

## Editorial

THAT there is something wrong with Christian giving in England has been apparent for a long time. The generous manner in which, for example, church members in the U.S.A. contribute of their means, shows us up in an unfavourable light. It is right that there should be concern over this matter, and that there is a growing concern is indicated by the appearance in recent months of a number of publications on the subject (a review of one such book will be found in this issue) and now, most recently of all, by the publication of a pamphlet, sponsored by the Central Board of Finance of the Church of England, entitled *The Christian Stewardship of Money* (Church Information Board, 2s. 6d.). This pamphlet, which merits careful study, constitutes in effect a plea for direct giving as opposed to dependence on bazaars, fêtes, and sales of different kinds, from which, according to statistics, the average parish derives more than half its income. Certain tested methods of direct giving are described and commended for consideration. No doubt a variety of reasons may be assigned for the existing situation. As an organization the Church of England is becoming increasingly top-heavy, over-regimented, over-centralized, and "run", more and more impersonally, by a hierarchy of gaitered bureaucrats. The big business machine should not be expected to stimulate the springs of personal generosity. But the Church's problem is, at root, a spiritual one. It is precisely those parishes which are spiritually most vital, and are concerned even more for the needs of those who have never heard the Gospel than with their own domestic needs, that find Christian giving has ceased to be a problem. It is important, too, that our people should be instructed in the right theology of giving, such as we have in that classic passage II Cor. viii and ix. God is the first Giver : in pure grace He gave His best for us. All Christian giving should be a spontaneous, cheerful, and single-minded response to the bounty of God's prior giving. And first, like the Thessalonians, we must give our own selves, placing ourselves and all that we possess at God's disposal for the glory of His Name. In short, truly Christian giving is the expression of a truly evangelical faith. The financial problems of our parishes are symptomatic of the spiritual stagnation of our land. We can expect these problems to vanish away in proportion as our people take up the Apostle's irrepressible exclamation : " Thanks be to God for His unspeakable gift ! "

\* \* \* \*

Another pamphlet which demands attention is the Reply of the Glasgow Presbytery to the Joint Report on Relations between Anglican and Presbyterian Churches published under the title *Glasgow Speaks* (The House of Grant, 2s.) which explains with admirable cogency and clarity the reasons why the Glasgow Presbytery (and subsequently, it may be added, the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland) rejected the proposals of the Joint Report. We have no hesitation in asserting that historic Reformed Anglicanism does not contradict but supports the contentions of this booklet, and that there are great

numbers of Anglican clergy as well as laity to-day who will wholeheartedly concur with the judgment of our Presbyterian brethren that "the only realistic solution" lies in "a frank and unequivocal recognition of each other's ministries as *valid and regular ministries* of the Word and Sacraments within the Church Catholic", leading naturally to the expression of Christian unity and fellowship by the practice of intercommunion at the Lord's table ("it is *His* table, not ours"). If, with our brethren of the Church of Scotland, we believe that such action would be in accordance with "Scriptural truth", "sound reason," and "the purpose of Christ", we should not neglect to work and plan towards that end.

\* \* \* \*

It would appear, however, that this is not the belief of the bishops (some seventy of them!) who at last year's Lambeth Conference constituted the Committee on Church Unity and the Church Universal, for in their Report they assert that "it must be recognized as a fact that Anglicans conscientiously hold that the celebrant of the Eucharist should have been ordained by a bishop standing in the historic succession, and generally believe it to be their duty to bear witness to this principle by receiving Holy Communion only from those who have thus been ordained"; and they add that "the existence of this conviction as a view held among Anglicans clearly makes it in practice impossible to envisage the establishment of fully reciprocal intercommunion at any stage short of the adoption of episcopacy by the Churches of Presbyterian Order, and the satisfactory unification of the Presbyterian and Anglican ministries". An attitude as intractable as this reflects a doctrine of episcopacy not to be found in the Ordinal or Articles of the Church of England, nor is it by any means the conviction of all Anglicans that it is their duty to bear witness to the "principle" of a so-called "historic episcopate" by receiving Holy Communion only from episcopally ordained ministers. The Report, indeed, discloses what appears to be a hopeless and unscriptural divorce in the minds of the bishops between the ministry of the Word and the ministry of the Sacraments: to Presbyterian orders they would, no doubt, concede validity in the former, but not at all in the latter (that is, in the administration of the sacrament of the Lord's Supper; strangely, the disability does not apply to the administration of the sacrament of Baptism). The teaching of Scripture, however (not to mention that of the Fathers) would lead us to conclude that to sunder the ministry of the Sacraments from the ministry of the Word is more open to objection than to fail of a succession of bishops. It is identity of faith, not identity of orders, which unites God's people. Perhaps there is room for more of the spirit of the late Dr. E. C. Dewick who used to say that he welcomed every opportunity of receiving communion, in England and elsewhere, in churches other than the Church of England, of which he was an episcopally ordained presbyter, thereby bearing witness to his conviction that the universal fellowship of all believers should mean freedom to meet together in genuine communion at the very place where, above all, in obedience to the Lord's command, Christian unity should be manifested.

\* \* \* \*

Following a leading article under the title of *The Barrier* (namely, "the Anglican insistence on the principle of episcopacy") which was published in *The Times* on the opening day of the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland, the debate has been proceeding in the correspondence columns of that newspaper. First to appear was a letter from the Archbishop of Canterbury who, without displaying any inclination to remove or modify this barrier (indeed, seeking rather to justify it), made the welcome assertion concerning the Church of England and the Church of Scotland that "we are both within the same body of Christ, under the same Spirit, the same Lord, the same God". This was followed by letters from Dr. Nathaniel Micklem, doyen of Congregationalist scholars, and Dr. G. W. H. Lampe, who is Professor of Theology in the University of Birmingham. Dr. Micklem asks the following pertinent question: "If, as he says, the Archbishop does not question the spiritual status of the Church of Scotland, why will not or cannot he receive communion in a Scottish church?" And Professor Lampe (who is of course a clergyman of the Church of England) maintains that the Archbishop's assertion which we have cited above "must surely imply that we share the same sacraments". The logic of the conclusion he draws is, or should be, inescapable: "If, then, we acknowledge that the same Lord is truly present at His Table in both Churches, we ought to give practical effect to that recognition by some official encouragement, on the Anglican side, of the intercommunion which is already widely practised by individual communicants. . . . Such a practical demonstration of our existing unity in Christ would show that Anglicans mean what they say when they assert that they are not 'passing adverse judgment on the spiritual status of the Church of Scotland'." There is need for much more of this sort of outspoken Christian commonsense. We applaud, also, Dr. Lampe's repudiation of "the 'pipe-line' theory of the transmission of sacramental grace". It is precisely the recrudescence of this levitical theory which bedevils the whole situation, making it all the more necessary for those who repudiate it to take such steps as are open to them to break through the barrier in loyalty to the sole and unique High Priesthood of Christ our Lord.

\* \* \* \*

In this issue we are happy to be able to include an article by Professor C. S. Lewis on a subject of very considerable importance in the field of Christian sociology, particularly as our world today is threatened by novel psychological ideologies and techniques which are radically inimical to the Christian view of society and the dignity of the individual. It is not a new article, but it has not hitherto been published in this country. When it originally appeared in the Australian quarterly, *Twentieth Century*, Professor Lewis concluded with the following comment: "You may ask why I send this to an Australian periodical. The reason is simple and perhaps worth recording: I can get no hearing for it in England." The distinguished author has something to say which certainly needs to be heard and taken to heart here in England, and our reprinting of the article in *The Churchman* (with due acknowledgments) will, we trust, ensure a fair hearing for it in this country after all. In view of the noticeable fact that what

Professor Lewis calls the humanitarian theory of punishment can boast the advocacy of a variety of leaders of the different churches, it might be worth considering whether the current fashion for excluding the concepts of strict justice and satisfaction from discussion concerning the treatment of criminals may not have some definite connection with the current fashion for excluding those same concepts from the theology of the atonement, with the result that men are seen as innocent victims of heredity and environment rather than as responsible and guilty sinners before a holy God. So far from being progressive and enlightened, the theory which Professor Lewis assails is, in fact, degrading to man and subversive of his true dignity.

\* \* \* \*

With the viewpoint so incisively expressed by Professor C. S. Lewis, Dr. P. T. Forsyth would certainly have been in agreement. "There is no Divine charity but gives justice its due," he once said. "That is true for faith and true for practice. It is the principle of the Cross and the principle of the State. . . . It might be to the good of the kingdom of God if our charity toward men had to stand still a little, while we regain that justice which springs from the justice of God. Were there more justice, we should need less charity, and less of what apes charity. Have we escaped from the severity of the theologians only to succumb to the spell of the philosopher and the philanthropist? It is a poor exchange." Among modern theological thinkers P. T. Forsyth was outstanding for the creative, dynamic, and prophetic qualities of his mind. Those who want encouragement to turn attentively to his writings will find it in Mr. Higginson's appreciation of Forsyth's theology, the central emphases of which need to be heard and reaffirmed no less in our own day than in his.

Dr. Bromiley's article deals with a subject of real importance for the Church of England at this present juncture in its history. It is not so much that we are faced to-day in our Church with a flight from doctrinal and propositional religion (such a flight is perhaps more characteristic of the Free Churches) as with a retrogression to teachings and resultant practices which are ill at ease in the company of the Thirty-nine Articles. Hence "the current neglect or evasion or even defiance of the Articles" which Dr. Bromiley deplors as "one of the greatest tragedies in modern Anglicanism". With him, we wish to see the place restored to the Articles in which "they can discharge their living and salutary function".

P.E.H.