

# 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](https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_churchman_os.php)

# THE CHURCHMAN

July, 1925

## NOTES AND COMMENTS.

### *The Final Stages of Prayer Book Revision.*

THE revision of the Prayer Book is drawing near to its closing stages. The general effect of the changes adopted has become more clearly recognized. The result is a development in appreciation on all sides of the significance of the proposals adopted, and a consequent warmth of feeling on the part of their supporters and opponents. This was to be expected. As the general tendency of the changes pointed more and more to a movement in the Romeward direction, it was natural that those who objected to this process should express their objections more definitely and directly. It was equally natural that those who looked upon the changes as a victory for the cause for which they had long contended should be prepared to defend their gains more vigorously. The issues have become so clear that even the most indifferent Churchman cannot plead ignorance of them. The final stages before us seem to involve a fierce contest, and those who have seemed so near success in securing the adoption of their teaching and ritual are not likely to abate their claims though they involve the Church in the bitterness of party strife.

### *Neither Geneva nor Rome.*

The issue really is the maintenance of the historical character of the Church of England. There are two widely different conceptions of Christianity. They have in the past for convenience been associated in a general way with Geneva and Rome. There are many intervening stages between the extreme Reformed and the ultramontane ideals. The Church of England has for nearly four centuries

been definitely among the Reformed Churches. In the earlier period succeeding the Reformation the connection with the foreign reformers was close, and the sympathy strong. With Laud a new phase began, yet the Caroline divines were as definitely Protestant as their predecessors. Even the Non-Jurors, with their high doctrine of the Church, were strongly opposed to the Church of Rome and its claims. The great Evangelical movement of the eighteenth century was strongly on the side of the Reformation. The earlier Tractarians were also opposed to Rome, but many of them did not appreciate the tendencies latent in their teaching. These are now making themselves evident, and have produced a School unknown in the Church of England since the sixteenth century. This looks to Rome for its model. It repudiates the Reformation. It desires to set up an authority apart from the National Church. It aims at a complete change in the religion of which England has been the chief representative for several centuries.

#### A Call to Action.

The claims of this new School to dominate the Church of England have become clear during the process of Prayer Book Revision. The adoption of the alternative forms in the Communion Service, the legalization of the chasuble and the permission of Reservation were steps towards this end. The declaration that Reservation should be allowed for purposes of adoration, and the acceptance by the House of Clergy of the festival of Corpus Christi, under another name, as well as the rejected proposal to adopt the festival of the Assumption of the Virgin, also under another name, finally indicated the ultimate designs of the Movement. The result has been an awakening of Churchpeople hitherto dormant, and an expression of their resistance to such proposals in "A Call to Action," recently issued under the signatures of upwards of 130 Churchpeople of prominent position in the social, political, and educational life of the nation. This is one of the most significant events in the recent history of our Church. It represents a movement on the part of those who have not hitherto been associated with any of the so-called party organizations. It marks the resistance of the "sober, peaceable and truly conscientious Sons of the Church of England" to the attempt to force the doctrine and practice of an alien religion upon our Church.

### The "Catholic" Appeal.

The Call is a clearly worded and moderate document. It deserves careful study on the part of all Churchpeople. After stating the facts to which we have referred, it calls on English Churchmen "to read the signs of the times and rouse themselves from their supine tolerance" in order to save the Church from the disaster which now threatens to overwhelm us. In carefully reasoned statements it shows that the cardinal issue is one of authority. The authority of the Church of England is overridden by an appeal to "the Catholic Church." This is neither the Roman Church, nor the Greek Church, but a "nebulous something which is not represented by any community." It means ultimately that the "Anglo-Catholics" are claiming to be a law unto themselves, and as a result they have introduced—each following his own fancy—miscellaneous rites gleaned from various ages and countries. These have no authority from "the undivided Church before 1054." The darkest period in the history of European Christianity gives them some support in their cult of the Madonna and the Saints. But compulsory auricular confession, the festival of Corpus Christi, the exposition and extra-liturgical adoration of the Host are of later date, and they have even adopted some of the extravagances of modern continental Catholicism.

### The Historic Character of our Church.

The Call emphasizes the comprehensive character of the Church of England. It is Evangelical in its assertion of the soul's direct communion with God through Christ, and Catholic in its maintenance of the Ministry and Sacraments. It is able to enrich its faith with the truths gained from the study of science and history, while restraining extravagances of speculation by a steadfast appeal to Scripture. A clear statement is given of the position of our Church, as standing "upon the principles of the Reformation, putting truth before tradition and testing later developments by the standard of New Testament teaching." It is the main position of our Church which is challenged by the attempt to restore Mariolatry, the Mass, and the control of the priest over conscience. The majority of Churchpeople, however widely they differ on minor points, desire to maintain the historic character of the Church. The Call closes with a stirring appeal: "If Englishmen wish to enjoy the privileges of their historic Church, they must show the spirit of their forefathers, who

made it what it is. They must awake from their torpor ; they must care more for truth than for peace ; they must waive lesser differences and unite in defence of basic principles." This appeal will meet with a hearty response from all loyal Churchpeople and all other lovers of freedom and truth.

#### "The Times" on Anglo-Catholicism.

The Call to Action has made a profound impression both by its carefully reasoned and moderate expression of views, and by the position, weight and learning of its signatories. The only reply that has so far been made to it on the part of the Anglo-Catholics is to question the inclusion of the name of Colet among representatives of the comprehensive character of our Church—a detail of little significance. It has received widespread notice in the Press. *The Times* devoted a remarkable leading article to its support, and condemned the spirit and method of Anglo-Catholicism in vigorous terms. It described the supporters of Anglo-Catholicism as "a determined and well-organized group, recklessly set upon transforming the outward face of the English Church after the pattern of a supposed 'Catholicism,'" and spoke of "their complete failure to put forward any intelligible theory of what they mean by Catholicism," while they display a total absence of the Catholic virtues of "obedience and respect for constituted authority." Of their claim that "obedience was only to be rendered in so far as the Bishops themselves obey the Catholic Church," it says: "It is impossible to characterize such an attitude in rational terms at all."

Such condemnation from the leading organ of the Press in the country ought to make people realize the extent and significance of the law-defying methods of this section of the Church.

#### "Ecclesiastical Bolshevism."

There are however still stronger terms of condemnation which ought to receive the widest publicity, for they describe the position exactly. Those who think in the way just described "are fanatics who know what they want, and are determined to get it, at whatever cost to the body to which they belong, with cynical forgetfulness of the obligations they have undertaken and recklessly indifferent to the complete absence of justification in tradition or history for their subversive methods. If this is really Anglo-Catholicism, then Anglo-Catholicism is sheer ecclesiastical Bolshevism." This is

the simple and appalling truth of the present situation in the Church. The spirit of Bolshevism is at work and will produce as devastating havoc in English religion as the same spirit has produced in the organized life of Russia. Constant appeals are made—and apparently without effect—to the more moderate Anglo-Catholics “to separate themselves from those who desire to wreck the ship by persistent and organized mutiny.” At a time when morality in every sphere requires to be strengthened, a section of the English Church is showing itself recklessly careless of solemn promises and obligations, the very foundation of any form of corporate life. In the name of one particular theory of authority they are hastening disaster to the great safeguard of English character and progress, and bringing the Church to chaos. A terrible responsibility rests on those who are acting in this way.

#### The Facts of the Situation.

Of the correspondence in the papers to which the Call has given rise, it is impossible to give here any adequate account. The silence of the Anglo-Catholic leaders is significant. They have made no attempt to repudiate the extremists. They know that their appeal to an authority outside the Church of England does not bear examination, for the clergy took their orders in the Church with their eyes open to the facts, and made their solemn promise of obedience with that knowledge. Some of the Anglo-Catholics have raised the cry of persecution, and refer to the days of the Public Worship Regulation Act, and its failure to restrain the advance of their party. The maintenance of order is a primary duty in any institution, and in the Church it rests ultimately upon the Bishops. It is absurd to speak of persecution in regard to the preservation of the known constitution of an organization from which members can withdraw if they are dissatisfied. As to the P.W.R. Act, it is a matter of profound regret that imprisonment should have been the punishment assigned for the clergy who disobeyed it. It gave opportunity to the rebels to cry persecution. If suspension and deprivation had been the punishment of the recalcitrant clergy; their places would have been filled, and they would have been left to their fate. The Church would thus have been freed from the rebellious elements; its true character and due comprehensiveness would have been maintained, and its legitimate development would have been fostered.

### Letters from Two Bishops.

Some of the Bishops have, however, expressed their views on the situation—notably the Bishop of Winchester in a long letter in *The Times*. He wrote “not indeed to attack or to defend the document,” but to point out that in his opinion “the great body of Anglo-Catholics are honest men loyal to their Mother Church,” and that “they have an assured position in our Church life,” yet he says that the more extreme wing is somewhat in the position of an army which by forced marches has made a swift advance and not paid sufficient attention to its communications with the base. This he infers is due to “the chaotic conception of authority in the Church.” He goes on to suggest that the controversies of the sixteenth century are out of date and that there must be a new synthesis. Sir Thomas Inskip recently pointed out that these controversies are as little out of date as those of the first century. The Bishop of Durham took the Bishop of Winchester severely to task. “What is he driving at?” he asks. It is not his optimism that lies most open to criticism but his irrelevance. Dr. Henson gets to the heart of the situation when he points out that “Some of the Anglo-Catholics . . . do not acknowledge the authority of the Church of England, and announce in advance their determination not to accept its decisions.” That is the point the Bishop of Winchester does not face. The Bishop of Durham says truly: “The system of English religion is being changed almost beyond recognition, and the fact that the revision of the Prayer Book is actually proceeding has proved an excellent plea for allowing the innovations to advance unhindered.”

### The Election to the House of Laity.

It is obvious that the electors to the House of Laity have recognized the serious nature of the situation. They have shown that they are determined to put a stop to the use of Prayer Book revision as a means of revolutionizing the worship of the Church. The election has considerably altered the character of the House. A number of the most prominent Anglo-Catholics have lost their seats. It has been stated that the Evangelical representation has been increased by upwards of sixty-five per cent, and that the Moderates, who are in general agreement with the Evangelical representatives on the subject of revision, have also largely increased in numbers, so that together they constitute considerably more than half the

House. This is an excellent result, and we hope that the new members will make their influence felt from the outset in securing the maintenance of the true teaching and worship of the Church. We are not opposed to the enrichment of our Prayer Book, or to its adaptation to the needs of to-day. We are in favour of greater elasticity, and we should welcome heartily any changes that would enable us to approach our fellow-Christians in the Free Churches of England, and enable them and us together to join in the fellowship of common worship. The changes so far in our Prayer Book have only served to alienate them, and to make us the laughing-stock of Romanists, who sneer at the attempts of our Church Assembly to adopt their rites.

#### Unity of Action.

The chief need of the moment on the part of Evangelical and Moderate Churchpeople is unity. There can be no doubt that the Anglo-Catholics will make every effort to produce division in the ranks of those opposed to them. They are adepts at devices of this kind and unfortunately Evangelical Churchmen only too frequently in the past have succumbed to their wiles. By flattery or threats, by accusations of inconsistency and of associating with the unorthodox, by some means or other, they will endeavour to divide the majority, which if united will defeat their schemes. It is of the utmost importance that the Evangelical representatives in the House should be prepared for these efforts. It is also essential that they should be on their guard against votes being taken when the Anglo-Catholics think they can snatch a victory in the House. Regular and constant attendance throughout the sessions will be necessary during the debates on revision.

#### The Unity of Evangelicals.

The present occasion emphasizes also the need of unity among Evangelical Churchmen. The future of religion in England depends largely now upon the action of the Evangelical School. It is a subject which demands the most prayerful consideration. No Evangelical of any section should allow personal considerations or personal prejudices to stand in the way of unity. The differences between the various sections of the Evangelical School are not so great as those between them all and the sacerdotal party. The quarrels between the members of a family are often the most difficult to settle, very



largely because no one will take the first step. The Conference at Cheltenham showed that the Committee arranging the gathering were sincerely anxious to provide some method of harmonious working. We hope that their efforts will meet with the happy success which they deserve and for which in the interests of the religious life of the country we earnestly pray.

#### Dean Wace House.

Dean Wace House in Wine Office Court off Fleet Street has been opened as the Headquarters of the National Church League, and its useful adjunct the Church Book Room. It is also intended to make provision for the accommodation of various Evangelical organizations requiring a meeting place, and as a Rendezvous where Evangelical Churchpeople can arrange to meet, or write letters, or hold interviews. The building is well adapted to its purpose, and will as time goes on prove increasingly useful in the development of all that is associated with Evangelical teaching and organization. To maintain Evangelicalism strong in all parts of the country is essential for the future of our Church's work both at home and overseas, and Dean Wace House will prove a valuable centre for all such efforts.

#### The Cheltenham Conference Papers.

The present number of *THE CHURCHMAN* has been enlarged in order to give our readers the opportunity of studying the papers at the recent Cheltenham Conference. These papers are written by representatives of the various sections of the Evangelical School. They serve several important purposes. They are important statements on the great fundamental principles of Christianity as interpreted by members of the Church of England who are proud to describe themselves as Evangelical. They also serve to show that amid diversity of opinion on matters of secondary importance there is unity on the basic principles of the Divinity of our Lord, the authority of Holy Scripture and the reality of the Atonement. We look for a great united movement in the proclamation of the Evangel as a result of the Conference, and we congratulate the conveners on the success of the gathering.

---

## JUSTIFICATION BY FAITH.

BY THE REV. C. SYDNEY CARTER, M.A., Litt.D.

THERE is a dictum with which we are all familiar—"The Church to teach, the Bible to prove," and if we apply *this* to the subject of justification by faith I suppose there is no question that the authoritative standards of our Church's teaching on it are to be found in *Article XI*, with its special reference to the "Homily of Justification," by which title is undoubtedly intended the "Homily of Salvation." To this Homily, as well as to the Article, as Bishop Harold Browne declares, "every one signing the Articles has virtually assented," as "setting forth" "doctrine agreeable to God's Word." But except to remind ourselves that the Homily of Salvation by its appeal to the Fathers, and "ancient authors" in support of the doctrine of justification by faith, at once disproves any novel theory that this doctrine is only a sixteenth-century invention, I intend to attack this vast subject by way of "Bible proof" rather than from "Church teaching."

It is as well perhaps to commence by defining our terms. Justification is a Law Court term which in everyday, as well as in theological parlance, deals with *acquittal* or *vindication*, the declaring of a person just or righteous in the eyes of the law or at the judgment seat of a righteous God. It has a fuller meaning than pardon, for it implies being "made right," or as our Article puts it, being "accounted righteous before God."

Faith, again, is a term which both in Scripture and in general use stands for *reliance* or *trust* in a person, or thing which is in itself *trustworthy*. It involves the idea of confidence in *something unknown*, or which is not visible. For instance, we place reliance on a footbridge by walking over it, not because we can absolutely see that it will bear our weight, but because we have faith to believe in its sufficient strength. Faith may involve courage, but it does not include *merit*. "By" does not mean "on account of," but, as the Latin of our Article tells us, "through." It would be more correct, therefore, to talk of justification *through* faith than *by* faith. We are justified *by* Christ. We are justified, says Hooker, "not

for the worthiness of our *belief*, but for the *worthiness* of *Him* who is believed."

It is impossible to deal with the Bible teaching on Justification, on "being accounted righteous before God" through faith, without touching on the deep and mysterious subject of the *death of Christ*, and its relation to man's sin and salvation, for we are declared and accounted righteous before God on account of the *merits* of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ. Justification is the application to the individual soul of the benefits of Christ's Atonement. It puts the soul into a right attitude and standing in God's sight. As I hinted just now we must be careful not to confuse justification with mere pardon. A criminal may be *pardoned* but he is not thereby *justified*. Justification is a state by which we are permanently put into a right relationship with God. We shall *repeatedly* need to seek God's *pardon* and *forgiveness*. Our Lord emphasizes this important distinction when He says: "He that is bathed, i.e., justified, needs not save to wash his feet, i.e., forgiveness" (St. John xiii. 10). When analysed therefore the difference between justification and pardon is almost as distinct as that between justification and sanctification. As the "judicious" Hooker concisely expresses it: "The righteousness whereby we are justified is perfect but not inherent; that whereby we are sanctified is inherent but not perfect." And as he further explains it: "The righteousness wherein we must be found if we will be justified is *not our own*, therefore we cannot be justified by any *inherent* quality" (*Works*, II., 603-6, 1850). Our Homily emphasizes this point in declaring that "Justification is the *office of God only*, and is not a thing which we *render* unto Him, but which we receive of Him, not which we give to Him, but which we take of Him by His free mercy" (2nd part).

Now the ideas of substitution, and of imputation of righteousness, and of vicarious penalty are of course familiar to all of us in connection with Christ's death and our justification. The question is, do they rest on a solid Scriptural foundation? I think there is abundant evidence in the New Testament to show that the *death of Christ* has a *direct* and not merely an *indirect bearing on the justification of man*. The ground of our justification is always associated with Christ's death. St. Paul tells us that "we are justified in His blood," and that we are reconciled to God "through

the death of His Son" (Rom. v. 8-10). God "justifies us freely by His grace" because Christ has been set forth as a *ἱλαστήριον* "through faith in His blood" (Rom. iii. 25). Now propitiation must involve some idea of anger to be appeased, or of favour to be conciliated, and here it is undoubtedly *God* who is to be propitiated, and this propitiation is accomplished, according to Scripture, by Christ making our sin and death to be His, so that His life and righteousness may be imputed unto us. And this is made operative through faith. "Faith," as Bishop Hopkins of Derry (1675) puts it, "is the marriage bond between Christ and the believer, and therefore all the debts of the believer are chargeable upon Christ and the righteousness of Christ is installed upon the believer." It is difficult to see how we can exclude the idea of imputed righteousness when we are distinctly told by St. Peter, "Who Himself bare our sins in His own body on the tree, that we being dead unto sin might live unto righteousness" (1 Peter ii. 24). Or again when St. Paul tells us plainly that "God made Him to be sin for us, who knew no sin, that we might be made the righteousness of God in Him" (2 Cor. v. 21). As St. Augustine paraphrased it: "Delicta nostra sua fecit ut justitiam suam nostram justitiam faceret" (on Ps. xxi. 3, *Op.*, Tom. iv, par. 1, c. 95, Paris, 1681). Hooker, commenting on this passage, declares, "Christ has merited righteousness for as many as are found in Him." "Such," God "accepts in Jesus Christ as perfectly righteous as if he had fulfilled the whole Law" (*Works*, II., p. 606). That great saint and scholar, Bishop Handley Moule, in speaking of this doctrine of imputed righteousness, puts it, I think, concisely when he says that "Christ *for* me must be my peace with God, Christ *in* me is the very flower and splendour of the Gospel" (*Justification by Faith*, p. 46). In other words, the one is the foundation of our peace (justification); the other is the basis of our purity (sanctification).

The cumulative evidence, both in the Old Testament teaching through types and prophecy, as well as in many New Testament passages, to the fact that the *death of Christ has a direct and unique relationship to man's justification is very strong*, but I can do little more than touch on it. "All things which were written in the law of Moses and the prophets and in the psalms concerning me" must be fulfilled, said Our Lord, and He explained that the chief of these "all things" was "Thus it behoved Christ to suffer . . . that

repentance and remission of sins should be preached in His name " (Luke xxiv. 46). We may safely say that it was to Him and His one great sacrifice and satisfaction for the sins of the whole world, that the Old Testament sacrifices pointed. It was of Him and of His sacrificial work that the Old Testament prophets spoke. I would, however, like to observe in passing that this evidence does seem to me to point strongly to some idea of *substitution*, i.e., that our justification is due to the fact of Christ dying *in our place*.

In the epistle to the Romans St. Paul is arguing that the death of Christ has satisfied the claims of the Law on the sinner. It has broken our bondage to the law and its condemnation. In the seventh chapter, when using the analogy of the widow freed from the law of marriage through the husband's death, He declares, "Ye are become dead to the law through the body of Christ," i.e. through the death of Christ (*v.* 4). "We are delivered from the law," he adds, *v.* 6, "that being dead wherein we were held." In Christ's being put to death for us *we* have been put to death. His death for us is our death. "One died for (or on behalf of) all," therefore all died (2 Cor. v. 14). As Bishop Christopher Wordsworth puts it, "the Second Adam as the universal proxy of mankind underwent the curse due for disobedience and so liberated us from the law." Or as another commentator expresses it, "The essential points of comparison" (i.e., between the widow freed by the death of her husband and the Christian freed by the death of Christ) "are that we are set free from the law according to the principles of the law, and by the *death* not of ourselves but of *another*" (Beet, *Romans*, p. 98). The whole section teaches us plainly that we are justified through the death of Christ, and the same truth is emphasized by St. Paul to the Colossians: "You hath He now reconciled in the body of His flesh through *death*" (i. 21-2).

But I think if we are to be true to the teaching of Scripture we must advance a step further and say that *Christ's death affects our justification* not merely because it was a crowning act of obedience but *because it was in some real sense a satisfaction for sin, a ransom and a poena vicaria*.

Of course it is true that the sinlessness and obedience of Christ were all necessary to our redemption, and that our justification is in some sense the result of these, but it is not due to the *merit* of them, but to the *merits of Christ's death*. Our ransom—our

expiatory redemption—was only effected by Christ's death, "once in the end of the world hath He appeared to put away *sin* by the *sacrifice* of Himself," i.e. on the Cross (Heb. ix. 26).

As Professor Denney well expresses it: "It is the Atonement which explains the Incarnation. The Incarnation takes place in order that the sin of the world may be put away by the offering of the Body of Jesus Christ (Heb. x. 10). Christ did not come into the world to be a good man. It was not for this that a 'body was prepared for Him.' . . . To preach the love of God out of relation to the death of Christ—or to preach the love of God in the death of Christ, but without being able to relate it to sin—or to preach the forgiveness of sins as the free gift of God's love, while the death of Christ has no special significance assigned to it—is not . . . to preach the gospel at all" (*Death of Christ*, pp. 234, 284).

To appeal, as is sometimes done, to the parable of the Prodigal Son (a story given to illustrate one special aspect of the Divine character) as a proof of a popular doctrine of "forgiveness without atonement" is surely an attempt "to expound one place of Scripture that it be repugnant to another." For to assert that the Incarnation was the sufficient proof which a holy God gave us of His willingness to give a free pardon to repentant sinners and that Christ's death had nothing to do with the grounds of that forgiveness, but was merely the chance work of "wicked men," is to do violence to the whole teaching of Scripture concerning justification and sin, which has created a barrier to our fellowship with God. It is not in Christ's taking our nature upon Him—in the "Word becoming flesh" and dwelling amongst us, that God reveals His love for us and the possibility of our forgiveness, but in His being here "as a propitiation for the sins of the world." God commends His love for us in that Christ *died* for us (Rom. v. 8). Our Church at least makes it quite clear that the purpose of Christ's Incarnation was "to be the Lamb without spot, who by sacrifice of himself, once made, should take away the sins of the world" (Article XV).

I suppose the passage which brings out most fully the ideas of satisfaction, of a ransom and of vicarious punishment as necessary for our justification, is St. Paul's statement in Romans iii. 24-6: "Being justified freely by His grace through the redemption in Christ Jesus, whom God hath set forth to be a propitiation through

faith in His *blood* . . . to declare His righteousness that He might be just and the justifier of him that hath faith in Jesus." Now, however crude and extravagant may have been the patristic theory of a "ransom paid to Satan," there is no doubt that a principal end of the death of Christ was to destroy the power of the devil, "him that hath the power of death" (Heb. ii. 14). There is also little question surely that the "*lutron*" of this redemption was the vicarious death of Christ. As Prof. Goodwin says: "Our Lord's declaration that He gave His life 'a ransom for (*anti*) many' (Matt. xx. 28) really settles the vicarious character of the Atonement. For we may boldly challenge any gainsayer to produce one solitary passage in the whole compass of Greek literature where 'anti' does not involve the sense of ransom" (*Thoughts on Atonement*, p. 48). Or as Dimock, one of the profoundest and most learned of our modern theologians, puts it, "If then it is clear that we have set before us in this passage (Rom. iii. 24) a Divine judicial proceeding by which sinners worthy of death, justly the subjects of condemnation, are justified, and justified for nothing and yet justified justly—and if we are here taught to see this effect as resulting from the death (the blood) of Christ, is it possible that we are not to see here the Divine Atonement made by (in some sort) a poena vicaria?" (*The Death of Christ*, p. 116).

There is one thing further which I think the teaching of Scripture entitles us to say, and that is that if we are to rule out all ideas of imputation, substitution and vicarious penalty from Christ's death, then it is *very difficult indeed* to understand the connection between *that death* and the *justification of man*. These ideas of imputation, substitution and vicarious suffering seem to be written quite clearly on the pages of Scripture and they certainly explain quite simply the close connection between the Cross and justification. For the whole argument and remonstrance of St. Paul to the Galatians for their attempt to turn aside from justification through faith to justification through "the works of the Law," is based on this appeal to Christ's *death*. "Who hath bewitched you that you should not obey the truth before whose eyes Jesus Christ hath been evidently set forth crucified among you?" (Gal. iii. 1). This question necessarily presupposes the direct connection between Christ's death and the sinner's justification, and the Apostle explains this further in v. 13 when he adds, "Christ hath redeemed us from the

curse of the law being made a curse for us"—that is, by undergoing crucifixion. Lightfoot says the expression "being made a curse for us" involves the religious conception of "the victim being regarded as bearing the sins of those for whom Atonement is made. The curse is transferred from them to it. It becomes in a certain sense the impersonation of the sin and of the curse. This idea is very prominent in the scapegoat, Lev. xvi. 5" (*Galatians*, p. 138). "Try if you can," says Dr. Dale, "to remove from this passage (Gal. iii. 10) the idea that Christ endured the penalty of the Law—the curse—in order that those who had transgressed the law might be redeemed from the curse and inherit the promise. Make the Death of Christ an appeal to the hearts and consciences of men, and let there be nothing in it which can be described as a vicarious endurance of penalty, and what becomes of the whole structure of the Apostles' argument?" (*Atonement*, p. 222.) "The wages of sin is death," and to the soul convinced of sin death is an awful reality delivering the soul into the hands of him "who hath the power of death." Our deliverance from the consequences of sin comes through the death of the One who took our nature upon Him and died our death for us—of the One who "by the grace of God tasted death for every man" (Heb. ii. 9). Surely if death is the punishment for sin, and Christ "tasted death for every man," then His death must be the penal consequence of sin? At any rate, we can truly say that the reality of Christ's finished work on the Cross for sin has led men in all ages to sing, "When Thou hadst overcome the sharpness of death Thou didst open the kingdom of heaven to all believers."

It is well perhaps to mention the *moral objections* which are raised against that which, without any exaggeration, *very many* believe to be the Scriptural doctrine of *vicarious suffering*. We are told for instance that it is unjust for the innocent to suffer for the guilty, but as Dr. Dale points out "the voluntary suffering of the innocent for the guilty is one of the loftiest forms of heroism." "Love is stronger and diviner than justice," and even human love delights to suffer for the base and unworthy, and so "if we have to save and serve the unworthy by suffering for them, God has saved and served *us* by suffering for us" (*Christian Doctrine*, p. 251). The penalties for sin are not dependent upon God's threats against it, but upon an irreversible moral Law which condemns all unright-



eousness, and thus although God's *love* for us needed no atonement, yet to free us from the penalties due to our sins in the violation of this eternal moral Law Christ's death was necessary. "Is there any immorality," asks Dale, "any crime to provoke a cry of indignant shame in the resolve of God Himself in the person of Christ to endure suffering instead of inflicting it?"

Again, whatever may be urged on the score of injustice we have in the end to reckon with the fact of the very *definite categorical statements* of the inspired Word of God. For St. Paul gives it as a direct divine revelation "that Christ died for our sins according to the Scriptures" (1 Cor. xv. 3). Or as St. Peter records it, "Who His own self bare our sins in His own body on the tree" (1 Peter ii. 24). Now as Dr. Denney well puts it: "The Apostle does not here raise the question whether it is possible for one to assume the responsibilities of others in this way, he *assumes* (and the assumption is common to all New Testament writers) that the responsibilities of sinful men have been taken on Himself by the sinless Lamb of God. This is not a theorem he is prepared to defend, it is a *gospel he has to preach*" (*Death of Christ*, p. 99). "Let it be counted," says our own Hooker, "folly or frenzy or fury whatsoever, it is our comfort and our wisdom, we care for no knowledge in the world but this, that man hath sinned and God hath suffered, and that God hath made Himself the sin of men and that men are made the righteousness of God" (*Works*, II., p. 606).

There are also two other facts which we must recognize. One is that Christ *did* suffer untold sufferings and that they were certainly *unmerited* sufferings. The second is that sinners *do* merit suffering and that even if they were repentant and were forgiven, their forgiveness is *unmerited*. These facts surely create admitted difficulties in dealing with a righteous God who has allowed them, but are not they in a measure removed when we remember that Christ *voluntarily*, in accordance with His Father's purpose of love, bore the *unmerited* sufferings that we might have the unmerited pardon "That Christ hath once suffered for sins, the just for the unjust to bring us to God" (1 Pet. iii. 18). The Cross of Christ makes it possible for God to forgive sin. As Dr. Griffith Thomas, whose recent death is such a great loss to conservative scholarship, puts it, "The Cross of Christ liberated His love (which sin held back) while maintaining His righteousness." "What His justice demanded His

love provided" (*Catholic Faith*, p. 80), so that through the death of Christ, "God is at once just and the justifier of him that believeth in Jesus" (Rom. iii. 26).<sup>1</sup>

But I suppose that in whatever way we try to explain the justification of man we shall all readily endorse the wise conclusion of Archbishop Magee when he says "the principle or the rationale of the Divine procedure we may not be able fully to explain. Like the permission of sin by a just and holy God, the remedy He has provided for sin may involve mysteries which we cannot fathom. But whatever may have been the reasons for appointing and accepting of the sufferings of Our Lord as a propitiation for the sins of believers, the fact that He has done so is undeniable" (*Atonement*, Diss. XXXVIII., pp. 93-5).

As our Homily states it, "God sent His own Son . . . to fulfil the law for us and by shedding His most precious blood to make a sacrifice and satisfaction or (as it may be called) amends to His Father for our sins. . . . And whereas it lay not in us to do that, He provided a ransom for us. . . . And so the justice of God and His mercy did embrace together and fulfilled the mystery of our redemption" (*Homilies*, p. 17-18).

Justification by faith may very well be summed up in the precise definition of Bishop Moule as "the acceptance of guilty man by the holy God in view of man's reliant acceptance, as his sacrifice of peace, of the Son of God, Jesus Christ, the righteous, the propitiation for our sins, who Himself bare our sins" (*Justification by Faith*, p. 35).

<sup>1</sup> It has been well said that "when the sinner places his confidence in forgiveness *without atonement*, he contradicts the strong conviction of his *conscience*, that sin ought to be punished" (Edwards, *Doctrine of the Atonement*, p. 169.)

---

## BOOKS AND THEIR WRITERS.

THE Bishop of Manchester's Charge at his Primary Visitation, which has been published under the title, *Christ in His Church* (Macmillan & Co., 3s. 6d. net), will be read with great interest. It is not as comprehensive a statement of the teaching and practice of the Church of England as Bishop Headlam's recent Charge, but it is similar in character, and gives an account of the principles underlying the constitution of the Church, of some of the characteristic features of the Church to-day, and of the attitude of the Church to some of the most important of the problems facing the Church in general and the diocese of Manchester in particular. On some of his fundamental points the Bishop is not as clear as many of his readers would desire. The Church, he says, "is the representative, in the historic order, of that infusion of Divine power into human nature which begins with the Divine act of the Incarnation ; and as we conceive the Church, it is a sacramental Body, that is to say, a Body which exists to be the medium of the Divine Spirit. It is not an association together of people who, finding that they are agreed upon certain points, think it desirable to combine in order to propagate their opinions. It is the actual and necessary product of the fact of the Incarnation ; and it is therefore itself, in the ground of its being, as Divine as the Lord Jesus Himself, and it is called His Body." Now this is a beautiful and inspiring conception of the Church, but we are left wondering what particular bodies represent it in the historic order, and why should the term sacramental be applied to it. Elsewhere "sacramental principle" is used in the current fashion, and we are told that the sacramental principle pervades the whole of life, but we find the same inconsistency in the use of the term as seems to be common to all who employ it. In general the sacramental principle is used to signify the use of material things for spiritual purposes. Dr. Temple even warns us against the danger of isolating the Sacraments of the Church from "the holy use of God's material gifts in God's service," yet when we come to the Sacrament of Holy Communion many of these writers introduce a quite new idea of the relation of the spiritual to the material, for the bread and the wine there are regarded as becoming in some way the actual vehicle of the spiritual ; the Divine Presence

is supposed to be located in them either by transubstantiation as in the Roman Church or by some less defined method.

Again, he says in regard to the reservation of the Sacrament that there should be liberty for any individual who so wished, to pray in the Church where the Sacrament is known to be reserved, and yet that our Church should decline altogether any sanction to organized devotions before it. He thinks that "this is the right point at which to draw the line," as it represents the balance of truth maintained by our Church. With all respect to the Bishop we cannot forget that our Church has definitely forbidden reservation, and it is difficult to imagine that the practice will be thus restricted once reservation and private devotion are sanctioned; and as to the balance of truth, if the presence of Christ is sought in the heart of the believer (in Hooker's phrase) there will be an end of any desire to reserve the elements for any purpose of worship. The elements will be regarded in their true light as symbols, the only view that is in real harmony with the sacramental principle as enunciated by its exponents.

---

Canon Storr's *The Living God* (Hodder & Stoughton, Ltd., 5s. net) is one of the most useful books recently published. The Archbishop of Canterbury's warm commendation in the Foreword is well deserved. We can never escape from the great fundamental truth that our religion depends ultimately upon our conception of God. It is therefore essential to get as near the truth as finite man can in his endeavours to approach the Infinite. Canon Storr suggests the line of thought to be followed in such an endeavour, and carries his reader along with approving consent as he builds up his case point by point. Starting from the existence of God and the difficulties of the position of the atheist, he examines the various ways in which God makes Himself known to man, and the character of God as thus made known. Most of the problems that are raised to-day, and especially those which are felt by earnest and truth-seeking people, are sympathetically considered. For the benefit of preachers I may add that there is the making of many sermons in these studies of the being of God, not the least important of which would be those to be derived from the careful consideration of what is said about the suffering and the severity of God.

---

*The Progress of Prophecy*, by W. J. Farley, M.A., B.D. (R.T.S., 6s. net), will be read with great pleasure by Bible students. It more than fulfils its aim of being "a study of Hebrew prophecy in its historical development." The treatment is necessarily brief, but the salient features are set out so clearly that the work of the prophets is conveyed to the reader in vivid and enduring outlines. There may be differences of opinion upon points of detail, but there will be general agreement on the author's conception of prophecy, and his interpretation of the prophetic messages. His account of the historical setting is specially helpful. Since Sir G. Adam Smith's books on the prophets, we have learned to appreciate how much can be learnt in this way, and Mr. Farley makes full use of the history. But the usefulness of the book extends beyond what I have so far suggested. There are notes and appendices on many points such as the use of particular words, the meaning of a covenant, the offices of Christ, which are specially valuable and give useful guidance in the interpretation of the Old Testament. It is a book that students will delight to use, and preachers will find help in it for the preparation of their sermons. Take as one example—the account of Ezekiel. There is sufficient in it to give the background of a good sermon on the prophet and his work.

---

The Rev. J. K. Mozley's work on the Atonement is well known. It is a book valued by students. In his latest volume, *The Heart of the Gospel* (S.P.C.K., 5s. net), he returns to the subject in the reprint of a series of articles which have appeared elsewhere, and addresses delivered on various occasions. For him this is the heart of the Gospel, and he treats it from the point of view which is regarded as essentially Evangelical, although he makes allowance for the criticisms and tendencies of modern thought. "There is," he says, "something which we can by no means afford to give up in the old ideas of the satisfaction which He made to God, and of the penalty of sin which He took upon Himself." Among the other essays is a warm tribute to Dr. P. T. Forsyth, to whom the volume is dedicated in grateful and affectionate remembrance. He speaks of him as occupying a position of almost solitary eminence in the sphere of dogmatics among the theologians of his day. The essay on "The Work of Christ in Modern Theology" is a useful guide to the best recent books on the person and work of our Lord, with which subject

two other essays also deal, answering some of the difficulties raised by modern thought.

---

“ The Living Church ” Series is maintaining the high level of variety and interest which characterized its earlier volumes. One of the latest additions is Canon Lacey’s *The One Body and the One Spirit ; A Study in the Unity of the Church* (James Clarke & Co., 6s. net). It bears two of the outstanding features of all Canon Lacey’s work : cleverness and honesty. He is honestly anxious to win towards the unity of Christendom, and he seeks to lay what he believes will be a solid foundation in proving that the terms used by St. Paul, which the Canon has chosen as the title of his book, are no mere metaphor but represent the reality of the character of the Church. He exercises his immense powers of mental ingenuity in performing various feats of intellectual gymnastics with words and phrases. We are left astonished at his ability and remain unconvinced. Yet with it all he is transparently honest. So much so that he prints along with an essay of his own on the Minimum Conditions of Intercommunion, which appeared in the *Church Quarterly Review*, the reply of Dr. Vernon Bartlett. The effect is that the plain English common sense of the reply makes the elaborate scheme of dialectic, and the casuistical word-play of the Canon seem irrelevant, and sweeps it gently away as of little significance in dealing with the main facts. It has often seemed a pity to us that the Canon’s great mental abilities and erudition should be joined with an almost Puck-like irrelativity to the facts of a situation. He seems to possess some un-English quality of mind which leaves the results of its working without influence on the ordinary reader.

---

Another interesting addition to the series is Dr. Rufus M. Jones’ *The Church’s Debt to Heretics* (James Clarke & Co., Ltd., 6s. net). Those who have studied the heresies in text books for examinations have little idea of the interest which can be derived from them when treated by a master hand. Dr. Jones is already well known as a writer of unusual ability, and his *Studies in Mystical Religion* holds a high place among books on that subject. As the title of the present volume indicates, he has a certain sympathy with some at least of the heretics, and it is probably this which gives his account of them its special attraction. A general view is given of the chief heresies

from Gnosticism down to the time of the Reformation, when heresy in the technical sense ceased, and became, as he says, synonymous with error. He emphasizes the tendency of many of the heretics to promote a spiritual conception of Christianity in opposition to those whose desire was to maintain its institutional character. Many will share his sympathy to this extent as well as his appreciation of the protestant position of Luther and the Reformers as "a proclamation of freedom and a declaration of the right of individual judgment." On some other points, such as his support of Abelard's view of the Atonement, there will not be complete agreement. In spite of the able presentation of that view by several modern writers, there are still many who believe that it does not cover all the facts of that great mystery. To those who desire a fresh outlook upon the chief heretics I cordially recommend Dr. Jones' stimulating account of them.

---

All who are interested in Mysticism will welcome the Rev. Dundas Harford's edition of the *Shewings of Lady Julian of Norwich*, 1373 (H. R. Allenson, Ltd., 3s. 6d. ). This is a new edition of the visions which were formerly published under the title "Comfortable Words for Christ's Lovers." They are from the earliest manuscript, round which there is something of romance, as it was lost for over 150 years and only came to light in 1909 when the British Museum acquired it from Lord Amherst's collection. There are three manuscripts of the visions in addition to this, the Sloane and the Paris, which have been edited by Miss Grace Warrack and Father Tyrrell respectively. These are both much longer than the Amherst MS., and in Mr. Harford's opinion they are expansions of it after twenty years of thought and meditation. In his recent book on the Lady Julian Dr. Thouless accepts this view, although he gives an account of the Shewings as they appear in the longer forms. The appearance of this edition is of special use on account of the revival of interest in Lady Julian and indeed in Mysticism generally. This is not the place to enter on an examination of the character and value of these visions. They are an important example of those mystical visions which have had such a prominent place in religious experience. Mr. Harford is to be congratulated on the success which has attended his careful transcribing and editing of the manuscript.

---

I have read Dr. Major's *Jesus by an Eye-witness* (John Murray, 3s. 6d. net) with the Greek text of St. Mark's Gospel, and have found it of great interest. He helps to make clear the truth of his quotation from Westcott's *Introduction to the Study of the Gospels*—"There is perhaps not one narrative which he (St. Mark) gives in common with St. Matthew and St. Luke to which he does not contribute some special feature," and in many cases these provide material for a better understanding of the whole passage. He also gives sufficient proof of St. Mark being an eye-witness from the character of his writing. He says, "As we read Mark, especially in the Greek, he impresses us as a plain man telling a plain tale. He is direct, simple, artless, almost naïve, but we get the impression that he knows his background thoroughly." Students will find this work a stimulating companion to the study of St. Mark's Gospel.

---

Two University men have set themselves the useful task of issuing a series of "Handbooks of Modern Evangelism." Their aim is to make our present-day evangelistic work more effective than it has been. They believe that the Gospel message has all its old power but it must be presented to modern minds in modern ways. As one of the series, they have issued a volume of model sermons—*The Modern Evangelistic Address* (5s. net). They have secured the help of a number of experienced and successful evangelists, among whom are Canon Hay Aitken, Dr. H. E. Fosdick, Dr. A. Herbert Gray, Mr. J. Chalmer Lyon, Mr. W. Graham Scroggie, Mr. D. P. Thomson, Mr. J. J. Virgo, and Mr. C. Ensor Walters. Each of them has contributed an address, and has prefixed to it a preliminary note explaining his purpose and his method of presenting his message. The Editors have written a general introduction explaining the meaning and importance of Evangelism, and giving a statement of their own position and hopes in the work which they have undertaken. They make clear that by a Modern Address they mean "one adapted to modern requirements, clothed in the language and thought of the twentieth century, couched in terms of common speech, availing itself of contemporary categories and implicit with the recognition of present needs and problems, intellectual and social." Such a volume is a useful contribution to the equipment of the Church to-day. It draws from a wide



circle of experience, and it will give a strong impetus to the much-needed revival of religion for which we all hope and pray and work. The Editors will have widespread support in their endeavour to give new effectiveness to this primary work of the Church.

---

In connection with the publication of *Away from Wellhausen*, which is reviewed on another page, Canon Nolloth gives some interesting particulars in a Prefatory Note. Dean Wace in a letter written shortly before his death told Canon Nolloth of the appearance of Dr. Kegel's "Los von Wellhausen" and said he would get it translated into English. The Canon suggested that Mrs. Nolloth would do it, and submit her translation to the Dean for revision. The Dean was pleased, and the work was sent him in November, when he was about to take part in the Church Assembly discussions on Prayer Book revision. The Canon says, "He took part in the debates with all his old clearness and vigour, but he never recovered from the exhaustion which followed. On December 1 we received his last letter to my wife, conveying his warm approval of her work, and adding that he would go through it more carefully when he had recovered from his fatigue. Alas! recovery was not to be. He slowly sank, and early in January, the grand old warrior-saint—as fine an example of a champion of the Church Militant as England has ever known—passed to his rest." This association of Dean Wace with the bringing out of the book will give it an additional interest in the eyes of many readers.

G. F. I.

---

The Missionary Magazines received during the last quarter show that the various societies appreciate the importance of interesting and well turned out literature. Among a number of first-class articles in *The Church Missionary Review* are two of special authority: "What Uganda owes to Missions," by Bishop Willis, and "Islam in India," by Dr. Zwemer. *The Outlook*, *The Mission Hospital*, *The Round World*, and *Eastward Ho!* are all in their various ways excellent.

The *East and West* also represents a wide circle of Missionary interests. Bishop Lasbrey writes a brief account of the Church in Nigeria, and the Rev. C. E. Tyndale-Biscoe a characteristic narrative under the title: "Christianity and Donkeys."

---

## REVIEWS OF BOOKS.

## THE ANGLICAN REVIVAL.

THE ANGLICAN REVIVAL. Studies in the Oxford Movement by the Rev. Yngve Brilioth, D.Phil. *Longmans Green & Co.* 16s.

We suppose it is right to speak of the Tractarian Movement as the Anglican Revival in contrast to the Evangelical Revival in the eighteenth century. We are not, however, convinced that a movement which found its trend back to Medievalism can be called a Revival of the essential principles of Anglicanism as interpreted by the history of the Church since the Reformation. The Reformers looked backwards—to the Apostolic and Primitive Church—the Tractarians looked backwards to the Medieval Church. Anglicanism has always been progressive—ready to admit new light on Divine Revelation whether discovered in the domain of science or history. The Tractarians based their views on a static conception of the Church, and this proving to the subtle mind of Newman an incomplete conception, he left his friends and propounded a doctrine of development which gave its sanction to the acceptance of dogmas and practices that really reverse the teaching of the primitive Church and the New Testament. But to quarrel about the title of a book is a poor introduction to the appraisal of a volume which is distinguished by its knowledge of the times and writings, keen study into sources and an impartial setting forth of facts that are allowed to speak for themselves. The Bishop of Gloucester, who had himself proposed to write the History of the Oxford Movement, acknowledges that he has learned a clearer idea of the Movement from the writing of Dr. Brilioth, and we, who have endeavoured to read what friend and critic of Tractarianism have written, have found very much in his pages that has made plain what was obscure and a spirit of open-mindedness that won from us admiration.

Dr. Headlam tells us "the piety of the Oxford Movement has never perhaps made a wide popular appeal, its influence would always be limited to the cultivated class. It has never stirred the great mass of the people in England. In its origin it represented religion combined with a simple and perhaps rather austere culture." There is much truth in this as regards its origin, but its development is the very opposite to the growth of the other Oxford Movement whose piety was even more austere and culture more simple. What Wesley and his contemporaries did has affected much more deeply the world life of Christendom than all the work of Newman and his friends. The nineteenth and twentieth centuries have become more remarkable for the expansion of Methodism than for the growth of Anglo-Catholicism, to give the movement its contemporary label. The remote sources of Tractarianism are explored by Dr. Brilioth, and it is possible that greater weight must be given to the formative influence of Knox and Jebb than has been assigned, and for our part we are satisfied that the glow and vision of the Romantic

movement in Literature formed the atmosphere in which Medievalism restored in the Church was able to live and expand. We at times feel that the men who began this work did not know whither they were tending, and the acceptance of the principle of Apostolic Succession—a conception as fostering of pride as it is destructive of true historical tradition—has laid upon Anglo-Catholicism shackles that must of necessity involve the loss of ability to expand with the freedom with which God has endowed His Church. “The idea (of Church Reunion) proceeds already from the premises given in the static view of the Church, but only belief in the Sacramental Church as Christ’s mystical body has given to it a deeply religious significance. Thus the two main lines of the Oxford Movement lead up to this idea, and perhaps the desire for reunion has nowhere been more of a real passion than with the leaders of the movement and their spiritual kindred. Thus Neo-Anglicanism has, to an extent that can hardly be overestimated, given life and strength to the work for Christian unity. But, on the other hand, does it not itself remain as the chief obstacle to the realization of unity within non-Roman Christianity? Have not even the modest advances which the episcopate has made, or might have found it possible to make, as far as it was itself concerned, been rendered futile, or impossible, either by the learned appeal to precedents, or by the more violent reaction of progressive Sacramentalism, that seems to find it impossible to recognize the reality of Christianity in other devotional forms than its own?” Here we are faced fairly and squarely with the inner spirit of the movement—it feels the pull of Rome and re-acts against the pull of reformed Christendom. It looks backward to the united pre-schism Church or to the Medieval Church of the West, but sees no real proof of the reality of the great Church of the Reformation. It makes tradition, not life, the real test of Truth, and the tradition is, as Dr. Brilioth shows again and again, the static tradition of the unreformed Church.

The picture given of Oxford during these years of strain and stress, when theological truth was discussed as a matter of life and death, is fascinating. He gives us thumb sketches of the minor characters and full-length portraits of the leaders. Newman dwarfs them all by reason of the mysteriousness of his personality and the magnetism of the man. We find the famous Tract XC discussed with an ability and impartiality that ought to be read and re-read by all who are in touch with the spirit of Anglo-Catholic dialectics, for what we have to meet to-day is the attitude that found its fullest expression in that document. “Actually the tract endeavours to square the doctrine of the Articles not with the standpoint of the primitive Church but with that of Trent. Here already occurs a shadow, which falls ever thicker, over the path of progressive Anglo-Catholicism right down to the present day, the absence of any clear content in the idolized formula of Catholicism. So when one has once left the safe anchorage of static Anglicanism in the common doctrine of the undivided Church, it is impossible to escape the attraction of Romanism.” And that is the end of the whole matter.

Static Anglicanism based on the doctrine of Apostolic succession is unhistoric in a double sense—it is not the teaching of the Anglican formularies—it is not the content of primitive Christianity. It makes the Church a clerical Church, not the congregation of God's people. It may issue in a sacerdotalism that is restrained by the conservative, independent temper of the English people, but when sacerdotalism once finds a footing it is nothing if not assertive. Rome presents the world with a rigid sacerdotal system, with teaching that develops from the corrupt following of the Apostles, and as Rome makes claims that once admitted exalt the priesthood while imposing fetters on freedom, Anglo-Catholicism wishes to retain the historic freedom of Anglicanism while at the same time proclaiming what historic Anglicanism rejects as untrue to the whole spirit of the Gospel.

We sincerely hope that the pages of Dr. Briemoth will be studied in spite of the practical exclusion from its contents—except in so far as the evangelical antecedents of Newman and Pusey are concerned—of the influence of Evangelicalism on English Church life. We are convinced that the day is not far off when the return to the Cross and Resurrection—the proclamation of the Gospel as taught by the Apostles and St. Paul will once more come to its own in the Church of England. When that day arrives the consuming fire of the great revival will leave the Oxford Movement an historical episode that temporarily diverted the virile life of the National Church into a wrong channel. It is for Evangelical Churchmen to work and pray for the coming of this new movement, which will bring into one all the Evangelical forces of contemporary Christendom in the great fight against materialism and superstition.

---

### SCRIPTURAL EVANGELICALISM.

SCRIPTURAL EVANGELICALISM. By C. H. Titterton and Chas. Neill.  
*Morgan & Scott.* 5s.

The sub-title of this interesting and earnest volume is "Fundamental Truths of the Word of God," and the Rev. D. H. C. Bartlett in his foreword writes: "Truth is sapping the power of the Church militant, until there is in her hand to-day no sword of attack or shield of defence. Impotent, she is either accommodating herself to the world or falling back upon a lifeless ceremonialism, pagan in origin, acceptable to that world." These are strong words, and in spite of what we may consider their exaggeration, truth lies behind them. The world is too much with us, the *Zeit Geist* is too often the sole test of Truth and the Church is weakened thereby. But it is not true to say that the disease is so widespread that the Church is impotent. In many directions it is doing great aggressive and defensive work—relying on the Sword of the Spirit which is the Word of God.

The twelve papers deal with such subjects as the Deity of Christ, the Atonement and Resurrection, Justification and Inspiration.

Most Evangelicals can heartily accept the greater part of what is written. Some may be repelled by a too great literalism in the quotation of single texts and the weight placed upon them, but no one will deny that the writers have good ground for expressing their conviction that on major matters they are loyal to Holy Scripture. It is easy to say that they are apt to overlook the other side on certain great facts, but we are convinced that their strong assertion of our Lord's Deity is warranted in the face of much humanitarian writing that professes to give a full account of the Person of Christ. We do not think that many who approach the study of His Person from the human point of view are fairly facing the whole Truth, and they leave us not with the Incarnate God but with a philanthropic Mystic who is neither real man nor God. We cannot grasp what the Incarnation really involves, and imagination does not suffice for us to see the King in His beauty as God and Man. We know He is Man, we know he is God, and in reverence we accept both facts as true. But Christianity has lived by the proclamation of His Deity as the key to His Personality, and we cannot reject this message from the New Testament without proving false to its true import.

It is on the question of the character of Inspiration and Revelation that many who adopt the main standpoint of the book will find themselves in difficulties. Bishop Ryle said : " I accept the difficulties and humbly wait for their solution ; but while I wait I am standing on a rock." Difficulties challenge solution and the present division of opinion is founded upon the way in which these perplexing facts are faced. We do not think that any Evangelical Churchman dislikes the supernatural and all miracles. To do so is to place himself outside the Gospel message which comes to us in a record, which, if at all honest, must be considered as testifying to the miraculous in its narratives and basing its whole teaching on the existence of the supernatural. We are glad to find the writers of this book fearlessly stating their convictions and believe that good must result whenever honest Christian men in the spirit of the New Testament put forward their views. Here and there we differ from them in the real meaning of the passages they bring forward in support of opinions that are by no means universally accepted by Evangelicals, but on the whole what they present must fairly be said to be the view of all Evangelical leaders until fifty years ago. Whether it is in all respects true in the light of present-day accepted facts of science and history, is another matter. In the main we believe it will stand examination.

---

### CONVERSION.

CONVERSION : CHRISTIAN AND NON-CHRISTIAN. By A. C. Underwood, D.D. *George Allen & Unwin*. 10s. 6d.

Dr. Underwood has given us a novel study of the phenomena of Conversion and its associations. As is generally known, there are instances of conversion in other religions, and we are glad to have a

careful setting forth of their character and the difference between them and Christian conversion. Dr. Underwood has studied Hinduism and Buddhism in India and of his competence as a comparative theologian no reader can have any doubt. He knows his facts and is able to draw correct inferences from them. We must in our ignorance argue from the known to the unknown, and the descriptions of revivals in this country are marked by a restrained accuracy and avoidance of anything like exaggeration that we are prepared to give full credence to all he tells us of India. It is impossible to discover a definition of conversion which covers all known cases, but we are probably right when we say with James that it is the "process gradual or sudden, by which a self hitherto divided and consciously wrong, inferior and unhappy, becomes unified and consciously right, superior and happy in consequence of its firmer hold upon religious realities." In simpler language it means a change of heart brought about by correspondence with the environment in which God is the chief factor. The mechanism of Conversion may be described, and Dr. Underwood endeavours to set it forth, but there is always something in the narrative that eludes exact definition and we conclude that as in all ultimate spiritual processes it is impossible to explain everything without explaining away the resultant facts. Revivals are the great occasions of conversion and mass suggestion may have much to do with their fruitfulness, but when all has been set forth, there is something unexplained which raises a man from weakness to strength and gives his life a continued new orientation. There are sad cases of back-sliding, sadder cases of moral downfalls incidental to wrong conceptions of emotional limitations and very great disappointments. But when the last word is said we cannot explain on purely natural grounds the marvellous transformations of life that are the fruit of these movements. Dr. Underwood shows very clearly that of all the great religions Christianity alone has a universal appeal through the absence of racial peculiarities and limitations in its Founder. "He is a Son of man, the ideal of all human conduct and the crown of all human strivings after the good and true. . . . But He is much more than the ideal of all human conduct. Men confront in Him the redemptive grace and energy of God in a degree that transcends all their hopes and fears." We thank the author for his fresh and most suggestive study of a theme of perennial interest to all Evangelical Churchmen.

---

#### THE SECESSION FROM WELLHAUSEN.

AWAY FROM WELLHAUSEN. By Martin Kegel. London: *John Murray*. 2s. 6d.

Mrs. Nolloth has translated a short work on Old Testament criticism that had attracted the attention of the late Dean Wace. His acute mind saw the importance of the standpoint of its author, and wished that English readers might be able to judge for them-

selves the value of the deadly blows he aims at the Wellhausen hypothesis, that has so strong a hold over the minds of contemporary Old Testament students. In Germany, the startling Modernism of the younger Delitzsch has made many who accepted without full examination the implications of the prevalent theory of the origin of Deuteronomy and the composite character of the Pentateuch and other books ask, Was Delitzsch right in going as far as he went? They believed he was only logically following the results of the work of Wellhausen, and have begun to inquire into the foundations of the criticism that is dominant. We do not think that the philosophical theory that lies behind Wellhausen has anything like the authority it once possessed. At one time the Tübingen theory of the origin of the Gospels and Acts was considered demonstrated beyond a peradventure. No one holds it to-day and the sooner we free ourselves from the idea that religious history must proceed on Hegelian lines, and if it does not then the historians are wrong, the better for sound interpretation of the past. Early religious history is ignored because it does not fit in with *a priori* preconceptions, and texts are excised from their context on account of their inappropriateness from the critical standpoint. Moses is, we venture to say, a more historical personage among sound historians than he is with the followers of Wellhausen, and it is a striking fact that a strong school of anthropologists argue that Egypt is responsible for a great development of civilisation all over the world. Anthropology may be right or wrong, but we see no ground whatever for doubting the truth of the tradition that Moses was a great Lawgiver. Deuteronomy is by no means the pious or rather impious fraud suggested by the Wellhausen school. Redaction may have taken place—but codified law had been in existence long before Moses was born.

No one doubts the value of much of Wellhausen's work, but his dominance in critical circles has been too long taken for granted as the one factor that must be regarded when truth is sought. Men have rather neglected the study of the problems as a whole through their devotion to critical examination of Texts. Dr. Kegel says that the secession from Wellhausen is going on to a surprising extent and it remains for scholars to put forward a conception of Hebrew History that will fit the facts. We believe that when this is done there will be a return to traditional views which maintain the substantial accuracy of the Old Testament history. Dr. Kegel makes many shrewd hits. At times we wish that he had quoted at length the authorities to whom he refers, but in spite of this fault, we recommend his book to all who desire to learn some particulars of a movement that will eventuate in the overthrow of the tyranny of an hypothesis that has too long sheltered itself behind a great name and a number of followers who, captivated by the ability of their leader, paid little attention to the unity of documents when they pronounced against their own suppositions.

---

## THE CREED.

THE CREED. By E. E. Bryant. London: *Longmans Green & Co.* 3s. 6d.

Some small books are valuable out of proportion to their size. Mr. Bryant is a Charterhouse House Master who has prepared boys for Confirmation, and in this volume he gives the outline of his addresses. They are at once scholarly and simply expressed, they face the problems that are in the minds of intelligent boys without presenting difficulties, and they are marked by reverence and a devotional spirit. The book is divided into four chapters: "Belief," "I believe in God the Father," "I believe in Jesus Christ," and "I believe in the Holy Ghost." He tells us "The Creed marks out the course along which our confidence in God and our belief in Him and our love and fear of Him will lead us rightly. The sign-posts are not the journey. But they are the fruits of the experience of other travellers before us." What can be a better help to a boy than to learn "What Christ was once on earth so that we could see Him, that is what God always is. God is not far off, is not waiting to punish us if we go wrong. He does hate wrong as Christ did. But as Christ was, He is always by our side; and His wish is not to punish but to help, to lift us to our feet again, and to set us trying again with new hope." In his treatment of the Atonement we feel that he is anxious to guard the boys against certain modern presentations of this great fact. In writing of Gethsemane he says, "In the Agony in the Garden, I think that Christ was not merely shrinking from pain and death. He was Man and must have shrunk from them as a man would. But I think, though I pray it may not be failing in reverence to put it tentatively into words, that somehow Christ came to the full realization of the horror of bearing as His own the foulness and stains of all human sin, and shrank from that while He did not refuse to bear it—He, the holiest in contact with the worst. So He bore more than we can ever tell; and His self-sacrifice won a result infinite in its greatness. We call Him rightly the Saviour of the world, who in His own body bare our sins on the Cross; and we look to Him with thankfulness and love." On the Holy Spirit, Mr. Bryant writes with insight and helpfulness. Those who have to prepare Confirmation addresses for intelligent classes will find this small book a mine of sound suggestion.

## A PHILOSOPHY OF TOOLS.

SHAPING A NEW WORLD: A PHILOSOPHY OF TOOLS. By F. Attfeld Fawkes. London: *Simpkins Marshall and Co., Ltd.* 2s. net.

The author of "The Riddle of Life after Death," and "Spiritualism Exposed," has given us in this little volume of eighty-seven pages something to think about, but the ambitiousness of the subtitle hardly seems justified. The several chapters are interesting



up to a point and make pleasant reading, but the treatment of the different subjects is "popular" rather than philosophic. The thinnest of all the essays is "A Tale of a Shorthand Typist," but Mr. Fawkes is capable of better things than that, and we see him in a better setting in "Labour and Socialism under the Microscope" and "Religious Tool Collectors." Let us quote a passage from each of these essays:—

"It is evident that, up to the present time, labour has been hypnotically asleep to the dangers of Socialism. The outlook for this country, owing to the general Socialist menace, would be black indeed, were it not my firm conviction that if and when the extreme elements in the Labour-Socialist partnership demand that their long prepared tools be put to practical use, then will labour awake from its hypnotic sleep. Then will the native common sense of the British working-man triumph. Then will labour clearly discern, to its astonishment, that the Socialist tools will injure those who use them quite as much as, if not more than, those against whom they are used. Then higher and nobler influences will prevail. Then the bonds of the *Sozialistische Arbeiter Internationale* will be shattered. Then will labour throw with disgust the many and sinister tools of Socialism on to the great scrap-heap. Then, as Tennyson foreshadowed, there will be

‘Something kindlier, higher, holier—  
All for each and each for all.’

"When labour really awakes, as awake it must sooner or later, to inevitable facts and truths, the labour tool-chest will be replenished with better, more efficient, more up-to-date tools. Such tools, for instance, as love, good-will, forbearance, co-operation, brotherhood, consideration for others, recognition of the rights and claims of other classes, acknowledgment of the duties and responsibilities of self."

This is well said. In regard to "Religious Tool Collectors," while we may not agree with all he says, there is point in the searching questions he puts to Religious Tool Collectors:—

"Of what avail is it for you diligently to collect, sharpen, clean and polish the admirable tools of Bible-reading, Church attendance, rituals, beliefs and creeds, if you never use them in shaping your life as Christ wished? Of what avail is it for you to have in your tool-chest the beautiful Christian tools of love, brotherhood, forbearance, co-operation, consideration for others, self-sacrifice, if you never use them?"

"Is it not the senseless conduct of the religious tool collector which is, certainly to some extent, responsible for the many people who have 'no use for Christianity,' who 'object to Christianity,' who say 'Christianity is played out'? Is it not the blundering conduct of the religious tool collector which is, at any rate partially, responsible for the fact that, as I am told, not more than one in six of the population attends a place of worship? Is it not the criminal conduct of the religious tool collector which is, decidedly

in some degree, responsible for the fact that Christianity has not made more progress during the last nineteen centuries, and that the establishment of the kingdom of God on earth has been delayed?

Do not many of us who consider ourselves good Christians, who are in earnest, who desire to be right, place too much reliance on the mere tools of religion? Are we not too much inclined, even the best of us, to place reliance on mere machinery, mere organization, mere tools? Are we not too much inclined to accept the existence of all this machinery as the end of our efforts, rather than the means to an end?"

---

THE ROYAL HOSPITALS AT CHURCH. By Ernest Harold Pearce, Litt.D., D.D., F.S.A., Bishop of Worcester. London: S.P.C.K. 2s. 6d. net.

An interesting account of the Royal Hospitals—St. Bartholomew's, Christ's, St. Thomas's and Bridewell with Bethlehem, together with the story of the Spital Sermon and the St. Matthew's Day Sermon. The preacher of the former must be appointed from among the Bishops of English sees, and it has never happened before that a former Scholar of Christ's Hospital has been privileged to preach both these sermons. To Dr. Pearce came this honour, and he has printed here two sermons on St. Matthew's Day (with thirty years between them), as well as the Spital Sermon preached by him in 1922. After an association of fifty years with Christ's Hospital, no one is better qualified than the Bishop to tell the story which is so pleasantly and lovingly unfolded in these pages, and which he has told more fully in his "Annals of Christ's Hospital." The book is dedicated "to the honoured memory" of the late Mr. F. A. Bevan.

S. R. C.

---

THE STORY OF SACRED SONG. By Rev. William C. Procter, F.Ph. London: James Clarke & Co., Ltd. 4s. net.

The sacred songs of the Old and New Testaments are fittingly and fully dealt with in the opening chapters, which are therefore not the least interesting and important portion of Mr. Procter's "Story." From that introductory study he proceeds to tell the history of many well-known hymns, with short biographical sketches of their writers. He also gives us an account of the composers of many of our familiar and favourite tunes. In these days of acute controversy it is pleasant to be reminded of the Catholicity of the modern hymn book, whichever it be we use, and the author has given us an excellent handbook. Such a companion to the hymnal might well be kept in Church, since there are often a few moments before service during which we might turn up the selected hymns and refer to the life of the authors or translators, to whom we owe a tremendous debt. It seems a pity that no place was found for mention of George Wither, of Bentworth, who may be regarded as the father of the English hymn book, and for some reference to the monumental work

of the late Dr. Julian, to which the compiler of every such book as this must turn for information. By the way, the Rev. W. St. Hill Bourne (who is a Prebendary of S. Paul's Cathedral) did not die in 1923. He has retired from active work.

S. R. C.

SHADE OF HIS HAND. Talks on Ecclesiastes. By Oswald Chambers. Oxford: Alden & Co., Ltd. 2s. 6d. net.

The author of these "talks" was called to Higher Service while serving with the Y.M.C.A. at Zeitoun, Egypt, in November, 1917, and they were the last lectures he ever delivered. He was an expert in the art of Biblical exposition, and though these studies are complete in themselves they are yet complementary to his other published works. In brief,—his interpretation of the message of the book of Ecclesiastes is that life is not worth living apart from Redemption, and many of the problems of to-day are courageously faced. Those who do not appreciate "apt alliteration's artful aid" may think its use is a little overdone, but this, after all, need not lessen the value of a very telling exposition.

S. R. C.

GENESIS INTERPRETED. By G. A. Gaskell. London: The C. W. Daniel Company. 3s. 6d. net.

Mr. Gaskell has given us two hours' amusement! His "interpretation" is stated to be "through undermeanings disclosed by the language of symbolism found in all inspired scriptures." Here is an example of his method:—

Passage, Genesis iii. 18-19: "Thorns and thistles shall it bring forth to thee," etc.

Meaning: Sins and sufferings shall proceed from the lower nature; and it is decreed that the mind shall subsist through assimilating facts of experience, the produce of the sensation nature. Through the gropings of ignorance (sweat), or the effort generated of the truth-nature (water) reflected as falsity and illusion (sweat), shall truth-goodness (bread) be appropriated, until evolution upon the lower planes (ground) ends. For the lower mind is but the summit of the lower evolution; it is as surface "dust," and it shall not and cannot ascend higher.

How very illuminating! Thus the author would explain away a simple statement of fact. "Thorns and thistles" and all plants which have those characteristics which cause them to be classed as weeds, only appear where man has begun to till the ground,—a remarkable proof of the truth of the verse Mr. Gaskell wildly attempts to "interpret." It would be really entertaining if it were not inexpressibly sad, for if all these "inspired" religions, and their sacred books, are equally true—they must all be equally false!

S. R. C.

# THE CHELTENHAM CONFERENCE.

## “Unity among Evangelical Churchmen.”

### Full Text of the Papers.

THE Tenth Conference of Evangelical Churchmen was held at Cheltenham on June 11, 12 and 13. In their letter of Invitation the Committee wrote: “In recent years the Conference has dealt with subjects primarily concerned with the world-wide influence of Christianity. The Evangelical School has a special contribution to make to those important matters, but while this is so, we have to recognize that it is not united in its witness. It has a great opportunity, but divisions in its ranks are weakening its power to make use of it. This is a domestic matter of the utmost importance, and yet of great difficulty. As convinced Evangelicals, and lovers of the truths for which we stand, the Committee desire to bring together representatives of all sections of Evangelical thought, to seek by conference, prayer and mutual intercourse to find the common platform on which we may stand, and from which we may proclaim the great fundamental truths on which the future of the Christian Faith rests. We desire to rise to the height of the opportunity which God is giving us at this time, and we believe the Conference can be, under God, the means of bringing Evangelical Churchmen together in a new confidence, sympathy, strength and co-operation. The need for Evangelical Unity is pressing and urgent, and we believe it can be obtained. For these reasons the General Subject of “Unity among Evangelical Churchmen” has been chosen for discussion.

The exigencies of publication do not permit of our giving any detailed report of the Conference, or the text of the Findings, but by the kind courtesy and hearty co-operation of the appointed readers of papers, which we desire most gratefully to acknowledge, we are able to print in this issue of *THE CHURCHMAN* the full text of their addresses. These papers are on subjects of such importance to the present welfare and future work of the Evangelical School in the Church of England that we feel assured our readers will be glad to have them in this convenient form. They contain a striking body of statements, and illustrate the underlying unity there is among Evangelicals of all sections. We are sure that as these papers are

read and appreciated they will lead to a clear perception that the whole Evangelical School is bound together by great truths and great traditions, and that the matters which divide, are in comparison of much smaller moment. We earnestly pray that the wishes of the conveners of the Conference may be gratified and that they may have the pleasure of seeing their desire fulfilled, so that as a result there may be a new era of Evangelical advance, and a united endeavour to make the truths of the Gospel have their full effect in the lives of men and in the affairs of nations.

The Conference met under the presidency of the Rector of Cheltenham, the Rev. Canon H. A. Wilson, R.D., who gave his usual warm welcome to the members at the opening session on the first evening. There was a large and representative attendance and the utmost interest was maintained throughout. His opening address was on "The Need of Unity," a subject with which he dealt in the last number of *THE CHURCHMAN*, in view of the meeting of the Conference. The first portion of the subject, "Our Common Ground," was then opened by Canon A. B. G. Lillingston in a paper on "The Authority of Holy Scripture" (see p. 201). Canon Wilson then read a paper on "The Atonement" (see p. 208), and another by the Rev. H. B. Gooding on "Unmediated Access to Christ and the Free Grace of God" (see p. 215) concluded the set papers of the session. The Rev. A. E. Hughes was the selected speaker on these aspects of the subject.

Friday, June 12, was the central day of the Conference. There was a service of Holy Communion according to custom in the Parish Church at 8 a.m., at which an address was given by the Rev. A. E. Hughes, M.A.

At the morning session of the Conference the portion of the subject appointed for consideration was "Differing Points of View." The Rev. T. W. Gilbert, D.D., read the first paper on "Inspiration of Holy Scripture" (see p. 220). The Rev. E. L. Langston followed on the same subject (see p. 228). The second division of the subject was "Ritual and Ceremonial," on which the Rev. T. J. Pulvertaft read the paper (see p. 234). The Rev. A. W. Parsons was the appointed speaker.

At the afternoon session the branch of the subject under consideration was "Our Common Foes," and Mr. W. Guy Johnson read the first paper on "Sacerdotalism." This was followed by a paper on "Rationalism" by Canon G. W. Briggs (see p. 238). The selected speaker was the Rev. H. M. Foyl.

At the evening session "Our Evangelical Witness" was treated under two heads: First as "Expressed by means of the Ministry and Scholarship," and secondly as "Expressed in the Councils of the Church." The first was taken by the Rev. H. F. S. Adams (see p. 245) and the second by Prebendary E. N. Sharpe (see p. 250). The Rev. W. L. P. Float followed as the selected speaker. The Conference met the following morning to draw up the Findings which were prepared for their consideration by a committee appointed for the purpose.

## THE AUTHORITY OF HOLY SCRIPTURE.

BY THE REV. A. LILLINGSTON, M.A., Canon Residentiary,  
Durham.

THE Committee have been well advised in asking us to consider the question of "Authority," and I trust it will be duly welcomed and seriously weighed. It is far from being a simple one to handle: it has its special difficulties and perplexities; but it is always an important one because men and women of every generation want to know where they can find a Guide, a supernatural and Divine Guide; a Guide for their daily life, and a Guide about matters eternal. The craving for a standard of belief and of conduct is nothing less than a universal one, and cannot be long ignored.

And it is unusually important at the present time because of the well-known bid of a vigorous body of Churchmen to capture the religious world by offering to guide it into all Truth by methods which, as we may see, must fail and can never satisfy, but may rather mislead and harm.

If you will now notice the title of our subject, you will see that we are to pay particular attention to the "Authority of Scripture," and it may be at once assumed that the object in view is to define and defend the peculiar qualifications of Holy Writ to act as an Authority, and to meet the spiritual needs and demands of mankind.

I do not hesitate to adopt that task, and I will endeavour to lay before you the reasons why Churchmen in England have during recent centuries consistently looked to the Bible for light and comfort in all their religious life, and have relied on its teaching to answer the various enigmas of the present and the future:—

I. Because we are satisfied, some would say, sure, about its origin and its source. This is a very important point, as the mind of man quite naturally refuses to rest on an uncertain and insecure foundation. If a man is a fool who builds his house on sand, how much more foolish is he who stakes his Eternal Destiny on anything less stable than an impregnable Rock, as Scripture has shown itself to be!

Here at once is the superiority of the Bible to TRADITION, of which the Roman Church makes so much. It is not that unwritten Tradition is necessarily less true than written Truth, but that we cannot trace it, we simply do not know where it came from. If we could be certain that any unwritten doctrine came from Christ and His Apostles, we should, of course, receive it with the same reverence and confidence that we pay to the written Word.

Bishop Harold Browne<sup>1</sup> said: "Tradition by word of mouth is a thing proverbially uncertain. In peculiar conditions of Society, or for a short time, it may be sufficient for the preservation of Truth. But it is evidently unfitted for a body like the Catholic Church, which was to pervade all nations, extend throughout all ages,

<sup>1</sup> [The Writer has drawn some of the material of this paper from Bishop Browne's notes on Article VI.].

weather the storm of ignorance and barbarism at one time, and bear up against the scorching and withering glare of learned infidelity at another." And then he added: "Scripture having been evidently designed to correct the uncertainty, and supply the deficiency of tradition, it is unreasonable to suppose that God would have suffered Scripture itself, the more certain Guide, to be imperfect, and to need the less certain Guide, Tradition, to supply its defects."

I think that it is he, too, who said: "If tradition committed to the Church had been sufficient to preserve the Truth, then the writing of the four Gospels, and of the other parts of the New Testament, would have been superfluous."

And so we may safely assert that there is a total absence of all evidence to prove, that there is even professedly any tradition extant, to which we are indebted for the knowledge of any great doctrine of faith, *independently of the Written Word*. John Wycliffe, who lived in days when tradition was more honoured in England than it has been since the Reformation, was even more emphatic, saying: "To place above Scripture, and prefer to it, human traditions, doctrines, and ordinances, is nothing but an act of blind presumption. A power of human appointment which pretends to set itself above the Holy Scriptures can only lame the efficacy of the Word of God, and introduce confusion. Yes, it leads to blasphemy, when the Pope puts forward the claim that what he decrees in matters of faith must be received as Gospel, and that his law must, even more than the Gospel itself, be observed and carried out."

Let these opinions suffice to confirm us in our allegiance to the Bible, and in our scepticism concerning Tradition which can never be anything but vague and arbitrary, consisting as it does of the *dicta* of fallible man, and possessing nothing of the certainty and soundness of the sacred Scriptures.

In the next place, if we are unwilling to honour Tradition and to recognize it as our Authority, what about the Church?

Is it not the prerogative of the Church to teach, and of the Bible to prove? Are not men justified in turning to the Church, as they do, for Authority: in expecting the Church to exercise Authority, and be their Law and their Guide?

This is a serious question, because to this day many take refuge in the figment of an infallible Church, which guards, sustains, and interprets revelation.

Before dealing with this special point, let me make two observations:—

(a) That we have never yet, with all our wit and wisdom, found out what exactly is the Church, and what is not.

(b) That it seems impossible for representative bodies of the Church of England even, to reach entire and unanimous agreement upon matters of grave and vital importance.

If by the Church, you mean the House of Bishops, I would remind you that Bishop Gore is reported to have said that he des-

paired of the Bishops being of one mind. And the Bench of his day was smaller, and not less distinguished, than it is to-day.

If by the Church, you mean the Church Assembly, does any man outside Bedlam expect unanimity there, after the discussions on Prayer Book Revision? And can any man with a Christian heart fail to pity the Bishops as they undertake to deal with the chaos that lies in front of them? I would only urge you earnestly to pray that they may do their work conscientiously by being true to their consecration vows, one of which is to uphold the sufficiency of the Bible.

Coming now to our special point, and speaking of the Church as "the faithful in Christ," we readily and gladly acknowledge that Bible and Church are dependent on one another; probably they could not have come into being without one another, and could not function now without one another. Certainly it is true that the Church has always been a failure when it has been untrue to the Holy Scriptures, which are the title deeds of the Church, the law of the Church's life, the test of her purity, the source of her strength, the spring of her progress.

As Dr. Westcott once wrote: "A corrupted Bible is a sign of a corrupted Church, a Bible mutilated or imperfect, a sign of a Church not yet raised to the complete perception of Truth."

We might argue over this question in a circle *ad infinitum*, but I will content myself with a valuable quotation from Peake's *Commentary* (p. 7): "The Church did not create the Bible, any more than the Bible the Church; they were both derived from a common source—the experience of those who came into personal contact with Jesus Christ, and felt the inspiration of His saving Personality and Work. The Gospels are the memorials of His life and teaching, which took shape within the early Church, but were not created by it; the Epistles are the literary deposit of the experience of those who were filled with the power of His Holy Spirit, and who, living under the quickening influence of His grace, founded the Church. This reciprocal relation between Church and Bible thus invalidates the claim of the Church to superiority over the Bible as the ultimate revelation of God, and the authentic interpreter of His will. They are co-ordinates." (*Vide* also Calvin's *Institutes*, Vol. I, chap. vii., p. 59 f.)

2. Because of the universal consent which the Bible has received, and the unwavering reliance which has been placed on it throughout the course of Christian history. When we look into it, we find that Scripture has ever been adduced, by Divines of all schools and all communions as capable of proving all the great doctrines of the faith, and all the important rules of duty, such as the Trinity, Incarnation, Atonement, Justification, Sanctification, the grace of the Sacraments, the privileges of the Church, etc. Though different schools have differed as to the way in which Scripture should be interpreted on some of these points, yet all have agreed that the true doctrine concerning the weighty and cardinal points of faith may be gathered from Scripture, if interpreted aright: and this,



largely on account of a conviction that it possesses a special and an unquestionable authority.

I need not give you more than a mere reminder that there are many passages which prove that our Lord Himself regarded the Old Testament as revealing the Will of God: that the Jewish monotheism which stood out so splendidly from the surrounding atmosphere of polytheism, stood or fell with the supernatural authority of the Jewish Scriptures. If any Jew denied the divine origin of the Scriptures and the Law, he would also have destroyed the grounds of the Jewish belief in one God.

Let me also remind you that, as Paley points out, the four Gospels and the Acts of the Apostles are quoted, or alluded to, by a series of Christian writers, beginning with those who were contemporary with the Apostles, or who immediately followed them, and proceeding in close and regular succession from their time to the present: *and* that when they are quoted, or alluded to, it is with peculiar respect, as books *sui generis*, as possessing an authority which belonged to no other books, and as conclusive in all questions and controversies among Christians. What is very striking is that the decisions of the first four General Councils, whose authority is acknowledged by all, and whose doctrinal standards are our heritage to-day, were accepted because they immediately and readily commended themselves to the judgment of the whole Church *as in accordance with Divine* revelation.

Let me give you the names of some of the primitive Fathers who with one voice affirm the perfection and sufficiency of the written Word for the end for which it was written, i.e. for a rule of faith and for a rule of life: Irenæus, Tertullian, Origen, Hippolytus, Athanasius, Cyril of Jerusalem, Basil, Ambrose, Jerome, Augustine, and many others. It is impossible to escape from the influence of these early Christians, and it would surely be unwise and even precarious to scorn their opinion on such a question, and to turn aside and pin our faith to any authority but the Scriptures by which they lived and did their work. It seems indisputable that they were convinced that the Apostles, under the guidance of the Holy Spirit, did not trust the known and well-proved insufficiency of Tradition, but had recourse to the Scriptures as a source and rule of faith.

Jeremy Taylor puts the matter thus: "The Apostles at first owned these writings: the churches received them; they transmitted them to their posterity: they grounded their faith upon them: they proved their propositions by them: by them they confuted heretics, and they made them the measure of right and wrong: all that collective body of doctrine of which all Christians collectively made public confessions, and on which their hopes of salvation did rely, were all contained in them, and they agreed in no point of faith which is not plainly set down in Scripture."

3. Because we are persuaded that, as Article VI states, "Holy Scripture containeth all things necessary to salvation," and that, in a unique way and to a unique degree.

We do not pretend that the Bible deals with all religious topics of interest in a final way, nor do we hold that it even refers to some of them. That is the criticism of some Roman writers, who would have us consult the Church and Tradition to supply the deficiency. For example, the Scriptures (it is said) do not adequately meet our curiosity about Original Sin, the perpetual Virginity of the Blessed Mary, the observance of Easter, Infant Baptism, Purgatory, and so forth.

We grant this, but we do not grant that full and complete light on such points is essential to salvation ; they do not all materially concern our personal faith or practice : if we knew all that is to be known about them, our salvation and sanctification might not be advanced one whit.

Given the Bible, we can do our duty fully to God and man : the Bible is our sufficient authority, because, as a careful student once put it, it is full, because it is clear, because it is definite, because it is accessible, because it is satisfying. The soul that humbly receives it needs nothing that is not derived thence for spiritual life and power.

Convinced of this, we generally concur with Wycliffe, who deduced from the Divine origin and absolute authority of the Bible its perfect and entire sufficiency. To him the Bible alone was the ground document of the Church, its fundamental law, its *charta*. He loved to speak of the Bible as the charter of the Church's liberties, as the God-given deed of grace and promise. To Scripture alone he ascribed the prerogative of authenticity. In comparison with it, all other writings, albeit they may be the genuine works of great Church Doctors, are " apocryphal," and have no claim on our faith for their own sake.

This point of the sufficiency of Scripture is one on which we cannot be too clear because of an insistent cry for a fresh revelation. It is sometimes stated that the only way in which to encounter scepticism and agnosticism, and the destructive power of science and criticism is by a sure word from Heaven. Against that we simply have to say that we need no revelation that is not contained in the Bible. Since the last words of Scripture were written no additional revelation has come. After all, this is the argument for inspiration which can never be set aside. It rests upon the sure foundation of fact and experience. The illumination of Christian genius has been thrown on every phase of religious thought and feeling. The promises of God have been every day fulfilled in the experience of Christian souls. These have borne their abundant witness that in Christ is Yea, and yet there is not one solitary sentence to be added to the Word of God. We know of God what was written of God nearly 2,000 years ago, and we know nothing besides. The completeness, the sufficiency, of revelation is an objective fact, certified by the failure of every attempt to add to it. Still the Holy Spirit takes of the things of Christ, and shows them unto us, and so revelation, while it is old and grows older, is perennially new.

To put it in another way, we are continually having a fresh revelation because Christ answers our perplexities and despairs by being present in His exalted life through His Spirit in faithful hearts, and by giving us an immediate experience of His life and power.

I need not go into this matter at greater length. Our Article VI, which stamps the Church of England as essentially Protestant, inasmuch as it echoes the original protest presented to the Diet at Spires in 1529 by the Lutheran Princes of Germany, is sufficiently plain. It draws a great distinction between things necessary for salvation, and things practically beneficial, but not essential. This distinction is the main subject of the second Book of Hooker's *Ecclesiastical Polity*. As for the sufficiency of Holy Scripture for salvation, it was a universal article of faith in the first four centuries.

Paley in his "Evidences" furnishes us with an overwhelming collection of quotations from primitive writers; and the subject was investigated in a complete and masterly way by the late Dean Goode in the tenth chapter of his *Divine Rule of Faith and Practice*.

In short, if we want to know what we should believe, and what we need not believe, the simplest answer comes from S. Augustine, who said: "If it is established by the clear authority of the Divine Scriptures, those I mean that are called Canonical in the Church, it is to be believed without any doubt. But other witnesses or testimonies, which are used to persuade you to believe anything, you may believe or not, just as you shall see that they have or have not any weight giving them a just claim to your confidence."

4. Because we are convinced that Holy Scripture has a supernatural element, and exercises a unique power over the heart of man. In other words, the authority which the Bible possesses is that of its own spiritual supremacy, and its unique spiritual power.

When it can be shown that Christianity is, as a whole, unique, spiritually exalted, adequate to the needs of men, and different from anything which might have been looked for as the product of human thought and experience, can the existence of a supernatural element in Scripture be seriously disputed? Do we not rather, readily and generally admit that if anywhere man has a revelation from God, it is contained in the Bible?

Calvin, in his *Institutes*, says: "Read Demosthenes or Cicero; read Plato, Aristotle, or any others of that class; I grant that you will be attracted, delighted, moved, and enraptured by them in a surprising manner: but if, after reading them, you turn to the perusal of the sacred volume, whether you are willing or unwilling, it will affect you so powerfully, it will so penetrate your heart, and impress itself so strongly on your mind, that, compared with its energetic influence, the beauties of rhetoricians and philosophers will almost entirely disappear: so that it is easy to perceive something Divine in the sacred Scriptures, which far surpass the highest attainments and ornaments of human industry" (Book I, chap. viii.).

If we look further and ask, "What is it that gives this word its power?" we have little difficulty in finding our answer.

It is not because of its morals and its moral idea. It is not in its ideas of two worlds, and men placed between them. It is not in its exposure of our incapacity by and of ourselves to rise to the higher, and become Godlike and Christlike. But it is due to the marvellous story which tells us that our moral warfare is shared by God Himself, that the Divine nature itself descended into that warfare, that it bears the agony of strife, the very shame and curse of it all.

Yes, because the Bible alone of all books in the world has that story of Divine love to tell, we know the Bible to be the Word of God. Not that it fits the older theories of inspiration, but that, independently of all human theories of inspiration, it carries home to the hearts and consciences and souls of sinful men, that otherwise would remain in sin but for this strange and almost incredible story of God's love, God's sacrifice and agony for them.

There it stands, full of grace and dignity, needing no proof for itself, but appealing only in its own strength, because God is in it.

Let me close with a word about the Holy Spirit, Who, we believe, is mainly responsible for this Holy Book, and Who employs it continually for His work amongst us.

I do not at all know how the Bible is inspired, but I am deeply convinced that it is inspired, and inspired in a manner and to a degree which belongs to no other volume. That fact (and I take it to be a fact) mainly constitutes its authority.

There is an indefinable something about the Book which lays hold of us, as with authority: sometimes making us tremble, sometimes laying us low, sometimes raising us up.

Verily, this Word *is* quick and powerful, and makes a mark of its very own.

But for this to be realized and experienced, we must ourselves be reverent and willing "listeners in." It is only to true hearts, childlike men and women, that the Holy Spirit gives His services: but He does make such to feel the authority as well as the dignity of the Bible: He opens their understanding, making the revelation of Christ as fresh and as direct from Heaven as on the day when it was first bestowed.

I mention this for a double purpose:—

(a) To utter a warning against reason.

Reason has its place, and its uses: it is needed in all our life; but it is human, and it cannot of itself and by itself apprehend the message of the Word. "The testimony of the Spirit is superior to all reason."

(b) To stress the importance of our personal dedication.

The Holy Ghost witnesses the Truth of the Christian Gospel in the daily renewal and sanctification of our souls. *We ourselves* can be, and ought to be, irrefutable evidence of the authority of the Bible.

## THE ATONEMENT.

BY CANON H. A. WILSON, M.A., Rector and Rural Dean  
of Cheltenham.

THE Atonement is not only the characteristic thing about the Christian Faith, it is the focus point of the whole of the doctrines of our religion.

The doctrine of the moral tragedy in the human race which we call Sin : the doctrine of the Love of God for humanity : of the coming of God into our world in human flesh : of the restoration of men to fellowship with God : of the promise of Eternal Life with God : these doctrines and all others have meaning, reality and power only in relation to the Atonement.

Without the Atonement, Christianity becomes as meaningless and unthinkable as a solar system without a sun or as a circle which has no centre.

This statement is fully borne out by the emphasis laid upon Atonement in the Bible. I do not propose to dwell upon this at much length, but it must be noted and underlined that Jonathan Edwards' happy phrase is true : the Bible is " The Record of Redemption."

The Old Testament is full of the yearning after Atonement. Thus in the first chapter of human history the story is told of the birth of conscience : the realization that something was fatally wrong between man and God. Altars are built and sacrifice offered—witnesses to an awareness in the heart that something must be done to make peace with God.

The Jewish Faith and Ritual took their whole orientation from the same spiritual convictions. God has been outraged : He must be assured of human penitence : sinful men must make reparation as best they can by giving some evidence, such as sacrifices offered, of sorrow.

The conscience becomes more tender, and men who have felt the bite of sin pour out their sorrow and cry for pardon in psalms and prayers. Deeper and deeper, yet higher and higher, grows the understanding of the problem, till one of the greatest minds that ever lived sees a glimpse at least of the stupendous truth that the wrong can only be righted by One who " bears the iniquity of us all " and " by whose stripes we are healed."

Then follows the Gospel narrative, which states the historical fact that God intervened in the Person of His Son, " Who gave His Life a ransom for many."

In the subsequent books of the New Testament there is given the interpretation of the historical fact, the explanation of the Cross and its significance from various angles.

Thus we have in the Old Testament the anticipation of the Atonement : in the Gospels the achievement of Atonement : in the rest of the New Testament the interpretation of the Atonement.

It is, therefore, true to say that the Atonement is the central truth of the Christian religion, that it runs through the whole of

Scripture as the dominant note, the connecting link which unifies the whole collection of books.

There is no need to labour these remarks, as no one here is likely to challenge them. I have simply stated them as an appropriate introduction to the consideration of certain points which are of great importance for us to-day.

I am convinced that for many reasons there is an urgent call—especially to Evangelicals—to reconsider and reaffirm the doctrines of the Atonement. Among these reasons I mention these:—

(1) The Atonement is the driving force of Christianity. It is the doctrine which finds men and meets their needs.

(2) The lamentable absence of the sense of sin which has debilitated the whole life of the Church is due to the absence of forceful and intelligent proclamation of this doctrine.

(3) The Atonement has always been the main theme of the Evangelical message, and if we want to serve our day and generation aright we have got to get a firm grip of this truth and proclaim it in the language of to-day. This will need profound and prayerful thought, for the mere reiteration of threadbare phrases, or an exposition which is contrary to the moral sense, is useless.

Now in approaching this question, I venture to lay down two postulates which are, I think, fair and just.

First of all: if we wish to arrive at a Biblical view of the Atonement we must include in our survey the whole Bible.

I mean by this to protest against the way in which certain writers rule out the Old Testament anticipation and explain away the great classic passage in Isaiah liii., or stake off the Synoptic Gospels as virtually the one group of books which really matter, or disparage Pauline theology as a rather deplorable survival of rabbinical theologizing in an otherwise Christian mind.

The Bible is an unity. Granted—as we must do—that we have therein a variety of presentations of the Atonement, we claim that the truth must lie in a synthesis of these presentations. To talk as some writers have done of the Synoptic Gospels as simple historical sketches free from theological subtleties, and to describe St. Paul as the creator of an ephemeral theology which clouded the simplicity of the Gospel, is sheer nonsense.

There is not only enough theology in the Synoptic Gospels to set us thinking till the end of time, but the supposed conflict of views between the Evangelists and St. Paul has no shred of evidence to support it. The theory is historically untrue and critically unsound. St. Paul was not only in immediate touch with the whole apostolic circle, but two of the Evangelists, St. Luke and St. Mark, were among his most intimate friends.

The wretched shifts to which writers of this kind have recourse would not be tolerated in any other realm of thought. Take for instance the way in which the late Dr. Rashdall tried to evade the difficulty presented to his theory of the Atonement by the passage: "The Son of Man came to give His Life a ransom for many." There the passage stands in two Gospels and not a MS. is extant in which

it does not occur. But the passage torpedoed his theory, and so it must be explained away by a number of pages of unconvincing "arguifying."

My second postulate is this: Not only must any complete theory of the Atonement take into account the whole Bible, but it must satisfy the demands of the whole man. Logic and reason are not our only taste of truth, perhaps they are not even our greatest. Conscience, the moral and spiritual sense, have also to be taken into account. "Mere sentiment" must not be ruled out as illegitimate. It will have a right to be heard, for religion is not only concerned with the head, but perhaps mainly with the heart.

Now with these thoughts in mind we may press forward hopefully in our inquiry. And to this end let us recall the main lines along which thought has moved in the quest of a theory of the Atonement.

Three main lines of thought are traceable in the great mass of speculation which arose: it will be sufficient to note the leading features of each.

(1) *The Substitutionary view* maintained that in some sense Christ took our place, and by His Death on the Cross did something for us which produced a change of attitude on God's part towards us. The key-note of this theory is that sin entailed a penalty, and it appeals for support to the great passage in Isaiah already referred to and the Scriptural references to "ransom," "propitiation" and similar terms, which are many in number. But its acceptance has been rendered difficult by the way in which its advocates have developed it into a transaction wherein God the Father and God the Son seem to be moved by impulses which are at variance: on the one part, wrath and justice, on the other, love. The penalty of sin is spoken of as a punishment inflicted upon the Redeemer by Divine Justice. Or, in other words, God is represented as if *He* had to be reconciled to man, His wrath against humanity appeased and transformed into love. Whereas in Scripture the love of God is described as eternal, *He* never needed to be reconciled to humanity. The Atonement is the exhibition of the love of God which was always there, it did not call that love into being. Nevertheless, despite the crudities and unintentional irreverence which have gathered around the popular and superficial preaching of this view, it stands for a tremendous truth, very difficult to formulate in words, but which must be preserved if the whole significance of the Atonement is to be grasped.

(2) At the other extreme lies the view, associated with the teaching of Abelard, that the value of the Atonement lies in the moral effect of Christ's death upon the human heart. All thought of the Cross as a penalty disappears from this view. In contemplating the wonderful love of God as revealed in the Incarnation, which did not shrink from a cruel death, the human heart will be melted into penitence, filled with horror of sin and seek for forgiveness.

(3) The view of Christ as *the Representative of the human race* stands intermediate between these two. The Son of God, by taking

human nature upon Him, became Representative Man, in the sense that what He did the human race may be reckoned to have done in and through Him. He lived before God the perfect human life of utter obedience, and in His life and death He offered to God for humanity a perfect penitence.

It is probable that these distinctive theories have arisen by just that very practice to which we have referred of isolating certain sides of the Bible revelation from the whole. They are each only partial, true so far as they go, but the whole truth can only be obtained by a synthesis of all the three main aspects, if that be possible. We may arrive at this if we approach the question by a different avenue.

The conclusion as to what is needful for a full Atonement depends upon our view of sin. If sin is merely a debt which the debtor cannot pay, his release from the obligation simply depends upon the good-will of the creditor. According to the Substitutionary theory, Christ pays the debt by His life and death. But as we have noted this is not satisfactory. It ascribes different and lower qualities to God the Father than to God the Son. The description of God as the inexorable creditor who demands payment to the uttermost farthing is unthinkable, and in addition the whole theory as thus stated trenches closely upon di-theism. These objections are fatal.

According to the Abelardian explanation, God remits the debt upon repentance. All that He requires is that man shall be truly penitent and to this He moves him by the supreme display of what Divine Love will do and suffer for man's sake. No objection can be raised to this view except that it is based upon an inadequate grasp of what sin is and does.

With very little emendation what has been said in the last two paragraphs still applies if sin be regarded as a crime against the Divine Majesty. The scene is changed so to speak from the County Court to the Central Criminal Court. In this case a punishment must be inflicted. But it makes no difference how we fence the expression with guarded phrases, vicarious punishment can never be squared with our moral sense, it outrages even the most elementary sense of justice.

In support of the theory that God requires nothing but repentance, the argument is commonly employed that in such a parable as that of the Prodigal Son it is clearly taught that all the sinner needed to secure forgiveness was simply the moral resolution to ask for pardon and to show his sorrow by a determination to amend. But this reasoning proves too much. If this parable is isolated from the rest of the New Testament and it is urged that it does not suggest the necessity of the Cross of Christ before Atonement can be made, then the obvious reply is, that in the Parable there is no figure which represents Christ at all. No one has yet advanced the opinion that Christianity teaches forgiveness of sin apart altogether from Christ!

The root objection to the Abelardian theory lies in the fact that beneath it there is an inadequate view of sin. Sin is God's problem



as well as ours: *simply to wash it away is not to deal with it finally at all.* The mischief which sin has done has got to be remedied. It has created a situation and it is this which requires treatment. It is partly true to speak of sin as a debt or a crime, but in essence it is a vastly graver thing. It is a power which has diseased the moral nature of humanity and reduced to impotence all capacity to realize goodness. The moral order is broken in the world and there is a sag in human nature. Man is not merely a criminal who needs pardon, he is a broken thing which needs mending. He needs a vast deal more than forgiveness, for his sin has brought with it other things beside the consciousness of indebtedness: it has brought shame, estrangement, moral impotence; and no Atonement which stops short of the repair of this damage is complete. To offer him merely forgiveness is not enough. He wants the power of sin broken, the entail of the past annihilated, a new beginning, to be as if he had never sinned.

A simple illustration will make this plain. A boy tells a lie to his father. But if there is a fibre of decency in the boy, he does not ask simply to escape the thrashing which threatens. He would rather welcome the punishment if it could accomplish what he really does want: that is, to have things as they were before. There is a breach of the old trust between father and son, and the punishment, whether given or remitted, does not touch the case at all.

Here let me make a remark in parenthesis, but one which I think is very important. Although in this paper I am using the word forgiveness as a synonym for escape from punishment, yet this is dangerously inaccurate, for forgiveness must not be equated with being "let off." Forgiveness of sin is a much more complicated ethical problem than this implies. The importance of mere escape from punishment has been dangerously over-pressed, and the conclusion of the enemies of Christianity that we believe for safety's sake has had some justification. The inadequacy of many of the theories of the doctrine which have been advocated lies in this mistake.

However logically satisfying all arguing may be that repentance is all that is required to reinstate man, our deepest convictions and our common experience tell us that this is not so. We want not only a Father whose love is infinite and who in consequence will "let us off" when we say we are sorry, we want shame and guilt and estrangement removed, we want power to realize our best. *In other words we want more than a Forgiver, we want a Saviour.* Forgiveness is, of course, a large part of salvation, but it is only a part, and it is just this other part, the price of Atonement or "the price of sin," as the children's hymn puts it, which constitutes the real problem. There is the easy way of escape—to deny that there is any "price" to be paid, but though this has certain advantages, as the avoidance of a difficulty generally has, there is our moral consciousness to be reckoned with. It may even be true that forgiveness is ours solely on the ground of our repentance, but it is probable that penitence could have been induced in us by the life, teaching and example of our Lord. Why then the Cross? Our moral instinct is not wrong. We read the

story of the Passion and we meet something there which strengthens our conviction that a penalty of some nature had to be paid by the Saviour. The Bloody Sweat, the "strong crying with tears," the terrible wail of agony from the Cross, indicate that here is something more than a brave man facing death: here is some nameless horror which must be borne if salvation is to be won for man. Love alone cannot do it. The Love of Christ is not the same thing as the Blood of Christ.

The testimony of the human heart agrees with the Gospel record. We need more than forgiveness. The conscience is not easily satisfied. "Some one has got to suffer for this," is its instinctive testimony when awakened by the conviction of sin. This is just what the Gospels seem to depict in the Lord's Passion. He is enduring a penalty. Any theory of the Atonement which does not take full account of this element in the Gospel narratives can never be accepted as satisfactory.

Now it is just because it does try to include this element in its theory that the Substitutionary theory lives on. It has been seriously wrong in some of the positions it has maintained, but it has laid hold of an essential fact in the Atonement which the conscience insists upon as vitally necessary. Right through the Bible lies a chain of passages, all of which have this running through them as an undercurrent.

"The chastisement of our peace was upon Him and by His stripes we are healed."

"The Son of Man came . . . to give His Life a ransom for many."

"Who Himself bare our sins in His own Body on the tree."

"Without the shedding of blood there is no remission."

It really cannot be too strongly insisted that any interpretation which glosses over this prevailing element in the Bible must not claim nor expect to receive very serious attention. It is a fatally eviscerated view of the Atonement which does not give full weight to such passages and true emphasis to the doctrine to which they witness.

Now it is just this element in the Atonement which Evangelicalism has always tenaciously maintained to be absolutely vital. Its popular expositions have often been difficult to defend, and in insisting upon some catchwords as essential shibboleths it has been at least unwise. But in its loyal emphasis of what is the deepest demand of our moral nature it has done an incalculable service to religion and truth.

In the Cross of Jesus, God did for us and apart from us something which we could not do for ourselves. Something had to be done for us to which we ourselves could not in any way contribute, and God did it through Christ for us by the Cross.

Theology has several terms which refer to this aspect of the Atonement: ransom, propitiation, reconciliation and so on. But human language is a clumsy medium which can only express profound truths very roughly. Men skilled in logic-chopping argue with the terms used, and darken counsel by scoring a victory over

ineffective and even erroneous attempts at expression. But the underlying truth can never be eliminated, the moral consciousness demands it even if words cannot be found to express it adequately.

What Christ did upon the Cross was to put right the situation created by sin. This is the demand of the human conscience: not merely to escape punishment, to get off scot free, but to be right with God and to be at peace with itself.

Sin has outraged the moral law, and to repair the situation Christ by His life and sacrificial death paid a full and final tribute to the moral order. By identifying Himself with us, He became involved in our disaster and all the misery and horror which sin has caused was endured by Him. He became one of us in our misery, disgrace and downfall. But He was more than equal to the occasion, and the Resurrection witnessed to His triumph. "It behoved Christ to suffer" if He was to save, but it was essential that He should triumph over suffering if His sacrifice was to be of avail for human needs.

Such is perhaps a not wholly inadequate statement of the root truth in the Substitution theory of the Atonement.

The question still remains, how does all this meet the case? To speak of Christ as our Substitute, enduring the punishment of our sin is not admissible. But there is no difficulty in speaking of what He endured as "vicarious suffering." There is nothing in that idea which offends our sense of justice, it is indeed a common human experience, and suffering is the price which love has constantly to pay in our own relations with one another. But "vicarious punishment" is an impossible thought. Even so, how does the work of Christ become available for us?

It is here that the Representative view of the Atonement comes in to fill up what is wanting. Christ endured the consequences of sin not *in our stead* but *in our behalf*. All that He did was done in the name of humanity and as Representative of the human race. So that we may even say that in Him humanity endured to the full the consequences of sin and paid its penalty. By an act of faith we appropriate and make our own all that He did, we become identified with Him in "a mystical union" and what he did for us, we do in Him. His sufferings become our sufferings, His death becomes our "death unto sin," His Resurrection becomes "our new birth unto righteousness." "God does not accept Christ's death instead of ours. He accepts our death in Christ."

St. Paul's words perfectly express what we are trying to state: "I am crucified with Christ, nevertheless I live, yet not I, but Christ liveth in me, and the life which I now live in the flesh I live by the faith of the Son of God, Who loved me and gave Himself for me."

It is the language of paradox, but it works out true in practice. Christ has become the Head of a new race in which sin is expiated and pardoned. Humanity makes a new start in which the handicap of sin no longer exists. A new situation has been created in which every one can share by an act of trust. Men are restored to full union with God. The claims of conscience are fully met, and man in his relation with God is as if he had never sinned.

## UNMEDIATED ACCESS TO CHRIST AND THE FREE GRACE OF GOD.

BY THE REV. H. B. GOODING, B.D., Principal, Wycliffe  
Hall, Oxford.

### I

THERE can be no doubt about the value of the service which Evangelicalism has rendered to the cause of religion by its insistence on the right of direct access to Christ for every individual, and on the fundamental importance to religious life of the experience thus acquired of the grace of God freely given, in forgiveness, in fellowship and in strengthening influence. Furthermore, in its clear grasp of these facts lies, perhaps, the greatest contribution which Evangelicalism can make to the religious life of to-day; for a glance at the present situation suggests that the greatest need of the moment, as a steadying influence and a corrective to dangerous tendencies, is for a quiet and steadfast witness to these fundamental principles of our Christian experience.

As the purpose of this Conference is practical, it is important to keep in mind the question of the way in which Evangelicalism can best make its contribution, both in this and in other directions. At the moment we may remind ourselves of three points.

(a) Evangelicals will not succeed in making any decisive contribution unless they close up their ranks. There is, so far as I know, complete unanimity with regard to the subject we are now considering, but in general, a totally wrong impression is produced as to the real nature of the religious thought and life of the country as a whole by our lack of unity in speech and action. If only we can learn to disregard minor differences and realize our unity on fundamental points, we will have the power to make a contribution of vital importance to the life of the nation.

(b) While our witness on the point of grace must be clear and definite, it must not be one-sided. There is the danger, continually illustrated in the history of religious movements, of emphasizing one aspect of the truth to the neglect of another. In bearing witness to the truth of immediate access to Christ and the free grace of God, we must avoid giving the impression that we neglect or depreciate the Ministry or Sacraments as means of grace.

(c) Some measure of united action is called for: but ultimately truth is never promoted merely by organization. We must be ready to give an account of the faith which is in us. Evangelicalism, rooted in freedom, can never refuse this challenge, save at the price of death. If present circumstances are calling on us to bear witness to what we have learnt about the dealings of God with man, our witness must not be merely the united testimony of a large body, but must include a clear statement of the grounds on which we base our convictions. A call to witness is a call to renewed study.

## II

It is, of course, impossible, in a short paper, to embark on any adequate study of the subject, but we must notice three lines along which we must be prepared to justify our position.

(a) First, there is the appeal to the Bible. It is important to insist that the evidence of the Bible should be regarded as decisive. There is, of course, the difficulty of interpretation in detail. But the following points, which bear on our subject, seem to be fairly clear. 1. The light which has been thrown on the ministry of the period of the New Testament, especially on the growth of the three-fold ministry of Bishop, Priest and Deacon, does not suggest that the Christian minister was intended to be an intermediary through whom only, or even normally, the individual could approach Christ or receive grace.<sup>1</sup> 2. The whole sacerdotal idea of the ministry, characteristic of the Old Testament, is strikingly absent from the pages of the New Testament. In the Pauline writings all the stress is on the pastoral character of the ministry. St. Peter speaks of all Christians as a royal priesthood.<sup>2</sup> The outlook of the writer of the Epistle to the Hebrews is summed up in the vividly clear phrase, "Having therefore a great High Priest, etc., let us draw near with boldness to the throne of grace."<sup>3</sup> 3. The reason for this change in the conception of the Ministerial office may be clearly seen in the argument of the same Epistle. The writer perceived (and states with great fullness) that all that for which the Old Testament priesthood and sacrificial system stood was fulfilled in and by Our Lord, and that the grace of God, only partially and inadequately received through such institutions, was brought within the reach of all mankind in all its fullness through Jesus Christ. If this writer's outlook is typical of the thought of his day, the change in the conception of ministry was clearly inevitable.

These facts, together with the emphasis which New Testament writers lay upon their own experience of fellowship with Christ and upon all which this meant to them, in contrast to what they had won through the legal or sacrificial system of the Old Testament, seem to me to make it clear that New Testament teaching and practice alike support those who insist on the importance of emphasizing the reality of unmediated access to Christ and of the free grace of God.

(b) In addition to the appeal to scripture, we must be prepared to appeal to reason. This is after all only part of the process of interpreting scripture. Revelation and reason are not opposed to one another. In this connection, I would venture to suggest that it is important to think out the meaning of grace and try to get a clear idea of its nature. It is a somewhat vague word, and has had unfortunate vicissitudes in its theological journey down the ages. The question is complicated also by the fact that grace can

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Lightfoot's *Essay on the Ministry* and Dr Headlam's *The Doctrine of the Church and Reunion*.

<sup>2</sup> 1 Peter ii. 9.

<sup>3</sup> Hebrews iv. 14 and 16.

come to us in many ways, and that we can distinguish many kinds of help which it brings to us. But, without attempting to treat the subject fully, may I suggest that behind all this variety in manifestation grace is ultimately always to be thought of in terms of personality. God may use, as a means of His grace towards me, a flower or the song of a bird, a picture, a sunset or a "chorus ending of Euripides," or any of the elements, material or personal, in my environment; but in the long run, what constitutes the grace is the touch, as it were, of God's Spirit on my spirit. In other words, grace, in whatever way it comes to us and whatever the kind of help it brings, is nothing more nor less than the influence of the divine personality working on a finite personality. The full revelation of the divine has been given to man in Christ. Hence it is through Christ that the fullness of God's grace is experienced. And since, as we have seen, grace is personal influence, reason at once suggests that it must work in accordance with certain laws of personality. Since God is a moral and spiritual being, we can be sure that He will deal with us along moral and spiritual lines. To take an example, we can understand how the offer of God's grace as seen in forgiveness is coupled in the New Testament with a call to repentance and an attitude of trust; but to imagine that when a man turns to God in repentance and faith God could refuse to respond until the seeker had performed some outward ceremony, or would not grant, let us say, His forgiveness except through a human minister, is to descend from the level of the personal to the mechanical, or to work on a conception of the divine personality which is surely transcended in our dealings with one another on the level of ordinary human life.

(c) A third line along which we must be prepared to give an account of our faith is that of experience. We would not in all probability be slow in attempting this, and to some extent we would be well qualified; for one of the secrets of the strength of Evangelicalism has been its emphasis on personal religion. The appeal to the evidence of experience is of vital importance, for Christianity is not a theory of life, but a way of living; ultimately we must judge it by its fruits. The argument, however, from experience must be used with care. In bringing forward our own experience as evidence, we must not, on the one hand, overlook other classes of people, whose experience has not been quite the same as ours, nor, on the other hand, must we isolate our experience on one point from the whole range of our experience in general. If we avoid these mistakes, we will recognize that the divine grace comes to men in many ways, and we will not overlook or depreciate the importance of the various means of grace. But I believe that, if there is one thing more than another which may be regarded as an assured result of the experience of countless individuals from the beginning of the Christian era down to the present day, it is that the individual can go direct to Christ, and through Him receive from God peace, joy and the help to live a new life. This may be taken to be so indisputable and well established a fact that it cannot be minimized

in the interests of any theory of ministry or sacraments, but on the contrary must be taken into account in any attempt to arrive at a reasonable conception of such institutions.

### III

So far, in emphasizing the freeness and fullness of Grace which comes to all through Jesus Christ, we have been dwelling mainly on the individual aspect of the matter. There is also the corporate side ; and there is need that Evangelicals should bear witness to this to-day with all their power. My experience leads me to think that there is an impression abroad that Evangelicals do not sufficiently stress the corporate side of religion nor see much value in the Church, the Ministry or the Sacraments as means of grace ; that there is a good deal of misunderstanding as to what we do believe ; and that clear teaching as to our belief on these subjects would be welcomed and do a great deal towards establishing the reasonableness of our position. We must make it clear that we do, of course, regard these things as means of grace ; but that, in the light of the conception of grace mentioned above, we are unable to accept any view which makes them mechanical means of grace. The Sacraments, e.g. are not a means of grace, either in the sense that some effect in the realm of grace is impossible apart from them (e.g. regeneration in Baptism) or in the sense that through their use grace is inevitably conveyed ; but that they are real, and amongst the most important, means by which, if rightly used, grace comes to and is appropriated by us, would be found to be true in the experience of the great majority of Christians. So with regard to the Minister, although the conditions of receiving grace are simply that one can go to God through Christ in repentance and faith, yet the Minister can give help to the individual, both in originating and strengthening the life of grace, by his ministry of the Word and of the Sacraments, by his visiting and his godly counsel, and in many other ways. The Church, and this carries with it the corporate side of life, is important to the Evangelical just because he keeps his idea of grace, as it were, on the personal level. Just because grace is ultimately personal, it may come to us most fully through persons (not as officials but as inspired personalities), and fellowship with God through Christ means fellowship with one another ; and the fullness of the life of grace comes not in isolation, but through sharing (giving and taking) one with another. The Church holds a vital place in the pages of the New Testament, because it is a living body sharing in one common life, the life of the Spirit, all the members growing together towards perfection and fullness of life.

It is obvious that what has been said above cannot be regarded as more than a slender outline of certain aspects of a large and important subject, but it may not be without value if it serves to emphasize the importance of this side of religious truth, and especially to direct attention, in this connection, to the necessity of think-

ing out a clear conception of the nature of divine grace. It may be doubted whether anything is more important than this for the solution of some of the problems with which we are faced. If we are to succeed in doing this we must keep in mind the evidence, which is abundant, in the New Testament and the facts of Christian experience as a whole, both throughout the ages and at the present day, and we must interpret all this evidence in accordance with reason. The present situation demands not only that we should bear witness to a certain view of grace, but also that we should be able, as I have suggested above, to show that it is in accord with the Bible (especially with the New Testament), with Christian experience and with reason. A conception of grace which fulfils these requirements will be found, I believe, to be one in the light of which we cannot fail to perceive the truth, of vital importance to the presentation of the Evangelical outlook, and, what is more important, essential to the unhampered development of full religious life, of the belief in freedom of access to Christ and, through Him, to all the blessings of divine love; a conception, also, in the light of which we will be able to present the true place of the Church, the Ministry and the Sacraments in the whole of the Christian life and to understand their necessity and true nature as means of grace. Finally, while such facts as these need to be emphasized in every age, the need that they should be re-emphasized to-day is especially urgent; and any work we may do along these lines, and any witness we bear to these facts will, I am convinced, be of real value to the religious life of our nation as a whole.

---

NOTE.—We regret that we have been unable to include Mr. W. Guy Johnson's paper on "Sacerdotalism" in this number of THE CHURCHMAN. We hope to print it in the October number.—[ED.]





## THE INSPIRATION OF HOLY SCRIPTURE.

BY THE REV. T. W. GILBERT, D.D., Rector of  
Bradfield, Berks.

THE peculiar value of Evangelicalism lies in the emphasis which it places on spiritual religion. Whatever variation there may be with regard to some matters, the essential feature of our Evangelical School of thought lies there. We stress the Atonement, we preach the redemptive power of the crucified and risen Saviour, we hold forth the promise of His abiding Presence and the power of the Holy Spirit, for these are the things which are needful for mankind, and these are the things which we believe God has given us to proclaim.

But the revelation of these truths is contained in the Bible, and the interpretation of the Bible has undergone some startling changes during the last couple of generations, so that the expression of these Evangelical truths is not quite the same as it was in the days of our fathers. The reality of the truths remains for those who call themselves Evangelicals, but the expression of them is found to vary, and the variation is the resultant of differing views of the way in which God has revealed Himself to mankind.

This fact is a hopeful one from which to start, because it makes clear that in the great Evangelical movement there is still the recognition of the vital truths for which our fathers stood. In spite of the much greater variety of opinion among us our primary emphasis still rests upon the great truth that God was in Christ reconciling the world unto Himself and calling men to be born again into a new life of fellowship with Him.

Had Evangelicals as a body looked more to the great positive truths they hold in common we should have been spared much of the anguish of the last few years, for the matters which tend to divide us are as nothing in comparison with the great truths which should hold us together.

This may seem to be prejudging the particular topic with which I am asked to deal, but all events it represents the point of view of those who, like myself, have links with all shades of Evangelical opinion.

The Evangelical school of thought seems to have become divided into three groups, so far as Biblical interpretation is concerned. The first group comprises those whose view would be summed up in the dictum that the Bible is literally the Word of God. Definitions are usually provocative of misunderstanding, and the phrase "the Bible is the Word of God," is no exception to the rule. But what is usually implied by those who use the expression is that they are in opposition to those who declare that the Bible "contains the Word of God," and by contrast they affirm that the Bible is the Word of God from Genesis to Revelation. Along with such a view, and explaining it, is usually a belief in a verbal inspiration of what some

might call a very extreme type, and yet the view seems logical if one accepts the premises of those who look at the Bible in this light. For the argument is stated somewhat as follows, i.e., Man is a moral being with spiritual hopes and longings. These spiritual hopes and longings are not self-created but God-implanted. Now God would not implant these spiritual longings unless He made provision to satisfy them, and the record of His provision to satisfy the spiritual needs of man is contained in the Bible. But God, because He is God, would ensure that the record of His provision would be accurate in detail, and because the Bible does contain the record of God's manifestation of Himself and of His plan for the redemption of man, therefore the Bible must be accurate. It must therefore be believed in implicitly in general detail, otherwise it is a dishonouring of God. Such a view implies as a rule a literal reading of such things as the six days Creation, a literal Garden of Eden, a universal Flood, a literal Tower of Babel, and the like. It sees no element of figurativeness in the book of Jonah, for example, but the whole Bible from the first word to the last becomes literally the Word of God.

Allied with this first group are those who accept the premises referred to above, with reference to the need that God should make some provision to satisfy man's spiritual longings—premises which all Christian men in fact will accept—but who at the same time are conscious of the necessity to define more closely the way in which the record of God's provision for man in the Bible is put together. Hence follows the attempt to define the meaning of Inspiration, and the definition is naturally coloured by the view already held of the Bible as a whole. If the Bible is literally the Word of God, then how can writers who obviously possessed supernatural knowledge in writing some sentences drop to a lower level in writing other sentences? If there are errors as to matters of fact which we can verify, how can we know that there are no errors as to the Godhead or the Future Life, which we cannot verify?—such are some of the questions put by those who hold these particular views, and the practical result is a literal belief in the verbal accuracy of the Bible from the first verse of Genesis to the last verse of Revelation. The view does sometimes take cognizance of the need for textual criticism in order to get back as near as possible to original texts, and it does in some degree allow for the inspiration of selection, as in St. Luke i. 1-4, or St. John xx. 30, 31. It may recognize the composite character of a book like Genesis, whilst there may sometimes be a recognition of the progressive nature of the Biblical revelation. But broadly speaking, the Bible is in this view not merely *sui generis*, but because it is *sui generis* it must be judged from a wholly different standard from every other book. The Bible becomes a complete whole in the sense that to doubt or criticize any part tends to reflect upon God's handiwork.

This summary may easily be criticized as imperfect by those who have been called in recent years conservative Evangelicals, for any writer who attempts to summarize the views of a large body of men,

many of whose views are in some small degree divergent, will always find himself in a position easy to be criticized. What has been mentioned above, however, will be found to be substantially true.

The second group of Evangelicals approaches the Bible in very much the same way as the first. They, like all men, feel the need for some answer to the spiritual longings and desires which they are sure are implanted by God, they are equally desirous of finding out what is the God-given plan for the *rapprochement* of sin-conscious man with a holy God, and they too find their answer in the God-given record of a people and of a Person. But to this group, the God-given record of the race by whom His ways were made known, was conveyed to men in the way in which all God's work has been done in this world, and that is by human agency. Whatever method God may employ in other worlds, in this world He has employed, and He does employ, just ordinary mortals like ourselves. The history of the people of Israel, therefore, makes this group of Evangelicals feel that in using them God was employing a nation who were as other nations, except in the one important point of God's revelation of His holiness and purity and of His promise of Redemption. They see the ordinary secular history of the Israelites running its way, from one point of view, just like the history of any other nation. They read the Genesis record of the beginnings of the world, and they are not perturbed to be told that the record is mythological or that it may possibly not coincide with the findings of science, for they know that the Israelitish statement is immeasurably purer than its supposed Babylonish origin. They read the statement of the million of armed men who came from Egypt, and they see in the large number the stereotyped exaggeration which they can find amongst the early records of other nations. They contemplate the slaughter of the Canaanites by the invading Israelites as they would the similar massacres by the Assyrians. In the idealization of such monarchs as David and Solomon they see repeated the idealization which our own forefathers gave to such kings as Alfred and Edgar, an idealization based upon a solid substratum of fact, but an idealization largely coloured by the contrast such kingships presented to the more decadent days of the succeeding ages. For the same reason they see in the books of Chronicles, for instance, only partial views of such men as David and Solomon.

So again with the views of the Israelites about God. This group sees given to Israel the revelation of "the Lord God, merciful and gracious, longsuffering and abundant in goodness and truth" (Ex. xxxiv. 6). They see this revelation, already foreshadowed in the revelations to Abraham, growing into the life of Israel, much in the same way that the first group does. But this second group would seem to emphasize, more than the first, the development of ideas about God. They are not unmindful of the great passages in such places as Amos ix. 7 or Jonah iv. 11 or Micah vi. 8, but they see that it is only slowly that the Israelites moved from the restricted and almost tribal view of God to the nobler conception given by Hosea and Amos; they find what they believe to be crude ideas of God's

dealings, such as that which attributes Uzzah's death to the latter's perfectly natural and commendable action in trying to save the ark of God from falling (2 Sam. vi. 7). In short, this second group has the same idea of God's revelation of Himself at the beginning, but they see this revelation slowly working its way into the life and conscience of the people, obscured very often by the narrow outlook of the Israelites, contaminated and weakened repeatedly by contact with idolatrous neighbours, but slowly gaining in strength and purity in the days of the prophets, until its fuller and completed revelation in our Lord.

The views of these two groups of Evangelicals about the Old Testament, therefore, do not seem to have any vital difference between them. Both see a clear revelation of God given to Abraham and his descendants, and both see the rise and fall of the purity of that revelation in the subsequent history of the Israelites as given in the Old Testament. Where the second group differs from the first is in the greater latitude allowed to the human element both in the working out of the revelation, as well as in the record of that working out.

In addition to the two groups already referred to, there is another section of Evangelicals whose views are those of what is usually called the "higher critical" school. Their number is small in comparison with those of the first two groups, but to say that there are Evangelicals who hold the "higher critical" views is simply to state a fact. These Evangelicals see two versions of the history of Israel formed and completed by the eighth century B.C., and these versions are combined in the next century to become the "prophetic document" known as J.E. Later in the seventh century part of the Book of Deuteronomy is supposed to be issued, and taken as the basis for the reforms of Josiah, and this Deuteronomic code is supposed to have caused a further revision of the earlier history of the Israelites. Then in the sixth century B.C. the Priestly Code is put forth and enlarged later by the addition of the Law of Holiness, and this becomes the basis for a new version of the early history written from the point of view of the priests. Later still all the documents are combined into the Pentateuch and put forth as such in the days of Nehemiah. Along with such views of the early history of the Israelites there are to be found many of the characteristics noticed as belonging to the second group of Evangelicals, and the main difference between them seems to be that the second do not see their way to accept a view of the history of the Israelites which runs counter to the whole traditions of the Jews. With this important exception the views of the second and third groups are alike in most other respects.

Such in outline is the position of the Evangelical school of thought with regard to the Old Testament. There may be many whose views are only approximately those of one or other of those of the three groups indicated, but in broad outline the varying opinions will be found to run right throughout those who call themselves Evangelical members of the Church of England.

Little need be said about the New Testament, for two reasons. In the first place, whatever differences may have manifested themselves amongst us, there has not been very much variety of view with regard to the authenticity and accuracy of the books of the New Testament. In the second place the position of the New Testament is becoming more assured as criticism is identifying the New Testament more and more with traditional views.

The whole matter, however, is further complicated by the existence amongst us of two differing points of view with regard to the dual Personality of our Lord. On the one hand are those who stress the Divinity of our Lord, and who emphasize it in such a way that to the others it seems to obscure His Humanity. On the other side are those who emphasize both the Divinity and the Humanity of our Lord, but in such a way that to the former group of Evangelicals it seems that the Divinity is in danger of being lost in the Humanity. The practical result so far as Biblical interpretation is concerned is as follows. Those who hold the first point of view would say that our Lord referred to the Old Testament, and that His references therefore placed the seal of authenticity not merely upon historical personages such as Abraham and Moses, and not merely upon the accuracy of the history of Israel as recorded in the Old Testament. They would assert that the books of the Old Testament referred to by Christ have thus the seal of authenticity placed upon them, and that no error of any kind can be admitted about them. They would insist that the book of Jonah, for example, is actual history, and that every quotation from the Old Testament is a quotation of fact, and not simply an illustration, allegorical, spiritual, or otherwise. The point of view is that the Divine Christ in all His references was incapable of error, and the Old Testament, therefore, as a whole is sealed with literal truth and accuracy, because Christ's many references place the imprimatur of Divine authority upon it.

The other section of Evangelicals would not admit this. They would argue that Christ was true man, and that as true man there were limits to His knowledge. His utterances about God and about Himself were absolutely true, but the illustrations He used to convey those truths were couched in the ordinary language of the time, and also from the standpoint of the age in which He was living. If He referred to Jonah, for example, He did not *ipso facto* change what is a prophetic parable into actual history, for it was the spiritual or religious significance with which He was concerned, not the historical. If, again, He quoted Deuteronomy at the Temptation and at other times, this did not shut down all argument as to whether that particular book was a composition of the later period of the Monarchy or of the Mosaic period.

Such is the position in which we find ourselves to-day. It is a position we share with every other section of the Christian Church, but it causes us greater difficulties owing to the emphasis we place upon the importance of the Bible. Our brethren, however, are asking for guidance, and the concluding section of this paper must concern itself with some attempts to give that guidance. In doing so, I

would mention that what I venture to suggest is based upon an examination of the attitude of the sixteenth-century Reformers to the Bible, men whose attitude has its warnings as well as its encouragements for us to-day.

The first thing I would put forward is that we should let THEORIES of Inspiration go by the board. The danger amongst us to-day seems to arise from the fact that Evangelicals who feel on the defensive against new ideas are inclined to fall into the error into which the second generation of Reformers fell. They are attempting too much in the way of definitions of Biblical interpretation, and they are trying to define too closely their particular views on the Inspiration of the Bible. It is from the pursuance of this policy that the present division in our ranks mainly arises, and if we are to profit by the lessons of the past we must beware of the policy of always defining, and then expecting adherence to our definition. What I would urge is, that if a man is convinced of the authority of Holy Scripture he NEED HAVE NO PARTICULAR THEORY OF INSPIRATION AT ALL. All that is required is that we accept the Bible as the supreme authority for faith and morals. No Evangelical should be asked for more, and as an Evangelical he would not offer less; but when this is guaranteed then we can afford to leave THEORIES of Inspiration on one side.

In the second place we should look to the Bible not necessarily for complete LITERAL accuracy, but for SUBSTANTIAL accuracy, the accuracy, that is, which guarantees that a right and correct impression will be given to those who read the Biblical record. The Reformers felt that the Bible would give a faithful description, not necessarily of history or of science, but a faithful record of the way in which God's revelation of His purposes has been made known to men. This is the point to which Evangelicals should address themselves, and if it is kept in mind it will be seen that some variation of interpretation is inevitable. The man who reads the Bible with a full knowledge of the evolution of races is bound to interpret details differently to the man who has not this knowledge. The man who reads it with some knowledge of textual criticism derived from other studies, is bound to interpret it in a way that other men, not so equipped, cannot. This is not necessarily a plea in favour of one point of view more than another, it is merely a recognition of the fact that the interpretation of the skeleton of the Bible is bound to differ according to the mental equipment of the reader. Therefore how far the views of the three groups referred to with regard to Biblical Interpretation are to be regarded as typical of Evangelicals, is quite beside the point. It may be open to discussion to what extent any of these views discountenanced the "substantial accuracy" of the Biblical record, but if the exponents of these respective views can demonstrate that their views do uphold the "substantial accuracy" of the Bible, then they can undoubtedly claim to be heirs of the Reformation and of Evangelical principles. And this is a matter for argument and for argument only; it will not be settled either way by *ipse dixit*.

From this it follows that we may expect much variety of interpretation of the Bible ; but such variety is inseparable from the position taken up by Evangelicals. Our acceptance of Articles XX and XXI implies the recognition of the guidance and moral authority of Church Councils ; and Evangelicals will not overlook that. But Article VI throws the onus upon the God-enlightened and God-guided individual. It is the position taken up by the early Reformers, and in consequence there is bound to be variety of view to-day just as much as there was at the Reformation. For example, we are not much perturbed to-day if some amongst us still insist on Bishop Usher's chronology as against the views of those who see the age of the world and of man lost in hundreds of thousands of years. Nor do we feel a vital difference if some Evangelicals insist on the total depravity of mankind and others do not, as in the eighteenth century. Nor again do we feel a fundamental point of variance if one man, following Calvin, should stress the sovereignty or transcendence of God, whilst another of perhaps more mystical turn of mind stresses His immanence. We might feel the need for a due sense of proportion, but no more than that. As practical men to whom God has given differing gifts, and whom God has endowed with a personality which in no two men is exactly alike, let us expect variety, and don't let us be afraid of it, or be suspicious of it.

With regard to the vexed question of the dual character of the Personality of our Lord there is little likelihood of getting absolute unanimity of opinion. What has puzzled the Christian Church at all times is not outside the realm of possible solution, but that it has puzzled Christians for all times is at least a plea for patience and forbearance. For there is one important fact which I wish to state unhesitatingly, viz., that among Evangelicals there is a uniform loyalty to Christ as Lord and God. Those who hold views about our Lord which may seem very strange to those who adhere to the more traditional views, do not hold those views with the idea of minimizing the Godhead of Christ in the least degree. If they are striving to interpret for themselves the "true humanity" of our Lord, they acclaim and acknowledge unreservedly His "essential Deity."

What I think we all need is the constant positive note about our Lord, and what He is able to do for fallen and struggling humanity. Pascal tells us that "all the seeming contradictions of Scripture are reconciled in Jesus Christ," and it may be that all the seeming differences amongst Evangelicals will be reconciled in the preaching of Jesus Christ and in what He did for our salvation. Those who have any acquaintance with the history of the Reformation will know that the central point of that movement was to direct men to "the Gospel of God, concerning His Son, incarnate, suffering, risen, and glorified through the Spirit, the Sanctifier," to use Luther's phrase. The Reformers had their great varieties of Biblical interpretation, and they had their differences about doctrinal matters, but through all their differences the central truth of Christ as the Saviour of men was never obscured. And it was not obscured

because differences of Biblical interpretation and differences on doctrinal matters never obscured it. The hope for Evangelicals lies there.

In conclusion I would refer to a phenomenon which points the moral to what I have tried to put before you. During the last few months there have appeared volumes in which the subject of Biblical interpretation has been referred to by the Rt. Rev. Bishop Knox, the Rev. Canon Storr, and the Rev. G. T. Manley. No one will dare to deny the name of Evangelical to any of these three, for those who know them recognize in all of them the spirit which animates Evangelicals in the Church of England. With this fact in mind I want you thoughtfully and prayerfully to read the following pages in the books with which their names are associated, i.e., *On What Authority*, pp. 123-126, 133-144; *Liberal Evangelicalism*, pp. 80-100; and *Evangelicalism*, pp. 121-155. As you read you will probably find much with which you agree in all of them, and something also with which you may disagree. But the writers are each of them Evangelicals, and there is a unity amongst them as Evangelicals. Surely the essential thing is that their unity is not IN SPITE of their different points of view, but rather because their differing points of view about the subject of Biblical interpretation are not fundamental to their Evangelical belief. In that fact lies the optimism of those of us who are still seeking for unity amongst Evangelicals.

---

Messrs. Thomson & Cowan, Glasgow, send us *A Quest for Souls* (6s.). Dr. Geo. W. Druett, the Author, is an American Baptist minister who is one of the best known preachers in the United States. His sermons are popular and rhetorical, but are full of insight and knowledge of the human heart and its needs. Somehow as we read them we were reminded of the style of Spurgeon, and although the outlook is that of the twentieth century, the Evangelistic note is reminiscent in many ways of the great London preacher. He is frequently strikingly epigrammatic, and has a breezy optimism that is infectious.

---

**The Layman's Church.**—Bishop Knox has reprinted, through the Church Book Room, his speech at the Albert Hall meeting on Tuesday, March 31st last. The Bishop has entitled the speech *The Layman's Church*, and we trust it will receive a very wide circulation. Nearly 3,000 copies have already been sold or distributed in connection with the recent elections to the House of Laity, together with the Bishop's companion pamphlet, *Misuse of Prayer Book Revision*. The price is 2d. in each case.





## "INSPIRATION."

BY THE REV. E. L. LANGSTON, M.A., Vicar of Emmanuel,  
Wimbledon.

THE Archbishop of Canterbury at the C.M.S. Annual Meeting last month, in a very remarkable statesmanlike speech, caused us to realize the extreme solemnity of the days in which we are living. Reviewing the history of the past, and comparing it with the present situation, he said, "I firmly believe that the time which you and I are called upon to live in and to use is a greater crisis hour than any one of these. The world war has involved as its issue, the reconstruction and reconsideration on a gigantic scale of everything international and inter-racial, and you and I are called upon to be not the witnesses of that but the sharers in it, the carriers of responsibility, a trust from God, laid definitely upon us all, and realized by those who think."

The question in front of us is: what part in this great crisis are we as Evangelicals going to play? As Canon Wilson pointed out in his article in *THE CHURCHMAN* last April: "Again and again during the last few years, leading men who would not class themselves as Evangelicals have made confident prophecies that Evangelicals might or could, or even would lead the Church of England in the near future." Is this possible? There is not one amongst us who in his heart of hearts does not believe that we have a very real message and contribution for these days of crisis, but if we are to meet the present need there must be unity, and we are gathered here at such a time as this as a band of Evangelical clergy to do all in our power to make that unity effective, and to do so we must be frank the one with the other. It is no good baulking crucial questions. It may be that the future of the Church of God, as far as the Church of England is concerned, depends upon what will be the outcome of this Conference.

We Evangelicals at present are hopelessly divided, and suspicious and critical the one of the other, and at the root of all our dissension is this question of the "Inspiration of the Bible."

Is it possible for us to understand one another better than we do? I want as one of the old-fashioned conservatives to state our position clearly and frankly, for I believe at the root of our dissension there is much misunderstanding.

We have been called names perhaps rather thoughtlessly on the part of our brethren who differ from us; such remarks as "being out of date," "early Victorian," or "obscurantists" are neither kind nor Christian, for many of us hold the view we do out of clear, careful, prayerful and scholarly thought, having read books on modern criticism, and weighed them up, and yet in spite of all the scholarly marshalling of critical facts, we still adhere to the old traditional view, and it does hurt when we find ourselves in articles and in speeches referred to as unscholarly and hopelessly "old-fashioned."

From reading critical books and articles, we are conscious all the time that many of those who criticize us, do not appreciate our standpoint, and often make us out to believe things that we certainly do not believe. If the ordinary conception of a conservative believer were true, some of us are supposed to believe many crude and utterly foolish views. Consequently, I want to state very clearly, and as best I can, our attitude :—

1. With regard to criticism.
2. With regard to inspiration.
3. With regard to verbal inspiration.

## I. THE CONSERVATIVE AND HIGHER CRITICISM.

We believe that one of the most important studies of theology is the science of Biblical criticism, which has for its object the investigation of the history and the texts of the various Books of the Bible. Biblical criticism to be really effective must be constructive, for the purpose of strengthening faith in the Bible as the Word of God.

Criticism, originally, had two distinct branches, viz. Higher Criticism and Lower Criticism. The term “ Lower Criticism ” was employed to designate the study of a text of the Scriptures, and included the investigation of ancient MSS. in order that we might have as nearly as possible the original words of the Divinely inspired writers.

Hence, Higher Criticism in the first instance was used in contrast to the phrase “ Lower Criticism ” and was employed to designate the study of the historic origin, authorship and dates of the various Books of the Bible. Such criticism we believe to be an extremely valuable branch of Biblical study, and is of utmost importance as an aid to the interpretation of the Word of God.

We want it to be perfectly clear that no study requires a more devout spirit and real faith in the supernatural as the pursuit of Biblical criticism, but I believe we are all here united on this point. Modernism, as it is presented to us to-day, none of us are in agreement with ; we do believe in the supernatural, and we do believe in the final authority of Scripture. We take that for granted. Without faith, it is impossible for us to understand and explain the Scriptures, and without real scholarship no one is equipped to investigate the historic origin of the Bible. True Biblical criticism ought then to be both reverent in tone, and truly scholarly in work. Alas, we have to criticize the critics. Biblical criticism has not always been pursued in this reverent spirit of scientific Christian scholarship.

The Bible is different from any other book. It is, we all believe, the Word of God, and therefore must be approached from that standpoint and that standpoint alone. It is impossible for scholars by mere human scholarship to unveil its mysteries and treasures. Just because a man is either a literary genius or scientific expert, he is not thereby equipped either to understand the integrity or the credibility of any books or passages in Holy Scriptures. For the

true perception of Biblical truth much more is needed than literary or scientific qualifications, viz. spiritual insight.

Surely we are right in demanding such fundamental principles in our method of Biblical criticism. We are all agreed, surely, that no one would dream of seeking to expound musical masterpieces unless he himself was musical, or to judge the work of an artist unless he himself was artistic. In just the same way we assert that merely scientific scholarly minds are absolutely disqualified for the study of the Bible, for the Bible has no revelation to make to the un-Biblical mind.

The mistakes of the past 50 years of Biblical criticism have been to a large extent that many Continental theological professors have lacked these necessary Biblical and spiritual qualifications. Men of great learning and noted ability have had a very strong bias against the miraculous and supernatural, and seemed to have very little faith in the God of the Bible.

We do not bring these accusations against the Higher Critics of Great Britain or America, but we do against many of the Continental critics, who have influenced tremendously both the English and American critical scholars.

## II. THE BIBLE AND INSPIRATION.

I suppose we all of us agree that the Bible is a literary phenomenon containing a supernatural revelation, and that human science and philosophy cannot account for this Book. It is the one Book of the ages, absolutely unequalled and unrivalled. At a time when all literature was at its beginning, this Book began to appear. Human hands had indeed to do with it, all sorts of different writers contributed to its pages, but this instead of accounting for it deepens our perplexity, for behind and above these human composers and compilers some one true Author superintended and controlled the whole. As the late Dr. Pierson once said: "The Bible is a stately Cathedral; many human builders have in turn wrought on the structure. Who is the Architect? What One Mind was that, that planned and saw the whole building before Moses wrote those first words of Genesis, which by no accident, as though to carve the Architect's name on the vestibule, are these, In the beginning God? The Bible as a Book demands a Divine Author." Most of us I think are agreed on these points, therefore we believe that what the heart of the fortress is to its outworks and minor defences, that, to the Christian Faith, is the inspired Word of God, its central stronghold. To give up that, in any measure, is, therefore, in so far, to yield up the whole fortress to the foe.

Infidelity and irreligion seem to be organizing their united forces for a final assault upon the whole system of Christianity. There seem to be plots for the undermining of the very foundations of the Christian Faith and of belief in the supernatural. In the last analysis this Book becomes the very centre of both the attack and the defence for the fundamental truths of the Christian Faith. The Church of God needs men to-day with strong convictions; men who

know from their heart, and therefore speak with confidence concerning the positive proofs that the Bible is of God ; men who by prayer as well as by scholarship have positive proofs and convictions that this is no ordinary Book. We all of us believe it has nothing to fear from rational inquiry ; investigation must mean vindication, and the more searching the investigation, the more triumphant the vindication.

We Evangelicals in the past have been men of the Book, and it is upon this Book that we have based our doctrines and our faith.

I imagine that every one of us present would agree to the statement, that we believe in the full inspiration of the Bible as the Word of God. It is a literary phenomenon, unequalled and unrivalled, stamped with Divine authority from beginning to end.

### III. THE BIBLE AND VERBAL INSPIRATION.

Now we come to the next question where we differ, and we ask ourselves the question " In what degree were the Bible writers inspired ? " Are we right in ascribing the whole Book, every chapter, every verse to be the Word of God ? Regarding this, there is much misunderstanding with regard to our view as conservatives. We do believe that inspiration is a miracle, and like all miracles there is a mystery about it, which our puny finite reasonings cannot always fathom.

We do believe in verbal inspiration. By that we mean that the writers were inspired to record what they wrote. This does not necessarily mean that every word was inspired of God, for we know very well in the Bible there are words recorded as being spoken by the Devil, spoken by men, e.g. Job's comforters, and that such words were not inspired by God, but the writer was inspired to record the things he wrote.

I have heard very able and scholarly men criticize some of us for believing " crude views of verbal inspiration," evidently thereby not understanding what we mean by verbal inspiration. I want to insist that our view of inspiration is that we believe that the people who wrote the Bible were at the moment of writing supernaturally inspired for the special purpose of writing the Scriptures. The exact manner in which the minds of the inspired writers worked when they wrote we cannot explain. We do not for one moment admit that they were mere automata, like typewriting machines, in the hands of the Holy Spirit, or like the Mr. Vale-Owen type of spirit writers amongst spiritists. Such a mechanical theory is open to many and grave objections ; but we do believe that in some supernatural way the Holy Spirit made use of reason, memory, intellect, style of thought, mentality and personality of each writer. How, none can explain. We do see this, however, that there is both a human and Divine element in this Book, and yet this Book is at one and the same time the Word of God, written by " men sent of God," and impelled by the Holy Spirit.

As we look back upon the past nineteen centuries of scholarship, we see how our Lord and His Apostles and the early Church Fathers,

to a large extent treated the Bible as verbally inspired from this standpoint—e.g. Clement of Rome said, in A.D. 90, "The Scriptures are the true words of the Holy Ghost." St. Augustine also contended for the infallible accuracy of the very words of Scripture, and the great Evangelical fathers of the 17th, 18th, and 19th centuries exercised their belief in the fully inspired Word of God, such as Bishop Jewel, Richard Hooker, Dr. Owen; and the late Dean of Westminster on September 3rd, 1904, said in Westminster Abbey, "If the Bible was inspired by a Divine Spirit, how can it record what did not actually take place? or if an element of human error and mistake is in the Bible, how can we regard it any longer as an inspired Book, or use it as an infallible guide of life? . . . behind and beneath the Bible, above and below the Bible was the God of the Bible." Bishop Wordsworth on inspiration says, "We affirm that the Bible is the Word of God, and that it is not marred with human infirmities. We do not imagine, with some, that the Bible is like the threshing floor, on which wheat and chaff lie mingled together, and that it is left to the reader to winnow and sift the wheat from the chaff by the fan and sieve of his own mind."

We assert that the Bible cannot be a perfect rule of life unless it is fully inspired in this way. We assert that the Bible is wholly useless as a weapon in modern controversies at home and abroad if such a view of inspiration is not believed in. We assert there could be no good in us Clergy taking texts or passages of Scripture and applying them to the hearts, minds, and consciences of those that hear, unless the Bible is thus inspired of God.

We assert that the denial of Verbal Inspiration of Scripture destroys all comfort and instruction in private reading and devotion.

I know there are many valuable objections to this attitude, and I am quite aware that there are occasional statements in the Bible which seem to contradict the facts of ancient history, but one must say at the same time that most scholars realize the difficulty of getting correct data as to very ancient history, but with the modern development of the study of Egyptology and Assyriology we begin to realize more and more that the Bible is in harmony with history.

It is a singular fact that practically all recent researches in Assyria, Babylon, Palestine, and Egypt have confirmed the Bible record and often proved other uninspired records to be inaccurate. There can be no doubt that Christ and His Apostles believed in the whole of the Old Testament as being fully inspired in every part. It was implicitly believed in as the Word of God.

It will not do for Modern Critics to say that our Lord, who said of Himself "I am the Truth," "I and my Father are one," was not a critical scholar and His knowledge was limited as to what was truth and what error. Even if our Lord was thus limited in His knowledge during His lifetime, and so emptied Himself that He was just like His brethren (I myself do not believe that He was thus limited), when He rose from the dead He was restored to the glory and knowledge that were His own before He took our flesh upon Him, and

after His resurrection He uttered these words : “ All things must be fulfilled which are written in the Law of Moses and in the Prophets and in the Psalms concerning me ” (St. Luke xxiv. 27). Such is the statement of the Lord Jesus Christ, Who had been declared the Son of God with power, and that for us all, surely, must be final and overwhelming ; for now in His resurrection glory He was not under limitations of the Kenosis, and in the full glory of His Deity He solemnly declares that those Books we have received as the product of Moses were indeed the Books of Moses, and He has set His seal upon the whole Old Testament as being the very Word of God.

In conclusion we all believe, surely, that this Book is no ordinary book, and is what it claims to be: the Word of God. Is it not possible, therefore, for us to unite, and with this Book in hand go to our day and generation and unveil its precepts under the guidance of the Holy Spirit, with the message God has given to us Evangelicals of “ a personal faith in the living Saviour, Who is the living Word of God ” ? And so with the written Word of God in our hands, we must seek to heal the breach and unite our ranks into one fellowship in this day of crisis, and hasten forward the consummation of the Gospel, viz. the manifestation of the Lord Jesus Christ with power and great glory, and the establishment of His kingdom here on earth.

---

Canon Douglas Maclean has a delightful way with him. He is in general a conservative in his outlook upon life, but he at times startles by the novelty of his suggestions and his revolt from anything like holding by traditions. On the other hand he sees very clearly the shallowness of much current idealism and has no regard for the sloppy stuff that passes for sound political philosophy in “ democratic circles.” In his treatment of equality in the Church he stresses the doctrine of Apostolical Succession. Is there not something more than a difference in wording between Hooker's contention, “ We hold that God's clergy are a state, necessary by the plain word of God Himself, whereunto the rest of God's people must be subject as touching things that appertain to the soul's health ” and what Canon Maclean holds to be the Established teaching of orthodox Anglicanism, “ The power of sacred order and of the keys is given by God immediately to those who are bishops and pastors, and by and through them belongs to the whole body, and not otherwise.” We are tempted to break many a lance with *Equality and Fraternity* (George Allen & Unwin, 7s. 6d.) ; but we refrain, and express our gratitude to its author for hours of amusing and suggestive enlightenment spent in his company. He provokes thought and challenges attention in every chapter.



## RITUAL AND CEREMONIAL.

BY THE REV. THOS. J. PULVERTAFT, M.A., Vicar of St. Paul at Kilburn.

WHAT a man says is not so important as what a man does, and what he does, will not carry as far as what he is. This is a commonplace which we all admit to be universally true. In the conduct of public worship a man's actions ought to be the expression of the teaching of the Church. They are authorized—at least they ought to be authorized—by the Church, and as such have something more than the teaching value attached to his pulpit utterances, which arise from his individual interpretation of the Church's message. What he believes in his heart is expressed by his ritual and ceremonial actions as well as by his spoken words. The actions of most men in the conduct of public worship are the same Sunday after Sunday, and their oft repetition has a greater psychological and intellectual effect than the fugitive memory of a sermon which varies from Sunday to Sunday. We have no desire to depreciate in any way the value of preaching, but the message delivered owes much to the framework of the service, and is interpreted very largely by the character of the service with which it is associated.

Broadly there are two types of men in the ministry of the Church of England. We are called to be Ministers of the Word and Sacraments. Some place the chief stress on the Word, and consider the sacraments owe their efficacy to the acceptance in the heart of the Gospel message. Others maintain that the Minister is a Priest in the Apostolical Succession, and on his sacerdotal character depends the validity of the sacramental ministry and the sureness of the reception of sacramental grace. The former places all his stress on the relation of the worshipper to God and the rightness of his heart with God—the latter looks upon the Priest as the essential element in the due reception of grace from God. Without the Priest there is no valid sacrament—the Priest offers the Divine Sacrifice, the Priest is a necessary agent in attaching the Divine Presence to the Elements, and through the Priest the ministry of absolution in the sacrament of Penance is practised.

Until the rise of the Tractarian movement the ceremonial ritual of the Church of England was practically the same in every Church. At first the Tractarians were content with asserting their view of the Ministry and the Sacraments, but they made little headway until they gave expression to them in Ritual and Ceremony. When this was done they at once challenged attention, and the English Christian public saw they were face to face with a reversion to views previously considered to be those of the Church of Rome from which the Church of England had emancipated itself. A new interpretation was given to the Ornaments Rubric, a new position of the Celebrant at the Holy Communion was demanded, and a fresh view was put forward of the meaning of certain phrases

in the Communion Service and the Visitation of the Sick. The difference between the traditional reformed conception of the services of the Church and the Tractarian view was symbolized in acts and vestments. And we as Evangelicals have to consider the course we must follow.

Two courses are open to us. We may persuade ourselves that many practices which are associated with the prevalent Tractarian or Anglo-Catholic movement are in themselves innocent, and therefore we may adopt them and by so doing take the sting out of them and show the public that they mean nothing erroneous. Or we may persevere in the simplicity of our worship, retaining the customary ritual and ceremonial of the Church as at once the mark of our beliefs and our protest against false teaching. Since the Lincoln judgment the Eastward Position, so called, has been made legal. It is not for us now to question the merits of the judgment. We are free to adopt it without incurring the charge of lawlessness. But we cannot forget history. In the primitive Church the Westward Position was universal—the consecrating Minister faced the congregation. It is an undoubted fact that in Spain until the eleventh century this was the universal custom of the Mozarabic Church, and was only abandoned when that Church became subject to the domination of Rome. It is still retained in certain South American Churches—by papal permission—whereas even in the Mozarabic Chapels in Spain the Eastward Position is uniformly adopted. Undoubtedly the men who introduced the Eastward Position in England held the belief that the Minister at Holy Communion is a sacrificing priest. The position symbolizes this belief, and it is a matter of conscience with a large number of men that they will not consecrate in any other manner. To do so would disown their priesthood, and this is with them a matter of supreme importance. In the Army it is incumbent upon all Chaplains to adopt the Eastward Position as legal without doctrinal significance. Uniformity is a rule in the Army, and many men who had never adopted this position in their parish Churches had to choose between losing the privilege of ministering to the troops in war time or doing what they had not done before. The interpretation of the King's regulations enabled them to do so with an easy conscience. On their return to civil life what should their attitude be? They knew that the Eastward Position is definitely symbolical of doctrine which they reject, and by continuing the practice they place themselves in line with the Roman and Anglo-Catholics who hold the sacrifice of the Mass. Are they able to maintain that their actions are not open to misrepresentation when at least ninety-nine per cent. of the Ministers of the two Churches known to them who consecrate in this fashion do so because they accept teaching which Evangelicals reject? The Eastward Position is a label that has a definite meaning to those who know what ritual means.

Attempts have been made to introduce a Diocesan use of the Eastward Position and two lighted candles on the Re-Table, in the hope that this may become the maximum and minimum of



ceremonial ritual. Has it been effective? Has any Anglo-Catholic or Tractarian reduced his ritual through satisfaction with the efficient symbolism of the position and the lights? No one has done so and the effort to secure Uniformity has not succeeded.

The same remarks apply to the use of the Chasuble, which is pre-eminently the sacrificial Vestment in the Church of Rome. It may be held, as it undoubtedly is by some, that the Chasuble has no doctrinal significance, that it is simply emblematical of charity and an outward sign of the continuity of the Church of England with the Church of St. Augustine, who brought Christianity to paganized England of the sixth century. It is also true that on some rare occasions in Roman ceremonial the Chasuble is used out of the service of the Mass, and that the Swedish Lutherans who have disclaimed the sacerdotal conception of the Ministry also adopt it. But who knew of the Jubilee celebrations in Rome or the clothing of Swedish ministers when the Chasuble was introduced? It is safe to say that only a few learned antiquarians were aware of the facts; and the effort to deprive an acknowledged symbol of the sacrificial character of the priesthood is an argument that attempts to justify the adoption of a vestment that is universally in the Roman Church, and ordinarily by those who use it in the Church of England, accepted as the outward sign of teaching which is rejected by all Evangelical Churchmen. Apart altogether from this we cannot as a minority of clergy in the Church rob of its significance a Vestment that has historically and contemporaneously one and one only meaning in the minds of at least ninety-nine per cent. of those who use it. We know its use in the Roman Catholic Ordination Service, and the attempt to revive its use in the Ordination Service of the Church in Wales met with just condemnation on the part of the authorities of that Church. Is there any instance on record that the adoption of this Vestment by those who do not attribute to it a sacerdotal significance has caused the change of conviction in a single one who has given to it the only meaning it has had in recent Church practice?

If this be so, then it is the plain duty of Evangelical Churchmen to consider carefully and prayerfully their conduct of public worship. They stand for certain well-defined views of the Ministry. They are the inheritors of a great tradition which they believe to be in full accord with the teaching of the New Testament and the Apostolic Church. They stand for Truth, and are bound to symbolize by all their actions their hold on Truth and to do nothing that will mislead their people as to the character of the Truth they hold and the doctrines they teach. History cannot be rewritten for the purpose of expressing the amiability of the Ministers of the Gospel, and their desire to go as far as possible with brethren from whom they profoundly differ on the character of the Christian priesthood. Our weekly actions and the vestments we wear have a permanent influence on the minds of those who worship with us. We desire above everything to lead them in the way everlasting. We can bring brightness into our services without compromising

truth—we can make our appeal to heart and head without attempting to read out of rite and ceremony what is in them and has caused them to be abandoned for centuries in our Church. Their revival is not the outward expression of Romantic movement in life and letters that is believed to have given a stimulus to the Tractarian advance. It means something more than this, for it implies the definite acceptance of teaching that is foreign to the Reformed and Protestant character of our Church as well as to its Catholic and Apostolic character. If the teaching symbolized were truly Catholic and Apostolic we should be bound to follow it, for a Protestant Reformation that is not Catholic and Apostolic would be a deformation, not a return to New Testament Christianity. I have no desire to condemn any man who differs from the view I put forward, but for my part I cannot conceive how a man who sees the great importance of the issues now at stake, and the duty of preserving the truth in Jesus, can adopt with an easy mind and conscientious regard to his influence being the greatest possible either Eastward Position or Vestments. It was not without reason that the late Archbishop Temple when he consecrated at Holy Communion uniformly adopted the North Side position. Have we really become so influenced by the prevailing custom of the day that we are ready to assimilate our practice to that of the Roman and Anglo-Catholics in our position at the Holy Table without thinking what it means to the people and to those from whom we differ? Is it not an easy step to go further in self-deception and to believe that by adopting the Eastward Position and wearing the Chasuble we can avoid giving the congregation the impression that we are sacrificing priests? Perhaps it may be said the white Vestment will be mistaken for the surplice and no harm will be done. Is this not in itself the gravest act of self-deception, believing that while we please our Anglo-Catholic friends and thereby show our liberality, we deceive our people into thinking we still wear the surplice? Evangelical Christianity in the Church of England can only exert its full influence, preserve its integrity and summon the Church back to Gospel truth by maintaining in its Ritual and Ceremonial a simplicity which proves to all that it is loyal to the New Testament view of the Ministry and true to its own great traditions. If we show, by our assimilation of our conduct of public worship to the practices of the Anglo-Catholics, our desire to stand as far as possible in line with them while rejecting the meaning they attach to their actions, we shall undoubtedly drive a wedge between ourselves and the great non-episcopal Churches of Christendom. It is a sad fact that Nonconformity has increased manifold in England during the last ninety years, and its growth has been contemporaneous with the spread of Tractarianism and Anglo-Catholicism. Do we or do we not wish our future to be bound up with Evangelical Christianity or with the reversion to Romanism and Medievalism which plainly reverses much of the teaching of the New Testament? That is the question we must answer in our decisions on Evangelical Ritual and Ceremonial.

## RATIONALISM.

BY CANON BRIGGS, M.A., Rector of Loughborough.

WHAT do we mean by rationalism? It is quite plain that we are not using the term in a philosophic sense. We are not greatly interested in the distinction between the rationalist and the empirical theory of knowledge: nor should I be in the least degree competent to expound it.

Nor are we, I imagine, thinking of rationalism in its popular sense, as the complete denial of religion. We are all familiar with what calls itself the Rationalist Press, which attacks the Christian Faith from a scientific standpoint: and familiar also with the much less scientific onslaughts of the gentleman at the street-corner. It is an attack which we need not fear to meet, even on purely rational grounds: for atheism makes life irrational. The only alternative to God is a blind Necessity, which takes away all possibility of freedom, all possibility of right and wrong. And these are primary instincts which men will never surrender, in obedience to any theory.

But I cannot think that even this sense of the true rationalism is in our minds to-day. It is admittedly among our common foes: but it is the common foe of all people who make any pretence to religion. To the rationalist of this type we all present a united front, whether we call ourselves Evangelicals, or Catholics, or the most modern of Modernists.

It seems clear, from our general subject, which is that of unity among Evangelicals, that we are thinking of rationalism in a much more restricted sense: namely, that of revolt, in greater or less degree, against authority as hitherto recognized. There is among many Evangelicals, as there is among Anglo-Catholics, a profound suspicion of Liberal and Modernist tendencies: and among Evangelicals there is even a fear that these tendencies are spreading within the citadel itself. I suppose that, for practical purposes, the "Modern Churchman" expresses the kind of Modernism with which we are directly concerned. As for Liberalism, the term Liberal Churchman has been used with such meaning that few, if any, of us would care to adopt it. But many of us would certainly call ourselves Liberal Evangelicals: which is not the same thing. The general attitude of the Liberal Evangelical school—though we are not all committed to every detail—is fairly represented by the series of essays published under the title *Liberal Evangelicalism*. I do not think that they can be called in any sense rationalistic.

But there are two things which, in all fairness, we must not forget. One is that Modernism, like Liberalism, is a very vague term. I am not at all sure that all who call themselves Modern Churchmen would admit that they are Modernists, as the term is sometimes understood. Since their own Magazine, however, uses both terms alike, we may without offence do the same. Still, Modernism is not a definite creed, or absence of creed: and because

A and B meet together, and A says something rationalistic, it does not necessarily follow that B is a rationalist. For B may, and sometimes does, repudiate A.

And the second thing is this, that the word rationalism has its respectable, as well as disreputable, relations. It is a derivative of the word rational: and rational we most decidedly claim to be. We differ profoundly from the rationalist when he claims that reason is the only ground of knowledge: for we hold that reason is only one of the faculties with which God has endowed us. But we have none the less a wholesome respect for human reason, and cannot even pretend to believe anything which is plainly irrational. We are not at all prepared to accept the dictum—*credo quia incredible*. To us, that is not faith: it is high treason. As we study the Scriptures, and especially the prophets, we find the appeal to reason strongly emphasized. When Isaiah pours out his scorn upon idolatry, it is on the ground that idolatry is irrational. We cannot fail to observe the rational appeal of our Lord Himself to elementary truth, as opposed to artificial traditions. His doctrine of the Sabbath is typical. Nor can we forget that Protestantism—I use the term in its historic, and not its modern meaning: for all the great Anglicans were avowedly Protestant, until some of our moderns made it a byword of reproach—is essentially rational in its appeal. What is private judgment but the exercise of reason? We are indeed sometimes taunted with “Protestant rationalism.” We do not admit the justice of the charge. We do not talk of “Catholic rationalism” because some Frenchmen have denied the Faith. Yet it contains some small element of truth. Protestantism is not rationalistic: but it is most decidedly rational. And there is always a danger of the rational degenerating into the rationalistic. It is a danger which we deplore—the results often distress us: but it is a danger which we must perforce accept. And after all, as Professor Gwatkin says, “There is a deeper scepticism in the return to authority than in particular results, however sceptical, reached by those who seek for truth. We sin the sin of sins only when we make authority our refuge from the first duty of reasoning men.”

But does this mean that we have no final authority? On the contrary, our final authority is Christ Himself. Christianity is a revelation, and not a mere process of reasoning. To find Christ, to interpret Him, we will use every aid which reason can give: but when we have found Him, our hopes are built, not on reason, but on faith in Him. “Believe in Me” is the first and final principle of Christianity.

On that there will be general agreement. But our difficulties are not ended: they are only just begun. Christ lived on this earth nineteen hundred years ago. How are we to interpret Him to-day?

The Catholic answer is delightfully simple. The Church interprets Christ: and the Church is an infallible guide. Delightfully simple; but unfortunately too simple. How are we to define this

infallible Church? Is it the undivided Church, or the Church of Rome, or the Church of St. Magnus the Martyr, and such other Churches as are like-minded? For there seems little doubt that some among us have gone far beyond the old theory of Catholicity, and rest their faith on the unerring instinct of the so-called "Catholic mind." As reasoning men, we cannot accept this standard of truth. We do not believe that things are true because they appeal to a certain number of devout people. Our Reformers held the doctrine of justification by faith: but never that of justification by feeling. So far were they removed from the modern theory of Catholicity that they laid little stress even upon the old. Even General Councils, they declared, were composed of fallible men. Our reformers accepted whole-heartedly the Catholic Faith: but their acceptance even of the creeds was not on the ground of the Church's authority, but on the ground that they are a reasonable interpretation of the Scripture itself.

The principle of the Reformation, then, was to go back from the Church to Holy Scripture: and it remains to this day the fixed principle of the Church of England. We are above all a Scriptural Church. But what is the nature of the authority of Scripture? The successive generations of the Reformers were not entirely agreed. With all his dependence on Scripture, Luther was frankly critical. We all know his criticism—a very ill-advised criticism—of the Epistle of St. James. The successors of Luther declared for Scriptural infallibility. They substituted the infallible Book for the infallible Church.

The Church of England has laid down no dogma of infallibility. She has simply declared for the authority of Scripture. And her general position is fundamentally sound. As Gwatkin used to teach us, the appeal to Scripture is the appeal to antiquity. It is the appeal to the Historic Faith, as presented by our Lord's first witnesses.

There are, however, many Evangelicals who are not content with this historic basis. To them the infallibility of Scripture is an article of faith, the denial of which is pure rationalism.

But let us be quite sure where we stand. Take the New Testament. What ground have we for a dogma of infallibility? Obviously not our Saviour's authority: for the New Testament was not even written at His command. Nor yet the claim of the writers. When St. Paul wrote, "I speak as a fool," was he claiming infallibility? When he withstood St. Peter to the face, was he admitting the infallibility of the man whom he withstood? Can we fairly assert that St. Peter was fallible when speaking, but infallible on paper? St. Luke's Gospel claims first-hand information: St. John's Gospel claims truthfulness: but there is a significant absence of any claim to infallibility. As far as verbal infallibility is concerned, it is plain that *all three* Synoptists cannot be even verbally exact. Quite obviously, they did not deem it to be necessary: they were content to be substantially true. It is admitted that the Church, after prolonged controversy on the subject of the

Canon, gradually decided for a rigid infallibility. But we cannot have it both ways. We cannot appeal from Church tradition to the plain language of Scripture, and then appeal back again from the plain language of Scripture to the tradition of the Church.

God forbid that I should even seem to speak lightly of the authority of Holy Scripture. But authority and infallibility are not the same thing. And we have no right to call them rationalists who cannot claim for the Scriptures what the Scriptures do not claim for themselves.

But, it may be argued, unless the New Testament is infallible, what reliable guide have we? Precisely the same guide as the earliest disciples. Our Lord sent His apostles to bear witness. They still bear witness to-day, though it is on paper instead of by word of mouth. Spoken or written, their witness has precisely the same value. That was their purpose in writing, as we are quite definitely told. And as the Holy Spirit bore witness with them, so He bears witness to-day. Above and beyond the historic basis of the New Testament, which is itself sufficiently strong, each successive generation has found in the Scripture life and light. Do men gather grapes of thorns or figs of thistles?

It is at this point that we come into conflict with some of our Modernists. I say "some" advisedly: since all who are called Modernists are not alike, and there is some complaint—probably with reason—of misrepresentation. We should be sorry to misrepresent anybody: but it is natural that we should deal with the views with which we do not—and cannot—agree.

And, first, we are told, as a fundamental principle of Modernism, that God does not reveal Himself through the abnormal, but through the normal. If that really means anything, it is the old denial of the possibility of a special revelation. It is true that the writer explains himself by saying that God does not work by miracles which are *contra naturam*. But that is begging the question. Who wants to affirm, at this time of day, that miracles are *contra naturam*? To us, not less than to any Modernist, the supernatural is not the unnatural, but the exercise of powers beyond our understanding. If God be a personal God, we must believe in His liberty. His actions cannot be irrational or immoral, for He cannot deny Himself: but there is no other limitation. With God all things are possible. Who are we, to say that He must reveal Himself in the way familiar to us, and not in some other way: that wonders beyond all our experience—that a Virgin Birth, if it be His will—are outside His working? Such an attitude is not merely lack of faith: it is primarily irrational. For even we men claim to be free agents: even we discover, and make use of, powers hitherto unsuspected. Are we free, and God bound?

The denial of the miraculous naturally leads to a non-miraculous Christ. But, as a matter of fact, when it comes to the actual history, Modernists as a whole do not seem to stand rigidly by the principle. Some frankly admit the miraculous, as being woven inextricably into the Gospel story. The Resurrection especially is accepted,

even where the miraculous in our Lord's Person is—to say the least—not strongly affirmed. And indeed without the Resurrection the origin of the Christian Church is inexplicable. Some firmly believe in the Incarnation, but challenge the Virgin birth. [There are probably many more people—not usually reckoned among Modernists—who do not deny the Virgin birth, but to whom it actually means very little.] We are told that the Virgin birth is not a necessary corollary of a true belief that God was in Christ : that St. Paul and St. John, who especially emphasize the deity of our Lord, say nothing of His birth of a virgin. As a matter of historical fact, that is perfectly true. Without surrendering our belief in our Lord's miraculous birth—which is Scriptural—we can admit quite frankly that the belief that Christ is God was held before the belief that He was miraculously born, and is to that extent independent of it. But the general tendency of Modernism is to the purely human Christ—purely human even if divine, since we are told that perfect humanity is Deity under human conditions. The climax is reached in the theory—which most Modern Churchmen themselves repudiate—that “Gentile Christianity transformed the original tradition of the man Jesus by assimilating it to the traditions of the Saviour-Lords of the mystery religions.”

On this last I need not comment. I agree, for once, with the *Church Times* that we Evangelicals have far more in common with Anglo-Catholics than with Modernism of this type. For we do at least share with them the fundamental belief of Christianity, that in Christ God was made man. We do not admit that this theory is even reasonable. Where is this original tradition of the Man Jesus to be found? In the Synoptic Gospels? As was said by a contributor to the Cambridge Conference of 1921, “In by far the largest portion of the Synoptic Gospels our Lord is very nearly the Christ of traditional belief.” Moreover, the Epistles of St. Paul are earlier, and not later, than the Synoptic Gospels. Are we to believe that St. Paul transformed Jesus, and that there existed, side by side with St. Paul's teaching, a very different and more primitive tradition, presented years later, in a more or less historic form, by the Synoptists? And was the early Church so uncritical that all this passed without remark? It is notorious that St. Paul's liberalism was bitterly opposed: he was throughout his life a suspect to Judaistic Christians. Are we to understand that he preached a doctrine of our Lord's Person which was a direct challenge to the monotheism of his colleagues? And that his critics were so complaisant that they had nothing to say: or such dunces that they never recognized it?

The significant fact is this, that among all the controversies of the New Testament, there is no Christological controversy. We admit quite freely that there are wide divergences—possibly even developments—in the Apostolic presentation of our Lord's Person. When St. Peter said at Pentecost, “Jesus of Nazareth, a man approved of God among you,” he was not using the later language of St. Paul, “Who, being in the form of God,” nor of St. John's

Gospel, "The Word was made flesh": nor even the language common to both St. Peter and St. Paul, "the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ." The difference does not distress us. "From the day of Pentecost onward," said Canon Glazebrook at the Cambridge Conference of 1921, from which we have already quoted, "the ever-increasing band of early disciples were irresistibly impelled to explain their wonderful experiences to themselves and to others, and each generation felt the same need. In attempting to describe Jesus, the object of their faith, they were plainly limited by the language of the current philosophy: for they could not go beyond it without becoming unintelligible." We can accept that statement. It does not shock us to be told that even our creeds—that even the Apostles themselves—do not exhaust the truth as it is in Jesus. St. Paul, I think, would have been the first to say that the knowledge of Christ, like the love of Christ, passeth knowledge. We are not opposed to any men—whether they call themselves Modern Churchmen or by any other name—who endeavour reverently to explain our Lord in terms which their own age can understand. But we cannot have Him explained away. We Evangelicals, whether Conservative or Liberal, stand fast by the old doctrine that in Christ God was incarnate. "No theory of Christ's person," says a writer in the book, *Liberal Evangelicalism*, "is adequate, which makes Him less than God under the limitations of human nature."

The doctrine of the Atonement has already been discussed at length. Both Evangelicals and Anglo-Catholics are agreed that any theory of the Atonement which regards the Cross as a mere appeal to men is quite inadequate. The Cross has its Godward, as well as its manward, side. It may remain a mystery beyond our understanding: but we cannot, and must not, ignore that aspect of the Atonement. At the same time, the history of strange theories—and some have been very strange—should be a warning to us. Let us be content with the language of Holy Scripture. For instance, when the Scripture speaks of man being reconciled to God, why should we invert the order, and speak of God being reconciled to men? Obviously, we must not contradict Holy Scripture. We must not talk about "appeasing the anger of God" (I am quoting from a well-known treatise, Nowell's Catechism), when the Scripture says definitely "God so loved the world." We must not allow the doctrine of the justice of God—true and necessary as it is—to overwhelm our still deeper sense of the love of God. Nor must we call men rationalists who will not subscribe to theories which seem to them not only unworthy, but plainly repugnant to the Word of God.

We have been considering rationalism in doctrine. But we must not lose our sense of proportion. The real test of faith is not in doctrine, but in life. Our Saviour would seem to teach us that the greatest danger to faith is not the danger of intellectual unrest, but of love growing cold. Rationalism is the denial of the supernatural: and if the supernatural is not openly denied to-day, it



is commonly treated as something which can be safely ignored. When I see the worship of God neglected, week by week, not through open unbelief—for the worst offenders would warmly repudiate such a charge—but in pursuit of pleasure : when I see Good Friday, the most solemn day of the Christian Year, treated as a mere holiday : when I find that even on Easter Day, because the weather is so glorious, professed Churchpeople take out their motor-cars instead of coming to Communion with their Risen Lord : then I know where the real danger of rationalism lies. Yet not all the abandonment of public worship—not all the spirit of the world—can crush out of men's hearts the conviction that man does not live by bread alone. There is a real craving, in this as in every age, for the supernatural. It is the secret of success in such cults as Spiritualism and Christian Science. It is likewise the secret of success (and I mean no offence by mentioning it in the same breath) of Anglo-Catholicism. Where Anglo-Catholicism lives—and it is admittedly a live force—it is not because of its extravagances, but because of the supernatural Gospel which it proclaims.

To the same human need—the eternity which God has put into man's heart—we Evangelicals also minister. And we also have the eternal Gospel to proclaim—a presentation of the Gospel which is certainly more Scriptural, and (we maintain) also more truly Catholic. Yet it is perhaps a weakness with us that we are so afraid of superstition as to lay, at times, too little emphasis on the supernatural. For instance, I cannot but think that we have made too little of the divinely-appointed service of Holy Communion. Our denial of any material Presence must not make us fail to lay emphasis on the reality of Christ's spiritual presence, in that Service certainly not less than wherever two or three are gathered together in His name. The weakness of all Protestantism—though original Protestantism, be it always remembered, was affirmative rather than negative—has been a tendency towards mere negation of what is untrue. But men do not live by negatives. To challenge the doctrine of other people may be a painful duty ; but our own progress will never be made in that way. Not by mere argument have we ever advanced, nor shall we advance ; but by the vitality of our own spiritual life, by obedience to the Faith as we know it. And we have our Master's own assurance that if any man will do the will of God, he shall know of the doctrine.



**OUR EVANGELICAL WITNESS :**  
**(1) EXPRESSED BY MEANS OF THE**  
**MINISTRY AND SCHOLARSHIP.**

BY THE REV. H. F. S. ADAMS, M.A., Vicar of Holy Trinity, Redhill.

**I**T is well for us to be reminded that our supreme task is to Witness. This was the special Charge left by our Lord to His Church, and we are failing Him in the trust laid upon us unless we, clergy and laity alike, are bearing our testimony to Him and His truth, both by lip and by life. It has been the claim of the Evangelical School that it bears its own special witness to the truth of God as it is found in the Bible, and it only accepts traditions, interpretations and doctrines which are in harmony with its teaching. It was the witness of Christian men and women, and sometimes even children, in the earliest days of Christianity which caused the wonderful spread of the Gospel of Christ over the known world : a witness borne to the foundation facts on which that Gospel rests ; a witness which carried conviction with it because the witnesses spoke from personal knowledge which manifested its results in holiness of life—" We speak that we do know and testify that we have seen."—" They took knowledge of them that they had been with Jesus." That witness centres round the Person of Christ. The Christian Creed is the history of that Person. Christian faith is the affiance of the heart to that Person. Christian morality is the following of that Person. Christian love and hope and joy, and power to conquer, all centre round that Person. He is the manifestation of God, the Saviour of sinful men, and the Lord and Sovereign of mankind.

I. Our Evangelical Witness is to be expressed through scholarship. The day is past in which it could truthfully be said that the Evangelical School is devoid of scholarship. It has done much in recent years to dispel that reproach. Some of us, however, who can make no claim to scholarship may be allowed to express some thoughts which are in our minds. We submit that a man who is a student and acquires a certain amount of scholarship need not think it necessary to lay ruthless and destructive hands on what we and our fathers have held most precious : to call in question as a matter of course the truth of Biblical narrative : to presume that the supernatural and miraculous must be explained away, and approach ancient Biblical history with the suspicion that it is largely Oriental romance. We deprecate the position of those who feel themselves at liberty to disagree with and discard the teaching of the Apostles on the verities of our faith, and say " We have no theology now, but we shall probably soon have one drawn from life." What we want our scholars to give us is real light upon truth, which will draw us nearer to God and make us more like Him.

But, on the other hand, there is not the slightest reason why a man who has become scholarly should therefore be regarded with suspicion, as he is in some quarters. There is such a thing as a humble devout scholarship, which only seeks to find the truth, which constantly seeks the guidance of the Divine Spirit, and bows more and more with reverence and awe before the wonders of the wisdom and power of God. The Holy Spirit will "lead into all truth": He will guide every humble seeker: He will dispel the darkness from our eyes, and display the light of truth. Let us give our full measure of honour and sympathy to those who thus consecrate their powers to the investigation of the truth of God and constantly seek new light. It will be well to stimulate our younger men to avail themselves of every opportunity afforded to them to acquire a sane and sober scholarship which can minister adequately to a laity among whom are many of thoughtful, reverent and well informed minds.

II. We are thinking further of our Evangelical Witness expressed by means of the Ministry.

Ministry is service, as Dean Vaughan loved to say to his students. The word has acquired a secondary and an erroneous meaning. It is made a dignity, instead of being a humility. And a dignity indeed it has, but a dignity of humility. "The Son of Man came not to be ministered unto, but to minister"—not to be waited upon, but to wait; not to be served, but to serve.

Ministry is service. Not a service which takes its direction from the persons served; for its direction is from One out of sight: but yet, a service which is the opposite of rule even towards them. "I have given you an example that ye should be even as I."

This feeling, cherished and acted upon, will give a peculiar tone and spirit to the minister, as he stands before the congregation, and as he goes in and out among the people. He is not ruling, not commanding, not laying down the law—no, he is serving: he is one waiting at the table at which his people are guests, supplying their wants, anticipating their wishes, studying their comfort, answering their call. Ministry is service, and its power lies in this. We shall find the thought of service showing itself in a tone of deference, very winning where it is real—that is, where it breathes a spirit of humility which is first in the heart. Our Evangelical witness should always be permeated by this tone and spirit. It will gain a far larger hearing, it will carry more conviction, it will win a far greater influence, and it will find its way into many more hearts than many another which may be correct, unsparring, brilliant in its eloquence, but at the same time deficient in that humility and fellow feeling which comes from the man who never forgets that he himself is the subject of the mercy of God.

Now in this Witness certain features are imperative:—

I. It must all through be marked by a definite aim to win souls for God. We clergy seldom have opportunities of listening to other preachers. But if we may trust what our laity tell us, who travel about more than we do,—amidst a number of sermons they have

heard there is seldom voiced this aim of longing to win souls for God,—the need of reconciliation, of surrender, and decision. It is possible to give a message which soothes rather than awakens, which gives a false impression that all is well, and which never deals with the fact and nature of sin. My own conviction is that though there is so much indifference, and alienation from institutional religion at the present time, there is also a widespread inarticulate hunger for the certainty of forgiveness and the power to overcome temptation—in other words, the longing for God and the experience of His grace; and only those can minister effectually to this need who set themselves under the guidance of the Holy Spirit to the definite task of winning souls. Let there be no fear of a plain clear message being unpopular, and congregations offended. Let the messenger be but human and sympathetic, not dictatorial, not superior, not scolding, and his message will not lack hearers or fail to help them.

2. The centre of our witness will be the definite preaching of the atoning work of Christ—a great accomplished fact, sin's burden borne away, the glorious victory gained, the great adversary laid low, the awful debt paid, the curse of the law all taken away, its condemnation quite exhausted. I am one of those who do not shrink from using the word "substitution" plainly and clearly. I do not hesitate to speak of the "precious blood of Christ." I know that sometimes crude statements can be made, imperfect illustrations used, and words quoted with painful familiarity. But that does not detract from our Lord's statement that He came to give His life "a ransom for many," or St. Paul's words, "Who gave Himself a ransom for all," or "He hath made Him to be sin for us, Who knew no sin; that we might be made the righteousness of God in Him." To speak of our Lord's death merely as a great example of self-sacrifice is insufficient. To preach of Him merely as our Representative is, as I think, inadequate. Let the word "representation" be used with a fullness of meaning, as adding to and not deducting from the idea of substitution, and then the message will have its power. Will anything less than this, anything which refuses to accept this idea, meet the dire needs of an awakened soul? Will it meet the requirements of Holy Scripture? Will it satisfy the language of the New Testament, or fulfil the idea which the teaching of the New Covenant has taken from the Old, the Levitical ritual, the Passover, the Day of Atonement, and the teaching of the word *ἱλαστήριον*.

Dr. Stalker, in his *Trial and Death of Jesus Christ*, tells the following story, taken from a private diary: "I remember, when I was a student, visiting a dying man. He had been in the university with me, but a few years ahead; and at the close of a brilliant career in college, he was appointed to a professorship of philosophy in a Colonial university. But after a very few years, he fell into bad health; and he came home to Scotland to die. It was a summer Sunday afternoon when I called to see him, and it happened that I was able to offer him a drive. His great frame was with

difficulty got into the open carriage; but then he lay back comfortably and was able to enjoy the fresh air. Two other friends were with him that day—college companions, who had come out from the city to visit him. On the way back they dropped into the rear, and I was alone beside him, when he began to talk with appreciation of their friendship and kindness. 'But,' he said, 'do you know what they have been doing all day? They have been reading to me *Sartor Resartus*; and oh! I am awfully tired of it.' Then turning on me his large eyes he began to repeat, 'This is a faithful saying, and worthy of all acceptance, that Jesus Christ came into the world to save sinners, of whom I am chief'; and then he added, with great earnestness, 'There is nothing else of any use to me now.' "

3. Further, let the gospel of the Risen Lord be fully preached, not simply from the evidential standpoint, but in the glory of His personal Presence, Companionship and living Power. Let us bear witness to the promise of His personal Coming and the glad hope of meeting Him face to face—and in the light of these truths let us plainly speak of the possibility of holiness, the daily victory through the indwelling Spirit, the effectual working of the Sacraments and other means of grace, that we may show to the world Christ's Resurrection power, and the beauty of His life manifested, though very imperfectly in us.

We shall find innumerable opportunities of bearing this witness not only in the pulpit but in our pastoral visitation, in the sick room, and in Bible and Confirmation classes. Especially do I plead the importance of definite teaching to our Confirmation candidates, who should be of an age to understand it. There has often been a disproportionate emphasis laid on what they have to renounce, and what they have to do, and an insufficient emphasis on what Christ has done for them. Let them clearly understand that the Cross and Resurrection are not meant merely to afford consolation and peace in our last earthly moments, but are the very foundation and strength of our life and service for Christ and His Church here. Let them be encouraged by the possibility of a victorious life through the indwelling Spirit, Who will fill them with the joy of service. If they grasp the foundations of this our Evangelical Witness we shall hear less about leakage and loss, and we shall see a great deal more of noble service.

4. Finally, let our Evangelical witness through the Ministry be full of Joy. What is it that has made us all delight in the Epistle to the Philippians? I think it is the joy that runs through it. Picture the aged and infirm Apostle, a prisoner at Rome in his own hired house, bereft of privacy, disappointed in those who came to interview him, and finding that some could even preach Christ of factiousness, supposing to make his chains gall him all the more. But he rejoiced, and bids his beloved Philippians rejoice alway. And the fact that he and Silas had sung praises in the stocks must have helped them to learn the secret also. If our witness is worthy of the name, we shall always be manifesting the truest Christian

joy ; not the natural merriment of good spirits, or a natural hopefulness forgetful of the past, but a calm deep settled gladness which comes from personal union with our Risen Lord. It is not a privilege only : it is a duty. We have a message of gladness : let us give it with gladness of heart. If only we were all joyous in our spiritual life and ministry, many would come around to ask for our secret, and would find it in our Lord and His Living Presence in the heart.

Perhaps one word more may be permitted with reference to candidates for the Ministry.

The shortage of clergy in the Church is appalling. The paucity of ordination candidates is most disquieting. The Editor of *Crockford* tells us that the average number of men ordained in the last six years has been 287 and the average annual loss to the ministry by deaths and retirements is about 700. There is I think an impression that Evangelicals are doing but little in securing men for the ministry. This is not the case. Much is being done, but unquestionably much more can and should be done. We can put the claims of the ministry before parents, and the joy and blessedness of the ministry before our boys. We can do much more in assisting the right candidates in their course of training, through our trusted agencies. Some of us are greatly encouraged by those who are now being trained. But we must spare no effort to obtain a succession of young men, on fire with the love of Christ, grounded in the doctrines of Scriptural Christianity, and with a capacity for hard work both in the preparation and in the subsequent ministry. We who are older will have to be drawing in our cords in the years that are ahead : but we shall rejoice in seeing them lengthening their cords and strengthening their stakes, carrying on the message which we have endeavoured faithfully to give, bringing to it the delightful enthusiasm of youth and commending it to the world by an example in which can be seen the love and purity of Him Who died for them and rose again, and "Who ever liveth to make intercession for us."

---

*Theology* is described as "A Monthly Journal of 'Historic Christianity.'" We feel at times inclined to describe it as a controversial magazine in the interests of Anglo-Catholicism, but there are occasional articles, such as Dr. Maynard's on Russellism, of special usefulness. Some of the scholars of the Irish Church would enjoy an hour's chat with the author of the one-sided article on the Effects of Disestablishment in Ireland.

---

The *Expository Times* always contain notes on recent exposition of great interest. Each issue is an excellent guide to the latest theological works, and its comments are generally fair to those from whom its conductors differ. It is specially rich in material of value to preachers in the preparation of sermons, and must have a very wide circulation among those who benefit by its help in this way.

---

## OUR EVANGELICAL WITNESS : (2) EXPRESSED IN THE COUNCILS OF THE CHURCH.

By THE REV. PREBENDARY SHARPE, M.A., Vicar. Rural  
Dean of Paddington.

ON June 30, five years ago, a fine summer morning, Westminster Abbey saw a new departure in the History of our Church.

Bishops, Clergy, men and women from every part of England met in the quietness of expectation. It was the first corporate act of the new Church Assembly, a Eucharistic Service in which all the members present dedicated their lives afresh to the Service of the Lord Jesus Christ and offered Him their souls and bodies to be a living sacrifice to God before the Assembly met in session. It was a new beginning of life. Speaking later on that same day in the opening session of the Assembly, the Archbishop of Canterbury said; "The actual pulsing life has definitely begun." He quoted the following words:—

"There is a day in spring,  
When under all the earth the secret germs  
Begin to stir and glow before they bud.  
The wealth and festal pomp of midsummer  
Lie in the heart of that inglorious hour,  
Which no man names with blessing; but  
Is blest by all the world. Such hours there are."

and His Grace added, "Yes, such hours, such days there are, *and this is one of them.*" It has been pointed out that that day had an added significance; the War had ceased some eighteen months before. Two days later the Lambeth Conference was to assemble from all the habitable world to send out its message of unity to every Church and to all people. From the first the Church Assembly faced a great opportunity, up from the furnace of the war the Church was to pass on to construction and reconstruction for the Kingdom of God from within and from without the limits of the Empire, and the powers bestowed by Parliament upon the Church Assembly were to enable it the better to play its part. Indeed, it is interesting to note that while all institutions in the country *talked* about reconstruction, the eldest of them all, the Church of England, *achieved* it. The ready assent which Parliament gave to the request of the Church for fuller powers of self-government was quite remarkable. It was a generous act of trust on the part of the State and an obligation of honour is laid upon the Church to justify that trust.

The Church Assembly has now its place in the Constitution of the Church and Realm of England. Its creation marks the beginning of a new era in its history and in its relation to the State. The change that has been wrought is difficult for those to realize that have not tried to get Church legislation through the entanglements of procedure and the morass of Parliamentary obstruction. Five

years of the Church Assembly has seen more done in the way of Church reform than would probably have been done in fifty years of Parliament. But the Assembly has done more than the passing of thirteen useful Measures. It has gained a spirit of its own, yes, an *esprit de corps*; a spirit which is more easy for its members to feel than to describe. As the Archbishop of York says in his introduction to a small book entitled *The First Five Years of the Church Assembly*, to which I am much indebted in this paper: "Of course there is ample room for improvement. The ultimate constituency of the House of Laity represented by the Electoral Rolls ought to be much larger. There ought to be a larger representation of the youth of the Church, and the speakers might well put a self-denying ordinance on themselves to restrain the frequency and length of their speeches. But Parliament was not made in a day: it is not to be expected that the Church Assembly should be perfected in five years. Possibly the next five years will put the wisdom and largeness of mind of the Assembly and its relations with the old Convocations and with Parliament to a severer test. But the beginning already made justifies the hope that the Assembly will be equal to the test."

In the Church Assembly at the present time there are three Houses: (1) *The Bishops* containing the two Archbishops and thirty-six Diocesan Bishops, making thirty-eight in all; (2) *the Clergy*, who number about 313, of whom 103 are Proctors for Chapters; and (3) *the Laity*, whose numbers reach about 352, making a total membership of just over 700. The Proctors for the Clergy are elected in every Diocese by the Clergy who have a licence under seal from their Bishop. Out of the 313 Members of the House of Clergy I do not think there are more than one in five who would label themselves as belonging to the Evangelical school of thought.<sup>1</sup> This does not seem to me an altogether satisfactory or adequate representation. It reveals a slackness on the part of those who have votes in recording them at the Proctorial Elections. In the Diocese of London at the last election if all Evangelicals had recorded their votes it would have been quite easy to have secured a fourth representation. Over 400 Clergymen who had votes in the London Diocese failed to record them. This slackness and indifference is unpardonable and Evangelicals ought to realize their responsibility in possessing and in using their vote. It will be interesting to see the result of the election which has just taken place for the House of Laity and to find out the proportion of the Laity who are Evangelicals.

Meetings are held from time to time between the Clerical and Lay Members who hold Evangelical principles in the Church Assembly, and they confer with one another on matters which are on the Agenda for the Session. Important and useful results have followed these Conferences. It is most important that the Church Assembly should be thoroughly representative of all schools of

<sup>1</sup> Hence we are largely outnumbered in divisions on critical occasions such as those on the Revision of the Prayer Book.



thought in our Church, and it is to this end that we would emphasize the importance of Evangelicals taking a greater interest in the elections to both the Houses of Clergy and Laity. If we fail to get our proper representation in these bodies it is our own fault and those principles for which we stand will suffer accordingly.

But this is not all, if the Church Assembly is to be a truly representative body of the whole Church, it is necessary that much more interest and enthusiasm should be aroused in our Parochial Church Councils and Ruri-decanal organizations. The Parochial Church Councils ought to be sympathetically viewed in all our Evangelical Parishes and every encouragement given to them in their work, and their co-operation invited in all matters concerning the spread of Christ's Kingdom in the Parish, Diocese, and Overseas.

The Electoral Roll should be a living record of all Churchpeople in the Parish and every qualified Member of the Church of England should be encouraged to sign the requisite declaration. Each Member should be visited and if possible given some card or token of Membership with a Prayer printed upon it for use. A personal invitation should be sent to each Member at the time of the Annual Church Meeting, and much more made of that occasion than is usually done. It is the opportunity now given for a real interest to be shown in the spiritual life of the Parish and much can be made of it. At that meeting the Parochial Church Council is chosen and every care should be taken that the Council is thoroughly representative of the Parish and its workers, and that the young people should have a place upon it. On the numbers on the Electoral Roll of each Parish depend its representation on the Ruri-decanal Conference. The growing importance of these links in the organization must be fully appreciated. Here in the Ruri-decanal Conference Parish meets Parish and the opportunity is given for the quickening of the spiritual life and activities of neighbouring Parishes. Here again it is most important that this Conference should be treated with more regard than is often the case. Attendance at its meetings should be regarded as very important. Those representing Evangelical principles should be amongst the first to show a real interest in their proceedings. Here is the opportunity given to understand one another better and to find out one another's point of view, and to explain our position to those who may misunderstand it, or know it not. Evangelicals have failed in days that are past to make their full contribution to the life of the Rural Deanery and Diocese, and on account of this we are suffering to-day from the comparative weakness of Evangelical influence in the Church at large, and in the Church Assembly in particular. To a certain extent we are recovering from this position, but we still have much way to make. If we Evangelicals have a witness to make, a contribution to give to the life of the whole Church, then we must see that it is made in the Councils of the Church: first, in the Parish Church Council, secondly, in the Rural Deanery, and lastly in the Church Assembly.

## CHURCH BOOK ROOM NOTES.

DEAN WACE HOUSE,  
WINE OFFICE COURT, FLEET STREET, E.C.4.

**Parochial Church Councils' Powers Measure.**—A fourth impression has been issued of Mr. Albert Mitchell's valuable explanation of the Parochial Church Councils' Powers Measure, 1921. The new edition has been considerably revised and enlarged in view of many inquiries which have been received since the issue of the last edition on little-understood points in the Act, and we are sure that this edition will be found even more useful than the last. An addition to the book is the Representation of the Laity Measure, 1922, which has been added as an appendix. To this also is appended special explanatory notes by Mr. Mitchell. The book, though written by a lawyer, is penned, not so much from the standpoint of a lawyer as from that of an active Church worker of widely varied experience, and if to the more technical mind some of the difficulties indicated and endeavoured to be met seem too slight for a textbook or exposition, the explanation is that the writer has had them propounded to him in or about his Ruridecanal Conference or in parochial work. The price of the book remains at 1s., and every member of a Parochial Church Council should possess a copy.

**Circulation of Literature.**—When the special Committee, consisting of the Archbishop of Sydney, the late Bishop of Chelmsford, Dr. Watts-Ditchfield, the present Bishop of Chelmsford and Canon Dawson Walker issued the series of pamphlets entitled English Church Manuals, a special book-rack was designed by the Church Book Room for the sale of these and other pamphlets, particularly in churches and parish halls. The Committee felt the importance of the circulation of literature in this way, having in mind the large quantities of literature circulated in Anglo-Catholic Churches by means of similar book-racks and literature tables. Over 500 of these special book-racks were quickly sold. Unfortunately, owing to the large increase in the cost of production in 1915, it was impossible to continue the supply until last year, when it was again possible to produce them at a reasonable price. Two racks are being supplied: one which contains space for a parish magazine and which is suitable for standing on a table, size 22 in. × 12 in. × 7½ in., and the other, size 19 in. × 22 in. × 2½ in., more suitable for placing on a wall. This is designed to show more manuals, but contains fewer of each kind. Each rack is fitted with a strong money-box, with a lock and key, in which purchasers can place the amount of their purchase. A label is affixed to the front of the box with the words, "Please take one and place money in the box." Both racks can be supplied at the same price, 16s. net each, or with 100 1d. manuals at 20s., or 100 2d. manuals 25s., carriage extra, which varies according to distance, but might be taken on an average at 2s. 6d. The racks are sent packed in strong wooden cases. †

Several instances of the value of these racks as a means of distributing literature have come to our notice, and we would particularly emphasize the importance of parishes in seaside and country places, where a large number of strangers visit the churches, being provided with these racks. In one village in Somerset over £12 worth of pamphlets was sold in the

summer months last year, mainly to visitors, who, in many cases, placed more than their actual purchase in the box. Large repeat orders have been received for pamphlets from parishes in seaside resorts, and also from churches where the vicar has recommended some of the booklets from the pulpit in the course of a sermon on a particular subject.

**Pamphlets.**—Of the various pamphlets suitable for placing in these racks, we once more draw special attention to the English Church Manuals, published at 1d., a list of which will be supplied on application, and to the new series of Prayer Book Teaching Manuals published at 2d. each. The great united Demonstration on the Reformation recently held at the Albert Hall, and the issue of "A Call to Action," draw particular attention to the pamphlets specially dealing with the subject of the Reformation. The following may be briefly mentioned: five pamphlets in the English Church Manuals series: *The Dawn of the Reformation*, by the Rev. H. E. H. Probyn; *The English Reformation and Since the Days of the Reformation*, by the Bishop of Chelmsford (Dr. Guy Warman); *The Story of the Prayer Book*, by Bishop H. C. G. Moule; and *Principles of the Prayer Book*, by Bishop T. W. Drury; and eight new pamphlets in the Prayer Book Teaching series which treat largely of the subject: *The English Church, Catholic, Apostolic, Reformed, Protestant*, by the Rev. C. S. Carter, Litt.D.; *A Short Sketch of English Church History*, by the Rev. T. J. Pulvertaft; *The Christian Church*, by the Rev. C. S. Carter, Litt.D.; *A Short History of the Prayer Book*, by the Rev. T. W. Gilbert, D.D.; *Apostolical Succession*, by Canon H. A. Wilson; *The Creeds*, by the Rev. Harold Smith, D.D.; *Fasting Communion and Non-Communicating Attendance*, and "This is My Body," by Canon A. P. Cox.

**The Sacrifice of Christ.**—This book by Dean Wace is one of his least-known works and one of the most valuable. A re-issue of the book with a new introduction was published in 1915 by Mr. John Murray at 1s. The book contains addresses written for Lincoln's Inn Chapel, which were prompted, as the Dean states in his Preface, by a desire to apprehend, if possible, how the Sacrifice of our Saviour, and its atoning efficacy, arose naturally from the circumstances of His life and ministry, and from His relation to the Jews. Much of the difficulty felt on the subject has probably arisen from an impression that the Atonement involved some arbitrary or artificial arrangement, amounting almost to a legal fiction; and thoughtful persons have been perplexed, or even repelled, by the introduction of conceptions of this nature into the profound moral realities of the relations between God and man. The subject is divided into the following sections: The History of the Sacrifice, the Efficacy of the Sacrifice, the Effect of the Sacrifice, the Testimony of the Sacrifice, and the Sufficiency of the Sacrifice.

**"Jewel's Apology."**—The disparaging references which are now so often made to the Reformation and the controversies of the sixteenth century make it necessary for Churchmen to ascertain for themselves the facts which led to those controversies. Canon Meyrick added to his great work for the Church when he published *Jewel's Apology*, written in modern speech, under the title *On the English Reformation and the Faith of English Churchmen* (6d.). We cannot too often mention Canon Meyrick's other books, particularly *Scriptural and Catholic Truth and Worship, or the Faith and Worship of the Primitive, Mediæval and Reformed Anglican Churches*, a new edition of which is issued at 1s. 6d. net.