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

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

THE

CHURCHMAN

MAY, 1890.

ART. I.—THE REFORM OF CONVOCATION.

IT is a remark not unfrequently made, when a proposal is put forward for entrusting some further powers or functions to Convocation, that such a proposal would be admirable if Convocation were a body truly representative of the Church, but that the idea cannot for a moment be entertained while its present constitution remains. We do not, however, observe that the holders of this opinion take any active steps for the reform of the body with whose composition they find fault. Its present functions are, in their opinion, too inconsiderable to justify the labour of doing so. And thus Convocation is involved in a vicious circle. Its powers remain insignificant on account of its unreformed constitution; and its constitution remains unreformed on account of the insignificance of its powers.

In the preceding remarks the common parlance has been adopted of using the word Convocation in the singular. This usage will, for convenience' sake, be for the most part retained throughout the discussion of the question. But it must of course be borne in mind that each Province has its distinct Convocation, and the constitution of the two bodies is not exactly the same. In both the Upper House is composed of the Archbishop and Bishops holding sees within the Province. But the Lower House of the Canterbury Convocation consists of 161 members, of whom 113, or seven-tenths of the whole number, owe their seats directly or indirectly to the nomination of the Crown or a Bishop; while the remaining 48, or three-tenths of the House, are elected as the proctors or representatives of the clergy of the Province. The first-mentioned number of 113 is composed of 24 Deans (of whom the 4 in Wales are each nominated by the Bishop of the diocese and the remaining 20 by the Crown); the

Provost of Eton, a nominee of the Crown; 64 Archdeacons, appointed by the Bishops in whose dioceses they officiate; and 24 proctors, elected by the Cathedral Chapters, the members of which have attained their position through royal or episcopal nomination. Of the 48 proctors for the clergy, two are elected by the beneficed clergy in each of the 24 dioceses of the Province.

On the other hand, the Lower House of the Northern Convocation consists of 77 members, 36 of whom, or not quite one-half of the whole number, are indebted for their seats either directly to royal or episcopal nomination, or else to the suffrages of persons who are themselves nominees of the Crown or a Bishop. The number is made up of 6 Deans, 21 Archdeacons, 7 proctors for the cathedral chapters and 2 proctors for the officialty of the Chapter of Durham. The remaining 41 members consist of 2 proctors elected by the beneficed clergy in each of the archdeaconries except that of Man, and of 1 proctor for the Diocese of Sodor and Man, which is coterminous with the Archdeaconry of Man. It appears, therefore, that the beneficed parochial clergy are better represented in the Northern Convocation than in the Southern. But the unbeneficed clergy have no representation in either; and in other respects the two bodies stand on the same footing. Their origin, history and constitutional status are practically identical. What is said of one may be said *mutatis mutandis* of the other. It will, therefore, be convenient to concentrate our attention mainly upon the Southern Convocation, and to it the following observations must be understood as primarily directed, unless the Convocation of York is specially mentioned. They will, however, be for the most part equally applicable to the Northern body.

By the terms of the writ which has from the earliest times been issued for convening it, Convocation is supposed to be an assembly, by representation or procuration, of the whole body of clergy in the Province. It is evident that as at present composed it is nothing of the sort. Thousands of the clergy are not in any way represented in it, and the representation of the beneficed parochial clergy, amounting in number to thousands more, is grossly inadequate when compared with those who may be called the official members of Convocation. Were there to be an amalgamation of the Northern and Southern bodies as at present constituted, it would be difficult to recognise in the united body that national synod with reference to which the 139th of the canons of 1603 declares that "Whosoever shall hereafter affirm that the sacred synod of this nation, in the name of Christ and by the King's authority assembled, is not the true Church of England by representation, let him be excommunicated and not restored until he repent and publicly revoke that

his wicked error." The problem before us is the mode of remedying this objectionable state of things.

It is not intended in the present article to enter upon the question of the introduction of a lay element into Convocation. More than four years have elapsed since a House of Laymen was first constituted in the Southern Province to deliberate and advise concurrently with Convocation. But it is a purely informal body, and has no legal or constitutional *status*. According to the present theory of Church government in England, the laity of the Church take part in it through the action of the Crown and Parliament. There is much to be said in favour of an alteration in this respect; but it would involve a radical change in the relations of Church and State, and the present is not the occasion for its discussion. Convocation has always been essentially a clerical assembly, and to deprive it of this characteristic would be, not to reform it, but to substitute a new body in its place. By the Reform of Convocation, therefore, in the present article, is meant such an alteration in the composition of the Lower House, and in the electorate who send proctors to it, as will secure in that House a fair and adequate representation of the clergy of the Province.

There are probably many persons who are under the impression that this would be a very simple matter, which could be no sooner said than done if there were a hearty desire for it. They imagine that the main obstacle to it lies in a disinclination on the part of Convocation to submit to the process of reform. This is an entirely mistaken idea. The real hindrance lies in the inherent difficulties of the question itself. The sittings of Convocation—after having been in abeyance for nearly a century and a half—were resumed in 1852; and since then repeated efforts have been made to deal with the subject. In 1855 a case upon it was submitted to Sir Richard Bethell (afterwards Lord Westbury), and Dr. (afterwards Sir Robert) Phillimore. In 1865, and again in 1868, Convocation presented an address to the Queen, praying for license to make a constitution, or canon, altering the composition of the Lower House. In 1866 that House appointed a committee to report on and advance the matter; and committees on the subject have been sitting since that time, and have issued no fewer than four reports. The last of these was presented to the Lower House in July, 1885. The Archbishop of Canterbury, in his address at the opening of the House of Laymen in February, 1886, pointed out to the newly-formed body that the urgent need for a reform of Convocation was not only patent to all, but had long been emphatically affirmed by Convocation itself. "The proper manner of reform," he added, "has received the careful study of great authorities, legal and

ecclesiastical, and the latest report on that subject is worthy of your own attention. The next step in the procedure is all-important, and is one of the points on which your opinion would be of great value." It was not until last year that the House of Laymen took up the subject, and they then appointed a committee to consider it. This committee reported to the House in February of the present year that they did not consider it expedient that further action in the matter should be taken at present. The House, however, was, not unnaturally, somewhat dissatisfied at this rather impotent conclusion, and referred the question back again to the committee, who are now charged with its reconsideration.

What, it may be asked, is the reason of all this difficulty and delay? If Convocation were unwilling to be reformed it would be intelligible. But with their evident eagerness on the subject, how is it to be accounted for? And, in particular, how are we to explain the extraordinary conclusion of the committee of the House of Laymen, which has the appearance of their being actually less zealous in the matter than the clergy themselves? The solution of the enigma is to be found in the peculiar constitutional position of Convocation, and the uncertainty which prevails as to what that position precisely is. For until this is defined, it is impossible to decide where the power to make the needed reform resides. There are four possible depositaries of it: (1) Convocation itself; (2) the Archbishop, as President of Convocation; (3) the Crown, by virtue of the Royal Supremacy; and (4) Parliament. The most natural and obvious conclusion would be that the reform of Convocation is the proper function of Convocation; but when the matter is regarded from a constitutional aspect this conclusion is seen to be open to grave doubts. The truth on the subject can only be ascertained by a careful historical inquiry, which is, unfortunately, beset by no little difficulty and uncertainty.

There can be no question that, to adopt the words of Lord Coleridge in his judgment in the case of *The Queen* v. *The Archbishop of York* (Law Reports, 20, Queen's Bench Div., 740, at p. 748), Convocation is "an ancient body, as old as Parliament and as independent." But when we attempt to trace the body further back than the period at which this assertion lands us, and to define more accurately its origin and early *status*, the investigation is involved in doubt and obscurity. This much, indeed, is clear, that, just as Parliament was evolved out of the Norman Great Council of the Realm, and this again out of the early English Witenagemote, so the two Convocations had their precursors in a series of synods of the Church of England, either national or provincial, held from the time of Archbishop Theodore in the seventh century onwards, and, in

fact, commencing with the Synod of Whitby, or Strenæshalch, as it was then called, in A.D. 664, four years before the consecration of that prelate. Lord Coke, in his description of Convocation ("Institutes," part iv., p. 322) evidently connects it with the very earliest period of our Church's history; though it is not very easy to understand what he means by saying that in "*Anno Domini* 686 Augustine assembled in council the Britain Bishops and held a great synod." Lord Coleridge, therefore, rather understated than overstated the case for the antiquity of Convocation when, in another part of the judgment already referred to, he said that "probably in some shape it is older than Parliament." At the same time, its modern form and time of meeting unquestionably dates from the same period as witnessed the final development of Parliament into its present shape—namely, the reigns of Edward I. and Edward II. Moreover, the main, if not the only, reason for the regular sessions, which were then initiated, of the two bodies, was identical. It was, in fact, nothing more nor less than the exigency of political finance. The knights of the shire and the burgesses of the towns were summoned to Parliament in order that the king might obtain the consent of the people, by their representatives, to the taxation which he desired to impose upon them. The clergy were required to attend in Convocation by their proctors, in order to vote subsidies out of the revenues of the Church. This they continued to do until 1664, when the practice was discontinued; and the clergy have thenceforth been taxed in common with the laity, although their right to tax themselves was at the time reserved.

So far we are on unassailable ground. But when we inquire whether Edward I. and his son created a new ecclesiastical assembly with the object of raising taxes from the clergy, or merely utilized for that purpose an existing body, we descend at once into an arena of doubt and conflict. The grounds for the former view are set forth in a Memorandum on the Representation of the Clergy in Convocation, drawn up by the Earl of Selborne, then Lord Chancellor, in January, 1881, as the result of an examination into the matter which he was requested to make at a conference between himself and Archbishop Tait and Mr. Gladstone. This memorandum is printed as a Supplement to the Fourth Report, presented in July, 1885, to the Lower House of the Canterbury Convocation by their committee on the election of proctors to Convocation. The latter view is stoutly maintained in the Report itself, in which the conclusions of the Memorandum are combated, and an endeavour is made to refute them.

Lord Selborne's position is shortly this: In the preceding ages of the Church of England, down to the thirteenth century,

no consent of the inferior clergy had ever been necessary to the validity of canons passed in provincial synods or councils. These assemblies might always have been, and in fact generally were, composed exclusively of Bishops, and if the Archbishop desired to be assisted at them by any other clergy, he could always make such selection as he pleased for that purpose. The attendance of proctors for the parochial clergy was, therefore, actually necessary only for the granting of subsidies and similar political matters. For that purpose it was introduced about the middle of the thirteenth century. But in 1293 Edward I. commenced to issue writs to all the Archbishops and Bishops, commanding each of them to attend Parliament, with his Dean and Archdeacons in person, and his cathedral chapter by one proctor, and the whole clergy of his diocese by two proctors, with a view to granting a subsidy. The clause in which this command was embodied was called the *Præmunientes* clause, from its opening word. The clergy resented the summons, on the ground that they could not be convened in this manner by the order of the King, or by any other authority than that of the Metropolitan of the Province. The struggle lasted for twenty-two years. It outlived the termination of Edward I.'s occupation of the throne, and was not ended until 1315, when his successor had entered upon the ninth year of his reign. Thenceforward, though the *Præmunientes* clause was retained in the writs summoning the Archbishops and Bishops to Parliament, it was tacitly allowed to become a dead letter; and, along with the Parliamentary writs, a writ was sent to each Archbishop commanding him to summon a convocation of the Bishops and clergy of his province to treat of and consent to a subsidy. The Archbishop thereupon issued his mandate to each Bishop of the Province, reciting the King's writ, and summoning the Bishop himself and his Dean and Archdeacons, and the whole body of his clergy, but adding a mode for the attendance of the inferior clergy by representation, similar to that prescribed by the *Præmunientes* clause in the Parliamentary writs. Lord Selborne considers this arrangement to have been a compromise between the King and the clergy. The issue of the Convocation writs was a concession to the clergy, by way of obviating the objections which they had made to attendance in Parliament under the King's order. Compliance with the writs was a concession to the King, in enabling his business to be done, which it had been impossible to transact in Parliament owing to the non-attendance of the clergy.

From that time onwards the Convocations became the recognised assemblies of the Church for transacting all ecclesiastical as well as secular business. And just as the Commons soon acquired the right to a voice in all State matters, in addition

to taxation, for the purpose of which alone they had been originally summoned to Parliament, so the proctors of the capitular and parochial clergy took part in all the ecclesiastical business which came before Convocation, and were not restricted to the sole question of subsidies. It is true that Convocation has, in the present day, nothing to do with subsidies, nor with any other secular matter. But this does not affect the mixed and semi-political character with which it was invested for all future time by the arrangement in the reign of Edward II.; and, in particular, the presence in it of the proctors for the capitular and parochial clergy continues to be incidental to its mixed and semi-political character. Consequently this representation could not be constitutionally varied by a mere ecclesiastical canon of Convocation.

This view is combated at some length by the Convocation Committee in the body of their Report. They maintain that proctors for the inferior clergy were summoned by the Archbishop to Convocation before the commencement, in 1293, of the struggle between the King and clergy, and those proctors not only dealt with the question of taxation, but also considered *gravamina* on ecclesiastical matters. They further assert that between the date of the arrangement in the ninth year of Edward II. and the passing of the Act for the Submission of the Clergy (25 Henry VIII., cap. 19) in 1534, besides the Convocations held under the mandate of the Archbishop issued in accordance with the King's writ, other Convocations were convened by the sole authority of the Archbishop, and that at these Convocations, no less than at the others, proctors for the inferior clergy were present, and took part in the business. These arguments do not appear to be conclusive. Early precedents cannot be implicitly relied on in a question of this kind. In the pre-Norman era neither our ecclesiastical nor our political assemblies had crystallized into that regular form which they afterwards assumed. The Witenagemotes were frequently attended by the ordinary thegns, and even by the ceorls of the particular neighbourhood in which they happened to meet. The presbyters of the locality, as thegns, would share in the privilege. And when their presence was permitted in the State Legislature along with its regular members—the Bishops, Abbots, and Priors, and the Earldomen and King's thegns—they would not be debarred from attending a Church council, if it happened to be held near their place of residence. It may be that after the Conquest their ecclesiastical right in this respect was lost, as was undoubtedly their secular privilege. But when in the reigns of John and Henry III. the practice of a representation of the Commons in the great Council of the realm began to be gradually, though fitfully, introduced, we cannot be surprised at

seeing, side by side with it, the habit growing up of the Archdeacons, or other proctors for the inferior clergy, attending the provincial synods of the Church. The only unquestionable basis of the existing representation of the presbyters of the Church in Convocation is the *Præmunientes* Clause, which was first inserted in the Parliamentary writs in 1293, and which, in respect of the details prescribed in it, was followed after 1315 in the composition of the assemblies convened in pursuance of the Convocation writs. The variation from it in the Northern Convocation of summoning two proctors for the parochial clergy from each archdeaconry, instead of from each diocese, is, of course, dwelt on by the Convocation Committee. But they have no explanation to offer for this variation as an alternative to Lord Selborne's suggestion that in the Province of York, where the number of dioceses was so small, it was adopted by the northern Primate, and permitted by the Crown, as a convenient, if not a necessary, modification of the method of representation prescribed by the *Præmunientes* Clause, and was not introduced in disregard or defiance of that clause. After 1315 the Convocations undoubtedly dealt with purely ecclesiastical matters, as well as with the granting of subsidies. But this fact cannot affect the question of their semi-political constitution.

It is, of course, conceded on all sides that Convocation could not make a canon for altering the representation of the clergy without the assent and license of the Crown. This assent and license is required to all canons and ordinances of Convocation by the Act for the Submission of the Clergy already referred to, which also declares that Convocation shall always be assembled by authority of the King's writ. But the same statute further contains a proviso that no canons shall be made or put in execution by authority of Convocation "which shall be contrariant or repugnant to the King's prerogative royal, or the customs, laws, or statutes of this realm." Lord Selborne sees in this enactment a further obstacle to the reform of Convocation by itself. No custom can be alleged in favour of Convocation altering its own constitution. Not a single instance of such a proceeding can be adduced. The one case which is sometimes brought forward as having occurred in 1279 is, on examination, found to be worthless as a precedent. This, however, is merely a negative argument. A positive and more serious objection is to be found in the fact that the present composition of Convocation has existed for something like 600 years, and therefore must, at the present time, be said to be, if anything is, a "custom of the realm." How, then, can a canon be lawfully made for changing it, in face of the express proviso of 25 Henry VIII., cap. 19? It can scarcely be argued that, in the teeth of this proviso, it would be

competent to Convocation to make a canon greatly restricting, or actually abolishing, the present representation of the parochial clergy. But if not, then it must be equally beyond their competence to make a canon enlarging the representation.

There is yet a further difficulty, which, perhaps, may be considered to be somewhat technical, but which, nevertheless, it would not be right to overlook. The Act for the Union of England and Scotland contemplates the maintenance *in statu quo* of the doctrine, worship, discipline, *and government* of the Church of England. An Act of Parliament can, of course, always be repealed by Parliament; but it cannot be lawfully set aside by any other authority. Consequently there are grounds for arguing that a change in the constitution of Convocation, being an alteration in the government of the Church, could not be made by Convocation without the authority of Parliament.

Possibly, if it rested with Convocation to take the initiative in the matter, that body, in spite of all these objections, might, so to speak, take the bit between its teeth and effect the desired reform, trusting that the step, when taken, would be acquiesced in, and be regarded as legal, or at any rate that the flaw, if any, in its legality would not lead to any serious practical mischief. But such a line of action is, of course, impossible. Whatever else is doubtful, it is perfectly clear that the royal assent and license must be granted before the reforming canon can be made. This assent and license will not be given except under the advice of the Ministers of the Crown; and in view of the grave doubts, to say the least, which, as has been shown, enshroud the legal aspect of the question, they have not seen their way in the past, and it is idle to expect that they will see their way in the future, to tender advice which would incur the risk of placing the Crown in the awkward and false position of having given its sanction to an unconstitutional and illegal proceeding.

The reform of Convocation by itself must, therefore, be regarded as, under present circumstances, impossible. It will be necessary to postpone until next month the consideration of the other instrumentalities by which the reform might conceivably be effected, as well as of the shape which it should take when it is actually entered upon.

PHILIP VERNON SMITH.

ART. II.—EXCLUSION OF THE CLERGY FROM THE HOUSE OF COMMONS.

IN the year 1801 a measure was brought into Parliament, to which there had previously been no parallel in English legislation.[1] It was proposed to annul the constitutional rights of fifteen thousand English gentlemen of education, capacity and character, and to place them on the same footing as aliens and felons—the only two classes who were by English law disqualified from sitting in the House of Commons.[2] What does the reader suppose to have been the ground on which this measure was defended? Some evidence of wide-spread treason, some astonishing display of bigotry, which shocked the national conscience? Nothing of the kind. It was simply the presence in the House of an obnoxious demagogue, who chanced to have been ordained in his youth, but who was about as fair a representative of the clergy as the Duke of York, the titular Bishop of Osnaburg, would have been of the English Episcopate!

I have no disposition to impugn the conduct of the Government in trying to rid the House of Horne Tooke. A more disreputable or mischievous man never entered it. It is hard to say whether his public or his private character was the more scandalous. If Addington's Ministry had simply brought in a Bill to declare him disqualified from sitting, it might have been an unwise measure, but it would at least have been an honest and defensible one. But they chose to take up the ground—which may have been widely, though certainly ignorantly, entertained—that the clergy were constitutionally ineligible for Parliament.

Again, I do not charge the promoters of the Bill with any wish to injure the clergy. The latter appear to have been quite

---

[1] It may be added, or in foreign legislation either. It is believed that in no other country in the world enjoying representative institutions does such a disability attach to the ministers of religion, as that which excludes the English clergy from Parliament. But see note, p. 405.

[2] I do not wish to be misunderstood. The clergy, aliens, and felons were the only three classes excluded *absolutely*. Other persons, no doubt, were excluded for not complying with the requirements for admission, as for not having the pecuniary qualification, or for refusing to take the required oaths. But this in every instance might be altered. A man might acquire his qualification, or conform to the Church, and so become eligible. This is what Lord Thurlow meant when he said that "the privilege of being chosen as a representative in Parliament was the birthright of every Englishman, though all Englishmen were not in possession of it." Even an alien might be naturalized, and a felon purge himself by fulfilling the term of his sentence. The clergyman alone is excluded irrevocably—*quâ* clergyman. It may be added that all the above impediments to entrance to the House have been removed by subsequent legislation, but the clergyman—*quâ* clergyman—is still ineligible.

indifferent to the measure. We hear of no remonstrances, no petitions to the House against it. There was, indeed, at that time, no inducement to them to enter Parliament. Their position was not assailed by anyone, their rights were not questioned, their property was not menaced. A Parliamentary career had no temptation for them. If anyone had brought in a Bill to prevent them from living in the Arctic regions, it could hardly have affected their equanimity less.

But the Bill was not creditable to the Government, and although they attained their object, the proceedings in Parliament were very damaging to them. They began with a simple attempt to expel Horne Tooke. On March 10th, Lord Temple moved that evidence should be taken as to whether Mr. Tooke had ever been ordained, and precedents should be searched for as to the eligibility of the clergy to sit in the House.[1] A committee was accordingly appointed, which reported on the 10th of April. It is not necessary to go into the details of their report, the particulars of which are elsewhere mentioned. But they afforded so slight a ground for declaring Tooke's election void, that Lord Temple's motion for "taking into consideration the return for Old Sarum" was lost by 93 to 53.

The Government were now in a serious difficulty. They must either make up their mind, like King Herod, to slay a host of innocents, in order to make sure of including their enemy among them, or they must endure his presence in Parliament. If the House had simply unseated Tooke, that might have been regarded as personal to him; and other clergymen, unless they, too, had violated all decency, might have retained their seats unchallenged. But that could not be now, and they presently resolved to release themselves from their *bête noir* by bringing in a bill to exclude from the Commons all clergymen.

They had a majority in the House, one of the comfortable majorities of those times, which adhered to its leaders without scruple in everything. Still, it must have been embarrassing, even to them, to have to vote that black was white, and again that it was black, several times in an evening; and the position was not improved by the extremely plain and trenchant language in which the leaders of the Opposition, Fox, Erskine, Grey and Sheridan, as well as Thurlow in the Lords, exposed their fallacies. It was clearly brought out (1) that the clergy had sat in the House without question in the times of the

[1] It is probable that during the seventeenth or eighteenth centuries very few clergymen entered Parliament. Considering the position they then occupied in society, little higher than that of menial servants, very few would possess the necessary qualification, and it would have been regarded as gross presumption if they had offered themselves for a constituency. Hence probably the vague notion that they were ineligible.

Edwards; (2) that there was no proof that they had not done so in those of Richard II. and the Henrys; (3) that although some clergymen had been expelled the House in subsequent generations, it was on the express grounds that those persons were members of Convocation, and a man could not sit in both Convocation and Parliament; (4) that in 1641 an Act was passed,[1] which stated that great mischiefs and scandals had arisen in Church and State from the Bishops *and clergy* sitting in Parliament, and disqualified them from sitting there in future; (5) that only sixteen years before (in 1784) the election of Rushworth, a clergyman, had been disputed, and the House had declared him duly elected; (6) that no law could be found in the statute book which declared a clergyman to be ineligible; (7) lastly, if the clergy were, as the Bill stated, disqualified, where was the need of a Bill to disqualify them ?[2]

It is curious to read the reasons urged in support of the measure. It was argued by Temple and others, (1) that although the right of self-taxation had been withdrawn from Convocation, it might be granted anew. Therefore the clergy were to be kept out of the House, because in that case they would *become* ineligible. He might as well have reasoned that no commoner ought to sit, because he might be made a peer, and so *his* presence in the House would become illegal. (2) That, if admitted, the clergy would exercise an influence at once so overwhelming and so injurious, that they would overturn everything that is valuable in the constitution! (3) that the consequence would be no less disastrous to the clergy, who would be *forced* to leave the plain and beaten road of religion, and wander into the crooked and uneven paths of politics—a doubtful compliment to the House this, one would think; (4) that although the clergy are, beyond dispute, the fittest persons of all to intervene in men's everyday affairs, they are the *un*fittest of all to intervene in their political affairs. How a man's everyday affairs are to be thus strongly marked off from his political

[1] This Act was repealed at the Restoration. Considering the circumstances under which it was passed and the short time during which it was in force, I have not thought that it could be accounted a precedent. But surely its repeal by a Constitutional Parliament is tantamount to a Parliamentary declaration that the clergy have a right to sit.

[2] It has been denied that the clergy always possessed the right of sitting in the Commons, and Coke and Blackstone have been quoted as upholding the opposite opinion. But Coke's language on other occasions is at variance with the passage in his writings which is generally cited; and Blackstone may have meant that the clergy were excluded as possible members of Convocation. On the other hand, two of the greatest of English lawyers, Bacon and Thurlow, declare them fully entitled to sit. Their opinion exactly accords with the principle on which members were originally summoned: "Hoc omnes tangit, omnes igitur sunt conveniendi" (Matth. of Paris).

affairs Lord Temple did not explain. (5) That if the clergy sat in Parliament there would be the greatest danger of their being corrupted by the Government, who would bribe them by offers of preferment. It does not seem to have occurred to the speaker that other M.P.'s were in like peril—that lawyers might be tempted by visions of judgeships, officers in the army and navy by the prospect of rapid promotion, country gentlemen by baronetcies and coronets; nay, that as it was, a good many livings were obtained by the clergy, if not by their own actual votes, at least by those of their friends.[1]

But at this point of the debate it probably occurred to Lord Temple that all he had thus far been saying bore as little reference as possible to the case of Mr. Horne Tooke, whom the Bill was expressly intended to eject. *He* was not likely to exercise an overwhelming influence in the House; *he* was well in the crooked paths of politics already; *he* was not likely to be tempted to leave the plain and beaten road of religion, seeing he had never walked in it; and lastly, he was not in danger of being bribed by offers of advancement in a profession which he had openly renounced. In fact, he might plead that he had given up his calling as a clergyman, and therefore the Bill, if passed, would not affect him. Temple therefore went on to say that although a clergyman might *try* to lay aside his calling, he could not do so. *His Orders were indelible.* This phrase seems to have been at once caught up, and became the *cheval de bataille* of the supporters of Government. Mr. Thorold Rogers seems disposed to believe that it had no existence previously to the debate; in plain English, that it was coined for the occasion. But however that may be, it was, at all events, a very strange and unsuitable subject for the House to discuss. Nor is it plain what they meant by it. If it was simply that a man, having made a vow to Almighty God, Almighty God alone could release him from it, that is doubtless true. The same is the case with the baptismal and confirmation vows. But what had the House of Commons to do with that? If it was meant that Orders, regarded as a profession, could not be set aside, so that a man would be free to enter another profession—that is historically untrue. But, true or untrue, what is it to the purpose? A man who, being in Orders, wishes to enter Parliament, may have no wish to cancel his Orders, and no reason for wishing it. No vow that he has

[1] The Bill brought in by Mr. Hibbert and rejected in 1879, which permitted all clergymen to sit, except those in possession of benefices, was not free from a certain injustice, because no such stipulation is made in the instance of any other profession. But it has, nevertheless, a fair show of reason, and no doubt would be willingly accepted by the clergy as a satisfaction of their claims.

made, no responsibility he has undertaken at his ordination, is inconsistent with a seat in Parliament. He swore to uphold, so far as in him lay, "quietness, truth, peace, and love." Is there any reason why he should not uphold these in the House of Commons as well as elsewhere; and would the House suffer any injury if he did? Would his presence in Parliament be inconsistent with those "consultations to the advancement of God's glory, the good of His Church, the safety, honour, and welfare of our Sovereign and her dominions" which are declared to be the duty of Parliament? If he did during the morning visit the sick, comfort the afflicted, pray with the dying, would that unfit him for legislating in the evening for the welfare of England, the maintenance of right and justice for all? Are the daily avocations of the merchant, the banker, the lawyer, the physician to be held suitable employments for an M.P., but those of the clergyman alone disqualifying? If so, on what possible principle? And why, if the clergy are not to sit in the Commons, are the Bishops to sit in the Lords? Their duties are, if possible, still more sacred and solemn than those of the inferior clergy. If a Bishop, who has been engaged in consecrating, confirming, or ordaining during the day, is not rendered unfit for a debate in Parliament at night, why should a priest or deacon be so?[1]

But, however weak their case, the Government carried the day, and for seventy years the clergy were excluded from the House without the occurrence of further agitation of the question. During those seventy years great and radical changes had been made in the constitution. First Nonconformists, then Roman Catholics, then Jews, then infidels were admitted to the House; that is, no security for their exclusion was retained. It was broadly laid down that no man should be shut out from Parliament on religious grounds—always excepting the clergy of the Church of England. The ancient traditional freedom from attack which had rendered the clergy in 1801 indifferent to their banishment from the Legislature, had been exchanged for bitter and determined hostility. Every ancient right which the Church had possessed was called in question; Church property, of whatsoever kind, was declared to belong to the nation, which would be quite justified in alienating it—nay, which was bound to alienate it (if it saw sufficient reason), and apply it to secular

[1] An additional argument to what is here urged as to the admission of the Bishops to the House of Lords is supplied by the election of the clergy as members of County Councils. The work to be done by these is even more strictly secular than that on which Parliament is engaged, seeing that Church matters can hardly come before them. If it is proper for a clergyman to concern himself with secular business in a County Council, why not in the House of Commons?

purposes. It was proposed to sell the churches and parsonage houses to the highest bidder, and allow them to be used for any purposes which the buyers chose. An attempt was made, and to a great extent succeeded, to pass off as true an enormously false statement as to the relative numbers of Churchmen and Nonconformists.[1] Even in Parliament the most monstrous perversions of facts were put forward, almost without contradiction, by the Church's enemies. Questions most nearly affecting the interests of the clergy were brought forward and debated on, and still the Legislature made no move towards untying the hands of the Church's natural and most efficient champions.[2]

At length some stir *was* made. But it could scarcely be said to proceed from the clergy, who were patient, as they have always shown themselves, under the most grievous wrongs. But there were some young men who had entered Orders early in life without due consideration of the step they were taking, and who found themselves debarred from the Parliamentary career they now desired, by Horne Tooke's Act. *They* agitated for its repeal. If they had effected that, no harm would have been done. They effected, however, something very different, or

[1] This is not perhaps the place in which to say it, but I cannot help remarking on the absurdity of trying to ascertain the relative numbers of Churchmen and Dissenters, and of those who are neither, by the aggregate of their attendance at churches or chapels. A man may go to a Dissenting chapel (1) because there is no church near him; (2) because there is no room for him in a church; (3) because he dislikes the ritual or the preaching in some particular church; (4) because he likes the preaching of some Nonconformist divine, though he does not agree with his doctrine: such a man is not a Dissenter, though he is reckoned as one. If there were a sufficient number of churches to hold all the population, and people still chose to forego their seats in church and attend a Nonconformist chapel, then the religious census, as it was taken in 1851, would be a fair criterion. As it is, half the population *must* be reckoned as Dissenters, because there is room for only half the population in the churches.

[2] If there were clergymen members of the House, who had been elected on the understanding that they were to look after the interests of the Church, these statements could not be made, or, at all events, they would be harmless. It would be their duty to look up such Church matters as were brought before the House, and provide themselves with answers to questions and statements made respecting them. Thus when Mr. Richards, in 1885, stated that the number of Nonconformist ministers in Wales was 4,500, he would have been at once taken to task for multiplying the real number by three, the official return showing only 1,557. Again, when Mr. Osborne Morgan, in 1888, affirmed that the Calvinistic Methodists had 4,500 chapels in Wales, his misstatement would have been corrected, and the real number shown to be 622. These are two instances out of a great number. There is at present no one whose *special business* is to attend to these matters; no one who could be called to account for not attending to them.

rather others effected it for them. It is true they gained their own end. The Horne Tookes—those who, like him, have repudiated their Orders—are free to sit in the House, if they can get returned. But against all others, certainly against those of the clergy who have any respect for their own position and character, the door is shut as fast as ever.[1] In 1870, under the guise of pretended relief, there was placed on the statute book an Act perpetrating really greater tyranny against the clergy than was caused by their original exclusion in 1801. Those who passed it expressly disclaimed any interference with the spiritual effect of Holy Orders; yet they exacted that any priest or deacon desiring to sit in the House must make a formal declaration, and give it to a Bishop, and an Archbishop, to be enrolled as a legal instrument—the effect of which is that he shall be incapable of acting, or officiating in any way, as a minister of the Church for ever after. No more anomalous statute than this was ever hurried through the House of Lords in the last days of a session. Its effect is utterly indefensible on any principle, and inconsistent with any reason. It creates a restriction uncalled for and offensive, alike to electors and elected. No other of her Majesty's subjects are compelled to incapacitate themselves from doing any conceivable thing before they can sit in the House. The iniquity is made all the more glaring by all that has passed between 1801 and the present time, in opening the doors of the House of Commons to everybody else, and searching out, as it were, with that intent, every semblance of grievance to conscience. Such an Act, so totally at variance with the whole spirit of modern legislation, was not the outcome of reason or justice, but of the arbitrary will of a majority.

For there was, and still may be, a party in the House to whom, for one reason or another, the idea of the admission of the clergy in their true character is very obnoxious. I do not here refer to the avowed enemies of the Church, who, it needs not to say, find it safer and more convenient to attack the clergy in their absence than their presence, but to those who consider themselves, and doubtless are, after their own fashion, the Church's supporters. As this question will probably be before long again raised, it may be worth while to consider the objections which, avowedly or secretly, are entertained by many.

There is first the somewhat vague, but widespread per-

[1] "The House, for fear that Tooke would mischief do,
Bound fifteen thousand honest men and true;
But when a cry was raised, and all declared
So great a wrong must straightway be repaired,
To free the Tookes a door they opened wide,
But left the honest men securely tied!"

suasion, that the clergy ought to have nothing to do with the affairs of this world, being concerned wholly with those of the next. It may seem strange that a notion so utterly untenable as this should influence men's minds. But there is the fact that it does, and therefore we must consider it. Traced to its source, it seems to be founded on the saying of the Apostles (Acts vi. 4): "We will give ourselves *continually* to prayer and to the ministry of the word;" that is (as such persons understand it), "We will pay heed to nothing else." But, it is reasoned, if the Apostles, the types and models of the clergy for all after-time, would not concern themselves with secular matters, neither ought their successors. But the Apostles did *not* say that they would pay heed to nothing else. The word "continually," which may have given this idea, is not in the original. What they said was that they would "employ themselves diligently" in prayer and preaching. That was work worthy of them, which distributing broken meat and keeping accounts was not. But they did not say that, if subjects worthy of their attention should arise, they would pay no heed to them. I am aware of nothing that goes to prove that the Apostles did not concern themselves with men's everyday affairs. The life of St. Paul, of whom we know most, evinces a very deep interest in the daily lives of those round him. Witness his solemn exhortation to obedience to constituted authority; his rebukes to his converts for going to law with their brethren before heathen judges; his careful advice about marriage; his intervention in the household affairs of Philemon. How could he have been "all things to all men" if he had not warmly interested himself in their secular, as well as in their spiritual, affairs? How, in fact, is it possible to separate the two? In order really to abstain from all secular matters, they must have been taken wholly out of this world—the very thing that their Master prayed they might not be (St. John xvii. 15), and have lived the life of the hermit—a life as different from that of the Apostles as it is possible to conceive. A clergyman may be, and ought to be, as earnest for the welfare of England, as jealous of her honour, as anxious to promote sound and righteous legislation, as any layman can possibly be.[1]

Again, there are those who, though they are genuine supporters of the Church, wish to keep her in the background

[1] No person acquainted with the history of England will need to be told that for more than 500 years after the establishment of the monarchy the affairs of the State were directed entirely by ecclesiastics; that it is to ecclesiastics she owes her wisest and most enduring laws; that it was mainly by ecclesiastics that her liberties were secured. Our fathers would have thought it strange indeed to be told that the clergy were unfit persons to legislate.

as much as possible. She is to be like a person whose position in society is doubtful, but tolerated. If a man so circumstanced puts himself forward, and tries to take a lead, people will ask who he is, and what business he has to be there. But if he keeps quiet, his presence will be overlooked. Considering how closely morality is interwoven with public affairs, this is a strange course to be pursued by men, whose office—when God's honour is at stake, as is sometimes the case now—is "to speak in men's ear, whether they will hear, or whether they will forbear."[1] All men are, or ought to be, God's servants, and, if need be, to declare themselves such. Are the clergy alone to be forbidden to do this in public?

Many more are influenced by the fear that the admission of the clergy to the Commons will bring on Disestablishment, if (as is sometimes said) it is not in itself the beginning of Disestablishment. It is almost amusing to see how this topic of Disestablishment is for ever intruding itself into all matters connected with the Church, as inevitably as King Charles's head intruded itself into all Mr. Dick's memorials. If a clergyman wears a coloured stole, or puts up a sculptured figure over a chancel arch, or stands in an attitude which offends his people, it will bring on Disestablishment; if he refuses to take ten per cent. off his tithe, or quarrels with his churchwardens about the sittings, or the lighting or the warming of his church; if his sermons are alarmingly high, or painfully low, or objectionably broad, the same result will inevitably follow.[2] Disestablishment is always lurking about, ready to slip in wherever the smallest opening presents itself. It is no wonder if men argue that he will certainly slip in if the clergy are permitted to sit in Parliament. And yet one does not see, after all, what connection there is between the two. In the first place, the right of the clergy to occupy seats in the Legislature existed for many centuries, yet it did not cause or even suggest the idea of Disestablishment.[3] In the second place, Disestablishment, in any intelligible sense of the word, was accomplished when the Test Act was

[1] Ought questions like those of divorce, involving as they do the most direct appeals to Scripture, to be discussed and determined without the voice of the clergy being heard at all? Might not the presence of two or three clergymen, who regarded that measure in a different light from that in which many laymen viewed it, have been of infinite service to the House and nation when that Act was passed?

[2] I remember a large crowd being gathered at the doors of one of our cathedrals on a day when some service of interest was to be performed. The doors were not opened as soon as was expected, and the complaints of the crowd took the shape of declaring that if the Church went on in that way she would soon be disestablished!

[3] It is sometimes argued that the Church cannot be disestablished, because she has never been established. It is quite true that no formal document can be produced declaring its establishment. No doubt, too,

repealed and the Roman Catholic Relief Bill passed. With the exception of the presence of the Bishops in the House of Lords there is now scarcely anything that could be "disestablished."

Disestablishment is nowadays simply a euphemism for Disendowment, as Disendowment is a euphemism for pillage.

Again, some are afraid of the entrance of Roman Catholic priests if the Anglican clergy are allowed to sit. This is the old false plea, "Something is just, but do not do it, because something else will follow." Justice is not to be withheld from the Romish, any more than from the Anglican clergy, but granted to both alike. And why need anyone be afraid of the presence of Roman Catholic priests? Would the House suffer by their admission? It is tolerably certain that none would be allowed to offer themselves for a constituency who were not well qualified by ability, high character, knowledge, and courtesy to represent the Romish clergy. Why should not Parliament hear from the lips of these men their views and wishes, and give them the consideration they deserve? Would they not, at all events, be a good exchange for some of the obstructives who now lead the Irish Opposition?

Lastly, many are alarmed by the scandal of a contested election, at which a clergyman, if a candidate, might be assailed by coarse and ribald language and the like. Well, it is not often the case that men of high and pure character, who give no ground for attack or retaliation, *are* thus assailed. But, at all events, a clergyman would be free to contest the university seats without drawback of this kind. And the presence even of a few clergy of high mark for learning, ability and eloquence would cause a debate on any Church question to assume a very different aspect from what it generally bears now. Doubtless it is said that the clergy are well represented by faithful laymen; but, without disparagement or ingratitude to them, faithful laymen are not clergymen. So the working man used to be represented by his employer and the field labourer by his landlord, and they, too, were "faithful laymen." But the cry now—a cry every day more respectfully listened to—is for direct representatives of trade and labour. Why are the clergy alone to be represented by deputies, not even of their own choosing?[1]

---

the popular idea of her having been created by Act of Parliament is ridiculously untrue. She is ten centuries older than the House of Commons, older than the creation of any House of Peers, older than the monarchy of United England itself. But the Acts which excluded all persons from the Legislature except members of the Church did constitute, in a very intelligible sense, Church Establishment.

[1] It is also urged that the clergy are sufficiently represented in Parliament by the Bishops in the Upper House. But the Bishops are not chosen by the clergy; and besides, notoriously, a Bill is regarded as

None of the above reasons justified the refusal in 1870 to undo the undisputed wrong of 1801. It is difficult indeed to conceive how *any* reasons *could* justify it. You cannot exact any conditions for repairing a simple injustice. If an innocent man has been imprisoned, you cannot let him out on condition of his confining himself to his own house. If a man has illegally been kept out of a property to which he was clearly entitled, you cannot give him one-half instead of the whole. Nor can you, in the one case, urge that if you let the man out you must let someone else out, whom you wish to keep in; or, in the other, that the man will make a bad use of the property, and it is better for both himself and others that someone else should hold it. In like manner, you have no right to restore the ancient rights of the clergy on condition that they will divest themselves of their sacred character. They were not required to do so before Horne Tooke's times. They ought not, in common justice, to be obliged to do so now.

Independently of this consideration, the condition exacted is alike insulting and cruel. Why is a man who holds his ordination vow sacred, yet feels that to enter Parliament would be no breach of it—why is he to be made to repudiate it? Why, if he values, as every right-minded man must do, the power given him by Holy Orders, of ministering to men's needs and sufferings—why is he to be obliged to forego these in order to possess what is already his birthright—the privilege of sitting in Parliament? Suppose some conscience-stricken sinner were to resort to him for ghostly counsel and absolution, suppose some dying sufferer were to entreat him to administer the Holy Communion to him, which otherwise, perhaps, could not be obtained at all—is he to refuse because if he complied it would be inconsistent with his presence in the House of Commons? Was it not monstrous to make such requirements—is it not equally monstrous to persist in them now?

H. C. Adams.

Art. III.—COMMON PRAYER.

"COMMON PRAYER," shall we say? or "Public Worship"? The one is an old English word which remains on the title-page of our Service Book. The other is more stately in sound and more familiar in modern language, is stamped on recent Acts

being already threshed out when it reaches the Lords. The House of Commons is the arena where the battle is fought, and where the Church's champions ought to wage their battle.

of Parliament, and, further back, at a critical moment of history, gained a temporary success in substituting itself for the older form. In 1645 was issued by authority of Parliament the Directory for Public Worship, prepared by the Westminster divines. Its title was:

A Directory for the Public Worship of God throughout the three kingdoms of England, Scotland and Ireland. Together with an ordinance of Parliament for the taking away of the Book of Common Prayer, and the establishing and observing of this present Directory throughout the Kingdom of England and the Dominion of Wales.

In a few years the Directory for Public Worship thus established had disappeared: the Book of Common Prayer thus taken away had resumed its former place.

I speak only of the two titles as typical of two aspects of devotion. No one will now question that the older is the better. Public Worship has its own proper grandeur as a large and general expression of a prime duty of the community, and one to be sustained and shared by every member of it. But it includes the celebrations of all religions, and, taken by itself, carries the idea of ceremony and performance. But prayer belongs to revealed religion, and expresses an articulate and intelligent act: also that which is common to men is a more interior thing than that which is public among them. Public worship is a religious function which we attend; common prayer is a spiritual act in which we join. It is the Christian idea of worship, and goes straight to its central act, and implies the true relation of the worshippers both to God and to each other. Most fit, therefore, in itself, and most eloquent of meaning, as well as peculiar to the English Church and dear to the hearts of its members, is the title of our book of Sacred Offices,

THE BOOK OF COMMON PRAYER
AND ADMINISTRATION OF THE SACRAMENTS AND OTHER
RITES AND CEREMONIES OF THE CHURCH
ACCORDING TO THE USE OF THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND.

From the first title these latter offices are justly distinguished, because the element of common prayer which is diffused throughout them all is in them attendant on particular acts which have another nature from it, either by Divine institution or by ecclesiastical provision for special religious occasions. The proper character of these offices will not be touched on here, nor is it intended to treat of the frame and order, the history or contents of the book itself, but only of the one idea pervading it which gives its title, and which is expressed in the heading of this paper.

For prompting and guiding all thought upon the subject we turn instinctively and gratefully to the example and source of Christian prayer, as presenting this particular character and

form of it with a force and fulness which in so few words would have seemed scarcely possible.

The Lord's Prayer is common prayer in its entire form and in each petition, in its letter and its spirit, in its topics and its language, in all that it expresses and all that it implies. This appears, in the first place, from its being couched in the plural number, being a prayer not to *my* Father for what concerns *me*, but to *our* Father for what concerns *us*.[1] The individual voice, still remaining personal, is thus made part of a common voice, expressing as the prayer proceeds a common relation, common interests, and common needs.

The relation to "our Father in heaven" involves brotherhood of the family on earth, whose members are to feel themselves sharers in the same rights, claims, and affections. In changing our feelings towards the heaven above us it changes them also towards the world around us. The heart is enlarged by a sense of multitude and warmed with a sense of kindred. We know that we speak for others, and that others speak for us. In this company we ascend more easily than we should do alone to those interests which are common to the children of the Father. The hallowing of His name, the coming of His kingdom, the fulfilment of His will in earth as in heaven—these are family interests; and each member breathes his petitions for them more sincerely, as feeling that he speaks for others as well as for himself—others in whose hearts these desires may perchance be stronger than as yet they are in his own. When the prayer passes from the common interests, which are above nature, to the common wants, sins, and dangers, which are its very state and atmosphere, the sense of fellowship in these experiences and in the promises of their relief makes it common prayer indeed. None can say to what extent this single invocation and these few brief petitions have woven bonds of union which men never knew before, gathering them in conscious brotherhood before the throne of God. A vague inarticulate sense of this effect steals over the child as he repeats this prayer by his little bed. This character makes the closet and the solitary chamber a part of the great Church of Christ. In the congregation it unites each worshipper with those around him, with those assembled elsewhere, with all whom he wishes to remember or purposes to comprehend. The indefinite expression expands or contracts at his will, but always witnesses of relations, interests and needs which he shares with others, and of others who share them with him. In this respect, as in others, that Divine prayer, as a

[1] In the shorter form (Luke xi. 2), if the doubtful readings be omitted (though the evidence for retention is about as good as that for omission), the disappearance of the word "our" does not remove the other plurals, or affect the character of common prayer.

model given at first, and as a form used for ever, has infused its spirit into Christian worship, and drawn the lines on which it is shaped. Following those lines, private prayer expands into a wider meaning than the personal, while common prayer retains the personal meaning at its heart.

Our service-book has adhered to these lines, as in other respects (such as largeness of compass, discrimination of topics, and the like), so, in a very special manner, in respect of the idea and feeling of community, making this by its very title the typical characteristic of public worship in the English Church.

It is both interesting and instructive to observe the relation between this character of worship and the character of the ministry which conducts it. In proportion as this latter character is exaggerated, or effaced, or impaired, common prayer is found to fail in one or other of its aspects, and, in some cases, in both of them. I say "both of them," for these aspects are mainly two, according as the epithet "common" is confined within the particular congregation, or is extended beyond it.

In the first meaning it expresses the participation of the members of the congregation—the persons then and there assembled—in the prayers which are being offered. This primary and obvious meaning is probably all the meaning which attaches to it in many minds.

But the catholic idea of common prayer is not comprised within the separate assembly or the passing hour. It intends a vaster congregation and a longer range of time. If the persons are members of the particular congregation, the congregation is itself a part of the Church in general; and thus the true idea of common prayer is that of prayer which is common to the whole; such participation being sought on principle, and realized as far as disturbing circumstances permit.

Bearing in mind this double sense of community in worship, we shall see how it is practically affected under different theories of the Church and its ministry.

In the Roman Catholic Church the development of the sacerdotal system has had the effect of casting the public devotions into the form of acts of worship performed for the people and enacted before them, rather than of acts properly and immediately their own. And this kind of participation by assistance and assent was distinctly emphasized and made still more vague and distant by the use of "a tongue not understanded of the people." The principle of community with the central and dominant Church, with the Church at large, and with the Church of the past, is no doubt represented by the one unchanging and universal language; but the use of it obscures and depreciates to the last degree the principle of actual personal and intelligent participation within the congregation itself.

The first step in reformation of religion was naturally directed to recover this lost right for each congregation and its several members, and that purpose was both asserted and achieved when the Latin was exchanged for the vernacular, and the old service books were transformed into a "Book of Common Prayer."

Passing to the opposite pole of religious life, in which the official ministry is effaced, we may observe the effects on common worship exhibited in two small sects, commonly known as the Quakers and the Plymouth Brethren. These are mentioned because they afford examples of common worship based on definite principles; in the first case, that of immediate guidance by the Spirit of God; in the second, that of limitation to true believers. Both are limiting principles proper to select assemblies, well defined circles, and rooms of retirement, and precluding anything that can fitly be called public worship.

The principle of the Society of Friends, that the worship must be conducted by someone who at the time is moved by the Spirit, has obvious defects as a provision for common prayer. In the first place, it leaves a great uncertainty whether there will be any prayer at all. The congregation assembles; but it knows not whether any member of it will on that occasion be so moved by the Spirit; and the result may be often a prolonged, and sometimes even an unbroken silence. But if these holy inspirations occur, they are not supposed to extend to those who only inwardly follow the words they hear. No doubt the impression, more or less strong, that such words are prompted, disposes the hearers so to follow, and the accustomed tone and phrases make it easy to do so. But sympathy and even assent cannot always be secured, since, under any view of the present dispensation of the Spirit, not wholly theoretical, the personal element plainly remains in force, and the individuality of the speaker, if it attract concurrence in some, may also repel it in others. If the principle were sound it would tell most effectively on the fervour and unison of worship. It is precisely in that respect that its failure has been most evident; and this is a main cause of the gradual shrinking and steady diminution of this highly respected Society. Its practical beneficence is not better known than is its failure to meet devotional needs. The theory of personal spiritual illumination, not as a quickening power in a system of ordinance, but as a substitute for it, has been practically tested and found wanting. It is according to the Divine will, and also to the constitution of human nature, that the normal movements and habitual circulation of spiritual life should be in a "body fitly framed" and "knit together through joints and bands," which should thus "increase with the increase of God" (Eph. iv. 16; Col. ii. 19).

These observations apply also to the sect of shorter history,

because of recent origin, which has adopted the name of "the Brethren." It also has gone very far in dispensing with the "joints and bands" in the supposed interests of spirit and life. It has not gone as far as the Quakers in discarding all show of sacramental acts, but it has gone farther in the direction of contraction, separation, and exclusion. Its principle that common prayer is allowable only among those recognised as true believers (a principle bearing directly on our present subject), involves an assumed prerogative of judgment on men's relation to God, and makes the discrimination dependent on such tests as the company or its leaders may think proper to apply—tests which, in fact, consist largely in adoption of the tenets peculiar to the sect and of its congenial phrases of profession. It is obvious that this principle places those who act on it in an attitude of opposition to the whole visible Church from the beginning, and carries a kind of excommunication of its worshippers and congregations. Opposition to the whole Church may possibly be to some minds a subject of self-gratulation and an evidence of being in the right; but it is not favourable to truthful dealing with the New Testament and the examples and records of Church-life which it contains. The mingled condition of the rapidly multiplying Christian Churches and the varieties of religious state and character which they comprised are plain to every reader of the Epistles, and grow plainer as we reach those of later date: and it is equally plain that all meet "in the church"—*i.e.*, the constitutional assembly (ἐν ἐκκλησίᾳ)—for the acts of worship. There is no trace of an inner circle to which ordinances and common prayer are confined; and the general assemblies of the Church in the next and later ages are in this respect continued on the lines which the Apostles had laid down. It is really a fraudulent use of Scripture which can endeavour to support this doctrine of a select and separate communion by mere words apart from their context, and even by the use of italics as means of interpretation in texts which speak of "the *brethren* coming together in the church," or "the *disciples* coming together to eat bread," or the "not forsaking the assembling *of ourselves* together;" for these are the insinuations of argument which are to be met with in their writings. We have certainly a free hand after we have appropriated all titles and prerogatives to "ourselves." When the visible Church has been counted an imposture because it is not coincident with the invisible; when its constitution, ordinances, and ministry have been repudiated; and when a little company, drawn together by personal proclivities, acting as natural selection, has been substituted for it, common prayer would seem to have obtained exceptional conditions for unity of spirit inside this contracted circle.

And such, no doubt, is the case. Spiritual minds must always be sensible of a special warmth and elevation from community of devotional feeling in the congenial atmosphere of a closer Christian fellowship. But this may be done at an enormous sacrifice of duty to others and to God. Such fellowship may be sought in a self-willed spirit, which adopts love of the brethren to the exclusion of the larger charity—a spirit which is impatient of all variation from its own taste and standard, and is ready, rather than allow it, to go to any lengths in separation. This has been illustrated in the short history of "the Brethren." Division within division has shown that the schismatic principle works according to its nature as a process of continual disintegration. In this process, when personal influence has taken the place of official ministry, and selection by sympathy that of corporate unity, it fares ill with common prayer, which is common no longer, except within the ever narrowing circles into which it tends to shrink.

After observing the effects of principles of limitation and exclusion, we apprehend all the more clearly the charity and generosity of the use of common prayer in the Church at large. The principle there is both definite and comprehensive. It is definite, in that prayer is the genuine voice of the spiritual Church of God, based on the truths breathing the desires which constitute its life, the proper voice of children who "through Christ Jesus have access by one Spirit unto the Father." It is also comprehensive, in that in the utterances of this voice all are welcome, most welcome to join, in such proportions and degrees of participation as their minds can reach. Even among those who worship in spirit, the same words have various measures of fulness and depth of meaning; and beyond these they fulfil a wider function. Over a margin of partial worship, indistinct apprehensions, wavering intentions, and faint desires, common prayer extends a spiritual influence of admonition, suggestion, and education, testifying of needs that should be felt and of grace that should be believed, drawing men to seek, assisting them to attain experiences of that communion with God, in the expression of which they join. As the exclusive principle shrinks from everything which is not up to its own mark, so the comprehensive principle welcomes everything that approaches to it. So the Church uses its native language of covenant relation to God, not to test, but to assist the realization of it by all who adopt its profession and receive its signs.

Common prayer on this principle and in the sense thus described, belongs to all the great Christian bodies outside the Church of England as well as to the Church itself: as well, but not as much. In proportion as continuity with the past has been disregarded, the ministerial succession broken and the

inherited language cast aside, in that proportion has the idea of common prayer been altered, and its use impaired. Taking the two aspects of the word already mentioned, that confined within the congregation, and that extending beyond it, the word loses some of its meaning in the former sense and nearly all in the latter.

The liturgic principle is, of course, far larger than the mere provision of a fixed form, in which those worshipping together in one place and at one time may think and speak together. But for this end it has evident advantages, and it is from this point of view that the use of a written form has been very generally defended. I say *written* form, because the most spontaneous prayer that man can utter is a form to those who try to follow him. To them it is not spontaneous. They can but adopt his expressions and turn their thoughts and feelings into the channels which he is making for them. Many of us have had experience that this is not always an easy task. Two things are against it, suddenness and individuality. To adopt at the moment when addressing the Divine Majesty expressions which we can only vaguely anticipate, and which may be of a kind to demand consideration, requires a distinct effort. Again, such prayer, in proportion as it is free and spontaneous, must breathe of the individual mind from which it flows, and express the tone and habit of the man. It cannot, therefore, be always readily accompanied or cordially appropriated by minds of different textures and experiences. There are, indeed, occasions which fuse men's hearts together in the glow of a common feeling, creating an instinctive language natural at the moment to them all. So it was when Peter and John returned from the presence of the Council, and the believers, seeing what they had to look for, "lifted up their voice to God with one accord;" though, it may be observed, the prayer found its expression in familiar words. There are also times when the leading mind has secured implicit concurrence and entire sympathy, as when Apostles, or those who had been to men the authors of their faith, taught them by example how that faith should express itself in prayer. In the first instance suddenness, so far from being a hindrance, is a condition of common inspiration. In the second, individuality is not felt, the voice of the speaker being itself the voice of the Church. There are approaches to these conditions when some prevailing thought or feeling has possession of a congregation, or when implicit confidence in its leader exists within it. And in ordinary cases the individual prayer becomes common, according to the measure of adhesion which it happens to obtain; and it is sometimes impressive to hear the appropriation of petitions, if not by the old Amen, by less articulate sounds of occasional concurrence. There are evident reasons for the use

of this "liberty of prophesying" on fit occasions, and there is and ought to be a broad margin for it outside our stated services; but there is a large experience which certainly does not recommend it as the customary provision for them. Speaking generally of this use, as seen in Nonconformist, Presbyterian and French Protestant congregations, the same observations must be made, first, that prayer does in fact become common only in proportion as, by accepted thoughts and accustomed phrases, it takes the likeness of a fixed form; secondly, that under this system the idea of worship, in the proper sense, is lowered and impaired, prayer ever tending to take the character of preaching, and the attitude of mind in the hearers to become much the same in relation to the one exercise as it is to the other.

On the other hand, the liturgic principle exhibits and sustains the true idea of worship, and also makes it a common act, both within and beyond the congregation. I will take the second point first, because on this principle the community of the congregation, with the Church at large, is the foundation of its community within itself.

Our service book regards the worshipping congregation as a part of the whole worshipping church, and it is in that sense also a "Book of Common Prayer." It is so in the way of extension; all congregations at the same time following the same thoughts and using the same words, and even their individual members joining with them at will, in sick chambers or in distant spots. It is so also in the way of succession, the same devotions being inherited from the past generations and transmitted to those which follow, as the language of a corporate life, which has in every age the same human needs and the same superhuman relations.

It is evident to all men that this is the principle on which the Service Book of the English Church is framed, giving one voice to all its congregations, and that voice not only concordant in spirit, but consonant in tones with the voice of the Church Universal. While eliminating devotions infected with later corruptions, and arranging the offices before in use to suit changed wants and habits, the compilers of the Prayer-book maintained continuity with the worship of their fathers on its pure and primitive side. Even the few links which connect the book with other reformed liturgies (Herman's Consultations and the Service Book of Pollanus), while adopted of course for their own fitness, yet recognise these offices as really on the same lines, and enlarge the sense of unity by just relations with reformed worship then spreading in other quarters. The prayers, which are not translated or modified, but original in the English Church (*e.g.*, the Prayer for All Conditions of Men, the General Thanksgiving, the Collects for second and third

Advent, sixth Epiphany, etc.), have both the shape and tone of the older collects. They exhibit a sympathetic feeling and instinctive harmony with all that surrounds them. These characteristics seem to have faded from us in later times, if we may judge by our devotional compositions in general, and the occasional prayers issued by authority.

There is one feature of the daily service which calls for separate notice from the present point of view, namely, its large proportion of (what may be called) *meditative praise*. This, together with the reading of Scripture, forms the centre of the service in the Psalms and the Canticles, in which the lessons are framed. It is evident that this use is a conspicuous instance of inheritance and transmission, maintaining communion with all the Christian ages, indeed, in the case of the Psalms, with those which are pre-Christian, and perpetuating to all generations the original language of devotion pervaded by the breath of the Divine Spirit. It would be useless to enlarge on the use of the Psalms, so amply has it been estimated, with an eloquence sympathetic and sincere, in some of the noblest passages which English literature can boast. I now desire to fix attention only on the particular effect of that use which has just been mentioned. In the use of the Evangelical Canticles, that effect is even more distinct than in the case of the Psalms. Why are the Magnificat, Benedictus, and Nunc Dimittis used by us as they are? For their dignity, their sweetness, their depth of meaning? Undoubtedly; but also because they keep the Church for ever in immediate connection with the hour of its birth, and with the words then inspired by the Holy Ghost, and pregnant with all the future. Whatever separations may arise in the later history of a family, it remains one in its origin and parentage, and the communion which remains to it must depend on the common consciousness of that. The songs which surrounded the birth of our Lord place us always in conscious connection with the facts of the history which then began, and so the voices of Mary, Zacharias and Simeon speaking in the spirit become leading, and therefore uniting voices in the Church for ever.

Passing from the larger idea of communion with the whole Church to that of communion within the congregation itself, we see that the one becomes a basis for the other, for then the members are one in this common consciousness. Beyond this, requirements for its realization in common prayer must be sought in respect of matter and of form.

In respect of matter, common prayer must express experiences that are common to Christians, not such as are special or singular. The self-condemnation and shame for sin, the faith in forgiveness and acceptance in Christ, the desires for righteousness and true holiness, the sense of conflict with opposing powers, the

assurance of divine assistance and strength, the interest for the Church and kingdom of God, the charity towards all sorts and conditions of men, the reliance on the merits and mediation of the Son, the appeals for the work and fellowship of the Spirit, the filial affections towards the Father in heaven, the reverent adoration of the essential Godhead, the praises and doxologies which acknowledge the glory of the eternal Trinity, and in the power of the Divine Majesty worship the Unity—these belong to all awakened and enlightened souls, and the expressions of them are the proper language of Christians as such. It only remains to add that for purposes of unison the *tone* of such expressions has its own importance. Pitched in an exaggerated key, they would make the concert of feeling more difficult, while most minds yield a secure consent to deliberate and well-weighed words. I believe that nothing need be said about the measure in which the Church of England has met these two requirements.

The form into which common prayer should be thrown was a subject of long discussion, and that exemplified in the Prayer-book was assailed with persistent dislike and an almost unaccountable bitterness. The directions for vocal participation from time to time by the congregation, the breaking up the service into parts, each calling for fresh attention, the shortness of prayers and collects involving the frequent "Amen," the alternate recitation in the Psalms, the occasional responses, the suffrages in the Litany, the supplications attached to the Commandments, were all appropriate methods for making the service a congregational act, and for shaping it as common prayer. Yet (as it would seem for this very reason) these features of the Liturgy were constant matter for Presbyterian and Puritan objections, and in the Savoy Conference furnished subjects of distinct demands. It was required, among other things:

> To omit the repetitions and responsals of the clerk and people and the alternate reading of the psalms and hymns, which cause a confused murmur in the congregation; the minister being appointed for the people in all public services appertaining to God; and the Holy Scriptures intimating the people's part in public prayer to be only with silence and reverence to attend thereunto, and to declare their consent in the close by saying Amen.
>
> To change the Litany into one solemn prayer.
>
> Instead of the short collects, to have one methodical and entire prayer composed out of many of them.
>
> To omit the petition after each commandment, the minister to conclude with a suitable prayer.

These demands were further illustrated by Baxter's "Reformed Liturgy," consisting of long prayers by the minister, composed in a fortnight, and delivered to the Conference for adoption as an optional alternative to the Prayer-book Service.

These particular demands, with the reasons given for them and the example provided, place the two ideas of worship side by side—the one as encouraging, the other as depreciating, the active participation of the people in it, and so illustrating most effectively the intention of our Service Book to be in form as well as in matter a Book of Common Prayer.

It will not be improper to add that the comparison of these two ideals goes also to corroborate the observation made above, that where the true position of the ministry in the congregation has not been preserved, the character of common prayer has suffered loss. The minister who is a priest in the Roman sense, celebrates the acts of worship *before* the people; he who, in the separatist sense, is little more than a preacher, prays as he preaches *before* them. In either case a true participation is possible, but it will be a silent one, which the service is not shaped to claim or assist. The Church of England is distinguished by her large provisions for St. Paul's ideal of public worship, "that we may with *one mind* and *one mouth* glorify God, even the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ."[1]

Provisions in a liturgy are one thing, the use made of them is another. All may be ordered for active participation, but the participation itself may be passive. It may be supposed that men are with one mind glorifying God, while it is plain that they are not doing so with one mouth. So, we know, it has been in fact. A service framed on one plan and carried out on another, adds to its observed defect the feeling of defeated intention. There is no need now to descant on this failure. We have heard enough of the cold, dull services, the silent congregation, the duet between the parson and the clerk. We are still but partially awake to the evil; certainly only partially awake to its remedies. There is a strong tendency to perpetuate the same fault in another way. The clerk has disappeared as leader of the people, and the surpliced choir has taken his place, but the people may no more be led by the one than they were by the other, possibly less so. The fuller voice may be taken as a more satisfying substitute, and the rendering may be such as to preclude rather than assist any general participation. Have we not all heard services conducted in such a way as to approximate to a "tongue not understanded of the people?" And when ritual observances are multiplied, and scenic effect is studied, the result is a partial return to the system in which worship was celebrated before the people rather than offered by them. The taste and habit of this (in a spiritual sense) retrograde religion make themselves felt in all sorts of ways, and men discuss the

[1] The one mouth is emphatic: ὁμοθυμαδὸν ἐν ἑνὶ στόματι (Rom. xv. 6).

performance of services and what is done in the churches as if they were criticising some secular function or artistic exhibition. The point of view may be that of public worship; it is scarcely that of common prayer.

This last is the ideal which the Prayer-book sets before us, and it should be the object of our definite aim. The aim will teach the methods and suggest the means of education. Of these the most natural will obviously be found in closer relations between the sermon and the service, in making it more felt that they form a homogeneous whole, the truths which are taught in the one being expressed in the other, in more frequent references to those expressions, and more suggestive interpretations of them. This would create a more general intelligence in the congregation than now usually exists, in regard to the words which are used in common.[1] It is a mistake to suppose that what is familiar is therefore understood. On the contrary, familiarity tends to act as a blind and a dispensation from thought. But community of intelligence is a main part of the community of worship. There is a full concert of devotion in those who "pray with the spirit and pray with the understanding also, who sing with the spirit and sing with the understanding also." Especially is this understanding to be cultivated in regard to the present subject by a more adequate sense of the collective priesthood offering its spiritual sacrifices of prayer and praise, and more particularly discharging its essential office of universal and mutual intercessions, for besides distinct and intentional intercessions, such as are contained in the Litany and elsewhere, "united prayer (as such) is necessarily of an intercessory character, as being offered for each other, and for the whole, and for self as part of the whole."[2]

So we ought to teach and to be taught; but for attainment of the end something is wanted beyond methods and instructions. Prayer with the understanding may be thus trained, but prayer with the spirit has a higher source. It may be said that this is a personal gift, proper to those whose hearts God has touched. That is true; yet its nature is diffusive and contagious. In a congregation where the Word has brought many hearts into living relations with God in Christ, and is stirring others with various measures of attraction, a quickening influence spreads around and tells on the mind and voice of the assembly. Then there is a sense of fellowship in the Holy Ghost. Then there is

---

[1] Simeon gave a good example, according to the needs and thought of his time, in his sermons before the University on "the excellency of the Liturgy," from the text: "They have well spoken all that they have spoken. O that there were such an heart in them" (Deut. v. 28, 29).

[2] Newman's Sermons "On Intercession."

a felt fulfilment of the words: "There am I in the midst of you:" and that is the true secret of common prayer.

T. D. BERNARD.

There is one form of united worship not noticed in this paper, but not to be forgotten in connection with the subject of it—namely, that which consists in the use of hymns. Many of them are genuine prayer, none the less so for being metrical and musical; and no form of prayer better deserves the epithet of common in the sense of creating general participation. But it is a distinct subject, and lies outside these lines of discussion. Nobody objects to *them* as written forms, or proposes that they should be given extempore, or led by the minister and "heard by the people in silence"; and perhaps "brethren" who object to common prayer in prose with those whose conversion is uncertain may allow it in verse. Anyhow, the increased use of hymns is a matter of great thankfulness from the point of view of this paper. It supplies the union of hearts and voices in systems which do not otherwise provide it, and gives new help for it in those that do; and many hymns in general esteem now form a link of common devotion between the Church and Nonconformist congregations. In this respect there is more in common than there was. Let us thank God for it.

ART. IV.—THE DEATH OF CHRIST.

CERTAIN scientific qualifications are required for the successful pursuit of every science, but the highest of all sciences demands qualifications peculiarly its own. Other sciences may follow out their investigations, and successfully pursue their researches under the gaslight of their own laboratories, but true theological science demands, first of all, that its disciples shall come out to seek their learning, and to learn their lessons of true wisdom, under the broad daylight of the sun of righteousness.

And in the inly shining of this light—the light of the knowledge of the glory of God in the person of Jesus Christ—the Christian student may find that he has to unlearn much which he thought he had attained to by the light of the fire which had come of the sparks of his own kindling. The truest science and the highest philosophy will lead a man to become a fool that he may be wise.

One of the dangers resulting from the present tendencies[1] of theological study is the danger, not of too careful or minute examination of the oracles of God, but of allowing our view of great truths, which may be seen clearly in the light of the Gospel of Christ, to be disturbed by attributing undue weight to alleged deductions from minute criticisms of certain isolated portions, such deductions being supposed to add weight to

[1] In Fairbairn's "Typology of Scripture," vol. ii., Appendix C., pp. 531, *sqq.*, will be found some valuable remarks on this tendency.

certain difficulties (intellectual and moral) which are brought forward against what are regarded as the worn-out traditional teachings of Reformation doctrine.

In former papers we have desired to set forth some considerations, the force of which may, we trust, be found to have a reassuring effect on truth-seeking minds which may have been troubled by the influence of these tendencies in their bearing on the doctrine of the atonement of Christ's death, and our justification as sinners by His precious blood.

In the present paper we desire to supplement the arguments already adduced by directing special attention to one or two general observations bearing on the subject.

The sum of direct Scriptural testimony to the vicarious character of Christ's passion is of far greater weight, we are persuaded, than seems now to be commonly supposed. But even if we were to concede the absence from Holy Scripture of that prominence given to clear and distinct didactic statements concerning the Saviour as the representative substitute, as the sin-bearer for the world, which some might think to be required by the importance of the doctrine—we ask to have it well considered that this fact might be accounted for either by the supposition of the teaching being unscriptural and untrue, or by that of its truth being very readily accepted, and therefore universally recognised—a quasi-axiomatic teaching, not so much ostentatiously exhibiting itself on the surface, because deeply underlying the whole tenor of Divine revelation. Hence it becomes a matter of high importance to determine which of these two theories has the best claim to be regarded as the true account of the matter. And for this purpose the following inquiries are pertinent, and their answers may be regarded as affording evidence of great weight on the point we are considering.

I. Do the sacred records of the Old Testament contain instances which can fairly be said either to be a preparation, or to assume anything like a preparedness, for the acceptance of the teaching of substitution and vicarious suffering?

A little consideration will suffice to show the importance of this inquiry. Language *suggestive of* substitution may be said to depend for its natural and rightful interpretation on the prevailing ideas of the people to whom it is addressed. It will convey no doubtful meaning to those to whom the idea of substitution is natural and familiar. It may be far otherwise to any to whom the notion is strange, unnatural and unheard of. And the true weight of the witness from some portion of the language of the New Testament will be affected considerably by the inquiry whether, in the school of Divine teaching, God's people had had anything like a preparation for receiving the truth of substitutional penalty.

In view, then, of this inquiry,[1] it is impossible to omit reference to the history of the intercession of Moses in Exod. xxxii.: "It came to pass on the morrow that Moses said unto the people, Ye have sinned a great sin, and now I will go up unto the Lord; peradventure I shall make an atonement for your sin. And Moses returned unto the Lord, and said: Oh, this people have sinned a great sin, and have made them gods of gold. Yet, now, if Thou wilt forgive their sin—and if not, blot me, I pray Thee, out of the book which Thou hast written." On this narrative it has been observed by Kurtz:[2]

> The meaning of this prayer is that God might accept the punishment inflicted on those who had been executed already (verses 27, 28), as an expiation or covering for the same sin on the part of those who were living still; and that if this did not suffice (since the latter had their own sins to atone for), that He would take his own life, the life of the innocent one, as a covering or expiation. No doubt Jehovah refused to grant this request, and said (verse 33): "Whosoever hath sinned against Me, him will I blot out of My book;" but the existence of the idea of substitution in the religious consciousness of Moses is, nevertheless, unquestionable. And more than that, the existence of a thought so opposed to human notions of justice in a man like Moses would be perfectly inexplicable and inconceivable, if it could not be traced to the manifestation of the very same idea in the sacrificial worship with the direct sanction of God.[3]

The life of David affords two very memorable examples which must be briefly referred to. David's great sin, by which he—the man after God's own heart—displeased the Lord; that sin, when the sentence of his own condemnation of that sin has come home to his own soul; that sin, when with broken heart he has confessed: "I have sinned against the Lord;" that sin, when the absolving word of the prophet has declared, "The Lord also hath put away thy sin;" that sin, concerning which he himself has said, "The man that hath done this thing shall surely die;" that sin, concerning which the Lord's word has now declared, "Thou shalt not die"—that sin has yet, in his own

[1] An earlier example in Gen. xlii. 37, xliii. 9, xliv. 32, 33, ought not to be altogether overlooked. The reader may also be referred to Gen. xviii. 26, xx. 7, 17, 18, Josh. vii., Jon. i., for examples of communities affected by the righteousness or sin of one or more individuals. (See also Isa. xliii. 27, 28.)

[2] See also Delitzsch on Hebrews, vol. ii., p. 458, Eng. Tr.

[3] "Sacrificial Worship of O. T.," pp. 106, 107, Eng. Tr. Some striking evidence as to the traditional notions of sacrifice found among the later Jews will be found in D. W. Simon's "Redemption of Man," note xii., pp. 431, 432. He quotes from Moses ben Nachman: "The blood of the sinner ought to have been poured out and his body burnt, as was the blood of the victim poured out and its body burnt." The following is from Rabb. Bechai: "God in His mercy and goodness took the victim *instead of*, and an *expiation for*, the offender"—"Blood for blood, soul for soul" (p. 432).

time, and in his own house, to be visited with death: "Because thou hast given great occasion to the enemies of the Lord to blaspheme, the child also that is born unto thee shall surely die" (2 Sam. xii. 14). Here we see that for David's deadly sin, put away from himself, the son of David, in the innocence of infancy, is to die—is (in some sense) to pay by death the penalty of his father's iniquity, and this distinctly by God's own appointment.[1]

Again, when David had sinned in numbering the people, and he besought the Lord to take away his iniquity—"David spake unto the Lord when he saw the angel that smote the people, and said: Lo, I have sinned, and I have done wickedly; but these sheep, what have they done?" (2 Sam. xxiv. 17).

Have we not here an example of a great sin of David, visited not on himself, except so far as he suffered in the sufferings of those that pertained to him, but visited on a people—as regards the matter of this sin—sinless?

Do we not see here the Lord visiting on the flock the sin of the shepherd? *He* has gone astray, and the Lord hath laid on all them the iniquity of only one.

Passing over other instances, and omitting the mention of other ways in which Israel of old was taught to recognise in their God One who, in His jealousy, visited the iniquity of the fathers upon the children, and showed mercy unto thousands in them that love Him, we may not altogether omit a passing reference to one very memorable incident, in which we are taught to see not only the people punished for the disobedience of their king, the flock condemned to death for the erring of the shepherd, but also, in the punishment of both king and people, shepherd and sheep, the fulfilment of a Divine sentence, in which is found the most distinct teaching of substitutional penalty and vicarious death. After Ahab had let Benhadad go with a covenant (1 Kings xx. 34), these were the words of the prophet of the Lord: "Thus saith the Lord, Because thou hast

[1] *This* Son of David may doubtless be regarded as a typical shadow of the *true* Son of David, and the death of this innocent infant a foreshowing of His atoning death. And so we may be said to have here that which admits, in an inferior sense, an application of the Apostle's language in Rom. iii. 25. In God's sentence of death on the child of David was that which, in some measure and in some sense, was to show His righteousness, because of the passing over (*πάρεσιν*) of David's sin. Compare the LXX. of 2 Sam. xii. 13, 14: *Κύριος παρεβίβασε τὸ ἁμάρτημα σοῦ οὐ μὴ ἀποθάνῃς . . . ὁ υἱος σοῦ ὁ τεχθείς σοι θανάτῳ ἀποθανεῖται.*

We should beware, however, of straining such comparisons. Of the death of Christ it has been well said that "forming as it does that great landmark and division in the course of time, which separates the mature age of the world from its infancy, we may assert of it that it is not only unlike anything which had previously occurred, but also anything which can by any possibility happen a second time in the history of the world" (Shuttleworth's "Three Sermons at Oxford," p. 12).

let go out of thy hand the man whom I had devoted to destruction, therefore thy life shall go for his life, and thy people for his people "—ἔσται ἡ ψυχή σου ἀντὶ τῆς ψυχῆς αὐτοῦ, καὶ ὁ λαός σου ἀντὶ τοῦ λαοῦ αὐτοῦ—LXX. (1 Kings xx. 42).

These examples will surely suffice to show that the suffering of one for another—the suffering of some for the sins of others, the bearing by some of the penalty of others' sins—was not a notion at all alien to the thoughts and feelings of the people separated from the world, to be specially trained for the coming of the Saviour, and Divinely instructed in preparation for the knowledge of His salvation.[1] And if this were so, is there anything to make us suppose that there could be no connection in their minds between this notion and the teaching of God's ordinance of sacrificial death—the death of a sinless, spotless victim—called by the very name of "*sin*," spoken of as an offering for sin, and enduring (so far) the penalty of sin? It is scarcely conceivable that no such connection could have existed in the minds of those who looked to the Rock whence they were hewn,[2] and remembered how Abraham their father had been called by God to look on his son—the son of God's gift, the heir of God's promise—bound on the altar, due to the knife and the flame, and then had received him back from death for life, because the Lord *had seen to it*, the Lord *had provided*, and Abraham had offered up on the altar a ram for a burnt offering *instead of* Isaac his son.

And it will not be altogether a worthless testimony to this view of Jewish sacrifice, that good evidence can be shown that so the teaching of sacrifice was understood and interpreted by the traditional doctrine of the Jewish schools (see above, pp. 313, 427).

But we must be allowed to ask special attention to the teaching of the Passover. That the paschal lamb was a sacrifice is now very generally admitted. If it was a sacrifice, indeed, shall we suppose that the sprinkled blood had to say to the destroyer only this: "I am here for a sign to mark for you the doors into which you are not to enter to do your destroying work"? For such a purpose, what need that the sign should be blood, and the blood the blood of sacrifice[3]—the sacrificial blood of a lamb slain? Can we doubt that the blood on the doorpost had this also to say to the destroyer: "Here you may not

[1] And it must not be supposed that there was nothing in the training in heathenism by which men's minds were prepared for the notion of atonement by vicarious penalty and satisfaction. (See *British and Foreign Evangelical Review*, Jan., 1861, pp. 40, 41.)

[2] See above, p. 206. This sacrifice of Abraham was regarded as the substratum of all sacrifices. (See above, p. 310.)

[3] See Kurtz, "Sacrificial Worship," p. 367, and Dr. W. Saumarez Smith, "Blood of New Covenant," pp. 51, 54; Crawford, "Sc. D. of Atonement," p. 501; Magee on "Atonement," pp. 60, 126.

enter, because here your work has been done, and the death of the lamb (whose sprinkled blood you see) has been appointed and accepted by God *instead of* the death of the first-born"? Is not this interpretation confirmed by the claim which God makes upon the first-born whom He has thus redeemed from death, that they may know themselves, not their own, but bought with a price—even as "the general assembly and Church of *the first-born* which are written in heaven" (Heb. xii. 23) are "redeemed with the precious blood of Christ, as of a Lamb without blemish and without spot" (1 Pet. i. 19)? And is not this view still further confirmed by the provision for redeeming again the first-born of the human race?[1] And still further by the order for the redemption of the firstling of an ass by a lamb (Exod. xiii. 13), and by the further order: "And if thou wilt not redeem it, then thou shalt break his neck"?[2] And still further by the order for the taking of the Levites as *instead of* the first-born, and by the words which follow: "And the Levites shall be Mine; I am the Lord" (Numb. iii. 45)? Does not the Passover sacrifice stand connected as one link in a chain, the first in a series of redemptions, and redemptions all by substitution? Can we suppose that it was for nothing that at this great turning-point in their history, and in its yearly commemoration, as well as in duties of daily life, reminding them continually of this event, the redeemed people had perpetually brought before their minds the thought of vicarious suffering, substitutional transfer of penalty, of claim, of obligation?

We have thus taken a few samples of evidence from the Old Testament. Space will not allow us to add to these, save once more to direct attention to the one prophecy which, in this connection, it is impossible to leave altogether out of view. If it be so, that in Isa. liii. we have set before us the consummation of Messianic expectation, as well as the summing up and explanation of the sacrificial teaching of earlier days, then is it possible, we ask, to deny that we have here that which is suggestive of a great redeeming work, the true account of which is to be found in substitution, the bearing of our griefs, the carrying of our sorrows—by One, the Man of Sorrows—by One who, pouring out His soul unto death, bare the sin of many, and made intercession for the transgressors? What else mean these words: "All we like sheep have gone astray; we have turned every one to his own way, and the Lord hath made to light on Him the iniquity of us all"?

And, now, what do we claim to have established by all this? We claim that these instances suffice at least abundantly to

[1] In this case by "corruptible things, as silver and gold," as in contrast with "the precious blood" (Numb. iii. 47, xviii. 15, 16).

[2] See also Numb. xviii. 17.

establish the fact that there had been, before the coming of Christ, a preparation for the acceptance of the teaching of redemption by vicarious suffering for sin, the substitution of the sinless for the sinful in the bearing of the penalty of transgression.

We proceed to another question.

II. Is the language of the New Testament such as accommodates itself to the theory of vicarious suffering being a thing strange and unknown, or, rather, to the theory of its finding ready acceptance in the minds and hearts of those who accepted as their Saviour the crucified Son of God?

It appears to us that we are saying far too little when we affirm that the second theory is justified and supported by a mass of evidence whose cumulative weight can never be outweighed, while the other theory must stand condemned as utterly untenable and incredible altogether.

Need we refer again to the sayings of our Lord Himself? Is it possible to deny that there is something more than suggestive of substitution in the language which spoke of giving His life a λύτρον for many?

In the apostolic Epistles let the passages which speak of Christ's *dying for us* be viewed in connection with those other texts which speak of His *dying for our sins*, and let these again be seen in the same view with the language which declares the truth of the ordained connection between *sin and death*, and still further let all these be set beside the teaching of Christ's *bearing our sins in His death*, and we feel sure that the combination of this testimony can only be made to fit in with the theory of a substitutionary character being recognised at once in the Christian view of the death of Christ.

And what shall we say of St. Paul's words—ἀντίλυτρον ὑπὲρ πάντων (1 Tim. ii. 6)? This language is all the more forcible in its bearing on the point before us, because it is not so much a didactic assertion, as part of an enforcement of recognised elementary truths of the faith, for which St. Paul was ordained a preacher and an apostle, a teacher of the Gentiles in faith and verity.

Add to all this just one text from the Epistle to the Hebrews, in which the writer assumes rather than teaches the connection between the appointment of Jewish sacrifice and the death of Christ, and the bearing of both these on the death of man: "Now once in the end of the world hath He appeared to put away sin by the sacrifice of Himself. And as it is appointed unto men once to die, but after this the judgment, so Christ was once offered to bear the sins of many, and unto them that look for Him shall He appear the second time without sin unto salvation" (Heb. ix. 26-28).

We have touched, we need hardly say, on but a very small

part of the evidence afforded by the New Testament—evidence which should be viewed, not so much in its separate items, as in its united combination. And we need have no hesitation in contending that it can never be made to fit in with any other assumption than that which avails to bind and hold all together in one harmonious whole—the assumption that the notion of vicarious penalty entered into the elementary ideas connected with the atonement of Christ in the view of the Christian Church in the time of the Apostles.

Another important question must wait for consideration in our next number. N. DIMOCK.

ART. V.—FOLK-TALES.

IN a volume just published[1] Mr. Wratislaw has penetrated into the obscure realm of Slavonic life and literature, and has presented to the English reader what cannot but prove to be a most welcome addition to his folk-lore library. Now that Mr. W. R. S. Ralston is no longer amongst us, we suppose there is no one more entitled to speak upon Slavonic subjects than Mr. Wratislaw, and it is pleasing to think that, just as we are mourning the severe and almost irretrievable loss of one great scholar in this branch of study, we have such good proof, as this book affords, that the breach is not likely to remain unfilled. "Le roi est mort; vive le roi!" is a motto true of others than political kings, and if it somewhat saddens the personal view of life, it is the only condition under which life could be carried on. Mr. Wratislaw will, we feel sure, understand how it is that we feel bound to preface our welcome of his book with these few allusions to such a man as Mr. Ralston, for those of us who knew him had learnt to admire him for more qualities than those of scholarship only.

The sixty folk-tales here collected and translated consist of seven Bohemian stories, two Moravian, four Hungarian-Slovenish, two upper and lower Lusatian, one Kashubian, and four Polish stories, as representative of the Western Slavonians; three White Russian stories, four Little Russian stories from Galicia, five Little Russian stories from South Russia, and two Great Russian stories, as representative of the Eastern Slavonians; five Bulgarian stories, five Serbian stories, two Serbian stories from Bosnia, five Serbian stories from Carniola, five Croatian stories, and four Illyrian-Slovenish stories, as repre-

[1] "Sixty Folk-Tales from exclusively Slavonic Sources." Translated; with brief introductions and notes, by A. H. Wratislaw. London: 1889, (Elliot Stock); 8vo., pp. xii., 315.

sentative of the Southern Slavonians. This very lucid grouping of the stories, according to their sources, follows upon Mr. Wratislaw's original object of taking up the book, viz., that of obtaining an acquaintance with the main features of all the Slavonic dialects; but it will be found of very considerable value to the student of folk-lore, because to notice the variants of incidents in the tales as they are told by different races of peasants is one of the branches of folk-lore study which runs almost parallel to that of philological study. Folk-lore and philology have had, and will continue to have, some pitched battles; but here they meet on common ground, and Mr. Wratislaw is doing good service in having preserved this information in his book.

Of course we meet our old friends in these tales; but we meet them in somewhat different guise. Taking, for instance, one of the most interesting groups—the Illyrian-Slovenish stories—we have a version of Cinderella, a version of The Clever Thief, and two local legends referring us back to a snake-cult, and to the primitive notion that names of persons are intimately connected with the well-being or otherwise of their owners. Now, it is to be noted that the two folk-tales proper—Cinderella and The Clever Thief—present features which, as a result of comparison with other variants, show unmistakable signs of a greater mingling together of the incidents of different stories than is to be found in the folk-tales of Western Europe. Take the following incident in the Cinderella story:

Maritza, the Cinderella heroine, has imposed upon her the task, by her wicked and jealous stepmother, of gathering ripe strawberries in sharp winter cold; and she was obliged to take her basket and go. "As she was going all in tears over the mountain, she met twelve young men, whom she saluted courteously. They received the salutation in a friendly manner, and asked her: 'Whither are you wading, dear girl, in the snow thus in tears?' She told them the whole story prettily. The young men said to her: 'We will help you if you will tell us which month of the whole year is the best.' Maritza said, in reply: 'They are all good; but the month of March is the best, for it brings us most hope.' They were pleased with her answer, and said: 'Go into the first glen on the sunny side; there you will get as many strawberries as you wish.'" Then, when after great success her step-sister tries to succeed as well, treats the young men scornfully, and tells them "'They are all bad, and the month of March is the worst,' the whole mountain clouded over in a jiffy, and a storm beat upon her so that she scarcely panted home alive. The young men were the twelve months."

Now, this personification of the twelve months is to be met

with very frequently in Slavonic popular tradition, and always it is grafted on to some form of legend, which is most distinctly of very ancient origin. Here it is forced into the Cinderella narrative in a pretty and charming manner, and does duty for other forms of incident in the versions of Cinderella to be found in Western Europe. Now, have we not in this feature of the Slavonic folk-tale evidence of the accretion of strictly Slavonic thought upon groundwork other than Slavonic, and hence does it not go to prove that the essential groundwork of the Cinderella story is much older than the Slavonic era?

Indeed, the charm of all folk-tales lies in their immense antiquity. They have been so softened and welded into poetry during the long years of their traditional existence, that the probable rational origin for most of the incidents is too apt to be lost sight of. When, for instance, in the charming story of "The Vila," in this same section of the volume before us, we meet with the chivalrous treatment of the handsome youth of a sleeping beauty, and in reward therefor she asks him, "What do you want for this kindness?" and the young man replies merrily, "Allow me to behold your most beautiful countenance, and to take you to wife," we are thus far only being told over again one of the eternal truths of human life—told to us by all romancists and by all poets, of all lands and of all ages. But the distinctiveness of the Slavonic story is in what follows. "I am content to take you for my husband," said she; "but you must know that I am a Vila; you must never utter my name. If you speak of my name Vila I must quit you at once." This is not one of the eternal truths of human life, but it is a very ancient conception of the human mind during that long infancy before the development of scientific thought. It is the notion that the name of any being, whether human or superhuman, is an integral part of that being, and that to know it puts its owner, whether he be deity, ghost, or man, in the power of another, often involving destruction to the named. "It is a part of that general confusion between names and things," says Mr. Edward Clodd, "which is a universal feature of barbaric modes of thought—an ever-present note of uncultured intelligence; a confusion which attributes the qualities of living things to things not living, and which lies at the root of all fetichism and idolatry—of all witchcraft, shamanism, and other instruments which were as keys to the invisible kingdom of the feared and dreaded."[1] Now, what with the fact that in this beautiful Slavonic story we have in the first place the expression of a universal factor in human life, and in the second place the expression of a very prevalent, if not universally prevalent, conception of the human mind in its barbaric or savage

[1] *Folklore Journal*, vii. 154.

state, the story comes to us with a whole cluster of interesting problems attached to it. In the Cinderella story we have already noted that its construction shows the accretion of Slavonic mythic expression upon a much older framework; in the Vila story we come again upon evidence of a very ancient groundwork for the story. All the archæological evidence of this district teems with the conflict of races, and remains of the oldest race are still extant. Is it possible, then, that in these nursery tales of the modern peasant we have evidence parallel to the monumental remains which have defied time, and have thus revealed to the modern inquirer some chapters in the history of man's long-past? At present, we admit, it is not possible to pronounce very precise opinions, because the evidence wants sifting and examining most thoroughly first; but tales like these will help us in the work.

In the meantime Mr. Wratislaw gives us specimens of other tales to which he attaches a mythological meaning. Thus our own "Little Red Riding-hood" is found among the Lusatian stories in a version but slightly differing from that known to all English children. Mr. Wratislaw explains this as a lunar legend. "Red Hood is represented as wandering like Io, who is undoubtedly the moon, through trees—the clouds—and flowers—the stars—before she reaches the place where she is intercepted by the wolf. An eclipse to untutored minds would naturally suggest the notion that some evil beast was endeavouring to devour the moon, who is afterwards rescued by the sun—the archer of the heavens—whose bow and arrow are by a common anachronism represented in the story by a gun." But if untutored minds thus spoke of an eclipse, and thus set down the events which led up to it and proceeded from it, they were poets of an order that would have done honour to the best imagery of Shakespeare; and in the meantime, in their very midst, were going on day by day, or season after season, customs which would readily explain such a story as "Red Riding-hood." The only element of the marvellous in the story is the restoration of Red Hood and her granny from the maw of the devouring wolf, and this seems to us to be best explained by the very prevalent custom of "re-birth" which attends almost all savage initiation ceremonies which take place upon the entrance of boy and girl into manhood and womanhood. At these ceremonies the candidates are sometimes immured in the ground, sometimes shut up in huts; but always in the dark, from which they emerge into light; and it not unfrequently happens that they are actually passed through the skin of some animal to typify the re-birth. Then, if we add to this the well-known effects of long feasting, which all savage people indulge in, and note how the attempt to pin the wolf down by putting

stones into his maw is paralleled exactly in New Guinea folk-tales, we seem to have in this story only another instance of the preservation of the primitive ideas of man derived from actual customs going on around him, instead of a highly poetical version of the doings of sun, moon, and stars. Men were accustomed to think and dream of beautiful women long before they thought and dreamt of the moon and its doings; and it is from this earlier stage of thought that the germ of such stories as Red Hood is derived.

In the Kashubian story, entitled "Cudgel, bestir yourself," Mr. Wratislaw points out that its close parallel to one of Grimm's well-known stories gave rise to bitter complaint by Slavonic literati, that their folk-tales have been appropriated by the Germans. But this question of appropriation by one nation or people of stories told also by another nation or people is a larger matter than that suggested by the Slavonic literati. The story of "Cudgel, bestir thyself" is wider spread than Germany. Like all folk-tales, it has its variants in many lands. This Kashubian story has an incident in it which once more shows the deep influence of late Slavonic thought upon an older groundwork, for the opening of it is imbued with that teaching of Christ, "Sell all that thou hast, and give to the poor." "A cobbler," runs the story, "was busying himself on Saturday with mending old shoes, that he might be able to go to church on Sunday. He worked till late in the evening, and having finished work, early in the morning dressed himself and took his book to service. In church he heard the doctrine that, if anyone dedicates his property to the Church, God will recompense him a hundredfold in another form. And as he was poor, he therefore determined to sell his cottage and goods, and take the whole price to the priest at the church. He went home and told his wife of his intentions, and in a few days the money was in the hands of the parson. But day passed after day, and nothing was to be seen of a recompense. At last, when hunger sorely tried the cobbler, he dressed himself like an old beggar, and went to seek for the Lord God." It is self-evident here that the folk-tale of the people has been grafted on to the teaching of the priesthood to serve a moral purpose, and it is remarkable that throughout nearly all Slavonic popular literature the influence of the Church and Christianity is very strongly marked—so strongly, indeed, as to be the true cause of that remarkable doctrine of Dr. Gaster, that folk-tales generally are derived from the apocryphal literature which arose in the East under the Greeko-Slavonic Church. We ourselves give no sort of credence to this theory, learnedly as it is upheld by its principal exponent; but we should have much liked to have had the opinion of Mr. Wratislaw upon this point. Indeed, in

the matter of exposition and explanation of these tales we must express ourselves as disappointed with Mr. Wratislaw. He has confined himself to the mythological theories of Sir George Cox and Mr. Max Müller, as if no such opposing theories as those of Dr. Gaster on the one hand, and Mr. Andrew Lang on the other, had ever occupied the attention of folk-lorists; and yet Mr. Lang's magnificent introduction to the latest and best translation of Grimm supplies a key to that school of folk-lorists who think that in the tales we have an expression of savage or barbaric fancy surviving in the traditions of a people long after the era of savage or barbaric thought and custom had passed wholly away.

There is another aspect of Mr. Wratislaw's work which must be touched upon. He supplies another story-book for the young, and one that many of our special readers will more than usually welcome. Nursery-tales, the delight of all children, are here very often, as we have already noted, appended to the teaching of Christian doctrine, and almost throughout there is a strong substratum of religious fervour and influences. This is not hurtful to the student of folk-tales. On the contrary, it allows him to understand one of the means by which, in the turmoils of racial and national conflicts, these old-world stories could have been preserved. And it is highly useful to those who wish to instruct children in religious principles while delighting them with the tales that have delighted generations of children. Alas! the time for true folk-tales has now almost wholly passed away. Nurses do not now tell tales with dramatic force, with nervous instinct which comes from the memories of their own childhood. They read them from books that are now constantly being issued from the press, and we feel assured that Mr. Wratislaw's volume will find its way into the hands of many who care nothing for the theories as to the origin and transmission of folk-tales, but who care very thoroughly for the tales themselves—those marvellous products of the human mind which in this nineteenth century delight the children of the nursery and the schoolroom and the student of early man and his ways.

G. L. Gomme.

Art. VI.—THE EPISTLE TO THE HEBREWS.

THE following epitome of the Epistle to the Hebrews, with the notes, was made during a reading of the Epistle in the original Greek with a clerical society. As to the epitome or abstract, doubtless better may be found in print; but the most helpful to a student is that which he makes for himself during

actual perusal of a work. As for the notes, they were not meant to be exhaustive; many passages well discussed in accessible commentaries are left untouched. The notes were written without much reference to commentaries; and rather on points of scholarship, language, and the rendering of the Greek, where I might claim to contribute an independent opinion. They were made before Dr. Westcott's invaluable book on the Epistle appeared. A few references to this have been added in the notes, and at the end.

Epitome.—Chaps. i., ii.

God, after many partial revelations, has finally spoken to us by His Son; by that Divine Son through whom He made and sustains the world; who, having purged our sins, is returned to His Father on high. Far above all angels is He, as the Scriptures show; He, the eternal victorious Son, while they are but ministers. To such a message of salvation we must give heed with reverent fear. Christ spake it first, then His immediate hearers, and God has confirmed it by miraculous signs and spiritual gifts. Jesus Christ is the Supreme Ruler of the world to come. Not yet do we see this supremacy complete; but, after humiliation and death, we see Him glorified. And as God's purpose is through Him to lead many sons of men to glory, He fittingly perfected through suffering Him, the Captain of their salvation. Christ is the Divine Son, but through Him we are called to be sons, made His brethren, freed from bondage by His victory over the devil our enslaver. He came to help men, not angels; He was, therefore, made very man, to feel for and with His brethren, to be a merciful High Priest.

Notes.

Chap. i. 1-4.—There is a beauty, majesty and melody in the Greek original here, which the English Authorised Version in a great measure reproduces. But the Revised Version, while labouring to be precise in details, loses much of this beauty; indeed, it can hardly be read aloud so as to sound well. The diction of these verses, as indeed generally that of the Epistle, shows that the writer was one who could easily and powerfully wield the Greek language.

Verse 2, τοὺς αἰῶνας.—No one word better renders this here, or in like passages, than does "world." Doubtless the first meaning of αἰὼν is "a length of time, an age." But "making the ages" is in English rather unmeaning. In the plural οἱ αἰῶνες comprises as well the created things and the events as the ages or times through which these exist and happen. Chap. xi. 3 of this Epistle, and Wisd. xiii. 9; xiv. 6, are similar to

this in the use of the expression. Westcott, in his note on chap. xi. 3, says, "This conception of creation as unfolded in time, the many ages going to form one world, is taken up into Christian literature." We do, in fact, use the English "world" in a wide sense. "Before the world began" means "before time began to be, and things to happen or be created." And the singular is thus wider than the plural, by which last we rather denote the material spheres, heavenly bodies, etc. Theologically, of course, this verse hangs together with *πάντα δι' αὐτοῦ ἐγένετο* of St. John i. 2; and our Creed's "By whom all things were made."

Verse 3, *ὑποστάσεως*.—"Substance" or "essence" is better than "person" here; though in defining either of the Divine nature we are beyond our depth. For *χαρακτὴρ*, "express image" of the Authorised Version seems at least as good as "very image" of the Revised Version. For this word "very" sounds rather mean and common in this collocation, and does not suggest the metaphor in *χαρακτὴρ* as the Authorised Version does.

Chap. ii., 1, *παραῤῥυῶμεν*.—"We slip from them, fall away from them." A close parallel is Prov. iii. 21, *υἱὲ, μὴ παραῤῥυῇς, τήρησον δὲ ἐμὴν βουλήν*. Xenophon (Anab. iv. 4, 11) uses the same tense of this word of snow slipping off a surface. Thucydides (iv. 12) uses another compound of *ῥέω*, to describe how, when Brasidas was wounded, "his shield slipped off his arm (*περιεῤῥύη*) into the sea." These compounds do not appear (as far as I know) to be used of ships or things floating on the water; rather of the particles of a fluid moving freely among or from each other, and then of anything slipping or falling with loosened hold. Hence I prefer "fall away," and Chrysostom's *ἐκπέσωμεν*, to "drift away" of the Revised Version. *Παραῤῥεῖν* is used of things slipping from memory, becoming forgotten, by Sophocles (Philoct. 653), and Plato (Legg. 781, A). And *ἐκπεσεῖν* is used for "to forget" in Aristotle.

Verse 16, *ἐπιλαμβάνεται*.—The uses of this word elsewhere, and the general tenor of the argument here, make for "take hold of for help" as the right rendering. It is very remarkable, as Westcott says, that none of the ancient authorities appear to have understood the words so. Chap. viii. 9 confirms this view of the sense of *ἐπιλαμβάνεσθαι*. Christ was made man so best to help man, and deliver him from bondage.

Epitome.—Chaps. iii., iv., to verse 14.

Christ is our High Priest. Study Him well. He is faithful, as was Moses; but is greater than Moses, as a son is greater than a servant. Moses was over Israel, who were God's house or family in old time. Christ is over God's house, and we

Christians are God's house now. But, to remain so, to secure the promised rest, we must be stedfast. Israel forfeited the rest through disobedience. Some never came to Canaan. And the final rest they have not attained to. For Canaan was not the only rest meant. A Sabbath rest was prefigured at the creation; a rest is spoken of long after the entry into Canaan under Joshua, in a Psalm of David. This rest is still in store for the people of God. But we need earnestness and obedience; nor can we escape detection and punishment, if disobedient, for to God all is open, from Him nothing hid.

Notes.

Chap. iii. 14, ὑποστάσεως, "confidence."—Without a doubt ὑπόστασις is here used of the mental state. The two meanings, "substance," "confidence," are, as Westcott says, well established. He has good and exhaustive notes on the word in chaps. i. 3 and xi. 1.

Verses 18, 19, ἀπειθήσασιν . . . ἀπιστίαν. Cf. iv. 11, ἀπειθείας. "Unbelief" is the cause of "disobedience"; the latter the practical result of the former. A man disobeys an adviser (his physician, *e.g.*) because he does not believe in him.

Chap. iv. 1, 2, ἐπαγγελίας . . . εὐηγγελισμένοι.—The latter word seems intentionally to echo and recall the former. In meaning the words are, indeed, partly distinct, but the promise in this case is the good tidings.

Verse 2, συγκεκραμένος. — The Revised Version reads συγκεκραμένους, and renders "because they were not united by faith with them that heard." This is explained to mean "because they (the people of Israel) were not united by faith with them that (first) heard," that is, with those to whom the message was given, viz., Moses and Joshua and Caleb. I must confess that I was long unable to find *any* meaning in the Revised Version rendering. The other reading συγκεκραμένος (retained by Tischendorf) seems far better for the sense. Westcott prefers this reading; he would take πίστει as an instrumental dative, "because it was not incorporated by faith in them that heard," . . . "because they were not vitally inspired with the divine message, though they outwardly received it." I rather prefer the other construction, to connect τῇ πίστει with συγκεκραμένος, "because it was not mixed with faith in the case of those that heard it." Words of advice, promise, etc., can do no good to the hearer who does not believe them; there must be something in the receiver to ensure the wholesome working of the thing received; something in the patient to render effective the medicine; something in the soil to enable the seed to germinate. These illustrations seem suggested by συγκεκραμένος.

Practically the whole sense of this is the same as that of Westcott's rendering.

Verses 12, 13.—A beautiful and forcibly-worded passage, illustrating what was said on chap. i. 1-4.

τομώτερος.—Quite a classical word, both in literal and figurative use.

τετραχηλισμένα.—That this word means "laid open" is certain; but by what metaphor is doubtful. *Τραχηλίζειν* means in some writers to "throw over the head or neck," as a horse does its rider; *ἐκτραχηλίζειν* is thus used literally by Xenophon, *Cyr.* 1, 4, 8, and several times by Aristophanes, for "to throw, cast headlong down." Also it is used by Plato, *Rival.* 132, C., of a wrestler, in the passive voice. And Xenophon says of the Spartans that they are healthy and strong in body, because *ὁμοίως ἀπό τε τῶν σκελῶν καὶ ἀπὸ χειρῶν καὶ ἀπὸ τραχήλου γυμνάζονται, Lac.* 5, 9. L. and S. refer to Plutarch as using the word in this sense. But what exact trick of wrestling is meant, or if any special trick, does not appear. Perhaps only the general working, turning and twisting of the supple neck in the contest. And the passage of Philo, quoted by Westcott in his note on this passage, seems to me to be referable to this idea, *ἄρξεταί ποτε διαπνεῖν καὶ ἀνακύπτειν ἡ πολλὰ γυμνασθεῖσα καὶ τραχηλισθεῖσα γῆ*, "the soil that has been well worked and turned about will begin to breathe through its pores and open upward" (or perhaps "recover"). It may be that the use of the word in this, the only New Testament passage, comes from this figure: Soil that is turned and worked this way and that exposes its particles to the air; is opened by such upturning. Chrysostom understands it of victims hung up by the neck and flayed. Œcumenius gives (with Chrysostom's) another explanation, *κάτω κύπτοντα καὶ τὸν τράχηλον ἐπικλίνοντα*, which does not appear likely.

πρὸς ὃν ἡμῖν ὁ λόγος, "with whom we have to make our account." The Authorised Version, "we have to do," is too general. Westcott quotes Chrysostom in support of the translation I have given.

Epitome.—Chaps. iv. 14; v., vi. vii.

Christ, I repeat, is our High Priest; a high priest merciful, sympathetic. Appointed by God, but not Levitical; rather like Melchisedec, as was prophesied of Him. Now, here is a hard subject, needing keen attention. Some of you have become dull; have not made advance in knowledge proportional to the time that ye have been Christians; are yet at the very beginnings, if, indeed, ye have not gone back. Bestir yourselves, give earnest attention and patience, strive onward to perfection. God's promise is sure, for God is sure, and He even confirmed it by an

oath. Of this promise we have a stedfast hope, a heavenly hope through Christ. This Melchisedec, whom I assert to be the type of Christ as priest, was, as the Scripture shows, greater than Abraham, for he received honour from Abraham and blessed him. He was not of the priestly tribe; he comes into the record mysteriously, goes out of it mysteriously, without recorded beginning or end; and, therefore, is a fit type of the one who is a high priest for ever. The prophecy, "Thou art a priest for ever, after the order of Melchisedec," found no fulfilment in the Levitical priests; in Christ it finds fulfilment. Christ is not one of many temporary changing priests, but is one abiding for ever. He, sinless Himself, has made one offering that needs not repeating for the sins of all.

Notes.

Chap. v. ver. 8, ἔμαθεν ἀφ' ὧν ἔπαθεν.—This phrase recalls some classical passages. That by suffering comes learning was proverbial. Cf. Æsch., *Agam.* 241, τοῖς μὲν παθοῦσιν μαθεῖν ἐπιῤῥέπει, and Herod. i. 207, παθήματα . . . μαθήματα. Westcott gives other examples of this alliteration.

Verse 11 begins a digression of personal address; the comparison of Christ to Melchisedec is reintroduced at vi. 20, and worked out in chap. vii.

Verse 12, στοιχεῖα.—What we might call the A B C of any study.

Verse 14, ἕξις . . . αἰσθητήρια . . . γεγυμνασμένα.—All rather learned and philosophical terms.

Chap. vi. 4-8.—On this solemn warning of the perils of apostasy Westcott notes: "The Apostle . . . makes one limitation to the efficacy of the work which he proposes. He cannot do again what has been done once for all. He cannot offer a fresh Gospel able to change the whole aspect of life and thought, if the one Gospel has been received and afterwards rejected. Nature itself teaches that the divine gifts must be used fruitfully. They carry with them an inevitable responsibility." And he connects verse 3 and verse 4 thus: "It is necessary, the Apostle seems to say, that I should add this reserve 'if God will,' for . . . it is impossible for man to renew to μετάνοια those who have fallen from the faith."

Verse 6, ἀνασταυροῦντας.—Notice the *present* participles (not as in verses 4, 5, *past*). "There is an active, continuous hostility to Christ in the souls of such men as have been imagined" (Westcott). May it not be that the writer is thinking of some known instances of apostasy? "For such," he says, "I, as preacher and teacher, can do nothing. But while I thus solemnly warn such, I am not classing you with them. Your kindness proves the contrary."

Verse 12, *νωθροὶ*. Cf. above, v. 11.—Plato speaks of men (*Theætet.* 144, B.) as *νωθροὶ πρὸς τὰς μαθήσεις*. *νωθὴς* he also uses of a sluggish horse, *Apol.* 30, E. Homer applies the word to an ass: *Il.* λ, 558.

Verse 14, *ἦ μὴν εὐλ.*—Here are both the ordinary Greek particles beginning an affirmation on oath and the doubling of the verb in imitation of the Hebrew idiom. This last is frequent in quotations from the LXX. And in Acts iv. 17, *ἀπειλῇ ἀπειλησώμεθα*, and in Acts v. 28, *παραγγελίᾳ παρηγγείλαμεν* may be modelled on the same.

Verse 18, *δύο.*—The promise simple, and the oath added to it. Men confirm their promise by an oath: God, condescending for man's assurance, did the same.

Verse 18, *καταφυγόντες*, "taking refuge," as a ship might do in a safe harbour. This would lead on to the metaphor of the anchor. But how is the anchor comparison to be explained in connection with the end of the verse? Perhaps "as an anchor fixed penetrates below the ground, so the Christian's hope enters into the unseen." But the metaphor is probably quitted before *εἰσερχομένην*, which simply agrees with *ἐλπίδα*. Westcott points out that all the three adjectives may be predicates of "hope" (and this he prefers); or the first two may be referred to the anchor, the third (*εἰσερχομένην*) to the principal subject (hope). No doubt *ἀσφαλῆ καὶ βεβαίαν* suit "anchor"; but in such comparison they are bound to do so. "Hope is like an anchor, sure and firm," would be of little force were an anchor not "sure and firm."

Chap. vii. 3, *ἀγενεαλόγητος.*—This word comprises and explains the two former. Of Melchisedec's genealogy, parentage, birth, we are told nothing; nor yet of his death. Mysteriously brought in, he as mysteriously disappears. Hence he is, as described for us in Scripture, a fit type of one ever-living. Especially emphasized is the fact that he was not of the tribe of Levi. Some have supposed Melchisedec not a man but an angelic or divine being. Surely this would impair, if not destroy, his fitness as a type. Westcott gives some of the opinions to this effect in his additional note, p. 202, but he does not agree with this view.

Verse 6, *δεδεκάτωκεν.*—The force of this and similar perfects is "hath been in the Scriptures spoken of as . . . ." Westcott says, "It stands written in Scripture as having a present force." And he gives a list of passages in this Epistle where the perfect is thus used. I do not know that I should quite agree with him as to all such passages that "the fact is regarded as permanent *in its abiding consequences*." Doubtless these important facts about Christ have "abiding consequences"; but

the tense appears simply to mean "the fact is written in the Scriptures we possess as having happened."

Verse 13, *μετέσχηκεν*, "belongeth" or "pertaineth" appear adequate; for "to share in the lot of a tribe" is "to belong or pertain to it." But it would be better after rendering this perfect by a present (see last note), to render *προσέσχηκεν*, "giveth attendance."

Verse 14, *ἀνατέταλκεν*.—It does not seem to me that this perfect should come in the list given by Westcott on verse 6. For the meaning is "it is quite plain that our Lord *hath* arisen," not that "He is recorded as having arisen." The expression "our Lord" plainly shows this to be an assertion of an obvious fact about Jesus of Nazareth, not of a recorded truth about the Scriptural Messiah.

Verses 23, 24.—The priests of old were many, mortal and transient; the new Priest one, immortal and permanent. With the whole tenor of the passage so plain, I cannot but think that *ἀπαράβατος* here does mean "untransmitted, that does not pass on to another." One cannot expect to find many examples for the use of a long negative verbal like this; but there is abundant authority for the active use of such verbals as *ἄμεμπτος*, *ἄπρακτος*, *ἀναίσθητος*. And the two passages from Josephus adduced by Westcott turn out, on examination, to be both *active* uses of the word. The first is C. Ap. ii. 42, *τί εὐσεβείας ἀπαραβάτου κάλλιον*, "What is more excellent than piety that never transgresses?" One may give an appearance of "passivity" to it by rendering it "inviolate, inviolable," but it does not mean a piety "that is not transgressed against," but a piety "that does not transgress." Josephus is eulogising his own nation as devout men who do not transgress. The other passage is Ant. xviii. 8, 2. Here also the Jews are saying how they have not transgressed the commands of their law.—*ἀπαράβατοι μεμενηκότες*, "having continued without transgressing them." This proves that *ἀπαράβατος* can mean, and does sometimes mean, *οὐ παραβαίνων*, that it need not mean *παραβαινόμενος*.

No example of *παραβαίνειν* exactly thus used of an office is given in lexicons; but I see no strong reason why the writer should not have thought of *παραβαίνειν* as a good opposite to *παραμένειν*, and therefore used *ἀπαράβατος* as equal to *παραμόνιμος*. This is the interpretation of the Vulgate, "sempiternum"; of Theophylact, *ἀδιάδοχον*.

Primasius explains "sempiternum" further by "nec ullum habere poterit subsequentem." Our English "unchangeable" fairly represents this sense. "Untransmitted" or "intransmissible" are words too academic to be recommended for a translation meant for all.

Verse 25, εἰς τὸ παντελὲς.—Of course, "completely, to the uttermost," is the right rendering of this. Westcott says, "the old commentators strangely explain it as if it were εἰς τὸ διηνεκὲς (so Lat., *in perpetuum*)." The fact is, they are penetrated with the idea (which I share) that verses 23, 24, throughout emphasize the continuance, the lasting permanence, of Christ's priesthood. And so they speak of the *permanence* of the salvation wrought. And after all "permanence" is a part and a necessary part of the "completeness."

W. C. GREEN.

Hepworth Rectory,
Feb. 1890.

(To be continued.)

Short Notices.

Gleanings from Old S. Paul's. By W. SPARROW SIMPSON, D.D., F.S.A., Sub-Dean of S. Paul's Cathedral. Elliot Stock.

ALL those who have read Dr. Simpson's "Chapters on the History of Old St. Paul's" will be glad to get his "Gleanings." It is full of interesting matter, and, like the companion volume, is tastefully got up in the antique style.

The Mystery of God. A consideration of some intellectual hindrances to faith. By T. VINCENT TYMMS. Fourth and cheaper edition. Elliot Stock.

We are pleased to see a new edition of this able work, which when first it appeared we strongly recommended. It is emphatically a book for the doubts and difficulties of the present day.

The Cleansing Blood: a study of 1 John i. 7. By H. C. G. MOULE, M.A., Principal of Ridley Hall, and formerly Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge (Author of "Thoughts on Christian Sanctity," "On Union with Christ," "On Spiritual Life," etc.). Seeley and Co., Essex Street, Strand.

A paper on this brief discussion of a most important subject "*was* to appear" in our pages some months ago. Without further delay we recommend this admirable tractate. It is a reprint from the CHURCHMAN of July, 1887, but contains additional matter, and in its present form can easily gain a wide circulation. We quote a few sentences from the Prefatory Note. Mr. Moule says: "The line of inquiry was suggested by the many interpretations of 1 John i. 7, which from time to time I observed, in which the 'cleansing' action of the Lord's holy 'blood' was explained wholly, or mainly, not of the work of propitiation and acceptance, but of that of internal purification of will, of thought, of heart; or, again, of that of the infusion of the life-power of the Lord our Head into His members. I cannot but think that such explanations are not borne out by the testimony of Scripture, inductively studied. This verse, like every passage of the Holy Word, should of course be approached (as in the presence of the Inspirer) with the desire to find out not what we wish it to say, but what it says; and I am well aware of the risk of forgetting this on my own part. But my

" belief is that in this case the true meaning of the verse has been missed " by learned and pious expositors, under the imperceptible influence of a " strong drift of thought in the modern Church—the tendency so to " place in the foreground of teaching all that aspect of our blessed Lord's " work which has to do with internal life-giving and subjective moral " deliverance, as to throw into the far background (to say the least) all " in it that has to do with satisfaction to the broken law, removal of " guilt, reversal of just condemnation."

Notable Churches of the City of London—" Church Bells " Album, No. 4. —is a very cheap and interesting publication. There are twenty-eight full-page engravings, with tersely-written descriptions. (" Church Bells" Office.)

Notes on China and its Missions, by Miss Constance Gordon-Cumming, whose books of travel are so well known, is published at the Church Missionary House. Like *Notes on Ceylon*, by the same pen, it is very welcome.

The seventh part of the monthly issue of Dr. Geikie's *The Holy Land and the Bible*, illustrated (Cassell and Company), has some delightful sketches of shepherd life.

Messrs. T. and T. Clark have sent us a second edition of Mr. Newman Hall's work *The Lord's Prayer*. The first edition was warmly praised in these pages.

We were somewhat disappointed with *Memorials of Edwin Hatch, D.D.*, edited by his brother (Hodder and Stoughton), for the volume is mainly made up of Dr. Hatch's sermons, though there are a few obituary notices.

What is called the " Jubilee Edition " of the Holy Bible (Pica 16mo., thin), printed at the Oxford University Press, is well known as an admirable specimen of tasteful and finished work. Among the many noble editions sent out by Mr. Frowde (Oxford University Press Warehouse, Amen Corner) it takes, in every respect, high rank. How with such large type the volume is so small will be to many a puzzle. A copy of this beautiful edition now before us has at the end the version of the Psalms "approved by the Church of Scotland," with the " Paraphrases ;" and not only to Scottish readers but to all who take pleasure in that curious version, which has charms of its own, and the hymus called Paraphrases, the volume will be very acceptable. Paraphrase No. lviii. is by Logan, or Michael Bruce, and begins—

Where high the heavenly temple stands.

We have pleasure in commending *The Bible Society Monthly Reporter.*

An etching of Mr. Waterlow's picture of " Wolf ! Wolf !" forms the frontispiece to the April *Art Journal*, a good specimen number of this excellent Magazine (Virtue and Co.).

The Field Club, a Magazine of General Natural History for scientific and unscientific readers (very well printed), is published by Mr. Elliot Stock. No. 3 has many good things.

In the new *Quarterly Review* the first article to which many readers will turn is that on Robert Browning, and probably few will be disappointed with it. No poet, it is well said, has enjoyed more ardent admirers ; and the opinion is gaining ground that he is our greatest modern seer. His poems are " the work of one of the greatest minds of the century." It is well remarked that Browning's firm grasp of the individuality of man and of the Personality of God gives a peculiarity to his treatment of nature. Individuality, indeed, is in all ways Browning's chief characteristic. The *Quarterly* thus concludes : " But as the " essence of his philosophical teaching is an insistence upon individuality,

"so the strongest impression left by his poetry is an abiding, ever-
"present sense of the robust, substantial personality of the poet. There
"is a mind conscious of its strength and rejoicing in the swiftness of its
"movement; a temper full of courage, manly, sincere, and resolute; a
"sympathy frank, impartial, comprehensive; a tenderness which is
"passionate, yet tranquil in the repose of strength; a speech direct,
"animated, forcible, coming straight from the man. The whole work
"leaves behind it the sense of health, reality, and greatness. Had he
"illuminated his book of life with more common traits of human
"character; had he chosen his examples from more ordinary types, or
"eschewed the dark nooks of nature and the desert places of the past
"for the broad frequented highways of life, he would have doubled and
"trebled his influence. He can never become a popular poet with the
"simple as well as the learned. His lines will not pass into household
"words, for his strength lies not in single stanzas, but in totality of
"impression. Yet the value of his influence can never be destroyed.
"His hopefulness and spiritual energy are alike indomitable. His
"optimism was not facile. Without closing his eyes to the reality of
"evil, he still could say:

"'God's in His heaven;
"All's right with the world.'

"The wail of pain, doubt, or despair is the keynote of much of the
"highest poetry. Browning's serene confidence robbed him of this
"pathos. But,

"'If precious be the soul of man to man,'

"it is this very faith in God and trust in man which will make his work
"immortal." Another *Quarterly* article which many readers will turn to with interest is "Buddhism," reviewing the work of Sir Monier Monier-Williams. "The Modern French Novel;" "The Beginning and the End of Life," reviewing Professor Weismann's essays on biological problems; and "The French in Italy; 1379-1415," are—to say the least—good average *Quarterly* papers. With the paper on Sophocles we are much pleased. It welcomes Professor Jebb's edition, which bids fair to be one of the very brightest ornaments of English scholarship. The *Quarterly* political articles are, as usual, readable and vigorous. "St. Saviour's, Southwark"—fresh and timely—thus ends: "The endow-
"ments for the good of the poor of St. Saviour's are large, and, with
"some modifications to suit modern circumstances, might be made of
"very great utility. A cathedral in South London, with poverty all
"around it, which had nothing to spare for the poor, would bring only
"cold comfort, and it is no small advantage that St. Saviour's, whenever
"it realizes its obvious destiny, will have the probably unique charac-
"teristic of being able out of its own funds to relieve the necessities of
"its poor neighbours. The value of St. Saviour's as a rallying-point for
"the forces of the Church of England may be measured by the absolute
"and inevitable uselessness of Rochester Cathedral (despite the admir-
"able efforts of individuals) for the same purpose. The distance is
"fatal. It is now a commonplace of Church opinion that the proper
"work of a cathedral is not merely to present a dignified ideal of
"worship, but also to strengthen weak places, to revive flagging ener-
"gies, and generally to impart vigour and life to the diocese. Nowhere
"throughout the whole wide field of the Church of England's activity is
"such an influence more needed than in South London. The restoration
"of St. Saviour's, Southwark, and the changes which in one form or
"another must follow, are interesting for their own sake, but in their
"relation to the religious and moral welfare of hundreds of thousands of
"Londoners they are of most urgent importance."

THE MONTH.

THE Tithe Bill passed its second reading, after a satisfactory debate, by a majority of 125. The speeches of Sir Walter Barttelot, Mr. Raikes, Mr. Heneage, and Mr. Sydney Gedge, among others, were welcome and effective. Mr. Jeffreys said that "there were few gentlemen in the whole of England who would be willing to enrich themselves at the cost of the Church"; and the attitude of the agricultural representatives, as a whole, is encouraging to the Government.

Certain "facts" advanced by Mr. Osborne Morgan have been shown in their true light by the Bishop of St. Asaph in the *Times*. For instance, the Bishop says:

> Mr. Morgan stated that "the Welsh farmers had objected all along not to the payment, but to the application, of the money." I quoted the fact that the lay impropriators and the schools and colleges, who between them hold a very considerable portion of the tithe in Wales, had experienced as great a difficulty in securing the payment of their tithes as the clergy had. Mr. Morgan does not question this fact, but falls back for a justification of his misstatement upon the plea that "it has been over and over again repeated in Wales." Those who know the Welsh press can justly estimate the value of this plea.

The New Code has been received with general cheerfulness. It certainly is a great improvement.

The Bishop of St. Albans' resignation has been gazetted. — We record with regret the death of the Bishop of Dover.

The clergy of Sheffield Rural Deanery have made their presentation to Archdeacon Blakeney, on the completion of his thirty years of ministry in Sheffield. Testimony was borne with marked unanimity to the great value of Dr. Blakeney's work. Other presentations to the revered Vicar are to be made by Lay Committees.

In an article on Parochial Work the *Guardian* says:

> On the whole . . . . the signs of the times point to considerable efficiency and energy in the parochial work of the Church. . . But it will be noticed that what we have said applies chiefly to towns, and that of the state of the country parishes it would be rash to say that equally satisfactory evidence was forthcoming. Of course, there are many country parishes in which admirable work is being done with the best results, and in the face of great discouragements and difficulties. But we question whether it can be said of the country districts, as a whole, that they present the same tokens of vigorous Church teaching and quickened interest that are afforded by the towns.

In St. Paul's Cathedral the Bishop of London, it is stated, took upon himself the duty of preaching the mid-day sermons all through Holy Week, including the addresses at the three hours' service upon Good Friday.

The Dean of Peterborough, a divine of the highest rank, has declined the See of Bangor. The *Record* says:

> The Dean's refusal is based upon grounds which do him honour. Dr. Perowne, although seventeen years ago intimately acquainted with the diocese, and with the vernacular, has felt that his appointment might entail a good deal of criticism from those clergy who have raised the cry of "Wales for the Welsh." Rather than enter upon the See under these circumstances he has elected to stand aside.