

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>



<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

Reviews.

Creation and its Records. A Brief Statement of Christian Belief with reference to Modern Facts and Ancient Scripture. By B. H. BADEN-POWELL, C.I.E., F.R.S.E. Pp. 240. Hodder and Stoughton. 1886.

THIS work deserves to be carefully studied by all who are interested in the reconciliation of revealed religion with science. It merits, indeed, a longer and more accurate comment than I have either the space or the ability to give. I can only touch upon certain parts, and I do so, not as a scientific, but merely as a thoughtful and reasoning man. As regards the object of the work, no Christian person can, I think, deny that it is a praiseworthy one, whether or not the author has succeeded in proving his points. His endeavour is to remove a stumbling-block, to show that the doctrine of evolution (on the truth of which he does not express a decided opinion) is not inconsistent with the Scriptural account of the creation. I wish that Dr. Darwin had lived to read this work. Its arguments might have influenced him, for he was a man possessed of remarkable candour of mind, as the following anecdote, which perhaps may be new to some of my readers, will show. Darwin had in former years visited the land of Terra del Fuego, and declared that the Fuegians were such a low type of humanity as to be no more capable of amelioration than beasts. Subsequently, on learning what Christianity and cultivation had done for that people, he said: "I was wrong, and I am very glad I was wrong;" and not confining himself to words, he sealed his recantation by sending five pounds to the South American Missionary Society. What his opinions respecting the creation were, I cannot exactly tell, and I doubt whether he himself could have told. For I know as a fact, that once, when asked whether the contemplation of nature never suggested to him the thought of a creative or superintending Providence, he replied: "Such an impression sometimes crosses my mind, but it is transient." Probably, in his case, as in that of some other scientific men, the impressions produced by the evidences of design with which all nature abounds, were swallowed up by the doctrine of evolution, as the fat kine in Joseph's dream were swallowed up by the lean ones. But this is no proof that the inseparable connection between design and a designer is not (as is generally thought) innate in the human mind. There are those, I know, who throw a doubt on the truth of this assertion from the fact that some deny that evidences of design suggest to them the idea of a designer. But if such individuals speak what they really believe to be true, it is evident that they must be self-deceived. For though, in judging of matters relating to God, Darwin and others like him, may be influenced by prepossessions, and be destitute of that faith "which is the evidence of things not seen," yet in judging of earthly and visible things, it is quite certain that no sane man hesitates for a moment in inferring that design implies an intelligent originator. This is so clear, that there is no need to illustrate its truth by giving one of the many thousand instances which might be quoted in proof of it. Waiving, however, all these considerations, to say that design does not imply a designer, is (in strict language) a contradiction in terms. For the very meaning of the word design, is that which proceeds from the mind and will of a designer (*i.e.* an intelligent being), and is not the mere result of general laws or qualities in the nature of things. Those persons, therefore (and there are such), who do not admit the truth of the conclusion which Paley arrives at in his "Natural Theology," cannot (without arguing very illogically) deny that it follows from his premises. What they mean, or

ought to mean, is that he has not established the truth of these premises, that what we call design cannot be predicated of the Almighty. But the arguments by which they try to prove this (whether they be conclusive or not) need not affect our views of God as the Creator, or as the protecting Father of His creatures; for as Mr. Baden-Powell observes:

No account of the creation can be other than wonderful and mysterious; nor can the mystery of the Divine act be explained in language other than that of analogy. We can speak without mystery of a human architect conceiving of a design in his mind; and when he utters it, it is by putting the plans and details on paper and handing them over to the builders, who set to work under the architect's supervision, and in obedience to the rules which he has prescribed as to the methods of work and materials to be used—all this we can transfer by analogy only to a Divine design.

This passage sets forth the point of view from which we should look at all the Divine acts. But our author proceeds to say, that "the design is in the Divine mind." This term is what the persons I have been just alluding to would say is not applicable to the Almighty. Miss Martineau speaks with contempt of what she calls "the mechanic God of Paley." But the great mistake which she and those from whom she derived her views on this subject fall into, is that they stop at this point which they think they have established, and thus lead themselves and others into practical if not actual infidelity; whereas, if rightly considered, these views need have no effect on our faith or our practice. For the office of revelation and, I may add, of all creation, is not to teach us the nature of God as it is in the abstract, but as it is relatively to us. And, as Archbishop King truly remarks, since it is only by analogy that one man can be said to possess the same qualities as another, of course the analogy between man and God must be weaker.

Of Mr. Powell's views respecting evolution, I can only give a short summary. The conclusion at which, after examining several of the phenomena in the animal and vegetable kingdom, he arrives, is that, admitting the agency of evolution, we cannot say that it explains all the facts which we see in human nature, or that it excludes the idea of a Divine Design or a Providential Intelligence. His opinions on this subject are summed up in the following passage:

Surely, if our conclusion in favour of a Divine Design to be attained, and a Providential Intelligence directing the laws of development, is no more than a belief, it is a probable and reasonable belief. It certainly meets facts and allows place for difficulties in a way far more satisfactory than the opposite belief, which rejects *all* but "secondary" and purely "natural" arrangements.

So clear does this seem to me, that I cannot help surmising that we should never have heard of any objection to Divine creation and providential direction, if it had not been for a prevalent fixed idea that by creation *must* be meant a final one-act production (*per saltum*) of a completely developed form where previously there had been nothing. Such a "creation" would, of course, militate against *any* evolution, however cautiously and clearly established; and no doubt such an idea of "creation" was, and still is, prevalent, and would naturally and almost inevitably arise while nothing to the contrary in the *modus operandi* of creative power was known. What is more strange is, that the current objection should not now be "Your idea of creation is all wrong," rather than the one which has been strongly put forward (and against which I am now contending), "There is no place for a Creator."—Pp. 78-9.

Some believers, perhaps, may have unintentionally played into the hands of infidels, by assuming that the old-fashioned idea of creation is the only one which can be entertained. But on the other hand, I cannot but suppose (as indeed Mr. Powell suggests) that many persons are influenced by the desire of getting rid of the thought of an all-powerful being to whom they are responsible, or by the desire of possessing a complete

system in accordance with which they can map out the whole phenomena of nature. And this suggests a fact which it is well for us to bear in mind, *i.e.*, that it is next to impossible for us to view matters which have a strong bearing on our personal life and conduct from a purely intellectual point of view. Those, therefore, who maintain that a young person's mind ought not to be biased in favour of religion, or against it, are aiming at an end which is unattainable. As an uncultivated garden will produce weeds, so will the carnal or natural mind (which St. Paul tells us is enmity to God), if left to itself, sow to the flesh, and will of the flesh reap the weeds of corruption. Can we therefore call those unfair who try to counteract these tendencies, and to work upon the only ray of light which, in our fallen nature, remains unbroken? All other rays of light in the natural man are divided as by a prism, so that the noblest attributes of God, the beautiful, the true, the moral, etc., appear to us, not as they really are, inseparably united, but running in different channels. But one ray remains undivided, white as when it lay upon the bosom of the Almighty. It is that instinctive longing after something which it has not found, something in which all these Divine attributes are united; it is an altar to the unknown God, a ray of undivided light, though when left to itself it either withers away, or remains in man's heart "a dull, imprisoned ray, a sunbeam which has lost its way." But when touched with the magnet of God's Spirit (not otherwise) it turns towards God, just as the needle touched with the loadstone turns to the North Pole. It is this ground on which the Missionary and the Evangelist can work with hopefulness, though they may be compelled to dig deep in order to find it, hidden as it often is under the mould of earthly desires. Who can say that to appeal to this feeling is to bias the mind unduly? For does not the analogy of other things show that every want in human nature has its natural fulfilment? and does not even the heathen philosopher, Aristotle, maintain that there is no such thing as a *κενὴ καὶ μάταια ὁρεξίς*?

Mr. Powell's remarks on the inspiration of the Old Testament, as inseparable from that of the New, though they are sufficiently obvious, and most of them not original, yet are such as in these days require to be stated again and again. For there are some who are seized with a sort of infatuation on this subject, and either deny the inspiration of the Old Testament, or so limit it that it becomes as a Divine authority, null and void. It is one of the devices of Satan to begin by impugning the authority of the Old Testament, in order that he might shake the foundations upon which the New rests, without alarming people at the outset. For there are some so blind as not to see that the two must stand or fall together (see p. 136). A lady once humorously remarked with reference to attacks made in this quarter, "If I rejected the Old Testament, I should, though with great reluctance, feel myself obliged to burn the New." Mr. Powell dwells principally on the evidence of the first eleven chapters in Genesis, as these bear most especially on the subject which he is handling. "There are," he remarks, "at least sixty-six chapters in the New Testament in which they are directly quoted or made the ground of argument. Of these, six are by our Lord Himself" (p. 137). "It can hardly be denied by any candid student of the New Testament that our Lord and His Apostles certainly received the early chapters of Genesis as of Divine authority" (p. 136). The whole of his tenth chapter is an able defence of the authority of the Book of Genesis in particular, and incidentally also of the whole of the Old Testament.

As to his manner of disposing of the difficulty with respect to the six days of creation, it seems to me the most satisfactory of all the theories which have been propounded on this subject. He inclines to the belief

that they were literal days, partly on the ground that the supposition of their being long periods is fraught with difficulties and objections, which it is not easy to get over. His view of creation is as follows: "I submit," he says, "that given the general fact that God originated everything in 'heaven and earth (as first of all stated generally in Genesis i. 1-3), 'the essential part of the *detailed* or *specific* creation subsequently 'spoken of, was the Divine origination of the types, the ideal forms, 'into which matter endowed with life was to develop; without any 'necessary reference to how, or in what time, the Divine creation was 'actually realized or accomplished on earth" (p. 169). He explains this by pointing out that in human affairs we talk of an architect creating a building, or a sculptor creating a form, not referring to the execution of the details, but to the conception of the first idea, because the design in human works so often fails in execution. A human ideal is often created, which can actually never be realized in practice. But with God there can be no failure, with Him perfect execution must follow creation, therefore they can be spoken of as virtually the same. God may have planned the system of creation in six days, though its details took thousands of years; in short, God set the laws going which were to operate and to be carried out, in the history of the creation. In creation, as in unfulfilled prophecy, it is manifestly not needed, and often not possible, that those who are to be instructed should understand the details. When it comes to practice it is otherwise. Moses had to make his practical teaching perfectly clear. All that was needed in the history of creation was to point out that the Supreme Being did it all, and then fix the order in which the phenomena appeared. Mr. Powell has given a table to show that the discoveries of geologists, in a certain way, correspond with this order. It is time, however, that I draw to a conclusion. I have not been able to do full justice to the contents of Mr. Powell's work, and perhaps it is as well that I could not, for there will be less temptation to make the perusal of this article a substitute for reading the work which I have been reviewing.

ED. WHATELY.

Charge. By EDWARD HENRY BICKERSTETH, D.D., sixty-second Bishop of Exeter, delivered at his Primary Visitation, 1886. Exeter: James Townsend.

Bishop Bickersteth's Charge will be read with lively interest by many outside his diocese. It is the Primary Charge of a Bishop honoured and beloved, and it deals with questions which are being discussed throughout the Church. Every devout and thoughtful Churchman, while admiring its candour and its fervent spirituality, will find it very readable and full of suggestions.

"There are many questions of worship and ritual," says the Bishop, "upon which the limited time at my disposal forbids me to enter now. But there are two or three subjects upon which I must touch, as they are matters which I know are exercising the minds of some of you.

"At our Diocesan Conference I ventured to say that, in my judgment, the humblest house of prayer ought, save with rare exceptions, to have its daily service and its weekly celebration of the Holy Communion. Many of the clergy seem to think this is impossible in their parishes: their churches are far away from the bulk of the inhabitants; a daily service, they say, would only be attended by the members of their own family, and perhaps two or three aged neighbours; and as to a weekly Communion, they find it difficult to gather their communicants around the Holy Table once a month." The Bishop here quotes from the Preface to the Prayer Book, "All priests and deacons are to say

"daily . . ." and proceeds thus : "I know that this habit has widely fallen into disuse. But I ask has the disuse tended to the greater devoutness of our people? I trow not. Is family prayer (and I should be sorry indeed to do anything that would weaken that great bond of home piety)—but is family prayer so general that it supplies all who desire it with the daily opportunities of united worship? I trow not. Is the Morning and Evening Prayer said privately in their own homes by those who fail to say it in church? I trow not by most clergymen. There is something to my mind inexpressibly dreary and desolate in the house of God being closed from Monday morning to Saturday night. A closed church repels rather than attracts the heart's best sympathies. And, on the other hand, the very fact of the house of prayer being opened day by day, and the church-going bell being tolled, and the little company of suppliant being known to assemble together for worship, has a quiet but deep influence on the minds of others. Be it that only two or three are there, the prayer of St. Chrysostom has lost nothing of its virtue by the lapse of years : the Saviour's promise is pleaded, and will not be pleaded in vain. Who does not gratefully think of Anna in the Temple? The little rivulet of prayer swells the great tide of supplication, which is arising from the Church militant night and day. And the numbers of worshippers will increase. Children will become used to the devout custom. In times of illness and anxiety at home, other members of the family will be found stealing into the church that they may join in the prayers offered for the sufferer. So times of deliverance will claim united thanksgiving. By degrees the church would vindicate its name more and more as the house of prayer. It may take the lifetime of a generation fully to revive the use of the daily office ; but the lifetime of a generation is a short period in the history of a church."

For ourselves, we are bound to confess, the good Bishop's arguments as regards small *rural* parishes, do not seem to us, after a considerable experience, to be quite as practical as they are persuasive.

Upon the question of a weekly celebration of the Holy Communion,¹ the Bishop says :

I believe the Church in these last days is returning to the freshness of her first love, and is claiming more and more urgently year by year this heavenly feast upon every returning Lord's Day. I believe that, when those who have been accustomed thus to hold tryst with Christ at His Table week by week, come to a parish church where there is no weekly Communion, they go away from that church hungry and dissatisfied. I believe further that, where this spiritual appetite is wanting in our people, we do well in trying by God's grace to awaken, and foster, and deepen it. And lastly, I believe that where the setting forth of Christ crucified does not hold the central position it ought in the services of the preacher (deeply as I deplore so grievous a loss, for only as Christ is lifted up will men be drawn to Him), there in many a parish the weekly celebration of the Lord's Supper according to the pure and simple ritual of our Prayer Book supplies to the faithful that spiritual maintenance which they had craved in vain from the teaching of their pastor.

Something is to be said, of course, on the other side ; and accordingly the Bishop proceeds as follows :

But I know that, as every kindled lamp casts its shadow, so every privilege has its danger. Frequent celebrations have theirs. God grant that this sacrament of His love may never hide the Saviour from our view, but by His Holy

¹ Some of our readers may be glad to be reminded of the remarks of Mr. Hay Aitken on this subject—CHURCHMAN, vol. x., p. 106.

Spirit reveal Him to the adoring eye of faith. I freely admit that there is a peculiar solemnity about a monthly Communion. And this many still esteem most profitable for themselves and for those recently confirmed. They feel that thus the Lord's Supper stands out as a more marked monument on their pilgrim road. But many long for it more often, and it is well to be able to answer their eager inquiry, "Is it your Communion Sunday to-morrow?" with the satisfying assurance, "It is always Communion Sunday in my church."

While he has not forbore thus to lay open his heart to them regarding daily Prayer and weekly Communion, his Lordship advises the clergy to do nothing rashly. "Weigh these matters seriously with yourselves when nearest to your God at the throne of grace," and then "talk them over with the devoutest members of your flocks."

"There is another question," he says, "upon which some of the most laborious parish priests in the diocese have asked my judgment, I mean the celebration of the Holy Communion in the evening. They have introduced the practice from a deep conviction that only an evening, in addition to an earlier, administration of the Lord's Supper met the needs of all the members of their flocks; and the numbers who avail themselves of it have, they think, abundantly justified this return to a Primitive and Apostolic use; but they have been pained by the severe criticism and condemnation which other Churchmen have not scrupled to pass upon this practice."

"Now in the first place we must remember that there is just as much authority in our Prayer Book for an evening celebration, as for an early celebration before Morning Prayer. Our Church has not fixed any limit of hours for the administration of the Lord's Supper, or affixed or prefixed that administration to any Service. Let me adduce the following testimonies to this."

"Bishop Phillpotts, my predecessor in this See, writing to Mr. Croker (1840), says, 'I apprehend that you are quite right in your supposition that the Communion Service is a distinct office altogether, and was wont to be performed at a separate time from either Morning or Evening Prayer. I apprehend, too, that there is no rule and no principle which connects it more with Morning than with Evening Prayer.'"

Bishop Bickersteth then proceeds to quote from the Charge of the late learned Bishop Jeune: "The hour of administration of the Lord's Supper has greatly varied in the Christian Church. . . . 'mple warrant there surely is for evening Communion in the institution of His Supper by the Lord, and in the practice of Apostolic and after times."

Bishop Bickersteth also quotes from Bishop Wordsworth (Addresses, 1873), and Dean Goulburn (on the Communion Office). He proceeds, as follows:

To these wise and weighty words I would only add that that saintly man, the late Dean Champneys, said to me not long before he left Whitechapel, "I hope God has permitted me to labour here these twenty years not without tokens of His favour, but I consider one thing has been a greater blessing than all beside to my flock, the commencement of an evening Communion; it has enabled so many to come to that blessed ordinance who could never come before."

The Bishop sums up his counsel upon this subject in a very practical passage: "Let those clergy," he says, "who prefer an early and mid-day celebration, and find *after careful inquiry* that these hours do not exclude any of their flock, abide in their present practice. Let those who have adopted evening in addition to morning celebrations, and are persuaded that this arrangement meets the needs of their people best, not be disquieted by any adverse criticism. According to Mackeson's 'Guide to the Churches of London,' evening celebrations are held in some 300

"churches of our Metropolis. The numbers progressively increase, so that the usage evidently meets one of the real wants of our age. In the parish of Christ Church, Hampstead, of which I was pastor so long, we always had an early celebration of the Holy Communion every Sunday morning at eight o'clock, a mid-day celebration on the first Sunday, and an evening celebration on the last Sunday in the month. We had more than 500 Communicant members of my flock. The evening celebrations were chiefly frequented by the working classes, and by domestic servants. They were the most numerously attended of all, and no one could doubt the solemn awe and reverence which pervaded the church. Perhaps, personally, I enjoyed most the sweet morning hour, but some of the happiest holiest Communion of my life have been at eventide."

The counsel given in the Charges of such Bishops as Dr. Thorold, Bishop of Rochester, and Dr. Bickersteth, Bishop of Exeter, will have weight, no doubt, with many who have hitherto refused even to consider the question of "Evening Communion."¹

In the opening portion of his Charge Dr. Bickersteth refers to the number of *small* parishes in the Diocese of Exeter. According to the last census there are 23 parishes with less than 100 souls, 61 with more than 100 and less than 200, 63 more than 200 and less than 300 souls. He gives excellent advice to the pastors of those parishes. For ourselves, the case as here presented seems to strengthen the argument we have for years advanced, viz., that many of the smaller rural parishes should be joined to contiguous benefices. Bishop Temple's Bill, passed last year, is, as we remarked in *THE CHURCHMAN*, a step in the right direction; but it does not go far enough. The National Church, in a day becoming more and more democratic, needs the men in the towns; with the present machinery or organization there is a waste of money and material.

We conclude our notice of this Charge by quoting a passage in which the Bishop refers to his predecessor's "Reform" Act:

"I have ventured to speak hitherto, as if all parishes were under the charge of faithful pastors, assisted by faithful lay-helpers; and I rejoice to believe that it is so in the great majority of the parishes of our diocese. But I have already found in my brief experience, as I have gone in and out among you, joying and beholding your order and the steadfastness of your faith in Christ, that while the larger number of parishes call for nothing but grateful praise to God, there is here and there a parish which is a grief and a stumbling-block, shepherded by a careless pastor, whose people, alas! sometimes love to have it so. It may be only one in twenty-five or more. Of the other twenty-four parishes nothing is heard in the busy world: God's work is being quietly carried on there. But it is very different with the twenty-fifth parish: distress is there; or worse, despondency; or worst of all, death; until at last the state of that sheepfold awakens the cry of public indignation."

"Now a new power has been put into our hands by the Pluralities Acts Amendment Act of 1885, for which we are so largely indebted to Bishop Temple. I say we, my brethren of the clergy and of the laity, for we are one body, and whether one member suffers, all the members suffer with it, or one member be honoured, all the members rejoice with it. Now in speaking of this Act I pass by its other clauses and provisions, valuable as many of them are, to draw your attention to the significant second paragraph, in which the ecclesiastical duties enforced by this Act are stated 'to include not only the regular and

¹ See the "Hour of Holy Communion," by Rev. N. Dimock, M.A. (Elliot Stock.) A reprint from *THE CHURCHMAN*, 1886.

"due performance of divine service on Sundays and Holydays, but also
 "all such duties as any clergyman holding a benefice is bound by law to
 "perform, or the performance of which is solemnly promised by every clergy-
 "man of the Church of England at the time of his ordination."

Short Notices.

The Great Commission: Twelve Addresses on 'the Ordinal. By JAMES RUSSELL WOODFORD, D.D., sometime Lord Bishop of Ely. Edited by H. M. LUCKOCK, D.D., one of his Examining Chaplains. Pp. 226. Rivingtons. 1886.

THERE is much in these "Addresses" to admire. Yet we are inclined to think some friends of the good Bishop will regret their publication. The spirituality of tone is unmistakable, and many passages are excellent; but occasionally the argument is weak, and a word or two seems lacking. For instance, in the address on "The Power of Absolution," we read:

This is, indeed, the meaning of that clause of the Apostles' Creed, "I believe in the forgiveness of sins." It does not only express the truism that our God is a God that forgiveth iniquity, but the clause, following directly upon that declaring belief in the Holy Catholic Church, embodies our belief in a particular way of remitting sins within the Church's pale.

Something might have been said, after Pearson on the Creed, on the historical point, as to the clause "the forgiveness of sins" immediately following the clause "the Holy Catholic Church." The paragraph as it is surprises us. Still more are we surprised at a paragraph on p. 116, touching Baptism, which seems to ignore the signing with the cross, the dipping or sprinkling, and the prayer "Sanctify this water. . . ." We give the passage, as follows:

Now, it is the Prayer of Consecration by which the elements of bread and wine are set apart to be thus the outward sign of an inward pact. . . . There is no similar setting apart of the water in the font; there are no manual acts to be performed analogous to breaking the bread and laying the hand in blessing upon the bread and cup. On the contrary, the opening prayer in the Office of Baptism of Adults run thus:—"Almighty and everlasting God, Who . . . by the baptism of Thy well-beloved Son, in the river Jordan, didst sanctify the element of water to the mystical washing away of sin." The whole element of water having been once for all hallowed for this purpose, there needs no further benediction of any separate portion of it. And hence, again, the ministration of the priesthood is by the Church demanded for the one Sacrament and not for the other.

Dr. Woodford, strongly sacramental as was his teaching, by no means went so far as some who reckon themselves true—even the truest—exponents of the Church's doctrines. For instance, on Absolution (p. 75), the Bishop wrote of "*special spiritual trouble*," and also of "*counsel and advice*," and he proceeds as follows:

I would have you then (for such I hold to be the mind of the Church of England), not look at Private Confession as the necessary door of approach to Absolution. I would not have you regard it or speak of it as generally requisite, and not set it forth as the essential habit of a high spiritual life. It is rather to be regarded as a special remedy for a special sickness, an occasional medicine rather than as the ordinary stay of the soul.