

# Theology on the Web.org.uk

*Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible*

This document was supplied for free educational purposes. Unless it is in the public domain, it may not be sold for profit or hosted on a webserver without the permission of the copyright holder.

If you find it of help to you and would like to support the ministry of Theology on the Web, please consider using the links below:



Buy me a coffee

<https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology>



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

[PayPal](#)

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

---

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

[https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles\\_churchman\\_os.php](https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_churchman_os.php)

# THE CHURCHMAN

February, 1918.

## The Month.

**The Bishopric of Hereford.** THE opposition to the appointment of Dean Henson to the Bishopric of Hereford failed to effect its purpose, and his consecration has been fixed to take place on February 2. It must be admitted, however, that the opposition assumed a grave and formidable character, and at one time it seemed quite uncertain what would be the result. But the calm and judicial letter in which the Archbishop of Canterbury announced his decision to proceed to the consecration did much to remove misunderstanding and allay fears. The various incidents of the controversy are of such great importance that it is necessary, if only for future reference, to put the main lines of the story on record. The chief opposition to the appointment came from the English Church Union, which by advertisements in the papers and in other ways sought to obtain signatures to a Protest against the appointment. The result, however, must have been very disappointing to the E.C.U., for when it was presented to the Dean and Chapter of Hereford it had only 2,300 signatures—an almost insignificant number when we remember the extraordinary efforts made to push it. The Protest, of course, had very little if any effect upon the Dean and Chapter, for when that body met on January 4 to elect the new Bishop, Dr. Henson was duly elected, without an adverse vote. Nineteen members of the Chapter attended, and of these fifteen voted in favour of the Bishop-designate and four abstained. But much heavier fire was then directed against the appointment.

**The Bishop of Oxford's Plea.** Within a few days a letter was published which the Bishop of Oxford had addressed to the Archbishop, the day before the election, begging his Grace to refuse to consecrate Dr. Henson. The Bishop of Oxford disclaimed

that he was taking action because of anything which Dr. Henson had said about the ministry of the Church or any other matter of Church polity or policy :—

I am driven to act as I am doing solely because his expressed beliefs touching the fundamental matters of faith seem to me incompatible with the sincere profession of the Creeds.

In more than one book he has argued that, though a man has been led to believe that our Lord was not born of a virgin mother, he should still be free to exercise his ministry in the Church and to recite the services of the Church in which the miracle is unmistakably and repeatedly affirmed ; and even if he believe that “ no miracles accompanied His entrance into, or presence on, or departure from the world,” he should still hold this “ freedom ” to make public profession to the contrary. But may I think that the Dean is simply pleading for freedom for others ? I am led reluctantly to conclude that I cannot. His treatment of the Virgin Birth seems to me incompatible with personal belief in its occurrence. Again, he expressly repudiates belief in the “ nature-miracles ” recorded in the Gospels as wrought by our Lord. He writes explicitly, “ From the standpoint of historical science they must be held to be incredible.” But the birth of a virgin mother and the bodily resurrection of our Lord—that His body did not “ see corruption ” but was raised again the third day to a new and wonderful life—are similar “ nature-miracles ” ascribed in the Gospels to the same power and Spirit of the Father as the miracles upon nature worked by our Lord during His ministry. I can conceive no rational ground for repudiating the latter as incredible and believing the former. The Dean himself seems incidentally to include both classes of miracles in the same category. He does indeed confidently and constantly affirm the truth of the Resurrection of Christ ; but he seems to me by “ resurrection ” to mean no more than personal survival. He repudiates again and again any insistence upon the “ empty tomb,” and declares it to have no significance. But the empty tomb was an absolutely necessary condition of any such resurrection as the New Testament postulates. If the tomb was not empty, Christ was not, in the New Testament sense, risen again. On the whole I am led irresistibly to the conclusion that, though he nowhere explicitly expresses in so many words his personal disbelief in the physical miracles affirmed in the Creeds, he does in fact regard them as incredible.

The Bishop of Oxford recalled to the Archbishop’s mind the terms of the Declaration recently agreed to by the Bishops of the Southern Province, and then continued :—

As things stand—that is, judging only from his published writings—if Dr. Henson were to take his place among the Bishops, I think three results would follow :

1. It would be impossible to deny that the Bishops—not all of them individually but the Bishops as a body—are prepared to admit to the episcopate, and therefore to the other orders of the ministry, one who does not believe in the miracles of the Creed, supposing he unfeignedly believes (as Dr. Henson does) in the doctrine of the person of Christ. And this, it appears to me, is to abandon the standing ground of the Catholic Church from the beginning, which has insisted on holding together the ideas and the miraculous facts. I do not mean that the action of the Bishops would commit the Church of England. I think the mind of the Church of England would

be opposed to their action. But I think it would commit the Bishops corporately.

2. An atmosphere of suspicion will increasingly attach itself in the mind of the nation to the most solemn public assertions of the clergy, in the matter of religion, just at the time when we are constantly hearing that the awful experiences of the war have forced us back upon realities.

3. An effective (though not, I think, a legitimate) excuse will be afforded to all officers of the Church to treat their solemn declarations on other subjects as "scraps of paper." Any discipline on the basis of official declarations will become more and more difficult; and the authority of the episcopate will be quite undermined.

In order that such disastrous consequences may be avoided I feel myself constrained to entreat your Grace and my brother Bishops, in the event of the Dean of Durham being elected to the see of Hereford by the chapter, to refuse him consecration.

Undoubtedly this letter, coupled with one from Dr. Darwell Stone, who also gave passages from Dr. Henson's writings, made a deep impression upon the public mind, and the uneasiness was increased by what we can only call a most unfortunate letter from Dr. Sanday. The result was that some who had previously upheld the appointment felt bound to withdraw their support. Of these the most conspicuous was the Dean of Canterbury.

Dr. Wace wrote to the *Times* to say that he felt  
 Dean Wace's  
 Position, compelled to join in the protest against the appointment, and in the *Record* of January 17 he thus explained his position:—

A letter from Dr. Sanday appeared in *The Times* on Saturday, January 5, entitled by *The Times* "Modern Belief," respecting the "expression of Fundamental Truths," which he began by saying that "my own general position is so similar to Dr. Henson's that I believe he will accept me as an advocate." He says that our own generation "has to ask itself whether the fundamental truths of Christianity can be stated in terms that are acceptable to the modern mind. Dr. Henson and I agree in thinking that they can," and he proceeds to give examples of such modes of statement. "The Virgin Birth," he says, the "physical resurrection and physical Ascension, are all realistic expressions, adapted to the thought of the time, of ineffable truths which the thought of the time could not express in any other way." The witnesses of the Gospel narratives would, he says, view them in the light of the thought of the Old Testament, while in the present day men view them in the light of scientific thought. If men of our day were describing these momentous events, "we should do our best to tell over again the story of the Gospels; but we should not tell it quite in the same way. . . . The First Gospel and the Third each devote two chapters to the Nativity and Infancy of the Lord. Both stories must be regarded as poetry and not prose." Now if these allegations, which must carry great weight in a person of Dr. Sanday's authority, are not in substantial accord with Dr. Henson's views, it is reasonable to expect that, if only for the sake of his friends, he would repudiate them. But when he failed to do so, it became unavoidable

to conclude that he is not materially out of harmony with them, and that his own statements must be read in the light of them. It must be supposed that it is to statements like this that he refers when he speaks of the narratives of our Lord's birth being "generally assumed by the learned to belong less to history than to poetry." I waited two or three days, after the appearance of this letter from Dr. Sanday, before abandoning the hope that Dr. Henson was not involved in the misbelief attributed to him; but under his continued silence, it seemed to me inevitable to recognize that he had yielded to the "modern" influences to which Dr. Sanday has made so disastrous a surrender.

\* \* \* \* \*

In face of these considerations, is it possible to acquiesce without protest in the admission to an office, in which the holder is solemnly charged to drive away "all erroneous and strange doctrines, contrary to God's Word," of a clergyman, however able, eminent, and personally beloved, who, to say the very least, is prepared to view with indifference or tolerance such errors on one of the most sacred elements in the Christian Faith? I am doubly grieved, considering the happy personal relations I have always enjoyed with Dr. Henson, to come to the conclusion that this is not possible, and that, whatever may be the result of this conflict, I must join in the public protest which is being made.

The Dean of Canterbury carries, so deservedly, such great weight among all classes of Churchmen, and especially among Evangelicals, that his defection was seen to be of very great seriousness to the cause of the Bishop-elect. About the same time some of the Bishops—London, Salisbury and Worcester—caused it to be known that they would take no part in the consecration ceremony. But one Bishop—his lordship of Peterborough—publicly championed the case for consecration.

The Bishop of Peterborough, with the Archbishop's permission, published the letter he had addressed to his Grace on January 14. In this he wrote:—

**A Bishop's  
Championship.** I do not propose to examine in detail the statements in Dr. Henson's writings which have been quoted by the Bishop of Oxford as evidences of heresy, but I would venture to point out that it would seem less than just to base so grave an accusation not so much on the statements themselves as on their implications, implications which must certainly differ according to the point of view from which they are approached. To refuse consecration to a duly elected Bishop in the absence of definite heretical teaching on his part, both *positive* and *proved*, would seem to be hardly in accordance with the genius of the Church of England. I hold no brief for Dr. Henson. I dislike his apparent Erastianism. I object strongly to the almost obstructive conservatism by which, as it seems, he seeks to retard the progress of those reforms in our Church which are so vital and so urgent. I differ *in toto* from what is alleged to be his position in regard to the Virgin Birth of our Lord, and His Resurrection. I believe with the Bishop of Oxford that these transcendent truths would never have become part of the faith of the Church without the physical phenomena by which they were attended. None the less, when I ask myself whether a man whose devotion to our Lord is beyond

question, and whose full faith in the supreme miracle of our Lord's unique personality as God and Man is known to all, but who, in his fearless search for truth, is not in all respects convinced as to some of the physical accompaniments of that faith, is therefore to be excluded from the Episcopate, and therefore incidentally pronounced to be unworthy of his priesthood, I confess that I do not find it easy to answer confidently in the affirmative.

\* \* \* \* \*

No Bishop would dare to face his task unless he believed that the Holy Ghost had called him. At the solemn hour of his consecration the Bishop-elect of Hereford will profess his faith in the words of the Nicene Creed. He will then give a solemn undertaking to banish all false doctrine from his flock. Most of all he will be endued with that Spirit Whom the Lord promised should guide His Church into all truth.

I am content to leave it at that. I am a Modernist, but not in the usual sense of that word. I believe in the present movement of the Holy Ghost in the Church of England. I believe that my Mother Church, which I passionately love, so far from being at the end of her usefulness, is on the threshold of a new potency as His instrument. I believe that one of her glories is the alertness with which, while holding utterly to the faith once delivered, she ever expects new light from Him, even if this should mean at times taking risks and making mistakes. I believe that with faith and patience and forbearance it is in the power of the Church to compel even the present perplexity to minister ultimately to her further effectiveness in the hands of God. With these considerations in view, I humbly submit that the Bishops will do wisely if they proceed with the consecration of Dr. Henson at this time.

The studious moderation of this letter, no less than its fearless courage, appealed to many, and, if the controversy had proceeded, would have proved a very important factor in the discussion. But the day following its appearance, there was published the important communication from the Archbishop which, to most reasonable minds, was the last word on this particular incident, although the discussion on the general question will doubtless continue for a long time to come.

The Bishop-elect had been pressed both privately and in the Press to ease the position of some of his best friends by making reference, in a sermon, or otherwise, to the doctrinal questions involved that it might be seen what his *present* position is, seeing that the allegations of his opponents rested on extracts from books published several years ago. But he was sufficiently ill-advised to turn a deaf ear to all such entreaties. At length, however, letters were exchanged between the Archbishop of Canterbury and himself which cleared up the point most satisfactorily. The Archbishop's letter to Dr. Henson was dated January 16, and was as follows:—

**Dr. Henson's  
Assurance.**

I am receiving communications from many earnest men of different schools who are disquieted by what they have been led to suppose to be your disbelief in the Apostles' Creed, and especially in the clauses relating to Our Lord's birth and resurrection. I reply to them that they are misinformed, and that I am persuaded that when you repeat the words of the Creed you do so *ex animo* and without any desire to change them. I think I understand your reluctance to make at this moment a statement, the motives of which might be misconstrued, and it is only because you would relieve many good people from real distress that I ask you to let me publish this letter with a word of reassurance from yourself.

The Bishop-elect at once recognized the reasonableness of the request coming from such a quarter. \* Replying on January 17, Dr. Henson wrote the Archbishop as follows:—

I do not like to leave any letter of yours unanswered. It is strange that it should be thought by any one to be necessary that I should give such an assurance as you mention, but of course what you say is absolutely true. I am, indeed, astonished that any candid reader of my published books, or any one acquainted with my public ministry of thirty years, could entertain a suggestion so dishonourable to me as a man and as a clergyman.

The reply could easily have been more graciously worded, and the last few lines of his letter shows that Dr. Henson has wholly misunderstood the anxieties of his friends; but when we pass from the manner to the matter of the reply we are thankful for its definiteness, and we feel that the whole Church should be grateful to the Archbishop of Canterbury for having been the means of calling forth so clear an assurance from the Bishop-elect.

With these letters was published the full text of The Primate and Dr. Gore. the reply of the Archbishop of Canterbury to the Bishop of Oxford's protest. It is a letter of the very first importance, and will become of great historic value. Especially interesting is the first point by reason of its reference to what might happen in the case of a conflict between the Crown and the Church:—

I have, as you know, always maintained that in the last resort a large measure of responsibility must belong to the ecclesiastical authorities, and especially to the Archbishop of the Province, in regard to the filling of a vacant See by the consecration thereto of a priest duly nominated by the Crown. It is, therefore, appropriate that you should write to me as you have written on a matter about which you feel so strongly. No constitutional rule or usage can force the Archbishop to the solemn act of consecration, if he be prepared, by resignation or otherwise, to abide the consequences of declaring himself in *foro conscientie* unable to proceed. I should be deliberately prepared to take that course if I found myself called upon at any time to consecrate to the Episcopate a man who, in my judgment, is clearly unworthy of that office or false to the Christian faith as taught by the Church of England.

In regard to Henson's case the Primate's review of the circumstances is most able and thorough and puts the difficult points in their right perspective :

During the last few weeks I have read with care most of Dr. Henson's published books, and since receiving your protest I have re-read with close attention all the passages to which your protest refers. Taking them, as in fairness they must be taken, with their full context, I find opinions expressed with which I definitely disagree ; I find in some pages a want of balance and a crudity of abrupt statement which may give satisfaction or even help to certain minds or temperaments, but must inevitably be painful and possibly even dangerous to others ; I find what seem to me to be almost irreconcilable inconsistencies ; I find much that seems to me to need explanation, qualification, or restatement.

But the result of my consideration of the whole matter—and it has not been slight or hurried—is that neither in Dr. Henson's books nor in the careful communications which have taken place between him and myself on the subject have I found anything which, when it is fairly weighed in its true setting, I can regard as inconsistent with the belief which he firmly asserts in the facts and doctrines of the faith as set forth in the Creeds. Some of the collections of isolated extracts from his writings, as sent to me by correspondents, are even more than usually unfair. And, as you say in your letter, " he gives noble expression " to what you have called " the theological ideas of the Creed and the New Testament."

We are familiar with the danger, common in ecclesiastical controversy, that a critic, taking his opponent's premises, may base on them what seems to him to be an obvious conclusion, and then describe, or perhaps denounce, that conclusion as the opinion of the man whom he is criticizing, when, as a matter of fact, whether logically or illogically, the writer commits himself to no such opinion. This danger is very real in the case of a writer so exuberant as Dr. Henson. It is a satisfaction to me to note your explicit statement that the " denial " which you attribute to him is your inference from what he has written, and is not found in the words themselves.

I am bold to say that no fair-minded man can read consecutively a series of Dr. Henson's sermons without feeling that we have in him a brilliant and powerful teacher of the Christian faith, who regards the incarnation of the Son of God as the central fact of human history, who accepts without qualification the Divinity of our Blessed Lord, and who brings these supreme realities to bear with persuasive force upon the daily problems and perplexities of human life. That he has also a singular power of effectively presenting the Gospel message to the hearts of a congregation of quite ordinary and untheological people is a fact of which I have personal knowledge and experiences.

You have legitimately directed attention to a resolution which was adopted *nemine contradicente* by the Bishops of the Province of Canterbury on April 30, 1914, in reply to certain memorials which had been presented to us. I do not find myself in that resolution, interpreted either literally as it stands or in the light of the ample and weighty debate which introduced it, anything which leads me, as one of those who voted for it, to feel that I should be acting inconsistently in proceeding in due course to the consecration of Dr. Henson.

I am acting, in a difficult matter, with a sense of high and sacred responsibility towards God and man after giving weight to the theological, the ecclesiastical, the constitutional, the practical, and the personal issues involved.



## Fastíng, a Means of Self-Discipline.

IN AGREEMENT WITH THE TEACHING OF HOLY  
SCRIPTURE AND OF THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND.

THE practice of self-denial in some form is generally admitted to be a duty of the Christian life. It is a duty upon the discharge of which depends not only our present, but also future happiness. The self-indulgent have never attained to the truest happiness, even in this life. He who is bent upon seeking his own pleasure, who is always "looking on his own things" (Phil. ii. 4), who seeks exclusively his own ease or comfort, and consults his own convenience, without considering the welfare of others, must sooner or later find that the good he has sought, the advantage which he covets, has passed beyond his reach. Selfishness, in all its multifarious forms, gives birth sooner or later to its own Nemesis. The Christian alone of all men is capable of attaining the truest satisfaction. He may have his trials, his losses, his sorrows, but they seldom come and pass away without leaving behind them some corresponding blessing or advantage. They may be *intensely real*, and such as he is compelled to admit cannot be fully understood (1 Pet. iv. 12, 13), but, inasmuch as they are not of his own seeking, he is assured that they are permitted by One who intends his eternal welfare (St. John xvi. 33). He is, moreover, the servant of One who "pleased not Himself," who "came not to be ministered unto, but to minister," who "took upon Himself the form of a servant," and condescended to appear among men "as He that serveth" (Rom. xv. 3; St. Matt. xx. 28; Phil. ii. 7; St. Luke xxii. 27); and whose words are, "I have given you an *example*, that ye should do as I have done to you" (St. John xiii. 15). Now, from these and many other passages, indeed from the general teaching of the New Testament, we gather that there is no greater contradiction in terms than that which is contained in the words as they are usually understood, a *self-indulgent Christian*. As, moreover, self-denial is of the very essence of Christianity, so no form of real selfishness can live, much less thrive, beneath the Cross of Calvary (Phil. ii. 2-8).

But, inasmuch as the nearest and in many respects the most powerful of our three great enemies acts upon us through "the flesh"—its natural cravings and desires often exceeding their

lawful exercise, and so developing into antagonism to "the spirit" (Gal. v. 16, 17)—and as all men are more or less under its influence, and by far the most numerous class of sins is distinctly traceable to this source, the Church has wisely set apart the season of Lent to "the silent discipline of Repentance," and inculcates in all her Lenten services, year by year, the great Christian duty of fasting as a means of self-discipline. There can be no reasonable doubt, then, of the mind of the Church with regard to this all-important matter. She, at least, fully recognizes its *necessity and utility*, and has marked out for her children the Lenten season as a time for its *special* observance. At each return of the solemn season, she directs the Christian to the records of our Lord's own intensely real self-discipline. She points to His fast as the Christian's warrant for a like exercise of this discipline. She causes to be read in her services His own authoritative words as to the great Christian duties of fasting, alms-giving, and prayer. And in recognition of the fact that these are duties too often and too sadly neglected, and in view of the general necessities of the Christian life, she requires her children to add to them the other exercises of self-examination and humbling of ourselves before God. Thus she meets the weakness and indecision of human nature by suggesting such means of discipline as God has abundantly blessed in all ages of His Church, which in the past He not only sanctioned but *commanded* to be used, and the faithful use of which by His servants He was pleased to mark with His own signal favour (Joel ii. 12-14; Ps. xxxv. 13; Dan. ix. 3, x. 2, 3, 12; Jonah iii.; 1 Kings xxi. 27-29; Jer. xxxvi. 1-10; Acts x. 30-48). Indeed, the practice of *fasting* is met with in all parts of the word of God. It is not confined to the Old Testament. It was not only observed by a David and a Daniel, and proclaimed by a Joel. It was practised by the best and holiest of men with whose names and history the New Testament has made us familiar. It was observed under widely different circumstances, but always, or nearly so, as a distinctly *religious* act, with direct reference to sin and its forgiveness, and consequently as a necessary preparation—either of the individual or of the nation—for a nearer approach to God in order to obtain His mercy or favour (Exod. xxiv. 18, xxxiv. 28; Deut. ix. 9, 18; Joshua vii. 6; Judges xx. 26; 1 Sam. vii. 1-6; 2 Sam. xii. 22; 1 Kings xxi. 27-29, xix. 8; 2 Chron. xx. 3; Ezra viii. 21-23, x. 6; Neh. i. 4, ix. 1, 2; Esther iv.

16; Ps. xxxv. 13, xlii. 3, 10; Jer. xxxvi. 1-9; Dan. ix. 3, x. 2, 3, 12; Joel i. 9, 13, 14, ii. 12-14, 26, 27; Jonah iii.). Wherever we meet with passages in the Old Testament which appear on the surface to discountenance the practice (e.g. Isa. lviii. 3-7; Zech. vii. 5, 6, viii. 8, 19), passages which those who reject its use quote with a peculiar emphasis, we find that the thing discountenanced is not the practice *per se*, but the *manner* of its observance, or the *spirit* in which it was used.

“ But vain all outward sign of grief,  
And vain the form of prayer,  
Unless the heart implores relief,  
And penitence be there.”

Ostentation, reliance upon the means as though it were the end, the neglect of other duties, as if the discharge of this compensated for such neglect in the sight of God, these were the things condemned. And why? Because they vitiated the observance of a *true* fast. If it is not allowable to “so expound one place of Scripture that it be repugnant to another” (Art. xx.) we cannot affirm that in “one place of Scripture” the practice of fasting is condemned and in another approved (as e.g. in the case of Daniel and Cornelius).

Moreover, the passages in which it is *commanded* in the prophet Joel (i. 14, ii. 12-14) occur in a book of which Professor Redford says, in a paper on Joel, under the head of “*Studies in the Minor Prophets*,”<sup>1</sup> “a leading feature is its entire freedom from Levitical *formality*,” and he truly remarks, “it is not *disparagement* of external services which deepens religious feeling.” Here and there, however, we meet with a sentence more or less adverse to the practice of fasting, but on the whole the paper is an interesting one.

But we need not confine our attention to the Old Testament. In the opening pages of the Gospel we find our blessed Lord Himself preparing to meet the tempter by “fasting,” prayer and meditation. In this, as in all else, He is our one perfect Example. Happily the shadows of nineteen centuries have not veiled His holy life from our view, while to say that because we cannot reach His “forty days” therefore His fast can be “no example” to us, is to deny so far the teaching of the collect for the Second Sunday after Easter, which speaks of Him as our “ensample of godly life.” In other words, it

<sup>1</sup> See *The Monthly Interpreter*, September, 1885. Cf. also the quotation below vi. (c) from Rev. John Wesley’s Sermon.

it equivalent to saying that the holiness we cannot *fully* attain to we are under no obligation to aim at, or to denying the possibility of *any* likeness in a copy to some great original of which it professes to be a copy. In short, it is a species of argument the fallacies of which are too patent to need pointing out. The Church has ever regarded our Lord's wilderness fast as sufficient justification for her practice.

“Lust of the flesh, lust of the eyes, life's pride—  
 Each weapon that o'erwhelmed the primal world—  
 'Gainst Him in vain, and thrice in vain, are hurled.  
 Then lo, He rests with angels at His side.  
 So wars and rests His *Church*. In Him she goes  
 Through *fasting*, prayer, and conflict, to repose.”

But our blessed Lord not only fasted as our example, He also gave certain general rules for its due observance. He took it for granted that men would fast, and so set it in its right light. For true fasting He had not a word of condemnation. He classed it with prayer, “the Christian's vital breath,” and almsgiving (St. Matt. vi. 1-18; St. Luke xviii. 1; 1 Thess. v. 17). He condemned the abuses which like parasites had fastened on it, and He taught that due regard should be paid to the *times* of its observance, that while some were strictly in keeping with it, others were not so (St. Matt. ix. 14, 15; St. Mark ii. 18-20; St. Luke v. 33-35). Referring to the time which would elapse between His Ascension and Second Advent, He announced that His disciples “should fast in those days.” He distinctly taught that certain kinds and degrees of evil could only be expelled by “prayer *and fasting*,” used with faith in Him (St. Matt. xvii. 14-21; St. Mark ix. 14-29; [St. Luke ix. 37-42]). And here it should be observed that our Lord's answer to His disciples as to their need of “fasting” shows that His previous reply on the subject to the disciples of John and of the Pharisees (St. Mark ii. 19, 20) must be interpreted in the light of His directions in the Sermon on the Mount (St. Matt. vi. 16-18).

It was practised, as our Lord said it would be, after His Ascension, by individuals like Cornelius (Acts x. 30), by teachers of the Church at Antioch (Acts xiii. 1-3), by apostles and their fellow-labourers (Acts xiv. 21-23).

St. Paul, too, mentions it among the things in which the apostles had “approved themselves as the ministers of God”—“in fastings,” “in fastings often” (2 Cor. vi. 4, 5, xi. 27); and in cases of a special

nature, we find him advising the use of "fasting and prayer" (1 Cor. vii. 5). And he himself, than whom none knew better the use of lawful things as distinct from their abuse, in order that he might "not be brought under the power of any" such things, practised self-mortification, and even from the time of his conversion onwards used "fasting" as a means to holiness of life (1 Cor. vi. 12; Acts ix. 9).

Thus, we see that the view which is so often taken of it—as a practice belonging exclusively to an earlier dispensation, or as something which might very well have served its purpose prior to Pentecost, but which is altogether alien to the spirit of the Gospel and superseded by the outpouring of the Holy Spirit—is a view which derives but little support from the Word of God.

The Lenten fast as a means to an end possesses, moreover, the testimony of a *very favourable ancient consent*. St. Irenæus, Bishop of Lyons, A.D. 177, states that some Christians made it a fast of forty *hours*.<sup>1</sup> Doubtless it was then more rigorously observed than it has been since it was extended to forty *days*. This, however, does **not touch** the *principle* of its observance. Further, Irenæus testifies that this state of things had existed in the Christian Church long before his time (A.D. 177 *et seq.*).

Eusebius tells us that it was observed in the Christian Church before the end of the second century.

Tertullian (second century) also testifies to its observance.

In the fourth century it extended to thirty-six days, and since the time of Gregory the Great, A.D. 590, its duration has been extended to *forty days*; hence, for the last thirteen centuries the Church has seen in "the Quadragesimal Fast and retirement of our Lord the best original and pattern of ours."

In the early days of Christianity Christians were not in these matters "a law unto themselves" (Rom. ii. 14). It was not then thought that such self-discipline as St. Paul practised, and which received the sanction of his authority, was not agreeable to the spirit of the Gospel. The fear was not then expressed that this self-

<sup>1</sup> The late Bishop Oxenden observes on the point: "At one time the observance of it only lasted forty hours, to commemorate those hours of sadness when our Lord, the Bridegroom of the Church, was taken from us and was laid in the grave, embracing therefore the period between His passion and resurrection, namely the Friday and Saturday before Easter morning" (*Thoughts for Lent*, p. 2).

discipline, wisely observed, would be productive of "more harm than good" to the souls of men. Such exhortations as "*endure hardness*, as a good soldier of Jesus Christ" (2 Tim. ii. 3), were not then regarded as savouring of an asceticism opposed to the spirituality of the Gospel. The wise counsel of the veteran apostle of Jesus Christ was not spoken of as legalism, or as encouraging "levitical formality."<sup>1</sup> The Christian of those days was not ever seeking a laurelled repose before the fight was fought and the victory won. He did not ignore his own responsibility to put forth earnest and persistent efforts, and to contend against the foe, because his Lord had fought and conquered. He did not deem the conquest of self, even in lawful things, a matter of small importance; on the contrary, he rightly regarded it as among the greatest of blessings (Prov. xvi. 32). And this blessing the Church would have us seek during the season of Lent with increased earnestness. At each return of the Lenten season she exhorts us, in the words of St. Anselm, "to flee repose and worldly pleasures, which draw off the mind from the true repose and pleasure, except so far as we learn that they serve to promote our purpose of attaining that end" (*Cur Deus Homo*, Bk. i. c. xx). She would have her children live as those who realize and believe that "the fashion of this world passeth away" (1 Cor. vi. 31), that they are journeying through an enemy's land where they have no "abiding city" (Heb. xiii. 14, R.V.), and that it should be their great aim to strive to be at "peace with God through our Lord Jesus Christ" (Rom. v. 1). Moreover, it has been said that the ante-paschal fast was a custom of the primitive Churches, almost as universal and established as the *Feast of Easter*." And Eusebius speaks of the Christians of his time as "accustomed to exercise themselves in fastings and watchings, and diligent attention to the Divine Word." Wednesdays and Fridays<sup>2</sup> were kept as fast-days in many parts of the Christian Church in commemoration of our Lord's betrayal and crucifixion. Justin Martyr speaks of fasting in connection with baptism; Clement of Alexandria of *weekly fasts*.<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup> N.B.—As a matter of fact, St. Paul was the great opponent of the Judaizers.

<sup>2</sup> See two tracts published by the S.P.C.K., *The Observance of Friday*, by Rev. John Isabell, and *A Plea for the Better Observance of Fridays*, by Rev. W. M. Rodwell.

<sup>3</sup> Cf. quotation vi. (b) below, from Rev. John Wesley's Sermon. Also the quotation below from George Herbert's *Country Parson*.

Our own branch of the Church Catholic takes it for granted that her faithful children will endeavour to act in agreement with the principles which she affirms, and sets before them in her venerable formularies. She has there clearly shown her agreement with the principles of the Early Church. She does not "merely allude" to the practice of fasting in some of her services, but has appointed definite seasons for its observance, namely, the forty days of Lent, the four Ember seasons, the three Rogation-days, *all the Fridays* of the year, except when Christmas Day falls on *that* day, and the vigils or eves before the feast days to which they belong, being the sixteen marked in the "Table of Vigils, Fasts, and Days of Abstinence" in the Book of Common Prayer. These are the days appointed by our Church as fast-days.

It has been said that "no injunctions are anywhere given to observe these days." But why were they appointed, if they are not to be observed?

And, as it has been remarked, "if our reformed Church lays down no precise laws on fasting for us, remember the principle is not changed, only she trusts more to our honour, she treats us, in comparison with the unreformed Church, as Christianity compared with the Jewish Temple, as grown up, able and willing to apply for ourselves the principles of discipline." She does *not* call the exercise of self-discipline "will-worship," or say that one who practises it becomes "a sort of saviour to himself." She does *not* encourage in her members even a thought of "*compensating* by austerities at *particular* seasons for habitual self-indulgence at other times." On the contrary, she puts into the mouth of her children, in her "daily" services, the prayer that they may "live a godly, righteous, and sober life." But knowing the weakness of human nature, the tendency there is in most men to self-indulgence, and the deep disinclination to self-denial, she calls upon all to mark the solemn and sacred season of Lent by a *special* and fitting observance.

"Grant us to curb the wandering sense  
Subdued by wholesome abstinence;  
That temperate food without, within,  
May conquer lust and banish sin."

It has been well said that, through a "dread of Popery we have too much slighted the *opposite* danger of self-indulgence. If fasting is 'one of the least commandments' we may not neglect it" (cf.

St. Matt. v. 19). With regard to its practice, however, the Anglican Church cannot reasonably be expected to "distinctly specify details," so much depends upon *physical* capacities and varying circumstances, but it cannot be pretended with any show of reason that she does not distinctly emphasize the principle (see her Sixteenth Homily, *On Fasting*).

The following quotations are sufficient to show the reasonableness of fasting in the judgment of Christians :—

A. (a) " It (fasting) is not all, nor yet is it nothing. It is not the end, but it is a precious means thereto ; a means which God Himself has ordained, and in which therefore, when it is *duly used*, He will surely give us *His blessing*."

(b) " In the ancient Christian Church there were *stated* fasts, and those both *annual* and *weekly*."

(c) " The people of God have been, from time to time, taught it of *God Himself*, by clear and open revelations of His will. Such is that remarkable one by the prophet Joel " (see above).

(d) *Of our Lord's words on Fasting, Almsgiving, and Prayer* : " His directions *how* to fast, to give alms, and to pray, are of the same force with *injunctions*. For the commanding us to do anything *thus*, is an unquestionable command *to do that thing* ; seeing it is impossible to perform it *thus*, if it be not performed *at all*."

(e) " It has been frequently said, ' Let a Christian fast from sin, and not from *food* : this is what God requires at his hands.' So He does ; *but He requires the other also*."

(f) " Fasting is a way which God hath ordained, wherein we wait for His unmerited mercy ; and wherein, without any desert of ours, He hath promised freely to give us His blessing."

The above quotations are from the Rev. John Wesley's *Sermons*. No. vii.<sup>1</sup>

B. Cf. also Hooker's *Eccl. Pol.*, Bk. v, sec. 72 :—

(a) " He (' our Saviour ') would not teach the *manner of doing*, much less *propose a reward for doing*, what were not holy and acceptable to God."

(b) " Is the body of the Church so just, that it never needs to show itself openly cast down for those faults which though not properly belonging to any one (had yet a special sacrifice appointed

<sup>1</sup> Cf. *Sermons on Several Occasions*. First Series. Wesleyan Methodist Book Room, 1881.



for them in the law of Moses, and), being common to the whole society, must so far concern *every several man* as at some time to require *solemn acknowledgment with more than ordinary testifications of grief.*"

C. The Rev. J. Milner in his *Sermon of Fasting*, says : " It may truly be observed that self-indulgence, and the *neglect of fasting* and of the other severer duties of the same kind, are evils which, in the practice of many who profess to be religious, need to be rebuked. While we have shunned *one* extreme, we have run into *another.*"

Again " they (the fasts of Moses, Elijah, and our Lord) recommend the thing to us very strongly, to be practised *in our measure.*"

And, further, " they who most resemble Christ in mortification and self-denial, shall be most favoured with spiritual views and refreshments."

D. George Herbert, in his *Country Parson*, ch. x, says : " As Sunday is his day of joy, so *Friday* is his day of humiliation : which he celebrates *not only* with abstinence of diet, but also of company, recreation, and all outward contentments ; and besides a confession of sins, and all acts of mortification."

A practice observed by Bishop Andrewes, Bishop Jeremy Taylor, and George Herbert, Henry Martyn, Wesley, and Brainerd, and by a multitude of others, " whose names are in the book of life " (Phil. iv. 3), and also, as we have seen, by our Lord and His apostles, can need no further commendation.

JOHN R. PALMER.



## Christ's Sacrifice considered as Vicarious.

IT speaks little for the grasp that the Church of Christ has of the principles of its own faith, that the doctrine of the Atonement, which lies at the centre, should present itself so largely as a puzzle to be solved. Every doctrine assuredly raises many questions, but it is the very essential meaning of the Atonement upon which men are so divided. Is a theory necessary to our appreciation of the fact? If so, what theory? And the theories offered us to choose from differ not merely as to the answers they give to the question, but as to the very question that they answer.

Indeed, I think, when we have properly fixed the question, the answer lies to hand. In this paper no allusion will be made to the doctrine in many of its various aspects: I shall keep to the exact subject expressed in the title, and even that only in respect of its most fundamental point. What is the *rationale* of the Atonement, regarded as the specific and historical Divine act which opened the way for the creation of the Church of Christ and for our individual forgiveness and salvation? To very many it seems as if such an act is, if not superfluous, at least something that specially needs to be explained. But surely, if the Cross of Christ is the supreme revelation of what God is to man, it ought to shine in its own light. It ought to reveal its meaning in our deepest and most distinctly Christian experiences. Now that throws us back upon the very meaning of Christianity itself. If we agree—whatever our differences—in believing that Christianity is the religion of Redemption—that it means a definite entrance of God into history—then this alone, I take it, should afford the key to the understanding of the Cross. It will lead us, as I shall try to show, face to face with a doctrine of Substitution that shall be free from the encumbrances of obsolete modes of thought, and yet shall not be liable to the charge of explaining away the fact it undertakes to explain.

The late Dr. Denney, in an incisive passage, maintains that there *must* be a theory of the Atonement, for a fact without a theory, or even a fact of which *we* have no theory, could never enter *our* world at all. We may heartily agree with this, and yet our very agreement may almost be stated in terms of the opposite view

For a theory suggests some distinctness from the fact. It seems to imply that the latter is at least capable of statement without the other. Indeed Denney himself prefers the word "doctrine," and says something to the effect that the Scriptural theory so immediately suggests itself to the unsophisticated mind that we hardly think of it as a theory at all. This, I think, is even more true of the form in which it is here proposed to state it than of the so-called "forensic" form to which he adheres.

What we need is to state the fact in terms of God and His relations to men:—the history, not as a mere record of earthly events, nor yet as a mere symbol of eternal realities, but as history on its inward and eternal side, yet still history: not to begin by affirming that we are saved, or forgiven, through Christ's Death, and then append an explanation, but to express the fact at the outset in such a form that the necessity of the connexion is involved. Divine forgiveness, once seen as Atonement through Divine self-sacrifice, should be henceforth unthinkable otherwise.

Now the reality of Redemption implies the reality of Sin. Those who tell us that Christ only came to disillusion us—to show us that the apparent barrier between us and God was not overcome but imaginary—either evade the whole idea of a specific revealed religion, or merely push the problem further back. But let us here assume a general agreement on this point. Sin has a meaning *per se*, an essentially religious meaning. It cannot be defined as selfishness. It *is* selfishness, in one aspect, but to *define* it as such is to reduce religion to terms of morality, and so to do is the very negation of religion, and therefore the undermining of morality itself. Sin is simply—Sin.

And so we must include in our idea of God a necessary aspect of His being which is directly antithetical to moral evil. For if Sin were merely of the nature of a disease, then the very idea of a historic Atonement, as distinguished from the subjective healing of individuals, would be unmeaning. Now it is difficult to express this antagonism in language that shall not lend itself to the importation of unworthy anthropomorphisms. The old-fashioned way of expressing that element in the Divine nature which rendered Atonement necessary, was by using the term "justice." I think this term is to be deprecated, and that it introduces a spurious element into our idea of goodness, due to a mixing up of the two

senses in which the term is currently used. Moreover, I think it has no support in Scripture; for *δικαιος* means "righteous." Now the idea of righteousness may include the punishing of Sin, but not because this is *due* to the sinner, but because punishment is included in the wider idea of *repelling* Sin—reacting against it in some form or another. What conscience requires is that forgiveness should come in some form which expresses, instead of limiting, this antagonism. The sense of this necessity is brought home to it by the Gospel itself, which *reveals the problem and the solution in one*. It is not a question of justice, as we use the term to express a particular virtue. It can never be *unjust* to forgive, though in some cases it may be unjustifiable. The problem, if it be such, lies deeper and yet is simpler. If Sin were not a violation of something in the Divine nature which must react for its own vindication, Sin would not be Sin or God would not be God.

We may use the word "holiness" as convenient to express that aspect of God by virtue of which He reacts against Sin. Now God certainly "is Love," but that does not imply that the idea of holiness is reducible to that of love. For if so, there could be no distinction between holy and unholy love. It is true that Sin may be viewed as an opposition to Love, which is similar to saying that it is selfishness. But wrong acts are not necessarily *direct* violations of the law of Love, and, if not, we can only regard them as such at all because we *first* regard them as sinful, and because He that is the infinitely holy is also Love. In short we cannot explain away holiness. God is known to the Christian consciousness as an Object not simply of grateful response, but of reverence and adoration. Our sense of an infinite Purity, which asserts itself as such against its opposite, is not subjective—is not simply relative to our ignorance; it is as truly a glimpse of God as our sense of His love, and as truly final in our analysis of spiritual experience.

I emphasize this, not only for its own sake, but because it places the necessity of atonement on the very deepest ground of Christian experience, and enables us to recognize this necessity without recourse to those transactional conceptions, which can only be metaphorically and relatively true, and without implying views of God that are justly repellent to the modern Christian mind. Now the old-fashioned theory of substitution, led astray by holding to a supposed necessity of "justice" rather than the simple

fact of a direct antagonism *ex definitione* between God and Sin, was content with the bare substitution of one duly qualified Victim for those who deserved to suffer. The primary idea was that of deliverance from the *penalty* of Sin ; deliverance from its *power* being a matter reserved for the doctrine of Sanctification, and the link between the two was forged afterwards. That our deliverance even from the *power* of Sin is *directly* involved in the Atonement itself can hardly be said to have been recognized at all. And the New Testament is clear on that point, even when it speaks of substitution. " God made Him to be Sin for us who knew no sin, that we might be made the righteousness of God in Him." " Who His own self bare our sins in His own body on the tree, that we being dead to sins, should live unto righteousness." So, I take it, throughout the Epistle to the Romans, St. Paul's teaching leads to this result : that we are delivered by Christ's death not simply from condemnation in the abstract, but from a state of subjugation to Sin, the deliverance from which directly involves not merely justification, but germinal sanctification. Thus the problem is not the problem of an initial condition, on God's side, of forgiveness : forgiveness, on God's side, is *presupposed* by the atoning act ; but how God's forgiveness can express itself—how it can reach man for his salvation, if Sin is a *real* barrier. If God merely *cures* it, then we should have to ask : Why did not He prevent it or cure it at its first appearance ?

This last question will be answered by the reminder that these things are hidden in the insoluble riddle of the Origin of Evil. But I reply, if the Atonement depends for its significance upon our confession of pure ignorance of the situation with which it deals, then it loses its character as a revelation of God. For it solves no problem—if we are not allowed to trace any element of necessity in it ; if, that is to say, there was any alternative course, even relatively to our own limited minds. Now if Sin is not merely an affection of the soul, but rebellion, then there is a real problem, and therefore a real solution. For free-will is fundamental to our idea of personal beings ; it does explain the central anomaly of the presence of Evil in God's world ; Sin then is no mere cloud but a barrier : it creates a situation objective to God and man : it sets a genuine practical problem comprehensible even to us : therefore the solution is a real solution : therefore a revelation.

That, I take it, is the problem, if problem it can be called, which, only comes into clear consciousness in the light of its answer. The Atonement, in overcoming Sin, must express, in so doing, its inherent and real antagonism to Him who overcomes it. There can be no real victory over an unreal foe.

Now is this precisely what the New Testament account of Christ's work discloses. Once admit His divinity, and the principle of the Atonement (as the Dean of Canterbury has shown in his "Sacrifice of Christ") lies on the very face of the history. Christ came to offer forgiveness, salvation. He used every effort to induce men to accept it, culminating in the dramatic Triumphal Entry which appealed to the crudest minds. His coming into the world was God's coming to save man, by disclosing to him his guilt and need and proclaiming pardon and renewal. Sin, thus challenged, came to a head. Belief on the one hand and unbelief on the other, as St. John's Gospel specially shows us, developed *pari passu*. Sin became more completely Sin, because the Light had come into the world and men loved darkness rather than light. It was not the Jews as such that crucified Christ, but the Jews as representing the human race. The crisis came because Sin was forced into the open. There was, as it were, a deadlock. God and Evil stood face to face, as never before or since. Men would not repent, and so Sin had to work out its consequence—because it *is* Sin and God is God. The eternal antagonism had to reveal itself and find its culminating and most awful expression. The only question was: Shall its consequences fall on the sinner or on Him who was sinned against? Either alternative would express that antagonism. Either would express the Divine holiness, considered simply as holiness. God made the choice. He suffered, in the giving of His Son and in the suffering of His Son. The impact of the collision was endured by Him, in order that there might be no rebound.

I am glad to acknowledge that this interpretation of the Atonement directly by the history first came before me through the little book of Dr. Wace's that I have just referred to.<sup>1</sup> I think that the importance of such a method of interpretation cannot be exaggerated. It brings the doctrine into that living contact with

<sup>1</sup> There is a difference, however. The Dean treats the subject in terms of Divine economy; he would probably think my thesis too metaphysical: yet it is only the metaphysic that is presupposed by the terms of our religion.

fact that the modern mind demands. And the result seems to be to dispose absolutely of the central difficulty which the Atonement presents to men. Of course we must grant the reality of Sin on the one hand and the Divinity of Christ on the other. But these truths themselves are not abstract dogmas, but rest upon corporate and individual experience. And, in the light of them, the atoning act explains itself.

Other methods have been employed to explain the manner in which Christ's Sacrifice vindicates the righteousness of God. The extraordinary idea of a vicarious penitence stands prominent among these. Christ, we are told, repented, on our behalf, for our sins. It is difficult to understand how any one can make such an idea real to himself for a moment. Even if it were sound in principle, how could the Sinless repent? How could any one repent even of his own sins, if we could suppose that he had *become* sinless since he committed them? Surely there can be no such thing as repentance *merely* for the past as past—sins *wholly* detached—without any consciousness of our present condition as being still infected. If we felt ourselves severed from the past, if we knew that its *stain*—its actual taint—was annihilated, how could we feel that its guilt remained? Of course this can never be, because even the imperfect renewal which is granted us in this life *presupposes* repentance and forgiveness, but the supposition I have made surely helps to show *mutatis mutandis* the impossibility of repentance in any sinless being, even if the idea of vicarious repentance could be tolerated ethically.

Such theories are even, I think, condemned by the very fact that they are mere theories. They do not work by way of simplification, but by way of elaboration. They do not show us how the doctrine—when once we have cleared away impedimenta—emerges directly from the history itself. And surely they are not drawn from the New Testament teaching as a whole, but have to be reconciled with it afterwards as best they can.

And then, if we approach the subject, not from the side of Sin, but from the side of Substitution in itself, we are confronted with highly unsatisfactory explanations. To treat of Christ's Sacrifice as simply the supreme instance of self-sacrifice, and of life through death, is to surrender its significance as the unique act of Atonement. What we need is to show, not that Christ's Death comes under an empirical law, but that Divine forgiveness actually

requires and involves a Divine self-sacrifice. To explain the central fact of Christ's Substitution as if it were a natural phenomenon which merely requires to be brought under a general law—even though it is the one perfect instance—is to misunderstand the very meaning of theological interpretation. Explanation—so far as it is not simply exegetical—must seek to set the central facts in their proper light : to eliminate accretions : to relate these facts with the fundamental data of religious experience and with one another. That is the only way to interpret a Divine revelation. For such revelation must, in the first instance, be luminous, not illuminated ; and further understood by us, not in the light that it receives but in the light that it sheds upon the facts and problems of life.

Of course, the maintainers of the empirical explanation of Substitution might well assent to this, yet still assert that Christ's Death reveals to us its meaning by the light it throws upon *all* self-sacrifice. But none the less it must shine first in and of itself, or it can illuminate nothing.

I have alluded to the direct connexion of the Atonement with renewal. Notice how this appears when we thus interpret the doctrine on the lines of the history. Christ came into the world to set up His Kingdom, and to proclaim repentance—which means the *forsaking* of sin—as an essential condition of membership. The resistance of man's sinful nature reveals the necessity of the Atonement—that is to say, a resolution of the deadlock between Sin and Divine Holiness—at the cost of God. It is at this point that the infinite condemnation of Sin appears. “ How shall we escape, *if we neglect so great salvation?* ” The awful consequences which all sin holds in the germ are revealed both historically and to the individual conscience in the light of Christ's offer ; for thus, whether by accepting or by rejecting it, man passes sentence on himself. But the offer relates directly to deliverance from the dominion of present and concrete sin—a present deliverance which contains the germ of progressive sanctification. There is no forgiveness of sin merely in the abstract, antecedent to that renewal of the will which is expressed in the renunciation (not conquest, which is a *process*) of our actual sins. As it was in the history, so it is in the individual. In the history Sin actually and in the concrete condemned itself by condemning Christ. In the individual cases, men condemn them-



selves in "crucifying the Son of God afresh;" and when they accept Him, even then their sin is condemned in the light of His Cross, because, even in accepting Him, they are conscious of that in them that pulls the other way: the old self asserts itself in the face of, and against, the Cross: the totality of the sinful nature starts into a fuller life—a clearer consciousness and so deeper guilt—when confronted by that which calls for its destruction.

Let us now glance at the main features of the interpretation I have put forward.


Substitution is commonly regarded, both by those who hold the older views and by those who adopt rationalizing interpretations, rather on the side of Christ's humanity than on that of His Godhead. Not that the latter is, by the orthodox at least, forgotten or regarded as unessential to the idea, but, so far as Substitution is concerned, it is explained with an eye rather upon the distinctness of Christ's personality from that of the Father than upon the identity of His mind and being with the Father's. The view I advocate, on the contrary, explains it primarily with reference to the divinity, not the humanity, of Christ. Both, of course, are essential, but it is the oneness of Christ with the Father that gives the key to the meaning of His death. Thus only can we fully understand how Atonement *presupposes* the love of God, and does not call it forth. "God so loved that He gave." This is the element of truth in Patripassianism. The Sacrifice of Christ was the Father's self-sacrifice, just as the place of Christ in the awakened conscience is no lower than the Father's place. Sin revealed, condemned, and destroyed itself, not simply by the crucifixion of the perfect Man, but by the imposition of that sacrifice upon the eternal God.

Here I may briefly meet a possible objection. It may be said that in the developed teaching of the epistles, this view of Substitution does not appear. For instance: "God made Him to be sin for us who knew no sin." Here we have the substitutionary position apparently assigned by the Father to Christ, with the emphasis certainly on the distinction rather than the unity. Now of course this is *only* a question of emphasis, for, since Christ was Man, there is no contradiction between this passage and the interpretation I suggest. But it must be admitted that the doctrine of Christ's divinity is not directly used in the New Testament to elucidate Substitution. My reply is this. That doctrine, in the order

of revelation, emerges from that of His redemptive work, *just because implied in it*. Even in the New Testament the former is seldom directly set forth, though it pervades the whole. This is in line with our Lord's own method. He made men to *feel* His divinity—assent to it implicitly in heart and will, before they understood it intellectually. First through His human personality and then through His redemptive work, His Godhead was revealed. Then, once revealed, it is seen to belong to the very foundation of any doctrine of Redemption. It is seen to have been implicit in experience from the beginning. In the experience of His saving power Christ's Godhead is realized. And even in the vision of the Cross, with all its human anguish and shame, we experience the fulfilment of His unfathomable words: "He that hath seen Me hath seen the Father."

And yet a few words more may be desirable on the bearing of the idea of Substitution on that of the Manhood. "Christ," says St. Paul, "redeemed us from the curse of the law, having become a curse for us: for it is written, 'Cursed is every one that hangeth on a tree'" (Gal. iii. 13). Are we to regard God as having passed a sentence upon Christ that rested on a fiction? Certainly not, we reply to this old question. But the very way in which we reject an error, the direction, as it were, in which we diverge from it, affects our positive conclusions. If we are not to accept empirical or imported theories of Substitution, how shall we deal with the problem of the curse?

Now I think that the quotation made by St. Paul in this passage—one of those quotations that we are apt to slip as superfluous and rabbinical—really helps us to view his pronouncement at the right angle. The mechanical connexion of curse and penalty—as we may think it—which is implied in the words "Cursed is every one that hangeth on a tree" actually seems to give us the required clue. Man can impose the curse, because he is a deputed administrator of that Moral Order which is of God. Man's infliction of punishment is, in one aspect, a part of the carrying out of God's law. Man, then, imposed the penalty: he misused the instrument placed in his hands for the vindication of the law. He perverted the "curse" itself, when he crucified the Son of God. So, then, Christ did actually endure the penalty of Sin, but it was man who inflicted it, thus revealing Sin and his own need of forgiveness. And yet, again, it was God the Father's act. God "made Him to

be sin for us." But not judicially. The judicial act—a false one—was man's. God's action was action in the sphere of Providence, it was "economic." The sentence was not pronounced by Him, for it has been committed long ago to man. If the curse seems attached mechanically to the penalty, whether justly inflicted or not, this only means—if we penetrate beneath the judaic form of the thought—that human condemnation, even when wrong in its application, is in the abstract an assertion of eternal Divine law. 

God brought this about simply as the Jews always regarded Him as bringing about any event. The Man Jesus did not meet His fate by chance. The condemnation *as such* proceeded from unjust men; the necessity of facing their injustice, from God.

A. R. WHATELY.



## The Sieges of Jerusalem.

THE joyful news of General Allenby's capture of Jerusalem recalls the fact, which few but students are acquainted with, that the Holy City has been subjected to the vicissitudes of war more frequently than any other city of the world. This enables us to realize not only that it is a sacred spot, revered alike by Jew, Christian and Mohammedan, but also that the possession of it has ever been regarded as of the greatest importance politically, militarily and religiously. In *Our Work in Palestine*,<sup>1</sup> the Palestine Exploration Fund enumerate no less than twenty-seven sieges or captures of the city ; so General Allenby's is the twenty-eighth time that the place has been attacked.

But there has been a great difference between former captures and the last. Former sieges have been so destructive that the present level of the modern city is several feet above the level of the site of the ancient city ; and we read that " There is not a stone in the city but has been reddened with human blood ; not a spot but where some hand-to-hand conflict has taken place ; not an old wall but has echoed back the shrieks of despairing women."<sup>2</sup>

At the recent capture of the city, however, so far as we can learn, there has been no blood shed, nor a stone disturbed. In Sir E. Allenby's " Historic Message " he expressly declares that—

" Every sacred building, monument, holy spot, shrine, traditional site, endowment, pious bequest, or customary place of prayer, of whatever form, of the three religions, will be maintained and protected according to the existing customs and beliefs of those to whose faiths they are sacred."

The following is a list of the various sieges of Jerusalem referred to in *Our Work in Palestine* :—

1. Capture of the lower city by Judah, about B.C. 1400 (700 years before the traditional date of the foundation of Rome)—(Judges i. 8).

2. Capture of the upper city by David, about 400 years later (2 Sam. v.).

<sup>1</sup> *Our Work in Palestine*, Pal. Exp. Fund, 1873, pp. 48-67.

<sup>2</sup> *Jerusalem*, W. Besant and G. H. Palmer, p. 2..

3. Surrendered to Shishak, King of Egypt, some years after Solomon's death (2 Chron. xii. 9).

4. About B.C. 887 Judah was invaded by Philistines and Arabians, who "carried away all the substance that was found in the king's house" (2 Chron. xxx. 16-17).

5. Capture by Jehoash, King of Israel, who broke down 400 cubits' length of the walls (2 Kings xiv. 13, 14).

6. The confederate kings of Syria and Israel besieged the city, but apparently unsuccessfully (2 Chron. xxviii.).

7. The Assyrians attacked the city in Hezekiah's reign, but it escaped conquest (2 Chron. xxxii.).

8. Nebuchadnezzar besieged and captured it, partly pillaging the Temple (2 Chron. xxxvi. 6-8).

9. Nebuchadnezzar's army, in the following reign of Jehoiachin, captured and despoiled the city, carrying away to Babylon the remaining treasures and 10,000 of the people (2 Chron. xxxvi. 10).

10. Captured by the Assyrians about B.C. 586, after a siege of eighteen months, the city, its walls and the Temple being destroyed, the ruins being left untouched for fifty years; the people who remained in the land being taken to Babylon (2 Chron. xxxvi. 17-20).

11. Ptolemy Soter captured it, carrying away to Egypt a great number of Jews from Jerusalem and Samaria.

12. In B.C. 203 it was taken by Antiochus the Great.

13. Four years later it was captured by Scopas, the Alexandrian General, who left a garrison in the place.

14. The fourteenth siege was by Antiochus Epiphanes in B.C. 168, when more destruction was wrought on the city than it had experienced since the Assyrian invasion 500 years before.

15. Antiochus again laid siege to the city, and partially destroyed its walls.

16. Antiochus Sidetes, King of Syria, besieged it in B.C. 135; but it was raised on making terms with Antiochus.

17. In B.C. 105 quarrels between the two brothers, Hyrcanus and Aristobulus, led to the seventeenth siege, which was raised by one of Pompey's lieutenants.

18. Pompey invaded the city in B.C. 63, slaying 12,000 of the defenders.

19. Herod the Great, in B.C. 39, took the city after five months' siege.

20. In A.D. 70 Titus commenced the siege of Jerusalem, which resulted in the destruction of the city and the Temple, after untold horrors suffered by the Jews from famine, pestilence and the sword.

21. The next siege was in the reign of Hadrian, in the year 135, after which all traces of the city were obliterated.

22. In A.D. 614 the Persian king Chosroes conquered the city, massacring many thousands of monks, and destroying the Church of the Holy Sepulchre.

23. Caliph Omar captured the city in 636, when it became to Moslems the most sacred place in the world, next to Mecca.

24. In 1098 it was besieged by Afdal, the Vizier of the Caliph of Egypt.

25. The first Crusaders captured Jerusalem in 1099, which led to its becoming a Christian city for a time ; but on—

26. Its capture by Saladin in 1187, after a siege of seven weeks, it reverted to the Mohammedans once more.

27. The twenty-seventh siege was in 1244, by Kharezmians, a wild horde of Tartars, who a few years later were driven out of the country, and Jerusalem fell under Turkish or Egyptian domination, which has continued until the present time.

28. The capture of the city by General Sir E. Allenby, his official entry into Jerusalem on Dec. 10, and the issue of his proclamation brings the Turkish misrule to a final end, brings peace nearer among the nations now at war, and fulfils the predictions of Holy Scripture.

R. R. RESKER.



## The Vicar of the Parish.

LET me make a disclaimer at once and at the start. This is not a judgment or an exhortation ; only a review. It is quite impersonal, except so far as the writer is bound to draw upon his own experiences in past years. And if the reader cares to insert the title of Rector or Incumbent in the place of Vicar, let him do so, for they stand just as well for the man I am trying to describe.

No other preface is, I think, required of me. You all know the man, set up like a lighthouse on the waters, standing out clear and distinct, and shedding, it may be supposed, a beneficent light amidst the perilous darkness and among the menacing rocks. As a peculiarly English product he is worth the study, I think, and will repay it.

### I.

Perhaps the first thought which occurs to most as they consider the Vicar of the Parish is *what an enviable position he occupies*.

This is the Vicar's first thought, probably, when he is appointed. From the day of his ordination he has set that prospect before him as a legitimate goal. And when, in his curate days, he has worn the yoke, light though it may have been, to be a Vicar himself was the oasis he looked forward to in his comparative desert. In fact, no man in orders can be said to have "arrived" until he finds himself seated in the Vicarial saddle. So may the mariner feel when, after tossing about on the stormy seas, he finds himself in harbour. For then he tastes the first sweet fruit of freedom. He is his own master. He can map out his own days, and need give no one an account of his stewardship. Provided he performs his specified and expected duties, none can take him to task. He can measure out his own holidays with a liberal hand and, when he feels disposed, take a day or two off between times.

He has, too, an assured position, for his living is his own freehold, and not even a Bishop can unseat him from his lofty saddle except for flagrant offence. A tenant at will may well sit on tenterhooks, for his holding may be snatched from him ruthlessly, but our Vicar can sit tight, and sit for life. He sits high, too, on a sort of Vicarial throne, master of all he surveys. Possibly nothing particular before, he has the chance now of swelling a little, and cutting

a figure. And, for the first time in his life, it may be, he is being looked up to. He sits above the salt. And as he is only a man after all, he is not beyond feelings of pride. Moreover, he becomes a sort of authority in his own particular sphere, a kind of parochial Pope, and can lay down the law on Sundays and weekdays, no man forbidding him. If it be a pleasure to become in very truth a "Sir Oracle," he has that delight to the full.

And there are still higher claims for our Vicar than these low-lying ones can supply, some more spiritual, and less earthly and natural. For a Vicar who believes that he is where God Himself has put him, and that He Who placed him there will assuredly meet all the demands which such a position makes, the satisfactions must be many. What more satisfying to any man than to feel that the Great Divine Player, Who moves His pieces on the Church's Chess-board, has moved him just there, and that, being there under such auspices, he is truly playing a part in the great game of life, and will share by and by in the great win eternal. It is only when a piece moves itself that it is likely to find itself on the wrong square. And for a Vicar who really cares for divine things, for the souls of men, and for the glory of God, there can be no better and more delightful sphere. For he is on the line of least resistance, in one of the brightest of the world's spots. He is following the lead of his heart and of his best inclinations, and working with the grain, and not against it.

He has the joy, too, of knowing that his life is being laid out to the best possible advantage. Most men have to fight for their own hand, and to come in daily clash with competitors in the struggle. But he fights for God's Hand, and for the direct welfare and gain of his fellows. There can be no collision of interests. He is tilling his Master's garden, and the produce is all for others, and never for himself. He labours for time, and not for eternity. Even in social matters he can scatter benefits around him. He can often stand between the poorer of his people and hunger. He can set himself against disease and physical perils. He can be almost an arbitration court to his parish, perhaps the fairest of all possible intermediaries. He can be an element of peace and conciliation amongst his flock. And, added to all this, he can become a bridge across the chasms which exist in social circles, and so relieve the aching loneliness of many. In fact, in numberless ways our Vicar can play the quiet,



beneficent part of friend and adviser to his people, to his own great joy and satisfaction. In all the world there is possibly not a more enviable position for a warm-hearted man who truly looks out upon the world with eyes of tenderness and love.

## II.

Lest any of my readers should be misled by this glowing and rosy description of the lot of our ideal Vicar I must hasten to drop one or two necessary qualifications.

It is quite true that the office is an enviable one to all who are rightly constructed within, but it must also be added that *no man occupies a more exacting position than the Vicar of the parish.*

I am not thinking only of the drain upon his pecuniary resources which he is continually subject to. It is one of the scandals of the Church of England that livings are rarely true to their name. And it will not be long before our sanguine Vicar will discover the difficulty of making two ends meet, and that a living is a splendid place to starve in. He will also discover, to his great wonder, how easy it is to starve with a well-to-do parish looking on and doing nothing to prevent it. No, the exactions I specially refer to here are those which emanate from exacting people, who with many opinions and views expect their Vicar to satisfy them all. High, Broad and Evangelical parishioners each demand exclusive satisfaction. The difficulty may not be great in town parishes where there are churches to suit all tastes, but in villages and smaller places with but one church the friction is bound to be enormous. The only man, perhaps, who can approach the solution of the problem is the invertebrate Vicar whose views are elastic and can stretch. But even he, with all his thin breadth, will find it difficult to cover so big a surface as a whole parish.

Unfortunately, we are not chameleons, able to adapt ourselves automatically to our surroundings, and taking the colour of our immediate ground. A few try to be, and succeed but ill, I fear. The changes are too many for even a Vicar of Bray. No Vicarial jelly that was ever concocted will fit into the parochial mould. It is a sheer impossibility for any Vicar, however well or ill disposed, to adapt himself to it. Silence, were it possible, might provide a convenient screen for our Vicar, for then he might look all sorts of wise and agreeable things, but he has to preach and speak and take

constant action, and to be a neutral under these circumstances is not in mortal's power. But what honest Vicar would wish to conciliate any one by the sacrifice of his heart's convictions? Were he to attempt it he would disqualify himself in the opinion of all right-minded people as a hypocrite. So he must perforce face the music, and go his own way, teaching what he believes, and bearing the frowns and reproaches of his offended parishioners as well as he can.

Besides theological exactions, there are sentimental ones, with which he is bound to come into collision. The ladies of his congregation, and some of the ladylike men, will be found to have a nice taste in millinery and decoration and such æsthetic matters. No doubt it is distinctly bound up with their views of truth, but it may not be. Some love a religion with a ritual to express it, and think a service drab and dismal where the Vicar does not dress finely, posture nimbly and keep abreast with the times. And, being very aggressive, they will try to force his hand by incriminating gifts to the church which commit the Vicar to their views of proper ornament and all that they represent. Having definite opinions of his own on such matters, he will naturally be found in the opposition, and will, just as naturally, be found in a very hot and difficult corner. The position is distinctly aggravated when the aggressors are the wealthy persons of his flock. Neither will he be helped much if he yields, for there are other aggressions coming on apace.

The worldly elements of his congregation will put in their exacting claims, demanding all sorts of concessions from the poor Vicar. They will suggest, and almost demand, dances, whist drives, theatrical displays, and many like things which have been more or less identified with the spirit of the world. Disguised under the ample drapery of charity, and linked ostentatiously to some parish organization which is in a weak financial condition, they will be introduced in so subtle a way that to rule them out is almost tantamount to cutting some poor parochial throat. But refuse such adjuncts he will if he be a spiritual man of God, and suffer for his refusal he will if the world be what it always has been, a truculent foe to the Church of God.

There will be exactions which will touch our Vicar in his very pulpit, where he is supposed to be supreme. He will be frankly told by his more outspoken parishioners that they like short sermons, that his discourses must be eloquent, and that they must be dis-

tinctly interesting, if they are to be induced to keep awake. He must not be too vehement, or too aggressive, or too personal. But then, on the other hand, he will be told that it is the very opposite which others like and demand, if they are to be kept from sleep. Some would prefer no sermon at all, and, if there is to be one, in spite of their protests, they intend to go out before it is delivered. And go out they do, with a sort of swishing disdain. It is hard for a poor parson, who perhaps has no particular gifts for preaching at all, to look down upon his critical people and remember their peculiar and antagonistic preferences.

Then, also, there will be exactions on his intelligence, which he will find hard to meet. He must be ready to give an answer on the spot to questions which occur to his active-minded parishioners. And it is astonishing how many and difficult some of these questions are. For these are days of heresies, of new faiths or unfaiths, and of new forms of thought, and many are the problems which our poor Vicar will be called upon to solve. It is possible that some of these questions are quite new to him, and he meets them for the first time when his curious interlocutors make play with them in his hearing and demand some reply. Of course it ought not to be so with a well-read and intelligent parson who studies these questions, and gives honest thought to both sides of them. But, then, our Vicar may not be a reading or thinking man, and, unfortunately, may be less active-minded than some of his people.

And so, when he has nothing to say to the Theosophist, the Christian Scientist, the Pantheist, or the aggressive Romanist, nothing to the point, nothing reasoned, he will be set down as incapable, and he will not be trusted on matters of which he has knowledge. A curate can turn over such questioners to his Vicar, but our Vicar can refer such inconvenient subjects to nobody because he is alone and in authority.

There are business exactions, too, which must not be overlooked, for on no man do business demands fall more heavily than on our Vicar. He is called upon to preside at meetings, to keep accounts, to collect funds, to see that these balance on the right side, and to decide no questions of ecclesiastical law and order. Even if he has a good business layman at his elbow, he must himself be able to understand business matters, and act upon his own knowledge. And Vicars are not as a rule trained in business habits.

Society, too, has its exactions to make upon our Vicar, for he belongs to all its strata, and must not make distinctions. His Vicarage should be open house for the parish, and all should be his friends. He and his household are the bonds which unite all, and it is in his power to draw together all classes, and make common ground with all. He is the Vicar of the parish ; not of this class or that.

It is of no good to disguise the fact of these many exactions upon our poor Vicar, for they undoubtedly exist, these and a hundred others. And it will not be long before he discovers that no man alive is able to meet them all satisfactorily. He must be a bundle of all the excellencies, an admirable Crichton, in fact. He must be an angel in his temper, a genius in his intelligence, an expert controversialist, a brilliant orator, a social success, and be, like Bayard, *sans peur et sans reproche*. He must be able to drive a team of a thousand horses abreast, and each of a different temper. He must dance among a thousand eggs, and not break one of them. He must be prepared to be an Aunt Sally for men to throw sticks at, and yet must manage to smile serenely. He is called upon to grasp nettles, to sit on thorns, and handle wasps' nests, and he must do it all as if he liked it. He must be a gentleman, a scholar, a saint, and an angel all rolled in one.

And so long as he pleases these exacting men and women, they will hasten to burn incense before his shrine, and applaud him to the skies. But once trip, and they will treat him as the African natives treat their disappointing gods, beat him thoroughly, and scold him unmercifully. A glorious position indeed has our Vicar, but, let it also be said, a very difficult one.

### III.

From these glimpses of the demands made upon our Vicar we may judge the kind of equipment necessary for him. And this brings us to the third position in our inquiries, that *it takes a good deal to make a good Vicar of the parish*.

Every Vicar when he gets into his stride evolves, I should imagine, a good working policy for his daily guidance. He lays down definite general principles to ease his going along the parochial paths. For instance, he comes to the conclusion that he cannot possibly please everybody. Even the Great Master could not do so when He was

on earth. There are antagonisms that can never be made to meet, divergencies that can never be bridged, demands that can never be acceded to by any self-respecting Vicar. And, seeing that this must necessarily be so, he wisely determines that he will not attempt to please everybody. This is a great step forwards, and one which he will have cause to be thankful for all his ministerial life. It will save him endless worries and mistakes. It will cut knots which are otherwise irresolvable. Later on he sees that his wisest and safest plan is to succeed in pleasing the best, which he will better achieve by doing his best than by any attempt at man pleasing. He certainly may manage to please the worst if he be willing to stoop low enough for it, for only by unworthy compromises can he delight the worldly. His principles must have been badly surrendered before a man of the world says "Well done."

Having taken this general view of Vicarial proprieties our Vicar will try to cultivate the attitudes which will yield the best possible results. He will, for instance, try to be what he preaches, to possess the experiences he proclaims, to cultivate the graces he commends, and to overcome in the contests he insists on. He will not be content to preach on love without love in his own heart, to hold up the Cross without clinging to it himself, or to tell of a pardon, a peace, and a life known only to himself at second-hand. The kings of old would only partake of food which their tasters had first tried, and we are to be the tasters of the good things of the Kingdom for our people before we commend them. Truth on the lips which has not first reached the preacher's own heart is never likely to appeal to anybody. It is not enough to speak truth unless it be spoken truly.

For another thing, he will see the necessity of cultivating a good temperament. In no one does a good temperament tell more for good than in the Vicar of the parish. Your calm man will bear the assault and battery of peppery parishioners with equanimity. Your buoyant man, however sat upon, will mount upwards again the moment the pressure is off. Your bright man will not easily lose his temper, no matter how hardly tried. Our Vicar must learn to listen, to smile and to forget, if he is to be a good Vicar. For a good temperament serves him as does a good water-proof in a storm the traveller who wears it; he runs through it dry and comfortable. He is like the good ship, which lifts with the great waves, rides over them, throws back the wash of the seas, and pursues her triumphant

course to her destination. A good temperament may be backed against any other virtue in the world.

A good Vicar, too, learns to observe strict impartiality in his parish. This is difficult, but it is not impossible. Again and again he will be asked to take sides with this group or the other, to adjudicate in some parish squabble with which he is not concerned. Better a great deal to let his neighbours settle their differences amongst themselves than burn his fingers in a hopeless quest. Quarrels mostly die better and faster for being let alone. Interference often adds fuel to the fire, and causes it to burn up more fiercely. Hot local politics, too, are not in his sphere as a rule, and had better be ruled out. Party spirit may lead to his undoing in his own proper sphere as the Vicar of the parish. Truth is above party, and tries to see the good in all parties.

The Vicar will see also the necessity of keeping a strong head. A little flattery soon makes a weak head swim, and many a man who stands bravely upright when storms are blowing will capitulate to praise and flattery. Foolish and designing people will do their best to spoil him. The praise of his sermons will be their sheet anchor, for here most Vicars are too vulnerable. Here his strength and common sense will prove of advantage, and lopsidedness prove his curse. An unbalanced man with a strong dash of self in his constitution will, like a ship in light draught, heel over and sink. Parasites feed only on weakness.

Not a day will pass either when our Vicar will not be called upon to use his tact, if he has any. It is not only horses which require to be driven with a light curb, and tact is just that light touch which makes all the difference in parish driving. Most blessed is the Vicar who has the most of it. For delicate situations—and our parishes swarm with them—our Vicar must have delicate tact, that instinctive quality which helps to smooth and straighten out rumples and tangles more than any dozen of other gifts. Like a gentle step which makes no jar, a soothing hand on aching brows, or a gentle voice which awakes no echoes, so is our tactful Vicar. For lack of tact the whole parish may boil and swirl like a mountain torrent. Good intentions, honest zeal, and the best of motives cannot save a situation which has been created by tactlessness.

The advantage of a large heart, too, will be apparent to every Vicar. Better a good heart than a good head, if the choice must lie

between the two. For the man of the good heart will steer a straighter course, dry far more tears, and gain a better welcome, than his cleverer brother in the ministry. Most of the failures in the ministry have been due to heart deficiency rather than to head lack. Is it not the hearts of men that we are out to win? Have we made any real headway when we have only convinced their reasons? There is too much heartless religion in the world, and heartless it will remain if ministers do their work with cold hearts. It takes a heart to win a heart, and where the heart fails the whole effort is paralysed and powerless. Rationality is good, logic has its real place, and hard common sense can fall like a sledge-hammer in its might, but for disarming opposition and winning heart-citadels a little warm blood and a little warm love will eclipse them all. Hearts fly open quickly when love comes and knocks at the door, and love's voice has a winning quality which is all its own.

It is quite as essential, too, that the Vicar of the parish should know his own mind. It need not necessarily be a closed mind, but it must be a clear mind. To have "no mind of his own" is a pure scandal, and wins nobody's respect. Besides, it is an invitation for the harder, clearer minds to assail him with their own good or bad views. Naturally, such a man is at the mercy of all, a poor invertebrate jelly-fish man who needs vigorous shaping, and hardening off. He is like a derelict, waiting for any fussy, determined tug to pick him up, and tow him away into some good or bad shelter. There may not be many such men, but there are a few here and there. You may know them by their softness, and by the way they keep for a time the impression made by the last assailant, like a dented pillow. You may know them too by the rapid changes through which they pass, boxing the compass in their views. Who can respect such squeezable, impalpable men? And of what use are they in the world? To catch a creed as you would catch a disease, by mere contagion, is to be a source of mischief to the whole parish, and they should be taken somewhere and disinfected thoroughly before being allowed abroad again. We respect a definite man even when he is wrong, but our inconsistent, intangible brother scarcely satisfies us even when he happens to be, for the moment, right.

It is also important that the man be not buried in the Vicar. It often is so, unfortunately, so much so that his manhood drops from him when he becomes the Vicar. But surely he ought to be the

more of a man when he assumes such a position, for certain it is that the more humanity he has, the better the man. Why in the world should his voice lose its manly quality? Why should he assume the unnatural in his manner and ways? Why, too, should he play the man milliner, and embroider altar-cloths? Why should he strike attitudes which no man in his senses would be likely to originate for himself? A man never poses or cultivates artificial sanctities, unless he be a successor of the old Pharisees.

But more than all of these is the divine equipment. A good Vicar is not what he makes himself, but what his Master makes him. No self-made minister is ever worth his salt. Universities may turn out scholars, and colleges may turn out theologians, but only the Holy Ghost can turn out saints. What avails an apostolical succession, even if it could be proved, if the touch of life be wanting? A man may be properly ordained, and his rights unquestioned, but a thousand bishops cannot make him fit to proclaim the everlasting Gospel if he be not ordained and changed within. There are baptized dead-heads, and there are ordained dead-heads, and neither are right with God if they have not passed under the Hand of Christ, and been baptized with the Holy Ghost. Natural gifts are not to be despised, learning is not to be undervalued, ordination is not to be gainsaid, but to be a faithful, effective minister of God requires the influx of a divine life, and the embrace of a divine and realized love. Oh! the joy of this divine equipment, the power of this divine touch. Without it we are only a simulacrum, a dummy, a counterfeit.

#### IV.

The next position we must take up in connexion with the Vicar of the parish is to point out *how easy it is for a Vicar to miscarry*. There are rocks before his feet as there are before those of every man. There are quicksands into which he may stumble and sink. It is good for him to know beforehand where his dangers lie, and to learn how to avoid them.

For instance, he may be in danger of playing the autocrat. Power is a dangerous weapon to use, and its sharp edge may cut the holder of it seriously, to say nothing of the victims. The law gives our Vicar a paramount position and naturally expects him to use his power wisely. It was never intended to be flourished overmuch, or to be flaunted in his people's faces. Not all parishioners are



mEEK and acquiescent, and willing to subside at the very sign of authority. Besides, the power is not all on one side, for if the Vicar has the power of the law, they have the power of the purse, the power to stay away from his ministrations, the power to shut their doors upon him. A parish boycott is an ugly phenomenon, and not to be earned or deserved recklessly. To rouse a parish by high-handedness is as bad as to overturn a hive of bees out of sheer wantonness. The sweets of power are bought in a dear market when they induce so much bitterness.

Then he may miscarry through a too restless love of change. There are in every parish a goodly number of fine old crusted Tories, who may be depended on to prefer old ways to any new ones. It is good to let well alone, and not to stir up sleeping dogs. Of course there are changes and changes, and one must make a distinction. There are changes which come naturally, with the lapse of time, and which, like the change in the dress fashions of the day, imperceptibly steal upon you. Such changes effectuate themselves as a rule. They are like the dropping out of the milk teeth from the growing pressure of the oncoming ones, and this happens usually without the intervention of the dentist. But the changes which vex and worry are the violent ones, the uncalled-for ones, the unwished ones. And these are the ones which cut across the cherished doctrines of congregations, and insinuate new views of truth or untruth. Many a man has embittered his own heart and exasperated the hearts of his people by the fight over trifles, or by attempts to shunt the congregation on to new, and as they think, down lines.

There are other Vicars who miscarry through running to extremes. There are extremes of views, which may easily throw him. He is not a Nonconformist, or he would have been amongst them; why, then, does he act as one, and speak ill of his own church? If a man is not a good Churchman, as he has undertaken to be, let him pass out. And if I may not lawfully look longingly over the Nonconformist wall, neither may I do so over the Roman wall. If my Catholic sympathies swamp my love for my own church, and send me flying in the direction of Rome, then my position in the Church of England is compromised and untenable. I am a traitor, and ought to share the traitor's fate. A disloyal Vicar is an offence to all honest men. They cannot understand the position of a man who explains away his own formularies, and tries

to import into the services of the Church doctrines and practices which have been deliberately rejected and disowned. And if such a man finds himself in very hot water in his parish, he has only to thank himself for it and richly deserves it.

There are, of course, other extremes than extremes of doctrines and views. A Vicar may be extremely unsociable, and shut himself in his Vicarage, appearing only when his public duties call him. He may be distinctly unapproachable, and his doors be kept closed by watchful guardians. But such a Vicar is not the Vicar of his parish at all. Or our Vicar may run to the extreme of joviality, and spend his life to the accompaniment of perpetual titters at his funny stories. Everybody will like him, but few will carry their troubles to him, or take him seriously even when he is preaching the Word of Life. The man of God is lost in the funny man, and the Gospel is attenuated by his festive jocularities. Surely, there is a cheerful mean between too great seriousness, and too extreme humour. Or the Vicar may run to extremes of sociability. Let a people once believe that their Vicar is a man of the world, and his influence ends. He is not supposed to be, and he ought not to be. But, even though he may not be, the suspicion is poisonous and hurtful. So it behoves our Vicar to take good heed that he does not give them a handle for the impression. We know that many are unduly severe in their judgments, and would limit even their Vicar's lawful amusements. But, then, they may be right, and have good cause for judging him as a pleasure-loving man. It is well to be on our guard against the danger.

He may miscarry, too, through personal neglect. He may neglect his mind, and let it lie fallow. Hence a plentiful crop of inanities and platitudes and second-hand assertions. He cannot afford to let the world of thought flow past him, and he not be in it. He must read, he must think, and he must know what his people are thinking of. He may neglect his body, too, forgetting the affinity between body and soul, between body and mind. His work demands the full care of the body, and all the exercise, temperance and wisdom which such a work involves. But the worst neglect of all is to neglect his inner being, for here is the mainspring of his manhood as a minister. What is a scythe without an edge, a gun without its priming? What is a candle without a light, or a body without a heart? And what is a heart without love? If the inner man

decays the whole man falls to pieces, and his usefulness ends. To lose touch with God is to make shipwreck of one's work, and to lose the spirit-quality is to lose the one absolute essential. Such a man may go along like an engine proceeding down the incline by its own weight of iron and steel, but, once at the bottom, it must needs stay there useless.

Out of all this, as a strict issue and result, must come the neglect of the parish. Seized with the spirit of sloth and inertia he will sink, and bring his parish down with him.

Yes, it is easy indeed for a Vicar to miscarry, but it is possible that he may not, and he cannot, if he hold fast the Strong Hand of his Master. No man has more resources open for him in his Lord, and the supplies are all close at hand. With all the special promises made to him, with all the divine possibilities open to him, why should he miscarry?

"Workers together with God"; it is along that road that he will carry the blood-red banner of Christ, and will never tire nor fail.

## V.

I will now draw my article to a close with *some general principles* which will stand him in good stead.

The first is, that the Vicar exists for the parish, and not the parish for the Vicar. The recollection of this simple fact will parry a multitude of ills. Parishes are not pocket boroughs, or private estates, or little families, of which the Vicar is the head. They are flocks put into his hand to be shepherded. In that sense only let him, if he will, call the parish "My people," or "My parish." Proprietary right there is none. It is God's parish, and he is only the man in charge.

The second fact is that God keeps the oversight. The Bishop sees that we do our superficial duty, but how we do it he can never know. But the great Master knows. He separates the merely physical and showy from the genuine and the spiritual. He reads the inner spirit of the Vicar, and is never deceived by rush and clamour and multitudinous organization. He detects the intention, the motive, and the honest desires. It is He Who is "the Shepherd and Bishop" of our souls.

The third fact is that the person in most danger in the parish is the Vicar himself. It is a dangerous business that of a Vicar, ever

handling spiritual realities, and appearing in religious postures. Those who are constantly in evidence may grow callous, like the oft-used hands in work. In the multitude of prayers he may grow prayerless. In the throng of spiritual engagements he may lose sight of God Whom he is supposed to meet. The Word of God, ever on the lips, may stay there, without going deeper. He is ever in danger of becoming a machine. Cant waits close to the minister, and will surely seize upon him if he slips along a smooth, unthinking way too often and too long. The spiritual essence which alone can keep him fresh once flown, he is only a carcase and a corpse.

My fourth fact is that there is no room for self and Christ in the same heart. It is good to know this, for there is an eternal seesaw in the ministerial life which it would be well if we could arrest. When self is out, Christ is in ; when Christ is out, self is in. And when Christ has to give place to self, the life's running stops like the electric trams when the current fails. Everything stops dead when He is deposed. And self's forms are many ; self-conceit, self-possession, self-seeking, self-praise and self-ambition. It is just in this neighbourhood that most of the tragedies of our Vicar's life are found. Self is the arch-enemy ; self is the standing menace ; self is the paralysing evil of life. Happy the minister who can say, " I live, yet not I, but Christ liveth in me."

CHARLES COURTENAY.



## Should Women be admitted to the Priesthood ?

A PAPER READ BY MR. J. G. FARRER-MORGAN AT A CONFERENCE OF THE RURAL DEANERY OF NORTH MEOLS (SOUTHPORT).<sup>1</sup>

“DEMOS” is now King in both Church and State, and any Churchman who refuses to recognize that fact is living in an unreal world, and is out of touch with the twentieth century. In my early years, the highest conception of the Church was an institution run on feudal lines by the parish priest and one or two of his well-to-do parishioners for the patronage and benefit—mainly eleemosynary—of the rest. That conception is not dead. It is not confined to these islands. It is rampant in the National Churches of Italy, Spain, and France, and is gradually eating away their Catholicity and reducing them to the level of sects. Some Churchmen think these churches are our goal for imitation. Their fate will certainly be ours, unless our Church recovers the democratic basis intended by her Founder.

I should like to say, parenthetically, that since I prepared this paper the bishops and priests of the Russo-Greek Church—officially the Church of the Orthodox Catholic Faith—have shown that they believe, what I have just been saying, that a National Church must be democratic or fall to pieces. The Metropolitans and Bishops, sixty-four in all, have given up their veto—votes by Orders are abolished. In the Ecclesiastical Council of all Russia, which governs all internal affairs of the Church, representative laymen preponderate. All sit together and have equal powers of voting—one man, be he Patriarch, Metropolitan, Bishop, priest, or layman, one vote. This composite Council is the ultimate Court of Appeal in faith, services, and ceremonies. The parochial franchise is in all adults, male and female, of twenty-five years of age, Conformist or Nonconformist, and they elect the clerical and lay representatives. Bear in mind that 30 per cent. of the population of Russia is admittedly Nonconformist. The Orthodox Greek Church is without doubt to-day the most—practically the only—democratic National Church in the world ; our own and the National Churches of Italy, Spain, and France are the reactionary churches of Christendom, and will all be blotted out as National Churches unless they quickly take the broad and intelligent view of the Orthodox bishops, priests, and laymen. If we wish to retain the proud position heretofore enjoyed of being the most liberal and enlightened Church in Christendom, we must reorganize ourselves on the lines of the Orthodox Church, and before anything can be done we must consign to the scrap heap the retrograde report of the Archbishops’ Committee.

<sup>1</sup> A Ruri-Decanal Conference for the North Meols Rural Deanery took place at Christ Church Parish Hall, Southport, on Tuesday, November 20, 1917, when there were present Canon Blakeney, Rural Dean (presiding), the Revs. F. W. Dwelly, F. Lindon Parkyn, W. D. Walmsley, R. A. Marsh, J. Llewellyn, C. Wright, J. S. Crisall, R. Norwood, W. Carrington, N. Brereton, R. Gregory, J. B. Richardson, A. F. Ritchie, B. H. Watts, Messrs. J. G. Farrer-Morgan, W. Greaves Lord, J. J. Cockshott, J. E. Willett, J. P., Cicero Smith, J. P., S. R. Park, G. S. Packer, T. Phillips, W. Shuttleworth, T. Dean, A. Marchant, A. Coke, T. C. Clare-Kershaw, Dr. A. M. Edge, W. S. Lomas, Geo. Haslam, T. B. Jones, W. Ryding, John Humpherys and the Rev. R. Sinker (hon. secretary). After Mr. Farrer-Morgan had read the paper, now reproduced in the CHURCHMAN, there was an interesting discussion in which both clergy and laity took part. It was proposed by the Rev. F. W. Dwelly, M.A., and seconded by the Rev. R. Norwood, M.A., and carried: “That this Ruri-Decanal Conference can find no principle which would debar womanhood from exercising the office of the priesthood of the Church.” There were seven dissentients, all laymen.

## CANON LAW AND THE MINISTRY OF WOMEN.

The language used by earnest Churchpeople has to be considerably discounted. In matters of controversy their sound and fury are, generally, in inverse proportion to the intrinsic merits of the matter. In the controversies of my time I remember "Apostate Church," "Cast out of the Holy Catholic Church," "Regenade Church," and other similar choice gems of rhetoric applied by militant Churchmen to their own Church if it did this or refrained from doing that. Nothing so dreadful has, however, happened, nor will it happen, if Churchmen are true to their ideals and their privileges. History, however, repeats itself. The very limited permission proposed to be given by the Bishops of London and Chelmsford sanctioning, during the late Mission, instruction within consecrated buildings by women, to women and girls, raised a perfect hurricane of wild and incoherent talk, both spoken and written. The threat by some priests and laymen to boycott the Mission frightened the two Bishops, and they withdrew their limited permission. In the course of this paper I shall have to consider whether the two Bishops were right or wrong in their action. I agree, of course, that their action raises—or may be held to raise—a question of principle much wider and more extensive than that involved in their limited permission. I shall attempt to deal with the question on its broader basis, viz.: Should women be admitted to the priesthood, as claimed by the feminalist organizations, on the ground of the absolute equality of the sexes? The question of principle involved is: Did Our Lord intend His Church to be an exclusively man-served and man-administered Church for all time? Admittedly the ecclesiastical laws of our own Church, and the Churches of the East and West, only provide for the public ministry of men in the Holy Catholic Church. The Canon law, and the rules and regulations of the Holy Catholic Church, are exclusively the work of man—women, forming considerably more than half of the baptized members of the Church, had no part, or lot, in their formation. If the disability of women is divine, that fact is immaterial. On the other hand, if the disability is of man's creation, then their having no voice is of importance. Some Churchmen say the Canon law and the ecclesiastical rules and regulations are, for the most part, the product of General Councils, guided by the Holy Ghost, and must be accepted without question as reflecting the mind of our Lord. History shows that position is quite untenable, and our 21st Article most truly says General Councils have erred, and may err, even in things pertaining unto God. The fact that the Canon law and the ecclesiastical rules and regulations do not provide for the ministry of women is not, in itself, conclusive either way. Let us get down to bedrock principles. The real question is: Is the priesthood of women incompatible with the teaching of Our Lord? Mr. Gladstone, in discussing Vaticanism, most truly said that whether it was right, or wrong, could only be decided by whether Vaticanism had, or had not, behind it "the irrefragable"—or, as he otherwise called it, "the impregnable—rock of Holy Scripture." The sole question for your consideration and mine as loyal members of our beloved Church, is whether the exclusion of women from the offices of our Church is supported by the impregnable rock of Holy Scripture.

## WOMEN THE SAME SPIRITUAL VALUE AS MEN.

In the eye of Our Lord it is a truism to say the woman is of the same spiritual value as the man, is capable of being the recipient of the same spiritual gifts, and is in no way inferior to the male, just as baptized believers of the negro, or other coloured races, are in His eye of the same spiritual value as

baptized believers of the white races, however cultured and civilized those white races may be—a position which the white races, for the most part, wholly and most unjustifiably decline to concede to them. It is most shocking to me that English Churchpeople decline to communicate at the same altar as coloured communicants, or, if they can help it, worship in the same church. Such people are ignorant of the rudiments of their faith, however much they may plume themselves on their good Churchmanship. In a noble passage St. Paul sums up the teaching of Our Lord thus:—"As many of you as have been baptized into Christ, have put on Christ. There is neither Jew, nor Greek, neither bond nor free, there is neither male nor female, for ye are all one in Christ Jesus" (Gal. iii. 27-28).<sup>1</sup> If there ever were an utterance breathing the Spirit of God, in every syllable, it is this.

It is the Magna Charta of the Church, applicable to all peoples, for all ages, dominating, over-riding, and subordinating every canon, rule, and regulation of the Church. (When I speak of Magna Charta throughout this paper, I mean this summary of St. Paul.) I can find no disability of women for the priesthood in the teaching of Our Lord, thus summarized by St. Paul. The argument of some Churchmen is, that nothing would have been easier for Our Lord, if He had so wished, to include women in the Apostolic College, and as He did not do so there is no room for discussion. I do not think so. Perhaps by the sane reasoning nothing would have been easier for Our Lord than to have condemned and abolished slavery; but when He was on earth He knew the time was not ripe for either. "I have many things to say unto you, but ye cannot bear them now." When the fullness of time came He sent forth men in His name both to condemn and abolish slavery; and we of the later generation recognize that it was the Lord's doing. So it is my faith that the fullness of the time has come and the Lord has raised up those who condemn, and would abolish, the bonds which keep women from exercising their priesthood. Only let the Churchmen of to-day recognize the fullness of the time, and after generations shall say of us what we say of Wilberforce and his colleagues, "It is the Lord's doing and it is marvellous in our eyes." Some Churchmen aver that Magna Charta does not mean what it says as to the equality of the sexes, because the same Apostle, in giving some directions to the Church of Corinth as to the seemliness of public worship, said: "Let your women keep silence in the Churches," and "It is shameful for a woman to speak in the Church" (1 Cor. xiv. 34-35), and to the Church of Ephesus, "But I suffer not a woman to teach" (1 Tim. ii. 12). These Churchmen say these directions to the Churches of Corinth and Ephesus must be read into Magna Charta, and the spiritual equality of women with men only applies when women hold their tongues!

#### THE PAULINE TRADITION AND THE CHURCH'S MAGNA CHARTA.

I proceed to give my reasons for stating that the Pauline tradition does not qualify Magna Charta in any way in the twentieth century. It is an axiom, in interpreting the regulations of the State, that one must ascertain the mischief which the statute seeks to remedy. The effect of these purely personal directions of St. Paul to the Churches of Corinth and Ephesus must be judged by the state of things in these churches at the time St. Paul gave the directions. It may well be, that read in the light of that state of things,

<sup>1</sup> My quotation is from the Authorized Version; the R.V. is:—"There can be neither Jew nor Greek, there can be neither bond nor free, there can be no male and female, for ye are all one man in Christ Jesus." Dr. Moffat, Yates Professor of New Testament Greek and Exegesis, 1916:—"There is no room for . . . male and female, you are all one in Christ Jesus."

St. Paul was dealing (as most probably he was at Corinth) with a set of chattering, talkative women who upset by their interruptions the decency he so much desired in Divine worship. Put at their very highest, these Apostolical directions of St. Paul are directions binding, no doubt, on the churches to which they were addressed, and which were under his supervision, but necessarily binding outside those particular churches. They amount to no more than if, at the present time, a Bishop of the Holy Catholic Church gave an injunction, quite within his competence, to the priests of his diocese to do a certain thing; the priests of another diocese would be under no obligation to perform that thing. The fact that the directions are included in the Sacred Canon does not, it seems to me, make any difference. As soon as one is satisfied the directions were called forth by the local circumstances and needs of the times, one is justified in treating them as local and temporary. Whatever may be their true meaning and effect, what is clear to me is, that they do not mean what the tradition of the Catholic Church has, almost throughout, held them to mean, because the same Apostle, writing to the same Church of Corinth, in 1 Corinthians xi. 4, 5, said: "Every man praying or prophesying having his head covered dishonoureth his head; but every woman praying or prophesying with her head unveiled dishonoureth her head." St. Paul obviously contemplated women praying and preaching in public. Further, we learn from Acts xxi. 9, that St. Paul was a guest in the house of St. Philip the Evangelist, "who had four daughters which did prophesy." Whether he liked it or not, St. Paul would have had to listen to women preaching during that visit. I reject entirely the allegation that the prophesying of women was limited to those individuals who were recipients of the Holy Spirit on the day of Pentecost. It is a mere assertion, without, as far as I can see, an atom of proof. An inspired pronouncement of general and universal application is, necessarily, of greater importance than a similar pronouncement of only local and limited application, and to let the local and limited override the general and universal is to violate perspective and to lose all sense of proportion. The Pauline tradition seems to have obsessed the minds of the rulers of the Church throughout the ages, probably because they recognized in it a ready means of keeping the power and privileges in their own hands. Some theologians are, of late, unhappy in their minds as to whether they are right in saying that Magna Charta is cut down by the Pauline tradition, and have expended much printers' ink in attempting to satisfy their readers that St. Paul cannot have intended, in Magna Charta, to contradict the tradition. Such special pleading does not carry any conviction to my mind. I reject all such casuistry. The "minor" cannot control and overrule the "major." Magna Charta holds the field, and the baptized woman is capable of holding the same office as the baptized man, providing each is, as the Apostle says, "in Christ Jesus."

#### DEACONESSES IN THE EARLY CHURCH.

It is instructive to note that quite early in the Christian Church, deaconesses were a recognized order of female ministers. In Murray's *New English Dictionary of Historical Principles*, 1897, Vol. 3, page 57, it is stated that, ecclesiastically, deaconess is the name of an order of women in the early Church who appear to have undertaken duties in reference to their own sex, analogous to those performed by the deacons among men, citing the *Dictionary of Christian Antiquities* as the authority. The later, and particularly the mediæval authorities, do not put the duties of deaconesses higher than the care of children, visiting the sick, and attending women



at baptisms. St. Paul himself, in Romans xvi. 1, commends Phoebe to the Church in Rome as a diakonon—deaconess—of the Church that is in Cenchrea.<sup>1</sup> Although preaching is not one of the duties of the diaconate mentioned in Acts vi. 1-7, yet it is known that some of the seven, notably SS. Stephen and Philip, were great preachers, and preaching was part of their regular work in the Church. If that were so in the male diaconate, it is not a very violent assumption that it was so also in the female diaconate. The order of deaconesses continued in the primitive Church as a recognized part of the Church's ministrations during the early centuries, the Western Church discontinuing such order about the seventh century, and the Eastern Church about the thirteenth century. It is clear that from Apostolic, and sub-Apostolic times onwards, the ministrations of women in public worship were for many centuries recognized by the whole Church. For many centuries such ministrations have been abandoned by the Universal Church. Baptism by women midwives, in cases of necessity, has, however, always been recognized, and in reply to the Puritans in 1584, Archbishop Whitgift said that the baptism of even women is lawful and good "so that the institution of Christ touching the word and element is duly used," and he adds that no learned man ever doubted such was the case (Phillimore, 1872, page 42). The Bishops of London and Chelmsford were vituperated as uncatholic for reverting to a practice of the universal Church for the first seven centuries, and one had to listen to and read columns of ill-digested stuff, spoken and written, by men who had not taken the trouble to inform themselves before they entered into the fray. The only fault I find with the Bishops was giving way to such ill-instructed clamour. Apart from the limited recognition of women in the Order of Deaconesses, it is very curious to note the treatment accorded to women by the Church. One section of the Holy Catholic Church, whilst it deified woman in the person of the Blessed Virgin, and glorified those who voluntarily selected the vocation of virginity, at the same time refused to women—because they were women—any open or conspicuous part in the conduct of public worship, however saintly and otherwise well qualified they might be. Evidently the authorities of the Church of Rome chose to regard the admonitory directions of St. Paul to the Churches of Corinth and Ephesus as Pontifical utterances, binding for all time. The attitude of our own Reformers was very much the same. After the teaching of Our Lord had been promulgated by man in his own unfettered discretion, and under his exclusive management, for fifteen to sixteen centuries, the general position of women was never lower than at the time of the Reformation. As far as I can see the Reformers never raised a little finger to improve it. In fact, in the religions of classic antiquity, long before the Christian era, women occupied, in many points, a position of more unqualified honour than in the Middle Ages.

Whilst I fully admit that women are indebted to Christianity for many advantages, yet the other side of the picture, I feel strongly, is that the teach-

<sup>1</sup> The Bishop of Oxford, in his book on *The Church and the Ministry*, says, page 230: St. Paul recognizes a ministry of women in the Church in Romans xvi. 1. But it is a ministry which is concerned with works of mercy, and, if with teaching also, only in private. The excellent Greek Scholars among the women say that Dr. Gore has sacrificed his scholarship to his prejudices in favour of the tradition. They point out that the Greek word in Romans xvi. 1, and in the A.R.V. translated servant is precisely the same as in 1 Corinthians iii. 5, where it is translated "minister" as applicable to Apollos and the general body of ordained men, and in 2 Corinthians vi. 4, where it is translated minister in relation to St. Paul's own office. They say bluntly to Dr. Gore that if his comment on Romans xvi. 1 is right, then the work of the general body of ordained ministers and the work of St. Paul and his successors in office must be a ministry which is concerned with works of mercy, and, if with teaching also, only with teaching in private. I leave Dr. Gore to get out of the dilemma into which the women Greek scholars have put him.

ing of the Church inculcating the submission and subordination of women has gone too far, and placed obstacles in the way of their full spiritual and mental development. The true view, it seems to me, is that Christianity, so far as women are concerned, has exerted an influence in two opposing directions. As the religion of the oppressed, the Gospel of suffering and pity, Christianity especially recognized women, sanctifying some of the most typically feminine emotions. On the other hand, from its ascetic side, Christianity has been actively hostile to women, shutting them up, as far as they could, in cloisters, as the peculiar representatives of sexuality, giving them, it is true, in such cloisters, modified careers of usefulness in ameliorating the sufferings of humanity.<sup>1</sup>

#### STATUS OF WOMEN IN THE COMMONWEALTH.

It is perfectly clear to me that we must all revise the opinions most of us held up to, say, five years ago, about the status of women in the Commonwealth, civil and ecclesiastical. It is stated that the Archbishops and Bishops have sent back to the Committee their report, about which Canon Inskip spoke to us lately, for rectification as far as women are concerned. At the next general election we shall have six million women voters. Women members of Parliament and women Cabinet Ministers must of necessity follow. What physiologists used to say—before physiology became an exact science—about the smallness of the female brain, is contradicted by the experience of most of us. I have been meeting, at various times, for many years—thirty at least—women whose intellectuality is of the highest order, certainly not inferior to that of any man I have ever met. They have attained that position by sheer solid brain work, and, having attained it, they will find an outlet for their mental powers somewhere. If the Church does not utilize their services they will become non-Church, to the great detriment of the Church. It seems to me that during the last fifty years, whilst men of all classes in this country, generally speaking, have led the lives of Pagans, women, also speaking generally, have kept alive Christianity in our land, and if, by our fatuous folly, we drive the educated and qualified women into the other camp, the candlestick will be removed from our Church. Most women have, intuitively, the gift or art of imparting instruction. It is sheer folly not to utilize this gift of the Almighty to women for the extension of God's Kingdom. I am not so foolish as to say that every woman possesses this gift, or that every woman is fit for the teaching office. What I mean is, that those who possess the gift, and are otherwise qualified, should be eligible. I am tired of hearing the parrot cry of the tradition of the Church for 2,000 years forbidding women teaching or preaching in Church. Every instructed Churchman values the office of tradition. I freely acknowledge the service rendered to the Church in the past by tradition, and the help it has been in solving the difficulties constantly cropping up in the every-day work of the Church; that useful office will continue for all time. Tradition, however, must be assigned its proper place. Whenever tradition points in one direction and revelation in another; whenever tradition does not rest on the "Impregnable rock of Holy Scripture," then tradition, whether of 50 or 2,000 years, must give way, or we ourselves shall be guilty of the Master's

<sup>1</sup> My authorities for the treatment accorded to women by the Church and their condition in the Middle Ages are the following:—*Womenkind in Western Europe*, by T. Wright. *Women's Share in Primitive Culture*, by Otis Mason. *Woman Under Monasticism*, by Eckenstein. *Man and Woman*, by Havelock Ellis. *The Woman Question in Europe*, by Theodora Stanton. *The International Council of Women*, by Mrs. Ogilvie Gordon, 1904.

condemnation : " Ye reject the commandment of God that ye may keep your own tradition " (Mark vii. 9).<sup>1</sup>

#### TRADITIONS THAT HAVE FALLEN INTO DISUSE.

The traditions of a National Church, or of the Universal Church, may be proved to be based upon a misconception, mistranslation, or misreading of God's Word. It is perfectly shocking to me that, under such circumstances, the tradition is to stand for all time, because so many generations of Churchmen have believed and acted on it. That is respect for antiquity run mad. There are several instances of matters allowed in Scripture, and appointed by the Apostles, which have been permitted by our, and other, National Churches to fall into disuse, e.g., all women must be veiled at public worship, prohibition of men wearing their headgear whilst worshipping, the Agape Feast of Love, abstaining from meats offered to idols, abstaining from blood and from things strangled, the precept of St. James as to the anointing of the sick, and some of the ceremonies of baptism, are all now, for the most part, treated as dead letters.<sup>2</sup> The judicious Hooker says : " Where things have been instituted, which being convenient and good at the first, had afterwards in process of time waxed otherwise, we make no doubt but they may be altered ; yea, though Councils and customs generally have received them." <sup>3</sup> There is a very striking, but rather long passage in the preface to the Prayer Book to the same effect. The Catholic Hierarchy throughout seems to have surrounded the Pauline tradition with a special halo of sanctity, differentiating it from the other Apostolical directions to which I have referred, which they have dropped or varied according to their own sweet will. For instance, they have sanctioned the wearing in Divine worship of Mitres and Birettas, thereby trampling on St. Paul and his views. Perhaps, their tenderness and veneration for this particular Pauline tradition enforcing silence on women is based upon a wholesome fear that their flocks would receive more spiritual illumination than they could bear if they did not keep all holy, gifted women out of the teaching office. I wonder whether the flocks thank their fathers in God for this tender solicitude. I do not think they do. I ask more particularly the laymen of this Rural Deanery to put aside all preconceived notions and prejudices and look into this question of the ministry of women calmly, dispassionately, and prayerfully. The sole question is : Are women disqualified, by revelation, for the priesthood ? For the reasons I have given, I hold they are not. A well-known residentiary Canon of another diocese, a man of high academical distinction, wrote to me some time ago that he was in agreement with the views I have expressed in this paper—that it was a layman's question, and that laymen must help the clergy to arrive at a right conclusion on this and other burning questions. The clergy themselves, he added, " were so hidebound with the opinions of their predecessors, and so autocratic in stating those opinions, that they needed the unprejudiced minds of the laity to guide the Church to a right conclusion. Though linked together, there are really two parts of this question, viz. : Authority to preach, and the priesthood. As I have said already, the Bishops of London and Chelmsford were, in my opinion, strictly catholic in following the practice of the Universal Church for the first seven centuries. Their

<sup>1</sup> The mind of our Church is perfectly clear, see Article 34 on Tradition : " Nothing be ordained against God's Word."

<sup>2</sup> My authority is the celebrated Church Divine, Thorndike, quoted by Dean of Arches Church Congress, 1901.

<sup>3</sup> Hooker adds : " For there is not any positive law of man, whether it be general or particular received by formal express consent as in Councils or by secret approbation as in customs it cometh to pass but the same may be taken away if occasion serve."

own inherent authority as Bishops of the Catholic Church sufficed. The larger question of the priesthood for women is on quite a different footing, and requires corporate action of the Church before it could be adopted. The action of individual Bishops would not suffice.

#### THE WAR AND THE CHURCH'S FAILURE.

When this terrible war is over there will be such a dearth of men that, in my opinion, all branches of the Holy Catholic Church will be under compulsion to reconsider the whole question. My desire is that our branch should be the pioneer, and that is why I want all Churchmen now to consider and thrash out the question in all its bearings. It is computed that there are over five hundred millions of people professing and calling themselves Christians, and approaching one thousand millions non-Christians, involved in the present war—a sad commentary on the utter failure of the Universal Church to inculcate the principles of her Master. The Pope, Patriarch, and every Catholic Archbishop, Bishop, and Priest, together with all of us laymen who value and exercise our priesthood, should be on his knees, confessing and deploring, in dust and ashes, the ghastly failure of his work for Our Lord. Judging from the reports of Convocation, and the religious newspapers, the Archbishops, Bishops, and Priests of our branch of the Church Catholic are quite satisfied with themselves and the excellence, in their own opinion, of their work, and quite oblivious of the Paganism stalking through our land and through Europe, are spending their time in the utterly useless attempt to put down prayers for the dead, in discussing the saintliness or otherwise of Charles I, and in squabbling about rubrics, postures, and vestments, and other similar utterly trivial things. The human side of the Universal Church, solely organized and administered by man—for nearly 2,000 years—has been a colossal failure in every country in Europe, emphatically so in our own. Our National Church, and all Christian bodies combined, have a hold on only one in ten of the adult males of this country; the remainder are either hostile or totally indifferent to all religious influences.

Those figures were given in the public Press from an authoritative Church source with means of knowledge, and I believe are approximately correct ("Artifex," in *Manchester Guardian* November 15, 1917). I ask you to allow your minds to grip them. In the twentieth century of the Christian era in this country, one only in every ten adult males has been reached and held by all Christian agencies combined; in other words, ninety per cent. of our manhood repudiate all forms of organized Christianity.

"Colossal failure" very inadequately describes what I feel.<sup>1</sup>

I wonder, and I would most solemnly ask you, is it because we have refused freedom to the complete man? "Male and female created He them

<sup>1</sup> Numbers, especially of Communions, are not a very satisfactory test of real spiritual work. Sometimes, however, numbers have a value, and I feel justified in using the following to enforce the thesis in the text:—The total population in England and Wales is, roughly, 36,200,000—36½ millions. Seventy per cent. of the children born in England every year are baptized in the Church of England. Seventy per cent. of our soldiers on mobilization declare themselves members of the Church of England, except in Wales, where the Bishop of St. Asaph states it is 82 per cent. I think, therefore, we may infer that 70 per cent. of the families of our population claim for themselves and for their children membership of the Church. That gives a little over 25½ millions of Churchpeople. Communicants between the ages of 12 and 65 should be approximately 8½ to 9 millions. Lord Wolmer, in *The Times* of October 8, 1917, stated that a surer method was to take the aggregate of the annual numbers of Confirmees. These, from 1867 to 1911, he made 8,587,379, a little over 8½ millions, reckoning only Confirmees of 21 years of age up to 65 years of age. I don't think it is far wrong to take 9 millions as the figure of potential Communicants from the age of 12 upwards. The actual Communicants from 12 years upwards at Easter, the Queen of Festivals, 1916, were 2,337,000, a fraction over 25 per cent. The figures should be studied by all Church dignitaries, parish and assistant priests.

in the image of God." The principles of Christianity have not failed, and will never fail. What has failed is man's conception of those principles and man's method of presenting them to an unbelieving world. Holy, gifted, spiritualized women have often a fuller and truer grasp of those principles in all their many-sidedness. I claim that by excluding such women there has been a quite unnecessary limitation to the opportunity for the expression of the spirit of God. I see the finger of God in this movement for admitting women into the offices of the Church. I say let us admit them. The state of things throughout Christendom is appalling, and cannot possibly be worse than it is to-day. When people, priests, and laymen appear painfully shocked, we will say with Old Gamaliel: "If this movement be of the earth, earthy, it will die; but if it be from Heaven, who are ye, that ye should presume to fight against God?"



## The Missionary World.

ONCE again the January number of the *International Review of Missions* brings us in its "Survey of the Year" strong stimulus and hope. Against a background of political events and social movements the living work of the Gospel is boldly traced. Not only is each fact significant in itself, but the combination of statements drawn from so many sources produces a total effect which is most impressive. We are glad to learn that several of the British Missionary Societies are putting into circulation a penny pamphlet based on this Survey, by permission of the editor, which, while it will by no means take the place of the sixty closely compressed pages of the original Survey, will make some of its material available for popular use and wide circulation. The pamphlet is called *Christian Missions and the World War*.

\* \* \* \* \*

The January issue of *The East and The West* contains articles by Dr. J. H. Ritson (on the Bible and the War), by Dr. Eugene Stock (on the C.M.S.), and by the Rev. Nelson Bitton (on Robert Morrison and the L.M.S.)—all writers well-known to readers of the *CHURCHMAN*. Another paper which should not be missed is a careful discussion of the training of ordained missionaries by the Rev. J. S. B. Brough. But the most thought-provoking pages in the number are those in which the Rev. Robert Keable, missionary in turn of the Universities' Mission to Central Africa and of the S.P.G., and now a chaplain in France, discusses the reaction of the four African clergy who have come over with the African labour contingent to the tests imposed upon them by the war. While it is open to question whether all African clergy have become as separated from the life of their own people as those of whom Mr. Keable writes, his fearless but entirely loving words cause much searching of heart. There is a depth in the meaning of the Incarnation which has not yet been wholly translated into the missionary service of, at any rate, the Anglican Church. We are so far from becoming in all points like unto our brethren of other races that those who are drawn most closely to us are apt to be severed from their own kith and kin. The problem is a deep and difficult one, and it is easier to criticize what is

than to lead onward to what should be. But eyes are being opened, and a way must and will be found.

\* \* \* \* \*

*The Missionary Review of the World* continues, side by side with a marked advance in scientific presentation of missions, to maintain its popular interest. Two articles in the December issue are particularly fresh and arresting. One is an account of the mental and moral degradation caused by Fetishism in West Africa, the other an account of work among the Doms, the thief caste in the Benares district. The former paper, from which we learn that in African tribes beyond the immediate restraints of foreign governments nineteen out of twenty persons die by violence as the result of war, or charges of witchcraft, has one charming anecdote which we must quote :

“It is truly astonishing how the African mind, despite its crude materialism and its degradation, grasps ultimately the spirituality of God and the spiritual nature of true worship. Let one instance suffice as illustration. The women of West Africa in preparing their food (the cassava or manioc) bury it in the ground beside a stream for several days. A missionary, one day examining an old woman who presented herself for baptism, and careful lest she should regard the water of baptism as a fetish, asked her a question regarding its significance, to which she replied :

“When I bury my food in the ground I mark the place. What use would the mark be if there were no food there? Baptism is but the mark; God dwells in the heart.”

The account of the work among the Doms, of whom probably 90 per cent. of the adults have been in prison, is one further illustration of the fact that where Hinduism has failed Christianity is winning its victories. Even the Government of India is glad to hand over the criminal tribes to the Salvation Army or other Christian agencies. Bright testimony is borne to the influence of high-caste Indian Christians and their readiness to serve these outcasts.

“One of our workers is an ex-Brahmin. To see this man sitting by the bedside of a sick Dom, giving him milk and medicine and teaching him the sacred law, is to see a miracle of the living Christ.”

The District Magistrate reports a “marked decrease in the criminal habits” of the Benares Doms, of whom there are about 1,100. The health officer of the municipality, a Brahmin trained in England, reports that the Christian Doms who are his servants do their scavenging work in the city much better now than it was done in old days. The keepers of drink shops complain that mis-

sion work is interfering with their trade. Indecent dancing has utterly ceased at the great gatherings of the Doms. The mission to the outcastes has become an object lesson to the Hindus and Moslems of India.

\* \* \* \* \*

It is curious how few books have been produced within the last seven years which bear intimately upon the ideals of central administrative missionary work at the home base. Yet the responsible staff of all the mission boards amounts to a considerable aggregate, and when the members of executive committees are added there is found to be a large body of men and women engaged in complex and highly differentiated work. For such the study of Dr. Ralph Wardlaw Thompson's life, written by Mr. Basil Mathews and published by the R.T.S. (2s. net) provides inspiring and instructive reading. As a biography the work is admirably done; a really great man stands out in the fullness of varied personality, with a delightful humanness running through strenuous work. But the special feature of the book is its record of missionary policy, its acute probing of the regions which lie behind routine and committee work. This definition of leadership in a representative missionary organization, for instance, should be written in letters of gold.

"Leadership consists not in walking ahead in the belief that the rest will follow, but in at least three laborious tasks: (1) the education of the constituent members of the organization, its directors and its local workers, in the principles on which policy is to be based; (2) the modification of that policy at a hundred points to fit the ideals, as it were, with the wheels of practicability on which to run; and (3) the lucid commendation of the policy thus planned to those who will be asked to give it their effective support."

Mr. Mathews tells us that Dr. Wardlaw Thompson "toiled terribly" to equip himself for these tasks. The administrative work of missions will be deeper and stronger where others in increasing numbers seek to follow in his steps.

\* \* \* \* \*

For the thousands of men serving in the labour battalions in France from many tribes and peoples in Africa and Asia, the Bible Society had already published the Scriptures in the vernaculars and is generously providing copies for widespread circulation.

"The Indian coolies who are now busy in France," says the *Bible in the World*, "if brought together, would of themselves constitute a picturesque and polyglot assemblage. There are Afrides from the north-west frontier, and long-haired Burmese, Bengalis from the



valley of the Ganges, and Santals from the jungles of Bihar. According to the *Calcutta Statesman*, no fewer than 10,000 recruits for the labour contingent have already been dispatched from Assam alone. . . . Of these coolies from India considerable numbers have been evangelized. Among the first 500 Santal recruits 150 are Christians; 600 of the Lushais are Christians. Many of these Indians have gone into the war area, not for the sake of the pay they will earn, but from a sincere desire to be of service to the Empire."

\* \* \* \* \*

No less interesting is the account given in the *C.M.S. Gleaner*—attractive in its new form—of the polyglot services held in Baghdad by an Indian worker of the S.P.G. now acting as chaplain to the Indian forces in Mesopotamia. He writes :

"In Baghdad there are five temporary English churches in connexion with the British campaign. In one of the churches in which we hold our Indian services, the Anglicans, Nonconformists and Roman Catholics have their services one after another in succession. On Sundays no fewer than seven services are held in that church in English, Urdu, Latin, Tamil, and Punjabi respectively. . . . There are four other churches close by which belong to the Christians of the place, who have their services conducted in Chaldean, Syriac, Arabic and Armenian. One Sunday I had five men coming to the service, a Punjabi, a Marathi, a Hindustani, a Telugu, and a Tamil . . . I had to use a sixth language—English—which was understood by them all."

\* \* \* \* \*

The fresh hold which Wesleyan missions are laying on the whole church membership is inspiring to all other workers. With courage and faith lines are being laid for a great advance. There is depth and reality in the monthly appeals from the mission house, and it is evident that a real *esprit de corps* is being created. The *Home Organization Department Magazine*, which is the medium of official communication between centre and circumference, has a happy way of linking details of work to large principles which govern action. The following paragraph illustrates this :

"Our way for 1918 will lie upward still, for it will be the second year of a period of five years during which we have adopted a programme of work needing a steady increase of five per cent. each year on the previous year's income from the circuits. To secure that we shall need to begin early, lay our plans wisely, and work strenuously. We shall not succeed by clamour, we shall not get the money we need merely for asking. There are many people well able to help us, but to whom we must give much before we can hope to get anything back. We must sow if we would reap, and our work in missionary propaganda must lie increasingly in teaching, spreading knowledge, deepening interest, creating fresh missionary motive that will be first an enrichment to the man and to the Church, and then a fountain of supply and a centre of service for the missionary cause."

\* \* \* \* \*

*The Guardian* for December 13 contains a striking paper entitled "The Missionary," written by Dr. Percy Dearmer, who has been spending the winter in India at the invitation of the Y.M.C.A. While it may be questioned whether there are many exact originals for Dr. Dearmer's missionary of the past, there is no doubt as to the clearness of outline in which he depicts the missionaries of the present. Many of his references are to people at once recognizable by those familiar with outstanding C.M.S. men. The article is a true and valuable appreciation of missionaries and of the reality and breadth of their work. They are not "a special breed of supermen," but by the nature of their work they have become "wiser and more charitable than we are at home." "Parties have become reconciled because something outside teaches them their essential unity, just as, since the war began, people have discovered in England that those things which hold them together are far greater than those which divide them." Dr. Dearmer writes :

"When I try to summarize my impressions I find myself thinking of a scholarly, quiet man, living simply but genially, though cut off from many things that make life desirable to most people—very fixed in his purpose and yet free in his outlook. He knows what he is doing, and why he is doing it, and finds it worth doing ; I think in that clarity of purpose he differs from the clerical order in England."

The paper closes with an earnest plea that the home world and the missionary world be brought closer together, for the writer holds that if young clergy "instead of going straight from the Theological School to the Mothers' Meeting" were to spend even five years in the mission field, "a new type of parson would pervade the Church." Such a plan would be, he adds, a great gain to the mission field, for many who went for five years would elect to stay.

G.



## Reviews of Books.

### THE ORIGIN OF THE WORLD.

THE PROBLEM OF CREATION. By the Rt. Rev. J. E. Mercer, D.D. London : S.P.C.K. Price 7s. 6d. net.

So rare are the merits of a clear style and forceful utterance in recent philosophical literature that a reviewer must hasten to thankfully acknowledge the remarkable extent to which Dr. Mercer has achieved both in a volume of great help to all who desire to keep themselves abreast of modern thought. Gratitude for such benefits will refrain from comment on the abundant use of the first personal pronoun.

In the progress of science an era of analysis has given place to an epoch of synthesis. In this a peculiar need arises to be cautious of the peril of logomachy. By assigning modern definitions to terms employed by former writers we may appear to reconcile opposites, and yet in reality only deceive ourselves. The acceptance of Dr. Driver's exposition of the word "create" in Genesis i. 1 enables an easy, but unsound, *rapprochement* of Scripture and Science. Reference to older commentaries—the Speaker, Ellicott, Lange, Alford, and others—shows it to be no new discovery that the Hebrew does not necessarily mean a creation *ex nihilo*. But etymology is not the whole of the science of words, and the phrase "in the beginning" requires an absolute interpretation of the idea of creation. Nor does our author's whole-hearted adoption of the principle *Nihil ex nihilo fit* permit a very lucid description of the initial act. "God detaches, as it were, but without severing from Himself a portion of His own being." Thus the origin of the universe is lost in the jargon of mediæval ecclesiasticism or the speech of a modern Hibernianism. Verbal speculations will never solve the mystery.

An excellent chapter on the limitations of evolution reaches a conclusive position in reference to the controversy which has raged since the publication of the *Origin of Species*. Argument based on ignorance is admittedly precarious, but Dr. Mercer discounts too heavily any accentuation of the gaps between the inorganic and the organic, or between the animal and man. "That man is the highest product of creative activity is hopelessly improbable." Can Evolution ever bridge the chasm between men and angels? But the precision which places Evolution in its rightful place by exposing its subordination to the primary concepts of space and time, to the laws of nature, and to psychic factors effectually demonstrates that a creation must have preceded the commencement of its operations.

Dr. Mercer is a disciple of Schopenhauer, but not blindly. Matter is resolved into force, and force into Will. But the abject pessimism of the foreign philosopher is avoided by endowing the Will with consciousness of purpose. The assumption of conscious Will-centres not only in lower forms of life, but even in material objects, leads to a sphere where such Will is hampered at every turn by environment, and, as we still further descend the scale, becomes the mere subject of environment. We get no nearer to the Absolute Will. The argument is based on experience. It was exactly upon this ground that the most primitive peoples held the belief in animism. Either philosophy must teach us to transcend experience, or we must hold that impeded by experience the origins of the world are unknowable to us. We are not infinite: by what authority are we required to explain everything by experience?

Scientific thought is subject to variation. The dogmas of the indestructi-

bility of matter, the conservation of energy, and the laws of motion are not held as tenaciously to-day as by a former generation : or rather, they have become more circumspectly defined. Of this fact Dr. Mercer takes the fullest advantage. Theology also changes. The present tendency is more and more to recover the Atonement through the death of Christ as the central feature of Christian doctrine. Here Dr. Mercer fails. But if the subject-matter is occasionally open to criticism, and if the theological standpoint leaves much to be desired, readers of scientific taste and philosophical disposition will have no reason to regret the expenditure of a few shillings in a book which, by its fullness of information and its cogent reasoning, stimulates inquiry into the interesting questions concerning the origin of the world.

---

#### AN INTERESTING DIOCESE.

THE DIOCESE OF GIBRALTAR. A Sketch of its History, Work and Tasks.  
By Henry J. C. Knight, D.D., Bishop of Gibraltar. London : S.P.C.K.  
Price 7s. 6d.

It was a happy inspiration that moved Bishop Ingham some years ago to gather together the chronicles of the Diocese of Sierra Leone. Bishop Knight has in this volume accomplished a similar task with no less success. In his opening chapters he tells the story of the early British trading settlements in South Europe and the Levant, and we are reminded how greatly we are indebted to Richard Hakluyt, whose writings are too little known, for records that the Bishop fitly describes as "priceless and absorbingly interesting." It is also good to be reminded, as we are in these pages, of the fact that the men, who as far back as the days of the Muscovie Levant Company in 1567, were actively engaged in mercantile enterprise, were at the same time imbued with a deep religious spirit and were not ashamed of either their faith or their Church. The proofs of this, which Dr. Knight has given us, will be read with the deepest interest. As far as is possible, owing to the paucity of early records, we have an account of the work of Bishops Tomlinson, Trower and Harris, the three prelates who presided over the See of Gibraltar from 1842 to 1873. In 1874 Bishop Sandford was consecrated and his Episcopate lasted thirty years. Perhaps one of the most interesting matters dealt with in the record of those busy years—for the extensive Diocese is no sinecure—is the story of the reform movement in Spain and Portugal. Dr. Sandford unfortunately, we think, maintained throughout (like his immediate predecessor, Bishop Harris,) an attitude of "sympathetic aloofness" (to quote Dr. Knight's own words), and though the Lambeth Conference of 1888 passed a resolution expressing sympathy with the reformers in their struggle to "free themselves from the burden of unlawful terms of communion," nothing was done until the Irish Bishops consecrated the late Bishop Cabrera in 1894. It is due to Bishop Sandford's memory to observe that though he preferred that the Chaplains under his jurisdiction should follow his example in the matter of aloofness from the reformers, he yet collated Rev. T. G. P. Pope, Chaplain at Lisbon, to a Canonry—a fact of which Bishop Knight makes no mention in the one passage in which Mr. Pope is referred to, though he mentions the fact that he declined to be Bishop of the Lusitanian Church on more than one occasion. It is a regrettable story of fruitless playing into the hands of the Roman Church for "fear of compromising" the Church of England, and though Dr. Knight is at pains to justify Bishop Sandford, we confess we do not think he has succeeded. Leaving that controversial subject we have in Bishop

Sandford the portrait of an exemplary and, in many respects, typical English Bishop—patient, painstaking and businesslike, and there are very many men still living who served under him in Continental Chaplaincies who cherish his memory. He was followed by Bishop Collins, a forceful personality with very decided opinions and exceptional ability. He had a perfectly prodigious capacity for work which helped to undermine a constitution never robust, and he died in March, 1911, at the early age of forty-four. He had, however, in the seven years of his Episcopate done much to consolidate the work of his predecessors, and if he had lived he would certainly have made his mark. The volume is enriched with portraits and photographs: the series of the former would have been complete had not Bishop Knight's modesty forbidden the insertion of his own.

Needless to say there are scattered throughout the book frequent references to the Colonial and Continental Church Society, the C.M.S. and the Jews' Society, and we are reminded that the former began to subsidize Chaplaincies as far back as 1839, having been founded in 1823.

Not the least interesting chapter is the last, in which we have an account of the Diocese as it is affected by the present war, and those who take the trouble to look at the map which shows the limits of the Bishop's jurisdiction will surely feel that there is probably no Bishop of the Anglican Church who is better entitled at the present time to our respectful and prayerful sympathy. Dr. Knight has placed us under a distinct obligation by the compilation of this very complete and comprehensive record. S. R. C.

#### THE STUDY OF PROPHECY.

THE NEW PROPHECY. By R. K. Arnaud. London: Hodder & Stoughton. Price 2s. 6d.

We have here a book which is likely to attract some notice, and not a little criticism. And it is not difficult to criticize it. A work of this kind is a sort of magnet which draws to itself many loose filings. The three schools of prophecy in our midst will each find something to approve, and no doubt something to disapprove, in its pages, which are at once interesting and controversial. It is not always evident what Mr. Arnaud's views are, in certain crucial cases; and he has not the knack of writing with conspicuous ease. But he has given us a book to think over carefully, and he states his case with moderation.

The present war has focussed the attention of thousands of people on the great prophecies of the Bible; and the result of this interest has shown itself in the number of "prophetic" books issued during the past three years. And, if we mistake not, the Fall of Jerusalem (the one really outstanding event of the past six months) will cause students to turn, with yet greater zeal, to learn the lessons which the ancient prophetic Scriptures have to offer.

Mr. Arnaud justly insists that the *master-key of all prophecy* is the Second Coming of the Messiah; it is the failure to understand this that has led to so much fallacy in the past. No final and complete conspectus of history has ever been, or will ever be, got out of the prophetic writings; the various attempts to do so have resulted in little that is valuable to students. One thing, however, appears to be certain—the Second Coming; this, and nothing else, is (to use Tennyson's words)

"that one far-off divine event  
To which the whole creation moves."

All prophecies connect there; therein all make their final contact. Prophecy,

so viewed, possesses something more than a speculative interest ; it becomes of supreme practical importance.

### STANTON AS PREACHER.

FATHER STANTON'S SERMON OUTLINES. By the Rev. E. F. Russell, M.A., St. Alban's, Holborn. London : *Longmans, Green and Co.* Price 5s. net.

The almost unprecedented welcome that has been accorded to the two volumes of Father Stanton's sermons which have appeared since his death has led to the preparation of the present volume. It contains outlines taken from his note-books without addition or alteration of any kind. In an interesting preface we are allowed to see this popular preacher at work in his study. "When he had fixed upon his subject, and it was time to get to work, he would draw up his chair to the fire and sit gazing on and on into it, as if in expectation that some spiritual light might come through the flame into his own soul." His tools were, we are told, few in number—he seldom consulted commentaries or books of any kind and studiously avoided critical questions—"the familiar Authorized Version contented him." The only exception mentioned by Mr. Russell is rather remarkable: he tells us that if Spurgeon or Dr. Parker had said anything on the subject with which he was dealing, he would look it up. In the sermons on Temptation, in the volume itself, we can trace Dr. Parker's shrewd comments in "*These sayings of mine.*" Of course not every book of this kind will be useful to every preacher, and some never can make use of such aids at all. But many a young preacher will find here ample suggestion. Father Stanton's own ideal, which appears on the title page, is well worthy of imitation—"This is what I should like to be said of me, when I am dead and gone the way of all flesh: 'He preached Jesus.'" This he seems to have kept steadily in view, and those who look in these pages for topical sermons with "catchy" texts will be disappointed—the old Gospel is everywhere set forth in one aspect or another and the claims of Christ plainly enforced. Though there are just a few sentences here and there in which things are not put quite as we should put them, we can yet venture to recommend this book, breathing, as it does, the fervent spirit of a great and good man.

### PASTORAL VISITATION.

PAX HUIC DOMUI. A Manual for Pastoral Visitation. By Bernard M. Hancock, Vicar of St. James', Southampton Docks. London : *S.P.C.K.* Price 2s. 6d. net.

The Bishop of Edinburgh contributes a commendatory note to this little book and certainly not the least valuable portion of its contents is the first of the five sections, entitled "*Ad Clerum Junioyrem,*" and consisting of practical hints together with some wise counsels gathered from other writers. The section "*Officia*" contains nine short services. The Visitation of the Sick is given in abbreviated form. In certain places the rubric is not from the Prayer Book—as where, in the Private Baptism of Infants, we read—"The Minister, vested in stole and surplice, shall say." As a matter of fact the stole is nowhere mentioned in the Prayer Book and is actually illegal by the Purchas Judgment! We think it was a pity the author introduced the Service for Compline and that he did not content himself with reproducing the Communion of the Sick exactly as it stands in the Prayer Book, without introducing the rubric on Reservation proposed by the Upper House of the

Convocation of Canterbury, even though he heads it—"For use where Church authority permits." Then again he is braver than the compilers of the Prayer Book, for he has given a form of Confession. The little service "In the hour of death," and the introductory hints, are quite excellent, and the readings, seed-thoughts, etc., of which the rest of the book is made up, are well chosen. The compactness of the volume is a great advantage, and notwithstanding these criticisms we feel that the author has compiled a manual which will help many young clergymen in their own religious life and in the work of pastoral visitation, which is often found difficult especially in the earlier years of the ministry. The suggestion (p. 21) that every man should make his own manual—in manuscript of course—is excellent. Looking over the list of books recommended we wonder why it is "of set purpose incomplete"? Was it the theological bias of the compiler that led him to ignore some that are worthy of mention? We hope not.

---

#### THE VIRGIN BIRTH.

THE VIRGIN'S SON. By Bertram Pollock, C.V.O., D.D., Bishop of Norwich.  
London: *John Murray*. Price 2s. 6d. net.

This little volume, from the pen of so scholarly an author, is somewhat disappointing: but it is good to have so plain and clear a defence of the doctrine of the virgin-birth, which can be put into the hands of doubters and inquirers, and such as desire to be able to give a reason for the hope that is in them. To the seven chapters of the little work, there is added as an eighth a sermon preached in Norwich Cathedral on Christmas Day, 1914, and a full summary at the beginning is a valuable aid to the reader. The Bishop gives advice concerning clergy who do not believe the doctrine of the virgin-birth, and yet find no difficulty in reciting the Creed. Referring to the growth of practices, during the period of the War, which rest upon no secure foundation, and in which distraught people have looked for comfort, the author writes—"The notion has gained ground that it is good for anxious and broken hearts to cling to any ideas, true or false, in which they believe they find peace"; and adds, "My own conviction, on the contrary, is that we must not let everything go by default because we have been at war. Nor, because of the results of the War, must we maintain anything and everything, in thought and practice, to be permissible for those who have felt the strain of such fearful years."

---

#### OTHER VOLUMES.

THE HEROIC DEAD. By the Rev. Dr. Homes Dudden, Rector of Holy Trinity, Sloane Street. London: *Longmans, Green and Co.* Price 3s. 6d. net.

Here are twelve excellent sermons dealing more or less with war topics, and dealing with them well. There is little to find fault with in the volume, and much to praise. The sermons cover a pretty wide field, treating of such subjects as—"The Heroic Dead," "The Christian Attitude towards the Enemy," "Plain Living in War Time," "The Duty of the Non-Combatant," "Work and War." Nor is the relation of God to the War overlooked. Three of the sermons deal with this—"The Lord upon the Throne," "Christus Imperator," and "God in the Cloud." The title of the book, and the titles of the addresses will combine to commend the volume to a large circle of readers, and they will not be disappointed when they lay it down.

THE LIFE OF THE WORLD TO COME. By the Rev. H. B. Swete, D.D., D.Lit., F.B.A. London: S.P.C.K. Price 2s. 6d. net.

This volume contains the last utterances of the great scholar in six addresses given during the Lent of 1917 in the Parish Church at Hitchin, where he had made his home after his resignation of the Regius Professorship at Cambridge. The addresses are marked by all the painstaking accuracy, wealth of scholarship, and deep spirituality that marked Dr. Swete's work: and deal with "Immortality," "The Intermediate State," "The Resurrection of Christ," "The Resurrection of the Church," "The Risen Body," "Eternal Life." The book will be read with eagerness by many in days when the Life of the World to Come has become a thing most real.

\* \* \* \* \*

JERUSALEM THE GOLDEN. By Gertrude Hollis. London: S.P.C.K. Price 2s. net.

A Biblical study, founded mainly upon the Revelation of St. John, of the joys that await faithful Christians in Heaven. After a preliminary chapter on St. John the Divine, the writer deals, in thirteen chapters, with the Bride, the Holy City, the Wall, the Foundations, the Gates, the Gate-Keepers, the Streets, the River, the Tree, the Inhabitants, the Golden Reed, the Light, the Beatific Vision. Recent events in the Holy Land will invest this little book with a fresh interest.

\* \* \* \* \*

THE MINOR PROPHETS UNFOLDED—HOSEA. By Dr. A. Lukyn Williams. London: S.P.C.K. Price 1s. 6d. net.

This little book is the first instalment of a devotional commentary on the Minor Prophets, intended for short daily reading. It is hoped that by its timely issue the prophet's solemn message may be brought home to the conscience of the nation. Like the author's previous work, *Romans*, in *St. Paul's Letters Unfolded*, it is intended for busy folk, who have a limited time to give to their Bibles. There are some thirty sections, of varying length, followed in each case by a brief summary and short notes.

\* \* \* \* \*

THE CATECHISM IN THE BIBLE. By Miss A. H. Walker, Organizing Visitor for Sunday Schools in the Diocese of Oxford: with an introduction by the Bishop of Oxford. London: Longmans, Green and Co. Price 3s. 6d. net.

The aim of this book is to give definite teaching, on modern lines, with the Catechism as a basis of instruction, and personal love for the Saviour as the great end. The Lessons are arranged according to the Church's year. It is difficult to follow the "order" in which the lessons are set out, but they are most useful and easy to teach. The Preface gives in four pages much valuable information with regard to modern Sunday School work. It is a pity that such an otherwise excellent volume is spoiled by such "exclusive" teaching as declares that "Other sects are not part of the Church," or by the advocacy of unwarrantable claims of a mechanical "Apostolic Succession."

\* \* \* \* \*

THE FAITH OF A FARMER. Extracts from the Diary of William Dannatt of Great Waltham. Edited by J. E. G. De Montmorency, M.A., LL.B. London: John Murray. Price 5s. net.

The editor tells us in his introduction something about the remarkable man whose reflections, culled from his voluminous notebook or diary, are



here gathered together. Mr. Dannatt was a successful agriculturalist, who—coming of Huguenot stock—was born in 1843 at Great Waltham where he died in 1914. Certainly Mr. Montmorency is quite justified in saying that “his life and his religious experience is so significant that even in these days of universal publication there should be a welcome for some record of his written expression of them.” We do not remember when we came across a book that gave us more pleasure than this. We cordially commend it and advise every country clergyman to get it and lend it to farmers. Materialism is potent in the country as in the town, and the portrait we have in these pages of the keen business man who is at the same time an unostentatious Christian and a devoted Churchman, with a fine spiritual perception and a simple faith of which he is not ashamed, is a delightful inspiration. May the faith of this Essex farmer stimulate the faith of many others!

\* \* \* \* \*

NEW LIGHT ON THE OLD PATHS AND THE FIFTH GOSPEL. By Wm. Pascoe Goard, Vancouver, B.C. London: *Marshall Bros.* Price 6s. net.

The writer of this work appears to have approached his subject from an original point of view—“no commentary has been on his shelves, no doctrinal scriptural help in his hands, for long years.” For over a quarter of a century he has brooded upon the message of the Word, endeavouring by a constant effort passively to catch the story of the Bible. The writers of the prefatory pages describe the book as “wonderful,” and its teachings as “revolutionary”: both terms have their correct application—but “arbitrary,” and “fanciful” would be nearer the truth.

\* \* \* \* \*

THE CONTROL OF THE SON OF GOD. By the Rev. John Bulteel, M.A., Vicar of Northfleet. London: *Elliot Stock.* Price 3s. net.

In this little volume the Sermon in the Upper Room (John xiii. 31-xvi. 33) is expounded sentence by sentence. The general plan is unusual, and for ourselves we think that the multiplicity of short paragraphs detracts from the readableness and utility of the book. There may, however, be persons with limited time at their disposal who will find them helpful as daily readings. We miss at the outset, in Mr. Bulteel's observations on the words—“I go to prepare a place for you,” etc., any reference to the Second Coming, indeed his comments explain it away, while at the same time he manages to get in several to the Eucharist. We confess that to be told that “house” and “way” are “the two words which express the relation of the universe to God,” does not appear very illuminating, nor do we like such expressions as “God the Son crammed His being into man” or “He is God's prodigal for man's sin,” and we might multiply examples of passages which are in some cases by no means lucid and in others hardly, we think, in the best taste. We observe (page 60) that Mr. Bulteel is one of an increasing number of clergy who would, within clearly defined limits, give women a wider ministry.

