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

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

The Churchman

JULY-SEPTEMBER, 1945.

Vol. LIX. No. 3. New Series.

Contents :

PRICE : ONE SHILLING

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

Editorial.

AS a further contribution to the important subject of " Confirmation ", the Archdeacon of Sheffield has contributed in this issue a paper of profound scholarship, " The Doctrine of Baptism and Confirmation ". It was originally written for the Evangelical Fellowship of Theological Literature. We hope it will be possible to reprint this paper together with several of the papers read at the Oxford Conference of Evangelical Churchmen, which were published in the last issue of *The Churchman*. Evangelicals have made a most important and scholarly criticism of the recent Report, " Confirmation Today ", especially in its doctrinal implications and, as this subject is now being freely discussed, we believe that the observations of Evangelical scholars should have the widest possible circulation, especially as the demand for the last issue of *The Churchman* was greater than the number we were able to print.

Our subscribers will read with interest a thought-provoking paper contributed by Bishop Stephen Neill, until recently, Bishop of Tinnevelly. To fully appreciate this paper it should be remembered that he uses the word, ' Protestant ', in a rather unusual connotation, not in its generally accepted meaning.

We are indebted to the Rev. F. J. Taylor, who has already, contributed several most valuable articles to *The Churchman*, for his paper on, " English Social History ", being reflections on the recent book by G. M. Trevelyan, which has had a phenomenal sale.

In a recent issue we published a paper by Dr. Basil Atkinson on, " Messianic Prophecy ", which was received with warm appreciation by many of our readers, though it suggested a theory of interpretation of Old Testament Prophecy entirely new to many. Archdeacon W. S. Moule has kindly written for us another paper on the same subject from the older and, until recently, more generally accepted interpretation. We are sure that his paper will be equally appreciated.

We regret that many recently have been disappointed in not being able to secure a copy of *The Churchman*. Owing to shortage of paper the number printed is strictly limited, but we hope, in the very near future, to issue a larger edition. We would urge all desirous of obtaining our valuable quarterly to become annual subscribers.

The Anglican Tradition in Liturgy and Devotion.

By The Rt. Rev. Stephen Neill, M.A.

THE Anglican Communion occupies a unique place in Christendom. This is a platitude. All the same it is worth repeating. The Anglican *via media* seems to the ardent something very different from the golden mean. Yet, though that *via media* has, from time to time, been synonymous with unadventurousness in theology, lukewarmness in devotion, and sloth in the carrying out of good works, abuse should not be allowed to obscure the excellences of use; that the *via media* represents a point of precarious balance does not make it any less admirable as an ideal of Churchmanship. In liturgy, as elsewhere, the Anglican tradition is a gallant attempt to reconcile law and liberty, to hold fast to the wealth of past experience, without denying whatever the Spirit may have to say to the Churches in the present.

For our liturgical tradition as we have it today, we are indebted almost entirely to one man, Thomas Cranmer, Archbishop of Canterbury. Without doubt, Cranmer had collaborators and advisers; but when we compare the services of the 1st and 2nd Prayer Books either with the prolix and tasteless compositions to be found in the books of Elizabethan special services, or with the 17th Century parts of the Prayer Book, admirable but so curiously different in style and feeling, I think the impression is deepened that the original liturgical work of our Reformation all bears the mark of one master-hand, and that can be none other than the hand of Cranmer. Luther laid upon the German Reformation the trademark of his ebullience and gusto, his deep feeling and his inspired gift of hymnody. It would be difficult to find a man more completely different from Luther than Cranmer. Cautious almost to a fault, patient, sensitive, he advanced only with great hesitation along the path of reform. When he wrote of his efforts at verse composition "Mine English verses lack the grace and facility I would wish they had", he was expressing himself with moderation. But he has left the world permanently his debtor by a unique precision in the use of English words, and an unequalled ear for English prose rhythms. He has made a greater contribution to the development of Christian worship than any other one man of whom we have knowledge in the history of the Christian Church.

Cranmer's intention was not to innovate but to restore. He was actuated by a genuine desire to get behind the complexities of the mediaeval tradition to what he rightly discerned as the simplicities and glories of a better stage of Catholic worship. Diligent and scrupulous as he was in the use of all the materials then available to him, he was hindered by the very imperfect state of liturgical scholarship in his age. In fact, in the latest appraisement of his work, he is blamed, not for having made too many innovations, but for having retained

too much of the mediaeval superstructure, and not having shown sufficient boldness in carrying through his own sounder principles of Catholic worship.

We will here leave out of account the minor acts of worship of the Christian Church, and concentrate on the two great traditions of the Eucharist and the Divine Office. Both of these, Cranmer found grievously depraved from their former high estate. In the Eucharist, the Communion of the people had almost ceased to exist, except on rare festival occasions; worse than this, even the genuinely worshipping minority of the congregations made no attempt to base their worship on the liturgy, but contented themselves with small individual manuals of devotion. The Mass, therefore, had ceased to be the corporate action of the whole Church, and had become a rite carried out by the priest on behalf of the congregation, in which the individual worshipper took a greater or less part, according to his personal inclination. The Divine Office had become in the strict sense of the word a "Choir Office". It was no longer regarded as being in any way the concern of the layman; it had become so complicated and lengthy as to be beyond the capacity of even the secular clerk to understand and to carry out; and in the ever increasing complication of the rules, the original purpose of psalmody and the plain and uninterrupted reading of the Scriptures had entirely been forgotten.

Faced with this jungle, Cranmer hacked out for himself a straight path by steady adherence to two great principles—every act of worship in the Church must be the act of the whole worshipping congregation; and every worshipper must realise himself in every act as a member of the whole redeemed and worshipping Body of Christ in heaven and on earth.

The first deduction from these principles made, be it noted, only in the eleventh year of Cranmer's Archbishopric, was that all worship must be in a language understanded of the people. With this decision, the Church of England takes its stand uncompromisingly with the Reformed and against the Unreformed Churches of Christendom. It must not be supposed that by this decision everything is made simple for the ordinary Christian; in fact, a liturgical service in the vernacular makes heavier demands on the worshipper than any other type of service. If we worship in an unknown tongue, the ordinary man is exempt from the effort to follow the actual liturgy, and is free to compose his own acts of worship according to his capacity, within the general framework of what the Church is doing. If the service is unliturgical, the minister can make infinitely varied adaptations of the order to what he knows of the capacity of his flock to receive the Word, and worship can be brought within the grasp even of the simple and unlearned. But a fixed liturgy, from its very nature, should be the expression of a wide range of not very simple theological ideas; and it will always tend to be exalted, noble, and therefore unusual in expression. Liturgical language may be understood of the people, it is very unlikely that it will be itself the common people's speech; but when the Liturgy is in the vernacular, the common man cannot be set free from the effort to understand it, and to pray according to it. This makes upon him very heavy demands; and, when we remember

what the level of education and intelligence is likely to have been in the 16th Century England, we cannot but be astonished by what Cranmer believed to be within the capacity of simple people, illumined by the Word and the Spirit of God. It is clear that he never imagined himself to be creating a book of worship for the élite; his ideal was that of Erasmus, that the ploughman and the weaver at their work should sing the songs of Zion, and the traveller beguile with them the tedium of his journey; he did not hesitate to take the ideal as being also the possible.

In the Eucharist, Cranmer's primary aim was to restore regular and general Communion. The moment the people come forward to receive the Sacrament, the priest is drawn out of his isolation at the altar; the Eucharist is no longer something done by the priest on behalf of a passive congregation, it becomes the act of the priestly body, the Church, and the ordained priest becomes the representative of the body as being the one through whom all perform their action, not as the one whose action makes impossible or unnecessary all activity on the part of the rest of the Church. This serious concern of Cranmer is expressed most forcibly in a passage not often noted except by experts in liturgiology, in the "exhortation at certain times when the Curate shall see the people negligent to come to the Holy Communion" in the Prayer Book of 1552: "Truly it is a great unthankfulness to say nay when ye be called: but the fault is much greater when men stande by, and yet will neither eate nor drink this holy Communion with other. I pray you what can this be els, but even to have the misteries of Christ in derision? It is said unto all: Take ye and eate; Take and drink ye all of this; do this in remembrance of me. With what face then, or with what countenance shall ye heare these wordes? What will this be else but a neglecting, a despising and mocking of the Testament of Christ. Wherefore, rather than you should do so, depart you hence, and give place to them that be godly disposed".

But, even if the devout communicant comes forward to approach the table of the Lord, it is possible that he may do so in the inviolate shroud of his own individuality. We have heard too often of "making my Communion", a phrase which would have filled Cranmer with amazement, and I hope is now consigned to the limbo of mediaeval horrors. The communicant must be reminded as forcibly as possible of his status in the Body of Christ, the one loaf, the one Body, the mystery of which, in Augustinian phrase, is set forth on the altar. There is interesting evidence of this concern in Cranmer's mind in the 1549 Rubric about the bread to be used at the Communion; the bread is to be "something more larger and thicker than it was, so that it may be aptly divided in divers pieces: and everyone shall be divided, in two pieces, at the leaste, or more by the discrecion of the minister, and so distributed". Each communicant is to be given only a divided part, in order that he may be emphatically reminded of the whole.

But still more significant is the arrangement of the service of Holy Communion in 1552, in which the communion of the people is brought nearer to the centre of the rite than in any other liturgy in Christendom. The communicant, after Communion, is not left alone absorbed in his

own individual devotion; he is drawn out of it to take part in a corporate act of thanksgiving, oblation and adoration. I suppose there are times when we all resent this intrusion of the fellowship upon the self—when, after Communion we would prefer to be left, as we might put it, alone in the presence of the Lord. But it does not take very deep theological thought to see that this, so far from being evidence of a higher spirituality, is really a relic of that individualism, which is in us all the legacy of original sin and from which Christ came to deliver us, and that the Eucharistic rite of our Prayer Book, with its culmination in the adoration of the whole body of the faithful now made one in Christ, is far truer to the Biblical and classical conception of the Eucharist as the expression of the common life in the Body of Christ.

In setting forth Mattins and Evensong, Cranmer was actuated by two purposes—first to provide the ordinary working clergy with a daily office, which really could be said daily as a matter of obligation, without undue interference with the routine of other spiritual work; second, to supply daily services in Church which ordinary Christians could be expected to attend with profit. It is only by detailed comparison with what went before that the magnificent simplicity of these two services stands out boldly. The substitution of the monthly for the weekly reading of the Psalter solved at a stroke a problem which has continued to vex the Roman hierarchy to the present day. Once it has been done, it is so simple and obvious, that we tend to underestimate the genius of the man who broke with the tradition of a thousand years, and said *it shall be so*. The services are a subtle blending of the needs of the day and the month and the year. The principle that all the more important parts of the Bible are to be read through in a year is strictly adhered to; very few special lessons are allowed, the remembrance of saints being provided for chiefly by Collect, Epistle and Gospel. The worshipper is to feel himself part of a nation-wide community; in every Church in the land, fellow-Christians will be singing just those Psalms and hearing just those lessons; wherever within the land the Christian may wander, he will know just what to expect, and will be able to take up the cycle of devotion just where he had broken off.

Cranmer's arrangement of the services is open to obvious criticisms; first, that excessive rigidity tends to monotony; second, that it is impossible to guarantee that the variable parts of the service will be appropriate or edifying to any particular congregation on the day on which they are used. To these I think Cranmer's answer would have been as follows: the idea of a single book of devotion, which is in the hands of the worshippers and contains everything needed for intelligent participation in the services, is a new one; the gains made possible by it are so great that nothing must be allowed to jeopardize them; much variety in the daily services—antiphones, responses, invitatories and so on—will soon make the book both complicated and unwieldly; if we must pay the price of monotony for simplicity, it is a price well worth paying. The second criticism is based on the fundamental Protestant conception of worship. This is that the unit in space is the single congregation, not the whole Church, and that the unit in time is the single service, and not the liturgical year. The aim of the

Protestant, as opposed to the Catholic tradition, is that every service should be immediately and plainly edifying to the congregation attending it. This they do much better in Geneva; we in England do not aim at small profits and quick returns. If a man coming out of Church says to us "I have gained nothing today", we shall reply "My friend, you are seeking the wrong thing. Do not hope to pluck an oak-tree from an acorn in a day. Let the discipline of Christ's worship grow with you from year to year, and you will find in the end that you have as many rings about you as has an oak-tree, and have gained in sixty years as much strength in the spiritual world as it has in the material". In the whole Anglican rationale of worship there is no point more fundamental than this, and nothing in which its adherence to the essential Catholic tradition is more clear.

By 1552, the main lines of the Anglican liturgical tradition have become plainly apparent. It is *Biblical*. For steady and systematic Bible-reading on the large scale, no other Church in the world can compare with the Anglican. It is *intellectual*; the Anglican Prayer Book is not intended for the intellectually idle; it demands that those who use it should exercise themselves to understand, and it will give little of its riches to those who merely acquiesce. It is *sober*; it never aims at awaking immediate and facile emotion; it relies on the development of deep currents of feeling through the patient contemplation of the mysteries of the Gospel. It is *ethical*. Perhaps the profound sense of sin reawakened in Reformation times by the renewed study of the Scriptures weighs a little too heavy on it. It is characteristic of the whole book that the Exhortation of Morning and Evening Prayer bids us approach God *with an humble, penitent, lowly and obedient heart*. But it is part of the strength of the Anglican tradition that it has never allowed it to be supposed that worship can exist in separation from conduct, or that emotion can usurp the function of conscience. It is again characteristic that Cranmer himself added to the Litany the petition, not found in any of his earlier models, for the grace of the Holy Spirit *to amend our lives according to thy holy Word*.

I imagine that there have never been more than a few who found in the Prayer Book the fulfilment of all their devotional needs. Most people have sought additional outlets, usually in one of three directions. Some have developed the individual approach to God, in silent meditation and prayer. Some have desired the emotional stimulus of the extempore prayer meeting, and other more Corybantic manifestations of Christianity, with their immediate relevance to daily needs, and their immediate satisfaction of an emotional craving. Others have welcomed the soothing balm of, it must be admitted, often rather sentimental hymns; and the need to soften the rather austere outlines of our services has become so generally recognised that the insertion of hymns has become an almost universal practice. I do not suppose that Cranmer would have objected to any of this, provided that the decorations did not obscure the structure. The common prayer of the Church should deal with universals; and its appeal should be to deep and permanent instincts of the human heart. If this is safeguarded, there is no reason why more transient emotions should not find their satisfaction in other ways.

The gravest defect of our liturgical tradition has been its rigidity and

the impossibility of spontaneous growth. For this the accident of the establishment is largely responsible. A healthy liturgical development depends upon the combination of intense loyalty to the central liturgical tradition with considerable freedom and flexibility in detail. It is just this flexibility which makes the study of ancient liturgies so extremely perplexing. Modifications always begin by way of individual experiment. An experiment which is successful in one place will quickly spread to another, and can do so without hindrance under the eye of a patient and tolerant authority, not concerned to maintain a rigid uniformity in non-essentials. Liturgical experiments can prove their value only by actual use, use in an ordinary congregation over a considerable period of time. Only then does the work of authority begin. When an experiment has justified itself in use, and has been widely adopted, it is time that it should be, as it were, officially registered, adopted into service books, and accepted as a permanent part of the rite. It was in this way, for example, that the recitation of the Nicene Creed in the liturgy very gradually established itself as part of the regular practice of the Church in both East and West. Such liturgical experiment has never ceased in England in minor matters, even under the rigid control of the Act of Uniformity. I have already alluded to the universal adoption of the singing of hymns, not frowned on, though never formally approved, by authority. I may mention here two other, not strictly liturgical, examples of the rapidity with which custom spreads, so that before long most people have forgotten that there ever was a time when the custom was not observed. One is the 19th century practice of holding a Harvest Festival, now in many places more observed than either Christmas or Easter. The other is the custom of taking a money collection at Mattins and Evensong, first introduced, I believe, by Hawker of Morwenstow, the minor poet, about the middle of the last century, but now so rigidly followed that its omission produces a slight shock. But in strictly liturgical matters the Anglican parson in England and his flock have no liberty of experiment, and are open to the charge of disobedience and disloyalty if they depart from the letter of the statutory requirements.

In consequence, such liturgical revision as has taken place within the Anglican Communion has mostly been put through in the self-governing churches and provinces. It is very desirable that the ignorance prevailing in the provinces of Canterbury and York about these various revisions should at least in a measure be dispelled.

It is a common experience of the theological teacher to find that his students have never heard of the very intelligent though conservative revision of the Prayer Book undertaken by the Church of Ireland. Very few even among well educated Anglicans know the extent of variation now sanctioned in different parts of the world. In addition to the several rehandlings of the Anglican liturgy, two rites based on the Eastern tradition have been sanctioned for limited use, and permission has been given for the use in two theological colleges of the use of the Reformed Syrian Church of Malabar. But all these many experiments, with their various merits and defects, labour under two great difficulties. In the first place, these revisions are not the result of a genuine movement of freedom in worship upwards from below. They have

all been, at least in a measure, academic revisions carried out by committees or interested individuals at the study table. Thus, for example, the Ceylon liturgy, meritorious as it is in conception, is much too much a scissors and paste affair, patching together fragments from East and West, to stand successfully under the test of regular and repeated use. Secondly, all these revisions have suffered under the hand of the liturgiologist. The critic of poetry is not infrequently the worst of poets. It seems that the expert liturgiologist is the worst maker of liturgies in the world. The scholarly and archaeological interests seem to conflict irremediably with the creative, and pedantry, the worst foe of worship, creeps into the construction upon which the expert has laid his hand. Both these troubles hindered the already vexed course of the abortive English revision which culminated in the fiasco of 1927-8. But, as has been correctly pointed out in the biography of Archbishop Randall Davidson, that revision was weighed down by a further heavy burden of trouble. It was not put in hand with a single-minded interest to discover and set forth that rite by which the eucharistic devotion of the Church of England in the 20th century could best be expressed. It was part of a long drawn plan to coerce a recalcitrant minority and to restore at least a measure of order in an anarchic situation, surely the very worst basis on which liturgical redrafting could possibly be taken in hand.

The storm centre in the English liturgical anarchy has been the Eucharist. It has not therefore been sufficiently observed that elsewhere also over-rigidity has had its natural effects, and that the war of 1914-18 brought not reform but revolution on the Church of England. It came, not with the flourish of trumpets, but without observation, and therefore it is only with an effort that even those of us who are over forty and were in the habit of going to church before the last war, can cast our minds back and remember what the state of things was in 1914. In that year, in the vast majority of churches in England, no prayer was ever read that was not in the statutory Prayer Book. There was only one lectionary, universally and faithfully observed, with no alternative lessons at Mattins. Thus Jezebel always came in the middle of the summer holidays ; we always heard her story read by a stranger, and not in the familiar voice of Col. F. the Vicar's warden. The State prayers were read every Sunday, unless their place was taken by the Litany, which was read so regularly that by the age of twelve we all knew it by heart. On the first Sunday in the month at midday was the parish Eucharist, at which, even at that date, it was no uncommon thing to see a family of parents and three or four children filling an entire pew.

In 1914 the flood of " Protestantism " burst upon the Church of England, as it never had burst since the days of the Protector, and threatened to engulf it. The old order has been completely, and apparently irrevocably, swept away. It is to be noted that all the changes have been in the " Protestant " direction, and away from the Catholic ideal, that is, away from the conception of a universal worshipping church progressing soberly through the liturgical year, and towards the conception of each congregation as a collection of hungry units, crying out for immediate edification. The first step in the direction of making the services adaptable to the needs of the day was

to authorise special war prayers, and not very good ones, for use after the Third Collect. That introduced the now well-known principle that what comes after the Third Collect is a gamble, and that you never know what you are likely to get. Then followed a new and eclectic lectionary. Experience had falsified Cranmer's hope that everybody would come regularly to church on Sundays, and a good proportion of the laity on week-days also. So the 1922 lectionary frankly abandoned the idea of regular Bible-reading covering Sundays and weekdays alike, and chose special lessons for Sunday services, on the general principle that each lesson should be, as far as possible complete in itself, and intelligible to the irregular worshipper with a slender knowledge of Scripture. But this lectionary provided so many alternatives, sometimes several for a single lesson, that the preservation of continuity in reading became almost impossible ; it depended on the caprice or judgment of the incumbent whether any part of the historical books of the Old Testament or any of the Epistles were read ; and the worshipper never knew beforehand what he might expect to hear. The mischief was increased by the growing demand for the observance of all kinds of special Sundays, for which the bishops were expected to provide or sanction special lections. To this must be added the practice, now very general, of inserting after the Third Collect any kind of intercessions from any kind of source authorised or unauthorised at the discretion or indiscretion of the parson ! It is clear that we have come very near to the " Protestant " ideal, where the parson is his own Pope, and his only concern is with the immediate needs and interests of his own flock.

With these radical changes in the character of the divine office was going hand in hand a similar " Protestantisation " of the Eucharist. We have seen that legitimate development in worship follows from careful and humble loyalty to a central tradition, combined with great flexibility in detail. But the developments in Eucharistic worship, which began in the third quarter of the 19th Century, and reached their climax perhaps about the end of the last war, cannot be said to have fallen within the limits of the Catholic framework. Development must proceed from within, from a profound understanding of the genius of the English rite and the liturgical ideas for which it stands, and an enrichment of the liturgy by extension along its own natural lines. The various official revisions shew something of what can be done in this way : though many of those who know them best and use them most frequently, may feel that not one is equal in dignity and force to the austere majesty of the Rite of 1662. But unfortunately many of those who were pressing for liturgical enrichment were doing so on indefensible lines. Having fallen in love with the Latin rite in its late mediaeval form, and being for the most part ignorant of the Eastern rites with their treasures of devotion, they took that one rather jejune rite as the norm of Eucharistic worship, criticised the Anglican rite for not being what it never set out to be, the lineal inheritor in English of the Latin mediaeval service, and tried to bring the English service up to their ideal of what Eucharistic worship should be by the singularly inartistic method of patching, fastening here and there a bit of the Roman on to the English to the mutual destruction of both. Those who solved the problem by simply

abandoning the English rite altogether and saying the whole Roman service in English or in Latin were few but logical. Those who reduced the Mass to a thing of shreds and patches were more numerous. But their position was liturgically precarious and inevitably Protestant. No rational authority could sanction such a proceeding, or authorise the more or less skilful conflation of two not altogether harmonious rites. The individual priest was therefore left to the dictates of his own conscience, or his own liturgical fancies. The appeal could not be to anything but the purely Protestant principle of private judgment—either to what the individual priest felt to be necessary for the celebration of what he judged a fully Catholic Mass, or what he found to be personally edifying ; or in certain cases, even to what his congregation had come to like, or would be sorry to be deprived of. Now one of the great weaknesses of Protestantism is the multiplicity of its rites, as will be well-known to any who have waded through any of the shapeless liturgies produced in the days when each small German city and principality thought it incumbent on it to have its own independent and hastily produced form of service. This was the situation reproduced in the English provinces in the early years of this Century, when it was computed that in one diocese alone there were twenty-seven distinct uses in the celebration of the Eucharist, twenty-five of them having no proper ecclesiastical authority at all.

We must recognise that to-day we are facing the dissolution of the Anglican liturgical tradition in a very much exaggerated form. For five years the great majority of the younger men and women of the country have been in uniform, and, in so far as they have attended Church at all, have become accustomed either to parade services, in which a truncated and fragmentary, though not wholly unliturgical, form of Mattins with sermon, is got through in thirty-five minutes ; or to the free-and-easy type of service conducted by the individual padre according to his lights. This new generation, even the Christianly inclined part of it, has become unaccustomed to the use of the Prayer Book, does not know how to find its way about in it, and is unfamiliar with the real structure of the regular services. What is to be our plan for the worship of the Church after the war, when we return to more or less normal conditions ?

It has to be recognised that at present the vast majority of our people are not communicants, and cannot be made communicants in any near future. Therefore, though the Eucharist will always be in dignity the principal service of the day, we cannot hope that it will be the principal service in frequency of attendance. We have also to recognize that for a whole generation at least, the greater part of our work must be evangelistic ; that is, that for the present, services have to be planned largely for those who stand outside the Christian tradition of worship, and have gradually and affectionately to be won back into it. This is a situation unparallelled in England for more than a thousand years. This means that we must be prepared for a great deal of experiment in the way of shorter and less liturgical services, much easier to understand than the Book of Common Prayer, and yet all planned with an educational purpose, not to bring religion down to the level of lowest common understanding, but to meet the not unfriendly seeker where he is, and to bring him slowly to appreciate

the meaning of worship and the significance of liturgy; and all this must be done without weakening the hold of the Church as a whole on the richness of its liturgical tradition. Clearly a problem great in size and difficult in complexity. In a paper of this length it is not possible to do more than to indicate certain lines of practical action:

1. It should be the aim of us all to bring the Eucharist back to its right place in worship, not by the endless multiplication of Celebrations, but by the development of the parish Eucharist, if possible followed by a communal meal, and probably at the start once a month rather than once a week.

2. There should be great boldness in experiment, outside the liturgical framework, but not out of relation to it, and not as a series of stunts, but as a steady educational programme, designed to familiarise the worshippers with the concepts and the classical forms of Christian worship.

3. We should aim at the printing of the standard prayer book in a form in which it is reasonably possible for the not very expert worshipper to find his way about. The prayer book put out by the Church in Wales is not a bad model from which to start.

4. Even though the daily offices should become for a time, as they were in the Middle Ages, a choir office, that is, the close preserve of a leisured and expert class, traditional Mattins and Evensong should not be abandoned, but should be retained as the form and standard by which other more vernacular types of worship are to be judged, and to which they should gradually be approximated. It is important that all priests should take seriously the duty of saying the Daily Offices, even when they cannot be said in Church, and should so discipline themselves in the inner life, that their own spiritual experiences and aspirations can find their expression in the wider context of the Church's historic worship.

5. We need to give time and attention to the study of liturgical principles, as well as to the solution of practical problems of worship. As I have said before, most of the work of liturgical revision in our Communion has gone forward on a basis of imperfect knowledge or sectarian bias, and has not therefore been very successful. It is the merit of Dom Gregory Dix's recent work *The Shape of the Liturgy* that he does ask the right kind of questions—What is the Church trying to do? How has it set about doing it? What are the permanently necessary parts of the liturgy and which are the accessories which may be changed or abandoned? How far his answers to these questions are satisfactory I have not the expert knowledge to be able to judge, and it will take time before his book has found its level in the liturgical world. In any case it deals only with the Eucharist, not with the daily offices, still less with the occasional offices of the Church. But the hopeful feature of the book is that it does go back behind the controversies of the mediaeval and Reformation periods, which have made liturgiology such a barren and exacerbating subject, and has helped us to study worship as a function of the living and breathing organism.

When we turn from the worship of the Church to the individual practice of devotion, a comparison of our tradition with that of the

Roman Catholic Church is likely to leave us distressed by the poverty of our inheritance. We have nothing to correspond with the Spiritual Exercises of St. Ignatius, or with the counsels of St. François de Sales. We have developed nothing like the elaborate systems of prayer and meditation so carefully listed and analysed in Dom Bede Frost's book on *The Art of Mental Prayer*. Not only so, but I suspect that, among Anglicans, those who can use such methods with pleasure and profit are very few indeed, and that the genius of our tradition revolts against such rigid classification and regimentation. There is a right individualism in the approach of man to God; if we accept as necessary the subordination of the individual in the liturgical approach, we feel that this must be compensated for by great freedom in the personal approach of private prayer and meditation.

In all Anglican history I can find only three books of devotion which can be called Classical or universal in their significance, one for each of the three Centuries since the Reformation—Lancelot Andrewes' *Preces Privatae*, the hymns of Charles Wesley and the *Christian Year* by John Keble. Andrewes' Manual of Prayer has proved its catholic character by the acceptance it has found with Anglicans and Free Churchmen of every conceivable variety of school and practice. It has many of the characteristics of Anglicanism at its best. It springs direct from the Biblical tradition; even where it is not directly using Biblical words it manifestly has the same gift as Cranmer's prayers of expressing Biblical thought in kindred and apt but original language. It is full of fervour, but of fervour under restraint; in the range and particularity of its intercessions it reveals a religion which is in no way cloistral, but takes into itself the concerns of the court and the camp, and of all sorts and conditions of men at their ordinary avocations. Wesley's Hymns, again, stand in the Biblical tradition; the emotional tension is higher, but the emotion is that which arises from deep and genuine religious experience, and is almost entirely free from sentimentality or mawkishness. The essential quality of the Hymns is unction, in the true, and not the modern, significance of that much misused word. It is a matter for regret that the Anglican Church has almost forgotten this rich heritage, which belongs specially to it, since Charles Wesley never departed from the Communion of the Church, of which to the end of his life he was a minister, and the whole body of his hymns was written for use by faithful members of that Church. At some points the 18th Century phraseology may be a hindrance to the modern reader; but for the greater part, the hymns are in plain straightforward English, and the experiences with which they deal are those which are common to all sincere Christians earnestly seeking fellowship with Christ. The *English Hymnal* contains only twenty of Wesley's hymns and not all of these have been left in the form in which Wesley wrote them. Bernard Manning the Congregationalist had some hard things to say of the feeble way in which Anglicans use hymns in their services. To the Free Churchman, with no fixed forms, hymns in a real sense *are* the liturgy, and the right choice of them seems a most essential part of worship. We tend to use them as mere ornamental accretions, without serious liturgical significance, and to spatter them about our services as vocal pauses in the exacting business of worship. Certainly

there is a warning here that we do well to heed ; and perhaps we are ourselves to blame for bringing on ourselves these strictures by neglect of our own devotional heritage. The *Christian Year* is on a much slighter scale than either of the other classics that I have mentioned ; but this too is almost wholly free from sectarian bias or influence. For two generations it was almost as popular in Evangelical as in Tractarian circles, and was the kind of present which Evangelical godparents invariably gave to their godchildren at Confirmation. The poetry is never of a very high order, but it bears the mark of a cultured, scholarly mind, and of that refined, sober piety which was lost when the Tractarian movement diffused itself in the marshes of ritualistic excess. John Keble in many ways belonged to the 18th rather than to the 19th Century. The revival of the Church interest is shewn in the direct connection of the poems with the liturgical sequence of the Church's year, but there is little in either doctrine or expression which would not have met with the approval of Dr. Johnson.

I can find no other book of devotion which can be regarded as of universal significance even within the Anglican Communion. I believe that this is largely to be accounted for by the ascendency of the Prayer Book. When people are really praying the liturgy their need for additional sources of devotion is much less than when the liturgy is an unintelligible performance in an unknown tongue, or is the extemporaneous composition of a possibly not very gifted minister. The Primers flourished and multiplied until the Prayer Book was put into English and then they wilted and died. As we have said, the Prayer Book does not by itself satisfy the devotional needs of the majority of worshippers ; but the characteristically Anglican supplements to it seem to me to have taken two directions.

The first is the devotional study of Scripture. This practice has so much died out that it is hard for us to realise how widespread at one time it was. The study was not always very intelligent, but it was painstaking and earnest. It was taken for granted that the devout Christian would spend some time every day, and a considerable time every Sunday, in Bible-reading ; it was further taken for granted that the subject of study was the whole Bible, and that the ordinary Christian would wrestle even with the more difficult parts until some kind of meaning had been elucidated. Whilst the learned would use commentaries, the unlearned might expect with the help of the Holy Spirit and of the Sunday sermon, to become in time acquainted with the whole range of the plan of salvation. There were of course eccentricities of interpretation ; but generally, the standard of doctrine being set by the Prayer Book and the Catechism, aberrations from the broad highway of Christian conviction were not so serious as to be dangerous. The high watermark of Bible-reading was probably about 1860 ; but the ebb of the tide did not begin to be very rapid until after the war of 1914-1918.

The other devotional outlet was the use of extempore prayer. It is often supposed that this is a special preserve of the Free Churchman. But this is by no means the case. Throughout the 19th Century, many parishes had a regular Saturday night meeting for extempore prayer. Perhaps the thing which most markedly distinguishes us from the

godly of two generations ago is that, whereas they felt it perfectly natural to kneel down and pray together on any and every occasion, we are self-conscious even with our closest friends. Perhaps we have gained in restraint; it can scarcely be denied that we have lost in spontaneity. Perhaps there is something here which we should seek to recover. It is noticeable that where Anglicans are familiar with the use of extempore prayer, they generally make a much better use of it than Free Churchmen; the constant use of the Collects has taught them definiteness in object and precision in expression, and saves them from the meandering and repetition which can make extempore prayer so tedious and meaningless. We have the testimony of many that opening their lips in prayer was for them a decisive turning-point in spiritual experience, and that the simple approach to the heavenly Father in company with a friend, or in the little group of two or three, was for them the surest and most effective means of experiencing the reality of Christian fellowship.

In writing this paper, I have been compelled to realise at every point that a great deal of what I have written is remote from our present practice and experience, that the Anglican tradition in liturgy and devotion is not what we do now, but something that we have to discover in theory and to recover in practice. The scantiness of our congregations, serious as it is, is much less serious than the dying out of religion in the home and in daily life. Anglicanism sets its mark on the faithful not in crises of emotion nor in extremes of self-denying service (though these have never been lacking among the faithful of our Church), but in the sober discipline of innumerable acts of turning to God, in the inner chamber and in the house of God. The real meaning and value of the Anglican tradition will not become apparent until the congregations in our Churches become once again conscious and worshipping manifestations of the *koinonia* of the Body of Christ, until the service of the Church has become, as it ought to be, the focussing of uncounted rays of personal fellowship with God.

The Doctrine of Baptism and Confirmation.

AN EVANGELICAL ANGLICAN INTERPRETATION

By The Ven. Archdeacon D. E. W. Harrison, M.A.

THE syllabus provided for this paper includes "The value and limitations of the historical approach; the adequacy of scripture as a basis for the doctrine of baptism and confirmation; current Anglican practice in relation to doctrine and a critical examination of the theology of *Confirmation Today*." That is a wide field and I cannot hope to cover it adequately. The width and indeed its complexity may be illustrated from a quotation from *Confirmation To-day*, "The freedom which the church has used in connexion with Confirmations is indeed remarkable; for there is diversity as to the form of words to be employed; diversity as to the outward sign; diversity as to the minister authorized to administer the rite; diversity as to the stage in the Christian life at which it ought to be administered; diversity as to its relation to Baptism; diversity as to its relation to Holy Communion; diversity as to teaching about the nature of that gift of the Holy Spirit through the rite, which all nevertheless agree is given." And to this multiform diversity we may add the diversities of interpretation of the practice of Infant Baptism to which, in the Anglican Church, we have to relate the rite of Confirmation. All I can therefore hope to do is work through the syllabus given me, picking out what seems to me most relevant and indicating what seems to me to be the most fruitful lines of interpretation.

We must begin, so it seems to me, at the very beginning. Christianity consists in a personal relationship to God in Christ, dependent essentially upon what God in Christ has done for men. The initiative was and is with God and the ways of God's self-disclosure and self-communication are of his choosing, not ours. The Incarnation is the starting point of our doctrinal quest because it makes clear to us that God's way with men is personal confrontation in which God is apprehended as infinite succour and infinite demand. God meets men in the person of Jesus Christ where they are in order that He may bring them where He is, conforming their character to His will, in Christ-likeness, through the loving activity of His Spirit. This is commonplace, but it is perhaps not unfitting to insist that all our thinking must therefore be in personal terms and more especially when we use words like "grace" and "faith" which even in the first century could become depersonalized—witness the refusal of the fourth Gospel to use them.

Having said that, we have then to recognise that personal relationships do not mean merely individual relationships, though these are included. Personality has been not unworthily defined as the capacity to enter into relationship. God, may we not reverently say, is the perfection of personality just because of the infinite range

of his relationships; and therefore in relationship with Him we are ourselves, however unconsciously, widely related; and more particularly to those who with us form the Body of Christ, the Family of God and the Temple of the Spirit. This implies that in all our thinking on this subject, we are concerned not simply with a person baptized or confirmed, but with the Church of God.

The third fundamental point of departure is that Jesus, clearly in the institution of the Lord's Supper, and less clearly in the ordinance of Baptism, expressed His personal activity by means of significant action. He not only called bread and wine His Body and Blood and commanded their continued use with that meaning, but He gave them to His disciples with the imperatives, "Take, eat"; "Drink ye all of this." Interpreted simply as "prophetic symbolism", what Jesus did in the Upper Room was linked by the Lord's own word and action with the historical events of the crucifixion and resurrection and with all which those events accomplished for men. There can, I think, be little doubt that the early church so understood Him and believed that in and through what we call the sacraments of Baptism and the Lord's Supper, the Risen Lord was active in the hearts and minds of those who in faith received them. Moreover, it was supremely the efficacy of His death and resurrection which was thus made operative by the Lord Himself in the lives of His disciples. The implication for all our thinking, so it seems to me, is that the sacraments are never to be conceived as mere signs but as "*efficacia signa*", "*instrumenta*", means by which Christ works.

The fourth fundamental for our thinking must now necessarily be introduced. From the initial preaching of the Kingdom of God in Galilee, repentance and faith are claimed to be the conditions of participation in blessing. But these are not man's natural powers inherent in his very humanity. As I read both the Gospels and the Epistles, they are themselves the fruit of the activity of the Spirit of God. In the Gospels men came to faith and repentance face to face with Jesus. "Depart from me, for I am a sinful man, O Lord"; "Lord, I believe, help thou my unbelief". When therefore we think of the sacraments we must postulate an activity of God which enables the response by which the gifts of God are received, and we shall therefore lay our primary emphasis on the Divine initiative; or in more well-worn theological terms, we shall only speak of faith in the context of grace.

With this introduction, we can turn to our subject of Baptism and Confirmation, and in the New Testament I, personally, do not find any insuperable difficulties. Baptism is everywhere regarded as initiation into the Christian community which is the Body of Christ and the organ of His activity with the world. That clearly does not mean that Christ's self-disclosure to the soul is *begun* in baptism. Paul went back again and again to the experience of the Damascus road (itself surely the climax of a long process) and he ascribes faith in his converts to the hearing (or preaching) of the Word. In one sense the decisive moment has come when faith is born in a man by the operation of the Spirit who takes the things of Christ and shows them unto us. But in another sense the decisive moment has yet to come both in the open profession of faith and the willingness to be

incorporated in the Christian community. Belief in the heart must lead on to confession with the mouth: relationship to Jesus Christ is only actualized and fruitful in relation to His Body. That incorporation St. Paul speaks of as the Work of the Holy Spirit, "for by one Spirit were we all baptized into one Body"; and it is always of this dual relationship to Christ and His Body that St. Paul is thinking when he speaks about faith or baptism. Thus in Galatians iii. 26, 27, "For ye are all the children of God by faith in Jesus Christ, for as many of you as were baptized into Jesus Christ did put on Christ". With this is consonant St. Paul's teaching about the Church. "For as the body is one and hath many members and all the members of that one body being many are one body: so also is Christ"; on which Calvin commented, "He calls Christ the Church."

Being made thus one with Christ and His Church, the Christian shares in Christ's death and resurrection, in His priesthood and His mission. In case I am misunderstood, I had perhaps better make it clear that I do not lose sight of the fundamental distinction of the Saviour and the saved, nor of the unique High-Priesthood of our Lord. What the Christian or the Church is, they are only by derivation and in the power of the Spirit, but what I am concerned to state is that "in and through baptism" or, if you like, "in and through justification", all the privileges and duties of sonship to God are covenanted to men. Their status, their title, their calling is secure. "He who spared not His own Son but delivered Him up for us all; how shall He not with Him freely give us all things?" That is the assurance which underlies Luther's "*baptizatus sum*" and it is a true New Testament insight.

Having said all that it is equally clear that the Christian's state, or for that matter the Church's state, does not coincide with his status. The fundamental principle of the New Testament ethic is that we are called "to become what we are". We are given our status, we are ἅγιοι but we have to become ὅσιοι in dependence upon that Holy Spirit of God who "helpeth our infirmities", in dependence upon whose leading we become the Sons of God in a sense deeper than at our baptism we ever knew. It is as the love of God is shed abroad in our hearts by the Holy Spirit that we know the ever increasing demands of true love, in responding to which our own love is kept fresh. Transformation into Christ-likeness is a process and in New Testament language is the fruit of "grace upon grace". And yet, this sanctification is implicit in our baptism. "We died, and our life is hid with Christ in God; and when He shall appear, we also shall appear with Him in glory". The end is implicit in the beginning. Baptism covers the whole of Christian life; its eschatological element may be transmuted but it is not removed by the passage of the centuries.

That, I fear, is all that we can find time for in the realm of Biblical doctrine concerning baptism. But two questions arise and must be answered. Can we rule out the possibility of infant baptism, even in New Testament times? Vernon Bartlet in his E.R.E. article on "Baptism in the New Testament" insists that in the ancient world a child's solidarity with its parents was universally assumed. In Colossians ii. 11, 12 St. Paul appears to regard baptism as closely

related to circumcision spiritually understood, and we know that he regarded the children of Christians as ἅγιοι. The argument can cut both ways but the probability is high that Christians would inevitably ask for baptism for their children. Polycarp we know must have been baptized in childhood and therefore in the first century. Argument from silence is dangerous, but personally I think that infant baptism probably does go back to the first century and that it would primarily be interpreted as initiation into the fellowship of the Church and as effecting also (on the basis of Mark x. 16) a real relationship with Christ in the Spirit.

The second question which must be raised is the relation of the laying-on of hands to baptism. It seems to me incontrovertible that St. Paul laid hands on the newly baptized men at Ephesus and the apostles on Philip's converts at Samaria. What I fail to see is that there is sufficient evidence for us to regard the rite as additional to baptism in the sense of conferring anything which baptism did not itself confer. On the other hand, it may well be regarded as part of baptism and as appropriately symbolizing the solidarity of the Christian community with its new members. The ceremony is interpreted by Lowther Clarke and many others as effecting *transference*, presumably of the Holy Spirit ; and reference is made to the ordination of Joshua and even of the Goat for Azazel. But the more normal sacrificial annotation of the act, the laying of the hand upon the sacrificial animal, is surely ***identification***. The laying-on of hands used as part of the baptismal rite, I take, therefore, to symbolize incorporation with the Church. It is the final act, and therefore in days when ecstatic utterance was common, if not normal, would immediately precede this manifestation of the Spirit's presence. This would account for Philip's omission of the act in the special circumstances of a mission to Samaritans, such a significant step requiring the assent of the Church in the persons of the apostles. If this is accepted, the direct inference is that the corporate aspect of the baptismal rite must be taken seriously and incorporation into the Church regarded not as of secondary but of primary significance.

I pass on now to the value and limitations of the historical approach. Here I can be brief and shall not attempt to go into detail, for the essential facts are comparatively few. The laying-on of hands (or unction) was universally, in the early Church, part of the baptismal rite and, except in Syria, followed it. If, as has recently been suggested, we regard the Syrian rite as primitive it would seem to follow that confirmation has no direct connection with the Apostolic laying-on of hands, and is therefore without scriptural authority. But we may safely follow *Confirmation To-day* in refusing to accompany Dom Gregory Dix down his liturgical by-paths and accept the main tradition both of the anti-Nicene and post-Nicene fathers in regarding the laying-on of hands—or of the hand—as the essential rite of which anointing with the thumb dipped in chrism is an Eastern variant and to which it is a Western addition. Unction in itself is best taken to symbolize consecration to the priesthood of all believers, which is an essential meaning of the whole baptismal rite. "*Sacerdotium laici id est baptisma.*"

The really significant historical fact is the dying out of the cate-

chumenate as infant baptism became the norm, together with the retention of the fully developed adult rite (including the ceremonies of the catechumenate) in the Mediaeval baptismal service for infants. The catechumenate, whatever we think of its accompanying ceremonies of insufflation, exorcism and the "*effeta*", was a real safeguard against any magical view of the sacrament. It was a solemn period of devotional preparation; it laid a solid basis of doctrinal instruction. All this was lost and nothing took its place until the Reformation. That fact is of cardinal importance.

Second only in importance is the dominance of the Augustinian doctrine of original sin involving guilt. Once this was accepted infant baptism became necessary to secure salvation and any hope of heaven. Is it unfair to suggest that, more than any other factor except that of the sheer weight of tradition, it was this doctrine, shared by the Reformers, which made the continuance of infant baptism a necessity in the 16th Century? The doctrine remains to this day clearly stated in the service itself.

Thirdly, comes the separation of confirmation from baptism in the West, necessitated by the retention of Episcopal confirmation. That retention is, I should hold, the survival of the primitive and important principle that admission to the Church of its new members is the function of the father-in-God. We have already seen that in the New Testament the laying on of hands is the effective symbol of admission to the Church, but this meaning is obscured when confirmation is separated from baptism, and it is not surprising that with the passage of the centuries it disappeared and the rite was otherwise interpreted. But the resultant doctrinal difficulty goes deeper, for as soon as Confirmation becomes a separate sacrament one of two things happens. Baptism must either be regarded as incomplete—an inference which the Middle Ages refused to draw—or Confirmation must be given a significance of its own which the Middle Ages found it exceedingly difficult to define. From that dilemma we have not yet recovered. We have divided what is indivisible—the operation of the Holy Spirit.

But the historical approach is fruitful in a negative direction. Confirmation was deferred for one, three or seven years. The Mediaeval schoolmen begin to talk of an age of discretion, but necessarily never once of spiritual maturity. The idea that Confirmation means ordination to the Priesthood of the laity finds no place in Mediaeval or Reformation theology, and it is difficult to see why *Confirmation To-day* makes it a dominant conception unless the whole rite is to be administered to the spiritually adult.

Lastly, despite episcopal efforts to check the practice, admission of the unconfirmed to Holy Communion was widely practised. Maclean quotes the Magdalen Pontifical in which, if the Bishop is absent, communion follows directly upon infant baptism; and Archbishop Peckham's regulations show that the practice was common. This is a departure, not only from primitive practice but also, surely, from sound doctrine, and reduces the significance of the other sacrament of the Gospel. To this we must return in the last section.

This brings us to the Anglican doctrine and I only wish I could be clearer than I am in suggesting a true way of approach. Some things

are, however, to me quite clear. First that the distinctively Anglican contribution is the deferment of confirmation to years of discretion and the provision of adequate instruction in the interval. The evidence as to what constitutes years of discretion is conflicting and meagre in the Reformation period. Twelve years was apparently the Elizabethan and Caroline minimum, but it must be pointed out that in that period confirmation was as disgracefully neglected by the Episcopate as in the 18th Century. The Puritan, Robert Cawdry, protested to Lord Burghley in 1587 that the bishops " themselves, for the most part, these twenty-nine years have not observed it " and Hooker speaks of " the deep neglect of this Christian duty ". Our Anglican precepts were better than our practice. But the deferment of confirmation was not merely to provide an adequate interval for instruction. That instruction was to lead to the personal acceptance of the vows made " in the name of the child " by his godparents in baptism. In this way confirmation became not as in the Middle Ages a separate sacrament, but the complement of Baptism and the necessary preliminary of admission to Holy Communion. The Baptismal office looked forward to Confirmation. " Wherefore, after this promise made by Christ, this infant must also faithfully for his part, promise by you that are his sureties (until he come of age and take it upon himself) that he will—renounce, . . . believe, . . . obey ". In a very real sense baptism is only given *upon this condition*, and its completion in confirmation is therefore, in the same sense, part of baptism itself. This, we may well claim, is a great step forward and if we could agree to regard the two services as parts of one rite we could, without great difficulty, produce a theology of " baptism-confirmation " consonant with the teaching of the New Testament. We should, however, have to refuse to dogmatize as to exactly what happens to the child in the incomplete rite.

But, even so, difficulties would remain so long as the wording of our baptismal office remained unaltered. First there is the language about original sin. As long as this remains (and presumably it still represents the teaching both of Catholics and some Evangelicals) then the corresponding language about regeneration must remain. For if sin involves guilt then either it must be dealt with in baptism or we must logically refuse to assert the salvation even of the baptized infant dying before conversion. But the English are never logical. If, however, we refuse to believe that the infant is guilty before God let us alter the language—and the sooner the better.

But granted that this difficulty is removed, what are we prepared to say is the rationale of infant baptism? The rite as it stands in 1662 administers baptism to infants on the basis of their promised repentance and faith—of their own promise, though in fact the godparents speak the words in the name of the child. But it is noteworthy that *Confirmation To-day* does not take this view. I quote (p.10) " Repentance and faith are indeed operative in bringing the candidate to Baptism, his own in the case of the adult, the Church's in the case of the infant." This means that baptism is based on the vicarious faith and repentance of those with whom the child has natural solidarity as a member of the family. This could be defended on New Testament grounds—*e.g.*, the palsied man borne of four, the

epileptic boy. But it is not the language of the Prayer Book. Are we prepared for the change involved? It is true that the principle involved is already stated in the Gospel of the baptismal office upon which much of the service is built. All that would be needed would be the explicit statement that it is this faith of the Church represented by the godparents which is the ground on which the child is baptized. The questions in the service should then be asked of the godparents.

But if this takes place, we shall really have changed our doctrine. The truth seems to me to be that the present office is not self-consistent. The language about original sin and regeneration imply a change both in the child's status and state, as the result of baptism; but the language about promises made by the child, implies that a gift is given on conditions which it is assumed will be fulfilled; and so, since the end of the 18th Century, Evangelicals have normally interpreted baptism as a covenant rite in which the gifts covenanted and sealed become actual as and when the conditions are fulfilled. Not unnaturally they have been uneasy about the language of the service which implies that regeneration has taken place. A final way out is to regard "regeneration" as used in something other than its full New Testament sense and there is surely a measure of truth in this. An infant cannot have regeneration in exactly the same sense as the repentant and faithful adult.

All this, I would insist, is the result of the unrevised use of a service which essentially is an adult baptism transferred *en bloc* to the conditions of infancy to which it does not apply. Is not our truer wisdom to re-think the whole question? We believe that our Lord will receive and bless infants, that in so doing He establishes a real relationship with Himself. If we call this regeneration, we can say so. The basis for this reception is two-fold, His love for men, and His honouring of the faith of those who bring the child. If we hold this we can regard baptism, like Holy Communion, as instrumental. But we shall not, I think, baptize indiscriminately.

We shall further believe that the relationship with Christ begun in Baptism, will be deepened by the activity of His Spirit both in the soul of the child and through the Church, which includes the family of which the child is a member, and we can pray expectantly for that repentance and faith which is essential to the fulness of personal relationship with God.

Can we call a service which includes all these things, setting forth the promises of God and stating the conditions of confirmation, "Holy Baptism"? If we can, our major problems are solved and Confirmation will be, as in traditional Anglican theology, not a separate sacrament but the fulness of life of which Baptism is the origin and earnest; and, I would add, itself instrumental.

For it, we need a much longer period of instruction than we are at present in the habit of providing. The Lutheran norm is two full years of weekly instruction, and I believe, if we are to produce really adult and instructed Christians, we need at least a full year.

This leaves only the final section of my syllabus, the criticism of the theology of *Confirmation To-day*, in which I can include all I want to say about the age of confirmation. The fundamental thesis of the whole report is that (p.11) "at confirmation the Christian,

who is already a member of the people of Christ, is solemnly consecrated and commissioned by the laying-on of hands with prayer for the exercise of that ministry which his membership entails. Confirmation may be truly described as 'the ordination of the laity'". The comment I would make upon this is that historically this was in the primitive Church the function of baptism and was more particularly symbolized by unction. It is not represented either by mediaeval or Reformation theology but is not therefore invalidated as a principle. The Report insists that Confirmation in the 20th Century (which is neither the 1st, 13th, 16th, or 19th) may be differently administered by the Church, and provided we agree with the principle we shall only be concerned with congruous administration. So far we can be prepared, I think, to admit that this particular aspect of baptism is best emphasized at Confirmation. But can we also agree (p.32) that the laying-on of hands involves a delegation of authority and responsibility in both priest and layman? Is not that an importation from ordination which has no historical precedent whatever? This, however, is a small point compared with the statement of p.43. "The ratification of vows, though in itself salutary and desirable is not essential; failure to make it does not invalidate confirmation nor call into question any confirmed person's right to communicant status". Now that, I should hold, is a betrayal of the whole Anglican position. It is true, of course, that the Report looks to such a ratification at a later stage. In practice, I believe this would be difficult. After a so-called confirmation and admission to Communion a candidate would with difficulty come forward again, and Bishops could hardly undertake the work involved; but it is not the practical difficulty which matters. What matters is that confirmation is virtually to be made a separate sacrament with no direct link with baptism. This is, in effect, to restore the pre-Reformation position, especially if confirmation is administered to young children or is preceded, as is elsewhere suggested, by admission to Communion. The ratification of vows is then made into a separate service (normally for eighteen year olds) but, as a glance at p.63 will show, without any real significance, since everything that can be given, done, or promised, has already taken place in confirmation and admission to communion.

But the final condemnation of this strange proposal is that it flatly contradicts the fundamental principle of confirmation enunciated by the Report—that of ordination to lay priesthood. Children who are too immature to renew their baptismal vows are to be solemnly consecrated and commissioned by the laying-on of hands for the exercise of their ministry as members of the Church. This is theology gone mad. If this so-called ordination had been attached to the renewal of vows at the age of eighteen it would have been understandable though not perspicuously clear doctrinally, but this is never even discussed.

The truth is that only one suggestion really fits the proposed doctrinal basis of confirmation, namely, that the whole rite be reserved for mature age seventeen to eighteen. This however is, in the Report, coupled with admission of unconfirmed children to Communion, after due preparation, at the age of twelve. It is admitted that this breaks up the almost unbroken tradition of the Church; the only significant

exception being Roman, and predominantly modern Roman, custom. But it is defended on the ground of the value in experience of early-formed habits of communion and the help given by the sacrament in the difficult years of adolescence. Some of us will, I think, be prepared to hold that faith which receives the Body and Blood of the Lord must be faith in the New Testament sense of the word, and where it is present confirmation is also possible. Where it is absent communion should not be contemplated. This at least is where I believe we ought to be prepared to stand—that in confirmation and before communion faith and repentance must have become realities. We shall not dogmatize about the age, for children greatly differ in their spiritual development, but we shall insist that only in confirmation so conditioned is baptism truly completed.

The Church as a Social Factor.

Reflections after the reading of "English Social History" by G. M. Trevelyan.

By The Rev. F. J. Taylor, M.A.

NO recent book has received such widespread testimony as the masterly volume on "English Social History" by the greatest of living English historians, George Macaulay Trevelyan. First published in America in 1942, it was not produced in this country until the autumn of last year on account of the paper shortage. Even now, nearly a year later, there are many still waiting to possess or even to read a copy. Such a literary phenomenon is a significant sign of the mental climate of the last few years. Before the war interest in the history and institutions of this country or of the Empire was mainly confined to teachers and students of history. The prevailing mood ran to a low estimate of the value of such interests. Many of the keener minds were more conscious of the defects in our past or present history and of the need for social reform, than of the richness and variety of the heritage which they had received. The grievous perils to which we were exposed in 1940 and 1941 brought a new realization of how much we should lose if the enemy at the gate were permitted to bring destruction upon us. With all its shortcomings, and they have been not a few, the British Commonwealth of Nations has made and is still making an invaluable contribution to the welfare and stability of the world. By such a road many who had no professional concern in such matters have been brought to a new appreciation of the importance of our history. The discussions on educational method and principles which filled these years up to the passing of the Act of 1944 have made many people aware that ignorance of their own past is a mark of deficient education. To be ignorant of how and why we have become what we are as a people, is to be uneducated. "Merely to define history and literature," says Sir Richard Livingstone, "is to prove that they are essential parts of every man's education"[1]

The history of Europe and especially of Britain derives from two sources, Greece and Palestine, and of these two, Palestine has been incomparably the more important and creative. At no point can our history or institutions be understood without taking into account the existence of the Christian community. Whatever explanations may be offered of the rise and expansion of Christianity, its existence and pervasive influence are undeniable facts of history which need to be understood by anyone who should undertake the task of explaining to himself how he comes to fit into the particular pattern of life which is his. To be indifferent to this need of self-understanding is to be content with an existence which is less than fully human. For this reason a country like our own, in which at the present time only ten per cent. of the people possess effective membership in any Christian community, can yet insist that instruction in the facts and history of Christianity must be an essential part of any true education.

The historian sees the Church as a voluntary institution in the world

for the maintenance of certain distinctive beliefs and habits of life. This institution enters into relationship with the State and with other coherent social groups. Like any other historical institution, it not only exercises a considerable influence on the course of history, but is itself moulded by the developing process of history. In this action and reaction, continuing now for nearly two thousand years, the historian discerns the historical significance of Christianity. He will not claim that this is the total significance of Christianity, for as historian he is not required to determine the truth or error of its claims or of its philosophy of life. Indeed a historian quite lacking in Christian faith would yet be obliged to assess highly the contribution made by the Christian movement to modern civilization.

The purpose which Trevelyan set before himself in his latest volume can best be described in his own words. " Its scope (social history) may be defined as the daily life of the inhabitants of the land in past ages : this includes the human as well as the economic relation of different classes to one another, the character of family and household life, the conditions of labour and leisure, the attitude of man to nature, the culture of each age as it arose out of those general conditions of life, and took ever changing forms in religion, literature and music, architecture, learning and thought . . . our effort is not only to get what few glimpses we can of his intimate personality, but to reconstruct the whole fabric of each passing age, and see how it affected him."[2] The religious habits, thoughts and hopes of men at each succeeding epoch will form an essential part of this task. The intricate structure of the Church will appear as an important social institution, exercising continual, if frequently unconscious, influence on the behaviour of men. We shall be shown how men looked upon the institution and manipulated it, what they really thought about Christian belief, what appearance Christianity had in the world at different moments of history. This book by Trevelyan deals with the social history of England from the time of Chaucer when the English people first clearly appear as a racial and cultural unit, to the death of Queen Victoria, a period of nearly six centuries during which organized Christianity in varying circumstances played a part of central importance, in the social as well as in the religious history of the people.

I.

In the latter part of the fourteenth century the Church in England was an integral part of the Western (Latin) Church and shared its theology and institutions. At least half of human life and its relationships was covered by ecclesiastical affairs. Within the walls of the parish church, where the parish priest celebrated Mass attended by the greater part of the village, was to be found the heart of medieval religion and the source of its influence in the common life of ordinary people. The peasant could not read and there were no Bibles available in his mother tongue since the language of religion was Latin, understood only by religious professionals and not even by all of them. Nevertheless the ordinary man was not ignorant of the main outlines of the Bible story for wall-paintings, coloured windows and carvings in his church had impressed it visibly upon him from his earliest days. This was the framework within which his life was set and which provided a common link with his counterpart in every European land.

As an institution the Church entered into his life as the divinely appointed body to lead him through the dangers of this life and discipline him for the eternal world. Compulsory confession, recurring holy days and festivals and financial demands made him continually aware of that august authority which beset his life before and behind. He was not entirely ignorant of the new thoughts and plans fermenting in the great world, since there were innumerable travellers, 'religious roundsmen' who covered the country, carrying with them as their gossip the latest ideas. Wandering friars, often feared and hated by the parish priest, invaded the village as confessors and preachers.

Many scholars such as Coulton and Manning[3] who have studied carefully the literature and institutions of the later Middle Ages have had occasion to point out that Puritanism, usually associated with the Reformation, has in fact a much longer ancestry dating from the Medieval Church, where opposition to ecclesiastical authority found an outlet in popular preaching and vigorous attacks on the Bishops and wealthy clergy, with a renewed call to practical asceticism. No sixteenth century Protestant could exceed the power of invective employed by fourteenth century friars in their attacks on contemporary abuses. Many and far-reaching changes were taking place in the economic and social structure of society at the time of Chaucer. Modern institutions were being developed, servitude was disappearing in favour of free labour on the manor, and new middle classes were rising to positions of importance on the land and in trade. Consequently there was much criticism emanating from lay sources of the corruption of the clergy. Definite measures of administrative and legislative reform were needed and demanded, but firmly resisted. The principal cause of this refusal of reform, which in the sixteenth century was to be achieved by a repudiation of Papal leadership, was, on the part of the Pope an ever-increasing need of money to maintain his position in Europe and on the part of the English episcopate, a preoccupation with civil affairs. In fact the King paid his ministers and other public servants out of episcopal revenues. In the ten years between 1376 and 1386, of twenty-five bishops, thirteen held high secular office under the crown and several others played an important part in politics. Nevertheless, although many of their religious duties were neglected in this way, the Bishops were ready to defend Church privileges and endowments against all attacks.

Criticism of the leading churchmen became more and more vocal as the century wore on until it received explicit formulation at the hands of John Wiclif about 1375. He was supported, not only by greedy laymen who declared that one third of the wealth of England was in the hands of the church, but also by many churchmen who believed that the possession of wealth was the prime source of the ineffectiveness of the church. But the support was divided when to his moral criticism of monks and bishops, Wiclif added theological criticism and the bishops were able to turn the edge of his attack by an accusation of heresy. Nothing was done to meet the insistent demand for reform and in default of action by the Pope or the Bishops, reformers began to turn to the royal power, declaring it to be the duty of the king to reform the church and compel ecclesiastics to do their duty. Meanwhile the decline in religious zeal was evidenced

by the increasing tendency of the pious to apply their wealth to the foundation of colleges and schools, although well-to-do merchants and industrialists were still prepared to build and adorn magnificent churches in the wool growing districts of the Cotswolds or East Anglia.

II.

Despite the failure on the Continent of the Conciliar movement for reform and the steady growth of a critical Renaissance outlook on the part of the educated classes, the demand for reform abated somewhat in the fifteenth century. Chantries and guilds received endowments from the wealthy in place of the monasteries. In the early sixteenth century, in face of the presence of much in the national life which proclaimed the advent of a new era, the Church went on just as before, the greatest social institution in the land, touching life, public and private, at innumerable places. For fifteen years, from 1514 to 1529 the career of Cardinal Wolsey, Archbishop and Prime Minister " displayed on a colossal scale the pride and power of the medieval Church ". But other significant factors were at work in the land. The old anti-clericalism which had served Wiclif so well, was fanned into a new blaze by the arrogance and pomp of Wolsey himself and the Church was exposed to renewed unpopularity and denunciation. Its power in matrimonial and probate causes and its unceasing financial demands were more deeply resented than ever. While Wolsey still kept a household of nearly a thousand persons and marched in state with silver pillars and pole-axes borne before him, a small company of men was preparing the way for a social and religious revolution. The new classical scholarship was used by Grocyn and Linacre, Colet, More and Erasmus to bring a fresh knowledge of the Greek Testament. William Tyndale, in obedience to the overmastering vision of every ploughboy having these words of life on his lips, gave himself in penury and danger to translating into the language of the ploughboy that Word of God so long kept in safe custody by ecclesiastical authority.

Thus was the ground prepared for the task of pulling down and of rebuilding which was to follow upon the fall of Wolsey. Dr. Trevelyan gives to his chapter which describes that quarter century of national life which ran from the first dissolution of monasteries to the settlement of Queen Elizabeth, the title of " England during the Anti-clerical Revolution ". It is this revolution of which he says " more than any other single event, it may be held to mark the end of medieval society in England."[4] The social consequences of this legal rupture with the Papacy have given to English life many of its outstanding characteristics in the subsequent centuries. Within five years the monastic system which covered the land with a network of religious houses, each with their local social significance, was swept away by " a demolition order to resolve at one stroke a social problem that had been maturing for two centuries past ".[5] It is almost impossible to generalize about the results of this demolition, but they were felt in spheres as far apart as academic learning and the proper place of spinsters. The citizens of towns like St. Albans and Bury St. Edmunds were released at last from the stranglehold of monastic lordship, against which they had so often waged unsuccessful war in the past. The destruction of popular centres of pilgrimage not only put an end

to a feature of medieval life mirrored in Chaucer's Tales, but also struck a blow at the position and importance of some towns which had benefited economically by the presence of pilgrims. The disappearance of monks and friars gave an enlarged importance to the parish clergy until new rivals appeared in the persons of dissenting ministers who frequently engaged in the religious peregrinations which had formerly been characteristic of the friars. The secularized wealth of the monasteries went far towards establishing the fortunes of some of the great families of the later sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. It is important to remember that the king sold the greater part of the lands and tithes, though the money he received was less than the subsequent real value of the estates. In this way, more on account of financial necessity than through deliberate policy, the king erected a formidable barrier against the restoration of the "militia of the Pope". The new owners, like the monks, varied in their care for the poor so that it is doubtful whether the poor lost anything positively by the dissolution. The disappearance of the dole at the abbey gate which had often been very harmful in its social effects, obliged the later Tudors to establish a proper system of Poor Relief, thereby recognising this task as a duty incumbent not merely on Christian charity but on society as a whole.

These more obvious social results of the new religious policy must not be allowed to obscure the genuine desire for reformation both of doctrine and manners amongst clergy and laity, especially in that part of England, East Anglia and the South East, lying next to the Continent and most open to the influence of foreign movements of thought. In this way the doctrines of Luther and Calvin, despite the watchfulness of bishops, found an entry into the country and some years before the death of Wolsey a group of reformers, including men who were in after years to be so influential as Cranmer, Latimer, Tyndale and Coverdale, was meeting quietly in Cambridge for common counsel and study. The later repudiation of papal authority, the abolition of the monastic life and finally the permission to marry granted to the clergy under Edward VI and Elizabeth kept them close to the thought and outlook of the laymen and prevented the growth of a professional caste, characteristic of the Roman Catholic priesthood. This change was fraught with tremendous consequences for the future of English history, since it not only produced a new type of clerical home, but enriched our annals with the names of many distinguished men. A reference to the Dictionary of National Biography will show how many of our greatest men have been sons of the vicarage, although curiously enough not one of these has held the office of Prime Minister. The reigns of Edward VI and Mary provided the source of a new kind of personal religion, the one, through the work of Cranmer in producing the Prayer Book to stand beside the English Bible and the other by providing the Reformed religion with its martyrs. Thus the settlement of 1559 was no mere piece of political astuteness but an order based on a firm spiritual and intellectual foundation. Religious zeal which formerly had found an outlet in the ascetic life of monastery or hermitage was now to win fresh triumphs in the homes of the people. "The religion of the home and of the Bible became a social custom common to all English Protestants."[6] If it was usually

found in the homes of squires, and the middle-classes it was also widely extended among the homes of the poor. The centre of devotion was no longer the parish church, where the priest celebrated a worship too complicated and mysterious for the laity to do more than watch, but the homes of the people where the head of the household exercised the priestly functions. As George Macleod has recently put it, describing the Scottish situation in the Reformation era—" the Church in its daily worship, in intention, was transferred to the people's houses. Religious exercises and the whole technique of how to pray found a quite new form in the home."[7] This was a change of as much importance to the social historian as to the theologian, since it marked the emergence of new middle classes able to take responsibility.

III.

The hope, long but vainly entertained by Elizabeth that all her subjects would accept " one religion " established by authority, expounded and defended with eloquence and learning by Hooker, was doomed to failure. Already before her death there was Romanist plotting to replace the queen by another ruler of her own sex. The uncovering of Jesuit intrigue formed a dominant motif in the work of William Cecil for nearly thirty years. On the other hand, while loyal to the political settlement and resolutely opposed to the power of Spain and the Counter Reformation, a small but growing and influential minority of Puritans showed themselves dissatisfied with the religious settlement as a half-way house. In the new century, marked by the accession of a new dynasty, England was sufficiently strong and the foreign danger sufficiently small, to allow of a struggle for the mastery between Puritan and Episcopalian within one Church which all agreed was Protestant ; a struggle which was to lead to years of strife, division and bloodshed but to issue ultimately in some of our most prized civil liberties and the unquestioned authority of Parliament. Here is another illustration on the grand scale of the fact that social problems and political questions are fundamentally involved in theological issues. Out of this struggle was born also that passion for freedom of worship and preaching which led to the first successful English experiments in colonisation. The whole future history of the British Commonwealth of nations and of the United States of America with their democratic ideals and insistence on personal freedom hung upon the issue of this struggle. While there was much to deplore, by our modern standards, in the methods employed by both sides in this fierce controversy, it is difficult to deny that the controversy itself has enriched beyond measure not only the social life of our country but also the history of the whole world.

The old anti-clericalism, which had slumbered during the reign of Elizabeth when most of the clergy were of poor calibre, was provoked into vigorous activity again under Charles I, when bishops and clergy thrust their way into important places in political and social life and even occupied great offices of State. The anti-clericalism of great nobles and of the London mob allied itself to the anti-episcopal Puritanism, which was a dominant force in the Long Parliament, in a successful endeavour to break the Laudian Church. Behind this struggle can be seen the existence of a powerful bourgeoisie, gentry and yeomanry, long liberated from ecclesiastical and feudal control

and accustomed to share in the work of government. The success of the revolt against the divine right of kings led to the attempt to impose by public law a Scriptural righteousness. It was a period of religious and social ferment, when projects of social levelling were preached as the gospel of salvation and the rule of the saints translated from an apocalyptic dream into historic actuality. This attempt to discipline a freedom loving people was doomed to failure and in due course not only brought the name of Puritan into contempt but also produced an exaggerated reaction in the reign of Charles II. Yet the Puritan left his mark in many ways on the social and religious life of the country. The serious use of Sunday and habits of integrity in business have contributed much to the quality of our history.[8] The best personal religious experience nourished in Puritan circles was enshrined in the "Pilgrim's Progress", a religious classic which comes next to the Bible in its widespread circulation. "The lonely figure, with the Bible and the burden of sin, is not only John Bunyan himself. It is the representative Puritan of the English Puritan epoch."[9] Nor was this earnestness confined to Puritans or Dissenters. It was to be found in many Anglican households and found eloquent It was to be found in many Anglican households and received eloquent expression in the community established by Nicholas Ferrar in his "Protestant nunnery" at Little Gidding.

IV.

The Prayer Book, the Bishops and the medieval structure of the Anglican church were restored in 1660 on a wave of reaction against the rule of the saints. As an inevitable consequence, religious nonconformity on both sides of the Border suffered persecution which, if intermittent, was frequently severe. The majority of the victims were merchants, tradesmen and artisans while Anglicanism appeared distinctively the religion of a gentleman with its greatest stronghold among the country gentry. That paternalism which marked the relationship of the squire to his tenants found expression also in his attitude to the parish church, its vicar and its worshippers. It has been exactly delineated by Addison in his portrait of Sir Roger de Coverley. Thus dissent, formally inaugurated by the forced exodus on St. Bartholomew's day 1662 of about 2000 ministers from their parishes, was mainly confined to cities and industrial districts until Methodism in the next century forced a way into the Anglican rural preserve. After 1689 the Dissenter, while still subject to various civil disabilities, which among other things obliged him to set up his own Academies in lieu of entrance into the Universities, enjoyed religious and personal liberty. The persecution while it lasted and the disabilities were hardly ecclesiastical in spirit. "The hard-drinking fox hunters of the manor-house hated the Presbyterians of the neighbouring town, not because they held the doctrines of Calvin, but because they talked through their noses, quoted scripture instead of swearing honest oaths and voted Whig instead of Tory."[10]

A new type of prelate was coming to occupy the important offices in the Established church particularly after the Revolution of 1689. Sprat, the Bishop of Rochester, like all the early members of the Royal Society, was a man of genuine religious feeling which moved him to a devout interest in the created universe. A liberal and philosophic

spirit was cultivated and spread abroad by a remarkable group of Cambridge clergymen (of whom, curiously enough, Dr. Trevelyan makes no mention) known as the Cambridge Platonists, led by Benjamin Whichcote and Henry More. Preaching, which was of a high order, laid more and more emphasis on the ethical content of Christianity and consequently less than the earlier ages on its dogmatic content.

Tillotson, the preacher of the gospel of moral rectitude, and Gilbert Burnet the historian are good examples of this kind of bishop, but the stigma implied by the adjective "latitudinarian" often applied to them, is hardly just. Burnet, besides being a considerable scholar and the first to undertake a serious documented historical defence of the English Reformation, was anxious to find an accord with Dissenters and was one of the first bishops to take in hand the question of the recruitment and training of the clergy. The end of the seventeenth century and the beginning of the eighteenth was a fruitful period for Anglican scholarship represented by names like Wharton, Rymer, Wake, Gibson and Wilkins. The growth of toleration, slow though it was, was a genuine factor in the eighteenth century, and it enabled the Quakers, who had left behind the queer revivalism of their first decades, to settle down as a respectable, exclusive sect which based itself on an acknowledged priority of Christian qualities before Christian dogmas.

V.

Two characteristics of social importance mark the life of the eighteenth century Church. The great rise in the economic and social status of the clergy occurred during this century. Whereas formerly the wives of the clergy came mostly from humble homes, it now became quite common for daughters of the gentry or even of the nobility to ally themselves in marriage to the clergy. By the end of the century, in the novels of Jane Austen and still more in the mid-nineteenth century atmosphere of Trollope, squires and parsons formed one social group. Another noticeable feature was the increasing tendency to look upon the church as providing an invaluable moral cement and the bulwark of social stability, teaching the lesser ranks of society "the grand law of subordination". Enthusiasm in religion was regarded in the same light as a lack of the social graces in society at large. The excellence of the Establishment was praised in the same way as the British Constitution was declared incomparable, while the foreigner was pitied for his lack of these privileges. Side by side with the highly polished civilization of the age of Walpole and Dr. Johnson, there existed, among the new proletariat forming in the industrial centres and in the foetid slums of the older cities, a squalor of life and an active denial of the Christian way, quite beyond the power of settled religious agencies to affect. The authorities in Church and State did not seem to consider the moral and physical welfare of these unhappy people as their responsibility. Nor did they look with favour on anyone who should presume to regard such a task as a Divine calling. Yet a great part of the secret of the amazing success of the Methodists lay in the fact that Wesley and his followers went and ministered to these social outcastes with whom nobody else would bother. In the social aspect of his mission, Wesley fell heir to a number of societies formed at the end of the seventeenth century

and in the reign of Anne for the spread of the Gospel (S.P.G. and S.P.C.K.) and for the reformation of manners. But with him organisation was dominated by a powerful evangelistic impulse which brought to untold thousands an assurance of the love of God and a new self-respect which ultimately, both in the religious government of their societies and in the formation of Trade Unions, were to have lasting results in the national life. This evangelistic endeavour found expression and a means of popularising the message, in a series of some of the noblest hymns in the whole long history of Christendom. Hated and despised by a majority of churchmen, the Methodists for long regarded themselves merely as a society within the Establishment until practical considerations made a formal rupture inevitable in 1795. Even in the early nineteenth century the masses of unregarded humanity in the factories were uncared for by Church or State who feared and disliked this new phenomenon. "No one but the Nonconformist minister (usually Methodist) was their friend."[11] And often this interest in Evangelical religion was combined with Radical politics and agitation. But the political conservatism of original Methodism was still strongly represented and acted as a restraining force.

The Established Church was not entirely uninfluenced by this great revival and a small but influential body of clergy with a larger body of laymen confessed themselves Evangelicals and achieved great and lasting results in many parishes. The revival which was a fresh experience and preaching of the Grace of God led to a remarkable outburst of social activity. Within half a century this small but enthusiastic body of men had not only convinced the Church of England of the vital importance of Foreign Missions, but also initiated and led to a successful conclusion the agitation against the slave trade and slavery, inaugurated Factory legislation and begun humanitarian reform.[12] The main work was done by a body of consecrated business men known as the Clapham Sect.

VI.

The first beginnings of a national system of education, like the growth of toleration at an earlier period, were promoted by the rivalry between the Church of England and Dissent. To modern eyes this may appear a sordid origin, yet it is hard to see what else but a Christian concern for religious knowledge would have pushed the state into taking up its proper responsibilities in the matter. The Evangelical influence not only achieved results which left an enduring effect on the statute book but also in the religious habits of the people. "The English of all classes formed in the Nineteenth century a strongly Protestant nation: most of them were religious and most of them (including the Utilitarians and Agnostics) were 'serious', with that strong pre-occupation about morality which is the merit and danger of the Puritan character."[13] Dr. Trevelyan goes on to point out that the popular heroes of the later nineteenth century were first and foremost religious men: Livingstone, explorer and missionary: General Gordon, soldier-philanthropist, Lord Shaftesbury and Mr. Gladstone.

Other factors were also at work in the nineteenth century. The great impulse to reform provided by the Reform Act of 1832 could not have left untouched the antiquated and inequitable arrangements of the

Church of England. Endowments were re-arranged, the Ecclesiastical Commissioners brought into existence and the leisured, wealthy clerical existence described in "Barchester Towers", made a thing of the past. It was fortunate for the Church of England that reforming Parliaments had dealt thus with its machinery, for by the middle of the century it was faced by a Dissent which had been re-invigorated through the religious revival and contained in its ranks many able leaders determined to reduce the last strongholds of established privilege and to make civil liberty a reality. One by one, the grievances associated with Tithe, Marriage, Burial and exclusion from the Universities were done away by act of Parliament. Although this legislative activity undoubtedly saved the Church from a frontal assault when its own leaders were neither capable nor willing to tackle the job of reform, it provoked vehement protest from a body of clergy who had come to hold exalted notions of the authority of the ministry and the inviolability of the Church. This protest was the immediate origin of the Oxford Movement which sought during the remaining years of the century to emphasize the "Catholic" inheritance of the Church of England. As perhaps was only to be expected it has steadily gained adherents among the clergy but made little impression on a population fundamentally Protestant. Like the Evangelicals, later generations of the Oxford Movement have applied themselves to the task of social criticism. On the whole their criticism has been more radical (though not constructive) than that of the Evangelicals but less concerned with action aimed at particular ends.

There, at the threshold of the twentieth century when the Great Queen died, Dr. Trevelyan brings the long fascinating story to an end. With great skill of arrangement, felicity of phrase and power of description he has depicted on a succession of canvasses, the English scene at different moments of her historical development. In every picture organized Christianity appears both in the institution and in the ordinary social life of the people, and indeed it cannot be omitted without grievously distorting the picture. It is good for us to look, through the eyes of a detached observer, at the Church as a social factor and to note carefully his estimation of its significance in national life.

1 The Future of Education : R. W. Livingstone p.74.
2 Trevelyan pp.vii.-x.
3 Medieval Panorama : G. G. Coulton pp.181, 255, 485.
The Medieval Village : G. G. Coulton pp.509, 559-60.
The People's Faith in the Time of Wycliffe : B. L. Manning pp. 186-88.
4 Trevelyan p. 100.
5 Op. cit. p. 105.
6 Op. cit. p. 127.
7 We Shall Rebuild : G. F. Macleod p. 40.
8 Vide the comment by Trevelyan on the Nineteenth century: "The genuine honesty of most British merchants as men of business had been one of the causes of our great commercial prosperity"; op. cit. p. 563.
9 Op. cit. p. 234.
10 Op. cit. p. 256.
11 Op. cit. p. 476.
12 See C. H. Smyth "Evangelicalism in Retrospect" in Cambridge Historical Review Vol VII. No. 3.
13 Trevelyan p. 493.

Messianic Prophecy.

By The Ven. W. S. Moule, M.A.

An article with the above title has appeared in a recent number of *The Churchman*. The following contrasted view of the subject is not offered in any polemical spirit; nor, it is hoped, with undue assurance. We are speaking to one another with a view to understanding the Scriptures, our common authority for faith and hope, specially now as regards what they reveal of the purposes of God concerning His Christ. The subject is too sacred for polemics, too deep and high for over positive assertion or denial.

The view of Messianic Prophecy advanced by Dr. B. F. C. Atkinson in the article referred to is, in brief, that the Old Testament promises to Judah and Jerusalem find their complete and final fulfilment in the Church of Christ, and that "the New Testament knows of no future for Jews as such" (p.11); or again, "the New Testament knows nothing of a national future for the Jews" (p.13); "the New Testament scatters the pretensions of a literal interpretation [of the terms Israel and Judah in the prophets] to the winds" (p.15). The four passages which are adduced as being key-passages in New Testament interpretation, however, hardly support this view.

All that St. Peter says in the first key-passage (Acts iii. 24) is that the prophets told of these Christian days. He does not hint that they have foretold nothing else. Similarly in his Epistle (1 Peter i. 10-12) he declares that the prophets who prophesied of Christian times, when the Spirit of Christ which was in them testified beforehand the sufferings of Christ and the glories which should follow them, knew that they were speaking for us in these Christian days, and not for themselves. He does not say that this was the whole subject of their prophesyings, but rather implies the contrary. Again when St. Paul affirms before Agrippa that his preaching of Christ was only what Moses and the prophets had predicted (Acts xxvi. 22, 23), that does not assert that it was all that they foretold. A fourth key-passage adduced later in the article is Galatians iv. 24-29, where St. Paul quotes Isaiah liv. 1, and interprets it of a Jerusalem which is above, our mother in the Christian Church, as contrasted with the literal Jerusalem, which, clinging to the covenant of law, is in bondage with her children. It is manifest, since in Chapter liii of his book the prophet Isaiah is foretelling the atoning death and consequent exaltation of Jesus, that from Chapter liv onwards he foretells the receiving of all peoples to be the people of God in a universal Church of Christ; and so St. Paul interprets the passage, and names the new mother of us all "Jerusalem that is above," in contrast to the mother-city of the Jews, which had rejected the Christ of God, and cut itself off from the salvation that is in Him. In doing so we cannot imagine that he ignored the preceding context (Isaiah xlix-lii. 12), where it is predicted in plain terms that when the Servant of Jehovah is becoming His salvation to the end of the earth, the literal Zion will be rejected, but that it will ultimately be restored. Still less can he be thought to

repudiate that final section of the great prophecy (Isaiah lviii-lxvi), whose whole subject is this latter-day glory of Zion, when its Redeemer comes to it in power, and the people are no longer forsaken, nor its land desolate.

If these are "the most prominent passages in which the New Testament interprets the Old", it cannot be said that they tend to establish the thesis of Dr. Atkinson's article.

Moreover there are other New Testament passages which seem to disprove it, or at least are very difficult to reconcile with it. The New Testament, while concerned chiefly with the proclamation of the Universal Gospel and the establishment of the Universal Church, without any difference between Jew and Gentile in it, yet at times is at pains to emphasize the continuance of the Jewish nation as a separate entity among the nations. Though not its main subject it even contains hints of its corporate restoration to a place among the people of God on earth. St. Peter in the temple at Jerusalem (Acts iii), while calling Jews individually to repent of the national rejection of their Christ, and to believe in Him and enter His Church, speaks also of "times of restoration of all things" spoken of by the prophets; when God shall send the Christ Who has been appointed for them out of the heaven to which He has now gone. And St. Paul, the great apostle of no difference between Jew and Greek in the present era of the Gospel, is specially commissioned to declare that God has not cast off His people whom He foreknew. Even now God has His people among them. But more than this—"God is able to graft them in again". How striking too are the expressions "their loss—their fulness", "the casting away of them—the receiving of them". If their loss and their casting away here spoken of are national, so it is a national fulness and national receiving of them which is in view in these antitheses. Moreover, though a national recovery may be posed as hypothetical, yet St. Paul remarks how natural it would be that they should be so received into fellowship with their Christ. And, to the present writer's mind at least, he goes on to declare that it will be so, "as it is written" (Romans xi. 25ff).

It is to be remarked then, that according to the New Testament view, while in the Church of Christ there can be neither Jew and Greek nor any other like distinction, yet in the world there will always be Jew and Gentile. Actually, after 1900 years, the Jewish nation remains a people apart. Is not this the meaning of our Lord's words, "This generation shall not pass away till all things be fulfilled. Heaven and earth shall pass away, but my words shall not pass away?"

Other New Testament passages which confirm the persistence of the people of the Jews, and foreshadow a national future for them within the Church of Christ are the following:

"He shall reign over the house of Jacob for ever."

"A Light to lighten the Gentiles and the Glory of Thy people Israel."

"In the regeneration when the Son of Man shall sit on the throne of His glory, ye also shall sit upon twelve thrones, judging the twelve tribes of Israel."

"A great multitude . . . when they heard that Jesus was coming to Jerusalem . . . went forth to meet Him, and cried out, Hosanna: Blessed is He that cometh in the Name of the Lord, even the

King of Israel. And Jesus, having found a young ass, sat thereon ; as it is written, Fear not, daughter of Zion : behold, thy King cometh."

"O Jerusalem, Jerusalem . . . I say unto you, Ye shall not see Me henceforth, till ye shall say, Blessed is He that cometh in the Name of the Lord."

" Jerusalem shall be trodden down of the Gentiles until the times of the Gentiles be fulfilled."

" Jesus stood before the governor : and the governor asked Him, saying, Art Thou the King of the Jews ? And Jesus said unto him, Thou sayest."

" Pilate wrote a title also, and put it on the cross. And there was written, Jesus of Nazareth, the King of the Jews. This title therefore read many of the Jews."

" One of the malefactors . . . said, Jesus, remember me when Thou comest in Thy kingdom."

After forty days instruction of His disciples in what is written in the Law of Moses and in the Prophets and in the Psalms concerning Himself, and concerning the Kingdom of God, they asked Him, " Lord, dost Thou at this time restore the kingdom to Israel," and Jesus answered, *not* that there is no such restoration to be looked for, *but* " It is not for you to know times or seasons, which the Father has set within His own authority."

The fact that the gifts and promises of the New Covenant, proclaimed to Zion and Jerusalem by the prophet Joel (ii. 28 ff), and to the houses of Israel and Judah by the prophet Jeremiah (xxxi. 31 ff), coincide with the gifts and promises to the Universal Church of the present New Testament Gospel, does not mean that they will find no national fulfilment in the literal Israel. It simply indicates that the national restoration when it takes place will be on the same terms as are being now offered to them and to all mankind. This is the rationale of the quotations of the prophecies by St. Peter to the Jerusalem multitudes (Acts ii. 16 ff), and by the writer to the Hebrews in his epistle (Hebrews viii. 8 ff). The good tidings which is now the salvation of all the world is that which will then be the salvation of the Jewish nation also (Romans x. 15 with Isaiah lii. 7-10).

The present writer is in full agreement with Dr. Atkinson on the importance of a thorough study of the numerous quotations from the Old Testament to the New, before any attempt to speak or write on the subject of Messianic Prophecy. The late Canon Girdlestone in his *Grammar of Prophecy* (Eyre and Spottiswoode 1901) refers to Gough's *New Testament Quotations* as a book which exhibits these in a compact and convenient form, " a book which might well be reprinted." The *Grammar of Prophecy* contains chapters on such subjects, among others, as Prophecies conditional and unconditional, Prophetic Forms of Thought, Recurrent Prophetic Formulae, The Future expressed in Terms of the Past, The Prophetic Use of Names, and finally one on The New Testament view of the Old Testament Prophecy.

This last is specially apposite to our present subject. The Canon estimates that there are about 600 quotations from the Old Testament in the New, besides constant allusive references. On a survey of these

as a whole he formulates twelve "canons of interpretation", too long for transcription here, but very valuable as a guide to the principles of New Testament quotation. He concludes with the words "To illustrate these twelve canons of interpretation by Christ and His followers would be to write a book. The enumeration of them is based on a careful study of all the known quotations."

The present writer cannot claim to have made such a complete study, but for many years he has endeavoured to examine and understand the principles of each New Testament quotation met with in his reading. Particularly he has made a careful study of all the known New Testament references and quotations from the Book of Isaiah, more than 100 in number, excluding allusions in the Apocalypse, which admittedly, as a revelation given by signs and symbols, stands in a class by itself, separate from the other New Testament books. The conclusion he has come to is that, in the view of New Testament authors, the Old Testament prophecies regarding the Jewish nation are to be taken in their plain and natural sense, and are not to be transferred *en masse* to the Christian Church.

The identification of the Millennium of the Apocalypse with the times of restoration of all things spoken of by Old Testament prophets does no violence to the context in which it occurs. It seems in agreement with a former vision of the Book, in which the kingdom *of the world* becoming the kingdom of our Lord and of His Christ is announced as the finishing of the mystery of God, according to the good tidings which He declared to the prophets (Apocalypse x. 7 ; xi. 15).

The statement in the article which we are reviewing that the New Testament knows of two dispensations only, that of law in the Old Testament and of grace in the New Testament, does not seem to be quite accurate. Taking the word "dispensation" (οἰκονομία) in the sense of a method of dealing with men by God, St. Paul speaks of a "dispensation of the fulness of the seasons" which is yet to come (Ephesians i. 10). Jesus Christ, in His last words to the Apostles also refers to "times and seasons" of the future (Acts i. 7), and to an "end" of this present age (Matthew xxiv. 14, comp. xiii. 39 ff). Looking back through Bible history we see an ante-diluvian dispensation with its clearly marked end. God's manner of dealing with men changed also with the Call of Abraham, and a period aptly called the Patriarchal Age followed. When the iniquity of the Amorites was full, the Age of Israel's national history began : and with the Christ was ushered in the Gospel Age, the present Christian era. The times of ignorance in the world God long overlooked, but now He commands men that they should all everywhere repent and believe the Gospel. How frequent in the New Testament is the mention of "ages" in the history of the world ! If the recognition of these is "dispensationalism", it is thoroughly Scriptural.

A Divine purpose that all the earth shall be filled with the glory of Jehovah is declared to Moses to be as immutable as the Eternal Being Itself (Numbers xiv. 21). This purpose is reiterated at two later crises in the development of the Divine Plan through Israel (Isaiah xi. 9 ; Habakkuk ii. 13, 14). This then, let us be quite sure, is a part of the revealed plan of God for the world. Such a time as is described in these prophecies will be seen in the world before it finally passes

away. Towards this goal events are infallibly moving, but, so far as we can see into the plan, it will be reached at last not by gradual development into a golden year, but, at the end of a period of preparation, by one supreme crisis, which will deal at once and effectually with the intractable wicked throughout the world, and also—and this is most important to observe—with the age-long Opponent of the way of God, the old Deceiver of the nations, and inveterate Enemy of man, Satan, the Evil One, the Devil. The incoming of such an era upon present conditions would be a new dispensation, and, taught by the Old and New Testament Scriptures, many continue to look for it when God " brings again the First-begotten into the World ".

Canon Girdlestone, in the concluding chapter of his *Grammar of Prophecy*, recalls a passage by Bishop Butler in his chapter on the Moral Government of God (Analogy i. 3), where he " adumbrates the millennial condition and the restoration of the Jews as a leading nation, in words not easily to be improved upon ". His own chapter on The Parousia and The Millennium poses many questions on Millennial life, and closes—" These are not a hundredth part of the questions which occur to us as we contemplate the prospect. But our absolute ignorance need not shake our convictions. Whatever God ordains will speedily seem natural."

We venture to close this article with some extracts from the closing words of Canon Girdlestone's volume. They are the testimony of the late Dr. Horatius Bonar, after fifty years' study of prophecy, and uttered in the year 1879. He says :

> " I speak my own experience in this matter, and I compromise no one in saying what I do except myself—I say I am getting, after fifty years' study, greatly more certain, and I am getting greatly more uncertain, about many things in the prophetic word . . .
>
> " I feel greatly more certain as to the *second coming* of the Lord being the Church's hope . . . I feel greatly more certain, as the years roll on, regarding the *pre-millennial advent.* I feel greatly more certain concerning the first resurrection and the millennial reign. I feel greatly more certain concerning the times of the restitution of all things spoken of by all the holy prophets . . . I feel greatly more certain concerning the new heaven and the new earth wherein dwelleth righteousness. I feel greatly more certain in reference to *Israel's* prospects of glory in the latter day, after their scattering of 1800 years. I feel greatly more certain in reference to the *doom of anti-christ,* whatever that name may include, and doubtless it includes many things. So regarding these things which I have briefly enumerated . . . I would say I feel the power of a demonstration now. They form part of what appears to me a demonstrative creed.
>
> " But then, on the other hand, there are things regarding which I am more uncertain than I used to be . . . I feel uncertain, very uncertain, as to the prophetical *dates* . . . I feel more uncertain in reference to the *Apocalypse* . . . I am waiting for light, and I believe the Holy Spirit will give it, and that we shall ere long, it may be, understand that marvellous book which the Church has been, age after age, trying to comprehend, but

which, I believe, it has hitherto failed in great measure to unravel. I feel also uncertain as to the details of events, and the relations of events, especially regarding Israel's latter-day history. It is not that I do not believe every word that is written concerning Israel in the latter day, but I feel at a loss how to arrange the various things which at first sight seem to conflict the one with the other . . .

" There is just one thing in connexion with this matter that I should like to add, and it is with regard to the certainties, for it applies to the whole, and I should like to avow it solemnly in these days. *I feel a vastly greater certainty in reference to the Divine authority and verbal inspiration of the Word of God.* If ever a doubt passed through my mind during the last fifty years in reference to these, that doubt has disappeared. And then, in connexion with this, I feel a greater certainty as to the literal interpretation of that whole Word of God—historical, doctrinal, prophetical. ' Literal, if possible ', is, I believe, the only maxim that will carry you right through the Word of God from Genesis to Revelation."

Book Reviews.

THE WAY OF AT-ONE-MENT. STUDIES IN BIBLICAL THEOLOGY.
By W. J. Phythian-Adams, D.D. pp. 125. 7/6 *net. S.C.M. Press.*

Whatever may be said in criticism of this interesting book, it cannot be denied that it springs from a passionate desire to see the attainment of unity amongst the Churches of Christendom. The work is pervaded by a large charity and an intense desire to see the healing of the wounds of the Church. The writer starts from ground common both to the reformed Churches of Europe and ourselves in Holy Scripture. Of the Bible, Dr. Phythian-Adams reveals, as we should expect, a profound knowledge, and the basis of his thesis might almost be said to be what he describes as the " Providential unity of the Bible ". It is his first great point and for it he uses a word certainly not very familiar to most people—" homology " by which he means " that there is between two things not a mere resemblance but a real and vital—in this case, an (economic)—correspondence ". In other words we must not regard the Old Testament as merely a Biblical repository for interesting analogies but as evidence of the continuing power and goodness of God begun in Old Testament times and continued in New Testament times.

It is quite impossible for us to follow the Author through the book and observe his use of this principle which, in some ways of course is not particularly original. It is certainly in his application of his theories that most people will be interested though hardly in agreement with the writer. Of course he has much to say both about the Bible and history which is extremely interesting but not always very convincing. A very good example of this is given on page 92 where he emphasizes the distinction between the preaching of the Gospel by those who had been " from the beginning . . . eye-witnesses and ministers of the Word and all later preachers." " Here," as he says, " the preaching of the Gospel was not the mere delivering of a message which, when the person of the messenger is a matter of indifference, is a purely instrumental function. It was rather of the essence of this preaching that the Apostles had personal knowledge of the Person whom they preached. . . ." He then proceeds to contrast this with the activities of the settled ministry of the Post-Apostolic Church. " Here the ministry of the Word . . . has virtually become an instrumental function." And to this he adds an interesting interpretation of a familiar expression. The very term " pure Word of God " " is enough," he says, " to prove this. ' Pure ' in this context means that the Word preached is quite uncontaminated by the personal views and prejudices of the preacher " . . . Thus we have on the ' Protestant ' side a perfect instrumental parallel to the ' Catholic ' view of the ministry of the Sacraments ". This is certainly an aspect of the matter that deserves consideration.

Earlier in the book, Dr. Phythian-Adams brings out another aspect of what must be called controversial theology. " Having lost the Biblical principle of *homology* according to which our Lord fulfilled and superseded the whole system of Atonement prescribed under the old Covenant. . . . " " the Church has forgotten that it is Israel." This, in his opinion, has had disastrous results in history. The great reformers were " strong institutionalists ", but having lost contact with this Biblical conception through, presumably, the necessity of stressing the doctrine of salvation through faith, " the voice of the Church as a people ceases to have much significance, and ultimately its form and even its visible unity becomes a matter of little account. That is why, for all the good that it has done, the Reformation has stopped short of final victory. It has recovered the true meaning of faith and grace but it has never caught sight again of Israel."

The writer goes on to develop this theme in a way which in many respects will carry most readers with him. For example on p. 57 he writes, " In a word *two* things, not *one*, are seen to be necessary for us men and for our salvation. We must be remade, reborn, redeemed, justified (call it what you will), by repentance and faith as individuals. . . . But we must find salvation together *as members of a community* ; and the living principle of that community, its spirit, the law of its being, must be love."

The final outcome of all this reflection is seen in a number of suggestions for

reunion which, to say the least, will inevitably involve a host of practical difficulties. He deals with the two Sacraments of Baptism and Holy Communion in what can only be called a novel fashion. The same can certainly be said of his treatment of Episcopacy which "*rightly understood* is the only possible form of government for the Church of Christ." And in an extremely interesting way, which we must leave the reader to discover for himself, he proceeds to demonstrate the truth of this thesis. The principle, it must be emphasised, is love. "As no Christian lives for himself without ceasing to be a Christian, so no Congregation can long be worthy of its calling if it looks to its own things and not to the things of others. Love must move ever outwards, that is the law of its being." Whether his idea of Episcopacy in the reunited Church of the future or his idea of a Diocese will ever be acceptable remains to be seen. If "No Diocese should be so large that a single Bishop cannot lay his own hands on those who are to receive Baptism with 'Holy Spirit'" one wonders where all those qualified for the office of a Bishop are to come from!

Anyhow, the book deserves to be read and studied as a fresh and arresting contribution to the immense problem of re-union, and should form the basis for much valuable discussion from what is certainly a new point of view. C.J.O.

THE WORD AS TRUTH. A CRITICAL EXAMINATION OF THE CHRISTIAN DOCTRINE OF REVELATION IN THE WRITINGS OF THOMAS AQUINAS AND KARL BARTH.

By Alan Fairweather. 10/6 *net. pp. xvi* + 148. *The Lutterworth Press.*

If any student is looking for a really stiff bit of theological reading he will find it in this work. We say this at once because no one should be deluded into believing that this is a suitable book for arm-chair reading by a busy preacher. On the contrary the author gives us a book which demands and should receive very serious thought and consideration. It naturally pre-supposes some acquaintance with the writings of Karl Barth and in a somewhat lesser degree with those of Thomas Aquinas. Both these great men in widely different ways have exercised a profound influence on Christian thought and are still determining factors in modern theology. Most readers will be probably more interested in what the Author of this book has to say about the theology of Karl Barth than that of Aquinas because far more non-Romans are probably acquainted with the writings of the former than the latter though there has been a revival of interest in Thomist theology in certain Anglican circles fairly recently.

The main Barthian position which is challenged by this book is stated at the very beginning: "Barth's whole view supposes that God cannot speak to man without first negating the effects of sin, whereas the emphatic witness of both Testaments is that he addresses man in his sinful state. The worldly form of His Work is the only form then adequate to His purpose." For "the point at issue in regard to revelation through history is whether historical events play any part in expressing a divine meaning". Orthodox theology would certainly maintain that they do and it is certainly true that "the Old Testament provides overwhelming evidence that God's motive is understood through historical events and their circumstances." Hence the difficulty of agreeing with Barth when he writes: "In no way is historical event and historical value of any kind to be identified with divine event and divine value. The movements of history, even the greatest and the best, must not be identified with the movements of the Spirit of God."

The further Barthian contention that "God cannot speak to man in his sin" is also open to very obvious objections from the normal Christian standpoint. "Cannot God speak helpfully and savingly to man in his sin while he still remains in it? The revelation of both Testaments forcibly proclaims that this is precisely what God does". Christianity is a revelation to sinful man in history. Against this view, Barthian theology, at all events as represented by Karl Barth himself, rejects the idea that the facts of history can reveal eternal truth. The Author's full discussion of this attitude is well worth studying. This is particularly true when he is dealing with such aspects of Barth's teaching as his attitude to sin. Barth has almost an obsession about sin, regarding it as a barrier between God and man of such a nature as to preclude that necessary contact between the all holy God and the miserable sinner. But surely the Author is right when he says that "The sin of man, far from being an unfit medium for revelation, is the only medium which permits that God should come to sin, as sin requires He should . . ." For, as he goes on to say, "Sin is not only a defiance of God, but the defiance of

God who forgives it. To forget this would be to miss its worst iniquity. God is not only the Forgiver, but the Forgiver of the sin which defies Him. To forget this would be to miss the greatness of His grace."

We have in this book a critical examination of the teaching of two great thinkers. Space has compelled us to limit our attention to what he has to say concerning that Teacher who has had so profound an effect upon non-Roman theology in recent years. In many ways this influence has been beneficial, but in any final and adequate appraisement of Barthian theology, its inevitable limitations must also be taken into account and this is precisely what this work enables us to do. C.J.O.

A GREAT TIME TO BE ALIVE.
By H. E. Fosdick. S.C.M. Press. (235*pp.* *Price* 8/6 *net.*)

This is the latest—but not, we hope, the last—volume of sermons by one whom a competent American contemporary has described as probably the greatest preaching voice in modern Christendom. The sub-title of the book describes it as a collection of " sermons on Christianity in wartime ", and we learn from the preface that with one exception they have been preached since the Japanese attack on Pearl Harbour, and that that one exception was, in fact, " preached on the Sunday morning of that fateful day ". " All these sermons, therefore, have this present war as their background ; and they have been selected because, in one way or another, they deal with the problems, personal and public, that the war presents."

In temper and outlook these sermons are not essentially different from those which Dr. Fosdick has already published and, beginning on what may seem a negative note, let it be admitted that they are somewhat deficient in dogmatic content so far as the preaching of the Gospel is concerned. By this we mean that their witness to the revealing and redeeming Word of God in Christ is less than wholly Catholic, in the true sense of that often abused word. Or, to put it a little more fairly, the purely doctrinal note is sounded less frequently, and less clearly than is required of the New Testament evangelist. That, however, does not mean that Dr. Fosdick fails to summon men to take Jesus Christ seriously. Indeed, his sermons continually hold what he describes in one of them as " a plea for loyal self-commitment to Christ and what He stands for," and nothing is more persistent in them than the quality of dynamic challenge. And now and again he comes nearer to the kind of direct witness and assertion which the times demand and which we would like to have more often in his message. So we gladly put on record his forthright statement that " If Jesus is only our ideal, then we are of all men most miserable, but if He is our savior, too, then the doors of hope begin to open ".

It is written in the New Testament that the ascended Christ " gave some to be apostles ; and some, prophets ; and some, evangelists ; and some, pastors and teachers ". Dr. Fosdick's place is with the prophets, and, in the opinion of your reviewer, it is a place which is both established and pre-eminent. These sermons, in common with all his preaching, reveal those particular qualities which authenticate the prophet. For one thing, they come to closest grips with vital and immediate issues—issues such as war and peace, and the spiritual bankruptcy, frustration and ineffectiveness which mark and condemn so much of conventional Christianity. Closely akin to this is his capacity for far-sighted, incisive, and impartial judgment. Every one of us is made to look spiritual realities squarely in the face, and acknowledge just what they mean for ourselves. A hundred quotations would serve to illustrate and emphasise this quality in his preaching : here is one selected almost at random. " Hitler is the incarnation of everything I fear and despise most, in national and international life. The Christian church's message involves no soft mitigation of judgment on so appalling an exhibition of antichrist. But the distinctive message of the Christian church does insist on the realistic fact that all of us nations together helped to make Hitler possible ; that by what we did not do and by what we did we helped to produce him and the opportunity he used ; that naziism is the horrid boil in which the base infections of the world have come to a head, and that if the world is to be really cured of its evil, all of us, acknowledging a common guilt, must by God's grace seek amendment together ". That is something which we need to be told, and which we shall need to remember in the difficult years before us. And it is in direct spiritual succession to the word of the Lord as, long centuries ago, it came, for example,

through Amos.

Enough has been said about the content of this modern prophet's message. There may well be added a word about his style,—and manner is hardly less important than matter. It is direct and pungent, free from artificiality and false pietism, and always " on the popular wave-length ", in the very best sense of such a phrase. Dr. Fosdick always speaks in a tongue " understanded " of the common people, and he is a sheer master of relevant and varied illustration. A close study of half a dozen of his sermons might well form part of a theological college course in homiletics,—which suggestion we courteously leave with those whom it chiefly concerns ! T. W. ISHERWOOD.

TREASURES OF DARKNESS.

By " Nicodemus ". James Clarke and Co., Ltd. 5/-.

The author who adopts the above pen-name has written this book as the sequel to another, entitled " Midnight Hour ". It consists mainly of a series of meditations on the lessons in the Revised Lectionary from Ash Wednesday to Easter Day (it is rather strange to find the day *after* Ash Wednesday described as " First Day in Lent " !) But there is also an introductory essay on " The Search of Scripture after the Spirit ", in which the author enlarges upon his aim in these meditations, as expressed in a sentence in the Preface, where he describes the Bible as " a Book which will remain sealed for the merely intellectual approach typical of our time," but adds that " opened by Spirit ", here are " wells of light and power able to give to our Christianity the dynamic which it lacks."

This is, in general, well said. But what, exactly, is the meaning of " opened by Spirit "—particularly in view of these other words (on p. 13)—" a total surrender of spirit to the rule and guidance of a Spirit of God " ? Why " *a* Spirit of God " ?—especially as, immediately following, is the phrase " a constant looking and listening for the Spirit that ' giveth life '." This is perhaps the first example in the book of a feature noted elsewhere, when what appears to be clear statements are followed by others which leave one wondering whether the author is after all intending them to be taken in their plain and full sense. This may be partly due to his fondness for pointing out paradoxes ; but in some cases things may be entirely incompatible (we shall have to return to what seems to be such a case presently).

The author's method of approach in his Biblical meditations has both its merits and its demerits. We shall all agree with the importance of a spiritual approach, penetrating, by divine grace, so far as may be to the heart of the divine revelation. We shall all acknowledge the profundity of thought in many of these chapters ; and very welcome are the author's outspoken and uncompromising declarations on the humility with which that revelation must be accepted. He is at his best in his scathing exposures of the modern attitude in this matter, and in his eloquent exposition of the stern requirements of Christian discipleship, and his timely warnings against the softness of some prevailing representations regarding it. Here are two examples—"Our soft pseudo-Christianities may reduce the Love of God to spineless sentimentality and Sunday syrup ; the Bible never does." Again, " There is, in the Bible, a conspicuous absence of all signs of the cosy, matey intimacy with God which certain forms of modern religiosity affect." This is a matter to which our author has done well to call attention : the question remains whether his book maintains a quite balanced line of teaching in regard to it, or whether, in reaction from any such softness, he has not, in general, struck too sombre a note with regard to the implications of the Christian life. It is clear that he is alive to the danger, for he knows how to lead up to the thought of Christian joy, and the closing paragraphs of the Book are emphatic as to Easter joy and power. But such references, on the whole, are slight by comparison. Possibly the fact that these are *Lenten* meditations may partly account for the impression referred to. And the title of the book is perhaps intended to indicate that experiences of darkness are mainly in view. But readers may feel that it does not sufficiently reckon with the joyful outlook of the New Testament—and indeed of the Bible taken as a whole.

Some striking analogies with the experiences of the Exodus and the wilderness wanderings are a prominent feature in several of the meditations. The tone is primarily devotional and mystical, and the practical side of Christianity is more prominent than the doctrinal. A somewhat slighting allusion to " the formulas of Chalcedon " may indicate the bent of the author's mind. But he is perfectly clear on the Incarnation, and there are welcome references to other great doctrinal

matters; for example, a strong passage on the Resurrection of the Body. References to the Atonement are perplexing: this is the point to which it was said we would return. Some of them seem quite clearly to declare the shed blood of the Lamb of God to be the only means of salvation. But what is the meaning of these sentences?—" Only by the shedding of our own life-blood can we cleanse the defiled holiness of our being; only with the blood of God can the holy Being of the Life of all the worlds be redeemed. There, in that Holy of Holies, the blood of God mingles with the blood of man and the striving of man for the truth is met by the agony of Him who is both man and God ". Yet, in the closing meditation, for Easter Day, we read of its message as " primarily a Redemption, a deed done, not by us, but for us, in which we can but ' stand still and see the salvation of the Lord ' " ; and reference is made to " the inveterate Pelagianism of the human (and especially the British) heart " ; and it is declared that " the Word of a Biblical Earth is not ' strive ' but ' yield '."

The book is certainly not published for financial profit: it is quite startling in these days to find a volume of this extent offered at so low a price. There is something unique and attractive about its vigorous style, though it cannot be said that as a whole it makes easy reading, and the author has an occasional habit of breaking out with words not generally familiar. But some of the most effective portions are clear enough, and forcible enough. Here is a very topical extract, drawing a lesson from the ten plagues which were necessary to soften the hardness of Pharaoh's heart. " How many has it taken, will it take, to soften our own hard hearts—or England's heart to-day? Was Dunkirk the first plague? Is it the last? Did not we too say—' We have sinned this time '—and then forget our sin? Will Europe, like Egypt, need ten plagues ere she set free the enslaved spirit of man? " And then, immediately, the personal reminder that we may easily burke the issue for ourselves. " It is self-soothing to think in terms of ' Man ' and world-history. But the drama of Egypt (and Europe), so the Bible insists, is also the drama of Everyman. ' Of *thee* the tale is told '. To *you*, gentle reader, this Word is spoken ".

One or two references indicate that the author holds the doctrine of universal salvation, and there is a strange allusion to " pre-natal memories ". We must demur also to the assertion that " the doctrine of extreme Protestantism " is that " the individual mind can sit in judgment upon the Word of God "—unless the reference is to extreme " liberal " Protestantism, of which indeed it may be true. The author's own outlook upon the Bible is that the mind of the Christian must be used to search for " the Word within the word ", and (one regrets to find him saying) " to clear away the debris ". How this differs from " sitting in judgment upon the Word of God " (an attitude which he verbally repudiates), it may be hard for many to see. He tries to evade the difficulty by a reference to the Spirit illuminating and leading the whole understanding. But (for one thing) who can be certain of not mistaking his own judgment for the voice of the Spirit? And such an attitude ignores the fact that there *was* One whose judgment was unclouded and impeccable, and that He held a very different estimate of Holy Writ from that which is recommended by our author and by some others.

W. S. HOOTON.

A PORTRAIT OF JESUS. A TWENTIETH CENTURY INTERPRETATION OF CHRIST.

By Sherwood Eddy. George Allen and Unwin. 7/6.

Many who view with apprehension the critical approach to the Gospels and the Gospel story, wonder how much or how little the critics leave us of the historic Christ. This book is the answer of a modernist, who reverently and with scrupulous fairness has attempted to set before us the result of much thought and learning, and of a spiritual experience of the power of the living Christ that in his view matters supremely. He is of the opinion that in our understanding of " the historic figure of Jesus " we owe more to Schweitzer than to any other man of our generation, though he does not follow him entirely in his eschatology, and the list of authors to whom he is indebted shews how widely he has read. Moffatt was himself known and consulted, and his translation is followed, not always very happily, throughout.

It is significant that Dr. Eddy begins where the Gospels of Mark and John begin, with " the historic fact of the Baptism of Jesus by John ", though even this appears to be open to question in the author's mind. This was " the beginning of the good news ". From this point we are given brief studies on the

Temptation, the ministry in Galilee, the Great Question, the crisis in Jerusalem, the Crucifixion and the Resurrection. To these are added chapters on the Gospel of Paul, the Interpretation of John and the Twentieth Century Portrait.

The general impression left upon the reader is that this is a helpful contribution to this greatest of all subjects, and gathers up many of the results of modern scholarship into a carefully drawn 'portrait' of our Lord "in the days of His flesh." It is obvious that, where compression is a necessity, the treatment of many sections must be slight and inadequate, and is apt to raise a good many queries that are not answered. Yet there are few of whatever school of opinion who will not gain from a study of this book suggestive lines of thought and some fresh aspects of the ministry and message of Christ. If, as Burkitt is quoted as writing, "to make a Portrait of Christ, each man for himself, is the duty of every Christian", this book should be amongst those that are consulted, if consulted in its turn critically, as the Portrait formed in the heart and mind of one whose life of Christian service and witness is widely known.

If we ask, does this Interpretation satisfy? many will be obliged to answer that it leaves much to be filled in, something, it may be, to be corrected. All will value the insistence upon "the Christ of faith", and the Twentieth Century answer to the question "Who say ye that I am?" surely the most urgent question of our day. But with that sense of gratitude will be mingled some disappointment and perplexity, inevitable perhaps in the Modernist approach to Christ. Your reviewer has noted amongst other points of possible difficulty these by way of illustration: the tendency to separate, even if only for thought, the historic Jesus and the transcendent Christ; the ignoring of the accounts of the birth of our Lord and of the doctrine of the Virgin birth; the rejection of the authenticity of many passages as likely to have been inserted later; a "mistaken" eschatology in Matthew corrected by the Fourth Gospel; the explaining away of some of the miracles; St. Paul's "strong aversion to the Greek *logos*"; the reference to the "cumbersome, artificial theory of two natures in Christ" as adopted at Chalcedon, and the emphasis on the divinity as apparently distinguished from the deity of our Lord.

It is, however, the author's purpose to be positive and constructive, and his interpretation is not without its strong Evangelical aspect. He ends by bringing his reader face to face with the challenge of the living Lord. "Unwilling or indifferent, evasive or procrastinating, blind or cowardly, or like Peter following 'afar off', *I must do something with Jesus Christ.* In the end I must either crucify or crown Him." This, after all, is the alternative before our own and every generation, and, as he says, "no postponement, no evasion, no compromise" is ultimately possible in that choice. S. NOWELL-ROSTRON.

WORLD CHURCH.
By John Foster. S.C.M. 6/-.

Christians everywhere are beginning to awake to the fact that the Church to-day is a world Church. This is, as Dr. Temple so often used to remind us, the great new fact of our time. The story of how the Church has been planted in every part of the world is a thrilling and a fascinating one. In this book Professor Foster unfolds something of that story, and makes it alive and vivid by the use of many telling illustrations, new and old. He writes of the Church as one, universal, militant, triumphant, and central in history.

Professor Foster rightly emphasises that Christianity is not simply an echo of something that happened long ago in the distant past. It tells of God's saving purpose in Christ. It tells of a living Christ, whose promise is "I am with you always, even unto the end of the world". In His Church Christ carries on His saving work. ". . . the Church," writes Professor Foster, "is and always must be the Church at work in a sinful world. It can never expect ideal conditions, and dare not wait for them. Having it at the heart of our Gospel that the Son of God came down from heaven, we take our stand in the midst, accept the shame of our associations, and by our central presence begin forthwith to redeem them." O.R.C.

MANY CREEDS: ONE CROSS.
By Christopher E. Storrs. S.C.M. Press. 6/-.

This book is a shortened version of the Moorhouse Lectures delivered in St. Paul's Cathedral, Melbourne, in November, 1943. The Author is Archdeacon of Northam, Western Australia.

Those who desire to know something about the great World Religions will find a mass of valuable information in each chapter. Millions of people are nurtured in the Creeds which are examined in these Lectures. The influence of Hinduism, Buddhism, Islam, and the philosophy of Confucius upon vast numbers of the human race is deep seated and widespread.

The Lectures throw much light upon the history and development of each of these systems of religious thought.

Shinto and Mystical Nationalism account for much in the mental outlook of the Japanese. It is most interesting to note the similarities and differences between these creeds. But, in contrast with the Cross, there is something lacking in each and all of them. This is brought out very clearly, and a valuable piece of constructive Christian evidence is furnished by the comparison of the various creeds with that which is centred in the Cross. H.D.

PROPHECY AND THE CHURCH.

By Oswald T. Allis, Ph.D., D.D. The Presbyterian and Reformed Publishing Company. $2.50.

There are very many books on prophecy, but very few of abiding value ; hence our welcome to this volume of Dr. Allis, who is known over here by his connection with our contemporary " The Evangelical Quarterly ".

A graduate of Princeton and Berlin, the Old Testament is his chief study, and we are indebted to him for the contribution he is making to conservative scholarship.

Few will challenge the popularity of dispensational teaching nowadays, and its dissemination through the widespread use of the Schofield Bible. It is to this theory that the writer turns his attention, and shows how it involves a distinct and radically different system of Bible interpretation from that hitherto held in the Reformed Churches. This latter may be called the " typical " or " higher plane " method of interpretation, seen at its best in the Epistle to the Hebrews : the " dispensation " may be called the " horizontal " method of interpreting Scripture. According to it the Kingdom prophecies of the Old Testament enter the New Testament absolutely unchanged ; they were made to Israel the nation, and they must be fulfilled literally to Israel the nation. Two very important inferences follow : (1) that the New Testament Church is a mystery parenthesis unknown to the Old Testament prophets : and (2) that the rapture of the Church will be followed by the restoration of Judaism. The " Church age " is thus the result of the rejection of the Kingdom by Israel ; and the Cross, in which that rejection found its expression, the foundation on which the Church rests. The Gospel of the Cross is pre-eminently the Gospel for the Church age. After the " any moment " rapture of the Church, the Kingdom will be restored to Israel. In the Kingdom age the middle wall of partition between Jew and Gentile will be erected anew, and it will remain, world without end.

It is this dispensational scheme of things which Dr. Allis examines in a manner which will yield satisfaction to every lover of the Bible. After defining his terms, and showing the important principles of dispensational interpretation, the writer then turns to the Biblical doctrines of the Kingdom and the Church. This is an extremely able exposition. He then proceeds to discuss the Biblical doctrine of the Coming of the Lord, together with the question of the future of Israel.

Not only is the style lucid and the argument clear, but the value of the book is further enhanced by excellent notes which are well documented, and thorough indexes. W.J.S.

INTRODUCING THE NEW TESTAMENT.

By A. M. Hunter. S.C.M. Press. 6/-. 121*pp.*

In this small book the author sets out " to present the New Testament in the light of modern scholarship ". This he succeeds in doing in a very readable way, compressing a good deal of information into small compass, interspersing it with apt anecdotes, and suggestive phrases of his own, as for instance, when he entitles the final epistle to the Corinthians " The Church of God in Vanity Fair ".

In the opening chapter the primary reason for the study of the New Testament is found, not in the beauty of its literary style nor in its lofty teaching, nor even in what it has to say *about* God, but because it brings " Good News *from* God ", telling how Christ came to save sinful men. This chapter with one on Language, Text and Canon, and a synopsis of what is to follow compose the first part. The second is devoted to the Gospels ; the third to the Pauline Epistles, Romans,

1 Corinthians, Philemon and Philippians each having special treatment; and the fourth part to Hebrews, James, 1 Peter, 1 John and the Apocalypse.

The standpoint of the author is that of the moderately critical school, and fairly represents the average of the teaching now being given in most colleges. The bibliography at the end mentions scarcely any books by conservative authors.

It is satisfactory to find the main articles of the Christian faith accepted, the atonement emphasised and Paul's epistles faithfully expounded. It is not so satisfactory to be told that whilst Matthew was the author of "**Q**", it is "incredible" that he could have written the Gospel, and that the miracles peculiar to it may be "safely discarded" as the least satisfactory part of the synoptic gospels (p. 46). The Gospel and Epistles of John are attributed to that shadowy person "John the Presbyter", who owes his very existence to the doubtful interpretation of a single sentence of Papias; yet Dr. Hunter clings to the idea that John the Apostle was the authority behind them. The treatment of the Apocalypse is still less satisfactory.

Whilst these instances show that the critical view is taken throughout, the style is markedly reverent, and the chapters on the individual books will help the student to grasp their substance and essential message. The printing is good, but the price seems high for so slight a volume. G. T. MANLEY.

THE UNREST IN RELIGION

By Erasmian. pp. 128. London: *George Allen and Unwin, Ltd.* 1944. 6/-.

This book deals with what is called the Unrest in Religion, but it does nothing to allay that unrest. We find in it scores of statements which raise difficulties and doubts, but hardly anything which makes belief in divine truth more easy to an enquiring mind. Moreover, one feels inclined to ask the writer whether he recognises that there is such a thing as "the Faith which was once for all delivered unto the Saints" (Jude 3, R.V.) and also whether he considers it to be wrong on the part of the Church through the ages to express the great doctrines of that Faith in a static formula such as the Nicene Creed. We have always regarded the Faith as a sacred "deposit", to be contended for earnestly, and to be handed on unimpaired to succeeding generations. "Erasmian", however, thinks otherwise, apparently, and would have the dogmatic statements reduced to the very thinnest dimensions.

The writer describes himself as "a lay member of the Church of England". In his introduction he states that "certain questions have long troubled his generation, and to-day are stirring young minds to revolt." To revolt against what? The Church's traditional teaching as enshrined and expressed in the Creeds of Christendom. But this is no new thing. In some form or other we find something like it in all periods of the history of the Christian Church. Were not the Creeds themselves to a large extent compiled for the purpose, to say the least, of correcting prevalent misconceptions concerning the Person and Work of our Lord?

"Erasmian" claims that the "fame" of the established Church is as high as ever. He acknowledges that we are heirs of a wonderful tradition. But the fame and the tradition seem to be of little value if the Scriptures and the Creeds are to be as little trusted as the writer would have us believe. A complaint is made that "the right of laymen to ask for explanations of these ancient creeds is not always admitted." But has it not been from apostolic times the privilege and duty of the Christian believer to be ready always to give an answer to every man that asketh a reason concerning the hope that is in him with meekness and fear? We do not recollect a single instance ourselves of refusal of the right of enquiry.

It is manifestly impossible in a brief review to deal with the many questions and problems raised in this book. Suffice it to say that there is hardly a single doctrine of our Faith which is unassailed or, at least, questioned.

The aim of the book is summed up in the closing words expressing the hope that the simple creed of the old prophet might suffice to answer many questionings and to bring comfort in dark hours to souls in travail—"What doth the Lord require of thee but to do justly, and to love mercy, and to walk humbly with thy God?" Quite so; but the New Testament links up all this with the work of Jesus Christ for the individual soul and particularly with His full, perfect and sufficient sacrifice for the sins of men offered on the Cross of Calvary. This book, as far as we can see, leaves out all reference to the awfulness and guilt of sin, and it is therefore not surprising to find no reference to the Atonement.

We cannot think that this book will really help anyone to that repose of faith which ought to be the possession of every believer. D. TAYLOR WILSON.