
A table of contents for *The Churchman* can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_churchman_os.php

The Churchman Advertiser.

APRIL—JUNE, 1938.

CONTENTS.

PAGE

NOTES AND COMMENTS 59
The Findings of the Conference.

OXFORD CONFERENCE OF EVANGELICAL CHURCHMEN:

THE BIBLE AND DOCTRINE IN THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND. By the Rev. C. M. Chavasse, M.C., M.A. .. 61

THE REFORMATION AND THE BIBLE. By the Rev. S. L. Greenslade, M.A... 69

THE REFORMATION IN DOCTRINE: JUSTIFICATION BY FAITH. By the Rev. E. Steinly, M.A. 77

THE REFORMATION IN DOCTRINE: THE PRIESTHOOD OF THE BELIEVER. By the Rev. A. W. Parsons, L.Th. 83

THE REFORMATION IN WORSHIP: THE MINISTRY OF THE WORD. By the Rev. J. E. Fison, M.A. 91

THE REFORMATION IN WORSHIP: THE MINISTRY OF THE SACRAMENTS. By the Rev. Canon J. R. S. Taylor, M.A. 100

THE REFORMATION IN LIFE: CORPORATE. By the Right Rev. the Lord Bishop of Truro, O.B.E., M.C., D.D. 106

THE REFORMATION IN LIFE: PERSONAL. By the Rev. L. F. E. Wilkinson, M.A. 115

THE CHURCHMAN

April—June, 1938.

NOTES AND COMMENTS.

To Our Readers.

IN accordance with our promise we present our readers with a full report of all the papers read at the recent Oxford Conference of Evangelical Churchmen (formerly the Cheltenham Conference), held at St. Peter's Hall, Oxford, on Monday, Tuesday and Wednesday, April 4th, 5th and 6th, 1938. In order to include the complete text of all the papers it has been necessary to increase the size of this number of THE CHURCHMAN, and we have accordingly added a number of pages so that the account of the Conference will be found fully reported. The importance of the subject: "The Bible and the Reformation" and the informative character of the contents of the papers give a permanent value to the Report, and we trust that our readers will secure for them as wide a circulation as possible. We regret that in spite of the increase in the size of this issue we have been obliged to hold over a large number of reviews of books, which is a feature that we know is much appreciated by very many of our readers. As the Report of the Conference and of the Findings filled all the available space, we felt that we were consulting the wishes of the members of the Conference and the wide circle of those interested in its proceedings in giving the Report as we have done in *extenso*. For reference we apend The Findings of the Conference.

The Findings of the Conference.

The following Findings were agreed upon at the final session of the Conference. They are to be taken, as in previous years, as expressing the general sense of the Conference, and not as representing in detail the views of individual members.

1. This Conference, meeting under the chairmanship of the Master of St. Peter's Hall who originally suggested the celebration of the Fourth Centenary of the Reformation, records its thankfulness to Almighty God for its blessings, more particularly for the gift of the open Bible in our tongue, and rejoices that the celebration is being so widely supported.

2. The Conference affirms its conviction that the only solution of the world's political, social and religious problems will be found in the recognition

of the redemptive work and teaching of the Lord Jesus Christ as set forth in Holy Scripture.

3. While thankfully noting the statement of the Commission on Christian Doctrine that " The Church has always claimed that its doctrine is based on Scripture," and that " the religious and moral teaching of the Gospels . . . possesses supreme authority," the Conference regrets that the Commission did not put this principle into practice by loyally applying the criterion of Holy Scripture to all doctrine on which there is disagreement among Church people.

4. The Conference takes its stand, with the Reformers, in reasserting the central truth of the Gospel that whereas " all have sinned, and come short of the glory of God," the believer is justified freely by God's Grace " through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus."

5. Those who are thus justified by faith alone have personal and direct access to God through Christ the one Mediator between God and men, and they constitute the Priesthood of all believers. Thus, to quote Bishop Lightfoot, " The Kingdom of Christ . . . has no sacerdotal system."

6. The Conference hopes that the emphasis placed by the Reformers on the paramount importance of the Ministry of the Word may be recovered, and that as one result of the Fourth Centenary Commemoration the Church will discharge more adequately her prophetic function of teaching and expounding the Holy Scriptures. It respectfully invites the Principals of Theological Colleges and Training Schools for the Ministry to instruct ordinands in the practice of Expository Preaching, as well as in the faithful proclamation of the Gospel.

7. The Conference thankfully recalls that the appeal to Holy Scripture by the Reformers led to more spiritual conceptions of the Sacraments, and to the purification of worship, transforming the Mass into a Communion in keeping with its original Institution. The Conference holds that the narrative of the Institution should continue to be the criterion of any Eucharistic development.

8. The Reformation has been the fruitful seed of true liberty in all departments of thought and life. It gave to our country a new spirit which inspired great social and economic changes, affecting alike Community, State and Church. The Conference believes that present conditions in the world demand the application particularly to our commercial and industrial life of the Reformation principle of man's personal responsibility to God.

9. The Reformation also awakened men through the indwelling of the Holy Spirit, to a new sense of Christian liberty which, in place of subjection to priestly direction calls for self-dedication to the Lord Jesus Christ, and a voluntary exercise of self-discipline with a view to more effective service to God and man.

10. The realisation of the noble heritage which is ours through the Reformation, demands of us a fuller acceptance of the Gospel of Salvation by the free Grace of God through faith which is in Christ Jesus, and a more consistent witness to the Gospel both abroad and at home, in the power of the Holy Spirit.

OXFORD CONFERENCE OF EVANGELICAL CHURCHMEN.

General Subject : " The Bible and the Reformation in England."

OPENING ADDRESS by the REV. C. M. CHAVASSE, M.C., M.A.

Master of St. Peter's Hall, Oxford.

The Bible and Doctrine in the Church of England.

THE fact that the Church of England stands to-day at a parting of the ways gives a note of urgency to the celebration of the fourth centenary of the Reformation and the English Bible.

In the near future the Church must declare her mind regarding two momentous Reports—that on Church and State, and that of the Commission on Christian Doctrine. Her attitude to these two documents must, inevitably, either accelerate the return to medievalism, characteristic of the past century, which would end in the National Church becoming a disestablished Anglo-Catholic sect unrepresentative of English religion ; or else consolidate the reaction of the last fifteen years or so, which seeks to re-affirm those Reformation principles which have made our country what it is. I would, therefore, ask this Conference to view the Quato-centenary Commemoration, which we are discussing, against the background of these two roads ; and pray that this national Bible celebration may prove, under God, the deciding factor as the Church chooses her path.

Look first at the Church and State Report of 1936.

It arose directly out of the Prayer Book controversy, ten years ago ; and it contained two " Interim Proposals " which seem likely to take practical shape.

1. The first is a definition of " lawful-authority," to which every ordained minister swears obedience in the conduct of Church worship, though no one knows in whom it resides. The Report rightly holds that " lawful authority " should be the Bishop, acting constitutionally in conjunction with both houses of Convocation and the laity in the National Assembly, and (most important of all) within the limits of the 1662 Prayer Book. Such " lawful authority " would immediately regularize a whole host of customary deviations consistent with Anglican formularies ; and thereby, incidentally, deprive flagrant illegalities in worship from entrenching themselves any longer behind a presumed state of general anarchy. At the same time such an agreed definition of " lawful authority " would, very properly, allow the Church to alter her worship without constant recourse to Parliament—though not beyond the doctrinal standards of the present Prayer Book.

But here two difficulties arise:

(*a*) The Roumanian Report, and the Report of the Doctrinal Commission (p. 9), both consider that the doctrinal standards of the Church of England are to be found rather in the Prayer Book than in the Thirty-nine Articles. This is exactly the reverse of what we were told when the Prayer Book was being revised. And it means that in future every proposed new phrase in the formularies of Church of England worship must satisfy a searching doctrinal test, and be proof against the perverted genius of a Cardinal Newman. There is a good illustration of what I mean on pp. 215 and 216 of the Doctrinal Report. Though it is notorious that Cranmer rigorously excluded all Prayers for the Departed in his Second Prayer Book, the late Archbishops Temple and Maclagan are quoted as holding "that the words in the Prayer of Oblation include the Church Expectant, when prayer is made that 'we and all thy whole Church may obtain remission of our sins.'" I take it that the Church Expectant is the same as the Church Triumphant for whom we praise God in the Prayer for the Church Militant. If so, is it Scriptural, and is it sense, to assert that God's servants departed this life in His faith and fear have not yet received remission of their sins?

(*b*) The other difficulty regarding the working of "lawful authority" in the Church, is that of deciding what are the doctrinal limits set by the 1662 Prayer Book. You will remember that all the controversial portions of the Revised Prayer Book of 1928 were declared to be consistent with the old Book, and to represent at most a change of *emphasis* —that convenient word! May I anticipate the conclusion of this paper by suggesting that the Sixth Article of Religion must be scrupulously enforced; and that nothing in the faith and worship of the Church can receive "lawful authority" unless it possesses the express warrant of Holy Scripture. In this way the fourth centenary of the English Bible will re-affirm the central principle of the Reformation which gave us our present Prayer Book.

2. The other Interim Proposal of the Church and State Report, which is of present importance, is the formation of a Round Table Conference to ascertain what measure of general agreement can be reached with regard to alterations in Church worship. It is obviously important that both Church and State should know beforehand the nature of the deviations that would be regularized by "lawful authority." But it is equally obvious that a Round Table Conference must concern itself, ultimately, with controversial as well as with uncontroversial proposals; and discover whether in the last ten years the Church has evolved a more united mind. Once more, it is essential that the Sixth Article, "Of the sufficiency of Holy Scripture" should be regarded as authoritative in all such deliberations.

This brings me to a consideration of the second document now before the Church, the recently issued Report on *Doctrine in the Church of England*. The pronouncements of the Commission on Christian Doctrine are bound to have effect both on a Round Table Conference in particular, and upon Prayer Book Revision in general.

The calling of a Round Table Conference would have been premature before the Commission on Doctrine had reported: seeing that both have the same objects in view—namely (to quote from the Commission's terms of reference in 1922), of "demonstrating the extent of existing agreement within the Church of England and . . . investigating how far it is possible to remove or diminish existing differences."

Then, also, the Doctrinal Report offers just that theological basis which should precede *Prayer Book Revision.* The fatal error which doomed the New Prayer Book of 1928 was its origin—namely, the Report of the Royal Commission of 1906 on disorder in the Church. The primary object of Prayer Book Revision became, therefore, not the enrichment of worship, but the restoration of order in the Church by liturgical compromise. If God is not to be dishonoured, the Church must first agree on the truth of its doctrine, and then (and not till then) express that truth in worship with all the fervour and beauty of which we are capable.

Unfortunately it is not possible to accept the Report on Christian Doctrine, as it stands, either as the basis for a Round Table Conference or as a standard for Prayer Book Revision.

The reason is indicated by the title of the Report—namely, "Doctrine *in* the Church of England," not "The Doctrine *of* the Church of England." This careful title explains the apparent, and otherwise surprising, agreement reached by the Report. The agreement is entirely illusionary, and simply means that on controversial questions which imperil the unity of the Church the members of the Commission agreed to differ. But, thereby, the Commission seems to enunciate a new principle for the Church of England, which extends our boasted comprehensiveness to limits of absurdity. According to their Report every sort of doctrine which had the support of a member of the Commission was accepted as legitimate, however violently the other members disagreed with it.

The cause of this over-charitable inclusiveness is not far to seek. In reading the Report it is most noticeable that though the Bible is given its proper place as the supreme authority in matters of doctrine; that authority is never once invoked to settle any questions upon which there is controversy in the Church.

Let me, then, consider with you, in greater detail, the Doctrinal Report in relation to the Bible:

On the one hand the statements of the Report with regard to the Bible and its position in the Church of England are wholly admirable. As the Archbishop of York writes in the Introduction, he and his colleagues on the Commission "fully acknowledge the supremacy of Scripture as supplying the standard of doctrine" (p. 8).

"The Church," the Report affirms, "has always claimed that its doctrine is based on Scripture" (p. 27); for "the Bible is unique, as being the inspired record of a unique revelation" (p. 28). Thus, the Report declares, "The Bible has been, and is, for the Christian Church the primary criterion of its teaching and the chief source of guidance for its religious life" (p. 31); and "when all allowance is made for possible divergencies between the records . . . it remains true that the

religious and moral teaching of the Gospels conveys faithfully the impress made upon the Apostolic Church by the mind and personality of Jesus, and thus possesses supreme authority" (p. 33).

Indeed, the following impressive passage excellently summarizes the teaching of the Commission—"The Church is constituted by the acts of God, and under the guidance of the Holy Spirit has accepted the Scriptures as being inspired witness to those acts; the Scriptures therefore take priority over all other standards of faith and doctrine" (p. 113).

As will be seen the Report on Doctrine is in no danger of diminishing the authority of Holy Scripture as set forth in the Sixth Article of Religion; and its well-chosen words fully justify the celebration of the fourth centenary of the Reformation and the English Bible. Moreover, we can accept Dr. Temple's warning (which only reflects the caution of Article Twenty) that "our attention must be fastened on the trend of Scripture as a whole" (p. 8); as, also, his opinion that in the interpretation of Scripture "our best guide is the continuous stream of universal Christian tradition" (p. 9)—insofar (we might add) as that stream does genuinely trace its source back to the Bible itself.

Then why, on the other hand, does not the Commission put this precept into practice, and loyally apply the criterion of Holy Scripture to all doctrine on which, at present, there is disagreement among Church people?

The non-controversial sections of the Report, such as those on the Holy Spirit, the Church, and the idea of Sacrifice, are evidently built up on Scripture, and afford a real contribution to theology for which we cannot be too grateful. But equally evident is the fact that the Word of God is silent or ignored in the controversial sections of the Report. I cannot but believe the reason to be that if Scripture had been invoked, it would have decided such questions; and that in a way unpalatable to many on the Commission, and those whom they represent.

For convenience sake we will divide the controversial sections of the Report into those which concern the Creeds and those which concern Worship.

As regards the Creeds, it will be generally agreed that it is neither right nor necessary to enquire too closely into the private interpretations of Church people as they recite the confession of their faith. But the case is different with the authorized teachers of the Church; and some members of the Commission would press "the obligation resting on all who hold office in the Church to believe and to teach the traditional doctrine of the Church" (p. 39). Dr. Temple, in view of his own responsibility in the Church, feels constrained to affirm for himself that "I wholeheartedly accept as historical facts the Birth of our Lord from a Virgin Mother and the Resurrection of His physical body from death and the tomb" (p. 12). But what would be manifestly incongruous in an Archbishop, applies equally to all who have Congregations committed to their charge. Instead of allowing it to be legitimate in the Church of England to cut the miraculous out of the Gospel record, and for the Cradle at Bethlehem and the Empty Tomb to be explained away as symbols merely; it would (to my mind) have been far better

to have sacrificed a false unanimity, and for the Commission to have affirmed as the doctrine of the Church what the inspired writings of the New Testament believe and teach beyond all shadow of doubt.

When we pass on to Worship, there is a like disinclination to apply the authority of Scripture to the Commission's findings on Holy Communion and the Communion of Saints.

As regards Holy Communion, it should not be expected that all sections of the Church should agree in their sacramental doctrine. But we may all unite in one sacramental worship. Indeed, we should be far happier if we followed the example of the first eight hundred years of Christendom when, as the Report reminds us (p. 163), " questions of speculative theology remained in the background " and were " quite subordinate to a thankful recognition of the (sacramental) Gift itself." But if we are to retain the privilege of uniting in one common Eucharistic worship, it must be entirely Scriptural in character. With such a principle the Commission seems to agree. " The form of this act of corporate and individual worship," they affirm, " is determined by the record of the Last Supper " ; and they are unanimous in holding that this record, as we find it in the New Testament, is true (p. 160). They insist, moreover, that such words as " This is my Body," " cannot bear a meaning inconsistent with that of their first utterance " (p. 167).

And yet, in defiance of such a Scriptural criterion, the Communion considers that the Church should regard as legitimate the practice of elevating the consecrated elements, whether as " a representation before the Father of the actual sacrifice of the Cross," or according to " the doctrine of the Heavenly Altar, at which we join in the perpetual offering by Christ of Himself " (p. 162). Now, such a dramatic presentation of the Body and Blood of Christ to His Father can claim no authority from our Lord's command, which instituted the Breaking of Bread to be a reminder to men (an " anamnesis," cf. Heb. x. 3) not a memorial to God (a " mnemosunon," cf. Acts x. 4) of the sacrifice of the Cross. It involves, moreover, a gross mistranslation of St. Paul's declaration (1 Cor. xi. 26), that at Holy Communion " Ye proclaim (downwards to men, it cannot mean upwards to God) the Lord's death till he come."

Furthermore, though the members of the Communion " do not regard the phrase ' we have an altar ' in Heb. xiii. as containing any direct reference to the Eucharist " (p. 150), they accept what they call " the doctrine of the Heavenly Altar." Yet Bishop Westcott is emphatic that neither the ritual of the Day of Atonement as described in Leviticus, nor the teaching thereon as given in the Epistle to the Hebrews, countenance any idea of Christ, our Great High Priest, pleading his sacrifice before the Throne of Grace. Undoubtedly, as the Epistle states, the Ascended Saviour " ever liveth to make intercession " for us (Heb. vii. 25) ; even as he made supplication for Simon Peter when he was on earth (Luke xxii. 32). But Scripture nowhere portrays him as pleading a sacrifice that has for ever rent the Veil and " opened the gate of heaven to all believers." Indeed, the whole conception " of placating an angry God " (as the Commission maintains elsewhere) " is definitely unchristian " ; and dishonours the love of a Heavenly

Father, whom (as the Commission again reminds us) does not require to be reconciled to us, but we to him (p. 146).

The same disturbing inconsistency between Scriptural principle and its application explains the refusal of the Report to give guidance even on the question of Reservation for purposes of Devotion. The Commission is clear " that the special sacramental Presence of the Lord is to be sought only within the context of those sacramental acts with which the original promise of it was associated " (p. 185). And yet they cannot agree whether or not the application of that principle provides a sufficient theological justification for the practice of " Devotions," either at the Eucharist itself or before the Reserved Sacrament. But this is special pleading, due to preconceived ideas. It is evident from Scripture that the Lord Jesus in the same night in which he was betrayed blessed Bread and Wine for purposes of communion only; and that, in the words of the Twenty-eighth Article of Religion, " the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper was not *by Christ's ordinance* reserved, carried about, lifted up, or worshipped."

With regard to the Communion of Saints, the Commission warns us, very beautifully, that " the way of truth and safety is to remember that our fellowship with the departed is a fellowship in prayer and worship." " The only way," it explains, " to come closer to those who are departed in the faith of Christ is to draw near to God, and to draw near to Him is, *eo ipso,* to come closer to them " (p. 214). And yet the Commission can speak with seeming approval of the practice of the Eastern Church in which " prayers are offered by the Church on earth even for the Mother of our Lord, and the prayers of friends lately departed in the faith of Christ are asked on behalf of those who seek this help " (p. 214). The Commission prefers to leave even the Invocation of Saints an open question. But does Scripture? If God intended us to use this way of fellowship, assuredly the Church of the Acts and Epistles would have craved the prayers of John Baptist; and the Apostles, whose prayers their Master asked in the Garden of Gethsemane, would have overheard him also invoking the intercessions of the two Old Testament Saints they had glimpsed holding communion with him on the Mount of Transfiguration. If we follow the teaching of Scripture, rather than the example of unreformed Churches, we shall continue faithfully to practise what the Report so emphatically enjoins, when it says, " The vital point to be at all costs secured is that God alone is the object of our worship, and that our fellowship with the departed is in and *through* Him " (p. 215).

The " Note " of the Commission on " Prayer for Departed " is entirely characteristic. It begins with the acknowledgement that no trace of the practice is found in Scripture except in the Apocrypha (p. 216). It concludes with the statement that " there is no theological objection in principle to Prayer for the Departed " (p. 216). This is not the place to discuss in general the difficult question of Intercession for the Departed, as distinct from Remembrance of them in our prayers. Suffice it to say that it would be possible to find, and to frame, careful prayers of thanksgiving, commemoration, and commendation, on behalf of the Departed, which would be at once utterly loyal to the

silence of Scripture, and at the same time perfectly satisfying to hearts that mourn. I would also add that because (as we must believe) by the guidance and inspiration of God the Holy Spirit, neither the invocation of Saints nor petition for the Departed is taught or countenanced in Holy Scripture; we must not suppose that the Church of England might not greatly enrich and warm her worship, both corporate and individual, by a far intenser realization of the Communion of Saints, such as the Commission so admirably advocates.

Let me conclude the whole matter by pointing you to that most beautiful and satisfying phrase, "the Sufficiency of Holy Scripture." By our celebration of the fourth centenary of the Reformation and the English Bible, we reaffirm with the Commission on Doctrine the inspired decision of the Reformers to make Holy Scripture the sufficient and supreme authority for the Church.

There are three reasons for exalting the Word of God to this unique position.

1. In the first place, in the Bible, as nowhere else, we are brought into closest contact with the Mind of Christ. Neither the Doctrinal Commission nor indeed any section of the Church believes the Bible to be infallible. There is only one infallible authority—namely, the Mind of Christ; if only we can learn it. And we discover the Mind of Christ most intimately and truly as we search the Scripture.

2. The second reason is our belief in the Holy Spirit and in his active guidance and inspiration. The departing Master promised the coming of the Comforter at once to inspire the writers of the New Testament, even as he had spoken of old time through the prophets (John xiv. 26); and also to guide the Church into all the truth (John xvi. 13). If we believe this, then we know that the voice of the Holy Spirit in the Church cannot contradict the voice of the Holy Spirit in Scripture. The two voices must speak as one if they are the utterance of the one and self-same Spirit. And the whole history of Christendom is proof that where the Church has spoken with her own voice alone, there she has erred and died in superstition; but that where the Church has attuned her voice to that of Scripture, there she has exhibited a true and living witness to her Master.

3. Finally, there is the Character of God and his eternal purpose to reveal himself to his children.

When René Descartes, "the Father of Modern Philosophy," was searching for philosophical certainty in an age of flux and upheaval, he laid down the foundation truth that God being perfect cannot deceive. "I recognize it to be impossible," he declared, "that God should ever deceive me; for in all fraud and deception some imperfection is to be found." If, therefore, as we all acknowledge, God intended to reveal his nature and his will to man through the inspired Scriptures; it follows that he gave his revelation truthfully and even plainly. That is, God's character is the guarantee to us of the truth and sufficiency of God's Word.

Few can fail to be impressed by Dr. Temple's words in the Introduction of the Doctrinal Report, as he reviews the result of the Commission's fourteen years of labour. Looking back, he is conscious

of a transition from a pre-war theology of the Incarnation to a post-war theology of the Atonement. The Cross, and the old teaching about the Cross, is increasingly becoming a reality to a generation living in days of fear and challenge and denial of Christ. " In all this," says Dr. Temple, " we shall be coming closer to the New Testament " (p. 16). Then why should we not always keep close to the Scriptures, and thereby view life and salvation with the eternal eyes of Almighty God, the same yesterday, to-day, and for ever ; instead of suffering the circumstances of our times, or passing movements in the Church, to dictate our theology and frame our worship ?

Future generations will acclaim this anniversary year with thankfulness, if the commemoration of the fourth centenary of the Reformation and the English Bible results in the reaffirmation of the central principle of the Reformation, and in the resolve to allow in the faith and worship of the Church of England only what possesses the warrant of God's most holy Word.

THAT THEY GO FORWARD. By Eric Fenn. *Student Christian Movement Press.* 2*s.* net.

Mr. Eric Fenn was the Assistant Secretary General of the Oxford Conference and he describes his book as " An Impression of the Oxford Conference on Church, Community and State." His main purpose is to make some of the findings of the Conference held last July available in short and simple form, and cheap, to younger people, and especially those preparing for the International Conference of Christian Youth in 1939. It was no easy task to survey the many and complicated problems considered at Oxford and to present a useful résumé of them in concise form, but Mr. Fenn has adequately performed it, and we commend this summary of the Conference to readers of all ages who desire to gain an insight into the work done. It is Mr. Fenn's hope that he may lead readers on to the further study of the official report written by Dr. J. H. Oldham : *The Churches Survey Their Task.*

The main task of the Conference was to face the fact that it is no longer possible to speak of the Christian West. There has been a steady move away from Christianity, until now the conception of the totalitarian state has set up " a society which is all-embracing and self-sufficient, for which God does not exist." In face of this menace the Churches are divided and their witness is rendered to a large extent ineffective. The message of the Conference was the need of unity and " the source of unity is not the consenting movement of men's wills ; it is Jesus Christ whose one life flows through the Body and subdues the many wills to His." The various forms of the challenge to Christianity are considered, and the elements in them incompatible with Christian truth are set out. Exaggerated Nationalism is the source of many of the difficulties and the true relationship of Church and State must be asserted and maintained. The explanation of these points and many others render this book a useful guide to the most pressing questions which have to be answered in our time.

THE REFORMATION AND THE BIBLE.

By the Rev. S. L. GREENSLADE, M.A.

Fellow and Chaplain, St. John's College, Oxford.

I have today been at youre chirche at messe,
And seyd a sermoun after my symple wit,
Nat al after the text of hooly writ;
For it is hard to yow, as I suppose,
And therefore wol I teche yow al the glose.
Glosynge is a glorious thyng certyn,
For lettre sleeth, so as we clerks seyn.

I wish that the husbandman may sing parts of them at his plough, that the weaver may warble them at his shuttle, that the traveller may with their narratives beguile the weariness of the way.

IN the second citation, from Erasmus' Paraclesis, you will recognize the inspiration of Tindale's famous vow, "If God spare my life, ere many years I will cause a boy that driveth the plough shall know more of the Scripture than thou dost." And even if Chaucer drew his picture of the Friar with the exaggeration of humour, the difference between the two passages may well serve as a testimony to the gulf between the church of the Middle Ages and the church of the Reformation.

Let us ask, first, what was the mediæval outlook against which the reformers rebelled, and what was then the state of biblical learning. Protestants commonly make much of the ignorance of the mediæval clergy—ignorance of which there is abundant evidence. But, bad as that was, it was not the only, and possibly not the main, obstacle to the preaching of evangelical Christianity. Some clergy possessed and knew the Bible; almost all accepted a very strong view of its inspiration, more rigid even than that of the early church; and many were sincere enough in their desire to teach the revealed truth. What spoilt their teaching—at least, as we judge it—was the prevalent method of interpreting the Scriptures. The Fathers had written voluminous commentaries—how voluminous!—from which diligent but unoriginal scholars of the early Middle Ages made anthologies or built up a continuous gloss on the text. Two glosses in particular were widely used, the marginal Glossa Ordinaria, formerly attributed to Walafrid Strabo, and the interlinear gloss, both of which reached their standard form in the twelfth century. Of later commentaries, the most popular was the Postilla of Nicholas of Lyra, written early in the fourteenth century. Now these and all similar commentaries were based upon the distinction, as old as the

Church itself, between the literal and the mystical, or allegorical, senses of the text. Again and again they quoted St. Paul, " The letter killeth, but the spirit giveth life," so that the literal sense was depreciated, and the allegorical alone held to contain the message which God intended. It is easy to see that this can lead to pure subjectivism, and equally easy to understand that authority intervened to control individualism. The Scripture, men agreed, cannot conflict with the teaching of God's church ; and by the method of spiritual exegesis, it was not too difficult to force the text into the mould of orthodoxy. That is not a characteristic of the Middle Ages alone. And if the teaching of the Church clarified and systematized the content of Scripture, why bother to read this obscure book? The inference was drawn, and, as Roger Bacon complained, the Sentences of Peter Lombard and the Summa of Thomas Aquinas were more often studied by theologians than was the Bible. As for the man in the pew—if I may be allowed the anachronism—he might rest content with such Bible stories of an edifying character as his priest chose to relate. The priest would instruct him in the truths of religion from a useful little manual. Again, that may not be a characteristic of the Middle Ages alone.

Given this attitude to the Bible, the mediæval system of faith and practice seemed impregnable. Yet some men knew its faults. Perhaps we can see now why it was that, though grumbles came from below, reform came from above. There might be mass discontent with certain abuses, but a clear lead could only come from the spiritual élite who were also intellectually alert ; men who could read the Latin Bible and could free themselves from traditional exegesis. Such men were Wycliffe and Hus and Luther. And once they had seen that the Church stood condemned at the bar of the Bible, that Bible whose divine authority the Church professed to accept, their strategy was clear. The Bible must once more create the theology of the Church. And, lest the clergy out of conservatism or some vested interest, refuse to acknowledge the necessity of change, the layman must have the Bible and be helped to understand it. So, one after another, they set themselves to translate the Scriptures into their own tongues.

So far we have been concerned mainly with the problem of interpretation. Now we must ask how far the mediæval Church had approved the circulation of Bibles, Latin or vernacular, and whether the layman had been encouraged to read it for himself. Manuscript Latin Bibles existed in considerable numbers, but, broadly speaking, only the clerical class could read them ; and the clergy were protected by their training from any undesirable reflections on the meaning of scripture. Perhaps they read it ; perhaps they loved it ; but they saw in it the teaching in which they had been nurtured. Normally, the laity were not forbidden to possess the Latin Bible, though the Synod of Toulouse in 1229 prohibited all but the Psalter. More significant is the fact that the very numerous manuals of instruction rarely recommend Bible-reading to the laity.

When we turn to vernacular Bibles, the case is altered. From the twelfth century onwards, the demand for a Bible in the mother tongue so often came from heretics, particularly Waldenses, that the ideas of

a vernacular translation and unorthodoxy became well-nigh inseparable in the official mind. In 1199, Innocent III condemned not only translations explicitly, but implicitly all reading of the Bible by the laity when he laid stress on its difficulty and warned them of the command that the beast which touched the mountain should be stoned. Towards the end of the fourteenth century the demand became insistent. You know how Wycliffe met it in England, and how the translation which he caused to be made was condemned at Oxford in 1408. No doubt Wycliffe's heretical views increased official distaste for an English Bible. When printing came, the continent was far ahead of us. A German Bible was published in 1466, an Italian version was printed at Venice in 1471, and a French Bible appeared in 1474, all long before the Reformation. What is the significance of these books? Did the Church relent, or yield to pressure? The subject is intricate, and this is no time for details. Perhaps I may quote from Miss Deanesly's minute study of mediæval bible-reading in her book, "The Lollard Bible." Speaking of France, Italy and Spain, she says, "In regions unaffected by heresy, there was no formal opposition to biblical translations as such; but their use, or rather their possession, was in fact confined to a few kings and princes, or doctors of the university. But manuals of instruction, whether for the laity or for the clergy, never refer to any religious duty of acquiring acquaintance with the contents of the biblical books, either by personal study or by listening to translations, until the last quarter of the fifteenth century—that is, until the spread of humanistic ideas, and the multiplication of unlicensed printed vernacular Bibles had made such a course inevitable." Of Germany, "It is quite certain that none of these printed Bibles was an official edition, approved by authority. . . . The chief authority on the history of the German Bible considers that there is evidence that the attitude of ecclesiastical authority was not favourable to the issue of these editions." And, summing up her work, she concludes, "The attitude of the mediæval Church to biblical translations has thus been seen to have been one of toleration in principle, and distrust in practice. . . . From his time (Gregory VII's) onwards the orthodox prejudice against lay knowledge of the biblical text hardened, except in the case of the most exalted personages, who were always allowed to possess them if they wished; but popular Bible reading, and the learning of the translations by heart, were found to lead inevitably to their exposition by lay people, and eventually to heresy. . . . Germany was the only country in Europe where orthodoxy allowed the study of biblical translations to lay people before the Reformation, and this only from about 1509 onwards. . . . In England, as in the rest of Europe, the great majority of those familiar with the text of the Bible in English were Lollards, and Sir Thomas More recognized the general state of affairs when he made his Messenger complain that 'The Bible is in so few folks' hands.'"

It is time to speak of the Reformers, and first of their work in providing vernacular Bibles, translated from the original languages. I shall confine myself to England, for Luther's German Bible, the first part of which appeared in 1522, was not the cause of Tindale's work. We may be tempted to attribute Tindale's determination to the in-

spiration of Wycliffe and the Lollard's, but, though such influence cannot be altogether ruled out, the available evidence points to a different source, the New Learning. In lectures at Oxford, Colet had tried to make St. Paul's letters live again ; Greek was once more studied in the West ; and in 1516 Erasmus for the first time edited the Greek text of the New Testament for the printing press. However useful the earlier printed translations may have been in preparing the ground, they, like the Lollard MSS., were translated from the Vulgate and perpetuated such errors as "penance" for "repentance" and the misleading "priest" for "elder." Erasmus's fame as a scholar was so great that even the Greekless were stimulated to read his parallel Latin version. Let us hear the effect of this on Thomas Bilney, afterwards martyred, told by himself in a letter to Tunstall, Bishop of London : "But at last I heard speak of Jesus, even then when the New Testament was first set forth by Erasmus ; which when I understood to be eloquently done by him, being allured rather by the Latin than by the word of God (for at that time I knew not what it meant), I bought it even by the providence of God, as I do now well understand and perceive : and at the first reading (as I well remember) I chanced upon this sentence of St. Paul (O most sweet and comfortable sentence to my soul !) in 1 Tim. i. : 'It is a true saying, and worthy of all men to be embraced, that Christ Jesus came into the world to save sinners ; of whom I am the chief and principal.' This one sentence, through God's instruction and inward working, which I did not then perceive, did so exhilarate my heart, being before wounded with the guilt of my sins, and being almost in despair, that even immediately I seemed unto myself inwardly to feel a marvellous comfort and quietness, insomuch that 'my bruised bones leaped for joy.' After this, the Scripture began to be more pleasant to me than the honey or the honey-comb ; wherein I learned, that all my travails, all my fasting and watching, all the redemption of masses and pardons, being done without trust in Christ, who only saveth his people from their sins ; these, I say, I learned to be nothing else but even (as St. Augustine saith) a hasty and swift running out of the right way." Almost the whole Reformation is wrapped up in that confession, complete with a reference to Augustine !

Tindale spent some years in Oxford under the influence of this New Learning, and went across to Cambridge soon after Erasmus left it. Already in Oxford we have a glimpse of him expounding the Bible to Fellows of Magdalen ; and while he was at Little Sodbury in 1521 or 1522 he translated Erasmus's Enchiridion, a work full of exhortations to Bible-reading. From this Gloucestershire village he went up to London determined to translate the Bible, and that from the original tongues. Tunstall rejected his request for assistance, and before long Tindale sailed for Hamburg. In 1525, his first New Testament had not gone far through the Press of Peter Quentell at Cologne, when it was forbidden by the local Senate. Tindale soon had another edition printed at Worms ; and now begins the fascinating and heroic story of its introduction into England. How the version was criticized by More and others, how the bishops forbade it and tried to buy it up, and

publicly burned it, how Vicar Constantyne and Simon Fish, Robert Necton and others risked property and liberty to circulate it, you must read in Foxe and in Pollard's Records of the English Bible.

Opposition was strong, but useless, especially as the new Archbishop was on Tindale's side. In 1530, though forbidding existing translations, Henry promised a new one. Nothing happened, and in 1534 the bishops actually petitioned him for one. At Cranmer's instance, they began to make one themselves, but the project fell through. Coverdale's translation, printed in 1535, was not authorized, but at least it was not suppressed; and in 1537, the Matthew Bible, largely Tindale's work, actually received the royal licence. The next year brought forth the royal injunction for which we are now thanking God, that before the next Easter, an English Bible should be set up in every parish church, and that every layman should have free access to it.

Thus one part of the work was done, and the Reformers had faith that the reading of the word of God would soon sweep away much that was wrong in the mediæval Church. But destruction was not enough. If the Bible was to be the foundation of a constructive theology, of a new way of life, they must face the problems of its inspiration, authority and interpretation—subjects so profound and so closely interwoven, that in a few minutes I can but skim the surface of them. Protestantism has often been charged with substituting an infallible Book for an infallible Church. But if that complaint is just at all, it is at least less true of the early stages of the Reformation than of later Protestant scholasticism. The early reformers agreed that the Bible is divinely inspired and supremely authoritative, but they were not rigid in their conceptions of inspiration and authority. Colet recognized that the Holy Spirit used human agents, and that these agents caused the books to vary in value. He also made use of the principle of accommodation. Indeed, the idea of verbal dictation and of the nullity of the human medium is more characteristic of the Middle Ages, for it was precisely that that had driven its scholars to so liberal a use of allegory. Luther distinguished the Word of God from the text of Scripture and held some views analogous to those of modern critics, as when he declared that Kings is in "a thousand places ahead of Chronicles and more to be believed." Tindale declares, "It is not the use to say the Holy Ghost writeth, but inspireth the writer." I do not deny that stiffer views were sometimes held, but they are not uniform, and in the case of the greatest reformers, not characteristic.

At the heart of their beliefs about inspiration lay a strong faith in the present work of the Holy Spirit. As He had inspired the writers, so He now inspires us through the writings. So Tindale says, "For though the scripture be an outward instrument, and the preacher also, to move men to believe, yet the chief and principal cause why a man believeth, or believeth not, is within; that is, the Spirit of God teacheth his children to believe." Herein too, lies the authority of the book. It contains the Word of God, and is the medium by which the Spirit teaches us. As a book, therefore, it is not exactly self-sufficient (though as against ecclesiastical tradition, Sir Thomas More's plea of "unwritten verities," its sufficiency is often proclaimed), for without the

present work of the Spirit, it has no creative power. And to the reformers at their best, as no doubt to many before them, the Bible is not primarily an arsenal of texts, but that by which God brings home to man the Gospel of Salvation. Hence the Gospel, as they conceived it, was used as a criterion of a canon within the canon, and Luther can write : " Those Apostles who treat oftenest and highest of how faith in Christ alone justifies are the best Evangelists. Therefore are St. Paul's Epistles more a Gospel than Matthew, Mark and Luke." And again : " John's Gospel, St. Paul's Epistles, especially that to the Romans, and St. Peter's First Epistle, are the right kernel and marrow of all books." And : " Therefore is St. James's Epistle in comparison with these a mere letter of straw, for it has nothing evangelical about it." And Luther's words were given by Tindale to an English public. Naturally, their opponents found here an element of subjectivism. It must be admitted, but needs no apology, as we shall, I hope, see when we consider the question of interpretation. It is true, however, that the earlier reformers scarcely attempted to formulate a clear theory of the authority of the Bible. At the time it was unnecessary, for the Church acknowledged it. They were more concerned to deny the equal authority of the Church, which was done partly by asserting that the Church is human and fallible, but chiefly by showing how in fact the Church had erred when judged by the Bible. Though, to-day, we may have to occupy ourselves more deeply with the questions of authority and inspiration, in the sixteenth century the principal battle-ground was interpretation.

We have seen how the mediæval church emphasized the obscurity of scripture, insisted that exegesis must be bounded by traditional dogma, and encouraged allegorical interpretation. More than once Tindale complained that at the Universities men were not allowed to study the Bible until their minds had settled into the grooves of scholastic theology. Against all this Luther declares that " the Holy Ghost is the all simplest writer and speaker that is in heaven and earth," and, with the utmost boldness, " I say that no part of Holy Scripture is dark. . . . Christ hath not so enlightened us that any part of his doctrine and his word which he bids us regard and follow should be left dark." From this he concludes that the divinely intended sense is the literal one. Erasmus preferred the allegorical sense, and some English reformers, like Latimer, allow some value in the old methods. But Tindale follows Luther closely. The literal sense is the true one and is the spiritual one. All God's words are spiritual. Not that even Luther and Tindale are quite consistent, but they, and, I think, all the reformers, preferred the literal sense, whereas previously this had been held almost in scorn. And largely because they believed in the literal sense, they were prepared to entrust the Bible to the layman. One after another, they stoutly deny the obscurity of the Bible. They were not so foolish as to assert that every sentence is easy, but they confidently believed that God can, through Scripture, say what He most wants to say to any God-fearing mind. God-fearing it must be. Many times they insist that, for the right understanding of the Bible spiritual qualities, humility, penitence, faith, diligence, obedience, are

far more necessary than intellectual ability. So Latimer can throw off the burden of glosses : " I pray you, was not the scripture, if ye would contend, before your most ancient doctors that ye can allege to have written of it ? Was it not, afore they wrote upon it, better received, more purely understood, of more mighty working, than it is now, or since they wrote upon it ? . . . Is not now the same word as it was then ? Is not the same schoolmaster, that taught them to understand it then (which, as St. Peter saith, is the Spirit of God) alive, as well as he was then ? Doth he not favour us now as well as he did them ? . . . Which Spirit if we have, so beareth witness St. Paul that we be Christ's men ; and St. Peter, that we may understand the scripture. Which only is that the lay-people desire ; utterly contemning all men's draughts and all men's writings, how well learned soever they be : only contented with their old and new schoolmaster, the Holy Spirit of God, and the minister thereto of him elect, and of him sent."

No doubt the reformers had their weaknesses. Men of good will did not agree on the interpretation of the Word ; and would not agree to differ. The Church split up into more and more sects, a wound to the Body of Christ which we must set ourselves, under God, to heal. They had, therefore, to admit the difficulty or ambiguity of much in the Bible, so that their works contain efforts to lay down new rules of exegesis and many deprecations of private, unlearned exposition, conflicting with their wish to approve the right of private judgment. Another point theoretically vulnerable is their practice, so striking in Luther and Tindale, of providing a key to Scripture in the doctrine of justification by faith. This may be sound, in itself, but such a use of it is difficult to justify to an opponent, who may well attack it as a disregard of part of Scripture or as an arbitrary determination to judge all Scripture in the light of the one doctrine which appealed to them most strongly. Thus Tindale set up his " feeling " against More's feeling. In time, especially in Lutheran circles, a new orthodoxy sprang up which claimed to control biblical exegesis no less rigidly than mediæval orthodoxy had done.

But how much there is to say on the other side ! They did try to interpret Scripture from Scripture, not from outside. They knew the Bible, they soaked themselves in it. That they honestly tried to let the Bible determine their own theology is evident throughout their works. And if they reached an overwhelming conviction that the Spirit of God was teaching them through the Scriptures how and where to find in the Scriptures the heart of the Gospel, they might be unable to demonstrate the truth of this conviction, but they had to stand by it. We have to do the same ; we have to take the risk of subjectivism, not only for the sake of liberty, but also of truth. God alone is infallible, and we must make the venture of faith that God will increasingly guide us into the truth if we use loyally the means which He has provided. Nor does the Spirit simply help us to understand ; as we read, the Spirit works creatively upon us, bringing us to God, creating faith and love, and so enabling us to obey God. The reformers staked their lives on this truth. It rings all through their writings. The rightness of such an attitude to Scripture is not to

be proved by a priori reasoning. We must welcome the appeal to experience, to history. It is thus that men have been, and so still can be, brought to walk more closely with God.

Finally, while we honour the reformers, we must not idolize them. They had not all truth, all grace. They have left us problems, and new ones have emerged since their day, problems which will not be solved by a narrow Protestantism. If we would show our gratitude to them, let it be by using all possible means to hear the Word of God for which they listened, not forsaking their assurance that God speaks to the humble and simple soul, but taking courage to face all our problems of biblical scholarship from their faith that God can break through human error, even the error which would justify itself by appeal to His Word, their faith that a living God, through His Holy Spirit, constantly holds us to Himself.

THE papers read at the one hundred and eleventh Islington Clerical Meeting last January are published under the title *Written for our Learning* (The Lutterworth Press, 1*s.* 6*d.* net). The importance of the subject was obvious, as in the year of the Fourth Centenary of the Reformation and the English Bible, the most appropriate was: "The Bible—Its Witness in History and Its Relevance To-day." The Rev. J. M. Hewitt had secured a strong platform of speakers, and the treatment of the subject was in every way adequate to the greatness of the subject. The names of the authors of the papers are a guarantee of their competence. The Revs. G. T. Manley, M.A., S. F. Allison, M.A., Prebendary H. W. Hinde, M.A., F. W. Dillistone, M.A., B.D., Canon R. H. Murray, M.A., Litt.D., M.R.I.A., Prebendary W. Wilson Cash, D.S.O., D.D., and J. R. S. Taylor, M.A. The Bishop of Norwich contributes a Foreword to the published addresses. He emphasizes the place of the Bible in our history and the importance of the practice of daily reading. A frontispiece is provided by a portrait of Daniel Wilson, D.D., the founder of the Islington Conference, and later Bishop of Calcutta. A wide circulation is assured for this volume of addresses.

The Church Victorious (Longmans Green & Co., 2*s.* 6*d.* net), is the Bishop of London's Lent Book for the present year. The author is the Rt. Rev. Bishop Crotty, D.D., formerly Bishop of Bathurst. The Bishop of London in his Introduction speaks of the volume as "an encouraging and hopeful book," and as a great help in these days when there is so much pessimism in the world. The essentials of the Church Victorious are love, sacrifice and truth. It must resist the blandishments of the world. Success may even come when the Church appears to be beaten, for the Cross is the centre of the Church's message. The price of victory has to be paid and the various phases of the world's antagonism are depicted which can only be overcome by the Divine life indwelling the Church.

THE REFORMATION IN DOCTRINE: JUSTIFICATION BY FAITH.

By the Rev. E. STEINLY, M.A.

Tutor, St. Aidan's College, Birkenhead.

IN Holy Writ, God is proclaimed as He Who created heaven and earth. The universe is thus regarded as an act of God's Will, not an emanation of His Being. As such it is, moreover, a personal or supra-personal act. Both the manner and the meaning of this act are incomprehensible to the human mind, since the fact of creation *ex nihilo* has no analogy in human experience. Thus, in a *created* universe man is confronted by a Wisdom deeper than any depths which the human mind can fathom, and by a Righteousness higher than any heights to which the human will can attain. This inscrutable Wisdom and this challenging Righteousness are nothing less than the living Word of the Creator, spoken in the first instance to this or that individual soul through seemingly contingent and fragmentary facts of human history. For the organ of the Self-revelation of God is never the whole Church as such but the Holy Remnant. By that revelation man is summoned to share in a deeper Wisdom and a higher Righteousness than the speculations and imperatives which he himself is able to prescribe.

In Holy Writ also, man's failure to acknowledge the Divine Wisdom and obey the Divine Righteousness is emphatically asserted. Such failure springs from no transitory ignorance of the human mind nor from any accidental maladjustment of human life to outward circumstances. Man's failure is something positive. Sin is a perversion of the will. In consequence God stands over against man as an alien God. For the relationship of the Divine Will to human life is a dynamic and not a static one. All knowledge of God, therefore, which embraces in its scope man's own status before God is knowledge of God's condemnation and wrath.

In such circumstances the problem of life is not, 'How can man know, or rather, be known of God,' but 'How can man know God and live.' For God is inescapable by man. "If I climb up to heaven Thou art there; if I go down to hell thou art there also." God's Word comes to individuals and communities alike when they least expect it. "In such an hour as ye think not, the Son of Man cometh." That it is or can be ultimately a Word of Salvation is beyond the bounds of hope in any heart brought face to face, as it were, with itself. Yet such, according to the Gospel, is in fact, the Word of the Cross. In Christ crucified God has declared his saving Righteousness and the riches of his Wisdom. By the Word of the cross God "justifies the ungodly" and chooses "the

foolish things of the world that He may put to shame them that are wise." The cross is thus God's miracle of grace whereby He creates *ex nihilo*, that is, out of condition of sin and death, a new creation which is beyond the reach of either. This new creation is at once discontinuous and continuous with the old ; discontinuous since Christ died and in his resurrection the old creation is not restored but, as it were, revolutionized ; continuous since He Who was raised is He Who died. Thus Christ is no mere new living soul in a world order of fate or chance similar to the old, but rather is the life-giving Spirit in an order of divine freedom. He is the Lord who has merited or obtained for man the saving righteousness of God. Henceforth God is the " Justifier of him that hath faith in Jesus."

The doctrines of Creation, the Fall and Justification through the merits of Christ were formally common both to the medieval Church and to the Reformers. Yet so diametrically opposed to each other were the interpretations they respectively affirmed that "the matter of justifying righteousness," to quote the testimony of Richard Hooker, became " that grand question which hangeth yet in controversy between us and the church of Rome." The controversy between the two parties centred mainly round the meaning to be attached to such statements as that of St. Paul when he writes that man is " justified by faith."

For St. Paul " faith " was the co-relative in the human heart of the Self-Revealing Word of God or Word of Christ. " Faith," he wrote, " cometh by hearing, and hearing by the Word of Christ." Moreover faith, for St. Paul, stands in contrast to " works." Neither the efforts of the human intellect as the Greek imagined, nor the endeavours of the human will as the Jew believed, can bring man into the knowledge and service of God. St. Paul also contrasts " faith " with " sight," that final contemplation and rest in which the life of " works " reaches its consummation. Faith is not a human vision any more than it is a human activity. Faith is *passio* on its human side, not action, as Luther taught. It is the moment of passivity out of which all activity springs because in it God acts. Thus it is the answering echo in the human heart of the Spirit of God to the creative activity of God through His Word. And since it is that creative activity which alone gives meaning and purpose to man's life, God may never be identified with objects fashioned on the lower structural levels either of human wisdom or of human effort.

This identification, however, was exactly that which the mediæval Church attempted to make. In the first place the chief scholastic thinkers identified the God of revelation with the object of human thought as set forth in the philosophy of Aristotle. Faith thus becomes a further extension of human reason. By faith, knowledge of God was more adequately brought within the scope of human intellectual activity. For Aristotle's God was related to the Universe, not creatively and dynamically, but causally and statically. He induced motion within " primary matter " whereby it approximated to a cosmos but such motion fell wholly within the cosmos thus fashioned. He Himself was the Unmoved Mover, immaterial, motionless, wholly engrossed in the contemplation of His own perfection. Knowledge of God, therefore,

meant not the Self-revealing Wisdom of the Creator but a human "work," induced in man by a passive artificer, and enabling him finally to pass beyond his own activity into the motionless self-contemplation of the Divine Being.

In the second place, the Creator was identified with the object of human will, that is, the guardian of human morality. Faith thus became also an extension of virtue whereby man was enabled to conform his life to the religious and moral order according to natural and supernatural law or tradition. Righteousness meant, therefore, not the redemptive activity of the Creator through the Word Incarnate, but a human activity set up in man by God through the Sacraments, and enabling him finally to achieve his own justification and to enter into the rest, that is, the motionless self-service of the Divine Being.

It was Luther, of course, who shattered the mediæval synthesis of Biblical truth and Aristotelian teaching. Not unfittingly, therefore, those Anglican articles which deal with the problem of Justification were based upon articles contained in contemporary Lutheran formularies. This mediæval synthesis, moreover, was not dissimilar from that made by Pharisaic Judaism between prophetic and scribal teaching and which the Christian Judaizers wished to perpetuate in the early church. St. Paul, however, forestalled their effort. For the Reformers, as for St. Paul, the saving righteousness of God was external to man, since it was the gift of the Word Incarnate undivorced from the Giver. Faith, likewise, was not a human virtue but the renunciation of all human credentials whatsoever. For their opponents, however, righteousness was an activity set up within the relatively autonomous life of man, and faith was a human virtue that took its place alongside other virtues.

"When they are required to show," wrote Richard Hooker, "what the righteousness is whereby a Christian man is justified, they answer that it is a divine spiritual quality; which quality received into the soul doth first make it to be one of them who are born of God: and secondly, endue it with power to bring forth such works, as they do that are born of him; even as the soul of man being joined unto his body doth first make him to be in the number of reasonable creatures, and secondly enable him to perform the natural functions which are proper to his kind; that it maketh the soul gracious and amiable in the sight of God, in regard whereof it is termed grace; that it purgeth, purifieth, washeth out all the stains and pollution of sin; that by it, through the merit of Christ, we are delivered as from sin, so from eternal death and condemnation the reward of sin. This grace they will have to be applied by infusion, to the end that as the body is warm by the heat that is in the body, so the soul might be righteous by inherent grace: which grace they make capable of increase; as the body may be more and more warm, so the soul more and more justified, according as grace shall be augmented; the augmentation whereof is merited by good works, as good works are made meritorious by it. Wherefore, the first receipt of grace is in their divinity the first justification; the increase thereof, the second justification. As grace may be increased by the merit of good works, so it may be decreased by the

demerit of sin's denial; it may be lost by mortal sin. Inasmuch, therefore, as it is needful in the one case to repair, in the other case to recover, the loss which is made, the infusion of grace hath her sundry after-meals; for which cause they make many ways to apply the infusion of grace." After alluding to these various "meals" and "after-meals" of infused righteousness or grace, Hooker writes: "This maze the Church of Rome doth cause her followers to tread, when they ask her the way of justification."

The "way of justification" thus described by Hooker appears in a modified form in the various doctrinal formularies that were put forth during the reign of Henry VIII after the breach with the Papacy. The first of these was the "Ten Articles," set forth by royal authority in 1536. In the article on Justification, it is stated that "this word Justification signifieth remission of our sins, and our acceptance or reconciliation into the grace and favour of God, that is to say, our perfect renovation in Christ. . . . Sinners attain this justification by contrition and faith joined with charity," yet not as though "our contrition or faith or any works proceeding thereof can worthily merit or deserve to attain the said justification." Such wording obviously represents a compromise between the conflicting views. The Reformers were coming to regard justifying righteousness as being (to quote Hooker again) "without us, which we have by imputation," and "a thing in nature different" from sanctification or internal righteousness. Their opponents, however, conceived justifying righteousness to be something infused, and so, in the words of the article just quoted, identical with "our perfect renovation in Christ." On this latter view "to justify" meant "to make just," since God's activity was interpreted in terms of that, not of a Creator creating *ex nihilo* but of an Artificer fashioning given material, namely, the relatively autonomous will of man.

A year after their publication, the "Ten Articles" were incorporated in a more elaborate statement of faith entitled "The Institution of a Christian Man." This work, popularly known as the "Bishops' Book," since it lacked royal authority, formed a kind of experimental prelude to a second authorized statement of faith set forth in the year 1543 under the title, "A necessary Doctrine and Erudition of any Christian Man." It was popularly known as the "King's Book" to distinguish it from the earlier "Bishops' Book." In the "King's Book," the influence of the Reformers is much less apparent than in the "Ten Articles." For example, it is stated that "this word Justification, as it is taken in Scripture, signifieth the *making* of us righteous before God, where before we were unrighteous," and that "man, prevented by his (i.e. God's) grace . . . shall be also a worker by his free consent and obedience to the same, in the attaining of his own justification. It is further stated that "as the grace of God and the gifts thereof, that is to say, faith, repentance, dread, hope, charity, with other fruits of the Holy Ghost, do increase in us, so do we wax and increase in our justification. And therefore it is plain that not only faith, as it is a distinct virtue or gift by itself, is required for our justification, but also the other gifts of the grace of God, with a desire to do good works proceeding of the same grace." Such was the mediæval

view of Justification. It was not, in Hooker's phrase "a thing in nature different," from sanctification, nor was faith other than an inherent virtue to be exercised along with other virtues "for our justification."

From the moment that the doctrine of justification by faith began to be proclaimed controversy centred primarily round the meaning of the word faith as thus used. If it merely signified a human "virtue" or "work" then the "new teaching" was merely a shadow of the old and, as such, submersive of all morality. The early reformers, however, were not slow to repudiate such an antinomian gospel. "The faith in Christ's blood," wrote William Tyndale, "of a repenting heart towards the law, justifies us alone and not all manner of faiths." "It springs not of man's fantasy, neither is it in any man's power to obtain it, but is altogether the pure gift of God, poured into us freely." "If works follow not, it is a sure and evident sign that there is no faith in the heart, but a dead imagination and dream, which they falsely call faith." Hence, "faith justifieth before God in the heart . . . love springeth of faith and compelleth us to work . . . works justify before the world . . . and certify that our faith is unfeigned."

Although the "Ten Articles" of 1536 show traces of the influence of such teaching, it found no definite place in any of the Henrician formularies. Even the Article on Justification, drawn up with twelve others at a conference of Anglican and Lutheran divines in 1538, does no more than repeat the compromising language of the Ten Articles. It was not until the accession of the boy king, Edward VI in 1547, that the new teaching received some kind of formal sanction. In that year the First "Book of Homilies" was published in which the doctrine of Justification of Faith was formally and consistently set forth. Justification is declared to be "the office of God only, and not a thing we render unto him, but which we receive from him." "Christ Himself only (is) the meritorious cause thereof" so that faith means "we must renounce the merit of all our said virtues, of faith, hope, charity and all other virtues and good deeds which we either have done, shall do, or can do." Thus, three things go together in our justification: "Upon God's part his great mercy and grace; upon Christ's part justice, that is, the satisfaction of God's Justice, and upon our part true and lively faith in the merits of Jesus which yet is not ours but by God's working in us."

Six years after the publication of the First Book of Homilies a new body of Forty-Two Articles was issued to take the place of the "King's Book" as a formal statement of faith. The new article on Justification merely referred to the Homily on Justification, but in the Elizabethan revisions of the Edwardian Articles, made in the years 1563 and 1571 respectively, a formal declaration of the doctrine of Justification was added, together with an additional article on Good Works as the necessary fruits of "a true and lively faith." These new additions were adapted from a formulary which the ambassadors of the Lutheran state of Würtemberg had presented to the Papal Council of Trent in 1552. The change of doctrine in regard to Justification was now formally complete. Justification is spoken of, on God's part as

something "reputed" and on man's part as "through faith." The formal statement ran thus: "We are accounted righteous before God only for the merits of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, by faith, and not for our own works or deservings."

In the doctrine of Justification by Faith the Biblical witness to the Self-revealing Wisdom and Righteousness of God through His Word remains free from those perversions of the Gospel which arise when men equate that Wisdom with the content of a system of thought, and identify that Righteousness with the maintenance of a ceremonial and legal tradition. For through faith a new creation comes into being. "If any man is in Christ he is a new creation." Hence, through faith we "are known of God," that is to say, God is known by an activity which is not ours but His. Likewise, through faith, "I live and yet not I but Christ liveth in me"; that is to say, the ethically and religiously good subject is not the goal to which we attain but the starting-point which the Son of God attains for us. There is a necessary place, of course, within the economy of the world of men for philosophy and for tradition. The Gospel is not antithetical to the Law as Marcion taught, any more than it is identical with the Law as the Judaizer contended, or complementary to it as the scholastic mind assumed. To deify the conclusions of philosophy or the sanctions of tradition in the form of a law, however, is to erect an idol in place of the Creator. At best they are but the *stoicheiá*, the "rudiments of the world," not the Divine "Fullness." In the Gospel their interim authority is confirmed yet abolished, as the water of human wisdom and human action is replaced by the wine of Divine Revelation and Divine Righteousness. At certain periods in her history the Church has been tempted, under pressure of circumstances, to enter into alliance with the spirit of Hellenism or of Judaism. In consequence, Church history, and especially English Church History, often merely exhibits the opposition either between Aristotelian Realism and Platonic Idealism, or between a ceremonialism analogous to that of the Temple and a legalism analogous to that of the Synagogue, and nothing higher or deeper. The alliance has remained intact until, in time of some great crisis, the human heart has been brought face to face with its own naked, idolatrous, covetous self. Then it is that the more fundamental opposition between the Law, whether of thought or action (that is, of our grasp of the Wisdom and Righteousness of God), and the Gospel (that is, God's grasp of us in His Wisdom and Righteousness) is rediscovered. For then the Word of the Cross is sounded forth anew, faith is born, the eyes of the understanding are enlightened, and the Spirit of God clothes man's heart with a righteousness which is not its own, but is the free gift of God through His Incarnate Son, Jesus Christ, our Lord.

THE REFORMATION IN DOCTRINE. THE PRIESTHOOD OF THE BELIEVER.

By the REV. A. W. PARSONS, L.Th.

Vicar of St. John's, Boscombe.

MAY I begin this paper by quoting the opening words of a little booklet (price 2*d.*) on *The Priesthood of the Laity*, which I wrote for the N.C.L. ?

Recent events in the world have shown that a cleavage not contemplated in primitive times has developed between the clergy and laity in many countries or rather, between Church and State, which may prove disastrous to both.

In his essay on Milton, Macaulay writes of the Puritans : " On the rich and the eloquent, on nobles and priests, they looked down with contempt, for they esteemed themselves rich in a more precious treasure, and eloquent in a more sublime language, nobles by the right of an earlier creation, *and priests by the imposition of a mightier hand.*" Dr. Temple, Archbishop of York, in *Christianity and the State*, says, " The humblest child of God has a rank above that of earthly emperors." Every Christian layman is in fact a priest. It is possible that in the due recognition of the priesthood of the laity we may find a great principle which shall be a buttress against the claim of the " Totalitarian " State to dominate the individual in the interests of the State.

1. The Reformation.

It was the Papal claim to universal supremacy, with all the abuses it involved, which made the Reformation necessary. In the Middle Ages there had grown up a conception of the Church which was fundamentally unchristian. St. Augustine, in his unfinished masterpiece, *De Civitate Dei*, with a devout and glowing imagination had contrasted the *Civitas Terrena*, or the secular state, founded on conquest and maintained by fraud and violence with the Kingdom of God which he identified with the visible Church. This conception filled the imagination of all Christians. The Roman Empire was breaking up and men began to conceive the idea of a force making for righteousness, which should be greater than local kings or princes and should secure just and decent government in Europe through its supervising moral control in every realm. The mischievous activity of Roman apologists and canonists transformed St. Augustine's vision of the Celestial City into that Terrestrial City which he reprobated ; and under strong and masterful Popes the ideal Kingdom of God became a vulgar, earthly monarchy, bolstered up by false decretals and extravagant Papal claims. The visible ecclesiastical empire was ruled by the Popes with all those accompaniments of conquest, fraud and violence,

which the great Theologian of the West had so strongly denounced. The mediaeval doctrine of the Church then found its basis in the Canon Law and the Forged Decretals. Its background was the conception of the Church as a great temporal Empire. Its sanction was found in the popular superstitions of the time. For example, it was almost universally believed in mediaeval times that the mediation of a priest was necessary to salvation, and that the priesthood was an integral part of this monarchy and did not exist outside the boundaries of the formal ministry. Harnack (*History of Dogma* VI., 132*n.*, Eng. Trans.) says : " No good Catholic Christian doubted that in spiritual things the clergy were the Divinely appointed superiors of the laity ; that this power proceeded from the right of the priests to celebrate the sacraments ; that the Pope was the real possessor of this power and was far superior to all secular authority." This conception of the Church and the ministry found support in the writings of the theologian, Thomas Aquinas (1226-1274), who set himself to prove that submission to the Pope was necessary for every human creature. The Popes from Innocent IV (1243) to Alexander VI (Borgia), in 1493, claimed this universal supremacy in a series of Bulls. The power they claimed was a twofold supremacy in things temporal and spiritual. The temporal supremacy involved in its widest extent the claim to depose kings, to free their subjects from their allegiance and to give their territories to others. Just before the Reformation the King of Bohemia insisted that the Pope should keep the bargain made with his Hussite subjects at the Council of Basel. He was declared to be deposed as a heretic by Pope Paul II in 1465, his kingdom was offered to the King of Hungary, and a dreadful war resulted. Later still, in 1511, Pope Julius II excommunicated the king of Navarre and empowered any neighbouring king to seize his dominions—an offer eagerly accepted by Ferdinand of Aragon. This excommunication was used by the Ambassador of Philip II to threaten Queen Elizabeth in 1559, as we learn from our own State papers.

The spiritual supremacy was, and is, as thoroughly worldly and political as the temporal. It was gradually interpreted to mean that the Bishop of Rome was the one or universal bishop and that all other bishops were simply his delegates. Lindsay (*History of the Reformation*), to whom I am here greatly indebted, points out that according to mediaeval ideas, men were spiritual if they were clergy or monks, and this meant that any such ecclesiastic was entirely exempt from secular control. Fields and fences, drains and dwellings, barns and byres were spiritual things if they were Church property. Thus a so-called spiritual kingdom lay scattered over Europe in Diocesan lands, Convent estates, and Parish glebes, which was interwoven in the web of the ordinary kingdoms and principalities of Europe. The papal claim to miscalled spiritual supremacy involved countless interference with temporal sovereigns and when the Reformation came it was welcomed in many countries because of the papal domination of all life.

In the realm of patronage temporal rulers sought to protect themselves by statutes of *Praemunire* or they made bargains with the popes which took the form of *Concordats* (1438 and 1448).

But the Church, in the language of the Italians, was *Il Bodega Papa*: "the Pope's Shop," and when he claimed, in spite of Statutes and Concordats, to deal with its property, the rulers had to give way. Pope John XXII (1316-1334) began that series of papal financial exactions which helped to bring about the Reformation. He was the first pope to make the dispensation of grace a source of systematic revenue and under his successors, annates, procurations, fees, incomes of vacant benefices, subsidies and dispensations became a regular and increasing source of income. The day at length came when Martin Luther in his address: "*To the Nobility of the German Nation respecting the Reformation of the Christian Estate*," could fitly describe the Papal Court as a place "where vows were annulled, where the monk gets leave to quit his Order, where priests can enter the married life for money, where bastards can become legitimate and dishonour and shame may arrive at high honours; all evil repute and disgrace is knighted and ennobled."

2. Rise of Nationalism.

Before the Reformation, as in many countries to-day, men were told that Nationalities had no place within the Catholic Church. Rome was the common fatherland and the Pope was really the King of the World. It is not always realized that a great wave of Nationalism was rising prior to the Reformation. Our own country was the first to become a compact nationality. In France the Hundred Years' War with England created a sense of nationality and resulted in power being concentrated in the royal hands of Charles VII and Louis XI. In Spain, the severities of the Inquisition led to revolutions and lawlessness until Charles V became the despotic dictator. But his troubles in Spain helped to prevent him from putting into execution in Germany, as he desired to do, the ban issued at Worms against Luther. Germany and Italy, in the beginning of the sixteenth century had made almost no progress in becoming united and compact nations. Machiavelli says that the Italians owed it to Rome that they were divided into factions.

3. The Renaissance.

Meanwhile, in the world the movement known as the Renaissance was taking place. It was a movement of discovery and emancipation; of the bursting of barriers primarily intellectual. "It was the blossoming and justifying of the European intellectual life; but perhaps it ought to be added that it contained a new conception of the universe in which religion consisted less in a feeling of dependence on God and more on a faith in the possibilities lying in mankind" (Lindsay: *The History of the Reformation*, Vol. I, p. 45). But as Sir Charles Oman said in a paper on "The Necessity for the Reformation," read in the Oxford Town Hall, on November 27th, 1933, "There was no salvation for the Christian soul in the Renaissance. It was a thing of beauty, an intellectual awakening, but it was not a moral movement. . . . What was wanted and what came, was a revolt against spiritual wickedness in high places, combined with a revolt against stupid traditionalism and the

worship of authority founded on ignorance." . . . "I am bound to confess," he continued, "that I see nothing convincing in the theory that the abominable condition of Christendom in 1500 could have been cured by good scholarship any more than it could be cured by good art. People like the 'Oxford Reformers,' or Erasmus, had their share in preparing the way for the spiritual revolt, but something much more explosive was needed to break down the whole system." That was supplied when Luther published, in October 1520, "A very small book so far as the paper is concerned" (as he said), but one "containing the whole sum of the Christian Life." It was called: *The Liberty of a Christian Man*, and it was a brief and direct statement of the priesthood of all believers which is a consequence of the fact of justification by faith alone. He first proves that every spiritual possession which a man has or can have must come from his faith. It is the possession of faith which gives liberty to a Christian man. "God is for him. Who can be against him?" He goes on to say: "Here you will ask, 'If all who are in the Church are priests, by what character are those whom we now call priests to be distinguished from the laity?' I reply, by the use of those words, priests, clergy, spiritual person, ecclesiastic, an injustice has been done, since they have been transferred from the remaining body of Christians to those few who are now, by a hurtful custom called ecclesiastics. For the Holy Scripture makes no distinction between them, except that those who are now boastfully called Popes, Bishops, and Lords, it calls ministers, servants and stewards, who are to serve the rest in the ministry of the Word, for teaching the faith of Christ and the liberty of believers. For though it is true that we are all equally priests, yet cannot we, nor ought we, if we could, all to minister and teach publicly."

4. The Priesthood of all Believers.

"It was this principle of the Priesthood of all Believers," says Lindsay (*The Reformation*, Vol. I, p. 444), "which delivered men from the vague fear of the clergy and which was a spur to incite them to undertake the reformation of the Church which was so much needed. It is the one great religious principle which lies at the basis of the whole Reformation movement. It was the rock on which all attempts at reunion with an unreformed Christendom were wrecked. It is the one outstanding difference between the followers of the reformed and the mediaeval religion." Either all believers are priests or none. A special caste of priests with exclusive prerogatives as regards communicating or withholding the free grace of God was irreconcilable with the Lutheran experience of faith and its benefits. As the late Dr. Diggle, Bishop of Carlisle, wrote: "No function is conferred on the priest to the abasement of the layman." Luther allowed distinction of function in the Christian ministry, but the function was representative and not exclusive. He therefore declared that at the Holy Communion, "Our priest or minister stands before the altar, having been publicly called to his priestly function; he repeats publicly and distinctly Christ's words of the institution; he takes the Bread and the

Wine, and distributes it according to Christ's words and we all kneel beside him and around him, men and women, young and old, master and servant, mistress and maid, all holy priests together, sanctified by the blood of Christ. We are there in our priestly dignity. . . . We do not let the priest proclaim for himself the ordinance of Christ : but he is the mouthpiece of us all, and we all say it with him in our hearts with true faith in the Lamb of God Who feeds us with His Body and Blood." This corporate character of the priestly function is brought out in the Coptic Liturgy, " Where the people generally by their responses are clearly shown to take a part and share in the consecration prayer," as the present Bishop of Gloucester indicated in the Oxford discussion on " Priesthood and Sacrifice." Karl von Hase (*Handbook to the Controversy with Rome*, p. 155), points out that before the Reformation it was taught that by virtue of the grace derived from office the most profligate priest possessed a higher dignity than the most pious layman. " The Lord God," they said, " required six days to create the world ; the priest creates the God-Man in a moment." The Council of Trent, therefore, based the priesthood upon the offering of sacrifice in the Mass. But the Catholic theory, as he goes on to state, is not carried out with logical completeness. Among so-called sacraments, marriage, according to old traditional opinion, is not completed by the action of the priest. Other sacraments too, can, in case of necessity, be administered by laymen. " Where the clergy are not at hand," says Tertullian (Exhort, Cast 7) : " Thou mayest thyself make the offering and baptize, and art thine own priest." Frumentius, the Apostle and Bishop of Ethiopia, while yet a layman founded the Church in Abyssinia and performed the sacred liturgical service. St. Augustine relates how, in a shipwreck, a layman and a catechumen hung upon a board, the layman baptized the catechumen, the newly baptized pronounced the absolution over the former, and thus they both met their drowning with good courage. Baptism by laymen in cases of necessity has always been considered valid. In the Middle Ages it happened not infrequently that knights in peril of death, where no priest was available, heard each other's confessions. Dr. Hatch in the " Organization of the Early Churches " (Lect. V), has shown that preaching, the exercise of discipline, the administration of baptism, and the Eucharist were all practised by laymen in the first two centuries.

In view of the claims made to-day for the Episcopate it is worthy of note that all Church members are called upon, in accordance with the words of our Lord in Matthew vii. 15, to form an opinion on doctrinal questions and to judge whether what they are taught is true or false. The Bereans are commended for testing the truth of St. Paul's own teaching. The Galatians are exhorted " to stand fast in the liberty wherewith Christ had made them free and not to be entangled again with the yoke of bondage," which erring teachers would lay upon them. The Thessalonians were to " prove all things, hold fast that which is good." And St. John addresses all Christians : " Beloved, believe not every spirit, but try the spirits whether they be of God." Dr. Garvie in the *Christian Preacher*, p. 317, speaking of the Ministry of the Word says : " The preacher not only speaks *to* the people, but

for the people; the sermon is no less a collective act through the representative of the community than are the prayer and the praise."

The Priesthood of the Believer is Taught in Holy Scripture.

The earliest mention of it occurs in Exodus xix. 5, where on the eve of the giving of the Law we read: "Now therefore if ye will obey My voice indeed and keep My covenant, then ye shall be a peculiar treasure unto Me from among all peoples: for all the earth is Mine and ye shall be unto Me a kingdom of priests, and an holy nation." The title "kingdom of priests" is here given to Israel, but St. Peter applies the term to all Christians as being the ideal Israel of God in 1 Peter ii. 5-9. "Ye are a royal priesthood, a holy nation, a people for God's own possession." The author of the Book of Revelation also applies these words to all believers. Rev. i. 6: "He made us to be a kingdom, priests unto God and His Father." Rev. xx. 6: "They shall be priests of God and of Christ." On this passage St. Augustine says: "This is not at all said *solely* concerning bishops and presbyters who are now appropriately called priests in the Church." Irenaeus (A.D. 167) declares: "All righteous men hold the priestly order" (Adv Haer, lib. IV c. XX, p. 245), and Tertullian (A.D. 192) says: "Are not also our laymen priests? It is written: "He has made us a kingdom and priests to God" (De Exhort. Cast. c. VII, p. 566).

In the New Testament the word used for the office of a minister is *presbuteros* from which sacrificial associations are entirely absent and never *hieros* from which such associations are inseparable. The apostles never claimed to be, or to appoint, priestly officers, and they never pretended to link on to the new Church any fragments of an O.T. sacrificial system that was in their opinion outworn and spent.

Dr. Elliott Binns (*The Evangelical Movement*, p. 118) says: "It is indeed remarkable that no trace of sacerdotal language is found in the N.T., a book coming from a community like that of the Apostolic Church, a Community, be it remembered, which was steeped in the ideas of the O.T., and made up for the most part of Jews, of people accustomed to a religion in which sacrifices and sacrificial ideas were very prominent."

The minister was regarded as a priest in no other sense than was every disciple. Indeed in the singular number the word "priest" is found only of Christ, and His Priesthood is said, in Heb. vii. 7, 24, to be undelegated or intransmissible, a priesthood not passing from one to another. When it is used of the Church it is always in the plural "priests" (Rev. i. 6), or collectively "priesthood" (1 Peter ii. 5). As the late Dr. Griffith Thomas wrote (*Principles of Theology*, p. 316): "The truth is that Christianity *is*, not *has*, a priesthood." Bishop Westcott is reported to have observed in some of his lectures at Cambridge that the avoidance in the N.T. of this familiar term "priest" was the nearest approach he knew to verbal inspiration.

To all believers alike then the priestly privilege of access to God belongs (Rom. v. 2; Eph. ii. 18; Heb. iv. 16; x. 18; 1 Peter iii. 18). All alike are called to offer spiritual sacrifices of praise and prayer (Heb. xiii. 15); of body and soul (Rom. xii. 1; Heb. xiii. 18) with

such actual gifts in charity and helpfulness as are prompted by love to God (Heb. xiii. 16 ; 2 Cor. ix. 7 ; Phil. iv. 18). Nothing of this kind is an offering for sin, the virtue of that made by Christ being inexhaustible. The individual believer gives an account of himself to God and no artificial system of mediation prevents him from standing in personal and incommunicable responsibility before God.

This is the teaching of our own Church. She declares in her homilies that : " We need no sacrificing priest." The Reformers took away from the Ordination Service that portion where the minister was directed to offer sacrifices and that portion of the Communion Service in which the Priest pretended to offer Christ's Body. Throughout the Prayer Book the term priest is interchangeable with minister. In the Latin of Article XXXI, when referring to the Roman Priest she uses the term *Sacerdos*, that is, a sacrificing priest. In Article XXXII referring to those ordained in the Reformed Church she uses the term *Presbyteris*. We may even pause to note the significance of the change of usage in the versicle from Psalm cxxxii. 16 from : " Let Thy priests be clothed with righteousness," to " Endue Thy ministers with righteousness." Dr. Ince, a former Regius Professor of Divinity at Oxford, points out that the power given in the Roman Church to her priests : " to offer sacrifice," " is not one of the powers . . . committed to the Anglican priest." He goes on to remark that our Reformers had been accustomed to the phraseology of the Sarum Ordinal, and that, " It cannot have been without significance that no counterpart to these expressions is found in the Reformed Ordinal. Our Reformers must have held the view which Hooker unhesitatingly asserted that sacrifice is now no part of the Christian ministry " (Ince : *The Scriptural and Anglican View of the Functions of the Christian Ministry*, pp. 12-13).

The late Dr. S. K. Knight, Bishop of Jarrow, in the Cambridge Pastoral Theology Lectures (1925-26) published in 1933, by the Cambridge University Press under the title *Fulfilling the Ministry*, p. 58, says : " All the baptized share this priesthood being appointed to offer sacrifice to God, to deliver others from sin, to pray for them and bless them. The English Church gives plain proof of this conception . . . in its public worship and the Prayer Book is designed to help them to take their part in it with the spirit and with the understanding. The prayers are in the Mother tongue, the order is so simple that all may share it. The directions to ensure congregational worship make it plain that all are called to exercise their priesthood. The arrangements of our Church also emphasize this fact. There is no part of the Church shut in from the congregation. All the communicants come to the altar rails to receive the Sacrament into their hands as consecrated priests of God." There is an interesting note appended. " The rubrical direction : ' into their hands ' has a special significance which has later been emphasized by the R.V., for the Hebrew phrase for consecrating a priest is ' to fill the hands,' that is to say, the holy things which no layman might touch were solemnly given to him. And so with us, all baptized and confirmed members of the Church are priests, for all have their hands filled " (see Ex. xxviii. 41 ; xxix. 24, 33).

" The Church of England," so writes the historian, Mr. C. R. L. Fletcher, " is a layman's Church." By that he means that the relations of the Church of England to the Church of Rome and her forms of public worship are determined by Acts of Parliament and not by the decisions of any Pope or of any General Council or of the Convocations. The Church of England is a Layman's Church as in the Acts of Supremacy and Uniformity the laity have laid down the conditions on which its endowments and privileges are enjoyed. It has been stated, however, that the new powers exercised in our Church by the National Assembly have all resulted in the exaltation of the power of the bishops and to a lesser extent the clergy, while those of the laity have been gradually curtailed. The Report of the Lambeth Conference in July 1908, declared : " The Church needs to realize in new ways the inherent priesthood of the Christian people." The contrary seems to have happened. History has shown us that an autocratic hierarchy has led into terrible tyranny over the Body of Christ. The corrective to such autocracy is the great truth of the privilege enjoyed by all believers as belonging to a Spirit-inspired body, personally taught by the same Spirit and possessing spiritual judgment as well as free access to God.

I have avoided the line of argument which I pursued in the little booklet to which I referred in my opening paragraph, but I would like to close by quoting from it. " I do not think that the modern habit of shutting out the laity from the discussion of religious matters and doctrine is good. It was a weakness in our Church at the time of the Prayer Book Controversy that sacred Synods of Clergy only, discussed the matter behind locked doors, the Press and all lay people being carefully excluded. In our English Courts of Justice twelve good men and true are still trusted to give an unbiased opinion on matters of fact, although they have never been trained as lawyers."

In *The Church of Christ* the Rev. E. A. Litton says : " The restoration, in theory at least, of the laity to their rights was an immediate result of the Reformation. By reasserting the universal priesthood of Christians and the indwelling of the Holy Spirit not in a priestly caste, but in the whole body, Luther and his contemporaries shook the edifice of sacerdotal usurpation to its base. Justification by faith put an end to the Confessional with its power of remitting and retaining sins. The Church ceased to be a synonym for the Clergy, and an enquiring age examined the claim of the latter to spiritual illumination. The change was life from the dead."

Are the laity going to use or to lose their sacred inheritance as priests unto God in the Church of England ?

THE REFORMATION IN WORSHIP: THE MINISTRY OF THE WORD.

By the Rev. J. E. Fison, M.A.

St. Aldate's, Oxford.

A. *Worship essentially supernatural.*

Last winter the choir of the Russian Orthodox Church in Paris was in Oxford, and in the preface to their Programme of Chants, Prof. Zander writes that the inner meaning of their service is in the words so often repeated: "As we stand in the house of Thy glory, it is as though we stood in heaven itself." "It is impossible," his note continues, "to regard these words as mere allegory or pious aspiration. They express the very essence of orthodoxy—the belief that heaven and earth are not separated by an unbridgeable gulf. Living here and belonging to the earth we may nevertheless belong to another world and dwell with the saints in eternity. This is the secret of the Church which unites the earthly and the heavenly, the eternal and the temporal, and makes us even now partakers in the bliss of Paradise and the life to come. The breath of life for the Church is her liturgical devotion: the fullest revelation of her true nature is her worship. Thus we can boldly affirm that the divine worship of the orthodox Church is 'heaven on earth' in the fullest and truest sense of the word. As a matter of history it was from this feeling of 'heaven on earth' that the spiritual existence of the Russian people began. When Prince Vladimir, the Baptizer of Russia, sent his envoys to visit different countries and to examine the different religions, the only thing which captivated their attention was the divine worship in the Orthodox Cathedral of St. Sophia in Constantinople. 'We knew not'—they said afterwards—'where we were: in heaven or on earth.'"

The average English Protestant Evangelical reaction to this is first complete bewilderment and incomprehension and then, secondly, severe criticism and condemnation, either, if the critic is a Liberal, with a finger of scorn at the Tsarist Church for its superstitious and unethical character, or, if he is a Conservative, with a gibe at the Pelagian tendency to "will-worship" (Col. ii. 23). Thus we easily succeed in concealing from ourselves the fact that the dynamic for the carrying out of the second of the two great New Testament commandments lies in obedience to the first. "Thou shalt *love* the Lord thy God with all thy heart and with all thy soul and with all thy mind and with all thy strength." Unfortunately, the position is made worse by the fact that where Orthodox worship has a more sympathetic reception in this country, so often emphasis is laid far more on outward ritual and

æsthetic appeal than on that proclamation of the living word of God which was intended by the Reformers to be the chief agent in the raising of Christian life and worship to that truly supernatural level which is fundamental to the New Testament Church even more than to the Orthodox.

To rediscover for ourselves and to reproclaim to others this living Word of the Living God is our greatest task as Evangelicals in England to-day. National characteristics count for a great deal and an Englishman will neither receive nor express his faith in the same way as a Russian. It is no mere coincidence that the greatness of our country is more evident after the Reformation than before it. Much of the strength of the national character at its best is shown by Ensor (England 1870—1914. O.U.P.) to lie in its essentially Evangelical and even Puritanical religious basis. Miss Underhill makes the point that "Anglican worship is Christian worship according to the 'English use,'" "produced under historical pressure" (*Worship*, pp. 322f.). There is no Evangelical bias in her acknowledgment that "perhaps the renewed sacramental devotion, which is so specially characteristic of the revival of worship, will never appeal in its fulness to more than a minority of English Christians" (op. cit., p. 337). The characteristic response of the English soul to the demand of God . . . leans more to the prophetic and biblical than to the liturgic and sacramental side of the Christian cultus" (op. cit., p. 318). If our country is decadent—and it is—the fault is ours. It is the decay of that truly supernatural conception of Christian living that is based essentially on the hearing and receiving of the word of God that is the trouble. And for that we Evangelicals of the Church of England and of the Free Churches are to blame. What we want and what we need is a Church that is not more than human in the sense that some high churchmen seek to make it, nor less than human, as a means to an end more important than itself, as some low churchmen would make it, but the truly human Church of the New Testament (Dr. A. B. Macdonald: *Christian Worship in the Primitive Church*, p. 20), where the measure of humanity is not bound by the materialistic limitations of our modern western world, but found in the living Christ of the New Testament, neither degraded to the liberal Jesus of an outworn Protestantism nor de-humanized by an over-dogmatic two-nature orthodoxy. Ten years ago the dogma of the classical "Mysterium Christi" that Chelcedon formulated was needed to arrest the disastrous Liberal humanism which was realized to be totally inadequate for the needs of the post-war world. There are many signs that this need has been largely met. To-day it is significant that Beverley Nichols' last book, *News About England*, has for its sub-title "A country without a hero." It is the liberation into the supernatural but truly human world (cf. Hogg, *Redemption from This World*, pp. 25-26) in which Jesus the Perfect Man lived that our spirits need if they are to be freed from the paralysis of despair and impotence. I do not appeal down to the Liberal Jesus but up to Him who manifested "the powers of the age to come" not only in His own Person before His death and Resurrection, but also through His Spirit in the Church after Pentecost.

B. *Christianity essentially charismatic.*

At the end of his last book, the *Kingdom of God and the Son of Man*, Rudolph Otto sums up his conclusions as to the essential character of the true Church. Powers that to the modern man are incomprehensible are not only possible but indeed are the *sine quibus non* of a spirit-controlled community such as the Early Church (cf. A. B. Macdonald, op. cit.). "For the historian of religion," he writes, "the charisma is a significant phenomenon, a psychic factum which he must include among his historical causes and explanatory factors, if he wants to avoid a false reconstruction." So far he has with him an increasing number of New Testament scholars. But he goes far beyond them in fearlessly drawing the only possible Christian conclusion that "The charisma together with the paeana as an anticipation of the eschatological order is an essential element of a community which is intended to be a Church of the Nazarene. That the church has lost its charisma, that men look back to it as to a thing of past times, that men make it trivial by allegories, does not show that this Church is on a higher level, but is a sign of its decay" (pp. 375 f.).

That is a brave appeal and a very searching challenge. But every religious revival in the history of the Church has arisen through some man taking it seriously. E. F. Scott is right in saying "that belief in the Spirit has always arisen out of actual experience and that the Primitive Church did not arrive at it by brooding over ancient texts and precedents. The belief was an expression of a fact" (*The Spirit in the New Testament*, p. 61). Streeter's words may shock us, but we can hardly deny their truth as we read the New Testament: "The reception of the Spirit was something as definite and observable as, for example, an attack of influenza" (*Primitive Church*, p. 69). The trouble with the history of Evangelicalism has been this. At the great periods of religious revival strong emotional feeling has coloured the lives of individuals, groups and whole Churches; the evangelical revival, the Moody missions and the authentic days of Keswick are all evidence of this. But as the revival has waned, the emotional experiences have often outlived their originally rigorously ethical accompaniments. The result has been a general mistrust of all emotional feelings and reliance on the naked word of God alone, generally as found in some definite biblical text. So the final step is sure: reliance on the word of God alone leads to "coddling" (or is it "kidding"?) ourselves into believing that something has happened to us although all the evidence available is to the contrary. This is what Oswald Chambers hit so hard, for it is something akin to the Jesuit doctrine of excaecatio, which makes a virtue of calling black white in obedience to a preconceived dogma.

No: H. R. Mackintosh has well said that if our gospel has not an antinomian look it is not a gospel at all (*Christian Experience of Forgiveness*, p. 119). To this we must dare to add that if there is not a dangerously subjective look about our Christianity it will not be the New Testament brand. For the twin bases of the New Testament Church were (1) the Resurrection of Her Crucified Lord and (2) the experience of the Spirit. And it will always be possible for the outsider

to criticize this latter fundamental of our faith as dangerously subjective. Tests of all kinds have been applied during and since New Testament days. They are valuable, but they are at best supporting or critical criteria. None can dispense us from the difficulty, which goes far back into the Old Testament, of distinguishing between the true and the false prophet. Ministry, creed and canon arose and were hardened into an ecclesiastical system to meet gnostic dangers. But when they alone were made the *sine quibus non* of the Christian community regardless of evidence of the Spirit's presence, it was forgotten that other sins besides irregularity of orders and heresy "grieve . . . the Holy Spirit of God" (Eph. iv. 30), and with the passing of the gnostic peril there passed also the greatest creative age of the Church.

Again and again this issue has faced the Church and never more acutely than to-day. Everywhere except in the spiritual world the frontiers of knowledge are being pushed back. New and undreamt of horizons are being discovered or rediscovered. Yet in religion such advances are being made outside the organized Church, which is in grave danger of being found with no God adequate for our modern age (cf. G. A. Smith, Isaiah, Vol. I). Conservatism has abandoned progressive seeking for truth in order to safeguard its own inadequate and outgrown dogmas. Liberalism has saved its intellectual "face," but only at the cost of the far more disastrous loss of all supernatural and converting power. It is clear that we must rediscover an Evangelicalism of the Spirit and risk gnosticism if we would save Christianity in this country. Streeter saw this and joined the Oxford Group—a courageous and costly step—and out of his experience he wrote: "Wherever there is life there is danger: but the danger of rejecting the call of God and so lacking the guidance of His Spirit is far graver than that of being occasionally self-deceived. Life is action; and we have to choose whether or no we will habitually act with or without that Spirit. And it is in action that we find it; only when the ship is in motion does the helm guide" (*The God Who Speaks*, p. 174). From another angle Berdyaev, expelled from Russia before the revolution for heresy and after it for his Christianity, sums it up thus: "No one who has left a Christianity based on authority can return to anything but a Christianity which is free" (*Freedom and the Spirit*, p. x.). This great evangelical issue St. Paul for his generation, and Luther for his, fought and won. For the true Church and the true Christian no less a standard than this may be accepted: "All things are yours: whether Paul or Apollos or Cephas; or the world or life or death or things present or things to come, all are yours; and ye are Christ's and Christ is God's" (1 Cor. iii. 21-23).

c. *Evangelical Emphasis on the Word.*

What is the distinctively Evangelical contribution to the realization of such a Church as this? There can be no doubt as to the answer. Our heritage and tradition are bound up pre-eminently with the Word of God. Catholics have their sacraments, Mystics their inner light, but Evangelicals have always lived by the Word of God. All the liturgies of the Reformation bear this out with differing emphasis.

Lutheran worship centres round the word in human experience—at every point Luther's own experience of the living word of forgiveness colours the worship of the Church. His " interest was not essentially in the form of worship, but in the spiritual experience that was to be expressed. . . . This experience gathered itself around the idea of God's Word as opposed to tradition, dwelt on God's touch upon the soul in opposition to the acceptance of ecclesiastical authority." For Luther and so for Lutheran worship, " the forgiveness of sins bulks as the one supremely significant thing in all spiritual life " (Hislop : *Our Heritage in Public Worship*, pp. 166-7). " And normally the Spirit works in and through the Word ; such is God's will." " This Word is the bridge and the path by which the Holy Spirit comes to us " (*Christian Worship* : Ed. Micklem, p. 130) are Luther's words in a sermon on 1 Tim. i. 8-11, in 1525. " Through the word, thus alive with the Spirit, the Lord is directly revealed to the heart of worshippers in the church : it is not ideas about Him, nor memories of His life, but He Himself, not even as the mere object of faith but living and working in us not by way of speculation but in reality, most directly and powerfully (*realiter, praesentissime et efficacissime*) (op. cit., pp. 130-1). This conception of the Word has held the element of mystery and objectivity within the Lutheran Church and for Luther himself it was such a living and vital reality that we can understand and justify in its historical context the emphasis that he laid upon instruction ; though for his successors who lacked his living experience, the danger of intellectualism proved too much. For, as Moffatt says, " A directly didactic arm dries up real devotion " ; and when we read that " He sought to make praise a lesson book, by versifying the Nicene Creed, the Sanctus and even the Te Deum " (op. cit., p. 124), we cannot but admit that this over-reaction from medievalism was in part responsible for the arid desert of intellectual Protestantism that blighted the German Church for so long. His sympathy with Catholic ritual helped to warm the worship of the Swedish Church but his fear of, and antagonism towards, the Mystics drove many of the deeper and more spiritually minded of his successors out of the State Church.

Calvin did not share Luther's original deep personal experience and consequently in the worship of the Reformed Church the word is central, not so much in its human relations as in its revelation of the will of God (Hislop : op. cit., p. 180). There is no doubt as to the strength of Calvin's position. " That Hilaire Belloc's " Ballade of the Heresiarchs " should begin with his name is a compliment intelligible enough " (*Christian Worship*, p. 154). " Calvin has been Rome's one really dangerous opponent." Hence her attention to Karl Barth and his neo-Calvinism. It is true that *fas est et ab hoste doceri*, but do we want to fight Rome on this ground, to set up a rival theology to Aquinas ? John Colet's words are strong, but to the point, and they apply to others besides the " Angelic Doctor." He says : " Why do you extol to me such a man as Aquinas ? If he had not been so very arrogant, indeed, he would not surely so rashly and proudly have taken upon himself to define all things. And unless his spirit had been somewhat worldly, he would not surely have corrupted the whole

teaching of Christ by mixing it with his profane philosophy " (Lindsay, *History of the Reformation* : I, p. 167). We do well to remember that there is a Protestant as well as a Catholic scholasticism. Reaction to Calvin will not see us through, even though it be via Barth to the 39 Articles, any more than will a return to Aquinas save our High Church brethren in this critical hour of Church history. But, the Calvinistic doctrine of grace through the Word of God and its experience in worship in all its solemnity and comfort put iron into the blood of Huguenots in France, Beggars in Holland, Puritans in England and Covenanters in Scotland (*Christian Worship*, p. 158), and we could do with more of their spirit to-day. In a fine vindication of the power of the " autopistic " word for Calvin, Streeter says : " Personally I should much regret a revival of the belief in predestination in anything like the form in which it was taught by Augustine or by Calvin. But religion will not again be potent in the life of Europe until the belief is revitalized that God has a purpose and a plan—not only for the world, but for every individual in it and for the minutest details in the life of every individual " (*The God Who Speaks*, p. 10).

When we turn to the Church of England, there is no doubt that the clear aim of the Reformers is to restore the primitive balance of Word and Sacraments. The Word of God service is brought out of the monastery and in intention, if not in realized fact, is coupled with the service of the Lord's Supper (cf. Macdonald, op. cit.). Biblical and Sacramental worship are both emphasized. There was no one outstanding experience to mould our worship and theology and this is both gain and loss. We lose in depth, but we gain in width, for no one man's experience however deep—not even St. Paul's—is adequate basis for a complete theology or a fully-orbed worship arising out of it. The Word of God is dynamic in a wider area than Luther realized, and fundamental as is the great doctrine of justification by faith, slavish adherence to its isolated pre-eminence by those who have really little authentic experience of its inner meaning of release and forgiveness does not help a world like ours to-day where very few are in the religious bondage out of which St. Paul and Luther were brought. Anglicanism offers a wider possibility of hearing the Word of God than either Lutheranism or Calvinism. The Christian Year was not abolished and Cranmer's Preface shows the aim of the Prayer Book to do away with corrupt interpolations into the lectionary, to use the vernacular instead of an unknown tongue, to restore the whole Psalter, to simplify the services and by providing the Calendar to increase and regularize Bible reading. These changes and the enforcement of preaching (even if this was only a homiletical second best !) were designed to restore the principles of " the ancient Fathers " of whom the Preface says that " They so ordered the matter that all the whole Bible (or the greatest part thereof) should be read over once every year ; intending thereby that the Clergy and especially such as were Ministers in the congregation "—note the phrase—" should (by often reading and meditation in God's Word) be stirred up to godliness themselves and be more able to exhort others by wholesome doctrine and to confute them that were adversaries to the truth ; and further, that the people (by daily hearing of

Holy Scripture read in the Church) might continually profit more and more in the knowledge of God and be the more inflamed with the love of his true religion." The principle underlying the Prayer Book changes is well put in the strong language of the first Homily (on Holy Scripture) where the exhortation is to search diligently " for the well of life in the books of the New and Old Testament (*sic*) and not run to the stinking puddles of men's traditions, devised by man's imagination for our justification and salvation." Even more impressive are the words of the Ordinal. " Seeing that you cannot by any other means compass the doing of so weighty a work, pertaining to the salvation of man but with doctrine and exhortation taken out of the Holy Scriptures, and with a life agreeable to the same : consider how studious ye ought to be in reading and learning the Scriptures and in framing the manners both of yourselves and of them that specially pertain unto you, according to the rule of the same Scriptures : and for this self-same cause, how ye ought to forsake and set aside (as much as you may) all worldly cares and studies." The intention is " that by daily reading and weighing of the Scriptures, ye may wax riper and stronger in your ministry." When this is followed by the giving of the Bible, not of the sacramental vessels, to the priest immediately after the laying on of hands, it is not too strong to say of the difference from pre-Reformation practice that " The Church of Rome in making her priests says nothing about preaching ; the Church of England in making her priests says nothing about sacrificing " (quoted by Neil and Willoughby : *Tutorial Prayer Book*, p. 527). Admittedly the Reformers were not working in a vacuum and the pendulum is always apt to swing too far. But there can be no question that the Ministry of the Church of England is first of the Word and secondly of the Sacraments. Our Church " proclaims not a gospel of sacraments, but sacraments of the Gospel " (*Christian Worship*, p. 245).

D. *Our Task.*

There can be no question that the post-Reformation as well as the pre-Reformation Church stands under that " judgment " which " must begin at the house of God " (1 Pet. iv. 17). So, as Forsyth says : " There are only two ways of treating the Reformation : one is to complete it and one is to escape from it " (*Positive Preaching and the Modern Mind*, p. 161). Escape may be back to Catholicism or away into the Liberalism of the Enlightenment. Completion can only be in the spiritual direction indicated at the outset. Obviously a tremendous weight is thrown upon the manner and matter of God's approach to man if man's response in worship, the one " disinfectant from egoism " (cf. K. E. Kirk, *Vision of God*) is to lift him to the heavenly heights of the New Testament experience of life in the Spirit. " It belongs to our tradition and to the truth of the Gospel to lay all the stress upon the action of the living God " says the Principal of Mansfield (*Christian Worship*, p. 243). And Miss Underhill in speaking of the Tractarians as " convinced, even impassioned, transcendentalists " (*Worship*, p. 330) is giving expression to what must be fundamental to any recovery

of the New Testament level of life and worship. "According to your faith be it unto you." We must believe in the Spirit and the powers of the age to come and life in the heavenlies and we must as "a colony of heaven" (Phil. iii. 20) experience them now as facts in our own life and worship. But the trouble is—we cannot, unless we are drawn to do so. Faith is the gift of God. It was not fundamental to Christ's preaching to challenge to a decision. Forsyth puts it in a startling exclamation, "Suppose he had measured his success by his supporters! Suppose his first and great object had been conversions!" (op. cit., p. 172). No: the point has been finely put by Otto, where he says of the Kingdom of God as preached by Christ that it is "a transcendental domain of salvation, which does not harass the will by threatening but draws it by attraction" (op. cit. p. 57). Here is the mysterium, tremendum indeed, but also and wonderfully fascinans. Only this can lift our world which is hungry for the Word of God and tired of crises and decisions into the New Testament life of the Spirit. Only Christ thus "offered"—the word is Wesley's—can meet man's need.

How the Word has been brought down from that high pinnacle where preaching is, in Forsyth's phrase, "the organized Hallelujah of an ordered community!" "Religion *is* sacramental. Where it is not it becomes bald. And the only question is, where the sacrament lies. We place it in the Word of the Gospel. *Accedit verbum et fit sacramentum.* Nothing but the Word made Sacrament can make a Sacrament out of elements and keep it in its proper place. But what a task for our preachers to fulfil!" (op. cit., p. 85). Yes, indeed, and we cannot hope to fulfil at all as long as we conceive of preaching as merely evangelistic or homiletic. What we need is the prophetic note. In the earliest New Testament lists (1 Cor. xii. 28; Rom. xii. 6-8; Eph. iv. 11) it is the prophets who come second only to the apostles. May God raise us up prophets in our age who will proclaim the Word as a living Person with their whole personality in utter dependence on the Holy Spirit who alone can make Him our contemporary!

That is our first task. Now for the second! "God is a spirit and they that worship him must worship him in spirit and in truth" (John iv. 24). After centuries of the Bible and the liturgy in an unknown tongue the Reformation emphasis on "truth" and consequently on teaching (διδάχη) was necessary and right and it is still needed to-day. Many have abandoned the lectionary and substituted a much more precarious and irregular system of Bible-reading. Yet the ordinal says, "for this self-same cause . . . ye ought to forsake and set aside (as much as you may) all worldly cares and studies." It is διδάχη in the spirit that we need: not teaching about the Bible, but teaching of it; not the re-editing of old commentaries, but the rediscovery of the living message of the whole book; not the rejection of St. James as "an epistle of straw" or of Ecclesiastes as "dumb" (so Luther), but the rediscovery of πασα γραφὴ θεόπνευστος καὶ ὠφέλιμος (2 Tim iii. 16). The breakdown of the old Biblical view has seemed to many of the most spiritually minded of our people a disaster and an apostasy. And no wonder, when the pulpit has so often degenerated into a school of ethics or an information bureau and a bad one at that! I appeal for

a διδάχη in the Spirit of the whole Bible in this, its fourth centenary year.

So much for διδάχη: now for κήρυγμα—the preaching. And this must be my final word. If worship "in truth" is difficult to secure, worship "in spirit" is still more difficult. This need not surprise us to-day, for even Our Lord found the Jerusalem attitude more difficult to deal with than the Samaritan. If there is to be worship "in spirit and in truth" there must be κήρυγμα. Theology has recently come to our aid here and has re-emphasized the old evangelical distinction between the preaching of Jesus Christ Crucified and Risen, and the teaching of, e.g. the Sermon on the Mount (cf. Prof. Dodd, *Apostolic Preaching and Its Developments*). Here is a crucial issue for our day. If the Reformation is to be completed, then the immediate task of the Minister of the Word is to *preach* the Gospel. Though theology has rediscovered the subject matter of the κήρυγμα, yet it has not so far dealt with the secret of κηρύσσειν. Yet it is not accidental that in the New Testament while there are less than ten references to the noun there are over fifty to the verb. It was the way the Word was proclaimed that mattered far more than the exact form of its expression. It—or rather He—was proclaimed as "Wonderful" and as "Gospel" not by the intellect alone but by intellect and emotion too. How otherwise could you speak of One you loved and who was living with you and in you? Such a preaching in utter dependence on the Spirit can make Jesus our contemporary and can lift us in His Real Presence into that resurrection life, to which Easter recalls us. It is κήρυγμα truly *preached* that is needed even more than διδάχη. The latter will never unite us unless we are prepared to go back to Aquinas or Calvin. But the former, as Campaign experiences prove, can unite not only Evangelicals but all Christians in the Body of Christ exercising that rich variety of gifts of the Spirit which must be "an essential element of a community which is intended to be the Church of the Nazarene" (Otto: *loc. cit.*) where "all things are yours . . . but ye are Christ's and Christ is God's."

Daily Sunshine from the Bible is a small volume of readings for every day in the year, by the Rev. Richard Wood-Samuel (The Lutterworth Press, 3*s.* 6*d.* net). The author's long connection with the Church Bible Study Union, and its magazine, *The Daily Messages*, gives him a special claim to authority as an exponent of the comfort and help of Bible study. Each of the short readings in this volume contains a forceful interpretation of a text of Scripture, and provides a thoughtful guide which many will appreciate and value.

THE REFORMATION IN WORSHIP: THE MINISTRY OF THE SACRAMENTS.

By the Rev. Canon J. R. S. TAYLOR, M.A.

Principal of Wycliffe Hall, Oxford.

THE title of my paper is, "The Reformation in Worship: the Ministry of the Sacraments." The terms of reference are given in the third cause for thanksgiving commended by the promoters of this centenary celebration, namely "The Reformation by its appeal to the Scriptures led to the recognition of more spiritual conceptions of the Church and Sacraments, to the purification of worship, and to renewed emphasis on the ministry of the word." The three phrases pertinent to this paper are: "The appeal to the Scriptures," "more spiritual conceptions of the Sacraments," "the purification of worship." I will try to follow the scheme there suggested.

1. *The Appeal to the Scriptures.*

Why did the Reformers make this appeal? They were driven to it by force of circumstances. Luther's conscience was offended by the growing scandal and menace of the system of purchasing pardons and dispensations. He appealed to the authorities of the Church, believing that when the full extent of the evil was made known they would initiate reform, but he was disappointed. The power of vested interests was too strong. What was he to do—to silence his conscience and let the matter rest? His conscience refused to be silenced. It had been quickened by a new knowledge of God, brought to him in the New Testament, and the voice of God which had spoken in scripture was authoritative. He must obey that voice, even at the cost of disobedience to the authority of the Church, which till then he had recognized as final. But now he recognized a paramount authority, that of the Word of God. What did the Word mean for the Reformers? It meant first and foremost *revelation*, the good news of the Grace of God brought to men in Jesus Christ, and this gospel proved itself still the power of God unto salvation. But the Word implied more than that. It implied *command*: if God had spoken He must be obeyed. Were not the ten commandments literally the ten "words," and was not this implied in the first answer given by our Lord to the tempter—"Man shall not live by bread alone, but by every word that proceedeth out of the mouth of God." And there was a third significance for the Reformers in the Word: it was that of *promise*. For every word of God must have fulfilment.

Now, while the Reformers found this Word in the Scriptures so that, as Luther said, they contained it as the crib of Bethlehem held Christ, they did not identify the Word with the Scriptures. Indeed, they recognized that the Scriptures themselves pointed to Christ supremely as the Word of God. He was Himself the revelation of the Father. He claimed to be Master and Lord, and gave commands to His disciples—" A new commandment give I unto you, that ye love one another," " Be ye perfect even as your heavenly Father is perfect," " This do in remembrance of Me," " Go ye into all the world and make disciples of all nations." And to His commands He often added a promise, " Come unto Me . . . I will give you rest," " Go ye . . . I am with you all the days."

It was the promise of Christ that for the Reformers gave power to the sacraments. In them the word of Christ was inherent. They had been instituted by His command. They were expressions of His gospel, and as such were means of grace. Luther said : " The Word, the Word alone, is the vehicle of grace," but the sacraments are a mode of the Word. They are *verba visibilia*, acted parables, dramatic declarations, sacraments of the gospel. As Canon Mozley has said, " The Eucharist is as truly evangelical as the pulpit. . . . If the sacraments are not evangelical they are nothing."

Only on this view can we understand the comparative insignificance of the sacraments in the New Testament. The apostolic writers leave no doubt that it was the word of Christ which created the Church, giving it life and light and liberty. As St. Paul put it in the Epistle to the Romans, " Faith cometh by hearing, and hearing through the word of Christ." He made his final appeal to the experience of the Galatians with the question : " Received ye the Spirit by the works of the law or by the hearing of faith ? " that is, by believing the gospel message. We remember that he even went so far as to say, " Christ sent me not to baptize, but to preach the gospel." And St. Paul is not alone in this attitude. St. James writes : " Of His own will He brought us forth by the word of truth," referring to the creation not so much of the world as of the Church ; and in his first Epistle St. Peter writes, " Having been begotten again . . . through the word of God which liveth and abideth . . . and this is the (spoken) word of good tidings which was preached unto you." It is true that later in the Epistle St. Peter writes : " Through water which also after a true likeness doth now save you, even baptism," but he is quick to show that it is not the outward washing alone but the inward cleansing, for he at once adds, " Not the putting away of the filth of the flesh, but the interrogation of a good conscience toward God, through the resurrection of Jesus Christ." And this is in keeping with what we find in the gospels. There the majority of the references to baptism are to John's baptism. We do not know whether any of the Apostles received Christian baptism other than the baptism of the Holy Ghost. Only once is it hinted that Jesus baptized, and then the fourth Evangelist adds that, " Jesus Himself baptized not, but his disciples." That Evangelist, too, is silent about the institution of the Lord's Supper, though he records the discourse on the bread of life about eating the flesh and drinking the blood of the Son of Man,

giving a broad spiritual application to a truth which finds its focus in, but cannot be limited to, the particular expression of it in the Holy Communion.

We know that there are some devout and earnest followers of our Lord who dispense with and perhaps despise the sacraments as an encumbrance rather than a help to the spiritual life, but such an attitude cannot find its justification in the early history of the Church. For it is quite clear that from the first days baptism was not only familiar, but regularly practised, and that the breaking of bread from house to house was one of the chief features of the corporate worship of the young community. But when St. Paul refers to both sacraments, as he sometimes does, it is not as to something *sui generis*, something apart, but as actions which illustrate and bring home to the deepest experience of his converts the most spiritual aspects of the gospel which he preached. Consequently those who have taken a different view of the sacraments, who have regarded them as something more than the sacraments of the gospel, have had recourse to the Old Testament to supply their analogies and to enforce their argument. They have carried forward from the old dispensation the contrast betweeen the prophet and the priest, and have magnified the more permanent status and the mediatorial influence of the priestly hierarchy. What is the answer of Protestantism to this? As Christ was the end of the law so was He the end of the ceremonial system. He fulfilled in His own person all that was foreshadowed in the sacrifices of Israel, when he became not only our great High Priest, "Who when He had offered one sacrifice for sins for ever sat down on the right hand of God," but also the Lamb of God who in the heavenly vision stands victorious upon the throne. Hence His Ministers in the Church are not priestly intermediaries but humble followers of Him who said: "I am among you as he that serveth." They are never given in the New Testament the title which might so easily have passed over from Judaism, the title of sacrificing priests. That is reserved in its more abstract form for the whole Church, whom St. Peter calls "A holy priesthood, to offer up spiritual sacrifices, acceptable to God through Jesus Christ."

This brings us to the second keynote,

2. *More Spiritual Conceptions of the Sacraments.*

(*a*) First comes the view of the Eucharist as a representation, not a re-presentation, of the sacrifice of the Cross, as the Latin Mass had clearly become, in which the consecrated elements were offered with these words: "We offer to Thy most glorious Majesty of Thine own gifts, a Victim pure, a Victim holy, a Victim immaculate, the holy bread of life eternal and the cup of perpetual salvation: upon which be pleased to look with a propitious and serene countenance, and to accept." Dr. Franks has summed up the position thus: "As the Middle Ages drew to a close, the supremacy of the view of the Eucharist as a propitiatory sacrifice continually increased in the Western Church: as is particularly evidenced by the institution of the Low Mass, which was said as a rite of

propitiation rather than as a service of Communion," and further evidence of course can be found in the enormous growth of private masses said for the souls of the departed. Consequently the Reformers immediately began to eliminate this feature of the Western liturgy. The Eucharist was now to be a showing forth to the Church and to the world of the Lord's death as a perpetual memory. So in the English Prayer Book the words of institution are given the chief place in the canon, presenting to the worshipper there by the very words and actions of the Lord His own interpretation of His passion.

And only in response to the Lord's sacrifice thus represented do we offer our sacrifice ; and herein we see the true genius of worship, which is reaction in us to the action of God. God has visited and redeemed His people. " Our worship is but *antwort* to His *wort*, an answer to His word." And it is in response to the marvel of His pardoning love and saving grace, given at such a cost on Calvary, that we offer our spiritual sacrifice, first of praise and thanksgiving, our Eucharistia for His unspeakable gift, our adoration for His infinite adorableness : then the gifts of our alms to the great Giver of all, and what he most desires " our humble, thankful hearts "—our souls and bodies, to be a reasonable, holy and living sacrifice.

(*b*) And spiritual worship must be intelligent worship. To offer God our bodies is to love Him not only with our heart but with our mind and soul and strength, that is with the intellectual as well as with the æsthetic and physical part of us. Because " God is spirit," our reaction must be to worship Him in spirit and reality. As St. Paul wrote to the Corinthians, " I will pray with the spirit and I will pray with the understanding also : I will sing with the spirit and I will sing with the understanding also. . . . In the Church I had rather speak five words with my understanding, that I might instruct others also, than ten thousand words in a tongue." How far from this ideal of edification had the medieval Church fallen ! The Roman Mass was for a large part inaudible, the Priest frequently introducing his own private prayers : but even when it was heard it was unintelligible to the large mass of the people who did not understand Latin, and there was no attempt then, as in the modern missals, to translate or interpret ; so the service became an impressive spectacle, mere attendance at which counted for devotion. In all these matters our Reformers returned to the Apostolic ideal. The whole service was ordered to be said audibly and in the vulgar tongue. So in Cranmer's first prayer book of 1549 even the kyries were translated, and later the 24th Article declared that it is " plainly repugnant to the Word of God and the custom of the primitive Church . . . to minister the Sacraments in a tongue not understanded of the people." Further, the Reformers provided food for mind and spirit in restoring the reading of continuous passages of Scripture. The earliest liturgy of the Christian Church had a twofold origin : it combined the main features of the synagogue service with the Christian Eucharist, and down the ages the main stream of Church worship has preserved the Liturgy of the Word with the Liturgy of the Upper Room. So the Prayer Book preserved the reading of the Epistle and Gospel as well as the commandments, and originally some

metrical psalms (now replaced by hymns), that in the words of Cranmer's Preface " the people might continually profit more and more in the knowledge of God, and be the more inflamed with the love of His true religion." A definite place was also provided for the sermon, which was to be a *sursum corda* to lift the heart to God. It is a false antithesis which we sometimes hear made between the pulpit and the " altar." What can better stir up our minds and hearts to the worship of God than a true sermon that sets forth His majesty and beauty, His holiness and love? It is our grievous loss that we have divorced the preaching from the Holy Communion, for one of its chief purposes is to lead our minds from private preoccupations and draw them all one way, and so make in effect a Holy Communion.

(*c*) For the third conception of the sacraments which the Reformers sought to restore was that of the fellowship of the feast. They did this first by encouraging the worshippers to communicate more frequently, for in the Middle Ages the laity commonly attended without partaking, and by 1215 A.D. the Church required participation only at Easter. Habits of such long standing take time to break down, and the Reformers' efforts in this direction often met with failure. But they were more successful in bringing the administration of the sacrament into the main action of the service, in which the climax is not reached with the offertory or the consecration, but with the delivery of the elements to the worshippers. " The cup of blessing which we bless, is it not a partaking of the blood of Christ? The bread which we break, is it not a partaking of the body of Christ? " It is to the believing disciple who takes and eats that the Lord says : " This is My body," and it is to those who drink in faith that the wine is the blood of the New Covenant. This emphasis again resulted in a more spiritual view of the sacrament, because it laid stress on the corporate action of the rite rather than on the consecrated element. Just as in baptism the focus is not on the water, but on the act of washing in the Name of the Holy Trinity, so in the Holy Communion it should not be on the bread, but on the breaking and eating of the bread ; for hereby is the Church, His Body, receiving from her Lord's pierced hands the gifts of His forgiving love, and the pledges of her intimate union with Him. And as He dwells in us and we in Him we are all knit together in one Holy Communion and fellowship.

3. *Purification of Worship.*

Of the more detailed purification of worship little remains to be said. We have already seen that the more spiritual conceptions of the Reformers found expression in some drastic recasting of the content and arrangement and language of liturgical worship. What was attempted by Cranmer in the first revision of the Book of Common Prayer is well set out in his Preface to the 1549 Book, and in the dissertation " Of Ceremonies " which he places after the Commination Service in that Book.

(*a*) In keeping with the transformation of the Mass into the Holy Communion, he found it necessary to reject some of the ceremonies, " which not only for their unprofitableness, but also because they have

much blinded the people and obscured the glory of God," were worthy to be cut away. And similarly he adds in the Preface, "Here are left out many things whereof some are untrue, some uncertain, some vain and superstitious."

(*b*) In like manner in seeking to make the liturgy intelligible and congregational he aimed at greater simplification both of the prevailing complexity of form and variety of use. So in restoring the reading of consecutive passages of scripture he ordered that there "be cut off anthems, responds, invitatories, and such like things," and he used the same method in simplifying the rules which needed to be kept, "so that they are plain and easy to be understood." And with the same purpose of increasing the fellowship in worship he ordered that "whereas heretofore there hath been great diversity in saying and singing in Churches within this realm; some following Salisbury use, some Hereford use, etc.; now from henceforth all the whole realm shall have but one use"—a uniformity which we have gone far towards losing!

In this commemoration we are taking a look back over four hundred years, and thanking God for the heritage of our English Reformation. But perhaps it may not be out of place for the reader of this paper to spend the last minute in taking a look around and a look forward, particularly in view of the events of ten years ago, and of what has happened since. May I express the hope, and indeed the prayer, that those who have authority in ordering our public worship may be given the moderation and courage of Cranmer, who would not lightly jettison what was of true value in the traditions of the past, but on the other hand saw clearly that "Christ's Gospel is not a ceremonial law but it is a religion to serve God not in bondage of the figure or shadow, but in the freedom of the spirit." May we not be hidebound by liturgiologists or diplomats, but be free to find the most perfect expression that we can of true spiritual worship, remembering that worship is essentially the glorifying of God, and that it will never be perfectly realized

> "Till we cast our crowns before Him,
> Lost in wonder, love and praise."

"The Road to Victory" is the title of the *C.M.S. Review* for the year 1936-37. It contains many inspiring narratives of the advance made throughout the mission field, and tells of the many openings and opportunities for further work for which the call for means and helpers is urgently needed. The appeal is urgent, and "the victory will not be complete until the Gospel is verified in a redeemed society."

THE REFORMATION IN LIFE: CORPORATE.

By the Rt. Rev. THE LORD BISHOP OF TRURO, O.B.E., M.C., D.D.

IN approaching this subject I think we shall find it helpful to begin by a brief consideration of three terms which we hear very often mentioned together nowadays : Community, State, Church. The corporate life of man finds expression in these three forms.

In the following paragraphs I am greatly indebted to a very clear and illuminating essay by Professor Ernest Barker in Volume V of the Report of the recent Conference at Oxford.

We find ourselves born into a community, let us say a Nation. The *community*, or nation, must be distinguished from the *legal* association of the *state* which is erected upon it. In a community there is conscious and purposive sharing in the general business of life.

The *state* is a *legal* association constituted by a Constitution and acting in the mode of legal activity. The state is recognized as legally exercising control over its members through an adequate power of enforcing legal sanctions.

The Christian Church is a Society which has in its custody the Word of God, and the duty of a universal mission incumbent upon it under the Word. It is further a Society permeated and made organic by the continuing and indwelling presence of a personal God in whose service all its members live and have their being. Thus the Church is unique among other forms or varieties of Society. To it more than to any other the metaphor of organism applies. It is an organism growing in Christ—" holding the Head " (Col. ii. 19).

In the early days of Christianity the Church was confronted by a great empire united by the common worship of the Emperor. State and community were one. The conduct of Emperor worship was a legal duty of legal officials, and the worship itself was a civic obligation. In the Fourth Century when the Church made its peace with the old system it made the existing world of the community-state a single integrated community-state-and-Church. The community-state, having become a community-state-and-Church, had henceforth, as Gelasius I put it, about A.D. 500, two governments : a secular government in things temporal, and an ecclesiastical government in things spiritual.

Thus identified with the community-state, the Church, in its outward form, ceased to be a pure body bearing the custody of the Word and knit organically to its Head. It is true that its own inner life did not cease. The Word by which it was inspired, and its guiding Spirit

were never without influence in determining its outward form and order. But at the same time it was necessarily affected by the changes in the life of the community-state. When the community-state divided into two parts, Eastern and Western, there arose an Eastern and a Western Church. " Then, many centuries later, in the era of the Reformation, there came another historical fissure ; and Protestantism emerged. This was partly produced by the working of the Word and the Spirit (we should be blind if we did not see that working) ; but it was also produced, in part, by a change of the community-state." The general designation of Protestantism cannot conceal the fact of a plurality of Protestant Churches ; and when we study this plurality, we have to remember not only the different doctrines (or different interpretations of the Word) on which it was based, but also the emergence of a new and plural conception and practice of the community-state.

When a region seceded from Rome, and adopted the principle of a Reformed Church, it assumed that this Church, in its outward form, must be identified and coterminous with itself. Lutherans and Calvinists would have been in full agreement with Hooker when he wrote, " in a . . . Christian State or kingdom . . . one and the self-same people are the Church and the commonwealth."

The Tudor age of the sixteenth century was an age of one commonwealth, one State, one Church, and everything unified. Soon, however, the Church, which, as a society of the Word and a community in the Spirit, had always been in essence distinct from the community-state, began to distinguish itself from the latter, and in doing so helped to distinguish the community from the State. This is true both of the Reformed Catholic Church of the counter-Reformation, and of the new Protestant Churches. The regional principle began to be challenged by the " collegial." The seventeenth century marks a new advance of free community-action. In the English Independents and in English Nonconformity generally, the doctrine of the collegial Church becomes fundamental. The " Free Churches " are conscious of themselves as societies of the Word and communities in the Spirit, distinct from the community-state. They are societies within the community in many respects analogous to other societies in the community, e.g. educational societies and Trade Unions. The different Free Churches in England help to constitute the English community. None of them professes to embrace the whole of it ; all of them acknowledge and respect one another's boundaries. By their side stands the Church of England whose relation to the English community is, as Professor Ernest Barker says, " far from simple. In one sense it seeks, like the Presbyterian Church of Scotland, to be a national Church, embracing the whole community, and bringing the ordinances of religion to the people of England in every parish. In another sense, less formal and more real, it is content, like the Free Churches in England, to recruit its own particular circle of adherents ; and like them it helps to constitute the English community without claiming (otherwise than in form) to cover the whole of it. In still a third sense—when we take the State into account as well as the community—the

Church of England has a peculiar relation to the State. It is 'established' by it—that is to say, it is given certain legal rights and subjected to certain legal duties which may be regarded as the corollary of its rights."*

Such then has been the actual historical development in England, and perhaps a development on some such lines as these was inevitable. For when the authority of the Bible, as interpreted by sound learning under the guidance, as it was believed, of the Holy Spirit, took the place of ecclesiastical authority, many questions naturally arose. Sound scholars were found to differ in some of their interpretations of Holy Scripture. And further, while it was clear that the New Testament describes far simpler forms of worship and organization than those of the medieval Church, it was arguable how far it would be wise to try to bring the Church back to exactly those primitive models. All the Reformers were agreed, for instance, that "dark and dumb ceremonies" should cease, but they were not all agreed about the retaining of those "which do serve to a decent order and godly discipline, and such as be apt to stir up the dull mind of man to the remembrance of his duty to God, by some notable and special signification, whereby he might be edified."

Only experience perhaps, could prove convincingly which these profitable usages were. By this year of grace, 1938, we have had centuries of experience. We are in a much better position now to judge what is really valuable in the way of organization or forms of worship. Moreover, we are becoming more tolerant of variety within the same society. If Christians within the same Church differ to-day with regard to details of procedure, or indeed, with regard to unessentials of any kind, they are not likely to split into a number of separate Churches on those accounts. The old centrifugal tendency of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries has happily been succeeded by a distinct and growing centripetal tendency in the twentieth. The Reformation is not yet finished. As George Santayana has said, Protestantism has not yet fully found itself.

"In the forms which it has taken hitherto," writes Dean Inge, in his brilliant essay on Protestantism, "it is scarcely worthy of the vigorous nations in which it has been the dominant faith. There has been a confusion in the spiritual life of the Western peoples, a want of clarity in estimating the values of life, a lack of disciplined thought which has often made the struggles of Protestantism against Catholicism like the tactics and strategy of untrained troops. There is also, at least in England and the United States, a downright silliness in many of the religious fads and crazes which find adherents, to which there is no parallel in Southern Europe. To erect Anglo-Israelitism, prohibition of alcohol, and prohibition of tobacco . . . into religious dogmas shows a very crude mentality. Nevertheless, these are the vagaries of a young and half-formed civilization rather than symptoms of senile decay."

*p. 53.

But to return to the more immediate effects of the Reformation in the sixteenth century on corporate life. The word Reformation as used in this connection properly refers to the changes in religion which then took place. The movement in religion was, of course, part of a wider movement affecting almost every department of human life. Changes in culture and in social and commercial life were coming anyhow, and it is not always easy to estimate the exact effect of the changes in religion upon these other changes, and vice versa.

In England the Reformation was mainly the work of the new middle class which was springing up under the Tudors : and in religion the middle class tends to be democratic and independent.

Henry VIII, as Dr. R. H. Murray has pointed out, had no means of compelling his subjects to obey him. He had only one castle in London, defended by a hundred Yeomen of the Guard. Except this Guard and a few gentlemen pensioners he had no standing army. He allowed his people to keep arms and encouraged them to have them ready for use. In breaking loose from Rome he was acting in accordance with the wishes of his subjects, and he could not have done it if the people had been against him.

On his death it became clear that the people wished " to Protestantize the Church further than he had allowed," and the English Reformation resumed the work which Wycliffe had begun. Then, after an interval of five years during which England was exposed " to the fanaticism of an embittered woman," came the Elizabethan settlement. In this the country as a whole readily acquiesced. Only 200 priests were deprived in 1559. Kitchin was actually Bishop of Llandaff without interruption from 1545 to 1563. During the remaining years of the sixteenth century the English people became steadily more Puritan. Earnest men in towns and villages all over the country, of whom the parson was sometimes but not always one, gradually trained their neighbours in the habits of Bible-reading and private prayer.

A good example of a Puritan home is that of the Milton family. John Milton's father was an accomplished musician. The boy himself often sat up till midnight studying Greek, Latin, French and Italian. " The Puritans," Dean Inge reminds us, " dressed plainly, but well and carefully ; they were very cleanly in their persons, more so than their opponents. Their dislike of ornament and symbolism in divine worship was due to their fear that doctrines which they wished to exclude might so be reintroduced."

At the same time we must note that Elizabeth and Archbishop Parker were sagacious enough to perceive that the wave of Puritanism would eventually ebb, and that the Church of England must not be remodelled, as many devout people wished, on Puritan lines.

As we have touched on the question of the effect of the Reformation on the Arts, another word had better be said before we leave it. In estimating that effect we must, of course, have first and foremost in our minds the wonderful outburst in English literature during the period. Spenser, Shakespeare, Bacon, the Book of Common Prayer, the

Authorized Version of the English Bible give amazing evidence of a great liberation of the human spirit.

It is true that no more churches were built : but there had been in the previous period rather over-building of churches—an over-building from which most of our cathedral cities are still suffering to-day. But Tudor domestic architecture was beautiful—witness the second Court of Gonville and Caius College, Cambridge, the foundation stone of which was laid on Saturday, May 5th, 1565, at 4 a.m. Nor must we forget the fair proportions and pleasing designs of Elizabethan Communion plate, of which a great deal happily is still in use. In the Truro diocese, for instance, we have nearly 100 pieces.

In passing we may recall a remark of Benjamin Jowett's to the effect that if it had not been for the Reformation we should probably have had little Norman or Early English left in our Cathedrals ; for it came just at a time when earlier styles were being pulled down fast to make way for the later.

In this short paper it is, of course, impossible to deal exhaustively with the changes in corporate life which accompanied the Reformation. We must be content with a few illustrations of them. It is sometimes more than hinted that the Reformation is responsible for the rise of Capitalism. But that is a mistake.

In the fourteenth century Italy was full of banking houses doing foreign exchange business in every commercial centre from Constantinople to London. The Popes regularly employed them, took them under their special protection, and sometimes even enforced the payment of debts by threat of excommunication.*

The strict rule of the Church against usury had been for a long time gradually modified. It is, for instance, distinctly relaxed in the writings of St. Antoninus of Florence, who died in 1459. Great financial houses like that of the Fuggers operated in Spain and Italy and above all in Antwerp. The Fuggers advanced the money which made Albrecht of Brandenburg Archbishop of Mainz and obtained repayment by sending their agent to accompany Tetzel on his campaign to raise money by indulgences and taking half the proceeds. "The head of the firm," says Dr. R. H. Tawney,† "built a church and endowed an almshouse for the aged poor in his native town of Augsburg. He died in the odour of sanctity, a good Catholic and a Count of the Empire, having seen his firm pay 54 per cent for the preceding sixteen years."

The fact is that in this sphere as in others the pre-Reformation Church had drifted into unreality. The gulf between profession and practice had widened and the rift was only concealed by a fog of pretence. The Reformers, whether Anglicans, Lutherans or Calvinists, recognize as fully as the Roman Catholics that economic problems such as those connected with the land question, the rise in prices, capital and interest, are to be solved in the light of Christian morality. But it was the Reformers who led the way back to practical

* R. H. Tawney, *Religion and the Rise of Capitalism*, pp. 44, 45.

† *Religion and the Rise of Capitalism*, p. 79.

consistency. Luther said that it was time to put a bit in the mouths of the holy company of the Fuggers. Calvin sought "to renew society by penetrating every department of life, public as well as private, with the influence of religion." All work is taken up into the religious sphere; there is no distinction between sacred and profane. Calvin taught that steady industry in profitable enterprise is eminently pleasing to God. He preferred capitalism to feudalism, because the former, when regulated as he desired, assures a reward to hard work and thrift.

Calvin was too uncompromising a theologian to find much favour with Elizabeth, and he was not at all happy about the state of the English Church in her reign. Yet no one can read the *Thirty-Nine Articles* without being reminded of the great influence he exerted in the Established Church of this country, and, through such men as Cartwright his impress on the foundations of Nonconformity is more apparent still.

The Christian Church has always held that ethical principles must be applied to the economic system. In the later Middle Ages this application had been growing less and less successful. The Church had become an immense vested interest, the greatest of landowners, unable therefore to grapple seriously with such defects of the feudal structure as serfdom or villeinage. Still less was the mediæval Church able effectively to control the situation as feudal institutions decayed and the new middle class emerged. Calvinism was a notable attempt to permeate the new system of trade and industrialism with the Christian spirit. It had, of course, serious defects, but as Dean Inge puts it, "No system was ever so effectual in promoting that kind of progress which is measured by statistics. If you can convince a nation that steady industry in profitable enterprise is eminently pleasing to God, but that almost all ways of spending money unproductively are wrong, that nation is likely to become very rich."

Dr. Tawney has shown how later on, after the Civil War in England, political theory became secularized. Economists came to believe that such practical questions as "the just price" were not to be discussed in Church. Prices would find their own natural level under the operation of economic laws. But it is not till the eighteenth century that we find the great exponents of this new science of Political Arithmetic: Dr. Josiah Tucker, Dean of Gloucester, 1758—1799, and Dr. Adam Smith, who died in 1790.

But to return to the sixteenth century: as a further illustration of the social effects of the Reformation let us briefly examine some of the results of the dissolution of the monasteries.

A good deal of research has been done in recent years on this subject. Mr. A. L. Rowse, for example, Fellow of All Souls, the great authority on Tudor Cornwall, has traced all the monastic lands in that county. He has found who bought them in Henry VIII's reign and how much was paid for them. For—be it noticed in passing—only a very small proportion of the grants of monastic land made during this King's reign were gifts: the rest were sales or exchanges. According

to a table constructed by Professor Savine, of 1593 such grants not more than one in forty were gifts.*

After the thirteenth century hardly any religious houses were founded in England except a few for the Carthusians. The re-building of parish churches and the erection of colleges, schools and almshouses took the place of the founding of monasteries as objects of fashionable devotion. A movement towards the suppression of the monasteries can be discerned all through the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries.

Bishop Alcock of Ely got a licence dated 12th June, 1497 for expelling the prioress and nuns of St. Rhadegunde's at Cambridge, and the result was the founding of Jesus College. Wolsey obtained authority from Pope and King to suppress twenty-one monasteries whose revenues were to go towards the endowment of the Cardinal's Colleges at Oxford and Ipswich.

Let us briefly enquire what was the effect of the suppressions of 1536 and 1539 on charitable relief and on education. Professor Savine has calculated that not more than 3 per cent. of monastic revenues was spent on charity, and Miss E. M. Leonard in her *History of English Poor Relief* goes so far as to say that the system of monastic charity did nearly as much to increase beggars as to relieve them. Mr. Baskerville sums up thus : " On the whole it may be reckoned that though a great deal of promiscuous almsgiving disappeared as a result of the suppression, that event made no great difference to the problem of the deserving poor as a whole."

On the other hand there can be little doubt that the disappearance of the monasteries was a cause of great inconvenience to many travellers, rich and poor. The duty of hospitality passed to some extent to the beneficed clergy. Thus in Archbishop Parker's questionnaire one of the questions with regard to incumbents is : Is he hospitable ?

How far were the monasteries centres of education ? Rich boys were brought up in them under the care of the abbot, and poor boys were housed in the almonry or the choir school. It has been calculated that there were about 1,500 such poor boys ; and a considerable number of these must have lost some form of education when the monasteries were suppressed. But the general education of the religious themselves was low, and of the secular clergy lower still. The figures revealed by Bishop Hooper's visitation of his diocese of Gloucester in 1551 are often quoted. Of 111 Clergy, 71 were unable to repeat the Ten Commandments, 10 could not repeat the Lord's Prayer, and 27 could not tell who was its author. Not more than 3 or 4 had ever preached or could preach. The moral influence of the clergy was low and there was a strong anti-clerical feeling in many parts of the country. Noteworthy also was the growing scepticism about images and relics which were part of the clerical stock-in-trade. These were very numerous : some of them of an out of the way kind, such as that which a Bishop of Dover said he found preserved by friars in Wales, namely, " Malchus' ear that Peter stroke off."

* Most of the following facts are taken from a book published last year (1937) by Mr. G. Baskerville on *English Monks and the Suppression of the Monasteries.*

Very confusing to the lay mind, too, must have been the unofficial marriages which were frequent among the secular clergy and not unknown among the regulars. A certain Abbot Barrington who wrote letters to Cromwell, for instance, was married to Mistress Bures, a nun—he quaintly calls her his " remedy." Of the two Cardinals who tried Henry VIII's case, the English one had a son who was a clergyman, and a daughter who was a nun, while the Italian brought his son with him to England. Old Parson Savage who held the family living of Davenham had a large family, one of whom became an Archdeacon, another a Chancellor, and a third, Edmund Bonner, Bishop of London. All this flagrant inconsistency between profession and practice must have been very bad for public morality in general, and thoughtful people must have heartily welcomed the abandonment of such pretences.

Henry had inherited some of his grandmother's zeal for education. Regius Professorships were founded at Oxford and Cambridge, Trinity College at Cambridge, and a number of schools up and down the country. A scheme for new bishoprics was drawn up in 1539 and if it had been carried out there would have been a bishop for nearly every shire. Unfortunately, money was needed for strengthening coastal defences and other warlike purposes, and social reforms had to give way to rearmament. This is a factor which should not be forgotten, though it must be confessed that extravagance and private greed were larger factors still.

I think we have now had illustrations sufficient. I will close with two or three reflections. The first is that whatever be the established form of a religious institution it is liable to internal corruptions. Vigilance must never be relaxed, and reform will be necessary from time to time. What happened to the Church in the sixteenth century is, with all its regrettable crudeness, rightly called a Reformation and Reformation must recur from time to time. And that leads to my second reflection, viz., that, as Benjamin Jowett used to say, we must think now of a new epoch in the history of Christianity bearing the same relation to the Christianity of the last three centuries which the Reformation did to the ages which preceded.

This new epoch will, we hope, be characterized by two things : first deeper unity and secondly stronger, simpler, more practical, belief.

The unity must not be the enforced unity of a totalitarian state. It must be the voluntary intelligent co-operation of free men. The Reformation of the sixteenth century saved us from a totalitarian Church, and opened the way for the Church of the future, which shall combine Catholic unity with Evangelical freedom.

Benjamin Jowett saw signs of its approach. It seemed to him, seventy years ago, that the old animosities were dying out, and men of different opinions were working together as they had not hitherto, recognizing the accidental nature of their separation and the reality of the bond which united them. " These," he went on to say, " are a few of the signs of greater harmony prevailing in the world, and of the Spirit of Christ being more diffused among men."

Protestantism has in the past been over-individualistic. It must recover, and there are many signs that it is beginning to recover, a

more vital corporate feeling, an enthusiasm for the Great Church, Christ's One Church Universal.

And the other characteristic of the new epoch is emphasized both by Jowett and by F. D. Maurice. In 1870 Maurice, referring to his expectation of a reformation more deep and searching than that of the sixteenth century, said, "The Reformation that we want is the same rise out of assents into faith as in the sixteenth century: only it must be into faith in a God who has redeemed mankind, in whom I may trust."

Jowett, nine years later (in 1879), in a letter to Lady Abercromby, wrote: "People must believe more strongly in a few truths which we all acknowledge, and they must apply them more vigorously to practical life."

MEMBERSHIP IN THE CHURCH. By the Rev. J. W. Augur, M.A. *Marshall, Morgan & Scott, Ltd.* 2s. net.

The Vicar of St. Giles, Northampton, has had experience in the preparation of candidates for Confirmation in several parishes, and in this book of "Further Instruction to Confirmation Candidates," he extends to a wider circle the benefits of his personal dealings with the problems of young people. In a series of practical chapters he sets out the main features of true membership of the Church in belief and work. The demands of the new loyalty to Christ with the importance of the decisions involved are explained in simple and impressive terms. An account is given of the meaning of Holy Communion. The call to work is indicated as a missionary obligation. The practical expression of thanksgiving as a duty and a privilege is shown, and an ideal of the nature of the Church is set up. Many points are aptly illustrated by incidents from life. The clergy will be glad of such a book to place in the hands of those who have been confirmed. The Provost of Bradford commends the book as giving a practical and spiritual message.

FIRST-BORN SONS. THEIR RIGHTS AND RISKS. By G. H. Lang. *S. E. Roberts.* 1s. 6d. Cloth and 1s. Paper Boards.

This is an enquiry as to the Privileges and Perils of the Members of the Church of God, and it is published from the office of the *Morning Star*. The book was written in Egypt in 1914. It aims at answering the question: "Is it worth while to follow Christ?" The author believes that the personal coming to earth and reign of the Lord Jesus Christ are absolutely indispensable to the fulfilment of God's programme. There is much about the Interaction of the Will of God and the Will of Man in relation to sharing in the Millennial Kingdom of our Lord Jesus Christ.

A. W. P.

THE REFORMATION IN LIFE: PERSONAL.

By the Rev. L. F. E. WILKINSON, M.A.

Evangelistic Secretary, Church Pastoral Aid Society.

I TAKE it that the purpose of the last paper of this Conference is to relate the subject, which we have had under discussion, to present circumstances. I am not, therefore, going to devote myself so much to the teachings of the Reformers concerning the personal life of the Christian, but rather to face our life to-day, in the light of the Reformation, and see how it should be affecting our individual living and conduct.

When the Reformation gave the Englishman liberty of conscience and freedom of action in the cause of Religion, it gave him something further. It laid upon him the obligation of using this liberty wisely and efficiently if he were to show to the world the full value of the truths which the Reformation had once again brought to light.

For the purpose of indicating the main principles which underlie this obligation, I am dividing the subject under four heads :

I. *The Reformation gave us a personal Access with a devotion to be practised.*

In the Pre-Reformation Church the layman had little or nothing to do on his own initiative. The priest stood between him and God. Provided that he attended the services as ordered by his priest, provided that he told his beads and said the round of prayers which he had been taught, all was well. What the prayers and services might mean was a very secondary matter. When and how often they came into his life, was a question which the Church alone determined. The only thing of account to the ordinary layman was that he was in line with the orders of his priest.

When, through the Open Bible and the teaching of the Reformation, the individual found that there was a New and Living way opened for him into the presence of God " by the Blood of Jesus," his practical devotional life had to be transformed. Now he was his own master. No priest would carefully regulate and scrutinize his inner life of devotion—though his minister, no doubt, would be glad to provide him with advice if he were to seek it.

The truth of " entering into the Holiest " by the new and Living Way, is one of the mightiest revelations of the Scriptures in which all true Evangelicals and Protestants rejoice. But practically—How many of us are day by day finding the truth a fact and a present experience in our daily life ?

I am certain that everyone of those who is proving it a reality will be found to be practising some definite plan of Devotion in their daily life. Still further they will be found to be those whose lives are showing forth the fragrance of Christ, and the glorious liberty of the children of God. This paper is, however, headed personal, and it is vital that we face this matter personally. May we then ask ourselves, is this personal access into the presence of God a reality, and a dominating fact in our own lives? Each of us clergy present, may we ask ourselves, are there many in our congregations to whom this fact is a daily living power?

If in facing this great truth we are conscious of coming far short, is not the reason this—that we have been abusing our liberty? The fact, that in our own personal lives there has not been any definite and ordered devotional practice? In our parishes, is not the weakness of many of the Christian laity in this respect due to the fact that they have never been guided along the path of organizing their devotional life?

It might be a most healthy thing for us here to tell the time which we set apart daily, on deliberate principle, to pray for the work of God committed to our charge, and also for the worship of the Almighty. How easy it is to live on for years, regarded as a man of prayer and devotion by others, and yet in one's inner being to know oneself to be an utter hypocrite in this regard.

To illustrate my meaning I will merely quote here from a book entitled *The Prayer Life* by Andrew Murray:

> "In 1898, there were two members of the Presbytery, New York, who attended the Northfield Conference for the deepening of the spiritual life. They returned to their work with the fire of a new enthusiasm. They endeavoured to bring about a Revival in the entire Presbytery. In a meeting which they held, the chairman was guided to ask the brethren a question concerning their Prayer Life: 'Brethren,' said he, 'let us to-day make confession before God and each other. It will do us good. Will every one who spends half an hour every day with God in connection with his work, hold up a hand?' One hand was held up. He made a further request: 'All who thus spend fifteen minutes, hold up a hand.' Not half the hands were up. Then he said: 'Prayer, the working power of the Church of Christ, and half the workers make hardly any use of it! All who spend five minutes hold up hands.' All hands went up. But one man came later with the confession that he was not quite sure whether he spent five minutes in prayer every day. 'It is,' said he, 'a terrible revelation of how little time I spend with God.'"

The Reformers and other Evangelicals such as Charles Simeon, and John Wesley had set times for prayer. They had often to fight to get the times. It meant discipline, it meant foregoing sleep and many claims in life. But they put the definite practising of their devotional life in the first place in their lives. And these were the men who did exploits.

A system of rules has always been distasteful to the Evangelical, savouring as it is thought to be of all that the Reformation removed. We have lost ground for too long by such a belief. Some system is essential. And I am absolutely certain that, if, as the result of this Conference, we

all were to order and systematize our devotional lives afresh or for the first time, so that this personal " access " became a living reality, we should do much to prove again in our day the glory and power of the Reformation. And this leads us naturally to our next heading :

II. *The Reformation gave us a personal Liberty with a discipline to be adopted.*

We have already thought of this liberty and the discipline which it calls for in the Devotional sphere ; but it is obvious that this discipline should extend into every department of life. It must start in the inner life, but as the liberty, which the Reformation heralded, reached every phase of human experience, so too, it is essential that the discipline which it demands should be felt in the daily walk and conduct.

In the Cadet Corps at my public school the recruits were invariably the show platoon ! Under the stern discipline of a sergeant-major from the Coldstream Guards they had to obey to the letter. The signallers, left largely to develop on their own, in virtual liberty, were by far the most inefficient. They did nothing to commend the corps.

The serious thing to-day is that there would seem to be far too many free-lance " signallers " in the ranks of the Evangelicals. They rejoice in the liberty—but they badly need a spiritual sergeant-major !

The names of Simeon and Wesley have already been mentioned. The glory and power of the Evangelical Revival was largely due to the fact that the leaders, and their followers too, were Methodists in very deed. They lived each day according to a set plan, and each evening they closely examined themselves to see how it had been spent.

Here, for instance, are the rules which Fletcher of Madeley, Wesley's friend, drew up for his guidance and daily examination :

1. Did I awake spiritual, and was I watchful in keeping my mind from wandering this morning ?
2. Have I this day got nearer to God in prayer, or have I given way to a lazy and idle spirit ?
3. Has my faith been weakened by unwatchfulness or quickened by diligence ?
4. Have I walked by faith, and seen God in all things ?
5. Have I denied myself *all* unkind words and thoughts ? Have I delighted to see others preferred ?
6. Have I made the most of my time, as far as I had light, strength, and opportunity ?
7. Have I kept the issues of my heart in the means of grace, so as to profit by them ?
8. What have I done this day for the souls and bodies of God's dear saints ?
9. Have I laid out anything to please myself when I might have saved the money for the cause of God ?

The personal Liberty which the Reformation has brought us, demands some such definite scheme of individual examination—say once a week. And I am quite certain that if all here, and all those who will be reached by the message of the Conference, were each week to examine their actions, thoughts, use of the tongue, reading and relationships with others, a spiritual movement would at once begin. If they

were willing to learn the lessons of the failures, and put right anything which might be advisable, their witness would at once begin to touch the thirty-and-a-half million in our land to-day, who have no use for the church and organized religion.

This discipline will also have to include the Matter of Time. Few people realize that the loss of an hour a day means the total irrecoverable loss of slightly over 45½ eight hour working days in the course of a year. This may sound dramatic, but actually the loss of time is far higher in most lives. With liberty in the use of their spare time, many Christians have no definite period allocated each day for their Prayer and Bible-reading, their Study and Recreation. It would be both a revelation and a profitable exercise if for one week we set down the amount of time we gave to the various activities which make up our days. The keeping of a careful journal of each half hour and how it was spent, and how much time was wasted, was a practice which made the early Methodists those who redeemed the time in very truth.

Never will we be able to give the essential time to prayer, study and work, unless we make it by definite planning. Never shall we fulfil the trust which we received through the Reformation, if our lives are merely drifting, as far as time is concerned.

The matter of Money was touched on in the questionnaire used by Fletcher ; but how little do the majority of Christians practise any definite discipline in the realm of their possessions ? Because they now have liberty concerning the amount given to God's work, the minimum—in keeping with respectability—often marks the limit of their gift.

I was at a church, not long ago, where the deputation in appealing for support, referred to the fact that many a business man will readily spend a guinea at the Golf Club on Saturday and feel it generous if he puts a 1*s.* instead of his usual 6*d.* into the plate on Sunday. The collection was double the amount usually given, that Sunday. And seeing that the preacher said little or nothing about his Society, it was obvious that many of those present had seen, perhaps for the first time, that it should always be the individual Christian that feels the pinch, and *never* God's work.

Every department of Evangelical endeavour is being held up to-day at home and abroad because of the lack of funds. It really comes to this—God's work is checked and hampered, largely because Christians are either neglecting or are unwilling to review their manner of living and annual expenditure periodically, so that it never becomes out of due proportion to that given to God's work.

May I put in one further practical plea that in this personal liberty which we enjoy through the Reformation, we should, through real discipline, seek to commend the Gospel in all things. The delay and failure to answer letters is an old and painful subject, and so is the careless settling of bills months after they become due—or never. Yet, perhaps especially to a secretary, they appear to be very common failings amongst Evangelical churchmen. The development of Accuracy, Neatness and Punctuality requires discipline—but how essential and worth while. If Evangelicals far and wide would conscientiously

accept for themselves a stern discipline in these connections, it would open the eyes of many business men to the practical value of the Reformation message of Salvation.

III. *The Reformation gave us a personal responsibility with a duty to be fulfilled.*

There is an easy way of living a Religious Life. It is to be linked with such a Church as Rome where the definite tenets of the faith are clearly laid down, and must be accepted, without scope for thought or argument, because they are settled by the Church. A layman also, linked in such a way, may speak for his Church, but can never bring another individual into living touch with Christ and His Church. That is a duty belonging to the priest alone.

We glory in the fact that the Reformation established the right of private judgment; that the open Bible became available to all men, so that within its pages the individual might search and discover the Truth for himself. But personally are we doing it? Are we "able to give an answer to every man of the hope that is within us?"

One of the tragedies of the past few years appears to be the way in which step by step Evangelicals have given way before the returning tide of pre-Reformation teaching and practice. Constantly practices are admitted and given currency, solely because their widespread use is held to make them devoid of meaning. Yet it is surely a curious logic which maintains that because a practice becomes fairly general that it therefore becomes both harmless, and one that should be adopted for the sake of uniformity.

An example of this fact lies to-day in the practice of the Eastward Position in the Holy Communion Service, and the customs which nearly always accompany it. There is no doubt that those in the Church who are working against the Reformation settlement have thought out their position on this point, and have a definite teaching on it. In tracts and books they have stated constantly that it both teaches the sacerdotal view of the priesthood which they hold, and also is an essential in their service, if these tenets are to be proclaimed to the congregation by *action* as well as by oral teaching.

On the other hand the reason generally given by Evangelicals who adopt these customs is that the practice has become so widespread that it has lost its significance. Rarely do we hear any argument based upon the study of history or liturgiology. It is to them merely a matter of expediency. Prevailing custom, an aid to devotion, and an æsthetic appeal are held to be the only matters of importance in determining the issue. Surely, if this had been the attitude of men like Latimer, Cranmer, and Ridley there would have been no Reformation and its martyrs.

I have raised this one example, not in order to bring about a heated discussion on this point, but to illustrate from an issue which is facing Evangelicals to-day, that many are not fulfilling the duty which the Reformation lays upon them.

And if this is true about the lack of knowledge on this point the same thing is true on the majority of vital though controversial problems

in our Protestant heritage. When some matter is raised in chapter meetings, ruri-decanal and diocesan conferences, all too often the Evangelical remains silent (if he has even taken the trouble to be present) because he has not the knowledge with which to put his case.

We glory in the Reformation standard set in the Thirty-Nine Articles and the Book of Common Prayer. Can we but blame ourselves, if we lose them, when they seem to mean so little to us that we utterly neglect the responsibility of studying and knowing them, and boldly standing and speaking for them as occasion may arise. Clergy present may we ask ourselves personally are we teaching our people these great Reformation principles? In our ministry are we progressively leading our people on, so that they have a firm and intelligent grasp of these great truths? Are we encouraging them to go forth and speak and stand for them in church meetings and conferences to which they may be elected?

In the material published by the National Church League, the Young Churchmen's Movement together with other Evangelical Societies which are issuing reliable literature, I am certain that the majority of the machinery for definite Instruction and Evangelical advance is ready and waiting. Yet how little this material is used! The demand is waning rather than increasing. The Catholic Truth Societies boast that they sell two million copies of their penny and twopenny booklets annually in England alone. Every Roman Church has its book-rack carefully set out, and kept bright. Yet how few Evangelical parishes run bookstalls and keep them up-to-date. How few Evangelical Clergy are circulating the literature amongst their church members, and encouraging the reading by definite courses of sermons along the themes covered by them.

There is another side also to this responsibility. The Reformation gave to the individual Christian the Ministry of Reconciliation. The words of John, xv. 16, "Ye have not chosen Me but I have chosen you and ordained you that ye should go and bring forth fruit, and that your fruit should remain," come as a statement of fact to layman as well as minister.

Let us apply this personally. Christ's purpose for you, is that you should be bearing fruit. Are you? A friend of mine, speaking at a meeting of younger Clergy—at which I happened to be taking the chair—stopped in the midst of his address with the words, "Will you all take out a piece of paper and a pencil, and put down on it the name of the last person whom you have been used to win for Christ. Then put against this the date. When was it? This year? Last year? Can it be that some of you would have to say, Never?" Sitting as I was, facing the audience, I may say that the expression on the faces of many was a study. The cause was this—that a number, when it came to a matter of black and white and definite names, had nothing to write. They were always hoping to touch souls, but actually the days and years had slipped by without any definite results.

Going further may I ask the clergy present if they are really building up a band of soul-winners in their parishes? I am certain that the only thing which will reach and win England now, is an

Indigenous Church. The clergy alone can never touch the whole country. Their main responsibility must be to gather round them, and then send out, Christians in the fellowship of their Church who are winning souls, so that they may become true Fellow-workers in the task of reaching the parish.

It is being done in some parishes. It should be a fact in every parish where the Evangel is known, believed, and preached. I think of Grantee parishes of the C.P.A.S. where "cottage" meetings are being held in tenement buildings and homes in new housing areas. These are being conducted solely by members of the Congregation, and are reaching "outsiders" and are being followed by definite results. I think of other Grantee parishes where the vicars have adopted the principle of the communist "cell," and have used it most successfully for the training of soul-winners. A group of five Christians is set to work as a "cell." They meet from time to time, on their own, for prayer over those whom they are seeking to win, together with discussion of their experiences in personal work since last they met. When any of the "cell" are instrumental in reaching another, that new one is linked to the "cell" and joins in the individual witness work. The vicar only steps in when the "cell" has doubled itself and numbers ten. Then he splits it in half, and the two "cells" continue on the same method.

Surely the majority of parishes would be able to start one "cell." And if, after a year's work, the "cell" had doubled, and the vicar had ten people, who had really got the vision that they were called to be witnesses, and who had had the joy and experience of winning a soul to Christ, he would have something in his parish which would continue whether he were there or not. He would have a living organism producing more possibly in the way of results than years of arduous individual sermonizing and parochial routine.

As Protestants and Evangelicals we have a personal responsibility for the Gospel and our heritage. May God find us in this hour ready and willing for the hard work, even the change of method and outlook, so that we may be fulfilling faithfully our duty to God, our Nation, our Church, and our fellow-men.

IV. *The Reformation gave us a personal Saviour and Indweller with a dynamic to be demonstrated.*

My time has all but gone, but as we close this conference let us remember especially that all our work and testimony must be linked to the Living Saviour and the Indwelling Spirit. Without Him, known and proved in heart and life, we are without hope and can do nothing. The Reformation brought to the fore, as the most vital question which every man must face, "What then shall I do with Jesus Who is called the Christ?"

Everything commences with the fact of knowing Him as Redeemer and Sin-bearer. The Open Bible brought the personal challenge of the Cross home to the Individual The first question that every honest person must ask is: "Do I know Him as *my* Sin-bearer, and

redeemer?" Can I say with Paul of old: "He loved *me* and gave Himself for *me*?"

But that is only the beginning. It is to such, that the Risen Saviour comes saying: "Ye shall receive *Power*, after that the Holy Ghost is come upon you, and ye shall be witnesses."

We live in a day of Dictatorships. A day when Might is once again being hailed to be the only Right. We live in a day when science so-called, and certain psychological teachings would seek to remove the miraculous from the history and work of Christianity.

The world is waiting for Facts. The world is waiting to see a Power which can transform individuals and through them a Nation which may prove again that Right is Might.

These are days of destiny, when the world is in the melting-pot. If we go forth from this Conference, thankful for the Reformation and the Scriptures, instructed but content to slip back into our old habits, ruts, and undisciplined ways of life, the day is *lost* as far as we are concerned.

Doors in the Home and Mission Field will soon be closed for ever if the men and money are not soon forthcoming. Revival alone will bring them. In the year after Moody's mission in London the income of the C.P.A.S. increased by £11,000, and remained at that figure for years. Foreign Missionary Societies were effected in exactly the same way. Men and women soon followed to fill the gaps in both the home and foreign fields.

The war-clouds will soon burst over the world, unless through Revival God brings our nation back to Himself, so that it may again take the lead, which it did in bygone days, through national prayer and righteousness, in evangelizing the sin-sick nations.

Men around us are being challenged and won day-by-day to this or that Ism or Ology which claims to supply individual and international peace and prosperity and power. In the days of the early Church, the Reformation, and Evangelical Revival, men and women were compelled to face the claims of Christ by the demonstration of His power which they saw at work in the Church. It must be so to-day.

A personal experience of Pentecost alone will enable us to meet the needs of the hour, and translate the Reformation truths into dynamic facts for the present.

Even as we meet here, God is working in various parts of the Mission Field in reviving power. This fact alone disproves the cry of the pessimist who declares that matters spiritually must steadily grow worse and worse. In Ruanda, China, and elsewhere God has been bringing native Christians, and through them the missionaries, to face the barrenness, powerlessness and lack of discipline in their lives. In many cases they have had to devote days to waiting on God in order that they might be broken, emptied, cleansed, and filled. But how well worth while! From these bands of waiting Christians, who were willing to pay the price, has gone forth the power of the Indwelling Spirit, so that heathenism and indifference has been broken down and Revival has come.

The question which this conference brings is—shall it be so with us? Everything depends on whether we are willing to pay the price. It will mean heart-searching, and much time for waiting on God. It will mean sacrifice, stern discipline, and possibly a thorough readjustment of our lives, our study, and our work.

Christian discipleship is not an easy thing. When Garibaldi went forth to free Italy, he won through because he had behind him men who had whole-heartedly answered this challenge of his :

> " I offer you hardship, rags, thirst, sleepless nights, footsores in the long marches, privations innumerable, and VICTORY in the noblest cause that ever asked you."

Christ calls you to-night to the same uncompromising dedication :

> " If any man come after Me, and hate not his father, and mother, and wife, and children, and brethren, and sisters, yea, and his own life also, he cannot be My disciple. And whosoever doth not bear his cross, and forsaketh not all that he hath, he cannot be My disciple " (Luke xiv. 26, 27, 33).

Our Lord, Who won the Victory in the days of the Reformation is able to do it to-day. He is abundantly able to build up here, through us, a Church which shall Evangelize to a Finish. The question then, which each of us must *personally* face is—**shall we let Him?**

Brotherhood Economics, by Toyohiko Kagawa (Student Christian Movement Press, 5*s.* net), is the latest work of the great Japanese Christian leader who has put his Christianity into practice in the most convincing way by living a life of poverty in the slums and sharing with the poorest their hardships.

In this book he has set out the theme of four lectures delivered in America on Christian brotherhood and economic reconstruction. He believes that it is possible to reach a Christian social order, and he explains the nature of the opposition that has to be encountered, and the spirit of Christian brotherhood by which alone a perfect system of co-operation can be attained. The book is full of interesting facts drawn from many sources and illustrating the many schemes that have been put forward for better economic conditions and the causes of their failure. His conclusion is that peace will come only when the consciousness of redemptive love as manifested on the Cross permeates the life of international economy through brotherhood love in co-operative movements.

The Rev. John Burr, M.A., in the *Prayer of Prayers* (Allenson & Co., 2*s.* 6*d.* net), provides an interesting study of the Lord's Prayer in which he analyses each petition and sets out with clearness the fulness of meaning which may be found in phrases that are very familiar and appear quite simple. The treatment of the subject provides ample material for the use of teachers or preachers.