

Theology on the Web.org.uk

Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible

This document was supplied for free educational purposes. Unless it is in the public domain, it may not be sold for profit or hosted on a webserver without the permission of the copyright holder.

If you find it of help to you and would like to support the ministry of Theology on the Web, please consider using the links below:



Buy me a coffee

<https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology>



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

[PayPal](#)

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

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

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

The Churchman

JULY—SEPTEMBER, 1941

Vol. LV., No. 3, New Series

Contents :

	PAGE
EDITORIAL	146
THE CHURCH MILITANT.	
The Rev. Hans Ehrenberg, Ph.D.	148
WORSHIP.	
The Rev. J. C. Hirst, M.A.	162
WHY ARE MEN NOT MORE RELIGIOUS?	
The Rev. A. W. Parsons, L.Th.	169
THE HOLY COMMUNION IN THE EARLY CHURCH.	
The Rev. F. R. Montgomery Hitchcock, D.D.	177
LAW AND GRACE.	
The Rev. H. L. Ellison, B.D., B.A.	186
THE EPISTLE OF TRUTH.	
The Rev. Edwin Hirst, M.A., A.R.C.M.	199
BOOK REVIEWS	210

PRICE : ONE SHILLING NETT

*"The Churchman," 1s. nett quarterly. Annual subscription, 4s. 6d. post free.
The Church Book Room, Dean Wace House, Wine Office Court, E.C.4.*

Editorial

ALREADY it is becoming abundantly clear that if the Church is to fulfil her high calling with success after the war there will be need for much hard but clear thinking, a fearless facing of facts and a willingness at whatever cost to protest (using the word in its double connotation of witnessing for truth and protesting against untruth) wherever necessary.

Such subjects as Christian Education, Christian Reunion, Church Worship and many others will no longer be matters of academic interest only, but will have to be dealt with frankly and squarely.

In this issue appears a challenging article from our contributor, the Rev. A. W. Parsons, of St. John's, Boscombe, entitled, "Why are Men not more Religious?" Also an article on "Worship" by the Rev. J. C. Hirst, Vicar of Haworth. Incidentally we learn that next year will be the 200th anniversary of the commencement of the Rev. William Grimshaw's ministry in that famous Yorkshire Parish where suitable commemorations are being planned.

The Rev. Hans Ehrenberg completes his Meditation on "The Church Militant," the first half of which appeared in our April-June issue.

A speaker at an Evangelical Conference said recently (speaking of the Evangelical Revival): "You and I are hardly likely to meet with the old opposition. We shall not be stoned or thrown into the horse pond or be surrounded by howling mobs demanding our very lives." With Professor Ehrenberg's article in mind we wondered if similar assumptions had been held by Christians in Germany a few years ago and how the Christian Church in England would react if such a situation should arise here!

The Rev. H. L. Ellison, a former tutor of St. John's Hall, Highbury, contributes a thoughtful article on "Law and Grace," and Dr. Montgomery Hitchcock's promised article is warmly welcomed.

The third instalment of "The Epistle of Truth" by the Rev. E. Hirst (brother of the Vicar of Haworth) appears also, and we hope to complete the series in our October-December issue.

Readers of THE CHURCHMAN will welcome the Rev. S. Nowell-Rostron's review of *The History of Ridley Hall* by Dr. Bullock, and many after reading this will want a copy for their own shelves of this very illuminating and fascinating record.

The Church Militant

A BIBLICAL MEDITATION

(Part II).

THE REV. HANS EHRENBERG, PH.D.

(The first half of this Meditation appeared in the April-June issue).

VII.

“**A**ND after the fire a still small voice” (I Kings xix. 12). “This text means a voice of a silence which either wrapped the world like a veil, or fell upon it like dust on one vast desolation. In either case it means the arresting, solemn, dread stillness of the great waste-places” (John Oman). Storms, earthquakes, conflagrations, convulsions, destruction, upheavals, times of judgment, crises and catastrophes sweep across the face of the earth. The fight of the kingdom of God on earth is inseparably bound up with these periods, with the epochs of mighty storms, consuming fires, and devastating tempests.

God teaches us to hear His “still, small voice.” There is always a “holy remnant”; it listens to that solemn stillness which follows the agony of nature, the catastrophes of world history. Believers both live in the great periods of judgment and survive them. A striking incident in the history of Judaism can be used to illustrate this. During the siege of Jerusalem by Titus in the year 70 Yochanan Ben-Zakkai, a leading rabbi, had himself brought secretly into the Roman camp; he persuaded them to let him live in a miserable little town; and thus rescued the “Torah.” By devious paths the fighting Church is brought through temporal judgments, and one day it will be brought through the eternal judgment. The zealot and martyr, who falls in the fight, the gentle saintly woman, who dies resignedly, and the preserver, like that Yochanan Ben-Zakkai, one and all heard the “still small voice,” while the storms of judgment were still raging; they heard God’s voice; they veiled their face like Elijah; they received God’s orders and obeyed them without question. “Here is the patience of the saints, they that keep the commandments of God, and the faith of Jesus” (Rev. xiv. 12).

In the judgment of men every fight waged by Christ’s

warriors is a foolish and impossible entanglement, nay more, an enterprise lacking in all seriousness. The world condemns all that fight for the Church as extremists ; they do not fit into society. Such as those of whom the Epistle to the Hebrews writes, " Who through faith subdued kingdoms, wrought righteousness, obtained promises, stopped the mouths of lions, quenched the power of fire, escaped the edge of the sword, from weakness were made strong, waxed mighty in war, turned to flight armies of aliens " (xi. 33-34), automatically place themselves outside the principles of the society of well-bred people. A man like Martin Niemoeller, who is beyond doubt a well-bred man, would offend almost all his enthusiastic followers everywhere, if they could only meet him. The world, if we may put it that way, is proud of its moderation ; for it the fight of the Church is only a forbidden presumption, for which room can only be found in the museum of the Church, i.e., in the memory of past periods of Christianity. We need not be surprised then that the totalitarian enemies of the Church are trying to put everything that has to do with the Church of Christ into this museum. That is being done in the imitation of the Church, " the church of well-bred people," in " the church of society." But it has already been seen to that no one will frivolously call himself a warrior of Christ, for he will have to concern himself with those things in the passage just quoted, with the subduing of mighty kingdoms, with the stopping of the mouths of wild beasts, with the quenching of devastating conflagrations. Of a truth the world is tilting at windmills, when it thinks it must take measures against the imagined presumption of the Church Militant. If there were presumption there, it would be full dearly paid for. But the Church will be happy and proud of her experiences in the fight. The chronicles of the fights of the Church, be it martyrdoms, or witnessings and confessings, are the eternal song of the Church, a song she sings together with the heavenly hosts, the eternal song, which is again and again heard in the Church's hymns, the song of

" One army of the living God,
To His command we bow ;
Part of the host have crossed the flood,
And part are crossing now."

We, who are proclaiming *the* King whose kingdom is ever-

lasting and whose servants are without fear, are not led astray by the fascinating "wonders of Antichrist." Nay rather in the midst of the victories of those that follow the man who claims to be the sole prophet of God to-day, in the midst of the victories of "the new Mahomet" we hear a "still, small voice," which shall come, and in which *is* God, the Lord. It is *thus* we believe in victory.

VIII.

The Church Militant is never found fighting in the ranks of the world ; it would be waste of words to belabour that point further. But it is not fighting only against the world, for it is not on the side of the numberless moralists who preach repentance, and only repentance, to the world. It does not find its pride in accusing and in looking for the guilty in everything wrong that happens. Its whole fight against the world is against that world that God so loved that He gave His only begotten Son for it. Our fight against the world is a fight against a world, which *is* God's world, and which shall once again be God's world. The fighter against the world gives himself as sacrifice and as prize in the fight ; he has not come into the world to be ministered unto, but to minister, a ransom for many. The Church Militant fights a *double fight*, a fight against the world and a fight for the world. Those who fight this double fight see with Christ in the cup of the angel in the Garden of Gethsemane the innumerable multitudes of the fallen and damned.

That is why the Church warns her members against the coming powers of seduction, which will be the worse the more humanity progresses. "But the Spirit saith expressly, that in later times some shall fall away from the faith, giving heed to seducing spirits and doctrines of devils, through the hypocrisy of men that speak lies, branded in their own conscience as with a hot iron" (1 Tim. iv. 1-2). Read the small, little-considered Epistle of Jude ; listen to Paul's so unwillingly-heard admonition, "A man that is heretical after a first and second admonition refuse" (Titus iii. 10). "*Haereses oportet esse*" is Paul's dictum. That does not mean that we are joyfully to welcome heretics, but that they are inevitable ; we are not to mourn about them feebly, "We have neither power nor call to save the nation as nation in its entirety, any more than the Apostles had the power or

call to re-establish the Greek nation or to regenerate the Roman Commonwealth" (Vilmar). Separation, expulsion, reprobation, anathematizing are all means by which the Church gathers and purifies its troops and leads them to the battlefield. When we had uttered the first condemnations in the confessional struggle in 1933, we began to be the Church Militant. We are not Arminians and Latitudinarians, but neither are we hierarchs and grand inquisitors.

During the years of the Church struggle hardly any portion of Scripture was more used by us than the Epistles to the Seven Churches in the Revelation of John. For there we found the spirit that judges and loves, the spirit that separates and suffers in the separating. In them we are preserved from the spirit of the Synod of Dortrecht and the spirit of Arminius, both of which have sorely wounded the Church, especially the churches of England. Of a truth it is only to "the victor" that God "gives to eat of the tree of life, which is in the Paradise of God" (Rev. ii. 7). Therefore the angel of God speaks thus to the churches in this world, "Repent therefore; or else I will come unto thee quickly, and will fight against them with the sword of my mouth" (Rev. ii. 16). There is no bloodier fight than this, for it is a fight in which no quarter is given; hear the words written to the church in Thyatira, "Behold I do cast her into a bed, and them that commit adultery with her into great tribulation, except they repent of her works. And I will kill her children with death" (Rev. ii. 22-23). Such severity is followed by equal clemency, "But to you I say, to the rest that are in Thyatira, as many as have not this teaching, which know not the deep things of Satan, as they say; I cast upon you none other burden. Howbeit that which ye have, hold fast till I come" (Rev. ii. 24-25). Such are to become "pillars in the temple of my God" (Rev. iii. 12). It is only a small door that has been opened for them, but no one will be able to slam it in their face (Rev. iii. 8). When the separation has been carried through, there is but "little strength" left on the side of Christ's warriors, but the power to fight is granted it. Those who have taken on themselves the separation from the lost and damned are granted in grace the power to do what the idealists of this world can never do. And when we no longer listen to the Word, "two shall be on one bed, the one shall be taken and the other

shall be left" (Luke xvii. 34), we cannot endure a fight. He who would be soft without letting himself be hardened, or he who is hard and will not let himself be relaxed, will be no true warrior in the ranks of the Church Militant.

Man always only wants to see and grasp one side of things in war. In earthly war he discusses the question, May we kill? and quite ignores the fact that war does not only mean killing but also being killed. In spiritual warfare he demands that the Christian should sacrifice himself (should let himself be killed), but he does not want to grasp that the Christian is fighting and must kill his enemy spiritually. So it is that men can find a right attitude neither to earthly nor spiritual wars.

The relevance of this to spiritual warfare is that normally comprehension for the true aim of the war is lacking. There is only one such aim, the destruction of man's self-deification. To achieve this aim we must judge and kill spiritually. For thus saith the Lord, "For I have come to set a man at variance against his father, and the daughter against her mother, and the daughter-in-law against her mother-in-law: and a man's foes shall be they of his own household. He that loveth father or mother more than me is not worthy of me; and he that loveth son or daughter more than me is not worthy of me" (Matt. x. 35-37). The greatest danger for modern man is always that he does not want to grasp the fact of devilish powers, that because of so-called love he will not fight, and finally plunges into the abyss together with those whom he should have fought.

The fight against the world should always be a fight for it, i.e., for its rescue. But the fight for the world should never cease fighting against it.

"The time is drawing near that we shall no longer lift up our hands in prayer in ones, isolated one from another, but together as congregations, as Church. We shall so do it that we shall be multitudes, even if they are relatively small multitudes compared to the thousands of thousands who have fallen away; we shall confess and praise aloud the Lord who was crucified and is risen, and is coming again. What kind of prayer, confession, song of praise will that be? It is a prayer of deepest love just for the lost ones that stand around us, who may well have already raised their hands to deal us a deadly blow. It is a prayer for those

wandering, confused, agitated, and devastated souls; a prayer that they may enjoy the same love and the same peace in which we rejoice; a prayer that will penetrate deep into their souls and draw their hearts with a much stronger grip than they are able to exert on our hearts, even though they try the utmost that hate is capable of. Yes, the Church, which is really waiting for its Lord, which really understands the time with its signs of final separation, must throw herself on this prayer of love with all the powers of her soul, with the united powers of her holy life, and with folded hands cry ceaselessly into the very faces of the lost, 'Have mercy, Lord, on these who are also called to the eternal life of peace and love, just as we are.' . . . He who holds back now even once in his confession from the until now customary and partly excusable motive of consideration for the world is not even a virgin without oil; he is the servant who buried his pound. Consideration and reserve have ceased—do thou in the Church keep the confession before the eyes of all, in season and out of season; it is the last time. Let them answer, and they must answer briefly, Yes or No. It will not be granted thee to learn much of Christ; there is only sufficient time to *confess* the Lord" (A.F.C. Vilmar, 1800-1868).

IX.

Paul has given us a Magna Charta of love and another of the fight; the former is in his first epistle to the Corinthians, the latter in the second, in chapter 6. In the German confessional struggle we did not pray publicly for any who made any use of political weapons—and what a political fight it was!—and had been persecuted because of a political phrase. We succeeded by this severe discipline in ensuring that our weapons did not become prematurely blunt. It was not a retreat from the fight against the world, but rather the most effective form of our offensive against the world, "Giving no occasion of stumbling in anything, that our ministration be not blamed" (11 Cor. vi. 3). What will be the appearance, the speech, the conduct of those that have passed through "stripes, imprisonments, tumults, labours, watchings and fastings," through "glory and dishonour, evil report and good report," and who themselves call themselves "unknown and yet well known, dying and behold we

live, chastened and not killed" (II Cor. vi. 5, 8-9)? If we give no occasion for stumbling under *such* circumstances, it means that we neither complain nor lament, that we do not speak bitterly nor arrogantly, that we do not become hard nor empty. What makes the world stumble? If the servants of Christ cannot suffer; if they cannot rebuke; if they are not redeemed, if they do not possess all things; if they do not remain true, although they are at everybody's call; if they follow the Right or Left or Centre; if their love is not sincere; if they no longer make others rich.

We fighters are placed in the midst of mighty spirit-armies, which would tear us in pieces:

Glory! For us? Yes! But there is glory too for the hirelings of *dishonour*, but it is purely earthly glory. For us, though, there is dishonour too, the glory of dishonour, and that is not for the hirelings of that glory.

Dying! For us? Yes! We, and not the faithless, who have taken good care of themselves, suffer and sacrifice ourselves. But yet we *live*, just we, and we are the judgment for the faithless, for we the dying live.

Sorrowful! For us? Yes! He has never fought who has never known despair, who has known a way of escape in every need. The children of this world do not know despair, or if they do, they die of it. But we are of *good cheer*, just because we despair. Despair leads us from death to life. Disconsolateness leads them from life to death.

The holy Apostle having finished his Magna Charta of the fight adds a touching phrase least of all to be expected there, "Our mouth is open unto you, O Corinthians, our heart is enlarged." Such was in some small measure our own experience in the German concentration camp, when we meditated on the Magna Charta of the fight in II Corinthians quietly to ourselves.

The fight of the Church possesses its own dialectic. It is not abstract. It is at once bloody and spiritual, invisible and visible; it connects death and life. So it comes that our own suffering is always half hidden from us—I am speaking of the suffering of the warriors of the Church—for it is included in a movement, in a happening that comes from God. What we know of it we know through our being crucified with Christ. So it is that Christ knows *what* we suffer as His soldiers; we hardly know more than *that* we are

suffering. For the sufferings that come from the fights of the Church Militant are those mysterious sufferings of which was said that they "fill up the afflictions of Christ." "For it is no longer I that live, but Christ liveth in me." "For we which live are always delivered unto death for Jesus' sake, that the life also of Jesus may be manifested in our mortal flesh. So then death worketh in us, but life in you" (11 Cor. iv. 11-12).

X.

"So then death worketh in us, but life in you." Such a metabolism does not take place in me or you, but in US, in the body of the Church, for we are the body of Christ (1 Cor. xii. 27).

The body of Christ is the bearer of this mysterious metabolism, in which death becomes food for life, dying is the medicine against death. Death becomes life, sin becomes grace, lies become truth (this last wording is from Dostoevsky's "The Brothers Karamasoff"). "I am the living bread which came down out of heaven: if any man eat of this bread, he shall live for ever; yea and the bread which I will give is my flesh, for the life of the world" (John vi. 51). The Christian cannot fight without the bread of life.

The scene changes: Now Christ is the only fighter, and He is fighting for us who receive His sacrifice and eat His true flesh and drink His true blood; it is for the old, the women and children, the weak and ill, the poor; all these are not at the front; He alone bleeds for them, He, our peace. But in the same moment the scene changes again. As members of Christ we are called to the war and He leads us into the fight, fighting together with Him as the members of the one body under the leadership of the head; and we, the old, the women and children, the weak and ill, the poor, all stand with Him in the front line against the powers of this world.

The members of the body of Christ go a *sacramental way*. The life they live can only be understood in the mystery of the sacrament. They must ever again confess, that HE alone fights for them, bleeds and suffers, that He alone bears all. But as soon as they confess that, they confess too that they are fellow-fighters in the fight of the Church. Just as in the sacrament the natural unites with grace, and

the living, present Christ with the natural elements, so that the union is both spiritual and natural (for that is the meaning of sacramental), so Christ unites Himself in us with our natural life through the faith given us by grace. Head and members have but one life together, and are yet different, namely Christ (head) and we (members).

In the world the way of the Christian is always a "third" way. He does not go with the party of the weak, which we call the Left, nor with the party of the strong, which we call the Right. He does not even go the middle way by using the cowardly "and also" (though he often enough is found in the most suspicious proximity to it). If Christendom lays down its arms, it becomes at once the prisoner of some party, generally of the strong in the eyes of the world, sometimes of the weak, often enough of those that are neither strong nor weak. To go with the strong may lead to success, it may be attractive to be with the weak, to try to hold a middle way may be clever, but the Church Militant will never choose any of these ways. The way of the fighting Church is the way of active faith in this world; the world and its parties find it suspicious, men of good will and clean heart find it surprising.

We never know *where* this way may lead, for God is His own builder. We know but one thing about it; somewhere it runs past the altar and pulpit of the Church. There we find the inexhaustible arsenal of the fighting Church.

It can, however, happen that the Church's warriors should on occasion become "voluntary allies in good faith" of one of the earthly parties. This is always temporary, the result of a special order from above. The continual intercessions of the Son at the right hand of the Father contain also intercessions on account of which the Father can order a relief campaign on earth for one of the parties fighting there. I think we can know approximately when this is likely to happen; it is when the horsemen of the Apocalypse ride across the earth—when some power suppresses both Right and Left and stops the natural competition of parties, groups, classes, and nations on earth.

Here we should quote Paul's word to his spiritual son, Timothy, "And if a man also strive for masteries, yet is he not crowned, except he strive lawfully" (2 Tim. ii. 5).

We should never use the phrase "holy war," for it has

been poisoned by that form of religion that cannot differentiate between the kingdom that is of that world, and the kingdom that comes from this. We should, therefore, beware of calling our fight a legitimate one just because it has brought us through concentration camps, through many outward sufferings and heavy afflictions. We only then participate in a "legitimate" fight, when it is the one in which the Crucified, the Humiliated, the Exalted, the Slain Lamb, is victor. Only the life and working of the holy body of Christ makes a fight legitimate.

Wherever the believer lives out his faith coming from the forgiveness of sins, is justified through grace alone, the saved lost follow Him, who died for them, and fight alongside Him in His fight for them. The Christian has only then *justification* for his fight, when he fights on the basis of justification through the free grace of God; but then he has full *justification* indeed. The body of the Church lives, when the power of the keys is being used; both it and its members sink into death when the forgiveness of sins is silenced; it becomes sick if forgiveness is made to depend on men.

So we fight the fight of the Church, without being weighed down by the anxieties and problems of this life, freed from the fear that reigns in this world, without the vain regard for others that men that are servants take on themselves; it is true we are bound, but by love and responsibility, and therefore free through grace and faith; we are not led astray, for we are persuaded that neither death nor life, nor angels, nor principalities, nor powers, nor things present, nor things to come, nor height, nor depth, nor any other created thing, shall be able to separate us from the love of God, which is in Christ Jesus our Lord" (Rom. viii. 38-39).

XI.

Man thinks he must first conquer himself, then he can fight for God's cause. But man can never conquer himself. Whenever he obtains effective partial victories over himself, these very victories make him a slave to his victories. That has been the fate of the moralist, of the stoic, of the idealist. The so-called "unending approach to the ideal of complete victory over oneself" had far better be called "an unending prolonging of man's defeat in his fight against himself."

Moralists and stoics, once they enter the sphere of hard facts, become without the least restraint dictators, tyrants and murderers, e.g. the stoics among the Roman emperors, Robespierre, Hitler. Until man realizes and acknowledges his defeat in his fight against himself, he is not capable of following the call to the fight of the Church.

We are speaking of a fight that man never understands but that he experiences, of the fight that the patriarch Jacob experienced in the valley of the Jabbok in the darkness of night (Gen. xxxii) ; to use the words of Hosea, Jacob " had power over the angel, and prevailed ; he wept and made supplication unto him " (xii. 4). You will fight, you will prevail, you will fight with God and prevail over God. But first surrender! Luther said about Jacob's fight, " God frightens Jacob and fills him with fear, but he begins to cry aloud and pray ; so He comes and would strangle him. That is truly a terrible fight, when God Himself fights, and appears as enemy, as though He wishes to kill. He who would endure in such a fight and emerge victorious, he must in truth be a holy man and a true Christian. That is why this story is so dark, for the matter with which it deals is so high. . . . Jacob is stronger than the man, but not because he is in reality stronger than the Lord. . . . But the Lord would test the powers of *one* man only, for He Himself, the Lord, is in truth stronger. I indeed do not desire to wrestle with a believing man, especially one that has the promise in addition, even if I were a strong giant ; for in such a man nature exceeds its powers. . . . But when the Lord saw that Jacob was stronger, especially in faith, which God does not willingly resist, He used the special skill of the wrestler and touched the hollow of Jacob's thigh. . . . *But Jacob answered, ' I will not let Thee go, except Thou bless me.'* Why do you not let Him go ? Your thigh has been injured ; you are already lame ; what do you still hope to do ? ' I feel no weakness yet,' says Jacob. But who is strengthening you then ? ' My faith, the promise, yes, specially the weakness of my faith.' "

It is always the same hobbler Jacob-Israel-Paul-Luther, who confesses, " When I am weak, then am I strong " (II Cor. xii. 10), and who calls to his spiritual son Timothy and to every coming generation of theologians and Christians, " I have fought the good fight, I have finished the course,

I have kept the faith : henceforth there is laid up for me the crown of righteousness, which the Lord, the righteous judge, shall give to me at that day ; and not only to me, but also to all them that have loved His appearing " (11 Tim. iv. 7-8).

Pride and humility in the fight have come together. The true soldier must be both proud and humble ; they are the constituents of his nature as soldier. " The weapons of our warfare are not of the flesh, but mighty before God to the casting down of strong holds ; casting down imaginations, and every high thing that is exalted against the knowledge of God, and bringing every thought into captivity to the obedience of Christ ; and being in readiness to avenge all disobedience, when your obedience shall be fulfilled " (2 Cor. x. 4-6).

Broken into fragments there lie on the ground the outrageous presumption of created powers (" Imaginations against the knowledge of God are cast down "), the blindly raging hardness of human intellect (" Every thought is brought into captivity "), the mad defiance of human self-will (" All disobedience is broken "). The last defence of the stoic is stormed ; it is conquered by Him in whom there is " no form nor comeliness," by Him who " was despised and rejected of men ; a man of sorrows and acquainted with grief : and as one from whom men hide their face He was despised, and we esteemed Him not " (Is. liii. 3-4). He is Christ the Conqueror.

XII.

Christ the Conqueror will conquer in the last of battles. At the end of each of the epistles to the Seven Churches there stands a promise to him who is victorious. The victors are promised, " that they will eat of the tree of life," " that they will not be hurt of the second death," " that they will eat of the hidden manna, and receive a new name written on a white stone," " that they will have authority over the nations to judge them," " that they will be arrayed in white garments, and they will in no wise have their name blotted out of the book of life, and will have their names confessed before the Father," " that they will be pillars in the temple of God," and finally " that they will sit down with Christ in His throne."

The phrase "eternal life" is not just a frame without a picture. It acts as a frame to the fullness of the mysteries of the kingdom of Christ. Bearing the indestructible treasure of these mysteries the Church Militant looks to the resurrection of the body, awaited by the martyrs. After the Lamb had opened the first four seals, after the horsemen of the Apocalypse had passed over the world bearing with them and revealing the diamond-hard facts of this world, John saw, as the fifth seal was opened, "under the altar the souls of them that had been slain for the word of God, and for the testimony which they held." Therefore the fighting Church makes known the victory of its saints, the splendour of its cloud of witnesses. Therefore the fighting Church knows that she always includes the saints above and the saints below, those that have fallen asleep in Christ and those that are now fighting in the army of God. "Pray, and time stands still. . . . Pray, and while you pray you partake of the eternal rest of the saints" (Vilmar).

The victory of the Church is a message of the fighting Church. "Cinderella" wrinkled and stained is even now bursting forth into splendour with the radiant glory of the coming victory. If the Church shrinks from her victory, then she must shrink in fear from the fight that has been laid upon her, for then it could but consist of that entirely respectable and unending series of defeats in the fight with oneself. The certain hope of the resurrection of the flesh, the radiant faith that all graves will open in one and the same hour, and that those that believed will enter the eternal light all together, hand in hand, to see that they believed on earth, all this sustains us in the fight of which Luther has written in his Easter hymn :

" 'Twas a wondrous war I trow,
 Life and death together fought,
 But life hath triumphed o'er his foe,
 Death is mocked, and set at nought.
 Yes, 'tis as the Scripture saith,
 Christ through death hath conquered death.
 Hallelujah ! "

The Risen One says, "All authority has been given unto me in heaven and on earth." Of the Beast, which we call

the Antichrist, has been said (he cannot say it himself), "And it was given unto him to make war with the saints, and to overcome them: and there was given unto him authority over every tribe and people and tongue and nation" (Rev. xiii. 7).

At exactly the same place the word of God says, "*Here is the patience and the faith of the saints*" (Rev. xiii. 10). And "out of the altar" from which the Lord Christ gives us His holy body to eat and holy blood to drink ("So that not only our soul and spirit, but also our flesh and blood should enjoy His grace, goodness, kindness and glory in all eternity"—J. Mathesius, 1568) speaks "the voice of another angel" to us, "*Yea, O Lord God, the Almighty, true and righteous are Thy judgments*" (Rev. xvi. 7). We, the Church Militant, hear that voice.

Worship

THE REV. J. C. HIRST, M.A.

(*Rector of Haworth.*)

(This paper was prepared to introduce a discussion at the monthly meeting of ministers at Haworth in March, 1941.)

“ANYBODY can make sermons, but it takes a saint of God to lead the worship of the people.” (W. B. Selbie, quoted in “Christian Worship” ed. N. Micklem, p. 241.)

There is no need to labour the point regarding the importance of the subject which I am to try to introduce. I shall try to treat it from a severely practical point of view, since we are all called to lead frequently the worship of a congregation. Unhappily, it cannot be treated “objectively,” and this paper must be to some extent a confession of one’s own ideals. The quotation above is a good starting point, though I would not credit “anybody” with such ability to make sermons. It is, however, certain that it is good for people to be moved by stirring discourse, but better far to be led in giving themselves to God by adoring and thankful worship. After all, Herod heard John Baptist preach, and heard him gladly, but in his case there was no worship in which the life was dedicated to God, as the necessary climax of the glad hearing.

Let it be said then, first, that no disparagement of preaching is implied in this short paper; and next, that it assumes various methods as permissible in worship. To this duty of worship and of leading worship however, we unconsciously bring not merely preferences, but deep-rooted prejudices. If in what is here written undue preference seems to be given to liturgical worship, it can be attributed to the fact that the Book of Common Prayer is part of my very life.

I. *What is Worship?* There are at least two things which must be noted: (a) awareness of God; (b) a fitting response on our part to this awareness.

Christian Worship means that the God of whom we are aware is the God and Father of Our Lord Jesus Christ, in whom we have free access to the Father ; and means too that the response on our part is the response of man's spirit, or rather (to use a more modern expression) of the *whole* man, and all this is on the plane and within the realm of truth as opposed to both unreality and error.

In this way, using worship in this sense, we realize that in it we are serving God, and that the act of worship is rightly called "divine service." Remembrance of this would "fræmony a blunder free us." Our worship is an offering to God and is not primarily (perhaps not secondarily) for the conscious satisfaction of the worshippers ; such satisfaction comes indeed, but is incidental.

It is further something which is of *obligation*. In the grand and simple words of the Church of England Catechism, "My duty towards God is to worship Him. . . ." Though private devotions, family worship, and the worship of smaller fellowships within the larger fellowship all contribute to the great offering of the Church's worship, we can now only think of public worship as that phrase is usually understood.

2. *AWARENESS of God's presence.* How is this to be obtained ? For one thing, the place of meeting should be suggestive of God's presence and help greatly towards awareness. The very arrangement of the house of prayer can help. Reverent use of this suggestiveness is to be commended, and may well be carried much further than in the past. There is no virtue in bareness, and I often wonder whether it is not a psychological mistake—however justifiable on other grounds—to build a place of worship as a preaching house. This suggestion may provoke dissent, but to set the man who leads the worship in eminence in the centre is questionable, and the implication that worship consists in hearing sermons is not one which will win much assent.

At once, however, we need to supplement this statement with the fine words of the Evangelical poet Cowper :

For Thou, within no walls confined,
Inhabitest the humble mind. . . .

While bareness (and its opposite) cannot guarantee spiritu-

ality, the reverent mind of the worshipper is always of first rate importance.

Posture, too, means something. There is much to be said for the bowed head and kneeling, in these days when reverence is so hard to ensure. I say this, too, as one who cannot kneel much in private prayer. What I can, perhaps, call picturehouse behaviour, and inattention, are enemies against which we must fight with every means at our disposal.

I may say at this point that I find no use for much of the traditional apparatus of devotion, e.g., the crucifix and dim religious light. Yet I wonder whether we ought not to try to find some Protestant equivalent for the Stations of the Cross, both for artistic reasons and even more for stimulus to devotion.

3. *Our response to awareness of God.* Here it is fitting to remember the words of Habakkuk and Isaiah, "The Lord is in His Holy Temple; let all the earth keep silence before Him." "With (two wings the seraph) did cover his face, with twain he did cover his feet and with twain he did fly." Silent adoration may often be more fitting than the noisy action which generally passes for worship. The demand for bustle and even boisterousness in worship which is sometimes made is misguided and needs correction by Biblical standards. At the opposite end, we can ask (with the late Dean Beching) whether St. Paul can be imagined as giving a place to the ceremoniarium in his list of the officers of the Church.

A. This leads naturally to consideration of the place of *silence* in worship. It has to be remembered that worship is not a one-way street; it is not merely what *we* do, what *we* bring to God in our prayers and praise, it is also concerned with what God brings to us, and this comes not only in the reading and through the preaching of His Word, but in those precious times of silence which the untrained find so trying and awkward because they do not know how to use them.

Here the Quakers have much to teach us; and we are often not only afraid to experiment, but even hindered by the dead weight of custom and a rather unintelligent traditionalism.

At the same time, the Quaker method *by itself* involves a great refusal of all the rich heritage of the past, with (a) its

positive discovery and its wealth of devotional experience and expression, and (b) its wholesome check on the possibility of error.

Is it a fair analogy to say that, e.g., in arithmetic, the children of each generation are not left to set out with no multiplication tables, which they must grope for and devise by dint of their own sharp wits ?

B. Most people would probably pass by the question of the value of silence, and would seek to tackle the problem of the rival merits of liturgical and extempore prayer. Our fathers often treated these two methods as mutually exclusive and argued the question on that assumption. Whatever our own practice or preference, we should be ready *in principle* to accept both methods.

As one who prefers the liturgical for a foundation along with some opportunity for the extempore, I offer the following observations.

(1) We are not expected to extemporize hymns, so why *must* we extemporize prayers ? In the early Church at the Eucharist, there was opportunity for both liturgical and "free" prayer, but "free" prayer was before long the privilege of "Prophets" only. To me, it seems to put an almost intolerable burden on the leader of worship—not least on the average lay preacher—if prayer is to be comprehensive, generally helpful to the devotion of all the people, and with the dignity worthy of its high purpose. If all could pray at all times as some can pray sometimes the case would be different ; but I feel strongly that some preparation of prayers is necessary where "free" prayer is the rule, and we have no right to rush into the presence of God without much and deep thought about the words to be used to express the petitions of a congregation.

(The "topical" is as undesirable in prayer as it is in preaching, in both cases it is best used sparingly.)

(2) There is such a thing as perfection of form in prayer as much as in poetry. When we paraphrase poetry we often feel the bathos of it, but within limits it has its use. In the C. of E. Catechism, we have in the "Desire" a paraphrase of the Lord's Prayer, but in actual devotion, private or public, there is no doubt as to which words we use. **The**

perfect expression is something which wears, bears much repetition and is capable of great adaptation to varied circumstances.

(3) Spontaneity and sincerity are not certainties when we pray extempore, and formality is not a certainty when we use a liturgy ; this is not the only danger to be feared, and those are not the only virtues to be desired. There is, e.g., a need for restraint in public worship, and for thought for the *general* needs of a congregation which would be less needed in a prayer meeting.

(4) Here again the method used is far less important than the heart of the worshipper.

C. The *place of song* in worship is beyond dispute, but in practice there is often much difficulty. There is to me a clear difference between the type of hymn and music to be used in "Divine Service" and that used in what is purely evangelistic. Perhaps this point may be better expressed, but I hold the distinction to be real ; and difficulty can and does arise when people are asked to leave the more elementary type of worship and grow up to the higher.

Also "hearty" singing is sometimes only *lusty*, and if so it is irreverent. "Enjoying ourselves" in our worship is a minor consideration when we offer our praise to God, and though it is applied it is a false standard to apply.

Words and tunes of hymns need much more careful sorting and choice than we are wont to give them. We are told on the authority of Robert Bridges that there are not one hundred best hymns in our language, not even 100 good ones. Without setting our standard quite so high, we can think some hymns not very suitable for a general congregation as being too individual or too subjective for regular use ; as an instance I give with real diffidence and regret Dr. Bonar's hymn, "I heard the voice of Jesus say . . ." We should try to keep our hymn-singing free from unreality and insincerity, and such hymns can only be used sparingly. Then there are some popular hymns which are too sentimental to deserve the place which they have got in worship ; again with diffidence I give as an instance "Safe in the arms of Jesus," which is (to say no more) hardly virile enough for the needs of the average congregation.

4. I will try to make some practical suggestions as this paper is brought to its close.

(a) We must train our people more definitely in worship ; mere exhortation will not do. We must begin in Sunday School where far too little on this line has been attempted in the past. The opening and closing of School are too often rather perfunctory and should be made periods of real worship. With the general congregation, we can expound the meaning of hymns, which are often sung with little intelligence. Our frequent use of the Lord's Prayer makes us need to be far more careful in its use, and its repetition should be much slower. Similar lines of training will be found as we make the effort.

(b) We must urge the *obligation* of worship, and the need both for keeping in practice and for making progress. Too often people tend to make their worship depend on their inclination " if they feel like it," but our duty to our Father is independent of our changing whims and should be rendered accordingly. It is as natural, as easy and as hard for a man to worship as it is for him to walk ; the power to walk can be lost through disease or weakness but also through refusal to use it. Worship cannot be treated otherwise ; the parallel is clear.

(c) We have to urge that worship is a *joint venture* of the leader and congregation ; it is not something done by another for the edification of a congregation and it can not be deputed. I find the Litany very valuable in this respect, particularly in war time, and I trust it will never be allowed to go back into comparative disuse. Any " pattern " which gives a congregation a definite share, something to do, in worship, is worth consideration.

(d) I find the Christian Year most valuable for the guidance it gives in such things as choice of hymns ; its guidance in choice of lessons where none are prescribed (in the Free Churches) ought to be welcomed. This guidance will help towards balance and fullness of both worship and the presentation of the whole faith. In spite of prejudice against it in some quarters, I feel that neither this nor the Liturgy should be dismissed *merely* because of ecclesiastical prejudice. They are part of the rightful heritage of *all* Christians.

(e) To me, the Collect form in prayer is a fine model and standard ; in extempore prayer, I always want to approximate to it. The unity of thought, the restrained fervour, and the unobtrusive dignity of diction of the Prayer Book Collects are things to aim at ; and we need to remember that we are heard in prayer neither for our much speaking nor for our fine speeches.

(f) We may be compelled by sheer force of circumstances to concentrate far more on the Sacramental services, which the B.B.C. cannot provide. This may or may not go against the grain, but there is the hard fact. Even here, however, there may be great gain, for the two Sacraments of the Gospel are the focus of all which is distinctively Christian in faith and worship. Of the Lord's Supper, Dr. C. H. Dodd writes : " In this Sacrament the whole of what our religion means is expressed. That which otherwise we apprehend piecemeal is integrated in a rite which presents it all as the sheer gift of God " (Christian Worship, p. 82).

(g) We come back at the close to the quotation with which we began. Whatever method we use, " it takes a saint of God to lead the worship of the people." The great preparation for the leader of worship is a life near to God, ' very far ben ' ; and there is hardly less need for a similar preparation on the part of those whose worship he leads.

Why are Men not more Religious ?

THE REV. A. W. PARSONS, L.TH.

(*Vicar of St. John's, Boscombe.*)

MAN is "incurably religious"; his hunger for peace, for final knowledge; for a key to the mysteries; for an anodyne against pain and sorrow, is inextinguishable. Many of us may have preached on Ecclesiastes vi. 7; iii. 11 literally rendered: "All the labour of man is for his mouth, and yet the soul is not filled. Also He hath set Eternity in their heart." I have always been supported in my own ministry by the conviction that men carry within their breasts immortal souls which yearn for God like exiles for their native air. Nevertheless these cravings assume different forms according to the prevailing pre-occupations of the age. And this is a hustling age in which initiative, energy and "punch" are prized above quieter graces—an age in which quick and visible results are demanded. It is an age, too, in which all men have received some education and some share in government—an age, therefore, in which men are accustomed to do some thinking for themselves and are apt to want "plain answers to plain questions" as well as "practical solutions to difficulties."

Most men to-day are more or less interested in religion. One small indication is that the parson is not avoided so much as he used to be. There is also a widespread instinctive admiration for the human character and ethics of Christ. But these friendly gestures do not often imply any great interest in institutional Christianity. I am most thankful for the men who do attend Church, but a much larger number give little or no support to it. I believe that a very large number of men are definitely anxious that the Church should continue to exist and flourish. In their own language they consider that it is "good for the kids" and "keeps the old woman out of mischief" and they will even admit that it

fulfils a useful function in the national life as at the King's Coronation, but they see no reason why they should support it actively.

No doubt there are growing numbers of human associations which may be said to have some kind of Christian ethic and which capture the allegiance of men, such as Freemasonry, the Labour Movement and various forms of charitable work. Many of those who are most active in philanthropic work rarely darken a Church door, though, on the other hand, most of the keenest supporters of such work are to be found, I think, amongst the more enthusiastic members of the Church.

When I was in Leicester I was put on a Committee appointed by the Bishop which carried out an intensive inquiry into the position in the Diocese with regard to men's work. Among other matters a questionnaire was sent out to every one of the 243 beneficed incumbents. Ninety-five per cent. of the replies were emphatic that there is no apparent hostility to church or religion and little or no anti-christian propaganda. Nearly all regard the majority of men as *friendly and indifferent*.

It is enough for most men to be content to believe that "we are all going to the same place." Many of them feel that their lives do not square with the teaching of Christ and while their consciences do not permit them to become or continue active members in the Church, they are not prepared to make the necessary surrender.

WHAT ARE THE CAUSES OF THIS GENERAL RELATION OF MEN TO THE CHURCH?

1. *Our unhappy divisions and differences of opinion within the Church* are often considered unworthy of it and they leave the impression that no guidance that is of value is to be found in Christianity as it is set forth by the Church.

Many men have told me that the Church is engaged in continual bickering and appears to be wanting in loyalty to its leaders. The Bishops in their Lambeth Letter, 1930, declared that this generation is "looking for leaders and will follow if given a lead which is both sane and daring." Yet as we look around we see Christian groups feverishly manœuvring to maintain their positions in the midst of a civilization

which does not recognize the Christian community as a decisive or even important factor in the realization of its destiny. The Church to-day appears at least on the surface to put more faith in manipulation and adjustment than in the possibility of individual and social transformation and recreation. "The most characteristic 'Christian' response to the problems of the modern world," writes the Editor of "The Student World," "can best be described by the word 'manœuvre,' rather than by the word 'message' and in the game of manœuvre between civilization and the Christian community civilization will win hands down." The strategy of manœuvring to attract interest and retain adherents has failed. The strategy of message was being tried before the war to some extent through the emphasis on Evangelism, but to affirm a message is infinitely more difficult than to plan a manœuvre, especially to a Church that on the whole has been more interested in Modernity than in the Word of God.

2. *Many appear to want a simpler, more practical and less ecclesiastical Christianity.* They find Church services dull though there is little evidence that freer and less ecclesiastical services make a greater appeal. Large regular men's meetings which were a feature in almost every denomination to some extent before the last war are now mostly things of the past.

3. We found in Leicester, and particularly this was voiced by the large representative Diocesan Committee of Laymen, a very great number of *complaints about the autocracy of the clergy and the conservatism of some congregations.* It was frequently stated in the discussions in the R.D. Conferences that "laymen are not wanted by the clergy," and that congregations do not go out of their way to welcome newcomers to the Great Fellowship. It became more serious when a member of the National Assembly complained bitterly in public of the pitiable position in which laymen find themselves in the Assembly and of the failure of the Church to implement its promises that the Enabling Act would mean a great opportunity for the laity.

4. These arguments are not strong ones but they are probably all expressive to some extent of *the disappointment and dissatisfaction left behind by the last Great War.* The pursuit of pleasure has left multitudes "fed up"—their

hearts are not satisfied. What was hoped for after the last war was "a land fit for heroes to live in" and "a decent time for decent men" and many have the idea that the Christian Church ought to have brought this about. If we fail again after this war we must not be surprised if judgment begins at the House of God.

5. *We have to face the fact that the spread of education* has not removed ignorance about religion but may have increased it. Walter Lippmann in "A Preface to Morals," pp. 12, 19, said: "This is the first age, I think, in which the circumstances of life have conspired with the intellectual habits of the time to render any fixed and authoritative belief incredible to large masses of men. . . . The irreligion of the modern world is radical to a degree for which there is, I think, no counterpart."

Education is far more secularized to-day than formerly. The authority of the Bible is commonly supposed to have been undermined. While science and philosophy are known to have disproved or rendered unnecessary, some things that were once accepted as true, men are not generally aware that philosophy and science are helping theology to re-think and re-interpret its old beliefs. Men are not sufficiently educated in religious matters to enable them to appreciate the Church's answer to modern perplexities and on the other hand their education has gone too far to enable them to be content to obey authority without question. Many of them decide to leave Christianity alone as something which is not really connected with the lives they live, the aspirations they possess and the difficulties they meet.

6. As further reasons for the alienation of men from institutional religion, *economic and social causes* are in a very, different category to those I have already mentioned, but probably more real hostility has been roused against the Church on these, than on any other grounds.

The Church is still widely condemned as the Church of a class which acquiesces in social wrongs rather than face unpopularity.

Some men feel that they must labour so hard for the meat that perishes that they have no time for religion. Others, driven by modern competition to methods of business that are doubtfully honest consider it hypocrisy to profess a religion that condemns such methods.

7. *We must place in another category the arrival of a rival faith.*

Here allow me to quote from the present Bishop of Gloucester: "Secularism as a belief in humanity stands for a point of view that, in any Christian sense, simply leaves God out. It permits indeed that sincere interest in religion which has been noted above . . . a non-credal and only mildly Christian religion . . . sufficiently vague not to commit anyone to the Way of Life which the N.T. demands, yet with enough in it to satisfy the religious instinct of mankind. It holds that "spiritual things" are uncertain; we cannot be sure what is true or whether anything is true. On the other hand the world is real or seems to be so; it is also very interesting. And so, men's minds are completely occupied with the study of the world and with maturing life—which is also something certain and definite as convenient and comfortable as may be. Science, because of its practical value; and the improvement of life are sufficient of themselves to occupy the mind of an intelligent person, and he need not trouble any further." Such views encourage a "religion of healthy mindedness"; a worship of fresh air and physical health. Motoring before the present war had opened a new world for thousands, and the disappearance of the old tradition of Sunday Observance gave the opportunity for its exercise. Any qualms of conscience are satisfied on Sundays with the music of the wireless and the gramophone and an occasional wireless service that can be "turned off" if it prove not completely satisfactory to the listener.

8. Our generation has inherited a traditional connection with the Church—a tradition which has made men anxious, for example, that their children shall not have a purely secular education—but *they are not handing on this tradition* to the generation now in its twenties, nor are they concerned that their children lack it. This, I venture to suggest, is as serious a menace as any in the present situation.

9. Two other points may help us in forming our estimate of the present situation. There are undoubtedly many men who feel that their *views on social subjects*, such as the limitation of families by artificial means, divorce and such habits as betting and gambling, are condemned by the Church. As a result they either regretfully excommunicate themselves rather than question their impression of the standards of

morality of the Church or they withdraw rather defiantly from membership in a society whose standards appear to be "behind the times."

Other men who remain outside have told me that *the Church is more concerned with its own maintenance* and about securing itself than with giving men life more abundantly. I do not believe this is true, but I often feel that indications to the contrary are not as obvious as they ought to be in our general Church life.

10. Finally, is there no truth at all in the very common plea: "I am no worse than those who go to Church?" The Clergy are all troubled by the weak lives of Church members. It is our greatest trouble. Many do not seem to live really changed lives. Here I am not thinking solely of "sudden conversion," but rather of what is meant by the "daily increase in the Holy Spirit." A great many years ago the late Bishop Gore declared that "what we need is not more Christians but better Christians." We may admit, as we do most thankfully, that in such a crisis as that which took the country by surprise regarding the monarchy, there are moral qualities in the character of the English Nation which enable us to judge soundly and behave reasonably to a degree which compels the respect of other nations. We are very thankful also that our Nation was so ready and united when the present war became a necessity. The Christian principle: "We that are strong ought to bear the infirmities of the weak," was the underlying factor in determining the Nation's willingness to support the Government. The behaviour of our people in the areas exposed to enemy action is also beyond all praise. But when we have said all that can be said in praise of our people is it not true even of many inside our Churches that there is a marked decline in the need for communion with the Unseen, for God and for His worship, and also that there is a parallel decline in the sense of obligation amongst professing Christians to their religious duties and a contentment with very low standards of spiritual attainment, and "if the righteous scarcely be saved where shall the ungodly and sinners appear?" Christopher Dawson, speaking of the modern man, declares that he "has not consciously denied the Christian tradition, he has simply lost sight of it in his concentration on material progress. His loss of faith is due

not so much to a change of belief as to a change of attention—a turning away of the mind from spiritual to temporal things, which causes a blunting of the spiritual perceptions and a darkening of the soul.”

I have not indicated any remedies for the situation as regards the relationship of men to religion. But I ought, I imagine, to remind you that we have in the Church and outside it many organizations which aim at reaching or retaining men. There is the C.E.M.S.

It was widely used between 1903-14 when it found its way into 5,000 parishes. In the latter year its maximum membership was reached (131,500). Just before the present war it stood at about 25,000. The last war deprived the branches of their normal recruits over a period of at least four years, and, through the absence of men from the parishes, caused many branches to suspend their working. After the war the P.C.C.'s rendered the Society unnecessary for administrative purposes and most men, especially the younger ones, sought fellowship through organizations like Toc H, the British Legion and the like which are based on comradeship in arms. Recently the Youth Fellowship has captured some young men, but my late colleague who shared with the Bishop's Chaplain responsibility for the Diocesan Youth Fellowship told me that he had been appalled at the fewness of young men in the movement.

The Y.M.C.A., the Rover Scouts and a few scattered Men's Meetings, Clubs and Bible Classes in the parishes probably sum up the total of the Church's approach to men. The slogan of the Modern Church appears to be: "Instead of thy fathers thou shalt have children" and

"In the World's broad field of battle
In the Christian Field of Strife,
You will find the Christian soldier
Represented by his wife."

I do not think I am unduly stressing this relative paucity of men. I am sure that if we are to have a revival we must do far more than we have been doing to reach men.

Our Sunday School figures show that we are losing the children. I think it is because we have lost the men to such a large extent.

Will our Churches be equipped and ready to welcome the men after the present war?

I mention in conclusion one or two methods of approach to men which have been found helpful.

One method which is proving successful in many parishes is through the creation of a "cell" in the parish—a little group of men in close touch with the Vicar or some other leader who is training them for witness and for winning others. Some have found that grouped gatherings of men are useful. They should be from four or five parishes and should meet in a series of joint services on a week night to discuss such definite subjects as "Personal Christian Life," "The Meaning of Discipleship" and "Why men do come to Church."

Others have started a small school for Lay Witnesses who are taught "What to say" and "How to say it," while a great friend of mine keeps his laymen busy visiting for him in a new area where new people are always arriving.

We can also encourage our own men to work for the outsider in the open air in summer and through special lectures and services in the winter.

I need hardly add that I do not ask you to agree with me in all that I have written, but if you are at all satisfied that the Church's work amongst men needs to be strengthened I hope that what I have tried to write may help you to think about this matter and so assist us all to find some way of reaching more men for Christ and His Church.

The Holy Communion in the Early Church

THE REV. F. R. MONTGOMERY HITCHCOCK, D.D.
(The first half of this essay was published in the April-June
number of "The Churchman.")

JUSTIN MARTYR.

WE now come to a writer who has been described as a disciple of the apostles (ep. ad Diogn.); "a man not far from the apostles in time or virtue." (Methodius in Phot. cod. 247).

Justin was converted from paganism in A.D. 133 and was martyred at Rome A.D. 163-167. He wrote his first apology between 138 and 150 (Gwatkin). The Dialogue with Trypho was written later. He had been a philosopher, and looked upon many things from a philosopher's standpoint. He gives an account of Baptism, the Lord's Supper, and the Sunday morning service at Rome in his day to the Roman Emperor (Apology I. 63. 65). The following extracts are of great interest and importance (I. 65). "We salute each other with a kiss when the prayers are ended. Then is brought (*prospheretai*) to the president of the brethren a loaf (bread) and a cup of water and (mixed) wine (*Krama*) and he takes it, and offers up praise and glory to the Father of all, through the name of the Son and the Holy Spirit, and makes a lengthened thanksgiving (*eucharistia*) for these favours vouchsafed to them. When he hath ended the prayers and the thanksgiving (*eucharist*) all the people present respond "Amen." When the president has made his thanksgiving and all the people present have responded, the deacons, as we call them, give to everyone present a *portion of the bread and wine and water* for which thanks have been given. (Note that they are still called, after consecration, bread and wine.) They also take away a portion for the absent ones. And this nourishment (*trophe*) is called by us *eucharist*, and it is not lawful for anyone to partake of it but a believer, and one who has been washed with the washing for the forgiveness of

sins and the new birth, and is living according to Christ's commandments. For not as *common* bread and *common* drink do we receive these things, but as through the Word of God our Saviour after His Incarnation took flesh and blood for our salvation, even so also the food for which thanksgiving has been made through the word of prayer that is from Him¹ (or through prayer in His Word), the food from which our blood and flesh are nourished by *digestion* (*metabole* does not refer here to change of elements but to assimilation of food), we have the right to regard as the *flesh and blood of that Jesus* who became incarnate. For the apostles in the memoirs which they made, and which are called gospels, so reported that the order was given to them, that Jesus took bread and gave thanks and said, "This do in remembrance of me, *that is my body*" (*toutesti*, explanatory) and that He likewise took the cup and gave thanks and said, "This is my blood," and gave it only to them. This the evil demons imitated commanding it to be done in the mysteries of Mithras, for that a loaf and a cup of water are set forth with certain formulæ in the initiation ceremonies² you either know or can learn."

THE SUNDAY SERVICE (C. 67).

"And on the so-called day of the Sun a meeting is held of all of us who live in cities or country, and the memoirs of the apostles or the writings of the prophets are read as long as time permits. Then, when the reader has ceased, the president (*ho proestos*) (presiding elder)³ gives in a sermon both admonition and exhortation to follow these good things. Then we all rise together and offer prayers and, as I said before, when we have finished the prayer, bread is brought (*prospheretai*) and wine and water, and the president likewise offers prayers and *thanksgivings* (*eucharistiae*) to the best of his ability,⁴ and the people respond with their "Amen."

¹ "Through the prayer of the word which is from Him." The Lord's Prayer. (*di' euches logou tou par' autou*).

² Mithraism or sun worship was popular with soldiers. It had ablutions and a bread and water ritual (see Cumont).

³ This title is in 1 Tim. v. 17, "the elders who preside well" (*proestotes*).

⁴ *Hosè dynamis autò*. This may prove that the prayers were either extempore or memorized. They don't seem to have been read. The liturgy was not yet formulated. They had the Lord's Prayer of course

Then follows the distribution and *partaking*¹ of the things² for which thanks were given (the bread, wine and water) and a portion is sent by the deacons to the absent ones. The well-to-do and the willing give as they intend, and the collection is deposited with the president, who himself succours the orphans and widows and those who are in want through sickness, or any other cause, and strangers and sojourners. In a word, he is the guardian of the needy."

There are several points to be noted in this account of the Church services.

(1) The *Agape* is not mentioned. Its place has evidently been taken by the distribution of food and other things to the needy by the president in their district. (2) There is no fixed order or canon of consecration, if there is any consecration at all. The president offers praise and glory to the Father through the name of the Son and the Holy Ghost, and *gives thanks at length*. At the end of his *thanksgivings* (*eucharistiae*) the people say Amen. The second account states that the president offers prayers and *thanksgivings* (*eucharistiae*) *to the best of his ability*, doubtless extemporizing as in the former case. There was no fixed formula evidently at the time. (3) There is no idea here of *oblation* of any sort. The verb used with the prayers, "*send up*"³ is not in the Greek Bible at all; and has no sacrificial connection in New Testament, being only used of sending people about or back. The bread is *distributed* by others and presented to the president. It could not mean "is offered,"⁴ as the president receives it, and he is not Deity. But he says the prayer and thanksgiving for it. (4) The bread and wine are still bread and wine, after thanksgiving has been made for them, but no longer "*common*" (*Koinos*), that is, they are to be used for no ordinary purpose. He does not call them "Holy" or "Sanctified." One may render the participle *eucharistethis* of the bread, wine and water "set apart by the thanksgiving." It does not mean "consecrated."⁵ The substance "bread" remains, as Pusey pointed

¹ *metatepsis*, this word is also in Irenaeus for the Communion.

² *ta eucharistethenta* (1) The things for which thanks (eucharist) were given, (2) over which the eucharistic prayer had been said (Pusey). There is no proof that one special eucharistic prayer had been drawn up at the time.

³ *anapempein*.

⁴ *prospheretai*.

⁵ See Irenaeus IV. 18.4. "Bread over which thanks have been made anem in quo gratiae actae sunt).

out. There is no transubstantiation. (5) Some of it is carried away at once by the deacons to the absent members, presumably to be consumed by them at once. There is no "reservation" here. (6) It is more than probable that one of the passages read from "the memoirs of the apostles called gospels" contained the institution of the Lord's Supper, which Justin gives in the Lukan form. The president also possibly referred to it, but this is not stated, in his prayer and thanksgivings. This is the earliest reference to the words of Institution. No doubt they had always been used from the days of St. Paul.

(7) The Three Persons of the Trinity, Father, Son and Holy Ghost, are mentioned together. Praises are offered to God the Father of all through the Son and the Holy Spirit. Compare the closing words of one of the oldest liturgical relics outside the Scriptures, the Gloria in Excelsis. "Thou only art Holy, thou only art the Lord; thou only O Christ, with the Holy Ghost, are most high in the glory of God the Father."

There is evidently no invocation of the Holy Spirit. He is not blessing and changing the bread and wine with which water is blended, but assisting with the Son in the directing of the "praise and glory"—the true sacrifice—to the Father. (8) The wine is mixed with water. Plain wine is not used. (9) The crux of the passage which refers to the Incarnation is the phrase "by way of change" (*kata metabolēn*). Does this mean that there is a change or conversion of the bread and wine into the Body and Blood of Christ? Nothing can be further from the writer's thought, for the water which was used with the wine would also be changed into something. He used *the phrase* of another change altogether, of the change by which the bread and wine as food are converted into our body and blood by the process of digestion (*metabolism*). We have this very phrase of digesting food in Xenophon,¹ where it is used with food (*trophē*) as here: "Our blood and flesh are nourished by digestion" (*kata metabolēn*), or by assimilation. Athenagoras, an imitator of Justin, in his *De Resurrectione* (c. iv) used this word *metabole* of the various actions of *digestion*. So that was Justin's meaning.

¹ Mem. i. 6.6. *trophēn metaballesthai*, possibly also in Ignatius, Mag. X. where "digest the true leaven" seems the best rendering.

The next phrase to settle is, "through the word of God." The phrase in New Testament means (1) written word (O.T. promise), (2) New Testament "Revelation," (3) the Word Incarnate. Now we have a close parallel in 1 Timothy iv. 5, which is much clearer in Greek than in English. "Every creature of God is good, when received with thanksgiving (*eucharistia*); for it is sanctified through the word of God and prayer." Here we have the same phrase as in "Jesus incarnated through the word of God" (*Apol.* I. 65) (*dia logou theou*)¹. In the former passage it is not the Word Incarnate, and so must mean either through the Gospel revelation or the Old Testament promise. In the latter passage some take it to be the logos, but the Holy Spirit in the Scriptures is the agent of the Incarnation (Luke i. 35). Another phrase seemingly parallel is "through a word of prayer that comes from Him,"² or "through a prayer—a word that comes from Him." Otto and Baumgarten-Crusius take it of the Lord's Prayer. Some form of prayer given by Christ was very likely used among the prayers said by the president during the Communion service. It corresponds to the preceding phrase, and so the whole phrase—"the food over which thanksgiving is made through prayer" is parallel to 1 Tim. iv. 5. "Every creature of God is good (for food) when received *with thanksgiving*, for it is sanctified through a word of God and prayer."³ It could not possibly mean *through invocation of the Word*. The words "*from Him*" rule out that and similar renderings. Note the absence of article in the Timothy and Justin passages. As he does not affirm any change in the bread and mixed wine themselves; but alludes to their being changed into our physical system by the process of digestion and assimilation, he could not have believed that they were made actually and literally into the Body of the Lord. What then did he mean by this remark—"As the incarnate Jesus Christ had both flesh and blood, so we were taught that the food, over which thanksgiving is made, is of that same incarnate Jesus both flesh and blood?" Did Justin make every fresh loaf over which thanksgiving is said, identical and co-extensive with, or an addition to

¹ Compare the phrases *dia logou theou sarkopoiethis* and *hagiazetai dia logou theou*.

² *di' euches logou par' autou*.

³ See article *epiklesis* (The Protestant Dictionary) by the present writer.

the flesh and blood—the humanity which Jesus Christ took at His incarnation? The latter alternative would be to read an eighth-century conception (impanation) into the second! In the former case (Harnack), if literal, there is a *reductio ad absurdum* of the Incarnation if every consecrated loaf is the same flesh, that is, the humanity assumed by that Incarnation. The Docetics would have easily exposed that subterfuge, if employed. If, however, he meant that every new loaf *represents* the flesh of Christ, he says what Christ said in His institution of the sacrament, which he (Justin) proceeds to give. He made the bread just what Christ made it in His institution, neither more nor less. And he reasons thus: as Christ was flesh and blood and His body consequently required food like ours, so He made this supper represent His flesh and blood to us, to remind us of Himself. He quotes our Lord's words of institution, of which logic forbids a literal interpretation, and refers to the similar use of bread and water in the mysteries of Mithras, in which, of course, there was no change. In those mysteries there was an *Agape* or feast. According to Cumont¹ there is a monument in which Mithras and the Sun are represented, reclining on a couch with a table before them, on which lies the sacred bread marked with the cross, and both are raising the cup in their right hands. It is a reconciliation scene, but there is no notion of a conversion of bread and wine into the body and blood of Mithras. Looking at this passage again and comparing it with Ignatius, Romans vii. "I wish for the Bread of God which is the Flesh of Christ, of the seed of David, and for drink, His blood, which is immortal love," where the spiritual character of the passage is shown by the concluding words, we note that even if Justin distinguishes between the pre-existent personality of the Word, and the humanity He afterwards assumed, the most he does—assuming for argument's sake that he does it—is to treat the bread and wine after the thanksgiving, as His humanity. This in itself would be very far from the Roman doctrine of transubstantiation, which means that the whole Christ, in both the Divinity and humanity, are in every particle of Bread and every drop of Wine, after consecration, and that the same Christ is on ten thousand altars at the same time. Justin,

¹ Cumont, *Monuments, Intr.* p. 175.

however, does not identify the bread and wine with the humanity Christ assumed. "Word of God," without the article, in this crucial passage is not the Logos or Word of John i. 1. It has not the article which Justin generally used with the Word (Apology, I. 33, 56, 67, 95, etc.), because it is distinguished from Jesus Christ. "Jesus Christ our Saviour being made incarnate *through (the) word of God* took flesh and blood." It might here mean the *reason* of God, but cannot refer to the second Person of the Trinity. Neither is Word—also without article—in the following phrase, "through prayer of a word that is from Him," the Word or Logos of John i. 1, for "a word from Him" can only refer to the teaching of the Word Himself. Gore, Gwatkin and others render "word of prayer." There is, consequently, no foundation for the assumption that Justin is here illustrating a supposed union of the Logos and the sacramental bread and wine by the union of the Logos of Christ with His humanity,¹ he is simply giving the reason why the bread and wine after the thanksgiving (through the word of prayer from Him) are no longer "common bread" and "common beverage." They have been set apart for a certain use, and are called, because of that use, by the names of the things they represent.

Justin's views of the Communion are also set out in this later and more mature *Dialogue with Trypho*. In this Dialogue C. 41. *Dial.* (260B) he takes Malachi i. 11. "In every place incense shall be offered unto my name and a pure offering," as prophetic of the Eucharist, chiefly because the Jewish sacrifices are condemned in the same context. He says, "He is speaking here beforehand of those sacrifices that are being offered by us Gentiles in every place, that is the bread of the Eucharist and the cup of the Eucharist." A similar reference is in 344D. to these things, "the eucharist of the bread and cup" in Malachi i. 11. In a previous passage, 259D., he saw in the oblation of fine flour for those cured of leprosy "a type (*typos*) of the bread of the eucharist, which Jesus Christ our Lord enjoined us to *prepare*² in *remembrance*

¹ Justin used *logos* or word in these senses, reason, word spoken or oracle, the Divine Word, Christ the reason which all humanity shared, Apol. I. 46, the germinant Reason (II. 13). (*logos spermatikos*).

² *poiein*, not "sacrifice" or "offer" but "prepare" here and elsewhere, unless the context has a term for sacrifice. "Do this in remembrance of Me" *not* sacrifice "this."

of His passion (*eis anamnesin*)¹ that we should give thanks to God for having made the world and all that is in it, for man and also for having delivered us from our evil state." This was the *Minchah* or meal offering of Lev. xiv. 21.

In 297A. of the same Dialogue (c. 70) after quoting Isaiah xxxiii, 16, "Bread shall be given him, his waters shall be sure," he says: "In this prophecy there is a clear reference to the bread which our Saviour Christ enjoined us to prepare in remembrance of His having assumed a body (*somato-poiestaschai*) on behalf of the believers for whom He suffered, and to the cup which He enjoined us to prepare with thanksgiving in remembrance of His blood." In this passage the bread and wine are used in remembrance of His Body and Blood. Justin altered the Lord's phrase, "Do this in remembrance of Me" (Luke xxii. 19, 1 Cor. xi. 24) into "in remembrance of my having assumed a body and of my blood." Accordingly, they cannot be His Body and Blood, being only reminders, types of His Body and Blood. In 345 D. 117, in answer to Trypho that God rejected the sacrifices of the dwellers in Jerusalem and only accepted the prayers of the Jews of the *Diaspora*, and that He called their prayers "sacrifices" (*thusiai*), Justin replied, "prayers and thanksgivings made by worthy people are the only sacrifices (*thusiai*) perfect² and pleasing to God. I myself assert. These are the only things Christians have been taught to do³ (celebrate) even at the commemoration (*anamnesis*) of this food both dry and liquid, in which they also remember the passion." And in 346 (118) he says, "At His coming again do not think that Isaiah or the other prophets say that sacrifices of blood or of libations are offered upon the Altar, but true and spiritual praises and thanksgivings." These are the only *thusiai* or sacrifices offered "at the Eucharist of the Bread and the Cup." (344 C.). Here we have Justin's view that the only sacrifices at the Eucharist, which is held in commemoration of God's gifts⁴ and the passion of Christ, are our praises and thanksgivings. This surely shows that he could not have entertained any idea of a physical change in the bread and

¹ See article *anamnesis* (Protestant Dictionary by the present writer.)

² *euchai kai eucharistiai teleiai monai thusiai*.

³ *poiein*, to prepare, not to sacrifice, which meaning would be absurd here. It is the context that fixes its significance.

⁴ *alethinous kai pneumatikous ainous nai eucharistias*.

wine. Their name and use had been altered; but their substance remained. He used the words of Institution, and as he, too, was arguing against Gnostic Docetics, he emphasised "the flesh" of Jesus, without the identification of the bread and wine, after consecration, with the actual body and blood of Jesus.

The Greek Fathers, who had no Hebrew and could not, therefore, perfectly understand the Old Testament, were entirely wrong in comparing the Lord's Supper with the meal offering or *Minchah*. There is absolutely no parallel between them, as the latter consisted of frankincense, oil and flour, was partly burnt and partly eaten by the priests, and the wine offering was quite distinct. However, it furnished them with a useful argument against the Jews that the Jewish sacrifices were rejected in Malachi i. 11, but what they declared without fear of contradiction was that the Scriptural prototype of the Lord's Supper was to be accepted by God. Justin gives no support to the later idea that the Logos or Word (Jesus in His Divine Nature) was united to the consecrated bread and wine as His Body. There were several forms of that theory in later days, such as impanation and augmentation. But they cannot be read into Justin. Again it is clear from his remarks that our blood and flesh are nourished¹ by the Eucharist, being turned by digestion into them, that he could not have conceived of any change in the substance of the elements, which were thus changed into the substance of our bodies. Again (*Dial.* 51) he believed that our Lord by "the fruit of the vine" meant real wine, for he says: "He said that He should come again to Jerusalem and there eat and drink with the disciples." If it was real wine still, after His consecration, is it anything different after man's consecration?

¹ Pusey (*Real Presence*, p. 145) makes this point that the outward part of the sacrament could not nourish our bodies if the substance thereof had been changed into another substance.

Law and Grace

THE REV. H. L. ELLISON, B.D., B.A.

A FEW years ago the annual conference of the German Baptist ministers of Roumania was held in Bucarest. For one of their sessions they invited a prominent representative of Seventh Day Adventism—a very active body in that country—to come and explain his position. As I was desirous of hearing an authoritative exposition of Adventist teaching, I readily obtained permission to be present. We were dumbfounded, when the Adventist began by reading a long extract from a sermon of Spurgeon's on "Sabbath Observance"¹ and saying, "That is our position, except that we in consistent loyalty to the Scriptures keep Saturday and not Sunday." What is more, he was not being unfair. If the views expressed in the sermon were accepted, there would be no Scripturally valid grounds for not keeping Saturday. The chairman gave the only possible answer, "However much we respect and admire Spurgeon, we cannot accept him as an authority, for our sole authority is the word of God."

The moral of this incident is obvious. Legalism has always been one of the subtlest and deadliest foes of true religion, and few there can be that have not at one time or another been affected and weakened by it. If a great preacher and teacher of the grace of God like Spurgeon could on occasion use language calculated to rejoice the heart of an extreme legalist, it only serves to show how real the danger for each one of us must be.

Legalism was after all the cause of the first great controversy in the Church.

If anyone doubts that it is a rank and gross offence before God, he need only ponder our Lord's scathing attacks on the Pharisees. It cannot be too deeply regretted

¹ The extract was read from the authoritative German translation of Spurgeon's sermons, but I have not been in a position to check up the English title of the sermon in question.

that ὑποκριτής was very early misinterpreted and mistranslated (if we may use the term of a transliteration) as hypocrite. We suspect it was due in all sincerity to men in whom the leaven of the Pharisees had done a deadly work, though they knew it not. We have no doubt that Lukyn Williams is correct, when he argues for the translation "play-actor."¹ Our Lord was not condemning that deception by which evil men would fain deceive others, but that self-deception by which sincere men deceive themselves to their own destruction. The Pharisee wished to be well-pleasing to God, and he played the part of the good man (and he played it well, too), until he had persuaded himself, and most others, that he was good and well-pleasing to God. If any one doubts this interpretation of the Pharisees, let him ponder the fact that though hypocrisy is a sin universally detested and easily detected, the Pharisees were through generations looked up to as the religious leaders of Israel.

Legalism is peculiarly harmful, for by it it is just the noble and upright who are blinded until the wonder of the grace of God becomes meaningless to them. All who have had to do with the legalist, whether Jew or Gentile, whether bound by the Law of Moses or that of his church, or by the law of his conscience or of humanitarian ethics, will have found a peculiar obtuseness, which simply cannot grasp the meaning of grace. Even if the language of Scripture is accepted, it is twisted in some way and emptied of its true meaning.

Legalism would be evil enough, if this were all the harm it does, but its pernicious influence is much more far-reaching. Our Lord warned His disciples, "Take heed, beware of the leaven of the Pharisees and the leaven of Herod."² "The leaven of the Pharisees" is the leaven of religious legalism. For every one that openly espouses and preaches legalism in one of its many forms, there must be at least a hundred subtly influenced and poisoned by it. It may even be maintained that legalism in its aspect as leaven is more harmful and deadly than in its direct and undiluted form. Legalism is always liable to break down under the stress of overmastering sin, and it has no comfort to bring the heart crying aloud in the dark for God's mercy and grace. When it works as a subtle leaven, it flatters that side in human nature that

¹ *Talmudic Judaism and Christianity.*

² Mark viii. 15.

welcomes legalism, but still seems to leave room for the grace of God, and so the victim does not realize his disease. There must be myriads suffering from the influence of legalism who do not realize it, and who would probably be indignant, if told so.

This subtle working of legalism can be easily observed by those with eyes to see in "evangelical" Christianity, quite irrespective of denomination; it is probably the main reason why it is so often so ineffective in the world to-day. To-day the preaching of the cross is as much a stumbling-block and foolishness as it was in the days of the Apostles. There is no more reason to expect any overwhelming response to-day, when the Crucified Christ is preached, than there was at Corinth. Now as then, the messenger of Christ should be not only "a sweet savour of Christ unto God . . . from life unto life in them that are being saved," but also "from death unto death in them that are perishing."¹ Unfortunately so many to-day seem to be neither. There is apparently a certain quality lacking in their message and life, without which they rouse neither enthusiasm nor opposition, and we attribute that lack very largely to the subtle poison of legalism.

The reasons for this widespread influence of legalism are not hard to find. The way is often prepared for it in earliest childhood. Almost all children—we might perhaps say all but a few victims of extreme psychological and pedagogic theories—are brought up to a greater or less degree on "You must do this" and "You mustn't do that." It is difficult to see how this could be avoided, especially in the child's earliest and most impressionable years. With all due respect to certain psychologists, it is very doubtful whether any harm at all is done, provided that those that do the commanding have won the love of the child and are really trying to understand him and help him. Thus with few exceptions children grow up with the idea of law accompanying them at every step. The effect on the child of this realization will depend entirely on the way in which he has been made aware of it. Unfortunately, where there is still religious training and teaching given, most children are introduced to God first of all as the great Ruler and Law-

¹ 2 Corinthians ii. 15, 16.

giver, and not as the great Lover ; they are expected to obey God before they have learnt to love Him. Many parents and teachers too have been and still are sufficiently short-sighted or lacking in knowledge of God to use the Divine authority to reinforce their own insufficient moral authority. Inevitably the child comes to look on God's law and God's will as something arbitrary. To conceive of God's law as something arbitrary and then to *obey it*, probably reluctantly, must produce legalism. So it is that most persons brought up with any religious background at all have legalism deeply ingrained in them. It forms part of their subconscious mind, and it is doubtful whether it is ever completely eradicated, even in those granted the deepest insight into the grace of God.

We are convinced that this so frequent wrong introduction to God and His will is, in part at least, the explanation of one of our saddest problems. It has often been commented on with grief how many children of staunch Evangelicals either never arrive at personal faith in Christ, or if they do, it so often is different to that of their parents and untrue to the word of God. We are suggesting that in most cases it is due in the first place to a wrong introduction to God. Its effect is often aggravated as the child grows older. With that keen insight of childhood we so often forget he realizes the contradiction in his parents' lives, a contradiction they are very often ignorant of themselves. With their lips they proclaim the grace of God, but in their lives they are in bondage to law. Influenced as he is by his earliest training the child is naturally inclined to assume that his parents' religion has little meaning or is even only a sham.

A healthy infant's earliest sorrows generally arise from its growing awareness that he is surrounded by other persons and things, which inflexibly limit his still limited desires ; moreover, though the infant is not aware of this, much of this limitation is for his own good. His experience remains essentially the same all through life, though his awareness of it and his reaction to it change. Although we all treasure the certainty that we are free agents, and account liberty one of the greatest of life's boons, yet we all go through life strictly limited—limited by the laws of nature, by the laws of our own make-up, by the laws and customs of the society we live in, by our bodily needs, by the life we have already

lived. Determinism is a purely philosophical concept against which the average mind instinctively revolts, yet the freedom enjoyed by any individual, even the most favoured, is strictly limited.

The reaction of the *average* man to the claims of God are exactly what might be expected. He emphatically and bitterly denies the claim of God's word, that his liberty is an illusion, and that he is but a slave, a slave of sin,¹ that behind his actions, both *good* and bad, sin rears its triumphant head²—"so it is no longer I that do it, but sin that dwelleth in me."³ He has no understanding for and no patience with the view that perfect freedom is the outcome of being perfectly mastered by Christ. To be the "slave" of Jesus Christ holds out no attractions for him. At the same time he is so tied and bound by law, habit and custom in his own life, that the very idea, were it even to occur to him, of his moral and spiritual life being lived without law would be repellent. So it is that he accepts whatever form of moral law and religious custom the period and society enjoin, and that normally with little, if any, hesitation. If he rebels against any part of it, it will normally be found that a considerable section of public opinion condones his action, or even actively supports him.

We have seen how earliest influences, religious training, and the natural inclinations of man all conspire to make a legalist, to a greater or less degree, of him. If we are to understand the baleful influence of legalism we must go further and examine its real meaning. There is unfortunately much misunderstanding on the subject, even among those who unreservedly accept Pauline teaching. This is in part due to the natural depravity of the human heart, which does not want to know and understand, in part to a misunderstanding of the Jewish background of the New Testament.

It is widely believed that the fight between Paul and the "Judaizers" was one about rites and ceremonies only, about the ceremonial law, of which circumcision was the symbol. Paul never repudiated the moral law, so it is said, although this accusation was brought against him. One might have

¹ John viii. 34.

² Romans vii. 14-21.

³ Romans vii. 17.

thought that his epistles were clear enough as to the issue involved, but for those who will not see and understand Jewish teaching ought to be convincing. The Orthodox Jew knew, and knows, nothing of any division of the Law into moral and ceremonial; for him it was an indivisible whole. Naturally he recognized that certain commandments were more important than others, but the deliberate breach of any commandment was equally heinous, even though the consequences might not be equally serious. Further, in the varying divisions of the commandments into "light" and "heavy" whatever the guiding principles may have been, the idea of moral and ceremonial was quite certainly not present.

The pious Jew recognized only three possibilities for a Gentile. He might continue in his heathen ways; he had then no place in "the world to come," and in theory at least would be expelled from a Jewish-controlled Palestine. He might take on himself "the commandments of the sons of Noah," in which case there was at least hope for him in "the world to come"; he was allowed to live in Palestine and could have some measure of intercourse with Jews. These commandments concerned idolatry, blasphemy, murder, incest, robbery, justice, and eating of blood. The first six are supposed to have been revealed to Adam and the seventh to Noah; according to Rabbinic teaching they are binding on all men. The third and only other possibility was for him to take on him the "yoke of the Law" and become an Israelite; the outward signs of his so doing were *circumcision*, baptism, and sacrifice. To a Jew Paul's rejection of circumcision could only have meant one thing; it was not merely the rejection of a ceremonial act, but the repudiation of the whole Law of Moses, moral as well as ceremonial.

To us it seems that this is borne out by the decision of the Council of Jerusalem, ". . . we write unto them that they abstain from the pollutions of idols, and from fornication, and from what is strangled, and from blood."¹ It has been very forcibly argued that "fornication" here is to be understood as marriage within the prohibited degrees, and we do not doubt that this is correct. If it is, we have three of the "commandments of the sons of Noah," idolatry, incest and eating of blood (four if "blood" is taken to mean the shed-

¹ Acts xv. 20.

ding of human blood, but this is unlikely). This can hardly be a mere coincidence. It is easy to see why all were not mentioned. Even if we grant that the full list of seven had been worked out by that time, and this cannot be taken for granted, those left unmentioned were things that could well be assumed in a Christian. This interpretation is rendered the more likely because of the reason given, "For Moses from generations of old hath in every city them that preach him."¹ In order not to offend the Jews the Church would ask the same minimum of the Gentile convert as the Jew asked of "the sons of Noah." But, and this is the important point, the Jew expressly exempted such persons from any obligation to keep any part of the Law of Moses.²

This conception of the unity of the Law is borne out, if indeed it needs further confirmation, by the fact that there is no evidence that any of the Apostles ever rejected any portion of the Law either for themselves or for their Jewish converts. It is true that this charge was brought against Paul,³ but the whole narrative implies that the accusation was false, and if it were not Paul's behaviour would be incomprehensible. The evidence is overwhelming that they kept the Law in a manner sufficiently exact for no valid objection to be raised on that score by their detractors.

Our Lord, too, kept the whole Law without any differentiation into moral and ceremonial. His quarrel with the Scribes and Pharisees was not about ceremonial, but about the "traditions of the elders," the "hedge" they had set about the Law. It was a fixed principle among the Pharisees, dating back long before the time of Christ, that the safest way of safeguarding the 613 commandments of the Law was to surround each with a hedge of man-made commandments. If this hedge were not broken down or climbed over then the commandment it was protecting would be bound to be kept. It was no portion of the Law our Lord rejected, but this "hedge," and so we may presume did His disciples. The Pharisees had not yet succeeded in completely dominating Jewish religion, and so it was easier to reject the "hedge" than it would have been a century later.

¹ Acts xv. 21.

² The very early modification in the "Western" text shows how quickly the true significance of the decision was lost, and an effort made to make it bear a moral character.

³ Acts xxi. 17-26.

We stand then before the fact that Paul with the full approval of the leaders of the Church in Jerusalem rejected the Law of Moses *in toto* so far as his *Gentile* converts were concerned. The anonymous writer to the Hebrews, strongly influenced by Paul, by his insistence on the transitory nature of part of the Law (the sacrificial portion) in fact teaches the transitory nature of the whole Law, and so the Jewish convert, at any rate from the destruction of the Temple, is brought also from under the Law. But can we accept that for the Christian there is no law of any kind, that the moral law has gone the way of the ceremonial?

We use the word "law" in two dissimilar senses. When we speak of the "laws of nature" we now mean (whatever may have been the case in earlier centuries) simply a scientific statement regarding the nature of things and the way they will in consequence act. The laws of gravity are not principles forced on matter by some outside power, but a statement of how matter will act under certain conditions because of its inherent nature. Human laws, whether aesthetic, moral or statutory are in large measure arbitrary and often have no necessity about them. The laws of nature cannot be broken, or rather the person or thing doing so must first change its inherent nature. Human laws can be broken with ease, and often with impunity. When we speak of the "laws of God" we may in fact be using the expression in both senses. They may be an expression of some of the Divine characteristics, a finite statement in human language of some of the ways God must act, just because He is God and cannot deny His nature. Then again we use the expression to refer to certain revelations of God's will, by one channel or another, to man. Then it is a case of laws imposed from without, laws that can be and are broken with ease (though not with impunity) without man ceasing to be man, for these laws are not an essential expression of the nature of man.

Herein is seen in perhaps the clearest light the tragic position of man. He was made in the image of God,¹ and God's law should be an expression of his own nature, only to be heard to be welcomed, to be recognized as that to which his heart was instinctively striving. In fact, the Fall demanded a change in man's nature (for sin is a contradiction

¹ Genesis i. 27.

of the Divine), and the Divine image has been marred, though by the grace of God not completely effaced. So it is that there is much in God's law that is normally welcomed and accepted as natural, and even incorporated in man's own laws. But in every man, in some more, in some less, there is rebellion against the law of God; in some it may seldom receive outward expression, but it is always there. Man feels the law of God to be an external compulsion to which at the best he bows unwillingly. By his rebellion against the law of God man reveals that his nature is not Divine—he is dominated by another force; "it is no longer I that do it, but sin that dwelleth in me."¹ That is why "unless a man be born from above, he cannot see the kingdom of God,"² for "flesh and blood cannot inherit the kingdom of God."³ "Cannot"; it is no arbitrary decision on the part of God, but a statement of fundamental law.

No man uninfluenced by the grace of God can accept this. "No man can come to Me, except the Father . . . draw him."⁴ Men point to "there is so much good in the worst of us" without realizing that God is not really concerned with good and bad. The fact that the good man and the bad man alike, unless it be for the grace of God, are in rebellion against the will of God shows that man is of another nature, that by the very immutable nature of things he cannot have fellowship with God and cannot inherit the kingdom of God; in the light of that fact questions of relative merit lose all meaning. A bad man is simply one in whom the rebellion takes an open form, or one condemned by public opinion, while the good man is one who keeps it for the most part shut up in his heart and who cares for the opinion of his fellow-men, but the rebellion is the same and has the same consequences.

One of the commonest and most widespread ideas among religious persons in Christendom is that Satan by his machinations is the cause of most sin. Nowhere in Scripture is there any evidence for this belief. Though Satan is the cause of some sin, yet man himself is the cause of most.

¹ Romans vii. 17.

² John iii. 3. margin.

³ 1 Corinthians xv. 50.

⁴ John vi. 44.

James gives us the normal process quite clearly.¹ Man sins because "he is drawn away by his own lust and enticed." It is the evil, fallen and rebellious nature of man that responds to the stimulus of the events of the outside world. So God is not so much concerned with the sins committed as with the sinful nature that by its own natural laws must beget sins. That nature, because it is nature, cannot be changed except by God Himself.

There are only three possibilities before men. They may give their rebellious nature its freedom, caring nothing for the possible consequences; they may seek to mask it by living a life that is a contradiction of it; or they may in despair throw themselves on the mercy of God. We need not concern ourselves with the first group. For the second the Pharisees may stand as representatives. One who had been of their number could look back and say, "As touching the righteousness which is in the Law, found blameless."² The Pharisee rejoiced in the Law, he carried it out eagerly, he delighted in finding fresh commandments to keep. As Rabbi Chananiah Ben-Aqashia used to say, "The Holy One, blessed be He, was pleased to make Israel meritorious; wherefore He gave them much Torah (law) and many commandments."³ The Pharisee knew all about his evil heart, or "evil inclination"⁴ as he called it, but he delighted to cover it up and mask it with layer upon layer of law-keeping. By perseverance in doing good he persuaded himself that his heart was not so corrupt and did not matter very much. That is why our Lord called him "ὑποκριτής," "play-actor." That is why His severest words were kept for him, for such a man finds it harder than any other to accept the verdict of God on his life. We may be sure though that Paul was not the only one to realize that strange phenomenon, "I should not have known what covetousness is, if the Law did not say, 'Thou shalt not covet.' Sin took advantage of this, and by means of the commandment roused within me every kind of coveting."⁵ In other words the Pharisees did not keep the Law because their nature demanded it. Nay

¹ James i. 13-15.

² Philipians iii. 20.

³ Pirge Aboth.

⁴ Yetser harah.

⁵ Romans vii. 7, 8. Weymouth.

rather they kept it in spite of the deep-seated dislike and urge the other way, because they wished to win God's favour without humbling themselves before God. The Rabbinic writings quite typically place the man who keeps the Law in spite of his inclinations higher than the man who keeps it because of his inclinations.

Such is all legalism. It is the supreme and subtlest expression of sin and man's sinful nature. Man does good, even though he would rather not, so as to win God's favour. He will do anything rather than humble himself before God completely. He will even humble himself and confess all manner of sins so long as his humiliation must not be complete, so long as he must not confess indwelling, dominating sin, the sin that is his by nature. We have the paradox that good is really being done "by the sin that dwelleth in me."¹

But what of the man who by the grace of God is brought to see himself, as he is seen by God? He can only do one thing, cast himself in despair on God. For him there can be no hope except in the mercy of God, and because "God was in Christ reconciling the world unto Himself"² he knows that his hope will not be put to shame. The essential purpose of salvation is to make true fellowship between God and man possible, and that is only possible, if man is granted a Divine nature. That is why he "must be born from above." When that happens he receives "a new heart and a new spirit."³ For such a man keeping God's laws involves as little merit as a duckling taking to the water and swimming; he is only expressing an inherent law of his new nature. That is why John can say, "Whosoever is begotten of God doeth no sin, because his seed abideth in him; and he cannot sin, because he is begotten of God."⁴ For a re-born man to acquiesce in sin, for the core of his being to rebel against the will of God, for him wholeheartedly to say Yes to temptation, even though the impulse is not acted on, would be a denial of the new Divine nature in him.

There is no suggestion in this that the man re-born by the grace of God is irresistibly carried away by the grace of God and the power of the Spirit, so that he is made sinless. Just

¹ Romans vii. 15-17.

² 2 Corinthians v. 19.

³ Ezekiel xxxvi. 26, 27.

⁴ 1 John iii. 9.

as in the unregenerate man there is always a conflict between his sinful nature and law, whether it is recognized as Divine law or not, so it is in the regenerate. "The cravings of the lower nature are opposed to the Spirit, and the Spirit is opposed to the lower nature, because these are antagonistic to each other, so that you cannot do as you would wish."¹ There is, however, a profound difference. In the unregenerate the conflict is caused by the impact of Divine law *from outside* on sin within; in the regenerate the conflict is due to the impact of "the world, the flesh and the devil" from outside on the nature of God *within*. The former conflict can be ended (unless the man bow in despair before God) only by the triumph of sin; the latter can only be ended by the triumph of the Spirit.

That is why Paul makes no reservation whatsoever in his rejection of the Law, for it was imposed from without by God. The triumph of the Spirit within—"Walk by the Spirit and ye shall not fulfil the lust of the flesh"²—of itself involves the removal of all fetters. "If ye are led by the Spirit, ye are not under the Law."³ This after all should be self-evident. If we have the Divine nature within us, if we are led by the Spirit of God Himself, then all external law is superfluous—"Knowing this, that law is not made for a righteous man, but for the lawless and unruly, for the ungodly and sinners, for the unholy and profane . . . for liars, for false swearers, and if there be any other thing contrary to the sound doctrine."⁴ As Ezekiel foretold, "I will put my Spirit within you, and cause you to walk in my statutes, and ye shall keep my judgements and do them."⁵ That is why Jeremiah could foresee the day when "They shall teach no more every man his neighbour, and every man his brother, saying, Know the LORD: for they shall all know Me, from the least of them unto the greatest of them, saith the LORD."⁶ This is "the liberty of the glory of the children of God,"⁷ which in its fullness awaits "the redemption of our body," but

¹ Galatians v. 17, Weymouth.

² Galatians v. 16.

³ Galatians v. 18.

⁴ 1 Timothy i. 9, 10.

⁵ Ezekiel xxxvi. 27.

⁶ Jeremiah xxxi. 34.

⁷ Romans viii. 21.

which none the less is the privilege now of all God's children, of all "born from above."

Just as unregenerate man will not accept God's judgment on him, so too he cannot bring himself to accept the possibility of the Spirit-led life. So evil is the "flesh," so subtle the poison of legalism, that many who claim to be regenerate share in that doubt. The reasons are too manifold even to be glanced at here. It often is because they have never taken that decisive and final step of *complete* humiliation before God; there has remained a lurking hope that somewhere in them there is something that may yet be saved from the general ruin. Others shrink from it, for it implies a tolerance of the Spirit-led and their actions that mere man cannot reach. "Who art thou that judgest the servant of another? to his own lord he standeth or falleth. Yea, he shall be made to stand; for the Lord hath power to make him stand."¹ Above all it is because they listen to the last desperate plea of the "flesh." To those who will listen it paints lurid pictures of the slavery involved, of the uncertainty, of the laughing stock we may become, and then as a contrast it tells with siren voice of the beauty of the regenerate and forgiven man doing that which before was impossible for him, keeping God's law. Many there are that listen, as did the Galatians. And sin, as long as we are kept from complete reliance on the grace of God alone, is satisfied.

Legalism is the deadliest product of man's unregenerate nature. It has been the means of hardening the hearts of untold men and women to the voice of God. But even when the heart has yielded, the struggle goes on, and legalism remains sin's chief weapon. Self-reliance in one form or another is always trying to raise its head, and when it does mistrust and rebellion always accompany it. There is only one place where sin ceases from poisoning our lives, and the Law finally and for ever vanishes from our thoughts. If we will accept fully God's judgment on our sin, if we are willing to humble all in the dust, if we are brought to despair of everything that we are, then we can say with Paul, "I have been crucified with Christ, and it is no longer I that live, but Christ liveth in me."²

¹ Romans xiv. 4.

² Galatians ii. 20.

The Epistle of Truth

THE REV. EDWIN HIRST, M.A., A.R.C.M.

(This is the third instalment of the Rev. Edwin Hirst's Studies in the Second Epistle of John. The first article appeared in the January issue, the second article in the April issue, and the final article will follow (D.V.) in our next issue.)

TRUTH AND OURSELVES

(2 St. John, verses 4-5)

THERE can be little doubt that the Apostle was fully aware of the human factor when he wrote this letter. He took into account the waywardness and fickleness of human beings. Plans are often ruined because of the human factor. No matter how carefully they are made, it is almost impossible to be sure that all will proceed according to plan. Many a missionary has found it hard to leave his work because of the uncertainty that all will go well, or because there may possibly be a lapse on the part of the converts. It is a characteristic of all humanity that, in climbing up the steeps of the hill of God, it is painfully easy to slip back or to retrace the steps. Anxiety for the safety of the flock is not limited to the Mission Field. The possibility and even the probability of a lapse is not confined to the newly converted. We, who have centuries of Christian inheritance behind us, need to pray for God's grace side by side with the members of the younger Churches, even as the Book of Common Prayer often reminds us. It is humbling for us, yet perfectly fitting, that we should pray in the attitude set by the Collect for the first Sunday after Trinity: "O God, the strength of all them that put their trust in Thee, mercifully accept our prayers; and because through the weakness of our mortal nature we can do no good thing without Thee, grant us the help of Thy grace, that in keeping of Thy commandments we may please Thee, both in will and deed; through

Jesus Christ our Lord, Amen." The weakness of our mortal nature is ever intruding itself. But to dwell on that side alone would present a sad picture. The other side is equally true, for we note the facts of regeneration both in the Bible and in history. Tennyson stated them finely :

" I held it truth, with him who sings
To one clear harp in divers tones,
That men may rise on stepping-stones
Of their dead selves to higher things."¹

All Christian workers feel the desire for results to be forthcoming. This is perfectly natural and human. But after all, the real issue rests with God. " One soweth and another reapeth " is still a condition of life. In her book, " God's Candlelights," Mabel Shaw puts the matter most eloquently from the missionary point of view, but the same is very true of almost all Christian work. " In spite of ourselves we are obsessed by the thought of results, we want to have something to show ; we are dismayed and distraught when things do not go as we imagine they should. A relapse into what we call ' heathenism,' an outbreak of behaviour that is to us contrary to the teaching we have given them ; a setting up of their wills against ours : these things not only distress us, but arouse our indignation. We expect to see a redeemed people in our own short lifetime. We do not think greatly enough. We do not see far enough, and we forget that while we work within the limitations of time and space, we can still, if we will, feel the throb and pulse of the Life Eternal ; our spirits can stand upon the threshold of the uncharted realms of the Unseen and Eternal."² St. John was anxious for his converts, and wished to protect them from actual dangers. It was that loving care which prompted his letter. He rejoiced to have found some of these people walking in truth. Yet the stern warnings of his communication seem to suggest that some were not so loyal to the truth God had revealed to the world in Christ.

There is a great responsibility involved in any contact with the Truth. Having heard Him Who is the Truth, we are bound to acknowledge that His truth has a claim upon our beliefs, our lives and our conduct. " No man, having put his hand to the plough, and looking back, is fit for the king-

¹ *In Memoriam*, 1.

² p. 150.

dom of God."¹ It is no mean matter to have met Him. His claims on us are paramount, for in Him God has spoken to men and given a perfect revelation both of Himself and His will. Because of this, our relation to the truth in Christ is of the utmost importance. "He that abideth in the teaching, the same hath both the Father and the Son."² The converse is equally true. "Whosoever goeth onward and abideth not in the teaching of Christ, hath not God."

The old question is still as significant as ever: "What think ye of the Christ?"³ Perhaps it is natural that we should first approach matters from our own point of view. But after all, even in the ordinary affairs of life we have to take other matters into consideration. None of us can be a law unto ourselves, though some seem to wish that it were so, and others live as far as possible as though it were so. It is only as people are willing to be governed by the laws of the community that order is at all possible in any state of society. A breach of those laws is an offence against the order of the community and against society as a whole. He who commits such a breach is an offender not only against himself but also against his fellows, and it might be necessary to apply pressure to convince the offender of the fact. Even where differences of opinion are possible, as in the matter of merit in music or art, there are certain realms of activity where differences of opinion are impossible. These are matters of finality and truth. Conscience and reason recognize their establishment as such. Yet these are not of human making. They are standards imposed from outside. Dr. Matthews has stressed this matter for us. "Any thinker who makes general statements about the universe or about knowledge must assume that there is absolute truth and that it can appear in the mind of a person, who is the product of evolution and subject to the conditions of time and space. But every time we do an addition sum we make the same assumption. 'Two and two make four' is finally true. We may come to know more about it, we may understand more of its implications, but no advance of knowledge abolishes the truth of the initial statement."⁴ If there is

¹ St. Luke ix. 62.

² 2 John ix.

³ St. Matthew xxii. 42.

⁴ *Essays in Construction*, p. 93.

ultimate truth and finality in a matter which can be apprehended by people of ordinary intelligence, it seems perfectly reasonable to believe that God, Who is Ultimate Truth, can reveal His truth to ordinary minds also. This has been done in various ways, but most clearly of all in Christ. Whilst Christians believe that God's revelation of truth through His Son has a standard of completeness and finality in itself, thus having a direct claim on our consideration of and obedience to it, most of them would be ready to admit that our human understanding has not grasped its entire significance. But even so, in the matter of apprehension of its content and meaning, as well as of its bearing upon life, no interpretation of truth can go beyond that which has been revealed in our Lord. That is why the first Christians were anxious to examine all things by the mind of Christ. In one of the most important decisions they were called upon to make, they felt themselves so very clearly to have been guided by the Spirit of Truth that they could issue their pronouncements with a tone and assurance of finality: "It seemed good to the Holy Ghost, and to us."¹ At our best, we all wish to know the ultimate truth. This is to be found in Christ, for "one of the elements in the Christian doctrine of the Incarnation is that this absoluteness and finality, which we find in human efforts to know and to create, has been achieved in a personal life. In Christ we are invited to see the absolute Personality."² From this point of view it is important that we should find our own personal answer to the question: "What think ye of Christ?"

Whilst the tendency is to view matters from our own standpoint, it is well to remember that there is another point of view. It is perhaps more important that we should seek to know what Christ thinks of us. His words and actions show His opinions of our needs. He went about doing good, healing both men's bodies and men's souls. Further, He pointed the way to God, and in His death removed the obstacle of sin and its penalty which blocked the way. It is when we recognize what we might have been and have failed to be that we realize how impotent we are. Christ then comes to our aid, and shows us the infinite love of God revealed in Himself. He assists us to a clearer

¹ Acts xv. 28.

² Dr. Matthews, *Essays in Construction*, p. 94.

realization of the truth, and enables us to live by it. What Christ thinks of our need humbles us ; but what He does to help us in our need ennobles us. " I came that they may have life, and may have it abundantly."¹

The knowledge of the truth, which grows from more to more, thus becomes for us a moral influence on the subjective side. Such knowledge will permeate our whole lives and thus become an operative force from within. The more we know of it, the more we feel that we must live by it. In this way the subjective becomes objectively a vocation, a sphere in which life can be lived in its fullest form, and where self-expression in its truest sense can be realized. " When we were dead through our trespasses, God quickened us together with Christ (*by grace have ye been saved*), and raised us up with Him, and made us to sit with Him in the heavenly places in Christ Jesus."²

The psalmist's experience is often ours. He knew the longing for communion with The Truth, the truth which would issue in light and bring illumination to the darkness of life. Having found the way to that life of communion open to him, he followed it and rejoiced in the knowledge of God :

" O send out Thy light and Thy truth ; let them lead me :
 Let them bring me unto Thy holy hill,
 And to Thy tabernacles.
 Then will I go unto the altar of God,
 Unto God my exceeding joy :
 And upon the harp will I praise Thee, O God, my God.
 Why art thou cast down, O my soul ?
 And why art thou disquieted within me ?
 Hope thou in God : for I shall yet praise him,
 Who is the health of my countenance, and my God."³

Yet the psalmist had not the fullest revelation. We have it given in Christ. Our heritage is greater than was his. It was in thankfulness for that revelation that St. John began his letter praising the Father for the truth made known in Christ, the truth which offered a sphere of life in which he and his converts alike could live a life of communion with Him.

¹ St. John x. 10.

² Ephesians ii. 5, 6.

³ Psalm xliii. 3-5.

“ The elder unto the elect lady and her children, whom I love in truth ; and not I only, but also all they that know the truth ; for the truth’s sake which abideth in us, and it shall be with us for ever : grace, mercy, and peace shall be with us, from God the Father, and from Jesus Christ, the Son of the Father, in truth and love.”¹

THE COMMANDMENT OF TRUTH

(2 St. John, verse 6)

Human life, as we know it, is set in a background of moral truth. For the regulation of that life many codes of conduct have been formulated. But, as Archbishop D’Arcy says, “ No one theory of morals has been able to command universal assent. Yet all agree that lying, stealing, and murder must be visited with the condemnation of society. In the ordinary moral conduct of life we, one and all, walk by faith and not by scientific demonstration.”² This is very true, and as Christians we walk by faith in our Lord, looking to Him for inspiration, guidance, and power, to reach a standard of successful living. It is to Christ’s teaching that we turn for an ultimate authority regarding our belief in God and the eternal verities of life. By His spirit we judge things, affairs, and movements, for Christianity is no cold system to be viewed abstractedly, but a life to be lived. There is no phase of human life in which ethical principles and codes of conduct can be wholly ignored. Christianity recognizes this fully, and so doing, presents to the world an ethical religion based upon belief in a moral God. For the Christian, the background of successful living is to be found in God as revealed by Jesus Christ. He sees that “ the ultimate values on which the Christian revelation rests belong to the eternal world,” and so “ the Ethics of Christianity are religious Ethics ; they have their centre in God.”³ Christ’s words, then, by which He taught of God and revealed His will, have an authority for us which cannot be questioned. Beyond them we cannot go. It has been thus ever since the time of the first disciples ;

¹ 2 John 1-3.

² *Christian Ethics and Modern Thought*, p. 10.

³ Dr. Inge, *Christian Ethics and Modern Problems*, p. 16.

and St. John evidently subscribed to such a belief. He gave to us what we might call "The Commandment of Truth" which came forth from God. "I rejoice greatly that I have found certain of thy children WALKING IN TRUTH, EVEN AS WE RECEIVED COMMANDMENT FROM THE FATHER."¹ The words "we received commandment" are most inclusive, and were evidently intended to include all the members of the Church to whom this Epistle was addressed. Further, as the aorist tense is used ("we received"), it seems to point to a definite time when the commandment was given and received. Those who had known the Lord in the flesh would be able to look back to the occasion in recollection; and for the rest, most probably it was at Baptism that the word was received. In these words, there seems to be an echo of one of Christ's sayings; for the Apostle clearly refers to the reception of this commandment of truth from the Father. Our Lord has said: "All things that I have heard from my Father I have made known unto you."² He had taken them into His confidence, giving them knowledge of the Father's will as they were able to receive it. The limitations placed upon man's reception of God's revelation are on the human side, where forces of a finite nature prevail, such as environment, standards of education, heredity, and locality. Yet the revelation of the truth stands firm in Christ. The message He brought was for all mankind, and it is "whosoever willeth" that can both hear and understand. In contrast with what was so frequently the case in other faiths, where the message was for the inner circle only, His message was ultimately to be proclaimed from the house-tops. That which was first communicated to the disciples was to be told by them in turn to the entire human creation. In His teaching, our Lord followed in the line of the prophets, but He deepened the meaning and widened the scope of much of the Old Testament teaching. A study of the Sermon on the Mount well reveals this, as for instance when He said: "Ye have heard that it was said, Thou shalt love thy neighbour, and hate thine enemy: but I say unto you, Love your enemies, and pray for them that persecute you."¹ This teaching was quite revolutionary, and it was given with authority. Its

¹ 2 John 4.

² St. John xv. 15.

outcome was, as He said, "that ye may be sons of your Father which is in heaven."¹

A son is expected to reproduce the character of his Father, and the fundamental basis of our relationship with Him is a filial one. In another place Christ said "Ye therefore shall be perfect, as your heavenly Father is perfect."² That is to be found in sonship; and that relationship is the greatest one possible in our approach to Him. St. John speaks of this on its natural side rather than from its legal aspect. We are children of the Father. Yet under Roman Law, adoption was thought of as conferring sonship in almost as real a manner as parentage, and by it, those who were adopted were received as sons. "Behold what manner of love the Father hath bestowed upon us, that we should be called children of God: and such we are."³

This "Commandment of Truth" seems to mean that, as God is true in His character, so also must we be true. His holiness, justice, beauty, and even His mercy, were well-known attributes of His, revealed before Christ came. Our Lord's greatest work was to reveal Him as the Father who is Love; this He did by both precept and deed. It is no wonder, then, that St. John insists on the necessity for His character of love being reproduced in His children. Love for God and love for man are the two great demands made by Christ on man. These two commandments of the Law find expression in life, and so we have three key words in this Epistle which touch upon actual life. They are truth, love, and commandment. The last of these implies implicit obedience to God in every phase of life. Dr. Plummer presses this point in his commentary. "Love, truth and obedience; these are the three leading ideas, which partly imply, partly supplement one another. Obedience without love becomes servile; love without obedience becomes unreal: neither of them can flourish outside the realm of truth."⁴ Servility is not a characteristic of sons, even though the Apostles rejoice in speaking of themselves as bond-servants of Christ; their service rendered to Him was not

¹ St. Matthew v. 43-45.

² St. Matthew v. 48.

³ 1 John iii. 1. (It should be noted that in the Greek children and sons are different words.)

⁴ *The Epistle of St. John*, p. 135.

that of cringing fear, but of glad obedience, arising out of a deep affection for Him. This is in line with Christ's words when He addressed His disciples as "friends."¹ In oriental lands the ministers, familiars and intimates of the king were called his "friends," a term which almost approached a title of dignity. One of the Papyri, a document recovered from the Serapeum in Memphis, uses the term "friends" for "Privy Councillors."² When our Lord spoke to His disciples as His "friends," rather than His servants, they would know that it meant their admittance into the secrets of His heart and mind. A great difference in status and relationship was implied. A slave obeyed without any knowledge of his master's will and intentions, just because he was a slave. But one admitted into the secrets and plans of his Lord, as a privy councillor is admitted into the confidence of his sovereign, knows his master's mind and acts out of love and loyalty. Christ's Friends had been admitted into the mysteries of the Kingdom of God which He came to found, and thus they knew their Lord's mind. "Unto you it is given to know the mysteries of the kingdom of God."³

It is in a life of love that this commandment of truth finds obedience to its summons. "This commandment have we from Him, that he who loveth God love his brother also."⁴ The Apostle was in the line of direct succession to his Lord's teaching. Christ gave God's commandments positively in His summary of the Law, and these find expression in terms of love; first, love for God, and arising from it, love for man. The second is dependent upon the first. It is not always easy either to love or trust our fellows. Yet it is to such a life that we are called, and it becomes possible when the love of God is in our hearts through Christ's redemption. Canon Barry says: "Christianity, when it is true to its own genius, is able to believe in Man recklessly, despite all that saddens and discourages, because it has seen the vision of God, the eternal source of worth and wonder—lifting us up to become sons of God."⁵ In love for God and love for man, the Christian scheme presents a matter which is for trial by

¹ St. John xv. 15.

² Milligan, *Greek Papyri*, p. 17.

³ St. Luke viii. 10.

⁴ 1 John iv. 21.

⁵ *The Relevance of Christianity*, p. 130.

experiment rather than a theory to be examined in abstraction. A mere theory has neither moral influence nor moral obligation in it. It is possible to have a very accurate knowledge of physics and yet be a bad man. The swindler may have a firm grip of the principles of accountancy, but yet be unwilling to handle accounts by its rules. It is possible to know a good deal about God and yet live an evil life. St. James said : " The devils also believe, and shudder."¹ To know about God is not sufficient. We are called to know God Himself, and knowing Him and His truth, it is essential that we should live by that truth in actual experience. Theory thus gives place to experiment, for knowledge of the truth brings with it the obligation to live by it. The son must reproduce the character of the Father.

The Christian knows that it is only as he has experienced the truth of Christ's redemption that he can live according to this standard. " Christianity is a religion of redemption. The heart and life of the Christian ethic is the redemption of our desires and wills, the transfiguration of our values, by God's power and presence in Christ Jesus. Nothing short of that can be called Christian, however friendly to the Christian spirit."² However, the cross is still an offence to those who find it either a stumbling-block or foolishness. Yet to those who follow Him, Christ crucified is both the power and the wisdom of God. The Father's scheme still stands, and in obedience to the commandment of truth we must seek to see things as He sees them. St. Paul stresses this point, and argues from human affairs to the eternal things of God. " Who among men knoweth the things of a man, save the spirit of the man, which is in him ? even so the things of God none knoweth, save the spirit of God. But we received, not the spirit of the world, but the spirit which is of God ; that we might know the things that are freely given to us by God. Which things also we speak, not in words which man's wisdom teacheth, but which the Spirit teacheth ; comparing spiritual things with spiritual. Now the natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God ; for they are foolishness unto him ; and he cannot know them, because they are spiritually judged. But he that is spiritual judgeth all things, and he himself is judged

¹ St. James ii. 19.

² Barry, *ut. supra*, p. 132.

of no man. For who hath known the mind of the Lord, that he should instruct him? But we have the mind of Christ."¹ So if we would know God's truth in an experimental fashion, we must discard the habit of examining it as a theoretic abstraction, and plunge boldly into the life it indicates. Our outlook must be like that of James and John when Christ asked them of their preparedness to follow Him unflinchingly: "Are ye able to drink the cup that I am about to drink? They say unto him, We are able."² If this is our course, and we are willing to be obedient to the Commandment of Truth, the example is clear, even as is the way. Christ's teaching "sets before us a concrete moral order, a universe in which every individual is to find his place and do his duty in relation to God above him and to his fellows; it gives us the highest possible conception of such an order of things; and then it bids us make the attainment of that great end the supreme purpose of our lives. The end of all moral activities is the Kingdom of Love. In that glorious end all the potentialities of the individual are to find their realization. In it, too, humanity is to attain its perfection, and the will of God to be fully accomplished. 'Thy kingdom come, Thy will be done on earth as it is in heaven'."³

¹ 1 Corinthians ii. 11-16.

² St. Matthew xx. 22.

³ D'Arcy, *ut supra*, p. 40.

Book Reviews

THE HISTORY OF RIDLEY HALL. VOL. I.

F. W. B. Bullock, C.F., M.A., Ph.D., B.D. (Cambridge University Press [printed for the Council of Ridley Hall].) 18s. net. Review by the Rev. S. NOWELL-ROSTRON, M.A., B.D. (Vicar of Paddington).

There can be no question as to the welcome that will be widely given to this book. It was a wise and happy thought on the part of the Council of Ridley Hall to set about the compilation of such a record, and as wise and happy was their choice of its writer. The volume now produced is of interest from many points of view. It will be sufficient to show the importance of Dr. Bullock's work if one or two of these are indicated.

I

First, it is of immediate, and indeed enthralling, interest to old Ridleyans by reason of the personal and intimate details set down about so many of their old friends and contemporaries, about those whose leadership meant so much to the well-being and progress of the enterprise, and, perhaps, not least, and to the surprise of their modesty, about themselves. Most members of the Hall will surely begin to browse with a thrill of expectation, finger on index, on its contents, seeking for familiar names, and pursuing references through its pages, marvelling as they do so, at the number of details gathered together about one and another, and at the skill and clarity with which each has been given his place in the narrative. What memories such a book will stir as men look back over the years, what pleasure it will give to those who thought, perhaps, they had been forgotten, to discover they have a permanent place in the life and growth of a college of which they have such reason to be proud!

This means that Dr. Bullock has succeeded remarkably in the aim he so diffidently expresses: "to make some attempt to reflect the friendly atmosphere of the place." He suggests that "perhaps the real history of Ridley Hall should centre around the friendship of individuals and groups of men." The "Ridley" fellowship is a precious thing to all who belong to it. It extends down the years and to the furthest parts of the earth. No one can have experienced "that friendly atmosphere" or shared the simple common life of the Hall without an indelible impression of belonging to a real community, "a band of brothers," whose lives might be parted by circumstance or distance but who nevertheless remained united in spirit by the unchanging bonds of affection and mutual sympathy of work and witness.

The period of this volume covers the Principalship of the first two Principals. It is natural that the larger space should be given to the first Principal, Dr. Handley Moule (1881-1899), whose name will

always be associated with the College to which he gave so many of the most fruitful years of his ministry. All who knew him, or came under his stimulating influence, will rejoice to have this portrait sketched incidentally to the telling of the main story, but bringing forcibly back the picture of a saintly and gentle-hearted man of God, with his ripe scholarship and deep insight into spiritual things, his sympathy with others, his powers as a preacher and teacher, his quiet humour, his sedate and eloquent speech. His "morning watch" in his garden has become a "Ridley" tradition. His walks with men to talk over their problems showed his common sense and his brotherliness. It must have been a sight worth seeing to see him "pedalling merrily along country roads." There is no doubt that the Hall owed very much indeed to his personality, his guidance and his standing in the University, in those first years of its history. We can find here reflected in his reports some of those problems he had to meet in this new venture under his charge. When in later years the present writer had a similar venture in his care in the Diocese over which Dr. Moule came to be Bishop, this, perhaps, was why so ready and understanding a sympathy with many difficulties was always available from the Episcopal visitor. For eighteen and a half years Dr. Moule remained Principal. "For myself," he wrote in 1909, as he looked back, "nothing in what remains of life can ever be like Ridley Hall, . . . sacred home by countless ties of friendship, of love, of memory and hope."

The second Principal was Dr. T. W. Drury (1899-1907). The contribution he made to the life and development of "Ridley" is clearly described. His wise, dignified, quiet and strong personality, with its complete absence of fuss or effusiveness, made an immediate appeal to the thoughtful and studious undergraduate. Dr. Drury was an expert teacher and stimulated his students to do and give their best. He encouraged theological studies, and especially used, as Dr. Moule was a little shy of using, the Theological Tripos Examinations for that purpose. When his period of office came to an end on his appointment to the Bishopric of Sodor and Man, he left behind on the "Hall" the distinct mark of his own character and outlook, and maintained and extended appreciably the influence of "Ridley" on the University and in the life of the whole Church.

The volume is strewn with a large number of short biographies of those mentioned in its pages, and considerable space is devoted to those who like Edward Henry Carr, and Bishop Perry, did so much to prepare for the establishment of "Ridley." One name stands out as being, above all others, the unfailing fount of information—that of the Rev. G. A. Schneider, the first Vice-Principal of the "Hall"—and as happily still here to read the MSS., and to draw upon the unique sources of his personal knowledge for the mass of details included. It is a tribute to the writer's skill as an historian that, despite these many personal touches, the sense of a narrative, helped by the method of taking the years in sequence, is never lost.

II

The value of such a volume as this is not only personal and confined to the immediate circle of Ridleians. It gives the opportunity for the production of a document of permanent value to the Church historian.

Its writer confesses to "an insatiable curiosity" and a mind that "naturally works backwards from that which is known and experienced to its source and early development." Only this could have set him "delving and digging about in the past" as he has done, and given the infinite patience and pains necessary for the discovery and consultation of papers, documents, and sources of information, many of which are trivial, and most of which now are rare. It is in the process of this investigation that he has brought to light much that must inevitably soon have been lost, and by his use of this material he has given a framework to the story of "Ridley" necessary to the understanding of its "raison d'être" and its place in the wider life of the University and the Church.

It is astonishing to look back over so short a period as a century, and to find there such widespread indifference amongst the church authorities generally, and the University Authorities particularly, to the special training of men for the Ministry. The Church Authorities, that is, the Bishops, whilst many of them were careful and concerned about the "choice of fit persons," were slow to appreciate the value of special theological training, and to adopt what became the G.O.E. They often ordained men without even consulting the Principals of the colleges from which they came, and were reluctant to accept any standardized examination for Deacons and Priests Orders. The lists given of the Theological Colleges connected with the Church of England and the details of their foundation show how varied were the aims and even the motives of their founders. The student of Church History will find this book very valuable for the account it gives of the early stage of the development of a movement of the utmost importance for the life and work of the Church.

Many of the University Authorities looked somewhat askance upon the Ridley project for two reasons. There was a strong conviction that the colleges themselves provided all that was necessary before ordination. There was, even on the part of Church leaders, an astounding indifference to the need of space of special preparation in reading, in teaching, and in habits of devotion between the free life of the undergraduate and the taking up of the Ministry. There was also, in the case of Ridley Hall, the suspicion of a narrow and sectarian outlook. The famous "six points" of the Deed of Trust caused not only the derision of some, but also serious criticism on the part of those, like Professors Westcott and Lightfoot, who were in general agreement with the purpose of the Hall, but deprecated, as Westcott said, "a narrower basis than that of our National Church;" and much misunderstanding was current about the "tests" to be imposed, as report went, on the staff and even on the members. The Principal-elect of the twin Oxford College, Wycliffe Hall, had to write to "The Guardian" to point out that "neither the Principals of the proposed Institutions, nor any of those who may hereafter work with them, will be required to take any pledge of a narrow party character. The councils resolved that it was best to pledge nobody but themselves." It is true there was a Trust Deed, but the drawing up of a Trust Deed was a usual course in colleges of various types in order that some particular point of view of their founders might be safeguarded, and

support be forthcoming for the project. It cannot be denied that behind the foundation of Ridley Hall was a strong desire that there should be for Evangelicals a College free from Tractarian and Seminarist influences, and of a kind that would strengthen and deepen in Ordinands their devotion to Evangelical principles; but this volume makes it abundantly clear that there was even more prominent the general motive of helping Ordinands to become more efficient spiritually as well as mentally, for their future work, and of testing their vocation to it.

It was long before such suspicions and criticisms became answered by the actual work and teaching of the Hall and its expanding importance in connection with the University, and in the wider life of the Church. Even in May, 1893, Dr. Moule reports "not a little prejudice and more or less overt antagonism in some quarters." But Ridley Hall has long since won for itself an honoured place amongst the many theological colleges of the Church of England, and its story is here seen to be that of a living movement within the borders of the Church, true to its principles, and sending out into its work at home and overseas a constant stream of men who, as the detailed records here given amply prove, have served with steady and devoted faithfulness, and many with distinction.

III

What sort of an ideal for the Ministry is represented in the aims of the founders of Ridley Hall, and carried out in its life and work? Dr. Tait (the then Archbishop of Canterbury) in 1880 at a special meeting at Lambeth Palace to raise funds for Wycliffe and Ridley Halls, voiced a popular objection to "Theological Seminaries—little bodies in which priests and ministers are trained under Seminarists, men of narrow mind, according to some the narrow platform, and are sent forth into the world with very little acquaintance with human nature." The kind of life lived at "Ridley," and the attitude fostered by its staff was the reverse of this. The ideal behind "Ridley" has certain prominent characteristics which are obvious to all who have shared and valued its influence.

Without exception, it has always been the spiritual aim that has been pre-eminent. "Nothing lower than this is our desire and our commission," said Dr. Moule in 1893, "to be channels of life eternal, not merely hard workers, good visitors, able organizers, acceptable preachers, but vehicles of the supernatural, agents through whom Christ shall touch dead souls into life." "Ridley" has never faltered in that great evangelistic ideal, and more than in anything that was said, the infection of that inspiring motive, which was taken for granted as being supreme in the lives of all "Ridley" men, has sent out hundreds of men whose chief joy and glory has been the winning of souls for Christ.

The intellectual equipment for the Ministry has always had a place at "Ridley" only second to this. Indeed one of the subsidiary reasons for its foundation was the prevalence of rationalist views as represented by the anonymous book, "Supernatural Religion," and

other similar literature. It is true that, for some years, as Mr. Schneider recognizes, "in general University circles 'Ridley' was deemed to be a resort of pious men indeed, but not of men of thought or learning," but the staff of "Ridley" was invariably one of scholarship, and the lists of the scholars of colleges who entered the "Hall," as well as of the academic and other achievements won by its members, is ample testimony to the encouragement given by the authorities to learning. Whilst there have been many members of the "Hall" who have taken a rigidly conservative position, there has been neither obscurantism nor bigotry in the teaching or control of the Principals and their colleagues, and many an one who has not found faith altogether easy has been helped by the sympathy and understanding they have thus found. In a day when more than ever a ministry is needed with insight into the problems and doubts of a highly scientific and materialistic age this is a training that it would be a betrayal of the ministerial office to neglect.

The "Hall" had care for pastoral training. Various opportunities presented themselves for pastoral work, and students were encouraged to undertake one or other of them. Occasional talks first with the Principal were most valuable; but this was perhaps in those earlier days the least developed of the aims of the "Hall," though even so "Ridley" men had more help given to them than most of their contemporaries in this important matter.

Not least valuable was the social life of the "Hall," the friendliness and the lasting friendships formed already mentioned. "Ridley Hall to us has been something more than a college or training place for the Ministry, it has been to us a home," so said the Rev. W. H. Stone in presenting Dr. Moule with his portrait. All "Ridley" men must surely feel that, and cherish the sense of brotherhood and community, the turning to "Ridley" as to a spiritual home, that draws together so many at the reunions and gives to those gatherings such zest and interest. The work and influence of Mrs. Moule and Mrs. Drury in this matter are cordially acknowledged in this record. One photograph reproduced is literally given a family touch by the inclusion of Mrs. Moule and her two children with Dr. Moule and those who attended the second Triennial Reunion. Neither was the physical side of college life neglected. There was ample opportunity for games, and these were encouraged in various ways. The breath of a clean, healthy, open-air life blows through these pages, and it is the very breath of "Ridley." The shade of Simeon striding along with his umbrella (a "relic" passed on from Dr. Moule to Dr. Drury) seems to hover still in the college that his work in Cambridge in no small measure inspired his successors to build. Dr. Bullock well quotes his advice to young students (familiar to many generations): "Your success in the senate-house depends much on the care you take of the three-mile stone out of Cambridge. If you go every day and see that nobody has taken it away, and go quite round it to watch lest anyone has damaged its farthest side, you will be able to read steadily all the time you are at Cambridge. . . . Exercise, constant, and regular and ample, is absolutely essential to a reading man's success."

This, then, is the type of character and of outlook that emerges

from the training such as "Ridley" has given and is giving to-day. It is devout, sincere, truth-loving, healthy in mind and body, devoted to Christ, loyal to His Church, seeking only to glorify God in life and ministry. Surely it is not far from the minister of God as described in the Epistles to Timothy; and has it not the true notes of the pastoral ideal learned from the precepts and example of our Lord, and of the ministry described in the Ordinal of our church? Times as they change, and leaders as they come and go, bring a different emphasis on this or that side of truth and experience, but the great essentials remain. In the story of "Ridley" these have been kept unflinchingly, and this has been its strength and its glory. It is fulfilling in a manner beyond his dreams the prayer of Bishop Nicholas Ridley in his "Farewell to Cambridge" which Dr. Bullock also quotes, "I thank thee, my loving mother (i.e., the University) for all . . . thy kindness; and I pray God that His laws, and the sincere Gospel of Christ, may ever be truly taught and faithfully learned in thee."

SIMEON AND CHURCH ORDER.

Charles Smyth. (Cambridge University Press.) 16s. net.

This present book, which has as its sub-title: "A Study of the Origins of the Evangelical Revival in Cambridge in the Eighteenth Century," is the published form of the Birkbeck Lectures for 1937-38. The book itself is a remarkable tribute to Simeon, and is packed with well-documented information.

In the first three chapters headed "Religion in the Home," "Religion in the School," and "Religion in the University" the background of Simeon's early life is outlined. In illustration of that background a great number of quotations are given from contemporary records. Whilst there were bright spots in that period, it must be admitted that these seem all the brighter because of the general darkness. Even though the Simeons had ecclesiastical blood in their veins, we are told that they "were deservedly respected in the neighbourhood; but the old house in the Forbury was not what succeeding generations would have recognized as a 'religious home.'" (p. 13). It was after his conversion that he sought to introduce family prayers into his home circle. This was a disturbing element to most of his family, being an unwelcome innovation; for until after his conversion, Simeon stood in the High Church tradition which flourished in that revival of Anglican piety which followed the Restoration. Family prayers, however, became "the badge of an Evangelical allegiance" (p. 16); and, as J. H. Overton says, "pious men naturally gravitated to that party which was, more than any other, identified with the spirit of piety," it is no cause for surprise that Simeon threw in his lot with the Cambridge Evangelicals. Religion in the Public School and in the University was not inspiring, to say the least; however, out of that background emerged some fine Christians. Simeon loved the Church and its ordinances, and of that Church our author says that it is "the product of a double Reformation; namely, of a Doctrinal Reformation which may be said to have begun in 1535 and to have been completed by 1662, and of an administrative Reformation which began in 1835

and is still in progress" (p. 204). It was an unsettled age in which Simeon lived, named by our author as "the Age of Doubts," and dated "from the meeting at the Feathers' Tavern in 1771 to the Great War of 1914-18, and of which Robert Elsmere (1888) is in some respects the typical literary monument."

It is clear that Simeon laboured at a crucial period of English history. There can be little doubt that the Evangelicals were the strongest and most powerful spiritual force in the English Church during the early decades of the nineteenth century; and as these were the years of Simeon's greatest influence, it is not easy to class him with the first generation of Evangelicals, even though he was a contemporary of Wilberforce. He had his own methods for dealing with problems for he was no "academic theorist: he was essentially a practical man confronting practical difficulties, and dealing with them boldly and resolutely, in the light of common sense. That is one of the reasons why he made such an admirable parish priest" (p. 17).

In dealing with the wider problems of Church Order, itinerancy, and relations with independents, his methods of approach to those entirely different characters, Berridge of Everton and Cadogan of Reading, show Simeon's loyalty to the Church. The book has two illuminating sketches of these two men and their relations with Simeon. In the second of these sketches, devoted to Cadogan, the subject of Patronage is discussed. A thorny problem is raised in this chapter, but Simeon's sincerity and honesty of purpose is plain. It was to no dishonourable end that Simeon consecrated his fortune—"I purchase *spheres*, wherein the prosperity of the Established Church, and the kingdom of our blessed Lord, may be advanced" (p. 24).

The last Chapter is devoted to the subject of Church Order. "Simeon's problems were problems which confronted not himself alone, but the whole Evangelical Party within the Church; and of these problems the two most critical were . . . the problem of continuity, and the problem of Church Order" (p. 250). It is claimed that "Simeon rallied the wavering Evangelicals and confirmed them in their faith and loyalty" (p. 250). Bishop Wordsworth said: "It is a mistake to suppose Simeon was careless about Church Ordinances," and one imagines that the same might be written about many more Evangelicals. They could have left the Church of their birth; but that so many of them did not do so, is proof enough for this.

Although so much has already been written about Simeon, the present book constitutes a considerable contribution to an understanding of that most remarkable man, and the age in which he lived.

E. H.

THE FORGIVENESS OF SINS: A DISSERTATION ON THE SIGNIFICANCE OF THE DOCTRINE DISCLOSED IN THE TRUTH OF THE ATONEMENT.

By F. H. Wales, B.D. Oxon. (Oxford Univ. Press. London: Humphrey Milford, 1940). pp. 133. 3s. 6d. net.

This is a little book; but there is much in it. The author presupposes a knowledge on the part of his readers of Greek, Latin and French, and even Italian; but his citations in those tongues are mainly

in the fifty pages of notes. The treatise is very devout and painstaking, and shows an extensive study of Holy Scripture and of the writings of Liberal Catholics, Anglican and Roman (especially the latter), and of other divines of the liberal school : but there are no citations from Evangelical theologians : although there are from Westcott, Lightfoot, and Trench. The author is indeed " thinking out loud " as he goes along, and collates extracts from his various authorities (of whom one of his favourites appears to be one " Father Lattey," whose opinions appear sometimes in English and sometimes in French), and the book suffers a little from the difficulty of separating the writer's own views from those which he quotes, not always apparently with assent or approval. Sometimes he frankly contrasts one view with another, without apparently reaching a conclusion for himself. It would appear that he rejects the substitutionary view of the atonement and he demurs to the word " vicarious " ; but he does not seem to use these terms altogether in their theological connotation ; and in dealing with the ideas behind them he is apparently prejudiced by a presentation that imports a punitive sense into them. He does continually quote St. Paul's wonderful summary that " God was in Christ, reconciling the world unto himself," but we cannot feel that he gives it full force or appreciates its Trinitarian implications. He is rightly repelled by references to " God's anger " ; he denies that the sacrifice of Christ was " expiatory." But he does say " So the atonement is the alpha and omega of God's forgiveness ; for it is in its redeeming fulness the remission of sins and the reconciliation of sinners. It reveals God's love as alien from all evil, yet forbearing the evil-doer ; so that he may sorrow unto repentance to retrieve his fall, and with true heart in singleness of faith find ' peace assured and reconcilment ' through the alone merits of Christ's Atonement."

The book is not one for the simple believer : it would puzzle, bewilder and mystify him. Nor is it one for the young theological student : it might lead him as a will-o'-the-wisp into marshy places. But for the mature Christian having his senses exercised to discern good and evil it might well prove a valuable quarry, and in a sense provide material for warning signposts. The author would have done well to have read Gustaf Aulen's " Christus Victor," and better still Henry Wace's " The Sacrifice of Christ." He might even have learned something from John Charles Ryle's theological writings. It may be noted that he quotes, apparently with assent, the Tridentine declaration on Justification, which asserts that it includes sanctification, an error into which the unhappy Anglican delegation to Rumania fell. But he also quotes Westcott's pregnant conclusion that " The modern conception of Christ pleading in heaven His Passion, ' offering his blood ' on behalf of men, has no foundation in the Epistle [to the Hebrews]." And he quotes from Sanday, " it is impossible to get rid of the double idea of (1) sacrifice ; (2) a sacrifice which is propitiatory . . . and further when we ask who is propitiated ? the answer can only be God. Nor is it possible to separate this propitiation from the death of His Son."

The book suffers from lack of either index or table of contents. It is impossible to " recover " a passage without turning every page.

It is like an unsorted commonplace book, full of good things with some that are not good—not yet reduced to discipline. Its affirmations are largely good : its negations less so. The author is an *alumnus* of Keble College : and is in the tradition.

The publisher and printer have done their work well.

A. M.

APOSTLE OF CHARITY

The Life of St. Vincent de Paul. By Theodore Maynard. (George Allen & Unwin, Ltd., London). 7s. 6d.

The Christian saints, it has often been remarked, display a strong family likeness, and it persists despite such differences of nationality and ecclesiastical tradition as might have been expected to obliterate it. There could hardly be a better illustration than is provided by the life-story of St. Vincent de Paul. His temperament had its markedly French qualities, moderated, however, by a capacity for such deliberation and cautiousness as must have tested to the utmost the patience of his more volatile colleagues. His Roman allegiance was thorough and indubitable, though like S. Francis of Assisi, he must have caused the authorities many an uneasy hour. He had the natural greatness to achieve an influence beyond anything that his origins could have promised, and he attained to such spiritual greatness as was destined to inspire and influence multitudes who have differed from him in almost everything save his devotion to God and his passion for service.

The author of this biography has scored a double success. In the first place, he has used with remarkable freshness the mass of material at his disposal. The story which we read never suggests anything of the staleness of a "re-hash." His hero has inspired the author, and moves before us as a living person. More important still is the fact that, whether designedly or not, chief emphasis has been placed upon those truly Catholic qualities in St. Vincent which make him the spiritual kinsman of all who have been found of God through our Lord Jesus Christ, and interpret life in terms of responsive love and service. His sustained concern for the practical forms and values of the Christian life is a case in point : it saved him from the exotic and unhealthy abnormalities which have too often marked a too introspective concern with the devotional life. More surprising still, from an Evangelical point of view, is the freedom, and the success, of his experiments in a Church which has always regarded the innovator with suspicion. That he should have brought into being, in the France and the Roman Church of the seventeenth century, an order of ministering sisters, so disciplined, and yet so ecclesiastically independent, is no small tribute to his genius. It was inevitable, and it is significant, that the later history of the movement is witness to the cramping influence of the kind of authority which tends to kill spiritual spontaneity.

S. Vincent himself was not wholly liberated. The hair-shirt, and what it suggests, had its place in his religious system. But it is more important to see in him a humble disciple who learned, and can teach us, much about the life in Christ ; and a brave man of action whose achievements in Church reform and social service are not irrelevant to some of our modern problems.

T. W. I.

WORSHIP

By J. O. Dobson. (S.C.M.). 5s. net.

We are frequently being told that we are living to a great extent upon our spiritual capital, and that unless steps are taken to arrest the decay of public worship that capital will be still further diminished. The importance of worship is emphasised in this comprehensive survey which treats of the nature of worship and proceeds to trace the development of the forms of worship which have persisted through many centuries. Some there are who disregard worship altogether. A life of personal goodness or of active social service can get on quite well without it. But, Mr. Dobson points out, "the living of the good life needs a centre of reference, an absolute standard of quality, by which all human purposes and achievements shall be measured and judged. Worship is the reference of all things to God. It means a readiness to be moved to that inward discontent with the self which is the true beginning of the better life."

Interesting comments on Music and Art in Worship raise many issues. *Quot homines tot sententiae*. A great deal of teaching is conveyed through hymns, as Mr. Dobson observes. Quite recently the Bishop of Chelmsford criticised "Songs of Praise," pointing out the doctrinal tendencies of the alterations and omissions in many hymns in that collection. Perhaps it is not out of place to suggest that the "Church Hymnal for the Christian Year" is deservedly popular in an increasing number of churches. It is published by the National Church League.

Everyone would agree that we should offer of our best in worship whether it be elaborate or simple, liturgical or formless.

One indispensable element in worship is the expression of truth. Dealing with the Prayer Book of 1552, Mr. Dobson makes the astonishing statement, "On the whole, this book was poorer than that of 1549."

Poorer perhaps in the omission of some ceremonies and the Mass Vestments. But, as everyone knows, the changes deliberately made were made in order to express vital truths and to exclude definite errors.

The fate of the 1928 Prayer Book is an illustration of the importance attached to doctrine in worship, for revision of our standards of worship is admitted on all hands to be overdue, but that unhappy attempt at revision was seen to revert to pre-reformation standards and therefore could not be tolerated. Had it not been for the deepest of all reasons—the necessity of safeguarding truth—the nation would have welcomed the proposed revision.

Is it too much to hope at this auspicious juncture when Christians of all kinds are drawing together in face of the increasing neglect of public worship, that men of goodwill representing every party in the Church might come together and frame a revised Prayer Book to meet our present needs?

We are persuaded that it could be done. And if it were, Parliament would gladly expedite its passing into law. There is so much common

ground and the need is so pressing. Could not controversial points be laid aside and a useful piece of work done in those areas in which only matters of taste and opinion but none of principle arise?

H. D.

THE CHRISTIAN RELIGION.

A Description of the Heritage and Hopes of Christian People.
By R. R. Williams. (S.C.M.) 3s.

The main purpose of this book is to commend the missionary work of the Church. By way of introduction the writer briefly surveys the different parts of the "heritage," such as the heritage of worship, of faith, of moral obligation, and of Scripture. As each part of the heritage is unfolded, it reveals imperishable values. In Christian worship, for example, we have the response of the Christian community to the call of the holy God summoning them to adore Him for His love and power. The Christian faith stresses the importance of right belief about God. Here the author, by means of a "modern instance," shows, in general, the close connection between belief and practice. "It is significant that Mussolini has painted in enormous letters on the roofs of farm buildings up and down the State Railways of Italy, the words 'Believe—Obey—Fight.' He would be blind indeed who could not see the importance of the first word of that trilogy. 'As a man thinketh in his heart, so is he.'" The values of the heritage of moral obligation are summarized as the morality of constraint and the morality of restraint. In both these ways the Christian religion has conferred great blessings on the world, although the former, by its insistence upon love, is the more powerful of the two. Finally, in the Scriptures, we have a value which is vital because it reveals the character of God through Christ.

From this great heritage the hopes of Christian people spring. The concluding chapter shows how the Church overseas is growing. In India, some 15,000 persons a month are being added to the Church by baptism. One missionary alone in Africa records an annual list of baptisms of over 80,000.

N. H. F.

THE DESTINED LORD OF THE UNIVERSE.

By D. Stewart MacColl, M.D., M.S. (Marshall, Morgan and Scott, Ltd.). 160 pp. 3s. 6d. net.

A Foreword by Dr. Alison Weeks expresses well-justified commendation of this collection of "Studies in the Book of Revelation and other Biblical Prophecies," edited by the daughter of the late respected author. It is delightful to find exactly the right points of emphasis, again and again; especially the practical aspects of Advent teaching—inspiring, calming, yet arousing. With Christ and His glory as its centre, the study of prophecy "becomes sanctifying instead of speculative." Advent truth will not allow "the soul to settle down in slothful indulgence, or to luxuriate idly in mere pious sentiment." Dr. MacColl deprecated divisions between those who differ in their interpretations, and would have liked to see "more communion in

testifying to the inspiring Hope." The chapters are full of penetrating sayings bearing on Christian truths ; and the book is a tonic for the times—moving, heartening, and altogether satisfying in refutation of alleged objections to prophetic study.

W. S. H.

A CHALLENGE TO THE CHURCHES

By *John Macmurray. (Vegan Paul.)* 1s.

This is No. 9 of a series of books edited by Francis Williams and entitled "The Democratic Order." John Macmurray is the Grote Professor of the Philosophy of Mind and Logic in London University. This is a thought-provoking book which says in new ways what many are saying, namely, that the Churches have failed. We put it down with a sigh and asked ourselves whether we ought not to abandon democracy in favour of Theocracy? The Professor believes that though we are fighting this war for democracy we do not agree as to what democracy is. He tells us that it is concerned to achieve freedom and that freedom and equality are the keynotes of democracy. He believes that Soviet Russia "represents a definite advance in the democratic direction" which at least shows what he means by democracy. The value of this discussion, however, for the clergy lies in its emphasis on the place of religion; the need of a new reformation. Religion is concerned with community and seeks to draw men into unity by love. Politics is concerned with Society and seeks to compel men into co-operation by fear. "As the power of religion declines, so the power of the State must increase; until at last, where religion is rejected by Society, the power and authority of the State must become unlimited. This is Genesis of the Totalitarian State, and the disappearance of democracy." The failure of the Churches is due to the Christian religion functioning as a conservative religion and consequently as the bulwark of the privilege of the upper classes. The challenge lies in this: "The old democracy is done. The Christian Church can, if it will, create the new democratic order and achieve equality without losing freedom." It must become a creative instead of a conservative religion. "It must function as the religion of the new community which is struggling to be born." "It must be in itself what it demands for all, a brotherhood of common men." That is the challenge. How much longer will the Church of England flourish as an ecclesiastical autocracy working in an indefinite democracy? This book should be read by all Church leaders. It is time we began to think and we must travail in thought until the New Order arises.

A. W. PARSONS.

TALKS IN PREPARATION FOR CONFIRMATION

By *R. W. Howard. (National Society & S.P.C.K.)* 4s.

"Bob" Howard is Headmaster of Liverpool College and was formerly Vice-Principal of St. Aidan's Theological College, Birkenhead. As an Assistant-Master at Eton he had a great deal to do with the religious training of boys, and still has. These talks are built upon a careful study of the Bible itself. There are eleven talks after

the introductory one on the purpose of confirmation. The first three are on God who is behind the world ; how He makes Himself known ; and how Jesus Christ revealed Him. The next is on the Holy Spirit. Then follows a fine chapter on the ever-growing Body of Christ. On this background he goes on to talk of Baptism, the Catechism, the Confirmation Service, the Holy Communion—its meaning and a further talk on the Church of England service, and finally a talk on "After Confirmation." It is all most helpful and evangelical in the deepest sense. There are synopses after every talk. Certainly no clergyman who wishes to prepare confirmees adequately should neglect to buy this book.

A. W. PARSONS.

THE JEWISH QUESTION

By James Parkes. (Oxford Pamphlets on World Affairs, No. 45.)
3d.

In days like these, when it is often difficult to know what to believe in the midst of conflicting opinions, censored news, and doctored facts, the "Oxford Pamphlets," are a joy, for they do provide a genuine attempt to reach the truth with a minimum of bias. The very nature of the series, however, is the inevitable cause of its chief weakness ; it is obviously impossible to deal adequately with our modern problems in pamphlets of some 32 pages, and the writers are often tempted unduly to simplify their subject.

This must be our chief criticism of James Parkes's pamphlet. As was to be expected both of the series and of the author, the matter is very well handled. Many who have swallowed much of modern anti-semitic propaganda on the ground that "there is no smoke without fire" may well have their eyes opened by it to the lack of any real basis for the charges brought against the Jews. The difficulty is, of course, to persuade such people to read it. Specially to be commended is the impartial way in which the author holds the scales and sees causes for blame and difficulties on both sides. An outstanding example of this is his frank recognition that in certain countries discriminatory legislation affecting the Jews may be a necessity, though he does not give his approval to existing examples of such legislation.

Valuable though his exposition is, we throughout had the impression of superficiality and this was particularly the case when we came to his suggestions as to how the Jewish question might be solved. One reason for this superficiality is not far to seek. No treatment of the problem can ever be adequate that refuses to recognize the Biblical explanation of the present position of the Jew. The other reason is not so obvious. Mr. Parkes assumes, as indeed do most writers against anti-semitism, that anti-semitism is only an extreme form of that dislike and even hatred of the Jew that has been found throughout Christendom from the early days of the Church ; but is it ? It is easy enough to understand why the Jew has been so generally disliked. But could that dislike ever spontaneously beget those outbursts of hatred, murder and spoliation of the Jew that have marred

the pages of European history from time to time, and have now reached their climax in German anti-semitism? We greatly doubt it.

These outbreaks have seldom, if ever, been based on ignorance, but very often on deliberate lies. Their leaders have not been the abysmally ignorant; on the contrary they have normally been very able men and their appeal has been *in the first place* to the intelligent and not to the mob. There has always been an element of "Deus vult" about them, even though God may be but the god of race and blood. In these outbreaks the Jew has very often been placed as a symbol of evil for "God's" fighters to wage war with and destroy. It is obvious that widespread dislike of the Jew will favour the spread of such an outbreak, but surely it cannot be equated with its cause. If it is true that anti-semitism is something essentially different in its nature to dislike of the Jew, then any proposed solution that ignores the difference is not only useless but even dangerous.

H. L. ELLISON.

THE THREE PILLARS.

By The Rev. A. Ross Wallace, M.A. (Chapman & Hall) 5s.

This book, written primarily to help Schoolmasters responsible for teaching Scripture to VIth Form boys, is equally suitable for the general intelligent reader.

It is never easy to treat theological questions in a manner interesting to "Everyman": there is a tendency either to be dull or shallow. Yet in my estimation Mr. Wallace has successfully achieved a combination of depth and interest in a short volume of 183 pages; the book fulfils its presumed intention, to stimulate thought and provoke further search, though in the latter connection a short bibliography of further suggested reading would have been helpful.

Some readers will not like certain too easy assumptions made in the book (the assumption, for example, that monotheism was a late development in the history of religion), but this in no way detracts from the general excellence of a book which is uncompromising in its Christian standards, clear in its teaching, and convincingly forceful in its expression of many things that need saying in these critical days.

R. P.

THE HOPE OF A NEW WORLD

By the Archbishop of York. (S.C.M. Press.) 3s. 6d.

This is one of the most thought-provoking books published during the last ten years. There is not a chapter of it which is not challenging both to one as an individual and as a part of a nation sharing in world politics in this time of upheaval.

To anyone preparing an Essay for the Cecil Peace Prize of £100 for 1941, *The Hope of a New World* is a mine of information, suggestion, and provocative vision.

Not every one will agree with the writer in his new economic theories and ideals. Those with capital invested in business concerns may find this sentence rather difficult to swallow practically as well as theoretically (p. 68). "Money exists to facilitate the exchange of goods; it must not be so controlled as to increase the gains of those who hold it at the cost of diminishing the exchange of goods."

No preacher who wishes to be fresh and abreast of the times can afford to neglect this book. Suggestions for great sermons are to be found in every chapter of it.

It is imperative that we win the peace as well as win the war. This creative book will do much to arm us to win the peace—greatly to improve the world and the position of the working man and his family in whatever country he may be a citizen.

H. H. D.

THE TRUE AND LIVING GOD

By Vernon F. Storr, Sub-Dean of Westminster and Rector of St. Margaret's. (S.P.C.K.) 2s.

This is, we believe, the last of the writings of the late Canon Storr. It is marked by clear thinking, and the earlier chapters on God in Nature and in History are specially valuable in consequence. There are, as one might expect in a short treatise of this nature, several debatable points. For example, we are not quite sure that the thoughts expressed with regard to the Atonement are as adequate as are the words of the Prayer of Consecration—"Jesus Christ . . . made there (by His one oblation of Himself once offered) a full, perfect, and sufficient sacrifice, oblation and satisfaction for the sins of the whole world."

D. T. W.
