the Church, the failure of previous attacks, that the ancient belief respecting the Inspiration of the Scriptures is true, will justly view with the utmost suspicion critical results of the distinctive character in question. They will feel sure that there is some subtle error in a criticism which leads men—however good and able they may be—to such conclusions; they will be content to rely on the plain, broad testimony of Evangelists and Apostles, and of an inspired teacher like St. Stephen, and will patiently wait until, as on former occasions, criticism has corrected itself by better criticism.

HENRY WACE.

ART. V.—"OUR UNHAPPY DIVISIONS"—V. (*continued*).

IN the time of the Reformation there were many who inclined to the conjecture that, "after the Apostles were deceased, churches did agree among themselves, for preservation of peace and order, to make one presbyter in each city chief over the rest."[1] And of this account of the origin of

[1] Few, I think, will be found to maintain that any form of Church organization is as distinctly prescribed to the followers of Christ as the emphatic command to evangelize the world; and if we grieve to see, on one side, a sad, though not unnatural, prejudice against Episcopacy, obscuring the view of the evidence in its favour, we may do well, perhaps, to inquire whether, on the other side, there may not have been manifested sometimes a prejudice against those who failed to see clearly Scriptural proof of its Divine appointment, and this in connection with a tendency to give it exaggerated importance, and unduly to exalt its monarchical dignity.

It cannot be denied that those whose prejudices led them to question the Scriptural evidence for the Order of Episcopacy might claim apparent support even from the Master of the Sentences. After speaking of the minor Orders, he says: "Excellenter tamen canones duos tantum sacros ordines appellari censent. Diaconatus scilicet et presbyteratus: quia hos solos primitiva ecclesia legitur habuisse, et de his solis præceptum Apostoli habemus" (Lombard, "Sent.," lib. iv., dist. xxiv., fol. 348*b*; Paris, 1558). Somewhat later he adds: "Sunt et alia quædam non ordinum, sed dignitatum vel officiorum nomina. Dignitatis simul et officii nomen est Episcopus" (*ibid.*, fol. 349*a*).

Archbishop Leighton, speaking of the esteem due to those concerned with "the holy functions of God's house," takes account of the straining of "this consideration too high, to the favouring and founding of a monarchical prelacy in the Christian world" ("On 1 Pet. ii. 9," vol. i., p. 283; S.P.C.K.); and he deprecates the seeking "those dignities that suit not with this charge, which is not *dominium*, but *ministerium*" (*ibid.*, ch. v., vers. 2-4; vol. ii., p. 442). He appears to be alluding to the saying of "that holy man Bernard" (see p. 436): "Blanditur cathedra? Specula est. Inde denique superintendis, sonans tibi Episcopi nomine non domi-

Episcopacy Hooker says: "Myself did sometimes judge [it] a great deal more probable than now I do" ("Eccl. Pol.," book vii., ch. xi., § 8). But we need not question "the general received persuasion held from the first beginning, that the Apostles themselves left Bishops invested with power above other pastors" (*ibid*). Yet, while thus contending, in a very true sense, for the Divine institution of Episcopacy, we may fitly quote the words of Hooker (written with another application): "He which requireth both mercy and sacrifice rejecteth His own institution of sacrifice, where the offering of sacrifice would hinder mercy from being showed" (book v., ch. lxi., § 5). In our last article, accordingly, we had our attention directed to Scriptural indications pointing to the fact that regulations concerning ministry should be subordinated to the supreme importance of the truth of the Gospel, which is the power of God unto salvation.

Nevertheless, we may need sometimes to be warned against the mistake on the other side of disregarding the teaching of the New Testament concerning matters of Church order and authority. The Covenant sealing—the sealing of the donation of the free gift of remission—which is "generally necessary to salvation," is "generally" to be sought in the communion of the Visible Church. And this outward bond of union is never to be lightly esteemed. Indeed, to believing souls it has to do with the union which is inward and spiritual, when "by One Spirit we are all baptized into one Body." We must not allow our lamentable lack of godly discipline to obscure our view of the *spiritual relation*, which appertains even to the Visible Church of Christ.

We may refer to an Apostolic injunction: "We command you, brethren, in the name of our Lord Jesus Christ, that ye withdraw yourselves from every brother that walketh disorderly, and not after the tradition which they received of us" (2 Thess. iii. 6). "Yet count him not as an enemy, but admonish him as a brother"[1] (ver. 15).

And certainly we must guard against the error of supposing

---

nium, sed officium. . . . Nec enim tibi ille dare quod non habuit, potuit. Quod habuit, hoc dedit, solicitudinem, ut dixi, super Ecclesias. Numquid dominationem? Audi ipsum. *Non dominantes*, ait, *in clero, sed forma facti gregis.* Et ne dictum sola humilitate putes, non etiam veritate, vox Domini est in Evangelio: *Reges gentium dominantur eorum, et qui potestatem habent super eos, benefici vocantur: et infert: Vos autem non sic.* Planum est: Apostolis interdicitur dominatus" ("De Consideratione ad Eugenium III.," lib. ii., cap. vi.; Op., tom i., c. 425; Venet, 1750). But this must not be understood as derogating from the due authority of the Episcopal office. See "Liber de Præcepto et Dispensatione," cap. ix., c. 514.

[1] See "Speaker's Com.," N.T., vol. iii., pp. 744, 745.

that the sense of the personal relation to God of each converted individual soul is to annul the sense of the relation of Christ's people one to another as members of the "One Body." We must beware of allowing the idea of anything like corporate unity to be regarded as a thing of nought in the Church of Christ.

It was not the unity of outward organization which made Christians of old—even the *whole multitude* of them that believed—to be "of *one* heart and *one* soul" (Acts iv. 32). But that unity of soul made them to continue "stedfastly in the Apostles' doctrine and fellowship, and in the breaking of the bread and the prayers" (Acts ii. 42).

The oneness in Christ (the glory of being "one even as we are one," John xvii. 22, 23) of the once straying sheep, now returned (brought home—ἐπεστράφητε) unto the Shepherd and Bishop of their souls (1 Pet. ii. 25), is a thing surely as much higher than the unity of any visible organization as the heavens are higher than the earth; yet this did not (and does not) make the souls of the "restored" free from the visible bond of submission to the due authority of those who (in a subordinate sense) had the charge of feeding the flock of God and doing the work of Bishops among them (ἐπισκοποῦντες, 1 Pet. v. 2; *cf.* especially Acts xx. 28).

And now if we would seek an answer to the question, How is it to be accounted for that the Churches of the Reformation were so long deaf to the word of the Risen Saviour, "Go ye into all the world"? we can hardly be far wrong if (beyond the pressing urgency of defence against Roman usurpation) we see some connection between this neglect and something like a dying out among them of the power of the truth—the truth of the Divine Word which is to be the light for our dark hearts, and the fire for our cold souls.

It is in proportion as we have the power of the Gospel known in our own hearts at home that the truth of the Gospel will be made known to the hearts of heathen abroad. And assuredly the revival of the power in our own souls is dependent on our obedience to the word which bids us "go into all the world." Alas! what a witness to the working of a spirit which makes Christian Churches to lose their first love, and then to become lukewarm, neither hot nor cold, is to be seen in the early history of the Church Missionary Society, and the way in which it was looked upon by the prevalent, respectable, self-satisfied, cool-hearted Christianity of those days! Let us thank God those days are gone by. But let us also take heed that we remember the lesson of those days for ourselves, that we may hold fast to the truth and ever look up for the power, the power of which the Apostle wrote:

"But we preach Christ crucified, unto the Jews a stumbling-block, and unto the Greeks foolishness: but unto them which are called, both Jews and Greeks, Christ, the power of God and the wisdom of God" (1 Cor. i. 22, 23). If we would know the power which can be as a salve for our unhappy divisions and make peace in our borders, let us remember the word, "Whatsoever He saith unto you, do it." Let us give heed to the voice which bids us repent, and do the first works, and let us bear in our hearts His word, which says, "Go ye into all the world, and preach the Gospel to every creature." No wonder we look in vain for spiritual miracles and wonders and signs; no wonder we mourn over lack of conversions, and want of spiritual fruitfulness, and failure of Apostolic enthusiasm, and the spreading of the form of godliness without its power, and the breaking up of Apostolic unity, if we are content to turn aside from an Apostolic commission. No wonder our boasted claim of Apostolic order, when divorced from obedience to Apostolic truth, fails to win for us the adhesion of those who know the power in their own hearts of the true missionary enthusiasm of true Apostolic doctrine.

The call of the Christian Church is to be as a stream carrying the water of life over a wilderness of death, that the desert may rejoice and blossom as the rose. But when a river of flowing water is dammed up and made to cease from its flowing, then the living stream will soon become a stagnant pool, and stagnant water in the midst of that which is impure will not long continue in its living purity. Is there nothing like this when pure Christian doctrine is bidden to fortify its own position and not go abroad? Is there nothing like this when there is a decay of Christian life and Christian love, and a multiplying of "unhappy divisions," because the stream of Christian activity has been made to be stagnant instead of flowing?

Let any national Church be satisfied to be *only* a national Church; let the Church of England be well contented to be simply the Church *of* England and *for* England; let it say to itself, "I am rich, and have need of nothing," congratulating itself on its superiority to Reformed Churches "beyond the seas"; let its insular position tell of the insular limits of its activities; let its sympathies, its mercies, its compassions be *all* Anglican; let it be well pleased to have its mission circumscribed by the waves of the ocean which on every side beat upon our shores; let any Church think thus selfishly to spend her strength at home, and at home to keep to herself the light of the Gospel which God has given her; then must we expect to see that Church's light grow dim and that Church's strength wax feeble, and its unity broken up by

discords and contentions, till it shall be afflicted as with the sleeping sickness which has been doing such deadly work among our converts in Uganda. Is there nothing like this to be seen in the rising generation? So many apparently deceiving their own hearts, taking delight in highly elaborate musical services and the attractive æsthetics of worship, while too often, alas! turning with aversion from the heart-pricking truth and the sin-convicting power of the Cross of Christ, with its heaven-sent message of redeeming mercy for sinners!

What urgent need there is of a crying mightily to God for true "showers of blessing"! for the shining in our hearts of the true Light of Heaven, that so we may make the light to shine in the dark places of the earth! for the mighty working among us of the Spirit of Him, who is able to exceed abundantly above all that we can ask or think! We must look up to Him to bring us up from the unhappiness of our divisions into the happiness of His peace, that we may know "how good and joyful a thing it is for brethren to dwell together in unity."

II. Thus we are brought up to another saying of our blessed Lord, which we cannot but desire to dwell upon in this connection, though it must be but for a moment.

"A new commandment I give unto you, that ye love one another" (John xiii. 34; see also John xv. 12, 17). It is a very plain and simple command from Him, whose word we must obey, if we would know the power of His Divine working in the midst of us. It is a word which points us to a unity far higher than uniformity, a unity which may even be conspicuously manifested in certain diversities of variety, a unity which can manifest its vitality in overleaping barriers and bridging over chasms of separation; but yet a unity the fruits of which cannot but fall upon even such earthly things as order and discipline, and upon these especially so far as their regulations may seem to have sure warrant from Scriptural and Apostolic authority.

Writing on Ephes. iv. 1-7, Bishop Moule has admirably said: "Indeed, the Apostle has in view a unity which does not satisfy itself with sentiment. It prizes all possible actual coherence of order and organization; all such methods of worship as may best aid the believing company to enjoy a public fellowship together before God as true and general as possible. Easy and ill-considered separations, even in things most external, are assuredly wounds to such unity, and in that respect are sins. The Christian Church should reflect as much as may be outwardly the inward principle and power of unity in Christ.

"Yet let us, on the other hand, earnestly remember that the

context and the terms of this passage alike lead us, for the heart of the matter, to a region of things far other than that of authority, administration, succession. For his basis of unity the Apostle goes to the height of heaven and to the depth of the sanctified soul. He has in His deepest thought, not a society founded by Christ on earth to convey His grace, but the Church written in heaven, and the Lord of it present in His every member's heart, welcomed in by personal faith under the power of the eternal Spirit in response to imploring prayer"[1] ("Ephesian Studies," pp. 183, 184).

But how does this new commandment of our Lord look in the history of the Churches of the Reformation?

I am not meaning to refer to the matter of erroneous and strange doctrines and the way in which they were dealt with. But, alas! what bitterness and strife of contentious controversy among those who should have been as brethren both at home and abroad! A so-called *formula concordiæ* made into a form of *concordia discors*![2] Our once famous "Harmonia Confessionum" broken up by those who could not attune their own "sibboleth" to sound in unison with their neighbours' "shibboleth"! Secessions followed by further separations, divisions multiplied by subdivisions! Must we not own that in such things as these was seen the weakness of the Reformation?

In Germany Lutheran Calovians turning away from Lutheran Calextins![3] Among the Reformed, what strife between Remonstrants and contra-Remonstrants! Plenty of learned theology, more than plenty of vigorous controversy, but, alas! not always the controversy of life with death, not always the theology of the Spirit of power and of love and of a sound mind! The irenical efforts of peace-loving souls too often made the occasion of further offence! Energies which should have been spent in united efforts for the evangelization of the heathen all turned aside to wear themselves out in strivings and contentions—about two sides, it may be, of the same truth—quarrels among those who should have been with one heart preaching "peace, peace," as the ambassadors of Christ, the ministers of reconciliation for the lost world!

In England what grievous reproaches heaped upon our Church because we thought well to aim at restoring what seemed truly ancient and truly Catholic, and preferred taking as our model the Church of primitive Christianity rather than

---

[1] See especially Hooker, sermon v., § 11: Works, vol. iii., pp. 670, 671; edit. Keble.

[2] See Hospinian's Works, vol. v.; Geneva, 1578.

[3] See Soames's edition of Mosheim, vol. iv., pp. 177, 178.

what our censors chose to call "the best Reformed Churches" of the Continent![1] What grievous prejudice, even among faithful and zealous men, against all things in which we stood distinguished from the practices of Geneva, though Casaubon was not standing altogether alone among foreigners when he testified, "Totius Reformationis pars integerrima, ni fallor, in Anglia est." The necessary revolt from an usurped authority, which had practically superseded the authority of the Divine word for the life of man's soul, should never have been allowed to open the door for a spirit of lawlessness and insubordination. Much rather it should have induced a disposition of ready and willing submission to the wholesome discipline and godly admonition of lawful authority. We need not wonder at being told that we know not how much of this ill-feeling and prejudice against our rules in general and against our Episcopacy in particular was fomented by emissaries from Rome.[2] (In speaking of *prejudice*, I do not wish to be understood as using the word in an offensive sense. No doubt Puritan prejudices were the result of acquaintance with the attitude of pre-Reformation and Roman prelacy towards the doctrines of the Reformation.) But we can grieve over the history, while we may acknowledge that on both sides there may have been too often something like a forgetfulness of that new commandment "that ye love one another."

What a refreshing contrast to this is to be seen in the history of the Moravian brethren! There was a time, indeed, when this Church of primitive Episcopacy and Apostolic missionary zeal had been troubled with a spirit of discord. But Count Zinzendorf resolved that the principles and discipline of the old Church were to be restored. On May 12, 1727, discord was banished. "This day the Count made a covenant with the Lord. . . . Self-will, self-love, disobedience —they bade these farewell. They would seek to be poor in spirit. . . . By the mighty working of God's grace all were, not only convinced, but, as it were, carried along and

[1] The *doctrinal* differences between the *Early* Puritans and Anglican Churchmen were comparatively trifling. Bishop Andrewes regarded the questions in controversy between them as pertaining only to matters of regimen, order and discipline. Witness his words: "Distinguat itidem, inter *res fidei*, in quibus ne ii quidem hic, quos Puritanos appellat (nisi plus etiam quam Puritani sint) a nobis, nec nos ab illis dissentimus; et *disciplinæ res;* quam aliam ab Ecclesiæ priscâ formâ commenti sunt" ("Ad. Bell. Resp.," pp. 290, 291; A.C.L.). See further evidence in my "Theology of Bishop Andrewes," pp. 6, 7, and "Doctrine of the Sacraments," pp. 118-120.

[2] See Sanderson's Works, vol. ii., Pref., pp. xli-xliii, Oxford, 1854; and Sittingfleet's "Unreasonableness of Separation," Pref., pp. vi, xii-xviii, London, 1682; and Dean Goode's "Rome's Tactics."

mastered." Somewhat later one of them wrote: "Under the cloud of our fathers we were baptized with their spirit; signs and wonders were seen among us, and there was great grace on the whole neighbourhood."[1] Is there no lesson here for the Churches of the Reformation? Is there no example here which we might seek to follow?

In speaking of the bitternesses which followed the Reformation in England we are speaking of things of the past—bygones which may well be bygones now. Yet it is well for us to remember them, that *now* we may rise to follow His example who said: "If I, then, your Lord and Master, have washed your feet, ye ought also to wash one another's feet."

And certainly we may be thankful for any hearts being moved with earnest desire to put away the prejudices of the past, and with purpose to change bitterness to peace for the future.

It may be wise, and sometimes needful, to utter a word of caution. But why should we any of us hesitate to recognise, or be slow to acknowledge with great thankfulness, the blessing which has come down from heaven on gatherings of those who, coming together from divers standpoints and from the atmospheric surroundings of various ecclesiastical prejudices, have met in the one faith of the crucified Saviour, and have had one heart of intense desire to know more and more of the rooting and grounding in love, more and much more of the exceeding greatness of God's power (*τὸ ὑπερβάλλον μέγεθος τῆς δυνάμεως αὐτοῦ*) to usward who believe?

There is, indeed, a godly jealousy which must earnestly contend for the one faith once for all delivered unto the saints, but this is not to be identified with the disposition which in the midst of those who labour for peace is ever making itself ready for battle. If we would have an eye to the promise of the New Covenant, "I will give them one heart and one way" (Jer. xxxii. 39), we must assuredly shun the combative temper which delights rather in provoking theological duels than in following after the things which make for peace, and the things whereby one may edify another.

---

[1] See Andrew Murray's "Key to Miss. Problem.," pp. 47, 48. It should be observed that, while resolving to retain Episcopacy, and while highly reverencing the Episcopal office, "in spite of all the corruptions with which they had been associated," and having taken pains to secure a true succession (see Durel's "View of Reformed Churches beyond the Seas," pp. 12, 13; London, 1662), the Moravians did not hold that Episcopal succession is actually essential to the being of a Church (see Marsden's "Dict. of Churches and Sects," p. 106, and Bost's "Hist. of Moravians," p. 146 *sqq.*, edit. 1834). This little community, never exceeding 70,000 souls, has sent forth 2,000 missionaries (see E. Stock's "Hist. of C.M.S.," vol. i., p. 27).

Are there no souls who have found a happy solvent for unhappy divisions in gathering together to seek a fuller experience of the power of God's Spirit within them? Are there none who can tell of being brought out of separations into the blessedness of realizing the true oneness of those who are all one in Christ Jesus? Are there none who can testify that in coming together out of diversities they have learnt, as never before, to hold and to keep the unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace?

Is it too much to hope that, as the result of such gatherings, Christian love may some day overcome inherited prejudices, and lead to a fairer estimate of the true claims of Episcopal Churchmanship?

Who can look on with cold heart, unmoved with a feeling of joy and praise, to see how in our mission-fields the evil and the weakness of division—division among those who should be at one in the love of the Saviour, and for His sake in the love of one another—is being felt, or beginning to be felt, as that which should be overcome and put away as far as possible by united effort, so that our warfare against the powers of darkness may be led on under one banner, the banner of one Lord, one Faith, one Baptism, one army moving onwards with all lowliness and meekness, with long-suffering, forbearing one another in love, giving diligence to keep the unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace?

It has been well said: "Let us unite in love with others and pray without ceasing, and watch unto prayer, that for the sake of His Son and a perishing world God would restore His people to their first estate in the devotion and power and joy of Pentecost. . . . The missionary problem is a personal one. A passionate love to Jesus Christ, born out of His love, truly possessing each of us personally, will teach us to pray and to labour and to suffer. Let us pray for such a love" (A. Murray's "Key to Miss. Problem," pp. 133, 134). And surely the disciples of a loving Saviour should love and pray for all those with whom we are called to contend in controversy, even those whose faith may be clouded with grievous error and sad superstition.

We may, indeed, make some apologies for feelings of indignation aroused by the provocations of those who, under the plea of Anglican "Catholicity," would fain bring back among us the superstitious practices and doctrines of Rome. But does anyone really suppose that the cause of Him, who would have us love one another, can be forwarded by nourishing in our hearts the bitterness, wrath, and anger of our grievous *odium theologicum*, or that the truth of the Gospel will be advanced by addressing unseemly language to those who are

set over us in the Lord? There are many, I hope, who can tell of those who have been drawn out of error by the force of truth faithfully spoken in love. But very few, I think, ever knew the case of an opponent brought out of darkness into light by the violence of controversial invectives.

Surely at home and abroad our hearts should be united in prayer that a manifest blessing—a blessed outpouring of spiritual power—may come down on the meetings of those who in Japan or elsewhere have been or shall be uniting their hearts in brotherly conference, and in seeking Divine guidance in the way of God's peace. Surely we may thank God for a movement which "seeks to unite the students of all branches of the Church of Christ, of all nations and races, in the sublime effort to evangelize the whole world, and to establish completely the kingdom of Christ" (see *Church Missionary Intelligencer*, May, 1902, p. 327).

If we are persuaded that the healing of our sad separations must come of Divine power, let us also be fully persuaded that that power must be sought in obedience to the Word, which says: "Whatsoever He saith unto you, do it."

In obedience to the Word, "Go ye into all the world and preach the Gospel to every creature," let the sight of the great power of the enemy make us to be as one man in love one to another; as we march against the giant foe, let us be as with one heart striving together for the truth of the Gospel; while we speak the word and blow the trumpet, at the sound of which we look to see the walls of Jericho fall down flat, not by the force of the trumpet's blast, but by the power of Him who commands us to blow, and bid the people shout with a great shout.

Well was it said at the C.M.S. Lay Workers' Union, April 12, 1902, by Prebendary Fox, that "if the Church were losing its influence it was because it had forgotten the great work the Master had laid upon it—that of being 'His witnesses.' Their capacity for being witnesses was unequalled; and what, he asked, might they not have done if, using their knowledge, they had given to the nations of the earth Christianity, the mother of all civilization. Not once nor twice only had Uganda been saved to England by the loyalty of the Protestant chiefs, and he believed that Uganda would yet be one of the brightest jewels in the English crown. Their responsibility to their country was great, but their responsibility to their Master was greater. They were to be His witnesses, the bearers of the King's message of peace to the nations of the earth" (*Record*, April 18, 1902).

N. Dimock.

(*To be concluded.*)