

The Fraternal.

Vol. XI.

JANUARY, 1917.

LITERARY CONTRIBUTIONS for the FRATERNAL should be addressed to the Editor, Rev. F. C. SPURR, Regent's Park Chapel, N.W., and all other communications to the Secretary, Rev. E. D. deRUSSETT, Baptist Church, Harrow.

From the Editor's Chair.

Many brethren have written appreciatively of the last number of our Magazine. It was a double number and of exceptional interest. But we might easily maintain that standard, both of quantity and quality, if the membership of the Fraternal were materially increased, so that the additional cost of the Magazine would be covered by subscriptions. The Magazine has by no means yet reached the ideal aimed at. With a membership of one thousand we could accomplish something worthy through the medium of these pages.

The two "Church" articles in the present number have been written at the request of the editor, who believes that they will be welcomed at the present time, when "Church" questions are once more to the fore in a rather acute form. Free Churchmen must face the whole situation. Mr. Collins is quite right when he says that we are lacking in a convincing doctrine of the Church. Anglicanism has staked everything upon the doctrine of the Church: we have been content to protest. The time has come when, if Nonconformity is once more to be a power in the land, we must set forth a worthy doctrine of the Church. We badly need it. It might be useful if a correspondence were evoked as a result of these two articles.

The Y.M.C.A. is appealing for a large number of ministers to offer their services for work in the Huts abroad amongst the

men on service. The opportunity thus presented is unique, and it should be seized by as many of our brethren as can possibly go. Not only is a new and immense field of service opened to us, but the experience gained through contact with the men who are engaged in actual warfare is bound to be invaluable in the days to come. It should be understood, however, that every man is not fitted for this particular work. It is not easy work in any way, least of all from the spiritual standpoint. The men who assemble in the Huts have to be gained and held; and they will listen only to men who have a living message delivered in a perfectly natural manner. There is no place whatever for the conventional sermon. The younger men especially would benefit by a spell of work at the Front. Churches should be willing to sacrifice their ministers for a few months for a work of such national importance.

To ministers who are on the look out for choice little books containing messages of cheer and consolation for wounded spirits, a new Shilling series published by Messrs. Morgan & Scott, Ltd., may be unreservedly commended. Mr. David Williamson writes on "The Oil of Joy"; Rev. Hugh D. Brown, M.A., on "Our Happy Dead"; Mr. Coulson Kernahan on "Hope's Star in War's Sky"; and "P.W.W." of the *Daily News* contributes a strikingly fresh "note" on the "Strange Resurrection of John Three Sixteen." The books are beautifully printed, and cannot fail to do great good wherever they are circulated. They bring just the message that is needed at the present time.

The Rev. H. A. HUNT, of Louth, who is relinquishing the pastorate, offers the following books for sale.—Communicate with him direct.

Hasting's Dictionary; *Parker's People's Bible*; *Young's Concordance*; *Godet on Romans and Luke*; 6 vols. *Expositors Bible*; 6 vols. *Exp. Times*; *Liddell & Scott Greek Lexicon, etc., etc.*

The Quest for Holy Church.

By Rev. BERKELEY G. COLLINS, A.T.S. (Bluntisham).

In spite of all that can be justly urged against it, the Tractarian Movement had a core of noble reality, to which so severe a critic as Dr. Fairbairn paid ungrudging tribute. It was "a movement for the recovery of the lost or forgotten ideal of the Anglican Church."* Those who believe, with Macaulay, that that Church originated in the Tudor council-chamber, and is essentially an organised compromise wrought by the hands of politicians, will naturally regard the quest of the Oxford Reformers as hopeless from the beginning. Such a 'Church' can have no higher ideal than the Erastian, the placing of "a resident gentleman in every parish." But this is to credit Kings and Parliaments with more power than they ever possessed, and it is to do injustice to the long line of great and saintly men who have been nurtured in the bosom of the Establishment, and have been proud to serve the Church with all their consecrated gifts. In any case, it does detract from the sincerity and sacrifice of those who had their Vision and were faithful to it: who dreamed of the Anglican Church as the One, Holy, Apostolic and Catholic Church, and strove to realise their dream. "Let us have done with this nonsense about a National Church," said Hurrell Froude to Newman, "and let us have a real Church." There is no true nonconformist who can fail to sympathise with that aspiration.

The history of the movement, the conditions of its rise, its defeats and victories, can be studied in the sympathetic pages of Dean Church. It had its shady side, like all things human. It exhibited, at times, that indifference to the chastity of truth which, according to Inge, † is one of the defects of the Catholic type. It was intolerant and perverse. Its implications and its

* *Anglicanism and Catholicism*, p. 34.

† *Types of Christian Saintliness*, p. 28.

principles were sceptical. Its reading of history was unwarranted by the facts. But with all its shortcomings, and they were neither few nor trivial, it accomplished a work in the Church, and beyond her borders, which was not of man's devising. "The Oxford Movement," says a recent writer, "even with all its conspicuous limitations, has made the English Church into a thing very difficult for John Bull again completely to tame and domesticate. In the words of Cardinal Newman, when still in his Anglican period, 'an unseen Incendiary has been at work.'"^{*} It is difficult to believe that the great conception of the Church as the visible, sacramental Body of Christ, a Divine Society, created and indwelt by the Holy Spirit, one through all the centuries and throughout the world, will again be obscured in Anglicanism, even though there are still many in that Communion who lack the Vision and the Faith. In this sense the Oxford Movement is not a spent force, as it is sometimes represented to be. Its work remains, and will remain.

The Vision of the Church, as of a Bride adorned, was lovely, and was reflected in the ordered beauty and the deepened reverence of the earthly worship. But the marks by which the Tractarians sought to identify her in the visible order were neither scriptural nor true. Their doctrines of the Apostolic Succession and the priesthood, and their curious theory of the geographical divisions of the Divine Society, were opposed alike to history and to the witness of the Spirit. The Movement failed to win the support of spiritual forces like Maurice and Robertson; of Humanists like Stanley and Pattison; while its account of primitive institutions has been emphatically repudiated by scholars such as Hatch and Gwatkin. But mistakes can be corrected, and the form the Movement has taken to-day is much less open to attack. In many respects the 'Liberal Catholic' marks an immense advance. He approximates to the position of Dr. Headlam, and regards the Church not so much as an organisation as a living organism, functioning through the centuries. Its

^{*}Osborne: *Religion in Europe and the World Crisis*, p. 132.

'orders' are its creation, not its foundation. "Ordination depends on the authority of the Church, and not the Church upon ordination."* Apostolic Succession is a deduction from the rule of ordination, and not a doctrine. The rule of the Church is the Episcopate, which represents its external continuity, and non-episcopal 'orders' are not so much 'invalid' as 'irregular.' The Liberal Catholic, while insisting that an episcopally ordained presbyter is necessary as the *guarantee* for the proper celebration of the Eucharist, shows a marked desire to avoid a doctrinal rigidity which would compel him to deny the grace of Nonconformist sacraments. But on the other hand he is persuaded that there is an inherent defect in Protestant Nonconformity which must always prevent unreserved recognition. In the words of a singularly fine-spirited writer of this school, "Between a convinced and religious Churchman, as distinct from a mere Establishmentarian, and a convinced and religious Nonconformist, are differences which go down much deeper than the question of *esse* and *bene esse* of the Episcopate. They are questions as to the nature of the Church in itself, and as to the nature of Christianity. To the one the Church, as the 'Body of Christ,' is essentially and organically visible, as far as her members on earth are concerned, and includes all the baptised, and not Protestants alone. On this point, the Church's visibility, her capacity for extending the Incarnation in visible embodiment, touching the world of sense as well as the world of spirit—in a word, her sacramentalism—there is no difference whatever between Catholics, whether of the Roman, Orthodox, or Anglican folds."† On this view, Protestantism, of which Nonconformity is the valiant and respected champion, is essentially individualistic and unsacramentalist. The only Church it is supposed to know is the Church Invisible, to which all believers belong, whether or not they are in any visible Communion. Its emphasis is on the solitary and isolated soul, and it knows nothing of the Divine So-

*See Temple's *Church and State*, p. 197.
Osborne: *Religion and the World Crisis*, p. 345.

ciety which, *and not the individual soul*, is the redeemed Bride of Christ. Hence it has no recognised doctrine of the ministry or of the sacraments; no consciousness of the One life which flows through the Body; no authority other than that of the soul's own choosing. With even-handed justice the Liberal Catholic acknowledges the faith and spiritual fervour of Nonconformity, and confesses the glaring defects of Catholicism. But he insists that the spirit of Protestantism finds issue in the individualism of a Liberalism which denies Christ, and in a sectarianism which puts Him to open shame. The future, he maintains, is with the Church which knows itself to be the Church of the living God, which is and abides in the central stream, the 'Bride of Christ' however soiled her beautiful garments, united to Him in perpetual union expressed in and mediated through the sacraments, rather than with loose societies which indeed are 'in a sense' churches, but which lack the great notes and guarantees of the Catholic order.

It is impossible to deny the force of the appeal, an appeal which in the days to come will win many. The men who make it are open, as their predecessors were not, to the culture and knowledge of the time. They are of the spirit of Colet and Erasmus rather than of Laud. They have learning and zeal and charity. And beyond doubt the present world-crisis is making inevitable a new orientation which assists them in their apostolate. The association of Germany with Protestantism must influence the outlook with many. The Churches of France and Russia, of peoples united with us against a nation which limits Christianity to the private faith of the individual, and whose corporate life is athiestic and immoral, appear in another light than that of mere apostates from the truth. And the grand vision of a visible Church which includes these, rises before the minds of men, and like Wisdom at the parting of the ways, invites them to enter in.

II.

The power of the Catholic revival lies mainly in its appeal

to the historic imagination, and to the wide-spread discontent with a drab and prosaic Protestantism. It has a richness in it as of cloth of gold, beside which our worship and faith seem often poor indeed. It is not to be met by mere negatives. Men and Churches do not live by their protests, but by their affirmations; and we cannot dwell indefinitely in the 'Everlasting No.' Not that the Liberal Catholic position is not open to a criticism which does full justice to the splendour of its aims. With all its glamour of Catholicity, it is singularly parochial and obtuse. Its prophets, for all their charity, do not appreciate the real significance of the fact that the great majority of English-speaking Christians are outside the Episcopal folds—a fact which Dean Inge, with mordant humour, reminds them.* It represents, at best, only the views of a section of the Church of England, and is powerfully assailed from within her borders by men of ripe scholarship and deep spirituality. It draws unwelcome attention to the anomalous position of a Church which "has framed tests of Catholicity which separate it from the non-Episcopal Churches, and which are scornfully rejected by all other Catholics.† Its notion of the extension of the Incarnation by means of the sacraments is a piece of modern metaphysics and not Catholic doctrine.‡ While the importance it assigns to 'orders' as guarantees of the reality of the Eucharist seems to imply that the Incarnation is "extended" by functionaries, and not by the extending life of the Church itself. The Church is degraded, and her royal raiment is given to her servants. The use also that is being made of the present world-crisis is ingenuous. The religious condition of Germany illustrates far more unmistakeably the evils of an Established Church than it does any supposed weakness in Protestantism, and the powers opposing us are not predominantly Protestant. Prussia may be the steel head of the spear which has struck at the heart of civilisation, but the shaft is Catholic Austria. But leaving these matters, and coming to

**The Church and the Age.* †b. 45.

‡Fairbairn: *Catholicism—Roman and Anglican*, p. 324.

what is regarded as the fundamental difference between the Liberal Catholic and the Nonconformist, can it be maintained that the Visible Church consists of all the baptised? This is not a question merely of their personal character, or of the mode of baptism, or even of the subject of baptism, although, in our judgment, as Baptists, the words of Jeremy Taylor respecting *Extreme Unction* are as true of Infant Baptism—"No rational Man can think that any Ceremony can make a spiritual change without a spiritual act of him that is to be changed: nor that it can work by way of Nature or by Charm, but Morally, and after the manner of reasonable Creatures."* But this is a question as to the significance of baptism from the standpoint of the Church itself. There are many thousands of children in England alone who have been brought to the font by parents or friends who are as the heathen in their thoughts and manner of life, and who will grow up like their parents, to the shame of the nation to which they belong, and the Church which has sanctioned their baptism. In what sense can they be regarded as members of the Body of Christ which does not make membership a mechanical and meaningless thing? And can baptism be isolated in this way? In the thought of the Church, as expounded by no less an authority than Dr. Moberly, Baptism and Confirmation (the Laying-on of hands) are "two ceremonies which in fact require and imply one another, because they are really part of one initiation, which is, in theological idea, one whole;" and he adds, "Whatever margin there may be of practical inexactitude in the sharp denial of the Pentecostal gift to anything but the Laying-on of hands . . . it is plain that the true principle expressed in such denial is deeper and more significant than the dangers of inexactness."† It would appear then that initiation into the Visible Church is not complete in baptism, and therefore the Church consists of those who have not only been baptised but confirmed; that is, of conscious and confessing believers. From our standpoint the

**Epist. Ded. to "Holy Dying."*

†*Atonement and Personality*, pp. 262-263.

separation between the two ceremonies is fraught with danger; but at least the fuller statement brings us immeasurably nearer to Reality and agreement.

But it is not enough to criticise. We must show that our own Church is at least as august, as apostolic; and as truly Catholic as any. We must deny emphatically the repeated assertion that we know of no Church but the Church Invisible, whose membership is seen by God alone; that we have no necessary place in our thought for the Visible Body of Christ. In its origin our Nonconformity was a protest of the Church, made by men who believed in the Church, and for the sake of the Church. And it would not be difficult to disprove the current misrepresentation of our position were it not that, like the Anglicans at the beginning of the nineteenth century but from other causes, we have largely lost the Church-consciousness. The most brilliant leader the Free Churches have had, our own beloved Secretary, has recently declared that "We have no doctrine of the Church and the ministry;" and it must be sorrowfully confessed that, as a statement of the present conditions, his words are true. We must join the Quest for the Church, because we have allowed the necessary individualism of the Gospel to degenerate into a mere atomism which has wrought disaster in many directions. In religious thought it has made the Atonement for the sin of the world an insoluble problem. In religious experience it has led to a subjectivism which substitutes spiritual self-culture for faith in an objective Saviour. It has introduced into religious fellowship a disintegrating idea which has made the Church a voluntary association of like-minded individuals who would be equally good believers if they chose to remain unattached to any communion. The natural consequence is that we have lost reverence for the Church, and the light in her sacraments has faded and left them dark and cold. It is not the Church which has inspired the thought and won the love of those who have wearied of this stark individualism, but the vision of the Kingdom of God with

its social promise and its radiant hope for the future of the world. Whether they have conceived rightly of the Kingdom, and have not yielded to the Tempter in the Wilderness and sought it in forbidden ways, are matters for discussion. But it is the Kingdom, however conceived, which for many earnest and chivalrous souls has eclipsed the Church.

Yet in the N.T. the Kingdom of the Gospels becomes the Church of the Epistles. The Church is there the sacrament of the Kingdom, the Kingdom breaking into visibility in the community it creates. For the Kingdom of God is not social justice, or peace among the peoples, or a new ordering of life, though it must produce all these by its own methods. It is 'righteousness, and peace, and joy in the Holy Ghost.' And if we cannot simply substitute Church for Kingdom in such a definition, it is because the Church is the Kingdom becoming, forcing its way through the veils of sense, and the end is not yet. The Kingdom is the Immanent Life of the Church;* and if any Church loses its sense of the Kingdom in its concern for anything unethical and unspiritual, or identifies its life with any of its institutions or orders, it becomes a faded leaf, mere fibre and membrane, showing only in its outline from what divine Tree it fell. The Church is the Kingdom as an organism, the living Community which is moved by the powers of the Kingdom. The local Church in the N.T. is but the Church localised, and part of the indivisible Whole. And it is in the Church the Lord has His dwelling, and through the Church that He acts on the world. "The living Christ is only realisable on an historic scale by His action through the living and historic community of a Church. . . The Holy Spirit can act upon the main stream of human history only by spiritual communities. It is true enough that the Spirit has action and effect outside the Churches. But the Church, as the moving area of the Cross, is the real base even of these operations. And it is still more true that it is through the Church that the Spirit

*See Fairbairn, *Christ in Modern Theology*, p. 528 f.f.

effects the conversion of the world into the Kingdom of God.”* The figures used in the N.T. to describe the Church are such as to suggest its supernatural character and mission. It is a holy nation, a royal priesthood, a spiritual House. It is the purchase of Christ's Blood. It is His Body, of which He is the Head and Life. It is the Bride being adorned for the union with Him in the mystery of marriage. More mystically still it is identical with Christ in the world, His extended Incarnation, one with Him as the Branches *are* the Vine, and the Vine is not apart from the Branches. In such words there is, no doubt, an ideal and even poetic element. The Church is conceived as it is in the thought and purpose of its Lord. But a thing essentially *is* what it is to become; and nothing can be understood except in the light of its ideal end. And the inspired men who wrote these glowing words had their eyes not on the clouds, but on the actual Church, the Visible Household of faith, with all its imperfections and blemishes, but with pure Water laving its threshold, and in its midst the Table, and One Who is known in the breaking of the Bread.

The Church is with us, but we need to rediscover her; not only because the Quest is calling to many who may look elsewhere than in our Baptist Community, but because the Church is a divine necessity, the Home of the Spirit, the Whole without which our separate and individual life is incomplete. It is more than the sum total of its members, even as a nation is more than the numerical sum of its citizens. It is the Holy Body, the fulness of Him that filleth all in all.

Three times did Hermas see the Holy Church. Once she was an ancient Lady who reclined in feebleness on a couch. Once she stood erect with more youthful countenance, but with the body and hair of old age. And then at last he saw her young and radiant, clothed upon with loveliness. On his asking the reason for these differences, he was told that the cause was in him and the people. Their vision was according to their spirit and their faith, and ‘repentance is,’ among other things, ‘*great understanding.*’

*Forsyth, *The Charter of the Church*, p. 61.

In Quest of the Unattainable.

A FEW NOTES ON "CATHOLIC" ORDERS.

By Rev. W. T. WHITLEY, M.A., LL.M., LL.D., F.T.S., F.R.H.S.

"In the whole Ordinal, not only is there no clear mention of the sacrifice, of consecration, of the Sacerdotium, and of the powers of consecrating and offering sacrifice, but every trace of these things . . . was deliberately removed and struck out."

Such is the deliberate pronouncement of Pope Leo XIII. on the "Form or manner of making, ordaining, and consecrating of Bishops, Priests, and Deacons, according to the order of the Church of England." So that anybody who quits Nonconformity for the Church of England because he misses the "altar" with us, makes a most uncertain gain. He goes to what a high authority on such matters considers no altar: he obtains ordination as a priest without the chief things that constitute a priest; he applies to a bishop who is no true bishop, who does not institute to a real priesthood, and would have no power to do so, even if he wished. If he can reason, he will have to go further, and he will fare no better.

Shall we attend to these matters, not as we ourselves interpret the mind of Christ, but as high authorities on Catholic ordinations view the "orders" in the Roman communion and in the Anglican?

The question raised plainly in the Pope's letter of 13th September, 1896, quoted above, is whether a necessary duty of a priest is to consecrate bread and wine so that they become the Body and Blood of the Lord, and to offer them in sacrifice to God. The Roman Catholics have not the faintest doubt that this is the grace and power of the Christian priesthood; and in this the great Eastern communions agree. A Russian Pope holds aloft paten and chalice, praying that the Lord will send down the Holy Spirit upon the gifts then presented, will consecrate them,

will transform this bread into His true Body, and this wine into His true Blood. He does not in so many words assert that by some virtue inherent in him, he transforms them; but it is never suggested that anyone but a pope should offer this prayer; and it is assumed that the pope's prayer is answered instantly.

Now the Archbishops of Canterbury and York, replying to Pope Leo, did not dispute his finding that Anglican "priests" do not transform the bread and wine; they explained carefully what sort of sacrifices are offered at the communion—gifts, praise and thanksgiving, themselves—along with a memorial being made of the death of Christ. And a large party in the Church of England not only admits the alteration in the ordination service of 1549, but glories in the fact that the Reformers removed the portion which gave authority to the minister to offer sacrifices, as well as that part of the communion service in which the priest professed to offer Christ's Body.

A second point of interest is, how a man attains the standing of a priest. To quote an earlier pope:—Sacraments have three requisites for their performance—things as their "matter," words as their "form," and the person of the minister who celebrates the sacrament with the intention of doing what the Church does; and if any of these be absent, the sacrament is not performed. The Archbishops accepted this statement. If the sacrament in question be that of Holy Orders, these three high dignitaries agree in saying that for a man to become a priest, he must have the hands of a Bishop laid on him, appropriate prayers must be uttered, and the Bishop must intend to confer on the candidate the powers of a priest. Pope Leo adds that as the chief power of a priest is to offer sacrifice for the living and the dead, this must be specified in words, and he must be handed a chalice with wine, and a paten with bread. The Archbishops deny this, show that it was not the custom in the old Roman Church, and declare that the delivery of the Holy Bible is vital, for that is the chief instrument of the sacred ministry, and includes in itself all its other powers. We need not dwell on this

conflict, but may attend to the point that the intervention of a Bishop is necessary.

This is not all; for a Bishop can only enter on his rank by the intervention of another Bishop, and under ordinary circumstances, of three other Bishops. Thus the whole existence of Bishops, Priests and Deacons, depends upon Bishops. In this theory the Church of England is fully agreed with the Church of Rome and the Eastern Churches. How, then, does it apply? Take the most illustrious and important case, the See of Rome itself.

Cardinal Baronius, about the year 1600, wrote Ecclesiastical Annals. Dealing with Rome in the tenth century, he asked: "Who can count as lawful Pontiffs, men of this kind, intruded into the See by harlots, without law? Never is there any mention of the clergy choosing them, or even consenting afterwards to their election . . . these monsters creating Priests, Deacons and Cardinals like themselves." How could Cardinals thus created, elect a legitimate Pope?

A reformation took place next century by the efforts of Hildebrand, who at last secured a law as to the succession. But strange to say, when he himself was chosen as Gregory VII., "it is plain from his own account of the circumstances of his election that it was conducted in extremely irregular fashion, and that the forms prescribed by the laws of 1059 were not observed."

Again, there was a Canon enacted at council after council, including the Eighth Ecumenical at Constantinople in the ninth century, that every Bishop of what degree soever must reside personally in his See, under penalty of privation, etc. In that century it was applied to Cardinal Anastasius, who had been absent from his See for five years; and the Council of Trent expressly declared that Canon bound even Cardinals. Yet in 1305 a French Pope moved to Avignon, and in sixty-eight years the Bishops of Rome only once visited Rome. On all Catholic principles, there was no Bishop of Rome as soon as the residence at Avignon passed the bounds of a visit.

The scandal of Avignon led to two rival lines of Popes, then to Councils to clear up the confusion. At these Councils all sorts of people insisted on voting, and a Bishop noted with horror that even the laity were admitted to the right of a decisive vote. Another innovation appeared at Constance, and one of the Popes who were being deposed, protested against votes being classified by nations, each nation casting one vote. This Council elected a new Pope, and the irregularities that began in 1305 did not end till Eugenius IV. was universally acknowledged in 1449. This Pope, who had been deposed by a Council, but had regained power after four years, had to grapple with the questions of "orders" among the Armenians, and it is he who laid down the doctrine of sacraments which has been quoted above.

Fifty years later another scandal became pre-eminent, in that the Cardinals succumbed to bribery. "Borgia by his great wealth succeeded in buying the largest number of votes," and became Pope Alexander VI. In one year he created twelve Cardinals "of those who offered him the highest price." Out of thirty-one Cardinals who chose Medici as Pope Leo X., twenty-nine owed their office to Alexander. And Leo on one day created thirty-one Cardinals, who paid him 200,000 golden crowns. But all this time, bribery of this kind was not only illegal, but it invalidated every step taken in consequence. Only twenty years before Borgia demoralised the Curia, Pope Paul II. had declared, "Any one who shall acquire ecclesiastical dignities simoniacally is by that very deed deprived of them, and is in future incapable of holding them or of obtaining any other." And this ruling was upheld by the Council of Trent. It follows that Alexander and Leo, to name no others, were not legitimate Popes.

Now if the chain of the Papacy itself is thus broken for most of the tenth century, in the eleventh, for most of the fourteenth; if it was treated so singularly by the Councils, if it was snapped again by simony—then the continuity of the See of Rome is demonstrably absent. And will anyone imagine that in

obscurer sees, where the facts are hidden away, the election and consecration of every Bishop was legitimate? Take a case in England, and see what it involved.

Henry VII. wanted an agent at Rome who could negotiate for him with the Papal Curia. He wisely choose an Italian; and as, like John Gilpin's wife, although on business he was bent, he had a frugal mind, he paid the Italian by appointing him Bishop of Worcester, which entailed an income of £1049 17 3. The ambassador died soon, but Henry appointed his nephew instead, and arranged his remuneration on the same basis. When he too died, a third Italian took the post, and the Bishopric. And a fourth succeeded to the embassy and the episcopal revenues. The system only ended when Henry VIII. threw off all connection with the Papacy, so needed no ambassador at Rome, and appointed Latimer to the See.

For nearly forty years the Bishops of Worcester lived continuously in Rome, and had no personal connexion with the diocese, the only link being that they drew its revenues. To carry on the work they paid various other Bishops, of Achonry, and other places, and thus inceased absenteeism. But deliberate and prolonged absence, according to Catholic principles, incapacitated the holder, and made him no longer Bishop. Therefore the Italians could not confer any powers on their Irish helpers; the substitute Bishops had no right to perform any episcopal duties in the diocese; the confirmations, ordinations, inductions, collations, were invalid; the whole life of the diocese was vitiated for a generation. It is another thing that the clergy had no Bibles, not even New Testaments, that they cut short or omitted sermons in order to have procession; that they neglected their duty so that parishoners could not even say the Lord's Prayer in English; all which things we gather from the Injunctions of Bishop Latimer. The point is not that clergy were inefficient and the parishoners ignorant, that is a point for the man of common sense; we appeal to those interested in "validity," that many of the clergy cannot have been validly ordained.

Now what is thus shown for Worcester, happened at one time or another in nearly every important Bishopric. Wolsey was made Archbishop of York in 1514. He never saw the city, and never entered his diocese till his fall from power. This was of course a scandal; but the present point is, that it invalidated his position, made him no longer Archbishop, made his acts purporting to appoint substitutes null and void; that from the time he deliberately neglected to take up residence, say for ten years, no episcopal act of Wolsey's was valid. When he professed to ordain a priest, or to consecrate a Bishop, the act was worthless.

How then can we be sure that any single Bishop has valid orders? So important was the chain of apostolical succession, that a Bishop derives his orders not through one consecrator, but through three; two may have forfeited their powers, but one may still enjoy them. And it is on this probability that at least one of three consecrators is himself a valid Bishop, that the episcopal churches stake their very existence, and presume to regard other communities beneath them.

A man who claims special rights and privileges must prove them. If a minister claims that he is a Ph.D. of Gale University in Wisconsin, and desires to have that part recorded in our handbook, we ask him to submit the evidence for two things—that he holds a diploma from that University, that the University has the right to issue it derived from a competent authority; and we further judge whether if his degree is "valid," it is also worth anything. Now when a man claims that he is ordained a priest, the burden lies on him of proving not only that a given Bishop did purport to ordain him, but that this so-called Bishop had any powers to perform such a ceremony; and even then, without consulting him further, we will on other grounds determine whether his priesthood stands for anything real.

A Roman Catholic knows this, and is prepared to prove his descent. Any priest can, if he chooses, produce his ecclesiastical genealogy; ordained by Bishop A who was consecrated by Bishop B, who was consecrated by Bishop C. As I write, I

have before me the official pedigree of the whole R.C. hierarchy in England, carried back for centuries. The average Anglican has seldom thought about the necessity of even stating his case. When he does, antiquaries will probably find a good many weak links in the chain, while we know what R.C. experts think about the Anglican succession.

Then of course there is the initial question as to authority. A man may proclaim his sheepskin from Gale, his list of presidents there back to the foundation perhaps; but he must also produce some copy of the charter entitling Gale to confer a Ph.D. Where is the evidence that any person whatever could admit to a priesthood other than that common to all believers, entered upon by baptism? Paul wrote of an Apostolic Succession, to which he admitted Timothy, and bade him select faithful men, who in their turn could be followed by others. But the duty of all was not to offer at an altar; it was to teach. If a man misses a literal stone altar among us, he misses a relic of heathenism, or of Judaism, falsely foisted in again on Christianity. If he goes elsewhere in search of it, he both goes back to weak and beggarly elements, and he goes following a will-o'-the-wisp.

For ourselves, we decline to be carried away with strange doctrines; we establish ourselves with grace, not with unprofitable rites; we have an altar spiritual not material; and we offer praise, beneficence, contribution for the work of the Lord, knowing that God is well pleased with such sacrifices. Of validity, legitimacy, and the like, the New Testament does not speak; the Head of the Church desired only sincerity and truth.

Open Court.

THE VICE-PRESIDENCY OF THE
BAPTIST UNION.

To the Editor of the *Fraternal*.

A year ago I addressed a letter to you upon the subject of the Vice-Presidency of the Baptist Union. It was apparently too late to be of use. I hope I am not too late this time. I am writing not on my own behalf alone, but in the name of a number of brethren who have freely discussed the subject, and who desire that it shall be ventilated in the pages of our magazine. Please understand that we cast no reflection whatever upon the brethren who have during late years occupied the President's chair. We honour them, and we believe they deserve the honour done to them by the denomination. But what very many of us feel is this, there should greater attention be given to the claims of some older brethren, who have rendered magnificent service to the denomination for many years. Some of the young men who have been, and are, "on the cards," could afford to wait a few years before being raised to the dignity of the president's chair. It is not their fault that they are nominated: it is the fault of the Assembly that it is swayed too much by the feeling of the moment, and which does not stop to consider the claims of older men. If the presidency of the Baptist Union is an honour rendered for faithful service and ability, ought it not to be offered to some of our Stalwarts who for forty years and more have been faithful servants of the churches? I do not want to be invidious, hence I mention no names; but cannot we all think of men in the Midlands and in the North—scholars, men of ability and friendly men—who deserve such an honour as that of the presidency of the Baptist Union? Hitherto they have been put aside. I ask my brethren to think of this. Let our honours be given first to

men of long service and ability. In a few years they will have gone from us. It would be a brotherly thing to do, and it also seems just.

There is no need for my name to appear. It is not a personal thing of which I am writing. But 'Northener' will at once describe me and conceal my identity.

A Book to Read.

FAITH OR FEAR? An appeal to the Church of England.
By DONALD HANKEY and others. Macmillan & Co.

It is not surprising that this book has been reprinted within a month of its first appearance. It is likely to be reprinted many more times yet. A more compellingly frank book has not appeared for a long time. While it deals primarily with affairs in the Church of England, it is in reality addressed to all the churches. It faces problems which affect us all. The five writers who contribute to it are loyal members (and ministers) of the Episcopal Church, and write in view of "the really tragic failure of the church to meet the needs of the nation." The plan of the book is simple. Part I. deals with the average man's religion. Part II. with the Anglican failure to use the new light God has been sending to the world during late years. The rest of the chapters are devoted to an attempt at reconstruction. There are a great many things we should like to quote from these pages, but lack of space forbids. There are other things from which we profoundly dissent. The writers are open-eyed men, but they are too much obsessed with the idea that theirs is the church of the future. Before the Episcopal Church can really become a church of the people it must have the courage to free itself from State domination, and to recognise that other churches also are organs of the Holy Spirit. The writers are on the right lines, but they do not go far enough. Our own ministers will do well to obtain this book. It will help many to see the defects in our organised Christianity, and it certainly does something towards pointing out a more excellent way of life and service.

The Doctrine of Divine Grace in Deutero-Isaiah.

By Rev. H. TOWNSEND, M.A., D.D. (Huddersfield).

There is no part of the Old Testament where the doctrine of Jahweh's Grace to Israel is set forth so forcibly as in Deutero-Isaiah. The Book of Jonah may define the scope of the divine purpose more explicitly, bringing out the obligation which Jahweh's generous goodness lays upon Israel towards the great heathen world; but for insight into the problems of divine grace and history, we must turn to the great evangelical prophet of the exile. For one thing, time and tide were with him. He beholds the stream of Jahweh's loving-kindness rising to irresistible flood, bringing down Cyrus on its bosom, leaving much human wreckage in its course, stripping Babylon, Lady of Kingdoms, until her shame is seen, and never ceasing its surge until Israel is carried home. The arguments of the prophet presuppose a profound spiritual temper in the pious remnant. Bereft of the Temple shrine with its impressive drama of worship, the pious had become more conscious than ever of the intrinsic character of spiritual communion with Jahweh. Jeremiah's message had found its soil in the hearts of the exiles: "I will put my law in their inward parts, and in their heart will I write it." During the captivity a new generation had arisen with a new heart and a new spirit. Hence the objective manifestation of Jahweh's Grace in Deutero-Isaiah is inseparable from the deepening subjective experience of the pious. The occasion made the prophecy intensely national on the one hand; but the prophet is under no delusion as to the universal reach of those principles according to which the Grace of Jahweh operates towards and in Israel.

The prophet proclaims himself the announcer of good tidings, and his first utterance is full of Grace: "Speak ye to the

heart of Jerusalem, and cry unto her that her time of service is accomplished." He then proceeds to bring out an objective aspect of Divine Grace which has received too little attention of late, showing its operation in history in the terms of divine will or motive. Jahweh's attitude to Israel was full of compassion. He yearned over her. But could he deliver her from Babylon? Yes, such was the divine tenderness that Jahweh "feeds His flock like a shepherd, He shall gather the lambs in His arm, and carry them in His bosom, He shall gently lead those that give suck." And the prophet reasons that the will and energy of God are equal to the task of carrying the people home. It is in the power of will that Jahweh is the Incomparable. Heathen gods have no strength. On the other hand, Jahweh faints not, neither is weary; by the greatness of his might not one of the heavenly host is lacking. He holds princes and peoples and stars in his hand. The gods of the heathen can neither foretell a thing nor bring it to pass. Jahweh can do both. He purposed to call Cyrus and does it. "I have raised him up in righteousness, and I will make straight all his ways: he shall build my city, and he shall let my exiles go free, not for price nor reward, saith the Lord of Hosts." (XLV. 13.) Cyrus, the mightiest political force of that day, was under the control of Jahweh, and would perform all his good pleasure.

The Grace of Jahweh alone explains Israel's existence as a nation. He claims to have chosen Israel and formed him from the womb. Never is Israel regarded as choosing Jahweh. The divine motive is pressed far back of Sinai and its covenant unto the rock whence Israel was hewn (LI. 1). Abraham was Jahweh's friend, even from the ends of the earth he had chosen him as the father of Jacob. Jahweh's choice of the nation was no afterthought. Israel's physical existence was a gift, and was meant to enshrine Jahweh's motive from the foundation of the world. As the spiritual horizon grows clearer to the vision of our prophet, the political existence of Israel becomes less of an end and more of a means for giving effect to the universal scope of Jahweh's purpose. More clearly than any of his predecessors,

Deutero-Isaiah sees the true place of Israel in the development of the divine purpose. He is the bearer of the good tidings of the Restoration; he glows at the prospective swoop of Cyrus upon Babylon and the rebuilding of the city; but, momentous as these events are, they are included in a divine teleology which reaches to further ends. We have but to compare the teaching of Deutero-Isaiah with Ezekiel's closing picture of the Restoration to learn how much more inward and comprehensive is his reading of history. The theme of these chapters is handled, the facts marshalled, the history of the race read and projected, by one who sees events from the standpoint of the divine motive in relation to mankind, rather than from the exclusive point of view of Israel.

At the same time, Jahweh's immediate concern is with Israel. The urge of divine Grace is towards the nation. God sees Israel's deplorable condition in Babylon, robbed and spoiled and impotent (XLII. 22); yet precious in His sight (XLIII. 4). He knew from the beginning how obstinate and stiff-necked she was (XLVIII. 4), but He had not forgotten her. She is graven on the palms of His hands (XLIX. 15). He had hid His face in wrath for a moment, but He will gather her with everlasting loving-kindness (LIV. 7f.). And His will is equal to His compassionate disposition: His arm is not shortened that it cannot redeem (L. 2; LIII. 1).

Deutero-Isaiah's distinctive contribution to the Doctrine of Grace lies in his clear penetration of its objective and subjective operations. Grace is not something which is given for nothing. There is nothing arbitrary in God's Grace. The prophet never loses sight for a moment of the great principles involved in his evangelism. He discerns that even the Grace of Jahweh cannot deny His righteousness and truth: it does not cancel human guilt unless certain subjective conditions make forgiveness possible: it only furthers its end through Israel as the nation closes with its demands, working outwardly the Grace which works inwardly. Deutero-Isaiah realised this as did no other prophet in the Old

Testament. He thus confronts the cardinal question of that generation; and the problem did not present itself as one between the Sovereignty of God and human freedom. In the first place, this evangelist of the exile sees the cost of Jahweh's Grace to himself; then, he sees the suffering of the servant as the working out of the divine motive towards transgressors. The prophet's eye did not linger too long on the past, he is inspired to set forth the timeless principle according to which the Grace of God operates. Forgiveness is a gracious act of God, but the Grace which forgives makes the most appalling demands on the human will. Deutero-Isaiah saw that the central appeal of Grace was to the will of Israel; in the case of the pious it appealed to the will to suffer; in the case of the nation it appealed to the will to repent.

There are remarkable passages which develop the objective character of Grace in relation to the suffering of God. The sufferings of the Servant no more than reflect the passions of the Divine Being. The emotions of God are agitated as His will moves to its goal. Jahweh says that it is no light thing that he should realise his eternal motive in the destiny of Israel. But however terrible the cost of progress, the prophet sees that Jahweh lays no suffering upon others which he does not bear himself. Could the urge of the divine nature be expressed more vividly than when Jahweh says, "I have long time held my peace; I was silent, I restrained myself: like a woman in travail I gasp and pant and palpitate together (XLII. 14). The stupendous expenditure of moral energy suggested in these words shows the cost of Jahweh's Grace to Himself. He gave Israel birth and He takes upon Himself the anguish of carrying and delivering her. For her sake He passes through rivers and through fire, which but for His Presence would finally submerge her (XLIII. 2). The writer of the closing chapters of Isaiah accentuates this suffering on the part of God. In all the affliction of His people Jahweh is afflicted. In His agony to achieve His motive His raiment is bespattered with the life-blood of nations. At such a

cost is His Grace available for Israel.

The climax of the argument for the objective reality of divine Grace in Deutero-Isaiah is Jahweh's appeal to the consistency of His character and motive. Such reasoning is found in Isaiah and Jeremiah, and later in Ezekiel. Isaiah had proclaimed to Hezekiah that the inviolability of Jerusalem rested on the consistency of the divine will. Jahweh would never renounce His covenant: "For I will defend this city to save it for mine own sake and for my servant David's sake" (XXXVII. 36). On that occasion, Sennacherib's army had melted away from before Jerusalem. The city now lay in ruins, a widow bereft of her children. But the days of her mourning are now drawing to a close. Jahweh has not cast her children off, but has refined them in captivity for His own sake. It is His purpose to bring them home again, for He cannot give His glory to another. "For mine own sake, for mine own sake will I do it, for how should my name be profaned, and my glory will I not give to another" (XLVIII. 9). His motive is like Himself, eternally consistent.

The strength of the prophet's evangelism must be traced to this conviction of the consistency of the divine will. At terrible cost to Himself Jahweh will keep His covenant. And it is the task of the prophet to convince the people that nothing can deter the will of Jahweh to carry them home. Their subjective condition now made that possible, for their time of service was expired. There had been much in their experience to blur the objective magnificence of divine grace. Blind they might be still to its modes of operation. But the tramp of Cyrus' armies coming from the north is music to the soul of the prophet. In the new political crisis which is breaking on the horizon he is inspired to discern the progress of the divine will towards its goal.

The subjective aspect of divine Grace in Deutero-Isaiah is brought out most prominently in the Servant songs. After all, the greatest element in the sufferings of the Servant is not physical. We must get behind His wounds and shame, visible

effects, to the invisible energies which urge him onwards. When this is done we discover that the mightiest thing in the Servant is his inspired will. "I was not rebellious," he says. "I gave my back to the smiters, and my cheeks to them that plucked out the hair: I hid not my face from shame and spitting—I have set my face like a flint" (L. 4-7). By what means? By the help of Jahweh. The immanent divine pressure revealed in these verses is seen in our Lord, who was straitened till His task was done. That this strength of will put forth by the Servant is the psychological effect of Jahweh's Grace comes out in the relation of the above passages to Jahweh's promise to put His spirit upon His Servant, and to give him as a light to the Gentiles that salvation may reach to the ends of the earth (XLIX. 6).

The suffering Servant in chapter LIII. is working out the Grace of Jahweh into the profoundest ethical values. "It pleased the Lord to bruise him," and we only understand the nature of this bruising as we regard the subjective travail of the Servant. Such passion is the resultant of the divine motive. In other words, Jahweh's Grace inspires the Servant's will to put forth the utmost expenditure of moral energy.

Chapter LIII., then, is the charter of the pious remnant who know their humiliation and suffering to have intrinsic values within the realm of divine ends. They know their passion to be the cost to the church of their day of Jahweh's everlasting motive to redeem. The division of the population into the pious and the transgressors may strike us as subjective and arbitrary, but it stands for the division between the church and the world which is as real to-day as it was for the pious remnant.

Now the pious within Israel heard the call to suffer, that the nation might be led away from sin into complete surrender to Jahweh. It was in the nature of their experience of divine Grace that they should do so. Through fellowship with God they had learnt the nature of that obedience which He required—even vicarious suffering unto death. But, as they became conscious of their calling, they became conscious too of the access of spirit-

ual energies which inspired them to fulfil it. The refusal to suffer would have closed the avenues of inflowing Grace. Hence Jahweh's Grace makes its central challenge to the human will and through surrendered will, Supernatural energies accomplish divine progress. There is a reciprocity of action between Jahweh and the pious remnant, between Grace and the will to suffer, between Evangelism and its Ethic. Deutero-Isaiah has left far behind all notions of Grace as mere favour, summary action on the part of God to secure material prosperity or political supremacy for Israel. He sees clearly that the Grace of Jahweh, with all its objective wonders, creates a task for the church which wounds and afflicts and chastises with many stripes. The price of the church's loyalty, learned in closest communion with Jahweh, is the will to suffer, and to die rather than fail His purpose.

The Grace of Jahweh is manifested further in the final majesty and glory of the pious remnant. The humiliation of the Servant, stricken, smitten, loaded with grief, promised no exaltation. But when chapter LIII. was written, Jahweh had vindicated the suffering Servant. Through their travail the pious had been led to triumph and glory. Box holds that LIII. 1 refers to something which had been said in the past, and which appeared incredible at the time it was uttered. "Who could have believed what we heard?" So that chapter LIII. "develops in a masterly way the paradox that the supreme sufferings of the martyr have supreme value." Goodness can never be abstracted from the objective manifestation of Grace in final glory.

Some Suggestions for the Conduct of a “Day of Devotional Fellowship for Ministers.”

By Professor the Rev. H. WHEELER ROBINSON, M.A.

[Professor ROBINSON has kindly supplied the following Notes by request. They are based upon experience. —ED.]

1.—The whole arrangements, as well as the actual conduct of the meetings, should be under the absolute control of one competent person. Details are important, for they all affect the “atmosphere.”

2.—Care should be taken to secure a quiet and comfortable meeting-place, free from outside noise and disturbance. It is best to arrange the seats round three sides of a quadrangle, leaving room for kneeling. The doors should be rigorously kept shut against late-comers, except during hymn-singing. The accompanist should select well-known tunes beforehand, and his competency to play them should be ascertained.

3.—The mid-day lunch should be very simple, and provided on the premises by friends in sympathy with the “Day,” who do not want “votes of thanks.” It is a great mistake to resort to a professional caterer, or to go for lunch to some place at a distance. There should be no charge for this lunch: the small cost can be shared without difficulty amongst those who arrange the “Day.”

4.—It is best to begin the “Day” with a definite statement of its objects, pointing out in particular the value of silence, and the real contribution made by those who do not speak, or audibly pray. The conductor should carefully refrain from repeated appeals for speech or prayer: collective silence can be more helpful than any spoken utterance.

5.—The morning session can be fitly begun by a suitable liturgical form (with responses), notably the excellent “Litany of Remem-

brance" of Bishop Ridding (George Allen & Unwin, 40 Museum Street, London, price 2d.) There must be no hurry over the devotions, as though they were merely the introduction to something more important.

6.—If a conference is part of the programme, this should form part of the morning session, rather than of the afternoon; it is, however, open to question whether the time may not more profitably be given to a suitable exegetical address by the conductor, followed by open prayer on the lines he has raised.

7.—The afternoon session should, in any case, be given to a devotional address on some experimental topic by the conductor, followed by something in the nature of a "Testimony Meeting"—short statements of definite experience on the lines he has raised. This can be one of the most valuable parts of the "Day," but it is the hardest to get, and a searching test of the "Day's" success or failure.

8.—The "Day" should close with the Communion Service, conducted preferably by one of the older ministers; this should end in ample time for trains and evening engagements.

9.—The conductor should have every possible detail thought out in advance, and be ready to fling aside all his preparations if the spirit of the meeting points to some better way.

The New Circulating Library.

Our Circulating Library is at last in being, mainly owing to the generous gifts of our own ministers who have subscribed so far the sum of £35 for this purpose.

The Library Committee, with Dr. G. P. Gould as its chairman, has made a careful selection of one hundred volumes, and these are being purchased in duplicate and triplicate as required (and as further donations are received), the idea being to have a small library constantly renewed rather than a large one with a considerable number of out of date books.

The library is now being made up into boxes of five books, ready for forwarding to the librarians of the groups who have booked them. The only thing our members have to do is to form themselves into groups of five, and select one of their number as librarian, who should write to the secretary for an application form and catalogue.

As to the matter of individual expense, this should not exceed one shilling per annum, as the only liability is the postage of the boxes, and for this sum it is possible for each member to receive twenty books, as five books are sent to each group each quarter.

It is obvious that it would be fatal to the scheme if the maintenance of the library and its renewal every five years were entirely dependent upon the efforts of an honorary secretary in addition to his ordinary duties, so it is felt to be essential that an Endowment Fund of £300 should be raised, but the committee will not consent to this being attempted until not only has the library fund been completed, but that it has been clearly demonstrated that there is a genuine need for the library.

I must appeal to our members to loyally help us in obtaining this sum speedily, as it is manifestly unfair that a plan which promises to be of real benefit to so many should be allowed to become the burden of one or two.

Subscriptions from members and friends should be forwarded to me, and I will duly hand them over to the treasurer, Professor W. Hackney, and send a receipt direct to the donors.—E.deR.

Prayer Union Notes.

By Rev. J. W. EWING, M.A., D.D.

As another winter deepens under the war clouds, the servants of Christ are led to realise more and more their need of the help which comes through prayer. Where ministers gather there is still evident a wistful desire for more of the divine power and grace. At the last meetings of the London Baptist Association, the ministers spent the morning in prayer and conference—the theme of the latter being “Intercession and its bearing on the Preacher’s Influence.” As Mr. Phillips directed our thoughts to the relation of Intercession to God, to the Word of God and the people around us, we realised how central and vital and indispensable prayer is in the ministers’ life.

The importance of prayer has also been brought home to us in the Capital in another way. Many ministers, Congregational and Presbyterian as well as Baptist, have been gathering every Wednesday afternoon for six weeks to hear lectures by Dr. T. R. Glover, on the “Jesus of History.” Quiet and conversational in style, but packed with rich fruits of learning, and charged with spiritual intensity, these lectures have brought Christ near to us, and made very real the actions and habits of His life. Among other things, they have shown us how intimate was His relation with the Father, how frequent, how natural, and how characteristic were His prayers. Week after week the lecture has closed in stillness, and we have gone away with a new vision before us of the life of which prayer is the fount of inspiration.

The Council of the Baptist Union is still concerned as to the condition of our churches, and at its meetings no report is more eagerly listened to than that of the Spiritual Welfare Committee. All feel that there is need among us of a new breath from heaven,

of a deeper spirit of love and sacrifice, a more devout worship and a more commanding influence. Just now plans are being considered. Will not every member of the Prayer Union ask that guidance may be granted and the Heavenly Vision revealed to those who lead?

Just now, too, Mr. Shakespeare's advocacy of the United Free Church of England is setting before many minds the ideal of a grander fellowship, and from various communions hands are being stretched to clasp the hands of brothers. What is this movement to lead to? Who can tell? It is a time when those who love Christ should be often in prayer that He, the great Head of the Church, may make His will known and enable His followers to go whither He points the way.

Nor can we forget the Mission of Repentance and Hope. Though it has not been open to us as Nonconformists to join in the active efforts of the Mission, we cannot but sympathise with the attempt to reach the people for God, and our prayers must ascend that the effect of the Mission may be seen in lasting good to the nation.

Among newer books on prayer, none is more likely to help than Dr. Fosdick's "The Meaning of Prayer." It is a masterly little volume, fresh and scholarly, full of apt and unworn illustration, deep in spiritual suggestiveness, leading one to the realities of intercourse with God. For personal use, or for Bible Class purposes it could not be surpassed. It is issued by the Student Christian Movement (93 Chancery Lane, W.C.) at 1/6.

My devotional classic for this issue is Rutherford's "Letters," a book of which C. H. Spurgeon once said that when he was dead and gone he wished men to know that after the Bible itself he valued Rutherford's "Letters" above all other books.

Samuel Rutherford (1600 to 1661), was the Pastor of the country church of Anwoth, near the Solway Firth, and in the days of Charles I. was condemned for "non-conformity to the acts of Episcopacy, and because of his work against the Arminians," to banishment to Aberdeen. To leave his beloved flock was to him an acute sorrow, but out of his trouble sprang the book which has made his name immortal. Exiled from home and church, he drew the closer to Christ, and soon began to write to those from whom he was now separated letters which breathed the most ardent love for the Saviour and devotion to His cause. He seemed to have passed into the immediate presence of his King. He wrote his letters from "Christ's Palace in Aberdeen." Often he was carried by the ardour of his spirit and the glory of his theme into true poetry. His pages glow with metaphors in praise of his Redeemer; he rejoiced in Christ's Cross which blossomed into flowers of Paradise; "I am not ashamed of my garland," he would say, when pointed out as "The banished minister."

Among his correspondents were some of the ripest Christians of the Scotland of his day; not a few were suffering ones, wounded by bereavement, or bruised among the conflicts which troubled the land. Rutherford was a great comforter, a true seer, and withal a humble believer in the merit of the Christ who had done all for him. His letters will always be precious, as Andrew Bonar says, to those who are "sensible of their own and the Church's decay and corruptions," to all "who delight in the Surety's imputed righteousness," to all who rejoice in the Gospel of Grace, who seek to grow in holiness, who love the Person of Christ and long for His appearing.

I recite a few revealing passages:—

On the Value of Prayer.

"I dare avouch, the Saints know not the length and largeness of the sweet earnest, and of the sweet green sheaves

before the harvest, that might be had on this side of the water, *if we would take more pains.*" "Pray, wrestle, and believe, and ye shall overcome and prevail with God, as Jacob did."

To a Friend removing to a strange neighbourhood.

"Believe me, Madam, my mind is that ye are well lodged, and that in your house are fair ease-rooms, and pleasant lights, if ye can in faith lean down your head upon the breast of Jesus Christ."

Christ's cause not really to lose.

"I see my dear Master Christ going His lone (as it were) mourning in sackcloth. His fainting friends fear that King Jesus shall lose the field. But He must carry the day."

Longing for Christ.

"I know a poor soul that would lay all cares in the water for a banquet or feast of Christ's love."

"O Great King, why standest Thou aloof? Why remainest Thou beyond the mountains? O Well-beloved, why dost Thou pain a poor soul with delays? A long time out of Thy glorious presence is two deaths and two hells to me. We must meet. I must see Him. I *dow not want Him."

*Am not able to do without Him.

The Church indestructible.

"The bush has been burning these five thousand years, and no man yet saw the ashes of that fire."

Desiring Christ's return.

"We have gotten the New Heavens, and, as a pledge of that, the Bridegroom's love-ring. The children of the wedding chamber have cause to skip and leap for joy; for the marriage supper is drawing nigh. . . O time, be not slow! O sun, move speedily, and hasten our banquet! O bridegroom, be like a roe or a young hart upon the mountains! O well-beloved, run fast, that we may once meet!"

There are many editions of Rutherford's "Letters." The best is by Andrew A. Bonar, 2 vols.