

Theology on the Web.org.uk

Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible

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

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



Buy me a coffee

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



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

[PayPal](#)

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

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

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

THE CHURCHMAN

January, 1922

NOTES AND COMMENTS.

Unity and the Evangelical Message. FOR a long time past the minds of many have been moved to consider whether it is not possible for Evangelical Churchpeople to come more closely together in the bonds of fellowship and service, but the difficulties in the way have been great. Not that there has been any real reluctance to join forces, but rather that it has seemed to be necessary in some cases to preserve independence of thought and action. Now, however, the matter has been lifted to a higher plane by the action of the Council of the National Church League, who have agreed upon the terms of a Manifesto, and this is in course of circulation. It deals with the question of "Unity and the Evangelical Message," and in a few brief pointed sentences emphasizes the need for unity among Evangelical Churchmen. "We have been reminded again and again," it says, "since the Lambeth Conference met last year, that one great hindrance to the spread of the Christian message is division in the Christian ranks, and many efforts from the most opposite directions have been made to promote a spirit of unity. The present moment, therefore, makes an appeal to Evangelical Churchmen to seek for a closer union among themselves, in order that they may more effectively contribute their part to the life and thought and work of the Church. Other bodies have definite aims, and a definite policy for attaining them, and Evangelicals are called upon for a similar unity of aim and policy. Such union and united action should not be difficult to attain, for there is a real agreement upon fundamental principles among

Evangelicals." It is important that the significance of this last sentence should be realized. Emphasis is too often laid upon the divisions among Evangelicals, but these are never really as serious as they are often represented to be. They are serious enough, no doubt, but below the surface there is a greater amount of unity than even the disputants themselves always realize. "There is real agreement upon fundamental principles"; exactly, and it is eminently desirable that this fact should be brought to the front and insisted upon. It is the agreement upon positive truth which needs to be emphasized, for as the Manifesto points out, "Union will not be reached by any policy of mere negation or opposition. Diverse elements may combine against a common antagonist, but their agreement is only temporary, and breaks up when the occasion for it has passed. It is the truths, we believe, not the errors we oppose, that unite us, and it is only on the basis of positive affirmation that we shall find the strength that comes from fellowship in a common purpose and work." This is well said, and it represents a fact which Evangelicals ought always to have in mind. In order, therefore, to help to a realization of the large measure of doctrinal unity which exists among Evangelicals, the Manifesto sets out in a series of nine paragraphs "the truths which specially call for emphasis at the present time"; or in other words, the truths which are most assuredly believed amongst us. They are so important that we have quoted them in full on p. 18 of this number, and we commend them to the careful study of our readers. We cannot imagine that there is anyone, with the least claim to be called an Evangelical, who would find any difficulty in subscribing to them; and, if that is so, they constitute a bond of union which should be of the greatest service in drawing together all sections of Evangelical Churchpeople, whatever may be their own individual views upon matters which lie outside what may be called these terms of reference. The matters which divide Evangelicals are mostly of secondary importance. Upon those, of course, a large liberty must be recognized, but they ought not to be allowed any longer to keep apart those who on fundamentals are in real agreement. It is upon the fundamentals that the Manifesto insists. "These [truths,]" says the Manifesto, "are not mere doctrinal formulas, but living and germinating principles, the ground work of all true spiritual life and of all effective preaching

of the Gospel. They represent God's provision for man's fallen and sinful state, and contain the promise of his redemption. If Evangelical Churchmen will, in dependence upon God, unite in a concerted effort to promote a knowledge and understanding of them, they will go far to remove the difficulties which retard so much of our religious and social work."

Is such Union Possible? Is union possible on these lines? We unhesitatingly answer that it is. Everything, however, will depend upon the way the question is examined, but with the will to unity, which we are persuaded exists, there should be in the very near future a closer drawing together among Evangelicals than has been witnessed at any time during the present generation. The closing words of the Manifesto contain their own appeal:—"The Council of the National Church League earnestly desire to bring Evangelical Churchmen together in a forward movement on these lines, and they cordially invite your co-operation and effective support." That will, we hope, be forthcoming in rich abundance, for, the National Church League having given this strong lead, Evangelical Churchpeople will naturally look to it for the development and extension of the movement. The Manifesto is but a first step; it will need to be carefully and wisely followed up until the principles it represents are not merely accepted but acted upon throughout the whole country. A definite effort must, of course, be made to stimulate a better knowledge of the whole Reformation movement. Modern scholarship has cleared it from most of the misrepresentations of Jesuit and Tractarian opponents, but, unfortunately, too many are quite unaware of the fact, and the lectures and literature of the N.C.L. will be needed to provide that healthy stimulus to study which is so imperatively required at the present time. But it is not for us to sketch a programme; it will be for the Council of the N.C.L. to decide what steps may best be taken to give effect to their Manifesto. Our task is the simple one of thanking them for giving Evangelical Churchmen so strong and so clear a lead in this matter, and in the name of our readers to bid them a hearty God-speed in their work. We are convinced that when once unity—real unity of heart and mind and spirit—is established among Evangelicals we shall witness an enormous development in their work, their witness and influence.

C.M.S. and the Scriptures. It is no part of our purpose to comment in any way upon the controversy which has arisen over a certain lecture delivered at the C.M.S. Summer School and we refer to it here only in order to record the happy termination of the discussion regarding it which took place in the very largely attended meeting of the General Committee on Wednesday, December 14. To the original resolution several amendments were moved, and the one ultimately adopted owed its origin to the wisdom and foresight of the Dean of Canterbury. He proposed, and Canon Guy Rogers seconded it; and it was seen at once that it so exactly fitted the circumstances of the time that Mr. S. H. Gladstone, the Treasurer of the Society, who moved the original resolution, accepted the amendment and it was carried by a large majority. It ran as follows: "The attention of the Committee having been drawn to the report of a certain lecture given at the recent Summer School, it was resolved that, as the lecture is not within the full cognizance of the Committee, they cannot pass judgment upon it; but for the assurance of those whose minds have been disturbed by rumours on the subject, and in view of the anxieties felt in the country, they reaffirm their resolutions of February, 1918, on the Holy Scriptures, as set out below." It is, however, the closing paragraph of the resolution which will excite the widest interest. There never was, we believe, any real danger of what was done in 1918 being upset, although rumours to that effect were current; but all doubts are set at rest now that the position has been so definitely reaffirmed. We quote in full the resolutions of 1918 dealing with the Society's attitude to the Holy Scriptures as they will be useful for reference:—

(a) We assume the acceptance by members of the C.M.S. of the views with regard to revelation and inspiration which are expressed in the formularies of the Church of England. But since these formularies have been variously interpreted, we think it right to state that to all of us these views involve a recognition of Holy Scripture as the revelation of God mediated by inspired writers, and as holding a unique position as the supreme authority in matters of faith.

(b) At the same time, since it is impossible to define the mode of inspiration, we deprecate any attempt to lay down a formulated definition. It is, however, clear that in Articles vi. and xx., inspiration, in whatever way defined, is attributed to Holy Scripture as a whole.

(c) Convinced as we are that no knowledge of Holy Scripture is adequate which does not lead to a personal knowledge of the Lord Jesus Christ, we recognize that our use and treatment of the Bible should be in harmony with His.

(d) It is the duty of the student of Holy Scripture, under the guidance of the Holy Spirit, to employ every faculty in its study, and to take into the fullest consideration every light that scholarship and saintliness can furnish.

(e) The grave responsibilities of the Candidates Committee, as well as their high privileges, have long been recognized by the Society, and we have no reason to believe that the present Committee have failed to maintain the high level of loyalty and devotion to the Society exhibited by their predecessors. Having regard to the special difficulties of students and young people at the present time, we suggest in their case :

(1) That every student should be interviewed by some who know and understand the life of students to-day.

(2) That personal devotion to Christ as Lord and Saviour should be a primary condition for acceptance, and that such doctrinal definitions as are more appropriate to maturer years should not be required.

(3) It is desirable that among the officers of the Society there should always be one or more attached to the Candidates Committee who possess a personality attractive to students as well as to other candidates, so as to carry on a work in the student world calculated to show that the Society is neither out of date nor impervious to new ideas or new methods in working.

**Central Church
Finance.** The question of central Church finance is a very difficult one and the discussions [regarding it at the November session of the National Church Assembly were not particularly helpful. Too much attention was given to destructive criticism, which is always an easy line of approach, and too little was heard of constructive proposals. The plain fact seems to be that the system of central finance has not "caught on," and the dioceses have not responded to their "quotas." It was reported that in one case—and by no means an exceptional one—a diocese was credited with £62 whereas its quota was £7,600. It is true that another £800 has since been received from the diocese in question, but even so it is a long way behind the sum expected from it. It would seem that the Budgets have been prepared without any sort of relation to the amount of money it is possible to raise, and the experience of the last year proves conclusively that unless future Budgets are moderated there will still be this alarming discrepancy between the amount asked for and the amount

received. The position on December 14 was that the amount contributed to the Central Fund by the Diocesan Boards of Finance was £57,000, but this fell short of their apportionment by no less than £169,000! The total receipts of the Fund were £86,000. It will be remembered that the Budget included £120,000 for the poorer clergy, but, as one of the speakers pointed out at the Assembly, "there is not a sixpence to give them." No doubt the Assembly will give its attention to the matter in time, but the matter is really urgent, for it does not enhance the reputation of the Assembly for business efficiency to have the central funds of the Church in such a chaotic condition.

The "Further Powers" Measure, 1921, finally passed the Assembly at its November session, although a brave attempt was made to defeat it. It does not give to the Councils all that was provided for them in the original Measure in relation to consultation regarding changes in Church services; and in the opinion of many it gives them—or rather the Bishop who is the final arbiter—too much power in connection with the appointment to a vacant Benefice. In these connections we call special attention to the very able and illuminating paper by Mr. Needham on Church Government which we are able to print in this number. It was prepared before the November session, but its comments still hold good as no alterations were made at that session in the Further Powers Measure. If the Measure should be presented to Parliament and should receive the Royal Assent—and it is important to note that until then it has no legal effect—it will place in the hands of Parochial Church Councils very large powers in relation to the appointment of Incumbents which will need to be very carefully handled. But on the whole we hope that, given that care and consideration, the new system may work well; there are however some obvious dangers, and Parochial Church Councillors will do well to equip themselves adequately for the faithful discharge of the new duties imposed upon them.

The Church Congress held at Birmingham in the middle of October had for its general subject "The Church in the New Age." We do not desire to be captious in our criticism but we do feel that there was some justi-

fication for the comment which was made in more than one *secular* newspaper that the discussions were not sufficiently spiritual in tone or outlook or purpose. The general scheme of the programme was good as far as it went, but the omissions were remarkable. It was passing strange, for instance, that this great gathering of Churchpeople from all parts of the country should be held without any session being assigned for the consideration of either Home or Foreign Missions. Yet evangelization is the great work of the Church and it is not being adequately carried out. The industrial life of the nation and the recreations of the people are, of course, important, and the Church should have something to say about them, but not to the exclusion of its primary work. There is great need in the Church to-day for spiritual leadership, and the Birmingham Church Congress had a great opportunity which was missed. One other point: the discussion on sex-relationships was very much too prominent, and we gravely doubt whether frank and free expositions such as were given at Birmingham do any real good or are quite healthy for those who listen to them. The Congress meets this year at Sheffield and we trust that those responsible for the programme will learn from Birmingham what to avoid. It has been suggested that "The Mission of the Church" would be a good subject. It would certainly do much to focus attention upon the real work of the Church, and that is very much needed at the present time.

CHURCH BOOK ROOM NOTES.

82 VICTORIA STREET, S.W.1.

Baptism.—The Church Book Room has purchased and issued at 6*d.* net, *Infant Baptism* by Canon Barnes Lawrence. This little book was published some little time ago, and has passed through three editions. Its design is to assist those who feel serious difficulty on the question of the Baptism of young children. As the author states in his preface, the case either for or against Infant Baptism is a matter of inference and argument, and he has given us an interesting and important little manual which is well worth study. An appendix on "Believers' Baptism" is added, as is also a valuable note on the testimony of the Fathers.

Parochial Church Councils.—A second edition of *The Parochial Church Councils (Powers) Measure, 1921, with Introduction and Notes*, by Mr. Albert Mitchell (1*s.* net), has been called for. This edition varies very little from the first, but an appendix on Church Collections, and one or two other notes have been added.

It will be remembered that in every parish the roll of electors must be revised not less than twenty-eight days before the Annual Parochial Church Meeting, and that notice of such revision must be given fourteen days at least before the revision takes place. Forms of such notice can be obtained from the Book Room, price 1*d.* each, or 9*d.* a dozen.

In response to many requests, a notice for Church doors under Rule 3, Parochial Church Councils (Powers) Measure, summoning a meeting of the Parochial Church Council, and a notice under Rule 4 of the Measure to be sent to the individual members of the Council, have been published by the Book Room. Copies can be obtained at 2*s.* 6*d.* per 100, and *pro rata*.

Confirmation.—In view of approaching Confirmation Classes, a sample packet of leaflets and manuals, published by the Church Book Room, has been prepared and will be sent for 1*s.* 9*d.* post free. It contains five courses of instruction for the use of candidates attending Confirmation classes: (1) *Class Notes*, by the Rev. Henry Edwards, Vicar of Gorleston, now in its fifth edition; (2) *A Soldier in Christ's Army*, and (3) *The Christian Disciple*, both by the Rev. Canon E. R. Price Devereux, Vicar of Christ Church, Woking; (4) *Strength for Life's Battle*, taken from addresses given by the late Canon Hoare, of Tunbridge Wells, and (5) *The Faith of a Churchman*, by the Rev. C. H. K. Boughton. These courses are issued at 2*d.* each, or 1*4s.* per 100, net. A useful manual (2*d.*) by the Archbishop of Sydney, giving in a clear manner the meaning of Confirmation, and a number of leaflets suitable for distribution to the congregation before classes commence, to candidates when they come forward, and to the newly confirmed are also added. These include *About Confirmation*, and "Be Strong—Be Glad," a message to girls who have been confirmed, by Canon Grose Hodge; *Confirmation: a Letter to Candidates before Classes commence* and *What keeps you back?* by the Rev. C. C. B. Bardsley, at ½*d.* each, or 3*s.* per 100, net; *Will you join the Senior Division?* and *The Race of Life*, by the Rev. C. H. K. Boughton, and "The Life Beautiful," by Canon Grose Hodge, at 9*d.* a dozen, or 4*s.* per 100, net; *Three Questions for Young Men who have been Confirmed*, by Canon Grose Hodge, at 1*d.* each, or 5*s.* per 100, net, and a card entitled *Your Confirmation* (1*d.*), being a letter to candidates, and three prayers to be used during the time of preparation; a sample set of Confirmation Hymns; a Confirmation Anniversary Letter, and Confirmation cards and labels.

Sunday School Prizes.—A list of books, which can be recommended as Sunday School Prizes, has been carefully compiled as a guide to those who are unable to call at the Book Room and select books from the shelves. The books in this list have been selected with a view to recommending to clergy and others, books which have merit and which avoid sacerdotal teaching on the one hand, and an anti-Church bias on the other. Every help will be given in the choice of books, and, if a list of the number of books required be sent, together with the age of the scholars and the prices to be paid, suitable books will be suggested or sent as desired.

Bargains in Books.—The following books, some of which are offered at very considerably reduced prices, will be found very acceptable as presents to clergymen and others: Sir Edward Clarke's three books, *The New Testament, the Authorised Version Corrected*; *The Psalms, the Prayer Book Version Corrected*; and *The National Church*; the three books bound in cloth, 4*s.* 6*d.* net, or in paper cover, 3*s.* net; Canon Meyrick's books, *The Doctrine of the Holy Communion, Scriptural and Catholic Truth and Worship*, and *Old Anglicanism and Modern Ritualism*, the set of three for 4*s.* 6*d.*

REPRESENTATIVE AND CONSTITUTIONAL BISHOPS.

SEVENTEENTH CENTURY PARALLELS TO THE LAMBETH CONFERENCE PROPOSAL.

BY THE REV. T. W. GILBERT, B.D.

A MIDST the shower of approval which has greeted the Resolutions of the Lambeth Conference with reference to reunion with Nonconformists, attention has been fastened, and rightly so, upon the changed attitude of the Bishops towards the claims of Nonconformist orders. There is, however, one point of great importance referred to in these particular proposals which seems to have escaped much comment hitherto. On page 28 in Resolution vii. there occurs the following statement: "But we greatly desire that the office of a Bishop should be everywhere exercised in a representative and constitutional manner, and more truly express all that ought to be involved for the life of the Christian Family in the title of Father-in-God." The view that a Bishop should exercise his office "in a representative and constitutional manner," indicates an advance as great as the attitude towards the fourth article of the so-called Lambeth Quadrilateral, because if the tendency of one school of thought in the Anglican Church has been to make Episcopacy of the "esse" of the Church, and inferentially to nullify Nonconformist orders, it is equally true that there has been a tendency also to make the position of a Bishop something autocratic and prelatic. It needed a civil war in the seventeenth century to check the abuses which arose from the false position taken up by the Bishops of that day, and of course the curtailment of the political powers of the Bishops has made the repetition of the ills of the seventeenth century impossible. Yet there is no doubt that the chastening and moulding influence of the last few years have tended, and are tending, to modify the somewhat archaic and remote position which has been adopted by not a few Bishops of the Anglican Church. The Lambeth proposals of 1920 represent a refreshing advance to a healthier conception of Churchmanship generally, and a broader view of the ministerial office, whether episcopal or nonconformist. The phrase concerning the office of

a Bishop is indicative of this more reasonable attitude, and it contains the seed of something that may prove revolutionary in the general conception of the Bishop's office.

But whilst the phrase may seem revolutionary to the present-day position of the Bishop, yet the idea is by no means a new one in the history of the Anglican Church. During the times of the Commonwealth and Protectorate in the seventeenth century, the Anglican Church passed through the furnace of proscription, but during the years 1641 to 1660 there were many schemes of Church reform offered, and particularly with reference to the position of the Bishop, which are not without their bearings upon the present-day suggestion that that position shall be representative and constitutional. Starting from the year 1641-2 we see that the remedy offered for the ills from which the Church was suffering was the same which was suggested towards the end of the Commonwealth, and the main feature of the suggested reform was the appointment of a body of presbyters to act always with the Bishop. The chief of the plans offered was that by Usher, Archbishop of Armagh, a plan which is preserved in *Reliquiae Baxterianae* under the ponderous title of "The Reduction of Episcopacy unto the Form of Synodical Government received in the Ancient Church, proposed in the year 1641, as an Expedient for the prevention of those Troubles which afterwards did arise about the matter of Church Government." The four points of Usher's proposals are: (i) "In every parish the Rector, together with the Churchwardens and Sidesmen, may every week take notice of such as live scandalously, etc. (ii) Suffragan Bishops are to be appointed, who should hold monthly synods for rural deaneries. (iii) A Diocesan Synod to be held once or twice a year. (iv) A Triennial Provincial Synod to which all Bishops and Suffragan Bishops and elected Clergy are to be invited." The representative idea is conspicuous in the proposals, whilst the introductory statement about the necessity for the co-operation of the clergy with the Bishop in the government of the Church gives the keynote to most of the plans of reform during the period.

Another scheme was put forward by John Williams, Bishop of Lincoln, whose ideas are embodied in the Bill on Church Reform which was read twice in the House of Lords (July 1 and 3, 1641). The main fact in the Bill is the proposal to add twelve ministers to the Bishop for the purposes of ordination and of general jurisdiction.

The wording of the Bill is as follows :¹ " And to the end that Archbishops and Bishops within their several dioceses may have such assistance as may hereafter tend and be for the better execution of their said offices and places, be it therefore enacted by the authority aforesaid, that within every shire or county of each several diocese within the kingdom of England and dominion of Wales there be nominated, in such manner as is hereafter expressed, twelve ministers being in Holy Orders, and being fit both in respect of their life and doctrine to be assistants to every such Archbishop and Bishop, together with the Dean and Chapter of each several diocese, in conferring of Holy Orders and in the exercise and administration of ecclesiastical jurisdiction, and for such other purposes as be hereafter declared : and that none of the said Archbishops or Bishops at any time from henceforth shall confer any Holy Orders upon any person or persons without the presence and approbation of four of the said assistants at the least : and that none of the said Archbishops or Bishops, or any Dean, Archdeacon, Chancellor, Commissary, Official, Surrogate, or other person, having or exercising any ecclesiastical jurisdiction within any of the dioceses aforesaid, or within any places of peculiar or exempt jurisdiction whatsoever, shall pronounce any sentence of degradation, deprivation or suspension against any minister or other person in Holy Orders, or any sentence of excommunication . . . without the presence and approbation of two, or at the least of one of the said assistants. . . ." The Bill goes on to declare that the twelve assistants shall be chosen by the King, by the Lords and by the Commons—four each—and that in case of vacant bishoprics, the assistants, together with the Dean and Chapter, are to present the names of three of the ablest divines to the King, who will choose one of the three.

The schemes propounded by the Archbishop and Bishop have a similarity to the proposals which were put forward by Dering in 1641 (June and July). Dering's suggestions were (i) that in each diocese twelve or more chosen, able, grave divines to be appointed by Parliament to be of the nature of an old primitive constant presbytery, and (ii) that over each of these a president, " let him be a bishop, or an overseer, or a president, or a moderator, or a superintendent, or a ruling elder, call him what you will."

¹ Cf. Gardiner, *Constitutional Documents*, p. 170.

This scheme of "pure primitive Episcopal presidency," as it has been called, is again seen in 1644 in the negotiations which took place between Charles and the Parliament. The "Propositions of Uxbridge," which demanded the abolition of Archbishops and Bishops, etc. (the Propositions are printed in Gardiner's *Documents*, pp. 275-286), called forth from the Commissioners appointed by Charles the offer "That the Bishop shall exercise no Act of Jurisdiction or Ordination without the consent and counsel of the Presbyters, who shall be chosen by the Clergy of each Diocese out of the Learnedst and Gravest ministers of that Diocese," and also that "the Bishop shall not receive any one into Holy Orders without the approbation and consent of the Presbyters, or the major part of them." These different extracts will suffice to show that the reformation of the abuses which had arisen in the Church was to be obtained by a reversion to the primitive conception of the Bishop as *primus inter pares*, and that this plan had the strongest support from those who were loyal sons of the Church of England. Had the course of events not been complicated by political and military affairs, it is quite probable that there would have emerged a synodical form of Church Government with Bishops at the head. Most men were at one in reverence for the office of the Bishop, the same men were unanimous in condemnation of the ritual excesses of the new school of Bishops and of their crying up of the divine right of King and Bishop, but the unanimity ended there. "I can tell you, sirs," said Cromwell to two members of the House of Commons, "what I would not have, though I cannot, what I would."

Such was the temper of many men. And while the country was hesitating about accepting the new scheme of Bishops and boards of Presbyters, the fortune of war brought another solution. Disasters on the field of battle forced Parliament to the taking of the "Solemn League and Covenant," which bound the Parliament to set up a Presbyterian Government on the Scottish model, and by natural sequence to proscribe episcopal government. Into this latter question, however, it is not our purpose to enter, because this proscription was based as much upon political expediency as was Charles's offer to restrict Episcopacy to certain parts of England.¹

¹ In Charles's conferences with the Scots after he gave himself up to them at Newark, May 5, 1646, "His Majesty proposed to admit the establishment

The normal attitude of Englishmen towards Episcopal Government was the attitude of Reform and not of Revolution, a Reform which would tend to prevent abuses, and also approximate Church government to the rising democratic feeling of the time. The tumultuous times which followed on the outbreak of the Civil War and the general association of Anglicanism with support of the Royalist cause¹ made any dispassionate consideration of Episcopacy very difficult, if not altogether impossible. Since Prelacy had become coincident with opposition to Parliament, it was inevitable that the success of the latter should involve trouble for the former, and the trouble culminated in the legal proscription of Episcopacy. This proscription carries with it the obvious inference that to the dominant party Episcopacy was by no means of the esse of the "Church," whilst the questions put by Parliament to the Synod of Divines during 1646 suggest that they had a conception of Divine Right which was very modern in its working. *Jure divino* ideas were not simply for Anglicanism, but also for Independency and Presbyterianism as well, the main difference between them being that to the average parliamentarian Divine Right spelled a spirit and not an organization. However, we must turn from such considerations to examine some further suggestions of reform which were promulgated towards the end of the Protectorate.

And first of all let us consider the suggestions of Dr. John Gauden. Gauden was the reputed author of *Eikon Basilike*, the work which professed to record the acts and meditations of Charles; prior to his execution, and which caused such a revulsion of feeling in favour of the king. Gauden managed to retain his benefice throughout the Commonwealth and Protectorate and became Bishop of Exeter after the Restoration. In 1659 he published a book entitled *Ecclesiæ Anglicanæ Suspiria*, and the subsidiary title explains its contents as "The Tears, Sighs, Complaints, and Prayers of the Church of England, setting forth her

of episcopacy and presbyterianism, in order to destroy the influence of the independents and the other sectaries. He declared that he would be content to restrain episcopal government to the dioceses of Oxford, Winchester, Bath and Wells, and Exeter, leaving the rest of England to the presbyterian discipline."—*Life of Bishop Hall*, by the Rev. John Jones, p. 334.

¹ It is well to bear in mind that there were Puritans who supported Charles throughout the war and that there never was any rigid division of classes, districts, or even of religion throughout the war, whilst many districts refused to take any part in the war.

former constitution, compared with her present condition: and also the visible causes, and probable cures, of her distempers." In this volume, of some 700 pages Gauden deals with seventeenth-century diffuseness, upon the condition of the Church to which he belonged, and he faces the problem with refreshing candour. The remedy, he declares, must begin with the clergy, for "many if not most of us, were loth to see and hard to be convinced of our pristine errors and indiscretions, our immoderations and transports, our Popish and popular compliances, our Jesuitick evasions and pretensions, our politick salvoes and distinctions, our pompous and empty formalities, by which we made either the power of godliness odious, or factions popular, innovations pious, and factions plausible, untill God overtook us with all His just, though sharp chastisements. Some Church-men thought their hill so strong that it could never be removed: whereas no policy availes, without true and exact piety, to bear up the honor of Church-men, when once people see without spectacles" (p. 429). Admitting thus the inevitableness of the blow which had fallen upon the Church, Gauden in one or two passages incidentally reveals his ideas with reference to Episcopacy, and also of the relationship of the contemporary ecclesiastical organizations to Episcopacy. An example of the latter is contained in his "appeal to all sober Ministers, whether they do not think that Episcopacy, as now it is stripped and devested of all secular greatnesse, and reduced to primitive poverty, might be as safely restored, as any of their crude and new Associations in their several stations and formations, with their mutable moderators and temporary Presidents, either in greater or lesser Circles, which are but the *thin parings, small shreds, and weaker shives of Episcopacy*. . . ." (P. 461.) Gauden's own ideas with regard to Episcopacy, which he mentions as typical of those of other men, are brought out when he is dealing with the difficulty of the restoration of the lands belonging to the Bishoprics. He declares (p. 478): "For my part, I can look upon Episcopacy in its primitive poverty and present barenesse, with as much respect and reverence as in its greatest pomp and superfluity. I value it and desire it not for state, but conscience, not for secular ambition, but spiritual satisfaction. Let them keep the lands that have justly got them, or paid a valuable consideration for them, provided they will but help to restore Primitive and Catholick Episcopacy, without which

Ecclesiasticall authority, yea and Ministeriall power, seemes to me and to many wiser men, if not wholly dead, and void or null, yet very defective, dubious and infirme, as one that is lame and maimed yet is still a man, having an esse or being as a true man, but yet *esse defectivum*, a being short of that fulness, firmness, and perfection which might be, were he so complete as he ought to be according to the pattern of God and nature. . . .” After this cautious and balanced estimate of Episcopacy Gauden proceeds to unfold his scheme of general reform in which he suggests various points, i.e. (i) Smaller dioceses—“if the Diocese committed to the presidential inspection of one worthy Bishop were of so moderate an extent, as might fall under one man’s care and visitation. . . .” (ii) Assistants for the Bishop—“if the generality of the Clergy or the whole ministry of each Diocese might choose some few prime men of their Company to be the constant Electors, chief Counsellors, Correspondents, and Assistants with the Bishop. . . .” (iii) Election of Bishops—“if in case of Episcopall vacancy, the generality of the Clergy meeting together, might present the names of three or four or more prime men, out of which number the Electors should choose one, whose election should stand if approved by the Prince or chief Magistrate, if not they should choose some other of the nominated. . . .” (P. 535.)

The second point about the association of some of the clergy with the Bishop is referred to in other places. On page 465 Gauden asks “that neither Bishops should be wholly ejected as superfluous, nor yet Presbyters despised as mere ciphers,” and again on page 453 he declares, “restore to Presbyters their priviledges in such publick counsel and concurrence with their Bishops as may become them . . . restore to Bishops that primitive precedency and Catholic presidency, which they ever had among and above Presbyters, both for that chief Authority or Eminency which they ever had in ordaining of Presbyters and Deacons, also in exercising such Ecclesiastical Discipline and Censures, that nothing be done without them. . . .” He finally makes the bold demand—which we are hearing in our own day—of finding some place for the choice or approval of the clergy by the people, i.e. “Restore to people their Liberty in some such way of choosing, or at least approving their Ministers, and assenting to Church-censures, as may become them in reason and conscience.”

Such are some of the main proposals offered by Gauden, and it is well to notice that the general idea of associating a number of clergy to act with the Bishop was not confined to men of one school of thought. There was no higher Anglican than Henry Thorndike, and yet he advocates the same proposal. In a book entitled *An Epilogue to the Tragedy of the Church of England*, published in 1659, "he expressly avows his approval of prayers for the dead, of the invocation of the Spirit on the elements of the Eucharist, and of the practice of penance; but whilst he contends for Episcopacy in the Anglican sense, he wishes to see Presbyters restored to their ancient position of a council to be consulted by the bishop."¹

From this brief examination of some of the writings of the time it is possible to realize that "divine" and "monarchian" ideas with reference to Bishops were far from being accepted by the Church during the period 1640-1660, and contemporaries who stood outside of Anglicanism were quite quick to draw the necessary inferences from the reforming proposals which were being advocated. It will suffice to quote one author. There was published in 1659 a pamphlet by Mar. Nedham entitled *Interest will not lie or a View of England's True Interest*, which purported to be an answer to a pamphlet, *The interest of England stated*. The latter was an attempt to secure the interest of the Presbyterian party in favour of the exiled Prince and endeavoured to do so by minimizing the difference between Presbyterians and Anglicans, i.e. "the differences are speculative and their contests with the Episcopal Divines are in the opinion of moderate men of either Judgment, easily atoned." A couple of quotations from the criticisms of Mar. Nedham are worth recording. In one place he declares, "They may talk what they will, yet there being no visible footstep in Scripture of its (i.e. episcopal government) institution, more than there is of the other waies of government practised by others, why should wise men contend for that as divine, which is merely prudential? seeing that the late King pleaded conscience for his insisting to maintain it, only upon this account, that he was sworne to do so, and we saw he did his utmost for it; which when he had done, then, seeing the necessity of affairs required the abolition of it, he in the Isle of Wight Treaty became content it should be abolished: to let his friends see, that having done what he could to preserve it, the thing itself

¹ Stoughton, iii. 34.

was of no such sacred authority, but that it might be cashiered by authority when prudence did require it to be done. And therefore our author likewise, having a point of prudence to dispatch, which is to hedge in the 'Presbyterian' to his 'Royal' party, he also makes the divine 'darling' of 'Episcopacie' a mere prudential matter, to be dismissed as his Master's occasion shall require. . . ." Therefore Nedham goes on, "if the Divines of both parties shall by consent accomodate and comply with each other (which appears to be one part of the present designe for bringing in Charles Stuart), what else do they both thereby but plainly confess, that the frames they have so long contended for are but political, and liable to alteration as prudence shall direct?" This is very plain speaking, and only evidences the views which the average man has always had with reference to the differing forms of church organization.

From this review it can be safely inferred that the Anglican of the Commonwealth times had a profound regard for Episcopacy, but the constant proposals for the association of a board of presbyters to act with the Bishop, and the continual insistence that the Bishop should assume the position of a president amongst a body of clergy, effectively destroy any idea that the *jure divino* theory had any deep hold upon Churchmen of the time. The attempt of a section of the Church during the reign of James I and Charles I to insist upon the Divine Right of Bishops received its answer in the reiterated demand for a "constitutional" episcopacy, and only the reaction which followed the Restoration prevented the adoption of a scheme which would have kept the Church of England more truly national than it eventually became. The inevitable further reaction has now set in, and it was a striking stage in this reaction when Lord Halifax in 1883 suggested, amongst other things, the election of Bishops by the Clergy and Laity, and that the Bishops so elected should govern their dioceses constitutionally with the advice of their Diocesan Synods. These suggestions and the statement of the Lambeth Conference of 1920 show that the seventeenth-century reformers, when compelled by adversity, were seeking a solution on sound lines. They felt—to use the words of Gauden in a sermon preached at St. Paul's, February 28, 1659—"that the whole Clergy of a Diocese, and the concerns of Religion, might not be exposed to one man's sole jurisdiction, without the such joint counsel, consent and assistance of Ministers, as is best for Bishops, Presbyters

and People . . . that Church-government might not seem to be a tyranny, or an arbitrary and absolute domineering over the faith and consciences of Christ's flock, but a mutual and sweet conspiring of the Shepherds with the sheep, to make each other happy, in truth and love, by orderly authority and due subordination."

T. W. GILBERT.

TRUTHS WHICH CALL FOR EMPHASIS.

In the Manifesto on "Unity and the Evangelical Message" issued by the National Church League, and referred to in our Notes, the following truths are set out as among those which specially call for emphasis at the present time:—

The Being and attributes of God, the Maker and Sustainer of all things; His infinite perfection, righteousness, holiness and love; His providential ordering of the world.

The essential Deity and true Humanity of our Lord Jesus Christ as manifested in the four Gospels and further declared in the Epistles.

The work of the Holy Spirit as the Giver of Life, the Sanctifier, the Teacher who is to guide into all truth.

The unique Inspiration of the Holy Scriptures and their supreme authority in matters of faith and morals.

The reality and hatefulness of sin as the transgression of the perfect law of God; a corrupting taint and tendency in man's inmost being; its disastrous results; the need for pardon and redemption.

The salvation of men from the guilt and power of sin as the central purpose of the Gospel, and as resting solely upon the one perfect and complete propitiation made by Christ upon the Cross.

The immediate Justification by the free Grace of God for Christ's sake of every sinner who with hearty repentance and true faith turns to Him.

The direct access of the human soul to God through our Lord Jesus Christ, the sole Mediator between God and men.

The efficacy of the Sacraments as means of grace only by the blessing of Christ and the working of the Holy Spirit in those who by faith receive them.

THE PROPOSED PERMANENT DIACONATE.

BY W. GUY JOHNSON.

AMONG the more urgent of the problems which the Church has to face at the present time, the alarming drop in the number of the men who are applying for admission to the ranks of its ordained ministry has a foremost place. It is true that the ex-Service candidates, now being trained, offer for the moment an additional source of supply, but when this is exhausted the problem will assume a still graver and more urgent aspect. There will not only be the shortage of clergy, but with this will come the inevitable temptation to lessen the period of their training, inadequate as it already is, and if this were done it would mean a fatal lowering of the educational standard of the clergy at a time when that of the laity is steadily rising.

It is not the purpose of this paper to discuss the subject of the shortage of the clergy, but we may take leave to express a doubt whether the reasons frequently given afford a sufficient explanation of its causes. The inadequacy of clerical stipends, the uncertainty of promotion and similar reasons no doubt have their effect, but the causes must be sought also in those wider and more subtle influences which have been tending for years past to keep men away from Church, and indeed from any organized form of Christianity. It is important to take account of this, for it is obvious that the same causes would be likely, in a measure, to operate also against the complete success of whatever remedies or palliatives may be proposed.

One of these, which is being very strongly urged in some quarters, is the creation or revival of what is called the permanent diaconate. There are some difficulties attaching to the subject, not the least of them being the different views of the origin and functions of the office of deacon and the purpose to be served by the new order, or modification of the order, which have emerged in the course of recent discussions. It is proposed that the statutes disqualifying the clergy from engaging in secular occupations shall be amended, as far at least as the Order of Deacons is concerned, so that men

earning their living in other professions or trades may be ordained to the office of deacon, with the definite understanding that they shall not proceed to the priesthood, and shall devote as much of their time as possible to assisting the Incumbent. It is generally understood, and would no doubt be the case, that this work would be unpaid. Among the reasons offered in support of the proposal is that it would be a reversion to the practice of the primitive Church, where the Diaconate appears to have been a definite office, and not, as with us, merely a short probationary step to the presbyterate.

Before examining the proposal itself, it may be as well to consider the actual needs of the situation which has elicited it. We can then judge better as to how far it would meet them, and how far it is necessary to resort to a step of such magnitude, in view of the fact that the Church has only within the last half-century called into existence a body of episcopally licensed Lay Readers and Preachers for this very purpose.

In many parishes, of course, the inconvenience of the diminishing number of clergy is not felt. This is the case in rural districts where the population of the parishes is small and the Incumbent would not in any case require a curate, and in some town parishes, usually at either extreme of the social scale, which afford attractive spheres of work. But in a large number of parishes there is a steadily increasing difficulty in obtaining curates, though they are very urgently needed. This means that the active responsibility for the organization of the parish, as well as for its spiritual work, falls upon the Incumbent. The establishment of parochial Church Councils with definite financial powers and responsibility, and with the duty of co-operating with him in the work of the parish should, and probably will, relieve him very considerably, not only in regard to finance, but also in the general parochial organization and work, much of which it has usually been the duty of the curate to arrange and supervise. But the curate assists the Vicar in another way as well, by taking part in the services of the Church or Mission Hall and by preaching, and, as time goes on, some means will have to be devised to increase this assistance if clergy who are single-handed are not to break down from overstrain. This is the particular need which the class—I may not call it an "order"—of licensed Lay Readers and Preachers was created to meet. It was intended to

afford some relief and help to the Vicar or Rector, but not in the matter of "serving tables." Such relief, immensely important as it is, must be sought in other directions. That this latter was not the purpose of the office of Reader is quite clear from the discussions in Convocation and elsewhere, and also from the various regulations which have been issued in the different Dioceses where the scheme has been adopted.

The proposal before us, however, looks in another direction. It is suggested, as already stated, that the diaconate should be so modified as to permit the ordination as deacons of men who would continue their secular calling and would give such time as was left at their disposal to the work of their ministry; and that these deacons should remain permanently in that office, not proceeding to any higher order. There is a certain attractiveness about the proposal, and if there were any evidence of a widespread demand for it the experiment might well be tried, but most of the evidence points the other way. The London Diocesan Conference, a very representative body with a strongly independent outlook, rejected at their meeting last year, by a two-thirds majority, a recommendation of its own Committee that there should be "a re-examination, by proper authority, of the grounds, theological and practical, on which men in Holy Orders are at present debarred from the exercise of a secular calling."

It is not a pleasant task to raise objections to a proposal which is put forth seriously and in good faith by responsible men, especially when, as is the case in this Diocese,¹ it has the support of our own Bishop and the approval of the Diocesan Conference.

But there are some considerable difficulties in the way of its adoption. One of these is that we should have two distinct classes of deacons, those as we know them now, and the new permanent order. Chancellor P. V. Smith notices this in his article on the subject in the *CHURCHMAN* of April last, as a real objection, but his attempt to meet it is hardly convincing. Another is that the permanent deacon would occupy a somewhat anomalous position as being neither layman nor cleric. Chancellor Smith suggests that they would naturally be associated with the laity in Diocesan Conferences, etc., and even in the Lay House of the

¹ The substance of this paper was given at a meeting of clergy and laity of the Diocese of Southwark.

National Assembly. Nevertheless they would technically and in fact be included in the ranks of the clergy, unless we are to regard their ordination as different in some way from that of other deacons. From the practical point of view, advocates of the scheme must be prepared to face the fact that a reconstruction of the diaconate on such radical lines as would be involved if we were to class its members as laymen would have the unflinching opposition of the main body of the clergy, and that only a very limited number of laymen would be prepared to relinquish their lay status while possessing only a very limited ministry. I mean, of course, laymen of the class and standing who would be of any real service in the particular capacity now proposed.

A good deal of scorn has been poured upon the diaconate as at present existing in the Church of England. Chancellor Smith calls it an "Ecclesiastical Camouflage" and cites Dr. Arnold as saying that it "is extinct in all but name"; and there is a good deal said from time to time about reviving the ancient order. Certainly, we can hardly be said in strictness to possess three distinct "orders" if one is only a temporary and brief stepping-stone to the next—if it is merely the chrysalis stage of the priesthood. But there is just as much camouflage, to use the awkward and overworked expression employed by Chancellor Smith, in talking of *reviving* an order when you are simply attempting to revive one of its accidental features while completely altering its character and functions. If our deacons were to be made permanent they would no more represent the primitive deacons than they do now, unless, which is not suggested, we give to them an entirely different class of work. It is not necessary here to attempt any history of the diaconate or of the manner in which it evolved in the Western Church. The generally accepted view seems to be that of Bishop Lightfoot, who held that its origin is to be found in the appointment of the Seven as recorded in Acts vi. He wrote in the well-known essay on the Christian Ministry, "I have assumed that the office thus established represents the later diaconate; for though the point has been disputed I do not see how the identity of the two can reasonably be called into question." He also says, "Thus the work primarily assigned to the deacons was the relief of the poor. Their office was essentially a serving of tables as distinct from the higher function of preaching and instruction." It is true that

Professor Gwatkin in *Hastings' Bible Dictionary*, Art. "Deacons," and in his *Early Church History*, Chapter iv., differs as to the origin of the order being found in the appointment of the Seven, but he does not differ as to its functions. Dr. Armitage Robinson, in the *Encyclopædia Biblica*, agrees with Bishop Lightfoot as to the functions, and, in a measure, the origin of the order. Unless, therefore, we are prepared to restore these functions, as well as the permanence of the office, it is far better not to talk of reviving the primitive order. As a matter of fact the primitive diaconate now finds its expression, though not its name, in our Church Sisters, Lay Helpers, Women Workers and District Visitors. Even its name is found in those cases where the Women Workers are called Deaconesses.

It has been suggested that the institution of this modified form of the Diaconate would provide a body of men who could mediate between the Incumbent and his parishioners, and where difficulties existed facilitate their removal, and generally promote a better understanding between clergy and laity. There does not as a rule appear to be much difficulty in the way of mutual understanding between the ordinary parson and his congregation or parishioners, but we may be permitted to doubt whether the mediation of a deacon of the new order would assist much, if at all, should such difficulty arise. Successful mediation of this kind demands personal qualities such as tact, judgment, character and general standing which have no necessary or definite relation to office or position. The Church of England supposes that the Bishop is the person to mediate when differences occur.

But a further objection to the proposal is that it ignores the existence of that large and increasingly influential body of Church workers created about fifty years ago to meet the very needs we are considering, which were even then being felt to a certain extent. The office of licensed Lay Reader and Preacher, parochial or diocesan, which was then established has been of the utmost service to the Church. Chancellor Smith, who regards it as only a palliative and not a remedy, and who himself was one of its most distinguished members, admits that "In many parishes it would have been impossible during the Great War to have kept up the regular worship of the Church without the assistance of these Lay Readers." This is very strong testimony, and much more could be furnished,

Why, then, should not an existing organization such as this, the value of which has been amply demonstrated, be developed and modified for the purpose in view? It is said to be "only a palliative, not a remedy." It is by no means clear that this is the case; but were it so, we must remember that the alternative is also only a palliative, and one, moreover, which affords no promise of being adopted on any adequate scale. An office which has successfully survived the initial stages of indifference and opposition; has proved its practical usefulness; has developed an esprit de corps, a compact organization for conference, co-operation and the promotion of study, has produced a very ably edited magazine now in its eighteenth year; and contains among its members men of such outstanding ability and character as Dr. Eugene Stock, Mr. G. A. King, Mr. Albert Mitchell, Mr. W. A. Kelk, Chancellor P. V. Smith, Mr. De Winton, Mr. H. C. King, Mr. C. E. Caesar, Col. Everitt, Col. Seton Churchill, to name only a few, is not one which should be lightly set on one side. We may be told that no such object is contemplated; but the success of the new scheme would either result in this or leave the office only for the less-qualified men, and we should moreover have a needless complication of orders or classes with deacons temporary and permanent, and lay and semi-lay workers which would cause much confusion and perhaps even jealousy.

The wisest course would obviously be to proceed along lines which have already proved fruitful of results and which have the potency of still greater things, rather than to attempt anything in the nature of an antiquarian revival alien to the whole atmosphere and spirit of the present age. It is said that there is a strong objection to lay ministrations in church and that this proceeds far more from the laity than from the clergy. This is true, though it is also true that the feeling is not now as strong or as general as it was a few years ago. It would, however, where it existed, apply with almost equal force to what would still be regarded as an essentially lay ministry, "camouflaged" (to use Chancellor Smith's word) by the intermittent use of a dog-collar. It is not likely that the objection to lay ministrations will long survive the growing realization of its need. Where the alternative is between having a clergyman or a layman to read or preach, the former will naturally be preferred; but where the alternative to lay assistance is either to have no services at all or to strain the Vicar to breaking-point,

there are not many congregations in which a matter of personal preference would ultimately be allowed to stand in the way of practical necessity.

The Regulations for Diocesan Readers have recently been revised and one of the most satisfactory aspects of the revision is the suggestion of special examinations and of a Diploma to be granted as a result of these. This, of course, would do much to stimulate the ideal of study amongst the Readers and would also furnish an objective to which their general reading and studies could be directed.

The new Regulations are, moreover, marked by the removal of some petty and needless restrictions, such as that which restrained the layman from the use of the pulpit. When we remember that the pulpit is only an elevated structure designed in order that a speaker or preacher should be more easily seen and heard, the unwisdom of such a restriction, which was very often disregarded, becomes apparent.

What is needed to meet the present case is a still further revision concerning those parts of the service which may be read by a layman, and possibly a provision that he may in cases of need be permitted to assist the clergyman by administering the cup at Holy Communion. There is no real question of principle involved in this. The cup may now be administered by a deacon, so that no function properly belonging to the priesthood is involved.

If some suitable revision of the scheme were made and the whole office regularized by proper authority, we should be then furnished with the means for providing in large measure for the situation in which the Church is placed. Something further, however, will still be needed. The clergy, and even more the congregations, must be ready to recognize and encourage the work of the Diocesan Reader. Most parishes should make it an object to provide one, and populous parishes more than one, for in urban districts at least there would be abundant opportunities of work for them even outside the Parish Church. There is one essential part of parochial work very largely neglected and very rarely done as it should be, the organization and conduct of open-air services, and this could well be developed by such lay agency. Like everything that is worth while, the movement will grow only by degrees, and may take a long time to become generally established; but at any rate it has passed the experimental stage, and it would be a grievous

waste of energy and machinery to give it a set-back now that its ripening usefulness has already obtained wide recognition.

It may be said in conclusion that if we suppose that any mere scheme of organization, or any plans of this kind, will of themselves effect the revolution so much needed in our religious and social life we shall be greatly disappointed. It is the duty of every individual member of the Church to endeavour, by prayer, by ceaseless effort, by love and mutual consideration to extend and deepen spiritual life, and to seek more of the Spirit of Christ, and so seek to raise the everyday standard of Christian living in order that the Church may give itself more unreservedly to that proclamation of the Gospel, still the power of God unto salvation to every one that believeth, which is its primary work.

W. GUY JOHNSON.

AN INDIAN PRINCESS.

THE AUTOBIOGRAPHY OF AN INDIAN PRINCESS. By Sunity, Devee Maharani of Cooch Behar. London: *John Murray*, 12s. net.

The daughter of Keshub Chunder Sen, one of the founders of the Brama-Somaj or Religion of the New Dispensation—a movement about which all students of Christian missions will know something—her betrothal and marriage to the Maharajah of Cooch Behar caused at the time much difficulty. This was eventually overcome, and the Maharani tells the story with feeling and candour. She herself is a woman to whom her religion is everything, and as one reads her confession of faith, one regrets that though she is not far from the Kingdom, she is yet not a Christian. Her story is one of an intensely happy married life, clouded only by the shadow of death. Moreover, it is the story of a life that has been for an Indian Princess singularly “full.” Perhaps one of the most interesting chapters is that in which she gives an account of her first visit to England for the Jubilee of 1887, and tells of many royalties and other notable persons whom she met and about whom she discourses frankly but always with unflinching good taste. She represents much that is best in native life and character, and she has given us a narrative of really absorbing interest. She commands our sympathy as in the closing pages she lets us look into a womanly heart and see the sorrow that has settled down over her life. The illustrations greatly add to the attractiveness of the volume.

MEGILLATH TAANITH.

"SCROLL OF FASTING."

ENGLISHED, FOR THE FIRST TIME,
FROM THE ARAMAIC AND THE HEBREW.

BY THE REV. A. W. GREENUP, D.D.

THE Megillath Taanith (Scroll of Fasting), our oldest Jewish post-Biblical work, is a short historical record containing a list of days, arranged in the order of the months, Nisan to Adar,¹ on which it was held unlawful to fast, and on many to mourn, in joyous commemoration of deliverances afforded by God to the Jewish nation. As it has come down to us it consists of three parts, (a) a groundwork of thirty-five short paragraphs written in Aramaic, (b) a commentary thereon, after the manner of the Gemara of the Talmud, written in Hebrew, (c) an additional chapter written during the Gaonic period.

As to the authorship of the Aramaic part we read in the scholion (*see* XII, end) that it was composed by the followers of R. Eliezer b. Ḥananiah b. Hezekiah b. Garon. This R. Eliezer is the Zealot general who took so active a share in the revolt against the Romans. But in the Talmudic treatise Shabbath we read that "the Megillath Taanith was written by Ḥananiah and his followers, since they thought with fondness of the troubles which their countrymen had experienced." This seems to point to the work having been begun by the father of R. Eliezer about the year A.D. 7, when Judæa became a Roman province. The Scroll was not completed, however, till the time of R. Simon b. Gamaliel II, president of the academy at Usha, who said, "Were we as of yore to record the troubles experienced since the Megillath Taanith was written we would never complete them, for we should be obliged to turn nearly every day into a festival," thus indicating that the Scroll was definitely closed in his time.

The object of the work was to aid the people to keep in mind the victories vouchsafed to the Jews, chiefly during the Maccabean times and in the great revolt against the Romans. Zeitlin, who has made an exhaustive study of the period, classifies these "remem-

¹ Our book is the first Jewish book which gives the names of the Jewish months in regular succession,

brances " in what he considers their chronological order thus (the references are to chapters and sections) :—

I. Pre-Asmonæan :—I, 1, 2 ; II, 1.

II. Asmonæan :—VIII, 1, 3 ; IX, 4 ; XII, 8 ; XI, 3 ; II, 2 ; XII, 3 ; IV ; VI, 1 ; II, 4, 3 ; IX, 1 ; III, 2 ; VIII, 2.

III. Roman period to A.D. 65 :—IX, 1 ; XI, 2 ; XII, 5.

IV. The Great Revolt, A.D. 65–6 :—III, 1, 3 ; VI, 2, 3 ; VII ; IX, 2 ; X ; V, 2 (?) ; XI, 1 ; XII, 2, 6.

In addition to these there are some (V, 1 ; XII, 1, 7, 4) of a miscellaneous character which do not come under the above headings.

The Hebrew commentary on the Aramaic text dates from Talmudic times, and its main purpose is a glorification of the victories of the Pharisees over the Sadducees. Internal evidence shows that the glossator flourished after the sixth century, and all the quotations from the Megillath Taanith in the Talmud are from the Aramaic text. The explanations given in the commentary are of little historical value, but have their interest in the light they cast on the religious and ritual disputes of a later age.¹

The Megillath Taanith was printed for the first time at Amsterdam, 1656 ; and the latest edition is that of Bornstein, Jerusalem, 1908, with a very full commentary in Hebrew.

MEGILLATH TAANITH.

I (NISAN).

These are the days on which one must not fast, and on some of which also one must not mourn :—

1. From the first to the eighth of Nisan,^a when the daily sacrifice was again established, one must not mourn ;

Because the Sadducees were saying that only an individual could bring daily sacrifices, one for one week, another for two weeks, and another for thirty days. Whence do they deduce this ? They said that it is written in the Law, The one lamb shalt *thou* offer in the morning^b ; holding that this is to be understood of a single offerer. The sages replied to them, You have no right to interpret so, since a communal offering comes only from all Israel, for it is said, Command the children of Israel, etc.^c " My oblation "—that

^a Taan. 17 b ; Men. 65 a.

^b Exod. xxix. 39 ; Num. xxviii. 4,

^c Num. xxviii. 2.

¹ See Schürer, *Hist. of the Jew. people in the Time of Jesus Christ*, vol. ii. div. ii., pp. 35 ff. (Eng. translation).

is, the blood ; “ my bread ”—that is, the pieces of fat ; “ my offering made by fire ”—that is, the incense ; “ sweet savour ”—that is, the frankincense ; “ my sacrifices ”—these are the libations, and all that is like the sweet savour of my sacrifices ; “ ye shall observe to offer it to Me in their due season,” for all of them come from the Temple treasury.¹

R. Akiba says,^{a 2} Whence is it proved that the lamb for the sacrifice must not go out and pasture among the flocks ? Since the Scripture says, Ye shall observe to offer unto Me in their due season ^b ; and again it says, And ye shall keep it until the fourteenth day.^c As in the one case they examined it for defects four days before slaughtering, so in the other case also. When the sages prevailed against the Sadducees, they ordained that they should pay their head-taxes,^d and place them in the treasury ; and so they offered the daily communal sacrifices ; and of all those eight days in which they argued they made festivals.^{e 3}

2. From the eighth of Nisan to the end of the festival (the twenty-second), when the Feast of Weeks was re-established, one must not mourn.

What is this festival ?^f It is Atsereth. But surely it is unnecessary to write down all the festivals in this roll unless they were matters of dispute with the Sadducees, who said that Atsereth was after Sabbath.^g R. Johanan b. Zakkai joined their discussions and said, Where do you stupid people get this from ? There was not anyone among them who could give him an answer but a

^a Pes. 96 a ; Men. 49 b ; Erub. 13 b.

^b *Ibid.*

^c Exod. xii. 6 (of the Paschal lamb).

^d Shek. 1-8. Exod. xxx. 11 ff.

^e Taan. 17 b, 18 a.

^f Taan, 17 b ; Men. 65 a ; Sifra p. 100 d. (ed Weiss).

^g Cf. Hag. II, 4.

¹ It will be seen that the Sadducees maintained that, from the use of the singular pronoun in Num. xxviii. 4, an individual might bring the communal daily offering, whilst the Pharisees held, from the use of the plural pronoun in Num. xxviii. 2, that it should be brought by the whole congregation at the expense of the community.

² The saying is ascribed to Ben Bag-bag in the Talmudic passages. See note in Taylor's *Sayings of the Fathers*, p. 111. At first sight there appears to be no connection between this and the preceding paragraph. Perhaps the Sadducees, who differed from the sages in the matter of offerings, differed also from them in this matter of the offerings being under examination for four days as in the case of the paschal lamb.

³ This explanation is without support. Zeitlin thinks that the holiday commemorated the dedication of the second Temple : cf. Ezra vi. 15 (LXX), Josephus, *Antiq.* xii. 4, 7.

garrulous old man who said,^a " Since Moses, our lord, loved Israel and knew that Atsereth would be but one day, he ordained that it should be after Sabbath, so that on these two festivals, one after the other, men might take their joy." R. Joḥanan b. Zakkai read to him this scripture, It is eleven days to Horeb by way of mount Seir to Kadesh-Barnea.^b If Moses, our lord, loved Israel, why did he detain him in the desert forty years (instead of eleven days)? The old man replied to him, Rabbi, with this answer do you dismiss me? R. Joḥanan said, You most foolish person in the world, is our perfect Law like your own vain opinion? He replied, How would you dismiss me? He said to him, The Scripture says, And ye shall count for you from the morrow after the Sabbath, etc.^c That reckoning cannot be dependent on anything but weeks. Hence follows, Ye shall number fifty days.^d How is this to be understood? When the festival falls on a Sabbath there must be numbered therefrom seven weeks; but if it fall after a Sabbath there must be numbered fifty days. So when you read, From the morrow of the Sabbath, the meaning is, from the morrow of the first day of Passover. But R. Eliezer said, He (R. Joḥanan) is not right, since it says, Seven weeks shalt thou number unto thee, from the time thou beginnest, etc.^e The numeration depends on the court, with the exception of the regular weekly Sabbath, which anyone can count for himself. R. Joshua said,^f The Law says, Number the days and sanctify the new moon^g: number the days and sanctify Atsereth.^h When the new moon is near its advent it is recognized; so also when Atsereth is near its advent it is recognized. R. Ishmael said, The Law says, Bring the omer at Passover, and bring two loaves at Atsereth.ⁱ As the one is a feast and the beginning of a festival, so is the other. R. Jehudah b. Betherah said, It is said, Sabbath,^j of Atsereth, and also, Sabbath,^k of Passover. So here, where Atsereth is spoken of, Sabbath means the feast and the beginning of the festival; and when you read, From the morrow of the Sabbath, the meaning is, from the morrow of the first day of Passover.^l

^a Erub. 22 b. ^b Deut. i. 2. ^c Lev. xxiii. 15. ^d *Ib.* xxiii. 16.

^e Deut. xvi. 9. ^f Ros. H. 5 a; Ḥag. 17 a. ^g Cf. Num. xi. 20.

^h Cf. Lev. xxiii. 15; Deut. xvi. 9. ⁱ Cf. Lev. xxiii. 10 ff.

^j *Ib.* xxiii. 16. ^k *Ib.* xxiii. 15.

^l See Lauterbach, J. J., in *Studies in Jew. Lit.* (1913), p. 192; Derenbourg, *L'histoire Pales.*, pp. 137 ff.; *Jew. Ency.* ix. 593 ff., 663.

II (IYYAR).

1. On the seventh of Iyyar was the dedication of the wall of Jerusalem, when it is forbidden to mourn.

In two places of this scroll mention is made of the dedication of the wall of Jerusalem, when it is forbidden to mourn. One is when the Israelites came up from captivity; the other^a when the Kings of Greece made a breach in the wall, and the Asmonæan house fenced it in again; for, of the first, it is said, And the wall was finished in the twenty-fifth day, etc.^b But although the wall was built, as yet the gates were not set up; so it is said, Though even unto that time I had not set up the doors in the gates^c; and again, He built it, and covered it, and set up the doors thereof, the bolts thereof, etc.^d; and again, And the porters, and the Levites, and the singers were appointed.^e So when they had completely set up the gates they made that day a festival.

2. On the fourteenth the little Passover^f was slaughtered, when it is forbidden to mourn.

This is the reply R. Joshua gave to R. Eliezer, when the latter said that a limb from a living man was unclean, but one from a dead man was clean.^g R. Joshua said, If a limb from a living man be unclean, will not a limb from a dead man be much more unclean? if the limb of a living man, who is clean, when separated from him is unclean, shall not the limb of a dead man, who is unclean, be much rather unclean? And it is written in Megillath Taanith, On the little Passover one must not mourn. If this be so, much more so on the great Passover. Moreover in another way did R. Joshua refute what R. Eliezer was saying: ^hYou may have a privilege for a minor, but not for an elder. R. Joshua said to him, If for a minor you say there be privileges, much more for an elder; and as is the law of the great Passover, so is that of the little Passover.¹

^a VI *init.*^d *Ib.* iii. 15.^g Hull, 129 b.^b Neh. vi. 15.^e *Ib.* vii. 1.^h Bab. Bath. 156 b.^c *Ib.* vi. 1.^f Num. ix. 10 ff.

¹ Zeitlin disagrees with the reasons given by the glossator, and thinks that the holiday was for the whole nation, not for those debarred from participating in the Passover. He connects the celebration of 14th Iyyar with the Syrians, when the Asmonæans were away during the Passover season on military duties, and so the celebration was deferred to that date, which commemorated victories over the Syrians.

3. On the twenty-third the children of Acra^a went forth from Jerusalem.¹

This is what is written, And David took the stronghold of Sion, the same is the city of [David.^b This is the place of the Acrates (?) until now.² Because they oppressed the inhabitants of Jerusalem, so that the Israelites were unable to go out and come in because of them in the day time, but only at night^c; so when the Asmonæan house overcame them and took them thence into captivity, they made a festival of that day on which they removed them.

4. On the twenty-seventh the coronation tax³ was remitted from Judah and Jerusalem^d

Because in the days of the Grecian Kings they were bringing wreaths of roses and hanging them on the doors of their idolatrous temples, and on the doors of their tradesmen's shops, and on the doors of the court-yards, singing songs to the idols, and writing on the foreheads^e of the oxen and of the asses that their masters had no portion in the God of Israel, just as the Philistines did, as it is written,⁴ Now there was no smith found, etc.^f So when the Asmonæan house overcame them, they abolished these wreaths, and made the day of their abolition a festival.

III (SIVAN).

1. On the seventeenth^g of Sivan the tower of Tsur was taken.

This is Cæsarea, the daughter of Edom,⁵ which was situated between the sea-places.^h It was a thorn in the side of Israel in the days of the Greeks, because they could not subdue it on account

^a 1 Macc. xiii. 51.

^b 2 Sam. v. 7.

^c Cf. VI. 2; XI. 3.

^d 1 Macc. xiii. 39.

^e Cf. Ezek. ix. 4; Apoc. vii. 3; ix. 4; xiv. 1; xxii. 4.

^f 1 Sam. xiii. 19-21.

^g Some MSS. "fourteenth."

^h Meg. 6 a.

¹ The citadel erected by Epiphanes to dominate Jerusalem, cf. 1 Macc. iv. 2 (οἱ υἱοὶ τῆς Ἀκρας).

² This sentence looks like a late gloss.

³ A fixed sum paid annually in commutation for the crowns of gold given to the King formerly on various notable occasions, as when he gained victory in battle, etc. See Josephus, *Antiq.* xii. 3. 3.

⁴ The point seems to be that just as the deliverance of the Israelites depended on God's power and not on material means (cf. 1 Sam. xiii. 5, 22), so did the deliverance from these Greeks who had "no portion in the God of Israel."

⁵ Cæsarea was called "daughter of Edom" because it was considerably enlarged by Herod the Idumæan. See *Echah Rabb.* iv. 21 (ed. Buber, p. 153 note 120).

of the mighty men therein. But when the power of the Asmonæan house prevailed they subdued and expelled them, and caused Israelites to dwell in the midst of it ^a; and they made a festival of the day on which it was subdued.¹

2. On the fifteenth and on the sixteenth the inhabitants of Beth-Shean and of the valley ² were taken into captivity.³

They too were a thorn in the side of Israel in the days of the Greeks, when they waged war against the Arabs. Because they had not been doomed to captivity before, neither Joshua ^b nor David ^c having led them captive, so when they were doomed to captivity through the power of the Asmonæan house who took them captive, they made a festival of those days, wherein they rejoiced before the Name because their Kingdom had been eradicated from the world, as it is written, And Saviours shall come up on mount Zion, etc.^d; and again, Jehovah is King for ever and ever.^e When? When the heathen shall perish out of his land.^f Again it says, Let sinners be consumed out of the earth, etc.^g.

3. On the twenty-fifth the demosionai ⁴ were removed from Judah and from Jerusalem.⁵

When the Ishmaelites came to contest the validity of the birth-right against Israel, and there came with them the two wicked families of the Canaanites and the Egyptians, they said, Who will go and contend with them? Then Gebiah b. Pesisa, the keeper of the temple, said to the sages, Give me authority to go and dispute with them. They said to him, Take heed that thou cede not the land to them. He answered, I will go and dispute with them; if I overcome them they will say, The Law of Israel has conquered us; if they overcome me, you can say to them, Ye have overcome an ignorant person amongst us. The sages gave him authority and

^a Cf. Jer. Demai ii. ^b Jos. xvii. 12. ^c 1 Sam. xxxi. 10. Hull, 10 b. ^d Obad. 21. ^e Ps. x. 16. ^f *Ibid.* ^g *Ibid.* civ. 35.

¹ Zeitlin and Grätz argue against the glossator's explanation, since Cæsarea was entirely inhabited by Greeks and Syrians till Herod's time. The former, on linguistic grounds, rejects Grätz's view that the festival indicated the period of Simon the Asmonæan, and connects it with the first Jewish victory over Florus. Cf. Josephus, *Bell. Jud.* ii. 15. 5 f.

² Perhaps = the plain of Jezreel: cf. Josephus, *Antiq.* xiii. 10. 3.

³ In the reign of John Hyrcanus. See Josephus, *Bell. Jud.* i. 2. 7.

⁴ Publicani, the farmers of the public revenues under the Romans; San.

91 a (end).

⁵ Josephus, *Bell. Jud.* ii. 16. 5.

the book of the Law. He went and disputed with them. The Ishmaelites said, It is written in the Law, In that day Jehovah made a covenant with Abram, saying, Unto thy seed have I given this land.^a We are the seed of Abram, for Ishmael was Abram's son ; so let us divide the land with you. Gebiah b. Pesisa answered, Since you bring me a proof from the Law alone, I also will do the same. It is written in the Law, But unto the sons of the concubines that Abraham had Abraham gave gifts^b ; and it is also written in the Law, And Abraham gave all that he had unto Isaac.^c They fled away. The Canaanites said the land of Canaan was theirs, since it is written in the Law, The land of Canaan according to the borders thereof.^d Gebiah b. Pesisa said to them, Is there a legal decision that one part of the Law is imperative whilst the other stands? lo, it is written in the Law, Cursed be Canaan, a servant of servants shall he be to his brethren.^e 'A servant who acquires possessions, whose servant is he? and whose are the possessions? Moreover, there are now many years wherein you have not served us. Alexander said unto them, He has given you an irrefutable answer : if you return answer, it will be well ; if not, you should become his servants. They said to him, Give us three days' time. He granted it ; whereupon they went away, and when they saw that they were bound to become servants of the Israelites because they found no answer, they immediately left their houses as they were full of goods, their fields sown, and their vineyards planted. In that year they fled away thence ; and tradition has it that it was a Sabbatical year. So that day was made a festival.

§ The^f Egyptians came and said, From their own Law we will bring against them a proof, because it is said, And let every woman ask of her neighbour, etc.^h Sixty myriad men went forth from us, each laden with silver and gold, for thus it is written in their Law, And they spoiled the Egyptians.ⁱ Let them return to us our silver and our gold. Gebiah b. Pesisa said to them, Since you bring me a proof from the Law alone, I will likewise bring you a proof from the Law only. It is written in the Law, Now the time that the children of Israel dwelt in Egypt was four hundred and thirty years.^j Our

^a Gen. xv. 18.

^d Num. xxxiv. 2.

^f San. 91 a, 105 a ; Meg. 16 a.

^h Exod. iii. 22.

^b *Ibid.* xxv. 6.

^e Gen. ix. 25.

ⁱ *Ibid.* xii. 36.

^c *Ibid.* xxv. 25.

^g San. 91 a.

^j *Ibid.* xii. 40.

fathers were sixty myriads, and they served Egypt in mortar and bricks and all manner of service for no wages. See you what our work was worth reckoned at a sela a day. Philosophers sat down and reckoned; and they did not reach a hundred years in their reckoning before finding that all Egypt would belong to Israel. So they went away ashamed.

When Alexander the Macedonian sought to go up to Jerusalem the Samaritans went to him and said, Take heed, for you will not be allowed to enter the most holy place of their temple because you are uncircumcised. When he thought on it Gebiah b. Pesisa went and made two shoes in which he put two precious stones valued at a myriad pieces of silver. When the King approached the temple he said to him, My lord King, draw off your shoes, and put on these two shoes, because the pavement is smooth, that your foot slip not. When he was drawing near to the holy of holies he said, My lord King, hitherto it is permitted us to come but no further. The King said to him, Lo, I go on and when I come back I will straighten your hump.¹ He replied, If you do so you will be called a true physician and will take away much gain.^a It is said that they did not move from that spot till a serpent stung the King.² The sages say of Gebiah b. Pesisa, Of thee the Scripture says, Let thy father and thy mother be glad, and let her that bare thee rejoice^b; and it also says, My son, be wise, and make my heart glad, that I may answer him that reproacheth me.^c

IV (TAMMUZ).

On the fourteenth of Tammuz the Book of Enactments was abrogated, and on that day one must not mourn;

Because in it was written and set down by the Sadducees concerning those who should be stoned, those who should be burned, those who should be decapitated, and those who should be strangled. And when they had written it, a certain man made enquiry and went to look into the book, and said to the Sadducees, How do you know that this man should be sentenced to stoning, this to burning, this to decapitation, and this to strangling? They could not bring a proof from the Law, wherein it says, According to the tenor of the

^a Gen. Rab. lxi. (end). ^b Prov. xxiii. 25. ^c *Ibid.* xxvii. 11.

¹ Gebiah means "humpback."

² On this story see Büchler, *Rev. des Etud. Juives*, lxxxvi. 1.

law which they shall teach thee, etc.,^a which indicates that they were not writing the laws which were in the Book but only what was written and laid down by them in their own Book of Enactments. Again, the Boëthusians were saying, An eye for an eye, and a tooth for a tooth^b: so if a man should put out his fellow's tooth, one should put out his tooth; and if anyone should blind his fellow's eye, one should put out his eye, that they might be alike.¹ And when it is said, They shall spread the garment before the elders of the city,^c they said it was to be literally observed. And the passage, And spit in his face,^d they also interpreted of literal observance.² The sages answered them, And is it not written, The law and the commandment which I have written (the written law) that thou mayest teach them^e (the oral law); and again, Now therefore write ye this song for you, and teach it—this refers to the teaching of the Bible; put it in their mouths,^f—this refers to the oral law? So the day on which the Book of Enactments was abolished they made a festival.³

A. W. GREENUP.

(To be continued.)

^a Deut. xvii. 11.

^b Exod. xxi. 24; Lev. xxiv. 20; Deut. xix. 21. ^c Deut. xxii. 17.

^d *Ibid.* xxv. 9. ^e Exod. xxiv. 12. ^f Deut. xxxi. 19.

¹ The Pharisees, in the interests of the people, maintained that pecuniary compensation was sufficient. Bab. K. 84 a.

² Instead of "spit on the ground before him." See Targum and Rashi *in loc.*

³ Zeitlin, who contends that none of the festivals arose from controversies between the Pharisees and the Sadducees, agrees with Cassel (*Messianische Stellen d. A. T.*, p. 107) that the event here commemorated is the annulling of the Greek decrees by Demetrius (1 Macc. x.).



THE EQUIPMENT OF THE MAN.¹

BY THE REV. J. GORDON HAYES, M.A.

JUST as the security of a tower rests only upon its foundation, so humanly-speaking the success of the *agent* depends entirely upon the character of the *man*. Designing our means as accurately as possible to meet the end in view, we know that the "natural man," whom it is our aim to catch in our net, is well able to appreciate superior manly qualities, and quite ready to value them. But until he is converted he cannot understand the servant of God, and will usually turn away from one instinctively.

The first business of the Church, therefore, should be to select good men for her agents. But it may be found more difficult to find them than to make them. We should do both. But to attend to her affairs with full purpose and understanding the Church should seriously undertake their cultivation. By the making of the man is meant the development of Christian character in all its fullness. Only upon a complete personality can the specialized training of the agent of Christ be safely erected. The Church should have no room for inferior men, they make her a laughing-stock in this sceptical world. We want men of naturally-commanding character, and we can have as many as we wish if we go to the trouble of selecting and training them. We should cultivate leaders of men who will lead men to Christ.

Up to the point where specialization begins the training may well be similar to that of other men, with this difference, that the servant of God must be better than other men. He should be taught to cultivate all the good qualities of others, and to carry them to a higher degree. He should be similar in kind to all good men, but quantitatively he should excel them. There are those who do this now, but we do not get enough of them into the Church.

It seems perfectly preposterous on the part of one who can lay no claim to being an educationalist to attempt to frame a system of training, even for a particular class. But a distant observer can often see the general proportions of a large object better than those whose intensive knowledge of the object may be complete, but

¹ Being a second section of the paper on "The Agent of God," which appeared in the October, 1921, number of the CHURCHMAN.

whose birth and life have forbidden the more comprehensive view. Again, we have a specific purpose to pursue, but a general basis is essential to our special end. The following, therefore, is thrown out as a suggestion for a liberal education in the case of those who are intended for the service of Christ.¹

The whole subject might be divisible into three main parts: the first two covering the training of the man, and the third adding that of the agent proper.

(1) Subjective, the cultivation of the human organism or the natural personality of *the man himself*.

(2) Objective, the knowledge of the *natural* environment, man and the universe.

(3) Objective and subjective, for they coalesce in the knowledge of God. The *spiritual* environment.

From our earliest perceptions of our own existence soon follow those of external matters, and as both develop through life we should become increasingly conscious of God, until Christ be formed in us.

Great God, from Thee we spring, to Thee we tend—
Path, Motive, Guide, Original and End.

I. THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE ORGANISM ITSELF.

This would mainly comprise the physical, mental, moral, social, and spiritual elements, which together may be considered to make up the complete personality.

(a) *Physical*. Some men live for sport while others exist without it. Neither is ideal. The body of a Christian is a temple of the Holy Ghost and should be kept in good condition, but without extravagant attention to its ornamental appearance. Due consideration for the physical basis of our being prevents it usurping authority over the mind and spirit. In the perfect life sport might be superfluous, for it is non-productive. About two or three hours every day in the cultivation of the soil seems to meet the case.

(b) *Mental*. What appears to the writer to be of the first importance here is the proportionate development of the reasoning powers,

¹ After the above was written a correspondence appeared in the *Times Literary Supplement* upon the relative educational merit of literature and of science. No agreement can be reached without common ground, and this is hard to find amid the diversity of human nature. Subsequently, the writer of the "Elements of Reconstruction" in the *Times* showed that neither group could of itself form a liberal education, but that "the backbone stuff," from the times of Plato until now, "must be a clear and critical knowledge of oneself in relation to God and to the Universe." This sufficiently supports the writer's contention.

rather than the vicious system of trying to cram the memory with undigested matter, from which we used to suffer so much.

There is at least this firm residuum of wisdom left from Herbert Spencer's contention for a scientific education that the most rational, if not the only reasonable, basis for the human mind is the basis of nature itself. As science is the basis of all life, it should therefore be the basis, if no more than the basis, of all knowledge. It will be noted that this does not restrict education exclusively, or even mainly, to science. But it is to provide the only adequate foundation for a properly organized mind. It is to build upon the truth of Nature, which is the only natural and proper foundation for the truth of God.

"The laws of Nature are the thoughts of God," though not *all* His thoughts. The mind is incomplete and ill-ordered until furnished with correct if rudimentary conceptions of the nature and properties of matter and motion, of time and space. Nor can the relative value of diverse conceptions, or the difference between truth and error, be apprehended, except by an organized mind; and organized knowledge is science. To lay an orderly basis for the human reason early in life is advisable for moral as well as intellectual ends, and in some cases it is of the utmost importance.

As man is but one of many parts of the Universe, humanistic studies should follow elementary natural science, as in the more detailed suggestions put forth in the second part of this chapter. Let beauty be grafted upon the stem of knowledge, and for this reason: that the emotions are apt to run riot in early years, and it is prudent to prevent the æsthetic faculties from outstripping the expansion of the mind. The writer has reason to regret an early passion for music which has long since expended itself with the prodigality of youth. Years, precious years, may easily be lost to all who are not making such art the main business of life. But matters of this kind must be, very largely, matters of opinion. The object is to produce well-balanced, orderly intellects, capable of receiving truth in correct perspective. It is also needful to remember that the training of the mind is only one section of one of the three great factors that make up the complete personality.

(c) *Moral.* As mental culture is more important than physical development, so also moral worth surpasses that which is purely intellectual, especially in the servant of God. Few are competent

to form an estimate of our learning, but all will sit in judgment upon our practical conduct, whether we like it or not. It is here that we see the need of the ordinary good qualities of men in an extraordinary degree. Christ's agent *must* live a well-ordered life for the glory of God. His physical and mental equipment must conduce to this. Hence the need of a fundamentally scientific or orderly mind ; for morality itself is but order in conduct, and knowledge of the laws of life is the natural path to moral living. At present there are many clergy, just as there are many laymen, who cannot see how unmoral their lives are because of the defects in their education. Considerable damage is thus being done, though unwittingly, to the Master's cause. The need of some rational system of education for clergy is most pressing. Of moral offences, in the popular meaning of the term, I am not thinking. But the clergy should know that no life is fully moral if it be disorderly even in matters which seem to them insignificant. The negligible details of some clergymen are business men's axioms. A well-ordered life is the only truly moral one. Unbusiness-like, careless and negligent habits, being un-moral, become a source of actual evil. There is a remarkably well-sustained charge against us that clerical honour in the affairs of this life is inferior to that of the laity ; not that our ethical ideals are lower, but that generally we are ignorant of the high moral standard that obtains in the relations of all reputable business men, who would scorn to reap a mean advantage, however hard a bargain they may drive. Stock exchange and sporting customs are well-known instances of this. Every bill unpaid when it is due is a spring from whence flows a whole stream of confusion, as the writer can testify from personal experience with other parsons.

We clergy have the unenviable reputation of being the worst class of payers that tradesmen have to deal with. Thus the latter are kept short of capital with which to run their business, and are not likely to love the Church. Indeed many a bankruptcy is caused by people leaving bills unpaid for years.

Honesty is moral order. General orderliness of conduct should be inculcated in childhood, that it may become habitual. Whatever in life is not done decently and in order is evil. Punctuality, another business axiom, should be habitual, or time is wasted which is a sin ; besides which, tempers are ruffled and again disorder prevails. No one has any right to waste other people's time if he does not

value his own. These, and many other qualities such as civility sympathy, and respect for others, the average layman possesses, but Christians, it is said, are notoriously bad "walkers." If the agent of God does not rise to the ordinary standard of the world in his general conduct, he must expect to be harshly judged, for no one has any excuse for failing here, and the laity have a right to look to their leaders to set an example in everyday matters. They should, and very easily could, excel others in all the amenities of life and conduct, they ought to be true gentlemen for the credit of their Master.

Further, the servant of God should learn to become an *active* agent in life. It is true that the opposite lesson of Christian morality also has to be learnt, how to endure, to

Know how sublime a thing it is
To suffer and be strong.

But he is to discriminate, and be able to suffer even fools at times, while able also to firmly but tactfully take the initiative. What is meant by being an active agent is this : many men of great mental ability are practical failures, tossed about like so much flotsam and jetsam upon the sea of life ; while other men, often of smaller intellectual calibre, choose their plan and carry it out, using this world, and indeed abusing it too, for the furtherance of their aim. How much more should not the agent of God, the design for whose life is prepared in Heaven,¹ train and utilize all his powers of observation and judgment, his reason and his will, to carry out with firmness and courage, as well as with meekness and love, whatever his Master has given him to do. He needs a distinctly superior moral constitution, that his daily life may *adorn* the doctrine of God our Saviour *in all things*. He, more than others, needs perfect self-control, and should possess the secret of it, which is God-control ; thus will he perform effectively whatever duty requires, and do so like an efficient machine with the minimum of friction and waste of time and energy.

(d) *Social*. However useful mechanics may be analogically, man is not a machine. Every Christian should be an instrument for doing his Master's work, but it is as a living and organic, not an inorganic agent, that our bodies are to be presented to God. And this because our business is with the living, with other men, our

¹ Eph. ii. 10.

kind. Hence the present section, the object of which is to consider the cultivation of the faculty for comprehending human nature. We might term it "the human instinct." It is our understanding of humanity that regulates in the main our conduct towards others. It is therefore an extension of the last section into the special and larger sphere of human society.¹ Knowledge of men, one of the fundamental requirements of God's agent, like the knowledge of God (or of anything), can only be acquired up to the limit of the individual capacity. It is, therefore, of the greatest importance that this capacity for understanding mankind be duly cultivated. The want of it is fast emptying our churches. The laity, who are sound judges of such matters, know that they are not understood, and that they never can be understood while clergy are devoid of the human faculty. A very moderate amount of book-learning will suffice, but nothing can take the place of knowledge of human life. The agent is supposed to exist to enable people to live good lives, but he is never officially trained for this purpose, one complete half of his equipment being denied him.

This is the preparatory stage of the individual for that wider acquaintance with men which should follow. Of the three fundamentals, "Know thyself," "Know thy fellows," "Know thy God," this is the preparation of the faculty for the second. Up to a certain age, and to a limited though varying extent, this faculty develops naturally. But divinity students are separated from the rest of the world early in life. Even the great Universities by no means epitomize the world outside them. Thus the main stream of life is abandoned for ever in favour of a smaller artificial canal. Again, very few have ever learned much about the lives of other classes of people, and their social outlook, which has always been narrow, gets still further restricted. Yet nothing is more eagerly learnt by the young than human lessons. Occasionally, fathers who have had experience of the world undertake the training of their sons, but such cases are necessarily rare among the clergy, because of the secluded lives most of the parents themselves have lived. The father is the God-appointed tutor for boys in all the practical matters

¹ No attempt can be made here at philosophical exactitude. Broad and practical ends alone are considered. Hence it is impossible to discuss, or try to settle, the inter-relation of the man and his environment, a knotty problem. This of course leaves the classification faulty because arbitrary, but it should serve its purpose.

of life, yet how few seem qualified for their office ! And how few of those who are qualified seriously undertake these important duties ! Although by no means perfect models for Christian ministers, Lord Chatham's training of his famous son, and Lord Chesterfield's futile efforts, are examples of what statesmen have attempted in this way.

The human faculty can be cultivated from quite early boyhood. The formation of business habits, too, cannot be begun too young ; and early efforts at simple administrative tasks under suitable guidance should be encouraged ; so also should experiments in organization, which may become quite serious and successful in youth. As progress can only result from two conditions, liberty and a variety of situations,¹ every opportunity should be taken of acquiring new conceptions of life, and there should be conversations upon them all. This kind of thing has an absorbing interest for the young, and might be promised as a reward for attention to duller duties, although very little will be learnt where personal interest is wanting. A sound judgment is easily acquired by the average boy, if given a fair opportunity of doing so, and with it will come prudence, business acumen, and the ability to handle his fellows, which are the great practical needs of God's agent on the human side. Nothing can take the place of actual experience of human life, for books and lectures cannot teach its lessons. Other religious bodies often succeed where the Church of England fails, in this knowledge of human nature, to which sometimes they unduly pander. But we ought to know how to " touch the public heart under the popular waistcoat," as well as how far to go in performing that delicate operation.

The object of the agent's life is in principle the same as that of other men, action. But his action is to be spiritual instead of worldly. He is to be guided by his Heavenly Master, and must be willing to obey. His permanent attitude must be " Lord, what wilt Thou have me to do ? " He is to influence the lives of those who, apart from him, will neglect higher things and live only for this world. To do so he must have all that is proper in common with them. He should therefore be formed very much as others are, being a specialist only in God's Revelation, like the Ancient Hebrew, whose place he takes in the world to-day.

(e) *Spiritual*. Any one intended for God's Service must have,

¹ Quoted from Humboldt by J. S. Mill in his essay on *Liberty*.

throughout the unfolding of his natural personality, his spiritual perceptions awakened and exercised. Words could scarcely exaggerate the advantage of this taking place in his earlier years. It is of transcendental importance. And here lies the ultimate need for an extended general education before specialization begins; there are some who seem as devoid of the religious as others of the human faculty, and these must on no account be permitted to embark upon the final training for the ministry. They can enter into some secular business for which they may be fitted, where their time will not be wasted, and from which they can still be withdrawn after a few years, should they believe they have received God's call. Most boys, however, are wonderfully responsive to Christian influence if introduced by skilful agents. Of these there are, happily, a goodly number who ought to be officially secured by the Church.

Possibly in most cases the chief hindrance to the spiritual life of children is to be found in none other than their parents, who are primarily responsible for leading them to God. This is probably the result of ignorance, of the duties of parent-hood, and of God, rather than of any coldness in desire to do their best for their offspring. Unless parents are themselves earnest Christians a nominal compliance with religious customs satisfies them, which, when the lads get older, is almost invariably thrown over. While those who do realize the supreme importance of the soul, by their over anxiety during tender years, very frequently sicken the youngsters of everything religious. This is one of those matters which are ruined if overdone. Those who present their children to the Lord, and leave them in His hands, have nothing to complain of. Account for it as we may, we are faced with a decided decline in true family Christian life. Fortunately spiritual work among the young can be undertaken by the Church, which is the next best thing. It is imperative that some one who is capable should be responsible for the souls of all who may be called to the ministry. But no time is to be lost over it, for in most cases the character begins to solidify by about the time of the legal majority, so that if the life is to be won for Christ this is almost the latest when such a change may be expected. Professor Drummond may be said to have established his case that the laws of the spiritual life are at least analogous to those of nature. The life-work of the agent of Christ among men is "to sow the seed of eternal life in their hearts." He cannot do

this if devoid of the Divine life himself. Spiritual, like natural, fertility can only proceed from a living progenitor. Even then, in both kingdoms, there are some who are mysteriously infertile. But all else is utterly useless unless the young agent has received the life of the spirit of God, and feeds his soul upon the Living Bread of constant communion with Christ. Hence definite spiritual work must be done if possible, during the responsive years, when the rudder of life is easily turned with the aid of a sympathetic friend.

Every part of the character of the servant of God must be practical and real, not having the appearance of qualities which are actually wanting, nor carrying more "luggage" (in the way of useless ornamental accomplishments) than is necessary to make him presentable. This is above all things important with his religious life, and hence it should be thoroughly well grounded as a layman, to prevent it, if possible, from becoming tainted by the clerical professional element, which is sometimes as objectionable as any other. For his own sake, and still more for the sake of others, let everything be based upon his actual spiritual experience, upon what he knows, personally and experimentally, to be true. Some of our clergy would be doing more good breaking stones. Let us have no superstition. Nobody believes that men are miraculously changed at their ordination. And if they have had no dealings with God before then they have no true vocation for the ministry. God does not send rebels to work in His vineyard. Christians are tired of the cultured and ordained sinners, sometimes set to minister to the saints, all their professional jargon cannot hide their abject spiritual poverty from the humblest believer in Christ. We must have spirit and truth, or give up altogether. Every layman can see through the wretched veneer, and judges what he can find of the real man beneath. Carlyle rightly honoured two men, and no third; the labourers for earthly and for heavenly bread. But the sham-priest is "the falsest and basest of men," under whose mask no living figure or spirit dwelleth, and who glares upon one "in ghastly affection of life."¹

II. OBJECTIVE. THE KNOWLEDGE OF NATURE.

Some minds are constitutionally analytical, others synthetical. Ideally, they should be diagnosed and divided so that each might

¹ *Sartor Resartus*.

have the method of instruction best suited to it. There is much to be said for a system of education which preserves the proportions of the Universe as we know it. Boys cannot usually be expected to receive very definite intellectual conceptions of immaterial things, but they can rise from creation to its Creator, and are not often emotionally deficient.

The heavens declare the glory of God,
And the firmament showeth His handiwork.

Begin, then, with the mechanism of the heavens, of which perfectly correct impressions are often formed by boys of ten or twelve years of age. The imagination of youth is readily seized by physical magnitude, of which sidereal astronomy is our limit. The æsthetic sense is not neglected, for nothing is so sublimely beautiful as the heavens. One look at the Ring Nebula or the cluster in Hercules through a telescope will affect a sober lad as long as he lives on this earth, perhaps longer. The physical constitution of the universe is a good start, the Solar System is "assimilated" with avidity, and the best foundation laid for a devout and studious mind.

Descend to earth and its physical history from the Nebula theory to modern geography, properly so-called, and sufficient geology to enable the architecture of our own planet to be appreciated. How anyone can live without at least a bowing acquaintance with the great forces of nature, the present writer simply cannot conceive. Neither is it wonderful that the God of the average unscientific person is such a puny being as to be entirely negligible. Amid the wonders of gravitation and denudation, of air and ocean currents, the circulation of water, glacial action and ice phenomena, nine boys out of ten will simply revel. They will then become keen on physics and the mechanics of matter and motion, possibly also on chemistry, to satisfy their cravings for further knowledge, besides being driven to books of travel and exploration¹ for pure recreation, which will often supplant mere fiction, and the pure truth of God's creation be inhaled like native air. Thus, in an unbroken chain of intellectual pleasure, the youthful mind is furnished with a faithful replica of nature. Travel leads to natural history, this to

¹ One has only to test a school on such a subject as the unveiling of the new continent, "Antarctica" to realize the keenness of the young for such healthful knowledge. Scott, Shackleton, Amundsen and Mawson are an unfailling delight.

the biology of both plants and animals, which again suggest botany, animal physiology and anatomy.

Human Studies. Then, rising through the scale of life, we come at length to man. His nature, and his history in its widest sense covering all human activities; the story of the human race, its varied and persistent customs, modes of life and endless attempts at government; political, economic and constitutional history as parts of the greater whole; with philosophy, literature and art, Ancient, Mediæval and Modern, according to taste, and in natural sequence. Knowledge of figures and calculation is essential to natural science as that of languages is to history in all its branches, but both are means rather than ends in themselves. The only ultimate object is life. All knowledge obtained from books alone is indirect or second-hand, and direct personal observation is peculiarly necessary for a complete comprehension of human nature. But this must ever be limited to our own time and experience, and is of itself insufficiently extensive. Thus, one may be led from some local incident to inquire how our country is governed, and so into a more or less exhaustive study of the English Constitution. Then, our own country has not led an isolated existence, and its relations with other countries naturally arise, leading, it may be, to an aroused interest in International Law, itself one of several gateways to jurisprudence in general. Or an effort to understand the present leads us back into the past, until we may reach the very dawn of civilization or of political life, before a starting-point which satisfies the mind can be found. But we must turn to the last item on the schedule of general education.

Experience of Life. Those who pass from school into business, on looking back in after years, invariably feel that all the great lessons were learnt when school days were over. This is perfectly true, and is due to the entrance into the great world of men. But our clergy rarely enter this world in the practical or good sense, though some do in the "worldly" sense of gaieties and amusements, from which there is nothing to be gained. All previous training fails at its most important point if it does not receive a strong course of practical experience in order to gain knowledge of the world, and if the spiritual life is healthy, to be eventually repelled by it. No intellectual advantages can compensate for ignorance of the real facts of life, for "the world" is the environment of

nearly all the population ; and the agent must live the same life as others to qualify himself for saving them from it.

Let it be said at once that nothing is further from the mind of the writer than to advocate a "worldly" life. A business life for a few years is quite sufficient to teach the practical lessons of human nature. The line must be drawn somewhere, and all true Christians draw it to exclude what is termed "worldliness." Very few of the laity whom the Church should get hold of are men with minds trained in the scholar's sense, their whole life consists of hard practical realities, which make the student's point of view seem visionary and useless. It is not the layman's business to understand our position, and perhaps he could never do so. From our standpoint his life may seem sordid and base. But it is our end in life to completely grasp his outlook, so that we may present our Divine message in a form which he can readily receive.

We must not live exclusively in our own world of thought, which may not faithfully represent nature, and so far as it fails to do so will be untrue and unworthy. But primarily we should live in the same world of fact in which all others have to pass their existence. The training of the mind should only subserve this purpose, that it enables us to see things as they are more clearly than others can see them. It must not abstract us from the reality of life, or our usefulness is at an end. The majority of the clergy should be men of action because the majority of the laity are so, and cannot understand those who are not. The only common basis of fellowship which is possible to the clergy and unspiritual laymen is that of their common humanity. But with so many of those in orders at present the man of the world soon exhausts his interest ; before much sounding line has run out he finds bottom, and sums up his man immediately.

Knowledge of the world of men is not soon to be acquired. The denizens of great cities seem to pick up quickly a superficial smartness, and many, no doubt, have a deep acquaintance with life. But a sound knowledge of human nature, which can sympathize with its weaknesses, because it knows its difficulties, and enables us to feel as others feel, and see things as others see them, such requires years of intimate relationship with all classes of people. Its acquirement is not included in the Christian minister's equipment. It is indeed more important that he should faithfully repre-

sent his Divine Master than gain the confidence of his fellow-men by merely human arts. But where one fails to deliver his Master's message, many fail to grasp the people's wants. He should have each in due measure, the human subordinate to the Divine, yet distinctly present, as they were so fully in our Blessed Lord. To obtain the needed qualities, may I repeat that the only way is *by living the same life as others* for a few years? Those who have done so, and only those, know how perfect is the mutual understanding and confidence between the pastor and his flock. More than twenty-five years among laymen, over a wide area, has shown that the clergy, although devoted to their work, are losing their hold upon the manhood of the country. Humanly-speaking the cause of this is that their training has been merely professional. But spiritual deficiency lies behind this.

J. GORDON HAYES.

(To be concluded.)



DR. DODDRIDGE.

BY THE REV. C. SYDNEY CARTER, M.A.

THERE is a danger that to the present generation some of the greatest of the eighteenth-century divines—men who were “burning and shining lights” in their day—will soon be little more than names familiarly associated, it may be, with a well-known hymn or notable religious treatise. The late Bishop Ryle in his *Christian Leaders*, and Mr. Balleine in his fascinating *History of the Evangelical Party*, have familiarized many of us with the wonderful work accomplished by the men of God who inspired and carried on the great Methodist and Evangelical revival, but we know of no such popular records of the lives and influences of other equally eminent Christian divines and teachers which fell outside that great movement. Probably few, except diligent students of Church history, know much of the life and character of the saintly Nonconformist scholar and divine whose most popular work is supposed to have led to the spiritual awakening of the great anti-Slavery champion, William Wilberforce. Philip Doddridge (1702–51) was probably the most prominent and influential of the Nonconformist divines of the first half of the eighteenth century. We know little about his ancestry except that his great-great-uncle was knighted and made a judge of the Court of King’s Bench under James I, while his grandfather was ejected from his living of Shepperton in 1662. His father, Daniel Doddridge, was in the oil trade in London, and Philip was the youngest of his twenty children. His mother was the daughter of a Hussite clergyman who was exiled from Bohemia on account of his faith in 1626 and settled in England and kept a school at Kingston-on-Thames. Philip, who had been at first cast aside as lifeless at his birth, was always of a frail and consumptive constitution. From 1712–15 he went to his grandfather’s old school at Kingston, where he gained a reputation for his diligence and piety. His father died in 1715 and his mother apparently shortly afterwards. Philip then went to a private school at St. Albans, but owing to the careless mismanagement of his guardian and trustee all his father’s fortune was lost, and had not his friend, Dr. Samuel Clarke, a prominent Dissenting minister, come very generously to his assistance, young Doddridge would

have been unable to continue his studies. He left school in 1718 and shortly afterwards, through the influence of an uncle, who had been steward to the Duke of Bedford, he received an offer from the Duchess to defray all the expenses of his education at the University and make future provision for him in the Church, if he would consent to take Anglican Orders. Doddridge, however, already felt that he could not conscientiously conform to the Church, and was therefore obliged to decline this very tempting proposal. His prospects for fulfilling his great ambition of entering the Ministry were now so small that Dr. Edmund Calamy advised him to turn his attention to something else, and for a time he seriously thought of studying law. It was while he was in this state of indecision that his friend Dr. Clarke came forward with a generous offer to provide for his training for the Ministry, and so in 1719 he went to an Academy at Kibworth, in Leicestershire, kept by the Rev. J. Jennings, a learned Dissenting divine. The very strict and careful rules which young Doddridge drew up at this time for the guidance of his student career show how fully in earnest and entirely consecrated his life already was in his Master's service, and what a high standard of Christian perfection he aimed at.

Doddridge commenced his ministerial career at Hinckley in July, 1722, when only twenty years old, and his first sermon was the means of the conversion of two people. In 1723 he accepted the call to the pastorate of a small country congregation at Kibworth, which gave him ample time to continue his studies. In 1729 he was chosen assistant minister to an Independent congregation at Market Harborough, having previously refused several other more tempting offers to larger and more important town churches. In the same year, under great pressure from numerous friends and brother ministers, Doddridge consented to open an Academy at Harborough for the training of students for the Ministry. Only a few months later he received a pressing invitation to the pastorate of an important Independent Church at Northampton, which, however, he at first declined to accept. A deputation of the young people earnestly besought him to reconsider his decision, and he regarded this intervention as a Divine call and went to Northampton in December, 1729. A very serious illness delayed his Ordination and the commencement of his work there till March, 1730, when, after making his Confession of Faith and Ordination

vows, he was solemnly set apart by prayer. The anniversary of his Ordination Doddridge always observed with special solemnity in his private devotional exercises. Dr. Stoughton, writing in 1878, tells us that the "old square meeting-house" in which Doddridge ministered for over twenty years, remained then the same externally as in 1750 with "five windows and two doors in front each surmounted by a penthouse, and just under the dripping of the main roof a square sundial" (*Religion in England*, I, 342).

Doddridge was soon greatly esteemed for his fervid and sympathetic style of preaching, and he frequently preached in the villages round Northampton. When we recall that the decline in evangelical preaching at this time was so general that Sir W. Blackstone could assert, after hearing every notable preacher in London, that "he did not hear a single discourse having more Christianity in it than the writings of Cicero," Doddridge's popularity, considering his zeal for Gospel preaching, is all the more remarkable. "The Gospel," he declared, towards the close of his ministry, "is a great thing or it is nothing. I am more and more convinced of keeping to the good old evangelical and experimental way of preaching and look upon most of the new-fashioned Divinity as a kind of Quackery, which bodes ill to the health of the soul."

Doddridge paid special attention to the young people of his congregation and lamented the neglect of the practice of catechizing the children in church, a course which he regularly pursued. He also promoted the formation of Young Peoples' Societies on lines somewhat similar to our modern Christian Endeavour movement. He was very zealous in his pastoral visitations, but finding it impossible to visit all the families of his scattered flock, in 1737 he set apart four Elders to assist him in this branch of the work. He was also instrumental in establishing a Charity School at Northampton, a sum being raised sufficient to clothe and educate twenty boys, who were taught to read, write and learn their Catechism and attend public worship regularly. Doddridge soon became very greatly beloved by his congregation, the membership of which was considerably increased during his ministry. He consistently refused other calls to larger and more influential churches in London and elsewhere.

In 1730 Doddridge married Mrs. Mercy Maris, of Worcester, and he had five children, but to his great grief he lost his eldest daughter

when quite young. In 1737 Aberdeen University conferred on him the degree of D.D.

During the whole of his ministry at Northampton he acted as Principal of the Academy which he had started, and for which he soon needed the help of an assistant tutor. This training College soon obtained considerable reputation, men coming to be under his tuition from Scotland and even Holland. It was mainly a theological seminary, since of the 200 pupils who were under his care in twenty-two years 120 entered the Ministry. Scotch Presbyterians and even Churchmen were included amongst his students. From the account of his biographer the curriculum at the College was most comprehensive, and if all of the subjects studied were at all thoroughly mastered his Academy must have been noted for its specially high standard of scholarship. Certainly the reproof of an unlearned ministry could not be applied to Doddridge's training. During their three years' course the ordinands included in their studies classics, mathematics, science and philosophy, as well as Civil Law, Natural History, Anatomy and Jewish Antiquities, besides their special Divinity lectures! The students rose at 6 a.m. in summer and 7 a.m. in winter. During Family Worship, morning and evening, Doddridge expounded a chapter of the Old and New Testaments from the Hebrew and Greek, the rest of the morning he lectured on other subjects. He, himself, well describes the great aim which guided all his tutorial labours: "It is my heart's desire and prayer to God that not one may go out from me without an understanding enlightened from above, a heart sanctified by Divine Grace, quickened and warmed with love to a well-known Jesus and tenderly concerned for the salvation of perishing souls." He earnestly prepared his students for an intelligent grasp of the privileges connected with a sincere approach to the Lord's Table. To this end lectures were suspended on the day preceding Sacrament Sunday and the time occupied with serious devotional preparation.

In spite of his teaching and ministerial work Doddridge found time to become a fairly prolific writer. Besides a popular *Life of Col. Gardiner*, he published numerous sermons and theological treatises. He also revised the Expository Works of Archbishop Leighton, whom he described as an "adept in True Christianity." Most of his works were translated into foreign languages and published abroad in Dutch, French, German and Danish. He is,

however, best remembered to-day as the author of *The Rise and Progress of Religion in the Soul*, a work undertaken on the urgent solicitation of Dr. Watts. It is a treatise on Practical Divinity and Christian Experience, and it was received with very great esteem by many eminent clergy and laity and quickly passed through many editions. Doddridge received numerous testimonies from England, Scotland, Holland and America to its usefulness in leading to the conversion and edification of many of its readers. Another, and at the time even more famous work, was his *Family Expositor*, a paraphrase of the New Testament with critical notes in six volumes, on which he had been engaged since the commencement of his ministry. The last three volumes were published after his death, as was also a volume of his Hymns.

Although Doddridge is not nearly so famous as a hymn writer as Charles Wesley or Dr. Watts, yet the Christian Church would be greatly the poorer for the loss of his poetic genius. As Dr. Stoughton well says, "there is a sweetness and tenderness in Doddridge's versification on devotional subjects, in admirable harmony with his amiable character, which has made him a favourite with all denominations, and has given him a place in the hymnology of English Christendom which he is not likely to lose" (*Religion in England*, I, 343). Many of his hymns are still included in our Collections, such as "Eternal source of every joy," "God of my life through all my days," and "Ye humble souls that seek the Lord," but certainly the two most universally used and loved are "O God of Bethel by whose hand" and "Hark, the glad sound! the Saviour comes," probably the most popular of all our Advent hymns.

Doddridge carefully studied the question of conformity to the Church, and was convinced of the lawfulness and expediency of separation. "I look upon the Dissenting Interest," he wrote, "to be the cause of Truth, honour and liberty, and I will add in a great measure the cause of serious piety too." He possessed, however, a catholic spirit and was very tolerant and charitable towards all who differed from him. He earnestly prayed for a closer union amongst all Protestants and longed, like so many Christians to-day are doing, for the happy time when the "Question would be, not how much may we lawfully *impose*, and how much may we lawfully *dispute*? but on the one side what may we *waive*, and on the other what may we *acquiesce in*, from a principle of

mutual tenderness and respect, without displeasing our common Lord." In his "Correspondence" he records the informal and abortive discussions which took place between Samuel Chandler and Bishops Gooch and Sherlock on a possible compromise to bring the Dissenters back to communion with the Church. He lived on terms of warm friendship with Archbishop Herring and Bishop Warburton.

The objection to what was regarded as the "irregular" method of street preaching was so widespread at this time that such celebrated Nonconformist divines as Daniel Neal and Isaac Watts actually censured Doddridge for inviting George Whitefield to occupy his pulpit. Doddridge, however, while wisely endeavouring to regulate the zeal and correct the errors of some of the early pioneers of the Revival Movement, definitely championed the despised "Methodist" clergy and their itinerant practices. "A Man had better," he affirmed, "be a sober, honest, chaste, industrious enthusiast than live without any regard to God and Religion at all."

The record of Doddridge's extraordinary diligence is amazing. Every spare moment was filled with useful work and he was scrupulously conscientious almost to a fault about the employment of his time. One of his pupils usually read to him even while he was dressing and shaving! Besides his daily morning lectures and his regular ministerial work he often preached several times a week in the outlying villages, while he maintained a very large correspondence with pupils, guardians, brother ministers, and a wide circle of friends. In addition to all these active duties, he spent many hours in secret communion with God, in fact his intense piety almost resembled the asceticism of the cloister. He certainly "practised the presence of God" in a very special manner. Sometimes whole days were definitely given over to prayer, while he had regular hours in which he retired to his vestry to review his life and work and to plead earnestly for his family, his people, and the Church of God.

It is not therefore surprising that he seldom allowed himself more than six hours' rest, but when urged to take a little more relaxation for his health's sake he replied: "I seldom know what it is to be weary."

His piety, his zeal, his unselfish and lovable character soon

gained for him a wide esteem and reputation amongst all classes and creeds. A good evidence of this was forthcoming during his last illness, the expenses of which were defrayed by a fund eagerly subscribed by his many friends through the active interest of a Church clergyman.

He was never jealous of the success or popularity of others, his one ambition being "to live and die striving for the Faith of the Gospel, for the conversion of souls, for the good of my friends, my neighbours and countrymen, and the whole world." There is little doubt that his zealous unremitting labours prematurely exhausted a constitution which was naturally delicate. A cough contracted in the winter of 1750 developed latent lung trouble, but it was only when utterly unable to continue his work that he consented, too late, to try a rest and change of air. A stay in Bristol to take the waters and eventually a voyage to Portugal were all in vain, and he died and was buried at Lisbon on October 26, 1751. Some lines composed by himself probably best sum up his character and career, which abundantly testify how strenuously he endeavoured to live up to his family motto of *Dum vivimus vivamus* :—

"Live, while you live"; the epicure would say,
 And seize the pleasure of the passing day,
 "Live while you live," the sacred Preacher cries,
 And give to God each moment as it flies.
 Lord, in my views let both united be;
 I live in pleasure, when I live to Thee.

C. SYDNEY CARTER.



CHURCH GOVERNMENT.¹

BY T. A. NEEDHAM, B.A., Member of the National Assembly of the Church of England.

IN approaching the consideration of the government of the Church, which professes a Revealed Religion given by God to man, the first question naturally is: Has there been any revelation of the constitution and mode of government of that Church, considered as a Society composed of human beings? The term "Society" raises in our minds the ideas of organization, rules, officers and other minor matters, in addition to the great and principal matter, the "Objects" for which the Society is formed. Now when I take the Gospels, I fail to find in them anything to indicate the formation of any organized Society at all, much less any Constitution or mode of government, but equally I do not find anything which excludes any Society or organization.

Man has been placed by the Creator on this earth, endowed with conscience and intellect, and with an instinct to live in community with his fellow-man, a social animal, but with no revealed rules according to which he must form himself into communities. He has been left to work out those rules for himself, and he has done it according to the circumstances in which he finds himself, and according also to the ideas he has inherited from his forefathers. Amongst these he has gradually grown. The physical characteristics of the land in which he dwells, its climate, its proximity to the sea, its proximity and means of access to the lands inhabited by other communities of his fellows, have all contributed to the formation of his political institutions, to the character of his government, whether monarchical, oligarchal, democratic, republican or anarchic, to his methods of legislation, to the administration of justice, to his economic conditions, and in short to all his concerns. In these respects we shall probably all find ourselves in general agreement that God has left man to work out his own salvation, that man has been so formed and constituted that he must of necessity and by his very nature form himself into societies, greater or smaller, and perhaps with a tendency to weld all these societies ultimately into one great society.

¹ A paper read at the Cheltenham Conference.

Now if there has not been any form of civil or secular government prescribed by God for man in respect of things temporal, it is not surprising that there has not been any form of religious or ecclesiastical government prescribed by our Lord for man in respect of things spiritual and eternal. And if no such form of religious government has been clearly prescribed to be observed by man at all times and in all places, we may conclude that man has been left to work out his own forms according to his necessities and particularly according to the genius he has inherited and certainly in such manner as to weld all into one great Society, one not only outwardly, but also inwardly and spiritually, and thereby lead the way to a political union of all mankind. The fact that we have clear revelation of the mind of God that man shall be one with Him, and of the means by which that union shall be brought about, namely, faith, and that in this and other revealed doctrine universally applicable there is one unvarying standard, assures us that one Society is the ultimate end.

But just as man gains his political and social wisdom by repeated attempts and failures, with no apparent finality, so, it may be, he must in like manner gain his ecclesiastical wisdom, and what he has learned in the former domain he may bring to his assistance in the latter, and just as one society or nation has found that somehow or other it is possessed of ideas and sentiments which render one form of political government more suitable to it, so another may find one form of ecclesiastical government more suited to it than another and better fitted to enable it to advance to union with the Creator.

This brings me to the thesis which I submit to the Conference, that for Church Government in England, which I understand is what we are here this evening to consider, it will be well for us to strive for a Constitutional Government similar to that of the Limited Monarchy under which we dwell, a government in which there is a clear separation of the Legislative, Judicial and Executive functions from one another, though as a matter of fact some individuals may take part in discharging two or all of those functions. The peculiar genius of the English people and those tribes most nearly akin to them has led them to retain the Legislative function in the hands of the people themselves when meeting in their various assemblies. The earliest records show the English

as meeting in their various "Motes," Town Mote, Ward-mote, Hundred Mote, Shire Mote, Witenagemote, with their various officers, King, Heretoga, Alderman or Earl, Shire-gerefa or Sheriff, Borough-reeve, Port-reeve and so forth. The Manorial system of a later day preserves the same form in substance, particularly in the Court Baron and Court Leet, the members of which were the freehold tenants, and which made all sorts of regulations in matters of food, drink, sanitation and good order, and adjudicated in the litigation conducted in the court. In our own day the setting up of Parish and District and County Councils, with their powers of making By-laws, i.e. town laws, for their own areas bears witness to the fact that this system is ingrained in our very nature. The limitations which have step by step been placed upon the Legislative, Judicial and Executive powers of the King have simply brought the holder of that office back to the position which his earliest-known predecessors held, namely, the embodied expression of the unity of the nation. That strong and praiseworthy bent of our race seems to me to find expression also in the Church of England Assembly (Powers) Act, 1919 (commonly called the Enabling Act), and in the Parochial Church Councils (Powers) Measure, 1921. If it be given free expression and fuller development, what will the resulting form of Church Government be?

We shall retain our Archbishops, Bishops and other officers as the Executive. We shall have our National Assembly of clergy and laity as the supreme legislative body, with Diocesan and Ruridecanal Conferences making by-laws and local regulations and our Church Courts as the Judicial Authorities. The Executive and Judicial Authorities as well in civil as in ecclesiastical matters must be conditioned to the Legislative Authority. That is so in the most primitive forms of civil society, even where the word of the chief makes the law, his executive and judicial actions are conditioned by the law which he himself and his predecessors have laid down, and even by those sentiments which he in common with his subjects holds, and from which even an autocrat cannot wholly escape. The Legislative Authority is therefore the basis of government, and according to the genius of the English people it must be representative of the whole people, in this instance, of course, the whole people who rank themselves as members of the Church. Legislation in its broadest sense includes minute directions to the

Executive Authority, and I so use it. The Legislative Authority gives general or particular and minute directions, the Executive Authority carries them out, but the latter authority is not precluded from everything else, it may still come to the Legislative Authority and ask for new directions and for directions to embark on new forms of activity.

Now for centuries we have not so acted in England in matters Ecclesiastical, if we have ever done so ; certainly we did not after the Norman Conquest until the time of the Reformation, and then only in a confused and partial manner. Perhaps in Anglo-Saxon days things may have been different, but with the Normans there came the Monarchical Idea more clearly defined, and it extended to ecclesiastical government in the person of the Bishop. But now nothing but the definition and statement " of the doctrine of the Church of England on any question of theology " is withheld from the National Assembly. (In passing I may point out that the exception of this power from the functions of the National Assembly does not vest the power in the Bench of Bishops, or the House of Bishops, or in any other body or person which does not already possess it, though many persons seem to have some confused idea or feeling that it does.)

The Assembly may legislate on the qualifications to be possessed by candidates for Holy Orders, the conditions on which Bishops may ordain those candidates, the qualifications to be possessed by clergy for the holding of Bishoprics, Deaneries, Benefices and other church preferments, the rights and duties of the holders of those offices, the conditions on which the tenure of those offices may be ended, the division or union of dioceses and other ecclesiastical areas, the discipline to which members of the Church are to be subject, the finances of the Church and the administration of its endowments, the powers and duties of inferior assemblies and a thousand and one other subjects.

In a system of this nature it will probably in time fall to the Archbishops to bring forward most new matters requiring legislation and to ask for changes in old matters which affect the whole Church or the whole of their respective Provinces, whilst the carrying into effect will be entrusted to them.

In matters affecting one Diocese only the Conference of that Diocese will be the normal Legislative Body, with the qualification

that the National Assembly will see to it that the proceedings of each Conference are limited to its own proper affairs and do not impinge upon the position and rights of the whole Church or another Diocese. For example, the alteration in the areas of Archdeaconries and Rural Deaneries, the union and sub-division of parishes, the raising and allocation of moneys in wealthy parishes for the assistance of poorer ones, the maintenance and provision of Day and Sunday Schools, the maintenance of clergy and lay agents, the establishment and maintenance of Training Colleges for Clergy and Teachers, are all matters which with varying qualifications or limitations in the exercise thereof may well be left to the Diocesan Conference. These alterations would mostly originate with the Bishop, and when approved by the Conference would be put into execution by him or under his direction.

In a less degree the Ruridecanal Conference would concern itself with, say, the pooling of funds raised in two or more parishes, so that the strong might help the weak, that the wealthier parts of the Deanery might take part in establishing and manning Mission Rooms or Churches in the poorer parts, that newly built districts might speedily be provided with Churches and Schools, that recommendations might be made to the Diocesan Conference and thence to the Assembly on all questions of administration in Church matters. Many of the scandals now existing in many parishes might also be removed by giving power to the Ruridecanal Conference to make complaint instead of leaving the duty, as at present, to the parishioners or parochial authority, who may be disinclined or afraid of moving.

The powers proposed to be entrusted to Parochial Church Councils are principally Legislative Functions within the definition of Legislation, which I have taken, but I do not propose to examine the proposals which have been already approved or the proposals which will be renewed in connexion with the patronage of livings, and will content myself with considering the question of the conduct of Divine Service.

In this matter the first and principal consideration which arises is as to the allocation of different parts of the service to the congregation and the minister, the second, and for present-day purposes the most pressing, is as to the powers of the minister over those parts which are allocated to him, and a third question is whether

the service shall be liturgical or not. We have decided that our services shall be liturgical, in which definite parts are rendered by the congregation, but the lead in them as well as the rendering of the remainder and major portion are allotted to the minister, with the consequence that the external character, at least, of every service is almost wholly what he chooses to make it. That position is not satisfactory to large numbers of the lay-folk, probably not to the majority of them, and they wish an alteration ; but the alteration is a very delicate matter, and the framing of any regulation or measure to effectuate any alteration is a matter of extraordinary difficulty. The delicacy and difficulty of the problem, however, are not as great in dealing with a liturgical service as would be the case with the other type. The wording of the prayers, canticles, psalms, versicles and responses remains constant, and the only legal variations which can be made are in cases which are provided for by the service book, and there seems to be little or no reason why a Church Council or Parochial Church Meeting should not be empowered to choose which of two alternatives should not be adopted, or at any rate why some regard should not be paid to their deliberately expressed preference, and why in case of continued difference between the clerical and lay authorities, it should not be determined by the superior authority of the Archdeacon or Bishop.

The hours at which Divine Service shall be held afford another instance where the laity ought to have an influential voice. I call to mind a case where an Incumbent appointed six o'clock in the evening as the ordinary hour for burials in the Churchyard of a suburban parish, for the unworthy purpose of exacting double fees for burials at the hours at which the sentiments and habits of the parishioners demanded they should bury their dead. We now have an increasing practice of substituting the Holy Communion under the name of the Holy Eucharist, or even the Mass for Morning Prayer, whilst that service is relegated to some hour at which the parishioners are unwilling to attend. At present the people are helpless in the matter, and have only the choice of abstention, which sadly too often is the choice they make, especially when the service is gabbled through at breakfast-time, with no choir present, no singing and no sermon, in short, with the absence of all the accompaniments to which the English people have been accustomed for centuries. On the other hand, many have come to appreciate

an early morning Administration of the Holy Communion, and many find it their only opportunity, but no power exists to compel the grant of that very reasonable facility, which so far as I know offends the conscience of no one. As a concession to some consciences, I for my part would be willing to except from any such power the right to require an afternoon or evening Communion, much as I value the latter.

The leading part in our ordinary services which is assigned to the minister and his right to the conduct of Divine Service, extends to the minutest detail, so that the whole external character of the services may become the manifestation of his own preferences to the utter disregard of those of the worshippers and would-be worshippers, however lawful those preferences may be, and however helpful they may find them to their spiritual life. If the people had had the right of an effective voice in fixing the character of the services in their Parish Churches, how much controversy and how much desertion of the Church for Nonconformity would have been prevented! The worship in Church is their worship, for which they are responsible to Almighty God, and if one lawful mode of conducting Divine Service appeals to them more than another, it seems difficult to justify the present arbitrary power of one man to deny it to them and to force upon them another which is distasteful and unprofitable. The unfettered power of the pulpit should surely suffice for teaching and persuasion.

Hymn-books and hymn singing are now universal and there are wide differences in the books and the hymns. The importance of the particular hymn-book and of the use of particular hymns cannot be gainsaid at the present day, but in case of conflict of wishes between the Incumbent and the people, the latter must yield, the matter is one of the conduct of Divine Service. Teaching strongly objectionable to the general sentiment of the people may be conveyed by the hymns, and particularly objectionable to parents who are concerned for their children, and it is not edifying that a parent should, after service, have to explain to children that the doctrine conveyed by a particular hymn which has been sung during its course is false. It is not only not edifying, but will very possibly be injurious, and the fact that there are such differences of belief may turn children away from any belief whatever. In any case the result will be to weaken the influence of the minister

on the minds of the children, and his object will be defeated. In a system of Constitutional Government where that particular question has been debated, the chances of all these various evils will be very much lessened, the position of the minister will be strengthened, the faith of the children will be confirmed.

Peculiar views may be held by some clergymen about the State Prayers and the occasional Prayers and Thanksgivings, and the people who desire them denied the opportunity of uniting in them. It seems a difficult thing to require of a clergyman that he should recite prayers to which he objects, but at all events he has voluntarily placed himself in his position, and if his flock desire them and are in position to demand them, reason says that the majority should have the decisive voice in requiring those particular parts of the Liturgy, to which he has declared his assent.

The question of music in the services is very often a burning one and leads to a sad lack of harmony. It is one of government and theoretically still belongs to the Incumbent, but practically it is now in the hands of the Church Council, if they will but imitate the example of their fathers in the House of Commons. The appointment of Organists, Choristers and Bell-ringers was proposed by the Parochial Church Councils (Powers) 1920, to be effected by the Council and minister in conjunction, but was struck out by the National Assembly, and is not in the Powers Measure, 1921. The power of the purse, and even the threat of the exercise of it, was sufficient to curb powerful Kings of England in times past, and to win for us the liberties and constitutional government we enjoy to-day, and to make the Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland the most liberal Republic in the world. That power in parochial concerns has been conferred by the Powers Measure, 1921, upon the Church Council, Sec. 4 (i) (ii) (a), and Sec. 6 (i) (iv), and by the withholding of moneys for the salaries of organists and the expenses of choirs, the people through their Councils will be able in most cases to secure the fulfilment of their proper wishes. These existing powers are as follows: By Section 4 there have been "transferred to the Council of every parish . . . all powers, duties and liabilities of the churchwardens of such parish relating to

"(a) The financial affairs of the Church, including the collection and administration of all moneys which may be raised for Church

purposes," which clearly includes all collections made for Church expenses.

By Section 6. "The Council of every parish have the following powers in addition to any powers conferred by the Constitution or otherwise by this Measure :—

"(i) Power to frame an annual budget of moneys required for the maintenance of the work of the Church in the parish . . . and to take such steps as they think necessary for the raising, collecting and allocating of such moneys," which gives the Council power to fix beforehand the purpose of the offertory or collection at every service in the year, and deprives the Incumbent of the power which he had previously, of announcing the object of any collection, and of appointing the persons to receive it for any purpose other than Churchwardens' Expenses or the Alms at Holy Communion and of administering it himself.

"(iv) Power, jointly with the Incumbent, to determine the objects to which all moneys to be given or collected in Church shall be allocated, subject to the directions contained in the Book of Common Prayer as to the disposal of money given at the offertory." The precise meaning and effect of sub-section (iv) may be doubtful, and may be that sub-section (i) is controlled thereby, and that the Church Council cannot of their own motion raise the moneys required for the maintenance of the work of the Church by collections in Church, or it may be that it only governs collections for other purposes, such as Missionary, Philanthropic, School and other such purposes. The precise meaning of the expression, "Power jointly with the Incumbent" is equally doubtful, and the difficulty is not lessened by the circumstance that the clause does not seem to take account of the fact that the Incumbent is not only Chairman of the Council, but also a member of it with a vote, but appears to contemplate for the moment that the Council and the Incumbent are two separate and independent bodies. It may be that the decision of a majority of the Council is the decision of the whole Council, even though the Incumbent voted in the minority, and that the Council has therefore jointly with the Incumbent determined the objects in question, or it may be that he can paralyse the decision of the majority without being able to exercise his former powers over collections in Church. The result appears to be that either the Council can override the Incumbent, or that a

deadlock will result. In either case the funds for musical purposes will not be forthcoming, and sub-section (i) will prevent moneys being raised by donation, if they are not provided for by the budget.

The extraordinary difficulty of dealing with the conduct of the services is illustrated by what happened in July in the National Assembly when Section 3 of the Further Powers Measure, 1921, was under consideration. As introduced it read as follows:—

“ Nothing in this measure or in the Parochial Church Councils (Powers) Measure, 1921, shall affect the rights, liabilities or duties of the Incumbent in respect of the Church or the Services or public worship therein, or of the churchyard, or of any property belonging to the benefice. Provided that the Incumbent shall from time to time consult with the Council concerning the services of the Church, and particularly concerning any important changes which he may propose to make in such services. And if, after such consultation, the Council shall be opposed to any such change, they shall have the right to make representations to the Bishop in respect thereof.”

As amended on Revision it reads: “ Nothing in this Measure or in the Parochial Church Councils (Powers) Measure, 1921, shall affect the rights, liabilities or duties of the Incumbent in respect of the Church, or the services or public worship therein, or of the churchyard or of any property belonging to the benefice, Provided that nothing in this Measure shall hinder the Council from making representations to the Bishop in respect to the services in Church, by exercising the power conferred upon the Council by sub-section (v) of Section 6 of the Parochial Church Councils (Powers) Measure, 1921,” a lame and impotent conclusion which will satisfy very few laymen. The expression “ important changes ” in the original draft probably accounted for the readiness with which many members of the Assembly accepted the amendment. The expression is too vague to use in a legal enactment by reason of the lack of any standard or gauge of “ importance ” or what is important, but perhaps the difficulty might have been met by substituting for “ any important changes ” the expression, “ any other than occasional changes ” in which case, the proposal would have read, “ The Incumbent shall from time to time consult with the Council concerning the services of the Church and particularly concerning any other than occasional changes,” and the test would have been one of time or frequency, which are much more susceptible of assessment by an outside authority.

T. A. NEEDHAM.

In all these various particulars of Government, I submit that the adoption of the Constitutional Principle, as we understand it, would make for the welfare of the whole Church, and not less for the Clergy than the Laity. The clergy would be giving up autocratic powers and would have to rely upon influence, character and the trust and respect of their people, and they would find that the position which depends upon such trust and respect is much to be preferred to that of the autocrat. Most if not all the evils which the clergy fear arise from the very fact that the people know and feel their present impotence, and when improper attacks are made upon the Incumbent the support of many of his sympathizers is withheld or weakened by the fear that some day that same autocratic power may be used in a less worthy cause. Men in other walks of life have to fight the battle of right against wrong, and to fight it from positions where they have no prerogative, no autocratic power, from which they may be removed by an adverse vote, but they do make the fight, they do win the victory, not by their own power, but by the support, advice and sympathy of the majority behind them, and by the inherent righteousness of their cause, and they find their positions secure. What can be more secure than the position of the Chairman of a Committee, Society or Company? If he does what is right, even though his action may be unpalatable to many, he is in the vast majority of cases so respected for his conduct that even his opponents resent any attempt to remove him or undermine his position, and if he is defeated in his aim, there is for most of the important questions another day on which, like him who runs away, he may fight again. Beyond this consideration, however, we Englishmen may look at another. Consider what has happened in the last four years in Europe. The King of England and the Kings of countries which have imitated our form of Constitutional Government remain, the autocrats have passed away, the influence of the King of England is greater to-day than ever before and greater than the power of any of the autocrats who have passed. Prophecy is dangerous, but I venture to prophesy that the position and power for good of an English clergyman under a constitutional Government of the Parish will surpass all that we and our fathers have ever seen.

T. A. NEEDHAM.

REVIEWS OF BOOKS.

A LONELY BISHOP.

LIFE OF BISHOP PERCIVAL. By William Temple, Bishop of Manchester. London: *Macmillan & Co., Ltd.* 18s.

Was Bishop Percival a great man? We lay down this *Life*—rather loosely held together—asking the question. There is something lacking in the biography, for in spite of the many letters published and the sympathetic treatment of certain phases of his activities we do not recognize the man as we thought we knew him. He has not the calm dignity with which he impressed us, he is without that quiet persistence which marked all his school work and now and then he does not seem to have been exactly fair to himself. He made Clifton. His work there is imperishable, for he created a new type of Public School. Yet he left it on account of the burden imposed on him as its virtual founder. “The strain was too great. He was scarcely ever alone; the masters turned to him for everything.” During his last three years at Clifton he had terrible nightmares and his wife was anxious about him. Was not the best course for him to take a long holiday and to allow the school to find itself and then come back and resume control? He had been regarded there as “one of the laws of nature,” and the best testimony to the magnitude of the work he did is the Clifton that flourished under Canon J. M. Wilson and preserves its character to this day.

He was appointed to the Presidency of Trinity College, Oxford. Robinson Ellis came to make him the offer of the post. Legends have grown up about his visit to Clifton. It is rumoured that he was nervous and seeking for alleviating circumstances. His host began by expressing surprise that he should have been selected. “Ah, my dear Percival,” said the Professor, “I do not wonder at your surprise, but you see we had such a very small field.” He had found Percival alone, and clutched at a straw. “You are unmarried, Mr. Percival?” “No,” was the reply. “I am married, but Mrs. Percival is upstairs to-day, as she is not well.” “Ah,” said the Professor hopefully, “then she *is* in poor health.”

As in Clifton so in Oxford he left a mark. His inauguration of the eight o'clock Sunday Evening Service in St. Mary's still lives as he said in 1908, “I have a singular interest in these, your Sunday evening gatherings in this place of manifold associations. Twenty-eight years ago or thereabouts, by the kindness of the Vicar of the University Church, I was permitted to start and personally manage these courses of Sunday evening sermons, inviting the preachers, and responsible for all arrangements, and sometimes I may myself have preached to the fathers of some among you.” Percival was always a preacher and of his sermons Bishop Robert-

son says, "Little was said of anything touching the ecclesiastical side of Christianity, dogmatic or organic, but immense stress was laid on all that went to the building up of life and character, setting us high and exacting aims and spartan severity in following them up. There was little to win or conciliate, but much to search, probe, pull up and stimulate character and will."

He left Oxford for Rugby and had to face a situation of the greatest difficulty. Morally and in every other respect the school had fallen on evil days. He had been rejected at a previous appointment and the man he followed had proved a failure. He grasped the nettle, expelled boys whose conduct was bad and with an insight almost uncanny, as at Clifton, he surrounded himself with the right type of masters. No man was ever a better judge of men fitted to teach the young. That impression is left on the mind of all who read this book. He had his eye on every department of School life, and his biographer tells how on one occasion he told the Head that he had overlooked a duty through reading the *Strand Magazine*. Here the cold smile came, but he signed the note, as he said, "Eh, you ought not to get so absorbed in that kind of stuff."

From Rugby he wrote his Appeal to the English Bishops advocating Welsh Disestablishment. He would have liked to be appointed Dean of Durham and when Lord Rosebery offered him the See of Hereford he hesitated. "If, therefore, your Lordship should recommend me for the office and Her Majesty is graciously pleased to approve of the recommendation, I shall accept it gratefully, and I will, by God's help, do my best to justify the confidence reposed in me." As in his school life, he was respected and feared and in the true sense loved in Hereford by those who knew him best. His kindnesses were endless and his money gifts to the poorer clergy were anonymous. He worked his Diocese faithfully. On two occasions his administration and policy attracted outside attention. He held a United Communion in the Cathedral which raised much controversy and was debated in Convocation. His own comment on the debate is as follows:—

"As you will have seen in to-day's papers, the hot water has boiled over, and Convocation has acted *more suo*. The Bishop of Winchester, whether of his own motion or not, I don't know, solemnly arraigned me, professing to do so in the name of the Church, so that I was obliged to say that he represented not the Church but the sacerdotal party in it. The Bishop of Winchester found he had rather a hard task to reconcile what he and his friends call their intense desire for Christian union with their refusal to do anything or countenance any effective step to bring it nearer."

The protest roused by his appointments in pursuance of a definite policy of Liberal Theologians to Canonries is fresh in public memory. He defended himself. "It seemed to me to be high time that this persistent exclusion of Liberal Churchmen from any due recognition should cease, or that some one at any rate should vindicate their claim and do something to re-establish the com-

prehensive and tolerant character of our National Church and to save it from becoming practically denationalized and sinking into a sect, and from inevitably losing vital influence over the educated manhood of a Protestant people."

Here we leave the story of the life of a man who as a boy "trudged to and from Appleby Grammar School with a blue linen bag of books over his shoulder, in his clogs, in the winter time." He was disappointed in being passed over for York as he wished to work in the North. But the life he lived was crowded and has left a mark upon the Church of England—not so deep as it might have been, but nevertheless influential, as we have seen, in his deliberate choice of what he believed to be right although unpopular, in the face of strong hostility.

WHAT DOES ANGLICANISM STAND FOR?

ANGLICANISM. By Herbert Hensley Henson, Bishop of Durham. London. *Macmillan & Co., Ltd.* 8s. 6d.

During September, 1920, the Bishop of Durham delivered a series of Lectures in Upsala on the Church of England. No more instructive lesson in the conflicting ideals of Anglicanism as expounded by leading Churchmen can be found than in the contemporaneous study of these lectures with those of Dr. Frere delivered in St. Petersburg. What is characteristic according to the Bishop is of secondary importance according to the Russian lecturer. An intelligent foreigner will find it hard to discover how both men can be considered faithful exponents of the Church of England. And Dr. Frere is by no means the English Churchman most removed from Dr. Henson.

We cannot criticize Dr. Henson's lectures, which are marked by his extraordinary power of lucid exposition. They deal in our opinion fairly with the conditions out of which the Church of England sprang and its doctrinal and liturgical character. He accepts the Reformation as a critical phase in the development of Christ's religion, and regards Anglicanism as properly continuous therefrom, a true expression in the twentieth century of the spiritual principles which emerged in the sixteenth, a version therefore of the Protestant religion, having its true affinity with the Reformed Churches. And he gives incontrovertible proofs of his convictions. He is much easier to denounce than to controvert and we believe we shall hear more denunciation than argument against his views.

His Preface calls for notice, as it deals with the National Assembly of the Church of England and the Enabling Act. He contrasts the Scottish Act with our Act. The former prepares the way for the union of other Churches with the Church of Scotland, whereas "the English Enabling Act was only concerned with the 'rights' of the Church of England, and had no reference to the non-established Churches, whose members were specifically for the first time excluded from membership in the National Church." He believes.

that the act will deepen the divisions between Anglicans and Nonconformists by "transforming the result of an unhappy history into the expression of a religious principle." He also holds that the cry of Catholic principle will be as valid against the decisions of the National Assembly as against the Parliament that created it.

Dr. Henson severely criticizes certain utterances of the Anglo-Catholic Congress and the book *Lambeth and Reunion* by the Three Bishops. He contends that the Anglo-Catholic movement cannot possibly provide a satisfactory alternative to the Anglicanism it is so busily engaged in destroying. "The Parish Churches, which become distasteful to the Protestant laity, are quietly abandoned. In parish after parish Anglo-Catholicism has the field to itself. In the event of disestablishment and disendowment, I think the Anglo-Catholic Movement will be discovered to have a very slight hold on the country."

Whatever we may think of the opinions of the Bishop on the National Church Assembly, it is fair to state that he has grounds for his contention. Already a Bishop who was largely responsible for its creation has told the Assembly not to trouble itself about what Parliament will do, but to go forward its own way. We have the Assembly, and it is for Churchmen to make it a power for good. It has not done what its promoters hoped. It could hardly realize their aspirations in so short a time, but it has already given proof that it possesses in its lay members a body of men and women who are prepared to act independently of clerical guidance. On its lay members its future will depend, and it is for them to make it not a focus of alienation from non-conformity and the religious life of the Nation, but the expression of the historical Church of England in its effort to face the problems of the new age. We wish that all its members would read the Bishop's Lectures and test their statements in the light of history.

CONSECRATION PRAYERS.

TWENTY-FIVE CONSECRATION PRAYERS. By Arthur Linton-S.P.C.K. 1s. 6d.

We shall soon be in the midst of the discussion of the proposals of the Committee of the National Church Assembly on Prayer Book Revision and students are recommended to procure and study carefully the Consecration Prayers contained in Mr. Linton's excellent volume. They will be surprised by the variations and after a detailed comparison they will be inclined to ask is there such a thing as a science of Liturgiology? Certainly variations within wide limits were permitted and the man is rash who says a valid Consecration Prayer must conform to one definite model.

Valuable as the Text is, we are inclined to think that his Introduction is more useful still. It contains within a very small space the best fruit of modern Scholarship on the Ancient Liturgies, and will come as a surprise to those who have not kept up their reading. He tells us that the Roman and Gallican uses agree in the variability,

according to the Calendar, of certain sections of the Mass and in the use of the words "*Qui pridie quam pateretur*" introducing the account of the Institution, as contrasted with the Eastern phrase, "In the night in which He was betrayed." He argues from this that the Roman use is a rearrangement of a primitive Western use, preserved in main outline in the Gallican use. He rejects the theory that the Gallican use was an Eastern use transplanted to the West. In discussing the Invocation he tells us that in its earliest form it was a prayer that that which had been offered might be spiritually efficacious to the communicants. "The primitive prayer was fundamentally concerned with gratitude and prayer to God, and the subsequent oblation of the elements in obedience to our Lord's command was the outward act of this Thanksgiving."

We believe that material exists for a much more thorough examination of the Mozarabic Rite than has yet been given it. A Spanish Jesuit in the eighteenth century carefully copied the old Gothic Books which had no Rubrics—the fruit of his industry is available to students in Madrid. Unfortunately the Gothic Manuscripts have disappeared from Toledo and we await the time when their present custodians—we cannot say owners—will give us a transcript of their contents. We heartily recommend Mr. Linton's volume to all who wish to have a grasp of the valid prayers of Consecration that have come down to us. By so doing they will find much that is now dogmatically stated not in accord with fact.

DATE OF THE PENTATEUCH.

MOSES AND THE MONUMENTS. Light from Archæology on Pentateuchal Times. The L.P. Stone Lectures, Princeton Theological Seminary, 1919. By Melvin Grove Kyle, D.D., LL.D. London: *Robert Scott*. 8s. net.

Dr. Kyle writes from a conservative standpoint. He is well known as an authority in Archæology, and in this volume he brings his knowledge to bear upon the problem of the criticism of the Pentateuch. His purpose is to show that the Pentateuch bears its own marks of origin. He identifies Pentateuchal times as Egyptian times and Mosaic times. He takes the witness of peculiar words, phrases, and narratives, the general literary characteristics, the contacts of the history of Israel, the significance of the Tabernacle and its furniture, the Eschatology, and the System of Sacrifices; and he finds as his conclusion that all these unite in a remarkable harmony with the time of the Exodus and the Wilderness, at which time he would therefore place the composition of the Pentateuch.

Incidentally, Dr. Kyle touches upon the question of the language in which the Pentateuch was written. He thinks that very much can be said for a Cuneiform original, and is himself inclined to think it a correct theory.

The vague Eschatology of the Pentateuch furnishes Dr. Kyle with another argument for referring the Pentateuch to Mosaic times. The doctrine of the resurrection and of the future life was

well known to the Egyptians ; yet it is passed over in silence in the Pentateuch. Why? Dr. Kyle suggests that "revelation utterly ignored these subjects until the Israelites should be taught higher and better spiritual conceptions than they already possessed." The gross materialism of the Egyptian idea prevented mention of the subject.

Enough has perhaps now been written to show the nature of Dr. Kyle's new book. It is written in a very readable, and even racy, style, with occasional "Americanisms," which appear strange to an English reader. At the end of the book are sixteen excellent plates, mostly borrowed from Maspero, Cobern, and Budge.

THE FOUR GOSPELS.

THE FOUR GOSPELS. The Literary History and their special characteristics. By the Rev. Maurice Jones, D.D. London : S.P.C.K. 6s. net.

This small book is the outcome of lectures given to a Church Tutorial Class and delivered also at a Training School for Clergy and Sunday School Teachers. The introductory lecture comments on the need for close examination of the Gospels in view of present-day concentration on the life and teaching of our Lord, and then deals with such topics as "Why and how the Gospels came into being," "The Synoptic Problem," etc. A lecture is then devoted to each of the Synoptic Gospels, discussing the author, date, and general characteristics of the particular Gospel, and two lectures of a similar nature are devoted to an examination of St. John's Gospel. The standpoint of the writer is inclined to the conservative side, he places before his readers the varying points of view on such matters as author or date of the Gospel, but his own conclusion is either a *via media* or adherence to the more traditional view. The book is written in a clear and easy style, and is well worth the consideration of those who desire an up-to-date introduction to the study of the Gospels. The book has one defect and that is the price, for six shillings seems an excessive price for a book of such dimensions. A cheaper paper edition would tend to bring the book more within the reach of those who would be glad to use it.

T. W. GILBERT.

THE MOORHOUSE LECTURES.

PRINCIPLES OF CHURCH ORGANIZATION, with Special Reference to the Church of England in Australia. By Philip A. Micklem, M.A., Rector of St. James', Sydney. London : S.P.C.K. 5s. 6d. net.

This book consists of the Moorhouse Lectures for 1920 and is a reasoned argument for dissolving the nexus which fetters the Church in Australia, and keeps it in subordination to the Church in England. Mr. Micklem first sketches the organization of the primitive Church, showing incidentally the influence of the State on Church organiza-

tion. He then devotes a chapter to the Eastern Church and notes the close relationship between membership of the Church and citizenship of the State, and follows this with a survey of the Church in the West in the Middle Ages, and illustrating the strong national spirit which showed itself in such countries as England and Bohemia. A chapter each is devoted to a sketch of the Expansion of the Church of England and to the organization of the Church in Australia, whilst in the last chapter the writer puts the case for removing the legal limitations on the freedom of action of the Church in Australia. The book is written in a clear and direct way, and if one might occasionally cavil at some of the statements as being only partial views—such as the view that the Reformation in England was merely a national revolt against a foreign Bishop—yet one can but admit the readableness of the book, and commend it to those who wish to understand the feelings of those who desire the Church in Australia to be free to develop her own individuality.

MAGAZINES.

The October issue of the *Journal of Theological Studies* (5s.) contains something to satisfy the wishes of all types of Students. The Lives of Saints and an Irish Manuscript of the *Transitus Mariæ* are discussed by the Dean of Wells and Dr. Seymour. Dr. J. M. Harden gives us a translation of the Anaphora of the Ethiopic Testament of our Lord and in so doing supplies an additional proof of the place he has won for himself amongst students of this neglected language. The Rev. J. M. Creed convicts the authors of *The Beginnings of Christianity* of a mistake in translating Josephus. Professor Burkitt is inclined to think that the Book of Ecclesiastes is a translation. "To say that life is Breath is almost tautology, but to say that life is a bubble is not very far from the thought of Ecclesiastes." The Book Reviews maintain their high standard for thoughtful accuracy and scholarship, and students of Dante will revel in Mr. W. H. V. Reade's delightful study of Dante with its pæan on the Romance of Theology. "Let theology, then, with many other sciences, take heart of grace and boldly advance to lay her wreath on the immortal poet's somewhat ignoble tomb."

The October *Church Quarterly Review* appears under its new Editorship and contains an article by their predecessor on "Hugh James Rose and the Oxford Movement." This is one of the most balanced discussions on the place he occupied among the leaders. Dr. Goudge writes a sane contribution on the Interpretation of the New Testament, which will well repay study, and Canon Lacey takes a more favourable view of Manning than has been customary. X. Y. Z. tells us many interesting facts concerning the Russian Church under the Bolsheviks, and Canon Nairne writes eloquently on Job. Few will leave unread Mr. Armstrong's charming In Memoriam on Dante. It is worthy of its author and his theme.