

THE EXPOSITORY TIMES.

Notes of Recent Exposition.

PROFESSOR MARGOLIOUTH'S address at the recent Church Congress appears to have had a disturbing effect upon some men's minds. He seems to have conveyed to them the impression that there were two classes of scholars occupied at present in the study of the Old Testament: the one, headed by himself and Dr. Wace (to quote a *Pilot* reviewer), the guardians of traditional beliefs; the other, certain revolutionary critics who had ceased 'to believe the Bible.'

This impression was apparently conveyed to the mind, among others, of the reviewer in the *Pilot* of the third volume of the *Dictionary of the Bible*. That volume convinces him that the impression is a mistake. There are not two classes of Old Testament scholars, there is only one. 'Professor Margoliouth writes the admirable article on the "Language of the Old Testament" in this *Dictionary*, and adopts as his own the precise methods, so far as one can discover, which his name is being used in "orthodox" circles to discredit.' So between one Old Testament scholar and another 'the difference is only a difference of degree and as to details.' And this reviewer thinks that 'a frank admission on the part of scholars like Dr. Wace and Professor Margoliouth and Professor Sayce that their methods and conclusions are widely divergent from the methods and conclusions of Protestant

orthodox interpretation of half a century ago is imperatively called for, if the public is not to be misled.'

The ordinary layman, says this candid reviewer, 'does not care two straws whether Professor Margoliouth is right or wrong about the Hebrew of Ecclesiasticus, or whether Mr. Harford-Battersby has or has not sufficient evidence for his elaborate analysis of the books of Leviticus and Numbers.' But there are two things he does care for; whether there is real disagreement among critics as to the *legitimacy* of the methods of analysis being applied to the Old Testament, and whether those who adopt such methods can consistently claim inspiration in any unique sense whatever for the literature of the Older Covenant.

The first question he himself answers and in a word. There is no real disagreement. The other he finds some answer for in the *Dictionary of the Bible*. He quotes from Dr. Curtis's article on the 'Old Testament,' and he quotes from Dr. Stanton's article 'Messiah.' And he says, 'The articles in Dr. Hastings' Dictionary on Old Testament subjects will show to any candid reader that the suspicion that there is no proper and unique inspiration in the Old Testament is ill-founded so far as the personal convictions of the writers are concerned.' 'That,' he adds, 'is a great step to

have made. It is one of the chief benefits which the publication of this great work has conferred upon the Christian public.' But more than that is needed. And he warns our Old Testament scholars that they cannot expect their methods to be favourably received among devout Christian people unless they explain distinctly and without reserve wherein *their* view of the Old Testament literature differs in principle from that of scholars who are purely naturalistic.

The review appears in the *Pilot* of 27th October. In the very next number the request is granted by Dr. Driver. Dr. Driver refers the reviewer to his *Sermons on Subjects connected with the Old Testament*. There, he says, he has more than once expressed what he intended to be regarded as his belief in the 'unique' inspiration of the Old Testament. He quotes from the sermon on 'The Voice of God in the Old Testament,' where, after remarking on the manner in which the Divine and human elements are blended, in different degrees, in Scripture, he has said: 'But viewed generally, the human element, whether it be present in a larger or smaller proportion, is interpenetrated and suffused by an element higher than itself; it is illumined, elevated, and refined by a peculiar and unique operation of the Spirit of God.'

Thus in this sermon, as well as in another which he also quotes, Dr. Driver has used the very word 'unique' and applied it in the very way desiderated by the *Pilot* reviewer. Nor is this all. He has said that apart from the special illumination vouchsafed to the great teachers who originated or sustained the principles of its faith, there is no ground to suppose that the religious history of Israel would have differed materially from that of the kindred nations by which it was surrounded. And he refers to others—Sanday, Ottley, Ryle—who have written as he has written, 'distinctly and without reserve.'

In his book, *Christ, the Truth*, published by Macmillan and elsewhere noticed, Professor

Medley explains the phrase which St. John uses for expressing faith in the Personal Christ. The phrase is πιστεύειν εἰς Χριστόν. It literally means 'to trust towards Christ.' But, says Mr. Medley, the English is scarcely sufficient here, and he 'indulges in a brief word of grammatical analysis.'

He tracks the great word πιστεύειν to its root, πίθ, a form most clearly akin to our own word *faith* and the Latin *fides*. And so he finds that its essential meaning is trust, reliance, *repose*. It is the perfect rest of a human spirit in the spirit of another.

Then he turns to the preposition εἰς. And he says that 'if there is anything entirely certain in the interpretation of Greek words, it is that this preposition εἰς, in all its variety of usage, always and without exception carries with it at its centre the conception of *motion forwards*.' Thus this phrase is a combination of two conceptions that are antithetic and even logically contradictory to one another. The one implies rest, the other motion. But it is just this combination that carries the complete idea of faith in Christ. For it is rest or repose, absolute and unflinching, in Christ; and yet, while it rests, it is ever vitally moving forwards and upwards.

The two conceptions may be contradictory in logic, but they are familiar in life. This is the analysis of all true friendship. An absolute trust, abiding alone, is but a stagnant, dead, inert thing—a stone securely built into a wall. On the other hand, an ever-continuous movement, cut off from repose, is a vain, empty restlessness. Neither of these is life. But combine the two: make the Person in whom the trust is reposed worthy enough, and then perfect rest joined with unlimited progress make fellowship perfect and entire, wanting nothing.

Of the books of the month the most important, theologically, is one published by Messrs. Longmans, and entitled *Priesthood and Sacrifice* (8vo, pp. xix, 174, 7s. 6d.). It is also of most

human interest. It is a Report of a Conference held in Oxford, on the 13th and 14th of December 1899, and edited by Dr. Sanday.

It was Dr. Sanday that called the Conference. He had found that ecclesiastical warfare was being conducted with excessive and most unseemly bitterness. He believed it was partly due to ignorance. Men did not know one another. They did not know what was believed and taught by one another. More than that, he knew that 'much of the keenness of controversy has at all times turned on the more or less latent suspicion that opponents were aiming at objects that were really immoral.' 'We draw consequences,' are his words, 'we draw consequences for them that they would not draw for themselves; we press these consequences to the furthest logical extreme of which they are capable; and then our indignation is roused by a picture that is more than half our own creation. The process is often quite honest, but none the less disastrous for the peace of the world.'

There are real differences. There are differences that possibly cannot be removed. But Dr. Sanday felt that 'outside the irreducible minimum of real difference' lay a whole region of uncertainty and suspicion. If men from both sides could be brought together, well, at least they might be led to entertain more respect for each other's sincerity; they might even be led to see that they were nearer to one another than they had dreamed. So he called the Conference. When it was over, he said, 'The Conference has been of great interest to me, and it has also caused me some anxiety, but the result has far exceeded my expectations.'

The bitterness of modern ecclesiastical controversy turns upon the associations of what is called Sacerdotalism. Now Sacerdotalism involves two things: the existence of something to offer in sacrifice and the existence of special priests to offer it. The Conference therefore dealt with *Different Conceptions of Priesthood and Sacrifice*, to

quote the full title of the book. Its members numbered fifteen. Five were High Churchmen, their names—Father Puller of the Society of St. John the Evangelist, Dr. Moberly of Oxford, Canon Gore of Westminster, Canon Scott Holland of St. Paul's, and the Rev. C. G. Lang of Portsea. Five more were English Churchmen, but not High, their names are Archdeacon Wilson of Rochdale, Dr. Ryle of Cambridge, Canon E. R. Bernard of Salisbury, Dr. Sanday, and the Rev. A. C. Headlam. Five were from outside the Church of England—Dr. Fairbairn of Oxford, Dr. Salmond of Aberdeen, Dr. Davison of Birmingham, the Rev. Arnold Thomas of Bristol, and Dr. Forsyth of Cambridge. Perhaps Mr. Headlam would call himself a High Churchman. On Dr. Sanday's invitation he took the place at the last moment of Dr. Moule of Cambridge, who could not be present.

Before the Conference met, fifteen questions or groups of questions were sent to each member to answer in writing if he chose. These questions and answers are also printed in the volume, together with Notes by Dr. Driver on the words for Sacrifice, for Priest, and for the Laying on of Hands. Three discussions took place; each member spoke for five minutes, and then the conversation became general. The subject of the first discussion was Sacrifice and Priesthood before the New Testament times; of the second, Sacrifice and Priesthood in the New Testament; and of the third, the Mystical Body with its Priestly Organs. But freedom was given. The last subject was sometimes found first and the first last, or anywhere in the middle. One man, however, had a definite scheme of doctrine in his mind, which he uttered in admirable order, and when he had uttered it he said no more. It was Father Puller.

Father Puller always spoke first. If we follow his three speeches and neglect the rest for the moment, we shall obtain a fairly complete view of the High Church doctrine of Sacrifice and Priesthood—in other words, of Sacerdotalism.

In his first speech Father Puller laid stress on the fact that the sacrifices of the Old Testament consisted of various acts. Some of these acts were done by the offerer and some by the priest. The offerer brought the victim, laid his hands on it so as to constitute it in some sense his representative, and killed it. Then—but not till then, *not till the death had taken place*—did the priest's part commence. The priest caught the blood as it flowed from the victim, and sprinkled it on the altar. Then he burned the victim, or such parts as were to be burned, according to the nature of the sacrifice. The feast followed, in which if it was a whole burnt-offering, nothing could be eaten but the accompanying meal-offering, which was eaten by the priest alone. If it was a peace-offering, the priest had his share, and the offerer and his family had their share. That was Father Puller's first speech. At the end of it, and in a sentence, he said that in like manner our Lord's priestly action *begins after His death* and goes on in the life of glory.

In his second, ignoring all that the rest had said, Father Puller started from the point he had reached in the first. Our Lord's priesthood began when He ascended on high. He thought that that was the teaching of the Epistle to the Hebrews; and he thought he could quote Dr. A. B. Davidson's 'remarkable commentary' on that Epistle in his favour. He said, 'Thus it would appear that, when our Lord entered the heavenly sanctuary and was about to present Himself to the Father, He became a High Priest, and in some mysterious way He fulfilled what the High Priest did on the Day of Atonement, when He went within the veil and offered the blood.' As a Priest in heaven, then, Jesus offers, is always offering, His own blood. And not His blood only; but as the priest laid the victim on the altar, our Lord is continually 'presenting His Holy Body as a sacrifice.' Father Puller finds evidence for this in the Book of Revelation. There it is said that St. John saw 'in the midst of the throne and of the four living creatures, and in the midst of the elders, a Lamb standing as

though it had been slain.' That Lamb, as though it had been slain, is the Lord's own sacrificial Body. And it is 'standing' because it has resurrection life in it. Having passed through death, Jesus is now alive for evermore, and can offer Himself a living sacrifice continually.

In the third discussion Father Puller began with that. Our Lord is a Priest for ever in heaven. He has also a sacrifice to offer for ever, His own body and His own blood. But that same sacrifice is also offered on earth, in the celebration of the Eucharist. Father Puller omits a link here, which, however, Dr. Moberly or Canon Gore will endeavour to supply. He omits to show the connexion between the offering of Christ's body and blood in heaven, and the offering that takes place in the Supper. He only proceeds to say that the language used by our Lord in instituting the Supper is sacrificial language. He says that every detail is sacrificial. The bread and wine are sacrificial. For the meal-offerings at sacrifices consisted of fine flour, and the drink-offerings consisted of wine. He says our Lord blessed and consecrated these sacrificial things, and when He had consecrated them He identified them with His own body and blood, saying, 'This is My body; this is My blood.' Further, he says that when our Lord spoke of inaugurating a new covenant—'This is the new covenant in My blood'—He was using sacrificial language, for covenants were made and ratified by sacrifice, And the very word 'memorial' (*ἀνάμνησις*) is sacrificial, being used in the Septuagint at Lv 24⁷ of that part of the offering which was burnt on the altar. And he concludes that thus 'the holy Eucharist was instituted by our Lord as a sacrifice, the earthly counterpart of the sacrificial oblation which is being carried on in the heavenly tabernacle.'

That is Father Puller's scheme of sacrificial doctrine. Let us repeat its points. Christ became a Priest only when He entered within the veil. His offering is a perpetual one, for He is alive for evermore. It consists of His own blood

and His own body. It has a counterpart on earth, the holy Eucharist. In it also a perpetual offering is made—made, that is to say, as often as the Eucharist is properly celebrated. And the offering made in the Eucharist is the same as the offering that is made in heaven—Christ's body and Christ's blood.

Father Puller, we have said, omits in his speeches the link of connexion between the offering in heaven and the offering on earth. He supplies it to some extent in his written answers. He says that 'Christ exercises His Priesthood in heaven in His own Person; He exercises it on earth in and through His Church.' Again he says, 'Our Lord perpetuates His sacrifice in the heavenly tabernacle, "appearing openly before the face of God on our behalf" in His glorified Body as the Lamb without spot, and cleansing "the heavenly things" with the "better sacrifices," that is, with the incorruptible "Blood of sprinkling." And the matter of the Church's sacrifice is also primarily Christ's body and blood. It follows that the sacrifice which the Church offers is identical with the heavenly Sacrifice which Christ offers. In other words, Christ's sacrifice is perpetuated not only in heaven above, but also in His Church below.'

It may be felt that Father Puller's phrase, 'It follows,' makes a leap in the dark. Why, we may ask, must Christ's offering in heaven be made by the Church on earth? Why does it follow? Dr. Moberly supplies an answer. He says, 'Because what Christ is, the Church is; because the Church is the body, whose breath is the spirit, of Christ; because the Church is Christ.' And Canon Gore also answers, though not quite so definitely, 'The Church is the Body of Christ. Christ lives, as quickening Spirit, in this body, in order that the priesthood and sacrifice of man may be realized in the Church.'

Well, if the Church on earth sacrifices, it is necessary, no doubt, that she have both somewhat to offer and priests to make the offering.

When we seek to understand what the offering is, we find a little obscurity and perhaps some difference of opinion. Father Puller says, distinctly enough so far, that it is the same offering as Christ makes in heaven, His own body and blood. What that involves, however, it is impossible with confidence to say. Does it, on the one hand, involve transubstantiation? And, on the other hand, does it involve propitiation? Perhaps with Father Puller it involves both.

And for a moment Dr. Moberly seems to go even further. For it is to be understood here that the whole conception of Christ's sacrifice being perpetuated in glory comes from the writings of the late Dr. Milligan of Aberdeen. Now on this point what Dr. Milligan says is that 'the Church does on earth what Christ does in heaven *according to her capabilities and opportunities*,' and again that 'what Christ is or does the Church must *in a measure* be or do.' But Dr. Moberly drops the limitations which we have thrown into italics. He says that 'Christ's people are what He is,' and even more strongly, 'the Church is Christ.'

It is probable, however, that Dr. Moberly does not indorse the literal offering by Christ of His body and blood in heaven. For he does not once refer to that idea, and when he speaks of Christ's sacrifice he refers to the sacrifice consummated on Calvary. If we understand him aright, he means to say that what Christ once did the Church continues still to do. Now, Christ offered Himself as a propitiatory sacrifice in perfect obedience to the Father's will, or, as Dr. Moberly puts it, 'in perfect love, to consummate human penitence.' So the sacrifice which the Church still offers is the sacrifice of a contrite heart. But it needs an outward expression. Says Canon Scott Holland, 'The inward motive is not in itself sacrificial until it has obtained an outward realization—until it can succeed in making an offering. The "Lo! I come to do Thy will"

becomes sacrificial when it has completed its intention in the offering of the *body* prepared for it. The will that is to be done is that He should have a *body* to present in sacrifice. And so it is that our own offerings of spiritual thanks and praises only gain the right to use sacrificial language through the sacrifice, present in their midst, of the body and blood. It is this that constitutes them sacrifices.'

That is not yet a definite statement of what the offering is. But it is the nearest we have. One thing is clear, it is an actual sacrificial offering, a victim external to the offerer. Whether it has propitiatory value, there is, perhaps, a difference of opinion. Canon Gore says distinctly that it has not. But Dr. Moberly speaks of the propitiatory value of penitence. And though he guards himself by saying *perfect* penitence, we understand that he would allow the Church to possess perfect penitence through her perfect union to Christ.

Well, if the Church has an actual Victim to offer, she must have priests to offer it. Now it is unreservedly held by all these High Churchmen that the Church possesses a universal priesthood, and that every member of the Church is a proper priest. More than that, it is emphatically stated that no priest can come between a member of the Church and God. 'The idea of a priest coming between me and Christ,' says Canon Scott Holland, 'is inconceivable.' So the official priests are simply, in Dr. Moberly's phrase, 'ministerial organs of the Church's priesthood.' It is the Church that sacrifices Christ's body and blood. The act must be performed by certain members of the Church. But they have no right to be called priests that the other members do not have. They are simply the Church's ministers or servants in the performance of this act. The point is that the whole Church, and therefore every member of the Church, is a veritable sacrificing priest.

And that leads to two questions. What is the Church? and How are the operating priests appointed? Both questions are keenly pressed, especially by Dr. Fairbairn and Dr. Salmond. Canon Gore is almost ready to admit that where the Spirit of Christ is (as witnessed by His fruits) there is the Church of Christ (*Ubi Spiritus ibi Ecclesia*). But Dr. Moberly demands something more than that. These are his words: 'I do not think it would be right to say *simpliciter*, or in the way of definition, upon earth, that where the Spirit of Christ is, there is the Church. In other words, I believe that, while the whole meaning of the Church is Spirit, there is, none the less, such a thing as a *true* and *proper* outward organization of the Church; and that in the orderly continuity of that organization is the due historical expression of the Spirit on earth.'

And in like manner he holds that, as there is a historical continuity belonging to the Church, according to this true and proper outward organization, so is there a historical continuity in respect of the Church's ministerial organs. They discharge only the priestly functions which belong to the whole Church, and they must be authorized by a public and ministerial action of the body. But 'their authorization requires something more than a popular appointment, whose method might depend upon the unfettered fancy of the contemporary body.' Now, the right to represent the whole body belonged originally to the Twelve. By them it was passed, through the laying on of hands, to those whom they thought fittest. And at the same time provision was made 'for its authoritative devolution for ever.' The words are Canon Moberly's. We understand him to mean apostolical succession.

Such then, so far as we have been able to discover and dispassionately set them down, are the essential points of what is known as Sacerdotalism. For the present it is enough.