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

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

The Churchman

MARCH, 1946

Vol. LX. No. 1. 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.

THE fourth Centenary of the death of Martin Luther has focussed attention on the great Christian doctrine of Justification by Faith, which was the inspiration, dynamic and victory of the Reformation. It has been said that one of the urgent needs to-day is for a new emphasis on the teaching of this doctrine. This is true, but the real secret of the vitalising power of the Reformation was not the rediscovery of this vital doctrine of New Testament theology, which had been falsified by mediaeval teaching, but in a deep spiritual experience of its truth by the reformers.

In opposition to " the general belief that man could merit God's favour by good deeds of his own, and that works of mercy, charity and self-denial procured (through the intercession of Christ or perhaps of the Virgin Mary) pardon for sin and acceptance with God," Luther fought tenaciously, asserting by his doctrine of " justification by faith only " that man is justified only by the merits of our Saviour Christ and that the sole instrument of his justification is faith. In the great crisis of Luther's life it was not a question of belief in this doctrine as opposed to the dogma of justification by works, but a struggle of the soul, the reality of the burden of sin and the consciousness of guilt ; " my conscience was filled with trouble and torment." As with St. Paul, so with Luther, the sublime, divine truth flashed into his heart, " the just shall live by faith," with mighty liberating power, " when by the Spirit of God I understood these words, I entered by an opened door into the very Paradise of God. From that hour I saw the precious and Holy Scriptures with new eyes."

It was a deep personal experience which revolutionised his life and revitalised the Christian Church. The same can be said of Wycliffe, Latimer, Ridley and Cranmer. It was this spiritual experience, through the revelation of the cardinal message of the Gospel, which was the starting-point of the Reformation. As Lindsay declares : " The Reformation started from this personal experience of the believing Christian, which it declared to be the one elemental fact in Christianity which could never be proved by argument and could never be dissolved away by speculation. It proclaimed the universally neglected truth of mediaeval theology, that in order to know God man must be in living touch with God Himself. The great reformers never attempted to prove this truth by argument ; it was something self-evident, seen and known, when experienced." It was this experience which gave them the great assurance. They knew they were accepted before God, they knew that they had peace with God, they were justified before Him ; all the guilt of their sin had been met by Jesus Christ, and his righteousness was imputed to them. This vitalising truth we need to recapture to-day ; it is the realised experience of " justified by faith only " which will revive the Church in our day, as it did in the 16th and 18th centuries.

The Anglican Doctrine of Confirmation in the Sixteenth Century.

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

CONFIRMATION occupies no mean place in the great controversy with Rome which fills the annals of sixteenth century church history. The name of the ordinance has survived unchanged, but the rite itself, as we now have it, is very different from the unreformed rite both in its dominant purpose and in its contents. Despite the fact that it had been given the status of a sacrament, the administration of Confirmation during the three centuries preceding the Reformation was extremely careless, frequently being left to suffragans to perform. In some areas, periods as long as seven years elapsed between the visits of a bishop for confirmation, with the result that large numbers of children, unprepared and uninstructed, assembled when the bishop did appear and the confirmation was frequently conducted in a hasty and unseemly fashion. No attempt was made to secure competent knowledge of the Christian faith on the part of the candidates and the matter of the rite was unction which, with its accompanying ceremonies, was far removed from any scriptural or apostolic model. The renewed study of the Scriptures in the early sixteenth century had revealed the great contrast that existed between the first days of Christianity and its developed form with which the students were familiar. It was inevitable that men who had already come to hold a critical view of contemporary church life, should judge it by the undeveloped standards of the New Testament and forget that the sixteenth century was not the first century.

Tyndale was the first writer to express vigorous criticism of the rite of confirmation as a human ordinance. In the *Obedience of a Christian Man* (1528) he wrote, " After that the bishops had left preaching, then feigned they this dumb ceremony of confirmation, to have somewhat at the least way whereby they might reign over their dioceses "[1]; and again, " that they call confirmation, the people call bishopping. They think that if the bishop butter the child on the forehead that it is safe. They think that the work maketh safe and likewise suppose they of anoiling. Now is this false doctrine verily."[2] These criticisms of prevailing practice were evidently becoming more widespread in succeeding years, for in 1536, the Lower House of the Convocation of Canterbury presented to the Upper House a document under the title, *Mala Dogmata*, containing a list of erroneous doctrines which were being printed, preached and professed in the realm. One of these erroneous doctrines is " that children ought not in any wise to be confirmed of the bishops afore they come to the age of discretion ".[3] During 1537, in the course of discussions for a religious formulary, which might not only give unity and peace in the realm, but also help the King in his projected alliance with Lutheran princes, certain leading questions were put to a number of bishops and other divines. In response to the question, " Whether this Sacrament be a Sacrament of

the New Testament instituted by Christ or not," in face of the implied assumption that the rite was a sacrament many felt obliged to suppose a direct dominical institution inferred from apostolic practice. The most interesting reply came from Cranmer who asserted emphatically, " There is no place in Scripture that declareth this sacrament to be instituted of Christ ". He added further, the significant point, " the church useth chrisma for the exterior sign, but the Scripture maketh no mention thereof."[4] This opinion was the result of an appeal to the facts recorded in the New Testament which led him to note the wide divergence of contemporary practice from Biblical example. Similar views had been expressed by four other bishops, Foxe, Shaxton, Goodrich and Latimer. Hilsey of Rochester defined Confirmation as a " godly ceremony " but not of such necessity, neither of such effect as it is taken for at this time, since it was " begun by Holy Fathers "[5] *The Institution of a Christian Man* or " Bishops' Book " as it came to be called, issued later in the same year, declared, " there is a difference in dignity and necessity " between Matrimony, Confirmation, Holy Orders and Extreme Unction and " the other three sacraments ". Confirmation was described in these words :

" The Apostles used to go unto the people after they were baptised, and by their prayer, and laying of their hands upon them, did give and confer unto them the Holy Ghost . . . the Holy Fathers of the primitive church, taking occasion and founding themselves upon the said acts and deeds of the apostles . . . thought it very expedient to ordain that all Christian people should, after their baptism, be presented to their bishops, to the intent that by their prayers and laying of their hands upon them and consigning of them with the holy chrism, they should be confirmed."[6]

The implications of this statement, despite its generalisations, are clear and important. There is, first, the implied citing of scriptural precedent in the apostolic laying on of hands upon the baptized for the gift of the Holy Ghost. The divine institution of Confirmation is expressly denied since the rite, in origin and persistence, is said to have arisen from the example of apostles and the holy fathers, who thought it *expedient* that Christian people should be confirmed after their baptism. Such an assertion was only possible if the compilers had come to the conclusion that Confirmation was a church ordinance and not a sacrament of divine obligation. Further, the explicit mention of laying on of hands in association with the use of chrism, marked the influence of scriptural study and the beginning of a tendency which culminated in the substitution of the laying on of hands for anointing with chrism in the Anglican rite. A further revision of the Bishops' Book was issued in 1543, under the title of *A Necessary Doctrine and Erudition for any Christian Man* and commonly called the " King's Book ". The article on Confirmation speaks of the rite in the same terms as the Bishops' Book, implying that it is merely an ecclesiastical institution.

Bishop Jewel, who may be regarded as the representative Anglican divine of the early Elizabethan period, has an interesting discussion of Confirmation in his " Treatise of the Sacraments " published in 1583, several years after his death. Before he expounds the meaning of Confirmation in the Church of England and defends it against its Puritan opponents, he gives a careful criticism of the prevailing un-

reformed practice, suggesting the necessary reasons for the changes made in the English rite. There is nothing so good and holy that it may not come to be abused in the course of time as has happened with Confirmation. " Time rusteth and consumeth all things and maketh many a thing to prove naught in the end which was first devised for good." The indictment consisted of five counts: first, the rite was administered in a strange tongue that no man might understand what was meant. Next " they received to confirmation such children and so young as were not able to make profession of their faith; so that the infant promised he knew not what ". Thirdly, the bishop in effect despised the rite which he professed to honour, because he " ratified and confirmed where there was nothing to be confirmed; he set to his seal where there was nothing to be sealed ". Fourthly, there was great abuse in the manner of administration and in particular with the form of the rite. " ' *Consigno te . . . signo crucis, et confirmo te chrismate salutis* ' It agreeth not with a Christian faith to give the power of salvation into oil. He that seeketh salvation in oil, loseth his salvation in Christ and hath no part in the Kingdom of God. Oil for the belly and for necessary uses of life. It is no fit instrument, without commandment or promise by the Word, to work salvation." Fifthly, " They say confirmation is more honourable than baptism; because any priest may baptize; but confirmation is given only by a bishop or a suffragan. So do they give a greater pre-eminence to confirmation which is devised by man, than to the holy sacrament of baptism which Christ Himself ordained. I need not speak more hereof; the error is so gross, so thick, so sensible and palpable."[7]

These words of Jewel present a restrained, scholarly, but searching criticism of unreformed practice. There were others whose criticisms were expressed with more violence. Thomas Becon who had been chaplain to Cranmer and spent some years in exile during the reign of Queen Mary, employed a sharper pen in making the same points.

" The papists say to such as are witnesses of the child's baptism, ' Ye are bound by the order of our mother, the holy church, to see that this child be confirmed so soon as is possible or as soon as ye hear that the bishop cometh within seven miles of the town, without any further delay '. . . . and what is the confirmation of the children that is used at this present but plain sorcery, legerdemain and all that naught is? The bishop mumbleth a few Latin words over the child, charmeth him, crosseth him, smeareth him with stinking popish oil, and tieth a linen band about the child's neck, and sendeth him home. O Lord God, what a Confirmation of a child's faith is this! Yea, rather what a delusion and mocking is this of the godly, ancient custom in confirming children."[8]

This passage was written during exile when Becon could only witness from afar the restoration in England of the unreformed rite. In 1565, James Calfhill, Archdeacon of Colchester and Canon of Christ Church, Oxford, published an *Answer to John Martiall* in which he sought to defend the manner of confirming now used in the English church, by pointing to the differences from Roman custom as well as to apostolic precedent. " What promise have they of grace annexed unto their sacrament, unless they have shut the Holy Ghost in their grease-pot."[9] Such criticisms were not, however, merely the expression of private

views held by individual theologians. They were opinions commonly shared by English Churchmen including the hierarchy. In episcopal injunctions during the reign of Elizabeth, the necessity of fulfilling the duty of catechizing was frequently emphasised[10] and for that purpose, no other catechisms were to be used by clergymen or schoolmasters except one or other of those composed by Nowell, Dean of St. Paul's. This authoritative standing accorded to his catechism, gave to his statements almost an official importance. It can, indeed, be claimed that in this Catechism issued in 1570, we can find the best evidence for the mind of the English church after the settlement of 1559. Under the heading 'Of Sacraments', he passes severe judgment on "another (*i.e.*, Roman) confirmation used of late:

> They conveyed a device of their own, that is, that the bishop should not examine children, whether they were skilled in the precepts of religion or no, but that they should anoint young infants unable yet to speak, much less to give any account of their faith; adjoining also other ceremonies unknown unto the Holy Scripture and the primitive Church. This invention of their's they would needs have to be a Sacrament, and accounted it in manner equal in dignity with baptism; yea, some of them preferred it also before baptism."[11]

In 1587, Thomas Rogers published an Exposition of the Thirty-Nine Articles which was re-published in quarto in 1607, and reprinted six times during the seventeenth century. An abridgment was issued towards the end of the eighteenth century, and the book was valued by many of the early Evangelicals. These facts seem to indicate that a high authority was, for a long period, ascribed to the Exposition. Moreover, since Rogers was a chaplain to Bishop Bancroft, we may assume that he was regarded as a very good churchman. Among the errors which he stigmatises as "dangerous and very damnable doctrine" are the doctrines that "the Holy Ghost is given in full"; "to say that men cannot be perfect Christians without Popish Confirmation" and "that the grace of Baptism is made perfect".[12] All these criticisms of unreformed practice fall within the general framework of Reformed thinking with its emphasis on repentance and faith as the foundation principles of Christian life and form the background against which must be seen the teaching of the reformed rite itself.

II.

When the first English Prayer Book was authorised in 1549, it bore the marks of years of discussion and criticism of the existing liturgy and its theology. The changes made in the rite of Confirmation, together with the omissions, indicate the doctrine implied.

In the Prayer Books of 1549, 1552 and 1559,[13] the title of the service is "Confirmation wherein is contained a Catechism for Children", and the catechism is printed as a section of the Order for Confirmation. The first rubric gives the reasons for this change: "To the end that Confirmation may be ministered to the more edifying of such as shall receive it . . . it is thought good that none hereafter shall be confirmed, but such as can say in their mother tongue the Articles of the Faith, the Lord's Prayer and the Ten Commandments . . . and this

order is most convenient to be observed for divers considerations". The word, *hereafter*, in this passage gives the key to the way in which the whole Order is to be interpreted. It is plain that the compilers deliberately intended a change in the usage to which English churchmen had hitherto been accustomed and they justified this change on the scriptural ground of the necessary edification of those who should participate in it. If the criticisms of Tyndale, Cranmer, Jewel, Nowell and Rogers of the unreformed administration of confirmation were justified there was evident need of improvement in the manner of its use, even if the structure of the rite had remained untouched.

In the first place, infant confirmation was abandoned by the insertion in the service itself of the catechism, "that is to say an Instruction to be learned of every child before he be brought to be confirmed of the Bishop". This change was emphasised by another rubric which spoke of the time "when children come to the years of discretion and have learned what their godfathers and godmothers promised for them in baptism, they may then themselves, with their own mouth and with their own consent, openly before the Church, ratify and confess the same". The open profession of faith and obedience at Confirmation formed no part of the medieval service, but it is a characteristic of the Lutheran Church Orders which had appeared some years previously at Cassel in 1539, and in Brandenburg in 1540. It is when the English rite of 1549, 1552 and 1559, is compared with the rite in the Sarum Pontifical that it becomes clear how salient a feature instruction, leading to profession of faith, has been made in the English service. It is true that the question addressed by the bishop to the candidates did not appear until 1662. But the intention of the service is declared in the prefatory rubrics wherein it is stated that the children "being instructed in Christ's religion, should openly profess their own faith and promise to be obedient to the will of God". The intention appears to have been that "the Bishop or such as he shall appoint", should at the time of the Confirmation "appose" the candidates at his discretion in certain questions of the catechism, thereby enabling them to profess personal faith and obedience. The separation of the catechism from the Order of Confirmation in 1662, and the insertion of the question addressed by the Bishop to the candidates made no essential change in the intention of the rite, but merely simplified and improved the procedure, leaving the task of catechising to the regular teaching ministry of the clergy.

Secondly, the sacramental character of Confirmation was denied by the omission of the anointing with chrism, hitherto the matter of the rite. It can hardly be maintained that the omission is not prohibitive and leaves the use of chrism to the discretion of the bishop, since in the Pontifical its use is expressly directed and, until 1549, this was the only service book which contained the words and rubrics of the rite. The absence of any form of service for the blessing of chrism from the Prayer Book confirms the intention of the compilers that chrism should not be used. Moreover, the practice of the Church of England since 1559, serves as an authoritative commentary on the meaning of this particular rubrical omission. In the "*Consultatio*" of Hermann of Cologne, the use of chrism was declared to be superfluous, a sign that has been superstitiously abused and without the authority of

primitive antiquity. In its place, the symbol of the imposition of hands was to be used since " it sufficed for the Apostles and the more ancient Fathers ".[14] No such explanatory rubric was inserted in the English rite but the same change was made and the Bishop was directed to lay his hand upon the head of the candidates : " And thus shall he do to every child, one after another ". In the second prayer book, this portion of the Service of 1549, in which the laying on of hands was accompanied by the signing of the forehead of the candidates with the cross, was omitted and a new prayer inserted ; " Defend O Lord, this child with thy heavenly grace ", prefaced by the rubric, " Then the Bishop shall lay his hand upon every child severally ". Hereafter the matter of the rite was to be the imposition of hands only, a custom which could be called Apostolic, and which was allowed by ample Biblical precedent. Doubtless there were many who deplored the omission of the annointing of infants, having come to suppose some special efficacy in the chrism. Consequently, another prefatory rubric was added to assure anyone who might think " any detriment shall come to children by deferring of their confirmation, he shall know for truth that it is certain by God's Word that children being baptized (if they depart out of this life in their infancy) are undoubtedly saved ".

Thirdly, the spiritual purpose of the rite was declared to be the strengthening and confirming of the candidates " with the inward unction of thy Holy Ghost unto everlasting life ", that is with such gifts as they need for the exercise of adult Christian discipleship. It is ministered to them that be baptized, having received the forgiveness of all their sins " that, by imposition of hands and prayer, they may receive strength and defence against all temptations to sin and the assaults of the world and the devil ". Since this was the purpose of the rite, the rubric went on to assert that the best age for Confirmation was adolescence, that time when, " partly by the frailty of their own flesh, partly by the assaults of the world and the devil, they begin to be in danger to fall into sin ". The emphasis of the whole Order, particularly in 1552, was on prayer in the commending of the candidates to the guiding and empowering hand of God. It was assumed that they had come forward with due understanding of the faith and in honest profession of obedience, and the laying on of hands (after the example of the holy apostles) was " to certify them of the favour and gracious goodness of God toward them ". The post confirmation prayer, which was a new feature in 1549, was adapted from a longer collect in Hermann's rite and emphasises the fact that the service is primarily, in Bishop Burnet's phrase " a gesture in prayer ".[15]

The doctrine of Confirmation expressly taught or implied by the English Prayer Book was, therefore, very different from that of the unreformed rite. Previously, Confirmation was administered in Latin, with chrism, to infants, as a sacrament, with no preparation or intelligent acceptance of obligation on the part of the candidate and no distinct and separate laying on of hands by the minister of the rite. " Hereafter," that is, after 1549, none were to be confirmed except they had been prepared, the service was in English and confirmation was by the imposition of hands and not by anointing. The principal concern of the reformers appears to have been the pastoral requirements of the situation consequent upon universal infant baptism. They found good

reason to retain that ancient practice, but it could only be used with becoming seriousness, if sponsorship were made a reality and the children taught the meaning of the baptismal obligations and led to ratify and confirm the same for themselves. " If thou shalt confess with thy mouth the Lord Jesus and shalt believe in thine heart that God hath raised him from the dead, thou shalt be saved."[16] In all these changes the English Reformers were at one with the Reformers on the Continent,[17] who denied the sacramental character of Confirmation, emphasised the need of previous instruction and restored the laying on of hands in place of the chrism. The principal difference was the retention of the bishop as the minister of the rite in England whereas on the Continent, the parish parson was the normal minister. But there were no reformed theologians in the sixteenth century who supposed that this difference of minister witnessed to any essential difference in doctrine or in practice.

III.

In the light of this discussion of the rite, we turn to consider the doctrine of Confirmation as it was understood by the Church of England in the sixteenth century, both in its official formularies, and in the writings of its leading divines, which present a sufficient commentary on the sense in which those formularies were understood by the men who bore the responsibility for their promulgation. The XXVth Article expressly denies that Confirmation is a Sacrament and leaves us to decide whether it has " grown of the corrupt following of the Apostles ", or whether it is a " state of life allowed in the Scriptures ". The suggestion has been made that Confirmation in the official language of the time, meant distinctly the rite of annointing and not the laying on of hands[18] so that it is annointing and not laying on of hands which is included in the Article among those things which have grown from " the corrupt following of the Apostles ". If this suggestion be true, it only serves to underline the point that deliberate changes were made in the matter and the meaning of the rite. Certainly it is true, both that the Reformers conceived themselves to be returning to a more primitive practice and also that they regarded Confirmation as a valuable ordinance. For this reason it is more likely that the rite is included in the states of life allowed in the Scriptures, since its salient feature was the use of a Scriptural symbolism and its purpose the decent public recognition as full members of the Church of those who had demonstrated their competent knowledge of the faith, and had publicly testified their personal belief.

The repudiation of the sacramental character of Confirmation which was a feature common to all the Reformers was not the occasion for a despisal of Confirmation, but arose from the high regard in which Sacraments were held. Only Baptism and the Lord's Supper were accorded this status because they were rites commanded by the Lord with a promise annexed to their due performance. Bishop Jewel sets out this view very clearly :

> " When I say a sacrament, I mean a ceremony commanded by God in express words. For God only hath the authority to institute a sacrament. Sacraments are confirmations and seals of the promises of God and are not of the earth, but from heaven . . . Augustine said : ' *accedat verbum ad elementum et fit sacramentum* '. Join the word to the creature and it is made a sacrament. This

creature or element is visible as are water, bread and wine. The word which must be joined is the commandment and institution of Christ; without the word and the commandment and institution it is no sacrament. I protest that the use and order of confirmation rightly used, is profitable and necessary in the Church and in no way to be broken. But it . . . is not a sacrament. Christ did not command it: He spake no word of it . . . You shall never find that he commanded confirmation or that he ever made any special promise to it. Therefore, you may conclude that it is no sacrament. Otherwise, being rightly used, it is a good ceremony and well ordained of our ancient fathers."[19]

To exalt Confirmation to the rank of a sacrament was to ignore this twofold test of the dominical command and the word of promise, and to set the action of the Church, however necessary or laudable, on a level with the action of Christ. In practice, in the sixteenth century, to judge from the complaints made by the Reformers, Confirmation was more highly esteemed than Baptism, largely because it could only be administered by a bishop with solemn and elaborate ceremony. " So they give greater pre-eminence to Confirmation which is devised by man, than to the holy sacrament of baptism which Christ ordained."[20] The appeal to Scripture showed not only the absence of any dominical word about Confirmation, but also remarkably little emphasis upon its use in apostolic times. The only conclusion to be drawn from these facts showed that it was an ecclesiastical ordinance and, therefore, an ordinance whose form and matter could be changed by the church if need should arise. Baptism was thus to be rescued from its position of inferiority and given its proper status as a gospel sacrament, the sacrament of regeneration. Jewel himself speaks of Baptism " as our regeneration or new birth ".[21]

Some years later the Puritan criticism of Confirmation, expressed by Cartwright in his controversy with Whitgift, alleged that restricting its administration to the bishop was the means " whereby the popish opinion which esteemeth it above baptism is confirmed . . . and therein great cause of suspicion is given to think that baptism is not so precious a thing as confirmation ". To this Whitgift replied:

" You know that Confirmation now used in this Church is not to make baptism perfect, but partly to try how the godfathers and godmothers have performed that which was enjoined them when the children were baptized; partly that the children themselves (now being at the years of discretion and having learned what their godfathers and godmothers promised for them in baptism) may, with their own mouth and with their own consent, openly before the church, ratify and confirm the same, and also promise that, by the grace of God they will evermore endeavour themselves, faithfully to observe and keep such things as they, by their own mouth and confession have assented unto. . . ."[22]

He pointed out further, how impossible it was to suppose that Confirmation was in any way exalted over baptism when the last rubric before the Confirmation service was considered, which asserted that no harm would come to children if their confirmation were deferred beyond what had previously been the customary period.

There are other witnesses to be summoned who will show that a deep concern for the right understanding of Baptism and the Lord's Supper was bound up with the denial of sacramental status to Confirmation. The Homilies approved in 1563, for use by " all parsons, vicars and curates", have an official authority beyond the authority of any single theologian. The " Homily on Common Prayer and Sacraments" teaches the doctrine of two only Gospel sacraments, and includes a statement clearly based upon the XXVth Article : " No man ought to take these (Orders, Matrimony, Confirmation) for sacraments in such signification and meaning as the sacraments of Baptism and the Lord's Supper are, but either for godly states of life . . . or else judged to be such ordinances as may make for the . . .edification of Christ's Church."[23] The Catechism of Dean Nowell was also endorsed by the considered judgment of his contemporaries, and it is instructive to note that the ground of his complaint against Roman practice is that it has accounted Confirmation to be equal in dignity with baptism.

" By all means they would that this, their confirmation, should be taken for a certain supplying of baptism, that it should thereby be finished and brought to perfection, as though baptism else were imperfect, and as though children who, in baptism, had put upon them Christ with His benefits, without their confirmation were but half Christians ; than which injury, no greater could be done against the divine sacrament, and against God Himself, and Christ our Saviour, the author and founder of the holy sacrament of baptism."[24]

In expounding Article XXV, Thomas Rogers is equally emphatic in concluding " it is an error that confirmation is a sacrament, because it hath no institution from God which is necessary to all and every sacrament."[25] He stigmatises as dangerous and damnable doctrine the notion that " the grace of baptism is made perfect " in Confirmation and adds the pertinent remark, " it savoureth of Donatism to measure the dignity of the sacraments by the worthiness of the ministers ".[26]

When these writers turn to consider the positive value of Confirmation in the Christian life, it is notable that they all suppose it to be an ancient rite, sadly corrupted in the course of the centuries, and which has now been restored by the action of the Prayer Book compilers to its primitive purity and simplicity. Indeed, so convinced were the Anglican Reformers that they were but restoring the godly system of the Primitive Church that they often read back into the early records, the original features of their own policy. Their knowledge of antiquity was inadequate and their historical sense ill-developed. The view of Confirmation in the primitive Church entertained by Bishop Jewel is thus described :

" When the children of the Christians were thus brought up and had learned the religion of Christ, and to walk in the ways of godliness, they were brought to the Church, and by their parents presented unto the bishop, and yielded a reason of their faith openly, before the whole congregation ; they professed they would so believe, that they would live and die in that faith. Then the bishop and all the people fell down on their knees and prayed unto God that He would continue the good thing He had begun ; and the bishop, laying his hand upon them, commended

them unto God. This was the ratifying of the profession which they made by others at their baptism, and for that cause called Confirmation."[27]

Dean Nowell has a similar account in which he speaks of parents and schoolmasters in ancient times diligently instructing their children, for which purpose " little books which we name Catechisms were written. After that the children seemed to be sufficiently trained in the principles of our religion, they brought and offered them unto the bishop . . . that they might after baptism, do the same which such as were older, who were also called *Catechumeni* . . . did in old time before or rather at, baptism itself. For the bishop did require and the children did render, reason and account of their religion and faith : and such children as the bishop judged to have sufficiently profited in the understanding of religion he allowed, and laying his hands upon them and blessing them, let them depart. This allowance and blessing of the bishop our men do call Confirmation."[28]

Rogers describes in the same general way, the origin of Confirmation as " an examination of such as in their infancy had received the sacrament of baptism and were then, being of good discretion, able to yield an account of their belief and to testify with their own mouths . . . which confession being made and a promise of perseverance in the faith by them given, the bishop by sound doctrine, grave advice and godly exhortations, confirmed them in that good profession ; and laying his hands upon them, prayed for the increase of God, His gifts and graces in their minds."[29]

It may be that these writers all relied on Calvin for their statements about primitive Confirmation, since in his discussion of the subject in the Institutes, he gives a similar imaginary picture of the early use of laying on of hands " done simply by way of benediction . . . which I would like to see restored to its pure use in the present day."[30] This view of the essentials of Confirmation, however inaccurate it might be historically, is none the less valuable, for the evidence it yields of the sixteenth century estimate of the ordinance. The supreme importance of instructing the young in the fundamentals of the faith and preparing them for a public confession of faith was everywhere recognised, and led to high regard being paid to its pastoral value by the Elizabethan divines. Only in this way could Infant Baptism be given its evangelical meaning and the personal category of repentance and faith secured in the sacrament. But the method of such instruction was for men to devise and the public confirmation in the faith of those who professed an adequate knowledge of it was also for man to order. The existing order had been a mockery and drastic changes had become necessary. The Apostolic custom of the laying on of hands was restored as a symbolic act of prayer for those who had testified to their faith. The new rite was designed for those who would be brought up in a Christian environment but who would yet need some outward seal upon their personal discipleship. In defending episcopal confirmation against the attacks of Cartwright, Whitgift, after quoting Bucer's admission that the imposition of hands was most fittingly done by those " to whom the chief care of the church is committed ", went on to say :

" It cannot be denied that by hearty and earnest prayers, God doth

work these effects in those children that be his ; and hereof imposition of hands is a sign. The ground of this is that promise whereupon all our prayers do depend, that is ' that we shall obtain whatsoever we ask the Father in Christ's name ; neither can you more justly cavil in this respect at the imposition of hands at the confirmation of children than you can do at the same in ordaining of ministers".[31]

When we come to the end of the century and consider the teaching of Hooker in the fifth book, " Of the Laws of the Ecclesiastical Polity ", published in 1597, we find a different manner of treating the subject with the Puritan critics primarily in mind. The conception of the rite set out in the Prayer Book was now commonly accepted as a reformed and scriptural order and the task of Hooker was to defend its retention on Scriptural, historical and reasonable grounds. But it is easy to exaggerate the differences between Hooker and the earlier writers. With them, he refuses to call the rite a sacrament, speaking of it as " the ancient custom of the Church."[32] The content of the service he defines by prayer in much the same way as Jewel, Nowell and Rogers ; " With prayers of spiritual and personal benediction the manner hath been in all ages to use imposition of hands as a ceremony betokening our restrained desires to the party whom we present unto God by prayer." For the rest, his discussion is taken up with the question of the separation of Confirmation from Baptism, the Bishop as the only minister and the spiritual gifts associated with the rite.[33] He makes little mention of the examination of candidates, and there is no word about ratification of vows. But these things were not in dispute with his opponents, who valued highly such godly discipline and, since the provision was made for them in the Prayer Book, there was no need to discuss them at any length.

It appears from this examination of the formularies of the Church of England, and the teaching of the earliest Anglican fathers that English Churchmen in the sixteenth century were careful to separate themselves decisively from the current doctrines of the place and value of Confirmation in the Christian life. By their writings as well as by liturgical reform, they sought to deliver the Church from the superstitions and errors they had learned to fear and despise. They made the rite into an occasion of great pastoral significance, laying emphasis upon the teaching and pastoral care necessary for those who should present themselves as candidates for Confirmation. In addition, the personal responsibility of the candidate was strongly emphasized. In this way, a change of historic importance was made in the meaning of Confirmation. There is no trace in antiquity of the ratification by the baptized child, when he has attained an age capable of deliberate choice, of the promises made for him by his sponsors. No change had been made in the meaning or practice of Confirmation when Infant Baptism became the general custom, with the disastrous consequences depicted in the Reformers' criticism of contemporary practice. The Reformation marked the first and on the whole, successful attempt, to bring Confirmation into line with the changed pastoral situation consequent upon universal Infant Baptism. Nor were the Reformers alone[34] in desiring the postponement of the age of Confirmation and the revival of the catechumenate in a modified form, to bring Infant Bap-

tism into harmony with the New Testament categories of repentance and faith.

1. Tyndale ; Works (Parker Soc.) Vol. 1, p. 274.
2. *Op. cit.* p. 277.
3. Quoted by S. L. Ollard in *Confirmation* (S.P.C.K.) Vol. I., p. 63.
4. Miscellaneous Writings and Letters of Thomas Cranmer (P.S.) p. 80.
5. The Reformation, the Mass and the Priesthood : E. C. Messenger, Vol. I, p. 253.
6. *Ibid.* p. 260.
7. Works, Vol. II. (P.S.) pp. 1124-5.
8. Works (P.S.) " Prayers, etc., " p. 234.
9. Answer to Martiall (P.S.) p. 216.
10. See Ollard in *op. cit.* pp. 98-101.
11. Nowell's Catechism (P.S.) p. 211.
12. The Catholic Doctrine of the Church of England : An Exposition of the XXXIX. Articles. Thomas Rogers (P.S.) pp. 254-5.
13. These texts can be found in the Parker Society volumes on the Liturgies of Edward VI. and of Elizabeth.
14. Further Studies in the Prayer Book : J. Dowden, pp. 266-7.
15. Exposition Thirty Nine Articles (1831 Ed.), p. 357.
16. Romans x. 9.
17. See the quotations from continental divines approved by Rogers in his discussion *op. cit.* pp.251-55.
18. The Relation of Confirmation to Baptism : A. J. Mason, pp. 426-7.
19. Works (P.S.) Vol. II. p. 1125.
20. *Ibid*, p. 1124.
21. Works (P.S.) Vol. II. p. 1104.
22. Works (P.S.) Vol. III. p. 494.
23. Homilies (1822 edition) p. 317.
24. *Op. cit.*, p. 211. Compare Cranmer's criticism of Roman eucharistic teaching.
25. *Op. cit.*, p. 252.
26. *Ibid.*, p. 255.
27. Works (P.S.) Vol. II. p. 1125.
28. *Op. cit.*, pp. 210-11.
29. *Op. cit.* pp. 252-3.
30. Inst. iv. xix. 4.
31. Works, Vol. III., p. 493.
32. Eccl. Pol. V., lxvi. 1.
33. *Op. cit.*, lxvi. 2, 4, 5-7.
34. See the evidence on Roman regulations for the instruction of children at various councils in the sixteenth century, quoted by Dowden, " Further Studies ", pp. 276-8. The development of catechetical instruction for which the Roman Church has become justly famous, is primarily due to the urgent need of meeting the Reformed challenge in the sixteenth century.

Ministry in the Body of Christ.

By The Rev. J. P. Hickinbotham, M.A.

THE evidence about the precise organisation of the Ministry in New Testament times is so fragmentary and ambiguous that champions of all systems of Church order, from The Quakers to the Roman Catholics, have claimed scriptural authority for their views. Two principal methods have been pursued in the effort to elucidate the truth. The one starts, with as few presuppositions as possible, from the New Testament itself, and endeavours to piece together the historical development as best it may, and from that to draw general conclusions. "The lesson-book of the Ecclesia," says Hort, "is not a law but a history." The difficulty here is that the evidence is insufficient to reach sure conclusions. The other method starts with a theory of the Ministry established on general theological grounds, and then works back to see whether the New Testament evidence can be squared with it. The difficulty here is that every investigator reaches the conclusions to which he is predisposed. Seeing the weakness inherent in both methods, some scholars have concluded that there was no one system of Ministry in the New Testament Church. Rather did each community evolve its own type, so that Episcopalian, Presbyterian, and Congregationalist may each find the prototype of his own kind of ministry existing in Apostolic days. Canon Streeter sums it up by quoting the verdict of the Dodo at the end of the Caucus-Race in *Alice in Wonderland*: "Everyone has won and all shall have prizes." But this radical cutting of the knot in fact raises more questions than it solves: the New Testament itself insists strongly on the necessity of "decency and order," and emphatically asserts the unity of the Church. If St. Paul checks congregational individualism by insisting on uniformity over wearing hats in church, it seems unlikely that he would have allowed, still less fostered, a condition of "happy chaos" in regard to the far more important matter of church organisation and ministry. Such a theory leaves out of account the general control which the apostles exercised over the churches, and makes well-nigh inexplicable the insistence on uniformity and order in the sub-apostolic Church, an insistence which resulted in the universal establishment of monarchical episcopacy by, at latest, the early part of the second century. We should not expect to find a detailed and exact organisation of offices of the Ministry in the infant Church; no doubt we must leave room for creative development under the Spirit's guidance, and for variety of nomenclature and overlapping of functions; and no doubt the early Church thought in terms of function rather than office. But it does seem at least probable that there were basic *principles* of Ministry which were generally recognised and which governed the development in such a way that unity was preserved and the later uniformity emerged as a natural growth. It is therefore suggested that it might be a fruitful line of research to leave aside for the present the disputed questions of organisation and to try to discover passages in the New Testament which approach the

subject of Ministry from a *theological* angle. From this it might be possible to deduce principles which would decide some of the points of organisation on which the direct evidence is insufficient or ambiguous.

The present article is an experiment in this method; space forbids the treatment of more than one inter-related series of passages, and the conclusions must of necessity be extremely tentative. The passages chosen are Romans xii., 1 Corinthians xii., Ephesians iv.; the three passages where St. Paul expounds at length the conception of the Church as a body, the Body of Christ. They are particularly relevant for two reasons. First, in all of them St. Paul is dealing with the problem of combining specialisation of function with the unity of the Church. The Ministry has always, in the history of the Church, been both based upon the necessity of such specialisation and the outstanding example of it. Therefore what St. Paul has to say about specialisation in general will rightly apply to the Ministry in particular. Secondly, an examination of the passages suggests that though St. Paul is dealing with specialisation of function in general, he has particularly in mind those functions which the New Testament regards as the essential functions of the Ministry; functions which in some, though not all, cases had already become crystallised in particular offices. If so, St. Paul is writing about the Ministry in particular, as the obvious illustration of the principle of specialisation of function, and his words have a direct as well as a general application to the Ministry.

The functions which St. Paul selects as typical illustrations (not an exhaustive list and not all given technical names) are 20 in number; but some of them overlap and are given different names in the five different lists, Rom. xii. 6-8, 1 Cor. xii. 7-10, 27-8, 29-31, Eph. iv. 11-12. They may, however, be classified under three heads. First, ministries of the Word: prophecy, teaching, apostles, divers kinds of tongues, interpretation of tongues, exhorting, the word of wisdom, the word of knowledge, discernment of spirits, evangelists, pastors. Secondly, ministries of Mighty Works: healings, miracles, faith. Thirdly, ministries of practical care for the community: helps, ruling, governments, ministry, giving, showing mercy, apostles, pastors. Discernment of spirits probably means judging whether an alleged prophet is truly inspired; faith cannot mean saving faith which is common to all Christians, and therefore probably refers to the special quality of faith required for doing miracles; "ministries" (διακουιαι) probably means those menial offices to which the title διακουος became specially applied; apostles according to Paul were primarily preachers of the Gospel (see *e.g.*, Rom. i. 1, 1 Cor. i. 17), but also included disciplinary and pastoral functions (see 1 and 2 Cor. *passim*), and must therefore be included under both the first and third headings. So must "pastors," who are closely associated with teachers in Ephesians; the pastoral office is certainly one of teaching, at least in part, in Acts xx.; but it probably includes also the thought of the shepherd's government of his flock. "Giving" and "showing mercy," at first sight odd examples of functions limited to certain people only, probably refer to the practical work of relieving the poor and caring for the sick which fell to officials such as the Seven in Acts vi. and the Widows in 1 Timothy v. St. Paul therefore thinks of a ministry of the word (in

various forms), a ministry of mighty works, and a ministry of care for the community, as the typical examples of specialisation of function, the typical limbs or organs through which the Body of Christ does its work. Among these the ministry of the word is the most important : it is much the most frequently mentioned ; it heads the lists ; and its predominance increases as St. Paul's thought develops as may be seen by its supremacy in the latest (Ephesian) list.

We might fairly suggest that if these are to St. Paul the typical specialised functions of the Church, they were the typical functions of the Ministry in St. Paul's day : for the Ministry is the official recognition and organisation of specialised functions within the Church. There is abundant evidence to confirm this. Several of the functions St. Paul refers to by the names of what were certainly recognised ministerial offices ; *e.g.*, apostles, prophets, and less certainly evangelists and διακονος. Here, then, he is thinking directly of the Ministry. And if we examine the functions elsewhere in the New Testament clearly attributed to official ministers, we shall find that they are *these* functions of the Word, Mighty Works, and Practical Care, and no others. The Ministry of the Word is committed to the Apostles (Mark iii. 14), to prophets (Acts xiii. 2), to presbyters (1 Tim. v. 17), to bishops (1 Tim. iii. 2) ; a ministry of mighty works to the Apostles (Mark iii. 15), and to presbyters (James v. 14, 15) ; a ministry of care for the community to the Apostles and presbyters (Acts xv. 23, *seq.*), the Apostles (2 Cor. xi. 28), presbyters (1 Peter v. 2), bishops (1 Tim. iii. 5), deacons (Acts vi.). Three apparent exceptions to this rule are more apparent than real. The duty of baptising is attributed to the Eleven in Matt. xxviii. ; but in view of St. Paul's assertion in 1 Cor. i., and the mention of baptism by others (*e.g.*, Philip, Ananias), this must be taken to apply to them as *disciples* (Matthew's word in the context), not *apostles* ; *i.e.*, this is the function of the Church, which they here represent, not of any particular organ of it. St. Paul once refers to his ministry as priestly (Rom. xv. 16) ; but it is his preaching which is the priestly act, and he is probably thinking of it as comparable to the declaration of the Torah by the Old Testament priests. In any case, it can have no suggestion of offering sacrifice, unless preaching itself is thought of metaphorically as a sacrificial act. The power to remit sins (John xx. 23), is probably to be taken as conferred on the Church, not the Apostles ; and in any case is to be interpreted as referring to the responsibility of making known the Gospel, without which forgiveness cannot be received, rather than as conferring an independent judicial power. We may therefore rightly conclude that when St. Paul speaks of ministries of the Word, of mighty works, and of care for the community as typical of specialised functions in the Church, he has the official ministry of the Church directly (though not necessarily exclusively) in view. With this established, we may now examine further what these passages imply about the Ministry, under three headings : the functions of the Ministry ; its relation to Christ ; and its relation to the Church.

The functions of the Ministry are striking both in what is included and what is omitted ; particularly is the inclusion of mighty works strange to modern ears, and the omission of the ministry of the sacraments. The predominance of the Word and the omission of reference to priesthood and sacrifice will come less strangely to Protestants.

The clue to the mention of these functions, and no others, is to be found in the phrase "Body of Christ." Christ's Body, and the organs which make it up, presumably exist to do Christ's work. This is indicated by the description of Christ as the Head in Ephesians, and of the Holy Spirit as the indwelling energising spirit in Corinthians. The Church, Paul means, is the community indwelt by Christ by His Spirit in order to do His work on earth, as the body does that which is dictated to it by its head or by the invisible spirit ("personality," as we should say) which possesses it. What is this work? The Synoptic Gospels portray Christ as the Messiah come to inaugurate the Kingdom of God, God's rule over all life victorious over evil. This He does in four ways. (1) By preaching and teaching. The Word is the means whereby God's rule is brought to bear upon the thinking and choosing spheres of personality; so it mediates forgiveness (Mark xxv.), comes with Divine authority and power (Mark i. 27, Matt. vii. 28, 29), and is the seed which, when it takes root, produces the Kingdom in men's hearts (Mark iv. 3-20). (2) By mighty works. God's redemptive rule applies to the physical as well as the spiritual and mental life, though our Lord clearly attached greater importance to the latter. The Kingdom, therefore, means healing of the sick, casting out of devils, raising the dead, and protecting God's people from physical needs (*e.g.*, the stilling of the storm). The fact that He does these works is thus confirmation of the Kingdom's presence (Matt. xi. 2-5, Matt. xii. 28). (3) By creating and caring for a community which recognises the presence of the Kingdom and lives within it. The disciples are the "little flock" who possess the Kingdom (Luke xii. 32), and He is the Shepherd (Mark xiv. 27). This is clearly the fulfilment of the Old Testament description of the Messianic Kingdom in terms of shepherd and flock; and it is on the "rock" of Peter's confession of Jesus as Messiah that Jesus will build his "Ecclesia." (4) By sacrifice. Only by His Death can the New Covenant which ushers in the Kingdom among men be fully inaugurated: so "the Son of Man *must* suffer." This is made clear in the Last Supper, and the reason why His Death is effective is that it is the vicarious bearing of sin by the Servant of the Lord, whose functions are united with those of the Son of Man and both fulfilled by Jesus. Now this last function is clearly unique: if it be true that "the Lord hath laid on Him the iniquity of us all," there is (as Hebrews puts it) "no more offering for sin." The New Covenant has been inaugurated; forgiveness and the Spirit are available freely for all. But the life of the Kingdom has still to be made known and applied to men. Hence the three other functions remain: spiritually men must be redeemed through the Word preached; physically they must be redeemed through mighty works wrought in the Spirit's power; and there must be a Community in which the Kingdom is accepted, and which, as sharing in the Kingdom's power, must propagate it as Jesus Himself had propagated it. This Community will need practical shepherding and care even as Jesus Himself had cared for it. Thus we see that the Body of Christ, the Community of the Kingdom, is committed to continue Christ's own work in His earthly life, with the single exception that His Atoning Death was a unique event which could not be, and did not need to be, repeated. This remaining work is therefore the proclamation of the Word, the

performance of mighty works, and the care of the community. We see, further, that it is in the performance of these central functions that St. Paul and the early Church alike recognised specialisation to be necessary; and that therefore it was for the fulfilment of these functions that the primitive Ministry existed. Priesthood and Sacrifice (in the sense of "offering for sin") are excluded because the New Covenant has been established by Christ's Death once for all. The absence of any reference, in Paul's lists or outside them, to a specialised ministry of the Sacraments might be explained in three ways: it may have been regarded as a function of the Church which did not need specialisation; or as part of the ministry of the Word; or as part of the care for the community, the work of the "helps" and "διακονιαι." Whatever the explanation, the fact that it is nowhere mentioned, even in the sub-divisions of Paul's lists, makes it evident that it was not regarded as being one of the obvious and essential functions of the specialised Ministry. All this confirms the Protestant emphasis on the ministry of the Word and its denial of the Roman doctrine of priesthood. It confirms the Anglican retention of emphasis on the Sacraments only if the Sacraments be interpreted as part of, and one with, the Word. But why has the office of "exorcist" fallen into disuse? Ought it to be replaced by ordained doctors? And ought not the deacon to care for the relief of the sick and poor, in fact as well as name, instead of being primarily a junior minister of the Word?

We now turn to the relation of the Ministry to our Lord. In all three Epistles Paul has emphasised that relationship to Christ, and therefore to His People, is the sheer grace-gift of God received through faith. Therefore the Church, His Body, is *God's* building, an olive tree into which *God* grafts men, a community into which men are reconciled *through the Cross*. If the Body is a Divine creation, its various organs must equally be so. So the Ministry is something which God "hath set in the Church" (Corinthians); it is the gift of the Ascended Christ (Ephesians). So the various functions are χαρισματα, spiritual gifts from God, not natural abilities. And this applies to *all* the ministries, the practical ones of helps and ruling, of διακονιαι and governments, as well as to the ministries of the Word and of mighty works. The ministry can only operate because "it is the same Lord that worketh all and in all" (Corinthians), and in so far as it is nourished by the Head which is Christ (Ephesians). This means two things: first the ministry is not a matter of human choice or ability; it depends entirely upon the grace-gift of God in Christ by His Spirit, both for the original endowment and for its daily working. No man can make himself a minister; he must be called by Christ; no man, when called, can fulfil the ministry by his own powers; he must depend upon the gift of Christ and remain in union with Him. We knew it in the ministry of the Word; has Augustine's teaching obscured it in the ministry of the sacraments? The application of this principle to *all* ministries alike rules out of court Harnack's theory that there existed in the early Church a "charismatic" ministry depending on spiritual gift alongside an "official" ministry owing its authority simply to appointment by the Church. Secondly, it means that the ministry has

the direct authority of Christ. Each organ acts on behalf of, and through contact with, the Head or the Spirit. Therefore it represents that Head or Spirit. The organs are Christ's gifts to the Church, set there by God. Therefore their position is decided by God, not by the Church. The Church, as part of its obedience, must accept and recognise God's gifts and God's disposition of its economy. So the ministry is a ministry of Christ rather than of the Church : its authority is the authority of Christ in so far as it takes the place and performs the functions given by Christ ; and the Church must recognise and accept that authority. Its authority is, of course, commensurate with its subjection : it is only as it acts under the Head, taking the place, in which it is set by God, that it represents Christ and God to the Church. But while it does so, the Church cannot question it ; nor can the Church create a ministry of its own choice ; the Church's task is limited to recognising, and giving scope to, the ministry given by Christ. This condemns the theory that the ministry is just a convenient mode of operation invented and used by the Church, owing its authority to the Church's commission. Likewise it condemns the idea that the specialisation of function is a later development. True, the forms of ministry developed, as limbs develop and grow. But differentiation of function is inherent in the Church from the start, if the Church is truly a Body : as there cannot be a body without limbs, so the Church has never been an amorphous uniformity ; Church and Ministry are inherent in each other.

This leads on to the relation of the Ministry to the Church. As we have seen, in so far as the Ministry is the setting of limbs within the Body by God, the gift of Christ to the Church, the Ministry is authoritative over the Church, and inherently indispensable to it. But to each of these positions there is a converse equally true. If there cannot be a body without limbs, so neither can there be limbs without a body. This rules out the theory that our Lord created a Ministry first (the Apostolate), and that the Church developed out of this. It is not true to say, with Ignatius, " Where the bishop is there is the Catholic Church," though it would be true to say, " Where the Church is there are divers kinds of ministry." This strengthens the Cyprianic view as against the prevalent Augustinian theory : ministry must mean ministry within the Church ; and a ministry outside the Church is as meaningless as a limb which has no body. It, incidentally, also rules out the view that our Lord gave to the Church one undifferentiated form of ministry, the Apostolate, and that the Apostolic functions were later delegated to a number of different officials. The Apostolate is listed on an equality with the other forms of ministry, as one among many, all equally the gift of Christ, all equally set by God in the Church. A body does not start life with one limb only ; all are present even if only in embryo. If, then, the Ministry, in all its forms, is inherently necessary to the Church, so also the Church is inherently necessary to the Ministry, and there can be no real Ministry apart from it. Moreover, if the Ministry, as representing Christ, is authoritative over the Church, the Church, in an equally real sense, is authoritative over the Ministry. For each organ is only set in the body in order to enable the body to function ; every limb performs all its subordinate functions only in order to contribute to the greater

purposes of the body as a whole. No limb can properly have any aim except to contribute to the action of the body, and if it is to do so it must always subordinate itself to the body, and act in harmony with all other limbs and with the body as a whole. So the Ministry is given to the Church, not to fulfil any aims of its own, but simply to undertake those particular functions which may enable the Church to fulfil its greater function with the greatest efficiency. This means that it must always act in harmony with the Church and all its members, and seek to promote the welfare and effectiveness of the Church as a whole; its functions are merely particular parts of the Church's function. In this sense, the Ministry is truly representative of the Church. True, the Church must act through the organs given it by Christ; but its actions remain the actions of the Church, the Body of Christ, and it can never undertake actions other than those of the Body. Therefore the Ministry must not only act in harmony with, and for the well-being of, the Church and all its members; it also requires the commission of the Church to act on its behalf. These points are brought out by the stress in Corinthians on the mutual dependence of the members, and the statement that all gifts are given "to profit withal," *i.e.*, for the common good; and in Ephesians by the statement that all gifts are given "for the perfecting of the saints unto the work of ministering"; *i.e.*, all have a ministry to perform, and the task of the specialised ministry is not to exclude the other members of the community, but to equip them the better for their work of ministering. This rules out any attempt to infringe upon the ministerial functions of the laity by giving a monopoly of ministry to the clergy. Christ acts through His whole Body. Finally, it may be noted that all ministries are equally given to or set in the Church, the Body of Christ; *i.e.*, they are ministries not of a local congregation (still less of a denomination), but ministries of the whole universal Church. This rules out Harnack's theory of sharply differentiated general ministries of the whole Church and local ministries of particular churches. While the exercise of some ministries may be for convenience located in one area, nevertheless all alike are organs of the whole Body; so that the local minister not only represents the local Church to the larger Body, but also represents the Universal Church to the local congregation.

The conclusion that Church and Ministry are necessary to each other, and that neither can dispense with the other, is fairly clear; though it should be added that we have not inquired whether any particular *form* of ministry is necessary, provided the ministerial functions are exercised. The second conclusion, that the Ministry is both authoritative over the Church as directly given by Christ and that it is subject to the Church, as existing only in the Church and to do the work of the Body, may (at first sight) appear a contradiction. It is resolved when we remember that Church and Ministry, Body and Limbs, exist only to do the work of Christ the Head and of His Spirit, the indwelling personality. For Christ came in love to serve: He Himself came "not to be ministered unto but to minister"—διακουειν, which means to do menial service. His Ministry was *ministry*, menial service. Therefore so is the work of His Body and of His limbs: to do menial service in love. Every χαρισμα is therefore a διακουια (1 Cor. xii. 4); and the Body and its members seek nothing for themselves, but only

to serve each other, and in serving each other to serve Christ the Head. Therefore each recognises the authority of the other, seeks the welfare of the other, and so Christ is He " from whom all the body fitly framed and knit together through that which every joint supplieth, according to the working in due measure of each several part, maketh the increase of the body unto the building up of itself *in love*" (Eph. iv. 16). We make a grave error if we expect to find in the New Testament an elaborate Church constitution, with checks and balances to prevent any member, or the Body as a whole, claiming undue power. For the Body is the Body of Christ, and it exists to serve in love; the organs are the organs of Christ, and they exist to serve in love. The only thing we shall find is opportunities of service; the only honour is the privilege of doing more menial service (1 Cor. xii. 22-24); and the only organisation is such as is needed to give scope for service. That is why framers of Church constitutions often find little to help them in the New Testament, and would perhaps regard these views as unpractical. But perhaps the fact that controversy about the Ministry is now centred in the question of who should rule rather than who should serve, is only a sign that the Church is inclined to forget its fundamental theology, that Christ and His Body came alike to minister, not to be ministered unto; if it does so, it may produce a water-tight ecclesiastical scheme; but the organisation it labels Church will no longer be the Body of Christ, and the organisation it labels Ministry will no longer be the Ministry of Members of that Body; for unless love be the governing principle, Christ cannot be the Head nor can His Spirit dwell in it; and if Christ and His Spirit be absent, neither the Body nor the Members can be His, and His work cannot be done.

The General Necessity of Baptism:

Testimony of Richard Woodman.

By The Rev. G. W. Bromiley, M.A., Ph.D.

THE sacramental quarrel of the Reformers with Rome centred mainly around the so-called sacrament of the altar, the presence, transubstantiation, the sacrifice of the mass; but not a little attention was also paid to the primary sacrament of the Gospel, baptism. Here, too, the theology of the Reformation, whilst it avoided the decisive break of Anabaptism, broke away at many points from Papist teaching. In general, Rome, building upon the assertion of Augustine, insisted upon the absolute necessity of the sacrament to salvation. Faith in the recipient, and the regenerative work of the Holy Spirit were tied to the sacramental act. The effects of baptism were limited to allow scope for penance. In baptism original sin only, and actual sins done prior to baptism, were forgiven. But these effects were the effects of the act itself. To be baptized meant to be forgiven and saved. Not to be baptized meant wrath and damnation.

Quite naturally the Reformers could not accept this position. Salvation to them was the work and the gift of God, appropriated to the individual by faith. The sacrament was the sign and seal of forgiveness, regeneration, salvation, a means of grace, but not salvation itself.[1] There could then be faith and salvation even where baptism with water was not available, and there could also be baptism where there was neither faith nor salvation.[2] As an ordinance of Christ, baptism ought to be observed where possible, and is generally necessary, but there is no absolute necessity, for God is not bound by His own general ordinances.[3]

These issues are raised, and a clear lay witness is given to the Reformed position, in the examination of Richard Woodman, a martyr burned at Lewes in the Marian persecution, whose story is chronicled by Foxe.[4] Woodman was not of course a trained theologian, but his witness is in a sense all the more valuable on that account. He was an ironmaker of the parish of Warbleton, Sussex—Sussex was at that time a centre of the older English iron industry, which was dependent upon charcoal—about 30 years of age at the time of his trouble. The first offence of Woodman was to rebuke the curate of the parish, one Fairebanke, for his forsaking of reformed doctrine at the accession of Mary. Clearly Woodman was a man of independent judgment, well read in the Scriptures, and the two-faced conduct of Fairebanke did not deceive him. He was arrested, committed to the King's Bench, and later removed to the notorious coal-house of Bishop Bonner, where Philpot was at this time a prisoner. In December of that year (1556) Philpot was burned, and Woodman and four others were released.

1 *Cf.* Jewel (Parker Society) i p.1105.
2 *Ibid.* p.1107; Bullinger (Parker Society) iv. p.372.
3 Jewel *Ibid.* p.1107.
4 Foxe Acts and Monuments (Townsend edit.) Volume VIII. pp.332 ff.

The birth of a child seems to have been the occasion of further trouble, and after some weeks of hiding he was re-arrested, the charge being that he had baptized the child himself, and refused to allow it to be baptized in the parish church. He was again committed to the coal-house, and underwent six examinations, before Dr. Christopherson, Bishop of Chichester, Dr. Story, and a certain Dr. Langdale, Parson of Buxsted and chaplain to Lord Montagu. Woodman himself has left an account of these interviews, reproduced in Foxe. It was at the third, before Dr. Langdale, that the question of baptism was discussed, and reformed teaching opposed to the papistical notions of Langdale. No doubt Woodman's account, written by one of the contestants from a definite point of view and under very unfavourable circumstances, is biased and puts Langdale in a not very creditable light, but even allowing for such bias, one thing is clear, that Woodman had a far greater command of the Scriptures than his opponent, and that with this Scripture knowledge he was quite a match for his opponent in dogmatic subtleties. It is also clear that Woodman had a good understanding of the general principles of the reformed doctrine of baptism. A summary of the argument will help to underline these principles.

Langdale began by reiterating the double charge brought against Woodman (p.355), that he himself had presumed to baptize, and that he had tried to prevent the baptism of the child in church. The implication (not a very clear one) was that Woodman was an Anabaptist, a name universally feared and abhorred since the Munster tragedy. Langdale warned him that "if the child had died, it had been damned, because it was not christened". Thus Langdale asserted an absolute necessity of the sacrament, and opened up the way for the main discussion.

Woodman first defended himself against the charges brought against him. He denied that he had baptized anyone. The Reformers, it will be recalled, insisted upon a lawful calling of those who minister in the congregation. He denied also that he had refused to have the child baptized. The truth was that he had been absent from home when the child was born, and that in view of the fear of non-survival, it had been christened at once by a mid-wife. Later Woodman seems to have resisted an attempt to bring the child to church for re-baptism or the confirmation of the private administration. Did Woodman allow then of baptism by midwives? On this point the Anglican reformers were divided, some holding for the custom, or at any rate not condemning it, as Whitgift[1], others demanding its prohibition, as Hooper.[2] The 1552 Prayer Book provided for private baptism, but by a minister lawfully ordained, as opposed to the 1549 book, which allowed private baptism by anyone ("one of them"). Woodman does not himself defend the practice, although he asserts the validity of such baptism. He disclaims all responsibility. What is probable is that Woodman preferred this expedient of private baptism by a midwife in his own absence to a public Roman baptism with all its added ceremonies, (salt, cream, spittle and the like, universally con-

[1] Whitgift (Parker Society) ii p.540 I suspend my judgment for baptizing by women, yet I am out of doubt for private baptism.

[2] Hooper (Parker Society) p.131 It is a profanation of the sacrament and not to be suffered.

demned by the Reformers), and in a language which was not understood and could not edify. The Reformers did not of course dispute the validity of Roman baptism, so long as water was used together with the Triune formula,[1] but they did object very strongly to the ceremonies added by man to the ordinance of God.[2] When questioned by Langdale whether he would willingly have brought his child to baptism Woodman significantly hedges, " That is no matter, what I would have done ", and he asks Langdale (p.356) whether the baptism already administered by the midwife is not sufficient. Langdale, bound by Roman teaching, cannot but admit that it is.

Having defended himself against the charges, Woodman goes on to challenge the bold assertion of Langdale, that if the child had died unbaptized it would have perished. These are words " uncomely to be spoken ". He demands of Langdale that he should prove them by the Word of God. The reply of Langdale is surprising and illuminating. He does not produce the usual text from John 3, but points to the words of institution in Mark 16. Had he used these words merely to urge a general necessity of baptism in obedience to the commandment of Christ, Woodman would have agreed. But Langdale, abusing the text on the one side as Baptists abuse it on the other, sought to prove by it an absolute necessity, " Whoso believeth and is baptized shall be saved, and he that believeth not shall be damned. These be the words of Christ, which are my warrant ". It is worth recalling at this stage the Baptist use of the same text. Infants ought not to be baptized because, not having self-consciousness, they cannot believe. Logically it would follow from this that all infants are damned, not because they are not baptized, but because they do not believe, although no doubt the Baptist would plead that the infant cannot receive or reject Christ, cannot believe or not believe, and thus does not come within the scope of the text at all. Langdale, however, equates believing and baptism, as Woodman is quick to perceive. He concludes that all who are baptized also believe and are necessarily saved (except they fall into mortal sin). He further concludes that those who are not baptized do not and cannot believe and are, therefore, inevitably lost. Woodman is horrified at this blatant misinterpretation, and he has the acumen to fasten on the weak point : the fact that Christ does not say " He that is not baptized shall be damned ", but " He that believeth not ". This Scripture Woodman compares with the text of John, that he that believeth not is condemned already, by and for the simple fact that he does not believe.

At this point Langdale seeks to retort with the accusation that Woodman denies baptism and is an Anabaptist. Woodman refuses the charge. He denies indeed that there is such necessity of material water that without it damnation is certain. But he does hold fast to the general necessity of the sacrament, for it is the ordinance of God and ought in all ordinary cases to be observed. What he objects to is the identification of baptism and belief, and the conclusion that

[1] Ridley (Foxe VII p.420) All the substantial points which Christ commanded to be done are observed.

[2] *Cf.* any of the Reformers. The answer of John Denley to Bonner (Foxe VII p.334) states the position ' The chamberlain in Acts viii we do not read that he called for any cream, nor oil, etc." So too Robert Smith to Bonner.

baptism is the cause of faith (p.357). The charge of Anabaptism was of course irrelevant and designed only to bring Woodman and his views into disrepute, but he was able to keep the discussion to the point at issue, whether faith is so tied to the sacrament that where the sacrament is, there faith must be also; where there is no sacrament, there faith also lacks. Woodman asserts against Langdale that faith is prior to and therefore independent of the sacrament, even in infants, and in answer to Langdale, who confidently states that "the child hath no faith before it is baptized; and therefore the baptizing bringeth the faith", he cites the example of Jacob, elect and therefore a believer before his circumcision (Romans 9). It is not the outward ceremony which produces faith, but the working and grace of God according to His purpose and election.

Langdale quibbles at this example because it is taken from the old law: "I speak of baptism, and you are gone from baptizing to the time of circumcision". Taking up the argument from election, he seeks, astonishingly enough, to foist upon Woodman a twofold heresy, that of denying original sin,[1] and that of denying free-will, a strange combination. The reasoning upon which this accusation is grounded is as follows: Baptism avails for the putting away of original sin. Unless original sin is put away a child cannot be saved. To say that a child can be saved without baptism is then to say that there is no original sin. To charge Woodman with a denial of original sin, and also of free-will, is of course nonsensical, since Woodman has a far stronger view of original sin than Langdale himself: that is why he does deny that the will is free. Woodman cannot admit with Langdale that original sin is destroyed and the freedom of the will restored by baptism and the obedience of Christ. He cites against him Paul groaning under the thorn in the flesh, and the constant need for the all-sufficient grace of God. But Woodman profits from Langdale's view of free will to this extent, that he secures from his opponent an admission that it is the death of Christ rather than the ceremony of baptism which puts away original sin. "You say in one place, it is not without baptism; and in another place you put it away quite, by the death of Christ; and in very deed you have spoken truer in the matter than you are aware of. For all that believe in Christ are baptized in the blood of Christ that he shed on the cross, and in the water that he sweat for pain and for the putting away of our sins at his death." It is this baptism alone which is absolutely necessary. An outward dipping in water is the sign and seal, necessary as a useful ordinance of Christ, but dispensable where extraordinary circumstances forbid its use.

The accusation of Langdale having been refuted, Woodman now goes on, with his opponent's permission, to prove his own main point, that faith is before baptism (p.358). In passing, he denies that any guilt attached to the child for the fault of a parent in neglecting baptism, citing Ezekiel, "The father shall not bear the child's offences, nor the child the father's offences". He then returns to the example of Jacob, and maintains that baptism and circumcision are one, for "circum-

[1] The Anabaptists had very real tendencies in this direction, but ordinarily they held to free will. Langdale meant, of course, a will freed by faith in Christ and baptism, which destroyed original sin. The Reformers maintained that original sin persists even in the regenerate, although it is forgiven.

cision is the figure of baptism ".[1] To the example of Jacob he adds that of the Flood according to the text of Peter, for at the Flood, another figure of baptism, it was faith, not the water, which saved Noah, " Water had not saved Noah and the other seven, no more than it saved all the rest, if it had not been for their faith, which faith now saveth us ". The teaching of Peter is thus " clean against " the assertion of Langdale, who claims that all infants dying before they attain to years of discretion are saved if they are baptized, but who denies that such infants have any prior faith. Peter shows that it is faith alone (the consent of a good conscience towards God) which saves. Therefore " if they have not faith, none shall be saved, although they be baptized. The argument of Woodman is a little laborious at this point, for he is building upon the assumption of Langdale that infants cannot have faith. What he seeks to show is that faith alone and not baptism, the outward sign and seal, can save, so that if infants have not faith, as Langdale says, then they are lost.

The dilemma is one which presses far more heavily upon those who deny baptism to infants than it does upon Langdale and Papists, for these latter could reply, with many reformers who also hesitated to ascribe a personal faith to infants, that children are baptized in the faith of the church.[2] The Baptist, however, denies that the infant has any faith either individually or corporately. But if there is no faith, then there is no salvation. Yet the Scripture undoubtedly regards infants as amongst the members of the Kingdom. Even when it is alleged that the text in Mark means only by unbelief a conscious rejection of Christ, which is reasonable enough, the general truth remains that all are concluded under sin and that without faith it is impossible to please God. Deny to infants all form of faith and either original sin is denied or infant salvation. But grant that they have some form of faith and their right to baptism is also granted, provided that steps are taken for their instruction in faith as they grow to years of self-conscious life. The root error of Baptism seems to be twofold : first that it makes of faith something intellectual only, whereas in the Word of God the working of the Holy Spirit is not restricted to those who have self-consciousness ; second it envisages faith as something too purely individual, whereas in the Word of God it is something corporate as well as individual—the faith of Abraham is the faith of the family of Abraham, and the early Christians believe and are baptized as households. These are points which the Reformers well grasped in their refutation of the Anabaptists and their defence of the immemorial custom of the baptism of infants.

Langdale, confronted with this dilemma, sees only a perverseness in Woodman, and confidently replies that children are baptized in the faith of their godfathers and godmothers (p.359) : " That faith is the good conscience that St. Peter speaketh of ; and the christening is the keeping of the law. Like as circumcision was the keeping of the old law, so is baptism the keeping of the new law." Woodman smiles at Langdale's readiness to bring in the old law (previously discounted) when it helps him to prove a point, but he is not impressed by the

[1] *Cf.* Philpot (Parker Soc.) p.277 Baptism is come in the stead of circumcision.
[2] Nowell's Catechism p.209 ascribes to infants the faith of the church, Becon ii pp.211-214 a personal faith by the Holy Ghost.

argument. It does not take account of the fact that children can have faith in themselves, as the examples of Jacob and John Baptist prove; for these children were chosen of God and filled with the Holy Ghost from the mother's womb, and therefore must have had faith. Again it does not take account of the fact that many godparents, indeed the majority, are not in any true sense believers themselves, and if that is the case, " in what faith is the child then baptized? In none at all, by your own saying ".

Had Langdale been a more adept theologian he would have given the reply which many of the reformers themselves would have given, that the child was baptized in the faith of the church,[1] but the Papists at this time seemed to hold rather to baptism in the faith of godparents as such, and he entered upon a defence along the lines that amongst three godparents there was sure to be one believer, " for the flock of Christ is not such a very little flock ", and that Woodman was guilty of judging others. Woodman had of course no difficulty in shewing from the New Testament that the flock of Christ is and always will be comparatively a little one, and Langdale could only reply by abusing the martyr, whose superior knowledge of the Scriptures was no doubt very provoking. At this point the discussion was interrupted by the entry of Master Gage, and after a few more words on original sin, shifted at Gage's instigation to the all-absorbing topic, the sacrament of the altar.

The main evangelical propositions which emerge from the discussion and from Woodman's assertions, are as follows: Baptism is generally necessary to salvation, and ought not to be despised or neglected. Water and the word of institution are alone essential to a proper administration, and non-scriptural ceremonies ought not to be added, nor the sacrament be administered in a foreign tongue which does not edify. There is no such absolute necessity of baptism to salvation, as that any dying without it would inevitably be lost. Baptism is the sacrament of salvation appointed by Christ, but it is Christ Himself who saves, in and through or without the sacrament. On the part of man nothing is required absolutely but faith in Christ.[2] Baptism does not give or produce faith. Faith is the working of the Holy Ghost, who renews the soul according to the divine election. The dipping in water is a sacrament of this work and of the work of forgiveness, and a means ordinarily used to further it, but it is not itself the work.

Two questions are not clearly resolved in the discussion. Both concern the assertion of Woodman that infants have a right to baptism because they have a prior faith. The first is, whether it is not better to maintain the more cautious view of many of the reformers, that infants are baptized in the faith of the church only, coming to a personal faith, or the confession of it, on the hearing of the word. To say

[1] The usual answer of martyrs to the third of the articles generally administered by Bonner. *Cf.* Christopher Lyster and others " They were baptized in the faith and belief of the catholic church ". Bonner wished to prove that they had departed from the faith of their infancy, that held by their godparents, but the martyrs claimed that they were baptized in the faith of the true as opposed to the Roman church.

[2] Even Rome, following the Fathers, was willing to grant that in the case of martyrs prevented from being baptized by death, the baptism of blood would avail instead of that of water.

categorically that infants have faith is a little bold. On the other hand it is equally bold to deny that they have faith, since from Scripture examples they clearly have the Holy Spirit. The second is, whether Woodman would assert that all infants have faith, some losing it with growth to years of discretion, or whether only some infants have faith. To judge from the use of Romans 9 the latter would be his view. The elect only have faith as infants (those who die in infancy would probably be reckoned as of the elect). The elect child is baptized and also has faith due to the inward working of the Holy Spirit, a faith which at some point (conversion) comes to consciousness with a decision for Christ. On this view it is not wholly correct to identify regeneration and conversion, for regeneration, as the work of the Holy Ghost, begins with the first movements of the Spirit, the new life coming to self-awareness at conversion. In the case of the child not elect baptism is also administered, but it is a ceremony without inward significance, for there is no faith, and with the growth to maturity Jesus Christ is rejected, and the way of ungodliness preferred to that of righteousness. The children of believers only are baptized because to them only the covenant promise is given. If the children of the heathen are of the elect it will appear at their receiving of Christ or at the last judgment—for those dying without profession of faith in Christ are to be left to the judgment of God.[1]

Whether this understanding of baptism would meet with the approval of many Evangelical Christians to-day is doubtful. Even those who accept the broad fact of election would perhaps prefer to see in conversion the beginning of the new life, ascribing to baptism a prophetic significance—for with God time is of little account and the time lag between confession and baptism or baptism and confession is of this world only—or granting to all infants, as infants, the common faith of the church, with the need for a personal decision with the advance to maturity. But whatever the reaction, this understanding does represent one view of the inter-relation of baptism which has no little support in the facts of the situation and the general teaching of Scripture, and which merits the closest consideration.

[1] Upon these points see especially Becon (Parker Society) ii pp.211 ff.

Martin Luther.*

By W. Guy Johnson.

In the earlier half of last year a book appeared with the title "Martin Luther, Hitler's Spiritual Ancestor", by Mr. Peter F. Wiener, which came as a surprise and shock to admirers of Luther who happened to read it. It represented Luther as a profligate, a drunkard, an enemy of democracy and of true Christianity, and also as having many other qualities equally undesirable. There is nothing new in all this. Luther was constantly assailed in his lifetime, and his memory has been defamed by innumerable enemies ever since his death; though so comprehensive an indictment within so small a compass can hardly have appeared in all that period. In order to appreciate Luther and the great work that he did for the reformation of religion in the sixteenth century, it is not necessary that we should obscure or deny his faults, though we ought to be on our guard against the tendency to judge earlier ages by the ideals and standards of modern and easier days. Luther's language was often violent and ill-judged, sometimes we may think inexcusably so. His conduct in the matter of the bigamy of Philip of Hesse, it is impossible to defend. He was harsh and intolerant in his attitude to the leaders of the Peasant Revolt. These and other faults, far from being unknown or ignored in England, as Mr. Wiener seems to suppose, have been admitted and deplored by everyone who has had any knowledge of Luther at all. But these blemishes are not the whole of Luther, nor are they any important part of him. Those who assert the contrary are either the victims of prejudice or lack any true understanding of history.

Mr. Wiener, however, professes to rest his case entirely on Luther's own speeches or writings. It is obvious, therefore, if his picture is a true representation, that a host of scholars, historians and divines have completely misunderstood and misinterpreted him throughout the past four centuries, which is a fairly large assumption; or, on the other hand, if it is a mere caricature, that some reply is urgently needed, for Mr. Wiener writes very plausibly and the great show of extracts purporting to be taken from what Luther actually said or wrote has a quite convincing appearance. Mr. Gordon Rupp has given us just the reply that was needed. With a wider and more thorough knowledge of the subject than Mr. Wiener manifestly possesses, Mr. Rupp takes up his quotations and misquotations and exhibits their worthlessness. Indeed, as the reviewer in "The Spectator" said, the reader gets tired of Mr. Wiener long before Mr. Rupp has done with him.

When Mr. Wiener's book was first published, the observant reader could, even without the author's admissions, see its completely one-sided and therefore unfair character. All that could present Luther in a bad light was raked together from every available quarter; anything

* *Martin Luther, Hitler's Cause or Cure?* by the Rev. E. Gordon Rupp, M.A., B.D. *Martin Luther, Hitler's Spiritual Ancestor*, by Peter F. Wiener. *Luther's Primary Works*, Wace and Buckheim. *History of Reformation in Germany*, T. M. Lindsay.

favourable was carefully excluded : and even of those which were unfavourable, many were obviously capable of a quite different meaning than that which Mr. Wiener intended that we should draw from them. But this critic of the Reformer had safeguarded himself beforehand against objections on this score. He wrote, " I shall not try to give a full and scholarly analysis of German Protestantism, of Luther and Lutheranism. I shall merely give my own reading of Luther ; I shall show only that side of Luther and his influence which is usually ignored in England and which is entirely the reverse of the traditional view." (p.9) And later (p.21), " I do not propose to enter into any discussion of Luther's doctrine, of his explanations of and views about the Scriptures." After that, it seems useless to object that the portrait is one-sided for the author could reply : " Of course it is, didn't I say at the outset that it would be ? " ; or to point to passages which could only be properly interpreted in the light of Luther's doctrinal views, since he could again reply, " It may be so, but I said plainly in my book that I did not propose to discuss Luther's doctrine."

Among the passages on which Mr. Wiener bases what he calls " my own reading of Luther ", is one which we will not repeat as it stands in his book, for it represents Luther as saying that our Lord was guilty of immoral relations with the woman of Samaria, with the woman taken in adultery and with Mary Magdalene. The passage is cited from the " Table Talk " which consists of Luther's familiar conversation written down at the time or afterwards by disciples or admirers who chanced to be with him. Though the " Table Talk " has a distinct value, it is obviously an unsafe source for what Luther actually said, as it is easy for words to get forgotten, especially if not written down at the moment of utterance, and it cannot by itself be taken as proof of a case ; and, moreover, we must not forget that this collection of sayings was not published until twenty years after Luther's death. It may confirm or illustrate Luther's own published works, but where there is contradiction or ambiguity what Luther wrote and published, and not what he is reported to have said, must determine the matter. The passage just mentioned is a case in point. In his Commentary on the Epistle to the Galatians, with reference to the thirteenth verse of chapter three, " Christ hath redeemed us from the curse of the law, being made a curse for us ", Luther writes, " For he saith not that Christ was made a curse for Himself, but for us. Therefore all the weight of the matter standeth in this word " for us ". *For Christ is innocent concerning His own person*, and therefore He ought not to have been hanged upon a tree " ; and a few sentences further on he adds " For He being made a sacrifice for the sins of the whole world is not now an innocent person and without sins, is not now the Son of God born of the Virgin Mary, but a sinner which hath and carrieth the sin of Paul who was a blasphemer, an oppressor and a persecutor ; of Peter which denied Christ ; of David which was an adulterer and a murderer and caused the Gentiles to blaspheme the name of the Lord ; and, briefly, which hath and beareth all the sins of all men in His body ; *not that He himself committed them*, but for that He received them, being committed or done of us, and laid them upon His own body." Truly, if Mr. Wiener desires to retain his own reading of Luther, he is wise to avoid the discussion of Luther's doctrinal teaching. He appears,

moreover, to have restricted his studies even of the "Table Talk," or he might have seen in it the following :—"Therefore the law which Moses gave to be executed upon malefactors and murderers in general took hold on Christ, finding Him with and among sinners and murderers, *though in His own person innocent*"; or again, "*Our everlasting High Priest is holy, innocent, unstained and separate from sin*; therefore it was needless for Him to wash His feet, but He washed and cleansed us, through His blood, from all our sins." ("Table talk," trs. William Hazlitt, London, 1848.) We have discussed this particular point at some length, as Mr. Rupp does not include the foregoing among his quotations in a forcible letter which appeared in *The Spectator* of 28th December last, and as much controversial capital has been made out of the passage in question in certain Roman Catholic quarters, since Mr. Wiener's book was published.

The truth is that in this country, notwithstanding the great work which he did for the Reformation, Luther is in more danger of being forgotten than of being over-esteemed. There are more reasons than one for this. The average man in these days has little acquaintance with history, and is apt to be deaf to the recitals of past heroisms of which he has barely heard. Then, again, the Reformers and the Reformation have for nearly a century been attacked and disparaged by the advocates of a resuscitated Romanism in our midst. And also the taunt, "made in Germany," has not been without its influence, especially since the first World war opened in 1914. But the words of Macaulay still remain true :—"A people which takes no pride in the noble achievements of remote ancestors, will never achieve anything worthy to be remembered with pride by remote descendants."

It is not too much to say that Luther was the greatest man of his age, even while we admit that he was no more free from faults than any of his contemporaries, or than we, with our vastly wider range of knowledge, can claim to be. We have our treasure still in earthen vessels, and are in no very good position to pass judgment on others who have been similarly placed. Edward Armstrong, in the preface to his great book, the Life of the Emperor Charles V., wrote with reference to the impression which Luther's appearances in the book, taken alone, might produce: "The nobler, the softer, the more intellectual sides of the reformer's nature have but the most indirect bearing on my subject. If the far-famed scene at Worms be excepted, Luther is usually seen at his very worst when brought into contact with the more marked political events of Charles's reign. We see nothing of his cheerful family life, hear nothing of his virile eloquence, read nothing of his loving care for the education of the young. But there are ample opportunities for his violence, his coarse utterance, his obstinacy, his inconsistency. His conduct towards the deluded peasants, his acquiescence in Philip of Hesse's bigamy, his alternate rejection and acceptance of authority or of foreign alliances, his very scolding of Zwingli, or Bucer, or Melanchthon, are unfortunately the episodes on which it may be necessary to touch, if not to dwell. Yet these disagreeables are no more the whole of Luther than are March winds and dust the whole of spring." (*Pref. xiv.*)

But when we turn to the real Luther, to the man he essentially was and the work he accomplished, these defects are but as dust in the

balances by comparison. Probably the first thing that arrests our attention is his indomitable courage. Alone, without prestige or position to support him, he faced the enmity of the ruling powers in the Church and the State, and he won through. Next we may note the depth and reality of his spiritual experience. He gave himself no rest until he could find peace with God, and this came at last by his diligent study of the scriptures. When he once had grasped the truth implicit in the words, "The just shall live by faith," and realised that God was not an angry Judge, but a gracious and loving Father, and that the sinner is saved by His free grace alone through faith in Christ's atoning work, the certainty and tenacity of his hold upon it were never shaken. By the preaching of this doctrine he liberated men from the oppressive weight of fear which had rested on them throughout the middle ages as a result of the current teaching of the Church. Again, his teaching with regard to the supreme authority of Scripture as the Word of God, and his translation of it into the language of the people, placed an inestimable treasure in their hands and ensured that the days of ignorance should not return. We may well marvel, too, at his prodigious literary industry at a time when the care of the Churches was taxing his health and strength to the uttermost; and in all this, to which much more might be added, we may find ample justification for the words of Principal T. M. Lindsay, "Hence it is that we may say without exaggeration that the Reformation was embodied in Martin Luther, that it lived in him as in no one else, and that its inner religious history may be best studied in the record of his spiritual experiences and in the growth of his religious convictions" (Hist. Ref. I. p. 193).

For the defence of Luther against his latest detractor, the reader may be left in the capable hands of Mr. Rupp, whose reply speaks for itself. It is fair, candid and convincing, and no point of importance is omitted. It is a book to buy, to read and to keep for reference. It should have a large circulation.

The Liberal and Post-Liberal Estimate of Man.

By The Rev. F. Hugh Barber.

COUNT LEO TOLSTOI wrote an interesting spiritual autobiography which he entitled "Christ's Christianity." In it he declared that most of his life had been based on belief in the doctrine of general perfectibility. "This belief," he says, "may be summed up in the word 'progress.' Everything develops, and I myself develop as well; and why this is so will one day be apparent." This facile philosophy failed to provide Tolstoi with an explanation of decay and death: "There was a time when I was myself developing, when my muscles and memory were strengthening, my power of thinking and understanding on the increase. I, feeling this, very naturally thought that the law of my own growth was the law of the universe and explained the meaning of my own life. But there came another time when I had ceased to grow, and I felt that I was not developing but drying up; my muscles grew weaker, my teeth began to fall out, and I saw that this law of growth, not only explained nothing, but that such a law did not and could not exist; that I had taken for a general law what only affected myself at a given age." A period of despair descended upon Tolstoi when he realised that his optimistic philosophy was a psychological rationalisation of his personal experience. This disillusionment carried him forth from academic speculation into the common ways of men. From the peasantry he sought to learn the meaning of life. For the Count, and his circle, life was hollow and pointless; for the poor, the labouring, and the humble, life had meaning. Why was this? It was, he observed, because the common, unlearned people had that childlike faith which sustained them in happiness and peace. They did not reason; they believed; and through their belief they found comfort and joy.

In his spiritual autobiography, Tolstoi could be said to personify Western Civilization itself. The Renaissance brought rejuvenation to Christendom. Both intellectually and geographically civilization began to expand, and an optimistic philosophy of development and progress was inevitable. This optimism received an enormous fresh impetus through the growth of mechanical and scientific knowledge which followed on the Renaissance. Anthropology was dyed the appropriate optimistic colour and was indistinguishable from the gay background of belief in Cosmic Progress. Then, alas, the Renaissance began to grow old. Geographical expansion reached its maximum; the teeth, which had bitten so deeply into the iced cake provided by infatuated philosophers, began to fall out. Humanity had taken for a general law that which had only affected it at a given age. Humanity had made the mistake which Tolstoi made, and a large part of Humanity fell into Tolstoi's gloomy despair. Today, the followers of Marx and Nietzsche are brutally trying to knock the poor old creature into obedient activity, while Barth and Brunner sit at the bedside in a

role strongly reminiscent of Job's comforters. Furthermore the orthodox theologians find it hard to refrain from an irritating "I told you so" attitude.

With this summary of the general history of liberalism in mind, we may venture to pass on to the discussion of anthropology. We shall find, as Tolstoi found, that to understand the nature of man we must go to life itself. God is always acting upon Man through the media of His Word and Spirit, and Man is ever reacting in a positive or in a negative manner. We can only discover the truth about human nature by observation, and we shall limit our observation to those occasions when Man is aware of God's search for him.

The great principle of liberal anthropology is the oneness of the human and Divine nature. Finite spirit is, in its essence, one with the Absolute Spirit. This great assumption is the fountain-head of the spate of over-confident humanism which has flowed out into the desert of Reality, and there it has vanished, burnt up by the hot sun of human sin and passion. All the superstructure which has hitherto been built upon the foundation of liberal anthropology has been shaken into ruins by the successive convulsions which have affected the foundation; nevertheless men are even now building again upon the old foundation in the hope that there will be no more earthquakes. How much better it would be if the sociologists transferred their constructive work to the rock of hard fact; but to do this they would have to obtain permission to build from the Lord of Truth and Fact, and this they will not do.

Reference has been made to God's media of Revelation, the Word and the Spirit. "The spirit of man is so akin to God that it is one with God, not merely united to Him." So say the humanists. Hence the revelatory Spirit of God is identical with the higher operations of the human spirit. What, then, is the liberal conception of the Word of God? Do you mean the Word of God made flesh? Why, His is the Personality which makes most patent and explicit those higher operations of the God-Man Spirit which every human soul possesses in a measure. He is superior in degree, though not in quality, to His fellows. On the other hand, do you mean the Word of God written? Surely it is obvious that this is the record of those higher operations of the human spirit. It is the record, first of all, of Him Who is the great Exponent of innate human potentiality, but other saints and heroes also add their contribution to the whole.

Such a generous estimate of human nature as liberalism permits still has to face the glaring examples which History affords of human depravity; Nero and Hitler have got to be explained somehow. Therefore they and their satellites are victims of some psychological aberration which is due to faulty genetics and an unsympathetic education. Progress of knowledge will enable us to reduce the number of such unfortunates. I must allow that today all this is wearing very thin with the world at large. Omnivorous liberals who can digest Hitler are few and far between. The resistance of liberalism to fact is disintegrating. The bomb which has blasted it is not so much the recent existence of Hitler, as the fact that millions have bowed down to him and have made him their god. Faulty genetics and unsympathetic education seem so widespread, that it might be simpler

to accept the anti-liberal view that man is a fallen being, wholly estranged from God. It would certainly afford a good working hypothesis.

Here come Barth and Brunner shaking their wise old heads and giving Humanity the same comfort which Job received. It has all happened because of sin. Along come the orthodox and the fundamentalists to add their quota of woe. God is "Wholly Other". What, therefore, can be expected from Society apart from God? All these terrible things could not have happened if Humanity had not been very wicked and very proud. Just a fragment of society, the few chosen, God will retain, but the rest are beyond redemption. Humanity, the poor old sick creature, murmurs in response, "The Master you profess to serve loved me and died for me." Post-liberalism has tended to make too much of diagnosis and too little of the marvellous curative power which resides in the Gospel of God's love. The Good Samaritan not only exposed the wounds to light of day. He poured in oil and wine, and the wounded man began to revive and to take courage. It is not to the wounds, nor to the stricken posture of Humanity, smitten to the ground by sin, that we should look in forming our estimate of Man, but rather to the way in which he responds to the pouring in of God's oil and wine. In other words, we must study the nature of religious experience.

Emile Cammaerts, in his book "The Flower of Grass", does an extraordinary amount of nail-hitting. He hits the anthropological nail right on the head with the hammer of mature faith. Having, in former days, drunk deeply at the various fountains of philosophy without slaking his intellectual and spiritual thirst, he can appreciate to the full the Living Water from Above. The fountain of belief in individual liberty, in the innate goodness of man, in the value of autonomous freedom of expression, ultimately failed to satisfy him. He saw that its rejection of authority could only result in chaos and licence. The fountain of totalitarianism he suspected from the first. Its waters were tainted. The outcome of thorough-going collectivism he knew to be an inevitable over-emphasis of secular authority, with the subsequent debasement of human personality. Only one Fountain provided Living Waters. Here he found the right combination of freedom with authority. Christianity demands personal freedom for men in this world, but it also demands complete submission to an Authority beyond this world. Thus it harmonizes freedom of the will with moral self-surrender, because God is the Fountain both of freedom and authority, and in His Perfection all the faculties of man find fulfilment.

George Herbert, in speaking of God's creation of man, pictures words of mercy on the lips of God :

> Let him be rich and weary, that at least,
> If goodness lead him not, yet weariness
> May toss him to My breast.

Man's innate goodness is an optimistic fiction ; man's weariness is an acknowledged fact. So weary is he that he will fall down before a false god, if he cannot find the True; but he will never find rest until he finds the God Who is Love. As St. Augustine cries of his soul :

" It is ruinous ; do Thou repair it." The soul of man is ruined and devastated, and yet it cries out to be restored, and the process of restoration gradually declares the nobleness and dignity which are the rightful lineaments of God's chief handiwork.

Rudolf Otto's definition of the numinous experience as "creature-feeling", in contradistinction from "the feeling of dependence", is significant. Schleiermacher's " dependence " is really a category of self-valuation in the sense of self-depreciation. It is an inference from Creation and is, therefore, in the realm of humanism, whereas " Creature-consciousness " has an immediate and primary reference to an Object outside of Creation, the Mysterium Tremendum. We are in the realm of the Mystical experience. It is the mysticism which Deissmann would call "re-acting mysticism". The pagan mysticism is active ; it tries to lay hold of the Absolute ; it seeks, and endeavours to know. Christian mysticism is reactive ; the soul realizes that it is sought and that it is known. It is this marvellous responsive capacity of man which forbids us to accept the Barthian anthropology. The depth of spiritual experience possible to man is illustrated by the saints. Barth regards the " analogia entis " as the invention of Antichrist, but Von Hügel would find in Christianity the revelation of human personality and depth. Christianity for him is "deep and dim and tender, slow and far-reaching, immensely costly, infinitely strong." It contains a " discovery and exemplification of the mysterious depth and range and complexity of human personality and freedom, of conscience and of sin." And one feels that the massiveness of Von Hügel's estimate of man is proper, though one realizes, with Barth, that until Christ comes into the life, it is all a mighty ruin plunged in darkness.

Christian religious experience is experience " en Christo ". Too much emphasis cannot be laid upon the post-regenerational fusion of our human nature with the Divine. The man or woman born into the family of God becomes a member of the New Humanity, and shares in the Spirit of the Second Adam. It is only by contemplating, and by being conjoined to the Second Adam that we can rightly understand the potentialities of the First Adam. The Christological discussion is intimately related to the anthropological. The great liberal and humanistic assumption is that in Christ the innate goodness of man has its supreme manifestation. Christ is man at his highest and his best, the Flower of Humanity, the supreme exhibition of man's essential affinity to God. All this simply will not do. It is not true to the Bible, it is not true to observation, it is not true to personal experience. The saints are not lesser Christs any more than their martyrdoms are " lesser Calvaries ". Perhaps, in a mysterious corporate sense, the Church is the extension of the Incarnation, and her sufferings the fulfilment of Christ's Passion, but individual saints are the first to own their inferiority to the Lord, and it is only " in Him " that they dare to seek for mercy. There is no personal attainment, or innate sanctity, or parallelism to the supreme Exemplar, which has ever permitted them to claim a similarity of function with Him, and no one would believe them if they did. If, therefore the saints fall short of the glory of God, the philanthropist and the " decent fellow " are not likely to be very convincing as claimants to the

Divine status. Both Revelation and common sense forbid us to think of Christ in any other way than as " sui generis ", and anthropology can never become Christology, even though Schleiermacher and Hegel tried hard to merge the two.

In spite of all this, we are not at liberty to pontificate about man being utterly evil. To talk of the " analogia entis " as the invention of Antichrist (as Barth does) is to talk extravagantly. If man were utterly evil, how could God become perfect Man? He could become like man, but He could not become truly human unless the Divine Image, which involves the " analogia entis," did exist. There is in the theology of Emil Brunner a marked tendency to avoid a Christology which lays an equal emphasis upon the human nature of Christ. There is a docetic element in his doctrine.

God and Man are one Christ, and if the Incarnation is the clearest declaration of man's inability to reach God unaided, yet it is also a Divine evaluation of man's nature which should lead him to dignity and self-respect. God did become Man. It was an act of condescension which fills us with wonder, but we do not feel that God degraded Himself in becoming Man, and there is no hint in the Bible that He did. There was Divine condescension, but not Divine degradation, and no greater demonstration of man's worth could be found than this simple statement. It is a decisive refutation of all inferior estimates of Man, whether theological or social. Man's pride is rebuked in that it cost God so much to save him; Man's dignity is preserved in that God could become human and yet remain Divine. As Dr. Maurice Relton avers: " The Divine Logos was capable of being the Ego, not only of His Divine but also of His human nature; because His Personality in virtue of its Divinity already embraced all that is most distinctive of a truly human personality."

In the light of all this, what are we to make of the fresh anthropological evidence so gratuitously given by Germany and Japan? Their atrocities beggar description. The general reaction is to declare that the perpetrators are not human beings. If they are not human beings, what are they? " Beasts! Swine! Dogs! " Are they? Would animals behave towards their own species as the Germans and the Japs have behaved? Surely it is an insult to the bestial world to use such expletives. " Devils! Demons! " Perhaps we are getting nearer the truth. Demon-possession seems to be more than an archaic oriental fiction. But they are not only devils and demons. The devils make use of the existing human capacities, but those human capacities are the attributes of men, moreover of men who have voluntarily prostituted their faculties to the service of the flesh and the devil. It is tempting to place these human monsters in an infra-human category, but somehow or other we must find a place for them in the anthropological scheme.

When we do this we part company with two schools of Christian thought. We part company, first, with those who consider Christianity to be an extension, amplification, and consummation, of the fundamental moral law which is written in men's hearts. Religious moralism is too superficial to find a place for such abysmal wickedness and it must, therefore, be rejected. Alternatively, we can have no use for Christian pietism. There is a detachment from the

world which surrenders it to non-Christian domination in the belief that such separatism is superior. To do any such thing is to take a shallow view of evil, for evil is dynamic, aggressive, omnivorous, cruel, and it must be fought and fought and fought. Give evil an inch and you have lost a mile ; give evil autonomy and Christian hegemony is no more. Not so long ago, it was the fashion to be cynical about the concept of a Christian comity of nations. Religious people were inclined to regard Christianization as dressed-up heathenism and Christendom as a gigantic fraud. This attitude is wrong, for we can now see that a nation which abandons Christianity, or else has never professed it, is heathen to an extent which bewilders those nations in which the Christian profession survives. The dissemination of Christian Law, and the conception of God as supreme Arbiter, may not be in themselves adequate for salvation in the next world, but they are indispensable for salvation in this, and, after all, this world does count for something. Ask the poor twisted inmates of Axis torture chambers whether or not there is a difference between Christian and non-Christian civilisation, or whether Christians ought to take an interest in politics.

International Law, cultural development, these abstractions are impotent to affect human nature unless behind and above them there is a supernational Source and Fount of Law and Culture—unless there is a known God to Whom all nations are terribly responsible. It is to such a God, revealed in Christ, that the Christians look. He is a God Whose Gospel can take that twisted trampled ruin which men call conscience, and in the fire of the Spirit can straighten and restore it. He is a God Whom to worship afar off is to rise superior and transformed. It is when the gleam of God's light falls upon the prostrate form of Man, that we discern a touch of reflected beauty, and this glimpse makes us eager to expose Humanity more and more to the Light of Heaven.

What, then, do we find man to be? Thomas Carlyle in "Sartor Resartus" quotes a view of man which describes him as "a forked straddling animal with bandy legs", to which description Carlyle adds the comment "yet also a Spirit, and unutterable 'Mystery of Mysteries'." Can we go further than this rather agnostic position? I think we can. Man is a created being capable of maximum voluntary response to the soteriological operations of God. Our review of the evidence permits us to reach this conclusion ; and it is a conclusion which might be more simply expressed : "Man is a created being capable of loving God." He is no more than this ; he is no less.

Book Reviews.

THEY FOUND THE CHURCH : The Armed Forces Discover Christian Missions.

By Henry P. Van Dusen. S.C.M. Press. 6/-.

It would be difficult to find a more convincing picture of how Christ can transform and transfigure peoples and individuals, nor more moving testimonies to the faith and courage of missionaries and converts than these pages contain. Henry van Dusen was not wildly enthusiastic about missionary work in the Pacific before he began to gather together the material which this book contains, nor were those who wrote the letters and articles which he has placed in more permanent form. It is a story of the Pacific campaign, of the surprise which met Australian and American troops when they found natives, not bloodthirsty cannibals, but courteous, at times gentle, Christians. Their surprise was so great that they felt they must express it in letters to their homes and people and in other cases in articles for public information. Almost without exception, they are written by men who hitherto either paid cold lip-service to the missionary cause or were frankly antagonistic. Almost without exception they express the writer's complete conversion to the cause and their desire to help forward the good work. Nor is it surprising when they knew that hundreds of their fellows owed their very lives to the Christian native—to his tender care of the sick and their ready help to any soldier in need. The genuine piety, devotion and consistent life of these native Christians was unmistakable. It could even be suggested that not a few white soldiers were brought to a new sense of God's redeeming power through the native. It would be possible to fill columns with quotations from this remarkable book and to fill more columns with speculations about the future of these native Churches. One of the pictures that remains is that of 4,000 natives, building as a labour of love, a memorial chapel in the cemetery at Guadalcanal where so many white soldiers lie buried, and of the procession of these singing labourers to the chapel for the service of dedication. Those who witnessed it will not soon forget. No wonder that soldier after soldier pays tribute to the magnificent work done by the earliest missionaries to these Pacific islands. Let every one who is concerned for the coming of the Kingdom, buy and read this book. F.B.

TIMOTHY RICHARD.

By E. W. Price Evans. The Carey Press. Price 6/-.

That this year is the centenary of Timothy Richard's birth is doubtless the reason for the present publication, which is a short record of his life and work. The book does not claim to be a biography in the strict sense, for an official biography appeared some years ago. The author describes his book, written at the invitation of the Baptist Missionary Society, as " A Narrative of Christian Enterprise and Statesmanship in China ". This description is an apt one, and a perusal of the book endorses the author's claim. Many will probably be led to read the official biography by Dr. W. E. Soothill after making acquaintance with this book.

Richard's work for China, with its difficulties, its problems, and its triumphs, will lead us to number him with the giants of those days. He must have been a man of faith, loyalty and courage, endowed with vision and sound judgment, for his work will influence the land of his adoption so long as the faith of the Cross endures in the far East. His efforts for education and the publication of Christian literature were far-reaching in their results, while his practical deeds of goodness in famine relief were astounding in their scope. His saintly life left its impress on all with whom he came in contact for, to use his own words, he always sought to make " permanent friendships in the service of God ".

In his evangelistic labours he deliberately followed a policy of "seeking the worthy " (see St. Matt. x. 11), aiming at winning the leaders of administration and education in the confidence that when these were won the rest would follow.

He faced the problems which have confronted the pioneers of the South India Scheme for re-union. At a reception held at Lambeth Palace, Richard asked the

late Bishop Gore's views on his hope that a Christian Commission of five men might visit China to study missionary problems—two Anglicans, two Free Churchmen, and one from the Church of Scotland. When the Bishop turned down the proposal as impracticable, Richard answered : " In that case, the Chinese, who are a practical nation, may very well think that a religion whose parties cannot unite in such a small measure would not do for China."

The book is opportune, and our knowledge of China's needs, combined with our debt to that nation for her part in the war, should stir us to endeavour in offering her that most priceless of all gifts, the good news of salvation in the Saviour of the world. E.H.

JUSTICE AND THE SOCIAL ORDER.

By Emil Brunner. pp. 257. 15/- *net. Lutterworth Press.*

No book could be more relevant to the circumstances of our time than the latest volume from the pen of the distinguished Barthian theologian, whose books have attained such widespread popularity in this country. It deals with those great political and social themes which are coming increasingly to the front at the present time. They have already received some treatment at the hands of the present author, notably in his *The Divine Imperative*, but here the reader will find a much fuller discussion of the problems involved. And many will be glad to have such a comprehensive study, for the main subject is of intensely practical value in the light of past and contemporary events. Nothing is more important at the present time than the establishment of justice in all the various departments of human life.

One of the most urgent tasks confronting Christian statesmen at the moment, is the establishment, in the minds of men and women, of the conviction that there is such a thing as a Supreme Justice, based on a supernatural authority, to which even the highest powers in the state, or in any combination of states, must ultimately be subordinate. In the light of the history of Europe during the last ten years, such a contention is of vital importance. Dr. Brunner, in one of the most valuable parts of his book, makes this abundantly clear. He points out very clearly what is perhaps the most sinister and significant feature of European civilization ; *i.e.*, the exaltation of what is known to be wrong to the place of honour which belongs only to absolute truth and right. This was brought about by the " breakdown of the ideal of justice in Christendom." Or, in other words, by the disintegration of that inherited conception of divine law which, in its Latin form, was incorporated in the *corpus civili juris*, which was the Western standard of law of two thousand years. In this work Dr. Brunner puts the alternative very clearly before us : " Either there is a valid criterion, or justice, which stands above us all, a challenge presented *to* us, not *by* us, a standard rule of justice binding on every State and every system of law, or there is no justice, but only power organized in one fashion or another and setting itself up as law." It is unnecessary to point out the bearing of that contention on current political and international problems.

This, and the other great theme embodied in the volume, is developed in a series of chapters with that theological competence which always marks the work of the author. We may not always agree with him, but no one can say that his arguments lack adequate theological foundation. One sees this in his writings at every point. All that concerns the life of man, either individually or corporately, is brought to the touchstone of Biblical doctrine. The principle is sound. It is precisely what we need for the present crisis, and no one has shown this more clearly than Dr. Micklem in his writings, notably *The Theology of Politics*. And, after all, it is only the Pauline principle, as the Epistles show. William Temple, in another but similar direction, blazed the same trail. Other writers are at work on the same great themes, such as Maritain and Reinhold Niebuhr. To show the relevance of our religion to the greatest problem of the age is surely a necessary and valuable task. And any book that attempts to do that deserves a welcome, and should not be ignored by anyone whose responsible duty it is to proclaim the Faith to the modern world. Here in this book we have sound guidance on quite a number of practical problems which are constantly arising in contemporary society and demand a solution.

A good example of this, since we cannot discuss each solution *seriatim*, is his eminently sane and balanced discussion of usury. He defends the principle of

saving, and shows how the money so accumulated and lent deserves some return, since it is the fruit of self-denial, for the owner or lender " might travel or buy something beautiful with it, and nobody could blame him." Hence money so lent may produce an income, however small, which would be " unearned income, but not undeserved income " (p. 143). The whole discussion is both illuminating and helpful.

Dr. Brunner has a short chapter on " Justice and the Revelation of Scripture," in the course of which he deals with the question as to the degree in which the Decalogue can be used " in the exposition of the Christian Ethic." The Old Testament, he readily admits, can be " a mine of instruction for all Christian teaching on the justice of this world." But there are limitations which cannot be ignored. " For there is obviously a great deal written in the Old Testament on divine law which no Christian can regard as binding upon himself unless he ceases to be a Christian."

It is very tempting to follow the Author in his treatment of other important and urgent questions, such as his vindication of the Christian conception of the individual and the community against many forms of collectivism or communism ; his championship, so needed at the present time, of the family against the claims of the State on the one hand and the School on the other ; or all that he has to say on justice in the economic order, but we must forbear. All those who are in any way responsible for giving Christian guidance on all these difficult political, social, economic and other practical problems must on no account miss this book.

C.J.O.

THE SIGNIFICANCE OF THE CROSS.

By F. W. Dillistone. 12/6 *net.* *Lutterworth Press.*

No more valuable contribution to Christian thought at this time can be made than a fresh and living study of the Atonement. The Christian doctrine is so depreciated by misconceptions and shallow criticisms, that it is often rejected without thought or investigation as out of keeping with modern ideas. We cordially welcome this book from one who has long been a teacher of others, and, like all true teachers, himself a constant scholar, in this most profound, exacting and rewarding of all schools.

The book has grown naturally from lectures delivered in Canada, where appreciation led to publication by the Westminster Press, Philadelphia, and so here in England, in remarkably well-printed and attractive form, by the Lutterworth Press. Mr. Dillistone has made this subject his chief interest theologically, and confesses his debt to many well-known thinkers and writers. Amongst these he mentions Denny, Forsyth, Vincent Taylor, Newton Flew and C. H. Dodd. Somewhat surprisingly, he does not mention anywhere one of the greatest English scholars and preachers of modern times, R. W. Dale, who also made this subject his own, and in treatise, and written and spoken word of popular character, revealed its relevance to modern thought and conditions. But Mr. Dillistone does not attempt, except in one short chapter, to survey the wide field of exegesis available. His purpose and approach are different, and should be carefully noted and considered. Thus he writes not as the dogmatist, but as the thinker whose aim is to relate the underlying truths and pre-suppositions of the efficacy of the atoning sacrifice of Christ to the acknowledged and unquestionable eternal principles that are basic in all human life and society. So, after a profoundly interesting and suggestive study of the Cross in the New Testament, he proceeds to investigate the correspondence of this with the ordinary experience of man. He singles out four areas of the imagination, from which, by " the new and untrodden path " of the method of imaginative comparison, words and metaphors illustrative of spiritual truth may be drawn : the struggle of life, the life of the community, the creative activity of men, the life of the family. This arresting line of thought involves the consideration of the whole extended range of human endeavour and struggle, and draws, by way of illustration, from many and varied sources. If at times the emphasis seems overplaced on the imaginative and the dramatic, nevertheless a field of enquiry and illumination is thus opened up that is stimulating and helpful to pulpit and pew, to minister and layman, alike. None will follow carefully the guidance of these striking chapters without a new and vivid realization of the love of God, of the wonder and the cost of His forgiveness, of the appeal of the Cross to the sinner, and of its necessity and inevitability

for the salvation of mankind. This is a book to obtain, read and ponder.

Mr. Dillistone has recently returned to England to take up work at the London College of Divinity, and we shall look forward to further contributions on this absorbing theme from his pen. S. NOWELL-ROSTRON.

CHURCH AND LEADERSHIP.

By F. R. Barry, Bishop of Southwell. 8/6. *S.C.M. Press.*

" Any given moment in history puts to the Church one question in particular. For us, the great overriding question to which all others are secondary is this : Is England to become again, or to remain still, a Christian country ? " (56). . . . " There is nothing that the whole world needs more than a Christian revival in this realm and commonwealth. Before God and man there is laid upon our Church, above all, the duty of leading it " (57).

A man who writes with this as the burden of his concern deserves our appreciative attention ; and the more so when, to save his words from misunderstanding, he adds, " Religious revivals cannot be made to order. God creates them by His living Spirit. We cannot manufacture a new Pentecost. But we can provide the conditions within which the Lord may do His mighty works " (57).

The book starts well with two opening chapters on the eternal and worldwide purposes of God. These chapters help to provide a true background and a proper perspective for the " close-up " detailed considerations which follow. The main content of the book is " a realistic and practical discussion of some of the main issues now confronting the churches in this country, and especially the Church of England." The chapter headings are " Church and Nation," " Clergy and People," " Leadership in Thought," " Leadership in Worship," and " Pastoral and Social Leadership."

Discerning and suggestive comment is made on a wide variety of points. The writer admits that the book has been put together mainly in short sittings. It was begun at one of the darkest times of the war. There is, in consequence, lack of unity and singleness of impression. First one thing and then another holds the place of primary urgency. The Bishop is eager to get us to move forward, but he does not set a strong lead in any one direction. He writes, " There is always plenty of ' wisdom ' in the Church : what this hour requires is faith and courage " (55) ; yet he himself tends in places to give us more of the first than the second.

Evangelicals will inevitably find some things they will like, and others which they will dislike. The book provides a rich field for the collection of ideas worthy of further thought and practical pursuit. No one person can implement them all. Therefore, as the book makes plain, the only leadership that can fully carry them out must be a leadership of the laity or whole Church of God within the nation.

A selection of points is added in illustration of the Bishop's method and line of treatment. " We shall certainly have a national church of some kind, and the question is what kind it will be. Continental experience should warn us that if it is not the religion of Jesus, it will be in the end the synagogue of Satan " (48). " The real objection, in the popular mind, to giving the Church freedom in things spiritual, has been the not unwarranted suspicion that self-government would mean clerical government. It is really concerned for the rights of the lay members ; and in this, frankly, it is entirely sound " (50). " Under present conditions and in this country there can be no effective evangelism which is not educational in form " (60). " The failures of attempted evangelism without theological or moral content are written large over the life of England " (61). " It is part of the strength of the Church of England, however irritating at a given moment, that the clergy are able to resist the bishop." " The Church of England is a laymen's church. That has been one of the secrets of its strength " (70). " Our Church avowedly and deliberately stands for public worship in the vernacular, in the language ' understanded by the people ' ; and this commits it to constant revision " (108). The Free Churches " have preserved something very precious in the value set on extempore prayer " (108). " By and large, the services we have are at once too involved and too archaic . . . " (122) ; *e.g.*, " We urgently need a simpler form of service as an alternative to Morning Prayer " (120). " Many believe, and I share that view, that the Church must now think out again, objectively and without ' party ' feeling, the vexed question

of Evening Communion. However ancient and however salutary may be the rule of fasting Communion, yet it is one of the ordinances of men. The Eucharist is the Lord's institution. . . . The time has come to ask ourselves searchingly which in the last resort matters most in the sight of God—the fast or the Communion ? " (124).

The Bishop puts great and frequently reiterated stress on the importance of theology. " Conviction is the prelude to venture " ; and so " the first condition of revival is a revitalised theology " (59). " If Christianity is to lead the new age, the first need of the Churches is theology. We have paid an appalling price for our neglect of it. . . . The minds of our people are at present dominated by an all-pervading secularised world-view in which the thought of God scarcely enters " (86).

This need for " the re-education of the average man into the axioms of the Christian world-view " (90), raises the question of method of interpretation. " The Church is, therefore, being compelled to ask itself whether those forms and categories of thought which we have inherited from our Christian ancestry are irreformable and unchanging vehicles for the presentation of the eternal Gospel. . . . The question is how its truth can be revealed in the language and in terms of the experience which contemporary men can understand " (96). Here there seems to be in the Bishop's thinking a serious doctrinal omission. His ' liberal ' emphasis (which, he says, " must be recovered " (95)) fails adequately to recognise that the root of the trouble is the need in sinful men for a changed attitude to life, in other words, for repentance. Men who are blind need their eyes opened ; that is the Gospel remedy. Christian missionaries do not interpret monotheism to the heathen in the light of their idolatry ; they cause idolatry to be abandoned in the light of the revelation of the one true and living God. Similarly, we do not need to attempt the impossible, and to stultify our witness, by seeking to interpret Divine revelation within the utterly inadequate thought forms of a finite secularised material outlook ; but, as Bishop Barry himself says elsewhere, we ought rather to give true Christian education, *i.e.*, " education into the Christian philosophy of life " (100), so that Biblical forms of statement about fundamental truth, which are now virtually a foreign language to many, may come to mean something intelligible to them.

There is, therefore, no more important note in the whole book than its emphasis on the need adequately to train those who can then teach others the things of God. This means as " A1 priority " the recruitment and training of the ministry (72). But there is also a wider field waiting to be entered. Only when labour has been bestowed upon it can we hope for a full harvest and fresh reaping. This is the field in which seeds of truth are sown in the minds of the rising generation. For those who have the eyes to see, the Bishop makes no more far-seeing statements than these, which as a final quotation may surely serve to commend the book as noteworthy :—" For fifty years an educational system . . . professedly ' neutral ' in theology . . . has been imposing on young minds a dogma—a completely secular attitude to life. . . . That has been the enveloping movement which must now, in turn, be outflanked by Christian forces as the necessary prelude to victory. . . . This is the field where Christians will be most needed. If the Church is to begin to reconquer, it must throw all its available resources into the national system of education. It must regard the teacher's vocation as one of the highest forms of Christian service and indeed as a Christian missionary pastorate. . . . This is the true and effective way of leadership " (99, 100). A.M.S.

PEOPLE MATTER : A Broadcast Series on the Nature of Justice.

By various authors. 6/-. *S.C.M. Press.*

The sub-title is as necessary as the main title itself, for an estimate of the aim and contents of this volume. " *People*," and the ways in which they " *matter*," are viewed in relation to the supreme principle of " *justice* " ; and the inadequate ideas of justice which are popular are set over against the true idea of it in the dealings and purposes of God. The word " justice " itself occurs in the titles of all but one of the eight chapters in part 1. Part 2 deals with the questions, " What Am I For ? " " Am I Wanted ? " " Am I Any Use ? "—and the Divine answer to the question, " Do people matter ? " *viz.*, " God Says Yes " ; with a final chapter on " The Next Step."

The title-page gives, in alphabetical order, a list of the contributors, without titles or degrees. The contents pages add certain distinguishing particulars in a surprisingly unequal fashion. We are not told, for instance, the degrees of a Dean or a Professor, though in some other cases (not all) these are added. So it may be better to confine oneself to the first list—F. A. Cockin, J. T. Christie, J. H. Duncan, A. S. Duncan-Jones, Kenneth Grayston, E. D. Jarvis, Ronald Lunt, F. D. V. Narborough, R. L. Smith, Norman H. Snaith, W. G. Symons. There is also a brief Foreword by Prebendary James W. Welch, Director of Religious Broadcasting.

Dr. Welch explains the origin of the series in the repeated demands for " justice " that are heard from men in the Forces, and the desire on the part of the contributors to set forth " the teaching of the Bible about justice." He tells readers that " within the limits imposed by the clock," they " will find in these addresses, not so much answers to their questions as challenges to their thinking as Christians, and challenges which should issue in action." After further reference to the main title, he concludes his Foreword by asking, " But why should people matter ? " and replying, " The Bible gives us the answer. In the end, people can only matter to us because they matter to God, and, in the end, justice must be fulfilled in love." This Foreword contains, incidentally, a saying which eloquently embodies a profound truth overlooked by querulous questioners of the dealings of God with men—" It is certainly true that many of us could not have gone on believing in the God revealed by the Bible if this war had not come." " Evil," he adds, " =chaos."

With their special aim in view, the addresses contain a great amount of thoughtful matter on the subject before them. Awkward questions are not shirked, and difficult situations are courageously faced. Home truths are forcibly stated here and there. We ourselves are especially interested in a section on " The Cross of Christ," constituting the second of two broadcasts by Dr. R. L. Smith, which contains a good deal to be welcomed with thankfulness, though it does not go far enough, as may be evidenced by at least one wholly regrettable sentence, " God's justice did not demand the Cross at all. But His love did." That first sentence, we maintain, is quite contrary to the Epistle to the Romans, and therefore cannot come within Dr. Welch's reference to the book as setting forth " the teaching of the Bible about justice." On the other hand, Professor Norman H. Snaith, speaking of " God's Righteousness and Man's Suffering," clearly says, " The Cross is God's great way of winning men back to Him, and it is God's great way, partly because of His justice and partly because of His love. And you must be sure of putting both in."

In two or three places there is an insistence, which one is glad to see, that the Old Testament has to be considered as well as the New. Dr. Welch himself pointedly links both in speaking of Bible teaching. And, to quote Professor Snaith again, " I do not agree that the God of the Old Testament is a God only of justice. First and foremost He is a God who saves." Even more pointedly, he says, a little earlier, that the " driving of a wedge between the Old Testament and the New Testament is a heresy which started as early as the middle of the second century."

The question as to who are the children of God comes up here and there, and the fact that all are only " potentially " His children in the full sense is recognised, but confusion is not wholly absent. Thus, in one place we read of treating other men " not as brother men, but as brothers in Christ," and then, only four lines lower, that " when men acknowledge and accept the Kingdom of God they become sons of God in this special family sense, and know it." How, then, can they have been " brothers in Christ " before ? And why not keep closely to the language of John i. 12, instead of the formula adopted in the second sentence just quoted ? Mr. J. T. Christie, on the other hand, does quote that passage as conveying an idea which is " at the very centre of Christianity." But what follows is not so clear.

The Rev. F. D. V. Narborough has a striking thought in this sentence—" That was not a fickle crowd in calling ' Hosanna ' on Palm Sunday and ' Crucify ' on Good Friday. It was a terribly consistent crowd "—its expectations of a " self-assertive, exclusive " king having been disappointed. Other suggestive extracts elsewhere in the book might have been quoted, too. It is regrettable that at the foot of p. 152 the word " spirit " is printed with a small " s " : it is so printed twice, and if the former is claimed to be defensible on one view of the passage, the second is much more open to objection.

Mr. Kenneth Grayston's final chapter recurs to a valuation of the meaning of the title. "It is a word," he says, "which takes its force and its life from the Christian gospel. It springs out of the eternal passion of God for men and women." And again—"The purpose that gives worth and dignity to *people*, is God's unceasing determination to rescue us from the grip of evil and suffering and restore us to fellowship with Himself and with one another."

W. S. HOOTON.

DOES GOD EXIST?

By A. E. Taylor. 7/6. 172 *pp.* *Macmillan.*

To read this book is to feel afresh the sense of loss to Christian philosophy occasioned by the death of Dr. Taylor, for throughout it is full of cogent thought and careful examination of fundamental issues.

The title itself would cause some criticism, on the ground that the answer to the question, "Does God exist?" can be given only by Revelation and not by any process of mere intellection, but such criticism is disarmed by the preface, where the author says: "My purpose is not to demonstrate 'the being of a God,' but only to argue that some alleged and widely entertained 'scientific' objections to theistic belief are unsound, and that it is unbelief (not belief) which is the unreasonable attitude. I am not seeking to create faith where it is simply non-existent—only God Himself can do that—but to defend it where it—or, at least, the will to it—is present against the specious bad reasoning of its assailants." And again: "I am not of those, if there are any such left to-day, who think that there can ever be a vital religion and a theology adequate to it independently of 'revelation,' self-disclosure, on the part of God, of truths about Himself which we could not have 'found out for ourselves.'"

That indicates the scope and purpose of the essay—a challenge to the "scientific" atmosphere of the day and a revealing of its own sheer presuppositions. The often quoted axioms used, it is true, rather by their partisans than by the scientists themselves—that science is identical with knowledge, and that what cannot be scientifically demonstrated cannot be known—are dealt with surely and firmly. Each science has its own limitations and cannot pronounce on the findings of other sciences, much less on the structure of reality itself, and when the results of the sciences are all co-ordinated, there still remains the greater part of human life and thought which is not patent of scientific demonstration. When, for example, it is said that no methods but those of the experimental laboratory will lead to truth, the theist may well retort that the truth of that very assertion cannot be demonstrated by the only method it prescribes. "It is not to exact science itself we have to go to decide whether all our trustworthy knowledge is 'scientific' knowledge or not."

The teleological argument is restated with fine force and shown to be implicit in the thought of science itself, while the sheer illogicality of materialism is made abundantly clear. Mind, purposiveness and moral authority—all are shown to be required in any adequate view of the universe, while the faith required to understand them is shown to be wholly necessary to those who feel it incumbent to deny it in the interests of science. No-one is more sure than Dr. Taylor that when philosophical thought along the lines laid down in this book has reached its zenith, it still produces a knowledge of God infinitely less rich in content than that of "the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ", but the theistic belief on which it depends receives a strong stimulus which will be intelligible to the thought-forms of the day.

Though published in 1945, the book was actually written in 1939 and subsequent events in the intervening years show only too plainly how right the author was when he wrote; "We all hope for a better Europe when the present calamity is overpast, but the better Europe will never be seen until 'science' has been gently but firmly 'put in its place', that second place which rightfully belongs to it as a servant of man's estate, not his master. Hereafter there must be no divorce between the spirit of understanding and knowledge and the spirit of wisdom and godly fear. It is such science divorced from wisdom and the fear of God which the world has directly to thank for the worst evils of 'modern war'".

This is not an easy book to read for the argument is closely knit and sustained throughout its 172 pages, and many will perhaps feel that it is not made any easier by the absence of index, table of contents, or even chapter headings.

R. S. DEAN.

RELEASE.

By Starr Daily. 7/6. *Messrs. Simpkin Marshall, Ltd.*

It is difficult for the reviewer to find words expressive enough to recommend to clergy and ministers, social workers and doctors, psychologists and psychiatrists to get hold of this book and read, mark, learn and inwardly digest it. It is an amazing book !

Here we have an autobiography of a man who has spent twenty-five years in prison, and has gone down to the very dregs of moral degradation, and in his very darkest hour had a revelation of the Love of God in Jesus Christ ; and from that moment, under the guidance of the Spirit of God, he has been led from the " guttermost " to the uttermost in things spiritual.

This book is no ordinary record of a marvellous salvation—it is much more than that, for Starr Daily, as he now calls himself, is a man who has intellectual abilities and qualities above the ordinary, and he uses language and illustrations which arrest. He has gone into thoroughly the finer points of psychology and healing of the mind, the soul and the body, and reveals the secret whereby the very lowest may be translated even in this life into the very highest, walking and talking with God as his normal experience. He was not only healed mentally and spiritually after coming to the Lord Jesus Christ, but he had an amazing experience in the workshops of the prison, and later on as a night nurse in the prison hospital, of being the means in God's Hands of mending the broken hearted, and raising up those dead in trespasses and sins, and healing the sick in mind and body. To read the book is a real spiritual tonic.

Get this book, read it, and get friends around you to read it and discuss it together. There is one secret I have not referred to which is the secret of this man's transformation, and I want to whet your appetite as you read this review, that you too may enter into that secret as he did.

This world is going to be a better world if the Spirit in this autobiography gets into every reader. E. L. LANGSTON.

THE CHRISTIAN WAY.

By Frederic Greeves. S.C.M. Press. 6/-.

The S.C.M. Religious Book Club has gradually established itself as an agency whereby the general reader can obtain books which are not too academic and yet which have something really important to say. One of the latest additions is " The Christian Way " by the Minister of the Wesley Memorial Church in Oxford, and it fits in admirably with the general plan of the series. The thought is nowhere difficult to grasp and yet Mr. Greeves deals with big themes and tries to show their importance for the life of to-day.

The author's chief concern is to give an adequate answer to the question " What does it mean to be a Christian ? " He feels that there is widespread confusion about what exactly is the difference that the Christian faith makes in human life and he sets out to frame an answer by appealing specially to the evidence of the New Testament. The fact that Christianity is often referred to as " The Way " in early times, gives him the title for his book, and the chapters consider this central theme under various aspects. His treatment may be said to be healthily doctrinal. He touches on most of the great confessions of the Christian faith and almost always has something fresh and interesting to say in regard to them. There is no space for any lengthy treatment, but no serious reader could study this book without gaining a true picture of the faith and conduct of those who belonged to " The Way " in New Testament times.

Every book of this type which is truly theological and at the same time simple, deserves to be warmly commended. One can only hope that some of those who are really anxious to learn about the Christian faith will read them. Possibly a study-circle in some parish might tackle this particular book : it seems to me to be admirably suited for such a purpose. F. W. DILLISTONE.

THE GUESTCHAMBER.

By Canon T. G. Edwards. Pp. 83. *Church Book Room Press, Ltd.* 1945. 2/6.

Manuals for Communicants have been produced in considerable numbers for many years past—and still they come. Some have had a great vogue and a

circulation of over a million copies. We think particularly of Bishop Thomas Wilson's *Short Instructions for the Lord's Supper*, issued in 1736, and Bishop Walsham How's *Manual for the Holy Communion*, produced in 1878. One or two Anglo-Catholic manuals have had a considerable success. Excellent Evangelical handbooks have from time to time appeared by such trusted writers as Bishop Handley Moule and Bishop Denton Thompson.

There is room, however, at the present time for another manual, which should be at once scholarly and simple, instructive and devotional, Scriptural and practical. The book before us is possessed of all these qualities.

Experience often proves disappointing with regard to the use of helps of this kind. They are much used in preparation for First Communion after Confirmation, and then laid aside. We need, therefore, a book which will prove itself to be really so attractive that, at any rate in the early days of communicant life, its disuse would be felt to be a real loss. Canon Edwards' publication possesses this attractive power.

The title, *The Guestchamber*, is most happily chosen, since "Our Lord chose the best room in some disciple's house in Jerusalem to celebrate His Last Supper with His followers."

The Manual is in two parts—the first providing instructions as to the origin and meaning of Holy Communion with suggestions on preparation; the second providing a companion for use during the actual service.

The instructions given are simple and Scriptural and in every way loyal to sound Churchmanship as expressed in the Book of Common Prayer. The duty of self-examination is stressed, but it is clearly pointed out that this does not mean morbid introspection, but rather the conscious and careful pondering over one's life in the light of God's Word. The treatment of the subject of Confession is wise, and must prove helpful to enquiring souls. The writer points out, as we have found time and again in our own experience, that there are some souls which long for and need objective assurance of God's forgiveness, and suggests that for such it would be wise to seek the help of a trusted minister or Christian friend. Canon Edwards, however, points out that "the best of all preparation for Holy Communion is a holy life; and the wisest course for one who communicates regularly, is to spend fifteen minutes to half an hour with God of set purpose some time during the previous week, laying the events of the past few days before Him and asking His Spirit to reveal anything that needs to be adjusted or set right; then seeking His forgiveness and humbly remembering that sins once repented of and forgiven can never again become a barrier between the soul and God."

The Service of Holy Communion is printed in heavy type in the second part of the Manual, with helpful comments and suggestions in lighter type.

We are profoundly thankful for this book, and without hesitation or reserve of any kind, we can heartily commend it. It is well printed, and the paper and binding are good.

The book is worthy of, and we trust will receive, a large circulation.

D. TAYLOR WILSON.