



3703791616

**THE THEOLOGY OF HASTINGS RASHDALL:
A STUDY OF HIS PART IN THEOLOGICAL
DEBATES DURING HIS LIFETIME**

MARGARET J RAYNER

A thesis submitted to
The University of Gloucestershire
in accordance with the requirements of the degree of
Doctor of Philosophy
in the Faculty of Arts and Humanities

August 2005.

Abstract.

Hastings Rashdall was a well-known Anglican Churchman, who was engaged in debates and discussions with theologians and other scholars of his time. The thesis aims (i) negatively, to repudiate the view that Rashdall's work can be dismissed as stereotyped and outdated; (ii) positively, to show that he is a major contributor to the contemporary debates and a perennially outstanding theologian.

Including in its detailed presentation of Rashdall's theological ideas previously unpublished material, the thesis aims to be an original contribution to scholarship in a hitherto neglected area.

In Chapter 1 (Introduction) the life and work of Rashdall have been set out in historical context; that is: the later Victorian period from his birth in 1858, through the Edwardian reign and earlier period of George V, to his death in 1924.

The main Chapters, 2-5, are on the following aspects respectively of Rashdall's work: doctrine of Atonement; Christology; doctrine of the Church; doctrine of Immortality. Chapter 2, centred on Rashdall's major work, The Idea of Atonement in Christian Theology of 1919, is an analysis of his controversial writings and discussions. Chapter 3 is an investigation into his Christology, especially his speech to the Modern Churchman's Union at Girton College Cambridge in 1921. Chapter 4 treats a wide range of ecclesial topics: they may be identified as: ministry and orders; sacraments; ritual; subscription debates; disestablishment; ecumenism; education. Chapter 5: Rashdall's doctrine of immortality has been analysed in three respects: (i) the resurrection of Jesus; (ii) the after-life; (iii) current debates on the credibility of immortality. A final concluding Chapter reviews the themes of the major areas of Rashdall's theology, seeking to demonstrate its outstanding character. Some avenues for further research are suggested. The Conclusion includes reference to the discussions stimulated by his approaches for contemporary and later theologians.

Acknowledgements

I should like to acknowledge the help of the following people:

My supervisor in Oxford, Dr. Mark Chapman, who has supported me throughout the writing of the thesis in many ways, and has been a great source of strength and encouragement.

My supervisor at Cheltenham since 2003, Dr. Peter Scott, who has been readily available, helped to organise administrative arrangements, and asked challenging questions.

The Chapter of Pusey House Oxford, who, for many years, have made manuscripts available and have been very generous with their time and use of the library facilities.

The archivist of New College Oxford, who has made documents available, and helped to check them.

The staff of the Bodleian Library, Oxford, especially those in charge of Modern Documents and those who helped in checking of references in the final stages.

The administrative staff of Gloucestershire University for their friendly support.

My friends Richard Jeffery and Michael Rayner, whose help has been indispensable;

Richard Jeffery with proof-reading and discussion, Michael Rayner with technical assistance and encouragement.

My friend Elaine Kaye for biographical suggestions.

Margaret Marsh, who, especially in the earlier stages, was an unfailing source of information and encouragement.

The Rev. Stuart Bell who spent a short time in Oxford studying Rashdall's doctrine of Atonement, with whom I exchanged ideas and information.

Contents

- Chapter 1. Introduction
- Chapter 2. The Doctrine of the Atonement
- (i) The Earlier Years to 1905
 - (ii) The Years from 1905 to 1924
- Appendix: Longer Summary of Idea of Atonement in Christian Theology
- Chapter 3. Christology
- (i) The Earlier Years to 1915
 - (ii) From Years from 1915 to 1924
- Chapter 4. The Theology of the Church
- (i) The Earlier Years to 1904.
 - (ii) The Years from 1904 to 1924.
- Chapter 5. Immortality
- (i) The Earlier Years to 1905
 - (ii) The Years from 1905 to 1924
- Chapter 6. Conclusion
- Bibliography
- Contemporary Works
 - (i) Published
 - (ii) Unpublished
 - Modern Works

Abbreviations.

AV	Authorized Version
B-B	Bethune-Baker.
Bod.	Bodleian Library.
BCP	Book of Common Prayer.
C in E	Christus in Ecclesia.
C of E	Church of England.
CDH	<i>Cur Deus Homo.</i>
CUP	Cambridge University Press.
D and D	Doctrine and Development.
ed.	editor or edition.
Ed. Eng.	Nowell-Smith, <u>Edwardian England 1901-1914.</u>
ET	English Translation.
HJ	Hibbert Journal.
HJS	Hibbert Journal Supplement
HR	Hastings Rashdall.
IJE	International Journal of Ethics.
JH and D	Jesus Human and Divine.
LM	Lux Mundi.
MC	Modern Churchman.
MCU	Modern Churchmen's Union.
MM	Margaret Marsh – <u>Hastings Rashdall</u> : Bibliography of the published works.
NC	New College.
nd	no date given.
NT	New Testament.
ODCC	Oxford Dictionary of the Christian Church.
OT	Old Testament.
OUP	Oxford University Press.
PH	Pusey House.
PP	Pringle-Pattison.
RC	Roman Catholic.
SCM	Student Christian Movement.

Shorter OE Dictionary Shorter Oxford English Dictionary.

SJTh. Scottish Journal of Theology.

SPCK Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge.

URC United Reformed Church

Chapter 1: Introduction.

Hastings Rashdall is an outstanding churchman and theologian of his period. His life-time spanned the years from 1858 to 1924. Thus he lived during the reigns of three British monarchs. In the late Victorian and Edwardian era, scientific and social progress was accompanied by hope for the potential of the created order, and especially of human kind. During the reign of George V optimism was shattered by the terrible events of the First World War, which for many engendered scepticism towards recent belief in the progress of ideas. The inter-war years from 1918 were characteristically a time of retreat into negativism or traditionalism. Rashdall was among those Victorian theologians who had accepted and defended the theory of evolution - his birth coincided almost with the publication in 1859 of The Origin of Species,¹ - and his general acceptance of the concept was accompanied by a belief in the potential goodness of man.²

Rashdall had a very wide range of interest; for his works covered the areas of history, philosophy and theology.

Although he was one of the most important of those theologians who held the concept of the progress or evolution of religious ideas and challenged traditional beliefs while remaining within the Christian Church, his general approach became in succeeding years unfashionable. This may account for the fact that, although he was a prolific writer and scholar, very little has been written about him.

Yet I believe that his work is perennially valuable. He was remarkably unaffected by the changed world outlook, for his belief was adequately supported, as I shall attempt to show, by a detailed and sophisticated theology.

The late Professor Dyson wrote, in his introduction to Margaret Marsh's Bibliography of Rashdall's writings,³ that he believed Rashdall may be described as 'a first-class, not as a second-class theologian.' To explore further this judgment is, I contend, a valid and worthwhile investigation.

¹ Charles Darwin, The Origin of Species by means of Natural Selection (London: Murray, 1859).

² I use the term in a generic sense, as a translation of *homo sapiens*.

³ M. Marsh, Hastings Rashdall: Bibliography of the Published Writings (Lesters: MCU, 1993).

My study of Rashdall includes the use of original material to which I have had access: correspondence from him throughout his life⁴ (from an early age at his first boarding school to the year of his death); correspondence to him;⁵ and autographs of sermons in manuscript or typescript.⁶

Rashdall's work may be regarded as more significant than that of some other contemporary liberal⁷ theologians, since after holding the post of canon at Hereford from 1910 to 1917, he was appointed Dean of Carlisle in 1917, an important position in the ecclesiastical hierarchy. Although he was regarded as a controversial figure, the toleration of his doctrinal position (at least until 1917), by the ecclesiastical authorities, which is signalled by the appointment, is an indicator of the legitimate and positive potential of his views.

The importance, significance, and relative neglect of Rashdall's theological work, together with the availability of original material, are factors accounting for my wish to write this thesis, which is offered as a contribution to scholarship.

Since it is advisable to be aware of contemporary conditions and events for an assessment of the view that Rashdall's writing is outdated, and invalidated by the more dogmatic and pessimistic theology of a later generation, some information on relevant social history is given.

His life is recorded in the autobiographical collection at New College, and further documented in the correspondence at the Bodleian Library. Additional information is available in the biography by P. E. Matheson, The Life of Hastings Rashdall,⁸ itself a primary source, since the author was a contemporary and acquaintance of Rashdall.

⁴ At New College Oxford.

⁵ At the Bodleian Library.

⁶ At Pusey House.

⁷ The term 'liberal' applied to theology, is often used as an antonym of 'conservative.' The liberal, considering the validity of a belief, will weigh up a number of factors, including the findings of Biblical and scientific scholarship, aiming, above all, at seeking for the truth and reckoning that any conclusion reached must be provisional, and subject to revision. A conservative theologian will argue from authority, whether of the Bible, the early Church Councils (especially Ecumenical Councils) or of the Councils modified by the Pope or his advisors. The terms, when applied non-specifically, are not mutually exclusive; for instance, Rashdall, though generally liberal theologically, was liturgically, and in aesthetic matters more generally, 'conservative.'

⁸ P. E. Matheson The Life of Hastings Rashdall (London: OUP, 1928).

Rashdall was a Victorian for more than half his life, from his birth in 1858 to early middle age. However, about half his working life was post-Victorian.

In order to show this prolific writer, priest and scholar in historical context, I shall in this Introduction, consider him against the background of: 1. The Victorian period; 2. The Edwardian period; 3. The reign of George V. Each section will include a short account of Rashdall's life. The Sections, like the periods, are of disparate lengths.

1. The Victorian Period.

Biography

John Rashdall, his father, was a London parish priest. The family was cultured, having literary and political acquaintances in the capital. During his early education at preparatory boarding schools and later at Harrow his letters already indicate interest in scientific and religious matters.⁹ He received much support from parents and relations. This public school education, followed by study for the degree of *Litterae Humaniores* at New College Oxford, where he had become a Scholar in 1877, was a typical education of the Victorian upper and upper middle classes.

After graduating, Rashdall continued work at Oxford for his first major publication, The Universities of Europe in the Middle Ages.¹⁰

Here there were ample opportunities for debate, including membership of the Oxford Union.¹¹ Rashdall was prepared through his scholarly work and varied interests for his later vocation as priest and theologian. Certainly he moved in a privileged and restricted section of society, but, encountering numerous important scholars, philosophers and theologians, he sharpened his ability to think independently and withstand opponents in controversy, in debate and informal discussion.

Rashdall's first paid employment in 1883 was at St. David's College Lampeter.¹² This was followed by an appointment as Chaplain at Durham University at which, in

⁹ E.g. NC MS letters: 22nd May 1869, 28th Jan. 1872 and 18th Oct. 1884.

¹⁰ HR, The Universities of Europe in the Middle Ages (Oxford: Clarendon, 1895).

¹¹ Matheson, Life, pp. 32-33.

¹² Letter from Principal F. J. Jayne, Bod. Eng. Lett. MS d. 355, ff. 44 -45, 31st Aug. 1883. Jayne to HR.

preparation for ordination, he acquired experience in parochial work.¹³ Here Rashdall encountered a society widely different from his own. Letters of thanks from a miner for practical help are a witness to his pastoral ability.¹⁴

Rashdall was ordained a priest at Durham by Bishop Lightfoot in June 1886.¹⁵ In 1888 he was offered an appointment at Hertford College Oxford.¹⁶ During these early years of his career Rashdall had studied German, an important tool for his theological work. Regular church duties had given him varied parochial experience, particularly in preaching. In doctrine, he had indicated his liberal position, in regions less accustomed to it than was the case in Oxford.. His Durham post had been valuable, for, in a cultural setting widely different from his own, he had responded sympathetically to the needs and hardships of an industrial community. During this time, he had taken the opportunity to sustain valuable contacts, and to travel as a scholar on the Continent. It was a formative and fruitful period of his life.

While based at Hertford College, in the period 1889-1895, Rashdall had many contacts with scholars and other eminent people. Gladstone visited the Oxford Union in 1890, at which Rashdall was present. He reports the event in a letter to his mother.¹⁷ His academic writings of the period included published articles on reward and punishment – a matter closely connected with his theological ideas.

In 1895 he was appointed to a Fellowship and Tutorship at New College Oxford. Rashdall had a wide range of social concerns. He continued to support University Extension lectures at Oxford as he had done at Durham.¹⁸ He was also concerned with possibilities for reform at Oxford. However, paradoxically but characteristically, he loved tradition; thus he opposed modernisation of ceremonies at Oxford.

Rashdall was a member, from its inauguration, of the Churchmen's Union for the Advancement of Liberal Religious Thought, of which the first Annual Meeting was held on the 6th October 1899. He was, too, a member of the Christian Social Union, a

¹³ NC MS 23rd June 1884. Unless otherwise stated, letters at NC are from HR to his mother.

¹⁴ Bod. Eng. Lett. MS c. 342, ff. 11-12, 17th March 1885. An ex-miner (name indecipherable) to HR.

¹⁵ Matheson states mistakenly in Life at p. 44 that Westcott was the ordaining Bishop in 1884 when HR became a deacon.

¹⁶ Bod. Eng. Lett. MS c. 342, f. 186, 19th Nov. 1888.

¹⁷ NC MS 5th Feb. 1890. HR says: 'Today I have been listening to the G. O. M. at the Union.'

¹⁸ Matheson, Life, p. 117.

body of Churchmen of widely different political views who believed that Christian principles should be expressed in social action.

A major event was the publication in 1898 of his collection of theological essays, Doctrine and Development. In these he introduces in germinal form the doctrines he would retain and amplify throughout his life.

Theology at the University.

In order to understand more of the theological background of scholars at Oxford in the late nineteenth century, it is helpful to be aware of the functioning of theology at the University. I shall therefore comment on (i) the Professors of theology, (ii) the history of the academic study of the subject, (iii) opportunities for ecumenical discussions.

*(i) Professors of Theology.*¹⁹

During Rashdall's period as an undergraduate, he would have been aware of an older generation of Professors, of which there were seven in 1880. I shall comment on the better known of these.

A dominant figure was **Pusey**, Regius Professor of Hebrew from 1828 to 1882, who was known outstandingly for his work with the Oxford Movement, and was a leading Anglo-Catholic. It is indicative of his doctrinal stance that his preaching on the Eucharist led to his being condemned for heresy in 1843. He was opposed to the removal of the Athanasian Creed from services. He also believed the doctrine of hell should be maintained.²⁰

While Pusey may be considered the most prominent of catholic theologians in Oxford in the two decades preceding 1880, **Jowett**, Professor of Greek from 1855 to 1882, was a prominent liberal, and influential as Master of Balliol to which he was appointed in 1870. He was widely criticised for his essay on 'The Interpretation of Holy Scripture' in Essays and Reviews.²¹

¹⁹ Oxford Calendar for the year 1880 (Oxford: Clarendon).

²⁰ Rashdall refers to this in a sermon. See PH, MS A.5. (5), St. Paul's, 1914. 'The life of Dr. Pusey records the fact that he solemnly resolved never to look at the fire without letting it remind him of Hell; but we should rather let the fire remind us of those who have no fire.'

²¹ Jowett, Essays and Reviews (6th ed., London: Longman, 1861).

Liddon, who was Dean Ireland Professor of Exegesis from 1870 to 1882, opposed the main University reforms, being strongly against the admission of women. Rashdall knew Liddon. In 1878 he wrote, in a letter to his mother, that Liddon preached the University Sermon for Pusey, who was unwell. Rashdall was initially impressed, but found him, on the subject of evolution, 'very dogmatic and one-sided.'²²

Changes in the years 1882-83.

By the time of Rashdall's return to Oxford from Durham in 1889, there had been considerable changes. With the death of Pusey and the appointment of Samuel **Driver** as Professor of Hebrew in 1883, there was the beginning of a new generation of Professors. Driver was, like Rashdall, educated at New College and appointed as Fellow in 1870. As Canon of Christ Church, he remained there till his death in 1914. Thus, Rashdall's time in Oxford coincided with his. A contemporary of **Wellhausen**,²³ and influenced by the critical approach of German scholars, he became an advocate of the Graf-Wellhausen theory of the Pentateuch. Driver was co-editor of the Hebrew and English Lexicon of the OT of 1906. That Rashdall was aware of and sympathetic to this theory is shown in a later sermon, which will be mentioned below.

William **Sanday**, a NT scholar, replaced Liddon as Dean Ireland Professor. He spent nearly fifty years in Oxford and, notably, gave the Bampton Lectures²⁴ in 1876 on the Gospels in the Second Century, a year before Rashdall's arrival in Oxford. Sanday was Dean Ireland Professor from 1882 to 1895, and Lady Margaret Professor from 1895 to 1919. He is credited with 'winning Anglican clergy to the acceptance of modern methods of NT study.'²⁵

Paget, a contributor to the important work, Lux Mundi²⁶ (which will be further detailed below), became Regius Professor of Pastoral Theology in 1886; while

²² Matheson, Life, p. 34.

²³ J. Wellhausen (1844-1918). Professor of Semitics, Marburg and Göttingen.

²⁴ Endowment of J. Bampton, Canon of Salisbury, in 1751. Eight annual lectures to be given at St. Mary's, Oxford, on exposition of the Christian Faith in the Creeds, on the authority of Scripture and the Fathers.

²⁵ See ODCC, p. 1452.

²⁶ C. Gore, (ed.) Lux Mundi (London: Murray, 1889). Publication in Oxford in 1889 is considered important in the history of liberal theology, especially as the contributors were from the Anglo-Catholic group, successors of the Tractarians. (Biblical Conservatives.) The change is seen notably in Gore's article, which includes

Moberly, also a contributor to Lux Mundi, replaced him in 1893. The fact that they were contributors signals that they were open to new approaches.

Cheyne was Oriel Professor of the Interpretation of Holy Scripture from 1885 to 1908. An OT scholar, he was working on the documentary theory of the Pentateuch with Robertson Smith.²⁷ He also produced, in 1895, a second edition of the latter's The Prophets of Israel.

Rashdall not only embraced the documentary theory of the Pentateuch, but, when discussing sacrifice in primitive communities, would refer to Smith's theories with approval.

In my survey of the Board of Theology, it has been my aim to show how senior academics of the late Victorian period provided a more favourable ambience for liberal ideas than had the *ancien régime*.

(ii) *Theology as an examination subject.*

The Bishops preferred as ordinands those who had taken degrees in the traditional subjects, centred on classics and mathematics. Rashdall himself, as noted, had taken a degree in *Litt. Humaniores*. But all candidates for degrees had to take a simple qualifying theology paper in *Sacra Scriptura*. Theology as an examination study at the University did not exist in the early part of the century²⁸ (with the minor exception of the formality noted above). However, a Theology School was proposed in 1848. The protagonists, Jowett and A. P. Stanley, held that the Bible should be studied as were secular subjects. Pusey at first opposed the suggestion but later supported it, assuming that the examination procedure would be dominated by the orthodox; as indeed it was when the School was opened in 1870. Most students were Anglican ordinands. Students in the School were expected to refute critical theories. For instance, while the question of Mosaic authorship of Exodus was included in the 1879 examination, it was expected that candidates would supply a conservative answer. By 1882, however, Cheyne, the OT examiner, favoured a critical approach; and by 1891, questions were openly critical.

Biblical criticism, not only of the OT but of the NT. LM will be referred to in the Chapters below.

²⁷ Robertson Smith (1846-94). Scottish theologian. Removed from Professorship at Edinburgh, 1881.

²⁸ See P. Hinchliff 'Religious Issues,' The History of the University of Oxford, Vol. 7. Eds. Brock and Curthoys, (Oxford: Clarendon, 2000), pp. 97-112 at pp. 97 -101.

Thus, the observations and writings of liberal theologians were no longer officially looked on with disfavour.

(iii) Opportunities for ecumenical discussions.

An important development in the religion of the University was that it had become more pluriform. Oxford had been exclusively Anglican. Dissenters, both Roman Catholic and Free Church, had been excluded from the two ancient Universities, but the requirement of subscribing to the Thirty-nine Articles had been abolished in 1871, with the annulment of the Test Acts. This change had a liberating effect since traditional Church doctrines could now be challenged by the presence of other denominations and faiths.

Further, the beliefs of the dissenters who founded new official bodies were liberal. These bodies were: Mansfield College (for Congregational ministers), whose move from Birmingham was possible after the abolition of the Test Acts; and Manchester College (for Unitarian ministers), which moved to Oxford in 1893. Liberal Anglicans, notably Jowett, supported the appointment of Fairbairn as Principal of Mansfield.²⁹ Jowett welcomed Mansfield in his last official speech.³⁰

The Society of Historical Theology.

An important manifestation of the new ecumenism was the inauguration in 1891 of the Society of Historical Theology. The Society followed the dissolution of its predecessor, the Taylorian Society. Initiators of the meetings had been Professors Driver, Sanday and Wordsworth.³¹ These meetings of liberal scholars are recorded in The Proceedings of the Society of Historical Theology,³² of which Rashdall was a life-member. In 1896, he was one of the 'honorary secretaries.' The presidential address was given by Cheyne. His liberal attitude is shown in his remark that 'The moment the historical student begins to form dogmas, and to imagine that he has

²⁹ A. M. Fairbairn (1838-1912). Congregational theologian. First principal of Mansfield College, (1886-1909).

³⁰ See Oxford Magazine, 20.10.1886. Quoted by E. Kaye in Mansfield College, Oxford: its Origin, History, and Significance, (Oxford: OUP: 1996) p. 69, n.1.

³¹ Professor of the Interpretation of Holy Scripture, (1884-1888).

³² Abstracts of these records, for private circulation, at Bod.

penetrated some corner of antiquity, his punishment is on the way, and some fresh discovery compels him ... to retract or modify.'³³

The ecumenical nature of the Society is illustrated by the fact that Fairbairn was President in May 1892. The style of these meetings was factual rather than devotional. Rashdall was himself the President at the Annual Meeting of October 1900. It is relevant to an understanding of Rashdall's dialogue with contemporary scholars to note that he was a member of this liberal, interdenominational and inter-faith forum.

Modernism

Rashdall has been referred to as a prominent Modernist. Some explanation, however brief, must be given of the term. In earlier centuries, dissenters from the dominant form of Christianity of the society in which they lived had not been tolerated, in varying degrees. They were suppressed, disadvantaged, or spoke from outside the Church, at personal risk.

It has been seen that liberal theologians could, by the end of the century, express themselves more openly. It was in the later years of the century that a group of liberal theologians, including Rashdall, became known as Modernists. (Not all liberal theologians were Modernists, but all English Modernists, in that they did not look, for a final appeal, to ancient authorities, were liberals.³⁴) The rise of liberalism, and, in particular, of that organised group in England known as Modernists, was closely connected with advances in the fields of scientific, historical and other secular studies.

Most importantly, it was now possible not to hold as literally true the Genesis account of the creation in six days, after the publication of Darwin's Origin of Species in 1859.

In view of Darwin's theory, and of field research carried out by pioneers such as Bishop Colenso,³⁵ a literalist view of the Bible was no longer necessarily assumed by theologians. The position has been stated thus:³⁶ 'The conservatives had achieved almost nothing in the heresy hunts which had been attempted in attacking the authors

³³ Proceedings, (1891-92), pp. 5-11, at p. 5. Cheyne.

³⁴ The word, used in a technical sense, of theology, has a wide variety of meanings. Here I use it in the more general sense; see note 7 above.

³⁵ J. W. C. Colenso (1814-83). Bishop of Natal. Deposed temporarily for his views on the Pentateuch.

³⁶ G. Neville, Radical Churchman. E Lee and the New Liberalism (Oxford: OUP: 1998), p. 298.

of Essays and Reviews, Bishop Colenso, and even Charles Gore³⁷ in the Church of England, Professor Robertson Smith in the Free Church of Scotland, and the Congregationalist divine, Dr. Samuel Davidson.³⁸

The change in the attitude of academic theologians towards the end of the century discussed above, notably at Oxford, together with the fact that the Ancient Universities were no longer exclusively Anglican, facilitated the rise of a liberal movement.

It may be asked how Liberalism differs from Modernism. Modernism itself is not homogenous:

(i) The term was first used of a Roman Catholic movement, which arose in the latter years of the nineteenth century within the RC Church, particularly in France; aiming to harmonise religious beliefs with the findings of modern secular studies. It was concerned with the use of a freer approach to the interpretation of the Bible. More specifically and idiosyncratically, the adherents not only had an ethical and practical emphasis (as had the English Modernists), but combined this with a hostility to the intellectualism characteristic of Scholasticism; and, further, with a strongly eschatological understanding of the Gospels. During the reign of Pope Leo XIII the movement flourished. It was, however, condemned by his successor, Pope Pius X. Among the leaders were, notably, Loisy (1857-1940) and Tyrrell (1861-1909), an Irish convert to Catholicism.

(ii) The term, as used in England, had a different history in its immediate context, although the name was adopted from French Modernism.³⁹ It has been suggested that,⁴⁰ in addition to the growth in liberal theology already discussed, the appointment of Frederick Temple as Archbishop of Canterbury in 1897 was propitious for dedicated liberal theologians. (Temple, though not a consistent liberal, had been a pupil of Jowett, and had contributed an article to Essays and Reviews.)⁴¹

³⁷ C. Gore, Editor of Lux Mundi and leading Anglo-Catholic.

³⁸ S. Davidson, (1806 ?-1898). Congregationalist. Forced to resign Chair of Biblical Literature at Lancs. Independent College, Manchester after questioning the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch.

³⁹ See A. M. G. Stephenson, The Rise and Decline of English Modernism (SPCK: London, 1984), pp. 5-6 & p. 53).

⁴⁰ Ibid. pp. 39 & 53.

⁴¹ See ODCC, p. 1586.

The beginning of an organised group of liberal Churchmen, which became the Modernist movement in England, may be dated from 1898. This is the group with which Rashdall was associated, and therefore the one with which we are concerned here. In that year a periodical expressing liberal thought was first published.⁴² The inaugural meeting of the Churchmen's Union (which later became the Modern Churchmen's Union) was held in 1898, while the first annual meeting took place in 1899. As noted, Rashdall preached at this meeting, at St. Peter's Bayswater.⁴³

The term Modernism came to describe an organised and visible association of liberal, Anglican theologians. In common with the RC Modernists, they held a critical view of the Bible, but were more radical in their reinterpretation of traditional, ecclesiastical doctrines.

Social background of late Victorianism

I have referred to the fact that optimism for the progress of humanity is often considered the intellectual ethos of society during the pre-war years of Rashdall's life. How far can this be justified by the social history of the Victorian period?

It may be replied that Victorian prosperity began to decline in the 1870's; and argued that Victoria herself was not sympathetic to progressive movements which arose in the late part of her reign. She did not, for example, wish for extended suffrage, remarking that she 'cannot and will not be the Queen of a democratic monarchy.'⁴⁴ The historian whose views are quoted above judges that 'In the closing years of the nineteenth century the idea of progress is, among intellectuals, stale and dated.'⁴⁵

This conclusion must be tested against the facts of the social and technological advances which were made during Victoria's reign. Examples may be drawn from a wide range of activities, as follows.⁴⁶ Prisons, no longer a temporary arrangement for those awaiting transportation or execution, as in the eighteenth century, were now relatively efficient, distinguishing between juveniles, adults and repeated offenders,

⁴² This was The Church Gazette. A Review of Liberal Religious Thought, See Stephenson, Rise & Decline, p. 53.

⁴³ *Ibid*, pp. 57-59.

⁴⁴ See A. F. Havinghurst, Twentieth Century Britain (New York: Harper & Row, 1962), p. 6.

⁴⁵ *Ibid*. pp. 57-59.

⁴⁶ See S. Mitchell, Victorian Britain (New York and London: Garland, 1988).

The last public hanging was in 1868, in which year, also, the last convict ship sailed. Imprisonment for debt was abolished in 1869. It is relevant to Rashdall's writings on punishment and reform that legislation from the decade 1870-80 stressed the reforming rather than the punitive nature of prison.

There was great progress in technology. The first large power station was built in London in 1888. Cinema began at the Empire Theatre in 1896; while the first motor-bus was in service by the end of the century.

For Victorians the sense of well-being was increased by the possession of an extensive Empire. It may be judged in view of the intellectual reorientation caused by the emergent theory of evolution, together with the social, technological and political achievements of the century, which did not terminate in 1870, that late Victorians, in general, may, not unreasonably, have enjoyed a sense of optimism for the future progress of humanity.

Rashdall was by now becoming a public figure, in touch with the eminent. For example, he sent a presentation copy of his Doctrine and Development to Balfour, a future Prime Minister.⁴⁷ He was also representative of the University at Windsor in 1887 to present an address to the Queen on her Diamond Jubilee.⁴⁸

⁴⁷ Bod. Eng. Lett. MS c.345, f. 77, from 10 Downing St. (erased). Acknowledgement, undated but probably early Oct. 1898. Balfour-HR.

⁴⁸ Matheson, Life, p. 212.

2. The Edwardian Period.

Biography

During the Edwardian period from 1901-1910, Rashdall continued his work at Oxford. In addition to his academic and pastoral duties at New College, he was appointed as preacher at Lincoln's Inn, where he gave Sermons on the Church and its Institutions.

Travel abroad and within Britain was a regular feature of Rashdall's life. Important academically was his German study tour centred in Jena between October 1903 and March 1904.⁴⁹ The main purpose of this was to learn and speak German at a time when German Biblical scholarship was in the vanguard. Here he met German theologians, notably Harnack and Weiss.⁵⁰

Rashdall's seven-year contract, which stipulated that he should not marry, but reside in College as a celibate don, ended in 1905. He married in 1905 his sister's friend Constance. The arrangement by which he would reside, after his marriage, at an address adjacent to the College is described in a letter of April 1905.⁵¹

In 1909, a letter⁵² states that he has been offered a canonry at Hereford. He was reluctant to leave Oxford, but the Bishop, Dr Percival, agreed that he might reside in Oxford for part of the year, retaining his Fellowship.

On his arrival in Hereford in March, he reported, 'I entered upon my residence and this evening I preached in the Cathedral.'⁵³ Shortly after, he reported: 'The diocese is very conservative politically and theologically. The Prebendaries preach "... to denounce intellectualism and invite to an unflinching adherence to dogma."' ⁵⁴ But this report was preceded by the death in May of the monarch and thus the end of the Edwardian period.

Rashdall had continued to become a public figure during this time. Notably, he had attended the King's birthday reception in 1907;⁵⁵ and had preached at Westminster Abbey at Whitsun 1908.⁵⁶

⁴⁹ NC MS 25th Oct. 1903, etc.

⁵⁰ Ibid. 4th March 1904.

⁵¹ Ibid. 30th April 1905.

⁵² Ibid. 2nd Oct. 1909.

⁵³ Ibid. 20th March 1910.

⁵⁴ Ibid. 8th Aug. 1910. HR to "Rowland."

⁵⁵ Ibid. 16th May 1907.

⁵⁶ Ibid. 16th May 1908.

Theology at the University.

Since Rashdall retained his residence and scholarly work at Oxford throughout the Edwardian decade, its personnel and activities continued to be important areas of his reflection and dialogue. I shall, therefore, comment on (i) some of the well-known Oxford theologians of the time, (ii) the continued discussions of the forum provided by the Society of Historical Theology, an influential body, in which Rashdall was still active.

(i) Senior or well-known theologians.

In comparison with the Victorian period, during which the water-shed after the death of Pusey occurred, there were few changes. Here I shall remark on some of those in office, either well-known or otherwise notable.

Of the eminent Professors cited above, Driver and Sanday remained in office throughout the period. During his long career, Sanday's theological position was not static. In general, he moved from a somewhat conservative position to a more liberal one. He is listed by Stephenson⁵⁷ in his authoritative work as one of the '*Dramatis Personae* of English Modernism.' Rashdall and Sanday were acquainted.⁵⁸

Ince, who had been Professor of Divinity since 1878, and continued in the post till his death in 1910, was interested in the function of the Faculty of Theology and the education of the clergy at the University. (Rashdall was concerned by and had strong views on the inadequacy of clerical education.) He preached before the University in 1904, advocating – as Rashdall did – the removal of the Athanasian Creed from the liturgy.

Moberly was followed as Regius Professor of Pastoral Theology by R L Ottley. The latter's very conservative work on The Doctrine of the Incarnation⁵⁹ was followed two years later by a contribution to Lux Mundi. This, the last essay in the book, is on Christian Ethics. In it, he stresses that God is an 'Ethical Being,' an emphasis central to Rashdall's teaching. As a contributor to Lux Mundi he has credentials as one of the new Anglo-Catholics wishing to be regarded as open to

⁵⁷ A. M. G. Stephenson, Rise and Decline, p. 269.

⁵⁸ See Matheson, p. 102.

⁵⁹ Ottley, Doctrine of the Incarnation (London: Methuen, 1896).

liberal ideas. Rashdall, in a letter of 1897, had remarked, after having heard his Bamptons, that, 'in 1860 the saintly Otley would have been a persecuted heretic.'⁶⁰

Another contemporary of Rashdall was W. R. Inge. They had both been fellows at New College, Rashdall from 1888 and Inge from 1889, until 1905. Inge moved to Cambridge as Lady Margaret Professor in 1907. Rashdall was mistrustful of Inge's mysticism, (as will be shown in Chapter 5). In a letter Rashdall remarks, 'He likes to take the liberty himself to hold views which he does not think it good for the vulgar to know about.'⁶¹ Thus, although not sympathetic to him, Rashdall does portray Inge as a theologian of independent and untraditional views. Inge was a Modernist.

It may be judged that, of this later generation, the balance had changed. The dogmatism of the earlier theologians at the University was no longer dominant; liberal theology was in a markedly stronger position at Oxford.

(ii) The Society of Historical Theology.

Volume 2 of the Society's Proceedings recording the meetings from 1900, shows that Rashdall had been the President in November of that year. His active membership continued. The discussion of the meeting of October 1903 provides an example of the liberal policy of studying other religions and of sharing ideas; at this meeting the President, Montefiore,⁶² an eminent Jewish scholar, spoke on Rabbinic concepts of repentance.⁶³ (His theme would have been well-known to some, especially OT scholars, but this was a disparate group.) He outlined the two inconsistent strains of OT doctrine, the prophetic and the priestly, the latter emphasising the sacrificial. He pointed to the Rabbinic teaching that usually, even in the Pentateuch, sacrifice is linked with involuntary offences and is not considered efficacious for serious sins; and continued with the theme of a deeper view of repentance, which grew up after the destruction of the Second Temple, when sacrifice was no longer possible. His subject in this Lecture was linked closely to the Christian doctrine of the atonement, a study of major importance to Rashdall, as will be shown in Chapter 2.

⁶⁰ NC MS 10th March 1897.

⁶¹ NC 27th March 1904, from Neuchatel, Switzerland. HR to Webb.

⁶² C. J. G. Montefiore (1858-1938). Born in the same year as Rashdall, he was a life-long friend. A Jewish scholar, he supported 'Liberal Judaism.' Educated at Balliol College Oxford, student of Jowett and T. H. Green. Wrote on OT, NT, and, especially, Rabbinic literature.

⁶³ Proceedings, (1903-4), pp. 5-38. Montefiore.

That NT criticism was not ruled out in their discussions is clear in the following two examples of contributions of the years 1908-9. **B. H. Streeter**, an Oxford NT scholar, spoke at the general Meeting in May, on 'The Special characteristics of Q and the Synoptic Gospels.'⁶⁴ (It was not only at these meetings that Rashdall met Streeter, on whose works he published comments.) **Percy Gardner**⁶⁵ spoke in May 1909 on 'The Speeches of S. Paul in Acts,' in which he analysed each Pauline speech, remarking that the author 'would have no scruple in composing speeches for his characters.'⁶⁶

Clearly, the Society of Historical Theology was a vehicle for exposition of theological attitudes acceptable in liberal circles. Its ecumenical membership, its emphasis on the contribution of archaeology and other secular learning, its willingness to search other religions for links with biblical writing, its neutral and analytical approach to both OT and NT; indicate that it was a powerful centre for the propagation of liberal theology. This Society has been described in some detail, since Rashdall was a contributor to and benefactor of its unique opportunity for wide dialogue.

Social Background of the Edwardian Period.

The first decade of the twentieth century has been described as 'a time of more extravagance and less restraint.'⁶⁷ There was a political shift in 1905. After the conservative government led by Balfour, a liberal administration was formed which would continue till 1916. Rashdall comments on this in his letters. He remarks, 'It is pleasant to see the Government going to pieces.'⁶⁸ The change of government affected the policy on religious education in schools, a matter in which Rashdall was interested. (This will be mentioned in Chapter 4.)

Although his social work was an integral part of his religion, - for his doctrinal stance was strongly ethical, - Rashdall did not identify himself with a socialist party.

⁶⁴ Ibid. Vol. 3, Jan. 1909, pp. 37-38.

⁶⁵ Percy Gardner. Professor of classical archaeology at Oxford, 1887-1925. In the last half of his life he wrote expositions of Christianity. Prominent modernist. Rashdall corresponded with him about his work Exploratio Evangelica in 1907. NC MS 10th Nov. 1907.

⁶⁶ Proceedings, (1908-9), pp. 42-45 at p. 42. Gardner.

⁶⁷ A. Briggs, 'The Political Scene,' pp. 45-102 at p. 45, in S. Nowell-Smith (ed.), Edwardian England 1901-1914 (London: OUP, 1964).

⁶⁸ NC MS 12th Nov. 1903.

He explained his position when he wrote an article in 1908, asking, 'Is the Christian necessarily a Socialist?'⁶⁹ The title implies a negative answer. He states: 'The purpose of the Paper is to protest against the growing tendency to identify Christianity with economic socialism. It is either mistaken about what Christianity is or what socialism is or both.'⁷⁰

Davidson, Archbishop of Canterbury from 1903 to 1928, - who introduced the form 'Queen Mother' for Alexandra, - aimed to strengthen the link between the Church and the Monarch. Official religion was slightly, but not seriously in decline. It maintained organisations supportive of the working population.⁷¹

Mechanisation in transport increased. Motor vehicles, electric trains and trams, and aeroplanes were used from around the beginning of the century; while the first Zeppelin flew in 1900.

In the technological field generally there were great advances. Developing telegraphy, important for the British Empire was, notably, used by Roosevelt in sending a message of greeting to Edward VII. The participation of a wide public in royal events was aided pictorially by new techniques; for Victoria's Diamond Jubilee (1897), her funeral, (1901) and Edward's Coronation (1902) were 'fully filmed,' while Edward's funeral was shown on cinematograph.

There was no shortage of domestic labour for the upper and middle classes. For example, when the Rashdalls married in 1905, they had three servants including cook.⁷²

Further developments, the results of which were clear only some years later, will be mentioned in the following Section.

Although this short reign is not a discrete entity, it was, in general, a time of peace and continuing progress. Together with the earlier years of the next reign, the hope that historical time could be viewed as a continuum of development and advance was not hard to maintain.

It is held by sceptical commentators that this *Weltanschauung* was the presupposition of the liberal theology of the period; and that, since it proved

⁶⁹'Is the Christian necessarily a Socialist?' *Economic Review*, no.18, 1908, 315-336.

⁷⁰ Ibid. at pp. 315-316.

⁷¹ S. Mews, 'Religion,' pp. 470-482 at pp. 470-474, in C Wrigley (ed.), *A Companion to Early Twentieth Century Britain* (Oxford: Blackwell, 2003).

⁷² NC MS 5th Oct. 1905.

temporary, was later the cause of disillusionment. More specifically, this is said of Modernism and, as he was a leading Modernist, of Rashdall. It is one of the aims of my thesis to show that Rashdall's work, having more permanent foundations than those induced by an easy optimism, was not invalidated.

3. The Period of George V

Biography

This period covers Rashdall's life in Hereford as Canon, and his time in Carlisle, to which he was appointed Dean in 1917, and where he remained until his death in 1924.

(i) At Hereford.

During this two-centred phase of his life, with ecclesiastical duties focused in Hereford and an academic residence maintained at Oxford, Rashdall matured, ever active in a variety of spheres. His extra-mural work included encouragement of women's higher education, in which he was unlike many of his fellow-clergy. His ecumenical interest was both an extension of his work outside the University and the Diocese; and a feature of his radical theology - for such an attitude was still, in the early twentieth century, very unusual. He was immersed in a number of other controversies, of which a major one was the liturgical use of the Athanasian Creed. In his personal life, he was aware of diminishing physical strength, and of a climate unfavourable to his health at Hereford. A highlight of his career was his visit to America from September to December 1913, during which time he gave sermons and lectures, ecumenical in their scope.⁷³

During the years from 1914 the War deepened his experience, not only in practical ways, but in sharpening his reflections on evil and pain. This phase ended when in 1917 he received appointment as Dean of Carlisle.

(ii) At Carlisle.

The post of Dean entailed not only ecclesiastical but also civic duties. This was symbolised at the Institution and Installation, when Rashdall was received by the Bishop, Dr. Diggle, the Chancellor, the Mayor, and the President of the Free Church Federal Council. The Bishop, a liberal Churchman, was sympathetic to him. Thus he entered on his final phase. Controversy concerning Rashdall continued during his time at Carlisle over a wide range of theological questions, of which the two most important were: the debates on Atonement that arose from the publication in 1919 of his 1915 Bampton Lectures, entitled The Idea of Atonement in Christian Theology;

⁷³ NC MS; various letters from 10th Sept. 1913. For Matheson's selection, see his Life, pp. 142-146.

and the lecture given at the Modern Churchmen's Union at Girton in August 1921, on 'Christ as Logos and Son of God.' His lecture caused a sensation, not only in theological circles but also in the national press. (These two controversies are discussed in Chapters 2 and 3 respectively.)

As an expression of sympathy with his ordeal, especially as Rashdall's health was clearly deteriorating, Archbishop Davidson invited him to stay at Lambeth for the Assembly there in November 1921.⁷⁴

From 1921, Rashdall's health rapidly declined. His mother died in 1923. Thus his remarkable correspondence with her terminated. However, in the last year of his life, he continued to write controversial letters to others; notably to the Bishop, on the Atonement. Physically weak, and near to death, he continued the debate. It was typical of Rashdall that the correspondence, vehicle of his determination to continue the dialogue, engaged his final thoughts and his last efforts.

Social Background of the Period of George V.

When the peaceful years of the previous reign were terminated by the First World War in 1914, all areas of life were affected. Rashdall, who often refers to it in his letters, supported the War in general, recording that he was at first doubtful about its justification, but was finally convinced by the government's case.⁷⁵ He joined a 'volunteer corps,' and helped with Prisoners of War.

In the area of employment, shortage of male civilian workers was severe. Conscription, though allowing for 'reserved occupations,' took effect from 1916. Domestic workers, abundant before 1914, became scarce. At the Carlisle Deanery, the Rashdalls had only three parlour maids left.⁷⁶ There were other domestic shortages; Rashdall refers to (food) rationing.⁷⁷ But the use of the vacuum cleaner from Edwardian times alleviated domestic toil.⁷⁸ (The refrigerator had been available from Edwardian times. Notably, Rashdall was to receive one for his birthday from his mother in 1912.⁷⁹)

⁷⁴ Ibid. 16th Oct. 1921.

⁷⁵ Ibid. 31st Jan. 1916.

⁷⁶ Ibid. 14th Jan. 1918. HR says 'This reduces them to three.'

⁷⁷ Ibid. 23rd Feb. 1918.

⁷⁸ Mentioned by M. Laski in 'The Domestic Scene,' pp. 141-212 at 144 in Nowell-Smith, *Ed. Eng.*

⁷⁹ NC MS 25th. June 1912.

These technological advances illustrate the fact that inventions based on technology sometimes alleviated war-time conditions. The reverse is seen in the case of a branch of research in industrial chemistry. This research, to produce synthetic fertilisers from atmospheric nitrogen, was begun in the previous decade, in Germany, with the intention of making available increased amounts of food for a growing population. However, it now acquired a lethal use, since it was discovered that the nitrogen released in the process could facilitate the production of explosives.⁸⁰

New forms of transport, of which a sinister and dramatic example was the Zeppelin, were also used in the hostilities. (Rashdall mentions high explosives, and a Zeppelin firing on London, where his mother lived, in 1915.⁸¹)

Private transport continued to become motorised. In particular, after 1918, motor-cars multiplied, becoming an acquisition, not only of the upper but of the middle classes. Rashdall records a striking example: an accident, in which a car drove into him and the Bishop.⁸²

Two expanding areas of education may be noted. Both received Rashdall's support:

(i) *University education for women.* Having earlier actively supported Lady Margaret Hall, Oxford, Rashdall lectured at 'Holloway College,' Egham (a women's College of London University) in 1912.⁸³

(ii) *Extended part-time education.* Rashdall continued to support this, giving various lectures, available to a wider audience.

As Dean, Rashdall arranged and addressed official services during the War and at the Armistice. In these his enthusiasm for ecumenism was manifested. However, the anti-climax to the periods of peace and plenty offered by the sufferings of war, which were not perceived by him as an obstacle to belief, in no way changed his theological stance; for his theodicy was found in his doctrine of immortality.

The post-war years were marked by disillusionment when achievement and advance were less obviously the *leitmotiv* of society. It had been perceived that, as in the classical case of high explosives mentioned above, evil could result from good

⁸⁰ Ubbelohde, 'Scientific,' pp. 243-244, in Nowell-Smith, *Ed. Eng.*

⁸¹ NC MS 30th May 1915 and 27th Oct. 1915 respectively.

⁸² *Ibid.* 7th Feb. 1918.

⁸³ *Ibid.* 4th June 1912.

rather than the reverse. It is said that the commonest prefix of those days was 're',⁸⁴ to return to the idealised past was the *zeitgeist*.

Thus, it is often assumed that the decline of Modernism in particular, and of liberal theology in general, was engendered by disillusionment - after the evil and destruction manifested by the War - with the idea of progress and the potential of human reason, when allowed to function freely. This explanation may, in part, be countered with the suggestion that attitudes of liberal theology had been accepted and assimilated. The intransigence, and, in particular, the Biblical literalism, of the generation of Pusey had largely gone.

However true this is, the attitude of brusque dismissal of liberal theology often expressed in the period following both World Wars manifests a more positive reaction and rejection.⁸⁵ Of Rashdall himself, to account for the neglect of his works is more complex, since he is not only a theologian. An important factor (often quoted, so I shall not detail, but merely acknowledge it) is that the philosophy of Personal Idealism, taught by T. H. Green,⁸⁶ to which Rashdall subscribed, fell out of favour. But Rashdall's professional career, and the most important part of his academic work was that of a theologian. Pragmatically, his philosophy and his theology are discrete entities; as a theologian, he is rarely dependent on the former, either in his sermons, or in his academic engagement.

The key areas of Rashdall's theology discussed will be: his theory of the Atonement in Christian doctrine; his Christology; the doctrine of the Church as he presents it; and his views on Immortality. These are all essential to an understanding of his thought.

⁸⁴ D. Thomas, England in the Twentieth Century, 1914 - 63 (London: Cape, 1964), p. 13.

⁸⁵ Roger Lloyd, for example, is a severe critic of the Modernists in The Church of England 1900-1965 (London: SCM, 1966). See especially pp. 112 ff. However, Lloyd does not argue that Rashdall himself was spiritually deficient. He says, on the contrary, 'His spirit was profoundly, ineradicably Christian. The two most characteristic features of his character were a deep sense of holiness, and a vivid realization and hatred of sin,' (p. 94). Nor does Lloyd argue consistently that Rashdall was unrepresentative. Although he attempts to divide Modernists into 'two wings' on p. 94, Lloyd has already weakened his own case by stating that Rashdall is 'the head & tail of Anglicanism Modernism in 1900, ... ' (p. 93).

⁸⁶ T. H. Green (1836-82). Whyte's Professor of moral philosophy at Oxford 1878-1882.

My intention is to study his work, not in the form of an isolated monograph, but as an account of his dynamic role in the dialogue which took place among scholars during his life-time, as he responded to or initiated debates in the key areas which claimed the attention of contemporary theologians.

Chapter 2. The Doctrine of the Atonement

Introduction.

Throughout the history of the Christian Church, from sub-apostolic times, there had been attempts to formulate this doctrine, the purpose of which was to investigate the idea that the death of Christ had effected an atonement between God and humankind. Etymologically, the English word 'atonement', with which we are chiefly concerned, in its use by English-speaking writers, has a neutral sense, a state of being or becoming 'at one.' Technically, however, as used by theologians, it is applied to theories concerning the soteriological significance of the death of Christ. Paradoxically, although it is held to be a central doctrine, it is not formulated as *de fide* in the Creeds, nor is its meaning discussed, even in that longest and most dogmatic of statements, the Athanasian Creed.

In Rashdall's life-time, the central debate concerned the question whether the Atonement was an objective event, affecting the relationship between God and man on a cosmic scale; or whether its effect was subjective, explicable in terms of individual influence. As a background to Rashdall's approach, it may be noted that the objective theory, held by traditional writers, continued to be expounded using the model of a 'substitution' or 'transaction.' Among liberal scholars, Rashdall was a proponent of the subjective theory.

It is the aim of this Chapter to expound and analyse his doctrine of the atonement. The structure of the second section is determined by the date of the publication of his major work in 1919, which is the central event in his work on atonement.

Section 1

The Earlier Years to 1905.

After the publication of his major work, The Idea of the Atonement in Christian Theology¹ in 1919, a written version of his Bampton lectures of 1915, Rashdall was known outstandingly as a writer on the doctrine of the atonement, among scholars and

¹ HR, The Idea of the Atonement in Christian Theology (London: Macmillan, 1st ed. 1919). References here from reprint, 1925.

that section of the public, whether clerical or lay, who were interested in theological matters.

The theme developed in this major work was however preceded by earlier expositions of his theory of atonement, published in learned journals and in his first important collection of published sermons of 1898, Doctrine and Development.² These contributed to the contemporary discussions and included comment on the writings of earlier authors.

In the first section I consider Rashdall's writings on Atonement in the earlier part of his life and career from the later years of the nineteenth century to 1905. All these witness to his deep interest in the subject; the doctrine was already being discussed by earlier theologians, some of whom are referred to by Rashdall, especially in his major work of 1919.

The Section will be subdivided. The first Part surveys the period to the end of the nineteenth century; including works of earlier theologians, and of Rashdall's writings both published and unpublished, on Atonement; together with Articles by him on the related subject of Punishment; while the second Part covers writings in the early years of the twentieth century to 1905. A relevant sermon from his Christus in Ecclesia,³ published in 1904, has been included here.

I: 1856 - 1900.

Earlier works on Atonement.

Among theologians who discussed the subject a liberal tradition had arisen in Germany, of which the best known proponent in England, according to Rashdall, was Harnack⁴

In England, the traditionally accepted theory was challenged by B. Jowett in his Essay in Essays and Reviews and his Epistles of St. Paul.⁵ I shall not discuss these in detail here, as they are not specifically works on the Atonement, but note that, at the time, they provoked serious disapproval from the ecclesiastical authorities.

² HR, Doctrine and Development (London: Methuen, 1898). Page references given in the main text.

³ HR, Christus in Ecclesia (Edinburgh: T& T Clark, 1904).

⁴ HR writes on him in 'Harnack and Loisy,' Principles and Precepts, ch. 24, pp.228-236.

⁵ B Jowett, Epistles of St. Paul (2nd ed. London: Murray, 1859).

Here, in addition to Rashdall's writings, I shall review works on the subject by other theologians.

McLeod Campbell, The Nature of the Atonement.⁶

The popularity of this book is indicated by its numerous editions. Before writing this book, Campbell had been subject to a formal condemnation by Scottish divines. Because his teaching was declared contrary to Scripture and the Westminster Confession of faith he was deposed from his ministry in 1831. He was, specifically, charged with opposing the doctrine of 'conditional grace' and of teaching, instead, 'universal atonement.' Thus he denied the 'high Calvinistic doctrine of election' according to which 'universal atonement' was not possible, for only the elect could be affected by grace.⁷

Campbell holds the traditional Calvinistic emphasis on the doctrine of revelation of sin; an experience which takes the form of a sequence of perceptions: blindness to sin, followed by a moment of conversion, resulting in 'newly awakened sinners.' (p. 41f.) Thus 'a man' understands the Atonement retrospectively (his underlining). Only after such an experience can he (the awakened sinner) understand the 'prospective' (Campbell's underlining) reference to 'eternal life.' While he speaks of the second with some emphasis '...divine light filling humanity...', of the first he uses traditional conservative terms, referring to '...sin and guilt,' (linked to) 'the righteous condemnation and wrath of God'

The inevitable question from objectors is now considered - 'Some, seeing this, ask why not the forgiveness without the atonement?' This is answered with the dogmatic reply; 'they' have not understood 'his wrath against sin (p.47f.) ...' or 'the real sinfulness of sin; ...'

It may be said of Campbell's work that his exegesis, although based on a firmly transactional doctrine is, however, different in its emphasis. For him, the love of God to man is the primary cause of the transaction, not the secondary effect. (p. 46) Using again his *leitmotiv* he comments that, 'in our systems of theology the stress has been

⁶ J. McLeod Campbell, Nature of the Atonement (1st ed. Cambridge: Macmillan, 1856; used here, new ed., Edinburgh: Handsel, 1996).

⁷ The heresy, in the view of the Scottish authorities, was derived from or identifiable with a work of 1645 by Edward Fisher, The Marrow of Modern Divinity. See Torrance, Intro. pp.2ff.

too much on the retrospective and not enough on the prospective, or beneficent change in the “sinner”.’

Although the doctrine differs greatly from Rashdall’s, it is this changed emphasis which has led Rashdall, in his work of 1919, to include Campbell’s name in a list of those who, ‘in various ways and in various degrees,’ have ‘contributed’ to a transformed view of the Atonement.⁸

Smeaton, *The Doctrine of the Atonement*.⁹

This work, by G. S. Smeaton,¹⁰ appeared in 1868, followed by a second edition in 1870, in the years of Rashdall’s childhood. Sharing a Scottish background with Campbell, he also speaks in the idiom of Calvinism. He will treat the atonement doctrine, he says, as a matter of ‘revelation’ drawn simply from the scriptures.

Smeaton expresses disapproval of those theologians who hold it does not matter whether the death of Christ is ‘the ground of pardon, or the mere assurance of it...whether the death of Jesus is ...a vicarious sacrifice, or an expression of divine love...’ His exposition of ‘The weighty reasons which rendered it expedient and necessary.... the Surety should die by a death which was accursed of God’ and his quotation of Galatians 3.13. - ‘Cursed is every-one that hangeth on a tree’ - which he refers to as ‘this quotation from Moses,’ indicate both his adherence to the Calvinistic doctrine of penal substitution, and his Biblical fundamentalism.

Moreover, he asserts, God is bound to act in a certain way: – ‘He must do so from what he owes Himself.’ Thus, the determinist view of a moral law, by which God himself is limited, as assumed by Anselm in Cur Deus Homo is also presupposed in order to explain the necessity of objective substitution. (Anselm’s model of Atonement, however, is not of a penal substitution.)

The chief interest here of his exegesis is that both the intransigent adherence to Biblical fundamentalism and the idea that punishment is a moral necessity, or due payment, are in complete contrast to the doctrine expounded by Rashdall.

⁸ HR, Atonement, p.438.

⁹ G. Smeaton, Doctrine of the Atonement (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1st ed. 1868, 2nd ed., used here, 1870).

¹⁰ Smeaton was the Professor of Exegetical Theology at Edinburgh.

R. W. Dale, *The Atonement*.

Smeaton's work was followed shortly afterwards by a further work on the Atonement written by R. W. Dale, a Congregational minister.¹¹ The Lectures were published in 1875,¹² while Rashdall was still at Harrow.

This work is important in a study of Rashdall, who, in his Idea of Atonement of 1919, opposed Dale's ideas in great detail, even including an Appendix, to summarise his objections.

Dale states his 'intention is simply to show that the Death of Christ is conceived and described as being the objective ground on which we receive Remission of sin.' (p. ix) His main enquiry is posed in the form of the antithetical option between the death of Christ as having 'a direct relation to the remission of sins' (the objective view) or the idea that it is 'simply a great appeal of the Divine love to the human race'; 'God's method of capturing the human heart.' (p.11) His proposal for the Lectures is to demonstrate the truth of the first.

Further reference to Dale will be made in the context of my review of the works of Rashdall in which he is criticised: first, in this Section, in connection with Doctrine and Development, and later, with reference to Rashdall's Idea of Atonement, in the second Section.

Rashdall's Writings, 1887-1900

(a) Published Works.

1. Doctrine and Development.

Doctrine and Development is a collection of university Sermons given by Rashdall mainly in the last decade of the nineteenth century. It is his first published volume of theology. His general theological position is outlined in the Preface: doctrine, he says, is the result of a development; it is not static, but, since the development is unfinished, must change further; theology is passing through a period of reconstruction, the result of changes in 'Philosophy, Science and historical criticism,' (p.x) which affect the world view of society. Thus his contention (p.ix) that 'there

¹¹ Dale had been asked to give a series of lectures at the request of the Committee of the Congregational Union of England and Wales on the Atonement.

¹² R. W. Dale, The Atonement (Lond.on: Hodder & Stoughton), 1875.

must be some “‘giving up” of accepted doctrines’ - and, in particular, the idea of verbal inspiration, and ancient views of the universe, - prefaces a collection of sermons on a wide range of doctrines.

Rashdall’s emphasis that the beliefs of a particular culture are affected by the knowledge and socio-economic conditions prevailing at the time is applied with special aptness to the Christian doctrine of the death of Christ. Thus he remarks; ‘men’s ideas of what is just and reasonable are different from what they were in the days of St. Anselm and Luther’ (p.ix). Three sermons in this volume expound Rashdall’s doctrine of Atonement. These are: The Abelardian doctrine of the Atonement (VIII) ; Justification (IX) ; and The Idea of Sacrifice (X).

(VIII) The Abelardian idea of the Atonement.

Text: ‘Even as the Son of Man came not to be ministered unto, but to minister, and to give his life a ransom for many.’¹³

This Sermon is an early example of Rashdall’s expositions on Atonement. Rashdall claimed support for his theory from Abelard,¹⁴ a medieval theologian, of whom he speaks with admiration and strong agreement.

In this Sermon Rashdall first considers the *crux theologica* ‘a ransom for many,’ Gr. Λύτρον ἀντὶ πολλῶν. He admits that ἀντὶ rather than ὑπέρ (the commoner preposition) ‘does mean “instead of,” “in place of”.’ In spite of this, he denies that a theory of substitution is implied by the text; rather, the leading idea is of Christ’s death as an example (his underlining) and is ‘the culminating act of a self-sacrificing life.’ (p. 129)¹⁵

Rashdall has little time for any theory of substitution, by which man’s sins are expiated by the sacrifice of Christ’s death, the ‘price’ being paid, either to God or to the devil. (The latter idea, known as the ‘classical’ or ‘ransom’ theory of the

¹³ HR, D and D, pp. 128-145. Text: Matt. 20.28.

¹⁴ Peter Abelard (or Abailard) 1079 – 1142/43, was born at le Pallet in Brittany. During his early years, he already challenged the views of his masters. He was attacked for his theology of the Trinity, forced to leave his monastery at St. Denis and to burn his *Theologia Summi Boni*. He was denounced by St. Bernard of Clairvaux to Rome in 1140. A list of his propositions was condemned at the Council of Sens. He was finally received at the priory of Cluny after a reconciliation with Bernard negotiated by Peter the Venerable.

¹⁵ Page numbers given in the main text.

Atonement, was the most prevalent in the first millennium AD.) Rashdall interprets the metaphor positively. 'The idea is not that of a debt undertaken, still less of a punishment submitted to instead of us, but of a ransom paid to win us back from slavery or captivity.' (p.130)

He then proceeds to a detailed study of Church history. Of the early fathers, Irenaeus and Origen are singled out for comment: Irenaeus first hardened the 'ransom' theory by elaborating it; for example, ' "Christ compensated our disobedience in the matter of the tree by His obedience on the tree," ' while Origen and later fathers complicated the account still further. But Rashdall emphasises that in the patristic church the Atonement was not a central doctrine. '... the theory of a ransom owed to Satan...' is 'arbitrary, childish, and immoral.' (p.133) In the early church, there was a medley of ideas, described as 'gold, silver, ... wood, hay, stubble ...,' of which we must ' ... reverence the more precious ... ' and leave the others to 'their inevitable decay.'

However, he remarks with more approval on two medieval theologians, Anselm and Abelard, by whom the 'demolition' of the theory was 'effected.' He admits, though, that Anselm's theory (also a 'transaction' model) 'was open to some of the same objections as its predecessor.' For the *Cur Deus Homo* also posits a debt to be paid, in this case not to the devil, but either to an 'abstract Justice' or to God.

Rashdall then arrives at the 'very different theory' of Abelard (p.135). In the subsequent exegesis, it is claimed that Abelard is the first advocate of the theory of an Atonement which works through example or influence; not as an objective event at an identifiable point in time, but a subjective process. Abelard is quoted at length. A short extract summarises the argument, '... Accordingly our redemption lies in that supreme love working in us ...through the passion of Christ, which not only liberates us from the slavery of sin, but acquires for us the true liberty of the sons of God;' (p. 136) Abelard's doctrine, Rashdall states, has three essential points:

- (1) 'There is no notion' of 'vicarious punishment' or of 'satisfaction' or of 'objectively valid sacrifice.'
- (2) Not only his death but the whole life of Christ, through its attractive influence, has atoning effectiveness. It 'excites the love of man, moves his gratitude, shows him what God would have him be'
- (3) The 'effect' is 'real,' 'not a mere legal fiction.'

Rashdall is indignant that Abelard's doctrine was opposed by Bernard of Clairvaux. He quotes a 'heresy' of Abelard in his statement to the Pope: 'I think, therefore, that the purpose and cause of the Incarnation was that He might illuminate the world by His wisdom, and excite it to the love of Himself.' (p. 138)

Finally, he comments on modern theologians. Quoting Abelard, he remarks that there are those who do not support this 'clear and intelligible doctrine;' who prefer either 'an objectively valid satisfaction or expiation;' or 'a mystical retrospective participation by Christians in the sufferings of Christ.' (p.140) He quotes and dismisses the views of 'Dr. Dale,' adding, 'After all, I cannot but feel that these modern theories of the Atonement are not very deeply held.'

Since Rashdall's reference to Abelard and his controversy with Dale are features of his later work of 1914, further comment will be made in the following Section.

(IX) Justification. Preached at St. Mary's, Oxford, 1895.

Text, 'Being justified by faith by his grace through the redemption that is in Jesus Christ'.¹⁶

In this Sermon, Rashdall discusses the sixteenth-century controversy concerning the meaning of 'justification.' He examines the Reformers' understanding of the concept as 'being counted or treated as righteous' by God, noting that, for them, justification was ... 'a sentence of acquittal, pronounced not in accordance with the facts of the case, ... but solely on account of the imputation to him [man] of the merits of Christ.' (pp.146f.) While it could be argued, he says, that the Greek δικαιόω (translated *justificare* in the Western Church) could be interpreted in this sense, the Catholic view that justification meant 'the actual making righteous' is preferable; is, as he puts it, 'more in harmony with the demands of Reason and of Conscience than that of the Reformers.' (p.148) Further, this interpretation 'will certainly commend itself to those who wish to see Theology brought into harmony with morality and with common sense.'

That God should punish the innocent instead of the guilty, that he should acquit the guilty instead of the innocent, that he should arbitrarily punish some and acquit others on account of the presence or absence of a certain quality called faith, which has in itself no connexion with any moral change – this is a

¹⁶ HR, D and D, pp. 146-163. Text, Rom. 3.24.

doctrine which is certainly not St. Paul's, and which certainly cannot be ours.
(pp.148-9)

The passage has been quoted at length since it encapsulates, at an early stage, the essence of Rashdall's atonement doctrine, stated negatively: its protest against the idea that 'vicarious punishment' should effect 'imputed righteousness,' which he regards as immoral, and his distrust of the Reformers' emphasis on faith, expressed in the aphorism *sola fide*. As for 'technical phrases of Theology,' or the 'half-believed survivals of them,' the effort to understand them 'may be a weariness to flesh and spirit'; and 'whether they meet with languid acceptance or with indignant rejection, may really stand between the soul and a rational acceptance of eternal truth.' (p.151)
(His insistence that doctrine must be rational is typical of his writings.)

Justification, in the sense of being, or having been made righteous, is effected by personal influence, which is seen in the self-sacrificing life and death of Jesus, brought about by Jesus' knowledge of and nearness to God. The Christian view of the office of Christ as Redeemer is therefore based on the 'doctrine as to His Person.' (p.153) It is not true that a sudden experience, or revelation, is a *sine qua non* of redemption.¹⁷ The 'proclamation of forgiveness' is inseparable 'from 'the love that inspires forgiveness.' (p.163)

In this Sermon, Rashdall has shown himself an overt advocate of the theory referred to by Smeaton and Dale with disapproval, for he has clearly written in support of the view that the Atonement is not an act of exchange, enabling God to forgive the 'sins of the world,' for which the death of Christ is effective. Catholic theology is 'not substantially wrong.' His message is that righteousness is imparted, not imputed, though he expresses it in less technical language. Finally, the 'changeless love of God,' he remarks strikingly, cannot have come into action 'for the first time' at the death of Christ. This is a dense Sermon, richly packed with ideas that would later be developed and expanded.

'*The Idea of Sacrifice*,' which is entirely consistent with the position taken in 'Justification,' but uses different models, will not be reviewed here, since, although it has multiple applications, it is especially relevant to the doctrine of the Eucharist. It will therefore be discussed in Chapter 4 (Theology of the Church).

¹⁷ HR does not use these words, but I believe they adequately express his meaning.

2. Christus in Ecclesia

Rashhdall describes this collection of sermons, preached at Lincoln's Inn between 1899 and 1904 as 'to some extent a supplement to, or continuation of, the volume entitled Doctrine and Development; ...' He adds, 'but in sermons limited to some five and twenty minutes it has not been possible to aim at the comparative fullness of treatment which is allowable in a University pulpit, and the theological questions dealt with are for the most part of a less fundamental order. Their object is to explain in a rational manner what has sometimes been called the institutional side of Christianity.'¹⁸

Because of the stated connection between the two works, a sermon included among the later collection on 'Penitence and Penitential Seasons'¹⁹ will be discussed here. Not intended to be an original vehicle of his thoughts, it need not be reviewed in great detail.

(XIV) Penitence and Penitential Seasons.

Text: 'Turn Thy face from my sins: Make me a clean heart, O God;'²⁰

The main homiletic teaching centres round the saying of moralists that the past is beyond recall; the result of past sins cannot be 'blotted out.' He comments, 'We feel that, to a certain extent, these truths are the very teaching of Christianity itself before it was corrupted by after-growths of semi-pagan practice, or crude and arbitrary theological system-making.' Later, this is expanded with ecclesiastical undertones. 'No expiation, or cancelling of the past, or compensation of the ill-doing, is possible or is demanded. It is a free pardon that is proclaimed by the teaching of Christ, not a pardon on some elaborate conditions, whether they take the form of sacerdotal expiations, or of accepting some cut and dried system of theological propositions, or of some mysterious feat of emotional legerdemain.'

A further theme is an extension of his thinking on punishment. Protestantism, he observes, has been 'too dogmatically reckless in assuming that because the sinner has repented, and because God accepts that repentance, there may not still be room ... for

¹⁸ Christus in Ecclesia (Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1904), p.vii.

¹⁹ *Ibid.* no. 14, pp.193-201.

²⁰ Text: Ps. 51. 9 and 10.

the improvement of the character by suffering – here and hereafter.’ (I shall comment on his views concerning the hereafter in Chapter 5).

It is not clear whether, in this context, Rashdall is speaking of ‘suffering - here’ (in this world) as self-imposed, - relevant to the penitential season, - or whether he speaks of a divine judgment. Some clarification would be helpful.

The theme is consistent with his other writings on punishment; it is useful, ‘not inconsistent with love’ if it ‘will do good.’ Moreover, where there is full repentance, punishment is unnecessary.

This is one of a series of sermons having an ecclesiastical reference. Because of its strictly limited time allowance, he has to leave unresolved some of the wide range of ideas introduced.

3. Writings on Punishment. 1890 – 1900.

Contemporary writers on Atonement had all, as already discussed, included in their theories as a central topic the question of divine punishment; some, in particular the Calvinists, affirmed it as a key factor in their interpretation of the doctrine; others with various degrees of intensity, denied that the death of Christ could be described as a ‘penal substitution.’ Attitudes to the nature and purpose of punishment were therefore closely linked to their exegeses.

In the last decade of the nineteenth century, concurrently with the Sermons of Doctrine and Development, Rashdall also wrote a series of Articles on punishment in the International Journal of Ethics,²¹ a philosophical journal.

First Article.

Rashdall considers here the case of homicide, intentional or unintentional, in primitive society, in which little difference was perceived between the two. The maxim was that “‘blood demands blood.” ’ (It is noted that in the Pentateuch account a limitation was introduced by the introduction of ‘cities of refuge’ for the unintentional act.) The ‘refined’ modern form of this, Rashdall suggests, is the retributive view of punishment, where the punishment is ‘an end in itself.’ Kant, who is quoted from

²¹HR, International Journal of Ethics : 1. Vol.2 (1891-2), pp.20-31; 2. Vol.5 (1894-5), pp.241-243; 3. Vol. 10 (1900), pp. 193-206. See MM, 25 p.21; 34 p.23; 91 p.38.

Philosophy of Law,²² insists on its incorporation in the penal law as a ‘categorical imperative.’²³ The graphic example is quoted that in the case of a society about to dissolve itself the last murderer in prison ought to be executed, even though it would have no deterrent effect. ‘There you have the retributive theory propounded by the prince of modern philosophers,’ Rashdall remarks.

He considers this hypothesis; his conclusion is that punishment is useless unless it results in amendment. If a comfortable prison were more deterrent than a harsh one, would it not be preferable (he becomes more specific) ‘to our present barbaric system?’

A modification by Bradley²⁴ is noted, namely that it is not necessary that the punishment should correspond ‘in amount’ to the offence; however, its purpose is still ‘for the sake of punishment.’²⁵ Rashdall argues in detail that this is inconsistent and illogical. Finally, he reviews briefly expedients for the application of punishment in the legal system. After pointing out that the law cannot go too far ahead of popular opinion, he states its reformatory as well as its deterrent effects. Although essentially a reformer, in these remarks he is quite practical, commenting, ‘Wickedness humbled and subdued’ is better than ‘wickedness successful and triumphant;’ ‘The state is entitled to repress immorality;’ and ‘Some do not understand wrong except by knowing of punishable offences.’

In this Article, Rashdall is realistic in discussing legal and social action, while insisting that punishment is justifiable as a means, but not *per se*, as a moral necessity.

The Second Article.

The second Article is entitled ‘Mr. Bradley on Punishment. An Explanation.’ The details of this esoteric essay will not be discussed here. Rashdall is replying to a ‘note appended’ by Bradley in the April Journal. In the note Bradley claims that Rashdall had misunderstood him in a previous number, in which Rashdall accused him of an ‘intuitive view’ of punishment. Rashdall apologises, if he has ‘ascribed to Mr. Bradley an opinion which he disdains.’ Bradley had denied teaching that ‘punishment consists in the infliction of pain for pain’s sake.’ Rather, pain is an accident of

²² Kant, Phil. of Law (HR cites: ET. Hoolie, 1887), pp. 195ff.

²³ Kant’s phrase for a moral law, unlike a merely expedient law.

²⁴ F. H. Bradley (1846-1924), philosopher; Hegelian.

²⁵ Bradley, Ethical Studies (1876), pp. 25, 26. (HR’s note)

retribution. However, Rashdall explains ironically, he is just trying to explain to himself Bradley's theory; but now it is even more 'unintelligible.'

Finally, Rashdall concludes that the theory to which he objected has now been withdrawn, but the one replacing it 'has not been adequately explained.' He dismisses Bradley's pronouncements, clinching the matter with the observation that 'the late Professor Green told me that he had once held the view of punishment maintained by Mr. Bradley,' but that 'when he came to work it out, he had to give it up.'

The interest of this repartee is not so much in the minutiae of the dispute, but that it illustrates the ironical style which Rashdall occasionally used effectively against his opponents.

The Third Article.

The title of the third Article is 'The Ethics of Forgiveness.' Rashdall explains: 'the duty of forgiveness cannot be thoroughly discussed' without first discussing the theory of punishment.

He states his position, without ambiguity, on 'the retributive theory.' It is 'irrational, immoral, and ... wholly unchristian;' continuing emphatically, 'To argue that punishment is "an end in itself" apart from its effect on a "spiritual being" is not "rational morality." ' Plato is quoted – an evil can be a good only relatively, as a means to an 'intrinsic good' or 'medicinally.' Further, it is argued that punishment cannot be 'a good' in order to assert the Moral Law. For neither is the Moral Law an "end in itself;" it, too, is a "means to an end" namely to promote 'the spiritual good of the man himself.'

The 'deterrent/utilitarian' aspect of punishment is reviewed. Rashdall returns to his main theme with enthusiasm. It is the retributive theory that is wrong, being based on 'a lifeless fetish styled the Moral Law,' which 'demands the immolation of victims to avenge its injured *amour propre* ' Those who support retribution are indulging their 'passion' above 'Moral Reason.'

Having established his position on this beyond a doubt, Rashdall addresses the titular subject. The retributive theory has no 'account of the duty of forgiveness.'

The question is raised – Can we first punish, and then forgive?²⁶ This is easier in the case of legal than of personal offences. Of the second, he comments, realistically, that it would be ‘disastrous’ if ‘anger and resentment’ were not shown at ‘personal rudeness ... or general want of respect ...’

Turning to the theological aspect, he arrives at what he calls ‘a few rather bald and dogmatic propositions.’

- (1) The forgiveness of God is not an ‘optional extra,’ available only after a ‘supernatural assurance.’
- (2) We must not hold that the fate of some is to be ‘tormented’ and of others to ‘escape punishment altogether.’ (His writings on the after-life, expanded and refined throughout his life, will be discussed in Chapter 5.)
- (3) The ‘atoning work of the death of Christ ... is found in the effect made upon the human soul ... by the influence of his character, and by the conviction that in that human love of Christ there is a revelation of the Divine.’

It may be thought that, in this long Article, Rashdall has sometimes lost sight of the practical issues he has raised. His theological conclusion is somewhat detached from the rest of the Article.

However, the first part functions as a further clarification of his philosophical position, working through detailed exposition of his views on retribution and its alternatives, while the last part states briefly the kernel of his doctrine of Atonement expanded much more fully in his theological writings.²⁷

²⁶ The question of the order of punishment and forgiveness appears to have been one of the discussion points in writings on atonement. Cf. C. Gore, in The Reconstruction of Belief : Belief in Christ (London: Murray, 1921), p. 594, ‘ “Heard, forgiven, punished” was the record of God’s dealings ... ’

²⁷ It should be noted that in the posthumous collection of HR’s works Principles and Precepts (Oxford: Blackwell, 1927), a sermon written in the same year as the third International Journal of Ethics Article and preached at Lincoln’s Inn appears. It goes over much the same ground. Ambiguities are again highlighted, notably the difficulty of ruling out retribution in a legal context. However, although the emphases are somewhat different, the material is so similar that a detailed review of it is not necessary here.

These articles supply further background, in a more academic register, for his atonement doctrine, by detailing his views on punishment in general and retribution in particular.

(b) Unpublished Sermons.

Rashdall was, at the same time as his published works, writing and preaching sermons for his congregations, in a form which expounds his teaching on a more popular level.

1. Easter Sermon.

An Easter sermon of 1887,²⁸ preached on the text of Romans 4. 23-25. is entitled 'Raised for our Justification.' I summarise his manuscript with quotations.

You will generally find, I think, that those people ... who are most fond of talking about Justification always tell us that it is Christ's death which justifies us and Christ's death alone. ... in the very next Chapter St Paul talks about this being justified by the blood. But when we find S. Paul now speaking about Christ's Resurrection as justifying, ... we cannot separate one part of Christ's teaching from another in the hard and fast ... way in which it is too often done. The whole work of Christ justifies. His whole life was a life of sacrifice. ... But what is the meaning of this mysterious word 'justification?'

He feels bound to touch on its meaning. Does it mean God will hold men as just when they are not? Can God 'blind' himself, and 'make believe' we are righteous?

... I must say boldly the thing is perfectly inconceivable. ... that the Son of God should have come into the world, not that mankind might be made better, but only that, without being better, they might be held to be better, whether by God or man. [Illegible passage] Yet what should we think of a human parent who never forgave? (He treats his children as better than they are. [My summary.]) Now how is this conduct to be defended? In only one way that I can see, - that is because forgiving a child or a man - forgiving a wrong is very often the best way to make the wrong-doer better. But how often to treat men according to their deserts is simply to harden [them.], ... whereas on the other hand, to forgive him, - to show you love him ... to treat (trust ?) him as if he were better, ... is the way to make him better: ... though that 'better self' may be very weak and seldom manifested. And surely it is so with the Heavenly Father. Christ came (?) to teach us that God is indeed a Father: and as a father he will treat us as a Father will treat us, 'as better than we deserve,'

²⁸ PH MS Box A. 1. (15)

... but only in order that he may make us better than we are. In that sense and in that sense only, I can believe that through Christ's death and Resurrection we are justified, (that is, held righteous without being so,) 'Herein is love, not that we loved God but that God first loved us.' God in Christ has treated us as better than we are. ... if it moves us to gratitude and love and effort after Holiness Only if we make [the end of life?] to live like Sons of God will the work of Christ justify.'

So, in this early sermon, Rashdall demythologises the sixteenth century Protestant concept of 'imputed grace,' teaching that it is meaningless unless it results in a more righteous life.

We may have reservations about the teaching that forgiveness, the expression of which cannot be guaranteed to produce ethical improvement, is appropriate only in this functional sense. In the context of a sermon, however, oversimplification is not surprising.

2. Good Friday Sermon.

In 1895, Rashdall preached a Good Friday sermon at Bethnal Green,²⁹ on John 3.16; 'because he laid down his life for us,' introducing his subject by saying that Christians should have founded their teaching about the death of Christ on this text. I shall summarise and quote from the sermon.

First he explains that the word 'for' does not mean 'instead of' but 'on behalf of.' His second point is that Christ's death is set before us as an example. He opposes the doctrine of penal substitution by a negative argument, a *reductio ad absurdum*.

If Christ's death was a punishment, it could not be an example to us. If that were so, we could not be told to go and do – in our poor, imperfect way – what Christ did. For, though Christ was innocent, we are not; we could not lay down our lives for others in the sense of bearing a punishment which they had deserved. If the punishment had been paid once for all, ... there would be no need to tell others to go and suffer it again. The penalty would have been paid; there would be (?) nothing left for anyone else to pay.

His next point, one that was also central to his thinking, is the difference between 'penal substitution' and 'substitutional suffering.'

²⁹ Ibid. Box A.2. (5)

There is all the difference between bearing a punishment instead of another and suffering something on another's behalf. Supposing a human Judge or a human father were to lay upon an innocent man or an innocent child the punishment that had been deserved by a guilty one, what should we think of him?

We ought not to attribute such action to God, he continues. But suffering for another is different. (People watch at the sick-beds of relations; support them through illnesses.)

If you wanted to reach the heart of a thoroughly bad man – say a convict in prison, how would you set about it? Well, I suppose the first thing you would try to do would be to show him that you care about him ... Gratitude is the very last trace of the divine grace to be rubbed off from the heart of man.

The sermon, after concluding points, has an addendum in which Rashdall introduces, parenthetically, the question of patripassianism.

The death of Christ teaches us that suffering is not wholly foreign to the nature of God. In some mysterious way God suffers too. God suffers with his people ... bears as it were Himself part of the sorrow which is needful to the working out of His gracious purposes for the world ... to believe their sufferings are not really unnecessary or meaningless or useless.

The sermon thus introduces a wide variety of points, most of which, though not the last one, were to be developed and become regular features of his later writings.

II 1900-1905.

During the early years of the twentieth century, the doctrine of Atonement continued to be a centre of interest for theologians. In successive years, two volumes were published on the subject; the first by Moberly, in 1901, and the second by Denney, in 1902. Moberly believed he had a new aspect on the matter, by stressing the role of the personality. Denney's is conservative, from a Scottish Protestant background, which he shares with McLeod Campbell and Smeaton. Moberly's book was reviewed by Rashdall.

Meanwhile, Rashdall continued his regular, informal preaching. A sermon included in this Section illustrates Rashdall's practice of giving his congregations a

theological background, and of experimenting with his ideas by repeating them in simple language.

(a) Contemporary Works on Atonement, including Rashdall's review.

Moberly, Atonement and Personality.

That Moberly's Atonement and Personality (1901),³⁰ is part of a continuing dialogue is clearly indicated in the Preface to his first edition, where he speaks of the 'inadequacy of certain more or less current explanations ... of the original apostolic doctrine.' These must be 'restructured.' They are 'inseparable' from the current discussions about personality, for there can be no 'adequate' explanation of atonement, if not in terms of personality. He disputes, in his first chapter, on Punishment, the views of Dr. Dale, who distinguishing between reformation and punishment, has insisted that reformation cannot function as punishment; for the latter is essentially retribution. Moberly argues that transaction theories not closely connected with the personality are inadequate. The facts of the Atonement were objective, but must be realised 'in us.' He calls this 'the realization in our personal being of the things which were wrought without.' His theory, he claims, is 'hundreds of miles from the thought of vicarious punishment.' Christ showed penitence for the whole of humanity, which is effected in men as an 'imparted gift.' It is not just an example. 'Our atonement' is ... 'no merely past transaction' it is 'a perpetual presence'.

Comment:

Although the author insists that his theory is new, his claim is doubtful; for it is based on the objective view, which is glossed over with an incompatible emphasis on personality, amounting to a subjective approach. His further salient points – stress on Christ's 'obedience,' and revelation 'in Him' of 'the meaning of penal death' – are respectively a repetition of other writers' views, or unconvincing in their quasi-mysticism.

³⁰ R. C. Moberly, Atonement and Personality (London: Murray, 1901).

Rashdall's review.

Rashdall contributed a review of the work to the Journal of Theological Studies.³¹ While striving to give a balanced judgment, he is aptly critical. Moberly succeeds at first, Rashdall says, in avoiding the “retributive” idea of punishment, but, as he believes in hell, which, ‘cannot be “explained away,”’ his case is weakened. Why does God, asks Rashdall, when the punishment has failed, have to go on punishing? Rashdall does agree with his treatment of forgiveness.

More generally, Rashdall criticises the development of Moberly's thinking, for, when difficulties arise in the argument, he ‘hurries off’, to another line of argument. Rashdall further complains that, in treating ‘vicarious’ punishment not as ‘on behalf of’ (ὕπερ) but as ‘in place of,’ (ἀντί) he is ‘trying to smuggle back’ ‘retributive punishment.’ Moberly's conjunction of the ‘work of Christ’ with Adam is unsatisfactory on three grounds.

- (1) Moberly does not refer to Jesus as if a real and separate man.
- (2) There is no reason given why humanity in general should ‘pay the price.’
- (3) He does not show how he connects the efficacy of ‘vicarious penalty’ with Christ's death. Moberly's thought, he says, (thus annulling the latter's claim to an original presentation), is largely derived from McLeod Campbell. Rashdall concludes with the trenchant comment that: when Moberly is shocked by any feature of the traditional theory, he repudiates it in discussion, but assumes it in subsequent argument.

His third point amounts to an accusation of intellectual dishonesty, or, if Moberly is unaware of the failing, of academic inefficiency.

It may be judged that Rashdall is justified in treating dismissively this superficially erudite, but well-nigh inaccessible book, as an unsuccessful exposition.

³¹ HR, ‘Dr. Moberly's Theory of the Atonement,’ JTS Vol. 3 (1902) pp.178-211.

Denney.

The next year, Moberly's work was followed by a further book on atonement theory: The Death of Christ³² by J. Denney, Professor of the United Free Church, Glasgow. When a revised, abridged edition appeared in 1951, the editor included in the Preface the comment that it is '... a sign of the changed theological atmosphere of our times, that it should be thought fitting to publish this book today.' The editor refers adversely to British theological scholarship 'at the beginning of the twentieth century' which was 'coming more and more under the influence of the Liberal Protestantism of Germany.' Many of these scholars, he remarks, 'had no real gospel to preach.'³³

Denney is both a Biblical fundamentalist and a conservative evangelical, appealing, for confirmation of his views, to Calvin's *Institutio*.³⁴ The first is illustrated strikingly when he uses as a proof-text a quotation from the longer ending of Mark, at 16.15 f.. '... He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved; but he that disbelieveth shall be condemned' (defending his use of the passage with the claim that the ending may have been the model for Matthew).

The second is encapsulated in the aphorism that 'Not Bethlehem but Calvary is the focus of revelation.'³⁵

Calvin's doctrine of penal substitution is enthusiastically endorsed. In his final Chapter he refers, for his advocacy of the view that God had no choice in the matter of Christ's death - the 'divine reaction' was not only 'inexorable' but 'necessary'- to Anselm's *Cur Deus Homo*³⁶ describing it as 'the truest and greatest book on the atonement that has ever been written.'

He has confused two models, for Anselm's theory, with a feudal background in which an honourable, not a penal exchange is envisaged, is not at all the same, as Denney must be aware; but he disregards distinctions between substitution theories.

Denney makes an arbitrary distinction between those who accept his theory and those who do not. 'It is the failure to recognise it, which ultimately divides interpreters of Christianity into evangelical and non-evangelical, those who are true to the New Testament and those who cannot digest it.'

³² J Denney, The Death of Christ (London: Tyndale, 1902). First revised 1951, by R. Tasker.

³³ Ibid. p.7.

³⁴ Ibid. p.42, n.. 2, *Institutio*, 11. xvi. 10.

³⁵ Ibid. p.179.

³⁶ Anselm, CDH, Denney, p.188.

Rashdall's theories, as published in Doctrine and Development and other writings reviewed here, would clearly fall into the latter category!

Rashdall himself comments in some detail on Denney's work in his major publication of 1919.

Of his three references in the notes, the first is of particular interest.³⁷ Here Rashdall argues, of the 'apocalyptic and messianic conceptions of the Messianic Supper' referred to by Denney,³⁸ that the eucharistic background of the Messianic banquet does not 'imply either a theory of vicarious atonement or the doctrine that reception of the eucharist was essential to salvation or entry to the kingdom.'

In his longer reference,³⁹ Rashdall, while criticising Denney's view that a subjective effect must be the outcome of an objective event, speaks of his work with respect, preferring its 'thoroughgoing and uncompromising manner' to the attitude of those theologians who refute 'indignantly' the 'older schemes, and then re-introduce them in ... surreptitious forms ...' (Is he referring to Moberly – or Dale?)

Rashdall's reference to Denney will be considered in the following Section, within the context of his Idea of Christian Atonement of 1919.

(b) Sermon of 1905.

During these years as an academic at Oxford, Rashdall continued to preach and write unpublished sermons on a wide variety of subjects. The manuscripts include one of these, preached in 1903, at Les Avants, entitled 'Forgiveness in God.'⁴⁰ The text is Isaiah, 55.7.⁴¹

The sermon has a first part, erased (for 'the Sundays of last term'), in which he is, it seems, working out his thinking about the role of resentment in punishment. A few extracts illustrate this.

... there was, we saw, no real inconsistency between the duty of resentment and the duty of Forgiveness. What is forbidden in all cases is the temper of

³⁷ HR, Atonement, p.42, n.1.

³⁸ Denney, Death, p.34. (HR's reference)

³⁹ *Ibid.* pp.439-443.

⁴⁰ PH MS Box A.3. (7).

⁴¹ 'Let the wicked forsake his way and the unrighteous man his thoughts: and let him return unto the Lord, ... for he will abundantly pardon.'

private malice or revenge. And the man who has the love that he ought to have towards his fellow-man will always resent the offence and love the offender.

His main sermon begins with a historical account of Atonement.

Primitive man thought that his God was very like his chief. ... And when people's idea of punishment rose higher than this, ... God presented himself to men as a just Judge who rewarded and punished men according to their deserts. Christianity came and substituted the idea of a loving Father, for the idea of a relentless judge.

He touches on 'the great schemes of the Atonement which are embodied in the later systems of Theology.'

Either the death of Christ was conceived as a debt due to the Devil who, by Adam's fall, had acquired a just dominion, a feudal lordship over the whole human race: ... Or, as in Anselm and much Reformation Theology, ... (the rest is erased)... Justice ordains that crime must be punished. By the sin of man infinite liability to punishment had been incurred.

He explains the Anselmian position. His comment and solution follow.

Now if there be any truth in the view we have taken of the true purpose of Punishment, and the true meaning of Forgiveness, we cannot set the divine Justice and the divine Mercy in this absolute antagonism to one another. Punishment is not indispensable, but only a possible means to an end. If the true object of Punishment be always the good of the sinner or of some other, there can be no need of punishment when its true end can be attained without punishment. On the other hand ... [He completes the antithesis.] And therefore the Atonement must become to us a divine plan for making man really better, not a device for remitting a penalty which was justly due.

The 'central place' of Christian Revelation is 'in that continuous self-revelation of God to the world of which the whole spiritual history of man is the record.'

This sermon contains a number of themes not fully worked out in the MS as we have it. In the substantial sermon, Rashdall gives his congregation a short historical background of doctrine, which illustrates at an early stage his life-long enthusiasm for and emphasis on the importance of teaching.

In some of his sermon notes, Rashdall's thinking is unfinalised, for this is the nature of drafts. We are fortunate to have these records of a formative period.

During the period considered in this Section, Rashdall developed his ideas on the doctrine of Atonement, treating the subject in early, unpublished sermons in which he was able to experiment. His published collection of sermons, Doctrine and Divinity covered a wide range of subjects; those reviewed here indicate the tendency of his thinking on the question of the Atonement in his early ministry.

Meanwhile he had the opportunity to reflect on a number of works on Atonement by others, whose positions, in general far more conservative than his, have been reviewed above.

We have here enough material to indicate the position he would assume when he turned to Atonement as a key doctrine.

Chapter 2. Atonement Section 2

The Years from 1905 to 1924.

Introduction.

It was during this second part of his life that Rashdall gave his Bampton Lectures on Atonement before the University of Oxford in 1915 and subsequently, published them as his major work, The Idea of Atonement in Christian Theology,¹ in 1919. This is a synthesis of his views on the subject, about which he wrote prolifically throughout his career. The work aroused much controversy. Rejecting the essentially traditional, objectivist doctrines expounded by earlier contemporary British theologians, he set out his own theory.

While my review of writings on and discussions of Atonement will include those of other contemporary theologians in their relation to Rashdall's, this Section will centre on his work of 1919. Therefore, its main divisions will be: events before the publication; the publication itself; and reactions after the publication.

I *Before the Publication.*

Introduction.

In this period Rashdall's life was full and varied. Already he had achieved some eminence. This is witnessed to by the remark of Howison after Rashdall's failure to obtain a Chair in Philosophy at Oxford in 1910. He wrote, 'You are a great power in the spiritual life of Oxford and England and indeed of the world. The professorship or the absence of it will make no appreciable difference to it.'²

Rashdall's reputation was further enhanced by his appointment to the Bampton Lectureship in 1914. In a letter to his mother on 12 May he writes, 'You will no doubt see it in the papers tomorrow but I should like you to hear first from me that I have been elected to the Bampton Lectureship ... it enables one to preach the University Sermon for eight Sundays, and attracts attention to the lectures when they come out as a book.'³

¹ HR, Atonement. Page references will be given in the main text.

² Matheson, p. 129.

³ NC MS from 18 Longwall, Oxford, 12 May 1914.

Before the publication in 1919, a substantial work entitled The Doctrine of the Atonement⁴ appeared by J. K. Mozley, in 1915. This, in addition to further writings by Rashdall in the period 1905-1918, will be reviewed here.

(a) **Mozley.**

The work of J. K. Mozley, a Cambridge academic, is strikingly contemporaneous to Rashdall's. Mozley is sympathetic to the Biblical criticism of the OT, acknowledging that ideas had changed as a result of fresh information on ancient religions. He points out, like Rashdall, the variety of meanings of OT sacrifices and in particular, their celebratory, as well as expiatory usage.

However, the second chapter, on the Synoptic Gospels, is very conservative. He accuses 'the Liberal School as a whole' of 'subordinating Jesus to the Gospel which he proclaimed,' and quotes with disapproval Harnack's 'well-known words,' 'The Gospel as Jesus proclaimed it had to do with the Father only, not with the Son.'⁵ (p.33) Opposing such views, he concludes the Chapter by asserting that the 'great cry from the Cross'⁶ is caused by separation from God; a 'dogma' that must be accepted.

In his Chapter on the 'New Testament Interpretation' he is equally conservative. He considers the view that Acts and the Epistle of James have no doctrine of Atonement, dismissing it as 'an argument from silence.' (p. 61) Mozley's hypothesis, however, is dependent on an *a priori* assumption. This is confirmed by his further statement that: 'Through the New Testament runs one mighty thought: Christ died for our sins; He bore what we could not have done for ourselves; He did for God that which was God's good pleasure. Apart from this there is no New Testament doctrine of salvation.' (p. 93) This is a routine defence of the traditional substitution doctrine.

In his Chapter on the Reformation, Mozley judges Luther more favourably than Rashdall does (as will be shown in his 1919 work.). While differing from Rashdall in this, though, he gives as his reason that the Reformers' 'soteriology is not concentrated to such an extent upon Christ's death that His life ceases to have any

⁴ J. K. Mozley, The Doctrine of the Atonement, (London: Duckworth, 1915). Reprinted in 1923-37. References, from the 1937 reprint, will be given in the main text.

⁵ Ibid. p. 33, n.1 gives: 'Harnack, What is Christianity? p. 147 (E.T.)' (1901).

⁶ Ibid. pp. 57-58 gives the NT reference: Mark 15.34 and p. 58, in notes 1-3, argues the case, giving the Liberal arguments, but claiming support for his own view from, among others, Denney, Death, pp. 63-65.

redemptive value' (p. 143). In this reflection, he is supporting in a modified way Rashdall's emphasis on the redemptive value of the whole life of Christ.

Mozley refers critically in the same Chapter to the book by Moberly, commenting on Rashdall's review of it in the JTS, discussed in my first Section. He remarks, of the latter review, 'It is an exceptionally fine and stimulating piece of criticism.' (I give below the full text of this informative note as far as it refers to Rashdall's review.)⁷ Having dismissed Moberly's theory of 'vicarious penitence,' he refers favourably to the coming 'Bampton's.'

The final Chapter, 'Towards a Doctrine,' is an exegesis of his own proposed theory. Mozley recognises the important role of cultural relativity in the familiar models of the Atonement. This suggests a possible flexibility in his conclusions. Finally, though, it becomes clear that the traditional dogma of the doctrine is not to be questioned.

Further Comments. View of Punishment.

On the critical question of the 'esse' of punishment Mozley asserts the validity of the retributive view. To hold that 'sin deserves (my underlining) punishment' is, he states, 'justifiable on two grounds.' (p.207)

- (1) The connection between sin and punishment, which, as far as we know, always existed, 'is inexplicable on any grounds except that wrong doing ... merits punishment.'

This assertion implies that any idea accepted before and until the early twentieth century must necessarily be right.

- (2) '... The verdict that sin deserves punishment ... is one that is endorsed by the sinner himself when penitence ... touches the soul.' This, he says, is 'invariable.' The 'penitent thief' is quoted:- 'We indeed justly; for we receive the due reward of our misdeeds.'

⁷ Ibid. p. 196 n.1: Every one who can should read Dr Rashdall's review in the Journal of Theological Studies, iii. 178-211. It is an exceptionally fine and stimulating piece of criticism, and Dr. Rashdall's own standpoint – the elaboration of which in this year's Bampton Lectures on the Atonement will be eagerly awaited – whether acceptable or not to the reader, is hardly obtruded at all, and never to the dislocation of the matter in hand. He finds two great confusions running through the book: (1) 'The confusion between an effect produced upon the character of the sinner, and an obliteration of sin or guilt which takes place independently of any such effect'; (2) 'The confusion between the retributive view of punishment and the disciplinary.'

A number of questions are in order here. (i) Does Mozley assume the verbal accuracy of the ‘thief’s’ saying? (ii) Is the reaction invariable? The assumption needs to be defended with evidence. (iii) Was the ‘penitent thief’ necessarily right, if, as reported, he made the statement? (iv) More specifically, was he right in accepting that the punishment was ‘due,’ that is, appropriate; that his sin, described here as theft, warranted execution? In more general terms, can it be assumed that the penalties inflicted in previous ages are acceptable in modern times? A negative answer to any of the questions (ii) to (iv) invalidates Mozley’s argument.⁸

He seeks to underline his conclusion by stating that the sacraments evoke worship centred on the Cross. Such a claim surely needs further analysis. First he speaks of the Eucharist, which may be, though not necessarily, interpreted as either a re-enactment or remembrance of death; but to extend this parallel dogmatically to ‘the sacraments,’ as he does in the same paragraph, is unwarranted without further definition of his terms. (p.221)

Rashdall’s Comments.

In his Atonement, Rashdall makes several references to Mozley’s work, chiefly on minor details, in notes. The most substantive comment is found in his conclusion to his third Appendix. Here he defends his own Atonement against the criticism that ‘the ideas against which this book has been largely directed are now obsolete.’ Thus, he draws attention to a range of contemporary books which support ‘the ideas of Christ’s death as expiatory, substitutionary, and sometimes penal.’ Among these, he quotes Mozley’s work: ‘I do not therefore think we need shrink from saying that Christ bore penal suffering for us and in our stead.’⁹

In conclusion, we may summarise. Mozley finally endorses: an objective theory of Atonement; a ‘penal substitution’ model; a retributive doctrine of punishment; the cross as a predestined action of God. This is very unlike the position of Rashdall on Atonement, as Rashdall himself has confirmed.

⁸ This is followed by a detailed commentary (p. 208) on Moberly’s attitude to retribution, Rashdall’s comment that it is ‘inconsistent,’ and the position of other contemporary theologians.

⁹ HR, Atonement, p. 496. Refers to Mozley, Doctrine of the Atonement, p. 216.

(b) Rashdall.*Published and Unpublished Works.***(i) Sermon at Hereford.**¹⁰

Before the high point in his career marked by the publication of 1919, during his regular pastoral work as Canon at Hereford, Rashdall continued to express his ideas in simpler, more accessible form. I include as an example a sermon of 1911, before Easter, on texts from 2.Cor.5: ‘God was in Christ reconciling the world to Himself’(v.18) and ‘Be ye reconciled to God.’(v.20) Extracts are given below.

And the simplest way in which the doctrine of the Atonement can well be put is to say that in Christ God was reconciling the world to Himself. Yet if we thoroughly appropriated to ourselves all that is implied in this simple statement we shall at least be on the way to the understanding of the eternal truth which has expressed itself in that doctrine, and we shall be guarded against many of those sad perversions and misunderstandings of it which have done such infinite harm, and which ... tend to alienate so many thoughtful and not naturally irreligious minds from Christianity altogether.

Three points follow. (The numbering is Rashdall’s)

(1) The most serious, the most horrible of all the ways in which the doctrine of the Atonement has been misrepresented and caricatured is when an opposition is set up between the character of the Father and that of the Son – when God the Father is represented as an arbitrary, revengeful, unloving tyrant, or at best as a God who is just but not loving or merciful, and whose wrath could be appeased only by the undeserved death of a Son Who is, all unlike Himself, loving, merciful and forgiving.

After an expansion, point two follows.

(2) ... St. Paul speaks of our being reconciled to God, not of God being reconciled to us. Even when it is not actually suggested that the character of God is unlike that of Christ, many theories of the Atonement [in the Western Church, both before and after the Reformation] have suggested that the self-sacrificing death introduced a change into the disposition or attitude of the Father towards us. The Father was angry, those theories suggest, but He was placated, propitiated, appeased by the sacrifice of an innocent victim, and so was induced to let man off the just punishment of his sins in consideration of a punishment which was unjust and unmerited. Now this representation of the doctrine is so horrible, so shocking to the moral consciousness of every ... modern mind, so out of harmony with the teaching of Christ Himself ... that it has happily almost dropped out of the living Theology of our time. We hardly

¹⁰ PH A.4.(4).

ever hear it preached or defended in all its naked hideousness (in brackets Rashdall uses the milder '[in] so many words') though I am afraid ... attenuated versions of it are still to be found. [Various alterations and erasures.]

The sentence finishes with a passage in brackets, erased, which finalises the invective.

While by more ignorant persons – both among those who still think they believe it or among those who are alienated from Christianity largely by this very doctrine – it is still supposed to be an essential element of Christian doctrine.

Rashdall's attitude to substitutionary theory must by now be clear to the most inattentive listener. He offers his own solution – the subjective theory. His second text, 'Be ye reconciled to God' is used to develop the third point.

(3) Let us make up our minds clearly and distinctly about this – that no part of Christ's work, neither His life nor His death nor His resurrection, will do anything at all for us except in so far as it stirs and stimulates us into doing something for ourselves.

Having thus pointedly dismissed the objective theory *per se*, he exhorts his congregation to various kinds of good works in the community.

(ii) Paper to Origen Society.

After his very full treatment of Atonement theory in the Bampton Lectures of 1915, and in the interim period between delivery and publication in 1919, Rashdall did not cease to make his views known.

For instance, he read a paper at the Origen Society at Oxford in March 1917 on the Atonement. (Published in the posthumous collection Ideas and Ideals,¹¹ it is a synthesis of material used in his earlier life, and in the Bampton in much greater detail.) Here we have his ideas in condensed form, which he has further summarised at the conclusion, and enumerated.¹² The content of the final summary, using Rashdall's enumeration, is briefly indicated below; either verbatim (indicated with quotation marks) or abbreviated.

(1) 'It may be treated as certain (whether or not we treat the ransom-passage¹³ as genuine) that our Lord Himself never taught the doctrine that His death was an atonement for sin. He consistently taught that God forgives sin on the one condition of true penitence - ...'

¹¹ HR, Ideas and Ideals (Oxford: Blackwell, 1928) pp. 142-162.

¹² Ibid. pp. 161-2.

¹³ Mark.10.45/ Matt. 20.28.

- (2) Traditional theories depend on OT prophecy. They are not binding on Christians. Nor are the early Christian interpretations, as a whole.
- (3) However, some early Christian teaching was consistent with the teachings of Christ. It is explained that Atonement is effected by the 'regenerating influence exercised by Christ's work as a whole.' ... 'The special prominence of His death' is due to the 'supreme way it exhibits the love of God and excites the repentance which that love awakens.'
- (4) St. Paul is the only NT writer who taught that Christ bore the punishment of sin instead of us. 'We are not bound by this teaching. ...'
- (5) Is similar to (3) applied specifically to 'most of the teaching of the Greek Fathers.'
- (6) It is not acceptable either that the death of Christ transforms a corruptible into an incorruptible body, or that every human being has 'paid the penalty of sin because Christ paid it.'
- (7) It is not acceptable that 'the death of Christ was required by justice to the Devil' (the 'ransom' theory), nor, - as Anselm has it - that it was 'due to the necessity that abstract justice demanded such a sacrifice.'
- (8) The Abelardian theory is consistent with the teaching of Christ, 'that the Father is always ready to accept the sinner on the one condition of repentance and amendment.' For Abelard, Christ's life and death, ... are the strongest influence ... for bringing about that effect.

II *The Publication of The Idea of Atonement, 1919.*

The publication of the Bampton Lectures in October 1919 was an outstanding event in Rashdall's life and an important contribution to British theology. It is a confirmation of the doctrines he had espoused and expounded on Atonement. Earlier expositions, though, had been to a limited audience, either of University members, or for dedicated readers. Now, his work attracted widespread attention.

In his Preface, Rashdall sets out his aims, characteristically calling for a readiness to abandon or reinterpret ancient formulae, especially where their origin is unclear, while preserving, if possible, the traditional language. He reminds us of the fundamental change in knowledge of the universe since the fourth and medieval centuries together with modern advances in historical and biblical studies. (This is similar to his earlier introduction to Doctrine and Development.) Rashdall does not claim originality for his position, which, on the contrary, he says, is '... now held not only by a consensus of the more "liberal" theologians, but by many others.' (p.xii)¹⁴

Rather, it is the historical interpretation of atonement beliefs that he considers the main interest of the work. He adds: 'the account I have given of patristic and other writers rests upon an independent study of their works. Except in the case of St.

¹⁴ Page references are given in the main text.

Augustine I have read through all the writings of the Fathers whom I have dealt with at any length in the lectures' (p.xiii)

The book may be regarded as a comprehensive introduction to Rashdall's doctrine of atonement for those unfamiliar with his writings, and an encyclopaedia of them for those who have encountered them already. The various disputed texts he discusses have continued to be the focus for specialist theologians, which texts have acquired a detailed and growing history of criticism since Rashdall's lifetime.

A brief summary of the book is given here; following the form of the Bampton Lectures it has eight chapters. (A fuller summary is given in an Appendix.)

Chapter 1: Christ's teaching on forgiveness.

Rashdall enquires how far the traditional doctrine of salvation derives from the words of Christ. Although Christ spoke of faith in him as essential for salvation, he meant by this faith in his teaching.

Two passages often quoted to support the substitutionary theory are the following: (i) Mark 10.45 (the 'ransom' passage), 'the Son of man came ... to give his life a ransom for many.' (λύτρον ἀντὶ πολλῶν) Rashdall questions the authenticity of this disputed passage. Alternatively, he suggests a contemporary meaning – Christ was saving his followers by offering his own life.

(ii) Last Supper Sayings.

Referring to Matthew 26.28. – 'this is my blood of the new testament, which is shed for many for the remission of sins,' Rashdall provides a critical working of the text, showing its complexity. It is not to be considered a proof-text for the now traditional doctrine.

Chapter 2: Pre-Pauline and Pauline Doctrine of Atonement.

Rashdall states that Paul did not originate the doctrine of vicarious atonement, but received it from the tradition. Rashdall explores primitive sacrificial ideas, and other pre-Christian theories. Of Paul, he comments that there is no consistent theory in Romans though Paul does believe in original sin and in the atoning death of Christ through his blood. Justification is effected through faith in that death; righteousness is imputed, not imparted. However, by 'faith' Paul never means 'faith alone.' The ethical effects are important. But since Paul's theories depend on interpretation, sometimes mistaken, of the OT, we must reject his substitutionary doctrine.

Chapter 3: Primitive Christianity.

This Chapter expounds extra-Pauline atonement doctrines before Irenaeus. Rashdall regards these as theoretically accepting the expiatory doctrine of Christ's death, but, in practice, emphasising the moral effects of that belief. In particular, he discusses the sacrificial doctrine of Hebrews, arguing that the sacrifice described is of purification, not expiation. Of the majority of early church writers, it is concluded that, while they quote the old formulae, they are more interested in works than faith; and in the fulfilment of prophecies more than in the death of Christ.

Chapter 4: Patristic Theories.

This Chapter is a study of atonement theories of the Greek Church Fathers. The first part deals mainly with Clement of Alexandria,¹⁵ Irenaeus and Origen. Clement of Alexandria in particular, is favourably reviewed: Although Clement occasionally uses formulae indicating a theory of Christ's death as a 'propitiation or a ransom,' he, like earlier writers, gives 'ethical and subjective explanations.' Clement believes there would have been an Incarnation without a Fall. Moreover, he perceives the difficulty of the idea of divine punishment.

Of the twelve later Greek Fathers discussed, Athanasius, perhaps the best known, is not viewed favourably, for his theory works through substitution. However, the death of Christ is less central to his doctrine than Incarnation.

Rashdall particularly dislikes the ransom theory as a trick played on the devil. This he shows as prevalent in its worst form in the Eastern Church towards the end of the period (seventh to eighth centuries).

Chapter 5: Latin Theology - Augustine, Anselm, Abelard.

Rashdall's main criticism of the Western Fathers is their legalism. He expounds chiefly the doctrines of Augustine, Anselm and Abelard. Augustine's doctrine is strongly criticised as an overt exposition of vicarious punishment, based on the belief in the depravity of human nature, and of predestination. The view of Anselm, dependent on the idea of a ransom paid to God, not the devil, as described in his Cur Deus Homo, is considered greatly preferable. Although Anselm works with

¹⁵ Clement of Alexandria, c.150-215 AD.

'equivalents' for sin, his substitution model is not penal. For Abelard's theory, Rashdall has almost unqualified praise. His Appendix on Abelard will be detailed below.

Chapter 6: Scholastic Theories.

Rashdall writes sympathetically of this period, in which the Anselmic doctrine had largely replaced ransom theories.

Thomas Aquinas replaced the Augustinian belief in hell for the majority with an intermediate purgatorial state, since he held that original sin alone did not merit hell. Rashdall, while not favouring his sacramental system, believed his atonement theory showed marked progress, for salvation was held to impart, rather than impute righteousness. This involved an emphasis on good works more than on faith, a position consonant with Rashdall's own view.

Chapter 7: Luther and the Reformation.

Reformation theology, Rashdall holds, is not original; it is Augustinian, but even more centred on the death of Christ as a penal atonement. The scheme of atonement, moreover, is 'contrary to reason.' Rashdall is thus strongly opposed to it.

Calvin's theology, too, taught Predestination and the total depravity of human nature. He is judged, however, less extreme than Luther.¹⁶ Rashdall, who considers Augustine's acceptance of the doctrine of purgatory an improving modification, is angry that Luther has refuted it.

However, he approves of Luther's condemnation of penances. There is some contradiction in his view that the Reformation reasserted the link between religion and morality. The last part of the chapter is a detailed polemic against Luther.

Chapter 8: The Truth of the Atonement.

The last chapter has a number of themes. First, Rashdall becomes very cautious, suggesting that traditional theories of atonement have some value in satisfying a need. He reiterates, however, but still in tentative register, that the doctrine was probably not Christ's teaching. Once more he asserts his preference for Abelard's subjective

¹⁶ *In omne opere homo justus peccat.* (Weimar, vii. 136) HR, p. 402 n.2.

doctrine; the cross itself was an ‘accident’ in the course of Jesus’ whole life of faithfulness (which is the salvific factor).

Introducing his Trinitarian doctrine, he uses it to support his atonement theory – there are not two pre-existent ‘persons,’ of the Trinity,¹⁷ the one ‘punishing’ the other.

Finally, Rashdall (i) refers to his doctrine of immortality, showing the dependence of the idea of salvation on the concept of an after-life;¹⁸ (ii) introduces the subject of ecumenism;¹⁹ Christianity, he suggests, should not claim a monopoly as a saving faith; for salvation is finally dependent on response to a moral ideal.

Additions.

Finally, there are additional notes and three appendices. It is not necessary to comment on all these. However, I shall review (1) his additional information on Abelard following Chapter V; and subsequent relevant comments of later, modern²⁰ scholars, who wrote on Abelard’s doctrinal position: (2) his appendix on Dale.

(1) **Abelard.**

(i) Rashdall’s Additional Note

In the first Section of my Chapter, reference was made to Rashdall’s interest in, and approval of Abelard’s theory of atonement. My review of his treatment of Abelard in the Idea of Atonement has shown that his position remained constant. This is expanded in the ‘additional note,’ which provides the Latin text of the controversial passage quoted by St. Bernard of Clairvaux in his condemnation of Abelard to Rome in 1140. The matter is complicated by Rashdall’s use, in his note (pp.362-3), of two different Latin texts – first the version drawn up by St. Bernard in his *Capitula Errorum*,²¹ the condemnatory document sent to Rome; and, second, immediately following, Abelard’s original version of the passage at issue, in his *Epist. ad Rom.*²² St. Bernard’s version does not follow exactly the words of Abelard (as given by Cousin, p. 207, lines 4-11). Bernard has made several changes which alter slightly Abelard’s emphasis. However, this textual curiosity does not affect the controversy of

¹⁷ Rashdall’s doctrine of the Trinity will be discussed in detail in my Chapter 3.

¹⁸ Rashdall’s doctrine of immortality will be discussed in detail in my Chapter 5.

¹⁹ Rashdall’s doctrine of ecumenism is discussed in detail in my Chapter 4.

²⁰ By ‘modern’ I understand: from the second half of the twentieth century.

²¹ HR, Atonement, pp. 362-364. Quotes from *Opera*, (11) ed. Cousin, Paris, 1859, pp. 766-7.

²² *Ibid.* p. 358 n.1. Refers to *Opera, Epist. ad Rom.* p. 207.

theologians as to what Abelard really believes, since they argue from Abelard's original version. The result of Bernard's action – the condemnation of Abelard – can scarcely have been due to minor inaccuracies in the document; and confirms Rashdall's claim that Abelard's views were considered seriously unorthodox at the time.

Abelard's position is a complex one for sometimes, in his lengthy work, he embraces a substitutional view of the atonement. Rashdall admits in a footnote, (p.359, n.2) 'There are, of course, passages in Abelard in which the death of Christ is treated in this conventional way as a "sacrifice," a punishment, etc. There is no cause of surprise in this, since Abelard was professing to explain the doctrine of the New Testament (including St. Paul) and of the Church and not to supersede it.' It is hard to see how, if Abelard did not intend to supersede the substitutional doctrine, he could have taught a radically different view. Perhaps the clue to this contradiction is in the last paragraph of Rashdall's Additional Note, (p.363) 'It must be admitted that Abelard sometimes shows a tendency to relapse into views hardly consistent with this position' [i.e. the subjective position]

That Abelard is not entirely consistent accounts for much of the controversy about him. It is possible that, as he was not able to speak freely, he may sometimes have disguised his views.

(ii) Comments of modern scholars on Abelard's theology.

In order to assess the validity of Rashdall's attitude, we may refer to the writings of modern scholars. A critical study of Abelard by **R. E. Weingart**, The Logic of Divine Love²³ was published in 1970. It is referred to by **Alister McGrath**²⁴ - in a mordant criticism of Rashdall's theory of atonement and, in particular, his interpretation of Abelard - as 'the most detailed study of Abailard's soteriology yet to appear.' Weingart examines Abelard's ideas on the 'ransom' theory; showing that he rejected both theories current: - first that Christ was 'incarnated to redeem man from' a lawful demand of the devil, second that he was 'incarnated to offer satisfaction to God or appease his wrath.'²⁵ According to Weingart's analysis, Abelard is asserting that God

²³ R. E. Weingart, The Logic of Divine Love, (Oxford: Clarendon, 1970), pp. 78 - 96.

²⁴ A. McGrath, 'The Moral Theory of the Atonement. An Hist. and Theol. Critique.' SJTh., vol.38, (1985), 205-220. Refers to Weingart at p. 208 and at n.14.

²⁵ Weingart, p. 82.

is not under the necessity of justice bound to exact a price or substitute for man's redemption, but will, 'because he is love,' do so freely. This would seem to amount to an acceptance of the subjective theory, and thus to support Rashdall's interpretation of Abelard.

However, Weingart cannot quite accept the result of his own logic. He admits, 'These considerations help to substantiate the conclusion that the question and solution in the second book of the Romans Commentary represent a summary statement of Abailard's soteriology.'²⁶ His argument then takes a curious turn. There is a serious omission, he complains: 'we have no scriptural ideas of repentance, forgiveness and justification.' Abelard's teaching is deficient, he implies. 'It is more certain that it is not a complete elaboration of Abelard's teaching on redemption' Why is this so, we may ask. Is Weingart about to produce proof-texts? No. He continues: '... since it suffers from self-evident and unaccountable omissions such as lack of any attention to the person of the Redeemer and the means of his work, and to man's appropriation ... of the gifts offered by Christ.'²⁷ Abelard's position, he implies, is not what he, Weingart, has shown it to be, because it does not include the doctrines Weingart holds dogmatically. The 'argument from omissions' is invalid. (One wonders whether McGrath, in his effort to nullify Rashdall's conclusions, has noticed this. He has passed it over, although claiming that Weingart speaks 'authoritatively.')

In his substantial interpretation, it must be concluded that Weingart has endorsed Rashdall's reading of Abelard.

A recent study of Abelard by **John Marenbon**²⁸ on his philosophy and theology in general, expounds his doctrine of original sin and unmerited grace. Marenbon, too, speaks of his inconsistencies. He says: 'Alongside the characteristic Abelardian doctrines there appear, though usually with less prominence, passages which propose or imply the traditional ideas which they replace.'²⁹

Where does the balance lie? Marenbon's judgment is that Abelard has 'characteristic' doctrines, 'offset' by traditional passages. He implies that Abelard gives lip-service to the latter, while the former express the 'esse' of his thinking.

²⁶ Ibid. p. 95.

²⁷ Ibid. p. 96.

²⁸ John Marenbon, The Philosophy of Abelard (Cambridge: CUP, 1997).

²⁹ Ibid. p. 330.

Both these scholars, therefore, provide, with different degrees of conviction, support for Rashdall's view of Abelard.

(2) **R. W. Dale.** (Appendix III, 'Dr. Dale's View of the Atonement and some other modern theories.' (pp. 493-496)

Rashdall has included a full Appendix, attacking the work by Dale on The Atonement referred to in Section 1 of my Chapter. It seems he is particularly incensed by this near-contemporary work, which is 'still regarded in many quarters with so much respect.' He will therefore quote from Dale's summary of his position. (Rashdall p. 493).

In his Appendix, Rashdall criticises four passages of Dale's summary. I shall refer only to the first of these, which Rashdall has analysed in particular detail. Having divided and numbered Dale's text in ten sections for this first passage, he has commented on it point by point. His Point 1 questions Dale's undefended assumption that 'the human race was condemned.' This is a precursor of one of Rashdall's two main objections, namely that the literal, historical truth of the Biblical reference - here the Genesis account of the Fall - is assumed dogmatically.

His Point 5 is an example of his second main accusation - that Dale uses ambiguous language to cloak contradictions. In this passage, Dale has said, first, that the submission of Christ to infliction of penalty does not 'release' humankind from 'submission' (to 'the penalties of sin'). But, Dale continues: 'He endured them, that we might escape from them.' Rashdall could have replied that it is an obvious contradiction. However, he employs the more elaborate antithetical method, commenting succinctly, 'The first interpretation is the one against which this book is chiefly directed: the second is that for which I have contended.'³⁰

In conclusion, Rashdall explains an important reason for including the Appendix. It has been suggested 'that the ideas against which this book has been largely directed

³⁰ A modern academic, C. Gunton, has written an article sympathetic to Dale's ideas in 'The Cross and the City,' (Supplement no. 2 of the Journal of the URC Historical Society, Vol. 6, 1999), 1-16. Gunton dogmatically defends Dale's view of the 'penal dimensions' of the atonement, opposing 'any merely utilitarian or reformatory conception of punishment.' But Gunton's defence merely confirms that he, like Dale, holds a conservative view of punishment. He praises Dale for 'not giving an inch to the challenges of modernity.'

are now obsolete' (that is, the view of atonement as substitution or satisfaction), Rashdall points out that these are ideas supported by various contemporary writers.

Why, then, was Dale selected for lengthy critical treatment? It may be because Dale's book was particularly well received: by 1902 it had reached its twenty-second edition. Or perhaps Rashdall considered that the faults he emphasises – disregard for Biblical criticism; and equivocal language – were not obvious to all readers, and should be clearly identified.

It is a richly illustrated, cogently argued last Appendix.

Rashdall's monumental work is a thesaurus of atonement doctrines. Its purpose is to detail, expand and justify the theory of the doctrine which he continued to hold at that period of his life when he was becoming a public figure. Although it is a work of great learning, with copious quotations in the original tongue, and impeccably scholarly in format, it is not written in opaque, technical style, but is accessible to non-specialists; likely therefore to have a wider reception than those other works preceding it, which pre-supposed a more eclectic readership.

III *After the Publication.*

Numerous extant letters and contemporary reviews witness to the reception of Rashdall's publication.

Correspondence

Rashdall had sent copies of his book to a circle of friends and acquaintances. The correspondence includes their replies, and that of other interested readers. I shall refer first to two cases in which we have letters with corresponding replies.

The themes at issue are found in an exchange of letters between (a) Rashdall and C. Feltoe; (b) Rashdall and A.H. Cruickshank.³¹

(a) Feltoe. Having seen a review of his book in the Spectator of the 6th March 1920, Feltoe wrote to Rashdall,³² quoting the latter's contention that, according to Jesus, repentance alone was necessary (that is, for the forgiveness of sin). Feltoe asks rhetorically, 'What need then of the Son of God becoming Man?' And how did John

³¹ Canon of Durham (see Matheson, p. 135). The Rashdalls were guests in 1914 (Matheson, p. 148).

³² Bod. Eng. Lett. MS c.350, fs.43-44, 15th March 1920. Feltoe to HR.

the Baptist's message differ from Christ's? Rashdall, replying the next day,³³ suggests he might read the book first! He then asks why Feltoe assumes the only reason for the Incarnation is to 'effect an Atonement for sin.' He summarises his own position.

The correspondence continues, till by December, Feltoe has read half-way through the book, and his tone is much warmer.³⁴ He says: 'I enjoy reading it very much because though you often surprise me and disturb many of my long-held presuppositions, you seldom do so in a way to shock or hurt my feelings and ... you are evidently so sincere in your convictions and so strong in your belief in our Lord ... that one feels we are in heart at one despite our differences.' Rashdall sends courteous replies to his letters, immediately.

(b) A. H. Cruikshank. Cruikshank wrote to Rashdall in March.³⁵ He comments that, attractive as Abelard's theory is, 'a case can be made out for the old-fashioned theory. ... What the world wants is more conversions of gross sinners,' who 'will feel with appalling strength the idea of God's anger. ... Now how is that anger to be satisfied? by repentance through Christ as the mediator. ... It is the death with its finality which proves him to be the one true mediator; he rolls away the anger of God and its consequences.' The metaphor will 'always appeal powerfully to minds of a certain constitution.' He speaks, finally, of his 'desire to retain the old idea in a modified way.'

In his reply,³⁶ sent immediately, Rashdall points out that Cruikshank has confused the two questions; '(1) which theory is true? (2) which theory converts sinners best?' He proceeds with the logical clarity which his correspondent lacks, that he might 'admit' what is said about (2) without changing his views on (1). However, he does not 'believe many sinners are now converted by the objective theory.' Cruikshank is referred to Rashdall's remarks on the failure of the Torry–Alexander Mission in Appendix 1 (of his Atonement). On Cruikshank's 'desire to retain the old idea in a modified way,' Rashdall comments that 'many' will be and have been 'in that state of

³³ NC MS deanery, Carlisle, 16th March 1920. HR to Feltoe.

³⁴ Ibid. MS f.110, 11th Dec. 1920. Feltoe to HR. Correspondence now available on www.hastingsrashdall.org.uk.

³⁵ Bod. ibid. MS ff.56-57, 30th March. Cruikshank to HR.

³⁶ NC MS Deanery, Carlisle, 1st April 1920. HR to Cruikshank. Correspondence available on www as above.

mind,' but, when asked what the 'modified form' is, 'those who answer' produce the 'old substitutionary view.'

Thus, Rashdall is patient and courteous to one who, indeed, had offered him hospitality.³⁷ The correspondence continued.

Of the collection of letters referring to his publication at the Bodleian Library, I shall refer to a few examples: of the many congratulating him, and of the critical, in varying degrees.

Hensley Henson (a controversial cleric and **Bishop of Durham** from 1920) writes, on receipt of his copy - 'Your book must remain for many years to come the book on the subject.'³⁸

C. Montefiore³⁹ writes: 'It is a splendid book, ... Your great book is a justification of Judaism!!! ... It is prophetic ... Rabbinic and Liberal alike!' He is pleased that Rashdall has proved wrong the contention of his (Montefiore's) 'old teachers' who said that the 'great difference between Christianity and Judaism' was that 'Judaism teaches what you say on pp.25 and 26⁴⁰ and Christianity teaches forgiveness by belief and Dogma etc.'

Enthusiastic letters were received in early January 1920 from **Margaret Pember, wife of the Warden of All Soul's Oxford**⁴¹ and '**Phelps**' of Oriel. The latter, supportive, wishes to 'banish from popular theology the old juridical notion of substitution.'⁴² Margaret Pember expresses her 'intense gratitude.' She is relieved. 'For years I have suffered under a growing sense of insincerity, a burden of secret untruthfulness, ... but now you have shown that one need not feel ashamed, nor hesitate to keep the name of Christian.'⁴³

W. Temple,⁴⁴ later **Archbishop of Canterbury**, writing in January 1920, is among those with reservations. He questions whether Rashdall does justice to St. Paul

³⁷ Matheson, p. 148.

³⁸ Bod. Eng. Lett. MS c.349, f.185, 17th Dec. 1919. Henson to HR.

³⁹ Bod. Eng. Lett. MS c.349, ff. 202-203, 26th Dec. 1919. Montefiore to HR.

⁴⁰ In this HR expounds his view of the Gospels that (for forgiveness) 'There is not the slightest suggestion that anything else but repentance is necessary' (p. 26).

⁴¹ F. W. Pember, Warden of All Souls, 1914-32.

⁴² Bod. Eng. Lett. MS c. 350, f.9, 5th Jan. 1920. Phelps to HR.

⁴³ Ibid. MS f.11, 10th Jan. 1920. Mrs. Pember to HR.

⁴⁴ W. Temple (1881-1944). Bishop of Manchester 1921, Abp of York 1921, Abp of Canterbury 1942.

and Augustine. Although he agrees that retributive punishment is immoral, he believes that failure to ‘state the whole Gospel as one may lead to disregard of the cost of sin to God.’ The Cross, he says, expresses this and meets the demand for ‘something objective.’ ‘God can only declare his forgiveness on terms such as these.’⁴⁵

It may be commented that this assumes; (i) that the demand for an objective event must be met, whether it is true or not that this took place; (ii) that there is an agreed meaning of the phrase ‘whole Gospel;’ (iii) that – if God is bound to terms of a certain kind – his power to forgive is limited. (Anselm’s theory) Temple’s comment begs the question which Rashdall has already analysed in detail.

William Sanday,⁴⁶ a leading figure of English Modernism (Professor at Oxford until 1919), after receiving his copy of the Bampton, wrote the following day, remarking, ‘You know my very high opinion of them and my large measure of agreement with your point of view generally.’ However, he maintains a cautiously ambiguous stance, remarking that he tries to see what is good in the old theories, provided that they are not regarded as dogma.

Unmitigated opposition is expressed by **Duncan Trevors**, a correspondent belonging to the University Missions to Central Africa.⁴⁷ He writes, ‘A book like yours, written by a person of your learning, ... is most upsetting. ... St. Paul is all wrong, ... the New Testament writers were wrong; the Fathers were wrong; we have all along been wrong, and are wrong in our teaching about propitiation and sacrifice.’ His argument, purely rhetorical, may represent the thinking of many contemporary pious people, unfamiliar with academic debate, who felt themselves undermined.

These extracts, taken as examples from the extensive correspondence Rashdall received, show the inevitably wide range of reaction to his book.

Reviews.

Rashdall’s book was reviewed in a number of periodicals and journals, of which examples are given here.

⁴⁵ Ibid. Bod. Eng. Lett. MS c.350, f.2, 2nd Jan. 1920. Temple to HR.

⁴⁶ Ibid. MS f.5, 3rd Jan. 1920. Sanday (1843-1920). Dean Ireland Professor at Oxford, 1882; Lady Margaret Professor; 1895-1919. Sanday to HR.

⁴⁷ Ibid. MS ff.78-79, 9th June, 1920. Travors (-ers?) to HR.

The Guardian review appeared in February 1920.⁴⁸ Having commended the book as ‘an important contribution to dogmatic theology’ the reviewer becomes critical. Reason, he says, cannot ‘explain away’ the traditional linking of salvation with the death of Christ. Rashdall’s exegesis of Mark 10. 45. (the ‘ransom’ passage) ‘falls far short of the idea’ expressed in the phrase ‘bought with a price’ (1 Cor.7.23.) and in the phraseology of Revelation, such as ‘hast redeemed us to God by thy blood.’ He questions Rashdall’s reference to the ‘Apocalyptic images’ as ‘in the imagination of the Early Church rather than in its thoughts’.

The reviewer’s difficulty concerning scriptural points is caused by his failure to recognise the difference in genre between the Synoptics and the Apocalypse. (Admittedly, Rashdall’s explanation needs clarification.) Finally there is a cryptic rebuke: ‘In our worship of the lamb, we reach a level of thought tinged with emotion above that of criticism.’

Later in February, **C. C. J. Webb**,⁴⁹ the first Professor in the Philosophy of the Christian Religion at Oxford from 1920, reviewed the book in the Oxford Magazine. Surprisingly, Webb mentions the Chapter on Luther as ‘specially valuable.’

He would have liked an expansion of Rashdall’s doctrine of ‘justification by repentance’ with reference to ‘later Protestantism’ (especially Methodism).

In April 1920, **H. R. Mackintosh**, a Professor of theology at Edinburgh from 1904, wrote in the Hibbert Journal.⁵⁰ While he is impressed by Rashdall’s work on the Early Fathers, Mackintosh trusts less his comments on the modern period, especially on Luther. Though his severity towards Augustine is good, his treatment of Luther is a ‘mysterious lapse’ in a great book.

He will accept a wide interpretation of Mark 10. 45. but questions Rashdall’s treatment of the Last Supper sayings.

Mackintosh notes the discrepancies between Rashdall’s reservations in Chapter 8 and the thesis he is putting forward throughout the rest of the book.

This review is detailed, thoughtful and constructive.

⁴⁸ Guardian, 13.2.1920, p. 170.

⁴⁹ C. C. Webb, Oxford Magazine, 27.2.1920, 251. Review of HR’s Atonement.

⁵⁰ H. R. Mackintosh, HJ, Vol.18, 1919-20, (April 1920), 607-613. Review of HR’s Atonement.

A later review in Theology of January 1922⁵¹ is contributed by **P. L. Snowden** with the sub-title, 'A criticism by an Objectivist.' Snowden concedes initially that Rashdall has compelled objectivists to reconsider. He refutes Rashdall's view that the Isaiah 53 passage is not a prophecy of Jesus' death, arguing that it was applied by Jesus to himself, especially after the Resurrection. (This is an argument, the premises of which are dependent entirely on the position the writer takes to NT criticism; Rashdall and Snowden hold incompatible views.)

Snowden argues that, even if the prophets were not fully conscious of its significance, the Isaiah passage could still be true. Opposing modern scholars, he argues for the reliability of John's Gospel.

Finally, Snowden states that Rashdall has failed to establish his case.

Conclusion.

Rashdall wrote prolifically on the doctrine of Atonement throughout his life. From the publication of his Doctrine and Development at the end of the nineteenth century, and in his sermons, he held the same position, referring frequently to Abelard as an example of an early pioneer of the subjective theory which he himself supported, while vehemently refuting the objective, substitutionary doctrine.

In his philosophical writings he argued the case against retributive punishment, for he held that punishment was justified only when reformatory and not an intrinsic constituent of repentance. These two contentions combined to form a consistent and characteristic interpretation of atonement.

With the publication of his Bampton in 1919 he became a figure known not only to local church-goers or to a predominantly academic public but was recognised as a prominent theologian. The letters and reviews are important in illustrating Rashdall's growing reputation in a wider area: beyond England: in Scotland and in other parts of the world.

⁵¹ P. L. Snowden, 'Dr. Rashdall's theory of the Atonement,' in Theology 4 (Jan. 1922), 30-41.

Chapter 2. Appendix

Chapter 1: 'The teaching of Christ concerning forgiveness.'

Rashdall enquires how far the traditional doctrine of salvation, centring on the death of Christ, can be considered 'Christ's own teaching.' He reviews Christ's conception of the 'Kingdom of God' and reasons that, having become convinced that he was the promised Messiah, he selected from the messianic teaching the most ethical and spiritual ideas. Discussing the content of Mark 13, Rashdall remarks that Jesus probably believed in an eschatological event; and that, even if 'He' were not the judge, a Kingdom would be established. However, the eschatological ideas are an 'accidental historical dress.' Probably Jesus did not speak of 'everlasting punishment.' Of Jesus' attitude to the Jewish law, he comments that 'the ceremonial part is never insisted on.' (p. 16) Of 'Christ's doctrine of salvation and its relation to contemporary Judaism,' Rashdall states, as his main contention, that although Jesus sometimes said that faith in him was a condition of salvation, by this he meant, not belief in him as the Messiah, but rather the acceptance of his message (that of a prophet or teacher). (p. 21) Consistently, Rashdall denies the authenticity of Matthew 10.32 - 'Whosoever therefore shall confess me before men, him will I confess also before my Father which is in heaven. But whosoever shall deny me before men, him will I also deny before my Father which is in heaven.'¹ In this Chapter, he refers to the 'crux theologica' in (i) Mark 10.45. (the 'ransom' passage) and (ii) The Last Supper sayings.

Mark 10.45 (see also Matt. 20.28.): 'For even the Son of man came ... to give his life a ransom for many.'

Of this much disputed passage, Rashdall is an early exegete. As to whether it is authentic or not, he concludes that the possibilities are about equal. If it is genuine, Jesus may have meant the 'Jewish rulers' would be satisfied with one life, thus his death would save the disciples. So it would have a contemporary, not a permanent meaning. In any case, there is nothing to suggest an expiatory sacrifice. (p. 36)

He concludes, 'We may be quite sure that either the words were not uttered at all,

¹ Rashdall gives the Greek, p. 21, n.1.

or that their meaning fell very far short of the doctrine of the atonement in the form which eventually obtained currency in the Church.’ (p. 37)

Last Supper Sayings

Referring to Matt.26.28, ‘this is my blood of the new testament, which is shed for many for the remission of sins,’² Rashdall remarks ‘the most conservative critic will have no hesitation in treating this addition as an explanatory gloss.’ (p. 38) He makes various suggestions about the sayings, treating in detail the possible conflation of ‘my blood’ with the ‘blood of the Covenant’, and provides documentation on the other critical arguments concerning this text. Rashdall concludes: that we are not justified in ‘reading back into Christ’s own words an idea which there is nothing in His language to suggest.’ (p. 45)

The extremely detailed knowledge of contemporary textual criticism is impressive.

Chapter 2: ‘The Pre-Pauline and the Pauline Doctrine of Atonement.’ Section 1. ‘The Origin of the Atonement Doctrine.’

Rashdall here makes the point that Paul did not originate the doctrine of vicarious atonement. He received it from the tradition. Previous Jewish history and other early beliefs are examined for possible sources. Notably, the Jewish expectation of a Messiah figure led to the belief in a saviour who was a supernatural being. The idea of salvation through suffering and death originated in certain sacrificial practices. Possibly arising from ‘totemistic ideas,’ the tribal god was thought to be incarnate in an animal and provided communion. There follows a review of sacrifices, in which he touches on one of his key ideas – that ‘the original idea of sacrifice’ was ‘not so much propitiation as communion.’ (p. 67) But with the ‘extreme fluidity’ of primitive ideas, the latter concept was ‘liable to be degraded into that of propitiation.’ Other OT ideas, especially the ‘suffering servant’ figure of Isaiah 53; Philo’s³ ‘logos’ concept; and the ideas of the Mystery Religions were contributory factors.

² Gk. εἰς ἄφεσιν.

³ Philo, c.20 – c.50 AD.

Section 2: 'St Paul's Theory of the Atonement.'

Rashdall notes that Paul believes in sin inherited from Adam, but does not believe in eternal punishment. For him the objective ground of justification is the death of Christ - by his blood. His language is usually judicial more than sacrificial. There is no consistent theory in Romans. As a Rabbi, he was bound to consider the OT literally true; this includes the idea of God's sternness. His general theme is that the death of Christ supersedes the Law, though the Law is willingly obeyed by the redeemed. But he does not explain whether this is the ceremonial or the moral law. Rashdall argues that Paul is more influenced by Christ's words than is generally thought. However, his doctrine that Jesus' death for all was required by God cannot be accepted by the modern mind.

Section 3: 'St. Paul's Doctrine of Justification.'

Paul's Doctrine of Justification posits an act of God operating objectively through Christ's death; its subjective condition is faith. By faith he means belief. Justification means righteousness is imputed, not imparted (from δικαιωω – 'declare righteous'). While Rashdall confirms that this is the meaning of Paul's words, he adds that Paul teaches justification is always followed by sanctification. He believes that Paul's emphasis is 'the moral and spiritual effects of justification are more prominent than its retrospective efficacy.' (p. 111) The idea of faith is never 'faith alone.'

Indeed, Paul's 'faith and works' controversy is based on a mistaken translation, 'the erroneous LXX translation of Habakkuk: "the just shall live by faith",' where the meaning of the Hebrew אמונה is 'faithfulness' rather than 'faith';⁴ and other mistranslated passages of the OT.

More generally, Rashdall states that Paul's theories rest on exegesis, largely mistaken, of the OT. (He cannot get away from Rabbinic ideas.) Thus, we have to reject his theory of substitution.

⁴ P. 119 n.1 gives Habakkuk. 2.4. (Rom.1.17.) 'The real meaning is "by his faithfulness," i.e. to God's commands.' This appears to be supported by Brown, Driver & Briggs (BDB), Hebrew & English Dictionary of the OT (Oxford: Clarendon, 1979), at p. 53.

Chapter 3: 'The Teaching of Primitive Christianity.'

This Chapter is an exegesis of atonement doctrine 'in early Christian literature (outside St. Paul) before Irenaeus.'⁵ Rashdall finds, in general, that expiatory atonement is cited on authority; of which the true origin is Jewish prophecy, especially Isaiah 53. But, outside Paul's teaching, it is subjective more than objective, prospective more than retrospective, moral more than legal.

Rashdall comments on the sacrificial ideas in Hebrews. The High Priest idea, he says, is suggested by Philo's priestly function of the Logos. As for the sacrifice, it is not a propitiation, nor a substitute but one of purification. While a ransom theory could be deduced from 2.14. (14b: 'that through death he might destroy him that had the power of death, that is, the devil; ... ') it does not follow the later model, for the devil is not paid, or said to have a just claim. (p. 152) The death works through moral effect; the writer repeats the old formulae, but does not really accept them. Rashdall is sympathetic to this writer.

Further exegesis covers various biblical and non-biblical works.

The Epistles of Peter are considered. The first refers to Isaiah 53 but without the model of substitution; rather, those addressed are 'partakers' in the sufferings of Christ. Of James, Rashdall asserts that the Epistle was written to oppose Paul's emphasis on faith. Of the Apocalypse, it is noted that the dead are judged according to their works. The Synoptics (in these Rashdall finds no distinctively Pauline doctrine). the Johannine writings, the Acts, and the Pastorals are treated in detail. The latter are described as the connecting link between the NT and the sub-apostolic writings, in which there is little mention of the death of Christ. Finally, Rashdall comments, of the Apostolic Fathers to Irenaeus, that, excluding the most dogmatic, Ignatius, there is much stress on the fulfilment of prophecies but little stress on the death of Christ.⁶

⁵ Irenaeus, c.130 - c.200 AD.

⁶ Rashdall himself gives a summary of this Chapter (pp. 205 - 8). In this he underlines his belief that the formulae of the Early Church based on the prophets and Pauline teaching must be freely re-interpreted. But we may still value the teachings of that period in its appeal to 'repentance, amendment of life, the overcoming of sin, the attainment of holiness.' (p. 207) Christ's death is 'the crowning and typical act' in a life of 'self-sacrificing love.' He concludes: 'Would that so much could be said of the later theories which have invited men to seek salvation by reliance upon the death of Christ and the deliberate repudiation of His teaching!'

Chapter 4: 'Patristic Theories.' Part 1.

The first and much longer part deals in detail with the theories of three major figures of the late second and third centuries: - Clement of Alexandria,⁷ Irenaeus and Origen.⁸ Justin⁹ and Tertullian¹⁰ are mentioned briefly. Rashdall disapproves of the latter, particularly, identifying him as the inventor of original sin.

Clement of Alexandria is judged as of 'higher calibre' than Justin, who was 'not a great thinker.' (p. 221) Though Clement occasionally uses formulae indicating a theory of Christ's death as a 'propitiation or a ransom,' he, like earlier writers, gives 'ethical and subjective explanations.' Clement believes there would have been an Incarnation without a Fall. He taught that Christ was 'the great bringer of the light ...' He does not support, Rashdall says pointedly, 'The depreciation of our Lord's moral and religious teaching which is now common both with ultra-orthodox and with ultra-liberal theologians.' (p. 225) For him Atonement is merged with Incarnation, which gives revelation. He was the first to raise the difficulties of the idea of divine punishment.

Irenaeus, whose dogmatism has as its background the struggle of the Early Church with the Marcionites, is the first of the Fathers to hold a distinctively objective theory. Since the canon of the NT was nearly complete by the last part of the second century, Paul's teaching had necessarily to be accepted as authoritative. Irenaeus, however, while working with a substitution theory and using the traditional language of justification by faith, was nearer to James than Paul in his explanations. His God is still a God of righteousness and love.

Origen is mentioned for his 'logos' doctrine. He recognises that Jesus was not the only man to whose soul the Word was united.¹¹ He has a ransom theory, which Rashdall finds preferable to other versions, being more metaphorical. While Origen quotes Paul on punishment, he does not posit a divine demand for retribution. Moreover, justification is by works (being made righteous). Rashdall praises Origen as the greatest patristic thinker, and as nearly acceptable to moderns.

⁷ Clement of Alexandria, c.150-215 AD.

⁸ Origen, c.185 - c.254.

⁹ Justin Martyr, c.100 - c.165.

¹⁰ Tertullian, c.160 - c.225.

¹¹ *Contra Celsum*, iii.28.Lom.xviii. 287. HR, 257-8, nn. 1& 2.

Part 2.

The second part of the Chapter, on the later Greek Fathers, portrays the group as less enlightened than Origen, but not descending to the level of Tertullian. It is noted that in their theology, the doctrine of Atonement was subordinated to that of Incarnation. Rashdall gives expositions of the works of twelve Fathers, whose lives span the period from the second to the twelfth centuries.

Of these, we may note briefly his reference to Athanasius¹² and Eusebius.¹³

Athanasius, Rashdall says, is 'very little of a thinker.' (p. 294) His atonement theory is based on substitutional sacrifice, though not clearly penal. However, redemption is by the Incarnation; the death is an incident. His Christology is reduced by docetism.¹⁴

Eusebius, Bishop of Caesarea (third and fourth centuries) was the first of the Fathers to emphasize penal substitution. Rashdall's judgment is stern: '... no Western, Catholic or Protestant, has ever presented the idea of vicarious punishment ... in a more repulsively juridical form.' (p. 302)

Rashdall is particularly impatient of the 'ransom' doctrine as a trick played on the Devil, who is deprived of his prey, mankind. The end of the period in the Eastern Church, dominated by the theology of John of Damascus (c. 680-c. 760), he describes as the 'dregs.'

Chapter 5: 'Latin Theology - Augustine, Anselm, Abelard.'

The Latin writers were legalistic. Cyprian¹⁵ held that God must be placated with penances. Rashdall follows the growth of importance of the ransom theory. These writers are predecessors of the 'great father of Western theology, Augustine.'

Augustine taught that Christ's coming was necessary because of the Fall. A legalist, he justified in great detail the ransom theory.¹⁶ The idea of vicarious punishment 'stands out in his pages, naked and unabashed.' (p. 334) It is in Augustine first that Paul's doctrine predominates; but Augustine is judged far stricter than Paul, teaching the ' "total depravity" ' of human nature. He is predestinarian,

¹² Athanasius, c.296 - 373.

¹³ Eusebius, c.260 - c.340.

¹⁴ Docetism, doctrine of the Early Church that the humanity of the earthly Christ was apparent more than real. See ODCC, p. 413.

¹⁵ Cyprian, d. 258.

¹⁶ *De trin.* E.g. xiii c.10 & c.16. HR, p. 332.

accepting that the majority of humankind will suffer eternal torment. Rashdall criticises his teaching severely.

Rashdall praises Anselm for rejecting the ransom theory. He explicates: according to Anselm's doctrine, expounded in Cur Deus Homo (see Sect. 1) the debt (for sin) had to be paid to God, not the Devil, and amount to more than God had lost. By his voluntary death, Christ acquired infinite merit, transferred to man. Since all were accounted guilty for the sin of one (Adam) this was an equivalent; for God was obliged, by 'necessary' law, to receive either 'satisfaction' or punishment. 'Satisfaction' differs from punishment, in that the death was voluntary.

However, both Augustine's and Anselm's doctrines are objectionable. Anselm's 'notions of justice are the barbaric ideas of an ancient Lombard king.' (p. 355)

Abelard, however, denies all substitutional or expiatory theories. His theory is subjective. Rashdall quotes him copiously, for example; 'I think, therefore, that the purpose and cause of the incarnation was that he might illuminate the world by His wisdom and excite it to Himself.'¹⁷ (Rashdall gives the Latin text of the passage from Abelard's Commentary on the Romans used by St. Bernard in his charges against Abelard, sent to the Pope.) An Appendix on Abelard expands the subject.

Chapter 6: 'Scholastic Theories.'

Here Rashdall speaks with some sympathy of Peter the Lombard¹⁸ who, says Rashdall, was the last to defend the ransom theory, at the end of the millennium, which, in any case, he treated metaphorically, - and was really a disciple of Abelard. Shortly afterwards, the Anselmic theory, which Rashdall regards as more moderate, prevailed.

The period of Scholasticism is described.

Thomas Aquinas¹⁹ is treated in some detail. Rashdall judges that Thomas had no new ideas, but systematised other theologians. He had a modified ransom doctrine, according to which no-one could merit damnation by original sin alone. Unbaptized infants, instead of hell, inhabited a *limbus puerorum*.

¹⁷ *Epist. ad Rom. Opera*, ed. Cousin, ii. p. 207. HR p. 358 n.1.

¹⁸ Peter the Lombard, c.1100-60. 'Master of the Sentences.'

¹⁹ Aquinas, c.1225-74. Schoolman.

Thomas, though sometimes confused, was more enlightened than Augustine. But, 'one thing is clear: justification is, with St. Thomas, the actual making of the man good through the virtue which is infused into him by God.' (p. 380)

Of the seven sacraments he posited, he was particularly concerned with penance. Rashdall is not sympathetic to his 'semi-magical' view of sacraments, but concludes by finding some progress in the medieval theories. The introduction of purgatory is an improvement on the doctrine of hell for the majority. Salvation works through the 'imparting' of righteousness. Rashdall is, on the whole, well-disposed towards the Schoolmen.²⁰ This is consistent with his preference for 'catholic' rather than Protestant doctrine in his emphasis of the importance of 'works' more than faith in salvation.

Chapter 7: 'Luther and the Reformation.'

Rashdall holds that Reformation theology is not original; it is Augustinian – a one-sided hardening of Pauline theology. Luther was much more under the influence of tradition than he realised. But, compared to Augustine and the Middle Ages, his theology is even more centred on the death of Christ; Christ is the 'greatest of all sinners' because he assumed our sins (p. 399). For, Luther declared, the 'scheme of redemption' is 'contrary to reason.' To Rashdall, who considered reason one of the most important attributes of God, this was anathema.

Calvin's theology is less extreme, but his God is 'an angry and punishing God.'²¹ Predestinarianism was linked to Lutheran/Calvinist teaching of 'the total depravity of human nature' (p. 400). Even after justification, according to Luther, the 'just man sins in every good work.'²² In Luther, there is a complete 'divorce between theology and morality.' In the view of both Luther and Calvin, the heathen would be damned. Rashdall, sympathetic to Augustine's doctrine of purgatory, is indignant that 'Luther swept away' this modification of damnation for unbelievers.

However, he adds that Luther did well in protesting against penances and earning of 'merit,' concepts responsible for 'nearly all the practical abuses of the medieval Church' (p. 418f.). Further, it is said to be 'impossible to exaggerate the beneficent effect' of the formula which, in other contexts, Rashdall so strongly criticises, -

²⁰ Schoolmen: teachers of philosophy & religion at medieval universities.

²¹ Inst. (1553) VII 29. HR, p. 400 n..2.

²² *In omne opere homo justus peccat.* (Weimar, vii. 136) HR, p. 402 n.2.

‘justification by faith only,’ - in its application to monastic, ascetic practices. The Reformation ‘did involve a practical reassertion of the true relations between religion and morality’. (This contrasts with his view on page 417 that Luther’s doctrine caused a decline in good works.)

The last section of the Chapter lists reasons why Luther’s doctrine should be abandoned. He summarises (lest any is unconvinced). The points made are:

- (1) The doctrine of the fall, taken literally, is no longer tenable. Nor can it be used metaphorically to support ‘penal substitution.’
- (2) The scheme is dependent on the retributive theory.
- (3) It is not workable, even on the retributive scheme.
- (4) The same objection applies to the theory that humanity, incarnate in Christ, really suffered the penalty of sin. It is also a logical fallacy to argue from a particular (Christ) to a general (all humanity).
- (5) deals with ‘Dr Dale’s’ theory, discussed further in an Appendix.
- (6) It is wrong to hold that ‘certain beliefs’ are pleasing to God without corresponding moral effects.
- (7) The doctrine contradicts the teaching of Christ.

The deadliest result of the doctrine of justification by faith is: that (among other things) it encourages ‘blind credulity;’ deters the clergy from study; prevents co-operation with those of unlike belief; and fosters ‘pharisaical complacency.’ (pp. 428-429)

While we may sympathise with Rashdall’s often apt polemic, it must be judged that the Chapter is somewhat unbalanced in its strong criticism of Luther, whose works were prolific and disparate. A wider analysis of Luther’s works might have resulted in a more modified assessment. Particularly, his less disapproving assessment of Calvin, whose doctrine of atonement in the Institutes²³ is surely the epitome of what Rashdall most abhorred, is surprising.

Chapter 8: ‘The Truth of the Atonement.’

In this Chapter, Rashdall (i) summarises the doctrine of atonement expounded above; (ii) introduces his view of the incarnation and his interpretation of the Trinity.

(i) He states that the doctrine of the atonement was probably not Christ’s teaching. The fact does not necessarily invalidate it; it satisfies a need. (It may be judged that the claim needs further clarification. Rashdall does add that ‘religious experience’ is

²³ Calvin (1509-64), Institutes. HR gives *Inst.* (Genev. 1602). See p. 399, n.1.

largely dependent on ‘intellectual belief’.) From the various theories proposed, it is asked whether we may select one acceptable to modern thought. It is confirmed that we may. It is the subjective view of Abelard, the Schoolmen and Origen. Various ‘modern’ writers, who also ‘contributed’ to the change are mentioned. The objection is expressed by Denney; why a death, if there is no objective need for it? Rashdall replies with Ritschl²⁴ that the cross was an ‘accident’ involved in Jesus’ faithfulness to his vocation. Such a view of the moral efficacy of Christ’s work implies a salvific effect as emanating from the whole life, not only the death of Christ.

(ii) Here Rashdall has an expansion from atonement theory. Asking whether the death is, as traditionally taught, the voluntary act of the pre-existent Son, he introduces his doctrine of Christology and the Trinity. The Logos, not the human Jesus, was pre-existent. (Now the argument returns to atonement.) It follows that we cannot assert any kind of transaction. For there are not two distinct pre-existing Persons, one imposing and the other enduring punishment. Rather, God is revealed in Christ’s sufferings, as God is revealed – but imperfectly – in other men. It is not orthodox to say that God died. (pp. 451-454)

Further major points are made in the concluding pages.

(i) On immortality. While Salvation is very important in the present life, it is meaningless (‘denatured’) if not continued in an after-life.

(ii) On ecumenism beyond Christianity. In the last two pages, Rashdall appears to vacillate between an inclusive and an exclusive view of Christianity as a saving faith. He is more convincing in his assertion of the liberal, inclusive view. Thus, he states that Christians must not claim a monopoly of salvation. The ideal may be found (imperfectly) in other religions. For salvation is effected by ‘the moral ideal which Christ taught ... illustrated by His life and death of love: ...’ (p. 463).

²⁴ Ritschl, Justification and Reconciliation, ET p. 566. See HR, n.1 p. 442.

Chapter 3. Christology.

Introduction.

Rashdall's Christology, which will be surveyed in this Chapter, is more complex than his Atonement theory. Though controversial, his doctrine on the latter is quite clear; while, in the case of his Christology, it is by not easy to analyse and ascertain his position, even though he maintained vigorously that he, unlike his opponents, was truly orthodox. In this Chapter, therefore, his public pronouncements and published works, his sermons and correspondence will be examined in order to reach a conclusion on the nature of his Christology.

This area of theology generated a considerable literature during the first two decades of the twentieth century and before. Rashdall's Christological pronouncements, of which the most famous was his speech to the Modern Churchmen's Conference at Girton in 1921, must be seen, therefore, as part of an ongoing debate.

Section 1.

The Earlier Years to 1915.

In this first Section, two periods will be considered. The first, at the end of the nineteenth and in the early years of the twentieth century, is dominated by Charles Gore's early writing; while the second, in which the distinction between deity, divinity and humanity was debated, covers the period from 1907 to 1915.

I 1889-1907.

In the years at the end of the nineteenth century, the outstanding theological work was Lux Mundi,¹ of 1889, a collection of essays by Anglo-Catholic writers. The chapter by C. Gore, 'The Holy Spirit and Inspiration,' is at the centre of the theological debate; for it sets forth Gore's acceptance of the idea that Christ's knowledge was limited, and the Biblical scholarship on which this view was dependent.

¹ C. Gore, Lux Mundi (London: Murray, 1889).

It has been remarked that an earlier generation had insisted on the doctrine of the ‘omnipotence, omniscience and omnipresence’ of Jesus Christ,² while soteriology, (considered in my last chapter) ‘took second place’ to the discussion on the nature of the ‘Logos’; of Jesus Christ in his ‘two-fold nature as Creator and Lord.’ Now, Christology was the main topic of theological interest.

In this sub-section, I shall review the discussion as it centres on certain focal points. These are: the limitation of the knowledge of Christ, which was recognized as a decisive issue after the publication of Lux Mundi; the Virgin birth, closely connected with the issue above; and finally, Logos and Trinity, revisited by contemporaries in the light of shifting Christology.

(i) Limitations of the Knowledge of Christ

Rashdall’s part in the debate cannot be understood without reference to Gore’s work.

Gore, Lux Mundi

Gore’s essay on the Holy Spirit, traditional in the first half, becomes controversial only when he reaches the subject of the Spirit’s inspiration in Scripture. Even in this section he states the orthodox catholic position that the scriptures cannot be understood without the presuppositions of Church teaching. From this point, Gore expresses striking reservations.

The degree of inspiration of the writers is varied, he says. Even those sources most inspired, notably the prophets, can be mistaken. Not only the OT but the NT receives critical treatment. For example, Paul was mistaken about the date of the Second Coming. ‘Nor would it appear that spiritual illumination ... has any tendency to lift men out of the natural conditions of knowledge which belong to their time.’³ Gore admits the non-factual nature of the OT books of Writings. This does not invalidate Christ’s use of them as literary references. However, there may be mistakes in the sayings of Christ, since he possessed ‘natural knowledge,’ that is limited knowledge. Having allowed this, Gore asks, finally, how much may be ‘legitimately conceded’ (that is, to the Biblical critics). He concludes with the markedly liberal

² T. Langford, In Search of Foundations (New York: Abingdon, 1969), p. 186. References to Liddon’s Bampton, 1866.

³ C. Gore, LM 2nd ed. (London: Murray), p. 354.

reflection; if there is openness to certain questions, faith is made easier for some, 'who certainly wish to believe ...'.⁴

The Bampton Lectures and Dissertations.

After Gore had given the Bampton Lectures in 1891, on 'The Incarnation of the Son of God,' he amplified them in a further work of 1895, Dissertations,⁵ in which he elaborated on questions resultant on his earlier pronouncements. Turning to the nature of the 'Consciousness of our Lord,' he states that Christ did have supernatural knowledge; he cites as an illustration the coin found in the mouth of a fish (Matthew 17. 27.) - a weak example from the point of view of modern scholarship - but concedes that the miracle is not an indication of Godhead; the prophets too had supernatural knowledge. His powers were limited when he 'took on the form of a servant,' which Gore describes as 'self-beggary' or κένωσις. (Gr. emptying)⁶ Gore holds the precarious position that Christ was not omniscient but was infallible.

Rashdall.

Rashdall, pursuing the same subject, included a chapter on 'The Limitations of the Knowledge of Christ' in his Doctrine and Development of 1898.⁷ Although its publication follows Gore's writings, the sermon was given 'before the University of Cambridge' in 1888.⁸ Thus it precedes Gore's works.

Rashdall mentions this sequence. In a preceding note,⁹ he writes, 'Since this Sermon was written, the question has been brought into prominence by Canon Gore in Lux Mundi (1889), in his Bampton Lectures, The Incarnation of the Son of God (1891); and in the learned Dissertations on subjects connected with the Incarnation (1895). ... Had these works already appeared, I might have spoken less apologetically, though ... I hold that in certain directions the theory of limitation in our Lord's knowledge must be carried further than Canon Gore would admit.'

⁴ Ibid. p. 361.

⁵ C. Gore, Dissertations (London: Murray, 1895).

⁶ The kenotic theory was a term used by certain nineteenth century theologians to indicate the reference in Phil. 2.7. αὐτὸν ἐκένωσεν.

⁷ D and D (see above), pp. 33-57.

⁸ In HR's publication, the date is 1889, but other sources give 1888. See MM, Bibliography, 20 p. 20.

⁹ HR, D and D, p. 33.

Rashdall comments that, while Christ was divine, we must insist on his 'real humanity.' He had a human brain, which had to grow and develop (Luke's saying that Jesus grew in wisdom is quoted). Rashdall, like Gore, refers to kenosis. He criticises some developments of the kenotic theory, but states that the Pauline doctrine of kenosis or self-emptying is essential. Christ was neither omnipotent nor omniscient. While the Greek Fathers allowed this, the medieval Latin Fathers did not. But, he points out, since medieval knowledge was immeasurably less than that of modern times, the concept of omniscience was relatively less problematic. Christ, like his contemporaries, was limited in scientific knowledge. Moreover, he probably knew only what 'an ordinary Jew of his day knew about the authorship of Old Testament books.' There is much emphasis on the culturally relative and progressive nature of accumulated knowledge.

Rashdall concludes by speaking, conversely, of Christ's 'absence of limitation' in spiritual teaching. This reservation may be compared to Gore's view that Jesus was infallible even if not omniscient.¹⁰ Both wished to introduce concessionary possibilities, but Rashdall's is more cautious and less insistent on definitions.

Conclusion.

Gore and Rashdall are dealing with much the same material. They both discuss references to the OT in the New, recorded as dominical sayings, which are factually incorrect. They do not dispute the authenticity of the text, but reach the conclusion that Jesus' knowledge was limited, and that it can best be explained by the kenotic theory. Rashdall is more outspoken, Gore placing more emphasis on the modifying effect of preliminary church teaching. Gore, in view of his Anglo-Catholic background, appears very progressive (this is why his Lux Mundi is well-known). Their conclusions have much in common.

(ii) The Virgin Birth.

Enquiries of the period into the 'Jesus of History' are closely connected with questions raised by Biblical criticism, which caused anxiety and rethinking about the traditional reliance on Biblical proof-texts. When it was no longer held by the influential theologians of the times that the New Testament in its entirety was free

¹⁰ C. Gore, Dissertations (London: Murray, 1895).

from error, the doctrine of the Virgin Birth, recorded in the Gospels of Matthew and Luke, was no longer regarded as unassailable.

This shift of opinion, coinciding with the emergence of the discovery of evolution in the mid-nineteenth century, led to a convergence of theologically and scientifically based agnosticism as to whether such a miracle as a Virgin Birth, effected by divine intervention and resulting in a biologically divine man, a Son of God in a literal sense, could continue to be held as a dogmatic doctrine.

I shall comment on the views of Gore, as the leader of the Anglo-Catholic group, before outlining Rashdall's opinion.

Gore.

Gore discusses the matter in his Dissertations.¹¹ Speaking of it as a 'recent controversy' in his Preface, he devotes his first section to the question. He will argue, he says, for the Virgin Birth, against the 'naturalistic writers' (he refers to Renan, Harnack and others). His exegesis begins with the assertion that 'The doctrine of the person of Christ is inseparable from his Virgin Birth' and that 'Jesus Christ really was the Son of God incarnate.' He argues, therefore, from an 'a priori' position. This he does, first, on Biblical grounds. To account for the silence of Paul on the matter, he reasons that Paul believed in the Virgin Birth, for he calls Christ 'sinless, whereas the human race shared Adam's sin.' Such reasoning is clearly a 'non sequitur' without further explanation (some form of a doctrine of Immaculate Conception). Gore then supports the 'birth' accounts in the Gospels of Luke and Matthew by stating that: of Luke, 'the account in these chapters is derived from no other person than the Virgin Mother herself;' while Matthew thinks the information comes from Joseph. This very conservative treatment of the Biblical text (based on the assumption that the text is verbally accurate) is weakened, when taken in conjunction with his Lux Mundi Article discussed above. It is possible that Gore had not fully accepted the implication of his critical position.

His second argument is the ecclesiastically dogmatic one: it has the authority of the Christian Church, which is 'committed to it as a fact beyond recall under divine guidance ... Any conclusion which would invalidate any single article of the original creed' must be rejected.

¹¹Ibid. (p. vii & pp. 3-68).

This too is a conservative argument, a position held by Gore consistently in discussions on the Creeds. (It will be referred to in more detail in Chapter 4 below.)

Rashdall.

Rashdall's views on the Virgin Birth are incorporated in a Chapter entitled 'The Unique Son,' in Doctrine and Development.¹² Although published only in 1898, it was preached a year before Gore's Dissertations, at Balliol Chapel Oxford, in May 1894.

His text was from 1 John 4.9., of which the crucial phrase 'God sent his only begotten Son into the world,' was the subject of his sermon. Rashdall begins with Lightfoot's exegesis of μονογένης; that is, it means, not 'only-begotten,' but 'only one of its kind.' The emphasis is on μονο, not on γένης; the latter refers γένος (kind) not to γένεσις (origin). He explains the meaning of the latter by referring to the Epistle of St. Clement of Rome, who applies the word to the legendary phoenix. According to the fable, the bird died every five hundred years, leaving a new egg hatched in replacement; it was therefore the 'only one of its kind.' This is how the word is to be understood. The earlier Latin Creeds thus correctly used *unicus*, not *unigenitus*. The 'Divine Sonship' is unique, but the phrase used in the Epistle (his text) does not refer to a miraculous birth, Rashdall implies - though he does not state it in so many words.

The differing positions taken by Gore and Rashdall were characteristic of the polarisation which would develop between conservative and liberal theologians on the doctrine.

(iii) Logos and Trinity.

In reviewing this central topic, reference will be made to Gore's position before describing Rashdall's quite different approach.

Gore

Gore, both as lecturer and editor, was an important figure in the christological discussion concerning the transcendent Christ.

¹² D and D, Chapter 5, pp. 77-88.

In his Bamptons, he devotes the fifth Lecture to 'God's triune being.'¹³

While Jesus did not expressly reveal this doctrine, Gore says, he reveals it 'in his inner being.' 'It was simply that in the gradual process of intercourse with Him, His disciples came to recognise Father, Son and Holy Ghost as included in their deepening and enlarging thought of God.'

Gore asserts that Jesus 'did not allow his disciples to confuse their sonship with His.' For he spoke of 'my Father' and 'your Father;' never, except when 'dictating' the Lord's Prayer, as 'our Father.' (It may be commented that such support for a doctrinal point is hazardous, unless a theory of verbal inerrancy is held.)

Gore refers to the Holy Ghost as a separate, male person. 'He spoke of the Holy Ghost as a person who like Himself, could be blasphemed.' (Surely, it is incautious to place reliance on the obscure text Mark 3.29., referring to the 'sin against the Holy Ghost' in support of a doctrine!)

He appears to imply the subordination of the Holy Ghost, identifying him as 'He': 'He was to be His vicar and substitute in the hearts of the apostles.' Even more overt is the statement: 'yet he was the third, not the second, among the sacred three.' This subordinationism is surprising. The exposition is not clarified by the counter-claim, 'Moreover it became plain that these divine three were not distinct individuals ... there appeared an inseparable unity.'

In Dissertations,¹⁴ Gore, considering the question what was the cosmic effect of Christ's terrestrial limitation, asserts dogmatically the *status quo* of the Trinitarian activity: 'This self-limitation was compatible with the continuing function of divine and cosmic functions in another sphere.' But he often ceased using 'divine functions and powers ... He was and is at every moment ... both God and man.'

Rashdall.

Rashdall's doctrine of the Holy Trinity is completely different from those of the Lux Mundi writers. He sets out his ideas in a Sermon at Balliol in 1894, published as Chapter 2 in Doctrine and Development of 1898.¹⁵

In this Sermon, his main point, round which all the rest revolves, is that the word 'Person' as used traditionally of the Trinity – 'three persons and one God'

¹³ C. Gore, The Incarnation of the Son of God (London: Murray, 1891), pp. 130ff.

¹⁴ C. Gore, Dissertations, pp. 90ff.

¹⁵ Pp. 21-32.

(Athanasian Creed) - does not mean a person in the modern sense. 'I am afraid that most people ... think of the three Persons as three distinct beings, three consciousnesses, three minds, three wills.' (pp. 23f.) But 'to those who first introduced it, it certainly did not mean that.' This is illustrated graphically in the case of the Holy Spirit, about which St. Augustine is quoted: 'The Holy Ghost is the love wherewith the Father loves the Son and the Son the Father;'¹⁶ (p. 21) and the Schoolmen, who 'repeated' but more generally: 'The love by which we love God and our neighbour is the Holy Ghost.' (pp. 22f.)¹⁷ Thus, the Holy Ghost is to be conceived, according to this exegesis, in abstract, not personal terms. Aquinas speaks 'indifferently' (that is, synonymously) of *Persona* and *Proprietas*.

The Trinity must be reinterpreted, then. By *proprietates* we are to understand properties, powers, activities, or modes of existence.¹⁸ So, Rashdall believes, the Trinity is a model of God's activities. The logos or Word of God was communicated to the later prophets. The Christian revelation was final, yet God is 'revealing Himself ever more perfectly in the souls of men,' 'through the continued working of God's Spirit.'¹⁹ The Schoolmen elucidated further; God is Power, Wisdom and Will (or Love). (p. 26) 'This is the sum and substance of the matter.'

An important subsidiary point, contained in the long, dense footnote of page 21, refers to the NT idea of the pre-existence of Christ. It arose, he says, from the belief that the Messiah foretold by the prophets was 'part of the eternal counsel of God.' Here Rashdall is implying that pre-existence applies to the logos, not literally to the human Jesus. 'Of almost equal importance' are what 'God once said to the world by His Son,' and 'what the Spirit is saying to the Churches of our own day.'

This very comprehensive sermon displays the approach to the interpretation of the Trinity which he would adhere to throughout his life. The doctrine is challenging to its expositor, on account of its complexity and its unfamiliarity to the public. It is, however, an integral and indispensable part of Rashdall's Christology.

¹⁶ *quo genitus a genitante diligatur genitoremque suum diligit.*

¹⁷ HR's note, p. 23: Petrus Lombardus, *Sententiae, Lib. 1., I Dist. XVII.*

¹⁸ In a long foot-note p. 21, HR rejects, however, modalism, or, as he calls it, Sabellianism. The 'activities' are permanent characteristics of God, and cannot be 'put on & off.'

¹⁹ This thoughtful passage would have perhaps been clarified by a clear statement of the differing functions of the logos and the Spirit, especially as the exposition is complicated by the alternative terms: Power, Wisdom and Will.

II 1907-1915.

Introduction.

Rashdall made high claims for the potential divinisation of man. It will be found that the question of the psalmist, 'What is man?' is one that engaged the attention of post-Darwinian thinkers urgently for the more it became possible to argue that man, like the lower animals, is merely a mechanistic device, not different in essence from related species, the more theologians sought to show that this reductionist view was seriously deficient.

In his essay on 'The Incarnation and Development' in Lux Mundi, Illingworth had quoted the scholastic saying that 'every creature is a theophany.'²⁰ And if it is pointed out that this does not differentiate humankind from other species, we may follow his thesis to its conclusion, which stresses, 'how profoundly the religion of the Incarnation has been a religion of humanity.'²¹ The question of the potential divinity of man became central.

This was a peak period in Christological literature. The initial impetus was given by the publication of a highly controversial work in 1907, The New Theology,²² by R. J. Campbell, a Free Churchman. In the same year, from a conservative, Anglo-catholic position, Frank Weston, the Bishop of Zanzibar, published The One Christ.²³ A further publication in 1910, Christologies Ancient and Modern,²⁴ was written by William Sanday, Lady Margaret Professor of Divinity at Oxford from 1895. In it, referring to the outpouring of Christological writing, he speaks of 'the ferment that is going on in the public mind.'

The Hibbert Journal²⁵ was an important vehicle for the dialogue. The impetus was a controversial article by the Rev. Robert Roberts, a congregational minister in Bradford. Published in the Hibbert Journal of January 1909, it was entitled 'Jesus or Christ?'²⁶ The article gave rise to a wide-ranging discussion among theologians in the Journal. Their replies led to the publication of a complete supplement devoted to the Christological issues raised.

²⁰ Illingworth, 'The Incarnation & Development,' LM, pp. 181-214, at p. 186 n.3.

²¹ *Ibid.* at p. 211.

²² R. J. Campbell, The New Theology, (London: Chapman & Hill, 1907).

²³ F. Weston, The One Christ, (London: Longman, 1907).

²⁴ W. Sanday, Christologies Ancient & Modern, (Oxford: Clarendon, 1910).

²⁵ HJS, 'Jesus or Christ?' (1909).

²⁶ R. Roberts, 'Jesus or Christ?' HJ Vol.7, (Jan.1909), 352-369.

Rashdall, having been appointed canon at Hereford in 1910, was much engaged in practical and pastoral matters, and involved in other theological areas. Though setting forth his views on Christology in articles and sermons, he was not a major participant at this stage.

Outstanding christological works of the period will be examined. Rashdall's comments will be noted against this background.

Weston.

Weston's The One Christ, published in 1907, the same year as The New Theology, is sharply conservative in comparison. Written in Africa, it was the published form of his Oxford BD thesis. He speaks apologetically of his 'bookless state,'²⁷ and, away from academic influence, writes in the style of earlier theologians - 'No-one should dare to come into the presence of the Incarnate who is not anxious to fall down and worship Him.' He had been an interested listener when Gore gave his Bampton at Oxford.²⁸

Weston is a kenoticist, in that he believed, 'Omniscience was limited and conditioned by the constraints of manhood, but was not renounced; instead God restrained himself to exist in this way.'²⁹ His biographer, Maynard Smith, in his 'inadequate account of his argument' expresses it thus: 'It is incorrect to say that the Son of God ruled the universe from His Mother's knee.'³⁰ However, Weston concludes that in his 'universal state' Christ is the 'unlimited Logos.'³¹

In later writings, he contrasts 'the fallible Jewish Jesus of the liberals' with 'his own Jesus, the God by whom the universe is made.'³² More polemically, he says that,

²⁷ 'How can I hope to satisfy a Regius Professor in my bookless state?' Quoted by Maynard Smith in Frank, Bishop of Zanzibar, (London: SPCK etc., 1907, 1926 & 1928), p. 62. All page references from 1928 ed..

²⁸ H. M. Smith, Frank Bishop of Zanzibar (London: SPCK, 1st ed. 1926; 2nd ed., used here, 1928), p. 9.

²⁹ M. Chapman, 'Christ and the Gethsemane of Mind; Frank Weston then and now.' Paper given as a memorial lecture at Leeds Church Institute for 75th anniversary of Weston's death, p. 6. (Publisher's version used here and in notes from 'Memorial Lecture' listed below.)

³⁰ Smith, H. M, Frank, Bishop of Zanzibar, (London: SPCK, 1st ed. 1926; 2nd ed., used here, 1928).

³¹ Weston, The One Christ, p. 152. See M. Chapman, Mem. Lecture, p. 6, n.35.

³² Weston, The Christ & the Critics, p. 68. See M. Chapman, Mem. Lecture, p. 14. n.90. (It may be asked how the fact that Jesus was Jewish affects the matter.)

‘in tolerating these foolish, arrogant criticisms of God incarnate, we are guilty of most serious sin.’³³

His antagonism is underlined by references to modernist opponents who write from the ‘cosy arm-chairs of college studies.’³⁴ This is an expansion of his logically indefensible device of coupling the doctrine of the Modernists with their disregard of social issues.³⁵ Indeed, Rashdall himself, a prominent liberal, was very active socially both in his writings and in his practice. However, Weston is a thoughtful, sincere and devout Anglo-Catholic of the post 1889 generation.

Campbell.

In complete contrast, R. J. Campbell’s The New Theology was published in the same year. Campbell (1867-1956) was a contemporary of Weston at Oxford, where he arrived in 1891, and knew Gore, then Principal of Pusey House. On the advice of Fairbairn, Principal of Mansfield College, Oxford (Congregationalist) he became a pastor in Brighton in 1895. This was followed by a ministry at the City Temple, London, in 1903.³⁶

His New Theology aimed to give ‘a restatement of the essential thinking of the truths of the Christian religion in terms of the modern mind.’ (p. 3) As an extreme advocate of the doctrine of immanence (God expressed in the creation) he states that we cannot know about the ‘infinite Cause ... My God is my deeper self, and yours too,’ he says. (p. 35)

Moreover, even evil, he tells us, is immanent; a result of the disintegration caused by the Fall.

In his Chapter on ‘Jesus and the Divine Man,’ he considers the credal formulae, finding them ‘confusing,’ ‘if only, because’ (he says, taking up one of Rashdall’s main themes) ‘the word “person” does not mean to us quite the same thing that it meant to the framers of the ancient Creeds’ (p. 72)

A characteristic of Campbell’s theology is that he breaks down definite distinctions between the divine and the human. He does, however, state the hierarchy

³³ Weston, The Revelation of Eternal Love, p. 91. See M. Chapman, Mem. Lecture, p. 14, n.92.

³⁴ Weston, The Christ and the Critics, p. 132. See M. Chapman, Mem. Lecture, p. 14, n.93.

³⁵ Ibid. pp. 23, 24, 29. See M. Chapman, p. 13, nn. 85-87.

³⁶ K. Clements, Lovers of Discord (London: SPCK, 1988), pp. 25ff.

thus: the order is: deity, divinity, humanity. (pp. 74ff.) Yet divinity and the human are ‘two categories’ which ‘shade into and imply each other.’ So, he argues, we do not need to talk of ‘two natures.’ If any human could live a ‘life of perfect love,’ Campbell states, ‘he would be divine.’ ‘He (Christ) was God manifest in the flesh, because His life was a consistent expression of Divine love, and not otherwise.’

But this is to be distinguished from Deity. For, if by the Deity of Jesus is meant, ‘He possessed the all-controlling consciousness of the universe, then assuredly He was not the Deity.’ (p. 79)

There is no evidence to support the claim that Jesus was pre-existent. The doctrine of the deity of Jesus was a late development. (These are points that Rashdall discusses and accepts.) In his Chapter on the Incarnation, Campbell makes clear that he does not believe in the Virgin Birth. He points out, referring to Paul and Mark, that the earliest Biblical writers do not mention it. Denying that the OT writers ever prophesied it, he gives an exegesis of the passage in Isaiah 7.14. (‘Behold, a virgin shall conceive, ...’) remarking that no OT passage is a prophecy of the Virgin Birth of Jesus. (The main critical point – that the Hebrew word, unlike the Greek of the Septuagint, means ‘young woman,’ not ‘virgin,’ - is not spelt out.)³⁷ Campbell even introduces parallel stories from other religions, including Buddhism, and remarks: - ‘Every birth is just as wonderful as a virgin birth could possibly be, and just as much a direct act of God,’ and continues: ‘Those who insist on the doctrine will find themselves in danger of proving too much. ... it removes Jesus altogether from the category of humanity.’ (pp. 98ff)

In this last Chapter, Campbell’s ‘degree theology’ is emphatic. ‘We deny nothing about Him that Christian devotion has ever affirmed; but we affirm the same things of humanity as a whole.’ Finally, he takes this to its logical conclusion, with ‘Jesus is God, but so are we.’ (p. 94) The theory is paradoxical in that the use of ‘God’ here does not imply deity; this follows from his previous argument.

But, in describing the conclusions of Campbell in The New Theology, we are debating with only the first *persona* of a *Doppelgänger*, since Campbell later withdrew his book. But it was important as a radical contribution to the contemporary Christological discussions.

³⁷ This will be discussed in more detail in Sect. (ii) below.

Rashdall.

Rashdall wrote a review in the Hibbert Journal of the same year.³⁸ Although saying that ‘liberal theology has long needed such a book,’ he has some reservations. God and man, Rashdall insists, are two separate minds. He does not agree that: ‘My God is my deeper self and yours too.’

He differs from Campbell in his treatment of sin. That ‘sin itself is a search for God,’ is ‘better not said.’ The misdeeds of an evil man cannot be ‘part of God.’ Campbell is right in regarding Christ as a ‘full and ... finally sufficient revelation of God.’ Rashdall himself, however, would lay more stress than ‘Mr. Campbell’ on the ‘uniqueness of degree.’

In the posthumous collection, Ideas and Ideals,³⁹ an article of 1908⁴⁰ appears, entitled ‘Alleged Immanence of God,’ in which Rashdall gives detailed objections to the idea, (a feature of The New Theology) that ‘“God is everything,” or “everything is God.”’ - meanings, he says, often attached to ‘the phrase “Divine Immanence”.’ (p. 181) Introducing the article, he explains his extended aim: ‘to ask, quite apart from present controversies, whether we ought to speak of God as immanent, and if the phrase is to be used at all, what meaning is to be attached to it?’

Rashdall denies that immanence, as opposed to transcendence, may be regarded as one of the marks of liberal theology, together with liberal ideas of Biblical interpretation, Atonement, and the interpretation of the Creeds. Three points are made.

1. The Relation between God and the world. (p. 186)

It is a mistake to assume that ‘God is immanent in the world’ can mean ‘God is all.’ God cannot be all, if he is in something.

2. The Relation between God and other minds.

Rashdall opposes the ‘vague abstraction’ that ‘My thought or feeling is a part of God.’ This is like saying that a statue is part of its model. It cannot be held, for instance, that Caesar Borgia (Rashdall’s stock example of an evil man) is a part of God. If this were so, God could not be regarded as a moral being. Such an idea of immanence is mistaken, whether from a ‘writer in Lux Mundi’ or ‘the pulpit of the City Temple.’ (p. 196)

3. The Relation between God and Christ.

³⁸ HR, Review of The New Theology, HJ Vol. 5 (July 1907), 921-928.

³⁹ HR, Ideas and Ideals (Oxford: Blackwell, 1928), pp. 180-201. Page references in the main text.

⁴⁰ See MM, 153. p. 55 for confirmation of date.

To assert that Christ is God on the grounds that ‘God is all,’ means one can also assert, ‘Judas Iscariot is God.’ This argument is formally invalid. Rashdall has made his point with a *reductio ad absurdum*.

However, the importance of the ‘doctrine of Christ’s Divinity’ (p. 199) is that we can ‘think of God in the light of the moral ideal He taught and the character He exhibited. ... This we can do without saying that the human Jesus was a part of God. ... humanity, in its moral and religious aspect, attained its highest level in the historical Christ.’

In this elaborate Article, Rashdall has employed his ability as a philosopher to identify logical fallacy and his technique of surmising the doubtful mental images frequently held. He has demonstrated that he has a deeper awareness of human sin than can be incorporated in a theory of immanence as expounded by Campbell, a theory which he considers theologically and philosophically indefensible.

Roberts.

In his Article of 1909 in the Hibbert Journal,⁴¹ Roberts identifies one of the problems precipitating the Christological debate. It is the Biblical criticism, which had cast doubt on what may be known with any certainty from the Gospel passages (especially the fourth Gospel) used by traditional theologians as proof texts to support credal beliefs. He discusses the implications, speaking of a ‘disturbing disproportion between the claims made and the historical evidence legitimately producible in support of them.’ Further, he says, statements made about Jesus are not evidence about Christ. This ‘illegitimate’ procedure has led to the ‘passage of Jesus into Christ.’ Though the Gospels were ‘familiar literature’ in the Graeco-Roman world, we should be worried that ‘the claims based on this ancient literature are so enormous.’ (p. 358) He asks whether ‘these fables of the beginning and end of the world’ are ‘what we should expect from the “Crown and Essence of Humanity”.’

We cannot expect Jesus to understand all modern science and philosophy if he was man, but an ‘insoluble difficulty’ arises if he was God, Roberts argues. Moreover, the records from the Gospel account, he considers, suggest not only ‘limitations of knowledge’ but ‘ethical limitations.’ (p. 360) Of the ‘confusion’ between theological

⁴¹ R. Roberts, ‘Jesus or Christ?’ HJ Vol. 7 (Jan. 1909), 352-369.

accounts of 'Jesus and Christ' he reaches the conclusion: 'It would be an abuse of language to say that it deals with a mystery. It is flat contradiction.' (p. 369)

Replies.

Replies to Roberts' article were published in the July issue of the Hibbert Journal from G. K. Chesterton, a well-known fiction writer, and J. H. Moulton, Professor of Philology at the University of Manchester.⁴² Roberts wrote a 'rejoinder' in reply in the October issue.⁴³

Chesterton likens the title 'Jesus or Christ?' to the question 'Napoleon or Bonaparte.' Jesus does not have limits, but 'a dangerous absence of limits.'

Moulton is chiefly interested in linguistic points - this is his area of study. He is justified in supposing that some of the textual points made by Roberts would be nullified by a more modern translation; and in suggesting that a change in the understanding of the person of Jesus occurred as Christianity acquired world-wide significance. But the extent of Bible translations sold, 'from Sanskrit down to the rudest jargon of savages,' is not relevant to his claim that 'Jesus is Christ and God.' Moulton's reply, though more scholarly than Chesterton's, is finally inadequate.

It is not difficult for Roberts, in his 'rejoinder' to show the dissimilarity between the titles Jesus Christ and Napoleon Bonaparte. Indeed, he has no difficulty in rejecting the criticism of G. K. Chesterton by demonstrating the theological ignorance of the latter point by point. Most relevantly in this Section, since Chesterton has attributed to Jesus the belief that he was God incarnate, Roberts challenges, 'We have a right to know by what claim he is said to be God.'

Having demonstrated the factual shortcomings of their criticisms, he feels free to reassert his more extreme pronouncements.

Though Rashdall does not participate in these exchanges, it is to be supposed that, since he was a contributor to the Journal, he would have been aware of the discussions; and of the extended Christological writing in the special Supplement devoted to it. I shall therefore refer to its contents here.

⁴² G. K. Chesterton and J. H. Moulton, 'Jesus or Christ. A Reply to Mr. Roberts,' HJ Vol. 7 (July 1909), 746-766.

⁴³ R. Roberts, 'Jesus or Christ? A Rejoinder,' HJ Vol. (8 Oct. 1909), 83-101.

Special Supplement of the Hibbert Journal of 1909.

The aim of this Supplement, the editor tells us, is more 'comprehensive' than to discuss Roberts' articles.⁴⁴ It is a collection of essays by contemporary theologians and others, entitled 'Jesus or Christ?' following Roberts' article, which is reprinted. There are eighteen writers in addition to Roberts. The question of the distinctness of deity/divinity/humanity, was an important aspect of the discussion. In order to give some idea of the variety of opinion, I shall refer briefly to four of these articles.

The early Modernist **G. Tyrrell**⁴⁵ emphasizes the distinction between *Deus* and *divinus*. This is the point that Rashdall has identified in his review of Campbell and his article on 'The Alleged Immanence of God' referred to above, in opposing the assertion of Campbell that 'my God is my deeper self.' Tyrrell emphasizes, 'Between God and Godlike the distance is infinite.'⁴⁶

Oliver Lodge, a well-known scientist and spiritualist, writing on 'A Divine Incarnation,'⁴⁷ regards the Incarnation as the 'display in bodily form, for a limited period, of some portion of an existing spiritual essence.' Although not a traditional Christian he speaks in orthodox terms of 'the Lofty Spirit thus partially revealed to us, the Being which existed before all worlds, the Logos which was with the Father from all eternity and without whom nothing exists - this infinite and omnipresent Being we speak of as the Eternal Christ.' This is a further attempt to explore the relationship between Spirit, Logos and Christ.

R. J. Campbell contributed an article to the Supplement, which has little to add to his book of 1907,⁴⁸ being somewhat superficial, and dismissive of the question 'Jesus or Christ?' Jesus, he says, 'has made the word "Christ" a synonym for the best and highest that can truly be called human.' This simplification, lacking serious comment on the debate about Christ as the eternal Logos, caricatures his own position of two years earlier.

⁴⁴ 'Jesus or Christ?' HJS 1909, editor, 1-2.

⁴⁵ *Ibid.* Tyrrell, pp. 5-16.

⁴⁶ Tyrrell was nearing the end of his life when he wrote this essay. In spite of his orthodoxy on this central question, because of his modernism he was expelled from the Jesuits, & refused RC burial.

⁴⁷ O. Lodge, 'Jesus or Christ: A Divine Incarnation,' HJS 1909, pp. 116-121.

⁴⁸ R. J. Campbell, HJS pp. 180-192.

Eslin Carpenter, a Unitarian and Principal of Manchester College, Oxford, writes a scholarly article⁴⁹ on the new knowledge of the Gospels; Judaism; and the Universe, which have led to ‘profound changes in the traditional concept of Christianity.’

He traces the history of figures considered divine or deistic in other religions. Aligning himself with those who do not endorse the credal view of Christ as a constituent part of the Godhead, he concludes, ‘Jesus of Nazareth will take his place as the loftiest leader among the children of men.’ This is worked through in scholarly detail.

Rashdall.

*Sermon of 1909.*⁵⁰

In the same year, Rashdall addressed his congregation on ‘Sons of God,’ a sermon in which he explained his doctrine of the ‘divinity of man’ in simple language. Short extracts will illustrate his theme.

It is surely very rash to say that when He declared that all men were Sons of God and called upon to realize and act worthily of their Sonship, he meant something quite different from what he meant when he declared that He was the Son of God. Some part of the meaning of the term must surely be common to the two cases. And I think we shall best approach the consideration of the subject by asking, this Sunday, what Christ meant when he taught his disciples that they were by nature or that they were intended to become Sons of God.

There is a sense in which there is for the Christian [only one?] Son of God. We do well to assert that very jealously. That we find God revealed in Christ as in no-one else, ... this is the very central doctrine of the Christian faith. But it is quite as much a part, ... of the Christian faith to believe that we are all in a certain sense, sons of God, and may become so in a higher sense, by the help of the One Son.

There is a sense in which the true nature of a thing is shown by what it is at its best. ... When we ask what a Musician is, we don’t want to know what a musician is or does when he is a bad Musician. It is not part of the nature of a musician to play false notes, though ... the worst possible musician perhaps plays false notes more frequently than true. We understand what a musician is or does when he is the best of his kind.

⁴⁹ Ibid. Eslin Carpenter, *HJS* pp. 225-247.

⁵⁰ HR, PH MS Box 4. (1) ‘Sons of God,’ Aug. 1909. Text: ‘Behold what manner of love the Father hath bestowed on us, that we may be called the sons of God’ (Rom. 3.14-15).

Here, Rashdall uses the phrase ‘Sons of God’ in the way he uses ‘divine;’ that is, reflecting the goodness of God. He is expressing the view that goodness, rather than evil, is, finally, ‘natural;’ but not that humanity is God, as Campbell has claimed.

University Sermon, 1910.

Rashdall preached the University Sermon at University College, Oxford, on the 22nd May, Trinity Sunday. The type-script has many erasures. The original title (erased) is ‘The Trinity not Mysterious.’⁵¹ His text was: Col. 1. 25-27,⁵² which speaks of ‘mystery.’ Rashdall pointed out that, as Paul uses the word (μυστήριον) it refers, not to ‘something unintelligible,’ but to a truth given to the initiated. Paul borrows the word which, in a Christian context, means, for him, ‘revelation.’ So we must not dismiss the Trinity as a ‘mystery.’ Some are dogmatic about the doctrine, others reject it. But we must try to understand its history, and theologians must explain it in simple language.

He makes the following points:

The doctrine cannot be deduced from the NT. It developed gradually and is the work of ‘human brains.’ It is not a ‘supernatural communication *ab extra* of ready-made divine truth!’ but the result of the reflection of men like Philo, Origen, Athanasius, Augustus, Aquinas, and others. It has been accepted as orthodox by General Councils, but this fact, for the Church of England, is not binding.

The teaching has arisen from the attempt to reconcile conflicting views; and is based on OT passages such as ‘Let us make man in our own image,’ which no-one now defends as an allusion to the Trinity.

Rashdall then rehearses the Augustine/Aquinas exegesis, with its theory of the three ‘immanent relations in the Divine Nature.’ The three are explicated as attributes of God: (i) memory or power (the father) (ii) Wisdom or Word (the son) (iii) love or Will (the Spirit). They are not ‘capable of holding conversations.’

‘There is nothing in this doctrine, ... which could not be accepted by a Jew or a Unitarian.’

⁵¹ This title may be in reference to the work of 1696 by John Toland, Christianity not Mysterious. Toland, 1670-1722, a deist, ‘attributed the mysteries of Christianity to the intrusion of pagan conceptions’ See OHCC p. 1628.

⁵² 26. ‘even the mystery which hath been hid ... , 27. ... to whom God hath made known ... the glory of this mystery among the Gentiles.’

It is, he concludes, a way of expressing the idea that God has revealed himself in nature, 'in the soul of man.' and 'pre-eminently ... in the Person of Jesus Christ.'

A further conclusion adds that the Wisdom of God became united to a particular human soul and body ... in an outstanding 'manner and degree.' (This idea was sometimes known as 'degree theology.')

In all Rashdall's sermons on the Trinity, there are a few variables, but the basic exposition is invariable.

Sanday.

Christologies Ancient and Modern, by Sanday, was published in the following year. The first part of this work is a formal study of historical Christologies. Arranged in nine Lectures, it has been restructured in the second part. For Sanday had encountered the research into the unconscious mind which was an area of interest of the period (referred to by Lodge, for example, in his article in the Hibbert Journal); he was especially interested in the work of W. James,⁵³ and of F. W. Myers.⁵⁴ (These will be discussed in my fifth chapter below). So his later chapters are based on this new area.

For Sanday, the role of the unconscious mind as a communicator of divinity is a form of mysticism. His reading of Myers, who writes on the 'subliminal self' (the unconscious mind), suggests the metaphor of a line drawn through the human person, below which are the 'divine forces.'

Applying the metaphor to Christ, in this, his seventh Lecture, 'A Tentative Modern Christology,' he draws the parallel that 'above the line' he was human; in speaking of the converse (below the line), Sanday cautiously but finally reaches the traditional conclusion that 'justice is only done when we proclaim him God as well as man.'⁵⁵

In describing 'The Present Position' (Chapter eight), he refers in detail to the letters in the Hibbert Journal from and in reply to Roberts. Of the latter's original

⁵³ W. James, Varieties of Religious Experience, (London and New York: Longman, 1902).

⁵⁴ F. W. Myers, Human Personality and its Survival of Death, (London: Longman, 1903).

⁵⁵ p. 74.

article of January 1909 he is rather too dismissive, accepting the articles by G. K. Chesterton and J. H. Moulton, surprisingly, as an adequate answer.

Psychological study was a comparatively new field of learning, (discussion of it occurs in some Hibbert Journals of the years immediately preceding his book). Sanday is experimenting with its applications.

Rashdall from 1911 to the end of the period.

Review of Foundations.

The meaning of the phrase ‘one substance’ is discussed by William Temple⁵⁶ in Foundations,⁵⁷ a volume published in 1912 of Essays by ‘seven Oxford men.’ Rashdall wrote a review of it in the Hibbert Journal⁵⁸ in October of that year. (He remarks that ‘the main method of passing on to the public the results of theological studies’ is a volume of essays. The first of the collection, Essays and Reviews, was, he says, the best, ‘in spite of its rather aggressive liberalism.’ Foundations, the third, can ‘take for granted’ what was defended in the second, Contentio Veritatis.⁵⁹ [1902])

In his review, Rashdall describes Temple’s Essay on ‘The Divinity of Christ’ as ‘the most ambitious’ in the volume. He is ‘in sympathy’ with much in the article. However, it would be ‘wiser,’ rather than the question ‘Is Christ divine?’ to ask, ‘What is God like?’ ‘And the answer to that is Christ.’ Rashdall criticises Temple’s preference for the Western Fathers and comments curtly, ‘If he had read the Greek and Latin fathers widely,’ he would not be so Lutheran!

The central argument concerns the relation of Universals and Substance. Rashdall claims, ironically, to be puzzled by Temple’s exposition that ‘Christ is not *a* God (or *a* Divine Being) but God; Christ is not only *a* man but Man’. If this last assertion means that He represents “the highest ideal of manhood,” few who are prepared to recognize any sense the Divinity of Christ will be disposed to quarrel with him; but’

He then expresses his view that Temple is prepared to stake his whole theology on the “‘bastard-Platonic and medieval-realist” ... doctrine of Substance.’ But unlike ‘the

⁵⁶ William Temple, Archbishop of Canterbury from 1942.

⁵⁷ Foundations, (London: Macmillan, 1912).

⁵⁸ HR, Review of Foundations, HJ Vol. 11 (April 1913), pp. 668-686.

⁵⁹ Contentio Veritatis, by six Oxford tutors, (London: Murray, first ed. 1902). HR wrote the first essay, on ‘The ultimate basis of theism.’

old scholastics,' he cannot give his references, except, Rashdall remarks, that of a quotation from Moberly's Atonement and Personality. (Rashdall did not review the latter favourably!) Temple cannot get support from either Pauline writings or from 'our Lord.' Having already referred to Temple's theory as 'unintelligible,' he repeats in his conclusion: 'there is much in it which I do not understand.'

Rashdall has thus repeated his characteristic understanding of the divinity of Christ, while, as a philosopher, he has made a serious criticism of the validity of the arguments used here.

The Creeds.

Rashdall contributed an article on the Creeds to the Modern Churchman in 1914.⁶⁰

In it he writes a section on his Christology, which I shall outline here, with its telling references to opponents.

The credal doctrine of incarnation, he says, is sometimes dismissed as a 'mystery.' Some 'look with much unchristian hatred upon other people whom they suspect of not believing it in their sense.' (p. 206) Others cannot believe what seems to imply the 'manifestly absurd or incredible.'

- (1) This doctrine was never taught by Christ himself. The '*aut Deus aut non bonus*' argument should never be used.
- (2) The Greek metaphysical references to the logos, as in John's Gospel or the Early Church, are basically concerned with Christ's teaching about God and human duty; 'his character seemed to them the fullest revelation of Deity which they had received or could conceive themselves receiving.' It was the 'appeal that Christ made to reason and conscience' that led to the belief that 'Christ was the fullest - in some sense the final - revealer of God' (though his work was continued in the Church). And that is 'the one line of argument that can appeal to us now.' (p. 208)
- (3) The corollaries of this view are these:
 We accept the limitations of his knowledge; and 'we must push the doctrine much further than the Bishop [Gore] ... is willing to push it.'
 Jesus did not himself claim to be the judge.
 He did not know the full setting up of the Messianic Kingdom.

Rashdall adds the following observations.

The 'ultra-orthodox' (and some 'advanced liberals') 'disparage' Christ's teaching. This is to destroy Christianity itself.

⁶⁰ HR, MC 'The Creeds.' Vol. 4 (July 1914), pp. 204-214. Page references in the main text.

The writing of the Jewish scholar, C. Montefiore, on the Synoptic Gospels is recommended.

Rashdall summarises, explaining the meaning of 'Incarnation' or 'Godhead,' if the 'moral appeal' doctrine is accepted as primary. This he does in terms of 'degree theology': 'if men represent and reveal God in proportion to the degree of their moral and spiritual insight, then it becomes possible to conceive that One Man was supremely, uniquely a Revealer of God.' (p. 212) As for the 'pre-existent Son,' that is a misunderstanding of the concept of logos.

Such is the real meaning of the Greek Fathers, and the Nicene Creed merely 'tried to embody it.'

It may be added that the '*aut Deus aut non bonus*' argument refers to the contention that since Jesus claimed to be God, he was untruthful if this is not so. But Rashdall implies, the argument is not valid, if, as he regularly insists, Jesus did not make that claim.

In this article, we have one of the clearest and most succinct statements Rashdall ever made on his understanding of Christology.

Conclusion.

In the early years of the twentieth century, the spectrum of opinion on the doctrines of Christology had become a phenomenon of the times. The several epicentres of this discussion ranged from a study of the human Jesus of history to the credal questions of the deity or divinity of Christ as set forth in the Creeds. Rashdall contributed to the discussions with studied moderation, but his perspective was invariably liberal.

By divinity, he understood likeness to God, which is available to humanity through transforming influence. As used by Rashdall and the Modernists⁶¹ generally, therefore, the doctrine, in its application to Christ, is aptly described by Macquarrie⁶² as the belief that Jesus differs from other men in the degree of his divinity, but not in 'kind.' Thus Rashdall does not use 'divinity' synonymously with 'deity.' This is clear. The most difficult problem is whether his Christology places Christ in both categories, or only the first.

⁶¹ See A. M. G. Stephenson, Rise and Decline, pp. 5 & 7.

⁶² J. Macquarrie, Jesus Christ in Modern Thought (SCM: London, 1990), p. 359.

His exegeses - although he insists from time to time that we should hold to the words of the Creeds, - are a very free reworking of the credal insistence on the deity of Christ. They do not rule out the conclusion that Christ shares divinity but not deity.

Chapter 3. Christology: Section 2.

The Years from 1915 to 1924: The Period of the Girton Conference.

Introduction.

It has been seen that Rashdall was an active participator in the Christological debate for many years. However, he did not become a public and major figure in this debate until he spoke at a Conference of Modern Churchmen at Girton College Cambridge in August 1921. The public peak of controversy for Rashdall occurred as a result of this Lecture. His Paper, on 'Christ as Logos and Son of God,' was one of a series of papers. The Conference caused a furore, not only in ecclesiastical circles, but more widely, for it was reported in the national press.

It was during this period that Rashdall's Christological position, under the spotlight of publicity, and the microscope of theologians and professional clergy, stirred up controversy, heightened by its ambiguity.

In this Section, preparations before the Conference will be noted, as well as the event itself. After reporting the substance of Rashdall's Lecture, I shall review the aftermath.

I Before the Conference.

Context.

The general subject: 'Christ and the Creeds' and the topic for the morning lectures 'Our Lord Jesus Christ' had been announced by Henry Major¹ in the Modern Churchman of the preceding February. The immediate reason for the choice of subject was the publication of The Beginnings of Christianity, Part I, by Foakes-Jackson and Kirsopp Lake.² Of the four chapters in this work, the last, on 'Christology' had been critically reviewed as too negative on the person of Christ. In his announcement, Major mentioned the 'interest in it which has been aroused by Professor Lake's two recent books,'³ of which the other, Landmarks of Christianity, a shorter and more accessible form of The Beginnings, was included on the list of books for the Conference.

A. M. Ramsey refers to this context⁴ of the Conference in describing how the Modernists had been 'embarrassed by the publication of Beginnings Part 1, since it deviated from their emphasis on the "Jesus of history."'

¹ Henry Major. A leading figure of English Modernism.

² Foakes-Jackson and Kirsopp Lake, (eds) The Beginnings of Christianity, Part 1 Vol. 1 (London: Macmillan, 1920).

³ A. M. G. Stephenson, Rise and Decline, pp. 109ff.

⁴ A. M. Ramsey, From Gore to Temple (London: Longmans, 1959), pp. 69-70.

Hensley Henson, Bishop of Durham, expressed fear that this difference would cause trouble.⁵ But the Agenda remained unchanged, except for the addition of a paper read by Foakes-Jackson representing himself & Kirsopp Lake.

Various Preparations for the Conference.

(i) *Articles in the Modern Churchman.*

These provide background to the ambiguities resulting from current Christological discussions. There were two Articles on 'The Incarnation' in May and June 1921, preparing the way for the August Conference. C. E. Howe, writing on 'The Crux of the Problem' I,⁶ says that he had not been satisfied with Sanday's position in Christologies; he was struck by the incredibility of the formula: 'Perfect God and Perfect man.' He quotes Rashdall in Philosophy and Religion;⁷ that, as we mean 'that Christ is the highest revelation of God to man'⁸ we can say 'very God of very God, of one substance with the Father.' This passage, of key importance in the whole debate, must be quoted directly, in its context. 'Now, if in the life, teaching and character of Christ - in his moral and religious consciousness ... we can discover the highest revelation of the divine nature, we can surely attach a real meaning to the language of the Creeds ...' Rashdall remarks that 'the phrase' (that is, the credal *deus de deo* with its expansion) 'undoubtedly belongs to a philosophical dialect which we do not habitually use.' (Rashdall is expressing here his view that the words of the Creed, since they are expressed in archaic language, need not be taken literally.)

Howe recalls Rashdall's position which was to be repeated at the Conference, that it was 'the divine Logos that pre-existed, not the human Jesus,'⁹ and stresses that, according to Rashdall, the traditional idea of the Incarnation is not 'Catholic.' Howe's Article is particularly relevant in reminding readers of Rashdall's previous pronouncements and therefore indicating his probable position at the coming Conference. Howe himself expresses reservations.

In the June issue, in a second Article by F. A. M. Spencer, 'The Crux of the Problem II,'¹⁰ the author discusses, in particular, the position of 'advanced liberals' who, like Kirsopp Lake in Stewardship of Faith¹¹ would substitute 'logos worship' for 'Jesus Worship' - for most of them hold some form of this doctrine, he says. Spencer speaks ironically of the sequence of

⁵ Boden-Worsley, 'The Girton Conference,' Theology (Sept. 1940), 151-159.

⁶ C. E. Howe, 'The Incarnation,' 'The Crux of the Problem,' 1, MC Vol.2 (1921-22: May 1921 Issue), 56-60.

⁷ HR, Philosophy and Religion (London: Duckworth, 1914), pp. 180-181.

⁸ Howe's wording, but summarises the sense of a longer phrase.

⁹ HR, Atonement, p. 444.

¹⁰ F. A. M. Spencer, 'The Crux of the Problem,' 2, MC, Vol. 11 (1921-22: June 1921 Issue), 113-117.

¹¹ K. Lake, Stewardship of Faith (London: Christopher's, 1915).

thought - 'God is love, Jesus was love, therefore we affirm of Jesus, absolutely and without reserve that He is very God of very God, and of one substance with the Father.' This is not entirely fanciful, though surely an exaggeration, since 'advanced liberals' would certainly have noticed such an elementary example of logical fallacy! However, for his part, he supports a less Christocentric worship.

M. G. Glazebrook, the organiser of the Conference, contributed his own pre-conference Article, published in the June issue of the Modern Churchman,¹² which is mainly a commentary on the function and content of the Creeds. He points out, first, the double function of faith, which describes both factual beliefs and the subjective effect. But, he continues, in the NT there was no 'inner conflict' arising from the incongruity of these two disparate matters, for there were no developed Creeds.

This leads him to his main subject - the Creeds - for the words of which he has little sympathy. The language (here he states the position taken generally by the Modernists) is dependent upon contemporary science and philosophy. In particular, he remarks that the account of the 'ascent' into heaven is 'demonstrably false.' More generally, he remarks: 'It is tacitly conceded that educated men may understand them (that is, the credal phrases) symbolically, and do no wrong in repeating words to whose literal meaning they cannot assent.'

Referring to OT criticism, he adds that the credal claim 'according to the scriptures' refers to proof-texts which are 'not remotely Messianic.'

He comments on the Christological points implied in the phrases (i) 'God from God' (*deus de deo*) and (ii) the Virgin Birth. On (i), he calls the reader's attention to the later Platonic background of the clauses on the Trinity in the Creed. The *de* (or $\epsilon\kappa$) clauses imply subordination, he points out, where the emphatic 'very God of very God' denies it. On (ii), he adds his comments to the much-documented discussion on the Virgin Birth, referring to the purpose of the credal statement as anti-docetic, and the proof-text from Isaiah 7. 14., as a 'double mistranslation.' Presumably, he refers to the mistranslation from Hebrew of עלמה into παρθένος and its subsequent mistranslation into English.¹³

Glazebrook's Article has been reported in detail, since it is important, not only as a pre-conference writing but also as an example of the discussions on the Creed so wide-spread among theologians of the time. Rashdall is also much concerned with the matter of credal

¹² M. G. Glazebrook, 'The Truth & the Creeds,' MC, Vol. 11 (June 1921 Issue), 97-106.

¹³ It could, however, be held that it is a mistranslation only at the later stage, since, in the Classical Greek period, παρθένος had the wider meaning of the Hebrew. However, whether it was a single or double mistranslation is merely a theoretical point, since παρθένος in the Matthean Greek is obviously meant to imply the narrower sense, unlike the Hebrew.

interpretation though usually more cautious in the words he chooses to express his reservations. The matter will be discussed below.

(ii) *Books for the Conference.*

(a) A list of books to be read as background to the Conference, of which the range and tone varies widely, was published in the Modern Churchman of July 1921.¹⁴

A number of the books are not academic in style but are more popular - in some cases devotional or for the use of study groups; some aim to modify the views of more radical critics. In this category are: T. R. Glover's The Jesus of History; G. R. H. Shafto's The School of Jesus. A Primer of Discipleship; H Latham's Pastor Pastorum; R. E. Speer's The Principles of Jesus; and C. A. A. Scott's Dominus Noster.

Since these are predominantly didactic and devotional, they are, for Rashdall and other academic theologians, scarcely relevant to the Conference.

(b) The book by Richard Roberts, The Jesus of Poets and Prophets is in a different category. Written only two years before the Conference, it is a book for the thoughtful, educated layman. The author makes a study of the Person of Jesus 'as certain great souls have seen it' Having referred briefly to the history of Christian art, he proceeds to treat sympathetically a number of poets and 'prophets,' including some of the less orthodox in religious belief, thus raising christological, as well as wider theological issues, which were exercising the minds of certain groups of the public. It is more challenging to the pious than the works reviewed above.

(c) The list includes some academic works.

Brief notes follow on the most important of these:

Harnack's Das Wesen des Christentums is based on lectures given to students of Berlin University in 1899-1900, of which the first English translation, What is Christianity?

¹⁴ Books for the Conference:

1. T. R. Glover, The Jesus of History (London: SCM, 1917).
2. W. Sanday, Outlines of the Life of Christ, (Edinburgh: Clark, 1905).
3. C. Anderson Scott, Dominus Noster, (Cambridge: Heffer, 1918.)
4. B. Latham, Pastor Pastorum, (Cambridge: CUP, 1854).
5. K. Lake, Landmarks in the History of Early Christianity, (London: Macmillan, 1920).
6. N. Micklem, The Galilean (London: J Clarke, 1920).
7. R. E. Speer, The Principles of Jesus (New York etc, 1902).
8. G R H Shafto, The School of Jesus (London: SCM, 1920).
9. F. C. Conybeare, The Historical Christ (London.: Watts, 1914).
10. Shirley Case, The Historicity of Jesus (Chicago: Clark, 1912).
11. A Schweitzer, The Quest of the Historical Jesus (London: A. C. Black, 1910.)
12. A. Harnack, What is Christianity? (London: Clark: ET 1901 and 1904).
13. Richard Roberts, The Jesus of Poets & Prophets (London: SCM, 1919).

appeared in 1904. Holding that Christianity does not depend on theology or philosophy Harnack stresses the figure of the historical Jesus, asserting that we may trust the first three Gospels. W. R. Matthews, looking back on the work in the Introduction to his 1958 edition considers it 'dated' on account of its form criticism, its dismissal of dogmatic theology and its rejection of eschatology. However, those who read it in 1921 had not yet experienced the Barthian reaction referred to by Matthews.

But between the writing of Harnack's book at the turn of the century and 1921 there had appeared, to counteract the latter's rejection of mystery and the *eschatos* in the Gospels, the book written by Schweitzer, in 1910, also on the Conference list: The Quest of the Historical Jesus, in which the interpretation of the NT was centred on its eschatology. Schweitzer reacts from the study of the 'Jesus of history.' He distances himself from the tendency of 'modern' theology to be 'world-accepting,' while Jesus, he says, was negative to the world. The book emphasises the struggle of the individual and rejects the emphasis on the ethical and societal teaching of contemporary exegetes.

The book by W. Sanday, Outlines of the Life of Christ, is an earlier work in the writings of a scholar whose theological position did not remain static. Sanday explains in the Preface that in this newer publication of 1905 it stands unrevised, retaining his views of 1899. Its views are therefore far more conservative than were the later ideas of the author - whose name is cited by Major in the Modern Churchman of June 1939 as one of the important liberal scholars of 'English-speaking lands.' It is therefore an anomaly that this work, with its conservative tone, no longer endorsed by the author, should have been recommended for the Conference.

The work by Conybeare, The Historical Christ, of 1914, the purpose of which is somewhat disguised by its author, is described, in his Preface, as providing 'a middle way between traditionalism on the one hand and absurdity on the other.' His main target, it is implied, is the 'absurdity' of the views of extreme radicals, which he claims to be investigating. But his most spirited criticism is of the orthodox - of the Anglican hierarchy in particular - which 'silences' those who do not concur with the 'orthodoxy' of the fourth century. The Greek Fathers are fiercely criticised by Conybeare who remarks that the cosmology of the Fathers shows how the NT writers thought. For, the NT as well as the OT should be open to biblical criticism (even though NT criticism is opposed by some of the clergy 'who are for ever trying to close their ranks').

Kirsopp Lake's Landmarks in the History of Early Christianity, was written the year before the Conference, while he was preparing, with Foakes-Jackson, the section on 'primitive Christianity' for the lengthy Beginnings of Christianity, Part 1. This section in Beginnings has a chapter on Christology (Chapter 4). The Beginnings is of particular importance here, for the subject for the Conference, 'Christ and the Creeds,' was chosen

because of the publication of Part 1 in 1920. It follows that Landmarks is an outstanding title in the Book-List, since the book contains, in much more accessible style, the substance of the Christological section of the longer book. If, as Charles Raven said, the 'treatment' of Jesus in Beginnings made him 'merely dull,'¹⁵ it cannot be said that the abridged and less technical Landmarks shares this fault. It is a remarkable treatise from an academic who has synthesised in lucid, simple style a work of detailed scholarship.

Rashdall, 1915-1921.

Rashdall continued to preach regularly at this period before the Conference, now as Dean of Carlisle from 1917. Notably, he restated his position on Jesus' limitations of knowledge in Sermons.

If he did not possess that knowledge from the first, then there is no reason to suppose that he ever possessed it. To suppose that our Lord knew all the facts of past history, all the undiscovered marvels of modern Science, all the languages which were then undeveloped, and all the books that were then unwritten, would be to make him no real man at all Our Lord tells us quite plainly in the Gospels that he did not know the day of the judgement.¹⁶

This is unremarkable theologically - simply an emphatic form of what Gore had been saying since 1889; but it points, in advance, to one of his five negative statements at the Conference, which caused public indignation.

II At the Conference, 1921.

Rashdall's Paper at the Conference, given on Friday 12th August, was entitled 'Christ as Logos and Son of God.'¹⁷ It did not appear in isolation, but was one in a series. Nor did it vary essentially from what he had said many times and in many places before. It was published in his book Jesus Human and Divine of 1922 from which page numbers are given here.

In my review below, I list first his negative points, adding, in some cases, extended references. As his remarks on the Virgin Birth were considered strikingly unorthodox, I shall subsequently note the contemporary state of the debate on this doctrine. This is followed by a synopsis of his positive views.

¹⁵ M.G. Glazebrook, MC, Vol. 11 (June Issue 1921), p. 101. Stephenson, Rise & Decline, refers at p. 110 to Raven's remark (p. 121 n.9) in The Creator Spirit (Hulsean Lectures 1927), p. 235.

¹⁶ HR, PH A.6. (19) 1919.

¹⁷ Published as 'Christ as Logos and Son of God,' in Jesus Human and Divine (London and New York: Melrose, 1922), pp. 11-26. Also included in the book were two sermons preached at Carlisle after the Conference.

Negative Points. (pp. 11-16)

1. Jesus never claimed Divinity for himself.
2. Jesus was 'in the fullest sense a man,' having 'not merely a human body, but a human soul, intellect, and will.' Weston, 'that fiery "malleus hereticorum"' is reproved for lapsing into monothelism - that is, denying that Christ had a human will.
3. The view that the human soul of Jesus pre-existed is unorthodox.
4. 'The Divinity of Christ does not necessarily imply the Virgin Birth or any other miracle.'
5. As his fifth point he stated :

The Divinity of Christ does not imply omniscience. Since the appearance of Bishop Gore's Bampton Lectures it has been unnecessary to labour that point, though the doctrine of a limitation of Christ's knowledge has not yet sunk into the popular mind, I must add that Bishop Gore himself does not push his admissions to anything like the point which is imperatively demanded by an honest and critical study of the Gospel narratives (p. 16)

The Virgin Birth.

On the matter of the Virgin Birth, Gore had not modified or changed his view by the time of the Conference. The doctrine is repeated, with the same arguments¹⁸ from the Gospels of Luke and Matthew in Reconstruction of Belief, published in 1921. He maintains here his view that Luke's account is based on a woman's narrative: 'the narrative in Luke i and ii – so plainly a woman's story - if it is true, must be Mary's story.' He does, however, concede that the question is 'secondary,' that (as Rashdall would agree) 'the question of faith in Jesus must rest ... on the life, teaching, death and resurrection of Jesus.'¹⁹

In contrast to Gore, liberals and radicals, including Modernists, expressed their doubt of the doctrine. Percy Gardner, in his essay on 'Jesus or Christ' in the Hibbert Journal Supplement of 1909²⁰ had stated his view that the Virgin Birth is a myth. Major discussed the matter in detail in The Church's Creeds and Modern Man,²¹ holding that only in the Greek-speaking world was the view dominant; and in English Modernism,²² citing it as one of the beliefs that should be doubted.²³

¹⁸ C.Gore, The Reconstruction of Belief: Belief in God (London: Murray, 1921), pp. 274-286.. Thinks that John shared the belief, adding a 2nd century reading of John. 1.13. 'who was born not of bloods (i.e. not of a mixture of human seeds) nor of the will of the flesh, nor of the will of a man (a husband)' (p. 275 n.2).

¹⁹ Ibid. p. 280.

²⁰ P. Gardner, 'Jesus or Christ?' HJS, 45-58.

²¹ H..Major, The Church's Creeds and Modern Man (London: Skeffington, n.d), p. 29.

²² H. Major, English Modernism, (Cambridge: CUP, 1927).

²³ Ibid. pp. 128-129.

Thus Rashdall does not broach a new and unmentionable subject when, at the Conference, he lists it as one of ‘the things which we do not and cannot mean by ascribing Divinity to Christ.’ He is more reserved than Gardner when he says; ‘the Divinity of Christ does not necessarily imply the Virgin Birth.’ He points to the anomaly that the synoptics which relate the Virgin Birth, do not assert divinity, whereas John’s Gospel, which asserts Divinity of the Logos does not speak of Virgin Birth. This relatively reserved position, which shows his sympathy for the Modernist position yet does not dogmatically oppose the credal assertion, is stated in an earlier writing of 1918²⁴ (which however is a posthumous publication). He says:

It is impossible to read what has been written in defence of the Virgin Birth by such men as the Bishop of Ely [F. H. Chase – my note,] without seeing that, though they think the balance of evidence inclines in its favour, they do not deny that the doubts felt about it by other competent critics are altogether unreasonable.²⁵ (sic) The Incarnation or the Divinity of Christ is not proved by the Virgin Birth: rather it is the Incarnation of Christ which renders the Virgin Birth credible to such men.

Positive Points.

Rashdall then comes to his positive points.²⁶ He insists that divine and human are not mutually exclusive. But God is not to be ‘thought of as incarnating Himself equally in all human beings, the worst as well as the best.’ He adds, ‘There is much in human nature which is not divine at all.’ However, ‘every human soul reveals, reproduces, incarnates God *to some extent*.’ Of Christ, he says: ‘we are justified in thinking of God as like Christ.’

Next, he speaks of the Logos (or Wisdom) pointing out the similarity of the doctrine of the Word in John’s Gospel to the Logos in Philo. Various points follow:

- (i) Early Fathers, such as Justin and Origen, admitted the Logos was not united to Jesus alone.
- (ii) Some Fathers thought of the Logos as a separate personality. This led to subordinationism. But Athanasius and Augustine counteracted this. The Logos is by them maintained (rightly, Rashdall implies) to be, not a separate mind, but an ‘activity’ (of the Divine Mind). It is wrong to speak of the three Persons as three minds.
- (iii) That Jesus is the fullest revelation of God is what we mean by the Divinity of Christ.

Summary of Significance of Key Points.

A brief summary of the significance of Rashdall’s key phrases is set out here. That Christ was not necessarily miraculously born of a virgin, was not omniscient, and had a human will, opened the possibility of a metaphorical understanding of Incarnation. That we are justified in

²⁴ HR, Ideas & Ideal (Oxford: Blackwell, 1928), Ch. 6; (a Paper read to the Carlisle Clerical Soc., 27th May 1918), pp. 94-116 at p. 114.

²⁵ He appears to mean ‘quite reasonable.’

²⁶ HR, JH and D, pp. 17-26.

thinking of God as 'like Christ' reinforces the model of Christ as a revelation of God but not necessarily 'like God' ontologically; or, more narrowly, biologically; the latter asserted in the credal reference to virgin birth, the former reinforced by the deliberate credal choice of the definition *homo-ousios*.

This metaphorical understanding is further facilitated by the emphasis of Rashdall that the 'Logos,' the 'Divine Mind,' was not united to Jesus alone. His conclusion is synthesised in the statement: that Jesus is the fullest revelation of God; and this is what we mean by the Divinity of Christ. (my underlining)

An auxiliary implication - that orthodox critics are often tritheistic - is the corollary of Rashdall's insistence that the Trinity does not consist of 'persons' in the modern sense. It is the Logos which is integral with, or an attribute of the Trinity.

An analysis has confirmed that his Speech is a summary of what he had said many times before. What differs is his position - a public one - and his readership: wider, no longer homogeneous and eclectic.

III *After the Conference.*

(i) Reactions to Rashdall's Lecture in the Press.

The content of this Paper was placed before the attention of a non-specialist readership as a stark, unprecedented declaration of Rashdall by the popular press.

The Daily Express²⁷ of 16th August may be taken as an example. It reported:

Was Christ divine? The conflict of opinion on this issue raised by Dr. Hastings Rashdall, Dean of Carlisle, in an address to the Modern Churchmen's Conference waxes daily. Letters continue to pour into the Daily Express office, criticising, condemning or upholding Dr. Rashdall's contention that Christ was, in truth, man in the fullest sense, and not God.

The Star.

Gore wrote a condemnation of Rashdall's Paper in the Star²⁸ which contained the phrase 'the denial of miracles and the abandonment of belief in Christ's Godhead will be found to carry

²⁷ Daily Express, (16th August 1921); see MM, 354. p. 106.

²⁸ *Ibid.* 123-4. This includes, at 123, the report by J. F. W. Boden-Worsley in Theology, Sept. 1940 that HR 'obtained damages out of court, on the grounds of quite unwarrantable misrepresentation of his conference paper.'

with them an abandonment of Divine Revelation altogether.’ Rashdall countered, ‘My paper distinctly asserted the Divinity of Christ.’²⁹

The Church Times.

In the issue following the Conference, (19th August), the Church Times reported, with comments and contributions. The leader was hostile. ‘Broad Churchmen met at Cambridge last week round the death-bed of Liberal Christianity.’

The following somewhat satirical sentence sums up the import of the article.

‘Especially does the adorable Deity of Christ sink into a bare divinity or community of nature between the creature and Creator, such as is immanent in all men and indeed in buttercup and beetle.’ (pp. 164-5)³⁰

Correspondence from Rashdall and Gore.

Letters were received from both Rashdall and Gore in this issue. Rashdall’s letter appears (p. 159) under the heading ‘The Cambridge Conference, “An Explanation by the Dean of Carlisle.”’³¹ In this he protests against the Article in the Daily Express, declaring, ‘I need hardly say that this is absolutely false: my paper was an assertion of the Catholic doctrine that our Lord is God and man.’ He demanded an apology and threatened to sue for libel.

Gore wrote (p. 163) under the heading, ‘Miracles and Doctrine.’ ‘Nothing but good, he said, ‘can come out of the frankness with which the Dean of Carlisle and Mr. Major and Dr. Foakes-Jackson have been explaining to the world what the “Liberal Churchmen” ... really feel able to believe.’

Dr. Sanday had said that ‘we’ need not believe in the Virgin Birth and the corporeal Resurrection ...; but now, ‘They cannot believe in the Godhead of Christ.’

Gore sets out a case for the ‘Catholics,’ including quotations from Mark and Luke which he declares categorically to have been written by ‘those whose names they bear.’ The Modernists are on a ‘very slippery slope.’ He adds ‘The current philosophy today is a sort of pantheism.’

The following week (26th Aug.)³² Rashdall replied to Gore (p. 186), making the following points. (1) Gore has the right to consider his ‘interpretation of our Lord’s Divinity as

²⁹ London Star, in response to Gore’s Article. See MM, 361. p. 108. This would appear to be an avoidance of the issue, since HR had often explained that he did not use ‘divinity’ & ‘Godhead’ synonymously.

³⁰ Church Times (19th Aug. 1921). Page references in the main text.

³¹ The Guardian (ibid.) p. 586.

³² The Church Times (26th Aug. 1921). Page references in the main text.

insufficient' but not to accuse him of not believing it.³³ (2) Gore should not imply that Rashdall has the same views as 'Dr. Foakes-Jackson.' (3) Gore should not accuse him of Pantheism. 'Men whose favourite watch-word is the "Fatherhood of God" are not likely to err in this direction.' (4) Gore should not condemn the Paper before reading it.

In the Church Times of 2nd September,³⁴ Gore wrote to admit that he had not read the paper but had based his estimate on Rashdall's books. He hopes he is mistaken and will 'await the publication of a full report.'

Of these exchanges, the following observations may be made.

- (1) Rashdall rightly protested that Gore had criticised, without having read, his paper.
- (2) Gore's premise concerning the identity of the Gospel writers was controversial, therefore an unsafe argument.
- (3) Nevertheless, Rashdall's indignant declaration, 'my paper was an assertion of the Catholic doctrine that our Lord was both God and man.' surely needs qualification, in view of the fact that Rashdall clearly did not use the term 'God' in a Christological context (as he had explained many times) in the traditional sense that Jesus was God.

After reading the report of the Conference in the September Modern Churchman

Gore wrote a detailed Article in the Church Times of 23rd September.³⁵ He expressed regret that the press were allowed to be first on the scene (possibly a muted apology for his undue haste?). The Conference, he says, was essentially discussing 'Of what sort is the God in whom we believe?' He outlines 'Three theories of Christ's person.' These are:

- (1) The Greek (Stoic) theory. This is the concept that 'Man, by becoming more reasonable, becomes more of a God.' 'Incarnation is a matter of degrees.' So, Jesus shares divine sonship of God, which is common to all men. This is Major's position.
- (2) The 'adoptionist' theory. Jesus, possessed of the spirit in a unique degree, may be worshipped and even called God, though ... only by an 'illegitimate use of the term.' All good men are 'more or less' incarnations of God. 'No doctrine of Trinity in God is involved, only the Old Testament doctrine of God and His breath or spirit.' This is Rashdall's position.
- (3) The 'Catholic theory' ... ' "of the Incarnation of a pre-existent Divine subject".' The Son was co-creator. (my wording) There can be no other Incarnation.

Gore adds comments. We must choose, he says. Some say clearly that they desire a new Creed. But 'Dr. Rashdall' is among those who obscure the issue, and this, Gore says, is 'intellectually intolerable;' the terminology of the Church was expressly intended to elucidate. He questions whether Rashdall's exegesis of Augustine's and Aquinas' understanding of the Trinity is right.

³³ The context of this complaint is not clear. Gore does not say this in his letter to the Church Times.

³⁴ Church Times (2nd Sept. 1921), p. 206.

³⁵ *Ibid.* (23rd Sept. 1921), p. 289.

The Guardian.

The Guardian of the 12th August³⁶ reports the speech of Dr. Glazebrook, the official organiser, who himself spoke of the development of the Logos doctrine from the early centuries and made the case for reinterpretation, after the fashion of the early church divines, who restated doctrine in contemporary terms. Glazebrook, it reports, outlines the defects of two models of Christ unsuccessfully reconciled at Chalcedon, and states it is the task of modern theology to put forward a model based on 'Christ's own teaching.'

In the Guardian of 19th August,³⁷ after Rashdall's Paper, we become aware again that Rashdall's was one lecture among a number - for under the general comment of 'The Week,' (p. 577) Rashdall's Paper is spoken of together with that of Bethune-Baker. It is reported that Papers, especially by the Dean of Carlisle and Professor Bethune-Baker, have 'aroused considerable uneasiness and not a little bitterness in criticism' but this is largely due to the secular Press, for whom 'negations are good copy.' The point is made that 'phrases torn from their context' give the impression that what may be 'merely speculative' is regarded as a 'definite statement.'

In a fuller review (p. 585) there is appreciation of the reverence and constructive attitude of the speakers; and that Papers like Rashdall's and Bethune-Baker's are not 'tied down' to the 'old phraseology' but 'preserve the essentials.' Rashdall's position on the Logos and his judgment that orthodox critics are often 'tritheistic' is quoted. The reviewer is very sympathetic to the Conference.

Rashdall's lecture, summarised for readers,³⁸ is followed by a report of Bethune-Baker's talk, which is said to declare, with much less reserve than Rashdall, that 'the old orthodoxy is now in ruins.'

(On the following page, a copy of Rashdall's letter of complaint, as published in the Church Times, appears.)

A new Creed as proposed by Dr. White in his Conference speech, quoted on the same page, would surely be just as startling to the general public. Rashdall had always maintained that the traditional words of the Creed should be retained (excepting the Athanasian Creed) while White disposes boldly of the *deus de deo* problematic phrase, replacing it with 'and in Jesus Christ, Revealer of God and Saviour of Man.' His Creed thus avoids any reference to the Godhead of Christ.

³⁶ Guardian (12th Aug., 1921), p. 569.

³⁷ Ibid. (19th Aug. 1921). Page references in the main text.

³⁸ Ibid. (19th Aug. pp. 585-6).

The Guardian of 2nd September 1921³⁹ returns to the subject of the Conference, quoting the support of Dr. Inge, the Dean of St. Paul's, for Rashdall, under the heading, 'Dr. Rashdall's views "not dangerous."' The Dean of St. Paul's, readers are told, had 'contributed an article to the Evening Standard the previous week in which he had described Rashdall as 'one of the most learned men in the Anglican Communion;' as 'a little combative, and apt to "lay hold of a poker by the hot end" ' but his views are not really 'dangerous.' Most forcibly, Dr. Inge had added in this article that, if traditionalists expelled all who disagreed with them, ' "only fools, liars and bigots"' would be left in the Church. Rashdall had been misrepresented. Inge had concluded with the memorable phrase: "authority may force a man to unsay; it cannot make him unsee."

(ii) Reports of the Conference in the Modern Churchman.

The September issue of the Modern Churchman gave the texts of the Conference speeches. I shall refer to Major's Editorial, and to those papers, which, in addition to Rashdall's, were of particular interest.

(a) **Major's Editorial.**⁴⁰

Of the press reports, many, he says, were 'examples of ... conscientious journalism,' but others were 'obviously intended by their scare journalism to provide sensation rather than information.' He emphasises the 'constructive character' of the Conference, with its 'note of affirmation;' but speaks critically of Lake's recent Landmarks as 'historically unjustifiable and psychologically inadequate.' He then turns to the traditionalists, criticising their use of scripture. (For example, they quote Pseudo-Mark as of equal value with Mark 1 to 16.8.) He challenges them to tell the Modernists why they are wrong; and asserts that the Modernists are not pantheists.

(b) **Glazebrook.**

Glazebrook's opening address, 'Christ and the Creeds,'⁴¹ was 'cautious.'⁴² (This is the speech referred to above in the Guardian of the 12th August.) Glazebrook refers to the debate highlighted in the Hibbert Journal of 1909, remarking that the twentieth century resembles the fourth in its centring on the christological questions. It is mistaken to claim that the 'Catholic Creeds' approach the 'absolute truth,' for each new age has its 'own perception.'

³⁹ Ibid. (2nd Sept. 1921), p. 612.

⁴⁰ MC Vol. 11 (Sept. 1921), 193-200.

⁴¹ MC Vol. 11 (Sept. 1921), 201-213.

⁴² A. G. M. Stephenson, Rise and Decline, p. 113 ('sounded a decidedly cautious note.')

Glazebrook asserts finally that it is modern enquirers who are the successors of the Church Fathers, since theological speculation had largely ceased after Ephesus.

(c) Bethune-Baker.

Bethune-Baker spoke on 'Jesus both Human and Divine.'⁴³ (This is the speech referred to above in the Guardian of 19th August.) He does not think Jesus thought of himself as God. God 'lives and moves and has his being' in 'us;' since the supernatural is blended with the natural, there is the 'beginning of an Incarnation.'⁴⁴ His statement that 'Power and Love and Purpose are characteristic of ultimate reality' is similar in terms to Rashdall's exegesis of the Trinity. He joins Rashdall, too, in expressing doubts of the doctrine of the 'pre-existence of the Son' in a personal sense. 'He (Christ) is the perfect expression in time and space of the personality of God.' This is similar to Rashdall's position that Jesus is the highest revelation of God to humans. He concludes: 'God stands for me for the highest values in life, and because I believe that those values were actualised in the person and life of Jesus, I must use the title "God" of Him.' So 'God,' applied to Jesus, is a title, with a restricted meaning. (Rashdall often expressed the same views, but hedged them in with more reservations.)

(d) Foakes-Jackson.

Foakes-Jackson explains that he and Dr. Lake have sought for 'a simple statement of the condition of primitive Christianity.' He defends himself against the rebukes of 'Liberals of our own Church.' These are deceiving themselves, for they are really preaching an unhistorical religion, by 'disguising it in the phraseology of the old.' Thus their writing is sometimes 'without meaning.' He highlights here the difficulty of retaining the credal phrases together with liberal theology. Foakes-Jackson identifies four types of Christology of which the fourth, the Johannine (not the first synoptic picture of Jesus) was the road to 'Catholic Christology.' The 'tendency' that led to 'sacramentalism' was of Gentile origin. He and Dr. Lake did not, however, 'satisfy' the contemporary sacramentalists by endorsing their views. They wished to remain objective, even if 'charged with coldness.'

It was remarked afterwards by one present at the Conference that 'by the irony of events it is just those members who opposed Foakes-Jackson who have been held up to obloquy in the Press.'⁴⁵

⁴³ MC Vol. 11 (Sept. 1921), 287-301.

⁴⁴ *Ibid.* at 295.

⁴⁵ Boden-Worsley, Theology, at 152.

(iii) Rashdall's Sermon in Carlisle Cathedral in September 1921.

After the Conference, Rashdall preached in Carlisle Cathedral on 'The Divinity of Christ.'⁴⁶ Angry at the adverse publicity, he describes as a 'lie' the statement that he had denied the divinity of Christ. 'And some of the papers went further. They prefixed to the notice flaming headlines Others ... reported me as saying that Christ was "man and not God." '(p. 28) It is a 'trick' of the press to represent him (Rashdall) as saying that Christ is 'man and not God,' and not a '*bona-fide* mistake.'

Rashdall continues the sermon with a detailed explanation of his negative points at the Conference, stating that they are not 'amazing' (as the press describes them) but that two (of the five) are 'orthodox doctrine.' He is referring to his second and third of the five Conference points – Jesus is truly a man, and therefore it was not Jesus but the Logos which existed 'from all eternity.'(p. 31) The other three are 'more or less widely held by theologians.' These are: the limitations of the knowledge of Jesus; the Virgin Birth; and the fact that Jesus did not himself claim divinity.

To the last he adds 'The Church has called Christ God - God as well as man. And I believe the Church has been right in so calling Him.' (pp. 40-41) It is expanded: the doctrine is 'due to the conviction of Christ's followers that in Him there has been made a self-revelation of God, which was full, final, capable of saving the world.' This is consistent with his characteristic doctrine that divinity is explicable in terms of a perceived 'revelation' of God; and with his subjective doctrine of Atonement.

Rashdall stresses that the doctrine of the 'Divinity of Christ has to be interpreted. Speaking of the work of chaplains to the forces during the recent War, he says of the forces: 'But much that is told them about Him simply puzzles them They feel that a being who was conscious at every moment that he was the ruler of the universe, ... could not be in any real sense human.' (p. 42)

The passage is, upon analysis, ambiguous. Did Rashdall mean only that the teaching was not appropriate pedagogically? Or did it leave open the possibility of doubt about Christ's role as 'ruler of the universe'? Was the cryptic ambivalence deliberate, the expression of Rashdall's own uncertainty, although the rhetorical question appears superficially traditional?

He continues, (p. 44) 'In Him God is once for all revealed. Think of God as you think of Him, (Jesus).' This is expanded. (pp. 46-47): 'After all, what do we really want in a supreme revelation of God ... in a human life?' (We want to know two things; what God is like, and what sort of people God wants us to be). The 'old Creeds' are 'all attempts to express the supremacy ... of the great revelation God has made of Himself in Christ.'

⁴⁶ HR, JH and D, pp. 27-48.

Comment

It may be concluded of the sermon, taken as a whole, that the exposition is different in style from the initial polemical declaration of orthodoxy. The sermon is set in the context of a Cathedral service, a setting in which an overtly credal declaration is a form of reassurance to the congregation.

Phrases taken out of context from it may be held to demonstrate a fully traditional, Nicene view. As it unfolds, however, it is seen to set forth Rashdall's consistent, characteristic doctrine – Christ is a revelation and an example.

This interpretation is reinforced by the following reference to a sermon he had preached on his doctrine of the Logos at Belfast in 1911.⁴⁷

Rashdall's Sermon of 1911 at Belfast.

When the ancient Greek or the Hellenized Jew said that the world was made through the Logos - i.e., the Word or Reason of God, that the Logos was continually in the world speaking through the prophets, that the Logos ultimately became incarnate in Jesus of Nazareth, it would be more natural for us to speak of the Revelation of God in Nature, in the mind of man, in the words of Israel's prophets and of all the world's great teachers, culminating in that unique and supremely important Revelation of God's nature and purposes for man, which we possess in the character and life, the work and the teaching of our Lord Jesus Christ. It is more difficult for us ... to discover the exact equivalent of the language of modern thought for the word which our version of the Eastern Creed translates, 'of one substance with the Father.' But the essential idea [is] that which we find in the preface to the Fourth Gospel. All humanity is, in some sense, of one substance with God the Father: it is a partial revelation of His nature.

iv) Correspondence to Rashdall after the Conference.

Rashdall received many letters following the Conference, both hostile and sympathetic. Correspondence available suggests there was considerable support, as well as much vigorous interest across the denominations, and wide geographical areas, including the American press.

Bishops.

A number of Bishops are among the correspondents, notably, Bishops of: Carlisle, Oxford, Durham and Lichfield, also the former Bishop of Oxford, Gore. These will be reviewed in chronological order.

⁴⁷ Published in the Church of Ireland Gazette, Feb. 24th 1911, p. 153.

Rashdall's own diocesan Bishop, **H. H. Williams, the Bishop of Carlisle**, writes a few days after the Conference. Generally supportive, he writes, 'there is a good deal in it with which I don't agree but much too with which I do ... I think more by Divinity than "the highest revelation of God" and I think that the last sentence of your paper either begs the question in "most fully incarnated" or comes near to identifying Christ with the moral consequences. But I am probably misinterpreting what you meant.'⁴⁸

The next day, **Gore** writes from Margaret St., to say he is sorry if he has misinterpreted Rashdall, but the reports seem to 'harmonize' with his books. He adds, 'If I turn out to have been mistaken I will grovel.' But, he remarks, it is hard to believe that Rashdall agrees with 'Nicaea or Ephesus or with S. Paul.' He concludes this, not from newspaper reports, but from Rashdall's writings on the Holy Trinity.⁴⁹

The **Bishop of Oxford, H. M. Burge**, writes in vigorous support, 'Such conduct (i.e. the newspaper reports) is 'nothing short of devilish ... but I am afraid some of these people are so poorly supplied with brains that they will not be able to follow your argument, and will repeat at the end what (unless they have forgotten it) they said at the beginning!'⁵⁰

The Bishop of Carlisle, H. H. Williams, writes further a few days later. He states, 'I quite agree with your notes on the legal orthodoxy of your position.' But he is cautious. He does not want to give a written certificate of orthodoxy to him. People will help with sermons, but he is reluctant to increase the controversy. He adds, 'we have no instructed congregations, not to say clergy, who understand the points at issue.'⁵¹

A letter from the **Bishop of Durham, H. Hensley Henson** in November 1921, is less supportive. He writes: 'In this vital matter of Christology I think liberal theologians must do a good deal more in the direction of clearing up their own minds before they embark on public discussion.' (This is an understandable comment - but the theologians concerned did not realise how public the discussions were to become.) He adds that the Cambridge Conference was a 'grave blunder!'⁵²

The **Bishop of Lichfield, J. A. Kempthorne**, writes in December 1921. The letter is detailed and thoughtful. He believes Gore is unintentionally unfair to Rashdall. He asks if the latter would be willing to modify 'Jesus did not claim divinity for himself,' for he himself thinks Jesus made an 'implicit' claim to divinity.⁵³

Further letters follow in 1922 from the Bishop of Durham. In March, he has received Rashdall's book, and is now enthusiastic. He says: 'Heresy hunters will have their work cut

⁴⁸ Bod. MS Eng. Lett. c. 350. f.127, 25th Aug. 1921. Williams, Bish. of Carlisle to HR.

⁴⁹ Ibid. f.129, 26th Aug. 1921. Gore to HR.

⁵⁰ Ibid. f.137, 29th Aug. 1921. Burge, Bish. of Oxford to HR.

⁵¹ Ibid. ff. 139-140, 30th Aug. 1921. Williams to HR.

⁵² Ibid. f. 205, 1st Nov. 1921. Henson, Bish. of Durham, to HR.

⁵³ Ibid. ff. 241-2, 23rd Dec. 1921. Kempthorne, Bish. of Lichfield to HR.

out if they are to discover heresy in those excellent discourses.’⁵⁴ He writes again in April, now clearly supportive, referring to ‘the “alarm” of the non-theological Bishops,’ and remarking that the ‘Catholics’ are so much more concerned ‘about the Mass and the Confessional, that if these can be left to them, they don’t really care about the credenda!’⁵⁵

Short letters follow in 1922 from the **Archbishop of York**, who writes with regret to excuse Rashdall from attending the Convocation, as the latter has to undergo surgical treatment; remarking that Convocation will probably give some consideration to the criticisms of the Cambridge Conference; ⁵⁶ and the **Bishop of Wakefield, G. R. Eden**, who speaks supportively of the ‘remarkable unanimity on the part of all the Bishops’ in their vindication of the Conference.⁵⁷

Clergy.

There are letters from various clergy of different denominations. Examples are quoted here.

From Aldingham Rectory a sympathetic letter is received: ‘I feel sure that if the rank and file had ever felt the difficulties they would at least respect and consider the suggestions with which thinkers are trying to meet them.’ The correspondent does not think Rashdall’s explanation adequate, but criticises ‘the braying of the Church Times and the armchair orthodox.’⁵⁸

A letter from **Fawkes, at Rugby Vicarage**, has some topical comments on the ‘Archbishop’ (presumably York); that he is being inconsistent, is good at using ambiguous language so that he can repudiate the meaning intended. He himself believes that ‘those who stir up strife will injure the Church of England,’ but ‘what Pattison⁵⁹ calls “The Party of Ignorance” seems to be bent on its destruction.’⁶⁰

F. Leggatt, minister of a **Croydon Congregational Church**, writes. He has been inspired by Rashdall, and has gone to work ‘with a freshly kindled impulse ... If Christianity is to be re-established’ in the country, he went on, ‘it is by those in high places daring to speak as you have done.’⁶¹

Nathaniel Micklem, a well-known **Congregationalist scholar**, writes from Selly Oak Colleges Central Council to refer to Rashdall’s ‘new book.’ He supports Rashdall:–‘You will know that in the Free Churches, in Congregationalism and Presbyterianism in particular, there

⁵⁴ Bod. MS Eng. Lett. d. 362, ff.18-19, 18th March 1922. Bish. of Durham to HR.

⁵⁵ Ibid. ff.23-24, 15th April 1922. Ibid.

⁵⁶ Ibid. f.27, 24th April 1922. Lang, Archbish. of York to HR.

⁵⁷ Ibid. f.28, 4th May 1922. Eden, Bish.of Wakefield, to HR.

⁵⁸ Bod. MS Eng. Lett. c. 350. f.156, 10th Sept. 1921. G.B(?) Rimes, Aldingham Rectory, to HR.

⁵⁹ Pringle-Pattison, mentioned by HR in his Speech.

⁶⁰ Bod. MS Eng. Lett. c. 350. f.238, 22nd Dec. 1921. Fawkes to HR.

⁶¹ Ibid. f.171, 26th Sept. 1921. Leggatt to HR.

is widespread sympathy with the general standpoint of the Cambridge Conference.' 'I think the traditional Christology involves an unworthy and strictly impersonal view of the Person of Christ!' he comments.⁶²

Modernist Colleagues.

There are various supportive letters from Modernist colleagues. **Emmet** writes from Oxford in October 1921. 'There is a tremendous reaction in our favour. The Church Times is giving us a hearing,' and '... an important section of Anglo-Catholics.' He remarks, 'Gore's bomb seemed to me rather a dud.'⁶³

Bethune-Baker, in a long letter which is difficult to decipher, discusses whether Athanasius 'never thought of any conscious mind in Christ except the divine Logos.'⁶⁴ In a card a few days later,⁶⁵ he adds that he thinks 'orthodoxy is with G. (Gore?) rather than you or me.' But the conclusion reached by 'orthodoxy' is 'untenable.'

Glazebrook writes in January 1922 to congratulate Rashdall on 'the skill with which you have floored your assailants ... Gore is the most serious - not intellectually, for he never could reason consecutively - but because of his position and reputation. ... It is sad that a man who has so many fine qualities can be so corrupted by flattery and by the exercise of Episcopal authority, for which he was peculiarly unfit.'⁶⁶

This review of Rashdall's correspondence after the 1921 Conference shows the attitude of those who wrote, to support or question the Girton Speech; whether Church authorities, clerics of various denominations, friends who encouraged and concurred, or interested inquirers. In the correspondence we are fortunate in having a wealth of information which contributes to our knowledge of the reaction to this important Conference.

(v) Rashdall's position after Girton.

The official and public aftermath for Rashdall of the Girton Conference will be recorded briefly here. The matter will not be chronicled in great detail, for, though it is important, it is discussed in a number of other sources dealing more generally⁶⁷ with the ecclesiastical history of the period.

I have already referred to the report that Rashdall obtained damages out of court for misrepresentation of his paper. It is reported from the same source (Boden-Worsley, in

⁶² Bod. MS Eng. Lett. d. 362. f. 26, 19th April, 1922.. Micklem to HR.

⁶³ Bod. MS Eng. Lett. c. 350. ff.179-180, 8th Oct. 1921. Emmet to HR.

⁶⁴ Ibid. f.195, 27th Oct. 1921. B-B to HR.

⁶⁵ Ibid. f.204, 31st Oct. 1921. B-B to HR.

⁶⁶ Bod. MS Eng. Lett. d. 362. f. 2, 8th Jan. 1922. Glazebrook to HR.

⁶⁷ Especially Stephenson, Rise and Decline, Chapter 6.

Theology, 1940) that Henson wrote of the Conference in a private letter to Hawkes, Vicar of Rugby, as ‘the fulfilment of his worst fears.’⁶⁸

It is significant, in view of developments, that Boden-Worsley quotes, in the same Article, the remark of Dr. Headlam to the Church Quarterly Review of January 1922, that he detected ‘an organized campaign’ against heresy.⁶⁹

Indeed, it was in that year that the English Church Union asked for an official condemnation of much of the Girton doctrine; the case was presented by the Bishop of Gloucester, Dr. Gibson, in the Upper House of Canterbury on the 15th February 1922. Archbishop Davidson replied that the agitation was ‘grossly exaggerated.’ His reaction infuriated Gore, who wrote subsequently to Davidson, arguing that ‘Major, Rashdall and others ... are heresiarchs.’ Davidson, an accomplished diplomat, replied that it must not be taken too seriously; and that the Girton speakers could expound their views at a later Commission to be held to discuss doctrine.⁷⁰

Thus, an important result of the Girton Christology dispute was the setting up of a Commission on Christian Doctrine, appointed by the Archbishops, of which the first session was held in Oxford in 1923. Lampe, writing in 1980,⁷¹ refers to Bell’s Randall Davidson in its discussion of the Commission of 1923. He cites Rashdall’s ‘Christ as Logos and Son of God’ among other Girton lectures, remarking ‘The Papers, though dated, are astonishingly relevant to the present-day debate about the Person of Christ.’ Lampe quotes further the words of Gore, after the negative reaction to his ‘heresiarch’ pronouncement, that he ‘never felt official optimism so sickening.’⁷² Lampe refers to the debate in the Upper House preceding the Commission as ‘fizzling out.’ So Rashdall was not pursued and designated a ‘heresiarch.’

(vi) Correspondence of Rashdall to Gore.

In a full reply to Gore’s letter in the Church Times, (23rd Sept.) Rashdall countered with three Articles in the Modern Churchman in: December 1921; April 1922; and July 1922. These were headed ‘Some Plain words to Bishop Gore.’ (The term ‘plain’ is scarcely apposite of much of this detailed and esoteric polemic!)

⁶⁸ Boden-Worsley, Theology, at p. 156. Fawkes himself ‘after seeing the published papers, said, ‘I think myself that to say that the views expressed at Girton are in any sense those of the Creeds, the Councils or “Catholicism” is nonsense.’ (At 157.)

⁶⁹ *Ibid.* at p. 153 & n.1. Dr. Headlam, Regius Professor of Divinity at Oxford, writing on ‘The Modernist Christology,’ in the Church Quarterly, Jan. 1922.

⁷⁰ G. K. A. Bell, Randall Davidson 2, (3rd ed.) (London: OUP, 1952), pp. 1136 ff.

⁷¹ Doctrine in the C of E. Report of the Commission on Church Doctrine (London, SPCK, 1982), 1938 edition with a new introduction by G. Lampe, pp. ix-lx.

⁷² Lampe, Doctrine, p. xxv, n.41.

First Article.

In his first Article⁷³ he complains of the garbled reports of the Press in saying that he had denied the 'divinity of Christ.' Since then, however, he adds, Gore had withdrawn his remark. Rashdall distances himself from Foakes-Jackson and Lake, saying that he and Major differ as much from Foakes-Jackson (he refers to The Beginnings of Christianity and Landmarks) as Gore does from him. (p. 471)

He also repeats his defence of the Modernists against Gore's accusation of pantheism. (The defence had already been made in the Church Times of the 26th August, as recorded above.)

That Christ had a human soul, Rashdall insists, is orthodox; reminding him that he, Gore, has accepted that Christ was not omniscient. On the point of the pre-existence of Christ, Rashdall reiterates; only the Word was pre-existent.

Rashdall then turns to his Trinitarian doctrine, based on Athanasius, Aquinas and Augustine, insisting that the three Persons of the Trinity are not 'persons' in the sense of three 'centres of consciousness' but are to be thought of as Power, Wisdom and Love, three characteristics of the Deity. (All this is going over old ground.) He promises to show in a future Article how far Gore is from these Doctors of the Church!

Second Article.

In his second Article,⁷⁴ Rashdall discusses Gore's accusation that he, Rashdall, not believing in the pre-existence of a separate Person, denies the divinity of Christ. Rashdall wishes to show that it is Gore who cannot agree with Athanasius, and is therefore an Apollinarian.⁷⁵ (Rashdall, however, does not always agree with Athanasius, dividing his thinking into two periods and admitting that the Biblical and extra-canonical exegesis of Athanasius is flawed by his regarding all proof-texts as of equal value.)

Concluding, he states his belief that there is a community of nature (i) between God and Jesus Christ; (ii) between God and humanity (p. 25); thus, a new Creed would say: 'Jesus Christ is the supreme Revelation of God; Christ is God revealed in humanity.'⁷⁶

⁷³ HR, 'Some Plain Words to Bishop Gore 1.' MC, Vol. 11 (Dec. 1921), 469-480. Page numbers in the main text in this and the following Articles.

⁷⁴ HR, 'Some Plain Words to Bishop Gore 2.' MC, Vol. 12 (April 1922), 5-28.

⁷⁵ Apollinarius (c.310-c.390), denied that Christ had a human mind or soul.

⁷⁶ On this point & on 'Plain Words' generally, see the discussion in Ramsey, From Gore to Temple, (London: Longman, 1959), Appendix D, 'Gore and Rashdall on the Doctrine of the Trinity,' pp. 185-7.

Comment.

In this exposition, a search for a key phrase of Rashdall's understanding is elusive. Nor is the matter solved by the 'new Creed', ambiguous in its second phrase; for it is not clear in what sense he understands 'God' here. To say that Christ supremely reveals God is not at all the same as to say that he is God 'revealed.' Does the latter phrase mean the traditional 'in the form of 'humanity,' with the unexpressed traditional idea of 'disguised as humanity' - or is it another way for Rashdall of emphasising the idea of Supreme Revealer? He is either too cautious or too undecided to clarify the contention here.

Finally, he refers to the anathemas of the Athanasian Creed, asking how Gore can take these definitions so seriously. But, he remarks, Gore himself reinterprets the Creeds. 'If Gore is at liberty to depart so widely from their original meaning, so are others.' (p. 28)

Third Article.

In his third Article,⁷⁷ Rashdall continues his lengthy exposition of the development of the word 'Person.' He repeats the assertion he had made in his Conference speech; that, while Justin and other Fathers spoke of a 'second God,' Athanasius saved monotheism. (This, too, is going over old ground). Gore, he insists, regards Father and Son as two personalities in the modern sense of the word. He recapitulates Augustine's definition of the Trinity as *una mens*, but admits that Augustine 'tries'- but does not always succeed, in 'making the doctrine intelligible.'(p. 204) Rashdall accuses Gore of 'looking into his (Rashdall's) mind' and 'misinterpreting it.' By this he means, Gore thinks that when he (Rashdall) says Christ is God and man, Rashdall really thinks of 'Him' as man only.(p. 208) Rashdall uses the rhetorical form 'I ... will refrain from saying' - but then explains what he is not going to say! - that 'if I could look into his mind, ... I should find he practically envisages the Holy Trinity to himself as three minds, i.e. three Gods.' (p. 208) This device of setting up a hypothetical debate between Gore's findings when he looks into Rashdall's mind and vice-versa is ingenious, even though it cannot be more than speculative.

Reaching a conclusion, Rashdall first discusses what he considers a 'technicality.'⁷⁸ He then arrives at the 'plain words' that God has made a full revelation of himself in the 'man Christ Jesus' and in the Church. In this third Article, his conclusion that God has made a full revelation of himself in the 'man Jesus Christ' and in the Church favours the more metaphorical interpretation of the 'new Creed' of his second Article. The 'full revelation' is syntactically giving equal balance to 'the man Jesus Christ' and 'the Church;' since the revelation in the Church must be metaphorical, it may be judged that the revelation in Jesus

⁷⁷ HR, 'Some Plain Words to Bishop Gore 3.' MC Vol. 12 (June 1922), 196-213.

⁷⁸ It concerns whether the view that hypostasis has substance would be acceptable to 'the modern mind.'

Christ is also intended as metaphorical, not a literal appearance of God on the earth. The statement sums up his thinking at this point - a point which is not only a crisis in his career as churchman and theologian, but is very near to the end of his life.

(vii) Further late correspondence to and from Rashdall.

Unpublished letters from Rashdall, in correspondence with an Indian cleric, and a Jewish scholar, are extant. These longer letters clarify - or, at least, supply further examples of - Rashdall's continued pondering on the questions raised.

The letters to Rashdall have come from correspondents who wish for further elucidation on his position in the central question as to the nature or identity of Christ.

(a) One is from the **Rev. Francis Kingsbury**, Principal Chaplain to British Forces in Baghdad. He is an Indian, converted Hindu, and feels the problem acutely in his own work. (Weston could not have accused him of being a mere theorist sitting in an Oxford college!) He refers to a leaflet he has written on the Synoptics, and wishes to discuss whether Jesus is God. He has already been in correspondence with Rashdall, and refers to the latter's remark, 'I think you scruple unnecessarily about the use of the term "Jesus is God".'

Kingsbury continues, 'I am certain that you will agree with me in saying "No; Jesus is not God."' He asks whether he should continue to use and explain the former meaning of words - why not use modern words, he asks. People have suggested that he should resign (so clearly the matter is pressing). His practical question is whether Hindus who want to convert, but do not accept the Godhead of Jesus or the Trinitarian formula, the Nicene Creed and the 'two sacraments,' should be 'denied the right hand of fellowship.' The letter challenges: 'This is the question which should be faced ... in the Mission-field today.' Kingsbury knows his own answer, he says. For himself, he seeks to explain the Incarnation metaphorically as 'God manifesting himself in the flesh,' but not 'God becoming a man.'⁷⁹

Rashdall replies to this letter on 7th June 1923.⁸⁰ He is cautious and clearly does not want to be quoted as saying more than he intended. But he sets out his views in the central passages of his letter:

I think He was conscious of a quite exceptional divine mission and union with the Father. How he expressed this to Himself, we simply do not know; but there is no evidence that He ever said ... 'I am God'; or used any [?] language equivalent to that; though (as I hold) we may legitimately [?] express the sense of the uniqueness of the Revelation of God in Him by so calling Him, provided we emphasise equally the fact of His real Humanity ... I continue to think that you underrate the value ... of the traditional formulae and their capacity for being understood in a (many cancellations; page torn off) sense which is at once orthodox and quite rational. I should emphasise

⁷⁹ Bod. Eng. Lett. MS d. 362, ff.45-47, 15th Sept. 1922. Kingsbury to HR

⁸⁰ Ibid. ff.91-92, 7th June 1923. HR to Kingsbury.

more highly than you do the importance of maintaining continuity in any statement of the Christian doctrine.

He gives Kingsbury permission to make any use he likes of the letter.

From this cautious letter, then, we may feel at liberty to extract the dominating message, which appears to be: that Jesus is not God in a literal sense; however, we may use 'God' as a title. As for the traditional formulae, we should keep them to represent continuity, but not for their literal truth, in a modern sense.

(b) In a substantial letter to the Jewish scholar, Montefiore,⁸¹ who has been in correspondence with him, Rashdall, in reply to Montefiore's 'probing questions,' again attempts to set out his christological views. He has six points.

Point 1.

Montefiore, speaking as a Jew, had accused 'much Christianity' of Tritheism. Rashdall does not explicitly deny this, but refers to 'truths which are practically and spiritually of more importance than a speculative assertion of the Unity, especially truths like this very doctrine of the Trinity' He admits the expression of it is 'often stated in a way which involves Tritheism,' but the truths referred to are 'the self-revelation of God in Nature and the human mind and in a unique manner in Christ.' He would like it stated more simply, but 'it is better to explain it rationally than to attack it.'

Point 2.

This concerns St. Thomas' view as to the Godhead of God during the life-time of Jesus. (Rashdall's underlining.) This is that the incarnate Christ did not give up governing the Universe (*curam gubernandae universitatis vel deseruerit vel amiserit*⁸²). Rashdall does not see how this could be. It is not 'consistent with any true humanity.' It was the Wisdom of God that went on governing the Universe after becoming 'united to the Soul of Jesus.' 'That the Wisdom [sic] of God went on governing the Universe just as before after becoming united to the Soul of Jesus,' he considers 'quite as intelligible as the doctrine which all Theists hold, that God went on governing the Universe just as before after creating man in His own image, and infusing into individual men some of his wisdom, goodness etc.' (Gore cannot make sense of it in his Bamptons, Rashdall says!)

Point 3.

Here Rashdall refers to God after the death of Jesus, holding that it is not Jesus who will judge the world, but the Wisdom of God.

⁸¹ Ibid. ff.33-37, July 1922. HR to Montefiore.

⁸² Aquinas, *Summa*, Pt III Q1 Art.1.

Point 4.

This point, referring to the Relation of Jesus to God after the Resurrection, (Rashdall's underlining) amplifies Point 3. Of this, he says that 'sitting on the right hand' means that Jesus is 'the supreme Man – the Man in whom God is most fully revealed.'

Point 5.

This concerns the technical point as to whether God can change. 'Thomas' held there can be no change in God; Rashdall does not agree. The Incarnation, as indeed any more partial revelation of himself, 'would imply a change.'

Point 6.

Rashdall replies to Montefiore's further questions, that Jesus continues to 'enjoy the same (or an increased) communion with God as he did during his earthly life.' He repeats his view that it is the Wisdom of God that governs the Universe. This Point includes the phrase: 'If the indwelling of God in Jesus was sufficient to justify our speaking of Him as Son of God or God' (my underlining); showing once more how Rashdall uses 'God' of Jesus occasionally as a title.

He indicates more than once in his letter that sometimes we cannot go beyond agnosticism.

Conclusion and Summary of Section 2.

In this period, the christological debate became more ecclesiastical, being centred on what the Church of England believed. The cultural background of this was a more widely read and therefore more influential press. In the wake of Education Acts at the turn of the century establishing compulsory universal education, periodicals, and especially newspapers, were read by a wider section of the population. Thus there were new challenges for the ecclesiastical hierarchy, since there was more detailed scrutiny of written matter by laypeople. The changed social situation was highlighted after the Girton event, which was a catalyst of the phenomenon, facilitated by a modernised press.

During the 1921 period, the most important ecclesiastical event of which was the Girton Conference of 1921, Rashdall was at the climactic centre of the debates. The controversy may be followed in the Articles published before and after the Conference, especially in the Modern Churchman. After the Conference, Rashdall was attacked in the Press and subsequently by the English Church Union. The official action of the latter was finally unsuccessful. Rashdall's tenets were those he had established over many years, which had provoked scandal only when made public to a wider audience. He set out his views once more

in his 'Plain Words' to Gore in the Modern Churchman, and in replying to correspondents after August 1921. The latter included detailed, unpublished replies, notably to his friend Montefiore. In these are recorded his final thoughts of 1922-23, during those years of failing health before his death in 1924.

The events of the Girton Conference and its aftermath generated a rich literature, from Rashdall himself and his contemporaries, at the culmination of a period in which Christology had been, for four decades, the centre of theological interest. It taxed and challenged Rashdall, and is an illustration of his earnestness, of his use of the inner resources he possessed, in enduring without defeat the onslaught of his opponents.

Conclusion of Chapter 3.

So Rashdall, a little-known cleric and academic at the end of the nineteenth century, became more involved in the discussions of the early twentieth century. With the Cambridge Conference and its aftermath, his views, those of a liberal theologian and opponent of traditional dogma, become prominent.

His insistence that the words of the traditional Creeds should be retained while understood in a modernised, fundamentally altered sense, is a sophisticated and precarious stance.

His final christological position remains elusive. Yet, though less overtly expressed than that of other liberal theologians, his thinking is not opaque. An attempt has been made to discover his key ideas. The following position is argued here.

It may be concluded that Rashdall believes emphatically in the unique revelation of the Wisdom of God in Christ. But Christ does not share the cosmic function which is that of the Creator. Rashdall wishes to keep the traditional statements of belief, but for reasons of continuity; the acceptance of the words conveying an attitude of loyalty to the Anglican heritage, rather than a literal endorsement of its culturally conditioned dogmatic statements. We cannot, in trying to solve the problem of his ambiguity, go beyond a certain agnosticism on his view of the doctrine of the deity of Christ; but may infer that, for him, while Christ may be given the title 'God,' to express honour and imply reverence, this is no more than a title. It does not mean that he is to be identified with God, the author and creator of the spatio-temporal cosmos and all that is beyond.

Chapter 4. The Theology of the Church.

Introduction.

During Rashdall's life-time, there was substantial discussion on the nature of the Church. Much of this was polarised; an encounter between liberals and conservatives, of which the lines of demarcation were clearly defined; at its centre was the nature of the Christian Ministry, and, in particular, the doctrine of Apostolic Succession.¹

There were also developments in ecumenism, one of Rashdall's major interests. In addition, he participated in the debates on the role of the National Church, including its involvement in religious education.

Although the Chapter is divided chronologically, the Sections themselves are subdivided topically, since the debates concerned were various, and not centred on a single doctrinal issue, as in the first two main Chapters.

Section 1: The Earlier Years to 1904.

Introduction.

This Section covers the period from 1868, when Rashdall was still a child, to the year 1904, when he published his Christus in Ecclesia, a collection of sermons on the Church.

The ideas of the Oxford Movement were being assimilated and discussed, as the matter of ministry was high-lighted. This, initially an investigation into types of ministry in the apostolic and sub-apostolic age, necessarily extended to the later history of the Church.

My survey in this section will centre first on the debate about orders and ministry. This will be followed by a review of the closely associated doctrines of the sacraments and of ritual in contemporary theology. Additionally, I shall comment on the Sidgwick Debate concerning the matter of clerical subscription, and, finally, on the question of disestablishment.

Rashdall has characteristic views, though his overall position on the theology of the Church is not easily categorised. His views will be considered against the

¹ The belief that the Priesthood could be traced back to the Apostles and had been passed on by an unbroken chain through the bishops.

background of contemporary discussions, as recorded in published and unpublished writings and outstandingly in his major work of 1904, Christus in Ecclesia,² a collection of sermons given during the years 1899-1904 at Lincoln's Inn as select preacher to the Society. These, he explains in the Preface, while 'to some extent a supplement to, or a continuation of, Doctrine and Development,' of 1898, are not dealt with in academic style and detail, - for they are not only limited by time but intended for a non-theological audience. Rashdall remarks that the 'obviousness' of what he has written makes him 'doubt whether they can be worth publication' but 'even highly educated persons, who have little leisure for such reading do welcome very simple statements... of Christian doctrine.'³ The book is not an academic work but, accessible in style to a wide readership, it is a readily available compendium of his position.

Towards the Evangelicals, he displays some disapproval in this work, because of what he considers a lack of intellectual seriousness, combined with a rigid and narrow doctrine; but of the Oxford Movement he speaks with some enthusiasm, for he not only admires their learning, but sympathises with their insistence on what he calls 'the externals'. Ritual, he considers, is important, a part of a strong doctrine of the Church, which he claims as an integral part of his belief. However, he criticises what seems to him a mechanical view of orders and sacraments, and aligns himself with liberals on these doctrines.⁴

(i) Ministry and Orders: its origin, purpose and function.

The central question asked in these debates - 'Did Christ found a Church?' - led to a discussion on the nature of orders in the early Church. In the period 1880 to 1904, Gore and Moberly wrote important books on the subject. Gore's The Church and the Ministry was published in 1888⁵ and Moberly's Ministerial Priesthood⁶ in 1897.

Their books are written in reaction to the conclusions reached a few years earlier by E. Hatch in The Organisation of the Early Christian Churches,⁷ published in 1881.

² HR, Christus in Ecclesia (Edinburgh: Clark, 1904).

³ Ibid. pp.vii-viii.

⁴ Ibid. Ch 1., 'The Oxford Movement,' pp.1-17.

⁵ C. Gore, The Church and the Ministry, (London: Longman, 1888).

⁶ R. C. Moberly, Ministerial Priesthood (London: Murray, 1897).

⁷ E. Hatch, Bampton Lectures of 1880. Published as The Organisation of the Early Christian Churches (Oxford and Cambridge: Rivington's, 1881).

Lightfoot had set out his theories twenty years before in his Commentary on Philippians⁸ of 1868, which contained a chapter on 'The Christian Ministry.' This, though a much shorter monograph, may be judged a theological predecessor to Hatch's work, the tenets of which are equally non-sacerdotal.

Lightfoot.

It is particularly apposite to review Lightfoot's position, since he was Rashdall's ordaining Bishop at Durham in 1886⁹ and had unique importance in Rashdall's career.¹⁰

In this Dissertation Lightfoot states unambiguously that, 'Above all, it (the Christian Church) has no sacerdotal system....' The Jewish priests (at the background of the earliest Christian Church), he argues, were 'representatives' and ordained by the whole congregation; carried over to the Christian communities, this meant, he continues, that every -one was 'potentially' a priest. Special 'officers' were appointed as the Church grew, but the people were still priests. The early apostolate, a temporary office, 'fell away.'(p.84)

The Priest.¹¹

Lightfoot traces the history of the 'Three-fold ministry' - at the centre of contemporary ecclesiastical debates - with 'demythologising' vigour. While accepting that the three orders existed before the middle of the second century he questions their authoritative status, and analyses the position historically. The deacons took over the 'less important functions' of the twelve apostles (Lucan account). The office of presbyter, he says, had a Jewish model; it was later extended to the Gentile Churches.

⁸ J. B. Lightfoot, 'The Christian Ministry,' Commentary on Philippians (London: Macmillan, 1868). Page references in the main text.

⁹ Bishop of Durham from 1879 to his death in 1889 when Rashdall was appointed to a clerical post in Durham in his early ministry, from 1883 to 1888. During this time he ordained Rashdall as deacon in 1884 and as priest in 1886. Rashdall would presumably have found him an influential figure

¹⁰ While still an undergraduate at New College, Rashdall had written a letter to his mother mentioning Lightfoot's sermons favourably. NC 23rd Feb. 1881.

¹¹ Lightfoot rehearses the etymological point that, while 'priest' in English may mean either: (i) presbyter or elder; or (ii) a ἱερεύς (Gk, NT.); it is a derivative of (i), not (ii).

The Bishop.

In his account of Bishops, he states, controversially, that they were not the successors of the Apostles. On the contrary, in the early days, the titles 'presbyter' and 'bishop' were used interchangeably; 'Bishop,' 'the title, which was common to all, came at length to be appropriated to the chief among them.' (p.194) He is entirely pragmatic on this.¹²

Lightfoot's final paragraphs are, variously, cautious and provocative. His conclusion that the priest 'represents' God to man, and man to God, acknowledging the special function of the clerical office, is in an Anglo-Catholic register; but is immediately followed by his insistence that this function is not vicarious, an idea which he refers to polemically as 'perverse.' (p.266) Yet he concludes that churches with an Episcopate are in a privileged tradition.

Hatch.

Hatch's thesis is that the ministry in the early Church was modelled on secular institutions of the Roman Empire. His approach is pragmatic and his aim that of 'demythologising' the theory of a divinely conceived method of 'succession.'

Hatch begins with the post-New-Testament period, examining the 'internal evidence' to be found in patristic and conciliar literature. (His decision to begin here is questioned by critics, for reasons which will be discussed below.) The Fathers, Hatch argues, are not necessarily reliable, since their reports may be second-hand. His critical handling of early records was still likely to cause disapproval among traditional theologians. Conciliar literature is 'demythologised.' Hatch refers to inscriptions which show that designations of church offices are not 'supernatural' but based on secular usage.

The Bishop.

The Bishops' main function, he says, was administrative, centring on works of charity to those within the Church or 'strangers.' Presbyters, too, were modelled on non-Christian officers: the Jewish Council of Elders; while similar officers are found in Roman municipalities. The Bishop (who is not allowed to act without his clergy) is

¹² It may be noted that Lightfoot assumes the Pauline authorship of 1 Timothy, a somewhat conservative assumption (pp. 189-190) in an otherwise radical discourse.

the 'president,' a post which was a 'universal institution' in secular society. Laymen, he says, could, on occasions, preach, teach, exercise discipline, celebrate the eucharist. Only when the communities grew were the clergy offices differentiated.

The Church.

The idea that the 'confederation of churches' was identical with the Church of Christ was not self-evident but 'the result of a long struggle.'

Finally, the 'main propositions' are summarised:

- (1) The development of the organisation of the Christian Churches was gradual;
- (2) The 'elements of that organisation' already existed in society.

'God has been pleased to act by an economy of slowly-operating causes.' It is not right to let an 'a priori' theory of what he was likely to do 'override' the conclusions which follow from an examination of what he has actually done.

The Lectures, given at Oxford while Rashdall was an undergraduate there, have been reported in some detail for they were much discussed by contemporary theologians. They are important in demonstrating one side of the debate which, continuing through the period, was countered by Anglo-Catholics, notably Moberly and Gore.

Reactions of the Opposition.

An article in the Church Quarterly Review¹³ recorded immediate reaction.

The writers of the Article are anonymous, but 'they' were, in fact, Gore himself, as Prestige reveals in his Life of Charles Gore.¹⁴ However, for convenience, I shall continue to refer to the author as 'they.' They 'felt "resentment, impatience,"' at the author's claim to an impartiality. They remark on their disappointment that the New

¹³ Church Quarterly Review, Vol. 12 (July 1881), 409-452. Page references given in the main text.

¹⁴ G. L. Prestige, The Life of Charles Gore (London: Heinemann, 1935), p.45. Holland, while agreeing with Gore, thought his Article too critical. He writes, 'I meant to say something about the great Egg Hatched in the Church Quarterly. It was very strong meat, that Egg I was a little grieved at the tight squeezing of the Egg'

Testament was not discussed. Does he accept the ‘established position’ on the NT documents?¹⁵

The writers, indeed, confirm that they accept ‘the documents’ including Matthew 18.16f.. They refer with disapproval to Hatch’s description of the Eucharist as originally the meeting of a ‘club,’ mainly engaged in distribution of alms. ‘Salvation,’ they say, is more important than alms-giving. They refute his view of the ἐπισκοποί as inheritors of the ‘lower work of serving tables’ and so on. Hatch’s theory is ‘too baffling in its falseness to criticise,’ ‘an insult to our intelligence.’

The writers work with ‘a priori’ arguments, (repeatedly protesting ‘we premise ...’). While it is not surprising that they oppose Hatch’s interpretation, they fail to support their arguments objectively. (For example, they quote uncritically Ignatius’ views on Bishops, forgetting that Ignatius’ martyrdom does not necessarily justify his pronouncements on the role of Bishops [p. 430] - a procedure Hatch has warned against in his first lecture.) They, on their part, criticise his view of the role of the laity, as lacking supporting evidence. On episcopacy, the writers conclude that Hatch has made the mistake of, as they put it, looking in from the outside (like looking in through a lighted window).

Finally, they declare his role as Bampton Lecturer ‘a breach of trust.’

Moberly.

Moberly was the Professor of Pastoral Theology at Oxford from 1893 till his death in 1903. His Ministerial Priesthood,¹⁶ published in 1897, is a further contribution to the debate.

Moberly comments that Lightfoot’s words have been ‘misleading,’ criticising, for example, his contention that every member of the ‘body, being representative of it, has the right to minister.’ (p.xxliv) He pleads that ‘interpretation of the NT should be throughout theological as well as exegetical ...’ (p. xlv).¹⁷

¹⁵ For ‘the established position,’ we may assume presumably the position of traditionalists such as Liddon and Pusey, i.e. a pre-Lux-Mundi position. See my introduction.

¹⁶ R. C. Moberly, Priesthood. Page references in the main text.

¹⁷ This relates to the general debate among theologians at the time as to the nature of theological study – an argument rehearsed in the Faculty of the University of Oxford – should the Bible be taught like every other book? Traced by Hinchliff, ‘Religious issues, 1870-1914,’ History of the University of Oxford, Vol. 7, pp. 97-112. (See

His position on Orders depends on his thesis that the 'outward' is subordinate to the 'inward;' that the external mechanism of being a priest is inseparable from the nature of the priest's function. In his emphasis on the importance of the 'outward' act of ordination he argues unconvincingly that the case of the Apostle Paul, who was ordained by 'brother prophets,' not by Apostolic Succession, was an 'exception' (p.108). He adds (p.125, note) that 'It seems anyhow to be unique in St. Paul's life'. This is directed to his opponents, who 'seek to bring it down to the level of a service of benediction'. The exchange is an instructive illustration of the prolonged discussions of contemporary theologians on the validity of orders; a discussion which was closely related to the Vatican Ruling of 1896, that Anglican orders were not valid.¹⁸

In this work, Moberly insists that, while the non-episcopalian Churches were wrong to dispense with orders, Anglican orders were, indeed, valid. His book, constructed as a review of the non-Anglican Christian bodies, is an ecumenical reconnaissance (in which argument is diametrically opposed to Rashdall's), as well as a historical assessment of the significance of orders.

Gore.

Gore published his work on The Church and the Ministry,¹⁹ in 1888. It was widely read. In its exegesis of the Anglo-Catholic interpretation of ministry it is overtly opposed to the views of Lightfoot and Hatch.

The publication of the book coincides with Rashdall's return from Durham to Oxford on his appointment as Fellow at Hertford College in 1888. Gore was also working in Oxford, appointed the first principal of Pusey House²⁰ in 1884.

Gore states that his book is an 'apology for the principle of Apostolic Succession.' In the year before Lux Mundi he was still rigidly supporting traditional views of the NT authorship, assuming 'a priori' what he terms 'the genuineness' of the NT writings, including the authenticity of the 'instructions and commissions' given by

introduction.) Essentially a conservative-liberal debate. Decided by end of century in favour of liberal view; endorsed earlier policy of Jowett.

¹⁸ Discussed in Appendix of Moberly, Priesthood, pp.301 - 354, at pp.343ff.

¹⁹ C. Gore, The Church and the Ministry (4th ed.1899; republished, 1919 and used here). Page references in main text.

²⁰ Appointed in 1884 and remained till 1893.

Jesus in the four Gospels (pp.2ff.). He sets out to inquire whether Christ intended to found a visible Church; his method will be to 'test the traditional belief.'

To the suggestion that Bishops may have been invalidly ordained, he replies that this would not matter, as three bishops are always involved in an ordination. (p.94) 'If we believe that Christ intended to institute a self-perpetuating ministry, he will make Himself responsible for its possibility.' Thus, 'Jesus is training the disciples for an office.' (p.200)

'Binding and loosing' – initially, defined as 'to give legislative decisions' (p.202) - is accepted without further discussion as a prerogative of the apostolic ministry. Tertullian, who sometimes conceded other arrangements, is dismissed as a Montanist.

Comments.

This exegesis would be an acceptable reply to the very different accounts of the Ministry given by Lightfoot and Hatch, if it had not been claimed to be a 'testing' of traditional belief. But, since the assumption of Biblical inerrancy precludes the possibility that any part of the Gospels may be incorrectly reported, further discussion becomes an authoritarian assertion of these 'traditional beliefs' rather than a testing. Indeed, Gore restates his initial remark near the end (page 203, note 2); 'this book is meant to be a simple vindication of the catholic idea of ministry.'

In his development of the history of ministry, Gore becomes more tentative, stating 'It was a "common instinct" that the three-fold ministry was everywhere adopted' (p.303). This is a surprisingly loose statement; it cannot mean more than 'an inspired guess' here. The impression of tentativeness is reinforced by the reference to Darwin, who will 'drop his anchor' on a theory not proven. This likens the doctrine to a hypothesis, not an established fact. In concluding, Gore speaks with hostility of Congregationalists and Presbyterians, who 'violated a fundamental law of the Church's Life' with their non-acceptance of the doctrine.

Rashdall.

Published Works.

1. Doctrine and Development.

Rashdall's first published sermon on the Church was included in his Doctrine and Development.²¹ This Sermon (Chapter XV), preached in 1897, already gives a clear idea of his subsequent ecclesiastical doctrine. It is a loosely constructed essay, in which it is clear that his main interest is not in the external form of the Church, - how its priests or ministers were appointed and to what purpose - but in the individual virtue and social activity of its members. He quotes Augustine's words, *Congregatio societasque hominum in qua fraterna charitas operetur*.²² We should think of Church authority more in connection with morality than with doctrine.

Already, in this sermon, he has set out his position on the integration of the antithesis between visible and invisible; external and internal. Although the kernel of the Church's activity must be rectitude (especially in deeds of the individual, and the reforming zeal of society) there must be organisation in the Church, in order to carry out its works and thus fulfil its mission. 'An invisible Church is a contradiction in terms,' and 'An invisible Church would be an impotent Church.'²³

His doctrinal position is expanded in subsequent writings.

2. Christus in Ecclesia.

Rashdall's collected sermons in his work of 1904, Christus in Ecclesia, set out in detail his thinking on the theology of the Church. On the one side, we have his insistence that there must be a strong, or 'high' (as he puts it) doctrine of the Church, while, on the other hand, he not only does not subscribe to the teaching, firmly held by High Churchmen, of the Apostolic Succession, but opposes it vigorously.

The Church must have 'externals.' But Rashdall's working of the antithesis differs completely from that of Moberly, for whom the central interest is the sacramental one.

Rashdall's emphasis on the importance of visible organisation extends generally to the use of signs and symbols, but does not include an endorsement of the exercise of ordination in Apostolic Succession, the historicity of which he questions.

²¹ HR, 'The Idea of the Church,' D and D, pp.247-267.

²² Ibid. p.252, note. Augustine, *De Fide et Sym.*, 21.

²³ Ibid. p.248.

Two sermons from the collection giving his detailed views on ministry will be reviewed below.

VIII. *Apostolic Succession*

In his eighth sermon of Christus in Ecclesia,²⁴ Rashdall preaches on 'The Apostolic Succession,' using as his text Acts 11.29-30 - a signal that his exposition will not follow the doctrine of the Episcopal Churches, as defended by Anglo-Catholics, for the text does not concern 'laying-on of hands' but distribution of alms. Rather he will be guided by the historical arguments expounded by scholars such as Lightfoot and Hatch.

In this address, he argues that Jesus did not intend any rigid distinction between clergy and laity - he states 'Our Lord did not ...bequeath to His Church any stereotyped pattern of ecclesiastical government or organisation' (p.109); however, the passage in Acts is the first allusion to a 'distinct Order or College of Elders or Presbyters.' (p.110) Having followed the account given by more radical scholars of ambiguous use of the title 'presbyter/bishop,' he asserts that, for some centuries there was no idea that episcopal 'laying-on of hands' was indispensable. (p.114) He points to the importance of other offices such as: evangelists, prophets and teachers in the Early Church, referring to the pre-eminence of prophets in the Didache.²⁵

Rashdall comes to the 'crux theologica,' of Acts 13.1.f.; 'It was the Prophets and the Teachers who laid hands on St. Paul at Antioch when he started on his mission to the Gentiles.' This is the case quoted by Moberly, who treats it as an exception, which somehow underlines the rule, as discussed above. Rashdall here heavily emphasises the superiority of prophets to Bishops. The latter formed 'local committees' for managing Church administration, - here he follows Lightfoot, who considers the Bishops 'promoted presbyters.'²⁶ But 'when the Prophet appears, the mere Bishop gives way.' (p.115) This leads him to the polemical inference: 'If a Church which has got rid of Prophets may remain a true Church of Christ, so may a Church which has got rid of Bishops.' (p.116)

²⁴ C in E, 'Apostolic Succession,' pp.109 -123. Page references in the main text.

²⁵ Didache, Early manual of the Church, date and place unknown, but thought to be first or second century.

²⁶ J. B. Lightfoot, 'The Christian Ministry,' Commentary on Philipppians, p.194.

Rashdall argues further that the development of Bishops was not uniform, either geographically or in function, since, long after the apostolic age episcopal and non-episcopal Churches co-existed, 'without the suggestion that a non-episcopal body,...lacked any essential note of a true Christian Church.' He allows that the Episcopate can be pragmatically useful but, after commenting that it is no more than an 'ecclesiastical institution,' challenges: 'Dare we say that a Church ceases to be a Church because, like the Church of Scotland or the Protestant Churches of the Continent, it has chosen to revert to the simpler organisation of Apostolic or post-Apostolic times?' Coming to the most sensitive central question of an unbroken succession, he states: 'That we cannot trace a distinct order of Bishops right back without interruption to the time of the Apostles in all parts of the Christian world, is now generally admitted by theologians.' (p.117)

Rashdall now details how some seek to evade what he calls 'the natural inference from the admitted historical facts.'

The first is the method of Gore who, he says, establishes a theory of Succession by distinguishing the roles of 'Presbyters-Bishops' (originally the presbyters acted as Bishops, but afterwards a distinction was made); this theory, for Gore, explains all discrepancies.²⁷ Rashdall, however, argues, *contra* Gore (pp.118ff.) that (a) it was the 'whole College which exercised the authority of the later Bishop - including the power of ordaining;' (b) the decision to differentiate between functions of Presbyters and Bishops was taken at 'a definite moment,' whereas it was a gradual and almost imperceptible change from the *primus inter pares* Bishop to the Bishop with specialised power to convey succession.

The second method, Rashdall continues, is to hold that originally the Episcopate was unnecessary, but later, its indispensable function was so declared by decree of the whole Church. This is invalid, Rashdall contends; national branches of the Church have not followed all ecumenical orders of ministry at all times. A trace of earlier conditions remains, in that the Bishop cannot ordain without priests' additional 'laying on of hands.' The closely argued contention, rivalling the ingenuity of Gore, must have been, for his congregation, difficult to assess (but 'habitués' of Lincoln's Inn were presumably used to complex arguments).

²⁷ C. Gore, The Church, p.334. HR, p.118. n.1.

Rashdall states: - 'I believe that the doctrine of the Apostolic succession is one which it is right to preach against, because it is an obstacle to Christian Unity and Christian Charity.' It is, he continues, a hindrance to relations with Non-conformist and other Protestant bodies. For this reason, and because he considers it unfounded, Rashdall opposes the doctrine. He asks whether Hooker's view of the Episcopacy; that it is of the 'well-being' of the Church, 'without belonging to its being'; is 'not enough.' (p.121)

Comments.

How can these two observations be co-ordinated? For, if the Apostolic Succession is of the 'bene esse' of the Church (which Rashdall does not deny) even if not of the 'esse,' that is to say, it makes for its 'well-being;' it cannot be desirable to seek to abolish the doctrine. There is a certain unexplained inconsistency in the statements. It has been seen, however, that Lightfoot, whose conclusion is more diplomatic and positive, does not avoid the dilemma and, equally, appears inconsistent. Rashdall's final plea (p. 122) that 'the claims of truth' must be 'paramount' is, whatever the logical difficulties of the argument, that of a courageous churchman.

IX The Social Mission of the Church.

The function of a bishop is further expanded in the following sermon, whose emphasis is indicated in the title, 'The Social Mission of the Church.'²⁸ Rashdall's text is 1 Tim. 3. 2-5, which describes a Bishop, who must possess various social and ethical virtues. He argues that - at the time of the Epistle, when Presbyters and Bishops were indistinguishable in the 'college of Presbyters'- the important qualifications required were administrative rather than 'for preaching, or leadership in worship or the performance of ritual acts.' (p.127) He emphasises the point that Presbyter/Bishops celebrated at the Eucharist only when a Prophet was not available.

The Sermon develops his central message; that the Early Church was 'primarily a society for the practice of the Christian life.' (pp.128-9) Organisation of the Church, he continues, was necessary for the purpose of carrying out this charitable function. '... it was and is very much concerned with justice and equity.' The Church's

²⁸ C in E, 'The Social Mission of the Church,' pp.127-138. Page references in the main text.

organisation, he implies, is pragmatic; this allows the parallel conclusion that the form of organisation chosen is optional.

We may note that Gore, who like Rashdall was a member of the Christian Social Union, while estimating highly the importance of the Church's social activity, had reached a different conclusion; for him, the episcopal framework of the Anglican Church was a *sine qua non*.

3. Paper of 1902.

Rashdall reiterates and expands his view on Apostolic Succession in an article to a learned journal, The Contemporary Review of Theology and Philosophy in 1902.²⁹

The article is noted here, but not detailed, for it is largely a repetition of the argument of the above sermon in a different register.

Unpublished Sermons.

Early Sermon, undated

Rashdall shared his thinking on the subject of Church Orders at least once with his congregation. An unpublished sermon on the text, from John 20.21, '...As my father hath sent me, even so send I you' is extant in an early collection.³⁰ The question he addresses is: to whom were the words said?

To whom was this saying of the Lord addressed? A careful study of the passage in comparison with other passages after the same kind, leaves, I think, no reason for doubting that they are addressed to the Christian Church of the time. There is not the slightest reason for limiting this great commission to the twelve. We cannot tell precisely who was present on this occasion. We are simply told, 'When the doors were shut where the disciples were assembled for fear of the Jews ... If it is probable that by disciples the twelve were actually meant, we have as little right to limit the application to the twelve as we have to suppose that it is only the twelve that were enjoined to abide in Christ, exhorted to bear much fruit, to keep Christ's commandments, and to love one another, because on the occasions when these words were spoken only the twelve appear to have been actually present.

He continues, coming to the key point of his sermon.

And if in their original application the words were not to be limited to the twelve or to any other inner circle of the infant church, equally little reason is

²⁹ 'Our Unhappy Divisions,' Contemporary Review of Theology and Philosophy, 81 (1902), 141-143.

³⁰ PH, Box 2. (18) No place or date given; prob. 1884-1896.

there for assuming that in their present application they refer only to the Bishops or any other order of the Christian ministry.

It may be thought rash on the preacher's part that a disparate collection of sayings from the Gospel of John should be used as an argument without further discussion. Thus, whether his premise has been convincingly presented is doubtful. But his conclusion that the second proposition follows from the first is sound logic.

Rashdall's position in the debate about orders is made very clear here, whatever register and procedure he adopts to promote it.

(ii) The Sacraments.

In his Article on the Sacraments in Lux Mundi, Paget³¹ writes on the meaning of sacraments. His lack of overt dogmatism corresponds to his position as one of the new generation of Professors of the post-Pusey era. As to the number of sacraments, Paget is flexible.

Here the discussion will be limited, as follows: the sacraments of baptism and the eucharist will be considered; in addition, some reference must be made to a subject on which Rashdall wrote several sermons - his understanding of 'binding and loosing' (the 'sacrament of absolution, penance, or reconciliation,' in some Anglican traditions).

1. *Baptism.*

The Anglo-Catholic Position.

This is set out by Darwell Stone, in his Outlines of Christian Dogma.³² He takes the position on 'baptismal regeneration' that 'In Baptism the water is an instrument' by which 'a result is effected.'³³ That is to say, the sacrament is objectively operative, any subjective change being dependent on this primary cause.

³¹ F. Paget, Prof. of pastoral theology, Oxford. LM, 'The Sacraments,' pp.405 - 433.

³² D. Stone, Outlines of Christian Dogma (London: Longman, 3rd ed. 1903. First ed. 1900).

³³ *Ibid.* p.176.

Rashdall.

For Rashdall, baptism is not a sacrament *ex opere operato*. In his fourth sermon of Christus in Ecclesia, using as a text Matt. 28.19,³⁴ he presents the case for a ‘demythologised’ understanding of baptism, commenting on the first century history of the ritual. He believes that the original baptismal saying was not the Trinitarian formula of Matt. 28, but the simpler, ‘I baptize thee in the name of the Lord Jesus.’ Referring to Acts 11.38 (which has ‘in the name of Jesus Christ’) and the Didache, he argues that Christians would not have used a ‘different form of words’ had they known that Jesus had used the Trinitarian form. (The argument is weakened by his reference to the Didache in a note, in which he admits, ‘the Trinitarian formula appears.’)

Rashdall discusses the text at length, regretting the ‘tremendous superstructure’ (p.57) built on such a doubtful text by ‘later theology.’ His view is summed up by memorable antitheses in his conclusion: ‘there are some actually within the Church, though they have neglected the initiatory rite, just as, alas! so many who have gone through that rite but are almost strangers ... to the real spirit and ideal which the Society exists to maintain;’ while ‘A usurper or a tyrant may be crowned, and a lawful king who realises the ideal of kingship may spend a long reign without a coronation.’ (pp. 62-63)

The fifth Sermon, ‘Infant Baptism,’ continues the theme.³⁵ Rashdall’s position on the doctrinal issue of the sacrament is seen in his phrase: ‘no wonder that in an age much given to mysticism and little given to science [Rashdall was mistrustful of mysticism] the ideas connected with the reality should gradually transfer themselves insensibly to the bare ceremony taken by itself.’ (p.69)

This follows an impressive evocation of the challenges of becoming a Christian in a pagan world; he thus focuses on the contemporary importance of the act, but not on the ‘operation’ of the ritual, emphasising its coincidence with a courageous and dangerous decision (as it was in the Early Church) and challenges with the pointed question ‘whether the Church has done wisely to change this solemn profession of

³⁴ C in E, ‘Infant Baptism,’ ‘Go ye therefore, and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost.’ The arguments concerning vv. 18-20 continue to the present day among Biblical scholars. Page references in main text.

³⁵ *Ibid.* pp. 67-77. Text: ‘We were buried with Him through baptism into death.’ Rom. 6.4. (A.V.)

personal dedication into a ceremony performed as a matter of course over every unconscious infant.’ (p.69) He adds that infant baptism was exceptional in the Early Church. For him, baptism means essentially becoming a member of the Christian society. (p.71)

But - he finally defends the tradition of infant baptism - it is a question which, he says, depends on our view of the Church. (p.72) The Church, he suggests, is not for ‘perfected Christians;’ it is ‘a great educational institution’ including children as members; *propter spem, non propter rem* ³⁶ In taking this position, he illustrates his paradoxical claim to hold a ‘high’ doctrine of the Church, combined with what his opponents would regard as a ‘low’ sacramental doctrine.

2. Eucharist.

In the years preceding Rashdall’s *Christus in Ecclesia*, eucharistic theology, an area of doctrine indissolubly linked to the question of validity of orders, had been much discussed. The matter had, for Anglicans, reached a crisis in 1897, when Pope Leo XIII had stated that Anglican orders were not valid.³⁷ In the following review of eucharistic doctrine, I shall refer to this event, and to the positions taken by Moberly, Gore and Darwell Stone, before considering Rashdall’s writing on the subject.

Discussions with the Pope.

The Pope’s declaration that Anglican orders were not valid, because of the defectiveness of its eucharistic understanding, was a critical external event in the ecclesiastical history of the Church of England. It provoked an answer from the Archbishops of Canterbury and York.

The Pope had said that ‘the principal grace and power of the Christian priesthood is the consecration and oblation of the Body and Blood of the Lord.’³⁸ The Archbishops write, ‘Further we truly teach the doctrine of the Eucharistic sacrifice, and do not believe it to be “a rude commemoration of the Sacrifice of the Cross” (as the Council says). But we think it sufficient in the liturgy ... while lifting up our hearts

³⁶ Ibid. pp.72-73 - he adds the translation, ‘... for hope, not for performance.’

³⁷ ‘*Saepius nostro officio*,’ 19th Feb. 1897. Answer of the Archbishops of England to the Apostolic Letter of Pope Leo (*Apostolicae Curae*) on English Ordinations (Longman: London, 1897).

³⁸ Ibid, sect. 22, p.18.

to the Lord, and when now consecrating the gifts already offered, that they may become to us the Body and Blood of our Lord Jesus Christ ... to signify the sacrifice which is offered at that point in the service in such terms as these.’

In this involved, ambiguous statement, the Archbishops insist that they teach the doctrine of Eucharistic sacrifice. If, by this, they mean that there is a sacramental act of repeating or continuing the event of Calvary, they are exceeding the sense of Article 28 of the 39 Articles. Nor does a reference in the same Article to the doctrine of the Real Presence imply a belief in a concept of liturgical death sacrifice (the Roman Catholic doctrine). In their convoluted statement, the writers imply that they teach the doctrine of eucharistic sacrifice, but they do not make their meaning clear. In view of the wide range of understanding in the Anglican Church, this is not surprising.

The Pope was not convinced by their argument.

This doctrinal disarray was the background of Rashdall’s eucharistic teaching, which is inextricably linked with his understanding of the doctrine of Atonement.

Anglo-Catholic Comments.

Moberly.

Against the background of the Roman Catholic developments, Moberly, in the same year, (1897) comments in his Ministerial Priesthood³⁹ on the eucharistic question. He writes with reservation on the Tridentine pronouncements (the basis of the Pope’s letter).

Moberly favours moderation, holding that it is a ‘mistake’ to emphasise the differences of doctrine, whether in a Roman Catholic or in a Protestant sense.

He agrees with the Tridentine doctrine that ‘the Eucharist is the Church’s divinely ordered ceremonial method of self-identification with the sacrifice of Christ...’ (p.231); however, he accepts (note 2, p.232) that ‘sacrifice’ can imply the ‘offering of worship or gifts’... but only ‘in a subordinate sense,’ which depends on its being the ‘Atoning Sacrifice of Christ.’ He reinforces the point, referring to ‘the Church’s ceremonial... identification’ with the ‘perpetual offering of the Sacrifice of Christ;’

³⁹ R. C. Moberly, Priesthood, pp.232ff.. Page references in main text.

‘... then every lesser act which ... expresses the surrender or homage of men ... becomes ... a true mode ... of the spirit of sacrifice in the Church.’

This very long peroration, moderate in tone, is essentially, when deciphered, an apologetic of the objective, catholic doctrine of eucharistic sacrifice.

Stone.

Stone’s book on *Christian Dogma*⁴⁰ of 1900 is rigidly conservative and Anglo-Catholic conceding nothing to liberal Catholicism. Stone’s method is to expound on the Eucharist in pedagogic register, describing the variations of the ritual in the Eastern and Western Church, to ascertain which customs can be considered ‘valid,’ and what is necessary for a valid consecration. (p.175ff.) He reasons it can ‘hardly be doubted ... that the words ... are sufficient; to omit the invocation of the Holy Ghost...does not invalidate them,’ though in the Eastern Church the view is taken that, ‘since the change in the elements is due to the operation of God the Holy Ghost, He ought to be invoked in express terms, so that a consecration cannot rightly be without this invocation.’

Stone then sets forth the ‘effect produced in the matter itself.’ (p.176) He has no recourse to subtleties, but states that the bread and wine become ‘the body and blood of our Lord.’ (p.177) He argues this, without modification, from the ‘discourse’ in John 6.51-56, the Gospel words of Institution and the Pauline passage of 1 Cor.10.16. This is followed by quotations from the Fathers and Early Church writers - so many of them that he has no space to analyse them or compare them with passages which do not support this view. A bizarre example is his quotation (p.178) of Augustine⁴¹ who uses the phrase that: ‘... our Lord in saying “This is my body” was carried in His own hands’. It is consistent with Stone’s literalism that he believes the elements to be immutably changed ‘apart from their reception.’⁴² Consistently, he asserts that the change in the elements is retained in the reserved sacrament.

⁴⁰ D. Stone, *Outlines of Christian Dogma*, Page references in main text.

⁴¹ Ibid. Note: ‘In Ps.xxxiii. Serm.i.10.’

⁴² A matter closely argued at the Reformation. Here Stone refutes the relevant phrases in Art. 28, BCP.

Comment.

This, and its overt consequence - devotions to the Sacrament in eucharistic worship - was not only no part of Rashdall's doctrine but was not pleasing to Gore, as will be noted below. Is Stone then committed to a full belief in transubstantiation? He dismisses the idea that in the consecration the original substances are 'annihilated.' It must be concluded that he does accept a variant form of transubstantiation. In this respect, Rashdall's position is nearer to the doctrine of the Prayer Book Article (28) which describes transubstantiation as 'repugnant,' than is Stone's.⁴³

The stereotyped reference to the Holy Ghost is wholly inconsistent with Rashdall's doctrine of the Trinity, which excludes the possibility of a Holy Ghost that can be visualised as a separate 'person' known as 'He.'

It has become clear from the above survey that Stone's views have no meeting-point with Rashdall's. Not only his conclusions (more accurately called 'assertions') but his method, which does not allow for enquiry, are alien to a liberal theologian. In this, he may be contrasted, not only with Rashdall but with Gore.

Gore.

Gore's substantial monograph, The Body of Christ⁴⁴ was first published in the following year, 1901. Gore's work has a widely different ethos. In his first Section, drawing on the works of a wide selection of writers, to express in general terms, the meaning of the Eucharist, he quotes Justin's⁴⁵ saying that the bread and wine, when blessed and consecrated, is '... something higher and diviner, the spiritual food of the flesh and blood of Christ.' (p.7) The quotation chosen recalls, not the Roman Mass, but the inclusive liturgy of the 1662 Prayer Book; not transubstantiation, but a 'spiritual food.'

In his next Section, referring to sacrifice in the Hebrew tradition and in other ancient religions, Gore emphasises the concept of the Eucharist as predominantly a communion meal, and thus a sharing in a divine life more than a giving in sacrifice to God. His credentials as a theologian who recognises and respects Biblical criticism is

⁴³ Strangely, he states that 'consubstantiation' was invented by Zwinglians against Luther, p.183.

⁴⁴ C. Gore, The Body of Christ (London: Murray, 1901). Page references in the main text.

⁴⁵ Justin, Dial. c. Tryph. c.41.

shown when he quotes Robertson-Smith on this.⁴⁶ Such an interpretation is, he suggests, a forerunner of the Christian sacrament. Although subsequently he mentions ideas of 'propitiation' he stresses that in the Eucharist, participants are 'in the manhood of Christ, made partakers of the divine nature which is also His.' (p. 17) Gore quotes Augustine's definition of sacrifice as 'any act that is done in order by a holy fellowship to inhere in God.' This concept, Gore says, is universally understood.

While he warns against the 'mistake' of regarding reception as a metaphor for 'believing in Him, or receiving His words' (pp.21 ff.). nevertheless 'Flesh and blood' is not meant in any 'gross sense,' but is 'spirit and life.' Gore quotes Westcott⁴⁷ who says of the Eucharist '... the crowning act of faith incorporates us in Christ.' It is the life of Christ which is 'imparted to His people by the Spirit.' (pp.30f.)

Although Rashdall would not agree with the term 'propitiation,' as has been amply discussed above in Chapter 2, there is here a certain resemblance to his view of the subjective effect of Atonement in Christ's death, which he views as the flowing of the divine life into the one who contemplates it.

Writing on the 'Eucharist as Sacrifice', Gore speaks of the idea of sacrifice in spiritual terms, even quoting Minucius Felix⁴⁸ (p.160, n.1) who, having stated that the Christians had no altars, speaks of the 'only sacrifice' as 'The pacific heart and the acceptable prayer.' Gore then reverts to the 'transactional atonement' model of Christ's death, whereas it is not his model for the Eucharist. He believes with the writer of Hebrews that there is no further need for sacrifice at earthly altars (pp.164-5) for 'the Church's sacrifice' is that of 'praise,' 'almsgiving,' and 'ourselves,' endorsing thereby the 1662 post-communion prayer, with its Protestant connotation. (Here he is basing his comments on Heb. 13.10 f. - the text of Rashdall's sermon on Sacrifice referred to below.)

It is a 'great pitfall,' Gore says, to think of the eucharistic sacrifice, not as centred on His 'heavenly presentation, or the pleading of the sacrifice of Christ, but with the slaying of it on Calvary.' (pp.198-9) This indicates that Gore does not hold a doctrine of the Eucharist which may be described as 'The Sacrifice of the Mass,' as opposed by Luther at the Reformation.

⁴⁶ Robertson-Smith, Religion of the Semites (London: Black, 1889), pp. 327, 418.

⁴⁷ Westcott, Revelation of the Father. Short Lectures on the Titles of the Lord in the Gospel of John (London & c., 1884), p.40.

⁴⁸ M. Felix, Octav. 10.

In his applied eucharistic theology (pp.269-288) 'Our Present Service of Holy Communion,' Gore is ready to endorse the theological position of Anglican eucharistic worship. His only serious criticisms are: the absence of intercessions for the dead (in the BCP Communion) which is 'grievous;' and the absence of any commemorative Resurrection and Ascension which he 'laments.'

He therefore has a double model which combines (a) the objective view of atonement enacted at Calvary, (b) eucharistic doctrine which excludes the concept of a re-enactment of Calvary, but includes the idea of a meal recalled, at which there is a 'real presence,' and the transcendent dimension of a 'heavenly presentation.'

Although Gore's theory of Atonement at Calvary conflicts with Rashdall's, his theology of Eucharist has important points of contact, both in Gore's stress on a shift in emphasis from a death-centred Eucharist, and his stress on the importance of the communion as a meal.

Rashdall.

A. Doctrine and Development

Rashdall's thinking on the Eucharist is introduced, with a Chapter on 'The Idea of Sacrifice.'⁴⁹ In this sermon (text: Heb. 13. 11-12⁵⁰), his points of contact with Gore in The Body of Christ are striking. Like Gore, he refers to the work of Robertson-Smith. (p.164) Speaking of sacrifice in primitive religions, Rashdall says the emphasis should be placed on its 'original notion' (p.165f.), that of the 'blood-covenant,' which, he states, was a rite for ratifying union between different members of the tribe and their 'tribal deity' to show that 'an artificial union is established between those who are not of kindred stock by nature.' The sacrifice was also important to signify a common meal. He sums up; 'In a word, the primitive idea of sacrifice was not so much propitiation or expiation as communion.'

That Rashdall wishes to establish the details of 'blood-covenant' is consistent with his rejection of the widespread use among later theologians of the idea of the covenant sacrifices to support theories of Atonement based on propitiation and expiation in

⁴⁹ D and D., pp.164-176. Page references in the main text.

⁵⁰ Heb. 13.11. 'For the bodies of those beasts, whose blood is brought into the sanctuary by the high priest for sin, are burnt without the camp.'

13.12. 'Wherefore Jesus also, that he might sanctify the people with his own blood, suffered without the gate.'

order to explicate the death of Christ, and, among Anglo-Catholics especially, the Eucharist. Thus Rashdall uses his material on sacrifice to refute those doctrines which Gore accepts in relation to the death of Christ, but modifies in his treatment of the Eucharist. It may be fairly claimed that, in its treatment of primitive sacrifice, Rashdall's complex of ideas has more unity. Gore has placed more emphasis on the later Jewish view - from post-exilic times, presumably - in which sacrifice was associated primarily with expiation. Rashdall, however, argues that the writer of Hebrews is trying to convince his readers that this is not a valid way of viewing sacrifice. (His reservation that 'It is not necessary to suppose that he [the writer of Hebrews] analysed very precisely in what sense sacrifice was necessary to take away sin' (p. 166) may indicate a vulnerable point in his exegesis; but he is not here attempting to write at great length on the theology of Hebrews. Of the passage of his text extended to Verse 13 it is a reasonable comment.)

Further agreement is found between the two theologians in Rashdall's insistence that the 'blood' suggested 'not the idea of death but the idea of life. In the blood is the life.⁵¹ That ... is the idea which lay at the root of all primitive sacrifice.' The agreement here between Rashdall's argument and Gore's insistence on the importance of avoiding a 'death-centred' concept of Eucharist (a 'pitfall' as he calls it) is again striking.

While Rashdall has no difficulty in unifying his doctrines of the Cross and of the Eucharist, his further teaching on the latter is less detailed than Gore's. He dismisses the possibility of a transcendent aspect of the sacrament which characterises Gore's theology, having a more pragmatic attitude. The Eucharist is 'that sacrifice of the will which He once offered perfectly' (p.169). This follows the clear indication that to expand further the doctrine of Eucharist is mistaken. 'The spiritual sacrifice of the heart and will is what the new covenant requires in the place of ritual.' He allows, however, that ritual worship may be inspirational, for it strengthens the will for self-sacrifice. Rashdall develops the idea of sacrifice as fundamentally an aim to share; he applies this to the sharing of wealth and culture in the community.

Both Rashdall and Gore emphasise the social dimension of the communion, stressing its importance from primitive times as an act of fellowship. While Gore

⁵¹ Refers to Westcott, Epistles of St. John (1883), p.34 and Epistle to the Hebrews (1889), p.293, to whom he attributes 'this illuminating remark.'

regarded the Eucharist as a present reality, Rashdall focused on the direct application of sacrifice.

B. Christus in Ecclesia.

Rashdall returns to the subject of 'The Holy Eucharist' in Chapter III of Christus in Ecclesia.⁵² Preaching on the text of John 6.53, he includes notes referring to NT critical study of John's Gospel. From this he argues that verses 53ff. ('except ye eat of the flesh of the Son of Man, ... ') is followed by its Early Church explanation in v. 63:- 'It is the spirit that quickeneth; the flesh profiteth nothing; the words that I speak unto you, they are spirit and they are life.' He contends that (note 1, p.33) while probably the words had a eucharistic reference in the Early Church, they indicate 'the spiritual and non-realistic belief' of the Evangelist's Church. However, he makes the additional point that the words, 'in so far as they are based on our Lord's own teaching,' must have had an immediate meaning; and did not refer to 'a rite that was not yet instituted.' (pp.33f.) Rashdall's exegesis of v. 53 is: 'Feeding on Christ's body and His blood means living upon His words.'(p.35) It is Christ's teaching, he insists, which is all-important. This is developed, in the form of an antithetical mnemonic: - 'The sacrament is a commentary on the teaching rather than the teaching a commentary upon the sacrament.'(p.36)

Rashdall supports his argument from patristic sources (p. 36, n.1) and, with some justification, expresses surprise at 'the confidence with which the Bishop of Worcester, in his scholarly and moderate work (Gore, The Body of Christ p.21.sq., p.290 sq.) ... explains "the words which I have spoken unto you" (ῥηματα) as meaning "the things I have just spoken to you of – the flesh and blood of the glorified Son of Man".'

The Oxford Movement is congratulated on restoring the Eucharist to its place as a central act of worship - for sacraments are important, Rashdall believes, as a sign of unity of the members to the community; but 'the value of the symbol disappears when attention is directed away from the meaning to the symbol itself'. He criticises 'high' teaching on the sacraments as having 'bad spiritual effects.' (pp. 39-40)

⁵² C in E, pp.33-49,'Except ye eat of the flesh of the Son of man, and drink his blood, ye have no life in you.' John 6.53.

Transubstantiation he explains lucidly in its Aristotelian form, rejecting it on philosophical grounds. He also refutes the doctrine of the Real Presence, arguing that it cannot mean anything other than Transubstantiation or Consubstantiation.⁵³ Here he is on less safe ground, since the BCP Article (28) speaks of 'effectual signs of grace,' expanding the phrase, so that 'grace' may be held to be *ex opere operato*. His argument that a spirit cannot have a 'local presence' although a relevant challenge to practices such as reservation and Benediction, may be judged something of a 'blunt instrument' when applied to the subtler concept of eucharistic anamnesis exemplified in Gore's theology.

To call the sacrament a 'mere sign' though, Rashdall continues, is to misunderstand the potency of signs. (p.44) Signs are 'efficacious' in that they produce an effect, just as language (a sign) communicates effectively. (p.45) But to point out analogously that words do not change their substance, may be judged a valid argument in refuting Transubstantiation, but a more doubtful one in refuting the doctrine of the Real Presence; for words, Rashdall declares, are efficacious - that is to say, they are causal *per se*. This, it might be argued, is to concur with Article 28, not to refute it. Yet, finally, although his analogies are promising as a vehicle of compromise, he cannot come to terms with 'the doctrine itself' which is 'intellectually unintelligible and spiritually unedifying.'(p.46)

Comments

Rashdall's position on Baptism and Eucharist is consistent, in that he refutes any doctrine which involves an element of what he would call 'magic' and his opponents 'mystery.' In the case of Baptism, his contentions are convincingly argued. It is, for him, a challenging initiation ceremony. His doctrine of Eucharist highlights the central importance of the meal, in which he agrees with Gore. However, by emphasising that the celebration of the Eucharist, though including effective signs, is essentially a vivid *aide-mémoire*, referring to a past event, an illustration of Christ's words and action, he is left with a significant meal, which inevitably recalls the passion and death of Christ. But he has maintained in his atonement teaching that the central emphasis of Christianity is not the death of Christ alone, but his whole life and

⁵³ The Lutheran doctrine that the bread and wine are not destroyed, but that the body and blood of Christ are added to them.

Resurrection. He denies transubstantiation, which focuses on tokens of death and of which the proponents regard the death as substitutional - so this is logically consistent. But, in denying any possibility of transcendental mystery, with present and future dimensions, it may be argued that he has not developed to the full his insight of the central importance of the Eucharist as a communion meal rather than a propitiation; since he has omitted any discussion of the scriptural reference to an eschatological meal.⁵⁴

3. Confession.

At an ecclesiastical Conference of 1878⁵⁵, the advice was given:

... no minister of the church is authorised to require from those who may resort to him to 'open their grief' a particular or detailed enumeration of all their sins or to encourage regular confession.

The 'provision' in the BCP was not however to be 'limited.'

Rashdall expresses his concern that a practice of regular confession, of the kind disapproved of by the 1878 Conference, was being advocated among certain High Church groups. In 1899, referring in a letter to the Times,⁵⁶ to the 'effluence of Romanising theology' as 'evil,' he says that 'the censuring of persons or things should not be forced on unwilling parishes.' He asks where the clergy learn all this, and concludes it is at the theological colleges. It is there that 'private confession is set before men as an ideal': - 'Non-confession is a lower state, which is only just recognized.'

The proof-text on which the practice of confession and absolution is founded, Matt. 18.18⁵⁷ is interpreted in a strikingly different way by Rashdall. In Doctrine and Development⁵⁸ he discusses 'that other great function of the Church, the power of binding and loosing, that is, the power of defining, fixing, interpreting, applying, the moral ideal, ...'.

⁵⁴ 'Verily I say unto you, I will drink no more of the fruit of the vine, until I drink it new in the kingdom of God. Mark 14.25. See also synoptic parallels.

⁵⁵ A conference on practices, ritual etc. It will be referred to further in a later paragraph.

⁵⁶ Times, 31st March 1899 p.5.

⁵⁷ 'Whatsoever ye shall bind on earth.'

⁵⁸ D and D, pp.250 f.

But ‘the actual historic Church’ cannot judge what is good and evil. The Church makes mistakes. He gives examples of changing views. Not only in ‘general moral principles’ is the Church fallible but in the ‘binding and loosing’ of persons it cannot be shown that all excommunications have been just, and thus ratified in heaven.

The same text is used in his first Sermon in Christus in Ecclesia, ‘The idea of the Church.’⁵⁹ His first point is that the saying applies to acts rather than people. It speaks of ‘whatsoever,’ not ‘whomsoever; for it is the expression used in a Jewish law court, to pronounce an act unlawful or lawful. While Stone is interested in the mechanism of it,⁶⁰ to Rashdall, the details are an irrelevance, since he does not believe, anyway, that the priest has inherited the status of apostle. He follows through the history of abuses of the saying both in secular rule and in the Church. As in Doctrine and Development, he emphasises that what is being spoken of in the Gospel is an unattainable ideal; but such a code of conduct should be the aim of a Christian society.

It is a theme to which Rashdall was particularly attached. The Sermon in essence appears several times among his collection of unpublished sermons. This emphasis, together with his view of the function of the Ministry as discussed above, rule out for him the practice of regular sacramental confession.

(iii) Ritual.

Though Rashdall did not ally himself with any extreme view, and was not greatly interested in the subject *per se*, his moderate position will be noted against the background of heated argument aiming to sway church politics on the matter.

There had been considerable development in ritual since the time of the Tractarians, who had introduced practices and questioned understandings of Anglicanism more vigorously than had been experienced since the settlement of 1662. A Conference took place in preparation for a Royal Commission, which attempted an official agreement in 1878.⁶¹

The acute necessity for negotiation becomes clear, when it is remembered that in this period several ‘ritualist’ clergy suffered imprisonment. (The Conference also included in its brief a review of Confession.).

⁵⁹ C in E, Ch. I, pp.19-30.

⁶⁰ D. Stone, Dogma, pp.198-202.

⁶¹ A. M. G. Stephenson, Anglicanism and the Lambeth Conference (London: SPCK, 1978), pp.69-70.

Report of 1878.

The Report by Magee, Archbishop of York, was, at first, not favourably received,⁶² but, after amendments, was accepted. On ritual generally 'no alteration from long-accustomed ritual should be made contrary to the admonition of the Bishop of the Diocese.'

Reservation of the Sacrament was an often discussed ritualistic practice. Whereas, for example, **Darwell Stone** speaks of extra-liturgical rites with approval,⁶³ **Gore** does not, for himself, accept these rites. His attitude is clear in The Body of Christ.⁶⁴ Here he speaks critically of the 'apparently light-hearted security' with which 'the obvious intention of the sacrament according to the mind of Christ has been enlarged in later practice.' Further, the 'wholly legitimate' reservation of the consecrated elements for absent sick people has mistakenly become a fulfilment of the desire of some for 'a permanent extra presence of Christ ... in a particular spot ...' His judgement is that it 'is a most serious lowering of the level of Christian devotion ... instead of the only sort of abiding the NT suggests - the indwelling of Christ in the members of His body.'

Rashdall.

Rashdall believed that, since the Church must be 'visible,' it must attach importance to externals. In his sermon on the Oxford Movement (of which he speaks appreciatively) in Christus in Ecclesia he says, 'It is a fundamental and external fact of human nature that spiritual realities ... must be taught through sensible media' And 'without some external signs or symbols it is scarcely possible that religion should have its proper influence on thought, act, affection, and ... imagination.'⁶⁵

Bishop Butler is quoted - 'external acts of piety and devotion, and the frequent returns of them, are necessary to keep up a sense of religion which the affairs of the world will otherwise wear out of men's hearts.'⁶⁶ However, his sympathy does not extend to extra-eucharistic practices such as permanent reservation - on the same page

⁶² Ibid. Refers to Macdonnell, Life of Archbishop Magee, vol. ii, pp.74-5.

⁶³ Stone, Outlines, e.g. p.180.

⁶⁴ Gore, Body, p.136 ff.

⁶⁵ HR, C in E, 1, pp. 12 ff.

⁶⁶ Ibid. p.13.

he dismisses ‘the exaggerations and absurdities of Romanising ritualism.’ Since, as discussed above, he opposes the doctrine of ‘Real Presence,’ it follows that he cannot attach any meaning to these practices, including genuflection.

But the main message of his sermon is that the major danger to religion is indifference, the danger that worship would be ‘crowded out’ of contemporary life. A counter to this lack of interest is ‘sensible media.’ Was this simply an appeal to the pedagogue’s ‘visual aids?’ No, the aesthetic attraction of the Church of England was to him of the ‘esse’ of religious experience. Only those practices that expressed outwardly doctrines he refuted were rejected.

(iv) The Question of Subscription; the Sidgwick Debate.

Sidgwick’s Paper.

An important debate occurred in the years 1896-97 between Rashdall and the philosopher Henry **Sidgwick** who published his address to the West London Ethical Society in the International Journal of Ethics.⁶⁷ This highlighted the dilemma of a radical, or untraditional thinker whose position deviated from the formally acknowledged one of the body to which he belonged. In the case of an Anglican clergyman: should he be prepared to subscribe formally, at ordination, to the beliefs required, that is, to the thirty-nine Articles and the Creeds, thus entering into a profession in which he had influence to publicise his own liberal views, or was this compromise dishonest? The argument, Sidgwick stated, was not primarily theological but moral, or ethical.

The question was relevant to the ecclesiastical debates of the times. Sidgwick considers more generally the position of one who, a member (whether lay or ordained) of the Church of England, while not believing all the doctrines held by that Church, chooses to remain within it. Discounting the merely hypocritical, he suggests that many honest members do so because they judge that the Church is a ‘moralising agent,’ by which their children will also benefit. Some who disbelieve in certain doctrines, may hope to ‘enlarge’ the teaching of the Church, to include their own, more liberal doctrines. But, while we may ‘sit loose to the Creeds’ for ourselves,

⁶⁷ Henry Sidgwick, ‘The Ethics of Religious Conformity,’ International Journal of Ethics, Vol. 6 (Issue 3rd Apr. 1896), 273-290. A lecture delivered to the West London Ethical Society, 24th Nov. 1895.

nevertheless any who is in a position to teach must reckon with the fact that those instructed are now used, in other disciplines, to receiving reliable information.

Sidgwick outlines his own view. He, as a utilitarian, does not hold that it is always wrong to lie. He gives the classical cases in which lying is considered to be justified. Finally, he remarks that there is, in the Church of England, the specific difficulty of a form of worship and 'elaborate official creed' more than three hundred years old. Bearing this in mind, he reaches the following conclusions. (i) A lay person is not bound to believe all that he 'recites.' (ii) However, anyone who becomes a minister or teacher, and who has reservations about the literal truth of the Apostles' Creed, should explain how he interprets it. In particular, any who does not believe in the Virgin Birth cannot remain in his post. The Article is prolix, but presents a good case.

Rashdall's Reply.

Rashdall, to whom this dilemma was of personal significance, replied to Sidgwick in the same Journal the following year.⁶⁸ He also considers the question whether it is always wrong to lie, and cites classical examples similar to Sidgwick's, in which 'unveracity' is ethically preferable to the truth - a routine exercise of philosophers. From this premise, he justifies the gap between 'formal professions and private beliefs' of the clergy. This he applies particularly to the case of the thirty-nine Articles. Rashdall believes: it is better to use language in a 'non-natural' way in order to become a clergyman, than not to be ordained, Thus, he argues (contra Sidgwick) that theology may benefit from that liberal cleric; he adds, rhetorically rather than logically, 'If anyone holds that this process in the past has not been beneficial, the difference between us is too fundamental to be argued here.'

He refers approvingly to the 'younger, intelligent High Church clergy' who by their participation in or support of Lux Mundi have shown a more relaxed response to the required subscription at ordination than the intending cleric believes all that is contained in the scriptures.

Professor Sidgwick, he notes, includes in his censure non-belief in miracles and the Creeds. On this, Rashdall details 'degrees' in attitudes to miracles. On the Virgin

⁶⁸ HR, 'Prof. Sidgwick on the Ethics of Religious Conformity. A Reply.' International Journal of Ethics, Vol. 7, No. 2 (Jan. 1897), 137-168.

Birth, he points out that Saints Paul and John do not mention it, and refers to the ‘weakness of the evidence.’

The latter is a valid point, but not a relevant reply to the argument of Sidgwick, who has claimed, not that the doctrine is true, but that it should not be endorsed by those who do not believe it. He concludes rather ambiguously that: ‘Dishonesty only begins when a man takes orders under a creed which he could not on fitting occasions avow’ and that: ‘one may be allowed to be silent or evasive on certain things.’

The Debate continued.

This debate led to further discussions and correspondence. Essentially, the same points were rehearsed. Examples may be given to illustrate the long and inconclusive debate.

Sidgwick was still corresponding in January 1898,⁶⁹ when he wrote: ‘probably I have said all I have to say of substantial interest on the question at issue’. The rest is, indeed, repetition.

Fairbairn, Principal of Mansfield, wrote to Rashdall early in 1897, referring to the article. He has ‘read it with sympathy, though with the imperfect sympathy of one who had never subscribed and who surrendered his prospect in his Mother Church and a promise of a career at home rather than do so ...’⁷⁰

Gore also wrote in February 1897 after receiving a copy of Rashdall’s Article.⁷¹ Gore protests that there is a difference between a general assent to the Articles and Prayer Book and, on the other hand, the more personal reciting of the Creeds, whose statements are ‘stern and categorical [?.]’ (Manuscript unclear.) However, he sits more lightly to the Athanasian Creed, which he regards as a ‘canticle,’ not as a ‘test.’

On Rashdall’s reference to the contributors to Lux Mundi, he replies, ambiguously: ‘In the sense and for the purpose for which that scripture is given (i.e. in things spiritual) I do unfeignedly believe all the canonical books [?] of the O. and N. Testaments each in its place and according to the kind of literature it represents.’

The controversy did not end with Sidgwick’s death in 1900. It continued through the early years of the twentieth century. In November 1902, a letter appeared in the

⁶⁹ Bod. MS Eng. Lett. c.345, 30th Jan. 1898, f.38. Sidgwick to Rashdall.

⁷⁰ Ibid. c.344, f.130, 2nd Feb. 1897. Fairbairn to Rashdall.

⁷¹ Ibid. c.344, ff.127-128, 1st Feb. 1897. Gore to Rashdall.

Times signed by ‘another Presbyterian’ (Rashdall),⁷² who wrote to the Editor on ‘The position of the Liberal Clergy.’⁷³ He repeats his previous points, adding that he himself told the Bishop (Lightfoot, Bishop of Durham) before ordination that he did not believe in the Virgin Birth.

In 1904, he takes up the theme⁷⁴ with Dr. **Sanday**, replying to an Article by the latter in the Independent Review.⁷⁵ After repeating his usual arguments, Rashdall concludes with the hope that he, Rashdall, has helped to bridge over ‘the gulf’ which ‘separates the conclusions of Dr. Sanday’s somewhat dogmatic head from those of his sympathetic and catholic heart.’

Relations between Sidgwick, Gore and Rashdall.

An Article was published in the Liberal Churchman in November 1904 entitled ‘Dr. Gore and the Creeds.’⁷⁶ The author is anonymous, but his thinking is very similar to Rashdall’s. It is complained that the Bishop of Worcester (Gore) is taking a very hard line with the liberal clergy. The author comments that, while Gore takes the same attitude as the liberal clergy to the Prayer Book and the scriptures, it is on the Creeds that ‘the old Adam once more asserts itself in the Bishop of Worcester....’ According to him there is ‘something fundamental about the creeds which exempts them from the operation of the Declaration of Assent. The Creeds assert (he says) that the historical records were true in fact and admitted of no ambiguity.’

The dispute, whether this last Article is, in fact, Rashdall’s or not, had had a marked effect on Rashdall’s relationship with Gore. An account of this is given by Prestige in his biography of Gore.⁷⁷ He notes that ‘As Fellow and chaplain of Balliol, he [Rashdall] had been in fairly close contact with Gore during his [the latter’s] last five years at Pusey House.’⁷⁸ (ending in 1893). He had consulted Gore as to whether he should accept the fellowship at New College, seeking from him spiritual guidance as a friend. After the Debate, however, relations cooled.

⁷² See MM, 109. p.43. Refers to Matheson p.102.

⁷³ HR Times, 15th Nov. 1902, p.17. See MM, 109. p.41.

⁷⁴ HR, “‘The Creeds and the Clergy.’ A Reply to Dr. Sanday.’ Independent Review, 2 (i) (Feb. 1904), 48–65.

⁷⁵ W. Sanday, ‘The Obligation of the Creeds,’ Independent Review, 1(i) (Oct. 1903), 92-94.

⁷⁶ HR? ‘Dr. Gore and the Creeds,’ The Liberal Churchman, No. i. (Nov. 1904), 57-62.

⁷⁷ G. L. Prestige, Life of Gore, pp.192-198.

⁷⁸ *Ibid.* at p.192.

Sidgwick was at Cambridge and did not know Gore until 'shortly afterwards' when he joined the Synthetic Society and they became 'fairly intimate.' Sidgwick died in 1900. Before they met, Sidgwick's Article had 'forged a spiritual link between them.' 'The sceptical philosopher had expressed almost exactly Gore's own conclusions, and maintained them on the same high moral grounds.'⁷⁹

Conclusion.

We have seen that Gore and Rashdall agreed on their conclusions about subscription to the Prayer Book in general and to the Articles, but differed on the Creeds. Prestige's statement should be modified. A conclusion on 'high moral grounds' would be the view that one should not assert anything in public which one did not fully believe. This is the position taken by Fairbairn. The dilemma for an Anglican ordinand is no different, except in the detail of the subscription required. So, first, he has to decide whether to take 'the high moral ground' by refusing to make any statement he thinks untrue. If, on the other hand, he concludes that a greater ethical goal is achieved by making those statements, it is a matter only of degree; how many statements, untrue in his view, is he prepared to make? The status of the Creeds in this decision is a factor of judgment of, together with knowledge of, the historical background of the Creeds.

(v) Disestablishment.

Among the conflicting arguments that arose at times of crisis in the Church of England, inevitably it was asked whether disestablishment of the Church from the State would be the solution. In this Rashdall was consistent; maintaining always that the 'status quo' was the most satisfactory arrangement.

It may be noted of Gore, Rashdall's frequent opponent in doctrinal questions, that in the earlier period, at the turn of the century, he was prepared to work within the framework of establishment. It has been commented that⁸⁰ he made 'an important contribution to the discussion of the establishment of the Church of England which was one of the most critical problems that the Church faced at the turn of the century.' He supported continuation of the establishment. Unlike Rashdall, however, he, at a

⁷⁹ Ibid. p.193.

⁸⁰ T. Langford, Foundations, pp.152f.

later period, changed his position, which, according to his biographer, was ‘forced upon him by his Scriptural ideals of spiritual freedom and constitutional democracy.’⁸¹ Some years later (after 1909) he wrote that there was ‘no way really to liberate the mind of the working Church except by disestablishment.’

During the time when Rashdall was writing the sermons of Christus in Ecclesia the Coronation of Edward VII was approaching. In this context he considers the question. Writing on ‘the Church and the State’⁸² which he introduces with reference to the ‘impending coronation’ he quotes with approval ‘the old Greek idea of the state as a society for the promotion of virtue.’⁸³ The role of the Church is consistent with this aim, as a more limited, voluntary society.

Disestablishment, he says, would be a ‘greater national disaster’ than the difficulties it sometimes engenders. His attitude is pragmatic. ‘It is enough to claim for the English system that it is suitable to the conditions and circumstances of the English nation at the present time.’⁸⁴

Whereas in Roman times, the two were opposed, the position is quite different when both are Christian. This was the case in the Middle Ages. Now, however, not all are Christians. Against this disparate background, there must be some interference from the state, which is justified if the Church is enabled to work more efficiently. There are some disadvantages – for instance, ‘we’ cannot alter our formularies - but the appointment of Bishops by Parliament he notes, may be more representative. ‘It is probable,’ Rashdall suggests, ‘that the appointment of bishops by the Prime Minister really means designation by the public opinion of the lay community far more thoroughly than their designation by diocesan synods would do.’

His view is clear in a paper published in his posthumous collection, Ideas and Ideals.⁸⁵ Read to the London branch of the CSU in 1896, Rashdall states objectively that the promotion of the Aristotelian doctrine of the state is not necessarily best effected by an established church. ‘Each and every relation between the State and the one or more religious societies existing within it may be the right one at a particular time and place.’

⁸¹ Prestige, Life, pp.314 f.

⁸² HR, C in E, 21 pp.303–314.

⁸³ Ibid. at p.303.

⁸⁴ Ibid. at p.306.

⁸⁵ ‘The Rights of the State,’ Ideas and Ideals (Oxford: Blackwell, 1928), pp.22-39.

It is then, for him, a matter of judgment, relative to the contemporary situation. However, his judgment of the optimum for the Church of England in his own time was fixed and definite.

Conclusion.

We may here summarise: though his attitude to outward 'signs and symbols' is very positive, Rashdall has no difficulty in complying with official rulings on limits of ritual.

During this period of Rashdall's early and middle career, the ministry featured prominently among theologians' writings. Preceded by the work of earlier scholars, among which Hatch and Lightfoot are particularly important in a study of Rashdall - for his thinking reflects their exegesis and his doctrinal position is in a direct line with theirs - the dissertations of theological engagement in those years include, in direct contrast, major writings of the Anglo-Catholic school. While the former group treats the rise of the ministry pragmatically: as based on secular models of organisation, a useful framework for the Christian communities, but not as a *sine qua non*; the latter, among whom Gore and Moberly wrote major works, held that the Christian priesthood, like the foundation of the Church itself, was divinely instituted, ordained and authorised. Those without Apostolic Succession lacked the divine warrant. The concept of the sacraments was central to the discussions, especially of the Eucharist, since apostolic ordination transmitted to the priest the authority, according to the theology of the Church of England, as an Episcopal Church, to celebrate.

It has been seen that Rashdall, applying consistently his theology of atonement, extended refutation of substitutional doctrine to the Eucharist; he did not regard either major Sacrament as *ex opere operato*, but as a token of membership, an act of loyalty and as a way of following the inspirational example of Christ.

While aware that establishment of the Church had some disadvantages, he consistently supported it as the best form of organisation for the Church of England in his time.

At the end of this period, having returned from Durham to the academic life of Oxford, he had had the time and opportunity to publish major works, including his study of Church doctrine, Christus in Ecclesia.

Chapter 4. The Theology of the Church. Section 2.

The Years from 1904 to 1924.

Introduction.

During this second period, the debates on orders of the Ministry continued. These were closely connected with the question of ecumenism, for it was the nature of the ministry which was the main controversy between the Anglican and the non-Episcopal Churches. The question of religious education in Schools, in connection with the Education Acts at the beginning of the century, also had an ecumenical aspect.

Ritualism, the external witness to differences in churchmanship and often related to the Eucharist, on the subject of which some contemporary writings will be reviewed, was a subject of lively discussion. For Rashdall, this was connected with the doctrinal question of differing attitudes to the Creeds; both being subject to legislation by Parliament. During the period, Rashdall acquired more authority to speak to official bodies and to convey his views to a wider public on his appointment as Dean at Carlisle.

(i) Ministry; Orders and Ecumenism.

1. *Orders.*

The central question: whether Christ had founded a Church, with a system of organisation to be retained *in perpetuum*, was, as before, polarised; a division between the Anglo-Catholics who answered emphatically in the affirmative, and the liberals, whose answer, following Hatch and Lightfoot, was negative. The main points of discussion may be followed by a review of the work of Gore in 1909, Orders and Unity,¹ the Kikuyu Crisis of 1913-15 and the Articles written by Rashdall for the Modern Churchman in 1914.

Gore.

When he wrote his second work on the Ministry in 1909, Gore was no longer living in an academic community in Oxford. More than twenty years had passed, during which

¹ C. Gore, Orders and Unity (London: Murray, 1909). Page references in the main text.

he had been appointed Bishop of Worcester in 1902, and, in 1905, Bishop of the new Diocese of Birmingham. Thus he was by 1909 a more powerful figure than in 1888 (when his first book on the ministry was written) but had less time for scholarly writing.

The second work, Orders and Unity, is much shorter and less academic. His position on ministry is unchanged; nor can it be said that, in the mean time, he has developed new and more convincing arguments. He merely presents his case in a more accessible style. Indeed, his former work is one of his sources; he remarks in his Preface of 1909 that the previous book is 'larger and more comprehensive than any thing I am now able to attempt,' and that he still refers to it.

As Gore mentions, the whole controversy was particularly relevant to the first decade of the twentieth century, since there were 'proposals and movements towards reunion' ('with both Catholic and Protestant bodies'). (p. 1)

All these proposals, Gore states, involve the question of 'valid Christian ministry.' 'Did Jesus Christ found a Church on earth or was he...simply a prophet who proclaimed the coming of the divine Kingdom with little provision for the interval?' (p. 2) It may be noted that this antithetical question is loaded by the use of the adverb 'simply,' and of the pejorative phrase 'with little provision.' It is clearly a question expecting the answer 'yes' for the first, and 'no' for the second proposition. He answers his question, arguing from Mark 13.34. – 'For the Son of Man is as a man taking a far journey, who left his house and gave authority to his servants.'

Comments on Gore's position as stated in the first Chapter.

However, this choice of saying is an unsafe one for his purpose, since the main emphasis of Chapter 13 is the imminent coming of the *eschaton* in which the 'servants' would have very little time to carry out an organisation, for verse 30 declares; 'Verily, I say unto you that this generation shall not pass, till all these things be done.' Does Gore believe that Jesus' knowledge was limited in verse 30, but not in verse 34? He has not made this clear. He supports his argument from the 'mission of the twelve,' quoting F.D. Maurice² (p. 13) who said the four Gospels could be called 'the institution of the Christian ministry.'

² F. D. Maurice The Kingdom of Christ, (3rd ed.) (London: Macmillan, 3rd ed. 1883), ii p. 118.

A curious *non sequitur* follows as he turns his attention to the question of earthquakes (is God loving?) to insist that disasters are mainly man's fault and God's trust in him is misplaced; - but, 'God has from the beginning of human existence made men his vice-gerents and ministers towards their fellow-men' All this leads to his conclusion that 'God governs men through men in spite of their unworthiness.' (p. 17) The 'earth-quake' argument is indeed, a doubtful one for his purposes!

Further doubtful sequences follow. Jesus, he says, spoke the truth, even though it brought unpopularity. This is compared here to the difficulties experienced (by High Churchmen, presumably) at a time when 'truth is sacrificed to popular adhesion.' (p. 24) Could this argument not be used equally by any group which claims the truth for its own beliefs?

Again, he makes the curious claim that 'Jesus, though a prophet, did not echo the prophets' criticism of religious rites' - a superficial dismissal of a matter which requires detailed analysis. Gore asserts that Jesus was not only a prophet but a priest, in his work of redemption by 'vicarious sacrifice,' arguing that the disciples derived this from Isaiah 53.10. 'unhesitatingly.' (my underlining) Gore dismisses all scholarly questioning of this conclusion. Additionally, it is hazardous to hold that the prophets were wrong in their criticisms of religious rites, while insisting, at the same time, that the words of Isaiah can be used as a proof-text. There is much more assertion without detailed discussion.

In his Chapter on 'The Church the Home of Salvation,' there is common ground with Rashdall in his opposition to an 'invisible' Church for the elect, and his emphasis on the importance of the 'obligation' of membership of the (visible) Church. (p. 70f.)

On the other hand, Gore opposes close links with the state. '... we do claim for the Church the liberty to formulate its own doctrine, to organise its own worship, to exercise its own discipline'

Gore's subsequent history of the ministry by succession is a reiteration, though briefer, of his position in the earlier book. 'The principle of succession was quite unbroken,' he states, 'whether in each church there were many Bishops or one.' (p. 131) He restates, in addition, the traditional catholic view of priesthood that, 'we must recognize divine office even in the case of bad men when they hold it.' (p. 171)

In his final formal Chapter, while emphasising the special position held by the Church of England, Gore turns, more controversially, to criticism of its function as a national Church. Unlike Rashdall, who consistently defends its role in the nation, with

all its disadvantages, Gore declares that it has to repent, ‘after years of letting membership of the nation ... stand in place of membership of the Church’ (p. 199)

He repeats his hostility to the ecumenism supported by Rashdall, remarking, ‘... we shall be very chary of doing anything which promotes the prevalent undenominational spirit.’ (p. 206)

This restatement of Gore’s position in his longer work of twenty-one years before, was enhanced in importance by the status of its author, now a Bishop.

Rashdall’s correspondence to the Times.

In 1908, Rashdall had written three letters to the Times³ in reply to an (unnamed) Principal of a theological College, who had argued for the validity of the doctrine of Apostolic Succession. In his first letter, Rashdall sets out his view that the questions of (i)⁴ the origin and truth of the doctrine, and (ii) its necessity, are quite different, the second not requiring the same answer as the first; nevertheless after the work of recent scholars, the traditional view of its origin might reasonably be doubted. In his second letter he refutes the Principal’s complaint that his letter is ‘contemptuous,’ but agrees that it is controversial; for he is faced with ‘unwarrantable inferences from unproved historical assumptions.’ The contentions are familiar ones.

2. Ecumenism.

Kikuyu.

A peak of controversy in the history of ecumenism, which high-lighted the contemporary relevance of the doctrine of Apostolic Succession in the Church of England, was reached with the Kikuyu meeting of 1913. Since without a reference to it, Rashdall’s series of Articles on the Apostolic ministry in the Modern Churchman of 1914, reviewed below, are out of context, the background will be reviewed here. The event illustrates dramatically the differences between Liberals and Anglo-Catholics in the Church of England.

³ (1) ‘Home Reunion and the Apostolic Succession,’ Times, 2nd Sept. 1908, p. 6; (2) ‘Home Reunion,’ Times, 18th Sept. 1908, p. 3; (3) ‘Home Reunion,’ Times, 3rd Oct. 1908, p. 7. See MM, 162-164. p. 57.

⁴ My numbering.

The Event.

The setting was a village in Kenya, where a missionary conference of Anglicans, Presbyterians and other Protestant bodies was held in June 1913, led by the Bishop of Mombasa, W. G. Peel, and the Bishop of Uganda, J. J. Willis (in the chair).⁵ At the meeting were about sixty Bishops.⁶ Its purpose was to explore the possibility of a federation of constituent missionary bodies in British E. Africa, of which the basis would be: (1) Holy Scripture as the supreme rule of faith and practice and the Apostles' and Nicene Creeds as an expression of belief; and, more specifically, of: the deity of Jesus Christ; and 'the atoning death of Our Lord' as the ground of forgiveness; (2) recognition of common membership between the constituent bodies; (3) regular communion in which all had the right to participate; (4) a common organisation.

Reactions.

A. Participants.

This ecumenical event was greeted by supporters with much enthusiasm. A Presbyterian minister, N. Maclean, contributed an Article to the Scotsman,⁷ describing it as 'The most wonderful gathering I ever saw;' and, even more triumphantly, 'The missions in E. Africa have solved the problem of how to coalesce Episcopacy with Presbyterianism.' He ended with an account of a final service of Holy Communion, in the evening of the closing day, in the Scottish Church. Bishop Peel celebrated using the BCP, a Presbyterian preached, and all except the Friends received communion.

It was proposed that in each Society of the Federation members could receive communion at any of the constituent Churches when away from home. The Anglican dioceses concerned were attached to the CMS, an evangelical Society.

B. Weston and Archbishop Davidson.

However, before the publication of the Article, Frank Weston, Bishop of Zanzibar, who was attached to the UMCA, an Anglo-Catholic Society, heard of the event.⁸ His diocese, in German E. Africa, bordered the dioceses of Uganda and Mombasa. As a

⁵ ODCC, p. 927.

⁶ G. Bell, Randall Davidson, Vol. 1 (London: OUP, 1935), pp. 690-708.

⁷ Ibid. at p. 690. 13th Aug. 1913.

⁸ Ibid. at p. 692.

conservative Anglo-Catholic⁹ he objected strongly to the proposal for a federation of Anglicans with 'Protestants.' Already, there had been hostilities between Weston and the Bishop of Mombasa¹⁰ when, in 1912 Weston had rewritten a Swahili manual translated by the Archdeacon of Mombasa. Thereupon, the Archdeacon had delated¹¹ Weston for heresy to the Archbishop of Canterbury. Subsequently, the charge was not pursued, as it was found that the passages concerned were not contrary to the doctrine of the Church of England.¹² The biographer comments that 'heresy hunting was not started by Weston.'

Nevertheless, after Kikuyu, it was Weston who called for formal ecclesiastical condemnation; he wrote to Davidson, the Archbishop of Canterbury, in September, submitting a request for a Synodical Court to take action on an enclosed indictment charging the Bishops of Mombasa and Uganda with 'propagating heresy and committing schism.' His communication was given great publicity by the Press. Gore wrote to the Times,¹³ saying he doubted 'if the cohesion of the Church of England was ever more threatened than it is now.'¹⁴ Bell points out that for Weston and Gore, Kikuyu was 'part of a wider modernist movement which seemed to threaten the foundations of the Faith.'

The effectiveness of Davidson's quiet diplomacy has been shown in Chapter 3. So also in the earlier dispute of 1913 his policy was to create a 'cooling off' period. He refused a heresy and schism trial but called a Consultative Body of the Lambeth Conference for July 1914. He also interviewed Weston and Willis jointly and later Peel, at Lambeth, in a friendly atmosphere.

The Consultative Body was asked: (1) if the proposed scheme contravened any principles of Church Order; (2) whether the service of Holy Communion held at the Kikuyu meeting was inconsistent with the principles of the Church of England. The Bishops of Uganda and Mombasa prepared a case ('Steps towards Reunion') in which

⁹ He is said to have regarded Gore's theory of kenosis as being as bad as Foundations; Davidson, p. 697.

¹⁰ H. M. Smith, Frank, Bishop of Zanzibar, SPCK (London, New York and Toronto: Macmillan, 1926), pp. 145-170.

¹¹ *Ibid.* p. 153.

¹² *Ibid.* pp. 153f.

¹³ Times, 29th Dec. 1913.

¹⁴ Bell, Davidson, pp. 694ff.

they referred to the four areas covered by the Lambeth Quadrilateral:¹⁵ the areas were; (a) Holy Scripture; (b) the Apostles' and Nicene Creeds; (c) baptism and Communion; (d) the historic Episcopate. Weston prepared his case, entitled 'The Case against Kikuyu, a study in vital principles,' in which he held that an Anglican Bishop was 'simply ... a Catholic Bishop while non-episcopal Churches could not be branches of the Catholic Church.'¹⁶

The meeting of the Consultative Body, in July 1914, was followed by the outbreak of the First World War in August. This caused a long delay in normal procedures and the replies could not be published. The circumstances also allowed Davidson a time for consideration. However at Easter 1915 his reply, based on the findings of the Committee, ruled that: (1) there was no objection to inviting a non-episcopalian minister to preach; (2) Christians not episcopally confirmed might be admitted to Communion when away from home; Anglicans should not receive Communion from non-conformist ministers.¹⁷

In February 1914, while publicity was still at its height, seven hundred signatories had expressed their support of Weston. This is the group Rashdall refers to in his Articles in the Modern Churchman of the same year.

After Davidson's reply, Weston wrote The Fullness of Christ¹⁸ to explain his position. However, H. M. Smith, Weston's biographer, comments, ¹⁹ 'Unfortunately, it did not make his position clear, for most people expressed their inability to understand the book.'

Smith also summarises the whole event, which may be regarded as a dramatic synopsis of the ecclesiastical, and at a deeper level, the theological, crisis, concerning the understanding of the Apostolic Ministry in the Church of England.²⁰ 'As the very wise ruler of the Church, he [that is, Davidson] is more concerned with composing differences than in formulating principles; he wishes to keep doors open for reunion in the future, while he cautiously recommends that it would be better for the present not to go through them' 'Frank with his zeal for truth and passionate adherence to principle was not satisfied.'

¹⁵ A basis for reunion proposed by the Lambeth Conference.

¹⁶ Ibid. p. 702.

¹⁷ Ibid. p. 706.

¹⁸ Weston, The Fullness of Christ (London: Longman, 1916).

¹⁹ Zanzibar, p. 162.

²⁰ Ibid.

C. Rashdall.

In the first half of 1914, after Gore's letter to the Times in December 1913, and with the arrival of the protagonists in England, the Kikuyu crisis was at its height. Rashdall joined in the controversy, by writing a series of five Articles in the Modern Churchman, from May to October 1914.²¹ Most noticeably, the first Article deals, point by point, with the Bishop of Zanzibar's accusations, and comments on the seven hundred signatories of the declaration of support for Weston.

In the *first* Article, Rashdall lists his points in detail. Weston and his party argue the following case. Episcopacy is a divine institution; without it no religious society is a true Church of God or part of the Universal Church. Moreover, valid ministry exists only when 'consecrated by imposition of hands'- traced to the original Apostles. But now, Rashdall reports, the 'Bishop of Zanzibar' says those who deny it have no legal place in the Church of England. The Petition asks 'the Bishops to make it plain that, in accordance with the teaching of the Church in all ages, the Church of England has always taught and must continue to teach the necessity of Episcopal ordination as a condition of exercising the Ministry of the word and Sacraments.' Rashdall's comment is, 'The hardihood of the assertion fairly takes one's breath away.' He remarks on the 'almost entire absence from the list (of signatories) of any scholars' So, he adds, they have no (scholastic) authority to quote, 'which would excuse them from study.'

Rashdall appeals to the Ordinal of the BCP, making several claims. They are the following. (a) The 'statement (in the Preface) ... primarily historical ... does not assert a universal necessity of such orders,' and does not condemn churches without it. (b) Nothing is said of the necessity of the succession having been maintained since the time of the Apostles. The principle asserted is that the priest must be admitted by 'lawful authority.' (c) 'the refusal to condemn other Churches is still more evident in the Prayer Book of 1552.' Rashdall's point here, though he does not make it very clearly, is that the Preface of the 1552 omits the phrase included in the 1662 'or hath had formerly Episcopal Consecration or Ordination.' (The 1549 also omits the phrase). (d) His main point is that 'it is undeniable that between 1549 and 1662 there are several cases of Presbyters ordained by Protestant Presbyters on the continent'

²¹ HR, Modern Churchman, Vol. 4 'Episcopacy and the Apostolic Succession.' (1) May, 74-78; (2) June, 146-157; (3) Aug. 251-263; (4) Sept. 318-328; (5) Oct. 371-383; 1914.

who became Anglican priests. Further, he aims to show that Weston's position had not necessarily been held by High Churchmen before the time of the Oxford Movement, especially in the eighteenth century.

Comments.

In this appeal to the ordinal, Rashdall has some justification. Scholars of the reformation and Tudor periods studying the question lend support to his claims. For instance, the work on Episcopal Ordination by J. W. Hunkis has relevant comments.²² The author observes that the early reformers did not pay much attention to episcopacy; they were considering doctrine. Hunkis quotes Keble in his Preface to Hooker's works - 'Nearly up to the time when Hooker wrote (1595) numbers had been admitted to the ministry of the Church of England with no better than Presbyterian ordination ...' ²³ The most famous in presbyterian orders to exercise ministry in the English Church, he says, are William Whittingham, J. Morrison (1582) and the incumbents of the parishes of the Channel Islands. Whittingham was an elder of the first English Presbyterian Church in Geneva in 1555 and in 1563 became Dean of Durham.

Sykes notes in his work on the same subject²⁴ that Presbyterian ordination was allowed in certain circumstances, referring to Jeremy Taylor, Works,²⁵ 'For we were glad at first of abettors against the errors of the Roman Church ... , we were willing to make them recompense by endeavouring to justify their ordinations, ... we did not condemn ordinations of their presbytery.'

(e) Rashdall turns to the thirty-nine Articles, remarking on Article 19, a definition, he adds, from the Augsburg Confession, of the 'visible Church of Christ' as a 'congregation of faithful men ...' which, by not mentioning the Apostolic Succession, is in the register of a reformed understanding of the Church; while Article 23, which he also quotes, 'Of Ministering in the Congregation,' does not mention the Succession; it may fairly be said (as he contends) that it 'seems worded to avoid

²² J. W. Hunkis, Episcopal Ordination and Confirmation in relation to Our Formularies (Cambridge: Heffer, 1929).

²³ Hunkis refers at p. 15 to Keble's Preface to Hooker (p. lxxvi).

²⁴ N. Sykes, Old Priest and New Presbyter (Cambridge: CUP, 1957), p. 58.

²⁵ J. Taylor, Works (ed. Heber, Vol. V, 1850), p. 118.

condemnation of non-episcopal Protestant Churches.’ Rashdall is justified therefore in claiming support from the Articles.

The majority of Bishops, he says, do not agree with the seven hundred signatories.

In the following four Articles much of the discussion goes over old ground in its history of the ministry, especially the question of the nature of ‘mon-episcopacy;’ we are reminded of its contemporary relevance by its references to Gore and Weston. It is not necessary to report all these Articles in detail, but some of his salient points and counter-arguments may be noted.

In the *second* Article, in answer to the titular question ‘Is the Apostolic Succession an historical fact?’ Rashdall replies that, even if it could be so established, that fact would not prove the truth of the doctrine that ‘says there can be no valid ministry without it.’ Conversely, it cannot be true if the historical facts are false. We cannot ‘unchurch’ other churches if the Apostolic Succession cannot be shown as historical fact.

He examines references to the NT, to Clement, and the *Didache* (in which, he says, the Prophet consecrates and the Bishop celebrates the Eucharist only in his absence.) He quotes Weston who has said the supreme government of the Church was ‘vested’ by the Apostles in the hands of Bishops. But, replies Rashdall, there is ‘nothing of the doctrine of “no Priest, no Eucharist” [Weston’s aphorism] in the *Didache*.’

In his *fourth* Article, of September, Rashdall refers to the older High Churchmen, for example, Jeremy Taylor, who thought they found ‘Mon-episcopacy’ in the NT, but it is now ‘almost universally admitted that they were wrong.’ However, he remarks, the ‘rank and file’ of High Churchmen do not change, in spite of modern scholarship. Dr. Gore, the Bishop of Oxford, has changed the emphasis of his argument, saying that the principle of Apostolic Succession is not found in the three orders of priesthood but in the contention that all authority must come from the Apostles. Rashdall comments, ‘Note the extraordinary confidence with which this absolutely unproved historical hypothesis is treated as an established fact. It has of late been rendered very doubtful whether the St. John (he refers here to the writer of John’s Gospel) who undoubtedly held a position of high authority in the Church of Ephesus, was the son of Zebedee.’²⁶ (Gore has spoken of the precedent set by the

²⁶ *MC*, Vol. 4 Article 4 (see note 21 above) at 320 n. 3.

‘Apostle St. John.’) This shows, he comments, how the modern High Churchman, when his theories have been abandoned, continues to defend a theological dogma which has no basis except those theories. Further, ‘Gore’s theory rests on the supposition of sudden changes, for which there is no evidence. Moreover, his theory is unlike that of the Tractarians, for he is almost admitting that Episcopacy owes its origins to the third century Church. His hypothesis, Rashdall concludes, ‘is a last desperate refuge by a theologian who finds that the facts fail to support the theory to which he is committed.’²⁷

The *final* Article, of October, ‘The Authority of the Church,’ asking once more, ‘What authority is there that Our Lord founded a Church?’ reaches general conclusions. Rashdall repeats his view that the Church is not ‘invisible’ (endorsing here the emphasis of High Churchmen on the importance of a visible, institutional, rather than an invisible ‘Church’). It is an ideal society. But (he returns to the contemporary crisis) there must be co-operation, especially on the mission-field. The main obstacle, he insists, is this theory of Episcopacy (that is, the Apostolic Succession) and the approach to the Sacrament that accompanies it. People should ‘disavow’ the theory, ‘in season and out of season.’ Steps should be taken towards unity.²⁸

Ministry; Orders and Ecumenism: Summary and Comment.

Rashdall’s view of the doctrine of Apostolic Succession is completely consistent, from his first detailed statement in Christus in Ecclesia to his Articles of 1914. Equally predictable were the arguments of his opponents. In ecclesiastical matters their hostility was implacable, but in their personal encounters, they were often amicable. For example, even at the height of the Kikuyu controversy, at Oxford in 1914, Gore conducted a very successful University Mission as Bishop of which Rashdall, after remarking, ... ‘alas! Controversy is necessary,’ continued, ‘I don’t suppose anybody could take a mission of this sort so effectively.’²⁹ Nor, it must be

²⁷ Ibid. at 323.

²⁸ There is some inconsistency in that Rashdall did not, after the Kikuyu event, comment on the first clause of the agreement of 1913, stating the proposed basis of faith, which implies views differing from his own, especially on atonement. His enthusiasm for unity, and zeal in publicising his views on ministry in scholarly detail, appear to have engaged his whole attention.

²⁹ G. L. Prestige, The Life of Charles Gore (London: Heinemann, 1935).

added, was the protagonist of the 1913-1914 crisis lacking in charity or, indeed, in charm. H. M. Smith sums this up when he says, 'Apart from his doctrine, Frank appealed to men's hearts and won them, even when he did not convince their minds.'³⁰

When Rashdall was appointed Dean of Carlisle in 1917 his desire for reunion took an active and practical form. In a letter to his mother he tells how he officiated at a United Service to celebrate the end of the War. Writing on the 17th August 1918, he recounts: - 'We had a "United Service" outside the Cathedral - short addresses by the President of the Free Church Council and myself.... The Choirs of the Cathedral and the two neighbouring Churches sang, ... there must have been some 3000 to 3500 people present.'³¹

Meanwhile, Weston's frame of reference had widened, and his desire for co-operation with the Archbishop of Canterbury strengthened by the time of the Lambeth Conference in 1920, to the extent that, in his speech on reunion, a subject given prominence at the Lambeth Conference, he asked, 'What is lacking to my orders, which I must receive before I may be invited to minister in other communities? ... I am prepared to accept at the hands of each community that will unite with me, whatever it thinks it can add to me, provided that it will also receive from my community what we think we have to offer ...'³²

So the dialogue was more eirenic; thus, in 1920, the contrasting concepts of a united church were no longer so sharply divided.

(ii) Education.

The Background.

Discussions on religious education were taking place in Parliament in connection with an Education Bill in 1906. While the Education Act of 1902 had favoured the Church of England, the Bill of 1906 was introduced in an attempt to redress the balance. The question arose whether in elementary schools not attached to the Church, instruction in religious education of a kind acceptable to all denominations should be provided.

³⁰ H. M. Smith, Zanzibar, p. 170.

³¹ NC and Matheson, p. 184.

³² H. M. Smith, Zanzibar, p. 234.

Rashdall's ecumenism is closely linked with his interest in education. He was, indeed, actively interested in the whole vista of education policy, having throughout his life taken a constructive part in encouraging the development of education.

Rashdall's contribution to the debate on non-denominational teaching.

1. *In the Times*

In April 1906, Rashdall wrote to the Times³³ as 'one who accepts the principle of undenominational teaching in elementary schools.' At the same time, he considered 'Mr Birrell's'³⁴ bill to implement the policy defective in certain ways. These Rashdall lists: - (1) he is worried that parents should be allowed to withdraw children, holding that those who need it most would not be there; (2) he thinks teachers should not be allowed to refuse to teach religious education when employed by the state; (3) teachers should themselves have attended bible lessons; (4) summing up his general support, he concludes that these small differences should be solved by amendment, not by wrecking the Bill, and thus being left with secular education.

2. *In the Liberal Churchman.*

In July, Rashdall wrote a longer Article in the Liberal Churchman with the title, 'A plea for undenominationalism.'³⁵ On the question whether religious education should be taught at all in State Schools, or whether the curriculum should be entirely secular, Rashdall begins by expressing sympathy for both sides. Referring to the approach of the French Lycée, where the curriculum is entirely secular, he observes that religion should not be treated as something unmentionable 'in school hours' ('a sort of poison').

The ideal, he believes, is denominational education, of which the most important feature is, not the doctrines taught, but 'the harmony' 'with some definite and organised religious body.' He notes, sympathetically, that, 'Most people's ideas are influenced more by their emotions than by formal instruction.' Rashdall is working with the model of his own School, Harrow - 'a public school with a liberal and tolerant head;' here, where denominational differences were not emphasised, he grew 'to love the Church of England.'

³³ HR, Times, 26th April 1906, p. 12f.

³⁴ Augustine Birrell (1850-1933), President of the Board of Education in 1906.

³⁵ Liberal Churchman, 11, July 1906, .93-117.

But, in practice, in small towns and villages, there is only one elementary school. If it is a church School (as is likely) there will naturally be objections from non-conformists who do not wish to pay for denominational teaching.

Is undenominational teaching possible? Rashdall, in reply to his question, gives an interesting but somewhat exaggerated analysis of the difficulties (a *reductio ad absurdum*). To obtain this, he says, one must 'expurgate the name of God from poetry;' but, by using a substitute (in the poem) such as 'nature,' one offends the theist. And so on. Thus, literature has to be banished entirely. The only 'undenominational' subject, he claims, is arithmetic!

After considering the objection, Rashdall turns to practical possibilities. Under the new dispensation, he suggests, the Church catechism should not be taught (in State Schools) but religious education should be given. It is better for children not in touch with the Church to 'hear something' of the Christian faith than to lack religious instruction entirely. Rashdall, in answering the question who should give this teaching, offers the following guidelines: - (i) instruction should be given by the 'regular school teachers;' (ii) who are Christians; (iii) and who themselves have been adequately instructed in religion. 'Not to teach children that there is a God is one of the most effective ways of teaching them that there is no God.'

Comment.

In this concluding epigram, Rashdall is considering the difficulty that non-denominational teaching may become indistinguishable from secularism. His objection to secular teaching may appear exaggerated. But his warning is not outdated; for, though related to contemporary problems, it is prophetic of the modern conformity, whereby it is increasingly required that all expressions of religion be exorcised from public places.

I have not aimed in this account of Rashdall's contribution to the education debates of 1906 to analyse all his proposals or to discuss those of opponents; but rather to indicate the width of his interests, not only in academic discourses but in their practical applications.

(iii) Eucharist.

While the question of sacramental practice continued to be discussed in connection with priesthood and ecumenism, the Eucharist is not a theological topic that is, *per se*,

prominent in the period 1904-1924 in the Church of England. I shall, however, review some writings of the period, to illustrate the continuing dialogue, in which Rashdall played a part.

Loisy.

Rashdall expressed his interest in Loisy in a sermon of 1904, remarking, 'There are probably two, and two only, continental theologians whose names ... are known to the average man who reads the newspapers. ... One of them is Adolf Harnack, ... the other is Alfred Loisy.'³⁶

It may be noted that Loisy³⁷ wrote a work,³⁸ expounded in the Hibbert Journal of 1910,³⁹ which included an interpretation challenging the traditional view of the eucharistic sayings in the NT. His reviewer, Toker, outlines Loisy's thesis that the Words of Institution in the Gospels are taken from the form of words given in 1 Cor.11. 22-25, the 'vow of abstinence'⁴⁰ relating to the 'cup after supper' (fourth cup.) The rest, he holds, is interpolation. Thus, Loisy's 'primitive gospel' has the cup but not the bread. When the 'interpolations' are removed, each Gospel ends with the 'vow of abstinence' and refers to the Kingdom.

Loisy asks whether it was a Pauline idea that Jesus 'used' the bread as his body. What is not authentic, on this view, is the specifically Pauline and Jewish 'direction of thought' recalling Temple worship (and therefore the idea of sacrifice). The main purpose of the Last Supper in the Synoptics is seen as a 'memorial' of the Kingdom. For Christ wanted to 'fix their (the disciples') attention not on his own death but rather on the life of the Kingdom, his own true life.' The Last Supper, Loisy concludes, was used by Christ to call attention to another (future) supper 'until I drink it new with you in the Kingdom.' 'The core of the Gospels is not redemption from sins, not the Son's work of atonement, not the founding of a divine Society,' it is the Kingdom.

³⁶ HR, 'Harnack and Loisy,' Principles and Precepts (posthumous) (Oxford: Blackwell, 1927), pp. 228-236, at p. 228.

³⁷ Loisy - French Modernist scholar, 1857-1940. Excommunicated, March 1908.

³⁸ Loisy, Les Evangiles Synoptiques, (two vols., 1907-8).

³⁹ M. A. R. Toker, 'The Words of Institution at the Last Supper,' HJ, Vol. 9, Oct.1910, 134-145.

⁴⁰ Matt. 26.29, Mark.14.25, Luke 22.1.

Rashdall, who (as far as I know) did not comment on the theory directly, would probably have known it, and would certainly agree with the emphasis on the whole life, rather than the death of Christ, and on the refutation of the Temple sacrifice as a forerunner of the Eucharist; though he does not represent the Eucharist as a model of the messianic banquet. Gore would oppose, on the other hand, the denial of the Eucharist as an enactment of Atonement based on Temple sacrifice; but he has some affinity with Loisy, in that, for him, too, the celebration is a present precursor of an eschatological triumph.

Gore.

Gore, at a late stage in his career, summarised his current thinking on the Eucharist in Belief in Christ,⁴¹ written in 1922. It is incorporated in yet another Chapter on the question, 'Did Jesus Christ found the Church?' His exposition, in more concise form than his Body of Christ, is, it may be judged, more conventional. Stating that the Eucharist is a sacrifice, following the Hebrew custom, he describes it as a 'peace offering,' the most important feature of which for the Hebrews was communion; but in the Christian Eucharist, he insists, the main purpose is atonement for sin. He notes that the priests partook of the sin offering, except the blood. This leads him to the insecure contention that, 'Christians have a higher privilege than belonged even to priests under the old law.'⁴²

His material, though not essentially changed, has a different tone and emphasis from that of his earlier work.

Rashdall.

Though he did not also publish writings specifically on the Eucharist, Rashdall continued to preach sermons on the subject from time to time, which conveyed in relatively simple language to the congregation his own beliefs. His approach may be illustrated by reference to some of these.

⁴¹ C. Gore, Reconstruction of Belief: The Holy Spirit and the Church (London: Murray, 1924), pp. 675-680.

⁴² *Ibid.* at p. 677 and n.1.

*Unpublished Sermons.*Undated sermon.

An undated sermon, probably preached in the period 1911-13,⁴³ is, in his notes, given the controversial title 'The Eucharistic Sacrifice.' The main text is from Hebrews 13.16. 'To do good and to distribute forget not.'⁴⁴ The text signals the development. This sermon follows a related, previous sermon on 'The True Sacrifice.' The introduction repeats a point from the latter, that in Hebrews the writer, who is consciously using the language of symbol and metaphor, is chiefly conveying the message that that perfect obedience to God's will seen in the death of Jesus may be shown (that is, by his followers) in 'loving service of mankind.' We should 'love and serve our fellow-men as Christ loved and served them.' So Rashdall's doctrine of Atonement (not a substitution for sin but a manifestation of Christ's love) coalesces with his doctrine of the eucharistic sacrifice.

He starts the sermon again (an alternative opening). After dismissing the Roman Catholic doctrines of 'repetition or reproduction of the cross' connected with 'conversion of the elements' for we do not find this 'in the NT or in the earliest writers,' Rashdall states that it (the eucharistic communion) does not have the 'expiatory value attached to animal sacrifices' but is the 'supreme exhibition of God's love for man;...', so this is what 'we, in our poor way, seek to repeat' This is the sacrifice 'of which those liturgies are simply full.' Further exposition follows: - (1) the bread and wine are symbols of the 'fruits of the earth'; and, (2), the continuation of the fellowship of the Kiddush with its solemn blessing and common participation in the bread and wine; he refers to 'a little work called "The teaching of the twelve Apostles" which was rediscovered some forty years ago ...';⁴⁵ it 'may well have been originally a Jewish form of prayer ... (adapted) to Christian needs;' (3) on the close connection of the Service with the giving of alms; (4) on the 'Sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving.'

The conclusion emphasises the practical aspect - that the 'sacrifice of worship is of no value unless it leads to and helps the sacrifice of life.' This stricture is unremarkable unless it is taken, not only as unexceptionable homiletic, but also to indicate the subjective nature of the Eucharist.

⁴³ PH A.4. (12)

⁴⁴ The heading also gives the texts Eccles. 35. 1-16 and 1 Cor.10. 14-20.

⁴⁵ HR refers here to the *Didache*, see above.

Sermon of 1918.

A sermon preached at Carlisle in 1918, is entitled 'The Body of the Lord.'⁴⁶ It includes a high proportion of practical advice. Interpreting the saying 'This is my body' Rashdall explains that Christ meant: 'I give myself to you.' As for the term 'bread,' he adds, it sometimes meant 'doctrine.' Further, the saying was intended to refer to 'His union with them; and their union both with Him and with one another.' It follows from this that absenting oneself from the Eucharist is like never attending a family meal. While nearly all sects practise it, the service has itself unfortunately become a 'badge of distinction between the different sects.'

Why, Rashdall asks, is the number of communicants so small? Various reasons are suggested, and practical suggestions are offered. Those who feel 'intellectual puzzlement' are advised that, while a 'magical view' is not helpful, the service links us 'with the Church throughout the ages.' He reminds those who have not been confirmed, whether because they belong to other churches or because they 'shrink from it,' that any who desires to receive the communion may do so. His emphasis here is liberal, but quite orthodox, since he is quoting the BCP rubric, and the comments of 'some bishops' on this rubric.

Sermon of 1923.

Rashdall preached a long sermon at Carlisle at an evening service on the 2nd December 1923,⁴⁷ less than a year before he died, on 'Transubstantiation.'

He asks in what sense Christ meant his words at the Last Supper. In the earliest Church, he expounds, there was a wide variety of interpretation; but the Fathers of the Church never suggest 'that the bread did not remain bread with all the physical properties of ordinary bread The contrary was never asserted till those ages of ignorance and superstition which we call the Dark Ages.' He tells his congregation that in order to explain fully the meaning of Transubstantiation he would have to discuss 'a number of very difficult and abstract philosophical questions about the nature of Universals and Substances ... ,' and that he will 'not attempt to do now.' Nevertheless he goes into some detail about the difference between the 'substance' and 'accidents' of the bread. 'Now if we? assume? [difficult to decipher] that

⁴⁶ PH A.5. (37)

⁴⁷ Ibid. A. 9. (32)

distinction between substance and accident, it becomes possible for the substance to change while the accidents remain unaffected. And that is what was alleged to take place in the Holy Communion.' He explains the application of this theory to the actions of the priest in detail and its assertion as a dogma at the Council of Lateran in 1215. But, 'It is very bad philosophy. No modern philosopher, unless he is a Roman Catholic expressly defending the doctrine of Transubstantiation, believes anything of the kind.' Moreover, 'It is extravagant to suppose that our Lord Jesus Christ, when he said "This is my body," had any such elaborate subtleties in his mind.' He comments briefly on the significance of the denial of the doctrine at the time of the Reformation, describing Luther's doctrine of Consubstantiation, for good measure. The Church of England, he continues, definitely repudiates Transubstantiation and Consubstantiation (Article 28 and the 'Black rubric'⁴⁸ are quoted) but, apart from this, allows latitude. There are different opinions 'in our Church as to the nature and presence of Christ in the Eucharist.' [Much cancellation here.] But, he continues, reverence for the sacrament does not necessarily imply anything like a 'magical view' of it.

Rashdall gives as one of his reasons for preaching this sermon that he wishes to show 'how hopeless it is' to consider reunion with the Roman Catholic Church while it forces 'upon all its members' the belief in Transubstantiation, which, he says is repudiated by Anglicans, including those who believe in the Real Presence.

Thus his sermon is not only for information, but to mark a position in the continuing ecumenical debate, in which some Anglo-Catholics were more enthusiastic about reunion with Rome than with reformed churches.

It is remarkable that Rashdall, less than a year before his death, and already seriously ill, had the strength and energy, on a dark December night, to preach this long, informative sermon.

(iv) Ritual

The Royal Commission.

At the beginning of the period 1904-1924, a Royal Commission on Ecclesiastical Discipline was set up; it lasted from 1904 to 1906. The background of this Commission was the continued quarrels between the 'ritualists' (the term was used by

⁴⁸ The final rubric of the BPC Communion. Denies that kneeling implies transubstantiation.

their opponents) and the others, particularly the evangelicals. Some half dozen Anglo-Catholics had undergone terms of imprisonment as a result of their illegal practices. It was hoped that a further conference would improve the position and, in particular, would preclude the use of litigation as a means of control of ritual; the matter had indeed been an issue at the previous election,⁴⁹ a vivid illustration of the intertwining of ecclesiastical and political affairs.

In 1903, Randall Davidson became Archbishop of Canterbury and proposed that there should be a Royal Commission on ecclesiastical discipline rather than, as Balfour the Prime Minister wanted, a parliamentary select commission. The conclusion of the commissioners was that the law of public worship in England since 1840 had been too narrow for the 'present generation;' that it should be reformed to allow reasonable elasticity; above all, however, it was necessary that it should be obeyed.⁵⁰ To this end, the Archbishops of Canterbury and York should prepare a new 'ornaments rubric.'⁵¹ The Archbishops were greatly helped in this Report by Paget, Bishop of Oxford. Ecclesiastical machinery was to be used to enforce the agreement, thus undermining dissident clergy who claimed not to obey 'secular judgments.' A 'period for reflection' was recommended. This period lasted about twenty years and achieved a 'breathing space.'

I shall consider here how Weston and Gore responded before referring to Rashdall.

Weston.

Weston continued exuberantly and defiantly to practise a range of Anglo-Catholic rituals. The singing of the Hail Mary at the Anglo-Catholic Congress of 1920 at which he was present, is recorded by its organiser as 'the first time since the Reformation that London Bridge heard such a great crowd singing to the honour of the Mother of

⁴⁹ N. Yates, *Anglican Ritual in Victorian Britain*, (Oxford: OUP, 1999), pp. 314-332.

⁵⁰ *Ibid.* pp. 329-330 and G. K. A. Bell, *Randall Davidson*, Vol.1. pp. 470-471.

⁵¹ The following were prohibited: Interpolations from the Canon of the Mass; The words 'Behold the lamb of God,' displaying the wafer; reservation of the sacrament for adoration; Corpus Christi processions; Benediction; Celebration without laymen; invocations to the Virgin Mary or the saints; observation of the Assumption or the Sacred Heart; the veneration of images. (Edited list)

our Lord.’⁵² Subsequently, Winnington-Ingram, Bishop of London requested that the Ave should not be sung, with which Weston, the chairman of the next Conference in 1923, complied reluctantly, observing, ‘Let us deny ourselves the joy of singing this hymn.’⁵³

In the closing speech of the Conference - which was counted a great success by its adherents - Weston defended the use of tabernacles, which implied reservation of a permanent kind (thus defying ecclesiastical instructions).⁵⁴ ‘In taking manhood as His personal organ of activity...,’ Weston commented, ‘he took it for ever.’

Gore.

1. *Reservation of the Sacrament.* Weston’s observation has some relevance to Gore’s strong reservations about the practice, which he did not support, not only as a matter of Church order, but also for doctrinal reasons.

In his time as Bishop of Birmingham, Gore found it not only possible, but important to control the use of reservation. He had himself had to deal with reservation in a parish church and a sisterhood of his diocese; and had adhered to the letter of the law by forbidding it to the sisters and limiting the use of it at the parish church: it must be taken only to the sick, and that as soon as possible after the conclusion of the service.⁵⁵

2. *Incense.* While he, as Bishop, restricted the use of incense, he regarded it as on a par with the ‘elaborate use of music.’

3. *Benediction.* This service, a development of reservation, he judged ‘devotionally most attractive,’ but contrary to ‘reverent adherence to the purpose of Christ in the ‘institution of the sacraments,’ as he wrote in a Preface to his new edition of The Body of Christ, in 1907. Gore therefore reached the conclusion, consistent with his views in 1901, that benediction could not be supported, both on the grounds of compliance with authority, and, on balance, on doctrinal grounds.

⁵² M. Chapman, Christ and the Gethsemane of Mind, p. 1, n.6, quotes H. A. Wilson, Received with Thanks, 1940, who quotes the organiser, Fr. Atlay.

⁵³ *Ibid.* p. 2, n.12, quotes Wilson, Received with Thanks, p. 112.

⁵⁴ *Ibid.* p. 11, n.71. Quotes Weston, Fulness of Christ, p. 272.

⁵⁵ For points 1- 5 see Prestige, Life, pp. 294-297.

4. *Genuflection* he took for granted, remarking, 'I shall genuflect until I die.' This must mean, in view of his decision on reservation, that he genuflected only at celebrations of the Eucharist.

5. He defended 'the full liberty of *vestments*, white or coloured.'

Rashdall's mistrust of the anti-ritualistic Measures.

The heated and detailed arguments of High Churchmen about extra-eucharistic devotions were of no interest to Rashdall. In view of his denial of the doctrine of the Real Presence, he was precluded from considering the use of such practices.

However, he was indirectly involved with the debates on ritualism. He wrote of his concerns following the conclusions of the 1904-1906 Ecclesiastical Commission, in an Article entitled 'A grave Peril to the liberty of Churchmen' published in the Hibbert Journal of 1907.⁵⁶ Writing of the Commission on Ecumenical Discipline, he expresses the fear that, when this Body tries to encourage Parliament to deal with its recommendations, there will be an attempt to widen the terms of the discussion, to include the matter of liberal theology. He discusses 'the Ritualists,' speaking favourably of 'moderate High Churchmen' but appears to consider the use of legislation against ritualism reasonable. He expresses himself glad that the government is 'moving towards' carrying out the recommendations. But there is the danger of possible heresy charges, he warns, with reference to the ecclesiastical Court of Appeal at which an Archbishop and four Bishops are assessors. Rashdall observes that, 'Every party of the Church of England has been brought before ecclesiastical tribunals and been condemned: every party of the Church of England has appealed to a secular court, and been acquitted.'

Having reminded his readers, with examples, that many would have been condemned in the 50's (by ecclesiastical authorities, it is implied) he turns his attention to Bishop Gore, remarking, 'The heretic against whom orthodox pamphlets...thundered in 1889 is now (next to Lord Halifax)⁵⁷ the nearest approach

⁵⁶ HR, 'A Grave Peril to the Liberty of Churchmen,' HJ, Vol. 5, No.18, Jan. 1907, pp. 343-360.

⁵⁷ Halifax - an intransigent High Churchman. His reputation was already established by 1889-1890; see O. Chadwick, The Victorian Church Part 2, (London: Black, 1970): he writes, 'The English Church Union, headed by Lord Halifax, did not help the high church party when he adopted a very defiant posture - he and his men would disobey the bishops whatever they ordered if it were uncatholic.'

to a theological Pope that the Anglican system can tolerate.’ The Bishops, he argues, should express their opposition to liberal doctrines openly, instead of using a ‘popular cover’ which purports to be for the ‘suppression of Ritualism.’ The Evangelicals, he claims, have played into the hands of ‘sacerdotalists.’ It seems the Commissioners have not realised that they (as Rashdall puts it) will not be attacking ritualism so much as ‘liberty of theological thought.’

He concludes: ‘The suggestion of this paper is that the weapons which the Commission have devised for putting down Ritualism are not in the least likely to be used in a way which will bear at all hardly upon the great body of High Churchmen, but that they are very likely indeed to be used to enable the narrower High Churchman and others to turn out of the Church the more outspoken representatives of broad-church opinion.’ Better to let ‘incense-burning’ go on ‘for a little longer’ than that this ‘weapon’ is given to ‘drive out’ clergy who think and study ideas ‘which may be universally accepted tomorrow.’

Thus (a reversal of received opinion), the church hierarchy, and in particular the Archbishop of Canterbury, would do well to negotiate with secular authority, in order to avoid involvement of the legislature. For Rashdall believed the activity of the Commission was more dangerous to liberal opinion than helpful in controlling ritualism.

Conclusion.

During his life, Rashdall’s doctrine of the Church does not vary. His views on ministry - the central doctrine, it may be judged, in a theology of the Church - were formed early. We have evidence of his definitive views at the end of his life, in a Sermon he preached in St Paul’s Cathedral in 1923.⁵⁸ Having referred to the Gospel sayings, especially in Matthew, which envisage the founding by Christ of an *ecclesia* with formularies for its government for all time, he turns to the critical theories throwing doubt on those sayings. Rather, all its vitality is derived from the teaching, the example, the character of its Founder. ‘Its outward and visible organization adapts itself to the requirements of successive ages.’ No divine plan has been laid down for

⁵⁸ HR, ‘What is the Church?’ MC, Vol.13 1923-24, 21-29. Preached, 23rd Jan. 1923.

its government. Each Church or 'society' 'is a very imperfect realization of the true ideal of the Church.' He concludes, 'Where love is, there is the Church.' (He is quoting Augustine.) Love can be perfectly realized only in society. 'The sooner any actual Church comes to that ideal the more it is a Church,' and, 'no society can ever actually become the Church until it includes the whole body of those who love one another in Christ.'

Chapter 5. Immortality.

Introduction.

Discussion of the reality of immortality, and, if real, its nature, was not, during Rashdall's lifetime a prominent area of theological attention. It was, however, part of the whole question of credal and scriptural belief. There were, at the same time, areas of enquiry into the underlying question whether the concept of survival after death was intrinsically credible physiologically and psychologically; a matter of intense interest to scientists and philosophers, as well as theologians. There was considerable interaction between these groups. It has been noted that Rashdall himself wrote philosophical as well as theological works. While, as I have conceded, Rashdall's more technical philosophy is not of perennial interest, his wide training enabled him to defend his theological ideas in that idiom.

The external event of major importance, causing public attention to centre on the question of immortality, was the First World War of 1914-1918. On account of the dramatically high loss of life on the battlefield, and the resultant close acquaintance of a large proportion of the population with sudden death, speculation attracted a wide public interest and was no longer a purely academic and theoretical discussion.

While the Sections of this Chapter are themselves chronologically divided, they are, as in Chapter 4, internally divided topically. In both Sections the discussion will be centred on the following questions. First, I shall consider the emphasis placed on the doctrine of the Resurrection of Christ. Next, I shall review theological writings on the nature of immortality. Finally, I shall survey the contemporary dialogue on the intrinsic credibility of immortality, highlighted by the position held by some philosophers, physiologists and other scholars of the time that, the mind-brain being a unity of the living human organism, biological death of the brain results in extinction of the personality, which is a function of the mind. As a theologian and philosopher, Rashdall was either involved in or actively aware of, all these discussions. There will, inevitably, be some overlap in these three sub-sections, for they are not discrete entities. The Sections are divided at the year 1905, the time when Rashdall's work at Oxford was coming to an end.

Section 1.

The Earlier Years to 1905.

Introduction.

A radical and often controversial thinker in the major areas of theology discussed above, though liberal in his approach to the credal doctrine of eternal life, Rashdall was a firm believer in immortality. However he always adopted a rational, rather than a dogmatic or mystical approach in defending this belief.

(i) The Resurrection of Jesus.

Westcott.

Reference must be made to an earlier work of 1866 by the Cambridge scholar B. F. Westcott: The Gospel of the Resurrection.¹ Westcott was Bishop of Durham from 1890, succeeding Lightfoot, the previous Bishop, by whom Rashdall had been ordained priest in 1886.

His view that the resurrection of Jesus was not 'isolated' but was 'the climax of a series of Divine dispensations,' not improbable 'to any one who believes in a Personal God' (p. 115ff.), – may be seen as a precursor of the view of later liberal scholars that a belief in the uniqueness of Christ should not be based entirely on the belief in a physical resurrection.

However, he is textually conservative. For example, he regards 1 Peter as the work of the apostle, and the Gospel of John as the work of, as he puts it, 'the disciple whom Jesus loved.' Moreover he remarks - contrary to later NT criticism - that 'taking all the evidence together ... there is no single historic incident better or more variously supported than the Resurrection of Christ.' Thus, the resurrection of Christ is a strong reason for believing in immortality.

Stone.

Darwell Stone, writing in his Outlines of Christian Dogma² in 1893 is consistently conservative. He writes, 'There is very convincing evidence for the historical reality of the resurrection of our Lord. It can only be rejected by setting aside the express testimony of the four evangelists and of St. Paul. There is no doubt that all of these

¹ B. F. Westcott, The Gospel of the Resurrection (London and Cambridge: Macmillan, 1866).

² D. Stone, Outlines, pp. 101f.

alike regarded the resurrection as a literal fact, and believed that the body of our Lord was restored to life.' Nor, he continues, can this evidence be 'depreciated' because the 'age was a credulous one and any marvel would be readily believed.' 'On the contrary,' he argues, 'the temperament of the Apostles was not imaginative. They were slow and unwilling to believe it.'

Stone's generalisation of the texts, his view that the Gospel texts and Paul's writings can be considered 'alike' in depicting the resurrection as a 'literal fact,' is unsatisfactory, since he makes no attempt to analyse or explain the obvious differences between the evangelists' accounts and the Pauline passages.

He further supports his position with quotations and references from early Church writing without critical analysis. Strangely, he includes in this collection the beliefs of 'the heretic Cerinthus' who denied the Virgin Birth but 'nevertheless acknowledged the fact of his resurrection.'³ (Why should a 'heretic' be regarded as a reliable source of information, without further explanation?) Another of Stone's early Church advocates is Ignatius,⁴ whose letter is quoted as follows:- 'I know and believe that He was in the flesh even after the resurrection: and when he came to Peter ... He said to them, "Lay hold and handle me, and see that I am not a demon without a body." ' This is a quotation that does not further Stone's argument for a bodily resurrection, since Ignatius' account of Jesus' words varies startlingly from that of the canonical Evangelists. Stone has thereby added to the difficulties of historical study of the post-resurrection accounts of the biblical text, seeming (as an Anglo-Catholic) to have as much faith in the accuracy of the words of the early fathers as in the biblical account.

Rashdall.

1. Doctrine and Development.

Rashdall's approach in his Chapter⁵ on 'The Resurrection and Immortality' in Doctrine and Development, is sharply contrasting. He distinguishes clearly between, on the one hand, the philosophical and moral arguments for immortality from Plato 'down to the days of Kant and of Lotze' (p. 179), 'reasoning sanctioned – in however

³ Ibid. p. 103 n.2, *St Iren. C. Haer.* 1. xxvi, 1.

⁴ Ibid. p. 104 n.1, Ignatius, *Ad Smyr.* 3.

⁵ HR, D and D, pp. 177-189. Preached in St. Mary's Church, Oxford, in 1897. Page numbers in the main text.

different an outward dress – by Jesus Christ Himself, ...⁶ and, on the other hand, (satirically) ‘the wisdom of those who in His name have sought to disparage all arguments for Immortality except that which is based upon the historical evidence of His Resurrection.’ Rashdall acknowledges that what he calls ‘that simple tradition’ (referring here presumably to the Gospel accounts of the resurrection of Jesus), ‘produce an intensity of belief in a life beyond the grave which probably could have been developed by no other means’ and is still ‘capable of inspiring’ those who would be ‘deaf’ to ‘reasonings’ of a more abstract kind. ‘But,’ he continues, ‘for those who have once learned to look with critical eyes on the recorded narrations of wonderful events, the historical evidence of the Resurrection story will seldom bear all the weight of this momentous belief.’ His position, though, is cautious. He does not discuss in detail the resurrection appearances of the Gospels. That ‘the Apostles believed themselves to have seen the risen Lord’ is ‘evidence which no sober criticism can set aside: ...’ but he asks for ‘more latitude than Theologians have sometimes allowed ... about the exact nature of the recorded appearances of the risen Lord.’ (pp. 179-180)

Thus, Rashdall does not deny the resurrection from the dead of Jesus, in some form, which, he says, is ‘symbolised and attested by the vision of the Apostles’ (p. 180), but is aware that the Gospel texts do present textual difficulties. As he expresses it: ‘it is not wise unnecessarily to hazard so vital a part of the Christian Faith upon a particular answer to difficult historical, critical or psychological problems.’ His main argument for the existence of immortality is that of ‘The inadequacy of the present life, ... the aspiration of the human spirit, ... the enormous contrast between the capacities with which human nature has been endowed and the meagre realization which can in general be given to them within the span of this earthly life,’ This is also expressed, more metaphorically, as ‘Reason’ affirming ‘that Justice ought to prevail’ in human life, but does not yet do so. (pp. 178-9)

⁶ Refers here to the text of his sermon, Mark. 12. .26. ‘But as touching the dead, that they are raised’

2. Unpublished Sermon of 1888.

Rashdall published an Easter sermon with a similar message nine years before, in his last year at Durham.⁷ Entitled ‘The Hope of Immortality: Easter, the Season of Hope,’⁸ of which the text is 1 Peter 1.3,⁹ it contains a number of themes all emphasising the importance of the hope of life beyond the grave. Rashdall comments first on the widespread criticism of this belief: that it is immoral, since it appeals to the motive of obtaining reward or avoiding punishment.

There are, indeed, at the present day people who condemn the instinctive craving of man’s heart for immortality as an almost [some necessary editing here of gaps etc.] immoral craving - “the sufficiency of the present life” is the title of a popular lecture which I saw advertised the other day. The present life is enough, such teachers would tell us, to satisfy all the demands of a reasonable man. The unbeliever alone can be really unselfish (they tell us); for he alone does right simply for love of Right and love of his neighbour, hoping and fearing nothing for himself But I think that few of us may like to imagine that Humanity would be any the better, from the point of view of happiness and ... Holiness if men should succeed in getting rid (as often men dream ...) of all the hopes and fears that the teaching of Easter suggests.

Hope is important for it counteracts a sense of purposelessness.

Rather do I feel inclined to agree with a writer - an open-minded and thoughtful writer - who says that the bare possibility of a future life is enough to make all the difference, under many circumstances between finding life worth living and finding it insupportable.

This is particularly so at times of suffering. The theme is elaborated.

It is said that even the criminal in the jail feels the difference between the useful labour that benefits somebody and ... his merely turning of the treadmill in a crank which had simply been invented to torture him. And to the disbeliever in Immortality how much suffering must appear absolutely useless!

Examples of extreme suffering are given.

... the agonising disease, the lingering death, the weary old age If there is ... a life beyond the grave, the hope of an explanation may lie there. And no Christian needs to be told what that sure and certain hope of Immortality

⁷ The location is not given. Presumably Durham.

⁸ PH MS Box 2. (19). 1888.

⁹ ‘Blessed be the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, which according to his abundant mercy hath begotten us again unto a lively hope by the resurrection of Jesus Christ from the dead.’

which springs from the Gospel of the Risen Lord has done for Christian sufferers in all ages.

(In social matters, Rashdall was genuinely concerned with the conditions of the oppressed and afflicted.)

The main point is that this life is explicable only in terms of a prelude to a further existence. In this unpublished sermon, the absence of argument from the Empty Tomb and the post-Easter appearances in the Gospel accounts to support belief in immortality is striking. It is consistent with the published sermon in Doctrine and Development.

3. Published Article for the Synthetic Society, 1905.

Rashdall expresses himself with more formality and detail in an Article written for the Synthetic Society, and read before the Society on the 11th May 1905.¹⁰ In this paper, entitled 'The Nature of Christ's Resurrection,' Rashdall discusses two questions - (1) Is the evidence sufficient to warrant belief in 're-animation' of the body put in the tomb? (2) If not, 'is there a sense in which we may regard the Resurrection of Jesus Christ as an historical event?'

New Testament evidence examined.

Rashdall states that he is not an expert on NT criticism but will accept the majority view of critics. He has what he calls 'moderately conservative' views as to the date and authorship of the documents; he will therefore accept as genuine the four 'still undisputed' Epistles of Paul;¹¹ and that Luke and Acts had a common author, but were not written before 70 AD; that the Gospels are based on the sources 'underlying' the three Synoptics and the Logia (the latter cannot be proved to be before 70 AD); that the first Gospel was not written by Matthew or any Apostle; that the fourth Gospel cannot be assumed to have been written by or to contain *ipsissima verba* of the Apostle John.

Rashdall surveys in more detail the evidence in the NT for the resurrection. He summarises: 'Within a very short time' after Christ's death it was attested by many

¹⁰ HR, papers read before the Synthetic Society, 1896-1908, pp. 505-516.

¹¹ Presumably refers to the Baur Theory. F. C. Baur (1792-1850), denied the authenticity of all the Pauline Epistles except Rom., 1 and 2 Cor., and Gal..

that he had been seen 'in some form' after his physical death. Especially is Paul's account in I Cor. 15.1-11 to be noted. Therefore, around 57 AD, 'many believed they had seen the Lord.' This is the earliest evidence.

Paul's account - Rashdall presses the point - contains no reference to the 'empty tomb' or the report that the body was 'supernaturally re-animated, annihilated or transformed.' The 'natural inference' is that a vision had been seen. This does not lead Rashdall to deny its reality, since he regards the evidence as 'too remarkable to be set down as mere illusion.' Rather, it is an example of a 'real psychological phenomenon' due to laws not at present understood. However, even if the phenomenon is accepted as a miracle, we do not suppose the body appearing to Paul was the body laid in the tomb. He adds that Paul does not mention the Ascension.

Considering the 'Evidence for the conventional theory,' Rashdall states that the divergencies between the four Gospels are so great that the passages cannot be assigned to early sources. Here he gives a detailed exegesis of the variations in the four Gospels' post-resurrection accounts.

Historian's Conclusion.

In answer to his question 'What is a historian to conclude?' he 'calls attention' once again to the 'inconsistency' of the accounts, noting what he calls 'the corporeal nature' of some passages, for example Luke's 'handle me and see,' but comments that this is often so in visions. Referring to Matthew's 'but some doubted,' he asks whether they could have doubted if the body had appeared 'in broad daylight,' as is in some passages reported. The 'enormous growth' of resurrection accounts between the writing of the Gospels and the Acts is commented on together with the discrepancies of time span between the Resurrection and the Ascension as recorded in these books. Rashdall is sceptical about the 'empty tomb' dismissing the argument that 'It is not the "empty tomb" by itself which proves ... but the "empty tomb" in connection with the subsequent appearances,' remarking that 'the appearances are no evidence when taken apart from the story of the "empty tomb".' This is a 'circular argument,' he points out. Paul's story is the most reliable, but the Gospels are inconsistent with Paul.

Positive Assertions.

More positively, Rashdall considers the evidence is strong that the Apostles believed they saw 'the Lord.' It can be believed, not on historical grounds, but 'in accordance with our general ideas of the Universe.'

Because he believes in theism, and in the probability of personal immortality, he believes that 'apparitions' can imply 'some real supernormal influence of departing or departed spirits upon the survivors.' So, his explanation of the resurrection suggests it is not a delusion. This, however, cannot be the main reason for belief in immortality. Returning to contemporary ecclesiastical polemics (the questions highlighted in the Sidgwick Debate discussed above), Rashdall declares that anyone who believes it (that is, his interpretation of the resurrection) has 'as good a right as a traditionalist to say "The third day He rose again."' He appeals to those who do not agree with him. The Church of England is 'large enough for those who hold both views,' he suggests.

Rashdall concludes his long Article: 'But in the present state of our knowledge of the kind of causality which is discoverable in the relations between mind and mind, or between mind and body, there is nothing to be said against the possibility of an appearance of Christ to His disciples which was a real, though supernormal psychological event but which involved nothing which can properly be spoken of as a suspension of natural laws.'

In these early sermons and articles, Rashdall is contending with two different groups. These opponents are, in relation to each other, diametrically opposed. There are the philosophers and other thinkers who hold belief in immortality to be immoral. More emphatically, though, in this period, on the significance of Christ's resurrection he engages with traditional theologians who base their belief in immortality on this central doctrine. He examines their case in detail, and finds it unconvincing.

(ii) The After-Life.

The concept of immortality implies an after-life. In the earlier part of the century it was still not unusual for sermons on hell to be delivered by preachers, and the practice had not ceased by 1878, as Farrar confirms, in the work to which I shall refer. There was continued speculation on the subject of the after-life; in particular on the question as to whether the duration of suffering of the wicked was terminable or eternal.

Farrar.

In 1878, while Rashdall was an undergraduate at Oxford, Dean Farrar of Westminster Abbey published a volume of his preaching on immortality under the title Eternal Hope.¹² Farrar gives a useful summary of the four prevalent views of eschatology. (He uses the word, not to indicate the final phase of the cosmos, but as a synonym for the 'after-life.')

1. The first is universalism (the belief that all will be saved). While he cannot accept the idea, he comments; the 'strength' of this is that its basis is 'the infinite love of God.'

2. The second belief he identifies is annihilation ('conditional immortality') - that is, after a retributive punishment the wicked will be destroyed. This theory he cannot accept for 'it leaves us with the ghastly conclusion that God will raise the wicked from the dead, only that they be tormented and at last destroyed.' (p. xvii)

3. The third is the belief in Purgatory - 'the state wherein those souls are detained and punished who are capable of being purified' - an intermediate state between death and judgment. Farrar says he cannot accept this 'Roman doctrine.' However, the reformers should have 'distinguished and used the theory of "imperfect souls" being purified.' (p. xix)

4. The fourth is what he calls 'the common view: ... that, at death, sentence is passed on the impenitent sinner;' which is an 'irreversible doom to endless tortures' Moreover, this doom awaits the majority of mankind. Farrar has been accused, he says, of denying the existence of hell and the 'doctrine of eternal punishment.' (p. xxi) He points out in a note that Article 42 in the 1549 Prayer Book, which asserts the doctrine, was omitted in the shortened 39 Articles of 1662, of which he is glad. (p. xxii) Of the 'common view' with its final doom for the majority, as an 'irreversible judgment,' Farrar adds the information that the doctrine is 'crudely inculcated from multitudes of pulpits even in the last few months.'

Minton and Liddon.

Farrar mentions in a footnote¹³ in his account of the second theory, 'Mr. Minton and other members of this school of thought' remarking that he respects them; their theory is preferable to the fourth. Minton did, indeed, write an Article in the format of a 'theological pamphlet' commenting on Liddon's sermon on the subject. It seems that 'the leading exponent of High Church principles' (Liddon) had defended advocates of the doctrine. In the Article that Minton quotes, the speaker says, 'death does not

¹² F. Farrar, Eternal Hope (London: Macmillan, 1878). Page references in the main text.

¹³ Sam. Minton (1820-1894), 'Canon Liddon on Immortality' or 'Unworthy of Eternal Life' (London: Elliot, 1878.). The extant text is reprinted from The Rainbow. It is loosely arranged, being contained in three Articles with a second edition.

necessarily close the period of probation.’ The sermon by Liddon can be quoted only at second-hand; it was not, it seems, published. So we have to piece together the comments of Minton. He reports: ‘Liddon says “conditional immortality” is a new phrase’ but he finds the doctrine in the Early Fathers, for example, Justin and Barnabas, who argue that the righteous live, but the wicked cease to exist. Minton’s Article concurs that the soul can be destroyed. It is well argued, though relying heavily on a literal acceptance of the NT text.

Gore on death

Gore writes in 1896 in The Creed of the Christian¹⁴ on ‘the other side of death.’ His first point is that ‘death neither destroys nor changes our souls, our true selves. Death does not change our character; it just transplants us into another world - where He is waiting to see us judge ourselves as He judges.’

After this general introduction, Gore becomes more specific, stating firmly that ‘we believe in the Resurrection of the Body.’ Referring to 1 Cor. 15 he expounds: ‘Not in the particles of our own former bodies; but in a spiritual body, which we shall recognize as our own body’; it will ‘probably take the form and impress of our own unchanged selves.’ This is a somewhat literalist interpretation, not taking account of the fact that Paul did not have the knowledge of particles to which Gore refers; and which raises the question how ‘form and impress’ can be maintained in the absence of particle. Was Gore unconsciously using ‘form’ with its platonic connotations? He continues: ‘since here, our body conceals our true selves’ – our unspoken thoughts, presumably, - ‘our bodies may be our condemnation in that day ... Resurrection to life to some ... resurrection to judgment to others.’ (Quotes John 5.29)

This reasoning surely needs some further explanation. Since ‘our bodies,’ as a cover or envelope, are merely an agent, why should they be seen as the object of ‘condemnation?’

¹⁴ C. Gore, The Creed of the Christian (London: Hibbert, 1896), pp. 103-109. Page references in the main text.

The Last Judgment.

He comes to the Last Judgment; 'not only on our single self but also a general judgment on all.' (p. 106) Here, he has come to the use of his ambiguous phrase 'in that day' assuming that a 'last judgment' comes at death for each individual, but on an assigned 'last day' for the world (or universe). Gore does not distinguish two different Christian traditions: either an immediate judgment (final or otherwise, as Farrar has itemised) or, a period of waiting followed by a universal judgment. Without pausing to disentangle the ambiguity, he continues with - 'After the Day of Judgment' - heaven or hell. His remarks on heaven are unsurprising. As to hell, he allows modifications of the most rigid doctrines, and rejects predestination, whether the catholic or the Calvinist variety, but concludes with what he calls 'the terrible truth concerning some whose "state is like that of Satan," they sin the unforgivable sin,' and are 'at last incapable of repentance.'

In Epistle to the Romans¹⁵ written four years later Gore again comments on doctrines of the after-life, in which his thinking has not noticeably changed. He remarks on recent reactions from older teaching about hell, and details a list of doctrines - extremes both of the predestinarian, 'total depravity' view and of 'total acceptability' soteriology.

His first list calls for the repudiation of the following points. (1) The idea that some men are doomed unconditionally to 'everlasting misery' which, he says, either contradicts or is a misunderstanding of certain NT passages. (2) The belief that God condemns for merely external reasons, as in the case of those who have remained pagans, or the unbaptised; for God, being equitable, will reject none 'whose will is not set to evil.' (3) An exaggeration of what has, in fact, been revealed. He expands this; we do not know that there is 'probation' other than in this world, but we cannot deny the possibility. (Reference is made to 1 Peter 4.6.¹⁶) Augustine's and Aquinas' doctrine of the 'indestructibility of each human soul' is probably not reliable as 'catholic' doctrine.

On the other hand, Gore states his position that we are not justified in saying (a) almost all men will be saved; (b) there is a probation beyond death; (c) the souls of the 'lost' 'will be at the last extinguished.'

¹⁵ C. Gore, The Epistle to the Romans, (London: Murray, Vol. 1 1899; Vol. 2 1900).

¹⁶ 'For this cause was the gospel preached also to them that are dead.'

Summing up, he reasserts his version of the inexorability of judgment to 'approval' or 'condemnation.'

Stone.

Stone, in his Outlines of Christian Dogma¹⁷ makes five statements on immortality (which he calls eschatology). They are the following.

1. 'It is clearly revealed' that there is an unending life of blessedness for those who accept the will of God.
2. 'It is clearly revealed' that there is the 'possibility' for any human of being estranged from God for ever. This absence is central to Hell. He notes a difference of opinion in the Church on the nature of, and the possibility of alleviation of the pains of Hell.
3. The only revealed time of 'probation' is in this life.
4. After this exegesis of revealed doctrine and its limitation, Stone speaks of the 'practical judgment of the Church,' - in which he allows himself more scope. This includes the view that the condition of the faithful departed is one of training for the 'Beatific Vision'; and the view of 'many' that the process of getting rid of evil involves suffering.
5. Concerning the saints, it is held by some that 'great saints' may be admitted to the Beatific Vision before the General Resurrection; some hold that the saints may be invoked by the living. He, like Gore, does not attempt any exposition of the two incompatible doctrines of: a final judgment at death; and a general resurrection and judgment on a given 'day.'

Summarising, Stone seeks to reassure; for example, 'all who seek Him in truth ... shall one day find Him.'

His concluding note is pastoral; we must 'trust God.' Stone shows himself, in his approach to this area of theology, surprisingly, less dogmatic and more sensitive than Gore, though he does it, paradoxically, by citing more 'catholic' alternatives.

¹⁷ D. Stone, Outlines, pp. 272f.

Rashdall.

Doctrine and Development.

In his Chapter on 'The Resurrection and Immortality,' in Doctrine and Development Rashdall chooses for his text Mark.12.26; the conversation of Jesus with the Sadducees (referring back to v.18. - 'which say there is no Resurrection.') Rashdall points to the change of perception of the Hebrews, highlighting that period 'between the age of exile and the Christian era' which engendered 'the revolution by which "man had come to consider or suspect himself to be immortal."' ¹⁸ In this sermon, the main purpose of which is the importance of a belief in immortality Rashdall does not discuss the nature of the after-life; the passage is noted as an early historical introduction to the subject.

Unpublished Sermons.

a. Undated early Sermon.

It is interesting to note that, in a sermon undated, but stored with sermons of around 1890,¹⁹ Rashdall preaches on the much discussed text of Job, that is 19.26.: 'And though after my skin worms destroy this body, yet in my flesh shall I see God.' Although his main exposition in the Sermon is on the theodicy of the book, he does make clear that it cannot be used as a support for the doctrine of the Resurrection of the Body. He examines the phrase, 'in my flesh shall I see God.' I quote from the Sermon.

... the exact meaning of the words has been obscured by the defects of the authorised translation. The Old Testament Revisers have as usual contented themselves with the smallest amount of change consistent with anything like faithful translation. Let me read you the whole passage as it stands in the Revised Version.

But I know that my Redeemer liveth,
And that he shall stand up at the last upon the earth
And after my skin hath been thus destroyed.
Yet from my flesh shall I see God:
Whom I shall see for myself,
And not another.

But though the first clause of the verse - 'And after my skin hath been thus destroyed' now becomes clearer, there still remains some obscurity about

¹⁸ D and D, p. 178. HR's note, Ecce Homo, ch. iv.

¹⁹ PH MS Box 9. (2)

the second. The words ‘from my flesh’ ... may mean one of two things. They may mean ‘from out of my flesh’- I looking as it were from out my flesh, shall see God: and this is evidently the way the words were understood by the old translators when they have the rendering ‘in my flesh I shall see God.’

But we are told by Hebraists that the real meaning of the expression ‘from my flesh’ is just the opposite – ‘away from my flesh, out of my flesh’ or (as the M of the R.V. has it) “without my flesh.”²⁰

In this case, what Job asserts is, that when his body has been destroyed, when the flesh which he now wears has been put off, he – the man himself – shall yet see God. There is no suggestion here of a Resurrection of the body.

In this linguistic exegesis, Rashdall again distances himself from a literal understanding of the credal phrase.

b. Sermon of 1899.

Rashdall considers the concept of ‘everlasting torments,’ in an unpublished Sermon of 1899.²¹ He refers to previous sages before centring on ‘modern thinkers.’

The last part of the Sermon is quoted below.

Abelard for instance maintained that even everlasting torments were inflicted in love, because it was for the good of the whole creation. And our own Wycliffe went even further and represented it as the best thing for the sinner himself. Few modern thinkers will be prepared to follow them there.

The idea of everlasting torments has usually been defended on the ground of abstract Justice, as demanded by an intrinsic necessity of things, with which even God himself cannot, consistently with his character, interfere. But if we give up the idea of Retribution, we shall probably find it difficult to defend, even in the attenuated form which is given to it by modern apologists, the idea of an endless punishment. If the true object of punishment is to make men better, we shall not find it easy to believe that God can go on everlastingly punishing men who, as the theory itself declares, become none the better for it all. If punishment be remedial, it must, one would think, in time succeed; or, if it be insisted that human passion may to the last hold out against the love of God and defeat his purposes, there must come a time, one would suppose, when no further purpose could be served by continual punishment. It is no doubtful speculation as to the meaning of the term ‘aeonian,’²² but the use of that moral consciousness which is itself a Revelation of God and the sole interpreter of all other Revelations, which

²⁰ The Hebrew phrase is וּמִבְּשָׁרִי in which the ׀ means ‘out of.’ Brown, Driver and Briggs, Hebrew and English Lexicon of the OT, p. 578, gives for this verse: (prob.) ... ‘without my flesh ...’

²¹ PH MS A.2. (20), 1899.

²² For the meaning of the word, used as an equivalent of ‘eternal’ and explained as ‘lasting for an age’ -which has a termination, see Farrar, p. xxx.

compels us to reject as libels upon the character of God, not only the horrors of the old Inferno, described by medieval poets or portrayed by medieval painters, but all ideas, however attenuated, of a punishment which is never justified by its effects.

I do not know that the idea of endless punishment is one which now needs much preaching against. But the mere ghost and shadow of it, the mere repetition in hymns and elsewhere of phrases which we do not really believe, fosters the wide-spread notion that Christianity is eternally committed to a doctrine which our hearts and consciences revoke (?), (and?) does infinite harm. Does it not really prevent, rather than promote, a really healthful and salutary fear of the divine judgment and a real belief in the future punishment of unrepented sin? It is no soft and eviscerated Theology that I am asking you to accept. I have no sympathy with the attempt to get rid of all idea of future pain. . . . If a divine purpose is being served by the apparently unequal and undeserved suffering of this life, there is far less difficulty in believing that hereafter too some purpose may be served by pain in the education of the human soul. All analogy would lead us to believe that moral evil cannot be removed without suffering. We do not, we cannot know much about the future world. It is better surely to dogmatise as little as may be about it. It is enough surely to believe that all souls are in the Hands of God, and that He will hereafter carry on in them that education which this life has begun, until each soul has realised the end for which it was brought into being by a righteous and a loving God. So expressed, the idea of future punishment would become not an arbitrary dogma which men half believe and yet are half ashamed of, but a healthful and life-giving doctrine which we cannot too frequently have present to our minds.

Comment.

The Sermon, written in 1899 while Rashdall was a young academic at Oxford, has a strong emphasis on the educational value of punishment. Rashdall's views are, in part, perhaps, influenced by the presuppositions of his epoch. But, more generally, his surmise as to the nature of the immediate post-death after-life is similar to Farrar's; that is to say, a non-Roman, modified purgatory.

Most importantly, he does not arrive at the traditional conclusion, like Gore, that there is a 'terrible truth,' that Hell (as described in Matthew 25) awaits, at the end, those who are 'incapable of repentance.' Rashdall's reason for rejecting such a concept is his philosophical conviction that retribution is not required by an entity called 'abstract justice,' a hypothetical attribute of the universe, which in the view of some, as he has explained in the sermon, even God cannot overrule. Thus, his position on the 'last things' is, in sum, characteristically liberal.

(iii) Is immortality credible in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries?

Discussions on the physiological and psychological as well as the theological/philosophical aspects of the question.

The Debate.

The theologians considered above, who had expounded on immortality, reflecting on the nature of the after-life with varying degrees of dogmatism, did not doubt its existence. For the more traditional, this belief, asserted in the Creeds, was endorsed by the paradigm of Christ's resurrection from the dead. For Rashdall as a liberal theologian, its existence was upheld rather on the grounds of belief in a rational and loving God.

However, at the beginning of the twentieth century, spurred on by the investigations of psychologists and maintained by the more theoretical but converging studies of philosophers, a far more radical dialogue was manifesting itself. The question was asked whether or not the concept of a life after death was any longer tenable; scholars engaged in debates, which they conducted in the learned journals or treated in longer works.

Discussions were much stimulated by two works early in the century: The Varieties of Religious Experience by William James which was first published in the USA in 1902; and Human Personality and its Survival of Bodily Death by F. W. H. Myers, dedicated to Sidgwick, which appeared in two volumes in 1903.²³ Rashdall, while not taking a central part in this debate, observed and commented on the debate as an academic with professional interests in both theology and philosophy.

The opposing arguments.

The positions of the proponents and opponents in the debate about the possibility of survival after death are indicated in two Articles appearing in the Hibbert Journal in

²³ F. W. H. Myers, Human Personality and Its Survival of Bodily Death (Hampton Roads, Charlottesville, USA: 2001); after the ed. of 1961 and 1st ed., 1903. See below for further details.

1904. The first,²⁴ by Mellone, is entitled 'Present Aspects of the Problem of Mortality.'

Mellone defends his belief in the existence of immortality on grounds similar to those propounded by Rashdall in the homiletic material quoted above. Mellone speaks first of the human desire to believe; next, he cites the fact that humans in their lifetime, have unfulfilled abilities and unrecognised deserts. He mentions the position held by some that immortality is to be found only in the effect of an individual on humanity, '... we are told that if individuals perish by the way, even after they come to be forgotten their work survives.' This is not adequate; - 'as a substitute for the belief in personal immortality, (it) is mere confused self-deception.' Mellone emphasises the further point that the view that 'human faculty has a purpose' rests on 'the deeper assumption that the world is rational.' Otherwise, it is useless to argue from 'the incompleteness of this life.' The principle that the universe is reasonable depends upon a belief in God - that the 'creative power which sustains the universe is rational.' The 'truth in the immortal hope,' he argues, is based on 'the essential reasonableness of the world.' (Rashdall essentially shares his position.)

Mellone expounds on the difficulties encountered in this belief. A central one is the view, held by some, that it is the brain itself which not only registers and communicates but produces consciousness.²⁵ Thus it can be argued that consciousness is a 'function' of the brain. If this could be proved, it would follow that extinction of the consciousness occurred at death. (The 'classic ... conception' of the soul and body as two different things is dismissed; that is to say,²⁶ the word 'soul' cannot be used to denote the post-mortem imperishable component.) So, any possibility of immortality must be, for the purposes of the argument, in terms of 'consciousness.' The question cannot be answered directly, he says, for it is not susceptible to the scientific system of inquiry.

Of those who carry out psychical investigation ('spiritualists') Mellone mentions among others Professor Sidgwick, F. W. H. Myers, William James and Oliver Lodge. While taking account of some deceptions in the work of spiritualists, he believes the investigations have shed light on the potentialities of the subconscious or unconscious

²⁴ S. H. Mellone, Examiner in Mental and Moral Sciences, Un. of Lond., 'Present Aspects of the Problems of Immortality,' HJ, Vol. 2, July 1904, 722-740.

²⁵ Here I paraphrase and expand the original, for greater clarification.

²⁶ Here again I expand, for clarification.

mind (the 'subliminal self'). James' theories of the subconscious, 'in contact with higher spiritual influences,' though controversial are considered 'of first-rate importance' in disproving the claim that mind depends on the mechanism of brain.

The Article concludes with the assertion of the 'great principle' that 'for each person growth continues, and death is but a stage in life.'

Mellone's Article is answered in the Hibbert Journal of October 1904 by W. E. Hazell.²⁷ The writer contends that many arguments point the opposite way. He maintains, in opposition to Mellone, that probably consciousness is a product or function of the brain. Asking how we conceive of consciousness in a future state, Hazell argues that it should (that is, if it exists) include the 'consequences' of the former state. But, he asks, could this be the case (in a future state) apart from a continued functioning of the 'brain substance?' Only a few of those who have studied the physiological aspects consider it possible. The argument from 'desire' he dismisses, with the comment that he (the writer) desires a future life but does not think he will get it.

Moreover, the argument from the 'inequalities of life' is not a good one, it is added. For – Hazell replies curiously - the 'sum total of happiness' is approximately equal. For example, those who hunger get more pleasure from eating a meal; and a chronic invalid gets more pleasure from a day of health than the normally healthy get from a year. While this reflection has some truth, the writer has not stopped to calculate that the habitually hungry are unlikely to get sufficient meals to outweigh the deprivation; nor does the chronic invalid enjoy many days of good health, not enough, surely, for his occasional day of health to outweigh the longer period moderately enjoyed by the healthy. The matter is not easy to calculate in scientific terms; but, without further proof, the hypothesis is unconvincing.

William James.

The well-known book by W. James on Varieties of Religious Experience²⁸ is linked only indirectly to the question of Immortality. It was published in the USA in 1902, a year before the study of Myers on Human Personality and Its Survival of Death,

²⁷ W. E. Hazell, 'Present Aspects of the Problem of Immortality,' HJ Vol. 3 (Oct, 1904), 170-171.

²⁸ W. James, Varieties of Religious Experience (New York: Penguin, 1982), p. 524. 1st ed. (USA: Longman, 1902).

which appeared posthumously in 1903. James, like Myers, is interested in exploring the psychological explanations of religious experiences. He discusses the role of the subconscious mind, remarking ‘how striking a part invasions from this region play in the religious life.’ It is through the subconscious that the religious person may perceive the presence of ‘an external power.’ James, himself, however, unlike Myers, is not interested in the question of immortality. He dismisses it briefly. ‘I have said nothing in my lectures about immortality ... for to me it seems a secondary point,’ he writes. Nevertheless, we are assured that he has ‘the highest respect for the patient labors of ... Myers,’ (and others).²⁹ Rashdall was sufficiently interested in James’ work to write a review in Mind.³⁰ It is James’ interest in the function of the unconscious which forms his most significant link with the work of Myers, who himself studied the workings of the ‘subliminal’ mind to support his belief in survival after death.

F. W. H. Myers.

William James provides an introduction to Myers, which is quoted in the Preface of the 2001 edition of Myers’ work; ‘for half a century now, psychologists have fully admitted the existence of a subliminal mental region under the name either of unconscious cerebration or of the involuntary life; but they have never definitely taken up the question of the existence of this region, never sought explicitly to map it out. Myers definitely attacks this problem, which, after him, it will be impossible to ignore.’³¹

²⁹ However, James himself wrote a book on Human Immortality shortly before this, in 1898. He is quoted by the American philosopher, G. W. Howison in The Limits of Evolution [(1st ed. 1901); 2nd ed. (New York: Macmillan, 1905)] in his Essay 6 ‘Human Immortality.’ Howison quotes him at length, concluding that, although James posits the immortality of Consciousness, this is not satisfactory, for, he says, James’ theory leaves us dead (as individuals). ‘We are not sharers in the imperishableness of the eternal Consciousness, be it One or be it many.’ Howison, p. 291.

³⁰ HR, ‘The Varieties of Religious Experience’, Mind, NS XII, 1903, pp. 245-250. It is critical; Rashdall judges that James relies far too much on emotion, and far too little on reasoned thought.

³¹ Quoted from: Myers, Human Personality, 2001 ed., (see below), p. xvii, n.2. James is quoted in a Preface; he quotes Frederic Myers’ ‘Service to Psychology,’ Proceedings of the Society for Psychical Research, Vol. XVII, 1901.”

The work of Myers on Human Personality and its Survival of Bodily Death³² was published in the following year (1903). Its history of republication is witness to its attraction to a wide public. It is dedicated to Sidgwick (as well as Gurney) whose debate with Rashdall has been discussed above. (Myers is a contemporary of Freud, born fifteen years later, whose researches on the unconscious mind are widely known.)

In his introduction, Myers³³ outlines the scope of the work, indicating the ‘most momentous’ question which his work investigates; ‘whether man has an immortal soul,’ that is, whether there is any ‘element’ of his personality which survives death. His evidence is collected mainly for the Society for Psychical Research. Myers identifies two current views:

1. there is no ‘life independent of the organism’ which survives death (p. 12);
2. the ‘ego’ survives the ‘disintegration’ (of death) (p. 13); there is a spiritual world.

In this work, he will argue for the importance of the ‘subliminal faculties.’

Case-studies.

Myers reports his investigations on extremes of mental ability; findings on the disintegrated mind are followed by studies of the genius. Of the latter, he finds that the ‘supraliminal,’ that is, the conscious mind, is the recipient of ‘uprushes’ (or inspiration) assimilated from the subliminal. The subliminal, he believes, ‘represents most nearly’ ‘what will become of the surviving Self.’ (p. 47) Myers assumes ‘a soul in man which can draw strength from a spiritual Universe’. He obtains further insight through his case-studies in the areas of: sleep, hypnotism and telepathy, telepathy involving the dead, and other forms of what he believes are communications from the dead.

He concludes ‘It is not we who are ... the discoverers The experiments ... are not the work of earthly skill ... but the work of ‘intelligences beyond our own.’³⁴ All

³² F. W. H. Myers, Human Personality became a classic on the subject. Unfinished at his death in 1901, it was published posthumously. Originally in two volumes, it was reprinted, re-edited, abridged and printed in one volume in 1919. A further revised one-volume edition appeared in 1961. The latest, based on the 1961 edition, appeared in 2001.

³³ Myers, Human Personality, 1919 ed. Page references in the main text.

³⁴ *Ibid*, 2001 ed., pp. 344 ff.

this leads to the assertion: 'Beyond us still is mystery; but it is a mystery lit and mellowed with an infinite hope.'³⁵

Review of Myers' work in the Hibbert Journal.

Myers' book is reviewed in the Hibbert Journal of October 1903.³⁶ The reviewer, F. Stout judges that the phenomena 'presented by the Society for Psychical Research' show an 'antecedent improbability.' Myers has claimed that they all (telepathy, clairvoyance, haunted houses, communications from the dead, etc.) involve the presence of the 'Subliminal Self.' Stout questions Myers' definition of the term, which he quotes: 'the "conscious self" of each ... of us ... does not comprise the whole of the consciousness or of the faculty within us ... There exists a more comprehensive consciousness, ... which remains potential only as regards the life of the earth ... which reasserts itself in its plenitude after the liberating change of death.'

'The most distinctive feature of Mr. Myers' view is to be found in this contrast between ... the earth-life and the life of the Subliminal Self.' He finds Myers' use of sleep and dreams as manifestations of the 'subliminal self' 'infantile,' but does not say whether he scorns, equally, Freud's well-known use of dreams.

In Stout's conclusion, some hesitation is registered. Myers' evidence is 'impressive' but 'unconvincing.' While Myers' theories are 'baseless, futile and incoherent' the experiments are worth doing more scientifically, he concludes. He adds, curiously, 'I am not myself clear as to the degree of my scepticism, or what evidence be sufficient to remove it.'

It is indicative of the width and complexity of the work that a Professor of Logic and Metaphysics should admit to such indecision.

Rashdall.

Rashdall, against this background of lively debate on the fundamental credibility of a belief in immortality, had no hesitation in establishing an affirmative position on the proposition that some part of the human person (whether it be called the Self, the character, the mind - or other appellation), survives after death. He does not take a detailed interest in the work of psychologists and physiologists; and, as for the

³⁵ Ibid. p. 345.

³⁶ F. Stout, Professor of Logic and Metaphysics at St. Andrew's University, 'Human Personality and its Survival of Bodily Death,' HJ, Vol.2 (Oct. 1903), 44-64.

researches of the 'spiritualists', he had neither the time nor the inclination to comment in detail on their investigations. In the debate described above, however, he vigorously and consistently supported the philosophical stance exemplified by Mellone, who based his argument on the intrinsic rationality of the transcendental, manifested in the universe. This position is not fully worked out in his sermons - it would not be pastorally and pedagogically appropriate. But, in the register of the lecture-room, he sometimes expressed his thinking more fully. We have an example of this in a lecture given on Immortality among his unpublished works.³⁷ The relevant material is quoted here.

The positive evidence which there is for the Resurrection Vision and the considerable evidence which there is for somewhat analogous visions of the dead or the dying to their friends, may well justify Christians who believe on quite other grounds in the exceptional character of Christ's personality, in refusing to dismiss the Resurrection story as a mere subjective delusion. But it is not here that we should look for the main grounds of any fundamental article of our Creed: ...

I want on the present occasion to approach this question of Immortality, as far as possible, without any distinctively Christian presuppositions. And yet it is not possible to discuss the matter altogether without presuppositions. For the belief in Immortality is based upon another belief - the great and momentous belief in God; (the more so as I have already on a very recent occasion endeavoured to lay before you some of the many converging lines which lead up to the great conviction that the power by which the world is governed, the ultimate principle and source of all things, must be spiritual).³⁸

And if the world is spiritual, it must be purposeful. Intelligence, Reason always works towards an end - an end which justifies itself as good. Spirit is causative: spirit moves towards an end.³⁹ ...

If then, we think of the ultimate cause of all things as spiritual, we must think of His action as rational - as determined by a purpose which seems to Him good. God wills this good.

Having dwelt at length on his main theme - that mortal life, painful and unfulfilling as it often is - would be irrational if it were a closed system; but the universe is rational;

³⁷ PH, MS Box B 3. No date is given, but it seems likely to belong to his earlier, academic period. Included in this Section with reservations.

³⁸ The passage in parentheses has been cancelled and another substituted; but I have retained the original, which is clearer for those who have not attended the previous lectures.

³⁹ Here Rashdall refers his audience to a book by 'Professor Ward of Cambridge': Naturalism and Agnosticism, for further details.

therefore it follows that there must be a further post-death existence - Rashdall ends more generally.

Further growth in knowledge and insight doubtless must be thought of as elements in the future life. Preparation for that (insertion, illegible ?) must be part of life's meaning here and now; but not so important a part as that fuller union with God and with the spirits of just men made perfect⁴⁰ in which Philosophers and Theologians alike have seen the best expression of Heaven.

Comment.

The conversations of theologians and philosophers on eternal life in this period were expanded when scholars of psychology, physiology and other sciences extended their inquiries to the area of immortality and the transcendental, an area of study which had in a former time been discouraged in a secular context. Myers, in his introduction to the book discussed above, remarks that the 'scientific method' had remained outside the inquiries of the Christian Church, which did not allow extra-ecclesiastical enquiries concerning the transcendent.⁴¹ Now, with the development of scientific investigation and the greater permissiveness of ecclesiastical authority the fundamental question as to the credibility of survival after death could be posed. It has been seen that, in this extended debate, Rashdall did not become involved as a major participant, but held firmly to his opinion, with a combination of philosophical and theological argument.

Conclusion.

Rashdall maintained consistently throughout the period his doctrine of immortality, which had distinctive features. His exegesis of the evangelical accounts of the Resurrection of Christ took full account of the work of critical scholars. Thus his arguments for belief in an after-life were not based primarily on the historical event described in the Gospels. His homiletic approach to Easter and the Resurrection was centred on a theodicy of mortal vicissitudes and an insistence on the concept of ultimate cosmic purpose. This, in sermons, was presented in an accessible form. In his doctrine of the nature of the after-life, he did not assume a traditionally Protestant, antithetical model, final and irrevocable at death. Rather, he proposed a more catholic solution, hypothesising a period of further opportunity, an experience, even if painful,

⁴⁰ HR refers here to Heb. 12 23, 'the spirits of just men made perfect, ...'

⁴¹ Myers, Human Personality, 1919, p. 4.

of gaining insight and empathy. Punishment, he held, is not retributive but reformatory. It follows that unlike traditionalists, whether catholic or protestant, he does not infer a final hell. In his communication with those scholars of varied disciplines who debated on the possibility or otherwise of an after-life he was somewhat remote, but was aware of their dialogue, and marked out his own position, using essentially the same arguments employed in his sermons, but in an academic and more formal register.

Chapter 5. Immortality. Section 2

The Years from 1906 to 1924.

Introduction.

Although Rashdall was fully engaged during this period with his public work and the major theological discussions recorded above, he continued to participate in the debates on Immortality. For to him it was not an optional doctrine, but an essential belief, a *sine qua non* of his position as a Christian theologian. The tenets he had held in the first part of his career he continued to maintain, in published articles and in sermons; the latter included an address published in the posthumous collection, Principles and Precepts,¹ and numerous unpublished sermons. The position he states in these is not only a repetition but a response to the continued debate among theologians, philosophers and scientists. These discussions scanned the period of the First World War when the subject held the attention of, and, in some cases, the urgent speculation of a wider public.

In this Section, as in Section 1, I shall review the subject of the doctrine of Immortality under the headings (i) the Resurrection of the historical Jesus; (ii) the nature of the future life; and (iii) the views of theologians, philosophers and scientists on the credibility of the concept of life after death. Since, again, the questions raised overlap, the three sections are not discrete entities.

(i) The Resurrection of Jesus.

It is important, since Rashdall held that a belief in eternal life was not dependent on belief in the raising of Jesus from the tomb, to be aware of contemporary scholars' views on the Resurrection as recorded in the NT.

Kirsopp Lake.

It may be recalled that Lake was a prominent scholar among those whose work influenced the discussions of the Modern Churchmen's Union at the 1921 Girton Conference, at which Rashdall's christological doctrines caused public controversy, as described in Chapter 3. Born in 1872, he was of a later generation than Rashdall. Lake was a NT scholar, having been professor of NT exegesis at Leiden from 1904 to

¹ HR, Principles and Precepts (Oxford: Blackwell, 1927).

1914. It was during this period that he wrote Evidence for the Resurrection of Jesus Christ.²

Lake discusses different ways of inquiring into 'the Resurrection. The method based on spiritual experience favoured by Inge, for instance, he considers unsatisfactory. The 'historical inquirer' he insists, must consider the reliability of the evidence by attempting to reconstruct events.

He emphasises the earlier date of Paul's exposition in 1 Cor.15, which he considers the most 'genuine' account. (p. 10) But Paul, he continues, who was arguing here with a party in Corinth which denied life after death, bases his reply on the Resurrection of Christ, and indeed, on a Resurrection body. However, since Paul did not believe in a resurrection of the flesh (that is, an unmodified physical resurrection), it is difficult to determine in what sense he understood this. (pp. 16ff.)

Lake deals with the following questions. (1) Does the experience of the women really justify the belief in the Empty Tomb? (2) Did the Resurrection take place on the third day? (3) How far does the fact of the appearances justify the belief in the Resurrection?

(1) On the first, Lake asks whether the Empty Tomb has been inferred from the fact of the Resurrection.

(2) On the second, he is interested in the question whether there is a 'period of waiting' between death and the Resurrection. The main point of this is to attempt to establish whether the narrative implies an Empty Tomb. He suggests the women could have confused the tombs. (p. 250)

(3) On the third: the Appearances – Lake asks whether these were subjective or objective; further, with a reference to the work of Myers, he enquires whether they were to be understood as telepathy.

Finally, he states that his conclusions may be considered an 'abandonment of the central doctrine of Christianity – the unique and miraculous character of the Resurrection.' (p. 277) Nevertheless, he argues, the Resurrection for the early Christians, was not a unique event, but was 'a triumph of life over death in which they all joined.'

² Kirsopp Lake, Resurrection (London: Williams and Norgate, 1907).

Comment on Lake's Conclusion.

It may be thought that this conclusion is begging the question whether the early Christians, while holding that they all joined in the triumph of life over death, did or did not believe that the 'triumph' was founded on miraculous happenings, and, in particular, on the miracle of the Empty Tomb. If, as he suggests in (1) it was an inference from the fact of the Resurrection, then those who inferred it believed the Resurrection was unique. More expansion of this point is needed for clarification.

Seven years later, in April 1914, Lake continued his discussion of resurrection in the Modern Churchman.³ Referring to his previous work, he reiterated his view of the significance of Paul's teaching and the unreliability of the non-Marcian Gospels. Now he will 'express the train of thought which has affected by [sic - must mean 'my'] own general belief and presupposition in such a way as turns me against a belief in a resurrection of the flesh of the Lord.'

The rest of the Article is a comment largely on the doctrine of the Resurrection of the Body/flesh historically and doctrinally, and, in particular, the nature of that resurrection. It is therefore not relevant to the present discussion.

B. H. Streeter.

Foundations⁴ of 1912 has been referred to above as an important work in the field of liberal theology. The editor, B. H. Streeter, contributed an article on 'The historic Christ.'⁵

In this Article, Streeter, having contextualised the Resurrection narratives of the Gospels, recalls how, in contemporary thought about immortality, the Pharisees believed that, at the advent of the Messianic Kingdom the dead would be raised in glorified bodies. The Resurrection stories in the Gospels are consistent with 'these popular eschatological ideas' he says. (p. 131) Streeter comments that the Gospel accounts do not seem to be from eye-witnesses; thus, popular ideas may have been read into them. He argues further, against a literally understood physical resurrection,

³ Lake, MC, Vol. 4 31-37.

⁴ Foundations, ed. B.H.Streeter (London: Macmillan, 1912). Page references in the main text.

⁵ Foundations, pp. 75-145.

for such a concept – a body taken up ‘flesh and bones’ into heaven - requires a contemporary cosmology; that is, a geocentric, three-tier universe.⁶

Streeter questions the credal ‘resurrection of the body,’ and reasons that by this, in modern terms, we must mean the personality. Since the NT writers believed that Christ’s Resurrection and ours are similar; and, since we cannot think of our own bodies as unchanging, physical beings, we cannot thus think of Christ’s.

Comment on Streeter’s views on the Gospel accounts.

Does this follow? Streeter is, surely, applying double standards to his comparison of early Church beliefs with those of modern times. For he is arguing (a) that ‘we’ with our scientific knowledge, cannot believe in a physical resurrection (and ascension) and (b) that because the early Christians believed that Christ’s resurrection was not unique, ‘we’ should adopt that view, too. This is, in itself, inconsistent, without further explanation of ‘our’ position vis--vis that of the Early Church.

Further, it may be asked, of (b), whether the first Christians did, in fact, think of Christ’s resurrection and that of other humans as parallel. For instance, the raising of a crucified body presents exceptional difficulties, which is not the case with the majority of humans. Moreover, while the emphasis in Pauline churches was on Christ as the ‘first-fruits,’ in the churches of the Synoptics the belief was in a unique and miraculous event. The inference is unconvincing.

He differs from Lake in considering likely the historicity of the Empty Tomb account, but suggests ‘natural causes’ (for instance, the Romans removed the body). Having rejected the traditional and the ‘subjective vision’ theories, he expresses a preference for an ‘objective vision’ concept - either a spiritual, transformed body using the Pauline model, or a kind of telepathy, or some other means ‘we cannot comprehend’- but, in any case, ‘directly caused by the Lord Himself.’ He argues that, in Mark 12.18ff.⁷ ‘our Lord’s own explicit teaching on the matter’ is that there is a resurrection after death, but not a physical one.

On miracles, Streeter argues that ‘a miraculous event does not necessarily imply “an interruption to the ordinary course of nature ... ,” ’ but may work through the intervention of providence, for example, through a human religious experience, (an

⁶ The last part is my wording

⁷ This refers to the passage in which the Sadducees question Jesus about marriage relationships in a future life.

answer to prayer, for example). In such a case God is guiding in an exceptional way but not overturning natural laws. So, the resurrection appearances should be 'regarded as a Divine Intervention of this kind.' (p. 140) Much depends, in these exchanges between NT exegetes, on the definition of miracle, as will be seen in Rashdall's comments.

Streeter's last paragraph is not convincing. He concludes that Christ's death accomplished his mission; Christ believed he would be vindicated; he 'put it to the test - and the experiment did not fail.' This is not conclusive, though, in the way that Streeter intended, for it raises the question: in what sense did it not fail? – and thus does not clinch the matter.

Rashdall

Rashdall wrote a review of Foundations in the following year for the Hibbert Journal.⁸ Of 'The Historic Christ' he says that 'Mr. Streeter's essay ... is on the whole the most remarkable, as it is the boldest, in the volume. Mr. Streeter writes with a mastery of his subject which can hardly be claimed for all the contributors.' He summarises briefly Streeter's critical position, confirming first that Streeter 'accepts the usual analysis of documents.' He continues: 'The part of the Article which will attract most attention is the treatment of the Resurrection.' Rashdall refers to Streeter's position on the Empty Tomb, commenting, 'It is clear that Mr. Streeter believes that the body which was buried did not rise again.' Thus far, Rashdall does not disagree.

He does, however, wish to distance himself when Streeter says, 'Only if the possibility of personal immortality be dogmatically denied can there be any real difficulty in supposing that the Master would have been able to convince His disciples of victory over death by some adequate manifestation.' Rashdall remarks:

Many of us who will agree with Mr. Streeter in (1) accepting the historicity of the Vision while denying the miraculous disappearance from the tomb, (2) leaving the nature of the Vision an open question, will feel that in suggesting that the only possible "difficulty" as to the acceptance of his theory must spring from the doubt or denial of personal immortality, he does less than justice to other views.

This reservation on Rashdall's part is not surprising, since he himself repeatedly asserts his belief in personal immortality, yet cannot accept Streeter's alternative

⁸ HR, 'Review,' Foundations, HJ, Vol. 11. 1912-13 (April 1913), 668-686 at 670-672.

treatment of the 'Visions.' Both are agreed that 'when a natural explanation of an event is at all possible, there must be a very special reason for falling back upon an explanation of a supernatural character.' Rashdall argues that only one of Streeter's alternative explanations is, on these terms, acceptable; that is, the 'telepathic explanation.' But he is critical of an acceptance of the Pauline model, protesting that a 'body of some attenuated material substance ... would surely involve a physical miracle no less signal than the reanimation of the material body.' Rashdall is ambiguous on whether Paul's 'spiritual body' is material.

Comment on Rashdall's view.

But can it be argued from the text of 1 Cor.15 that the body is thought of as 'material?' It is held in the recent Oxford Bible Commentary⁹ that by contrasting the Greek *psychikon soma* with the *pneumatikon soma* 'Paul (thus) wishes to preserve the term "body" but only when it is shorn of its connotation of physicality and mortality.'¹⁰ If that is a correct interpretation, and Paul's model speaks of a non-material 'body,' then a 'physical miracle' is not required.

It must be concluded that Rashdall's argument on this text is not convincing. However, it is the only point on which he has taken issue (though rather vigorously) with Streeter in his review. Their area of agreement is wider.

(ii) The After-Life.

While Biblical scholars continued their expositions of the events and significance of the NT resurrection accounts, speculations among theologians continued on the future life. The two topics often overlapped, especially on the nature of the resurrection body, as has been seen in the exchanges of Rashdall and Streeter. Exegesis of the Pauline passage in Cor. was particularly complex since it treats of both the resurrection of Christ and that of humankind. To categorise the parallel searches is a matter of fine balance.

⁹ J. Barton and J. Muddiman Oxford Bible Commentary, (Oxford: OUP, 2001).

¹⁰ *Ibid.* at p. 1132.

Rashdall on future reward and punishment.

Rashdall contributed an article on the subject to the Modern Churchman in 1914.¹¹ It immediately preceded Lake's article on Christ's Resurrection, in the same number of the Journal; this illustrates the inter-active nature of the discussion.

Here Rashdall states his consistent position, refuting the criticism of Christ's teaching as an appeal to selfish motives. Christ makes the love of God the supreme and ideal motive for goodness; '... you cannot love from hope of reward or fear of punishment.' In any case, the ethical value of belief in a future life depends on the 'character of Heaven and Hell it encourages men to expect.' Jesus thought of the Kingdom of Heaven 'in a spiritual manner. Even if His teaching does not go beyond Judaic teaching, it was always a Kingdom of righteousness and peace.'

Rashdall feels 'some indignation at the insincerity and superficiality with which these cant objections to any moral teaching which is connected with the hopes of a future life are often repeated.' (p. 19) He quotes a passage from Montefiore's Synoptic Gospels.¹²

Rashdall's main purpose, he states, is to enquire about the 'actual teaching as to the duration of future punishment.' (p. 21) Montefiore, from a Jewish point of view, 'expresses great horror at what he supposes to be His (Christ's) teaching about everlasting punishment.' On this Rashdall makes several points.

1) If Jesus did indeed teach it and meant it, 'modern Christians' would have to regard this as 'another of those limitations of his knowledge.' But Rashdall 'would be reluctant' (because of Jesus' teaching generally) 'to believe that He had thus intended.'

2) The teaching on hell is metaphorical. He quotes Mark 9.48 'where their worm dieth not, and their fire will not be quenched,' identifying the quotation as Isaiah 66.24. which refers to 'the carcasses of those who have transgressed against me' – they are to be consumed. Thus, 'unquenchable' means the fire will not be quenched till it has consumed what is put into it.'

3) Rashdall cites a number of passages in Matthew in which it is said the punishment is 'aeonian.' Here he rehearses the critical and linguistic argument that the meaning of the word is 'age-long' but not everlasting; it may, more specifically,

¹¹ HR, 'On Christ's Teaching about Future Reward and Punishment,' MC, Vol. 4 (April 1914), 18-30. Pages references in the main text.

¹² C. Montefiore, The Synoptic Gospels 2, p. 11.

refer to the Jewish belief in a Messianic Age; it may have the particular sense of 'lasting for a thousand years' (chiliasm). Further, the Greek 'kolasis' (punishment) implies a reformatory punishment. All these sayings are limited to the first Gospel. Since they reflect Judaistic beliefs of the late first century, he continues, the passages may be ecclesiastical additions.

There follows a long exegesis of the 'sin against the Holy Ghost' which need not concern us here.

4) Rashdall returns to the meaning of 'unquenchable fire' in Mark 9.48 paralleled in Matt.18.8. He is particularly suspicious of the 'aeonian' concept, linked to the phrase 'unquenchable fire;' it may, he suggests, belong to the ecclesiastical vocabulary of the first two evangelists. Possibly the original had only 'Gehenna (of fire)' and it was expanded (wrongly, he implies) for the benefit of Gentiles.

5) Jewish contemporary opinion on everlasting punishment was varied. 'There were many views current as to the future destiny of the wicked.' (p. 27) One was ultimate extinction.¹³ Jesus, Rashdall says, 'would not have adopted the severest view.' (that is, everlasting punishment) The last sentence of this paragraph is, in its ambiguity, somewhat inconclusive. It reads: 'We are surely not called upon to believe that He adopted that one of the current opinions which was most difficult to reconcile with His own teaching about the Fatherhood of God, thought (sic) it may well be that, in the depth of His stern indignation against sin, He may have used severe but vague prophetic language without expressly attempting to reconcile it with His other great conviction about the love of God.'

It must be judged that, because of its lack of clarity (not helped by the misprint!), the sentence is not effective in forwarding his argument.

6) Here Rashdall discusses 'a few passages' which are sometimes taken to indicate 'an everlasting Hell.' His main example is 'broad is the gate that leadeth to destruction.' (Matt. 7.13.) He reasons that, while some (his underlining) lost opportunities caused by culpable failure are irreversible, that 'is a very different thing from saying that its punishment shall be endless.' (p. 28) Of Lazarus,¹⁴ for example, it is argued that his inability to visit his brother was for the period of his brother's lifetime, not for ever.

¹³ Refers to the Ethiopian Enoch and to 'Dr. Charles's Eschatology', also Thackeray, The Relation of St. Paul to Contemporary Jewish Thought, p. 116.

¹⁴ Luke 16. 19-31.

In his final paragraph, Rashdall considers the words of Matt.10.28, reasoning, 'Jesus said: "But rather fear him who is able to destroy both body and soul in Gehenna." ' If this version is correct rather than Luke's 'hath power to cast into Gehenna' (12.5.), then we may conclude that Gehenna, in Jesus' thinking, did not involve 'everlasting torment.'

In this long and detailed paper, the exegesis is mainly worked out effectively. His conclusion is that the answer to our question 'whether Jesus taught the doctrine of everlasting punishment must be *non liquet*.'¹⁵ Finally, he reminds us that 'it was long before it became the settled view of the Church.' (p. 30)

Montefiore.

Montefiore gave a lecture¹⁶ three years after the Article by Rashdall reviewed above was published, 'being the second of the series of War Lectures under the auspices of the liberal Jewish Union and delivered at Steinway Hall, Feb. 25th, 1917.'

This Article,¹⁷ referring to the War which had then been in progress for over two years, deals with the intense public interest in the future life at a time when so many young soldiers had been killed. It will be reviewed both as a contribution to the general discussion of immortality, and because it represents a non-Christian approach in the scholarly exchanges (especially important in view of his close relationship academically to Rashdall). In it, Montefiore refers to Rashdall's writing several times. His main interest here is in the nature of a future life.

Attitude of Judaism to the after-life.

The organizers of the Lectures had wanted an address on Immortality 'not merely for its perennial interest, but for two special reasons.'

The first is the War. 'When death is claiming its victims by the thousand the poignant question is forced into the foreground: what is there beyond death? Moreover, there is a more urgent question still, which wife, mother and sister are wistfully whispering, "May we not hope to be united again to our beloved beyond the veil?"'

¹⁵ *Non liquet* - It is not clear; a legal term.

¹⁶ Published in the Jewish Chronicle (30th March 1917), pp. 14, 17, 18.

¹⁷ I have edited the article with sub-headings.

The second is that: some think Judaism is 'lukewarm or negative' on the doctrine of the future life. This error must be corrected. Montefiore traces the history of the belief. 'Belief in a future life of spiritual blessedness and moral worth has for two thousand years been an official dogma of the synagogue' It is agreed that 'It is the one great doctrine of Judaism which is later than the Old Testament.' The doctrine is traced from a development of the Messianic hope and the influence of other countries, especially Persia and Greece.

The two main doctrines.

There are, he says, two main forms of the doctrine: (1) Resurrection with bodily form at a future day of judgment. (2) Immediate entry into the 'life of blessedness and value.' (1) was 'for long the official doctrine of the synagogue.' It was gradually supplanted by (2).

One should not reject a doctrine because of its older forms. We may deny 'heaven above' and 'hell below,' but the doctrine of a 'future life of value and progress is unaffected.'

Objections.

Some objections are mentioned. For instance, if animals die, why should not man? 'yet if life in the bee closed with its earthly career, why not also in man?' (This consideration rises, from discoveries about 'the relation of man to the lower and higher animals.'). Montefiore's reply is that man is essentially 'new' (that is, in 'his moral, intellectual and spiritual life;' his concept of 'truth, beauty, righteousness;' his 'worship of God') He mentions the view that horses or dogs may qualify and would himself prefer to 'posit another life for the higher animals,' than, because of doubt about the animals' prospects, 'to deny it to man.' Montefiore refers us to 'some judicious and balanced remarks ... in Dr. Rashdall's fine book, "the theory of Good and Evil."'¹⁸ On the objection that the doctrine of Immortality presents an immoral reason for living virtuously, he remarks 'The pious delight in God's commandments, not in their rewards.' He admires those who, without belief in God and immortality believe, nevertheless, in 'absolute value;' but 'if we do not belittle them, they must not belittle us.'

¹⁸ Note 6 gives The Theory of Good and Evil, 1907, Vol. 2, p. 352.

Beyond the Grave.

His next heading, 'Action beyond the Grave,' leads him to consider retribution and purification. The 'greatest sinners' do not always feel remorse, nor do they suffer most. Of the War it is commented that the 'prime offenders will probably have the least to pay.' (That will fall to the lot of the 'mass of the people' and their 'guiltless descendants.')

For justice, there must be retribution after death, in the form of purification. The penalty must 'make for righteousness.' It is asked, 'Can we believe that God will allow one soul to remain in perpetual alienation from the good?' We 'need Immortality even more for the wicked than for the righteous.'¹⁹

We cannot know what form the future life takes. But "“That we shall live again,” ... is far more certain than that we shall take any particular form of life.” ’ We must not claim to know more than we do.

However, 'modern Judaism is emphatic in the direction of universalism. A single lost or alienated soul would be ... unworthy of that divine Unity in which justice and mercy are indissolubly fused together.'

Value of the Doctrine.

Immortality 'enhances the value of earthly struggle,' and 'It raises men into an eternal world even while they remain among things temporal.'

Rashdall's comment.

Rashdall wrote to Montefiore the following month. He comments: 'The only assertion that I should hesitate about in your letter is that "a single lost or alienated soul would be unworthy," etc.. Certainly unless it is inevitable: but if we have to admit that God finds it impossible to avoid some evil in this life, it seems difficult to say positively that there must be absolutely none in the new stage of existence, or even that finally there may not be some failures or very imperfect successes.' (It is curious that Rashdall assumes evil in the present implies evil in an after-life.)

¹⁹ Note 22 refers us to his Bible for Home Reading, Vol.2, pp. 206-7.

That the two were largely in agreement, however, is clear in his opening sentence, referring to Montefiore's 'excellent lecture.'²⁰

H. Major.

Major became involved in a public controversy on the 'resurrection of the body' in those days of intense controversy of late summer 1921, following his paper at the Girton Conference.²¹ A phrase used by him in a letter to the Church Times of the 9th September setting forth his view of this doctrine, - part of the great outpouring of correspondence that followed the Girton Conference of August 1921, - provoked the indignation of a reader of the paper, who wrote to Burge, the Bishop of Oxford, accusing Major of heresy. A record of the correspondence in connection with the accusation was published by the Bishop.

The phrase in question was 'Canon Green's supposition that as I do not believe in the resurrection of the material body from the grave the only form in which I can believe in the resurrection is in the form in which Napoleon survives in the *Code Napoleon* suggests that he has never heard of a *tertium quid* ... viz., the survival of death by a personality which had shed its physical integument for ever. This happens to be the form which the doctrine of the Resurrection assumes in my mind.'

The accusation was 'of openly teaching Doctrine concerning the Resurrection which is contrary to the Christian religion' as set forth (a) in the Creeds, and (b) in Scripture, 'where the Resurrection of the body is taught explicitly.' Major's reply to the Bishop follows.²²

Of the phrase quoted in the Church Times Major denied that it is contrary to the Christian religion.

Major noted that the Early Fathers did not accept this doctrine unhesitatingly, bearing in mind the Pauline saying 'flesh and blood shall not inherit the Kingdom of God.'²³ Origen, he remarked (of the phrase 'Resurrection of the Body') tried to 'spiritualise the phrase,' but was defeated by the end of the fourth century. Major continued to draw on a wide range of theological writing, following its history throughout the Christian era to modern times, after which exposition he admitted -

²⁰ Matheson, Life, pp. 167-8.

²¹ 'Jesus the Son of God.' See MC, Vol. 11 (Sept. 1921), pp. 270 ff.

²² H. M. Burge, Resurrection (Oxford: Mowbray, 1922), pp. 186-7.

²³ 1 Cor. 15.50.

‘The doctrine that the literal flesh would rise was affirmed in all the Western Baptismal Creeds, and defended ... by Christian leaders of both East and West, who were well aware of its “scientific” difficulties.’

In contrast, numerous contemporary theologians are quoted, among them Westcott,²⁴ Gore,²⁵ and an SPCK Paper of 1917.²⁶

Major commented: ‘The teaching of these modern English theologians constitutes ... an absolute denial of the Catholic doctrine as to the mode of the resurrection of the dead.’ (p. 46)

Meaning of the Creed.

The monograph continues, on ‘The meaning of the Creed,’ in which his references were again wide-ranging. He quoted, for example, Bethune-Baker’s view that we can say the words of the Creed — ‘if it is our faith that we ourselves in our human personalities, as we are in the days of our flesh, ... no bare and empty disembodied ‘spirits, but as we have been made by all life’s experience – will live again after death “and receive” the things done in the body’²⁷ E. J. Bicknell is quoted, from his A Theological Introduction to the 39 Articles.²⁸ Bicknell calls the resurrection of the flesh ‘at the best a pious opinion.’

Major argued that ‘these thoughts are typical of our day.’ It is, he said, ‘excusable’ to use traditional terms in an untraditional sense. ... But we must not pretend that ‘although the resurrection of the flesh has been jettisoned’ there is no real change. He names F. D. Maurice and R. H. Charles as important in the change of opinion on this doctrine.

(Rashdall, too, admired F. D. Maurice; his Lecture on the work of Maurice will be referred to below.)

²⁴ J. B. Westcott, The Historic Faith (London: Macmillan, 6th ed. 1883), pp. 136 f. (n.1, Burge, p. 38.)

²⁵ Gore, Creed (7th ed., 1895), pp. 92-93.

²⁶ SPCK Paper for the National Mission, The Meaning of the Creeds (London, 1917).

²⁷ B-B., The Faith of the Apostles’ Creed (London and New York: Longman, 1919), p. 173.

²⁸ E. J. Bicknell, A Theological Introduction to the 39 Articles (London and New York: Longman, 1919), p. 132.

‘Christ,’ Major stated, ‘decisively rejects the materialistic view taught in Daniel and the later Apocalyptists.’ The traditional teaching is ‘a product of the thought, exegesis and polemic of an age which has long passed away.’

The Bishop’s Conclusion.

After consulting several Oxford divines, the Bishop decided not to proceed to a charge of heresy.

It may be concluded that Major, Streeter and Gore, at least in his earlier theology, did not differ greatly in the content of their belief about the doctrine; but Gore, and indeed Rashdall, judged that they were justified in using the words of the traditional Creed (of the later Western Church) though with mental reservations, while Major was more radical in challenging their usefulness.

Rashdall. *Unpublished Sermons.*

Rashdall continued to pass on his beliefs about the future state to his congregations. Extracts from two of his unpublished Sermons, originally delivered in the Hereford period, will illustrate his approach.

1. Sermon of 1912.

In the first, it is seen that biblical criticism was not disguised, merely expressed in simpler terms than in his academic writings. No attempt was made to modify his beliefs in the context of the pulpit. This sermon was given at Hereford Cathedral in 1912²⁹ and repeated at Carlisle in 1922.

The teaching of our Lord about the future Life. Matthew. 8.11-12.

But what was to be the ultimate future of the excluded? For how long were they to be excluded? Was it to be for ever? This is a question which ought, I think, to be distinctly faced We have got rid for the most part of those horrible pictures of future torments which used to figure so largely in the teaching of the pulpit. The modern tendency is rather to burke discussion and to leave the whole subject severely alone.

On page 6 we have further details:

²⁹ PH A. 4. (10)

The word Gehenna ... originally meant the Valley of Hinnom under the walls of Jerusalem in which idolatrous kings had burnt fires, and made their children to pass through the fire to Moloch. Sometimes we are told that in later years perpetual fires were kept burning in the valley to consume the filth and refuse of the city, but this is more doubtful ... The allusion to fire is meant undoubtedly to suggest the thought of punishment; but we must remember that fire not only torments and consumes. It also refines or purifies, and it is perhaps not too much to say that the use of this term naturally suggests the thought of a purifying, ameliorating kind of punishment.

A punishment that is to improve cannot be thought of as everlasting.

On page 11, Rashdall approaches his conclusion.

I have tried to show you that it is not certain that our Lord ever uttered these words about aeonian punishment, and still more doubtful what he meant by them. [sic] if he did utter them. But after all there is a better way of getting at our Lord's real mind on this subject than by elaborate speculations on the meaning of a single Greek word contained in one of the Gospels: and that is by asking what view of the matter is most in accordance with the general spirit of his teaching.

2. Addition to Sermon of 1913 (1914?)

The second is 'another beginning,' presumably added for 1914, of a Sermon³⁰ for All Saints' and All Souls' Day, preached in Hereford. I quote extracts from this; Rashdall linked the liturgical year to his teaching, appealing to the imagination and reason of his hearers.

Heaven. Rev. xxi.4.

With its usual instinct for symbolism the ancient Church fixed upon the beginning of November – the period in which all nature seems but only seems to be in a state of decay and death - as its season for the commemoration of the departed – a commemoration which was nonetheless wise and Christian because it took the place of the old pagan rites - of which traces survive even now all the world over - the offerings set out to be literally consumed by the ghosts who were supposed at this time to revisit their old haunts. On Nov: 1st the Church commemorated the Saints - meaning especially those who had died for the Christian faith: on Nov.2 she observed what was known as All Souls' Day, in remembrance of all the faithful departed. This November the dead are nearer to the thoughts of most of us than in ordinary Novembers. It is well that we should keep them in mind, and do what we can to keep alive in ourselves the hope that as the apparent death of Nature is but the prelude and the process to the renewal of life in the spring so for our heroes and our friends the death of the body is but the entrance upon a fuller and a richer life. But I don't think that the belief in a future life is the less valuable because it must needs be vague. THE strength of a belief and its influence on life is not always

³⁰ PH A. 4. (25)

to be measured by its definiteness. COLUMBUS' belief that the world was round and that he would come to land if only he sailed far enough towards the setting sun was none the less vivid and inspiring, none the less momentous in its effects upon history, because he knew nothing as to the kind of country and the kind of inhabitants whom he would meet with when he reached the distant shore. So to us the belief in Immortality will be sufficiently valuable if it keeps alive hope for ourselves and for the world.

He develops the theme of growing knowledge; and suggests that our knowledge will continue to increase in a future life.

These sermons illustrate the importance to Rashdall of (a) making explicit his opposition to the belief, still prevalent, in everlasting torment in hell; (b) of strengthening in his congregation, especially in the period 1914-18, the hope of 'another country,' as the war-time poet Cecil Spring-Rice expressed it;³¹ (c) of appealing to the imagination of his listeners when appropriate, as well as to reason.

Rashdall on F. D. Maurice.

Maurice had been dismissed from his post as Professor at King's College London in 1853, because of his liberal views on the theology of hell. Rashdall paid tribute to him in an address given at Carlisle Cathedral in 1920.³²

In this Lecture, Rashdall has treated the work of Maurice: as an overtly Christian social reformer; as a liberal theologian; and, in particular, as a theologian who questioned the traditional view of the after-life. Rashdall expounds the orthodox doctrine briefly and effectively.³³

If there was a single theological tenet about which High-Churchmen and Low-Churchmen ... were thoroughly agreed in those days it was this, that all human beings who failed to comply with certain conditions of salvation, ... and to attain at least a minimum standard of goodness in life, would pass after death into a place of everlasting, irremediable torment. That was the fate for which a loving God had brought into existence, ... the vast majority of mankind.

Rashdall makes an apposite observation:

³¹ Cecil Spring-Rice, 'And there's another country I've heard of long ago,' from the poem 'I vow to thee my country.'

³² HR, 'F. D. Maurice,' *Principles and Precepts* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1927), pp. 154 - 163. Preached at Carlisle Cathedral, 18th March 1920.

³³ *Ibid.* pp. 160 f.

William Paley, Archdeacon of Carlisle, to whose memory this pulpit was erected, had read before the University of Cambridge a thesis on 'the non-everlastingness of future punishment.'

He continues:

But nobody had ever ventured to proclaim this doctrine from the house-tops. Maurice had the courage ... to maintain that 'eternal punishment' did not last for ever; he dared to preach the Gospel of eternal hope For teaching this doctrine Maurice was violently denounced in the religious newspapers ... , and deprived of his Professorship This was in 1853.

Summary.

It has been seen that the discussion among theologians on the after-life was vigorously pursued. One of the pivots of dialogue was interpretation of Paul's Corinthian passage. This involved much debate on the meaning of the Resurrection of the Body. There was further exegesis on the meaning of 'everlasting fire.' In the latter part of the period during and after the First World War, the matter acquired a new urgency. Rashdall continued to be interactive in this dialogue.

Its ramifications as it was further explored through scientific and philosophical enquiry will be the subject of the following sub-section.

(iii) Is immortality credible in the twentieth century?

In this second part of Rashdall's life, he continued, in addition to his public, ecclesiastical work, to contribute to the many-faceted writings and debates of philosophers, theologians and other scholars on that area of the discussions about immortality which raised the question whether, in the light of new scientific knowledge, it could still be believed that human beings survived, in any form, physical death.

The case for the opposition expressed by the philosopher F. H. Bradley³⁴ is referred to by Rashdall and others. There are more probings of the physiological aspect of whatever may currently be considered the capability of humanity to survive after death. Rashdall, in his role as Dean of Carlisle during and after the First World War gave addresses to mark the national events which touched on this aspect of the

³⁴ See HR, 'The Metaphysics of Mr. Bradley,' Proceedings of the British Academy, 5 (1912), pp. 429-455. Also collected in Ideas and Ideals, Ed. Cross and Major (Oxford: Blackwell), 1928, pp. 202-239. See MM 203. p. 67.

after-life. A range of writings and addresses relevant to my discussion will be considered here.

1. *Rashdall's Sermon in Westminster Abbey.*

At the beginning of the period, in 1906, Rashdall preached a sermon in Westminster Abbey on Immortality, which was later published in Principles and Precepts.³⁵

A variation of his consistent and repeated approach, it is noted here, because it is directed particularly at those who take a negative view of human post-mortem survival. He says:

Doubtless it (his argument) will not appeal to those who have persuaded themselves that human souls are the mere chance product of blind material forces.

The sermon, a theodicy is summarised in this passage:

If there be a God of Love, His love cannot cease with death; if there be a God of Justice, there must be some closer correspondence between happiness and goodness than is discoverable here on earth. The belief in immortality is, then, a direct consequence of our belief in God.

2. *What is the soul? The mind/brain controversy.*

The conversation continued. Examples are given here

(a) In the Hibbert Journal.

Mascoll.

In the following year (1907) an Article in the Hibbert Journal returns to the mind/brain controversy, which continues unabated. Hugh Mascoll writes on 'What and where is the soul?'³⁶ This contributor attempts a definition. First, he suggests, the soul is that which feels. He will use sensation and consciousness as synonyms. Mascoll argues³⁷ that the brain is not 'the real terminus of the sensory medium of transmission.'

He then asks the central question - is the 'soul' (that is, 'the thing that feels ... thinks and reasons') matter or non-matter? Mascoll takes his position against the

³⁵ HR, 'Immortality,' P and P, pp. 237-247. preached at Westminster Abbey, 3rd April, 1906.

³⁶ H. Mascoll, Boulogne sur Mer, 'What and where is the soul?' HJ (Oct. 1907), pp. 158-170.

³⁷ Against Professor Haeckel.

atheist, who says the brain and soul are identical (so, at the death of the brain, whatever is meant by the soul dies). He comments that, as we grow older, the brain changes; the man of seventy has 'a new brain.' So, it is suggested, while the material brain changes, it (whatever the 'soul' may be) - remains. Perhaps the brain is only in a chain, he hazards. It may further be supposed that the 'ego' (by which he means the 'soul' or consciousness) is always receiving a new 'instrument of education;' this entity continues when its body has been lost.

The hypothesis is consistent with the supposition of Rashdall, and indeed of others, such as Farrar, whose doctrine of the after-life includes the concept of a benign purgatory.

Lodge.

The attempt to describe what has traditionally been called 'soul' is pursued in different terms in the Hibbert Journal by Oliver Lodge,³⁸ a professional physicist, though better known popularly known as a writer on the psychic. In his Article, 'Ether, Matter and the Soul,' Lodge seeks analogies for the 'soul' in the phenomena of physics.

The first section of his Article is concerned with the nature of energy. It has been discovered, he says, that electricity and heat are not matter at all, but energy. However, a 'material body' is necessary (for this energy). In the case of heat, this is seen as 'a quiver of its ultimate particles.' Further examples follow.

His main point is, 'A duality runs through the scheme of physics - matter and ether.'³⁹ Energy passes from one to the other, though 'our sense organs tell us of matter and do not tell us of ether.' As knowledge advances, the 'vague and indeterminate' becomes 'the substantial and the definite.'

This can, Lodge suggests, be applied to psychical research. At present, its findings may be described as a 'tendency,' not as an 'accomplished fact.' While 'soul' has hitherto been used in a 'vague and indefinite way' he thinks it will be found that 'soul is related to the ether as body is related to matter.' 'A sort of ethereal body' ... 'it may be detachable and capable of a separate existence.'

³⁸ O. Lodge, 'Ether, Matter and the Soul,' HJ, Vol. 17 (Jan. 1919), pp. 252-260.

³⁹ Ether - 'a medium, not matter, assumed in the 19th century to fill all space and transmit electromagnetic waves.' Chambers Concise Dictionary, ed. Davidson, Seaton, Simpson, (CUP 1988), p. 330.

Lodge concludes, 'But whatever spiritual or mental affinities can be found in one, presumably belong equally to the other - that is my hypothesis.' So he confirms his belief in a 'spiritual body' the concept of which will be clarified, as 'comprehension' grows.

These suggestions differ in content from the speculations of other scholars; but firmly support the view that there is an individual survival at death, which can be termed 'the spiritual body.'

(b) At King's College London.

In 1919 a series of Lectures was given on Immortality at King's College London. They were published in the following year.⁴⁰ Of these, Rashdall gave the third, which will be reviewed below

Here, the Lecture of William Brown is noted.

William Brown.

In this fourth Lecture, Brown, who was a Reader in Psychology at London University, and 'sometime' neurologist in the BEF, 4th Army, in France, writes on 'Immortality in the Light of Modern Psychology.'

He says, 'We can only begin to consider the question from the psychological point of view if we have been able to refute the various theories which would make it impossible.' Brown therefore proceeds to outline theories which are held by some researchers as a result of physiological and psychological studies. All are dependent on the view taken of the brain/consciousness relationship.

He identifies a number of theories precluding the possibility of immortality, all of which are functions of the view that consciousness depends on the brain. 'Automatism,' for example, holds that brain change comes first, change in the consciousness second. Movement is always in one direction, from matter to mind or spirit.

On the other hand, some studies suggest that brain-death does not rule out the possibility of life after biological death. For example Bergson's⁴¹ 'new' theory of 'pure perception' suggests that no 'pure' memories are ever lost, though brain disease

⁴⁰ W R Matthews, (ed.), KCL Lectures on Immortality, (London: University of London Press, 1920).

⁴¹ Henri Bergson (1859-1941), French philosopher.

may prevent conscious awareness of them. The findings of hypnosis support the theory.

While Brown is sceptical of the theories of psychical investigators, of whom he mentions Myers, he concludes, 'The verdict of modern psychology is in favour of the possibility of the future life.'

3. Survival: individual or collective?

The most basic division concerning immortality was the one defined above; that is, whether any part of the person could survive the death of the brain. This was denied by the materialist but defended by the theist.

However, there was a further controversy, which divided the latter group - mainly theologians and philosophers. This was the question whether survival after death was individual or a fusion of some kind, either with other entities or by absorption into the absolute, whatever this may be taken to mean.⁴² A further approach was to hold that, while neither form of survival could be credited, the memory of an individual survived; thus immortality would have been achieved in the corporate, human memory. This view, however, is consistent with the materialistic position, since it does not involve the survival of any faculty of the physical body.

(a) Rashdall's Reviews.

Rashdall entered fully into this controversy, as an advocate of clearly individual survival. This is one of the themes of his Article appearing in the Church Quarterly Review of 1920.⁴³ It is a review of recent books, including W. R. Inge's Outspoken Essays and The Idea of God by A. S. Pringle-Pattison. I shall refer to these, to illustrate the discussion of personal immortality.

Rashdall introduced his remarks with a quotation from F. H. Bradley,⁴⁴ a scholar with whom he disagreed on basic philosophical grounds: - 'The Absolute exists only

⁴² Rashdall introduces the subject in his earlier article of 1908, published in Ideas and Ideals, 'The Alleged Immanence of God,' pp. 180-201, at pp. 197-8. See MM, p. 55, 153. 'It is vain for Christian preachers to talk about a continuance of personal life side by side with the doctrine of absorption into the Infinite.' Etc.

⁴³ HR, 'Personality in Recent Philosophy,' Church Quarterly Review, 90 (April 1920), pp. 19-50.

⁴⁴ HR has dealt with the subject at greater length in his posthumous collection, Ideas and Ideals. See 'The Metaphysic of Mr. F. H. Bradley,' pp. 202-239, (n.1 'A paper

in its appearances, ... God is one of these appearances.' The argument implied by this statement is outside the scope of my enquiry. However, it led Rashdall to the reflection that the one (of the writers he is reviewing) nearest to Bradley is Inge - an intimation that Inge's argument, too, is flawed.

W. R. Inge.

Before reviewing Inge's Outspoken Essays ⁴⁵ Rashdall refers to a longer, more academic work by Inge, The Philosophy of Plotinus ⁴⁶ Between this and the more popular Essays, he finds little difference in ideas, and speaks of Inge's 'systematic minimizing of the importance and independence of the individual.'

The Essay relevant to this enquiry is 'Survival and Immortality.' In a long introduction Inge pours scorn on the 'supernaturalist' (he refers to those interested in psychic investigations). This 'recrudescence of superstition in England before the war' is, he says, especially the preserve of the 'educated rich.' 'It is caused by the 'arrogant dominance of a materialistic philosophy,' which 'has supernaturalism for its nemesis.' 'Highly educated men' have been 'playing with occultism' by 'exploring the dark places of perverted mysticism.'

One cause, Inge says, is that preachers talk little of the 'Christian hope of immortality,' which 'burns very dimly among us.' 'They are more interested in the unemployed than the unconverted.' Inge condemns the 'notion of spirit as the most rarefied form of matter - an ultra-gaseous condition of it.' Both psychologists and physicists, being outside 'ideas of value,' trespass. His subsequent, more positive statements are somewhat unclear. The predominating idea, however, is that of impersonal immortality. 'If my particular life-meaning passes out of activity, it will be because the larger life, to which I belong, no longer needs that form of expression.'

Rashdall's comments.

Rashdall speaks of Inge's 'systematic minimizing of the importance and independence of the individual.' He quotes Inge's expansion of the statement:-

read before the British Academy, June 5, 1912). Reprinted from the *Proceedings of the British Academy*, vol. V) (sic) at p. 202.

⁴⁵ W R Inge, 'Survival and Immortality,' Outspoken Essays (London: Longman, 1919), pp.266-281.

⁴⁶ *Ibid*, The Philosophy of Plotinus (Gifford Lectures, 1917-18) (London and New York: Longman, 1st ed. 1918).

‘... I repeat that the question whether it is “my” soul that will live in the eternal world seems to have no meaning at all.’⁴⁷

Rashdall asks: ‘What class of opponents has the Dean before his mind in this diatribe?’ He distances himself from ‘the Dean,’ remarking, ‘There is no difficulty in understanding what are Dr. Inge’s philosophical opinions, though we may have frequent doubts about their consistency: it is more difficult to ascertain the precise grounds on which they are supposed to rest. He is too much disposed to regard the sneer, the innuendo, the epigram as the only weapons of philosophical warfare.’⁴⁸

In short, Rashdall rejects Inge’s theory of the soul as ‘merging,’ while considering his argument unclear as well as inconsistent.

Pringle-Pattison.

On the other hand, his review of Pringle-Pattison’s Idea of God⁴⁹ is much warmer.

It is, according to Rashdall, ‘a penetrating criticism upon the Bradleyan mode of thinking - much of which would apply to Dr. Inge, if the argument by which his conclusions are reached were made equally explicit’.

‘Pringle-Pattison,’ he says, ‘argues against an all-inclusive Deity.’ He quotes from the latter’s Hegelianism and Personality: ‘“The argument was directed against the fusion of real selves in a logical universal or ... the identification of all selves at a single point of being. What I emphasized ... was the uniqueness of each self.”’ Each self is ‘impervious,’ that is to say, it cannot be merged with other selves.⁵⁰

Rashdall finds a certain contradiction in The Idea of God since Pringle-Pattison ‘persists in identifying God with the Absolute and including all finite selves in His Being.’

This contradiction, so pertinent to the question of whether the individual survives as a separate entity after death, was the subject of correspondence between Rashdall and Pringle-Pattison. ‘In a reply’ (says Rashdall) ‘which he has done me the honour to

⁴⁷ HR, Church Quarterly Review, 90 p. 24 quotes Inge, Essays, pp. 274-5.

⁴⁸ *Ibid.*, at p. 23.

⁴⁹ Pringle-Pattison, The Idea of God (Oxford: Clarendon, 1917); the publication of his Gifford Lectures of 1912 and 1913. Professor of Logic and Metaphysics at Edinburgh. See HR, pp. 40ff.

⁵⁰ HR, Church Quarterly 90 p. 41 n. 2. Quotes P P, Idea of God, p. 389.

make to my criticisms the Professor has given explanations which seem to admit everything for which I have contended.’⁵¹

Rashdall refers to the continuation of this dialogue in Mind, during the period 1918-1919.⁵² He quotes verbatim in the Church Quarterly of 1920 a long passage from Mind of an Article (1919)⁵³ by Pringle-Pattison.

It is plain that the process involves a real otherness in the finite selves. If it were not so, where would be the ... ‘joy in heaven’ over the repentant sinner? I have protested, accordingly, ... (as Dr. Rashdall acknowledges) against the cheap and easy monism which treats the individual selves as merely the channels through which a universal consciousness thinks and acts – masks ... of the one actor who takes all the parts in the cosmic drama,⁵⁴

Rashdall finally remarks, ‘That is all I have contended for; and that is just what is denied by Dr. Inge’ (‘and Mr. Webb’). He adds, ‘I am bound to say that Professor Pringle-Pattison’s Article in Mind seems to me to amount to a recantation of much ... in The Idea of God.’

(b) Further Comment on Pringle-Pattison.

It is fortunate that further elucidation is available, for Pringle-Pattison expounded further his thinking on the after-life in The Idea of Immortality in 1922, the year in which he was again a Gifford Lecturer,⁵⁵ so we may follow the consolidation of his beliefs. The present volume is, he says ‘a sort of continuation of The Idea of God.’

In the later volume, ambiguity remains; notably, in his seventh Lecture, ‘Eternal Life,’ he stresses a form of ‘realized eschatology;’ but in the following Lecture, (‘Eternal Life and Personal Immortality’), he is critical of those philosophers who are negative towards personal immortality, remarking that in the NT, the present experience is regarded as a foretaste of ‘fuller realization hereafter.’ He denies that a desire for personal immortality is selfish; it ‘entirely escapes such censure’ Finally - ‘The experiences we have been considering show us that absorption of mind

⁵¹ Ibid., pp. 41f.

⁵² See Church Quarterly 90 p. 42 n.1. This refers to Mind N. S. 28 No. 109, Jan. 1919.

⁵³ PP, ‘The Idea of God: A Reply to some Criticisms,’ Mind 1919. *ibid.* pp. 1-18, at p. 11.

⁵⁴ Continues: ‘And I have protested equally (though Dr. Rashdall seems to be not quite so sure of this) against the opposite idea, which denies any divine self-consciousness except that which is realised in the finite individuals.’

⁵⁵ P P, The Idea of Immortality (Oxford: Clarendon, 1922).

and heart in an object does not mean the disappearance of the knowing and feeling subject by its being absorbed into the substance of that which it contemplates.’⁵⁶

The concluding Lecture refutes the suggestion that we love our friends not for themselves, but for certain qualities; so we are satisfied to meet these qualities in our new friends; thus is obviated the need to meet them in heaven. This is ‘poverty of feeling and shallowness of nature.’⁵⁷

While Pringle-Pattison’s meaning is sometimes elusive, he appears finally to endorse the view held by Rashdall: that eternal life is not absorption into the absolute but immortality of the individual.

(c) KCL Lectures on Immortality.

The discussion continued as one of the themes in Lectures given at King’s College London already mentioned, with reference to William Brown’s discussion of the mind/brain controversy. The theme will now be identified in these Lectures.

I shall then comment briefly but more generally on Rashdall’s contribution to the KCL Lectures.

Bethune-Baker.

The first Lecture was given by Bethune-Baker,⁵⁸ who, speaking on ‘the Religious Value of the Idea of a Future Life,’ repudiates a religion which ‘does not look beyond this life, and point to an abiding reality.’

Raising the question of individual survival, he comments that some Christians do not believe in it. He quotes: - ‘Till in the ocean of thy love / We lose ourselves in heaven above.’⁵⁹ But, although we are a body with many members, ‘A corporate ... immortality is only the background ... of individual immortality.’ Further, ‘In the Beatific Vision the soul retains its identity and consciousness.’ For him, as for Rashdall, a very liberal attitude to Biblical material is not accompanied by a sceptical view of individual survival. Rather, he asserts its importance.

⁵⁶ P P, Immortality, p. 162.

⁵⁷ Ibid. p. 191.

⁵⁸ BB, See Matthews, KCL Lectures, pp. 5-39.

⁵⁹ No reference given. It is from Keble’s hymn, ‘Sun of my soul, /Thou Saviour dear,’ taken from his The Christian Year, 1827. New English Hymnal, 251.

H. M. Relton.

Relton gave the fifth Lecture, speaking on 'The Christian Contribution to the Concept of Eternal Life.'⁶⁰ In his Introduction he stated: Eternal life does not mean living in the memories of others; nor does it mean the dead live in the memory of the race;⁶¹ it does not coincide, either, with eastern pantheism, absorption into God.

Eternal life for the Christian is life with God. (My underlining for clarification.)

Pantheism, often confused with the Christian doctrine, is the 'real foe' he says. 'Our end' is not Nirvana, not annihilation, not absorption, nor a suprapersonal or impersonal existence within the Divine, but Communion; 'Communion is only possible as a relationship between two. If one is absorbed, the communion ceases.'

Here, Relton has categorised and refuted all the shades of non-individual concepts of post-mortem possibilities.

4. *Rashdall on Immortality in his final years.*

Having completed my main survey of opinions on assertions of or alternatives to the idea of individual immortality, I shall review Rashdall's position in his KCL Lecture more generally. Subsequently I shall refer to one of his public speeches, as Dean. These may all be categorised as touching areas of knowledge or interest outside the purely theological.

(a) Rashdall's KCL Lecture.⁶²

This was given only five years before his death. It may be assumed that here we have his final formal thinking on the philosophical justification for the belief in immortality. The Lecture is entitled 'The Moral Argument for Personal Immortality.'

Premises.

Rashdall states his assumptions for the case he will make. These are: (i) The ground of the universe is spiritual; (ii) The human mind can be relatively independent of that mind; (iii) Our moral judgments have objective validity. Expressed in 'more popular

⁶⁰ Relton, Vicar of Isleworth; see Matthews, KCL Lectures, pp. 167-247.

⁶¹ Montefiore discusses the suggestion that immortality is only in the memory of the race in his Lecture cited above, at p. 17. To this theory he replies that the individuals are the reality: 'the race apart from them is a fiction.'

⁶² KCL Lectures, pp. 79-121.

language' these are (he says): the existence of God; the reality of the human soul; the authority of conscience.

Rashdall refutes the idea that man is merely 'an appearance of the absolute.' (Here he is opposing Bradley, Spinoza and others.) He 'has no time' for the idea 'of merging with the Absolute.'

Believing in God, he asks, why can we not have a reasonable view of the Universe without immortality? The rest of the Article is aimed largely at answering this question.

Reward and Punishments.

Opponents often attack what they regard as the essence of the Christian doctrine of immortality. Rashdall rehearses the argument he has used repeatedly. Here he directs his polemic, in particular, at a named opponent - Professor Laird, who has written on 'The Ethics of Immortal Reward.'⁶³ Philosophers, he remarks, are not good at stating their opponents' arguments; they attack old versions or caricatures. He summarises his own view, which is as in previous writings already reviewed.

Theodicy.

Rashdall returns, though in philosophical language, to the argument which he has often expressed in more popular form as 'Would we like to be responsible for the world as it is?' The evil in the world outweighs the good; nor is it equally distributed. But, in a moral Universe, virtue and happiness should go together. Therefore he believes there must exist a life 'both happy and moral.' The only solution, given these premises (I paraphrase here), is provided by the concept of immortality.

Individual Survival.

He takes the opportunity, once more, to oppose Inge's theory of 'an impersonal immortality in which the person will ... be swallowed up.'

Having refuted, with practised logic, a wide spectrum of views held by philosophical opponents, Rashdall concludes emphatically that he 'can understand ... any attitude but one - that of contemptuous indifference.'

(b) Published Local Speech.

'The Dean and the Hope of Immortality - Memorial Service in the Park.'

⁶³ HR gives: 'Prof. Laird, Vol. XV1, p. 580, 1918.'

Published in the Carlisle Journal in 1917, the occasion is named: - 'Foundation Stone: Laying of Government aided building.'⁶⁴ This is an address in simple language, with the predictable truisms and clichés, some possibly introduced by the reporter, - but yet not lacking the profound ideas which he sought to elucidate in his more learned lectures. An extract from the report will illustrate his approach.

Think of the enormous waste of life that had gone on in the course of this war; think of all those young lives cut out in their prime almost before they had entered on the real battle of life for which their early days had been training them. The hope of immortality was a great consolation, surely. It reconciled us in some measure to their loss when we believed that they were living now, and that all those possibilities of goodness and of happiness which failed to be realised here might hereafter be realised in a better life than this. And there was still one more reason, more important, perhaps, than those he had mentioned. This belief reconciled us not merely to the loss of particular sons, brothers, friends, fellow countrymen, but it reconciled us, if he might so say, to the universe.

Whether this introduction of his cosmic theodicy was a consolation to distressed relations of the war-dead is impossible to determine. But it is an example of Rashdall's insistence on the point, in widely differing contexts.

Conclusion.

Rashdall's belief in Immortality remained consistent throughout his life. Although he refuted the penultimate clause of the Apostles' Creed' ('the resurrection of the body') in any literal sense, he was emphatically in agreement with the ultimate phrase as expressed in the Nicene Creed ('the life of the world to come'). His defence of the concept was always based, not on the physical resurrection of Jesus as recounted in the Gospels – a record he considered historically unreliable - but on a strongly theistic position from which he developed his theodicy of a loving and rational God. From this he argued the logical necessity of a future life. He held, further, that that future state, involving the survival of the individual as a discrete entity, excluded an everlasting hell. This was the teaching which, whether in learned terms to scholars or more simply through his pastoral and public pronouncements, he communicated unwaveringly.

⁶⁴ Carlisle Journal, 'The Dean and the Hope of Immortality – Memorial Service in the Park' (4th Sept. 1917), p. 2.

Chapter 6. Conclusion.

In this thesis, the work of Rashdall, both published and unpublished, has been reviewed and analysed in order to support the claim that he is a perennially significant theologian. It has become clear, in the course of my survey, that: negatively, his work cannot be dismissed as stereotyped or outdated; positively, I have shown that he was a major contributor to the ongoing debate, which is the context of and stimulus for his writings. Though having much in common, doctrinally, with others in the Modernist Group, of which he was a leading member, he had an identifiably characteristic approach and style; that of a radical, yet, at the same time, an unswervingly loyal adherent of the Anglican tradition. It is in the functioning of this paradoxical originality that his greatness may be perceived. I have aimed to illustrate that quality, while examining his work in depth.

My exegesis of Rashdall's work has been structured in four main chapters, in which I have examined the key areas of his theology.

In the first, I have discussed his theory of the Atonement. His major publication of 1919 has been central to my exposition. As well as analysing the work in order to highlight the main points of his richly illustrated argument, I have considered it in the context of preceding treatments of the subject by contemporary theologians who maintained or defended an opposing, conservative and objective doctrine.

Rashdall does not claim to hold original views¹, but to present his case by setting out the background of 'the history and development of the traditional doctrines.'²

His contributions to learned journals, in which he writes on the closely connected philosophical debate of the nature of punishment, have been reviewed. In these I have found consistency in his fundamental tenet that the belief in retribution *per se*, as a just desert, is mistaken, and cannot be used to support a theory of divine justice; for punishment is justifiable only when reformatory; moreover, it is not a *sine qua non* of justice. Rashdall names the medieval theologian Abelard in support of his own, subjective interpretation. This is an intrinsic consequence for Rashdall of his view that

¹ He expresses indebtedness, notably, to 'Professor Harnack's great work on the history of dogma' (Atonement, p. xiii). Harnack, (1851-1930) wrote *Beiträge zur Einleitung in das Neue Testament*, 1906-11.

² Atonement, p. x.

divine love is inconsistent with the artificial equivalence involving transfer of penalty to a substitute victim.

It has been my aim to show this well-structured consistency, already present in his earlier works.

In addition, Rashdall's atonement doctrine has been amplified by reference to unpublished sermons from the archives available at Pusey House. These show how his teaching was presented in the more informal context of a limited exposition, in a non-academic format; his style and thought simplified yet characteristic.

Unpublished correspondence has been used: from the New College Collection of Rashdall's letters; and from the Bodleian Library archives, of letters sent to him after the publication of his work of 1919.

These documents have provided examples of the lively, continuing wide debate.

My second main chapter is an examination of his Christology. This is a doctrine which dominated theological interest and generated much literature in the earlier years of the twentieth century. Rashdall's position in this discussion has been shown to be much more complex than his clearly defined stance on the Atonement.

Rashdall entered fully into the discussions concerning the Jesus of the Gospels, as well as the credal statements on the divinity of Christ. He expressed general support of the idea that the term 'divinity' may be used in relation to humanity whose potential likeness to God is being realised. He is, however, cautious in his statements, which are carefully worded. This can be attributed partly to his own struggles in reaching a final position, which are preserved for us in the correspondence dating from the latest years of his life.

Rashdall's doctrine of the Trinity, on which he wrote repeatedly, has been reviewed as a central part of his doctrinal structure of Christology. It is an essential part of his argument that the interpretation of the term 'person' is to be found, not in the modern sense of a being with its own centre of consciousness, but as a 'persona' – *una mens* – which he explicates in terms of power, wisdom and love. Among Church authorities, he refers to Thomas Aquinas and Augustine as exponents of similar theories.

The Girton Conference of Modern Churchmen has been discussed in detail, since it was the peak of his public career, and his lecture provides us with a short synthesis of his Christology.

Of the events following the Conference, I have reviewed the reactions published in the national press, especially correspondence from Gore. I have noted the mainly supportive articles in the Modern Churchman. The challenges to his ecclesiastical position organised by opponents and the diplomatic solution of Archbishop Davidson, upholding the right of Churchmen in Conference to discuss the subject have been followed. This signalled that the doctrine outlined by Rashdall was tolerated, as part of a legitimate discussion.

The correspondence of Rashdall to Gore, his 'Plain Words,' published in the Modern Churchman, have been reviewed, since they show in some detail Rashdall's persistent defence of his position against his most relentless opponent.

Unpublished manuscripts have been used from the Bodleian Library to illustrate the differing reactions of widespread and diverse correspondents to his Lecture. Letters from Bishops and other Churchmen underline the importance to the Church hierarchy of Rashdall's speech, especially in view of the national participation made possible by an expansion of public education and a correspondingly better-equipped Press.

Access to his late correspondence has been afforded by unpublished documents at the Bodleian Library and New College copies.

Rashdall's Christology synthesises much of the reflection and discussion taking place during his life-time. It was developed against vigorous polemic, though simultaneously attracting support. I have remarked on his frequent ambiguity, but have concluded that his 'degree theology' shared with other Modernists, and his more forthright statements on Christology, made, though with characteristic reservations, in the last years of his life, lead to the conclusion that, for him, divinity was not synonymous with deity.

My third main chapter is an exegesis of Rashdall's theology of the Church. Though less prominent in his work than his doctrines of Atonement and Christology, his ecclesiastical writings provide an additional source of information, a background to his professional activity. His writings in this sphere are closely related to and consistent with his position as a liberal theologian. This is, however, accompanied by the paradox mentioned above, that, while dismissive, in his expositions, of matters concerning the intangible and affective in contrast to the cognitive, he was sensitive to the aesthetic quality of Anglican worship.

Rashdall entered readily into the debates on the Ministry of the Church. I have reviewed his participation in the discussions on the nature of the Church by scholars of a previous generation. Lightfoot, an earlier exponent of the origin of the priesthood, moderate, yet analytical and radical in his views on the 'three-fold ministry,' has been discussed. As the ordaining Bishop, he was particularly influential in Rashdall's life.

E. Hatch, writing on the 'Organisation of the Early Church,' has been referred to as an important liberal exponent.

In this chapter, the central question of the validity and significance of the Apostolic Succession has been considered in relation to Rashdall's theology, as he entered into the debate on orders; a debate which posed the fundamental question of whether Christ founded a Church. I have reviewed the defence of the theory of Apostolic Succession by Gore and Moberly in major works, and Rashdall's mistrust of it - set forth in detailed, scholarly historical exposition, - on the grounds of insufficient evidence. Although he insisted that the Church must be 'visible,' his concept was of a body morally rather than mystically effective. We have seen that, consistently, he adopted a positive attitude to the ecumenical conference at Kikuyu in 1913.

The theology of the ministry is closely connected with sacramental doctrine.

During Rashdall's early career, the Anglican Church had made representations to the Pope concerning its claim to Apostolic Succession, which, as noted above, had been declared invalid. We have seen that, in the discussion, which centred round the Eucharist, the Archbishops' reply concerning the eucharistic sacrifice was ambiguous.

In this chapter, I surveyed in more detail, Rashdall's sacramental teaching in an ecclesiastical context: on the two sacraments recognised by the thirty-nine Articles, namely Baptism and Eucharist; and his comments on the practice, or (from a more catholic angle) sacrament of 'binding and loosing.'

On Baptism, his interpretation is clear and well argued. Rejecting the more mechanical view of 'baptismal regeneration' he uses characteristic antitheses to support his case that the rite of Baptism witnesses to the occasion rather than functioning '*ex opere operato*.' Appositely, he emphasises the reality of challenge in the early Church for candidates in a pagan world, and at the same time stresses the educational role of the Church.

A background of Eucharistic theology in the early twentieth century was the undeniable fact of the Pope's rejection of Anglican orders. The discussions reported

above have highlighted the difficulties of summarising the varieties of interpretation of the nature of the Eucharist in the Anglican Church. Rashdall's interest in the meaning of sacrifice in ancient times has been found relevant to his understanding of the Eucharist, as well as to his atonement doctrine. Consistently, in both contexts, he refutes the idea of an objectively operating action of forgiveness by the expiatory death of a victim. Rashdall thus denies the substitutionary doctrine, whether in relation to the death of Christ as a historic event, or applied to an extended, eucharistic action.

He does, however, wish to emphasise the importance of visible symbols, in which he sees potential value, not only in recalling past events but in their present effect. He refers to the Eucharist as a family meal, at which attendance signifies membership; and, in general, he interprets biblical references in a moral and figurative sense. This is consonant, negatively, with his denials of the Eucharist as culturally enacted death sacrifice, and, positively, with his emphasis on the importance of the meal in ancient sacrifice. I have suggested that he has not drawn out that element expounded by Loisy (of whom he was an admirer) in the latter's perception of the Last Supper as an eschatological meal. But, in any case, he did not have time to develop all aspects of his teaching.

Rashdall in referring to 'binding and loosing' as 'that other great function of the Church,' did not interpret it as sacramental confession and absolution, and certainly not as a license to excommunicate. Identifying its origin in the context of the Jewish law-courts, he held that it applied to acts rather than people. As to the Church's ability to make judgment, he considered this impossible, since laws, like society, change with the culture. Thus, the aim of society should be the ethical ideal advocated in the Gospels, which cannot be closely defined. It has been noted that Rashdall was speaking against the background of the 1878 ecclesiastical Conference, which had striven to interpret the BCP reference to absolution; and, at a later stage, in the context of teaching in theological Colleges.

It has been reflected that, while Rashdall was not greatly interested in ritual (the discussion of which, he feared, might be used to cloak attacks on the freedom of speech of liberal clergy), he had an appreciation of the spiritual value of the visible symbol and an ordered liturgy.

Rashdall's writings on the functioning and role of the Church included a wide range of other topics, which have been surveyed. His liberal view of the Ministry led

to an active role in the promotion of ecumenism, practised in his role as Dean. His early debate with Sidgwick on clerical subscription displayed his pragmatic attitude to the foundation documents, though his stance required a delicately balanced assessment of the issue. His judgment that Disestablishment of the National Church would be harmful was, similarly, an empirical conclusion. It was closely connected with his view that religious education should have a place in state schools, in preference to the secular alternative.

Rashdall's theology of the Church therefore covers a wide variety of contemporary debates. In the course of discussing these, I have continued to draw on archive material, notably, in this Chapter, on documents at Pusey House and New College.

Unlike his doctrine of Atonement and Christology, his ecclesiastical views sometimes involved action, and required compromise. In these ambiguous situations, Rashdall is seen as a church politician. Where, however, a doctrinal matter was concerned, his position was consistent with his established convictions.

My last main chapter, a survey of Rashdall's doctrine of Immortality, included, as illustrations, further extracts from unpublished sermons. Rashdall's discussion was reviewed in relation to the following topics: - (i) the resurrection accounts in the NT; (ii) the nature of the after-life; (iii) the fundamental credibility of survival after death. In this last area of debate, he encountered not only philosophers, but scientists and others – displaying his width of interest and ability to communicate with scholars on a wide variety of subjects.

- (i) I have reported his writings on the view that belief in life after death is not dependent on the Gospel accounts of the resurrection of Jesus. It was noted that the liberal scholar, Westcott, as well as Stone, from an Anglo-Catholic position, believed the Gospel accounts were reliable, and that the Easter event, as described, was a major reason for belief in immortality. Other scholars, however, of whom Kirsopp Lake and Streeter are examples, doubted a physical resurrection of Jesus. Of the Empty Tomb Lake was doubtful; Streeter believed it was empty, but for other reasons. Rashdall, reviewing Streeter, did not disagree with him on this point. It was confirmed that Rashdall himself did not consider the evidence for a physical resurrection convincing.

- (ii) Next I considered Rashdall's writings on the nature of immortality against the background of the beliefs of contemporary theologians. A fundamental point of debate was whether any was condemned to the fire of hell as cited in the Gospels; and, if so, whether their torment was temporary, unending, or terminated by destruction. Farrar, it was noted, had written on the subject as early as 1878. In his Eternal Hope, he categorised the possible positions under four headings: universalism (all are saved); annihilationism (the wicked are finally destroyed); Purgatory (purification); and the 'common' view, that, at death, judgment is final – this involving endless torment for the condemned majority. Rashdall had reached much the same conclusion as his predecessor – the hypothesis of a modified purgatory. This Rashdall sometimes expounded in terms of a form of continued training; and heaven as an eschatological fulfilment. Accepting that we had no exact knowledge of the latter, he referred to it analogically as an unknown goal, but one by which humans could be motivated and inspired.

I have reviewed Rashdall's detailed analysis of Biblical passages on the meaning of everlasting fire. He regarded 'fire' as a metaphor for purification, and favoured the solution that 'everlasting' implied 'age-long,' that is: lasting for a limited time. This is to be taken in conjunction with the idea of final destruction of the wicked, who no longer suffer, as a possible hypothesis. I have referred to conversations with the Jewish scholar, Montefiore, who was a universalist. Rashdall, sympathetic to this position, could not, however, finally, with certainty, commit himself to it.

It has been noted that, in the period following the Girton Conference, Major, the future leader of the Modernists, challenged the credal phrase 'resurrection of the body.' Rashdall, at the time, was fully engaged. However, it has been shown, in this chapter, that he, too, did not accept the phrase literally.

- (iii) Finally, I have surveyed Rashdall's participation in the contemporary debate on the most fundamental question in any consideration of immortality: whether the belief in life after death is itself true or meaningless. When it is not treated dogmatically, this is a function of the enquiry concerning the surviving faculty. Identified as mind or consciousness in the discussions, is it dependent on the physical brain? For, if it is, there can be no post-mortem

survival. The controversy is essentially a variant of the philosophical mind/matter dispute. However, with the advance of research, and the loosening of Church restrictions on such enquiries, the question acquired an extra dimension. The ensuing dialogue was joined by scientists, philosophers and other scholars. The new situation was a challenge to theologians. Rashdall did not avoid the issue. Although, as we have seen, he was not a major contributor to the discussions, he had written detailed works on the mind/matter antithesis³ and continued to state firmly his position that the 'source of all things must be spiritual.' To the theory that individual personalities are finally assimilated into some final merged existence, Rashdall was not sympathetic.

In these three discussions he combined the skills of a textual critic with the synthesis of a systematic theologian and the special knowledge of a philosopher of religion.

Before concluding, I shall briefly consider and comment on some of the criticisms of theologians, both contemporary and later, of Rashdall's more important writings, those on Atonement and Christology.

1. Atonement.

(i) Gore.

Gore restates his position on the doctrine in The Reconstruction of Belief. Included in the second volume, Belief in Christ, of 1922,⁴ he comments on Rashdall's Idea of Atonement. After words of appreciation, he expounds his view that atonement is the basic doctrine of the NT. Referring to Rashdall, he says, 'But he labours in vain ... to dislodge (it) from its position Everything in the NT appears to depend on this initial sacrifice of atonement and propitiation.' Later, he reasons that 'anything not grounded in truth' could not have 'made such an appeal'

As has been noted before, this is the argument from emotional appeal often made by Rashdall's critics. But, as Rashdall pointed out to his correspondents, an emotional reaction does not prove the truth of a doctrine. Had Gore lived through the Second

³ Notably, 'Mind and Matter,' Lecture 1, Philosophy and Religion (London:Duckworth: 1909 & 1914).

⁴ Gore, Reconstruction; Belief in Christ, pp. 589ff.

World War, he would have witnessed (to take an extreme example) the emotional appeal of fascist ideology to its audience.

Gore continues with the further sweeping remark, ‘The instinct which welcomes it ... has its roots in the various theologies of almost every non-Christian tradition.’ This bald statement is incautious. (He is not an expert on world religions.)

Although claiming that he believes with Rashdall in ‘vicarious suffering,’ not ‘vicarious punishment,’ he argues in terms not only of propitiation but of expiation. His alternative thesis lacks clarity.

Gore has an appendix, ‘Note A. Dr. Rashdall’s “Idea of the Atonement in Christian theology”.’⁵ In this he complains that Rashdall is ‘arbitrary’ in ‘denying that the tradition is due to our Lord’s own teaching.’ This is inadequate. Rashdall gives a detailed exposition of his source texts; his view that the atonement tradition was based, not only on the Hebrew scriptures, but on other contemporary writings, cannot be refuted in one or two sentences; certainly not with the claim that Isaiah 53 is the only passage which would suggest the doctrine at all obviously. Such a statement cannot be made without reference, at least, to the apparatus of OT study – and this Gore has not attempted to do. He has not even quoted any OT scholar, either Christian or Jewish, in support. This is, indeed, arbitrary.

His final point, - that Christ came ‘to inaugurate the New Israel,’ – does not show why, if this is so, it proves that a death sacrifice was necessary. He gives no information on Hebrew Messianic teaching to support an otherwise inexplicable assertion.

In this terse Note, Gore’s theological and Biblical exegesis lacks scholarly precision.

(ii) Ramsey.

Ramsey’s comments on Rashdall’s Atonement doctrine⁶ are informative, particularly his extended references to other theologians. Ramsey himself, while using the pejorative phrase ‘in vogue within the liberalism of the time’ (the first two decades of the twentieth century), of the ‘exemplarist’ theory, acknowledges that Rashdall’s Idea of Atonement is ‘the greatest work’ of that ‘type.’ But Ramsey is dismissive. He too

⁵ Ibid. pp. 599 f.

⁶ Ramsey, From Gore to Temple, pp. 53ff.

complains that Rashdall does not perceive the ‘religious need’ or ‘theological instinct’ satisfied by theories he criticises. What can be meant by ‘theological instinct’? Surely ‘instinct’ is a technical term with an exact meaning! In any case, the objection is a variation of Gore’s criticism and answered with the same response: feelings are not proof of the truth of a doctrine.

John Oman,⁷ described by Ramsey as ‘one of the most genuinely liberal theologians of the time,’ is quoted. In the passage selected, Oman complains, similarly, that Rashdall has missed the ‘spiritual need’ which Dale, Denney, Forsyth (a Congregationalist theologian), and Moberly – although failing to ‘put reality into the penal theory’ - have somehow satisfied. It seems, though, that Rashdall’s theory is regarded as indispensable, for ‘until his criticism is accepted a sound theology convincing by its own veracity is impossible.’ But Rashdall has fallen short – he is ‘untroubled’ at having ignored the ‘problem.’ This again is to suggest that the emotion aroused by a doctrine is the overriding consideration; more important than truth. The passage ends with the curious remark, ‘But when one compares him (Rashdall) with St. Paul, or even with Luther, one realizes how little he cares to live in the half-lights, and how all really creative souls have to live there all the time.’ It is difficult to see how Paul and Luther ‘lived in the half-lights,’ while Rashdall falls short, without further explanation. Oman’s reasoning is obscure, for his cryptic saying is not elucidated. Yet the passage is described by Ramsey as ‘the most penetrating comment on Rashdall that has ever been made,’ – a quixotic observation!

O. C. Quick. Who, then, in Ramsey’s view has succeeded in his presentation of the Atonement? His preference appears to be, as the review proceeds, for the treatment of the later theologian, Quick.⁸ The latter relies on the rhetoric of ‘both ... and’ ‘Thus, Christ is both the pure victim ... *and* the unholy scapegoat.’ ‘Again, ... the death that is penal is also sacrificial’ And so on. Why does Ramsey give the stamp of approval to this medley of models? Is he beguiled by the rhetoric? (Even Gore had rejected the theory of penal substitution.) His alternatives are not complementary; they are unwarranted. To Quick’s approach, Rashdall might well have replied with his firm ‘either ... or’ method of precise and demanding analysis.

⁷ Ramsey pp. 54-55. Quotes Oman’s passage in JTS, April 1921.

⁸ Ramsey, *ibid.* p. 57.

2. Christology.

Rashdall's treatment of this much more complex doctrine is complicated by the fact that he sometimes made paradoxical statements, especially when engaged in a phase of the 'subscription' debates as described in Chapter 4 - which continued into the twentieth century. Thus he would use a credal phrase, but not with the widely accepted meaning. This difficulty had not occurred with the doctrine of Atonement.

I shall again consider criticisms and comments; which demonstrate the wide spectrum of perception of his views.

The debates were centred on two points. One was Rashdall's understanding of a 'person' of the Trinity. The other was whether his 'degree theology' was tantamount to pantheism.

(i) The nature of the Trinity.

The conflicting views of the Trinity were fully recorded in Rashdall's 'Plain Words to Bishop Gore.' It is asked whether, in this exchange, he was right in claiming that he interpreted Augustine and Aquinas correctly. The matter has been addressed by a Dominican theologian, McNabb, in his From a Friar's Cell.⁹ Stephenson¹⁰ reports, 'It is interesting to note that Vincent McNabb, the head of the Oxford Dominicans, supported Rashdall's interpretation of Aquinas.' McNabb does, indeed, remark 'The Bishop does not ... seem as acquainted with the orthodox Trinitarian doctrine as does the Dean!' McNabb is amused that Rashdall accuses Gore of using phrases incorrectly. 'As the Modernists of the Church of England have been again and again charged with a disloyal use of theological phrases and ... of ecclesiastical formulae ... this last *tu quoque* of the Dean to the Bishop is a dialectic thrust to delight the onlooker! ... The Bishop does not seem as acquainted with the orthodox Trinitarian doctrine as does the Dean!' He further expounds: 'We are bound to say that the Dean's judgment seems, on the whole, more correct than the Bishop's when giving the doctrine of St. Thomas. It would be certainly tritheism to speak of *three minds*. Dean Rashdall has this idea in his mind without being able to bring the authority of St. Thomas in its support. We find this authority in the following words: 'To be

⁹ V. McNabb, Chapter 25. 'Bishop Gore, Dean Rashdall, and St. Thomas Aquinas.' From a Friar's Cell, (Oxford: Blackwell, 1923), pp. 225-235.

¹⁰ Stephenson, Rise and Decline, p. 128.

intelligent (i.e. to understand) belongs to God in the same way as it belongs to Him to be God.’¹¹

McNabb has subsequently added (highly technical) reservations about Rashdall’s definition of personality. But, in his account of the Gore-Rashdall exchanges, he has awarded the ‘imprimatur’ to Rashdall!

(ii) Incarnation.

Gore’s most basic criticism of Rashdall was that he, believing that ‘God and man are of one substance’ was a pantheist. In his Belief in Christ Gore returns to the matter. ‘The really root question is the question of what sort is the God in whom we believe?’¹²

Gore’s view was (according to Prestige)¹³ ‘...the Incarnation was being interpreted as only an exceptional instance of the general divine inspiration of mankind, and the doctrine of the Person of Christ was being undermined.’ This has all been discussed in my Chapter 3 above, in which I have noted Rashdall’s replies to Gore in the Press; in these he has refuted the conclusion that his incarnational theology is consistent with pantheism.

That modern critics are somewhat unclear in their understanding of Rashdall’s christological position is illustrated by the following interlocking series of comments. Stephenson says, in his Rise and Decline of Modernism:¹⁴ ‘A statement made by Bishop Stephen Neill, who seems to have swallowed Roger Lloyd whole, in The Truth of God Incarnate is the suggestion that Girton 1921 anticipated The Myth of God Incarnate. This is quite wrong. None of the men of Girton 1921 refused to believe that Jesus Christ was God incarnate.’

Why, with reference to Rashdall’s position (as one of the men of Girton), does Stephenson imply that Lloyd himself made the same judgment as the later Neill? It is true that Lloyd disapproved of Modernism, believing its approach too intellectual. However, of Rashdall himself he spoke appreciatively, stating¹⁵ that Rashdall believed the ‘Incarnation of Jesus was blessedly true ...’

¹¹ 1a. Qu.34 Art.2, ad.2.

¹² Reconstruction: Belief in Christ, pp. 466-67.

¹³ See Ramsey, Gore to Temple p. 185 n.1. Refers to Prestige pp. 455-456.

¹⁴ P. 120.

¹⁵ Lloyd, The Church of England, p. 97.

It must be concluded that Neill had not, as Stephenson supposes, ‘swallowed Lloyd whole.’ From my interpretation of Rashdall’s Christology, it may be judged that: Lloyd’s assessment of Rashdall; Stephenson’s reference to Lloyd; and Stephenson’s own conclusion, are mistaken.

In the diagrammatic form adopted by McNabb in his illustration of Aquinas’ perception of the Trinity, we may formulate the position (where A is the traditional Church view and B is Rashdall’s view as I have defined it): Stephenson says Neill, like Lloyd, holds that Rashdall believes B. (But he has misunderstood Lloyd.) Neill really does hold that Rashdall believes B. But Lloyd in fact, holds that Rashdall believes A. So does Stephenson. Thus Lloyd and Stephenson agree. But, if the conclusion I have maintained is right, they are both mistaken.

It is, further, relevant to quote the opinion of Anthony Quinton in his essay on ‘Thought’ in the Edwardian period.¹⁶ Speaking of Rashdall, he says, ‘The incarnation was seen rather as a case of man’s approaching as near as possible to being God, rather than of God’s literally taking on the body of a man.’

Ramsay’s conclusion is a variant of this: ‘With deep piety, he (Rashdall) found himself satisfied by an exclusively “symbolic” view of the Incarnation.’¹⁷

It is striking that interpretation of Rashdall’s Christology can vary so widely. If this implies ‘living in the half-lights,’ then Rashdall cannot be denied, from Oman’s epithet, a place with ‘all really creative souls!’

Taking in conjunction the two major doctrines considered here, it may be claimed that his originality is two-fold; for he lives in the ‘full-light’ (as we may express it) of a unified doctrine with the one, but ‘in the half-lights’ of a complex and elusive doctrine with the other.

Is Rashdall’s work outdated?

I have claimed that Rashdall’s theology is not (as is often thought) outdated, but is of lasting value.

As discussed in the Introduction of liberal theology generally, this may mean; either: have his ideas been accepted and assimilated ?; or have his ideas been found wanting, in a harsher, disillusioned post-war age, and discarded?

¹⁶ A. Quinton, ‘Thought’ in Nowell-Smith, *Ed. Eng.*, pp. 253-302, at p. 282.

¹⁷ Ramsey, *From Gore to Temple*, p. 67.

In answer to the first: as of liberal theology in general, so of Rashdall's application of it. His biblical criticism and questioning of received dogma no longer causes scandal. This is reflected in the outdatedness of his social interests, such as his support for women's education. Polemic is no longer necessary; for the case has been won.

Of the second, substantial question, it has been my purpose to show that the dismissive judgment often made of Rashdall's theology is short-sighted; that the areas of theology on which he expounded are of great interest in the present century.

Ramsay remarks in his Epilogue; 'Liberal Modernism has waned. Conservative Evangelicalism had a revival, partly aided by the craving for authoritarian security in the tempestuous post-war years.'¹⁸

Yet, although some parts of Rashdall's writings are ephemeral and Biblical scholarship has advanced, the questions he raised are still being asked.

The neo-conservatism referred to by Ramsay has not prevailed, unchallenged, to banish further probing of traditional doctrine. For the major questions concerning Atonement and Incarnation raised by Rashdall were discussed in numerous works of the second half of the twentieth century. In the last decade alone, one may cite, for example: K. Ward, A Vision to Pursue, 1991; J. Hick, The Metaphor of God Incarnate, 1993; M. Goulder, A Tale of two Missions, 1994; and P. Balham, The Contemporary Challenge of Modernist Theology, 1998.

Nor are Rashdall's writings on the theology of the Church and on immortality irrelevant in the twenty-first century. He was in the vanguard of the ecumenical movement. This has grown throughout the twentieth century, notably; to include, in Britain, discussions and increased cooperation with the Roman Catholic hierarchy. Rashdall's writing on the ministry is related to the developments of modern ecclesiastics. Whether the Apostolic Succession is a '*sine qua non*,' historically authenticated as an unbroken succession beyond all doubt, or whether it may be regarded, with more reserve, as of the *bene esse* of the Church: - all this is central to relations between the episcopal and non-episcopal churches.

In addition, ecumenism is now understood as a wider discussion, that is, with other monotheistic religions. The Society of Historical Theology in general, and Rashdall in particular, were fore-runners in this field.

¹⁸ Ibid. p. 169.

Rashdall's writings on immortality, though less expanded than his major research, explore an area of enquiry which, even in a secular society, is a perennial human interest. The nature of his belief, moreover, is not exclusively Christian, in that it is not dependent on his Christology, but rather on his theodicy.

Suggestions for further study.

It may be suggested that, because of the width of Rashdall's doctrinal interests, his theology provides a bridge between Christianity and other monotheistic religions, which is appropriate to the twenty-first century: a time when a wider ecumenism is actively promoted by Christian leaders.¹⁹

A field for further research is that of the theological communication between the Christian and Jewish communities. Already, informally, the study is pursued jointly. Rashdall's cooperation with Montefiore exemplifies the ecumenical conversation. Joint research remains to be done, for instance, on the doctrines of Atonement and sacrifice, between Christianity and liberal Judaism.

The claim that Rashdall is a first-class theologian may be confirmed. Dyson has 'awarded' this 'honour', primarily for Rashdall's skill in co-ordinating his 'theological and philosophical resources' to 'interact in a significant way.'²⁰ I have argued that, while his work is enhanced by his extensive background learning, it is when his more technical philosophy, based on personal idealism, is excluded, that his claim to greatness as a theologian is vindicated.

As I have emphasised, this theology evolved, not statically but dynamically, as he participated in the contemporary debates

Rashdall was not, ecclesiastically, an iconoclast for he appreciated and wished to retain, as far as possible, the phraseology of the Anglican liturgy and the customs of the 'visible' Church. But there were greater values than those of established authority. This is explicit when he speaks of Abelard's resolve that, though 'authority shall have its due weight, neither truth nor reason nor morality shall be sacrificed to it.'²¹ In contrast Luther 'blasphemed against God's gift of reason.'²²

¹⁹ E.g. *The Council of Christians and Jews*.

²⁰ Dyson, *Introduction to MM*, p. 7.

²¹ HR, *D and D*, p. 143.

²² HR, *Atonement*, p. 399.

Reason, thus, is a dominant note in his writings on Atonement. Justice, too is a divine attribute; Rashdall opposes theories which, like the substitutionary models, malign the justice of God. Of his many-faceted doctrine of Christology, an outstanding feature is his struggle, through thesis and antithesis, to a synthesis, in his search for truth. His doctrine of the theology of the Church is diverse, unstereotyped. His final emphasis, for a *bona fide* Church, is its witness of love. Rashdall's doctrine of immortality is determined by the conviction that all the qualities identified above manifest essentially and sufficiently what humanity may understand of the nature of God.

In an article on Edwardian thought, Anthony Quinton speaks of Rashdall as a leading yet original figure;²³ he says: 'With Rashdall modernism reached its lucid and reasonable consummation.'

It is this constellation of ideas - his belief in the integration of truth, justice and love in a rational universe - which is the presupposition of his characteristic theology.

²³ A. Quinton, 'Thought,' Ed. Eng. at p. 282.

Unpublished Primary Sources.

MS Sources.

- (i) Sermons and lectures of Rashdall at Pusey House Oxford.
- (ii) Correspondence from Rashdall at New College Oxford.
- (iii) Correspondence to Rashdall at the Bodleian Library

1. Pusey House.

Catalogued in Boxes.

These boxes are labelled: A, B, or simply Box, followed by a number.

The second number, in brackets, is my own, unofficial number, indicating position in the box at the time. Series B is mainly Lecture notes.

Atonement.

- A.1. (15) 'Raised for our Justification.' Easter 1887.
- A.2. (5) Good Friday 1895. Bethnal Green.
- A.3. (7) 'Forgiveness in God.' Les Avants 1903.
- A.4. (4) 'God was in Christ reconciling the world to Himself.' Hereford, 1911.

Christology.

- Box 4. (1) 'Sons of God.' 'Behold what manner of love the Father hath bestowed on us.' Aug. 1909.
- A.6. (19) 'Jesus increased in wisdom.' Carlisle, 1919.

The Church.

- Box 2. (18) No place or date given. Probably 1884-96. 'As my father hath sent me ...'
- A.4. (12) 'The Eucharistic Sacrifice.' 'To do good and to distribute forget not.' Undated. Probably 1911-13.
- A.5. (37) 'The Body of the Lord.' Carlisle, 1919.
- A.9. (32) 'Transubstantiation.' Carlisle, 2nd Dec. 1923

Immortality.

- Box 2. (19) 'The Hope of Immortality,' Durham, Easter 1888.
- Box 9. (2) 'and though after my skin worms destroy this body, yet in my flesh shall I see God.' (Job 19.26.)
- A.2. (20) 'Punishment Human and Divine' (Matt. 25.46.) 1899.
- B (3) (28) No date given. Probably HR's earlier, academic period.
- A.4. (10) 'The teaching of our Lord about the future Life.' (Matt. 8.11-12.) Hereford Cathedral 1912 and Carlisle Cathedral 1922.
- A.4. (25) 'Heaven.' (Rev. 21.4.) Hereford 1913 (and 1914?)

2. New College Archive.

Uncatalogued.

Taken from contemporary typescripts of the original.

Unless otherwise stated, the letters are from Rashdall to his mother.

22.5.1869 from Belmont, Dartmouth.

28.1.1872 from Dr. Butler's, Harrow.

18.10.1874 from Harrow as above.

23.6.1884 from University College Durham.

6.7.1887 from Durham as above.

5.2.1890 from Hertford College Oxford?

10.3.1897 from New College Oxford.

25.10.1903 from Jena.

12.11.1903 from Jena.

4.3.1904 from Unter den Linden, 59 A 111, Berlin.

27.3.1904 from Hotel Bellevue Neuchatel, Switzerland. HR to Webb.

30.4.1905 from New College Oxford.

5.10.1905 from 18 Queen's Gate, London S. W.

16.5.1907 from 18 Longwall, Oxford.

16.5.1908 from 18 Longwall, Oxford.

2.10.1909 from 'Oxford.'

20.3.1910 from The Residence, Hereford.

8.8.1910 from The Residence, Hereford. HR to Rowland.

1.6.1912 from 18 Longwall, Oxford.

25.6.1912 from 18 Longwall, Oxford.

10.9.1913 Canadian Pacific Service, Railway Atlantic Service, HMS Empress of Ireland.

30.5.1915 from 18 Longwall, Oxford.

27.10.1915 from The Close, Hereford.

31.1.1916 from New College Oxford. HR to Rowland.

14.1.1918 from The Deanery, Carlisle.

7.2.1918 from Banwell Tower, Newcastle upon Tyne.

23.2.1918 from The Deanery, Carlisle.

16.3.1920 from The Deanery, Carlisle. HR to Feltoe.

1.4.1920 from The Deanery, Carlisle. HR to Cruickshank.

16.10.1921 from the Deanery, Carlisle.

3. Bodleian Library.

Eng. Lett MS.

Earlier Years.

d.355.

ff.44-45, 31st Aug. 1883. Principal F. J. Jayne to HR.

c. 342.

ff.11-12, 17th March 1885.f.186, 19th Nov. 1888. Official of Hertford College to HR.

c.344.

ff.127-128, 1st Feb. 1897, Gore to HR.f.130, 2nd Feb. 1897, Fairbairn to HR.

c.345.

f.38, 30th Jan. 1898. Sidgwick to HR.

f.77, undated. Balfour to HR.

Atonement.

c. 349.

f.185, 17th Dec. 1919. Henson to HR.fs.202-203, 26th Dec. 1919. Montefiore to HR.

c. 350.

f.2, 2nd Jan. 1920. W. Temple to HR.f.5, 3rd Jan. 1920. W. Sanday to HR.f.9, 5th Jan. 1920. Phelps to HRf.11, 10th Jan. 1920. Mrs. Pember to HR.ff.43-44, Ripple Rectory, 15th March 1920. Feltoe to HR.Correspondence now available on www.hastingsrashdall.org.ukff.56-57, 30th March 1920. Cruickshank to HR.Correspondence available on www as above.ff.78-79, 9th June, 1920. Travors (-ers?) to HRf.110, 11th Dec. 1920. Feltoe to HRCorrespondence now available on www as above.

Christology.

c.350

- f.127, 25th Aug. 1921. H. H. Williams, Bish. of Carlisle to HR.
 f.129. 26th Aug. 1921. Gore to HR.
 f.137. 29th Aug. 1921. H. M. Burge, Bish. of Oxford to HR.
 ff.139-140. 30th Aug. 1921. H. H. Williams to HR.
 f.156. 10th Sept. 1921. G. B. (?) Rimes, Aldingham Rectory, to HR.
 f.171. 26th Sept. 1921. F. Leggatt to HR.
 ff.179-180. 8th Oct. 1921. C. Emmet to HR
 f.195. 27th Oct. 1921. B-B to HR.
 f.204. 31st Oct. 1921. B-B to HR.
 f. 205. 1st Nov. 1921. H. H. Henson, Bish. of Durham to HR.
 f.238. 22nd Dec. 1921. Fawkes to HR.
 ff. 241-2. 23rd Dec. 1921. J. A. Kempthorne, Bish. of Lichfield to HR.

d.362.

- f. 2 8th Jan. 1922. Glazebrook to HR.
 ff.18-19. 18th March. 1922. Bish. of Durham to HR.
 ff.23-24. 15th April. 1922. Ibid
 f. 2. 8th Jan. 1922. Glazebrook to HR.
 f.27. 24th April 1922. C. G. Lang, Archbish. of York to HR.
 f.28. 4th May 1922. G. K. Eden, Bish. of Wakefield to HR.
 f.26. 19th April 1922. N. Micklem to HR.
 ff.45-47. 15th Sept. 1922. Kingsbury to HR
 ff.33-37. July 1922. HR to Montefiore.
 ff.91-92. 7th June 1923. HR to Kingsbury.

Bibliography. Contemporary Writers.

- Bell, G., Randall Davidson Vol.1 (London: OUP, 1935).
- Bethune-Baker, J. M., The Faith of the Apostles' Creed (London: no publisher given, 1918).
- Burge, Resurrection (Oxford: Mowbray, 1922), pp.186-7.
- Campbell, R. J., The New Theology (London: Chapman & Hull, 1907).
- Denney, J., The Death of Christ (London: Tyndale, 1902). First revised 1951, by R. T. Task
- Doctrine in the C of E, Report of the Commission on Church Doctrine (London, SPCK, 1982), 1938 edition with a new introduction by G. Lampe, pp.ix-lx.
- Farrar, F. Eternal Hope (London: Macmillan 1878). Page references in the main text.
- Foakes-Jackson and Kirsopp Lake (eds), The Beginnings of Christianity, Part 1 Vol.1 (London: Macmillan, 1920).
- Gore, C., The Church and the Ministry (London: Longman, 1888).
- Gore, C., Lux Mundi (London: Murray, 1889).
- Gore, C., Orders and Unity (London: Murray, 1909).
- Gore, C., The Creed of the Christian (London: Hibbert, 1896).
- Gore, C., The Incarnation of the Son of God (London: Murray, 1891).
- Gore, C., The Reconstruction of Belief (London: Murray, 1921).
- Gore, C., Dissertations (London: Murray, 1895).
- Hatch, E., Bampton Lectures of 1880. Published as The Organisation of the Early Christian Churches, Oxford and Cambridge: Rivington's, 1881).
- Hunkis., J. W., Episcopal Ordination and Confirmation in relation to Our Formularies (Cambridge: Heffer, 1929).
- Illingworth, J. R. 'The Incarnation and Development,' in LM.
- Inge, W. R., Outspoken Essays (London: Longman, 1919.)
- James, W., Varieties of Religious Experience (USA, Longman, 1902).
- Jowett, B., Epistles of St. Paul (2nd ed. London: Murray, 1859).
- Lake, Kirsopp, Resurrection, (London: Williams and Norgate, 1907).
- Lightfoot, J. B., 'The Christian Ministry,' Commentary on Philippians (London: Macmillan, 1868).
- Major, H., English Modernism (Cambridge: CUP, 1927).
- Major, H., The Church's Creeds & Modern Man (London: Skeffington, no date), p.29.
- Matheson, P. E., The Life of Hastings Rashdall (OUP, 1928).
- Matthews (ed.) King's College Lectures on Immortality (London: ULU Press, 1920).

- Maurice, F. D., The Kingdom of Christ (3rd ed.) (London: Macmillan, 1883).
- McLeod Campbell, J., Nature of the Atonement (1st ed. Cambridge: Macmillan, 1856); used here, new ed. (Edinburgh: Handsel, 1996).
- McNabb, V., From a Friar's Cell (Oxford: Blackwell, 1923).
- Minton, Sam. (1820-1894), 'Canon Liddon on Immortality' or 'Unworthy of Eternal Life' (London: Elliot).
- Moberly, R. C., Ministerial Priesthood (London: Murray, 1897).
- Moberly, R. C., Atonement and Personality (London: 1901).
- Mozley, J. K., The Doctrine of the Atonement (London : Duckworth, 1915). Reprinted in 1923.
- Myers, F. W., Human Personality and its Survival of Death (London: Longman, 1903).
- Paget, F., 'Sacraments,' in LM.
- Prestige, G. L., The Life of Charles Gore (London: Heinemann, 1935).
- Pringle-Pattison, E. S., The Idea of God (Oxford: Clarendon, 1917).
- Pringle-Pattison, S., The Idea of Immortality (Oxford: Clarendon, 1922}.
- Relton, H. M., 'The Christian Contribution to the Conception of Eternal Life,' in Matthews (ed.), listed above.
- Sanday, W., Christologies Ancient & Modern (Oxford: Clarendon, 1910).
- Smeaton, Doctrine of the Atonement (Edinburgh: Clark, 1st ed. 1868, 2nd ed. 1870).
- Smith, H. M., Frank, Bishop of Zanzibar (London: SPCK, 1st ed. 1926 and 2nd ed., used here, 1928).
- Streeter, B. H., 'The Historic Christ,' in Foundations (London: Macmillan, 1912).
- Temple, W., Foundations (London: Macmillan, 1912).
- Weingart, R. E., The Logic of Divine Love (Oxford: Clarendon, 1970),.
- Westcott, B. F., The Gospel of the Resurrection (London and Cambridge: Macmillan, 1866).
- Weston, F., The One Christ (London: Longman, 1907).
- Saepius Nostro Officio, 19th Feb. 1897. Answer of the Archbishops of England and Wales to the Apostolic Letter of Pope Leo (*Apostolicae Curae*) on English Ordinations (Longman: London, 1897).

Books by Rashdall.

Christus in Ecclesia (Edinburgh: Clark, 1904).

Doctrine and Development (London: Methuen, 1898).

God and Man (works selected by Major and Cross, Oxford; Blackwell, 1930).

Ideas and Ideals (works selected by Major and Cross, Oxford; Blackwell, 1928).

Jesus Human and Divine (London and New York; Melrose, 1922).

Philosophy and Religion (London: Duckworth, 1914).

Principles and Precepts (works selected by Major and Cross, Oxford: Blackwell, 1927).

The Idea of Atonement in Christian Theology (London: Macmillan, 1st ed. 1919. Reprinted, 1925).

Book to which Rashdall contributed.

Contentio Veritatis (London: Murray, 1st ed. 1902, 3rd ed. 1916).

Books for the Girton Conference 1921.

1. T. R. Glover, The Jesus of History (London: SCM, 1917).
2. W. Sanday, Outlines of the Life of Christ (Edinburgh: Clark, 1905).
3. C. Anderson Scott, Dominus Noster (Cambridge: Heffer, 1918).
4. B. Latham, Pastor Pastorum (Cambridge: CUP: 1854).
5. K. Lake, Landmarks of Early Christianity (London: Macmillan, 1920).
6. N. Micklem, The Galilean (London: J. Clarke, 1920).
7. R. E. Speer, The Principles of Jesus, (New York etc: [Fleming, R. Revell?] 1920).
8. G. R. H. Shafto, The School of Jesus (London: SCM, 1920).
9. F. C. Conybeare, The Historical Christ (London: Watts, 1914).
10. Shirley Case, The Historicity of Jesus (Clark, Chicago, 1912).
11. A. Schweitzer, The Quest of the Historical Jesus (London: A. C. Black), 1910.
12. A. Harnack, What is Christianity? (London: Clark: ET, 1922; 1st ed. of ET, 1904).
13. Richard Roberts, The Jesus of Poets & Prophets (London: SCM), 1919.

Contemporary Journals including Rashdall's Contributions.

Church Quarterly Review, Anonymous (C. Gore?), Article on Hatch. Vol.12 (July 1881) 409-452.

HR, Reviews from 'Personality in Recent Philosophy,' Vol.90 (April 1920), 19-50.
Reference here to:

The Philosophy of Plotinus by W. R. Inge

Outspoken Essays by W. R. Inge

The Idea of God by A. Seth Pringle-Pattison

Contemporary Review of Theology and Philosophy, HR, 'Our Unhappy Divisions,' 81, (1902), 141-143.

Economic Review, HR, 'Is the Christian necessarily a Socialist?' no.18 (1908), 315-336.

Hibbert Journal, Stout, F., 'Human Personality and its Survival of Bodily Death,' Vol.2, (Oct.1903), 44-64.

Hazell, W. E., 'Present Aspects of the Problem of Immortality,' Vol.3 (Oct. 1904), 170-171.

HR, 'a Grave Peril to the Liberty of Chuchmen,' Vol. 5 (Jan. 1907), 343-360.

HR, Review of The New Theology, Vol.5 (July 1907), 921-928.

Mascoll, H., 'What and where is the soul? Vol.6 (Oct. 1907), 158-170.

Roberts, R., 'Jesus or Christ?' Vol.7 (Jan. 1909), 352-369.

Chesterton, G. K. and Moulton, J. H., 'Jesus or Christ? A reply to Mr. Roberts,' Vol.7 (July 1909), 746-766.

Roberts, R., 'Jesus or Christ? A Rejoinder, Vol.8 (Oct. 1909), 83-101.

Tuker, M. A. R., 'The Words of Institution at the Last Supper,' Vol. 9, (Oct. 1910), 134-145).

HR, Review of Foundations, Vol.11 (April 1913) 668-686.

Lodge, O., 'Ether, Matter and the Soul,' Vol.17 (Jan. 1919), 252-260.

Mackintosh, H. R., Review of HR's Atonement, Vol.18 (April 1920), 607-613.

HJS 1909.

Editor, 'Jesus or Christ?'

Tyrrell, G., 'Jesus or Christ,' 5-16.

Gardner, P., 'Jesus or Christ?', 45-58.

Lodge, O., Id. 116-121.

Campbell, R. J., Id.. 180-192.

Carpenter, Eslin., Id. 225-247.

Independent Review,

Sanday, W., 'The Obligation of the Creeds,' Independent Review, Vol.1 (Oct. 1903), 92-114.

HR, 'The Creeds and the Clergy. A Reply to Dr. Sanday,' Vol.2 (Feb. 1904), 48-65.

International Journal of Ethics,

HR, 1.'The Theory of Punishment,' Vol.2 (Oct. 1891), 20-31. 2. Discussion: 'Mr. Bradley on Punishment,' Vol.5 (1894-5), 241-43. 3. 'The Ethics of Forgiveness,' Vol.10 (1900), 193-206.

Sidgwick, H., 'The Ethics of Religious Conformity,' Vol.6 (April 1896), 273-290.

HR, 'Professor Sidgwick on the Ethics of Religious Conformity. A reply,' Vol.7 (Jan. 1897), 137-168.

Jewish Chronicle, Montefiore, C., Second War Lecture (30th March 1917), 14, 17, 18.

Journal of Theological Studies, HR, 'Doctor Moberly's Theory of the Atonement,' Vol.3 (1902), 178-211.

Liberal Churchman, HR? (unsigned), 'Dr. Gore and the Creeds,' 1.2, No.1 (Nov. 1904), 57-62.

HR, 'A Plea for Undenominationalism,' No. 11 (July 1906), 93-117.

Mind,

HR, 'The Varieties of Religious Experience,' Review of James' book. NS.10 (1903), 245-250.

PP, 'The Idea of God: A Reply to Some Criticisms,' NS. 28 (1919), 1-18.

Modern Churchman, Vol.4

HR, 'On Christ's teaching about Future Reward and Punishment,' (April 1914), 18-30.

HR, 'The Creeds' (July 1914), 204-214.

HR., 'Episcopacy and the Apostolic Succession.'

May 1914, 74-78.

June 1914, 146-157.

Aug. 1914, 251-263.

4. Sept. 1914, 318-328.

5. Oct. 1914, 371-383.

Lake, K., 'The Resurrection of the Flesh and the Resurrection of the Lord,' (April 1914), 31-37.

Vol.11

Glazebrook, M. G., 'Truth and the Creeds' (June 1921), 97-106.

This Volume gives the texts of papers at the Girton Conference of Sept.1921.

Cited here:

Major, H. D., Editorial, 193-200.

Glazebrook, M. G., 'Christ and the Creeds,' 201-213.

Bethune-Baker, J. F., 'Jesus both Human and Divine,' 287-301.

Foakes-Jackson, F. J., 'Christ and the Creeds,' 228-236.

Major, H. G., 'Jesus the Son of God,' 270-277.

HR, 'Some Plain Words to Dr. Gore,' 1 Vol.11 (Sept. 1921) 469-480.

Vol.12

'Some Plain Words ...,' 2 Vol.12 (April 1922) 5-28.

'Some Plain Words ...,' 3 Vol.12 (June 1922) 196-213.

Oxford Magazine, Webb, C. C. (27.2.1920), 251. Review of HR, Atonement.

Proceedings of the Society of Historical Theology (1891-1909). Bod. Private Circulation.

(1891-92), 5-11; (1903-04), 5-38; (1908-09) 37-38 and 42-45.

Theology,

Snowden, P. L., 'Dr. Rashdall's theory of the Atonement,' Vol.4 (Jan.1922) 30-41.

Boden-Worsley, J. F. W., 'The Girton Conference of 1921,' Vol.41 (Sept. 1940) 151- 159.

Contemporary Newspapers including Rashdall's Articles.

Carlisle Journal

(24.9.1917), 'The Dean and the Hope of Immortality - Memorial Service in the Park,' p.2.

Church Times

(19. 8.1921), HR, 'An Explanation by the Dean of Carlisle,' p.159.

Ibid. Leader Writer, p.164-5.

Ibid. Gore, Letter, p.163.

(26.8.1921), HR to Gore, p.186.

(2.9.1921), Gore, p.206.

Guardian

(13.2.1920), p.170.

(12.8.1921), p.569. Report of Glazebrook's Speech,

(19.8.21), pp.577, 585-6. Reports of Conference.

(2.9.1921), p.612. Further Reports of the Conference..

Times

(31.3.1899), p.5, HR

(15.11.1902), p.102, HR? ('Another Presbyter')..

(26.4.1906), p.12; concerning religious education, HR.

(2. 9.1908), 'Home Reunion and the Apostolic Succession,' p.6, HR.

(18. 9.1908), 'Home Reunion,' p.3, HR.

(3.10.1908), 'Home Reunion,' p.7, HR.

Bibliography: Modern Published Works.

Books.

- Bell, G. K. A., Randall Davidson, II (1st ed., OUP: 1935; 3rd ed., OUP: 1952).
- Chadwick, O. The Victorian Church, Part II (London: Black, 1970).
- Hinchliff, P., 'Religious Issues,' The History of the University of Oxford, Vol. 7. (Oxford: Clarendon, 2000), pp. 97-112.
- Kaye, E., Mansfield College, Oxford: its Origin, History and Significance (Oxford: OUP, 1996).
- Lampe, G., in Doctrine in the C.of E (London: SPCK, 1982). Report of the Commission on Church Doctrine; 1938 ed., with a new introduction by G. Lampe, pp. ix-lx.
- Langford, T., In Search of Foundations (New York: Abingdon Press, 1969).
- Lloyd, R., The Church of England, 1900-1963 (London: SCM, 1966).
- Macquarrie, J., Jesus Christ in Modern Thought (SCM, 1990).
- Marenbon, J., The Philosophy of Abelard (Cambridge: CUP, 1997).
- Neville, G., Radical Churchman Edward Lee Hicks and the New Liberalism (Oxford: Clarendon, 1998).
- Nowell-Smith, S., (ed.), Edwardian England 1901-1914 (OUP: 1964).
- Briggs, A., 'The Political Scene,' pp. 45-102.
- Laski, M., 'The Domestic Scene,' pp.141-212.
- Ubbelohde, A. R., 'Scientific,' pp.215-250.
- Quinton, A., 'Thought,' pp.253-302.
- Ramsey, A. M., From Gore to Temple (London: Longman 1959).
- Stephenson, A. M. G., Anglicanism and the Lambeth Conference (London: SPCK, 1978).
- Stevenson, A. M. G., The Rise and Fall of English Modernism (London: SPCK, 1984).
- Sykes, N., Old Priest and New Presbyter (Cambridge: CUP, 1957).