

**THE DOCTRINE OF THE CHURCH
AND CHRISTIAN REUNION;
BEING THE BAMPTON
LECTURES FOR THE YEAR 1920**

Published @ 2017 Trieste Publishing Pty Ltd

ISBN 9780649742721

The Doctrine of the Church and Christian Reunion; Being the Bampton Lectures for the Year 1920 by Rev. Arthur C. Headlam

Except for use in any review, the reproduction or utilisation of this work in whole or in part in any form by any electronic, mechanical or other means, now known or hereafter invented, including xerography, photocopying and recording, or in any information storage or retrieval system, is forbidden without the permission of the publisher, Trieste Publishing Pty Ltd, PO Box 1576 Collingwood, Victoria 3066 Australia.

All rights reserved.

Edited by Trieste Publishing Pty Ltd.
Cover @ 2017

This book is sold subject to the condition that it shall not, by way of trade or otherwise, be lent, re-sold, hired out, or otherwise circulated without the publisher's prior consent in any form or binding or cover other than that in which it is published and without a similar condition including this condition being imposed on the subsequent purchaser.

www.triestepublishing.com

REV. ARTHUR C. HEADLAM

**THE DOCTRINE OF THE CHURCH
AND CHRISTIAN REUNION;
BEING THE BAMPTON
LECTURES FOR THE YEAR 1920**

THE
DOCTRINE OF THE CHURCH
AND CHRISTIAN REUNION

BEING

THE BAMPTON LECTURES
FOR THE YEAR 1920

BY THE

REV. ARTHUR C. HEADLAM, D.D.

CANON OF CHRIST CHURCH, AND REGIUS PROFESSOR OF DIVINITY IN THE
UNIVERSITY OF OXFORD
FORMERLY FELLOW OF ALL SOULS COLLEGE, OXFORD
AND PRINCIPAL OF KING'S COLLEGE, LONDON

SECOND EDITION

LONDON
JOHN MURRAY, ALBEMARLE STREET, W. 1.

1921

EXTRACT
FROM THE LAST WILL AND TESTAMENT

OF THE LATE

REV. JOHN BAMPTON,

CANON OF SALISBURY.

—“ I give and bequeath my Lands and Estates to the
“ Chancellor, Masters, and Scholars of the University of
“ Oxford for ever, to have and to hold all and singular the
“ said Lands or Estates upon trust, and to the intents
“ and purposes hereinafter mentioned; that is to say, I
“ will and appoint that the Vice-Chancellor of the University
“ of Oxford for the time being shall take and receive all the
“ rents, issues, and profits thereof, and (after all taxes,
“ reparations, and necessary deductions made) that he pay
“ all the remainder to the endowment of eight Divinity
“ Lecture Sermons, to be established for ever in the said
“ University, and to be performed in the manner following:

“ I direct and appoint, that, upon the first Tuesday in
“ Easter Term, a Lecturer may be yearly chosen by the
“ Heads of Colleges only, and by no others, in the room
“ adjoining to the Printing-House, between the hours of ten
“ in the morning and two in the afternoon, to preach eight
“ Divinity Lecture Sermons, the year following, at St.
“ Mary’s in Oxford, between the commencement of the last
“ month in Lent Term, and the end of the third week in
“ Act Term.

“ Also I direct and appoint, that the eight Divinity
“ Lecture Sermons shall be preached upon either of the
“ following Subjects—to confirm and establish the Christian
“ Faith, and to confute all heretics and schismatics—upon
“ the divine authority of the holy Scriptures—upon the

“ authority of the writings of the primitive Fathers, as to
“ the faith and practice of the primitive Church—upon the
“ Divinity of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ—upon the
“ divinity of the Holy Ghost—upon the Articles of the
“ Christian Faith, as comprehended in the Apostles’ and
“ Nicene Creed.

“ Also I direct, that thirty copies of the eight Divinity
“ Lecture Sermons shall be always printed, within two
“ months after they are preached; and one copy shall be
“ given to the Chancellor of the University, and one copy
“ to the head of every College, and one copy to the mayor
“ of the city of Oxford, and one copy to be put into the
“ Bodleian Library; and the expense of printing them shall
“ be paid out of the revenue of the Land or Estates given
“ for establishing the Divinity Lecture Sermons; and the
“ Preacher shall not be paid, nor be entitled to the revenue,
“ before they are printed.

“ Also I direct and appoint, that no person shall be
“ qualified to preach the Divinity Lecture Sermons, unless
“ he hath taken the degree of Master of Arts at least, in one
“ of the two Universities of Oxford or Cambridge; and that
“ the same person shall never preach the Divinity Lecture
“ Sermons twice.”

PREFACE TO THE SECOND EDITION

THE demand for a second edition of these Lectures gives me an opportunity of replying to some of the criticisms which have been directed against them, and I hope incidentally of strengthening my argument. As regards my reviewers generally, I must express my thanks for the cordial manner with which they have received my work. There are only two of those that I have seen which were not courteous and fair. For the most part, whether writers have agreed with me or not, they have treated my arguments with respect. There has, of course, been a natural tendency to dwell on those points on which I happened to support the opinions of my critic, and to ignore what has been said on the other side. That is inevitable. For the most part it is not necessary for me to refer to these reviews; they deal rather with conclusions than arguments, and it is not worth while criticizing mere differences of opinion. There are, however, two which demand more careful consideration. Mr. C. H. Turner has, at my own request, reviewed me at some length in the pages of the *Church Quarterly Review*, and Bishop Gore has written *An Open Letter to the Bishop of Nassau* in which he criticizes those points on which I differ from him, while speaking with great kindness of the book in other ways.

I must begin by expressing my thanks to Mr. Turner for undertaking to write a review at somewhat short notice. I had felt that in my position as editor of the *Church Quarterly Review* the fairest method that I could pursue in dealing with a work of my own on a subject which I knew to be of importance at the moment was to secure that it should be reviewed from different points of view. I entrusted the work to Dr. Nairne and Mr. Turner. I must thank Dr. Nairne not only for treating the work in a sympathetic way, but also for showing that he rightly understood my purpose. In one or two other reviews that has been so misrepresented that I wondered whether it was any failure of lucidity on my own part Mr. Turner, as I knew, would not agree entirely with what I had said, and it is an advantage, I think, to have the case or part of the case on the other side put with the ability which one may expect from him.

I would pass lightly over certain personal questions, for Mr. Turner thinks it necessary to criticize somewhat severely my methods of work. I do not feel particularly guilty, because I have succeeded in obtaining some answer to ques-

tions to which I have devoted many years of thought. I do not feel that I have stated my conclusions over-dogmatically, and I am quite ready to change my opinion if good arguments are produced on the other side. Nor do I feel that there is any need to apologize, because when I differ from another writer I state frankly my difference of opinion and criticize his arguments. In fact I do not think I have been nearly as severe to anyone as Mr. Turner has been to myself; for he suggests that I have ignored passages because they did not harmonize with my conclusions; and he accuses me of the perversion of evidence. Nor again do I feel that I have been so guilty as he suggests of over-emphasizing one particular side, in particular of over-emphasizing the evidence for the authority of the Church as against the authority of the Apostles. I venture to think that if my readers will turn to pp. 86-89 they will find that I have attempted to balance both sides. The conclusion I arrived at is: "I venture to think that a wise theologian will not lightly give his adherence to either of the theories which have prevailed. They are both one-sided. They only represent one aspect. Authority resides in the Church, which is the home of the Spirit, but it has always acted through its duly appointed ministers. The Church is built up on the two principles of discipleship and ministry, and neither in our historical investigation nor in our practical churchmanship can we safely subordinate either."

But let me now turn to Mr. Turner's criticisms. His first main complaint is that I discuss the ecclesiastical passages in the first Gospel without even the faintest hint of the existence of such a thing as the synoptic problem. I did so quite deliberately, because experience of modern critics has convinced me that the synoptic problem provides no guidance in these matters at all. If the critics had been able to discover different strata in the synoptic gospels which could be accurately distinguished from one another, and represent different stages in doctrinal development, then it would be worth while referring to it; but this is just what they have failed to do, as is shown by their own arguments.

Let me take some illustrations. The first shall be one which Mr. Turner himself refers to—namely, the passages in St. Matthew and St. Mark dealing with divorce. This question is most interesting. According to the synoptic theory St. Mark represents the original and St. Matthew represents the same material worked out at a later date. But unfortunately the passage in St. Mark agrees with the opinion of the High Church party, who do not, under ordinary circumstances, like criticism very much, and

conflicts with that of Broad Church divines, who rather pride themselves on their critical acumen; so we have the amusing spectacle of Dr. Charles, who is not only a great critic but very anxious to be quite in touch with modern ideas, labouring to prove that in this case we must follow the guidance of St. Matthew and not St. Mark, while we find all our High Church divines pointing triumphantly to the fact that St. Mark's Gospel does clearly represent the original and authoritative teaching. In this case Mr. Turner accepts the authority of St. Mark; but when he finds a passage which occurs in St. Luke alone which he thinks inconsistent with my argument he shows no hesitation about quoting it.

Or if I turn to Dr. Rashdall, who again would be very sorry not to be on the critical side, I find that he indulges in a long and elaborate argument to prove that a passage in St. Mark must not be accepted, because it conflicts with his particular theory. So again, when I turn to the new work on the *Beginnings of Christianity* by Dr. Foakes Jackson and Dr. Kirsopp Lake, I find that they have an elaborate argument to prove that when a passage which occurs in Q might seem to support the view that the Kingdom of Heaven means the Church it was clearly derived from some other source. The same book affords many other instances of the way in which, though a passage may occur in St. Mark or in Q, it is rejected because it contains something inconsistent with the somewhat limited view of the Gospel which those writers are anxious to propound.

These and other instances are sufficient to convince me that the so-called synoptic problem gives no results of any authority. Writers who call themselves critical quite indiscriminately reject passages which come from the supposed sources if they are displeasing to them, and accept others on the authority of St. Luke or St. Matthew alone if they support their views.

Under such circumstances it is obvious that it is quite futile to think that I shall do any good to my argument by paying attention to the synoptic theory as customarily stated, and I have therefore deliberately suggested another method of dealing with the evidence. So far as I can judge our Gospels as we have them, they are put together from several different sources: one of those is St. Mark; another is what is now commonly called Q, the limits of which are, however, quite uncertain; another is a special source of St. Luke. There were probably other sources also, and there is no particular reason for thinking that what occurs in one Gospel only is for that reason less original than what may occur in more than one, nor do I think that St. Mark's Gospel

really represents a better authority than the sources of the other two Gospels. In fact it seems to me that a large part of St. Matthew gives us the teaching of our Lord both more fully and probably more accurately than any other source. It seems to me, further, that we have no reason for doubting that these documents give us the teaching of our Lord as it was preserved by the first generation of Christians and that it is authentic. It is, of course, possible or even probable that in transmission it has been to a certain extent coloured by later ideas; but the extent to which that has been proved to have taken place is in my opinion very slight, and the suggestion that a large part of it represents the teaching of the Church and not the teaching of our Lord appears to me in the highest degree uncritical.

Under those circumstances I laid down the following method of criticism (p. 19): "I propose to avoid relying on isolated passages and special texts, and to examine the general tendency of our Lord's teaching. If we find that the more definite sayings are in harmony with the rest of the teaching it will be a reasonable deduction that they are genuine." Those are the principles I have laid down, and I may reasonably expect that my critics would recognize my methods and discuss their value, rather than accuse me of ignoring a different method of investigation.

But the main point of course is this: Am I correct or not in following, for the most part, the authority of Dr. Hort in ascribing greater influence to the Church and less to the Apostles? Mr. Turner has a long and elaborate argument designed to prove that St. Mark wishes to distinguish the Apostles from the great body of ordinary disciples, and that he gradually separates them off, until in the final scene of the Last Supper our Lord is left alone with them. Whether St. Mark had the intention that he ascribes to him I doubt; I distrust this habit of finding intentions in writers instead of assuming, unless you have grounds to the contrary, that they are simply relating facts. So far as I can see, St. Mark tells us without any definite purpose at all that the Twelve were those who remained faithful to our Lord until the end, simply because they did so. No one at any rate doubts the fact. But if he will turn to Dr. Hort he will see that what Dr. Hort emphasizes is that throughout it is as His disciples, that they remained in close contact with our Lord; that they represent "discipleship," in its highest form; and that they are not primarily the appointed rulers of the Church, but the nucleus of the Church out of which it grew. For example, the Last Supper was celebrated with them as the beginning of the Church of the future. If they