

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

July, 1918.

The Month.

The Cheltenham Conference. WHAT is the Cheltenham Conference? Whom does it represent? What are its powers? These questions, and such as these, have been much in the minds of Churchmen during the last few weeks, and it may be well to offer some sort of answer to them as far as we are able to do so. (1) The Conference had its origin in a strongly expressed desire on the part of some of the younger Evangelical clergy for some means of discussing together current Church problems in order, if possible, to arrive at a policy with a view to united action. The matter was carefully considered and it was ultimately arranged that the Rector of Cheltenham should convene such a Conference and that it should be held in that delightful town. Hence the name of the gathering. The first Conference was held in June, 1916, and immediately proved successful. A small Committee was afterwards formed, with headquarters in London, to arrange for future meetings. The second Conference was held at Cheltenham in September, 1917, with a larger attendance, and the interest manifested was so great that it was evident that it met a need not provided for in any other way and that it must become an annual event. The arrangements for this year's Conference presented some difficulty. The restrictions on railway travelling, coupled with the food problem, made a meeting at Cheltenham almost impossible. It was decided therefore that the Conference, still retaining its original title, should meet in London, under the presidency of the Rector of Cheltenham. Accordingly it met in London on June 5 and 6, but the Rev. H. A. Wilson was unable to attend owing to a domestic bereavement, and his place was taken, and his opening address read, by the Chairman of the Committee, the Rev. George F. Irwin, B.D. The attendance was large, over 250 acceptances having been received from clergy and laity largely, but by no means

altogether, belonging to London and the district. Such is the Cheltenham Conference. (2) The second question, Whom does it represent? is more difficult to answer. Strictly speaking it represents only those who attend it, but from a wider point of view it may be said to voice the views of a large and growing body of Evangelical Churchmen, laity as well as clergy, who, in the words of the Rector of Cheltenham, "stand for a progressive Evangelicalism" which they believe "must issue in a firm and fearless policy." There are, however, certain limitations for, even in the matter of the Findings, it is always clearly provided that they are to be taken to express "the general sense of the Conference and not as completely representing in detail the views of individual members." This is an important safeguard, enabling all in general sympathy with the aims of the Conference to attend it, without in any way compromising their liberty of thought or of action. (3) There remains the third question—What are its powers? In the ordinary sense of the term it has none. It has no executive or administrative functions; yet it is no mere debating society. It is a deliberative body brought together for the express purpose of coming to certain conclusions, and on the questions under discussion it helps to create an atmosphere and to formulate a line of policy. It will be seen, therefore, that its moral "power" is great, and the more widely its "Findings" are made known the more widespread will be its influence. Not that its conclusions will always and everywhere carry conviction in detail; there must always be allowed room for honest differences of opinion, but it is something gained to have the views of a deliberative assembly, composed of clergy and laity sincerely attached to Evangelical principles, upon current Church problems in regard to which definite guidance is most clearly needed.

The Cheltenham Conference, while not excluding
This Year's Findings. other questions from its purview, has centred attention chiefly upon the Reunion problem. In 1916 and in 1917 certain aspects of it were discussed; this year it was considered more fully and certain conclusions were arrived at. The "Findings" stand by themselves; but special interest attaches, also, to the papers read at the Conference. We are glad to be able, by the courtesy of the writers, to print some of these this month, and we are sure our readers will value the opportunity of reading

the Chairman's impressive address, and the clear and masterly expositions of each of the points of the Lambeth Quadrilateral contained in the papers by Dr. Harden (Holy Scripture), the Rev. H. B. Gooding (The Two Creeds), Canon Barnes-Lawrence (The Two Sacraments: On Baptism ¹) and the Rev. C. Sydney Carter (The Historic Episcopate). Dr. Eugene Stock's paper on "The Historic Episcopate" and the paper by the Rev. George F. Irwin and the address by the Rev. Dr. Garvie on "Possibilities of Reunion" will appear next month. But the full text of the "Findings" agreed to at the final session of the Conference must be given at once. They are as follows:—

(1) That the ultimate goal at which to aim is the union of all believers in Christ in one visible society.

(2) That the four points of the Lambeth Quadrilateral present a sufficient preliminary basis of future reunion.

(3) That the acceptance of the authority of Holy Scripture is to be taken as "the general and loving acceptance of the Holy Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments as containing all things necessary to salvation, and as being the rule and ultimate standard of faith." (Lambeth Conference Committee, 1897, p. 109.)

(4) That the Apostles' and Nicene Creeds, "both in their statements of historical fact and in their statements of doctrine, affirm essential elements of the Christian faith as contained in Scripture, which the Church could never abandon without abandoning its basis in the Word of God. There is no contradiction between the acceptance of the miracles recited in the Creeds and the acceptance of the principle of order in nature as assumed in scientific inquiry, and we hold equally that the acceptance of miracles is not forbidden by the historical evidence candidly and impartially investigated by critical methods." (First Interim Report, Sub-Committee of the United Conference on Faith and Order.)

(5) That the acceptance of these Creeds should be an expression of corporate belief on the part of the churches concerned.

(6) That the administration of the Sacraments of the Gospel—namely, Baptism and the Supper of the Lord—is essential for such an united Church.

(7) That Episcopacy appears to be that form of Church order on which it is practical to look for reunion. The approximations to episcopal systems which have made their appearance in more than one non-episcopal Church are an evidence of growing acceptability of some form of Episcopacy.

(8) That acceptance of the Historic Episcopate as an order of the ministry without any theory as to its origin or character should be sufficient.

(9) That no proposals for reunion which would discredit the present ministry or status of recognized ministers of the non-episcopal Churches should be contemplated.

(10) That pending the consummation of a visible unity, those churches which accept the first three articles of the Quadrilateral should be fully recognized as branches of the Church of Christ, and their members admitted to Holy Communion in the Church of England, and reciprocally.

¹ We regret that no report is available of the perfectly admirable address given by Mr. G. A. King on the Holy Communion.

(11) That members of the Church of England should not be discouraged from partaking of Holy Communion with members of such non-episcopal Churches in their places of worship.

(12) That the action of those clergy is to be supported who have accepted invitations to preach in non-episcopal places of worship or have united with non-episcopal ministers in evangelistic and devotional efforts on common grounds, and that legal barriers which prevent the parochial clergy from inviting recognized ministers of such non-episcopal Churches to preach in parish churches should be removed.

It is not to be supposed that these "Findings" will be adopted in their entirety even by Evangelical Churchmen. It is not pretended, as we understand the position, that they in any way bind "the party" as such; but they do offer, for general guidance, lines of policy on Christian unity which all sections of Churchmen, and not Evangelicals only, may well consider with a view to acceptance and adoption. It will have been noted, as at least significant of the way feelings are being moved on this question that the *Church Times* of June 14 referring to the "Findings" said: "Without committing ourselves to the approval of the Conference's proposals in detail, we welcome them as showing that Evangelicals cling to the historic episcopate, and as encouraging the hope that the feeling of loss is prompting many in the non-episcopal communities to make some sacrifices in order to repair it. We may still be a long way from reunion, but it is something to have planted the feet in the path towards that goal."

Changes in the Communion Service. Before parting with the Cheltenham Conference proceedings, it must be noted that at the final session the following resolution was adopted unanimously: "That this meeting of Churchmen desires to place on record its determined opposition to the proposed changes in the prayers in the Communion Service, as being calculated to support a doctrine concerning the Lord's Supper which this Church rejected at the Reformation, and as constituting a grave hindrance to reunion with other reformed Churches." No more important question than this is before the Church at the present time and every opportunity should be taken of registering a protest against the proposal. The gravity of the issues raised by the suggested change was fully explained in articles in the *CHURCHMAN* of May and June, and evidence is not wanting that if the change is persisted in it may possibly rend the Church of England in twain. If the Bishops want to

“ hold the Church together ” this proposal must be dropped. Nothing during the whole course of the twelve years’ discussion on Prayer Book Revision has aroused such deep feeling among Evangelical Churchmen, and the Bishops may rest assured that under no circumstances will the change be assented to. The sooner the proposal is abandoned the better it will be for the peace of the Church.

Dr. A. C. Headlam’s inaugural lecture as Regius Professor of Divinity at Oxford struck a new and welcome note. His theme was “ The Study of Theology,” and laymen certainly will thank him for insisting as strongly as he did that if it were not to be a barren study it must be the interpretation of a deep and simple religious experience. Shall we be going too far if we say that much of what passes for theological exposition has become a real danger to the spiritual life of the people? Some modern theologians—but by no means all—have seemed to think so much about scientific “ exactness ” and “ accuracy ” that they have obscured the splendour of Him Who is the heart and the centre of all true theology, the Lord Jesus Christ Himself. Or, to put it another way, they have given the impression that they care more about the husk than the kernel of religion. Dr. Headlam expresses so exactly what we have long been feeling on this subject that we venture to quote his words :—

It had to be confessed that, to a certain extent, our academic theology and the religious teaching of our clergy had been found wanting in the present crisis. Our theology had been too much concerned with subordinate questions, and too little with the fundamental facts. Our minds had become absorbed in the history of the ministry, or the dislocation of the canon, or the Chalcedonian Christology, and we had forgotten to speak and think of the being and nature of God, of life and death, and judgment. Interest in the details of worship or current controversy or ecclesiastical business had prevented us from being conscious of failure in deeper things. Yet, what availed all the subordinate concerns of religion if the fundamental faith were obscured? Religion, again, had become confused with the conception of material progress, which was the creed of the Victorian era, and we had begun to think that sin had no real existence. Christianity had become confused in many minds with the shallow contemporary political thought, and when the breakdown came, the disillusionment was terrible. People thought that God had failed. It was not the Christian religion which had failed, but the popular version of it, which had been profoundly influenced by the utilitarian and progressive ideas of the times, and the official presentations which had largely got out of touch of reality.

“ Out of touch of reality.” It is a serious charge, but it is largely

true of much of what passes for religious teaching in these days, and until we get into touch with the greatest realities of all there will continue to be failure, absolute and complete.

As the Bishop of Ely's letter to Canon Glazebrook
Canon Glazebrook's was quoted in last month's CHURCHMAN it is right
Reply. to mention here that the Canon has addressed to him a reply in which he claims that, in regard to the resurrection, the Bishop has seriously misrepresented his position. He says that it is "the resurrection of the flesh that modern Churchmen claim may without heresy be regarded as symbolical," and that the Bishop's letter "has naturally given some readers, who were not acquainted with the book, the false impression that I have denied the reality of our Lord's Resurrection." Canon Glazebrook then enters upon what we hope we may without offence call a subtle analysis of the Lambeth Conference declaration with a view to showing that it cannot be understood in its natural sense. How then, he asks, is it to be understood? He replies: "We must take 'the historical facts' to mean such of the statements as appear in the light of our present knowledge to be historical: and regard the other statements as symbolical." But "since they have left it doubtful how far their principle of symbolical interpretation may be carried, their followers have in some measure to judge for themselves." This is not a very satisfying explanation and we shall await with interest the fulfilment of the Bishop's intention to challenge the Canon's arguments.



[NOTE.—In order to make room for the papers read at the Cheltenham Conference, which are of pressing importance, we have been compelled to hold over the continuation of Dr. Griffith Thomas's "Studies in St. John" and of Archdeacon Moule's "Exposition of Isaiah xxiv.-xxvii." Further papers will appear in the series on "The Office of Lay Reader" and in that on "The Training of Candidates for Holy Orders."]

THE CHELTENHAM CONFERENCE.

King George's Hall, Y.M.C.A., Tottenham Court Road, W.C.

WEDNESDAY and THURSDAY, JUNE 5 and 6.

Chairman's Address.

By the Rev. H. A. WILSON, M.A., *Rector of Cheltenham.*

FOR the third time I have the great honour of opening the Cheltenham Conference. It is matter for regret that we are unable to meet this year in the charming town, now looking at its best, where our Conference originated. But circumstances were against us. There is, however, little doubt that future sessions will be held at Cheltenham, and that the removal to London is only part of that strange life which we are all living owing to War conditions.

I earnestly hope that the value of our gathering may not suffer from the changed conditions. Here may I venture to make a plea. Many of our members are near their work. To drop in for an hour or so and make a speech and then drop out again, I dare to say is not going to be much use. We are a deliberative assembly and not a debating society. To arrive at any really useful conclusions (which is what we are here for) is not possible if the attendance is fluctuating and irregular. The Report of the Conference and its findings which will be printed on Thursday evening will be based upon the papers and the discussion which will follow each paper, and members who have not been present pretty regularly at the various sessions of the Conference may at the final session not only be useless, owing to their ignorance of what has transpired, but may even be an embarrassment. We are here to formulate some conclusions, I venture to hope some bold and definite conclusions. This will necessitate hard work and regular attendance by the members. I hope the event may prove that our Conference has not suffered greatly through its temporary transference to London.

Cheltenham has won for itself a reputation, and I think we may say a proud one. The Cheltenham Conference has a reputation for fearless and progressive Evangelicalism, and I hope we shall enhance that reputation this year. Of course we lay ourselves open to the charge of being rather dangerous persons. But I believe I speak

for many when I say that to "live dangerously," to dare to take risks, make a strong appeal to us, especially in these days. Certainly people of this temper are needed if the subject with which our Conference was concerned last year, and which will mainly occupy our attention this year, is ever to be brought on to the plane of the practical.

The re-union of Christians is more prominently before the Christian Church than ever before in living memory. Influential bodies are discussing it in the slow and dignified way habitual to such assemblies, more adventurous groups of men in our Church and outside are meeting to discuss points of difference and possibilities of agreement.

Now all this consideration of the subject of reunion gives us grounds for deep gratitude to God. But at the same time there is danger. Reunion is a popular subject now. There is such a thing as "being in the fashion," and these assemblies have need of a body of "hot Gospellers" who will watch and stimulate and goad on the mere thinkers and theorists into definite action. Such people are not usually popular, and laurel wreaths are not likely to come their way, but they are essential to every movement. I believe the Cheltenham Conference is destined to play this part in the forward march to reunion.

To state my meaning baldly, we want to see something done, and we are here to do our best towards the achievement of this object. Three incidents have recently occurred which are of great importance, and bear more or less directly upon the subject we are about to consider. The first of these is the Report of the Joint Committee appointed by the Archbishop of Canterbury and the Free Church Council, which is a hopeful document so far as it goes. It was published to be read, and I assume to be commented upon, so I suppose we are quite at liberty to handle it pretty freely. In this matter I speak entirely for myself. For years past we have had from various assemblies statements in varying degrees of definiteness. Usually they are couched in vague phraseology which can be assented to fairly and honestly by men of totally different opinions. The present document is not exactly of this order. Every word in it we welcome, and the tone of the document enhances the value of what it actually says. We note with thankfulness that the expression "Christian Churches" is applied to the non-episcopal communions,

and that it is acknowledged that they have been used by "the Holy Spirit in His work of enlightening the world, converting sinners and perfecting saints." This whole-hearted acknowledgment of the great work of the Free Churches, and the recognition of their status as part of the Spirit-filled Body, which is the only logical deduction from these words, marks a great advance on the petty and unworthy language of the narrow controversialists which freely unchurched all non-episcopalians and talked foolishly of uncovenanted mercies. Let us hope that this great document marks the end of this boastful, and I fear we must add profane, self-satisfaction.

Another most interesting part of the interim report is the admission that our Church, while retaining episcopacy, holds no official theory concerning the episcopate. Of course, every fairly-well informed person knew this. But it is of great value to have it stated by such a body as this, as it may serve to check the zeal of those who endeavoured to manipulate our formularies with a view to proving that our Church stood for opinions on the ministry which have been destroyed by critical and historical enquiry. What it says is quite admirable, but it is defective in what it does not say. There is a studious avoidance of any categorical statement that episcopacy is not essential to the existence of a Church. Knowing as we do the opinions of many of the signatories on this point, I cannot but feel that the great obstacle so far has only been talked round. More and more I feel, and here I venture to speak for the Conference, that we at Cheltenham last year were right in our findings. It will be recalled that then we boldly stated that non-episcopal ministries were ministries of grace equally with our own. This phrase was severely handled by some who accused us of being willing to surrender episcopacy. Nothing was further from our minds. We are fully conscious of the growing feeling of appreciation among the non-episcopal Churches of the value and effectiveness of episcopacy: we are alive to the fact that on the one hand some of their leading men are firmly of opinion that reunion can only be finally accomplished on an episcopal basis, and that on the other hand, probably not a single Free Church leader would ask us to give up our system and accept his as the price of reunion. We, for our part, are as confident as ever that episcopacy has the sanction of the Divine Spirit, is in complete accord with primitive custom, and agreeable to Holy Scripture. So that apart altogether from our personal

attachment to the system, and our confident belief that it is intrinsically the best form of Church Government, these considerations have prevented the idea of sacrificing episcopacy from ever crossing our minds.

But there is the widest difference possible between the contentions that episcopacy is the best system of Church Government, and that episcopacy is the only system. The former expresses the opinion of last year's Cheltenham Conference, the latter we should like to have seen denied by the Archbishops' Committee, and we contend that until it is frankly repudiated, reunion is not yet on the plane of the practical.

For it is as certain as any fact can be that the Free Churches, which cherish now precious traditions, and upon whose ministries the Divine Imprimatur is so evident, will never deny their status. It is possible that they might adopt our system, but only on the basis that the past is recognized and their present ministries acknowledged.

This, I say again, is exactly the Cheltenham position. We acknowledge the non-episcopal Churches as ministries of grace equally with our own; that is to say, so far as their efficacy is concerned. God has stamped upon their services and sacraments the same marks of His approval which we thankfully record He has placed upon ours—no less and no more.

The fundamental point in last year's Conference was this: recognition is the first and essential step. We can perhaps shape an effective policy if we meet as equals; otherwise we see no hope of reunion.

Part of the policy of recognition is the plea for inter-communion and pulpit exchange. These are the inevitable marks of recognition, and if we are courageous and consistent, we are bound to work for them. We do not mean to suggest that we would encourage indiscriminate gadding about. The religious nomad who wanders everywhere and belongs to no Church has approached as nearly as a Christian can to the point of uselessness. But we do press for an official recognition of the status of the baptized members of the Free Churches which would acknowledge their full right to join us at the Lord's Table, both at those times when they have no access to the Holy Communion in their own Churches, and also on some great occasion (as for instance, the declaration of peace) when an united witness to our unity is called for.

The second incident to which I would refer is the publication of the series of Essays on *The Early History of the Church and the Ministry* which the late Professor H. B. Swete edited. This volume is the reply to the destructive criticism to which Apostolical Succession has been subjected by historians and theologians for many years past. A defence was urgently called for, and anxious minds among adherents to Apostolical Succession were full of hope. The book has appeared, and what must be our estimate of it?

It is a great misfortune that the late Professor Gwatkin was not spared to give us his criticism of this book. Some of us were expecting some remarkable discoveries and some new and overwhelming arguments, after the curious letter published in *The Times* recently by Dr. Sanday. Frankly we fail to find them. It is hard to see that the High Anglican theory is made any the stronger by the arguments of the essayists. I must not give way to the temptation to discuss the many interesting points suggested by this volume, but for our purpose it is interesting to note that the Dean of Wells, who deals with that period of history which is decisive so far as this dogma is concerned, maintains the substantial correctness of Bishop Lightfoot's view "that the episcopate was formed not out of the apostolic order by localisation but out of the presbyteral by elevation," and affirms what we could all endorse, viz : that the Christian ministry was the result of a process of evolution. This view is most damaging to any theory of Apostolical Succession. Bishop Gore, who has striven more diligently than most men to recast Apostolical Succession in the light of modern scholarship, has declared that "authority to minister is given in the Church only by devolution from above on the principle of succession to the original apostolic ministry," and that this is "a law of divine authority in the Church, and also an essential principle of the Church's continuous life" (*Orders and Unity*, pp. 183-4). But evolution is the very antithesis of this opinion. Evolution as applied to the ministry means that the Church possessed the power to develop from within itself the ministry which meets its needs. The Reformation principles maintained that the Spirit-filled body could evolve from within itself, owing to the previous involution accomplished at Pentecost, all things needed for its life and mission.

We do not declare that it is impossible for the adherents of Apostolical Succession to adapt the new opinions to some modified

form of their theory. The facts can with some ingenuity be squared with the requirements of Apostolical Succession, provided that that theory is not too precisely stated nor too exacting in its terms. Cinderella's slipper can be squeezed on another foot than that of its rightful owner, but only by cutting off the great toe. And to maintain that episcopacy is the result of evolution is nothing else than the mutilation of "the Catholic theory" to such an extent that it is practically unrecognisable.

The Essay on the Apostolic Succession by Mr. C. H. Turner which follows that by the Dean of Wells is even more doubtful in value to those it is designed to help. As an accomplished scholar he, of course, dismisses the view that Apostolic Succession was approved by the Apostles as a cut and dried theory. But he does not leave things there. He holds that the theory took gradual shape in the minds of great Church leaders owing to the necessity of being able to make an appeal to authority against the Gnostic heretics. But it appears their words are so vague that unless they are read with the assistance of some bias they cannot apparently be used to prove much. For instance, Mr. Turner shows that Clement of Rome was zealous for the principle of succession, but not necessarily episcopal succession; and Ignatius, on the other hand, though clear about Episcopacy is vague on the question of succession. In other words it is necessary to form your conclusions before you read the earliest writers, and your preconceptions will then fit in the gaps in the argument!! But even more disturbing are the further considerations urged by Mr. Turner. Hitherto in order to be assured of sacramental grace, the adherents to "Catholic" theory urged that it was enough to possess an episcopate. But Mr. Turner destroys this view. A Church must not only have an episcopate, but it must be one of the right kind. That is to say an heretical or schismatical episcopate is inadmissible according to fifth-century opinion. The deductions from this are apparent. Heretical and schismatical are terms freely used of us by Rome, and now Rome is furnished with a very strong argument. She can say: apart altogether from the question of the validity of your ministry you are certainly schismatical and heretical, and your episcopate, even assuming you have one, is thereby nullified.

I dwell upon this book because it was expected to advance new arguments and strengthen old ones. I am bound to say that it

leaves our views entirely unaffected, but I doubt if the Catholic party will be able to say so much.

The third incident to which I will refer is one which appears only indirectly to touch upon reunion, but I venture to think that upon examination it will be found quite vital. I mean the recent determination by the Upper House of Canterbury Convocation to sanction the alternative use of a Communion Office based upon a re-arrangement of our prayers.

This surrender by the Bishops, for it is a surrender, may appear at first to be a matter merely of domestic interest.

I do not propose to discuss the theological significance of the new projects. It is of such grave importance apart from its bearing on reunion that we have determined to consider this aspect of the matter at the last session of our Conference. I would at this stage only point out how gravely it will hamper all efforts in the direction of Home Reunion.

The advocates of the new departure will bring back into the Prayer Book a pre-Reformation view of the Holy Communion. Evangelical Churchmen are not the only children of the Reformation in our land. The Free Churchmen are also the offspring of that great movement. Indeed in many cases they left the English Church originally because it was not zealous enough in the work of reform. Now the Bishops are on the one hand warmly inviting the Nonconformists to reunite with us, and at the same time capitulating to that faction in our Church who "repent of the Reformation in dust and ashes." The Bishops are, as it were, fraternising through the window with the Nonconformists, but at the same time shooting another bolt in the front door.

The arguments of the Catholic Party in favour of the restoration of the Canon of the Mass are quite familiar, but their most effective argument, most effective because apparently so innocent, is that this restoration is a return to old custom. But this old custom was one of the principal things which was considered to require reform, and I think that we must be urged to see clearly that a return to pre-Reformation ideas is going to make hopeless all efforts to arrive at a reunion with the Evangelical Free Churches. We are grateful to the Bishops for their consciousness of the need for some rapprochement to Nonconformity and for the great interest which practically all of them are taking in the subject, but we would respectfully point

out that in thus surrendering to the Catholic Party they are taking back with one hand what they offer with the other.

The controversy is simply a clear illustration of the conflict of ideals amongst us. The Catholic Party favour an orientation to Rome, and we Evangelicals to the Free Churches: the Catholic Party have their eyes on the past and we on the future. There is no doubt whatever as to what the final result will be. The progressive and forward-looking men always win. But what about our Church in the immediate present and the near future if the progressive party suffers a temporary reverse? That is the anxious question which agitates our mind.

With these preliminary observations I pass on definitely to open the Conference.

The basis of the various papers is the Lambeth Quadrilateral. This document was drawn up at the Lambeth Conference in 1888 and has since been frequently reaffirmed.



Holy Scripture as the Final Authority in Faith and Conduct.

By the Rev. J. M. HARDEN, B.D., LL.D.

Vice-Principal of the London College of Divinity.

I

“THE Holy Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments as containing all things necessary to salvation and as being the rule and ultimate standard of faith.” The Lambeth Conferences of 1888 and 1897 put this as the first of four Articles on the basis of which approach might be, by God’s blessing, made towards Home Reunion. Whether there is any special significance in its position as first is not quite clear. The compilers of the XXXIX Articles put first in Articles I–V what corresponds to the second Article of the Lambeth Quadrilateral. Only in their VIth Article did they first touch on the question of Holy Scripture. The Lambeth order is that of the Helvetic Confession and the Westminster Confession of Faith. As a matter of logic either order will stand. For if, on the one hand, it seems natural that the “ultimate standard” should precede, it is clear, on the other hand, that in a sense the Creeds (or, at any rate, a creed) must come first, at least so far as to assume

the existence of a Personal God, able and willing to communicate with His creatures.

None of those, however, whom this Quadrilateral concerns would deny the possibility of such a revelation, however much they might differ as to its character, its method, or even the nature of its authority, when given. On these points there has been, no doubt, endless controversy. Yet, viewed solely in relation to the reunion of *Churches*, this Article may be seen to involve no great difficulty, for it is quite evident on consideration that the question as to the authority of Holy Scripture (and as to its inspiration therein involved) is not a question of Church against Church, but of individual against individual. Differences of opinion, that is to say, will be found, to a greater or less degree, amongst the members of all the Churches concerned. Therefore the difficulty in connexion with this article is not to arrive at common ground between Church and Church ; rather is it to find some view sufficiently comprehensive to include all believers in a Divine revelation in a real sense, and specially not to exclude by over-definition any who might be willing to consecrate their natural gifts to the ministry of the Church.

II

It would be waste of time to prove that the last century has seen a great change in opinion as regards the Bible. Perhaps it may not be needless to point out that such change is a return in some respects to the position of some of the greatest of the Reformers. The later Reformers set up an infallible Bible in place of the infallible Church—making it infallible too not only in matters of faith and duty, but also in questions of science and history. Neither Luther nor Calvin thus taught. The former relegated to an appendix some of the New Testament Books and his words as to the Epistle of St. James are well known ; the latter expressed doubts as to the genuineness of 2 Peter, and recognized fully the existence of discrepancies in the Gospel narratives. The view that arose in the century following the Reformation that it was necessary to consider the Bible in every respect perfectly free from fault and omission reached its zenith when in 1675 the Formula Consensus Helvetica laid down that the “ volume of the Old Testament is θεόπνευστος both in its consonants, and its vowels—the points

themselves, or at least the force of the points." This view, or one akin at least to it, became the prevalent one.

When we seek to find the causes of the reaction from this view, and of the change to more modern opinions, some of them are obvious. Men have had in the first place to read their Bibles in the light of ever-increasing knowledge. Astronomy, Geology, Biology, Anthropology were yet in their infancy, if indeed they can be said to have been in existence at all in the 16th century. Historical Criticism again is almost entirely a modern growth and has altered *everyone's* opinion of the nature of the Bible. Once more, if we take Archaeology, while we can truly say that discoveries in this field have shed floods of light on the pages of the Word, removed not a few objections of its opponents and guaranteed in many wonderful ways its truth, yet it also has shown the necessity of caution in attributing absolute accuracy to such things, for example, as figures and dates.

But besides these obvious considerations, there are one or two others perhaps not quite so obvious which it is well to mention. The first of these belongs distinctly to the sphere of religious philosophy. A change has taken place in the views of most men as to the relation of God to the world. They have learned to emphasize His immanence no less than His transcendence. Formerly when prominence was given to His transcendence the tendency was to think of revelation as something coming altogether from without. On the other hand undue emphasis on His immanence tends towards a too subjective view. To get at the whole truth we must combine the two views, and recognize both elements, the objective and the subjective, or more simply, the divine and human elements in revelation.

Nor must we overlook the influence in the same direction of the application of modern scientific methods to Biblical studies. In days when deductive methods held sway the argument was, As God is what He is, the Bible which comes from Him must be of such and such a character. Against such a method Bishop Butler lifted his voice even in the 18th century. He was, however, in advance of his time. Few would now deny that it is best to follow the inductive method and learn what a revelation is from the facts presented by the Bible itself. What precisely these facts are, is a question which will receive widely different answers from many

who are ready to accept the Bible as the ultimate standard of faith and duty ; and therefore in all discussions on such points in connexion with Reunion, it will be necessary to see that any statement that may be made for general adoption is wide enough to include all whom it may be intended to include. Not to speak of those who deny the theory of verbal inspiration and assert the presence of a large human element in Scripture, it must be wide enough to embrace also those who cannot hold the absolute accuracy of the Bible in historic or scientific matters, those who believe in the progressive character of the revelation contained therein, and those who are ready to accept the modern opinions as to the method of its composition. Whatever our own particular opinions may be (and mine, were I to give them, would, no doubt, on some of these points appear old-fashioned and out-of-date to many here) we need, if we define at all, something wider than just that which will embrace our own immediate coterie. We need something which will be wide enough to include, shall we say, the writers of " Foundations " and of " Fundamentals," provided that they on both sides are tolerant enough to include each other. As lately as 1893 it was laid down : " The Bible as we now have it in its various translations and revisions, when freed from errors and mistakes of copyists and printers, is the very Word of God and consequently without error." To put forth such a statement in these times for the sake of binding together any one church, not to speak of uniting together different churches, betrays an absolute ignorance of present conditions of thought. It was of similar statements that it was written not by any German critic, but by a sturdy Protestant, the late Professor Mayor : " The sacred page endures worse wrong from friends than foes. A true instinct, say an overruling Providence, has saved the Church from defining inspiration : the wind of God's Spirit, blowing where it listeth, is too subtle to be pent in any Aeolus bag of human shibboleths."

It is a commonplace that the Anglican Church has nowhere given a definition of Inspiration. It has, in the VIth Article, laid down that Holy Scripture containeth all things necessary to salvation ; and in the words that follow, it excludes from the things necessary to be believed " whatsoever is not read therein nor may be proved thereby," but it does not state what things contained therein must be believed ; it also gives assent to the words of the

Nicene Creed that the Holy Ghost "spake by the prophets"; and in the XXth Article the phrase "God's Word written" occurs.

Not one of these phrases would cause any hindrance to reunion. It is perhaps otherwise with the well-known words to be found in the Office for the Making of Deacons, "Do you unfeignedly believe all the Canonical Scriptures of the Old and New Testament?" Quite apart from any suggestion of reunion, it has been felt by many that some alteration in these words is necessary. It would be out of place now to discuss what change, if any, should be made. I merely point out that the importance of the already existing discussion would be increased in connexion with Home Reunion. The words have obviously not been of use in the sense originally intended. One man in a hundred perhaps answers the question now in the same sense as the words had in the 16th century.

III

Is the range then of this article to be so wide as to include every view, even that of those who make the Bible differ, not in kind, but only in degree, from any other religious book? If it is, if the comprehensiveness pleaded for is to be as far-reaching as this, then the first Article of this Quadrilateral is meaningless. It was never intended to include such a view as would speak of "the total disappearance . . . of all external authority in matters of religion," or would say, "We have no authoritative text-book of divine truth and human duty, so we must open our minds to all that speaks divinely to them whether in the Bible or elsewhere." Without of course denying the truth of these last words, it must be maintained that the Bible, if it is to be the "final authority," must be regarded as a divine gift, nay more, as being in a unique sense a divine gift. It may not be possible to define in what this uniqueness consists with the precision which some might desire. May it not be wise to hold with Dr. Charteris that "it well beseems us to admit the truth of intuition which does not come as the last step in a syllogism"? Archbishop Bernard says much the same: "It will probably never be possible to set forth with logical precision the conditions under which the Divine Voice speaks to the children of men."

Is it any wonder? Is it not exactly here with the Written Word as with the Word made flesh? It has often been pointed out how

the Councils of the fourth and fifth centuries rejected the successive heresies which were attempts to explain the mystery of the Person of Christ, and contented themselves with reassertions of the fact of the Incarnation and of the union of the Divine and Human Natures. It may be our wisdom too, in this matter of Inspiration, to take a similar stand, while not forgetting Dr. Sanday's warning, "The legitimate consequence of a denial of inspiration is the denial of all spiritual influence of God on man, and the next step is the denial of any true Personality in God Himself."

Why, then, are we to receive the Bible as authoritative? On the one hand, we are told that "it is becoming more and more difficult to believe in the Bible without believing in the Church." The terms of this statement are not without ambiguity, but, if it means that the divine message cannot still come direct from the Word to the soul, the story of Christian Missions and the experience of many an unlearned reader at home shows that it requires correction. The College of Physicians may tell us much about the Laws of vision, but it cannot give us sight.

On the other hand we are told that only so far as the Bible "finds" us, is it God's Word for us. I need not quote the *locus classicus* from Coleridge. This, though it is true in a sense with regard to the message to the individual soul, is insufficient, by its utter neglect of historical testimony, when we consider the Bible as a standard of truth.

The truth of the matter seems to be, as Dean Wace puts it, that "from first to last the authority of the Scriptures has been equivalent to the authority with which they themselves have convinced men they came from God."

The books of the Old and New Testaments were accepted as of divine authority for generations before they were collected into a Divine Library. This fixing of a Canon could not impart to the books a divine authority which they had not before. "The judgment of the Church is nothing more than the consensus of the private judgments of those that constitute the Church."

So we receive the books as authoritative, because we believe, we know that we get in them and from them a message from God, and this belief or knowledge is guaranteed to us besides by the contemporary experience of other Christians and the continuous experience of the Church of Christ throughout the ages. It has

been well said that "the element of truth at the heart of this appeal to the Church is the fact that the general experience of Christian men comes in to confirm the individual faith, to correct its errors, enlarge its narrowness, and broaden its catholicity."

Somewhat in this sense the Bible is for us the Word of God, and therefore authoritative. We believe it to be inspired in a unique way. This uniqueness, as I have said, we may not be able to define with logical precision, but yet may we not say this much at least? First, it is unique, because no book leads us to God as the Bible does. Every good gift and every perfect gift is from above. That we know, but the inspiration of the Bible differs from all other to which the name might, in a sense, be given, not only by being from God, but also by leading to Him. Then, again, and specially, the Bible is unique in that it points us to the Person of the Incarnate Word. He is the Light of all Scripture. In the Bible we see

"Him first, Him last, Him midst, and without end."

He is the centre and the cause of the organic unity which we discern within its pages. What He Himself said of the Old Testament, we may say of Old and New alike, They testify of Him. No need here further to develop the point. Part of the uniqueness of the Bible is in its unique subject—the Word made flesh. We accept the Bible as our "final authority" of faith and conduct because it contains in the Old Testament the record, given by inspired men, of the revelation which led up to Him—a record stamped by Him as of Divine authority; and then in the New Testament the story of His Life, His Teaching, His Death, His Resurrection—in a word, His Gospel; as well as the interpretation of His Person and Work by those who were His immediate followers, and had received from Him the promise that they would be led into all truth.

The limitation to the sphere of faith and conduct agrees with the teaching of the New Testament itself. It is the sphere mentioned by St. Paul when he claims for the Old Testament that it is "profitable for teaching, for reproof, for correction, for instruction which is in righteousness." We have no need, or indeed right, to go any further. "Inspiration," Dr. Gwatkin writes, "will guarantee the message so far as its proper purpose requires, but not necessarily any further. . . . We cannot assume that the record will be perfect

for any use to which we may please to put it, for example, as a text-book of science, or a horoscope of the future." We weaken rather than strengthen its authority when we attribute to it more than it claims for itself, or, it is necessary to add, when in our interpretations we apply to it methods which we would not apply to any other book.

It has been inevitable that much should be omitted, or lightly touched on, which might seem to have needed discussion. Questions about the Canon of Holy Scripture, about methods of interpretation, about Biblical Criticism in general were close at hand seeking admission, but time forbade their inclusion. My endeavour has been to confine myself strictly to the special part of the subject set before me—Holy Scripture as the final authority in faith and conduct, considered with reference to prospects of Home Reunion.



The Two Creeds.

By the Rev. H. B. GOODING, M.A., *Rector of Gatcombe, Isle of Wight.*

“THE Apostles’ Creed, as the Baptismal symbol; and the Nicene Creed as the sufficient statement of the Christian Faith.”

This is the second of the four corner stones which the Lambeth Conference of 1888 recommended as essential in any scheme of reunion between the Church of England and other Christian bodies. The words used remind us of an early chapter in Church History. Two kinds of creed can be distinguished, gradually taking shape, in response to two needs which became manifest at an early period of Christian experience. Firstly, there was the need, which must have been felt from the very beginning, of having some simple but definite profession of faith which every individual would be required to make before admission into the Kingdom of Jesus Christ which was being founded on earth. In origin the Apostles’ Creed was of this nature; and, although expanded in course of time and extended in use, it has always remained *the* Baptismal Creed. Secondly, it was not long before the growth of heretical opinions made it necessary that Christians should have some fuller profession of faith which would serve to exclude such errors. The

so-called Nicene Creed is the example of such a profession of faith hammered out to meet this need.

Now these two needs, from the time when they were first felt, have never lost their force. And it is well that the words, in which the resolution of the Lambeth Conference is framed, should bring them to our notice—seeing that, always operative, they become still more urgent when reunion between our branch of the Church and other bodies is contemplated. For, in the first place, there must be some formula of admission to be used and adhered to by all the members of the enlarged body. This should of course be as simple as possible. In this connexion we may notice in passing that the Lambeth Conference gives a right lead in omitting the Athanasian Creed. I am sure we all value it, for its history and as being an able attempt to express our faith. But it is evident that if we are to bring reunion with other Christian bodies within the range of practical achievement, we must keep rigidly to essentials stated in as simple a form as possible. On the other hand when we have eliminated everything but essentials our statement of these must be quite clear and definite. There should be no doubt about what is expected of those who are baptized in any "part" of the enlarged and united body.

Again, the danger lest certain lines of thought and certain kinds of speculation should prove to be subversive of essentials of the Faith, just as it is at all times present, will need to be especially guarded against when two or more bodies of people propose to come together who although sharing in the common name "Christian" have for long acted independently of and divergingly from each other. Once more we must limit ourselves to essentials, but about them we must be perfectly clear, if we are to produce union and not sow the seeds of worse divisions in the future.

Now the Apostles' Creed and the Nicene Creed, in point of origin and the long test of subsequent history, definite as they are and yet on the whole simple, do, it would seem, really meet the two needs mentioned above. But there is another aspect of the matter which will also come to the front in any attempt at reunion. It is the question of interpretation. It has been said that we need definiteness. And yet from the nature of the case, any attempt to state our Faith in an absolutely definite form is impossible; for we are trying to state spiritual truths in human forms of expres-

sion which are inadequate for the purpose. There will always be what we may call a "symbolical" element in our Creeds. To take one example, it is evident that such an expression as "sitteth at the right hand of God" cannot be taken literally of spiritual Beings. This element in our Creeds constitutes a real difficulty. Who is to say how far their language generally may be taken symbolically? Who is to decide on the interpretation of each clause and lay down its exact meaning? Is there such an official interpretation of details? A very superficial acquaintance with the theological literature of the present day will suggest that as a matter of fact in the Church of England a considerable amount of freedom is allowed to members in their interpretation of particular clauses of the Creed. This at least suggests that we ought not to require from other bodies more than a conscientious adherence to the truths which the Creeds stand for, leaving some room for differences of individual interpretation in details.

If we take up this attitude, it immediately becomes important that we should consider what are the great truths to which acceptance of the Creed will bind all alike, in spite of a certain measure of freedom of interpretation. I cannot pretend to do this myself. My purpose will be served if what I say provokes discussion.

(A) If we turn to the Creeds, we find that in each there are three divisions; and a statement about the godhead is spread over these three parts. We may take the Nicene Creed as being the fuller of the two. We say then that we believe (a) in one God the Father Almighty, Maker of Heaven and Earth And of all things visible and invisible; (b) And in one Lord Jesus Christ, etc. . . . being of one substance with the Father; (c) And in the Holy Ghost, the Lord and Giver of Life, Who proceedeth from the Father and the Son.

(1) Now it is evident that any one accepting this Creed must believe in a God Who is a personal being, not a vague force or abstraction: a God moreover who is the source of all things and so closely connected with them that He interferes in human history (by sending His Son).

(2) Any one accepting this Creed must believe in the Trinity. Taking the three parts of the Creed, we have three separate distinct persons, Father, Son, and Holy Spirit presented to us. But the Creed carefully defines that the Son is as much God as the Father "Very God of very God . . . being of one substance with the

Father." So too of the Holy Spirit "Who proceedeth from the Father and the Son, Who with the Father and the Son together is worshipped and glorified." In short, the Creed says explicitly that there is one God and three Persons. No honest interpretation of the language of the Creed can fail to involve belief in the Trinity. It is clear therefore that union with a Non-Trinitarian body is excluded.

But with regard to some of the expressions, in which the Creed sets out this belief as to the nature of the Godhead, there may be room for some difference of interpretation. The word *ὁμοούσιος*, as we know, caused a great deal of searching of heart in ancient times. The centuries that have elapsed since then have not minimized the difficulty. How exactly are we to think of the phrase "of one *substance* with the Father." We see through a glass darkly. Surely we must leave the interpretation to individual consciences and require only a loyal belief in the "Three Persons in One God."

We might raise similar questions with regard to "sonship" and "procession." We have a basis for these in Scripture. And we do mean something very real by the different relationships in which we say that the Persons of the Trinity stand to each other. But we must realize that we do not mean just what we ordinarily mean when we use such terms of human relationships.

It may be convenient, now that we are considering the question of interpretation, to take certain other clauses of the Creed out of their order. *E.g.*, "I believe in the Resurrection of the body" (assuming that this, not "Flesh," is to be the word used). "Flesh and Blood cannot inherit the Kingdom of God," says S. Paul. Such a statement at once throws a cloud of uncertainty around the word "body" in the Creed. Evidently it is not the human body just as it is now. If not, what is it? What do we mean by the word? Still more important—what are we expected to mean? There does not seem to be an official interpretation binding on every one. We must be content to leave some measure of interpretation to private consciences: keeping the words as a safeguard against certain errors, *e.g.*, Pantheism and a failure to conceive of the redeeming work of our Lord as extending to every element of Man.

To take one more example, perhaps if we go behind the clause "I believe in the forgiveness of sins," or "I acknowledge one

baptism for the remission of sins," we shall find different ideas and forms of expression with regard to our Lord's redemptive work among different bodies and schools of thought. Yet on this at least all must agree that it is through Him and Him alone, and in connexion with His death, that forgiveness of sins is possible.

(B) So far we have been thinking mainly of the more dogmatic elements of the Creeds. But Christianity is essentially a historic religion, I mean, in the sense that it is based on certain historical facts. The dogmatic and theological clauses in the Creeds are an attempt to draw out the meaning of the historical facts: the facts come first. To omit or to minimize or undermine any of them when attempting to build up a Christian body, would be disastrous, because it would be building on insecure foundations. The importance therefore of the historical clauses in the Creed for our present purpose is evident. The very history of the Creeds reminds us of this. We know how the emphasis secured in such clauses as "was made man," "was crucified also under Pontius Pilate," "suffered and was buried," has been a safeguard against various erroneous theories of only apparent death, etc. We must therefore lay especial stress on these clauses.

I suppose, however, that the majority of these statements would be accepted as they stand. But there are two which the course of recent speculation has brought into prominence, viz., "was incarnate by the Holy Ghost of the Virgin Mary," and "the third day He rose again from the dead." Must we not, it may be urged, concede a certain freedom of interpretation with regard to these clauses, if we concede it with regard to other clauses of the Creed? Now it is evident that there is a difference between such a clause as "was incarnate by the Holy Ghost of the Virgin Mary" and "sitteth on the right hand of God." The latter is an attempt to express something which lies outside the sphere of our experience in the best way we know how. The former, though running counter to our ordinary experience, claims to be an event which has come within the totality of our experience. The only question in regard to it is, Did it really happen or not?—just as with regard to any other fact of history. In accepting the Creed we mean that we do accept the evidence for it and are prepared to believe it. We must be quite clear about this. But, of course, in saying this, we do not close the door to speculation as to how "Virgin Birth" is possible,

or how Our Lord's human body rose again, any more than we could refuse to inquire how He healed the sick or stilled the waters of the lake. These are legitimate questions which we can and ought to pursue. But we do insist that the attempt at interpretation should stop short of touching the "historicity" of the event: we allow explanation: we cannot (if we accept the Creeds) allow events to be explained away.

The whole question of interpretation is very difficult and needs much careful thought. The instances taken above are only meant to suggest the importance of re-emphasizing the historical facts stated in the Creeds, at the present time in general and especially when the widening of our boundaries is contemplated.

(C) There is one other clause of the Creeds which calls for special notice. We profess (if we combine the words of the two Creeds) a belief in One Holy Catholic Apostolic Church. Time will not allow any full and adequate consideration of what is involved in the word Church. But, for our present purpose, it may be useful to remind ourselves of S. Paul's description of the Church as the Body of Christ. For:—

1. This in the first place implies "oneness." There can only be one body. In the Epistle to the Ephesians, S. Paul labours, through a variety of phrases and expressions, to emphasize the fact of the oneness and the unity of the body. But the word body also implies diversity. It is never safe to press a comparison too far; but S. Paul himself in the first Epistle to the Corinthians points out that the unity manifested in the body is a unity composed of differences.

Moreover, if we ask what is the nature, the essence of this unity which pervades the whole body, it is simply "being in union with Christ"; or if we prefer to express it in a slightly different way, we find that at the very beginning of the Church's history in the book of the Acts, emphasis is laid on the indwelling of the Holy Spirit. So the Church is called Holy. We may distinguish, it is true, between those who are really in union with Christ, and those who though nominally members of the Society, do not as a matter of fact share in this union. But the aim which is set before the body is that every member should make real the holiness attributed to all.

When we bear these principles in mind two questions naturally

occur to us. (1) Where we see signs among any body of men that this union with Christ, the life of the Spirit, is being realized, can we, for other reasons, refuse them a place in the Church, the one Body of Christ? (2) In view of the manifold divisions amongst Christians, together with the clear evidence of the working of God's Spirit amongst various disunited societies, ought we not to keep steadfastly before ourselves the fact that the unity of the Church is like the unity of body, based on differences? That the one Church is Catholic, not only because it is world-wide and offers the one true faith to all men, but also because it must be comprehensive, lest it miss any part of the one truth.

2. What has been said above, must not be taken as implying that outward forms are of little or no value. In so far as the Church is a Society established among men, it must have some definite structure and express its unity in outward forms. The word Apostolic reminds us that we must go back to Apostolic times. When we do so we find at least three definite forms through which the unity of the Church finds expression: (a) There is one teaching and one faith. It is evident that every body of men, every individual who is in union with Jesus Christ, must believe in the Incarnation, the death, the redeeming work, the resurrection, the forgiveness of sins, the Holy Spirit, etc. In short there must be a definite summary of essential beliefs such as our creeds attempt to provide. (b) Secondly, we find in many ways that the spiritual is closely connected with the material. The establishment of the Sacraments seems to fit in with this side of our experience. Thus S. Paul endeavours to show how Baptism really brings us into union with Jesus Christ and gives us a share in what He did. In a similar way he refers to the Lord's Supper in 1 Corinthians, "The bread which we break, is it not the communion of the body of Christ? Seeing that we who are many are one bread, one body: for we all partake of the one bread." (c) Thirdly, the unity of the body is from the first expressed through a definite form of government. "We have no such custom, neither the Churches of God" (1 Cor. xi. 16). In the New Testament the exact details are not clear. But we can trace an outline which is definite but at the same time flexible. (a) On the one hand there is room for more than one kind of ministry; (b) on the other there are clear traces of the three-fold order which for centuries was a visible expression of unity all

over the world and to which we have always held. It is evident that in any scheme of reconstruction, due weight must be allowed to both these facts. But the further history of this subject and its bearing on the question of Reunion must fall within the province of the papers on Episcopacy.



Baptism.

By the Rev. A. E. BARNES-LAWRENCE, M.A., *Vicar of St. John's, Boscombe, and Hon. Canon of Southwark.*

“**A**N age which has its face to the future, and in which men are full of plans for the welfare of the world, is not an age that has lost its faith. Its temper of mind is constructive, it is eager for new institutions, keen for new ideas, and has already a half belief in a future in which all things will be new.” With these ringing words of Matthew Arnold in our ears we face to-day one of the most insistent problems of the time—the reunion of the National Church with the orthodox non-episcopal churches of our land. Such a reunion would mark a long step taken towards the ultimate reunion of Christendom, and the realization of the Saviour’s prayer that all His people might be one. For such a consummation we need clarified vision, a heart of love, and withal the courage which refuses to accept an immediate gain at the sacrifice of essential principle.

English Churchmen have a great responsibility and opportunity in so stimulating an endeavour. The position of our Church, let us remind ourselves, is unique among the historic Churches of Christendom, a fact of which we have been growingly conscious since the days of Hooker. She alone has been able to combine loyalty to Holy Scripture with deference to the practice of the Early Church. A Bible-loving Church is of necessity a freedom-loving Church, while the historical instinct guards that liberty from degenerating into licence. If our reformed Church continues faithful to her historical position, she may yet reunite Christendom in one. That is a vision that lies in the still distant future, for there is no hope of reunion with Rome until the reunion of the rest of Christendom leaves her an outcast among the Churches, just as there is no hope for the moral regeneration of Germany until she realizes that

she is outside the pale of civilized nations. Our immediate and most hopeful concern is reunion with the orthodox Evangelical Churches of our own land. It is clear from the careful wording of the Lambeth Conference that it is in that direction that we at present look, and never was the prospect more full of hope.

It is with the third great principle laid down for us that we are now concerned. The Conference demands as an essential to reunion "the two Sacraments ordained by Christ Himself—Baptism and the Supper of the Lord—ministered with unfailling use of Christ's words of institution, and of the elements ordained by Him."

In dealing with Baptism, I shall ask you to consider first the points left open as non-essential, and then those regarded as essential. Both are instructive:—

1. We observe then with much interest that the Lambeth Conference is prepared to consider proposals for reunion without specifying the question at what age Baptism should be administered. In a word, it is silent upon the question of Infant Baptism. That is, I submit, a very important matter. Upon the question which divides multitudes of our fellow Christians the world over, and separates the Baptist Churches from our own, the Conference says nothing, and its silence is in complete accord with the temper of the Prayer Book and the history of the Early Church. The separation that unfortunately exists is based, let us remember, not upon divergence as to a particular use of Baptism, but upon a fundamental difference of outlook. It would not, I think, be difficult to show that Infant Baptism found some acceptance from the first, though the evidence to which we can appeal is not demonstrative; but that would not affect the Baptist contention. It would be perfectly easy to show that with the beginning of the fourth century the practice of Infant Baptism became general, but that would not persuade the Baptist; he would reply that in the third century a mystic power was ascribed to Baptism, and that is quite sufficient to account for its application to Infants. He would go on to point out that even so the practice was by no means universal. Many of the most eminent Christians of the fourth century did not baptize their infants. Gregory of Nazianzen in Cappadocia, the son of a bishop, and his mother the saintly Nonna, was not baptized until his conversion in mature life. Basil the Great, whose mother was the pious Emmelia, was not baptized before he was thirty when his conversion took place.

Chrysostom of Antioch, born A.D. 347, whose mother Anthusa was an outstanding Christian, was not baptized until his conversion at thirty-two. And Augustine, the holy Monica's son, did not receive baptism until he too was brought to the knowledge of Christ. Here were four of the most eminent Christian women of the fourth century, who prayed for their children before and after birth, who did not have them baptized. It is clear that the Baptist has something to say for himself.

Now this divergence of practice rests, I repeat, upon a fundamental difference of outlook, which needs to be stated if we would appreciate aright the silence of the Lambeth pronouncement upon the question of age.

It was not until the fourth century that the Church awoke to the world-wide character of her divine mission. It was then that, delivered from the persecution of the State, she took the whole of mankind unto her ken. One interesting proof of this was the publishing of her own Ecclesiastical Kalendar, in which she claimed both Time and Space for the Kingdom of God; another was the adoption of infant Baptism, by which she claimed the whole of human life for that Kingdom. The age, let us not forget, was still fierce and cruel; infanticide was fearfully common, and there was no moral power in the State to stop it, or to improve the general tone of society. The Church thereupon stepped in and claimed the whole of man's life, from his earliest years, for God. Infant Baptism was the confession of the Church's faith that an infant is capable of regeneration, that the child of Christian parents has a distinct place of privilege under the New Covenant, and that the Church is a great educational institution, securing a Christian atmosphere and Christian training for the baptized child. Our own Prayer Book takes the same view. It does not attempt to found an argument for Baptism upon obscure or doubtful inferences from New Testament language, but basing itself upon the broad fact that our Lord said, "Suffer the little children to come unto me, and forbid them not, for of such is the kingdom of heaven," it bids all parents who profess and avow themselves Christians to give their children to Him in Baptism, "nothing doubting but that He favourably alloweth this charitable work" of so bringing them. We baptize such infants "*propter spem, non propter rem,*" on grounds of hope rather than of performance. Of any theory of an *opus operatum* in this

Sacrament there is not the slightest trace in the Prayer Book; all is reasonable, scriptural and in harmony with Catholic truth. The Church's outlook then is clear, her action logical. If the Baptist contention that the Church of Christ is to be composed exclusively of mature instructed and zealous Christians is right, then the position of the Church is wrong. The Baptist stands for the principle of individualism, demanding intelligence, repentance and faith as the condition of Baptism. The Church—and with it concur the great majority of the non-episcopal churches—stands for the principle of collectivism, the solidarity of the kingdom of God, and that all life within its boundaries is sacred from the moment of its appearance. Which is right? Are the two views mutually exclusive? May not both be true? Certainly the Lambeth pronouncement leaves the question open, and we may thankfully acknowledge its breadth of view. It excludes no Baptist from reunion on this question of age, and we notice with equal satisfaction that it leaves the method of administration equally open. That too is in keeping with the practice of our own Church; the question of whether administration shall be by immersion or affusion is insignificant, it sanctions either use for its own members.

Such then are the points which Lambeth regards as non-essential. It is well to note that two points insisted on by the Baptist Churches as essential are not so regarded by us, and in themselves offer no obstacle to reunion.

2. We come then to those matters on which the Lambeth Fathers insist as essential to any plans of reunion: first, that the element of Water be unfailingly used; and second, that Baptism shall always be in the Threefold Name.

There is no difficulty as to the use of water, "sanctified to the mystical washing away of sin by the Baptism of Jesus Christ in the river Jordan." The Churches, with the exception of the Society of Friends, are all of one mind. I do not forget that in a more superstitious age when Baptism was deemed to be absolutely essential to salvation, even the sands of the desert might be used if water could not be had, and the baptism of blood in a martyr's death was held to suffice in case of a catechumen, but these variations merely illustrated the universal use. Unfortunately the Society of Friends is excluded from reunion by this rule. That cannot be helped; the Society has to pay the price once more of

its spiritualization of the two Sacraments, whose outward and visible signs were given to us in mercy, God thus stepping as it were from the invisible into the visible for the strengthening of man's faith. None the less the continued existence of this little Society of 20,000 members all told, a community rich in good works, exemplary in Christian virtues, and contributing £25,000 a year to its missionary work in heathen lands, is at least an effective protest for the sovereignty of the Spirit of God, who, while He would fain accompany the formal rite of Baptism with His blessing, can and sometimes does act independently of even a divinely appointed ordinance.

When we come, however, to the Trinitarian formula, it seems to me little short of miraculous that the Churches should be practically of one mind, for divergence at this precise point is what we might not unreasonably have expected. When we reflect that with the single exception of the verse in Matthew xxviii. 19, "Baptizing them in the name of the Father, Son and Holy Ghost," this formula is never once found in the whole of the rest of the New Testament, and that as a fact Baptism is always spoken of as "in" or "into" "the name of Jesus Christ," or "of the Lord Jesus," it is a natural inference that His Name alone was used in Baptism. If this inference is accepted as probable, then at once it will be questioned whether the exact words attributed to Him in St. Matthew could actually have been spoken. Is it likely that He would give such a formula? May not the familiar words be an interpolation of later date, the reflection of a subsequent piety? It is at any rate suggestive that in the age of Cyprian, no less a person than Stephen, Pope of Rome, defended the validity of Baptism when given in the Name of Jesus only. The dispute between the Bishop and the Pope is highly instructive. Cyprian with an even more than customary vehemence insisted that persons so baptized must be rebaptized in the Name of the Holy Trinity. The Pope replied that there was a potency in the name of Jesus to which all things in heaven and earth and under the earth must bow, and that to account Baptism in that Name invalid would not merely do Him infinite dishonour, but would actually imperil the very existence of the Church. That the Pope was right and the Bishop wrong we can now see, and in the event all such baptisms were legitimated by the invocation of the Holy Spirit, together with the laying on of hands, in short, by Confirmation. But so late as the ninth century

we find Popes and Councils deciding that Baptism "in the Name of Jesus Christ" was valid, a clear proof of the continued prevalence of that formula.

At the back then of those quiet words of the Lambeth Conference demanding the unfailling use of the Threefold Name, there lies a stormy history. For a thousand years that controversy has now ceased, but considering the natural "dissidence of dissent," and our inborn love of faction, it seems to me little short of miraculous that on this question of all others connected with Baptism the Churches are at peace.

But a word more is needed in closing. That the Lambeth Conference is entirely justified in its insistence, I do not for one moment doubt. There is ample ground for maintaining that our Lord did actually use the words in question, or at the very least their equivalent. There is much Trinitarian doctrine in the New Testament which cannot be explained except upon the supposition that it was part of our Lord's systematic teaching. I refer to language such as in 1 Peter i. 2, "According to the foreknowledge of God the Father, in sanctification of the Spirit, unto obedience and sprinkling of the blood of Jesus Christ," or that of St. Paul in 2 Cor. xiii. 14, which for nineteen centuries has conveyed the Church's blessing: "The grace of the Lord Jesus Christ, and the love of God, and the communion of the Holy Ghost, be with you all." Dr. Hort writes: "In no passage is there any indication that the writer was independently working out a doctrinal scheme, a recognized belief or idea seems to be everywhere pre-supposed. How such an idea could arise in the mind of any Apostle without sanction from a Word of the Lord it is difficult to imagine, and this is a sufficient answer to the doubts which have been raised whether Matthew xxviii. 19 may not have been added or recast by a later generation" (Quoted, Plummer *in loc*).

I will merely note that about the year 160, Justin Martyr is at pains to explain to the heathen why Christians baptize in the Threefold Name, and in the *Didachè* we find the Trinitarian formula and "baptizing in the name of the Lord" both spoken of as if the latter were in effect the equivalent of the former—and there I must leave an interesting subject.

To ourselves gathered here to-day, in earnest hope that it may please God soon to open up the way to a lasting and sound reunion

with the separated Churches of our own land, it is a matter for profound thankfulness that on the question of Baptism our Church, clear and definite as to her own position, opens the door as wide as possible.

[Mr. G. A. King then gave an address on The Holy Communion.]



The Historic Episcopate.

By the Rev. C. SYDNEY CARTER, M.A.,

Formerly Rector of Aston Sandford, Bucks.

THE subject which I have been asked to speak on—The Historic Episcopate in its relation to Home Reunion—naturally suggests two initial questions: (1) What, precisely, is connoted by the term Home Reunion? and (2) What is involved in the description Historic Episcopate?

One of the "Findings" of this Conference last year stated that "the goal to be aimed at is some form of federation rather than anything like organic reunion." With all respect for this decision I would venture to qualify it by the addition of the word "immediate," so as to read "the immediate goal to be aimed at is some form of federation rather than organic reunion." For recognition, fraternal intercourse, and even federation, important as they are to attain as soon as possible, will not, I am persuaded, at least in the Homeland, secure for us a visible realization of our Master's high-priestly prayer "That they all may be one." Nothing but corporate reunion, that is the witness in each country of one and only one organically united Christian Church will effect this, and for our ultimate goal we should be wrong to be satisfied with anything less. Intercommunion and federation may very probably prove the most desirable and practicable form in different countries, testifying to the virtual unity and solidarity of the Catholic Church, but it will never in the same country be a sufficient witness to the unity of Christians. Perhaps I may illustrate this point by the present Anglican Communion. Its various branches in different lands are not joined together by any visible central or supreme executive authority. They resemble rather our self-governing colonies in being mainly independent and autonomous Churches,

and yet their virtual unity is founded on a very real basis of a common standard of doctrine and worship as well as by a common allegiance to the historic episcopal government. But if we could picture the independent Church of South Africa working side by side with our own Church in the Province of Canterbury, even though the most friendly relationship existed, the result would surely be a witness as much to a schism as to the true visible unity of the Church. In other words, so long as we have in one country the spectacle of separate independent and rival, if not hostile, Christian organizations, it will be difficult to convince the ordinary man in the street that they are not working as much to proselytize or at least help forward their own interests as to advance the cause of Christ's Kingdom. I do not for a moment undervalue the great gain to the cause of Christian Unity which would result if our Church enjoyed a similar measure of intercommunion with the Free Churches as they now possess among themselves, but even then the different Christian bodies would still be organically separate and until a common basis of government and organization for the Church of Christ is attained the witness to the power and reality of Christ's Gospel will be marred. To quote from a striking Report recently issued under the signatures of prominent Churchmen and Free Churchmen, "The visible unity of the Body of Christ . . . can only be fully realized through community of worship, faith and order, including common participation in the Lord's Supper. . . . It is only as a body, praying, taking counsel, and acting together that the Church can hope to appeal to men as the Body of Christ, that is, Christ's visible organ and instrument in the world." (Second interim Report of a Joint Sub-Committee in connexion with the proposed World's Conference on Faith and Order.)

We come then to the conditions laid down by the Lambeth Conference of 1888 known as "The Lambeth Quadrilateral," as "a basis on which approach may be by God's blessing made towards Home Reunion." The first three conditions, The Holy Scriptures, The Two Creeds and the Two Sacraments, have already been dealt with, there remains the fourth, "The Historic Episcopate, locally adapted in the methods of its administration to the varying needs of the Nations and peoples called of God into the unity of His Church."

We need to notice carefully that this condition is not laid down

as an essential "note" of a true Church, but *only as a necessary plank in any scheme of Reunion*. This is really a more important and vital distinction than may at first sight appear. For in the original report of a Committee of the House of Bishops of the American Church in 1886 which preceded and led to the issue of the Lambeth Quadrilateral, the Historic Episcopate was stated to be "an inherent part of the sacred deposit of Christian Faith and Order committed by Christ and His Apostles to the Church." We may be devoutly thankful that such a statement was rejected by the Lambeth Conference, since, contrary to our Article VI, it adds an article of faith incapable of Scriptural proof, as well as an additional note of a true Church to "the ministry of the Word and Sacraments" laid down in Article XIX. The Apostolic conditions of Christian fellowship were the profession of "one Lord, one Faith, one Baptism," and we must refuse to accept anything beyond these as an essential. To assert the Historic Episcopate to be an essential part of the sacred deposit of Christian Faith would be to close the door to any possible reunion with our non-episcopal brethren.

But while we protest against the Historic Episcopate being regarded as a necessary note of the Church, we fully acquiesce in it *as an essential condition for Reunion*. Not only is its retention essential in any future, even if distant, rapprochement with the Roman or Greek Churches, but we ourselves would never dream of surrendering a primitive and ancient system of government which has been so manifestly owned and blessed of God in the preservation of the purity and unity of the Faith in the development and history of the Church. Moreover, the undoubted link with Apostolic Christianity secured by the episcopal succession is a precious historical heritage. While we must insist therefore that the Historic Episcopate is not an essential *principle* in Christian Reunion, we must also assert that it is essentially *expedient* for any successful scheme of union. It is a necessary condition only from the point of view of practical expediency.

What then is involved in the term Historic Episcopate? What is its practical and historical interpretation? Roughly speaking we may say that there are two widely different and conflicting answers usually given to this question in slightly varying forms. The first asserts the historical fact that the Episcopate is connected with Apostolic or at least sub-Apostolic and primitive times by a

succession of bishops to whom normally the supreme powers of Church government and of ordaining the regular ministers have been limited according to the rules and order of the Church. It further claims that the experience and history of the centuries has proved this historic episcopate to be for the well being—the *bene esse* of the Church.

The other interpretation, while accepting this historical fact of episcopal succession, claims that it is also the sole guarantee for an authoritative and valid ministry and for the conveyance of grace. The bishops in fact are regarded as succeeding to the functions of the Apostles and from the fact of their consecration as transmitting the Holy Spirit from the Apostles' day to our own. Dean Hook in his Church Dictionary speaks of "a perfect and unbroken transmission of the original ministerial commission, from the Apostles to their successors, by the progressive and perpetual conveyance of their powers from one race of bishops to another." "The Apostolic Succession of the ministry is essential to the right administration of the Holy Sacraments. Without this no security exists that heaven will ratify the acts of an illegally constituted minister on earth" (pp. 727 and 43).

To quote another and more recent of the foremost upholders of this theory—"Authority to minister is given in the Church only by devolution from above on the principle of the succession to the original apostolic ministry" which is "a law of Divine authority in the Church and also an essential principle of the Church's continuous life." To neglect the "Apostolic Succession" is to "neglect a fundamental and Divine law of Christian fellowship," and Churches so living do so on the basis of "rebellion" (Gore, *Orders and Unity*, pp. 183-5). In other words the historic episcopate is of the "esse," the very life blood of the Church, its sole "protection for the reception of truth and grace through Word and through Sacrament" (Canon B. J. Kidd). As a consequence the Bishop of Zanzibar declares that "the very existence" of non-episcopal bodies "is hostile to Christ's Holy Church" (*Open Letter*).

Now I think we must admit that the chances of Home Reunion with an Historic Episcopate regarding all non-episcopal Christians as in a state of "rebellion and hostility" to the apostolic and divinely commissioned Church are very remote, and we have therefore the right to ask that this stupendous claim excluding and excom-

municating vast numbers of Christians from Church Fellowship should at least be based on some clear command of Our Lord and His Apostles and supported by the most unimpeachable historical evidence. But this is exactly what is not provided, and we are left at best to conjecture, probability, inference and supposition. Not only is this theory unconfirmed in Scripture but it is unsupported by the ablest and latest investigation and scholarship. Such eminent authorities as Whately, Lightfoot, Hort, Lindsay, Westcott and Gwatkin all testify against its historicity.

It is universally admitted now that the terms bishop and elder in the Epistles are used interchangeably to denote the same office, while the most careful students of the New Testament declare that in the Apostolic age the ministry of the Word and Sacraments was not confined to any particular officers of the various churches. All believers were regarded as "a royal priesthood," and there was no clear distinction between the ordained minister and the layman. The divinely inspired "prophets" often took a superior position to the bishops or elders whose duties were mainly of a regulative, disciplinary and pastoral character. The presbyters who *also* exercised the preaching office were, however, considered "worthy of double honour" (1 Tim. v. 17). As late as the close of the first century the *Didache* in advising the churches to appoint for themselves bishops and deacons, declares them to be "honourable men along with the prophets and teachers." Ordination was not confined to the Apostles but was performed at times, not only by their deputies like Timothy and Titus, but by the prophets and teachers (Acts xiii. 1-3). There is also no evidence to prove that the ceremony of "laying on of hands" was regarded as of any deeper significance than that taught by Augustine—the invocation of a blessing on the recipient. It certainly, as Dr. Sanday says, involves no idea of the transmission of grace. "It is simply," as Dr. Swete tells us, "the familiar and expressive sign of benediction inherited by the Apostles from the synagogue and adapted to the service of the Church."¹ To quote another modern authority, "there is no evidence for the supposition that the Apostles were regarded as the only conduits of grace which they must confer before public office could be undertaken. . . . The grace of ministry was always held to come from God, the commission to use that grace came

¹ *The Holy Spirit in the New Testament.*

from the Church . . . we cannot find sufficient indications to justify any theory, which would assert that the Apostolic Churches considered the ministerial grace to flow in a stream of which the Twelve and the Twelve only were the sources." ¹

While it is undoubtedly true that the New Testament bishops or presbyters soon ripened into a Council of presbyters presided over by a chief presbyter-bishop, who early in the second century had usually become the single supreme bishop of a congregational or city church, yet these bishops were in no way successors to the Apostolic office or functions. "In fact," as Professor Gwatkin puts it, "no two men can be more unlike than the wandering apostle, whose parish is the world, and the resident bishop overseeing a single city." ² While it is also true that the adoption of monarchical episcopacy was very rapid, yet as late as the end of the first century the Church at Corinth was governed only by presbyters, and this fact alone forbids the supposition that the Apostles left a command for the episcopal government of the Church. Twenty years later the silence of Ignatius (who was most insistent, not only on an exaggerated respect for the deacons and presbyters, but also on the supreme claims and authority of the bishop) concerning any *divine command* for the episcopal office, is, as Gwatkin asserts, conclusive that no such command was ever given. The question would have been settled if he could have said "Obey the bishop as Christ ordained or as the Apostles gave command." ³

The claim for the bishops to be regarded as the successors of the Apostles, the guardians and interpreters of the "Faith once delivered to the saints" was not heard of till the time of Irenaeus and was not perfected into a doctrine approaching the current theory of the transmission of grace till the time of Cyprian when the clergy began to claim sacerdotal functions modelled on those of the Aaronic priesthood. From this time also the bishops began to regard themselves no longer as the representatives of the congregation but as responsible only to God and appointed directly by Him. There is also sufficient evidence to prove that the change to a monarchical episcopal government was due solely to the circumstances and needs of the Church at the time and was not the result

¹ Blunt, *Studies in Apostolic Christianity*, pp. 99-101.

² *Episcopacy in Scripture*, p. 3.

³ *Early Church History*. I, 294.

of any recognized doctrine that the bishops were the only channel of the Holy Spirit through ordination and confirmation. Jerome's testimony of the custom of the presbyters at Alexandria up to 250 A.D. to elect and consecrate their bishop is sufficient to discredit this latter theory, while it is evident that the true origin of the supremacy of bishops was well known when he states "Before dissensions were introduced into religion by the instigation of the devil . . . churches were governed by a common council of presbyters . . . therefore among the ancients presbyters were the same as bishops, but by degrees that the plants of dissension might be rooted up, all responsibility was transferred to one person."¹ Augustine corroborated this statement when he declared that it is "according to the titles of honour which the custom of the Church hath now obtained the episcopate is greater than the presbyterate, yet in many things Augustine is less than Jerome."²

It is, as Dimock points out, almost inconceivable that there should have been no contemporary censure or protest against the Alexandrian practice if such ordination had been generally regarded as irregular or invalid. In confirmation of this Canon Bigg has reminded us that as late as the third century the "Canons of Hippolytus" direct that after a bishop's election by the people, he is to be consecrated in prescribed form "by one of the bishops and presbyters,"³ thus proving that the Nicene rule requiring the assistance of three bishops for consecration was not yet in force. As late also as the fourth and fifth centuries the original identity of the office of bishop and presbyter was recognized by the former addressing the latter as a "fellow presbyter."⁴

We may however fairly claim that the change to diocesan episcopacy was divinely guided or inspired since it was imperatively needed to cope with the forces of heresy and heathenism opposing the Church, for, as Bishop Lightfoot well says, "It was only by such a providential concentration of authority that the Church, humanly speaking, could have braved the storms of those ages of anarchy and violence." Yet his further statement cannot now be seriously questioned that historically "the episcopate was formed not out of the apostolic order by localization but out of

¹ On Titus I, 5.

² Quoted Harrison, *Whose are the Fathers*, p. 507.

³ *Origins of Christianity*, pp. 263-4.

⁴ Cf. Lightfoot, *Philippians*, p. 230.

the presbyteral by elevation," and the title which originally was common to all, came at length to be appropriated to the chief among them."¹

Such being the origin of episcopacy, not only is the Tractarian theory of Apostolic succession devoid of historical foundation, but there is much to be said for the claim of Presbyterianism to possess an historic episcopate, at least in its primitive form. Principal Lindsay declares: "We Presbyterians are quite assured of the validity and regularity of our Orders. We believe them to be of more ancient standing than the Anglican. . . . We find the true threefold ministry, as we think, in every Presbyterian congregation where we have the pastor or bishop (the terms were synonymous down to the fourth century at least) surrounded by his "coronal" of elders (presbyters) and deacons. The historic episcopate is seen by us in the pastorate of our congregations which represents the congregational Bishops of the early centuries."²

Another and perhaps even more important historical question bearing on Home Reunion is the opinion of our Reformers on the importance of episcopacy. What was their practical attitude in regard to it, what doctrine of its value did they enshrine in our authorized formularies? In other words did they assert it to be of the "esse" or the "bene esse" of the Church? Is it correct to assert in the words of a recent petition of London clergy to Convocation that "In accordance with the teaching of the Church in all ages, the Church of England has always taught, and must continue to teach, the necessity of episcopal ordination as a condition of exercising the Ministry of the Word and Sacraments."³ Statements similar to this are so constantly being made and reiterated that at length they come to be regarded by many as axiomatic truths, in spite of the fact that they are entirely incapable of proof. Historically, as I hope to show, our Reformed Church of England has *never taught that episcopal orders are essentially necessary for the performance of a valid ministry or sacraments*. We Evangelicals need, I think, to take a lesson from our opponents, and to emphasize and re-emphasize the undoubted fact that our Church has always regarded the Historic Episcopate as only of the "bene

¹ *Philippians*, p. 196.

² *Church Family Newspaper*, Aug. 7, 1908.

³ *Steps towards Reunion*, p. 40.

esse" of the Church. Were it not for the fact disclosed by the recent correspondence in the *Record* that there are apparently still some Evangelical Churchmen who are ignorant of, or who refuse to credit, well established facts, it would seem to be mere waste of time to go over familiar ground to show this Conference that the Reformers and their successors fully recognized the orders of their non-episcopal Continental brethren.

Cranmer, the author of the 1549 Ordinal, publicly affirmed his conviction that "in the beginning of Christ's religion bishops and priests were no two things, but both one office."¹ We should also bear in mind that this view had been practically held by many eminent medieval Schoolmen who regarded the episcopate as merely a different "grade" of the priesthood. The opinion "that the bishop differs only in rank and not in order" from the presbyter was not only shared by many eminent Reformed Churchmen, such as Archbishops Whitgift and Ussher, but seems to have influenced Cranmer in the compilation of the Ordinal. For while the Preface states the historical fact that "from the Apostles' time there have been these orders of Ministers in Christ's Church, Bishops, Priests and Deacons," yet 1 Timothy iii. 1, "If any man desire the office of a bishop he desireth a good work," was used as an epistle in the Ordering of Priests in 1549, while the bishop at his consecration was exhorted "to stir up the grace of God which is in thee"; and although these epistles are changed in our present Ordinal (of 1662) it is significant that there is no sermon ordered to be preached at a bishop's consecration (as at the ordination of deacons and priests), showing "how necessary such order is in the Church of Christ."

It has also been frequently pointed out that our Articles are significantly silent as to any particular or necessary form of the Christian Ministry. They define the notes of the Visible Church simply as "the preaching of the Word of God and the due administration of the Sacraments" (Art. XIX), while they make only a general statement declaring lawful ordination to depend on the authority of the Church, i. e. "by men who have public authority given unto them *in the congregation* to call and send ministers into the Lord's vineyard" (Art. XXIII). That Churchmen of that age did not consider that such "public authority" could only be

¹ *Barnet, History of the Reformation*, vol. ii, Records No. 21.

given to bishops is evident from Roger's treatise on the Articles published in 1607, with the express object of "proving them to be agreeable both to the written Word of God and to the extant Confessions of all neighbour Churches Christianly reformed."¹ In commenting on this Article (XXIII) Rogers, Archbishop Bancroft's chaplain, declares "So testify with us the true Churches elsewhere in the world." "And this do the Churches Protestant by their Confessions approve."² Bishop Hooper distinctly affirmed that those who taught people to know the Church by the sign of "the succession of bishops taught wrong."³

We have also the best practical proof that Cranmer did not regard episcopal succession as of the "esse" of the Church in his persistent endeavour to obtain a Conference of all the leading Reformed Continental divines, such as Melancthon, Calvin and Bullinger (the last of whom had never been episcopally ordained) to frame "one common confession and harmony of faith and doctrine." Although Cranmer was never able to carry out this design, it was practically realized in 1581 by the publication of the "Harmony of Protestant Confessions," in which the Church of England was represented by Jewel's *Apology*. Bishop Andrews claims affinity with the Reformed Churches abroad by referring to this compilation as "Our Harmony": "We hold one Faith as the Harmony of our Confessions sufficiently testifies."⁴

The modest claim in our Articles for episcopacy, that, to use Bishop Gibson's phrase, it is "only an allowable form of Church government," is thus perfectly natural when we keep in mind the important views of our Reformers and their immediate successors on the subject; for as regards the Elizabethan bishops we have Keble's reluctant but well known admission that "they were content to show that government by Bishops was ancient and allowable; they never ventured to urge its exclusive claims or to connect it with the validity of the Holy Sacraments."⁵ Not only have we numerous testimonies to the close intercourse, as well as to the real unity of doctrine, between the Church of England and the foreign Reformed Churches at this time, but what is more important,

¹ Preface.

² Rogers, *Thirty-nine Articles*, pp. 239-40.

³ *Early Writings*, pp. 81-2.

⁴ *Responsio ad Bellarminum*, p. 36.

⁵ *Preface to Hooker's Works*, p. 59.

as proving Keble's statement that the Elizabethan bishops held no exclusive views of the necessity of episcopal orders, is the undoubted fact of the admission of these foreign Reformed divines to cures of souls in England, during this period, without any further ordination. Here again Keble bears an unwilling confirmation that "nearly up to the time when Hooker wrote, numbers had been admitted into the ministry of the Church of England with no better than Presbyterian ordination."¹

The plea often urged that in spite of this practice, the sufficiency of these foreign orders was always doubted even at the time, rests, I am persuaded, on a confused and faulty interpretation of contemporary history. Such doubts as were brought forward in specific cases as those of Whittinghame and De Laune, dealt with the doubtful sufficiency and validity of non-episcopal orders in relation to *the laws of the realm* and not of the Church. In other words, their essential and intrinsic validity, ecclesiastically was not questioned, although bishops were at times in doubt, whether the State recognized them as legal for the tenure of an official position in a National Church. This distinction is most important and explains what otherwise might be regarded as inconsistent in the actions and opinions of contemporary bishops. Thus Archbishop Grindal in licensing the Presbyterian divine, John Morrison, to minister in the whole Province of Canterbury adds "as much as in us lies, and as far as *the laws of the kingdom do allow*."² Similarly Bishop Overall advised Dr. De Laune, who had been ordained by the Presbytery at Leyden, "to take the opinion of Council whether by the *laws of England* he was capable of a benefice without being ordained by a Bishop," while at the same time admitting his readiness to institute him to a benefice with the orders he possessed. Bishop Hall also definitely tells us that where any scruple arose concerning these foreign Orders, it was only a question of what "the Statutes of the Realm do require." "It was not," he affirms, "in the case of ordination but of institution, they had been acknowledged ministers of Christ without any other hands laid upon them," but, he adds, "I know those that by virtue of that ordination which they have brought with them from other Reformed Churches have enjoyed spiritual promotions and livings without any excep-

¹ *Preface to Hooker's Works*, p. 67.

² *Strype's Grindal*, p. 402 (1821).

tion against the lawfulness of their calling."¹ Bishop Cosin some years later in confirming this statement declares that all that was required of such foreign clergy by "our law," was "to declare their public consent to the religion received among us and to subscribe the Articles established."² He is evidently referring to the Act XIII Eliz. cap. 12, which Strype asserts was passed "undoubtedly" to comprehend Papists, and likewise such as received their Orders in some of the foreign Reformed Churches when they were in exile under Queen Mary.³

That the concession covered by this Act was exploited and abused by extreme Puritans of the school of Cartwright, who denied the actual lawfulness of episcopacy and reviled and "depraved" the discipline and ceremonies of the Church, was evident in the case of Travers, who to retain his ecclesiastical office and yet avoid the detested episcopal ordination, employed the artifice of obtaining foreign Orders and then appealing for the protection of this statute! Such a course was not only dishonourable but was regarded in that age of an exclusive National Church as a seditious attempt to undermine the existing government in Church and State. Yet, in spite of this Travers would have been left in peace had he not have created the scandal of directly controverting Hooker's teaching in his own pulpit! A little later he received another preferment in the appointment to the Provostship of Trinity College, Dublin. But the attitude of the authorities of the Church in suppressing and rigorously condemning, as they did in the Canons of 1604, such "impugners" and "depravours" of the doctrine, discipline and worship of the Church, proves nothing against their full recognition of non-episcopal ministries as such. For while they denounced and excommunicated in their sermons and Canons the secret conventicles and presbyteries of the English schismatics, who were endeavouring to subvert the national religious settlement, their 55th Canon of 1604 officially committed the whole Convocation to the recognition of the Scottish national (Presbyterian) Church as a branch of "the Holy Catholic Church." Again in 1610 when bishops were for the first time consecrated for the Scotch Church, Bancroft distinctly stated that "where Bishops could not be had, ordination by the presbyters must be esteemed lawful, otherwise

¹ *Works*, IX, pp. 160-1. †

² Letter to Mr. Cordell.

³ *Annals*, ii. p. 71.

it might be doubted if there were any lawful vocation "in most of the Reformed Churches." ¹

Although the Caroline divines usually followed Bancroft in claiming a divine obligation for episcopacy except in cases of necessity, they all of them vindicated the foreign Reformed Orders under this latter plea, or like Archbishop Bramhall and Bishop Hall, maintained that the "superintendents" of these foreign Presbyterian churches were essentially performing episcopal functions. We should also remember that while the new rule enacted in 1662 made episcopal ordination a necessity for ministering "in the Church of England" it did not lay down any fresh theory concerning the value of the historic episcopate. It was a domestic rule "for our own people only," and in no way condemned all other non-episcopal Churches. It was, we may safely assert, dictated as a policy of recrimination rather than from any fresh ecclesiastical principle. It would seem that the Churchmen considered that the successful attempt, during the Commonwealth, to overthrow the National Church government was deserving of greater punishment in England than in Scotland, where Episcopacy had only had a short and turbulent existence; for while the Presbyterian clergy in England were ejected for refusing reordination, the bishops consecrated in 1662 for the Scotch Church only required the Presbyterian ministers there to acknowledge the episcopal office in its executive function of instituting them to their cures. There was no question of enforcing reordination in Scotland. Had Caroline Churchmen been desirous of enunciating a fresh theory that Presbyterian ordination was insufficient for the performance of a valid ministry and sacraments, it is certain that they would not have hesitated to enforce reordination in Scotland as in England. The persecution meted out to the Covenanters is sufficient proof that they would not have been dismayed at any consequences of their convictions. In England however they were, after their recent sufferings, determined rigidly to enforce, in Professor Gwatkin's language, their "old ideal of one Church and no dissent."² Men like Travers had succeeded before in evading and exploiting the laws of "the Church and Realm," and they were determined that this should not be possible in future. That there was no intention of denying the validity

¹ Neal, *History of the Puritans*, vol. i. p. 449. ² *Church and State*, p. 354.

of foreign non-episcopal orders by this new regulation is evident from the "Comprehension" proposals of the bishops and clergy at the Jerusalem Chamber Conference in 1689, when the foreign divines were to be received without further ordination as they had been up to 1662.

It is most important to remember, in considering the ecclesiastical problems of this period, the great difference made by the Toleration Act of 1689 in the status and treatment of English Dissenters. Previous to this date every Englishman was legally a Churchman, and every attempt to alter the national religion or to set up a different form was treated as seditious and penal. This medieval ideal of uniformity accounts for the different feeling with which Churchmen regarded English Nonconformists and foreign non-episcopalians; as Bishop Hall once declared, "We can at once tenderly respect them and justly censure you."¹ In the eyes of the Caroline divines the Puritans were not only rejecting a primitive and Scriptural episcopacy where it could be had, but were attempting to overthrow the cherished "doctrine" of "one State one religion." The passing of the Toleration Act at once created a change, and it is instructive to notice that it must have been the indirect cause of the Occasional Conformity Bill. I do not remember to have seen this point often noticed, but I think it is safe to assert that had there been no Toleration Act, the objectionable practice of receiving the Sacrament merely to qualify for civil offices could have been prevented by the existing Church rules. *The strict enforcement of the Confirmation rubric was all that would have been required to stop it*, but with the existence of the Toleration Act the Dissenters for the first time obtained a recognized legal status as "non-Churchmen." The very fact that an Occasional Conformity Act was *necessary* to stop the practice, is valuable additional proof that the Confirmation rubric was never designed except as a domestic rule "for our own people."

It is thus important to remember that for over a hundred years after the Reformation the Church had no problem of Home Reunion to deal with, since Home "separation" was illegal, therefore we have no exact historic precedent to guide us on the subject. We may, however, fairly claim that the case of the non-episcopal Free Churches to-day is analogous to the case of the foreign Reformed

¹ Quoted in Dimock, *Christian Unity*, p. 46

Churches at that time, since whichever side is the more guilty for the original schism, it is impossible now with any regard to equity to "visit the sins of the fathers upon the children." The fact of the full recognition of the orders of foreign Reformed divines, and especially of Archbishop Bancroft's refusal to reordain the Scotch presbyters consecrated bishops in 1610, proves conclusively that the Church of that day fully recognized non-episcopal ministries, and did not consider the Historic Episcopate to be any bar to a real and practical union and fellowship with other Reformed Churches. In spite of the narrow and uncharitable statements so frequently made by numbers of "Tractarian" Churchmen, there has never been any official condemnation of such ministries by our Church since that time. On the contrary we may fairly claim that the Lambeth Conference Committee on Reunion in 1908 again virtually admitted the validity of Presbyterian ministries, by declaring that wherever they have remained faithful to the "Westminster Confession of Faith" they have satisfied the first three conditions of the Lambeth Quadrilateral.¹ In other words they have retained a valid ministry of the Word and Sacraments. It was therefore only a natural corollary to this admission that the Lambeth Conference Report of that year should declare that "it might be possible to make an approach to Reunion" with Presbyterian and other (orthodox) non-episcopal Churches "on the basis of consecrations to the Episcopate on lines suggested by such precedents as those of 1610."² I have inserted the word "orthodox" in this quotation not only because it was certainly implied in the Report, but as an additional testimony to the fact that we have no thought or intention of considering reunion with any body of Christians which does not loyally and fully accept the Nicene Faith, as summarized by the Scriptures, the two Creeds and the two Sacraments. Neither, unless they show evident tokens of repentance, are we willing to welcome into full Christian fellowship small isolated sects which have hitherto factiously and wilfully caused or perpetuated rents and divisions in the Church of Christ or have displayed an aggressively hostile spirit towards other branches of the Catholic Church.

From this brief survey we may safely affirm that the "Historic Episcopate" does not imply a narrow, rigid and fixed system, but

¹ *Steps towards Reunion*, p. 28.

² Lambeth Conference Report 1908, p. 65, Resol. 75.

historically has already often been "locally adapted in its administration to the varying needs of nations and peoples," so that the Apostolic presbyter-bishop, the *primus inter pares*, was far more akin, as Mr. Hugh Price Hughes once claimed,¹ to the modern Methodist superintendent or the Presbyterian moderator than to our diocesan bishop; while there is certainly a family resemblance between the modern Baptist or Congregational pastor and the early bishop of a single city church.

If the Historic Episcopate has thus been locally adapted to suit the Apostolic and primitive times, the Alexandrian and Reformed Church needs, there is no reason why it may not be again adapted to receive back into an outward visible unity our separated Free Church brethren. We refuse to credit the Bishop of Zanzibar's theory that it is Episcopacy which hinders "so powerfully the work of Reunion," or to accept his mischievous and misleading alternative that "Episcopacy is either God's gift or a terrible curse,"² for we believe that rightly understood, and as held by our Church, simply for the *bene esse* of a Church, the Historic Episcopate is rather an inducement than a barrier to Home Reunion.

After all, the one ultimate and infallible test of a true Church lies in the fruit of its ministry. "A Divine Society," as Mr. Blunt well says, "can live neither upon its past history nor upon its present externals . . . the test of 'results' in the widest sense of the word is the final test whether a system shall continue to be regarded as Divinely ordained."³ If we apply this test to the non-episcopal Churches, even Bishop Gore fully and generously admits that "both individually and corporately they have exhibited manifest fruits of the Spirit alike in learning, virtue and Evangelical zeal."⁴ How then, we ask, is it possible to think that God would so manifestly fill with His Spirit those whom Bishop Gore also declares to be "rebels against a Divine law"? Since also it is "by one Spirit we are all baptized into one body" (I Cor. xii. 13), how dare we repudiate the fellowship of a body of fellow believers, who by their full possession of God's Spirit, are truly members of "the Church which is His body"? Or again how can we with such evident

¹ See *Methodist Times*, Sept. 21, 1899.

² *Open Letter*.

³ *Studies in Apos. Christianity*, pp. 119-20

⁴ *Orders and Unity*, pp. 183-5.

proof of the sufficiency in God's sight of non-episcopal ministries approach them with a view to real organic union on terms of superiority or condescension, simply on account of what we consider a defect in their Church polity, for which there is no definite Scriptural warrant? If however on the other hand we make it perfectly clear that our proposals for Reunion are on the basis of a full recognition of the validity of their ministries, we do not believe that the orthodox Nonconformist Churches, who accept the Scriptures, the Creeds and the two Sacraments, will long seek to hinder a visible fulfilment of our Lord's prayer by rejecting our requirement of the Historic Episcopate "locally adapted" in such a way as to safeguard their conscientious scruples and respect their cherished convictions. This confident conviction is fully borne out by the remarkable Report recently issued by the English Sub-Committee at present considering the conditions of Reunion to be submitted to the proposed World Conference on Faith and Order. This Report, drawn up by representative Nonconformists as well as Churchmen, recommends that "continuity with the Historic Episcopate should be effectually preserved," although "acceptance of the fact of Episcopacy and not any theory as to its character" should be a sufficient requirement. In other words the acceptance of the Historic Episcopate for any successful scheme of Reunion is fully recognized on both sides, while as regards "local adaptation" the same Report suggests that the "Episcopate should re-assume a constitutional form, both as regards the method of the election of the bishop as by clergy and people and the method of government after election." To quote again the words of Professor Gwatkin, If the Historic Episcopate "committed us to the Cyprianic or medieval theory of Episcopacy it would only be a sword of division in our own Church. Episcopacy is like monarchy an ancient and godly form of government which we may be proud to acknowledge and obey. . . . To claim for it a binding command of Christ or His Apostles is a defiance of history; and to make it necessary for other Churches without such a command, comes near to a defiance of Christ Himself. We cannot dream of union with the Non-Episcopal Churches of Christ unless we recognize they are as much Christ's Churches as our own, and their ministers as truly Christ's ministers as we. Our Lord Himself laid down once for all the condition of union "that they may be perfected into unity."

Unity is not the way to perfection, but perfection is the way to Unity, and the higher we can struggle towards perfection, the more deeply we shall feel that unity—the only unity worth striving for—is already with us in the one true life that binds in one true Catholic Church all those who love our ever living Lord and Saviour ” (Pan Anglican Congress Speech, 1908).

While we rejoice in the truth thus eloquently expressed, as to the real and deep spiritual unity of all Christ's believing people, yet we feel we must qualify it by endorsing the concluding words of the moving appeal to the Christian Churches, already quoted, which declares “ that it must be felt by all good hearted Christians as an intolerable burden to find themselves permanently separated in respect of religious worship and communion from those in whose characters and lives they recognize the surest evidences of the indwelling Spirit ” (Second Interim Report, u.s.). We cannot rest content until all those who confess Christ's Holy Name shall “ agree in the truth of His Holy Word and live in unity and godly love.”

[NOTE.—The second paper on “The Historic Episcopate,” by Dr. Eugene Stock, and the paper by the Rev. George F. Irwin, B.D., and address' by the Rev. Principal Garvie, D.D., on “Possibilities of Reunion,” will appear in the August number of THE CHURCHMAN.]



The Cup in the Communion Office.

A QUESTION has been raised as to what, if any, is the law of the Church of England as regards the "vessel" that is to be used by the communicant for the purpose of "drinking" the wine at the service of Holy Communion. Is it permissible under the Prayer Book as it stands to use individual cups for individual communicants in the administration of the wine; or does the Church of England prescribe only the use of a common cup? This paper seeks to maintain that the common cup, and that only, is the use directed by the law of the Church of England.

The matter must obviously be decided by the Rubrics, unless they are so ambiguous that other factors must be considered in order to elucidate them. The Rubrics must govern the practice. The practice can only be invoked if there is doubt as to what the Rubrics mean.

The Rubrics do not seem to me to leave room for more than the common cup in the administration of the wine. They are definite and unqualified. Throughout they speak of "*The Cup*" as if there were no question of it being other than the one cup used throughout the service. In the ordering of the Holy Table the priest is directed so to order it "that he may with the more . . . decency break the Bread before the people, and take *the Cup* into his hands." This presupposes the one cup of the celebration. In the Rubric of the Manual Acts we read: "Here he is to take *the Cup* into his hand." Again, the Rubric for directing the use of words in the administration of the wine is explicit: "And the Minister that delivereth *the Cup* . . . shall say." Finally, the Rubric which provides for the method of consecrating additional elements when the first supply is exhausted gives definite direction "for the blessing of *the Cup*." This fourfold repetition of the same phrase, "*the Cup*," according to the ordinary use of language, presupposes a common cup for communicating communicants, and not individual cups for individual communicants.

This obvious interpretation of the Rubrics

(1) is in keeping with other Rubrics dealing with the Communion Service; and

(2) is in harmony with the past history of the development of the Rubrics; and

(3) above all is borne out by the general principles upon which our Prayer Book legislation is based.

1. The administration of the wine in the Holy Communion by a common cup and not by individual cups for individual communicants is in keeping with other Rubrics associated with the Communion Service.

For example :

(a) In the Office for the Communion of the Sick the Rubric directs: "At the time of the distribution of the Holy Sacrament, the Priest shall first receive the Communion himself, and after minister unto them that are appointed to communicate with the sick, and last of all to the sick person." The direction that the sick person shall receive last is so marked that it must have had a reason. There was evident fear of spreading infection. But no infection could be spread by the distribution of the bread, for the sick person does not touch the Paten that contains the bread. It remains that *the Cup* was intended, the one common cup, which for good and sufficient reasons would, by this Rubric, be ministered to the sick person last.

(b) Also, the Rubric, following the Order of Communion itself, which directs how the elements are to be consumed after a celebration, is in harmony with the use of a common cup more than it is with the use of individual cups for individual communicants. It is as follows: "If any" of the Bread and Wine "remain of that which was consecrated, it shall not be carried out of the Church, but the Priest and such other of the communicants as he shall then call unto him, shall, immediately after the Blessing, reverently eat and drink the same." It is easy to understand how they are "to drink the same," if it refers to the unconsumed wine left over in the common cup: it is not so easy to interpret it on the other theory.

2. But I wish especially to emphasize the fact that the interpretation of the Cup prescribed by the Rubrics as a common cup is in harmony with the past history of the development of the Rubrics.

The Prayer Book as we have it to-day is the last of four stages of development, viz., the Prayer Book of 1549 (commonly called the First Prayer Book of Edward VI.), that of 1552 (known as the Second Prayer Book of Edward VI.), the Elizabethan Prayer Book of 1559, and the final revision under Charles II, the Prayer Book of 1662, which is our Prayer Book of to-day. In all alike *the Cup* is the

phrase used, and the interpretation of *the Cup* in our present Prayer Book, as meaning one common cup, and not individual cups for individual communicants, gains support from the consideration of certain facts connected with the use of the phrase in the earlier editions named.

(i.) The first point to which I would draw attention is the Rubric in the Prayer Book of 1549 which directs: "Then shall the Minister take so much Bread and Wine as shall suffice for the persons appointed to receive the Holy Communion . . . putting the Wine into *the Chalice*, or else in some fair or conveniente *cup*, prepared for that use (if the Chalice will not serve)." I may say in passing that there is no real distinction between the Chalice and the Cup here mentioned. The Chalice is probably here used to designate the Pre-Reformation cup, which was frequently small because denied to the laity; and had often to be replaced by a larger cup when the laity as well as the clergy had to be communicated.

But the phrase "fair or conveniente cup" is noteworthy because it and its context is borrowed *litteratim et verbatim* from the Order of Communion of the previous year, 1548, with one important difference of great significance for our purpose. In the Order of Communion of 1548, the priest was directed "to bless and consecrate the biggest Chalice or soome faire and convenient *Cup or Cuppes* full of wine." There is to me no doubt that even in 1548, though using the phrase "Cup or Cuppes," the Church never contemplated anything but the use of a common cup passed by the priest from communicant to communicant, and certainly not individual cups for individual communicants. The directions in the same Rubric of 1548 makes this abundantly clear, for in the immediate context two rules are laid down: (a) the cup or cuppes are to be "full of wine," and (b) the priest is directed, "that daie not to drinke it up al himselfe, but taking one only suppe or draught leve the reste upon the Altare covered." Evidently the cup contemplated is a cup so large that it contains more than what one communicant would be expected to drink upon communicating; otherwise why should the priest be bidden to take "one only suppe or draught"? (c) This is further confirmed by the Rubric in the same Order of Communion, 1548, which provides for the consecration of additional wine, directing: "If it doth so chance that the wine hallowd and consecrate doth not suffice or be enough for them that doo take the

Communion, the priest after the firste Cup or Chalice be emptied, may go again to the Altar, and reverently and devoutly prepare and consecrate another, and so the third, or more likewise." I need not enlarge upon this. The word "emptied" carries its own message.

Yet in spite of all this cumulative evidence of its intention to prescribe a common cup, the Church deliberately, one year later, in 1549, omitted the words "or cuppes," directing only "some fair or conveniente cup," determined, as I interpret it, to remove any danger of irregularity being introduced through ambiguity of expression as regards a common cup.

(ii.) This intention of the Church of England to use a cup from which more than one was to drink is emphasized by the somewhat quaint direction of the Rubric in this same Prayer Book of 1549, which governs the *administration* of the "fair and conveniente cup" already named. It directs, "And the Minister delivering the Sacrament of the Blood and giving to every one to drink *once and no more* shall say," etc. The phrase "giving to every one . . . once and no more" evidently had in mind the use of *the Cup* large enough to be shared by many in common and intended for that purpose.

(iii.) This intention is actually expressed in words in a subsequent Rubric of the 1549 Book, which enters into particular directions for the action of an assistant priest if such were available to lighten the duties of the celebrant in any Service of Holy Communion. This Rubric is careful to say: "If there be a Deacon or other Priest, then shall he *follow with the Chalice*, and as the Priest ministereth the Sacrament of the Body, so shall he (for more expedition) minister the Sacrament of the Blood in the form before written." It needs little exercise of the imagination to picture the action which this Rubric is desired to effect. The assistant carrying *the Cup* is to "follow with" it, and "for more expedition" administer it to the communicant to whom the celebrant has just administered the Bread.

In reading to-day these Rubrics which might be said to be precise and minute to a fault, we must remember that they were providing directions for what was then a novelty in the Church of England of that age, viz., the administration of the Cup to the laity, and therefore it was felt necessary to give meticulous rules which later experience would soon make superfluous. They are,

however, useful guides to show that it was the mind of the Church to use a common cup.

(iv.) In all subsequent changes the Church has shown no sign of intention to depart from the use of the one common cup then laid down. In 1552 the last named Rubrics were omitted, as also were all the Rubrics providing for the Manual Acts, and for a hundred years and more no direction was given about the Manual Acts. But yet through all these years one strong Rubric remained about *the Cup*. The Rubric for the administration of the wine said: "The Minister that delivereth *the Cup* shall saye," and its interpretation must be guided by the mind of the Church as shown more fully in the Prayer Book of 1549, of which the 1552 Book is a modification.

In 1662 three Rubrics were inserted or reinserted, all of which made the direction to use *the Cup* more emphatic. These were the direction for ordering the elements, "that he may with the more readiness and decency . . . take *the Cup* into his hands"; the direction for the Manual Acts, "Here he is to take *the Cup* into his hand"; and the direction for "the blessing of *the Cup*" when additional wine is needed. There was also one most significant insertion of the words "to anyone" in the existing Rubric so that henceforward it said: "The Minister that delivereth *the Cup* to anyone." I do not presume to explain why these words "to anyone" were then added, but I do say that having been added they make it yet plainer that the Church intended to use *the Cup* for more than one communicant. (It is also to be noted that this same Prayer Book of 1662 retained the Rubric of 1552 requiring that there be no communion "except four (or three at the least) communicate with the Priest.") I ought to add that there was one other Manual Act Rubric inserted in 1662 which is sometimes quoted, erroneously as I believe, to show that the Church had changed her mind at this juncture and had ceased to require the use of a common cup. I shall deal with that Rubric shortly, contenting myself with saying that the facts already adduced are abundant testimony that the Church has constantly at different stages of her history since the Reformation, shown her intention to require the use of a common cup in the Holy Communion.

3. The last point that I urge is that the interpretation of the Rubrics as requiring a common cup, and not permitting individual cups for individual communicants, is alone in harmony with the principle

of uniformity consistently maintained by the Church in her formularies, as laid down in the Preface to the Prayer Book, "Concerning the Service of the Church." I need not enlarge upon the resolution there expressed, that instead of the "great diversity" that there had been "heretofore," "from henceforth all the . . . Realm shall have but one use." I only say two things : (i) Until by legal process that principle is withdrawn it still holds as the law of the Church of England, and (ii) it would be strange if any alteration in this respect was made by the Prayer Book of 1662 which expressly re-enacted this Preface that first appeared in 1549, and was afterwards contained in 1552.

Yet the Rubric to which I alluded above is sometimes quoted as if it actually did this very strange thing. The Rubric, one directing the Manual Acts, says : "And here to lay his hand upon every vessel (be it Chalice or Flagon) in which there is any Wine to be consecrated." This Rubric is actually quoted as giving authority for the use of individual cups for individual communicants instead of the common cup, because in the phrase "every vessel" it allows scope for an unlimited number of vessels besides the common cup. I would only say in passing that this Rubric never mentions an unlimited number of vessels to be drunk from, but only vessels "in which there is any wine to be consecrated."

But the argument that I wish to press is, that such an interpretation of this Rubric is only tenable if the Rubric is unambiguous and susceptible of only one meaning. For if that Rubric permitted the introduction of individual cups for individual communicants it would run counter to the expressed declaration of the Church "that from henceforth all the . . . Realm shall have but one use." It would create diversity of the most flagrant kind in connection with one of the most solemn acts of our holy religion. We are also asked to believe, on that assumption, that the Church did this without giving any reason for this startling new departure. Usually in legislation when we depart from existing law we show that the maintenance of the law as it stands is either impossible or inexpedient, and that therefore a change is demanded. No such explanation is attempted or hinted at here. But in addition we are asked to believe that the Church made this tremendous innovation in a revision in which she was already doing the very opposite, namely, reaffirming her will that *the Cup* be used, by the three new Rubrics,

and the modification of the fourth, which I have detailed above. We are asked to believe too much. The setting of that Rubric in the place in which it is found, and under the circumstances of its enactment, renders such an interpretation absolutely impossible in law.

Furthermore the Rubric can be adequately interpreted without involving the Church in such a maze of historical and liturgical inconsistencies. It is seeking to remove legally, as far as possible, all inconveniences connected with the administration of the Communion to a large number of communicants such as it was fondly hoped would flock to the Holy Table in the enthusiasm of the Restoration, when the old Church of England again emerged out of her suppression. It provides that in addition to consecrating the wine in the Chalice, it is legally permissible to consecrate wine in the Flagon, or even also the wine in any other vessel in which, like a Flagon, there might be wine to be consecrated, afterwards to be poured into *the Cup* for purposes of administration.

This is a case in which, supposing that there were any ambiguity of interpretation, which I deny, it would be right to support the new interpretation by reference to contemporary practice. But there is no tittle of evidence in contemporary practice to show that either the revisers themselves, or any of their contemporaries, ever departed from that uniformity which the Church laid down as a principle of her legislation. They all used, and continued to use, the common cup. The onus of proof rests with those who hold the contrary view, and no such proof is forthcoming.

For these reasons, drawn [from study of the Rubrics alone, and without reference to the authority of the New Testament, or the example of the Primitive Church, which in my judgment leads to the same conclusion, I maintain that the law of the Church of England as regards the administration of the wine requires the use of a common cup, and does not permit, as it stands now, the use of individual cups for individual communicants.

J. C. SYDNEY.



Reviews of Books.

CAMBRIDGE ESSAYS ON EDUCATION.

CAMBRIDGE ESSAYS ON EDUCATION. Edited by A. C. Benson, C.V.O., LL.D., Master of Magdalene College, Cambridge; with an Introduction by Viscount Bryce, O.M. Cambridge: *At the University Press.* Price 7s. 6d. net.

"Education" is a word we hear a great deal of nowadays. Various schemes are in the air, some of them good, many indifferent, and some bad. What we want, however, to get at is not so much this or that "scheme"—often the piecemeal work of interested partisans—but to ascertain (if we can) some of the principles that lie at the root of all true education. Apparently the twelve writers who contribute to the book now under review have clearly seen that, apart from such principles, no scheme, however cleverly devised, is likely to be permanently successful or generally useful. As the editor remarks: "To deal with current and practical problems does not seem the *first* need at present. Just now work is both common and fashionable; most people are doing their best; and, if anything, the danger is that organization should outrun foresight and intelligence." For these reasons he has, like the experienced schoolmaster he is, endeavoured to collect the opinions of teachers and administrators upon "certain questions of the theory and motive of education which lie a little beneath the surface."

So far so good. Now let us see what the various contributors have to say.

The book opens with an introductory note by Viscount Bryce. It is brief, but it is illuminating. He points out that educational ideals to-day have become not merely more earthly but more material. Modern doctrines of equality (most of them wrong-headed, it is true) have tended to discredit the ancient view that the chief aim of instruction is to prepare the wise and good for the government of the State. Nowadays everybody thinks he is wise, even if he isn't good, and believes himself quite capable of self-government, which too often means government for selfish ends. The whole theory of latter-day democracy lies in the notion that every man—especially if he is a manual labourer—is as good as his neighbour, if not a little better. If the Old Testament has anything to teach us in this respect, its tendency certainly does not run to that extreme; it realizes quite clearly that the mass of mankind is not, and never will be, fitted for self-government in the sense held by modern democrats, and that it is the duty of the leaders to mould the actions of the majority in accordance with the supreme dictates of the Moral Law. It is not a question of coercion; it is a case of proper leadership. Some men are born to be hammers; some—and these the greater part—to be anvils; and the molten mass of human thought and activity must be wrought out by the hammers on the anvils of common life. That is not the doctrine made popular by the French Revolutionists; but truth and wisdom are not peculiar to these "doctrinaires." Plato saw things in clearer fashion; and so have many since Plato's day. Our duty, primarily, is to see that every one has a fair chance in running the race that is set before him; and that those who by aptitude or circumstance excel their fellows in knowledge, wisdom, and energy, are placed in a position where they may exercise these powers for the benefit of the world at large.

The nineteenth century, writes the High Master of Manchester Grammar

School, with all its brilliant achievement in scientific discovery and increase of production, was spiritually a failure. Why? The writer assigns the reason to the fact that "the great forces that move mankind were out of touch with one another and furnished no mutual support." That is, partially at any rate, true. But what are these great forces? Primarily (and ultimately) moral and *religious*. A generation that has forgotten to include God in its educational schemes is not likely to be successful in the spiritual sphere; nor ought it to be. And, if the spiritual sphere is depleted of its vital force, we must expect that the whole body politic will suffer proportionally. Have we not seen this in the recent past? Do we not witness its results to-day? People complain of the lack of sympathy existing between Capital and Labour, for example; of the constantly recurring phenomenon of disastrous strikes; of the evils of overcrowding, and ill housing; of drunkenness and licentiousness: all these things are rightly to be deplored; but do we look for the true remedy? To read some of these essays, one might be tempted to suppose that the teaching of poetry in our national schools, the establishment of art galleries for the workers, or the growing enthusiasm begot by scientific advances, would of themselves cure the hurt, and lead towards the amelioration of mankind. Nothing could be further from the truth. Instill into the minds and hearts of the young the great fundamental lessons that God wills the righteousness of His children; that He desires their happiness, not their degradation, but such happiness as can come only by ready obedience to His laws; that the Gospel of earthly getting-on and quick success in life is so much druff beside that other older Gospel of the renewed heart and the uplifted spirit,—well, *then* you will have taught them the "one thing needful"; and all other blessings will flow naturally from such an ideal as from a ceaseless spring.

There are really some excellent things in this book—which, for many reasons, we may gladly commend to every teacher in the land—but, with the exception of the Head Master of Wellington's useful paper on "Religion at School," there is far too little stress laid throughout on the teaching that should be dominant. Compared with this, *nothing else matters*. In our generation perhaps Ruskin alone saw all that was implied in any education that could justly deserve the name. Depend upon it, unless we make God, and His religion, the basis of our morality—whether at school, or in the counting-house, or in Parliament, or in Trades Union conferences—we shall be going the way of all those who elaborately build a pyramid on its apex. That we have not made God our primal care in the past is only too evident, and the fruits of our neglect are (or should be) pretty patent even to the thoughtless. The whole of this war is due to our grievous neglect; and the terrible thing is less God's judgment on the guilty nations, as our own judgment on ourselves. "Ephraim is turned to his idols; let him alone." Fearful words! Shall we, late and at last, understand wherein the true education—the education of the whole man, body, soul *and* spirit—really consists? If so, well and good: the war will not have been fought in vain if it turns the nations to the Living God Who desires for His own "a wise and an understanding people," not a people immersed in petty cares, petty ambitions, and petty cash. But if not, the doom of the nations that forsake Him is certain, and perhaps imminent. Let us see to it that, in educating our young people—the future hope of our race—we begin at the right end. Seek ye *first* the kingdom of God, and His righteousness, and then—*and not till then*—all things needful (literature, art, joy in the innocent things of the world, peace and prosperity) will be added unto you.

E. H. BLAKENEY.

AN EXCELLENT HANDBOOK TO EARLY CHURCH HISTORY.

AN INTRODUCTION TO EARLY CHURCH HISTORY. Being a Survey of the Relations of Christianity and Paganism in the Early Roman Empire. By R. Martin Pope, M.A. London: *Macmillan & Co.* 4s. 6d. net.

An excellent handbook to Early Church History has been provided by Mr. Martin Pope in this new volume.

The work is intended for students and others who desire to possess a compact statement of the main features of the historical process of the acceptance of Christianity as an imperial religion. No attempt is made to survey in detail either the history of the Empire or the history of the Church during that period. Instead, there is given a series of impressions, by means of which the chief factors of the historical process are elucidated.

The historical work has been thoroughly done. It is manifestly based upon very wide reading, and full advantage has been taken of recent research. The ground is quite adequately covered, and the prospective reader may be assured that, in these sketches, he will find a reliable guide to the period. The volume, small as it is, suggests the lines upon which a closer study may proceed, and indicates the authorities, patristic and otherwise, for a wider inquiry.

A few extracts will be sufficient to arouse the reader's interest and to send him to the book itself. Concerning the growth of Episcopacy, Mr. Pope writes :—

"With the passing of the apostles, or apostolic men, the administrative headship of the church tended to become vested in a leading presbyter, to whom the title 'bishop' (*episcopus*) was given, though originally this term had been used interchangeably with presbyter. Nowhere in the New Testament do we find anything corresponding with this type of monarchical bishop. The evidence for the development is afforded by the writings of Ignatius, and in the age of the Antonines the supremacy of the bishop is everywhere to be found: while certain functions originally performed by bishops or presbyters were now formally assigned to deacons" (page 24).

And again (page 76) :—

"Local congregations would tend to fall into groups—as we see in the Pauline epistles, e.g. the churches of the Lycus—and where a large city was situated in a neighbourhood with surrounding churches a certain prominence would attach to the person of its bishop. Hence, in the second century we have signs of the process by which the bishop of a capital city in a province became a 'metropolitan' with supremacy over the other bishops. . . . The metropolitan constitution of the episcopacy paved the way to the imperial, whereby the bishop of Rome became 'the bishop of bishops' (*episcopus episcoporum*) as Tertullian names him."

The traditional theory of apostolical succession is criticized, in the words of the late Bishop of Hereford, as "resting on no scriptural or historic foundation."

Cyprian's views are very pointedly, though not unjustly, summed up by Mr. Pope :—

"He expounded a severely sacerdotal view of the ministry and sacraments, and so advanced the catholicizing tendency which had been steadily growing within the pale of the Christian community towards the end of the second century. No salvation outside the Church—was in effect Cyprian's view. . . . Though no one can doubt the saintliness of his character, yet Gwatkin hits the mark when he pronounces that Cyprian's general conception of religion is more heathen than Christian. In the ecclesiastical sense he was the first High Churchman of the Christian Church. . . . Historically, he is the predecessor of Augustine and the Latin conception of the Church" (pp. 98-99).

On the supposed influence of the Mystery Religions upon Christianity, Mr. Pope writes:—

"As a matter of fact, St. Paul never uses the word "mystery" to describe either baptism or the eucharist. His mysteries are truths or doctrines or spiritual facts to be declared: they are not external rites. . . . There is no suggestion of a magical or semi-physical mediation of purifying grace, such as is implied in the mysteries of Eleusis, Cybele, or Isis: and though we discover in the terminology of St. Paul resemblances to the language used by our available authorities in relation to the psychology and ritual of mystery religions, underlying all his thought and its specific expression there is a lofty ethical and inward ideal, a conception of personal surrender to a historical Redeemer, the Lord who has become the Saviour-Spirit, which differentiates the whole atmosphere of Christianity from the nebulous and elusive promises of spiritual elevation held out to the initiate by the mysteries of mythical redeemer-gods" (pp. 43-44).

Some idea of Mr. Pope's judgments will have been imparted by these extracts. While conscious of his immense indebtedness to historians and scholars, Mr. Pope has preserved an independent outlook. It is evident that Gwatkin has greatly influenced him; and it is interesting to note how he constantly keeps a critical eye on Gibbon. We like the chapter on Early Interpreters and Defenders of Christianity, though we are disappointed with the four bare lines given to the *Octavius* of Minucius Felix. We do not quite like the classification of Marcion. In the account of Monasticism, all reference to Pachomius need not have been omitted. The conspectus of authorities, given in one of the appendices, is very useful.

With the style in which this book is written we are not altogether pleased. While some parts are well written, the workmanship of other parts varies in a most tantalizing manner. The printer may possibly have to be blamed for the statement that Josephus "died about 100, six years before he published his *Jewish Antiquities*"; but, scattered throughout the book, there appear irritating deficiencies of punctuation and also a troublesome faulty construction of sentences. But, apart from these minor defects, the work deserves a most hearty welcome.

W. D. S.

THE "CATHOLIC" SCHOOL AND THE LAITY.

THE PLACE OF THE LAITY IN THE CHURCH. By the Rev. Dr. Sparrow Simpson, the Rev. G. Bayfield Roberts, Mr. Gordon Crosse and the Rev. N. P. Williams. London: *Robert Scott*. 3s. net.

This is one of the latest additions to the series of "Handbooks of Catholic Faith and Practice," and theologically it is of the same colour as most of the others, some of which have already been reviewed in these columns.

In a chapter on the position of the laity in the early Church Dr. Sparrow Simpson crosses swords with Dr. Gore and lays down the proposition that "the Church is a monarchy, not a democracy." "It is," he says, "a kingdom which is governed by a divinely appointed hierarchy. To that hierarchy our Lord, Prophet, Priest, and King, delegated the ministerial exercise of His prophetic, priestly and regal powers." In the face of this bold pronouncement it is not surprising to find him challenging Dr. Gore's contention that "there is in the pages of the New Testament evidence of the co-ordination of the laity with the clergy in the regulation of the affairs of the Church," and he disposes summarily of the examples the Bishop gives, characterizing them as "somewhat unconvincing"—he regards them as "very slender" proofs. But what shall we say of Mr. Roberts' dictum that "our Lord designated the hierarchy as the sole ministerial depositaries of His regal, priestly and prophetic powers. Nowhere had He indicated the

laity"? It is impossible to read Mr. Roberts' essay without feeling that his conception of the Church is very different from that expressed in Article XIX. Even the Bishop of Gloucester in his work on the Articles goes no further than to observe that Episcopacy is "merely an allowable form of Church government." But Mr. Roberts divides the Church into two parts. "The hierarchy," he says, "is one part of the Church; the laity another." So the Godly layman, who dreams of having a share in the government of the Church, will find here no sympathy or encouragement, but is met by the bald statement that it is "contrary to Christ's institution." But there is a very definite reason for this strenuous opposition to the admission of the laity into the councils of the Church. It is a reason which constantly influences Anglo-Catholics—there ever before their eyes the mirage of reunion with Rome, and Mr. Roberts says—"The scheme, if adopted, will slam the door in the face of any future project for reunion with either Eastern or Latin Christianity."

Judging by the chapter on *Newman's essay on consulting the laity*, Mr. Roberts is more Pro-Roman than the famous ecclesiastic, who believed in the *consensus fidelium*. The essay in question, which is of considerable interest and importance, appeared in *The Rambler* in 1859, and the outline of its contents will be welcome to readers who would find it difficult to procure a copy of that ill-fated journal. It was Newman's views on this subject (among others) which led Mgr. Talbot to describe him as "the most dangerous man in England."

A chapter is given up to the history of the Synodical system adopted by the Church of Scotland, and from it we learn that the late Bishop John Wordsworth, of Salisbury, held views practically identical with those of Bishop Gore. Notwithstanding his advocacy, the laity were allowed no place in the Church's Synods. All the writers stand committed to the most approved Catholic views of the Episcopate, but these have been shown by scholars of repute to be based on false premises; indeed Bishop Lightfoot demolished the whole superstructure long ago. It is significant that the "Proposals of the Archbishops' Committee on the relations of Church and State," when tested by what Mr. Williams calls "Catholic principles," pass muster in the main. We believe that these proposals demand more consideration than the great body of Central Churchmen have yet given to them.

THE CALL TO WITNESS.

VISION AND VOCATION; or, Every Christian called to be a Prophet or Witness for Christ. With special reference to the present crisis. By the Rt. Rev. J. Denton Thompson, D.D., Bishop of Sodor and Man. London: Robert Scott. 3s. 6d. net.

The Bishop of Sodor and Man is well known as a preacher and writer who invariably "touches the spot." He is a vigorous thinker, whose utterances are courageous and candid, and in the latest volume of his addresses he lays his finger, we think, upon the weakest spot in our modern Church life and emphasizes the call to witness for Christ,—a duty devolving upon the laity as well as the clergy. To the former he appeals, at the outset, for "a wider recognition of their responsibility to the Lord and the Church, and for a fuller development of their gifts and powers both for edification and evangelization." That there is need for such a call to witness, no one can doubt. (There is too great a tendency nowadays for our lay-folk to think they can leave the work of testifying for Christ to the official representatives of what is called organized religion. The need, "present and prospective," is for witnesses duly qualified by vision. Taking the Vision

of Isaiah as a basis for study, the Bishop shows how such a vision must inevitably issue in vocation. Models of careful homiletic arrangement, these addresses are characterized by virility and lucidity and we commend them more especially to the attention of the younger clergy as examples of sane and scriptural exposition,—the kind of preaching of which we have unfortunately far too little.

S. R. C.

“ THE MORNING COMETH ”

WATCHMAN, WHAT OF THE NIGHT? By R. H. Malden. London: *Macmillan & Co., Ltd.* 5s. net.

Mr. Malden has in his watching as a naval chaplain found time and opportunity to think. He has had experience as a parochial clergyman and head of a clergy school as well as an examining chaplain. He surveys the state of the Church theologically and ecclesiastically with a view to reconstruction after the war. He frankly tells us that he does not desire to provide a programme but to survey the situation, and he has much to say that will provoke dissent as well as win approval. His honesty is evident on every page. He endeavours to draw a coherent picture by giving us his frank reflections and if at times he seems to be limited by his preconceived ideals and anxious to discover a sound basis for them he is alive to the other side of the question. No school of Churchmanship will wholly endorse his verdict. Evangelicals will find him one of the most forceful critics of the Principal Service movement, and will be surprised to discover that, while he rejects Apostolical Succession, he holds a sacerdotal view of the Ministry. Friends and critics of his conception of Episcopacy will be struck by his contention that our present plan for making Bishops is the one that best fulfils the theory that lies at the root of his view that the Bishop represents the laity in an especial manner.

Apart from these and other points, all will be impressed by his desire to bring the Church to a fuller recognition of the place of the Holy Spirit in all sound Christian teaching. “ The Church considered as a society apart from the Holy Spirit is not a very inspiring object to contemplate. Frankly it is no more than a semi-political institution with a remarkably chequered history. “ Individually and collectively we can never attain the breath of life until we give to the Life-Giver more of the place which should be His as Lord of our thoughts, our hearts and our worship.” We have read the entire book with an interest that increased as we somehow came nearer to the heart of a man who honestly faces difficulties and wishes to do all in his power to help his brother churchmen to greater consecration to the Head of the Church. That is the real charm of the sustained earnestness of the volume, which was not written for publication.

