the fulfilment of this com-

¹ St. Luke xvi. 22.

² Ps. xxxiv. 7.

forting promise in their case? ¹ Are they not in some mysterious way employed in the presentation of our prayers: "And another angel came and stood at the altar, having a golden censer; and there was given to him much incense, that he should offer it *with* the prayers of *all* saints upon the golden altar which was before the throne." ² Angels announced our blessed Lord's Birth and Resurrection, and appeared to the disciples at His Ascension; and He their Lord as well as ours, deigned to receive their ministration in His hour of weakness and anguish in the Wilderness and in the Garden. ³ An angel is "sent" by GOD to shut the lions' mouths, that they should not "hurt" ⁴ His servant, and again with an answer to that servant's prayer, announcing in this instance that it was by "the *commandment* which came forth" that he appeared. And the Psalmist exclaims: "Bless the Lord, ye His angels, that excel in strength, that *do His commandments*, hearkening unto the voice of His word." ⁵ Again, the same agency is employed to deliver His Apostle from prison and from death, to feed the despairing prophet in the desert when fleeing from an arm of flesh, and to assure the great Apostle of the Gentiles that he should escape the watery grave which, humanly speaking, threatened to terminate his arduous "course." ⁶ Such are a few of the instances mentioned in Scripture in which angels have been and are employed in the service of man, and for the glory of GOD. But we are not to suppose that these instances represent the whole of their loving service; we may reasonably believe that under GOD they convey to us spiritual blessings in strengthening the weak and wavering will, in supporting us in difficult paths and trying circumstances of life, in inspiring us with hope when the future seems dark and frowning, and the present a fitting prelude to it, in urging the spirit to rise in grateful adoration when otherwise it would be hopelessly depressed and saddened with the ills and cares of life. They have "turn'd to help us in th' unequal fray" when we have been conscious of the presence of mighty spiritual foes, and have been "in heaviness through *manifold* temptations." ⁷ They are closely and intimately connected with

¹ 2 Kings vi. 13-18.

² Rev. viii. 3.

³ St. Luke ii. 8-15; i. 26-38; St. Matt. i. 18-25; Acts i. 10, 11; St. Matt. iv. 11; St. Luke xxii. 43.

⁴ Dan. vi. 22; ix. 20-27.

⁵ Ps. ciii. 20.

⁶ Acts xii. 5-11; 1 Kings xix. 1-8; Acts xxvii. 21-26; 2 Tim. iv. 7.

⁷ 1 Peter i. 6.

the dispensations of God's providence as they are evolved in the lives and experiences of the saints. Oh! let us not hold, as some do that such beings have but a shadowy existence whose only sphere is the human imagination, and that belief in their existence is only entertained because it elevates the feelings of the good, and renders more serious those of the wicked and the worldly. Such theories derive no support or countenance from the Word of GOD. It teaches in a multitude of ways the truth and reality of an unseen world peopled by various orders of created intelligences, who again and again have been permitted to burst on the astonished vision of the best and holiest of mankind, and render to them all kinds of service. They fulfil the commands of their Lord as the evil spirits do those of theirs, and both classes of spirits are organized and disciplined as "principalities and powers."¹ It is an awful thought that, if "order is Heaven's first law," there is also that which answers to it in the abode of darkness, though widely different are the ends and purposes for which it exists in the two places. But happily we may believe that they who are for us are more than all that are against us. Were it otherwise, Scripture would scarcely be as hopeful as it is concerning the final salvation of the faithful. With what confidence did our blessed Lord speak of the "legions"² whom He might have summoned to His assistance. We do not believe that the hosts at the command of the Evil One outnumber those of "the King of Kings and Lord of Lords." We believe that the contrary is implied in numerous passages of Scripture. "Suddenly there was with the angel a *multitude* of the heavenly host."³ "For by Him were all things created, that are in heaven, and that are in earth, visible and invisible, whether they be *thrones*, or *dominions*, or *principalities*, or *powers*: all things were created by Him, and for Him."⁴ "*Thousand thousands* ministered unto Him, and *ten thousand times ten thousand* stood before Him."⁵ Again, who are "the ninety and nine" in our Lord's Parable of the Lost Sheep who "went not astray,"⁶ if the lost "one" represents the human race? If the lost "piece of silver"⁷ represents fallen man, who are represented by the nine pieces not lost? "A saint of GOD lies down to sleep beneath the cold sky, with a stone for his pillow ;

¹ Ps. ciii. 20 ; St. Matt. xii. 24 ; Eph. iii. 10 ; vi. 12.

² St. Matt. xxvi. 53. ⁴ Col. i. 16.

⁶ St. Matt. xviii. 12-14.

³ St. Luke ii. 13.

⁵ Dan. vii. 10.

⁷ St. Luke xv. 3-7, 8-10.

and, behold, above him—friendless as he seems—a ladder reaching from Earth to Heaven, on whose bright stair the Angels of GOD are ascending and descending all night long! ” (Burgon). Jacob, we read, trembled at the prospect of meeting with his brother, but in order that he might not be utterly cast down on account of the “four hundred men” that were coming out against him, GOD granted him the vision of the “two camps”—“Mahanaim”—and he exclaimed, “This is GOD’s host.”¹ We, too, may derive comfort and encouragement in meditation on the hosts who by day and by night, and in every part of the universe of GOD, do His holy bidding. Not only do we find that they were with the servants of GOD when they “appeared”²— $\omega\phi\theta\eta$ —unto them, that is, when they took a form in which they could be discerned by the bodily senses, but that they were as really present when they were not so discerned, as in the case of Elisha’s servant who was not aware of their presence until, in answer to his master’s prayer, “the Lord opened his eyes.”³ And as it was with the prophet and his servant so may we confidently believe it is with us—“they that be with us are more than they that be with” our spiritual enemies. Our bodily eyes may be “holden,”⁴ so that we see them not as we see our fellow-men, but with the eye of faith we may still discern their presence. The dispensation has passed away under which they “appeared” objectively to the faithful; but speaking of the Christian’s experience in all ages the writer of the Epistle to the Hebrews says, “Ye are come unto Mount Sion . . . and to an *innumerable company of angels*,” or, according to the original, to “myriads” of angels.⁵ It has been truly said that “if Revelation had been silent respecting angels, reason would be a sufficient ground for our believing in their existence.” Let us then beware of a Sadduceeism which would rob us of the comfort of a reasonable belief in their existence and ministrations. But we must not forget that there is another side in the employment of angels revealed to us in the Word of GOD which we have not yet dwelt upon. There are many instances recorded in which these holy beings not only brought blessings to the faithful, but also condemnation and destruction on the wicked. They not only delivered “righteous” Lot, but brought swift destruction on the

¹ Gen. xxxii. 1–12.

² St. Luke i. 11.

³ 2 Kings vi. 13–18. See Dr. Goulburn’s “Occasional Sermons,” Serm. xiv., *Christ wielding the Keys of Death, and of the World Unseen*.

⁴ St. Luke xxiv. 16.

⁵ Heb. xii. 22.

cities of the Plain.¹ When David sinned an angel slew of his people no less than "seventy thousand men."² "The angel of the Lord went out, and smote in the camp of the Assyrians an hundred and fourscore and five thousand."³ An angel smote Herod when "he gave not GOD the glory."⁴ "Angels" will be employed, our Lord said, in executing the final judgment on the ungodly.⁵ We need not multiply instances of their bringing destruction swift and terrible on the wicked, as well as succouring, defending and comforting the faithful. Enough has been said to show us that their office is one which should fill the hearts of the faithful with gratitude and love both to GOD and to them. But we have not by any means reviewed the whole of the teaching of Scripture in this important matter. It is plainly implied in Scripture that they are gifted with the power "to discern good and bad,"⁶ and we are told that St. Michael and his angels contended in behalf of the people of GOD with the devil and his angels. The Holy Angels are the servants of GOD Whose they are, and Whose commands they obey. They are "fellow-servants" with the faithful and so do not receive their worship. They are required to worship our blessed Lord in His Incarnate life "Who," in common with mankind in His humanity, "was made a little lower than the angels"⁷; and yet He willed to receive their ministrations in the two great crises of His holy life in the Wilderness and in the Garden.⁸ In the latter instance, He is said to have been "strengthened" by the ministrations of "an angel," as Daniel, the "man greatly beloved," tells us that he was.⁹ Thus did our Lord, though sinless, put Himself on a level in the conditions of His humanity with the *adopted* sons of GOD, whom "He is not ashamed to call His brethren."¹⁰ In St. Matthew's account of the Temptation, we find the words already quoted, "And behold angels came and *δηκονοῦν*—ministered—unto Him."¹¹ Now what this ministration consisted in we are not able to say for certain, but it is reasonable to believe that these blessed spirits brought our Lord the food He needed after His forty days' fast. We may also believe

¹ 2 Pet. ii. 6-9; Gen. xix.

² 2 Sam. xxiv. 15-17.

³ 2 Kings xix. 35.

⁴ Acts xii. 23.

⁵ St. Matt. xiii. 41, 42.

⁶ 2 Sam. xiv. 17.

⁷ Dan. x. 10-21, xii. 1; Jude ix.; Rev. xii. 7; xix. 10; xxii. 9; Col. ii. 18; Heb. i. 6; ii. 6-11; Ps. viii. 4, 5.

⁸ St. Matt. iv. 11.

⁹ St. Luke xxii. 43; Ps. cxxviii. 3; Dan. x. 19; St. Matt. iii. 17.

¹⁰ Heb. ii. 11.

¹¹ St. Matt. iv. 11.

that they brought Him supernatural support and comfort ; coming directly from the presence of His Father, they may have been employed to confirm the words of approval spoken at His Baptism. As to the word *δῆκονοῦν* from *διακονέω*, *διακονεῖν* signifies *to be an attendant on any one*, to serve at table, and so it comes to mean to supply with *food*. We have many instances of these uses of the word in the New Testament.¹ It is thus related to “ministrare” in Latin. And we also find Bengel using the words of the angels ministering to our Lord, “allato cibo.” We read, moreover, of an angel ministering to the disconsolate prophet, Elijah, in the Wilderness in this way : “And as he lay and slept under a juniper tree, behold an *angel* touched him, and said unto him, Arise and *eat*. And he looked, and, behold, there was a *cake baken on the coals and a cruse of water* at his head. And he did *eat and drink*, and laid him down again.”² Krummacher has some thoughts on this incident in the prophet’s life—not less striking than beautiful. One passage well worth quoting is as follows : “Elijah, apparently more asleep than awake, stretched out his hand, ate of the bread, drank of the water, and sank down again, weak and weary, and fell asleep. For that he fell asleep may be supposed from the angel’s touching him a second time. We, however, should have thought that his surprise would have been so excited, and his thoughts so set in motion, as to have rendered it impossible for him to fall asleep again immediately. But here is no appearance of surprise expressed. He partakes of the refreshment, not as if he were lying in a desolate uninhabited wilderness, but as if he were at home in his own dwelling. If he was not in a half-awakened state, he must have been absorbed, like Mary Magdalene at her visit to the sepulchre, in higher thoughts. This is no un-supposable case ; and, spiritually applied, it is a very common one. Persons of weak faith, and under spiritual temptation, may hear the word of consolation, and receive it ; but taking only a hasty draught of the living waters of promise, the enjoyment is soon gone again. It is, however, not without its use. If it effect nothing more, it serves to revive and confirm the persuasion, that He Who can thus cast a ray of comfort into the benighted soul, is able at any moment to send into it the full sunshine of peace. The sleep of Elijah serves also to remind us of those who are for the most

¹ St. Matt. viii. 15 ; xxvii. 55 ; St. Luke viii. 3 ; xvii. 8 ; xxii. 27 ; St. John xii. 2 ; Acts vi. 2.

² 1 Kings xix. 4-8.

part spiritually asleep, and have never yet been thoroughly awakened. They eat and drink, or, in other words, they hear much that is good, they read the Bible, and are regular in attending the worship of God; yet everything seems lost upon them, and not the smallest decided proof of spiritual life is discoverable in them. Yet let no one venture to say, before their course is ended, that such persons have eaten and drunken in vain. They may suddenly one day prove the contrary to your surprise. The food they have received may at unawares be found effectually to have nourished them. *Let all diligently use the means of grace*"—and we would add as a passing comment on the whole of this remarkable passage—let the servant of God as diligently and hopefully dispense them to His flock. Let us believe the blessed promise, "Cast thy bread upon the waters: for thou shalt find it after many days."¹ And if the labourer himself reap not of his toil another may; as our Lord said, "Other men laboured, and ye are entered into their labours."² Happy will that servant³ be who shall receive his Lord's commendation—"He hath done *what he could*."⁴ He shall assuredly receive that still further proof of his Lord's approval—"Well done, thou good and faithful servant: enter thou into the joy of thy Lord."⁵

We conclude this article with Keble's beautiful lines about the bright and happy spirits whose existence and ministrations Scripture so wonderfully unfolds—

Ye stars that round the Sun of righteousness
 In *glorious order* roll,
 With harps for ever strung, ready to bless
 God for each rescued soul;
 Ye eagle spirits, that build in light divine,
 O! think of us to-day,
 Faint warblers of this earth, that would combine
 Our trembling notes with your accepted lay.

Nor less your lay of triumph greeted fair
Our Champion and your King.
 In that first strife, whence Satan in despair
 Sank down on scathed wing:
 Alone He fasted, and alone He fought;
 But when His toils were o'er,
 Ye to the sacred Hermit duteous brought
 Banquet and hymn, your Eden's festal store.

JOHN R. PALMER.

¹ Eccl. xi. 1.

² St. John iv. 38.

³ Is. xxxii. 20.

⁴ St. Mark xiv. 8.

⁵ St. Matt. xxv. 21, 34.

WILLIAM LAW ON THE HOLY SPIRIT.

BY THE REV. S. HARVEY GEM, M.A.

THE writer of the following pages has never met with so forcible a lesson on cherishing the Presence of the Holy Spirit as William Law offers us in the ninth chapter of his *Christian Perfection*.¹ It may be well to state at the outset that the devout author is not so foolish as to suppose that entire perfection of character can be attained in this life. There are persons who have yielded to this error, and they have usually been undeceived by a grievous fall. Law, on the other hand, remarks "that Christian tempers and virtues must never be regarded as already won by the seeker of them, there will always be need of watchfulness and prayer and effort, or we shall fall back. Life will always be a struggle against the world, the flesh, and the devil." But it is our duty to aim at the highest, though here below we can never fully reach it. Christians should maintain a continuous purpose to seek the highest right, in thought, word and action. With this in view it is all-important to desire the constant Presence and guidance of the Holy Spirit for the progressive development of the Christian character. It is not enough to avoid actual sin, an attitude of daily conduct is required that will *invite* the Presence and Grace of the Spirit. Law shows by various racy examples that in his day the usual practice fell lamentably short of such an aim. Can we say that there is no danger for us now?

It is the usual belief of the Church, and the teaching of Scripture, that the Grace of the Spirit is not given once for all, as a provision for the whole of life, but in successive supplies, as we read in St. John, "grace for grace," which means continual accessions of grace.

How are we to obtain these gifts? Of course they cannot be had, as all will admit, by those who live in wilful sins, which grieve the Holy Spirit of God, yet there are people who are regular attendants at Church, and even at Holy Communion, and who would be shocked at the idea of anything definitely sinful, who are unconscious of their defects, and overlook the fact that they are careless of their thoughts and words, and combine worldly habits with their Church Services.

¹ The first of his practical treatises, published 1726.

Now although the Holy Spirit comes at times as a "rushing mighty wind,"¹ yet His usual action is gentle and delicate, "a still, small Voice,"² so as not to force our free will. Therefore any allowed inconsistency, short of actual sin, is unfavourable to the coming to us of His gracious Presence.

Law bases his remarks on the passage, "the wind bloweth where it listeth,"³ etc., and holds that the birth given by the Spirit to the soul is a continuous process, as St. Paul says, "My little children, of whom I travail in birth again until Christ be formed in you,"⁴ showing that the spiritual sequence of baptism needs to be a progressive development of the Christian character in each individual soul. Shall we place ourselves in an attitude favourable to the influence of the Spirit, or shall we not? If we desire to practise this, what are we to avoid, and at what are we to aim? We may divide the suggestions that Law gives into two kinds: negative on the one hand, positive on the other. It must be our endeavour to remove all hindrances to Divine Grace. Only a few such faults can be indicated here. One of them is self-satisfaction. The prophet Isaiah, when the heavenly vision of the perfect Holiness of God was unfolded to him, exclaimed, "I am a man of unclean lips."⁵ St. Peter, naturally self-confident, cried out, "Depart from me, for I am a sinful man, O Lord."⁶ Further, an excessive attention to the cares of this life, as well as unreasonable pleasures, must be avoided. Our Lord mentions both of them together as choking the growth of the soul's life (Luke viii. 14).

Law remarks that we should choose those pleasures that do not soften the mind, or make us less watchful against temptation. The vanity of a mind given up to trifles needs to be cured.

Our ordinary conversation and talk should not hinder the presence in our hearts of the Spirit of God.⁷ We should never say anything against other people behind their backs.

Indulgence in idleness and luxury must be cast out. "Did we desire to set ourselves in the fairest posture for the Devil to hit us, we ought to choose that of idleness and indulgence. We have to deny and renounce the whole corruption of our nature, and resign ourselves up entirely to the Spirit of God."

¹ Acts ii. 2.

² 1 Kings xix. 12.

³ John iii. 8.

⁴ Gal. iv. 19.

⁵ Isaiah vi. 5.

⁶ Luke v. 8.

⁷ Eph. iv. 29, 30.

No words or look or act inconsistent with the constantly pervading element of religion should be allowed.

As regards efforts of a positive kind, we are to consider "whether our ways of life and thought are such as to suit with the Holy Spirit, and invite His assistance." With Law, and all spiritual writers, humility is a primary condition. We are to realize our nothingness in the Presence of an All Holy God, and also of many better and abler Christians than ourselves. Self-deception is easy. "Humility and every other virtue is never in a complete state so that a man can say that he has finished his task in such and such a virtue." For instance, the founder of the Franciscans gave them the title of *Fratres Minores*, as an incitement to lowliness, but the time came when they petitioned the authorities that on account of their deeper humility they should take precedence of the Dominicans in processions.

Again, Christianity calls us to a mortified attitude of soul, to exercise self-restraint and self-discipline and self-denial, which are due from us as a practice of our repentance. And to follow our Lord it is very necessary to take up our Daily Cross. "If any man will come after Me, let him deny himself and take up his cross daily and follow Me." ¹ What can be more senseless and absurd, to see a Christian ever acting in any other consideration than as a Christian? He is senseless when he indulges a thought or a motion of his heart where he cannot say, "I do this as a Christian, as suitable to that state in which Christianity has placed me."

"For Devotion, when it is real, is a constant state and temper of the mind, and not merely saying words at special times." We are to conduct ourselves in all our behaviour with such a spirit of wisdom and piety as may make the Holy Ghost delight to dwell in us."

And of course we are not to think only of our own spiritual progress, but to bear in mind how our conduct affects others. Our ordinary temper and manner of common life, as Law reminds us, "affects other people, and either hardens them into sin, or awakens them to a sense of piety. . . . We can neither live well or ill to ourselves alone, but must of necessity do either good or harm to others by our manner of conversation. We have not the powers that belonged to Christ, but it is open to us, and required of us, to live

¹ Luke ix. 23.

in the spirit and temper of His life, and we can all do something for the salvation of souls. Even one who is ever so poor and mean can by living an exemplary life, largely contribute to the salvation of others. And though Christians are not Redeemers of the World, yet they have their part to act, which though it be a different part, must not be performed with a different spirit, but with such obedience to God, such regard to His glory, for such ends of salvation, for such good of others, and with all such holy dispositions, as our blessed Saviour manifested in every part of His life. . . . The Blessed Jesus came into the world to save the world; now we must enter into this same design, and make salvation the greatest business of our lives, and though we cannot, like Him, contribute towards it, yet we must contribute all that we can, and make the salvation of ourselves and others the one great care of our lives."

Much of what has been said may seem depressing; but this is not so in Law's view. Those who have cast the anchor of Faith on the shore of eternity can best endure the sorrows and afflictions of mortal life, and as regards the lesser evils that make up the larger part of our trials in daily existence Law remarks: "Those who do not think it necessary to apply to Religion in all the common and ordinary disquiets of life, make a serious mistake; for had we but learnt to bear troubles and disappointments because we are Christians and children of God, we should find few troubles that would have any great trial in them. We should indeed make it our endeavour to keep ourselves easy, thankful and cheerful, by making religion the measure and standard of all our thoughts and judgments, in all the common chances of life. He that lives in the spirit and temper of devotion, whose heart is always full of God, lives at the top of human happiness, and is the farthest removed from all the vanities and vexations which disturb and weary the minds of men who are devoted to the world."

St. Paul tells us that the "fruit of the Spirit is Love, Joy, Peace."¹

Shall we take two or three homely instances of how, in the present day, we may fail to invite the Holy Spirit?

Imagine some parishioners meeting at afternoon tea. They are communicants, but they break the injunction, "Speak not evil one of another, brethren"²: they talk of the faults and defects of their fellow churchpeople.

¹ Gal. v. 22.

² James iv. 11.

Or again, books come from the circulating library. There are novels, not only good ones, but some that touch on subjects that Christians should not entertain. Yet suppose they are read. Is this to invite the Holy Spirit?

Thirdly, we read in the Revelation, "I was in the spirit on the Lord's Day."¹ Yet there are Christians who, when they have attended early Communion, will spend the day in a secular manner. Cannot persons who have some leisure time in the week give one day in seven to the things which belong to their peace, to the study of the Bible and of the great devotional books of the Church? To do this would be to invite the Holy Spirit.

Our Lord declares, "No man cometh unto the Father but by Me."² Through Him and in Him we become partakers of the Holy Spirit. He says, "I will pray the Father, and He will give you another Comforter (that is, Strengthening Guide), that He may abide with you for ever, even the Spirit of truth, whom the world cannot receive, because it seeth Him not, neither knoweth Him, but ye know Him for He dwelleth with you and shall be in you. The Comforter, which is the Holy Ghost, whom the Father will send in My Name, He shall teach you all things, and bring all things to your remembrance, whatsoever I have said unto you." "When He, the Spirit of truth, is come, He will guide you into all truth. . . . He shall receive of Mine, and shall show it unto you." "Quench not the Spirit,"³ says St. Paul. "As many as are led by the Spirit of God, they are the sons of God."⁴ "Be renewed in the spirit of your mind."⁵

S. HARVEY GEM.

¹ Rev. i. 10.

² John xiv. 6, 16, 26; xvi. 13, 14.

³ 1 Thess. v. 19.

⁴ Rom. viii. 14.

⁵ Eph. iv. 23.



STUDIES IN TEXTS.

Suggestions for Sermons from Current Literature.

BY THE REV. HARRINGTON C. LEES, M.A.

I. THE LIVING SACRIFICE AND THE ACCEPTABLE OFFERING.

Text.—"I spake not unto your fathers, nor commanded them in the day that I brought them out of the land of Egypt concerning burnt offerings and sacrifices. But this thing I commanded them 'Hearken unto My Voice.'" (Jer. vii. 22, 23).

[Book of the Month: THE BOOK OF THE PROPHET JEREMIAH,¹ by Rev. L. Elliott Binns = B. Other refs., Peake in *Century Bible* = P. Davidson in *Hastings' Dictionary of Bible* = HDB. Payne Smith in *Speaker's Commentary* = PS. Thorn's *Prophets of Israel* = T. A. R. Gordon's *Prophets of the Old Testament* = G.]

I. THE CHARACTER OF THE PROPHET.

(a) *His timidity.* "The outward sternness of his life only concealed an inward conflict. His physical cowardice and shrinking make Jeremiah a figure much more human and like unto the ordinary Christian of to-day; and those who share in his weakness have the consolation of knowing that they can also learn the secret of his strength" (B. xxxviii).

(b) *His power of endurance.* "The more one studies his life, the greater becomes one's wonder that he was able to endure at all. For the most considerable part of his ministry he had to stand practically alone" (B. xxxix). "Almost alone he had to expose the immoralities, the self-deception founded on superficial reforms, and the fanatical confidence in the protection of Jehovah who dwelt in His temple by which all classes were carried away" (HDB. ii. 569).

(c) *His sensitiveness.* "He was not one who heard the deep sighing of the poor and left it unheeded; rather was he one of that noble but suffering band

'to whom the miseries of the world
Are misery, and will not let them rest'" (B. xl).

¹"Jeremiah," in the Westminster Commentaries, pub. by Methuen. A careful, moderate, spiritual and able commentary by a young and promising Cambridge scholar, now engaged in pastoral work.

“ His style reflects all the articulation of his thought and all the emotions of his mind ” (HDB. ii. 576).

(d) *His desire for sympathy.* “ One point which must strike every student is his great loneliness. It is as though throughout his whole life he was lavishing his affection upon objects from which he vainly expected some return ” (B. xlii). “ His naturally affectionate disposition, cut off from the love of wife or child, poured itself out in overflowing measure upon his country ” (B. xl). “ Jeremiah, whose heart was so exquisitely fitted for love, and to whom a home would have been a welcome refuge from the scorn and cruelty of his fellows, was doomed to a life of loneliness uncheered by wife or children ” (P. 15). “ Yet the prophet longed for the love of his fellows, and the fact that they misinterpreted his motives and suspected his teaching was a great grief to him ” (B. xlii). “ He was not of naturally morose temper, nor had his isolation soured him ; he looked at the felicity of others with no jaundiced eye, but only with the sad conviction that it would soon utterly cease ” (P. 15).

2. THE STATEMENT OF THE PROPHET.

“ At first sight Jeremiah’s statement as we have it in EVV. that God gave no commands as to sacrifices and burnt offerings during the wilderness period is exceedingly startling and unexpected ” (B. 75). “ A similar statement in Am. v. 25 ” (B. 75). “ ‘ Did ye bring unto me sacrifices and offerings in the wilderness ? ’ obviously expecting an answer in the negative ” (B. 75). “ The suggestion is merely a statement that it was not sacrifices *only* that were offered, but also ‘ true worship of the heart and righteousness, public and private ’ ” (B. 75). “ No less a critic than W. R. Harper says ‘ This rendering places the emphasis in its proper place and does not compel Amos to say that there were no sacrifices or offerings in the wilderness ’ ” (B. 75).

So in Jeremiah “ an alternative translation is grammatically possible ; this translation avoids the difficulties involved in any explanation which may be suggested on behalf of the more usual rendering ” (B. 76).

“ The Hebrew word rendered ‘ concerning ’ may equally well be rendered ‘ for the sake of,’ ‘ because of,’ : see Genesis xii. 17, Deuteronomy iv. 21 ; while in 2 Samuel xviii. 5 and Jeremiah xiv. 1 the rendering ‘ for the sake of ’ would meet the sense equally well ”

(B. 76). "Jeremiah's statement would then be rendered, 'I spake not unto your fathers . . . *for the sake of burnt offerings.*' In other words, the prophet is emphasising the fact that God did not reveal Himself to the people in order to obtain their sacrifices, a rendering which obtains support from v. 21; the two vv. might be paraphrased 'eat your own meat yourselves, God doesn't want it.' The same lesson exactly is taught in Psalm I. 12 f. 'If I were hungry, I would not tell thee: for the world is mine and all the fulness thereof.' God wanted the hearts of His people, not their offerings" (B. 76).

"The current exposition of the older commentators is best given by Kimchi, who points out that the decalogue, which was the basis of the whole law, and laid up in the ark as the bond of the covenant, contained no ritual ordinances except that of the Sabbath" (PS. 376).

3. THE TEACHING OF THE PROPHET.

"He was not denying the cherished belief of the people that the sacrificial system was of Divine origin, but he was trying to restore to them a worthy notion of the meaning of that system" (B. 77). "In the writings of Jeremiah, on the eve of the long exile, when the sacrificial ritual became impossible, it was natural in the order of divine Providence that the realities symbolised by sacrifices should be brought into prominence" (Westcott on Heb. viii. 12, cited B. 77). This is the teaching of Samuel in a famous passage, 1 Samuel xv. 16, and of Isaiah i. 11-13. And compare Jeremiah's derisive description of the sacrifice as so much "meat" with Isaiah's bitter description of "going to church" as "trampling on God's floor," and the services as "wickedness and worship." And Micah's words in vi. 6-8. "No membership of any nation or church, no trust in Bible or sacraments, no submission to the authority of priest or creed can suffice. In the secret depths of the individual's soul there must be a direct meeting with God" (T. 113). "This lifeless ritualism and laxity of faith and morals" (G. 181). "The sacrifice of bullocks and rams with bloodstained hands was blasphemy" (G. 181). And it is striking that from this chapter Christ justified His unique violence in the temple (vii. 11; Mark xi. 17). "Where the thing symbolised is lacking the symbol is but a mockery and intrinsically valueless" (77).

REVIEWS OF BOOKS.

DR. PLUMMER'S PHILIPPIANS.

A COMMENTARY ON ST. PAUL'S EPISTLE TO THE PHILIPPIANS. By Alfred Plummer, M.A., D.D. London: *Robert Scott*. 7s. 6d. net.

Once more Dr. Plummer has placed us under an obligation to him. Few men have utilized years of retirement to better advantage than he, for since in 1902 he resigned the Mastership of University College, Durham, he has given us a succession of publications, chief among these being Commentaries on St. Matthew and 1 and 2 Thessalonians. This latest Commentary on Philippians is not a whit behind its predecessors, and we may here observe that the excellent print and lucid arrangement makes the volume eminently readable. Needless to say, there is a scholarly introduction. Concerning the genuineness of the letter Dr. Plummer quotes Schaff: "The objections raised by a few hyper-critics are not worthy of serious refutation," while of the internal evidence he observes that "it would be difficult to point to any four consecutive chapters in the New Testament as more intensely Pauline." He thinks it was "probably not all dictated at one sitting," and that there are signs of "some disturbing interruption" at iii. 1, but he dismisses the two suggestions that (1) two letters are joined together at that point, and (2) that two letters "lie scattered about through four chapters." He also rejects the recent theory of Dr. Kirsopp Lake and others that the letter was written from Ephesus—a theory which he describes as based upon "a number of more or less probable conjectures," while the generally accepted view is based upon "well-ascertained facts." Further, he proceeds to defend the accepted view, pointing out that we have no evidence that St. Paul was ever imprisoned at Ephesus, while with regard to the statement "I have fought with beasts at Ephesus," he maintains that it must be a metaphor for conflict with brutal men, since it is incredible that a Roman citizen could have been sentenced to fight with wild beasts in the arena, nor are these the only arguments advanced. The hypothesis that it was written from Cæsarea "will not," he says; "bear investigation."

The informality of the letter and the absence of a pre-arranged plan make it difficult, as Dr. Plummer says, to analyse; but notwithstanding he gives us a useful outline or synopsis of the contents of the letter, and according to this the commentary itself is arranged, a suggestive paraphrase following each paragraph. Perhaps the needs of the general reader were uppermost in Dr. Plummer's mind, but at the same time it is evident that the student of the Greek Testament was not forgotten, and it seems to us a pity that the Greek text was not given instead of the A.V.

Commenting on the words "with joy," we are reminded that this is the dominant note of the Epistle as well as a leading feature in the Apostolic Church. He describes "in the bowels" (i. 8) as a clumsy mistranslation frequent in A.V., and observes that "*σπλῆγγα* included the heart, lungs and liver as distinct from the intestines or bowels, and were regarded by the Greek poets as the seat of the stormy affections, as anger and love, and by the Hebrews as the seat of the tender affections, as pity and charity." No one word, he says, will suit all the passages. Here he translates "with the tenderness of Jesus Christ." Dr. Plummer has a fine instinct for seeing the inwardness of St. Paul's meaning, as, for instance, where he says, "He adds 'in the flesh' because 'death' does not mean ceasing to live; for the same reason he substitutes 'striking camp' for dying." There is no elaborate

discussion of the Kenosis theories. We read "a reservoir cannot empty itself without parting with its contents, and the contents in this case are the glories of the Divine nature. The exact meaning of this is beyond us. Attempts to explain the union of Godhead and manhood are inevitably failures."

St. Paul's desire for unity and attention is drawn to the characteristic words *κοινωνία*, *συνκοινωνός* and *κοινωνεῖν*.

Enough has been said to show that this commentary, which includes an English and Greek index, leaves nothing to be desired. S. R. CAMBIE.

A PADRE-GUNNER'S SHOTS.

ROUNDS FROM A PULPIT: BY A PADRE-GUNNER. By Captain the Rev. J. A. F. Ozanne, R.G.A. London: *Philip Allan and Co.* 5s. net.

Seventeen sermons preached to men of the Garrison Artillery, but apparently since the cessation of hostilities, for the first speaks of the victory and the second of the "late war," and other expressions seem to indicate that these are post-war discourses. However, they are none the worse for this, in fact they are rather the better because they contain many lessons for the difficult time in which we are living, and many of the shots fired by this Padre-Gunner were no doubt fired with good effect. They are homely but vigorous in style, and enforce many truths and useful lessons. We cannot agree with him on every point. For instance, in a sermon on *Prayers for the Departed*, with a text from 2 Maccabees ("It is a holy and wholesome thought to pray for the dead"), he tells us that "when the reformed prayer book came into being, the prayers for the faithful departed were retained in the communion office, and the Commemoration of All Souls had its place in her calendar." This would leave the uninformed with the impression that these are there now, whereas the truth is that the prayers to which Mr. Ozanne refers were omitted from the Prayer for the Church Militant and the words "here in earth" were added with the express purpose of showing that there was no intention of praying for the departed, and the Feast of All Souls' likewise disappeared from the calendar.

Mr. Ozanne goes on to quote "We bless Thy holy Name," etc., which are not in the form of prayer for the departed at all, but merely an expression of gratitude for the testimony of faithful lives. We express no opinion as to the wisdom or otherwise of removing all such petitions; it is merely, as lawyers say, a question of facts, and facts are stubborn things even in Prayer Book History!

There is a useful sermon on Spiritualism. Quoting the words "Thy servants departed this life," he proceeds—"Departed: therefore they do not return." It may be true that they do not return, but we are not sure about Mr. Ozanne's argument. We may be unusually dense, but we cannot see that *departed* necessarily implies ("therefore") that they do not return. He is on safer ground when he quotes Job, "I shall go the way whence I shall not return," and David, "before I go hence and be no more seen." There are not a few startling facts recorded, as, for instance, where we are told that it was difficult during the war to get a priest in Ireland to say Mass for a man who had died in khaki, and that Bolshevik laws, couched in revolting terms, have been enacted abolishing Christian marriage and establishing free love. He tells us, too, of two girls whom he saw himself, whose hands had been hacked off by the Germans.

In a sermon on *True Churchmanship* there is an excellent explanation of "the rock" passage in Matthew xvi. 17. This is what we might expect since

Mr. Ozanne is an ex-Roman priest, and it is only fair to him to say that he displays no pro-Roman sympathies and has a considerable grasp of fundamental Gospel truths.

S. R. C.

THE HOLY SEPULCHRE.

THE HOLY SEPULCHRE. By George Jeffrey. *Cambridge University Press.*
10s. 6d.

Mr. Jeffrey is an architect and an antiquarian who has devoted much time to the study of the Church of the Holy Sepulchre, its site and the Reproductions of the Church as a pilgrim shrine in Europe. He adds something to our knowledge, but he does not convince us that the traditional site is the only possible one. Constantine when he permitted in the fourth century the destruction of a heathen Temple to make room for the central shrine of Christendom fixed the site traditionally. We are accustomed to forget the centuries that pass at the beginning as they are foreshortened by comparison with later centuries, and whether the Holy Sepulchre was or was not under the existing Church is a matter of antiquarian interest. Many think that our uncertainty is part of the Divine discipline that prevents us fixing our attention on things of earth instead of on the things of heaven. Students will find matter of the greatest interest in the historical pages of Mr. Jeffrey's learned book, but they will feel that they are on surer ground when they read his detailed description of the Church and the other Churches in the Holy City. There is much to be said for the contention "the Christian sentiment about pilgrimage to Jerusalem quickly develops into a veneration for relics, and instead of older religious customs as of visiting a temple as the abode of the deity, the new faith seemed identified from its beginning with a special regard for tombs." Mr. R. A. S. Macalister—who is perhaps our best authority on Jerusalem sites—tells us plainly that we may rest in the certainty unless an inscription turns up that the exact site of the Holy Sepulchre never has been and never will be identified.

Mr. Jeffrey gives us many plans and photographs which will bring home to his readers the history and appearance of the Church that owes its internal fine effect to the principles of design which were beginning to be displayed in France in the Cathedral architecture of the twelfth century. In a most thought-provoking obiter dictum he tells us that pre-reformation Churches have frequently lost more than half their original design and all their beauty and interest by the destruction of their furniture. The chief symbolism of pre-reformation churches was to represent the permanent living Christian organisation divided off from the outside world. This made the altar the centre of everything. We can only refer to the detailed descriptions of the chief and other ancient Jerusalem Churches as well as the European reproductions. All will interest readers who desire knowledge from a competent guide who has spared no pains to make himself clear to those who wish to learn from him.

BROAD CHURCH THEOLOGY.

BROAD CHURCH THEOLOGY. By the Rev. W. J. Sparrow Simpson, D.D.
London: *Robert Scott.* 3s. 6d. net.

Save that the author's ecclesiastical position is so well known, the title of this treatise might lead to the supposition that in its pages the reader would find an outline, from a sympathetic pen, of Broad Church Theology. Needless to say, this is not the case. It is a scholarly attack upon the Latitudinarian position, and Dr. Sparrow Simpson proves himself to be well equipped

for the task he undertook. He is familiar with the literature of the Broad Church School and he examines some of the statements of its leading exponents. He argues in a powerful chapter on the Personality of God in order to show that while an informal abstraction may suffice for the requirement of some Philosophies, nothing less than a personal Deity can suffice for religion. Nor is he less effective when he goes on to prove that the Christian Doctrine of the Trinity was not a mere product of philosophic thought, but arose as an explanation of facts in Christian experience and was an inference from the fact of Christ, and he proceeds to show that the Sabellian and Arian theories are forms of that Unitarian Religion which always haunts the outskirts of the Christian Faith. He charges Milton with Arianism "undisguised" and examines Channing's essay, showing how in reaction from the Arianism of Milton he fell back on the Sabellian alternative. He maintains that the criticisms which Broad Church theology makes on the Nicene Creed prove conclusively that it is not the Faith of the Church, and with lucidity and force he discusses the views expounded in Mr. Charles E. Raven's *What think ye of Christ?* in which the Incarnation is interpreted in terms of modern thought.

The last four chapters of the book are devoted to the subject of the pre-existence of Christ, and they are full of suggestion as well as refutation of the opinions very commonly held by many Broad Churchmen.

OTHER VOLUMES.

CHEMISTRY AND ITS MYSTERIES. By C. R. Gibson. London: *Seeley Service and Co.* 4s.

Mr. Gibson has a practised hand in writing elementary science, and it is no exaggeration to say that he makes his subject as interesting as an adventure tale. Many a boy has a natural taste for science which may lie undetected unless he has as it were a spark applied to set it alight. The accurate and readable volumes written by our author supply the needed stimulus, and we strongly recommend "Chemistry and its Mysteries" to parents and friends of the rising generation. We have known boys obtain scholarships in Science who have never been taught it in school. They made such good use of their hobby that examiners recognised their natural aptitude. Apart from this aspect of the matter, the more all young people know of nature the better for them and the world in which they live.

* * * * *

SUBMARINE WARFARE OF TO-DAY. By C. W. Domville-Fife. London: *Seeley Service and Co.* 7s. 6d.

The facts of the anti-submarine campaign are now disclosed, and those who recognise how near we were to losing the war when the sinkings were at their height, will turn to the lucid and well-informed pages of Mr. Domville-Fife with the keenest interest. We have read from beginning to end his narrative of national effort, and when we remember the conditions of the problem to be solved and the wide expanse of the open seas, we are amazed by what has been done and are much wiser than when we opened his book. He gives full details of the "hush" and "mystery" ships, of paravanes and nets. The many illustrations make plain his descriptions, and we wish that all who write for non-specialists had so good a knowledge of their needs as Mr. Domville-Fife proves himself to possess. As long as the United Kingdom remains two islands in the sea, we cannot afford to overlook anything that contributes to our safety and that of our shipping, which is our main artery of essential supplies.

CHURCH BOOK ROOM NOTES.

82 VICTORIA STREET, S.W.1.

A CHAPLAIN at one of our large public schools recently sent us a letter from which the following is an extract: "I am most grateful to you for the inestimable help you gave me during November towards the Confirmation, preparation of my Confirmation Candidates. I found Barnes-Lawrence's book very useful. I was particularly thrilled with the way my fifty-one candidates gripped my words about the inner significance of the Holy Communion. I feel that I won all hesitancy over when I said, 'Dear boys, can you really believe that when I give you the bread and wine next Sunday I am actually holding God in my hands? *I do not.* My whole soul revolts against such a thought.' They crowded round me afterwards, even those who acknowledged they liked a 'High' Service, and asked eager questions. Next Sunday I had well over seventy communicants—isn't that splendid? I do hope and pray that I may be used to help and strengthen these fellows. They actually sent me at Christmas two silver candlesticks suitably engraved, with a letter from a Sixth Form boy who wrote thanking me 'most heartily for the great help and comfort' I had given the confirmees last term. . . . I tell you all this because I feel that much of the gratitude of the boys is due to yourself and the N. C. L. who so large-heartedly helped me. . . . I shall never forget your kindness."

In these Notes last month we gave a list of the pamphlets which we issue in connection with Confirmation, and a complete set of which we will gladly send on receipt of a postal order for 1s. 3d. for cost and postage.

The Chaplain referred to above mentions Canon Barnes-Lawrence's book, *The Holy Communion*. Unfortunately at the moment this is out of print.

The Holy Communion. It has already run through two large editions. Arrangements are being made for the issue of a new edition, which has been thoroughly revised by the author, and it is hoped that copies will be on sale early in March. The book deals, by the method of positive teaching rather than controversial treatment, with the fact that the Holy Communion is central to those foundation truths which underlie the whole Christian life, and its thoughtfulness, its spirit of quiet devotion, its clear and definite teaching, all combine to render it a really beautiful book. We know of no volume on the subject better fitted to be given to the young people of the more thoughtful and educated classes, and it is, moreover, a valuable addition to the devotional library of men and women.

A number of little manuals suitable for distribution to Confirmation candidates are stocked in the Church Book Room. Of these we would name

Other Manuals. *My First Communion*, by the Rev. A. R. Runnels-Moss, with a preface by the Bishop of Manchester, 1s. 3d. and 1s. 6d. net; *The King's Table of Blessing*, by the Rev. A. L. Hunt, 1s.;

The Holy Communion, by the Rev. H. M. Lang, paper cover, 6d., stiff boards, 1s.; *Thoughts for Communicants*, by the Right Rev. Bishop Stratton, 9d. net; *The Holy Communion*, a manual, historical, doctrinal and devotional, by the Bishop of Sodor and Man, 1s. 3d.; *At the King's Table*, by Principal A. J. Tait, D.D., 1s. 3d. net.

The following Sermons by the Rev. Canon Pryor, D.D., Vicar of Holy

Trinity, Margate, have been published in book form, and can be obtained from the Book Room:—*God's Message to Men*, 1s.; *The Brotherhood of Man*, 1s.; *The Gospel of a Second Chance*, 6d.; *The Sacredness of Motherhood*, 6d.; *The Sweet Will of God*, 6d.; *The Problem of Pain*, 6d.; *The Secret of Happiness*, 6d.; *Home and Happiness*, 6d.; *The Sacredness of Married Life*, 6d. It is well known that Canon Pryor draws large congregations at Margate, particularly to his Men's Services, which testifies to the acceptability and usefulness of his message, and we feel sure that the sermons will be most helpful to those who read them.

The third large edition of the little manual *About the Feet of God; or Brief Daily Prayers for use in the Home*, by the Rev. E. R. Price Devereux, is now nearly exhausted. The manual contains morning and evening prayers for a week, and is admirably adapted for use in family worship. It can also be used for private devotions. All the collects which it contains are short and simple, and most of them are from the Book of Common Prayer. We trust that this little book will continue to be of help to clergy and others in their endeavours to introduce family prayers into the households of their parishioners and friends.

Another little penny Prayer manual is called *Family Prayers*, and is one of the English Church Manual Series. Its price brings it within the reach of all, and enables each member of the household to have a copy so that they may follow the prayers and join in the responses. The services appointed for each day are brief, and broken up into separate parts of worship, such as confession, praise, thanksgiving, prayer or intercession. The familiar words of the Prayer Book have been very freely used, and the order and arrangement of the services are purposely somewhat varied to avoid monotony. Bishop Oxenden's *Family Prayers* are well known. They are published in two series at 2s., each containing prayers for a month with litanies and occasional prayers at the end. The two series are also published together in one volume at 5s. net. The aim of these prayers is simplicity of language and directness of supplication. In *Home Prayers*, Mr. G. F. Chambers has got together a very excellent selection of Family Prayers for each morning and evening in the week. The type is large, and the volume neatly bound.

Of *A Manual of English Church History*, by the Rev. Charles Hole, price 3s. 6d. net, the Dean of Canterbury writes: "It was the aim of the author that this History of the Church of England, from the introduction of Christianity to Britain to the present day, should be written with a thoroughness and impartiality which has too often been absent from similar books. It is the work of one who was in full sympathy with the Reformation, but who, both by learning and temperament, was averse from controversy, and whose retiring and scholarly life enabled him to exercise the quiet judgment of an historian on the life and the struggles of the past." In *The English Church and the Reformation*, 2s. net, you have a book to place in the hands of those who wish to have a scholarly and concise account of the Reformation—what it meant, what led to it, and what its results were, written in a clear and interesting style. *The Layman's History of the Church of England*, by the Rev. G. R. Balleine, 1s. 6d. net, is a popular and most interesting history. The story of a parish is carried down through the various periods, and the whole linked together by this means in a most interesting way.