

f. d.

227.0826214

21517✓

15

BIBLICAL STUDIES

S. PAUL ON THE
MINISTRY OF WOMEN

BY

W. J. SPARROW SIMPSON, D.D.

LONDON:

SOCIETY FOR PROMOTING
CHRISTIAN KNOWLEDGE
NEW YORK: THE MACMILLAN CO.

1920

BY THE REV. CANON
W. J. SPARROW SIMPSON, D.D.

The Letters of St. Augustine. (Hand-
books of Christian Literature.) 10s. net.

Reconciliation between God and Man.
3s. net.

French Catholics in the Nineteenth
Century. (Studies in Church History.)
5s. net.

Christ's Perpetual Intercession. 4d. net.

Revision of the Prayer of Consecration.
4d. net.

Nonconformists in Anglican Pulpits.
4d. net.

S. Paul on the Ministry of Women.
6d. net.

The Ordination of St. Paul. 6d. net.

The Diocesan Synod. 1s. 3d. net.

LONDON: S. P. C. K.

S. PAUL ON THE MINISTRY OF WOMEN

IF the problem whether women may be constituted preachers to the mixed congregation is to be rightly decided, the decision must be based on Christian principles. These principles must be studied in Scripture, and especially in the teaching of S. Paul, because he is the chief exponent of this subject. Attention must be fixed on the two main passages in the First Epistle to the Corinthians, where the apostle regulates the demeanour of women in the assemblies of the Church. The two passages are 1 Cor. xi. 5 and 1 Cor. xiv. 33, and the verses following.

In the former place the apostle lays down the dogmatic principles that "the head of every man is Christ, and the head of the woman is the man" (verse 3). On the basis of this principle he rules that "every man praying or prophesying with his head covered dishonoureth his head. But every woman

praying or prophesying with her head unveiled dishonoureth her head."

The second passage occurs in the fourteenth chapter. Here S. Paul says:—

"Let the women keep silence in the churches: for it is not permitted unto them to speak; but let them be in subjection, as also saith the law. And if they would learn anything, let them ask their own husbands at home; for it is shameful for a woman to speak in the church."

These are the two passages. The question is, What is their interpretation?

I

We may place first what may be called *the feminist interpretation*, that is, the exposition which makes S. Paul an advocate of women preachers in public worship.

1. It is asserted that when S. Paul wrote in 1 Cor. xi., "every woman praying or prophesying with her head unveiled dishonoureth her head," he tacitly gave permission that women should preach to the general congregation. For "prophesying," it is said, means preaching and giving instruction. And the preaching which S. Paul contemplates

is evidently to take place in the public worship of the Christian Church.

And all that the apostle concerns himself to do about this preaching by women is to regulate its conditions. He only insists that the woman must be veiled. He cannot therefore have intended to forbid her to preach. For you do not regulate the conditions of doing something which you intend altogether to forbid. Consequently this regulation of the conditions under which women were to prophesy involves a tacit permission that they might preach. So far, then, from forbidding a woman to preach, the apostle is actually in favour of the Women's Movement.

2. But then there is the second passage to be dealt with. In 1 Cor. xiv. 34 the apostle says: "Let the women keep silence in the churches: for it is not permitted unto them to speak."

It is admitted that this appears at first sight very much like an absolute prohibition against women preaching. And the feminist expositors are divided as to the solution of this difficulty.

(1) Some assure us that this second passage is an *interpolation*. It is a prohibition which S. Paul never wrote. It has crept in

unawares. It has no apostolic authority. It is not genuine. If 1 Tim. ii. 12, "I permit not a woman to teach, nor to have dominion over a man," be quoted in support, the quotation is valueless, because the Pastoral Epistles are not genuine. Consequently we may ignore this second passage altogether.

(2) Others are not prepared to go as far as this. They are unable to dismiss the passage quite so easily. No, they say, it is not an interpolation. It is genuine. There is no doubt that the apostle wrote it. But the fact is that even the wisest of men are not always wise. It is a *contradiction*.

Either the idea of forbidding the practice had not occurred to him when he wrote the earlier passage, or he forgot what he had written, or he changed his mind in the course of writing the letter, and withdrew what must be called the tacit approval of the earlier passage, leaving it all the while unerasd, or he dictated his letter to his secretary and omitted to revise what he had written.

(3) Others, again, are not satisfied with this. It is not a contradiction. But in this second passage S. Paul has been *misunderstood*. What S. Paul forbids is not preaching, but talking, interrupting, chattering in church:

a failing to which Corinthian women are supposed to have been particularly addicted.

II

Now, there are obvious criticisms to be made on this feminist interpretation.

1. Consider this second passage a little more. "Let the women keep silence in the churches, for it is not permitted unto them to speak."

(1) Has S. Paul's intention been entirely *misunderstood*? Did he really refer to nothing more than interruptions and chattering? But this is contrary to the Biblical use of the word translated "speak." When the Epistle to the Hebrews declares that God, "having spoken in the prophets" hath "spoken unto us in His Son,"* it is evident that the meaning is instruct or teach. Or when our Lord declared: "the word that I spake, the same shall judge him in the last day,"† it is clear that the meaning is not mere talking but teaching. Then the Biblical use of the word "speak" does not allow of its restriction to superficial talk or chattering. Moreover,

* Heb. i. 1.

† S. John xii. 48.

talking in church is not a failing confined to women.

(2) Then as to the theory that the passage is an *interpolation*. It might seem enough to say that no MS. omits the passage. Moreover, it is not proved that the Pastoral Epistles are not genuine. In any case the words are part of the Canon of the New Testament. The Church must have thought that their contents expressed the apostolic belief.

(3) Then as to the opinion that this second passage is a *contradiction* to the first.

Before this opinion can be accepted there are at least two points which deserve to be considered. One is that S. Paul is admittedly one of the most acutely logical and penetrating minds that Christendom has ever known. It is therefore natural to pause before asserting his inconsistency. The other point is that the asserted contradiction depends on the interpretation which his former words receive. There is more than one interpretation of the passage about women prophesying. It is therefore reasonable to give the apostle the benefit of the doubt.

2. Let us therefore consider what these other explanations are of the passage about women praying and prophesying.

(1) Some say that it refers only to

instruction given by women in private or sectional gatherings, probably composed of women, and not to the public assemblies of the Church.

(2) Others, again, are persuaded that here S. Paul is referring to a case which he is convinced ought never to occur, and which he intends to condemn, after he has discussed the whole subject and reduced it to just principles, and which indeed he does actually condemn in the later passage in the fourteenth chapter.

Now it is clear that none of these interpretations of the passage concerning women prophesying contradicts the apparent meaning of the passage concerning women keeping silence. For whether the former passage refers to giving instruction only in sectional gatherings of women, or to a condition of things which, in S. Paul's opinion, ought never to occur; in either case it is perfectly consistent with a prohibition against women preaching in the mixed assemblies of the Church. No contradiction between the two passages need exist.

It should further be remarked that the feminist explanation of S. Paul's words sets to work in a very questionable way. What it does is this. It first takes the passage about women prophesying as being obvious and

clear. Having assumed that there can be no doubt about the meaning, it then proceeds to bring into harmony with it the passage about women keeping silence. But this method offends against a very important principle of interpretation. The principle is that passages which are obscure should be explained by passages which are plain. Now, considering that the passage about women keeping silence in the churches is clear and not easily mistaken (as the general concurrence of the vast majority of expositors shows), whereas the passage about women prophesying is much more uncertain and disputed; to interpret the former by the aid of the latter is to explain the obvious by means of the obscure.

III

Setting, then, this interpretation aside, we come to what may on the whole be fairly called *the traditional interpretation*.

First, with regard to *the earlier passages* in 1 Cor. xi., let us agree that prophesying is the same thing as preaching.

And further, let us agree that the passage refers to public instruction of the mixed

congregation by women; since it is not explicitly restricted to sectional meetings. Then certainly S. Paul does not condemn this practice here. But it does not follow that he tacitly approves. For it may well be true that the case is one which the apostle considers ought not to happen at all, but that he withholds a condemnation of it, because he prefers first to discuss the matter thoroughly, and to state the fundamental principles upon which his decision is based, thereby to put his readers in possession of his reasons, and to bring them to a frame of mind more favourable to securing their obedience. This temporary withholding of a condemnation may be the diplomatic procedure of a great mind which is well acquainted with the qualities of ordinary human nature, and sees instinctively that his readers must be led and cannot be driven.

That this sort of procedure is one of S. Paul's own methods is unquestionable. It has been long ago pointed out by commentators of the first rank that S. Paul does precisely this very thing elsewhere in this same Epistle.

Consider then what the situation is against which S. Paul contends.

It is that the women, or some of them, in the Church at Corinth, were overwhelmed by

a flood of new and most impressive Christian ideas concerning the spiritual equality of the sexes. They are all one in Christ. There is neither male nor female. These splendid illuminating ideas had taken such strong possession of their imaginations that they rushed to the conclusion that spiritual equality involved identity of function. They attempted, therefore, to carry this into effect in the general assemblies of the Church. They appear (1) to have laid aside their veils which formed a distinctive symbol of their womanhood; (2) and to have claimed identity of function with the men in prayer and prophesy. That was the situation.

1. By way of meeting this situation and regulating it, S. Paul maintains that the natural, that is the Providential, constitution of man and woman, the order of the creation, the Creator's will, involved the principle that the man was the head of the woman. The spiritual equality of the sexes revealed in Christ has another aspect of the truth, but it did not cancel the law divinely imposed at the creation. There is in Christianity as well as in Nature a principle of subordination.

2. This principle of subordination must according to S. Paul be maintained when men and women assemble in Christian worship.

He insists that in these assemblies a woman must be veiled: the veil being a recognised symbol of her subordination. When the apostle asks, "Is it seemly that a woman pray unto God unveiled?" he clearly does not refer to her private prayers nor to family devotions in the home. What he is concerned to regulate is the relative position of men and women when taking part together in the public worship of the Church.

3. Moreover, it is the relationship of men and women all throughout the mixed worship which S. Paul is contemplating. He does not confine his attention to official acts. When he speaks of a woman "praying or prophesying" he certainly does not mean that she must put on a veil when she leads the prayers or gives an address, but need be veiled no longer when her distinctive task is completed. It is obvious that S. Paul intends a woman to be veiled during the entire course of the common public prayer. She is clearly not to appear at all in the general worship without it. Thus S. Paul is not only concerned with a woman preaching or prophesying, but also with a woman's presence in the general congregation. He makes regulations which are designed to be observed by women during the entire course of the public devotion.

4. This is the reason why S. Paul cannot at this point content himself with forbidding a woman to preach: Because he is concerned with a far larger and more comprehensive subject; namely, the general attitude of a woman, under all circumstances whatever, while sharing the general worship of the Church with men. If S. Paul had at this point prohibited a woman from prophesying, he would not have achieved his purpose; his purpose being to regulate her entire behaviour in public devotion. S. Paul therefore concentrates attention on the veil and the principle of subordination.

5. It seems to follow that the words "praying or prophesying" must in this context be understood in a wider meaning than elsewhere. "Praying" must not be restricted to official leadership in prayer. It must include uniting in the general devotions of the congregation. And, in the same way, "prophesying" must include all utterance of praise.

The meaning of *the second passage* (I Cor. xiv. 34) seems quite plain.

After regulating at considerable length the whole procedure with regard to prophesying and emotional utterance and the interpretation of it, during which discussion S. Paul

speaks constantly of prophets but significantly makes no reference to prophetesses, the apostle adds a proviso to the effect that the whole of these regulations apply to the men, but do not include the women.

It should be further noticed that S. Paul bases this prohibition on four foundations:—

On Scripture (verse 34); on reason (verse 35); on the universal practice of all churches, which (verses 33 and 36) involves the corresponding duty of the local community to comply with the general rule; and on his own apostolic authority (verses 37–38).

That S. Paul forbids a woman to preach in the mixed assemblies of the Church is confirmed by *the History of Interpretation*. It is the traditional construction which has been placed upon his teaching. This holds true not only of ancient and mediæval exposition, but also of the great majority among *modern* interpreters. It would be no easy thing to say how many commentaries and criticisms have been written upon these two passages during the last half century. But an investigation of some forty writers yields the following results. About thirty support the traditional view. Some ten adopt the feminist view. Nearly all of these date since 1900. They are the product of the last

nineteen years. That is precisely the period during which the feminist claim to preacher-ship and priesthood has developed. Now, nineteen years is a very short period in the history of interpretation. It is natural to suggest a caution before committing ourselves to a revolutionary change of front with regard to the meaning of S. Paul on so important a matter.

Most Churchmen are aware of the existence of the very valuable Report on the Ministry of Women recently presented to the Archbishop of Canterbury. It is a vast and elaborate treatise of some 300 pages. But it is chiefly concerned with the historic evidence subsequent to New Testament times. Of the sixteen appendices only two are concerned with New Testament interpretation. It must be confessed that this is meagre. And considering that one of these discussions on the Biblical evidence says that "when S. Paul orders that women should keep silence in the churches, it is unnatural to suppose that he is withdrawing a permission so recently acknowledged," while the other remarks that "one does not like in understanding so great a mind as that of S. Paul, to be over-critical as to consistency," it is obvious that no presentation of the traditional exposition of S. Paul

has been included in this voluminous report. Consequently the impression given is one-sided. The whole of the weight of influence is thrown in the feminist direction; very much as if there were no other interpretation which held the field, and was at least deserving of statement and discussion. This one-sidedness only illustrates the popularity of the feminist view. But it is, to say the least, unfortunate.

It becomes, therefore, all the more necessary that attention should be called to some of the abler recent exponents of the traditional view.

The drift of the passage about women keeping silence is given by Bishop Robertson and Dr. Plummer in the following terms:—

"When I say that all in turn may preach, I do not include your wives. They must keep silent in the assembly. Utterance, whether in a tongue or in preaching, is not allowed to them. . . . Perhaps you think that you have the right to do as you please in such matters. What? Are you the Mother-Church or the only Church, that you make such claims?"

The exposition given by Bachmann in Zahn's Commentary is: "As in all the Churches of the Saints (it is the rule) that the women (that is in Corinth also) keep

silence in the assemblies of the Church. For it is not permitted unto them (that is, in accordance with the providentially ordered nature of things) to speak, (whether that speaking be prophetic or ecstatic or of any other kind)."

It is then quite plain that very weighty recent expositors understand S. Paul as he has been traditionally understood.

To sum up, then, the apostle's teaching on this subject. S. Paul's ruling principle is the principle of subordination. This principle rules out as not permissible the placing of women in the Church in the position of instructors *to the men*. They may not preach to the general congregation because such action would contradict the providential constitution of Nature which Christianity does not change. The order of the human creation is not reversed by the order of grace.

Philip's four daughters who prophesied cannot reasonably be introduced to neutralise the apostle's principles. Everything depends upon the conditions under which they prophesied. And that is exactly what we do not know.

But it is perfectly in keeping with apostolic principles that a woman should pray and preach *among women* in the Church.

For the principle of subordination only forbids her to give public instruction to men, or to mixed assemblies of men and women in the general worship of the Church. This principle is not violated if a woman leads the prayer of women, or gives instruction to women.

And of course it will be remembered that "in church" does not mean the consecrated building. That had no existence in the time of S. Paul. It means the sacred assembly of the general Christian congregation, in whatever place they were collected.

Further, S. Paul's prohibition of women as official preachers for the mixed congregation does not at all prevent them from exerting most invaluable unofficial influence. There is the case of Apollos, the learned Alexandrian, who taught only a preparatory message until Priscilla and Aquila "heard him," and "expounded unto him the way of God more carefully." *

It is possible, of course, although we do not know it, that Priscilla did much more in instructing Apollos than her husband did. But her instructions did not in the least disobey S. Paul's prohibition, for she had no official authority and simply held informal

* Acts xviii. 26.

conversation. Thus while Apollos, the distinguished preacher, owed his Christian knowledge largely to a woman, he held the official place while she kept silence in the general assembly; which is exactly the Pauline principle.

IV

So far then in exposition of the Apostle's meaning. The further question now confronts us: *What is the value of S. Paul's teaching on the subject for modern life?*

Much has of late been written in order to set S. Paul's teaching on women's ministry aside. It has been contended, among other things, that his arguments are not convincing; that his authority is not decisive; that his outlook was restricted; that his regulations were of a temporary nature. It is further asserted that he once caught a glimpse of a nobler view, and that in his religious ideas he differs from Jesus Christ.

Now, at any rate, all these objections prove conclusively that the objectors are convinced that S. Paul does not approve what they desire. If the feminist interpretation were correct these objections would be superfluous. They assume that the traditional

explanation of the Apostle substantially represents what he means.

Then further, contemplating these objections as a whole, it seems self-evident that if you once admit the right of the individual to set aside S. Paul's teaching on one important subject upon such grounds as these, it is impossible to prevent the application of this destructive method to many other departments of the apostle's teaching as well.

1. As to the objection that S. Paul once caught a glimpse of a higher principle when he wrote the memorable passage, "there can be neither Jew nor Greek, there can be neither bond nor free, there can be no male and female: for ye are all one man in Christ Jesus,"* this passage is appealed to as overriding all inferior notions of disqualification for office in the Church on the ground of sex.

But this interpretation of the passage misconceives its purpose. What S. Paul is here concerned to proclaim is the equal value of every member of the Church in virtue of incorporation with the Body of Christ. Neither racial nor social nor physical differences can affect the share of each individual soul in the privileges of Redemption.

* Galat. iii. 28.

But S. Paul is not in the least concerned with the question of ecclesiastical functions or official ministries. The Church in which he was ministering contained within it ministerial distinctions. He himself was a conspicuous illustration of the principle of official functions assigned to one and denied to others.

The spiritual equality of all Christians is one subject; the diversity of ecclesiastical functions is another. S. Paul never confused them; nor must we.

2. Some recent writers assure us that there is a marked contrast on this subject between the teaching of S. Paul and the teaching of our Lord. Their spirit, we are told, is different. Christ directs in broad generalities; S. Paul in particulars and hard details. Christ is more gracious and comprehensive; S. Paul is a Rabbi more or less disguised. S. Paul's authority for us, say some, is not decisive. The disciple must give way before his Master. The ultimate authority is not S. Paul but Christ.

Now certainly we shall not dispute that the supreme authority for Christians is Christ. But neither shall we forget that all we know about Him comes through His disciples' minds. They are His exponents. They are His

authorised exponents, for He selected them. And if He is what the Church believes Him to be, this applies to S. Paul as well as to the Twelve. For S. Paul's conversion was not only a remarkable coincidence; it was a providential determination. He was just as truly Christ's selection as were the other apostles. And if you think of the influence which he has exerted over Christendom it would be serious to arrive at any other conclusion.

Now, Christ our Lord was acutely conscious of His apostles' limitations. The Gospels are full of it. "How is it that ye do not understand?"

Nevertheless, Christ combined that consciousness of their limitations with a perfectly serene assurance that they will not seriously misrepresent Him. He wrote nothing. He left the presentation of Himself to the world entirely in their hands. What was the secret of this confidence?

It is revealed in the words: "I have many things to say unto you but ye cannot bear them now. Howbeit, when He the Spirit of Truth is come, He will guide you into all the Truth." That is the reason why they will not misrepresent Him.

And that certifies them as His authorised exponents.

Moreover, the outstanding fact remains that Christ never set a woman among the number of His twelve apostles. Also that His mother's position in the Church was one of reserve and reticence and not of official publicity. She was no preacher to the general congregation. She did not preside among the faithful. She neither celebrated the Eucharist nor gave instructions to the mixed assembly.

3. The question has been raised of late how far S. Paul's teaching is applicable to the present time. Grant that his regulations on the Ministry of Women in Church were suitable for and appropriate to his contemporaries, does it follow that they are still appropriate nineteen centuries afterwards? Modern conditions are utterly different from the old. The place which women occupy in the social order is entirely changed. New regulations are required by new conditions. And S. Paul himself, were he now alive, would probably be the first to revise his ancient and now obsolete prohibitions.

What are we to say to this? We must say that a Scriptural direction may certainly grow obsolete. Certain disciplinary injunctions contained in the New Testament undoubtedly refer to temporary conditions.

The order to abstain from things sacrificed to idols, and from blood and from things strangled is a case in point.* But it is difficult to see how this can be the case with S. Paul's injunction: "let your women keep silence in the churches." For S. Paul, in giving this injunction, goes down to fundamental principles. He bases the injunction on the principle of subordination. And this principle is for him one of the essential Christian realities. It is founded in the constitution of human nature. There is for men and women, according to S. Paul, identity of spiritual privilege but diversity of religious function. Their office in religion is not the same. Since therefore S. Paul bases his injunction about the work of women in the churches on fundamental principles, it seems impossible to take his decision as a temporary regulation.

V

But, after all, besides the interpretation placed upon S. Paul by individual expositors, there is the interpretation placed upon his teaching by the practice of the Church.

* Acts xv. 29.

There is no real question what that practice has been with regard to the Ministry of Women. No one really doubts that the Church has never admitted women as preachers to the mixed congregation. Indeed this is precisely the complaint made against it. Only last year inquiries were made, for the purposes of a committee on the subject, what the prevalent opinions were in other Ancient Communion. Replies were received from Roman, Russian, and Greek ecclesiastics. They all agreed that a woman cannot be permitted to preach before the general congregation. The concurrence of the ancient churches of the East and West makes the question inevitable whether the English Church would be well advised to diverge from an interpretation of S. Paul in which the rest of the Ancient Communion agree.

In the Report of the Joint Committee of Convocation presented to the Bishops of the Province of Canterbury, in 1919, there is an emphatic repudiation of the idea that women could be ordained to the office of priesthood. That repudiation is based on the ground that such ordination would be "wholly contrary to the immemorial and consistent custom of the Catholic Church."

The refusal of priesthood to women could

hardly be expressed in stronger terms. But nevertheless the report goes on to recommend that women should be preachers to the general congregation. Now this recommendation is not consistent with the reason for which priesthood is refused them. For it seems historically certain that it is just as contrary to the immemorial and consistent custom of the Catholic Church for a woman to preach to the general congregation, as it is for a woman to be a priest. Tradition no more supports the one than it does the other.

Those who, on the ground of tradition, deny that women may be priests and yet recommend that women may be preachers, are relying upon the custom of the Catholic Church in one instance and rejecting it in another. But if the appeal to the tradition and custom of Christendom has decisiveness in the one case, it must be decisive in the other also. To accept it in one case and reject it in another is virtually to undermine its authority for the case which is accepted. For this selectiveness makes private judgment the final arbitrator about the value of universal traditions.

I feel sure that this criticism is exactly what advocates of the women's claims to the priesthood will make. They will say, You

have destroyed the basis of your own objection to conceding us the priesthood; since you refuse it on the ground of tradition, and yet, in the face of that same tradition, you allow us to be preachers. I do not think that such criticism would be easy to refute.

Indeed it seems quite clear that this Report to the Bishops of the Southern Province has weakened its own refusal of priesthood to women still more, when it goes on in a later passage to observe that "to look to the Past alone for guidance, and tenaciously to cling to mere precedent is incompatible with belief in the present guidance of the Spirit of God."

For on what ground is this refusal of the priesthood to women based, if not on contemplation of the Past and clinging to precedent? Advocates of the women's claims to priesthood will not unreasonably inquire whether if the evidence of custom and tradition may be set aside in favour of their preaching, in order to adapt the Church to modern changed conditions, may not the evidence of the same custom and tradition be also set aside in favour of their becoming priests?

I feel sure that the simultaneous acceptance and rejection of the principle of tradition is

open to and will receive exceedingly damaging criticism. I do not see how it can be consistent to take this double line. Either accept tradition or reject tradition. But you cannot reject it in one case without compromising your acceptance of it in the other.

I desire most earnestly to suggest a caution in drawing the contrast, which is now so popular, between *the guidance of the Past* and *the guidance of the Present*. The guidance of the Past is spoken of as mere precedent. The guidance of the Present is called the guidance of the Spirit. This is constantly implied when it is not actually stated. It is constantly assumed that somehow or other the guidance of the Present can be relied upon independently of, or in contradiction to, the Past. Now this whole assumption, widely prevalent no doubt, is, I submit, seriously misleading, and takes for granted the very issue which it proposes to determine.

(1) The guidance of the Past is *not* mere precedent. It is the guidance of the Spirit. And it is the guidance of the Spirit over a very considerable area both of space and time. It is extended universally over Christendom for a duration of nineteen centuries. It is in fact the whole process of the historic evolution of Christianity until the present day.

That is a guidance which, when practically unanimous, is, I submit, profoundly impressive.

(2) On the other side there is the guidance of the Present. There also is unquestionably the guidance of the Spirit. But it is the guidance of the self-same Spirit. And we cannot be intended not to recognise an equal authority at least in the guidance of the Spirit in the Past. For it is a guidance of nineteen centuries as compared with the guidance of nineteen years. Moreover, we are in the rush of a great novel movement whose popularity is large, but whose limits and whose principles are anything but clear. It is easy to be carried away in the rush of its popularity. It is difficult to resist. We have to distinguish popularity from the guidance of the Spirit, and the methods permissible for the world from the methods permissible for the Church. We are to adapt the Church's life to new conditions, but not to allow the ancient principles to be swept away.

Those who maintain the traditional interpretation of S. Paul are sometimes thought to deprecate women preaching before the mixed congregation as being what is popularly described as the thin end of the wedge, and

calculated to encourage women to claim the priesthood also. But this is a complete misunderstanding. What the advocates of the traditional interpretation deprecate is the treatment of the subject on the basis of mere expediency. The Church must face the problem of women's ministry as a whole. So far as Scriptural prohibitions are concerned, it is the woman preacher who is distinctly forbidden: the woman bishop or the woman priest is not even contemplated. And those who recommend that women should preach to the general congregation, while disallowing any claim of women to be ordained to the priesthood, must give their reasons for this restriction of the priestly ministry to men. If the reason which they give is the practice of the Church, it is a reason which also applies to the preaching office for women. And if this practice of the Church is founded upon principle in the one case, is it not also in the other? The fact is that either you must maintain that the spiritual equality of men and women involves identity of religious functions for the sexes, or else you must maintain diversity of functions. If you maintain the former, then women may be priests as well as preachers; if the latter, then you virtually accept the principle of S. Paul.

30 THE MINISTRY OF WOMEN

And you must give a reason why there should be this diversity. And what reason can you find except the argument of S. Paul, that the principle of subordination is inherent in the providential constitution of human nature and also in the order of grace ?

THE END

Study Outlines

ON

Women and the Ministry.

1st week.

Preliminary meeting ; arrangement as to book or books to be studied ; allotment of questions, &c.

2nd week. NEW TESTAMENT.

1. Whether the foundation of the Ministry by our Lord was of such a character as to exclude women from rule in the Church ?
e.g., could the place filled by Matthias have been conceivably filled by a woman ? if not, why not ?
2. What was the exact position taken up by St. Paul ? and what did it rest on ?
3. What ministries are recorded in the New Testament as having been actually filled by women ?

3rd week. EARLY CHRISTIAN CENTURIES.

1. What were "deaconesses," "widows," "virgins," "prophetesses"? Were any of them at any time an order of the Ministry in the same sense as bishops, presbyters, or deacons?

2. Is there any truth in the view that the ministry of women in the early Church, so far as it was formal and official, was a "zenana ministry"?

3. What conclusions are to be drawn from the Montanist movement and its treatment by the Church?

4th week. MEDIEVAL TIMES.

1. What was the nature of the rule exercised by women in religious houses? How far was its basis feudal?

2. Estimate the opportunities of unofficial ministry afforded to women in the mediæval church, illustrated, *e.g.*, by the life of St. Catherine of Siena? Why was there no demand for an official ministry?

3. How does the growth of religious orders for women bear on this subject and what was the effect of the dissolution of religious houses at the Reformation?

5th week. AUTHORITY.

1. The exclusion of women from the official ministry has been largely based (*e.g.*, by St. Thomas) on the authority of Scripture. What is the authority of Scripture?

2. And what is the authority, in such a matter, of the practice of the undivided church?

3. Is the question one of Church Discipline only, or are doctrinal issues involved?

6th week. PRESENT DAY.

1. Estimate the importance in this matter of changed social conditions.

2. Is it reasonable to urge that the needs of the day can be adequately met by the services of women in new orders of ministry, whether formal or informal?

3. Has the Church of England the right to act in this matter independently of the rest of the Church Catholic? If so, what conditions would make the exercise of such a right opportune?

The following books are suggested :—

- Women in the Apostolic Church*, by T. Allworthy.
- Woman and the Church*, by B. H. Streeter and E. Picton-Turberville.
- Woman : her Position and Influence in Ancient Greece and Rome and among the Early Christians*, by Donaldson.
- The Church in the Roman Empire before A.D. 170*, by W. M. Ramsay.
- St. Paul the Traveller and the Roman Citizen*, by W. M. Ramsay.
- Roman Society from Nero to Marcus Aurelius*, by Samuel Dill.
- The Ministry of Deaconesses*, by Cecilia Robinson.
- The Early History of the Church and the Ministry*, edited by H. B. Swete.
- Priesthood and Sacrifice : the Report of a Conference*, edited by W. Sanday.
- The Body of Christ*, by C. Gore.
- The Church and the Ministry*, by C. Gore.
- Ministerial Priesthood*, by R. C. Moberley.
- Pamphlets.
- The Ancient Office of Deaconess*, by E. A. Gilchrist.
- Women and the Church of England*, by A. Maude Royden.

261.8344

21519✓

(17)

(12)

A LECTURE GIVEN FOR THE CROYDON
BRANCH OF THE WOMEN'S SOCIAL AND
POLITICAL UNION, JANUARY, 1912, BY
MARGARET ELEANOR THOMPSON.

ADAM AND EVE.

For a few minutes this afternoon I am going to transport you to the Garden of Eden. That sounds, perhaps, more delightful than in reality it will be. I cannot promise you happiness there—no, I am afraid we shall come across unpleasing things, but perhaps before we part we may catch glimpses of a far more beautiful Garden of Eden, with far finer inhabitants than any that have existed in the past. The phrase “the Garden of Eden” brings to one’s mind the sense of something delightful lost, but have you noticed how little affection or regret any one seems to feel towards our so-called first parents, Adam and Eve? In fact, when Eve, the woman, is mentioned, one has a feeling, half of resentment, half of shame.

Our great poet, Milton, whose poem “Paradise Lost” is the foundation of our lecture this afternoon, tries quite reverently to give a full and perfect description of the creation and the fall of man—with ideas taken partly from the Bible, partly from other writings, largely from his own imagination. He tells how man came to be created and how he fell. I think it is significant and almost amusing that in his first fine opening lines of “Paradise

Lost" Milton says his task is to justify the ways of God to man. Our idea is that the ways of God ought to require no justifying, but as we read the poem we see that indeed they do need it, and Milton does not succeed in his task, either in the matter of theology, or in the matter of the creation and fall of man.

I am not going to take the theological part of the poem at all, and I hope you will understand that when I mention God Almighty I do not mean the God we all now worship—I mean only Milton's God. With this proviso I can speak freely.

I shall dwell solely on the part that deals with the man and the woman.

When Satan, after his expulsion from heaven, has made his long and perilous journey through chaos to the newly-created earth, and has arrived at the Garden of Eden, he watches with interest all the new and beautiful things there, the various plants and trees, the birds, the fishes, the four-footed animals; but what rivets his attention most are the two beings that represent the highest created things on the earth, the man and the woman. Hear how finely the passage in the poem begins, how it gets less fine towards the middle, how wretchedly it ends:—

“Two of far nobler shape, erect and tall,
Godlike erect, with native honour clad
In native majesty, seemed lords of all
And worthy seemed: for in their looks divine

The image of their glorious Maker shone,
Truth, wisdom, sanctitude severe and pure,
though both

Not equal, as their sex not equal seemed;
For contemplation he, and valour formed,
For softness she and sweet attractive grace.”

Then comes one of the wickedest lines in all poetry:—

“He for God only, she for God in him.”

Then he goes on:—

“His fair large front and eye sublime declared
Absolute rule; and hyacinthine locks
Round from his parted forelock manly hung
Clustering, but not beneath his shoulders broad:
She as a veil down to the slender waist
Her unadorned golden tresses wore
Dishevelled, but in wanton ringlets waved
As the vine curls her tendrils, which implied
Subjection, but required with gentle sway
And by her yielded, by him best received,
Yielded with coy submission, modest pride,
And sweet, reluctant, amorous delay.”

Do not these last lines give us the same sickening feeling we experience when we read some of the writings of the Anti-Suffragists?

Let us now consider the actual creation. Later in the poem Adam tells the story of his waking to life and of the creation of Eve to his angel visitor, Raphael. I shall give it in my own words:—

Adam and Eve are not together at the beginning. (It is significant that a man of Milton's type of mind should take the story of the creation from the second chapter of Genesis, instead of from the different and more dignified account in the first chapter.) Adam is alone in the garden. All the living things are subject to him. He appears to have all he wants, yet something is lacking. In an interview with his Maker (for in those days God appeared in the garden and talked with him) Adam tells how something is wanting to make his happiness complete. The animals, he has noticed, all have companions, have mates. But he cannot converse with the animals; they are too far below him; he cannot converse with the angels, they are too far above him. The Almighty is not displeased, says He knows what he wants, and sends him into a deep sleep. A woman is formed from the rib taken out of Adam's side, while he sleeps.

When Adam wakes he sees the beautiful form of Eve near him. She runs away, he pursues her; after a time she turns, and they become at once very friendly together. These are my own words. Milton's are much finer, but the ideas expressed do not seem worthy to me of the first meeting of man and woman, so I do not repeat the lines.

Eve also tells to Adam the story of her creation—or rather of her waking to consciousness after her creation. She sees the image of herself in a lake, and is delighted with it, but presently she sees

Adam. She thinks him, although very fine-looking, not so fair and winning as the watery image of herself. Just at the first, you see, there appears one little bit of superiority in the female over the male, *i.e.*, in physical outside beauty; but note this, Eve ends up her account of her first meeting with Adam in these words:—

“With that thy gentle hand
Seized mine: I yielded; and from that time see
How beauty is excelled by manly grace
And wisdom which alone is truly fair.”

It turns out, then, that what seemed like a little bit of superiority is not superiority at all.

Adam, too, after describing to Raphael, in rapturous terms, his delight in seeing fair Eve, and the transports into which her presence puts him, gives utterance to these words:—

“For well I understand in the prime end
Of nature her the inferior, in the mind
And inward faculties which most excel.”

So Milton, to his own satisfaction, makes the woman know she is inferior to the man; makes the man know he is superior to the woman.

In doing so, is he justifying the ways of God to men? Quite the reverse. These are not the ways of God at all. From the inferiority of the woman to the man comes more than half the trouble in the world, and more than half the sin.

Now let us see how the idea of the woman's being created to please the man works out in the poem. In the early innocent days Adam and Eve converse together about the garden, themselves, God, and the angels. Hear how Eve addresses Adam. When Adam has suggested one evening that it is time to retire to rest, Eve answers:—

“ My author and disposer, what thou bidd'st
Unargued I obey. So God ordains
God is thy law, thou mine; to know no more
Is woman's happiest knowledge and her praise.”

Adam often addresses her “ Daughter of God and man.” I suppose he is son of God only. Another time she is “ Heaven's last best gift.” Again, when Adam suggests they should sing a hymn of praise to the Creator, Eve answers:—

“ O thou, for whom
And from whom I was formed, flesh of thy flesh
And without whom am to no end, my guide
And head! what thou hast said is just and right,
For we to Him indeed all praises owe
And daily thanks (Note these words) I chiefly, who
enjoy
So far the happier lot, enjoying thee
Pre-eminent by so much odds, *while thou*
Like consort to thyself canst nowhere find.”

You will remember that the one thing lacking to Adam's happiness was a comrade with whom he

could converse on equal terms. God alone could give him such a comrade. He has given him one, but something has gone wrong in the creation, and the gift falls short of perfection. Where woman is concerned, God the Creator has failed, it would seem.

In the conversation between Adam and the angel Raphael, Adam describes the effect Eve's beauty has on him, how it makes whatever she does seem good and right. Not, you observe, that the woman wakes to life all the good in him, stimulates his best and highest faculties—but, these are his words:—

“ All higher knowledge in her presence falls
Degraded: wisdom in discourse with her
Loses discountenanced, and like folly shows.”

Now when Raphael hears this effect of her beauty he frowns, as well he might, and says:—

“ Accuse not nature: she hath done her part.”

Raphael then goes on to warn Adam that whatever the effect of Eve's loveliness on him, he must never let go wisdom. “ For,” he says, “ what admirest thou, what transports thee so? An outside?” Then he advises him thus: Value yourself, see your own true value, and she will soon come to acknowledge you her head. “ And to reality yield all her shows.”

Adam does not like this reproof, and explains how it is not only the outside beauty that has so much effect on him, but all her daily graceful words and actions. Raphael's last words of warning to

Adam are that he must not give way to passion. It is evident it is not so much the simple passion for the forbidden fruit which he is to eat, as the passion for the woman who is to tempt him to do wrong.

There is no doubt that Raphael cannot satisfactorily explain Eve's influence. He does not want, when he hints at her inferiority and weakness, to cast a slur upon her Creator, so he puts all the difficulty down to that vague being, "Nature."

"Accuse not Nature," he says, with contracted brow; "she hath done her part. Do thou but thine, and be not diffident of wisdom."

There is something very ludicrous in all this: the angel and the man solemnly conversing about the woman. She is something they cannot really understand. How is it she was made so imperfect? Why was she made at all?

To please Adam, God has created a beautiful creature, and this creature, by her beauty, weakens and degrades the very best qualities of the man she was created to help. They do get themselves into a hobble, these men, when they think of the woman as something created solely to please the man. For, if she delights his sensuous nature, at the same time she weakens his moral nature, and all is somehow unsatisfactory and incomprehensible.

It has been made by the poet sufficiently clear that Eve is the weaker of the two. Note, then, the unfairness of the temptation.

Satan, the rebel angel, in order to revenge his expulsion from Heaven, determines to bring to his side—*i.e.*, to the side of evil—the newly-created inhabitants of the new earth. Listening to the talk of Adam and Eve, he finds out that one thing is forbidden them to do. Here is his chance. Although the Almighty, knowing his bad intention, sends guardian angels to Eden, yet Satan manages to disguise himself, finds an entrance into the garden, and when Adam and Eve are taking their night's rest, *squats like a toad, at the ear of Eve*—not, you observe, at the ear of Adam. He has thus power to lead Eve's fancy astray, and to make her dream. She dreams she is led to the tree of knowledge of good and evil, that her guide tempts, or rather advises her to eat, and she does eat. This dream, you see, first makes possible to her mind the act of disobedience.

In the morning Adam wakes fresh and bright. He had a good digestion, Milton said, and so his morning waking was all it should be in freshness and vigour. Not so poor Eve. She is flushed and disturbed, and tells Adam her dream. He is puzzled and tries to explain to himself and to her how it can come about that a being created pure could have thoughts that are evil. He analyses the different parts of the soul. Reason is the prime faculty; there are other weaker ones, like fancy, for instance. It is this fancy that can let ideas other than reasonable and good enter the mind. Here is the first

intimation that the unreliable qualities like fancy and imagination are specially predominant, or at least active, in the female mind.

Now comes another act of unfairness towards the woman. The Almighty, seeing how Satan has begun his first part of the temptation, by these suggestions in Eve's ear, sends Raphael, one of the greatest angels, to warn Adam of the danger. The warning is to be given only in a secondary sort of way to Eve. We shall pass over at this point Raphael's long talk with Adam, and come to the day itself—the day of the Great Fall. In the morning Eve suggests to Adam that as there is so much to do in the garden in the matter of pruning the over-luxuriant growths, it might be a good plan for them to work apart. More could be done; there would not be the temptation to dally and talk with one another. Adam replies that he is sure the Lord does not mean their labour to be so excessive that they have no time for pleasant talk; then comes the mannish touch

“but if much converse perhaps
Thee satiate, to short absence I could yield.”

He fears, too, after Raphael's warning that some harm might happen, but at last he reluctantly consents to her leaving him. Milton puts very sensible arguments in Eve's mouth as to their going apart at times. We should be entirely on Eve's side, on account of their reasonableness, but then

Milton gives himself the satisfaction of knowing that all these sensible-sounding arguments for the woman to be alone, and find her strength cannot be relied on. Calamity does overtake her. Eve then goes off alone. Satan comes to her in the form of a serpent, points out to her the foolishness of keeping back from knowledge—knowledge which has made of him a dumb beast of the field, a creature able to speak, and which will make of her, a human being, one able to know good and evil, as an angel does. The temptation is not one to a poor selfish pleasure, but to finer knowledge, greater power. Eve eats, and is transported into a state of bliss, but—hear Milton's words:

“she plucked, she ate
Earth felt the wound, and Nature from her seat
Sighing through all her works, gave signs of woe
That all was lost.”

Many, I fear, experience the same dismay, and feel that all is lost whenever woman dares to advance in knowledge and power.

There is a loss—a loss of the sense of superiority of authority, of power, in the male mind, but the loss is really a gain both to man and to woman.

Eve goes to Adam, and with perhaps the least little bit of misgiving, tells her story, and urges him also to eat of the fruit. Adam is horror-struck, sees at once what an act of disobedience it is, remembers the angel's warning that death must

follow; yet, after a time he also reaches forth his hand and eats the fruit.

“Against his better knowledge, not deceived
But fondly overcome with female charm.”

Here, again, the effect of this act on the whole creation—

“Earth trembled from her entrails, as again
In pangs; and Nature gave a second groan,
Sky lowered, and muttering thunder, some sad
drops
Wept at completion of the mortal sin.”

Nature does indeed groan, and all things become dark and dismal, when man gives way to the sensuous part of his nature, when that only is stimulated when woman is near—when the spiritual part which should be aroused, and at its best, in the presence of a true comrade, is in abeyance.

I cannot help, at this point, contrasting the narrative in the Bible with Milton's. You will remember how everyone, although feeling that the chief blame of the Fall should lie on the woman, yet has a sense of contempt for Adam when he answers God's question in this way: “The woman whom thou gavest to be with me, she gave me of the tree, and I did eat,” and how there is a feeling almost of respect for Eve, when she answers simply: “The serpent beguiled me, and I did eat.” Now see how Milton turns this; how he subtracts and adds according to

his wishes, so that the man's character may come out the better of the two. Adam is weak through accessibility to female charm, but even this weakness Milton tries to turn to nobility. While he is still full of the shock of Eve's rash deed, he says: “My resolution is with thee to die.” So great is his love for her he would rather die with her than live unhurt alone. And this, although he is fully aware that the Almighty could give him another Eve. Such faithfulness and love! Do we recognise them in all Adam's male descendants? On the other hand, Eve, after eating the fruit, hesitates as to whether she should tell Adam or not. She reasons thus with herself: If I do not tell him, I shall possess knowledge he does not possess; will then be superior in one respect to him.

“so to add what wants
In female sex, the more to draw his love
And render me more equal: and perhaps
A thing not undesirable, sometimes superior.”

Then, again, she says: But perhaps God has seen me, and death will come. Then Adam will have another Eve. “A death to think,” she exclaims. “I am resolved that he also shall take the fruit and live or die with me.”

Contrast these motives with Adam's unselfish ones. These are entirely Milton's ideas.

After they have both tasted the fruit, according to Milton, they become very disagreeable indeed.

They know they are wrong, and they blame and reproach one another.

Now comes the punishment. The Divine Judge, Son of the Almighty, after hearing Adam's account of his transgression, reproves him severely, not so much for eating the fruit as for obeying Eve.

“ Was she thy God, that her thou did'st obey
Before His voice? Or was she made thy guide
Superior, or but equal, that to her
Thou didst resign thy manhood, and the place
Wherein God set thee above her, made of thee
And for thee, whose perfection far excelled
Hers in all real dignity? Adorned
She was indeed, and lovely to attract
Thy love, not thy subjection; and her gifts
Were such as under government well seemed
Unseemly to bear rule, which was thy part
And person, hadst thou known thyself aright.”

“ So having said, He thus to Eve in few—
Say, woman, what is this that thou hast done?”
—almost as if He could hardly bring himself to speak to the woman at all.

We know the doom. Adam is to toil, in the sweat of his brow he is to eat bread, and so on. Eve is to bring forth children in sorrow, and to submit to her husband; he is to rule over her. As Adam had acted so wrongly in obeying Eve one might think it would be his punishment always to have to submit to and obey his wife.

They both go through a bad time. Adam alone is very wretched, and when Eve attempts to speak to him he bursts forth into terrible invective against her. Then comes this clamorous complaint:—

“ O, why did God
Creator wise, that peopled highest heaven
With spirits masculine, create as last
This novelty on earth, this fair defect
Of nature, and not fill the world at once
With men, as angels, without feminine
Or find some other way to generate
Mankind. This mischief had not then befallen,
And more that shall befall: innumerable
Disturbances on earth through female snare.”

But when Eve, weeping and submissive, pleads with him for pardon, saying, “ Both have sinned, but thou against God only, I against God and thee,” he forgives her, and says he wishes he could take all the burden of the punishment on his own shoulders. They must help each other, he thinks, in being loving, as he sees there will be a long-drawn-out punishment, extending to their seed. Eve then suggests that rather than that they should bring such evil on their posterity, let them not have children at all. Adam demurs to this. Then, one day, when they are trying to become reconciled to their lot, Adam sees approaching a majestic figure—a great potentate from one of the thrones above. He says to Eve he must go forth to meet him in a fitting manner.

“ Whom not to offend, with reverence
I must meet, *and thou retire.*”

It is the great Archangel, Michael. From him comes the chill doom. They must leave Paradise. When they have recovered a little from the blow, Michael sends Eve into a deep sleep, and takes Adam to see in a vision what will be upon the earth in the future ages. One only of these visions need I comment on as bearing upon our subject.

After being shown visions of cruelty, murder, disease, Adam sees a company of men coming from the hills.

“ Just men they seemed, and all their study bent
To worship God aright, and know his works
Not hid; nor those things last which might preserve
Freedom and peace to men.”

To them come a company of fair women. The men looked at them gravely at first, then interestedly, and at last they joined together—

“ And with feast and music all the tents resound.”

Adam is delighted at the sight, and thinks it so much better and more hopeful than the previous visions, but Michael has solemnly to warn him—

“ Judge not what is best by pleasure,
For that fair female troupe thou saw'st; that seemed
Of goddesses, so blythe, so smooth, so gay,
Yet empty of all good wherein consists
Woman's domestic honour and chief praise,

Bred only and completed to the taste
Of lustful appetite, to sing, to dance,
To dress, and troll the tongue, and roll the eye;—
To these that sober race of men, whose lives
Religions titled them the sons of God
Shall yield up all their virtue, all their fame
Ignobly, to the trains and to the smiles
Of these fair atheists! And now swim to joy
(Erelong to swim at large) and laugh; for which
The world erelong a world of tears must weep.”

The poet would have a peculiar sort of satisfaction in recording this vision of the grave, just men, tempted by the light, vain women.

In her sleep Eve is soothed by the vision that in time to come, of her seed should come One who would redeem the world.

Then the Archangel bids Adam and Eve prepare to leave.

“ They hand in hand, with wandering steps and
slow

Through Eden took their solitary way.”

They are banished, and Paradise is lost. Yes, and Paradise will always be lost to such a couple as Adam and Eve.

Let us see what they really are. What are their characters as sketched by the poet? Adam is at first joyous, grateful for all God has given him, willing to be obedient, full of intellectual interest,

capable of some generosity and nobility. He says he would like, you remember, to bear all the burden of the punishment himself. What weakness and badness there is in him comes out in his relations with the woman.

Eve also has a certain amount of nobility, but even before the Fall, Milton makes her very retiring and modest and submissive—as if modesty and submissiveness were very desirable virtues. But although Eve has all the sweet, modest graces that a man could wish for in a woman, she has two weaknesses inherent in her. It was not only the desire for knowledge that tempted her, but it was the subtle flattery of the serpent which roused her vanity. One great weakness, you see, vanity. Then, again, when she is wondering whether to get Adam to eat of the fruit or not, when she thinks it possible that death may come to her through the eating, the thought of Adam having another woman for his wife is intolerable—selfish jealousy, you see.

I suppose Milton considered these weaknesses, vanity and jealousy, as eternal feminine characteristics. They are there, according to him, at the beginning. We know that these two faults have been very common among women, but we consider they are the result of wrong conditions and circumstances, not inherent weaknesses of the female mind. If you enter into the reason of their being in Eve, you will find it is in the consciousness of

her inferiority to the man. I sometimes think that the jealousy of the married woman which is supposed to have done so much harm in the world, is at bottom a consciousness of inferiority, or at least the absence of the happy consciousness of worth and equality.

Now Adam, with all his fine qualities, has the one great defect of being weak where the woman is concerned. God and the Archangel severely reprimand him for giving way to this weakness, and try to instil into him the value of his own worth, telling him he has received superior gifts, and he must make use of them, and not let his lower nature that delights in the woman's outside beauty lead him astray. This, of course, has been, and still is, a very common conception of the man and the woman. He, the man, will let go his better judgment, will let his wisdom forsake him when woman is near. She, the woman, is the temptress—she alone is at the bottom of all man's sinning. Milton makes such a point of Eve's being created to please the man, and then goes on to show how this very pleasing is a snare.

But there is one other reason for the creation of the woman that I have not yet dwelt upon. It is the chief reason. You will remember that I have mentioned the long talk which Adam and Raphael had together. Raphael relates to Adam at length the story of Satan's rebellion and his expulsion from Heaven. Then he tells of the desire of the

Almighty to create a new world, with new inhabitants. Adam is intensely interested. After describing the creation of the living things on the earth, Raphael says:—

“ He formed thee, O Adam, thee, O man
Dust of the ground, and in thy nostrils breathed
The breath of life : in his own image he
Created thee, in the image of God
Express, and thou becamest a living soul.
Male He created thee, but thy consort
Female for race.”

That's it—female for race.

Now, to be quite fair and just to the poet, we must mention that Raphael does at one point say some rather fine things about love—the love between man and woman, and admits that there may be something in Eve which might bring out Adam's higher feeling apart from just the fact that she is to be the mother of the race. He does try to make Adam see there is a difference between love and passion, *but* the whole attitude of the poem is so much that Adam is the great thing—the being for whom all things, including the woman, are created—that we cannot but dwell upon this attitude and condemn the whole part of the poem that deals specially with the man and the woman, on account of it.

One has a consciousness that God, the angels, and the man all have some feeling of fellowship

among them, and that Eve, in spite of Adam's love for her, is a lonely being. Yes, she appears in the light of a necessity, sometimes pleasing, sometimes the reverse.

I cannot gauge how much influence Milton's poem has had on the minds of men, but we can see even now how these two ideas have a very firm hold on many men's minds, and women's too—that women are created chiefly for carrying on the race, and secondarily (and this is involved in the first), to please the men, and for this reason are endowed with certain outside attractions.

These are very harmful ideas, and must be got rid of. Paradise will not be regained until we do. Milton's grand language is apt to make them more acceptable than they would be if put more crudely and plainly. In the seventeenth century, I believe, women did take a very low position in England. Milton's poem would not help them to improvement. Now, with the help of fuller knowledge of the records of antiquity, and with the help of science, we can tell how some ideas have grown.

There was a time, we believe now, in the far-off ages, in the dawn of civilisation, when woman was in the ascendant—in that position chiefly through her care for her offspring, through the necessity to procure food and shelter for them. Then came the time when the man joined with the woman in something like a home, and in time came to be the protector of the home, and to a certain extent the

bread-winner. Gradually there came, through the necessities of warfare, the need for numbers of human beings; above all things, then, the race must be preserved. To secure this end, the man used his gradually growing greater strength to keep the woman in subjection, so that whatever happened there might always be mothers and children.

Ideas take a long time to grow, and a long time to die.

The greater physical strength of the male at a time when physical strength was a necessity for existence brought about the idea of the superiority of the male. We have long outgrown the need for physical strength only, but we have not yet outgrown the idea of the inherent superiority of the male. In some respects the male is indeed still the superior, but not through inherent capacity, not because God has willed it to be eternally so, but through the artificial subjection of the female, through the shutting out of opportunities for development, long after the necessity for quiet and protection for the rearing of the children had ceased.

What a far finer conception of the man and the woman we have now among the speakers and thinkers on this Woman's question.

Man is a human being, and woman is a human being—complements to each other if you like—but also each worth much for his or her own sake. Contrast the Eve of "Paradise Lost," with her submissive graces, her frailty, and her consequent

bad influence with the conception of the woman in a little poem by a modern writer, Mrs. Gilman. Note how she describes her different aspects, first as woman, then as mother, then as body, mind, soul, and, summing up, as a human being:—

"A Woman—in so far as she beholdeth
Her one Beloved's face;
A Mother—with a great heart that enfoldeth
The children of the Race;
A body, free and strong, with that high beauty
That comes of perfect use, is built thereof;
A mind, where Reason ruleth over Duty
And Justice reigns with Love;
A self-poised royal soul, brave, wise and tender,
No longer blind and dumb,
A Human Being, of an unknown splendour
Is she who is to come!"

Yes, and how can we help forward her coming? Now, there are five little words very significant in our poem which I should like to speak about. I must again refer you to Eve's colloquy, when, seeing that the extra knowledge she would gain from eating the fruit would make her superior, or at least equal, to Adam, she adds these five words—"For inferior, who is free."

When Milton puts such words as these into Eve's mouth one cannot help thinking that now and then he had a dim consciousness in his mind that he was on the wrong tack when portraying the

woman as he did. Milton, where women were not concerned, had a fine idea of freedom; he knew its value for men. Well, we know its value for women. For, without freedom, there can be no true development, and women must be fully developed human beings.

There must be no laws, no marriage service that crystallise and perpetuate the idea of the inferiority of women. The laws of the country, to which all the citizens should give willing obedience, must be made by all.

The one thing at present which will help to lift off this incubus of inferiority and open out the freedom which is necessary to true life is the Vote. We believe that the Vote will raise the status of women. What does this phrase, "raising the status of women," imply? The burden lifted from the poor, sweated worker, that she may become a human being, instead of a machine; the black stain of immorality purged away, and the young of both sexes made strong and clean; the opportunities given, and not withheld, for the development and exercising of special gifts that might be beneficial to the race.

To the women struggling for freedom has come, instead of help from those in a position to give it, a great blow—the Manhood Suffrage Bill. Whoever brought this into being have not advanced in ideas since Milton's time—indeed, have much the same—the unique position of women in pleasing

and influencing the men, and her inability to exercise political power, through the necessity for carrying on the race. What a retrograde step this Bill is. Let us, with that grand idea of Mrs. Gilman's before us, do what we can to attain that great step towards the freedom, which will make that future woman possible.

The man and the woman of the future will not, hand in hand, with wandering steps and slow, turn from Eden. No, hand in hand they will go firmly through both the bright places and the dark places of the world. They will not remain in selfish innocence and ignorance, but will eagerly seek for knowledge of good and evil, that the evil may be exposed and destroyed, that the good may be seen and claimed as their own for ever, "for the good, when once it has been clearly perceived, never abandons the mind." For since, according to the old writers, ^{by the frailty} sin and death came into the world, so now, by the ^{woman,} strength of woman, will come righteousness and the resurrection of the dead.

Yes, the woman and the man together will eat of the tree of knowledge of good and evil, and by so doing will take firm hold on the Tree of Life.

19 261.8344

MY SISTER, MY MOTHER

21520✓

WOMAN — AS SEEN BY CHRIST
AND AS SEEN BY HIS DISCIPLES

BY

ISABELLA WATSON

GARDEN CITY PRESS LTD.,
PRINTERS,
LETCHEWORTH :: HERTS.

EDINBURGH

ROBERT GRANT & SON

107 PRINCES STREET

1913

MY SISTER, MY MOTHER

WOMAN—AS SEEN BY CHRIST
AND AS SEEN BY HIS DISCIPLES

I HAVE heard many sermons, and read not a few, but I have never either listened to, nor read one, that honestly set before men and women, the difference in our Lord's treatment of woman, as compared with that meted out to her by the disciples, and Apostles.

I am going, therefore, to try to show a few of the many instances we read of in the Holy Gospels, of this difference, unpopular as this much concealed truth will be with men.

During our Lord's earthly ministry, no sick or sorrowing woman was ever brought to Him by the disciples; on the contrary, if they dared to intrude or beg for help, and healing, they drove them away if they could. Only because Jairus was a man and the ruler of the Synagogue was he permitted by the disciples to plead for his sick daughter without objection.

Only once was a woman brought to our Lord by men, and that was by the Temple

authorities to try to get His consent to their murdering their helpless victim.

As the Lord silently wrote on the ground they all, one by one, slunk out of His Presence. Priests, Levites, Scribes, and Pharisees, and the disciples also. Yes, their consciences drove them out with the rest, a fact seldom or never alluded to; and the woman was left alone standing before the Divine Judge of All. "Woman, where are these thine accusers, hath no man condemned thee?" "No man, Lord." "Neither do I condemn thee." And St Veronica, as one beautiful tradition has it, departed then from the Temple court, to meet her Lord again, on the road to Calvary, where unveiling contrary to the custom of her people, regardless of sneering Pharisees and Sadducees; fearless of the Roman soldiers, and yelling mob, she presented her veil to wipe the dust from the Saviour's bleeding face, giving what help and comfort she could, together with the other women, who "walked sorrowing by His side," when all the men who had made such loud professions of loyalty and desire to die with Him had forsaken Him and fled.

The sick woman who came secretly and touched the hem of His garment was not afraid of the Great Healer, for she knew He

was as kind and gracious to women as to men. It was the rude harsh disciples she feared, and it was to teach them, that He came to help all sufferers and not men only, that our Lord would not let her go away unnoticed, though healed of her sickness, but calling her forward He said, "Daughter, be of good comfort, thy faith hath made thee whole."

It is very noticeable that both cases where our Lord did remonstrate with women it was for over-anxiety in providing for men's temporal wants. What a revelation it must have been to St Martha to find that in God's sight her soul was worth more than a well-served meal. It was upsetting all the usual idea of woman's place in Creation, which, as taught by men, made service and obedience her first, last, and only duty. "What," asked the average man of those days, as he still asks now, "what else was woman created for except to serve us and minister to our comfort and pleasure; she is here to humbly serve and obey us, we cannot allow her to have any individual freedom." Do not the words of the marriage service unhappily foster this view; so different from the Lord's beautiful conception of marriage. "They twain shall be one Flesh" is the Pauline doctrine of man's supremacy and woman's subjection insisted

on in our Anglican service. I am told it is not so in either the Greek or Roman, at least to the same extent. Our Lord made no reply at first to the poor Canaanite woman's cry for help, not because He did not hear her. He always heard every appeal to Him. Jesus wished to bring home to His disciples, through her, their selfishness and inhumanity to the other sex. "Send her away," they said, "for she crieth after us." It was most disagreeable to have a bold, brazen woman calling to them to stop, and making people look. What did it matter if she was in trouble and distress, she was only a woman, a dog. Here occurs one of the rare, but always telling, kind and true sarcasms occasionally met with in Christ's sayings:—"It is not meet to take the children's bread and cast it to dogs." The poor woman saw the point at once, and replied, "Truth, Lord, but the dogs eat of the crumbs that fall from their master's table." Yes, only the crumbs, woman's portion in spiritual things. No man had bid her "be of good cheer for the Master calleth thee," and even the crumbs would have been denied to this Canaanite, could the disciples have had their way.

One can almost think one sees the smile of quiet amusement and mutual understanding

pass between the Lord and the woman, at the blatant selfishness and airs of superiority of the disciples. And then she went away helped and happy, home to her own people, to tell them of the Man who spake, as never did man before, words of help and comfort to women, and to ask them, as did the Samaritan, "Is not this the Christ?" The disciples had no welcome to give the little children, but sharp rebukes for the mothers for daring to bring them to Jesus. How different His reception of them, and how happy the poor mothers must have been when He had silenced the disciples.

Yet those very men had no scruples in making a woman ask a favour for them that they dared not suggest themselves. The mother of Zebedee's sons was made to ask for the seats they desired to occupy on the Heavenly Throne. Our Lord's gentle enquiry, "What wilt thou," was addressed to her, but the stern refusal of the presumptuous demand was made to the ambitious pair, not to their mother.

The story of the anointing of our Lord's feet by the Magdalene again brings out the jealous dislike the disciples had of women having any share in the Master. They were also very angry because she offered to him the homage and attention they had neglected to see

given to him, according to the Jewish custom. Besides, the woman was one of the outcasts whose presence was a great offence to them. One must hope this all took place before the scene in the Temple court, but the disciples' hearts were very hard and their ears dull of hearing when women were concerned, and it may have been quite as likely after.

The other holy women were not so self-righteous as the disciples; they did not say to St Mary Magdalene, "Stand aside, we are holier than thou," but seem to have taken her at once to their number and fellowship; for we read she was the one who attended the Blessed Virgin to the foot of the Cross, where hung The Redeemer, who, even while fighting the last stage of the battle for the world's salvation, could turn from the contest and, mindful of her and "the sword that was piercing her heart," lovingly commend His Mother to the care of St John.

Surely this ought to have at last taught the disciples some consideration, but on the Resurrection morning none of the disciples took the trouble to accompany the women when they started "very early in the morning, before it was light," taking their sweet spices to the Tomb. Yet the disciples must have

known that they would have to face the rough Roman guard, and that there was a great stone before the door of the Tomb. Indeed it seems to have caused the women much anxiety, for "Who will roll us away the stone," they asked each other, but they did not let fears of either soldiers or stone stop them. Somehow, they must, they would overcome both difficulties.

Little need they have been anxious had they known that long before they started, St Michael, the great Chief of the Heavenly Armies, had come down and rolled away that stone, and with one glance had sent the Roman guard flying in deadly fear; as God made Man, passed in triumph through the open door of the Tomb, and then, at the word of that risen Master, St Michael waited, seated on the stone, for the coming of those lonely women, to give them the first news of the Resurrection from the Dead, and bid them go and tell the disciples.

How they ran, full of joy and love, to bring to the men the glad tidings the angel had intrusted to them, only to be received "as women bearing idle tales" by the sneering disciples.

The much debated reason, why St Mary Magdalene remained behind alone at the Tomb and did not go with the others, seems easily explained. She knew she would not be

welcomed by the disciples, who despised her, as men always do the victims of man's depravity, putting on them the whole burden of the sin. So St Mary preferred to stay behind at the empty Tomb, where weeping, trembling, wondering at what had occurred, and half fearful of what might happen next, and, above all, feeling a great longing for the Master's presence, she found in the supposed gardener the Lord she sought, heard Him call her by her name, and be honoured as His special messenger of the news of His Resurrection to St John and St Peter.

The fact that the imminent arrival of the Messiah and the Resurrection were first made known by angel messengers to women ought to have convinced the Apostles that they are fellow-sharers with women in the glorious liberty of the Gospel; but we find even during the lifetime of the Blessed Mother, or very shortly after, the influence of St Paul becoming paramount, and he, if he did not actually hate woman, despised and looked on her as an inferior and mere slave. You will not find one kind and encouraging word addressed to women, as women, in the whole of the Epistles considered to be strictly his own writing, but much harsh rebuke and unkindness. Even the

liberty to re-marry when widows, which he dared not refuse to them, he does grudgingly give, accusing them of unfaithfulness and wickedness in desiring what our Lord freely permitted, and concludes with a bitter curse at the disliked sex. He treats as a sin the women plaiting their hair and wearing ornaments. Yet our Lord in His parable of the woman and her lost bit of gold said no word of condemnation of the wearer, though these gold pieces were strung and platted with the hair, and in the Revelation of St John we read of "the New Jerusalem coming down from heaven adorned as a bride for her husband."

Did it ever occur, I wonder, to St Paul, when he commends Sarah as a pattern woman because she called Abraham "Lord," how little cause Sarah had to either love or respect Abraham, who to protect himself had remorselessly sent her into the Egyptian king's palace, forcing her to lie and say she was his sister? Did St Paul ever notice that God sent plagues on Pharaoh till he guessed that Sarah was Abraham's wife and sent her back to him? God did not disdain to protect poor Sarah, though she was only a woman. No wonder in her tent Sarah laughed at her cowardly, selfish lord, and when caught lied, as he had, for his own ends, taught her to do.

And it was to save Hagar that the angel was sent to show her the spring in the desert, when Sarah, fearing for the life of her son at the hands of the wild, fierce Ishmael, insisted on his being sent away, though for long years she had patiently endured her slave being set over her as favourite; and it was not Sarah who sent them alone and unprotected into the wilderness, but Abraham, who had so many servants and camels and asses.

Barak would not go up to battle unless Deborah left her palm-tree and went with him. Jephtha offered his noble daughter a sacrifice to his vanity and profane vows. How one does wish it could have been only to perpetual virginity she was condemned: so fine a spirit would soon have found out that there was no real hardship in that; but the comments in the Temple Bible say it is now universally agreed that, in spite of the absolute condemnation and abhorrence expressed by God in the Law, the Israelites at that time did offer human beings, and Jephtha's daughter was undoubtedly sacrificed.

Esther also was used by her cousin Mordecai for his own purposes, with ruthless selfishness and disregard for what would be her terrible fate if the king had not received her. Esther's

own behaviour to the disconsolate ex-favourite, poor Vashti, is a refreshing contrast.

All those women were used and looked upon merely as tools, for use by men, neither their lives nor their honour being held of any account at all. And down through the ages it has been ever so, the Reformation depriving woman finally of what equality she had enjoyed in feudal times, when the widowed mother of a boy baron sat in the courts of those times, representing her son till he came of age, and the Lady Abbesses also, governing their convents and the large and often populous lands attached. Whoever seems to think (when they first become engaged) of impressing on young and and thoughtless girls what it is they are taking on themselves if they marry? Often her own wedding is the first time a girl has heard the service at all. Some do not realise what they are doing in the excitement of the moment. Some do not care, but some are "amazed" indeed to find, when it is too late, what vows they have unthinkingly made. Would indeed that all mothers read over the Marriage Service with their girls and asked them, "Are you prepared to surrender your whole individuality to another's will? Think well while there is yet time for you to do so." Many an unhappy

marriage would in this way be prevented, and those women who did marry would do so with their eyes open, and not in utter ignorance of what is demanded of them by the Church, which, while departing from our Lord's own dictate of equal fellowship, "They twain shall be one flesh," still is representing Him; and however hard and unjust the Pauline exactions of obedience and servitude, while they remain in the service order, women must, if they marry, keep those vows for the Master's sake.

Strange it is that men who have banished the Athanasian Creed, that bulwark of the Church, and mutilated the beautiful orders of Matins and Evensong almost past recognition, and seem never sated with changes, are adamant if asked to afford to women any relief in the Marriage Service. Change at once becomes Anathema to them then. In our Lord's own service of the Holy Communion and in Holy Baptism no difference is made between the sexes. At the altar laymen and laywomen meet as equals; and in baptism the girl baby is signed with the cross, and received into the Church, in the same words as her more fortunate brother. The Confirmation, the Visitation of the Sick, and the Burial of the Dead—it is the same for a man or a woman—only in the Marriage

Service is man's supremacy over woman asserted. One right men have never denied to woman, and that is the right to suffer and to die for her religion or her convictions. It is not men only whose souls are crying beneath the heavenly altar, "How long, O Lord, Holy and True, dost Thou not judge and avenge our blood on them that dwell on the earth," for the Noble Army of Martyrs is a mixed one.

"A noble Army, Men and Boys,
The Matron and the Maid,
Around their Saviour's Throne rejoice
In robes of white arrayed.
They climbed the steep ascent of heaven,
Through peril, toil, and pain:
O God, to us may grace be given
To follow in their train"—

To that Country where our Lord has Himself told us, "They neither marry, nor are given in marriage, but are as the angels of God."

ISABELLA WATSON.

253.2

21521 ✓

19

THE ANGLICAN DEACONESS

IN THE LIGHT OF THE RESOLUTIONS OF
THE LAMBETH CONFERENCE OF 1920

BY THE REV.

OSCAR HARDMAN, B.D.

CHAPLAIN OF DULWICH COLLEGE, AND WARDEN OF THE ROCHESTER
AND SOUTHWARK DIOCESAN DEACONESS INSTITUTION

WITH A FOREWORD BY

THE RIGHT REV.

THE LORD BISHOP OF ELY

LONDON :
SOCIETY FOR PROMOTING
CHRISTIAN KNOWLEDGE
NEW YORK : THE MACMILLAN CO.
1921

FOREWORD

I GLADLY and heartily commend to Churchmen and Churchwomen this pamphlet on *The Anglican Deaconess*. Much has been written on the history and the office of a Deaconess, but the majority of Churchpeople know but little of the subject. At the present time it is of real importance that the recommendations of the recent Lambeth Conference on the formal and canonical restoration of the Diaconate of Women and the report of the Committee appointed by the Conference to consider these questions should be widely read and discussed. This pamphlet, though I do not, of course, pledge myself to every opinion expressed in it, seems to me to present the main points clearly and fairly, and I feel sure that it will be of great service. I would only add that a student of the utterances of the Lambeth Conference must always carefully remember (1) that the Conference itself is not responsible for the report of any one of its committees, but only for the Resolutions and the Encyclical Letter; and (2) that the Lambeth Conference possesses no legislative authority, and that therefore its recommendations

become operative in a Church of the Anglican Communion only if and so far as they are adopted by the legislative assemblies of that Church.

F. H. ELY,

Chairman of the Lambeth Conference Committee appointed to Consider and Report upon the Position of Women in the Councils and Ministrations of the Church.

THE PALACE,

ELY,

January 24, 1921

NOTE

THE canonical restoration of the Diaconate of Women throughout the Anglican Communion has been recommended by the Lambeth Conference. It seems not unreasonable to expect that, while each Province has full power to accept, to modify, or to reject the resolutions of the Conference, action will be taken generally on the broad lines laid down by the Conference, so that the deaconess will presently become a recognized officer in all branches of our Church, everywhere enjoying the same status and exercising the same type of ministry. This is at least the hope and expectation of the present writer. With a view to promoting knowledge of the subject and assisting possible candidates for this ministry, it seemed desirable, therefore, to offer this brief interpretation of the pertinent resolutions of the Lambeth Conference, an interpretation based on a measure of practical acquaintance with the non-community side of that experimental restoration of the Diaconate of Women which has been carried out in the Church of England since 1862. An attempt is made to answer clearly the questions :

- I. What is a Deaconess?
- II. What are the Functions of a Deaconess?
- III. How does one become a Deaconess?

O. H.

THE ANGLICAN DEACONESS

I

WHAT IS A DEACONESS?

Resolutions of the Lambeth Conference, 1920 :

"47. The time has come when, in the interests of the Church at large, and in particular of the development of the Ministry of Women, the Diaconate of Women should be restored formally and canonically, and should be recognized throughout the Anglican Communion.

"48. The Order of Deaconesses is for women the one and only order of the Ministry which has the stamp of Apostolic approval, and is for women the only Order of the Ministry which we can recommend that our branch of the Catholic Church should recognize and use."

These resolutions suggest—

1. That the Diaconate of Women once existed in the Church, but has since lapsed.
2. That that Diaconate was a part of the primitive Ministry.
3. That the Anglican Church is competent to restore the Diaconate of Women.
4. That deaconesses are to be regarded as holding a permanent office, and that it is not permissible to advance them to the priesthood.

(1) Detailed and authoritative statements of the history of the Diaconate of Women may be found in Deaconess Cecilia Robinson's book on *The Ministry of Deaconesses*, the second edition of which was published in 1914, and, more fully, in the appendices to the report drawn up by a committee appointed by the Archbishop of Canterbury, entitled *The Ministry of Women*, published in 1919. The main facts are these. In the New Testament one Phœbe by name is specifically referred to as a deaconess in Rom. xvi. 1 (R.V. marg.); and 1 Tim. iii. 11 is now generally held to refer, not to the wives of deacons, but to deaconesses as to a recognized class of Church officers. In about the year 112 A.D. deaconesses (*ministræ*) are mentioned by Pliny, governor of Bithynia, in a letter which he addressed to the emperor Trajan. From that time onward until at least the beginning of the third century no reference to deaconesses has been discovered; but there is practically continuous evidence of their existence from the early years of the fourth century in the Eastern Church, and from the sixth century in the Western Church, down to the eleventh century. Then they begin to disappear. In the West the deaconess is gradually absorbed in the monastic system, not, however, without passing on to consecrated nuns some few traces of the dignity of the office she held; in the Orthodox East she continues a little later; and in the separated Eastern Churches she is found later still: but the order has been in abeyance in the Eastern Church generally since the Middle Ages.

There is, therefore, a gap of two centuries in the earliest history of the Diaconate of Women; it has not at any time been universally used in the Catholic Church;

and, having lapsed through causes not yet wholly understood, it has been completely lost to the Church during a period of nearly seven centuries. But over against these facts the following considerations are to be set: It took its beginning in Apostolic times and with Apostolic approval; it was not a local irregularity, but was found in the great centres of Church life in East and West alike; in view of its long history it certainly cannot be described as a temporary experiment which must be held to have failed; and, a very important point, its disappearance has been paralleled in considerable measure by the *practical* disappearance in the West of the Diaconate of Men as an effective type of ministry.

(2) There is no doubt, then, about the former existence of a Diaconate of Women. But some who are zealous for the maintenance of the Catholic organization of our Church are quick to deny any suggestion of parity between the deaconess and the deacon. They contend that the deaconess was never recognized as an ordained minister in the full sense of the term, but was only in minor orders. In the report of the Archbishop's Committee, however, we read on p. 10: "Thus it would seem that from being at first, perhaps, merely an admission without imposition of hands, like the minor orders, or like the admission of widows, the ordination of a deaconess developed into a real ordination strictly parallel to that of the male diaconate." "The evidence of the ordination forms in the *Apostolic Constitutions* and the older Greek Euchologia—and there is other evidence to support it—justifies the assumption that the diaconate they were intended to confer was as real a diaconate as that conferred upon men." The report presented

to the Lambeth Conference by its own committee appointed to consider the position of women in the councils and ministrations of the Church is equally clear. On p. 102 we read: "In our judgment the ordination of a Deaconess confers on her Holy Orders. In ordination she receives the 'character' of a Deaconess in the Church of God; and, therefore, the status of a woman ordained to the diaconate has the permanence which belongs to Holy Orders. She dedicates herself to a lifelong service." Resolution 48, quoted above, may be fairly held to constitute an endorsement of this position by the Conference, since it refers to the Diaconate of Women as an order of the Ministry having the stamp of Apostolic approval; and the inevitableness and the justice of these verdicts will appear if we review the history of the Diaconate of Men so as to discover its essential nature, and then compare with it the Diaconate of Women.

A convenient sketch of the history is contained in a report, presented to the Southwark Diocesan Conference in 1919, by a committee appointed to consider "The Restoration of the Permanent Diaconate." "There are two theories of the origin of this order. Either it took its beginning in the appointment of the Seven to undertake the daily administration (Acts vi.); or it was called into being later, when it became necessary to provide assistance for the presbyters at the Eucharist. In either case it came about that the deacons were subsequently given both types of duty, being held responsible for the work of relief and visitation, and for the 'subordinate and more mechanical functions' in the worship of the Church. The diaconate was a distinctive ministry of liturgical and administrative assistance, created by the Apostles to

meet permanent needs of the Church, and, in time, graded in relation to the other two types of ministry, as the third order.

"The decline of the diaconate appears to have been due in the first place to the growing presumption of the deacons, which led to conflict between them and the presbyters. Relieved of their more menial functions, which were given to newly created minor orders, they used to the full the power that lay in their hands by reason of their administrative and financial control. The present position of the archdeacon is reminiscent of the nature of the authority that rested with the deacons. In the Middle Ages, the importance of the diaconate was still further reduced by the withdrawal of the chalice from the laity, and by the establishment of the religious orders. Both parts of the deacons' work were thus taken from them, and there was little justification for the continuance of the order.

"The order survived, however, down to, and through, the Reformation; but, while the distinctive functions of the diaconate were fully recognized by the Church of England at that critical time of change, the order was not provided for in any adequate sense. In the Church of Rome it exists to-day just as ineffectively: but in the Eastern Church it retains its original importance, and in the various Nonconformist bodies, though ordination of any sort is lacking for the most part, and the office is held only temporarily, yet 'deacons' are almost invariably used, and their work is modelled on primitive lines." So it has come about that "the diaconate exists in our Church not as a distinctive type of ministry, but only as a probationary introduction to the priesthood.

When the episcopate is in dispute, the Church has much to say on the necessity of the three orders of the ministry, yet we have the third order only in a shadowy and utterly ineffective form. Our deacons are received as priests in the (very brief) making, and are known negatively rather than positively—that is to say, they are known rather by the things they may not do than by the duties which peculiarly belong to them.”

Now in the light of this history it may be claimed that the Diaconate of Women is parallel to the Diaconate of Men, rightly understood. In the early Church it shared the same name; admission to it was by episcopal ordination according to a corresponding form; and it was a ministry of assistance, involving similar, though not identical, functions. The essential nature of each is seen to be the same. They are parts of one type of ministry. When they are mistakenly regarded as standing at different levels, it is because the Diaconate of Men has become the invariable starting-point from which men are advanced to the priesthood, while the Diaconate of Women has never been so used. The deacon has come to be regarded as an embryo priest; the deaconess cannot be so regarded; yet her office is closely parallel to that of the deacon, and this will be seen by all when the Church has restored the Diaconate of Men as a distinctive type of ministry and we have become accustomed to deacons who are not priests in the making but deacons for life.

(3) The Diaconate of Women did not lapse by decree. As the report of the Archbishop's Committee says (p.20): “There has been no decision of the Church, as a whole against it. No Council of importance has condemned it

And it is impossible to maintain that the disuse has been of so complete or decisive a nature as to render the revival of the order incompetent to any part of the Church.” In the report of the committee of the Lambeth Conference emphasis is laid on the fact that the Church is taking no novel and unwarranted step in providing for the ordered ministry of deaconesses. “We lay stress on the word *restoration*: for what we recommend is not in any sense the creation of a new but the constitutional restoration of an ancient ministry” (p. 102).

Nor can it be said that the Church is acting with any undue haste in this revival. The first Anglican deaconess was ordained in 1862 by the Bishop of London (Dr. Tait). Since that time some four hundred deaconesses have been ordained, and, though this has been done by individual bishops who have lacked the authority of the Church's clearly expressed resolve to restore the Diaconate of Women formally and canonically, they have not acted without the general cognizance and approval of the Church. In 1871 a body of relevant “Principles and Rules suggested for adoption in the Church of England” was put forth by the two archbishops and eighteen bishops; in 1891 the Convocation of Canterbury agreed that “it is desirable to encourage the formation of deaconess institutions and the work of deaconesses in our dioceses and parishes”; in 1897 the Lambeth Conference resolved “that this Conference recognizes with thankfulness the revival alike of brotherhoods and sisterhoods and of the office of deaconess in our branch of the Church”; and the matter was discussed by the Pan-Anglican Congress in 1908 under “The Church's Ministry.” Now at length the Lambeth Conference of

1920 has agreed that "the time has come when, in the interests of the Church at large, and in particular of the development of the Ministry of Women, the Diaconate of Women should be restored formally and canonically, and should be recognized throughout the Anglican Communion"; and it only remains for the Provinces to take action. Here is no room for suspicion of precipitancy. On the contrary, there has been a long period of careful consideration and of wise experiment, and honour is due to those bishops who have made the experiment possible, and to those deaconesses who, by their devotion, their faithfulness, their patience and self-restraint, have recovered for the Anglican Church the long-forgotten ideal of the life of the deaconess.

Where it is decided on, the full recovery of the Diaconate of Women is likely to proceed without serious difficulty, so well has the way been prepared. But it ought to be noted that one important matter has so far received no consideration. No place is found for the deaconess on any of the councils of the Church. In view of the possibility of the restoration of the permanent Diaconate of Men, the question should be regarded as one which affects both deacons and deaconesses; and it will probably be found advisable that they should sit in the Ruridecanal Conference, but not in the Chapter, and in the House of Laity rather than with the presbyters. This arrangement would emphasize their position as the vitally important connecting-link between priests and people; it would reduce the danger of conflict between priests and deacons through the latter unduly magnifying their office, and history shows that this is no imaginary danger; and it would tend to

prevent a repetition of the costly mistake that has been made in the practical absorption of the diaconate into the priesthood.

(4) That absorption is undoubtedly responsible for the fear with which some regard the possibility of the "woman deacon." It seems to them to mark the first step towards a serious breach of Church order—namely, the admission of women to the priesthood. We have already seen, however, that this is in no way involved in the diaconate, which stands on its own merits as a distinctive type of ministry.

This is not the place to consider at length the reasons why women may not be advanced to the priesthood and to the episcopate; it will suffice to quote the report of the Archbishop's Committee from pp. 4 and 5, where it is stated that "the historic ministry of the Church of Christ has been transmitted through the male sex from the days of the Apostles. This restriction of the priesthood may have been due to the fact that in those times women would not have been entrusted with official posts of public administration; it may have been due to the influence of Jewish usage in the Temple and synagogue; it may have been due to the recognition of fundamental differences in function and calling inherent in the natural variety of sex. It is not our province to discuss these questions. We simply record the fact that the restriction of the ministry of the priesthood to men originated in a generation which was guided by the special gifts of the Holy Spirit. The evidence of the New Testament is the evidence of that generation."

II

WHAT ARE THE FUNCTIONS OF
A DEACONESS?

Resolutions of the Lambeth Conference, 1920 :

" 49. The office of a deaconess is primarily a ministry of succour, bodily and spiritual, especially to women, and should follow the lines of the primitive rather than of the modern Diaconate of Men. It should be understood that the deaconess dedicates herself to a lifelong service, but that no vow or implied promise of celibacy should be required as necessary for admission to the order. Nevertheless, deaconesses who desire to do so may legitimately pledge themselves, either as members of a community or as individuals, to a celibate life."

" 52. The following functions may be entrusted to the deaconess, in addition to the ordinary duties which would naturally fall to her :

" (a) To prepare candidates for Baptism and Confirmation.

" (b) To assist at the administration of Holy Baptism ; and to be the ministrant in cases of necessity in virtue of her office.

" (c) To pray with and to give counsel to such women as desire help in difficulties and perplexities.

" (d) With the approval of the Bishop and of the parish priest, and under such conditions as shall from time to time be laid down by the Bishop : (i) in church to read Morning and Evening Prayer and the Litany, except such portions as are assigned to the priest only ; (ii) in

church also to lead in prayer and, under licence of the Bishop, to instruct and exhort the congregation." [NOTE.—Clause (d) (ii) was carried by 117 votes to 81.]

The points for consideration are these :

1. That it is permissible for a deaconess to lend certain ministerial assistance to the parish priest.

2. That the deaconess is a succourer of women especially, and is required to be expert in ministering to soul and body alike.

3. That the deaconess is not pledged to celibacy by her ordination vows.

4. That there are both community deaconesses and non-community deaconesses.

(1) Hitherto the modern deaconess has had no ministerial part in the services of the Church. She has been content to devote herself to a great variety of good works in her parish, and has never clamoured to be allowed to exercise any of the ministerial functions which belong to the deacon. But recent years have witnessed a remarkable advance in the general status of woman, through her demonstration of unsuspected powers on a grand scale, and it has followed, very naturally, that the Lambeth Conference has considered the possibility of making fuller use of the deaconess. The opinion of the Conference is that the time has come for the deaconess to be allowed to undertake some further duties belonging to a true diaconate.

No mention is made of the Holy Communion. In the primitive Church the deaconess was permitted to carry the Sacrament to sick women ; and it may be found desirable to revive this custom in some parts of the

mission-field and, under special circumstances, at home ; but the Conference makes no recommendation in this matter. It does provide for ministerial assistance at Holy Baptism, and here no doubt the special intention is that, as in the early Church, the deaconess shall attend on women and girls who are baptized by immersion. When the deaconess herself administers Baptism "in cases of necessity," she is doing no more than any unordained person, man or woman, may do in such circumstances : but the point of this part of the resolution probably is that, in the absence of a priest or deacon, the deaconess shall be privileged to baptize in preference to any lay person.

The recommendation that the deaconess shall be authorized to read Morning and Evening Prayer and the Litany, with the exception of those parts which are specially assigned to the priest, has met with strong criticism, mainly on the ground that the primitive deaconess does not appear to have performed any analogous service in the presence of the general congregation. Some regard "the coming of the clergywoman" as a folly, calculated to wreck all possibility of reunion, and therefore to be resisted by every means. Others, who consider the proposal a legitimate development, are disturbed by the prospect of mixed ministrations of men and women and the possibilities of evil which are involved in such a system ; and they would desire the limitation of this step by the provision that a deaconess shall so minister "only in the absence of a priest or deacon." This would permit a deaconess to serve a mission church visited by the parish priest for the administration of the Sacraments, and it would allow her to prevent the inter-

ruption of the daily offices in the parish church when, for any sufficient cause, the parish priest was unable to be present. In view of the position of the deaconess as an ordained minister of the Church, it seems unreasonable to maintain that the proposal confers on her a power which is in the least degree extravagant ; and, considering the present status of woman and her acceptance of responsibility and leadership in modern public life, it must surely be recognized that there is nothing at all incongruous in her performance of the ministerial office in the public recitation of Morning and Evening Prayer.

In the opinion of a majority of the Bishops who voted, the ministry of the Word ought also to be permitted to the deaconess who has a gift of exposition and has received the Bishop's licence to exercise that gift. It is not to be assumed—as it is, in practice, in the case of a deacon—that every deaconess has this gift and is free to claim the office of preacher as a necessary sequel to ordination : but episcopal authorization is to be restricted to those who have given proof of their ability as students of theology and of their power as teachers and speakers. There is clearly a great divergence of opinion as to this recommendation. But it is probable that if, where it is adopted, the Bishops exercise due care in granting their licence, there will soon be a qualified agreement with the statement made in the report of the Lambeth Conference Committee (p. 100) that "women possess a wonderful evangelistic gift," the qualification consisting in prefacing that sentence with the word "some." As to the oft-repeated objection that St. Paul forbids this departure, an objection which no true Christian would lightly dismiss, it is felt by very many that the committee's answer is

sound and convincing. On p. 98 they say, "Our firm conviction is that the precise form which St. Paul's disciplinary directions took was relative to the time and to the place which he actually had in mind, but that these directions embody an abiding principle. To transfer with slavish literalness the Apostle's injunctions to our own time and to all parts of our own world would be to renounce alike our inalienable responsibility of judgment and the liberty wherewith Christ has made us free. On the other hand, it is our duty to endeavour clearly to discern the abiding law which underlay St. Paul's stringent temporary and local rules. We believe it to be this. Human nature being what it is, the Christian Church, whose duty and desire is to keep itself unspotted from the world, and to be like a home of brethren and sisters at unity with each other, must exercise unsleeping vigilance that in its regulations for worship in the congregation there lurk no occasion for evil or even for suspicion of evil; no occasion for confusion or strife; nothing which falls below the purest and strictest ideal of peace and seemliness and order."

Less difficulty is felt about the deaconess being allowed to conduct and to speak at children's services and special services for women, and this will probably be admitted as seemly in many of those parishes where, for the present, the deaconess will be given no opportunity to conduct liturgical services. For it must be carefully noted that the participation of the deaconess in such services is regulated by the express provision that it shall be only "with the approval of the Bishop and of the parish priest, and under such conditions as shall from time to time be laid down by the Bishop."

(2) The other part, which is by far the larger part, of the work of the deaconess consists in her ministrations to the individuals—especially, though not exclusively, women and girls—among whom she is sent to work; and it is altogether misleading so to stress the new proposals as to liturgical ministrations and preaching that it is made to appear that the deaconess will be occupied mainly with such duties. She assists the parish priest in seeking out and preparing candidates for Baptism and Confirmation, and here her help is invaluable. For she can deal with female candidates far more understandingly and intimately than a man is able to do; and in regard to instruction and warning in respect of sex matters she is clearly in a specially privileged position. Similarly she counsels young women during courtship, and prepares them for Holy Matrimony. She conducts Bible-classes, study circles, clubs, and meetings; she diligently visits the homes of the people; she ministers to the sick and prepares them for the ministrations of the parish priest; and in all these things she teaches by word and prayer and example what it is to rejoice in Christ and to live in His peace.

In addition a good deal of general work for the promotion of social welfare falls to the share of the deaconess, and is to be regarded as strictly within her province. The Lambeth Conference Committee says (p. 104): "We are anxious that the office of deaconess should be a standing witness that the Church welcomes workers of many kinds, and believes that a pure Christian intention hallows labours which are often regarded as secular. We therefore urge that, while a sufficient training in devotion and in doctrine must ever be con-

sidered as an indispensable element in the preparation of a deaconess, deaconesses and women looking forward to the diaconate should be encouraged to qualify themselves for, and to take part in, work for public welfare—*e.g.*, educational, medical, or social. We should rejoice to see a deaconess devoting much of her time to social or civic activities, provided she undertook those duties as part of her share in the great work of forwarding the Kingdom of God, and performed them in the name of Christ." There can be no question of the wisdom of these words. In this way direct connection is established with the primitive deaconess, and the full range of the work of the Church's ministry is recovered.

It is of course evident that not all these things are to be expected of every deaconess. Some experts will devote themselves almost exclusively to evangelistic or educational work, some to work for social purity, some to medical work, according to their gifts: but the chief need will always be for the good all-round parish worker, who can go on steadily, year in, year out, visiting and praying, counselling and teaching, mothering and loving, rejoicing and sorrowing, constantly spending, and yet heaping up rich treasure.

(3) The demands made on the deaconess are clearly heavy. It was understood from the beginning of the experimental revival of the order that this would be the case, and it has, therefore, been the rule that none but unmarried women or widows should be ordained. Further, it has resulted that no ordained deaconess has married and continued in her office. No vow of celibacy has been required at ordination, but it has been felt by the deaconesses themselves that the vocation of marriage

was for ever closed to one who had accepted the vocation to the ministry, because the claims on the one side were incompatible with the claims on the other side.

But naturally the question has arisen, "If a deaconess chooses to marry, does she thereby forfeit her status?" And again, "Cannot a deaconess discharge the duties of wife and mother and ordained minister of the Church, even as the priest is recognized as having the right to be at the same time husband and father?" The Lambeth Conference Committee considered the matter, which had been fairly stated on pp. 26 and 27 of the report on *The Ministry of Women*, and their opinion is to be found on pp. 102 and 103 of the report: "There arises the grave question of the possibility of a deaconess marrying. We are well aware that opinions on this subject differ, and many who hold the office of deaconess desire that, though they have taken no vow of celibacy, marriage should be regarded as wholly out of the question for them. We have given the question our anxious consideration. And we record our deliberate belief that it ought plainly to be understood that no promise of celibacy is to be required for admission to the Order of Deaconesses. We recognize that a deaconess who is married is likely to possess as a married woman a peculiar power by prayer and counsel to help married women; and, that being so, we do not think that deaconesses should be precluded from marrying. A married deaconess might, especially during the earlier years of her married life, be compelled to ask the Bishop to allow her to suspend the actual exercise of some, if not all, of her functions. But she would retain the status of a deaconess and, after an interval, would in most cases be able to resume her active work."

Resolution 49 definitely endorses this opinion, but provides that "deaconesses who desire to do so may legitimately pledge themselves, either as members of a community or as individuals, to a celibate life."

This resolution is undoubtedly in agreement with the general mind of the Church of England. Yet it will probably be found that the married deaconess will prove less effective and therefore less common than her unmarried sister in the ministry. For men and women do not make the same contributions when they marry. The husband necessarily continues his work in the world, whatever that work may be; the wife, on the contrary, finds her work mainly in the home, especially if she becomes a mother. There arises also a possibility of conflict of authority in the case of a wife who is the ordained servant of the Church, answerable to a Bishop, and licensed to work under the control of a parish priest; though such a possibility is scarcely existent in the case of a married priest. In the latter case no difficulty arises normally as to the occupation of the wife: in the former case the husband's occupation would invariably have to be considered. The question of dress is of less importance, but it is the custom for the deaconess to wear a distinctive dress and badge, and this will probably be found to be so desirable as to be continued: will this be gladly worn by the married deaconess, or will she appear dressed as a deaconess only when she is on duty?

It is possible to conceive cases at home, and more readily in the mission-field, where the wife of a Bishop or of a priest or deacon might be also a deaconess, to the great advantage of the Church; and it is also possible that benefit might result from the ministrations of the

wife of a godly man of whatever occupation, whose children have grown up or to whom no children have been granted, and who can afford to pay for the proper care of his house by others; but apart from such exceptional cases the married deaconess is likely to prove of doubtful value both to the Church and to her home.

(4) In providing that deaconesses may pledge themselves to celibacy, either as individuals or as members of a community, Resolution 49 points to the existence of deaconess communities. These are similar to the priest communities in our Church. Their members form families, each of which owes obedience to its superior and has the Bishop as visitor; whereas the non-community deaconesses are individually licensed to parishes by the Bishop, with whom they communicate through the Diocesan Head-Deaconess, and they work under the sole authority of their parish priests very much as do assistant priests. The community deaconesses stand for a side of Church life which it is important to preserve and there must always be a place for them; but the history of the order since 1887 shows that the majority of deaconesses will undoubtedly be non-community deaconesses, and Resolution 49 makes it clear that they need not join a community in order to assure themselves that they are pledged to the celibate life.

III.

HOW DOES ONE BECOME A DEACONESS?

Resolutions of the Lambeth Conference, 1920 :

"50. In every branch of the Anglican Communion there should be adopted a form and manner of making of deaconesses such as might fitly find a place in the Book of Common Prayer, containing in all cases provision for:

"(a) Prayer by the Bishop and the laying on of his hands.

"(b) A formula giving authority to execute the office of a deaconess in the Church of God.

"(c) The delivery of the New Testament by the Bishop to each candidate.

"51. The forms for the making and ordering of deaconesses should be of the same general character, and as far as possible similar in their most significant parts, though varying in less important details in accordance with local needs."

The subjects to be considered are these :

1. Vocation to the diaconate.
2. Preparation for the diaconate.
3. Admission to the diaconate.

(1) Vocation first declares itself by creating interest, though not all who are interested have a true vocation. When there comes to a woman a desire to know for herself what a deaconess is, and what she does, it may mean that God is calling her to that way of life; and it is her bounden duty to attempt, by prayer and thoughtful

consideration and earnest inquiry, to discover whether that is truly so.

She must consider the matter, not in terms of privilege, but in terms of service. That is not to say that she is to endeavour to exclude from her mind all appreciation of the dignity of the office of deaconess. On the contrary, it ought to present itself to her increasingly as something too high to be sought unless God Himself compels the quest. But she is not to allow herself to be drawn to it because of any honour it will confer, or because of the dress which is associated with it, or, generally, because it seems to promise a degree of exaltation above other women. She must patiently test her desire until she can feel honestly assured that what she seeks is just the grace and the opportunity to minister to Christ's people, under authority, in a lifelong dedication of all her powers to the service of the Lord.

She need not come from a particular social class, but she must be a lady in the sense that she is a pure, right-minded, self-controlled Christian woman. She need not have had a university education, but she must be an educated woman of good average intellectual ability. She need not be physically robust, for much of the world's best work has been done by delicate people; yet she must remember that the work is exacting, and that it is as a rule beyond the capacity of any but fairly healthy women.

If, when she has thought and prayed over these matters, she still believes that she is called to offer herself, she should write to the head of a Deaconess House, asking for an interview. A list of the houses already established is given below.

LONDON.

1. St. Andrew's (Community) Deaconess House, 12, Tavistock Crescent, Westbourne Park, W. 11.
2. All Saints' (Community) Deaconess House, Church Crescent, S. Hackney, E. 9.
3. The Rochester and Southwark Diocesan Deaconess House, 113, North Side, Clapham Common, S.W. 4.
4. St. Catherine's Deaconess House, 90, Grosvenor Road, N. 5.

PROVINCES.

1. Winchester Diocesan Deaconess House, Portsmouth.
2. Diocesan Deaconess House, The Chantry, Exeter.
3. Ely and St. Albans Diocesan Deaconess Home, Bedford.
4. Diocesan Mission House, The College, Durham.
5. The Deaconess Institution, South Ashfield, Newcastle-on-Tyne.
6. Llandaff Diocesan Deaconess Institution, Penarth.
7. St. Salvador's House, 7, Grosvenor Street, Edinburgh, N.B.

OVERSEAS.

1. The Deaconess House, Morland Road, Byculla, Bombay.
2. St. Hilda's Deaconess House, Lahore.
3. All Saints' Deaconess House, Allahabad.
4. St. Faith's Deaconess House, Napier Park, Madras.
5. The Deaconess House, Sydney, N.S.W.
6. The Deaconess House, Christchurch, New Zealand.
7. St. Faith's Deaconess House, Peking.
8. New York Training School for Deaconesses, New York.

9. Church Training and Deaconess House of the Diocese of Pennsylvania, 708, Spruce Street, Philadelphia.
10. The Deaconess Training School of the Pacific, Berkeley, California.
11. Deaconess House, 210, South Lincoln Street, Chicago.

N.B.—A deaconess signs: "A—— B——, Deaconess." She is referred to as "Deaconess A—— B——," not as Miss or Mrs., not as Sister, unless she is a member of a community. In correspondence the correct form of address is: "Dear Deaconess," or "Dear Head-Deaconess."

(2) Referring to the preparation for the diaconate, the Report of the Lambeth Conference Committee says (p. 103): "We lay great stress on the requirement that each candidate should pass through a course of appropriate training, devotional, practical, and intellectual. Special attention should be paid to the study of the Bible, Christian Doctrine, the Book of Common Prayer, and the History of the Church. It will be important to maintain a high standard in intellectual attainments. Each candidate should be examined by persons well qualified for the work and appointed by the Bishop himself."

The normal course of training provided at the Deaconess Houses involves residence for a period of two years. During this time devotional habits are fostered, the life is disciplined with a view to the punctual and regular performance of the duties which belong to the deaconess, there is systematic and progressive training in the practical work of the diaconate, and instruction is given by lecturers and tutors in a variety of subjects, including Holy Scripture, Christian Doctrine and Ethics,

Church History, the Comparative Study of Religion, Pastoral and Liturgical Theology, Social Science, and Educational Theory. An annual retreat is generally provided; there are vacations at Christmas, at Easter, and in August; and in each week of term Saturday is usually a free day: but it will be seen that the time of a student is otherwise fully occupied, and that the life is somewhat strenuous.

When women of special qualifications and experience offer themselves, the period of residence may be reduced at the discretion of the authorities: but in no case is it entirely dispensed with. Even a brief stay in a Deaconess House will give an able woman a better view of the field of her work than she can gain in any other way; and it will put her into a right relationship with the other deaconesses in the diocese, who count the Deaconess House as their headquarters and keep in close touch with it, though they do not reside there. It is increasingly recognized that every candidate for the priesthood should pass through a theological college; and it is to be hoped that the bad practice of ordaining untrained men who have gained little or no sense of the brotherhood of the ministry they are entering will not be repeated in the case of women.

Ordination depends upon the acceptance of a candidate by the Bishop after a satisfactory report by the Diocesan Head-Deaconess and by the Warden or Examining Chaplain appointed by the Bishop. It is not usual to ordain a woman who is less than thirty years of age; but younger women who have completed their training go out to work in a parish as licensed lay workers until they are of age. It is of course necessary to obtain a

title before ordination—that is, to be accepted for work in a particular parish by agreement with the incumbent.

(3) As in the case of deacons and priests, the ordination of deaconesses usually takes place at the Ember seasons. It is associated with the service of Holy Communion, and is generally held in the cathedral church of the diocese. At present there is a variety of uses, but it is recommended by the Lambeth Conference that a common form shall be drawn up, suitable for inclusion in the revised Book of Common Prayer. Hitherto there has not been sufficient publicity in the announcement of impending ordinations; it is desirable that the practice of making public challenge in the face of the Church shall be instituted, and that ordination lists shall be communicated to the Press. They should also appear in the Diocesan Directory; and the editors of the various clerical directories will probably consider it advisable to include in them a list of deaconesses and to revise it annually.

After ordination the newly appointed deaconess is licensed to her parish, and she generally begins work there at once.* If she has received assistance from diocesan funds towards the expenses of her training, she is under obligation to serve that diocese for a number of years. If she is ordained for service overseas it is customary for her to gain experience by serving at home for a time. When a scheme for providing clergy pensions has been set on foot, the deaconess may hope to find a place in it. Meanwhile she is usually expected to make some small provision for her future by contributing to a Pension Fund organized by her own Deaconess Institution.

The need of the Church to-day for well-trained, zealous, and loyal workers is great. The deaconess will find splendid opportunities of service open to her. And it may be confidently asserted that, if she uses faithfully the grace received in ordination and the fellowship of the ministry to which she is admitted, loyally obeying the lawful commands of Bishop and incumbent wherever she is called to work, she will always regard her ordination day with fervent gratitude as a day of inestimable blessing.

O Lord, Who didst accept the loving service of women in the days of Thy humiliation, and hast raised to so noble a dignity the estate of womanhood: Give Thy benediction, we pray Thee, to Thy servants whom Thou hast called to the office of deaconess, and be pleased to further their labours for Thy Kingdom. Inspire the hearts of faithful women that they may offer themselves for this ministry according to the needs of Thy Church; abundantly prosper the work of the Deaconess Institutions; and grant to all who go forth therefrom such a measure of power and love and discipline that they may serve with glad and unwearying devotion, to the benefit of Thy Church and to the glory of Thy Holy Name, Who, with the Father and the Holy Spirit, livest and reignest ever one God, world without end. Amen.

Price 1d. 9d. doz.
21522 ✓ 176 (20)

IS IT REASONABLE TO EXPECT THE SAME MORAL STANDARD FROM MEN AS FROM WOMEN?

Speech delivered at the Conference of the British Dominions
Woman Suffrage Union, London, June, 1918,

By EDWARD BEADON TURNER, F.R.C.S.,

Chairman of Representative Body, British Medical Association.

Chairman of Medical Committee, National Council for Combating
Venereal Disease.

Member of Advisory Board to Ministry of National Service.

I PRESUME that you have asked me to speak to you on this subject because I am a physician, and I am going to give the view of a doctor in the matter. I shall also touch on the point of view of a man of the world who has been very intimately mixed up with young men, and who has taken a great interest in these subjects for a long time.

I will begin at once by telling you that it is absolutely reasonable and possible to expect the same moral standard from men as from women. Of this I am certain—I am sure that it is quite possible that both sexes should attain the same ideal standard. I have never known any healthy man, an absolutely healthy man, go wrong in health because he has lived a perfectly clean life.

Some of you may have known men who have been in hard training for some athletic contest for six months or more, during which time they have kept their bodies in temperance, soberness and chastity. They are not broken down men by any means but come out of training in the pink of health and condition. Therefore if they can live a pure life for six months there is no reason why they should not do so indefinitely.

There are some few persons to whom this does not apply. I have known a very few men who have practically been almost sexually insane, and the results have been disastrous, but it is an extremely small minority in which this obtains; such conditions are abnormal and do not affect the great mass of ordinary men.

Perhaps on the whole it may be rather more difficult for men to keep straight than for women for various reasons. I do not think, however, that there is really a very great difference in this matter between the two sexes. I presume that in speaking of an equal moral standard for men as for women you are expecting that the standard for men shall be at least as high as that for women. If you mean to approximate the two standards by degrading that of woman to the level of that of the ordinary man, then I am "right off it," but provided your aim is to raise the man's standard so that it shall be the same, then I am entirely with you.

There is no doubt in my mind that, during the last forty years the standard of morality as between the two sexes has somewhat approximated, and for two reasons. The man's standard has become somewhat higher because a much larger number of men live cleaner lives, and they do that for various reasons, some of which I will point out. In the first place the temptations to which a young man is now exposed are not nearly so great as they were when first I came to London. In those days if one dined out, or went to the theatre and walked home, one was not only frequently accosted but actually physically assaulted in the street. The whole thing was brought right under one's eyes, and not only that, but there were various places in those days where, if any young man went, he had the pick of the London prostitutes paraded before him. In these matters there is no doubt a very great improvement, and the condition of the streets is much healthier. If a man be not actually thinking of these matters he is very much less likely to fall than if the temptation were continually put right under his eyes. In the second place, during the last forty years there has been a great extension of practical participation in athletic sports among young men, and more especially among those of the industrial classes. The number of young fellows who go in for athletics has increased a hundredfold, and every one of them being in training is less likely to yield to temptation. In the third place the question of temperance comes in. There is no doubt, that as a whole, we drink much less now than was the custom in those days, and a sober citizen is not so likely to fall a victim to the seductions of vice as one rendered reckless by too much alcohol.

On the other hand, what I may describe as the standard of practical morality among young women of all classes has become distinctly lower during these years, and I account for that by these reasons among others. First, the Malthusian propaganda which has been carried on during this time, and the public advertisement and exhibition of Malthusian appliances has had a great deal to do with it. In old days many young women were kept straight by the fear that a lapse from morality might be followed by an increase of the population, and the fancied security given by the use of these appliances has tempted a large number to subordinate discretion to desire. Secondly, some young girls have absorbed all that is worst in socialistic dogma and profess, and practically carry out,

the principles of "free love." A smaller number, perhaps consider that, in these days of emancipation and advance, their morality should be the same as that of their brothers and cousins, and they act on this principle. For these reasons the woman's standard has on the average deteriorated.

We must face the fact, that at present, a dual standard of morality between the two sexes does exist, and before attempting to point out what we can do to raise and elevate in either case, it is as well to consider some of the reasons why it has existed and does now exist. One of the original causes I think may be prehistoric and date back to the days when the Cave Man clubbed and carried off his prospective bride, and the bigger and the stronger the Cave Man the larger number of brides he clubbed, and in this way the Divine command "be fruitful and multiply and replenish the earth" was carried out, with the result that a different morality requirement of the two sexes became at once operative. (I should be very curious to ascertain, if it were possible, whether in those parts of the world where polyandry is the custom, the standard is reversed and a higher moral standard is expected from men than from women.) Another reason may be the operation of the law of entail. You know the old proverb "It is a wise child who knows its own father," but with regard to the mother there is absolute certainty, and a higher morality was therefore expected from women than from men because, otherwise, exalted titles and great possessions might pass to a personage in no ways whatsoever related to the family which was entitled to them. A third reason, doubtless, was the fact that on woman was laid the responsibility of reproduction. It is possible that these reasons, taken together, may have had, in the past, a great deal to do with the institution of the dual standard. That it exists at the present day depends upon other reasons; and in considering them, let us first take the case of the woman. Hers is indeed a hard one, because she gets no good word either from man or her own sex. If a woman fall, a man will look at her with a certain half-pitying contempt, because every man, however depraved he may be, has at the bottom of his heart an ideal of pure womanhood to which he looks up, and has looked up to all his life. He therefore thinks badly of any woman who has fallen from it. With regard to women, they are generally harder upon her than the opposite sex; and the reason for this, I think, is to be found in the fact that, in the mimic war of the sexes, a woman who falls from virtue is considered to be rather in the position of a man who, through lapse of duty, has betrayed his outpost into the hands of the enemy.

If we wish to attain to the same standard, it is important that we should consider what both men and women generally think about it. First of all, let us take the opinion that women have of men, and then that which men have of themselves. To a woman a rake is very frequently a very attractive personage, and I am absolutely certain that there is no single woman, worthy of the name, who does not in her inmost heart of hearts think that, if he be really fond of her and she be fond of him, she can reform him and change his nature. It is the instinct of motherhood and protection, which is at the bottom of every woman's heart. It also frequently happens that the rake is an exceedingly handsome, amusing and attractive man, and a very large number of women are rather inclined

to look upon him as being "a bit of a sport." They do not look upon his immorality with the severity which is, in fact, its due. With regard to what men think of men, their opinion is absolutely different. I have only on two occasions come across a woman who has deliberately gone wrong and then talked of it to her friends and companions; but in a young man there is no shame in discussing this matter. If a man be merely immoral, he is not looked down upon or despised by his companions, nor is he ostracised or turned out of any important position he may hold. But there is an unwritten law by which certain matters of this sort are very differently looked upon. If a man is known to be a seducer of virgins, or to have betrayed the wife of a friend, then his fellow-men are very much more inclined to be down upon him.

If it be possible these things should be altered, both men and women should demand equal morality the one of the other. How are you going to set about it? It will take generations to accomplish, for it is hard to eradicate that which is bred in the bone. Legislation is of no use. If every woman had every vote in the world you could not accomplish it by any law that might be passed. Unless caught in the act it is impossible to prove that a man is immoral. There is no physical change in him as in woman. But though law can do nothing, I believe that the solution lies entirely in your own hands. But you must begin at the very beginning. You must begin with the mother, who must take her sons and teach them and discuss with them these matters, discuss them healthily and cleanly reverently and devoutly, teaching them to reverence both themselves and the other sex. Then you must alter the sentiments of an enormous number of women towards immoral men—a man who is notoriously immoral should not be allowed to be the honoured guest in any drawing-room—and you have finally to convince the mothers in this Kingdom and the Empire, and also an exceedingly large proportion of their daughters, that chocolates, diamonds, furs and motor cars are not the "be all and the end all" here, and that a coroneted millionaire, with a lurid past and a dozen discarded mistresses is by no means the most fitting mate for a pure young girl, and that she probably would be much better with a clean young man as a husband, who may have his way to make in the world.

324.62
130941
21523 ✓ (21)

"No Votes for Women"

A Reply to Some Recent
Anti-Suffrage Publications

By

Lady Constance Lytton

*E. Louie Acres
Ashton
Streetwork
Herts.*

London

A. C. Fifield, 44 Fleet Street, E.C.

1909

“No Votes for Women”

A Reply to some recent Anti-Suffrage
Publications

The question of the vote appears to me to be not one of women versus men, but of the men and women of the future against the men and women of the past.—VERNON LEE.

Woman's cause is man's; they
rise or sink
Together, dwarfed or godlike,
bond or free.
TENNYSON.

I earnestly hope the day is not far distant when women also will bear their share in voting for Members of Parliament, and in determining the policy of the country. I can conceive no argument by which they are excluded. It is obvious that they are abundantly as well fitted as many who now possess the suffrage, by knowledge, by training, and by character.—*The late MARQUIS OF SALISBURY at a Primrose League Meeting, Edinburgh, November 12th, 1888.*

THE more active advocates of woman suffrage are frequently told by their opponents that they have only one achievement to their credit, viz. the destruction of the cause which they have at heart, which cause, but for their tactics, might conceivably have persuaded a reluctant Government to legislate in its favour. Nevertheless, the anti-suffragists are finding it worth while to unite their forces and arm against this adversary who has recently committed suicide. Among the knights-errant who have volunteered for the ghostly quest, there are many to whom I would like to offer my sympathy.

4 "No Votes for Women"

The earnestness of their appeal and their good intentions towards humanity in general, and women in particular, are obvious. They are conscientious, for they speak out, despite a certain tone of reluctance and apology which seems to haunt their arguments. I long to lift from their kindly hearts the nightmare that oppresses them. On their behalf I desire more ardently than before the hastening of the franchise, that they may know how much less dreadful is the reality than their expectation of it.

It is said that the subject of "Votes for Women" is woefully threadbare. I admit that some of the arguments against granting the franchise to women are not only threadbare, but worn into holes; yet the question has not up to the present made for itself a slang or system of word-signalling such as generally accrues to proposed legislation of a controversial kind. The fact is, the proposal, in this case, is so unusually simple and definite that, on the part of its advocates, there is no need for an algebra. "To grant the parliamentary franchise to women on the same terms as it is or may be granted to men," this demand can hardly be codified into briefer simplicity, and the meaning of the phrase is self-evident. There is no appeal for privilege; where inequalities exist they will remain, where equality is proved the demand is for removal of the law which creates artificial disqualification on the ground of sex. But when we turn to the opponents of this measure, the arguments used are many and various, often contradictory, and sometimes difficult to grasp. It is then that one yearns for some terminology that will summarise a whole group of ideas after the manner, let us

"No Votes for Women" 5

say, of those elucidating phrases "Cowper-Templeism" and "contracting-out" in the case of education, or "tied house" and "time-limit" in the case of liquor licenses. To the uninitiated the connection between these expressions and the subjects of learning or the drink traffic seems remote in the extreme, but to those who have followed the controversy what vistas of battlefields they reveal! At the mere mention of one of these masonic pass-words any detailed discussion of the points in question becomes superfluous, and by the manner of their use one is able at once to recognise a friend or foe.

For my own satisfaction I am going to try and codify a few of the arguments against female suffrage.

DARKEST AFRICA. A leap in the dark. We know the ways of women as mothers, sisters, daughters, friends, sweethearts, and wives, in numberless professions and occupations, in public and private work, even in politics, where they have played a considerable part, yet it is quite impossible to gauge how women would use the vote. On this point they are to us as some undiscovered tribe of the dark continent. It is assumed they would all be of one colour, but what that colour would be, who can tell?

PLAIN AS DAY. Are you a Conservative? Then it is perfectly clear to you that if the franchise is given to women you may as well throw up the sponge. Why, all women are born rebels! They have no sense of law and order, they recognise no traditions, honour no authority. If additional proof of this were needed, just look at the manner in which they are carrying on this campaign. Have men ever behaved in such a

6 "No Votes for Women"

way? If you are a Liberal you are equally certain that all women are Tories at heart, born to fear change, steeped in prejudice, bound hand and foot by conventionality. This is self-evident; besides, look at the way women voted at the last municipal elections in London. Have men constituents ever shown a bias equal to that?

UNSEX. If women are given a parliamentary vote they will cease to be womanly and neglect the interests of maidenhood, of wifeliness, of maternity. Only men can truly safeguard such matters. Have men, through the franchise, ceased to be manly and ignored the special rights and qualities of their sex? In the matter of local government, women may not only vote, but, in certain instances, be members of the legislating bodies: is it national and imperial questions alone that contain this venom of unwomanliness? It is admitted that women may hold meetings, speak, and canvass in favour of a parliamentary candidate: is it voting, then, that unsexes or achieves the hermaphroditic trick?

PHYSICAL DISABILITIES. Women can't fight. They are less muscularly developed than men. They have some physical capacities which men have not, but these are of a kind that do not assist them in the firing line. But for these exclusively feminine physical capacities, the recruiting problem would be more dire even than it is; but this is a side issue—the main fact remains, women cannot fight. It is those men capable of fighting who alone bear up the pillars of our Empire. When it comes to a call to arms, when the nation is threatened by a foreign army, of what avail are the

"No Votes for Women" 7

politician, the diplomat, the men of learning and science, the preachers and artists, financiers, merchants and tradesmen, the mechanic and labourer, if they are not trained to war? It may be due to these men that our armies fight in a good cause and not a bad one, that they have strong allies or at least powerless neutrals in the armies of other nations, that international interests are respected, and the ever-growing recognition of the claims of a common humanity maintained even during war itself. The weapons and equipment that our soldiers and sailors use may be inventions resulting from a lifetime of experiment by such men; the food, the clothing, the financial supplies, the whole apparatus of our fighting forces may be the outcome of their skill, knowledge, and years of grinding labour. But what of all this if they cannot fight? The conditions entailed by these civilian occupations have unfitted them for a campaign; out with them from our political arena, why do they cumber the public life of our warrior nation? Let them join the ranks of disenfranchised women, and then we shall stand on firm ground. But it is said, in the case of men, these incapables are given the vote for their latent, or once latent powers as fighting men. They have ignored and neglected these powers, but they receive the prize for what they might have been. It is only due to their own perversity that our non-combatant public men are not sailors and soldiers.

In answer to these arguments it may be said that, if truly the claim to citizenship rests on fighting power, this should be maintained, if need be, for both sexes. In the days when it was required of them, women

8 "No Votes for Women"

proved themselves capable of fighting, and probably it would take less than a generation for such capabilities to develop again. But, if by common consent they are thought more useful to the State by keeping themselves to other pursuits, if differentiation between the sexes is agreed upon for the good of all concerned, then why should the result be stigmatised as an incapacitator for citizenship any more than it is in the case of non-combatant men? Personally I agree with those who claim for physical development, amongst both men and women of all occupations, a greater recognition than is accorded to it in civilised countries to-day. I also think that while standing armies and other systems of national defence are found to be necessary it would be well if public opinion could be brought to some more logical and deliberate attitude upon the subject. If war has ceased to be a necessity, let this be recognised and persisted in at times of international strife, of national disaster. If war is still a necessity, let the fighting man be respected, not only in times of war but also in times of peace, not as a ruffian who suffers from intermittent attacks of heroism, but as the prime element in the fighting machine, worth maintaining at a rate of payment to scale with civilian professions, worth honouring at all times for those extremes of self-sacrifice which are exacted in his calling as in no other, and which are not payable in money. In the days when neighbouring towns, families, and individuals were constantly at war with each other, it was reasonable and truly honourable to wear a sword. A gentleman so equipped in the normal civilian life of to-day would find this weapon not only useless, but

"No Votes for Women" 9

supremely ridiculous. This does not mean that the sword-bearers in their time would have been wise to go unarmed or ill-armed. If international conditions can be changed and interests unified, will not the armaments rot of themselves?

THE DRAWING-ROOM LADY. To come to other matters in which physical disability is urged against women's claim to the vote, one writer* maintains that a woman is crippled, mentally and physically, during the three principal stages of her natural life—in adolescence, at the age of child-bearing, and again when maternal faculties come to an end—and that on this ground "it is only for half the affairs of life that her uncertain work is suitable." It is not stated which "affairs" are to be found in this "half," but one is tempted to suspect the allusion is to those services which, however arduous, are unpaid and unrecognised. I appreciate the obvious sincerity of this opponent's convictions, but if alarm is felt for the crippled sex at the prospect of those of them who are so minded being able to vote for a parliamentary candidate, what must be the dismay, now to-day, for that overwhelming majority of women who work unremittingly, mostly for longer hours than men, almost invariably for far lower wages, from fourteen years old and younger, right through the years of maternity, with seldom so much as a fortnight off for child-birth, and on into old age—at home-maintenance work, at home industries, sweated and otherwise, in factories and shops, in domestic service, in laundries, on the stage, in offices and schools

* "What Every Woman Knows," by Mrs. J. Parker Smith, *National Review*, Dec., 1908.

and professions of all kinds too numerous to mention. I would also suggest, for the consolation of this class of alarmist, if there is a law of nature so pronounced that women are verily incapacitated from all but intermittent pursuits, how can a parliamentary law influenced by women supersede it? If the law of female nature demands that for the greater part of life she should be excluded from mental and physical exertion, then inevitably the result of giving women the vote will be that in course of time legislation will become modified in the direction of enabling them to lead these purdah lives.

FOOLS. Intellectual disability. Women are less mentally capable than men, how can we allow them a share in the direction of great affairs of State, of the Empire, our Colonies and India, of foreign affairs, finance, and trade? True, the technical management of these matters is not in the hands of the electorate, but it is the popular vote which selects between one set of ministers and another, and so decides the broad lines of policy at issue. It is for decisions of this kind, we are told, that the male mind is peculiarly fitted, the female peculiarly not! A woman may have spent many years of her life in India, one of the colonies, or elsewhere abroad, she may be in constant communication with over-sea friends or relatives. To every man who leaves this island home there are on an average at least two or three women specially tied to his interests, who by their devotion bridge the separating seas and mentally take part in his exile, its conditions and surroundings, and all that concerns these whether in home or foreign policy. Yet it is said that the opinion of women

with regard to greater Britain must necessarily be less reliable than that of the club-men, the sporting squires, the over-worked parsons, the city clerks, the artisans, the labourers who have never stirred from these shores, whose interests are purely local, and who indulge in none but a business correspondence. Do not the incidents of foreign policy, war and peace, trade and taxation and colonisation affect women's lives, property, and interests as much as those of men?

The other day a friend took me to visit a lady whom she described as good, intellectual, charming, well-read, a model administrator of her own life and of the lives dependent upon her. On seeing her, this praise seemed justified. My friend introduced the subject of votes for women. The lady put in that she was against the vote because she herself did not feel qualified "to judge of foreign affairs." I have no doubt that if an anti-suffrage appeal had reached her in time she would have set her signature to it with a good conscience. I answer her and the numbers of women who echo her confession: "Do you not feel qualified, if you give your mind to it, to judge between two political parties as represented by their local candidates?" And to women of all classes one might add, "If you have any particular interest in or opinion about any matter affecting politics, do you not feel yourself as fit to urge that opinion upon your local candidate when he or his emissaries come round to tout for your vote as the male electorate of your own class?"

When there is a question of women's influence in the control of their country's destiny with regard to foreign countries or our over-sea Empire, these localities are

talked of as remote and mysterious, but of infinitely greater importance than home affairs. But if one of these distant giants has played a successful experiment in the way of female suffrage it immediately, in our adversary's references, dwindles to something insignificant, as a place "almost exclusively occupied with local and domestic affairs . . . of the very kind that women are best suited to undertake." In looking at the statistics and public tributes to the women's vote in these "parochial" districts, one is at a loss to discover how its influence would be detrimental to any affairs of State, international or otherwise. I am told that the case of Wyoming is hackneyed, but the following document seems to be little known, and I think it should be given every publicity. Women do not sit in parliament in Wyoming, but after they had enjoyed the suffrage there for twenty-five years the House of Representatives in 1893 passed, by a unanimous vote, the following resolution—

BE IT RESOLVED BY THE SECOND LEGISLATURE
OF THE STATE OF WYOMING

That the possession and exercise of suffrage by the women in Wyoming for the past quarter of a century has wrought no harm, and has done much good in many ways:—that it has largely aided in banishing crime, pauperism, and vice from this State, and that without any violent or oppressive legislation; that it has secured peaceful and orderly elections, good government, and a remarkable degree of civilisation and public order; and we point with pride to the facts that after nearly twenty-five years of Woman Suffrage, not one county in Wyoming has a poor-house, that our jails are almost empty, and crime, except that committed by strangers in the State, almost unknown; and as the result of experience we urge every civilised community on earth to enfranchise its women without delay.

RESOLVED, That an authenticated copy of these resolutions be forwarded by the Governor of the State to the Legislature of every State and Territory in this country, and to every legislative

body in the world; and that we request the Press throughout the civilised world to call the attention of their readers to these resolutions.

The testimony of numerous Governors of Wyoming, who are appointed by the President, not elected, and therefore independent of the women's vote, is in agreement with this resolution.

Mrs. Humphrey Ward and the Anti-suffrage League have made general statements as to the failure of woman's suffrage in America, and in illustration of this contention they point out that the preponderance of the more populated states have not yet followed suit. But I am able to learn of nothing more definite than that. The neighbouring states may have excellent reasons for not yielding to the example of Wyoming, Colorado, Utah, and Idaho, but one would like to know these reasons. It would not be surprising if they prove to be identical with those which obtain in most European States. These I summarise under three heads: (1) Blindness to the need for woman's suffrage; (2) Unwillingness to recognise the harmful injustice of withholding it; (3) Unwarranted fears as to the results of granting it.

It is sometimes asked, would not India take offence if the home Government were controlled by a partly female electorate? Do we, then, regulate our central Government according to native Indian, Hindu, or Mahomedan opinion? When our political and social rule in India itself is brought more closely into harmony with local traditions and aspirations it will be time to consider the question of home Government in accordance with the same. If our national customs and forms of

14 "No Votes for Women"

government are such that we ourselves are proud of them, we need not fear that India will feel insulted by them. Did India resent the rule of the Great White Queen? Could anything surpass the loyalty, the personal devotion amounting almost to worship, which India laid at the feet of Queen Victoria? But some say, "Queen Victoria herself was against female suffrage," and sentences from her early letters are quoted in corroboration. The private correspondence of great statesmen, Queen Victoria included, must always have special value and interest to the student of human nature and of history, but the State as a whole is less concerned with the opinions than with the life, the actions, the example of her public servants. When posterity judges whether Queen Victoria was equipped to rule, as a constitutional sovereign, over the destinies of a great Empire, can it be doubted that the verdict will be "Yes"?

MECHANICAL TOY. The minority argument. "This complicated, modern, hyper-civilised State," say some of the male voters to the women, "we for the most part make it, you shan't help to wind it up." It has been said a thousand times, but one cannot here avoid repeating that if men mostly make the mechanical toy, women have far the larger share of making and rearing the toy-makers. The tax of maternity is well-known and obvious; it nevertheless (perhaps because of those very reasons) is often ignored. It is also often forgotten that even if we discount women's contributions to the State as mothers, as participators in numerous professions and trades, and as taxpayers, another joist in the mechanical toy making consists

"No Votes for Women" 15

of those forms of labour which have so far escaped the statisticians, and whose value is not tabulated in £. s. d. Even if it be granted that the male labourer, artisan, clerk, and so on up the scale, have alone constructed the mechanism of the State, how could they be released and equipped for their work but for the mother, wife, sister, daughter, who as housekeeper, cook, laundrywoman, needlewoman, nurse, spare him the time and thought he would otherwise have to spend on these essential details of maintenance? We have but to imagine the removal of all women from the land to realise the drain which their absence would cause to the national resources. One more point before leaving the mechanical toy. Women certainly have only a minority share in its direct production, but is not this partly due to their arbitrary exclusion and thanks to laws produced by a one-sided franchise? Is not this argument against giving women the vote as if the State had decreed, Chinese fashion, "Women's feet shall be crippled," and then denied them equal privileges with men in other directions because they do not run races. The laws of Parliament and of national custom have a way of following the same bent. To the women these laws and customs now say: "You shall mostly be employed in works for which there is no cash payment; when paid, you shall receive lower rates of wages than men, you shall inherit under greater disadvantages, and finally you shall not be enfranchised because your contributions through taxation are insignificant compared to those of men."

THE DANGEROUS MAJORITY. Women in England are more numerous than men. The day is not far

distant when universal suffrage will inevitably come upon us. Then where shall we be? Petticoat government! Out-voted by women! Women-made laws rampant! Women-filled offices! Women, women everywhere, and not a wife worth wedding! What will Europe say? What will India think? What of the Navy and Army then? There is much talk of hysteria in connection with the franchise demand. This particular argument against it, "the dangerous majority," has called forth as fine a display of hysteria as one may wish to meet. Will the women then unite, and the men against them? If there is a subject on which it might reasonably be supposed that they might do so, it would be this of the franchise. But what do we see? A women's League against the women's demand, a men's League for it.

At the time of the Reform Bill of 1867 the nightmare of that day was that the working man would unite against the wealthier classes; that, his interests being certainly different and he in a great majority, all stability of the country would come to an end. Lord Ellenborough, in a protest which he issued "to remain on record as long as the House of Lords lasts or any trace of its proceedings be preserved," wrote: "When labour makes laws for capital, poverty for property, legislation no longer directed by educated intelligence will impair the individual freedom of action and the security of possession which have been the foundations of our prosperity and wealth." I am grateful to the man who put this opinion on record. He was shortsighted, but he had the excuse of inexperience for his surmises, and the preservation of his gloomy forebodings

are of immense value to us of a later generation. It may now be pointed out, as a lesson of recent years, that when one set of people legislate for others that are wholly unrepresented, then "individual freedom of action and security of possession" are apt to remain almost exclusively in the hands of the legislators, in defiance of the fact that the distribution of education, land, and money are no birthright of any particular section of the community. We may show that, in need as they were of a share in these assets, the newly enfranchised class are acquiring them but slowly, and that, in spite of their overwhelming majority, they have proved to be sufficiently varied in temperament, in interests, in aims, in beliefs, to rank themselves with both of the two leading political parties in the State. Conservative, Liberal; Tory, Radical; Unionist, Home Ruler; Tariff Reformer, Free Trader—all these political creeds and scores of others equally find recruits among the working classes. If this is how a majority class-franchise works out, is there reason to suppose that women, who represent all classes and every variety of interest and opinion, would be more tied to one policy? Some people are horrified at the unspeakable injustice of male voters possibly one day being in a minority, though I suppose it is felt that they could at least give a good account of themselves as a powerful minority. But the sense of justice of these same individuals sleeps quietly to-day while a male minority has sole representation, the female majority none. In a country where, broadly speaking, majority rule has been accepted for years, it is put forward as an unanswerable argument against female suffrage that women represent a majority

of the population! The situation recalls a remark attributed to Anatole France when questioned as to his opinion on the "Yellow Peril." "The Yellow Peril for Europe," he replied, "is an unlikely chimera; let us discuss a calamity now actually taking place, the white peril in China."

In this connection the argument may be mentioned of the adult-suffragists and of those who fear that a mere sex-disability-removal Bill would not place female franchise on a democratic basis, that while being nominally on the same basis as male suffrage, it would in fact include a smaller proportion of the working class than is the case with the male franchise. Conservative-minded advocates of female suffrage urge that the removal of sex disability will act as a barrier to universal suffrage, for many of the hitherto advocates of universal suffrage, who by that term meant only manhood suffrage, will be reluctant to pursue their demand once it includes womanhood suffrage. This strikes me as a sound argument so far as it goes: the removal of sex disability will not only defer the day of solely manhood suffrage, it will make it an impossibility for all time.

On the other hand, from the democratic point of view, it is inconceivable that those who are willing to move at once from the state of present-day total disenfranchisement of women to universal suffrage (for women as well as men) should be deterred from this course by the fact of women having first been admitted to the franchise on the present basis. There remains the argument that the present franchise system being on a property basis, every additional set of people enfranchised on this footing would militate against universal suffrage.

This, I confess, is the only one of all the arguments against the present demand which seems to me, taken by itself, a more or less plausible one. But what, from this point of view, are the alternative expectations? (1) That the present electorate will achieve manhood suffrage, and manhood suffrage be followed up by universal suffrage. (2) That the disqualification Bill be passed, and that universal suffrage, when it comes, will automatically include womanhood suffrage. As regards these alternatives the attitude of women may be described as "once bitten, twice shy"—or, rather, "many times bitten, incurably shy." Ever since 1832, when women were first by law excluded from the franchise, the promises have been many and friendly. For each extension of the franchise to men, women have worked alongside of them in the fight, have claimed and been promised equal reward. In every case they have been left out. Nothing short of a separate Act removing sex disability will satisfy the women of to-day. The extension of the present franchise basis can be brought about separately and as speedily as may be, but not until the sex disability is first removed. The argument of the universal suffragists seems to lie this way: "Unless and until we can enfranchise all women, we will enfranchise none." The reply of the women is: "Even on the present basis, the removal of the sex barrier will widely affect the position of women throughout national life, even in the ranks of the still disenfranchised." The men who raise this objection themselves hold the vote on a property basis. If it is not illogical and undemocratic for men to use this present franchise, why should it be so for women? Public

opinion in England is ripe for the removal of a glaring injustice to women; it is not yet ripe for the wider measure of universal suffrage. It is only by realising the no harm and the much good of a sex equality franchise that the nation will ever become friendly to the idea of universal suffrage.

I suppose until women actually go to the poll and the revising barristers set their seal upon disputed qualifications, it is impossible to state minutely what will be the proportion of working women enfranchised, but I have nowhere seen it disputed that although the present property basis tells against women much more than against men, yet the great bulk of women voters would undoubtedly belong to the working classes. "A thorough classification made by the I.L.P. in the town of Nelson (Bradley Ward), in Lancashire, showed that even if the property qualification were the test, only 7 women out of 468 could not be classed as working women. On the Bolton Municipal Register there are to-day 5234 women voters, and of these 4752 are working women—that is over 90%."* There is one more point overlooked by the democratic critics of the disability-removal Bill, who look with dread at the women property holders. It may be safely assumed that these are not numerous: the inheritance laws and male commercial monopoly determine that.

When I first became keen on the suffrage movement, a friend of mine, a Liberal, wrote: "Because too many men have the vote, is it a remedy to cut political

* *The Case for Woman's Suffrage*, by Thomas Johnstone. The Forward Printing and Publishing Company, Ltd., 164 Howard Street, Glasgow. Price 1d.

power into still smaller pieces by giving it to women?" Whether "too many" men, or enough, or too few have the vote is a matter wide of my subject, but because many men have the vote is certainly among the strongest reasons why many women should have it. The case presents itself to me somewhat after this fashion. I take a homely illustration. A household sit at meat together; their table is daily ruled by the householder, who sees to the bill of fare. In spite of creditable efforts to please, he often makes mistakes as to the tastes and requirements of the various members of the community, but, except for those who have the advantage of sitting near to the householder, they all share alike, their risks and their chances are on a par. One day a change is made, and half the household—those of certain tastes, physique, and occupations—are allowed to choose the bill-of-fare, the other half—of other tastes, physique, and occupations—remain unprivileged as they were before. Is the diet of these last and the manner of serving it not likely to suffer from the change? It is suggested that the requirements of the bill-of-fare choosers and of those remaining unprivileged are identical: if so, what harm is feared from giving them equal revising power? If the needs of the two are different, how can it be just to give the means of expression to one and withhold it from the other?

Some anti-suffragists have remarkable appreciation for the virtues of women. Mrs. Maxse* does not "in any way suggest that women are inferior to men."

* "Votes for Women." *National Review*, November, 1908.

22 "No Votes for Women"

"I live," she writes, "in continual wonderment at the capacities and virtues displayed by women as a whole." She has a high admiration for women's special abilities and gifts, and practical experience of their value in politics, and she summarises amongst the virtues which "unfit woman from taking over from man the reins of State" (who, I wonder, has suggested that they should do this?), "her wonderful capacity for detail . . . her sympathy, tenderness of heart, and power of imagination . . . her deep devotion and loyalty to those she loves"; and that "she is patriotic, high-minded, disinterested, no one can be more so." Now I feel it to be a very sad thing that here, where at least I might look for agreement between Mrs. Maxse as an anti-suffragist and myself as an ardent suffragette, I still must record a difference of view. It is suggested that the above virtues are feminine rather than male. I have not found them so. One of the most distressing necessities to combatants for the removal of women's disabilities is that opponents always assume we are arguing to the disparagement of men, urging the superior claims of women to exceptional privileges. I think we do nothing of the kind; certainly such a line of argument would be most unsuited to my own opinions. The desirable and lovable, as well as the contemptible and repellent, characteristics seem to me fairly equally divided between men and women, and, broadly speaking, they strike me as much alike, despite the wide divergence in the traditional habits and customs of the two sexes. To work for the removal of injustice to one sex need imply no partiality. For my part I wish, among other reasons, that women were on a

"No Votes for Women" 23

political equality with men, that we might help to champion the causes that men have at heart more fully than we now can do, and after the manner that many of them have often fought for our welfare, unaided by us.

UNWANTED. Most women do not want the vote. Then they will not use it, and the majority nightmare at least is removed.

The bulk of women now clamouring for it will not use it when they get it. Maybe; then why fuss about the "national disaster"?

If they do get the vote and use it, women will find it enables them to obtain nothing which they could not have without it. In other words, the vote is a meaningless fetish that has been worshipped too long. Perhaps; if so, when men realise this and cast away the franchise system, women will probably follow suit.

Women have won much without the vote, there is no limit to their present powers, they can "advise, influence, and inspire" the electorate; and the weight of moral character, we are reminded, will always tell. Mrs. Humphrey Ward urges that women have "the power which will always belong, vote or no vote, to knowledge and experience wherever they are to be found." Are men, then, without these same "almost limitless" advantages? Can they not also advise, influence, and inspire others, and if they can manage to tack on knowledge, experience, and moral character, will not their gain likewise be the greater? Yet do they not discover some latent merits in the parliamentary vote, despite their other immense powers?

I cannot nearly exhaust the strange and varied argu-

24 "No Votes for Women"

ments used against extending the franchise to women, but there is one more I must mention which weighs strongly with those who put it forward.

PICCADILLY. To quote Mrs. Maxse again: "The abolition of prostitution constitutes an item in the legislative programme of the suffragists. But no explanation is forthcoming as to how they propose, by a stroke of the legislative pen, to solve this eternal problem of human nature." First of all, may I suggest an amendment to the term "eternal problem of human nature"? Is it not rather a temporary phase of dislocated civilisation? Does it exist in the world commonly described as "of nature," in the animal world, in the world of primitive human races? Is it not the product of a disharmony between the natural state and the truly civilised state? It is a thing surely impossible where women are developed fully and equally with men, each along their own lines; where they have the physical force to protect their own bodies, where they have proportioned intelligence to defend their own interests. It is equally non-existent in primitive civilisations (tribal organisations) where men and women together have agreed to divide up the labours of life in the way best suited to each—the men to fight and watch against external enemies, the women to guard the home and rear the children. The thing should be impossible in a reformed, enlightened civilisation, where the interests of the two sexes are studied from the point of view of both. I have yet to come across the individual man or woman who proposes to remedy any branch of this evil "by a stroke of the legislative pen." Many strokes will be wanted, and some of them, no doubt, will strike

"No Votes for Women" 25

amiss, and their work will have to be undone and done again with the help of a wider experience. But on a question which concerns women so intimately and so acutely, can it be maintained that the best chance of a solution can be found by men alone, that the influx of the women's point of view into legislation would not give a tremendous stimulus, an indispensable guidance in the direction of an effectual solution?

We may as well look for "strokes of the legislative pen," concerning these matters, to states where women are among the electors. In New South Wales, soon after women were enfranchised, a Bill was passed enabling an unmarried woman to name the father of the child and to claim from him by law the funds to carry her through her trouble and to provide for the child up to a certain age. Formerly the percentage of deaths among children born out of wedlock amounted to 240 per 1000 as compared to less than 100 deaths per 1000 among legitimate children. The new law has had the desired effect—the death rate has decreased and fewer children are born out of wedlock.* In England the yearly statistics show:

Number of legitimate children born, 897,691. Deaths per thousand, 127.13.

Illegitimate children born, 37,390. Deaths per thousand, 261.35.†

I have in my possession a letter that appeared in a

* *The Women's Vote in Australia*, by Mrs. Martel. Price 1d. The Woman's Press, 4 Clement's Inn, Strand, W.C.

† Sixty-ninth Annual Report of the Registrar General of Births, Deaths, and Marriages in England and Wales (1906), C.D. 3833, 1908.

provincial paper. It was sent to me anonymously shortly after I had joined the suffrage movement. It is signed "Barrister-at-law," and it raises a point which the writer declares he has "nowhere seen expressed." But his view of the matter, whether or not it has appeared in print, is one frequently held, and I am glad of the opportunity his letter affords for discussing it. Referring to the women who form the militant sections of the franchise movement, he writes: "Such persons, indeed, are common scolds and viragos, who are fortunate to live in an age which has forgotten the use of the ducking-stool." He then proceeds to his main point. "There are in London at the present moment between 50,000 to 60,000 fallen women.* In *Darkest England and the Way Out*, General Booth estimates that about the year 1890 there were no less than 200,000 in Great Britain. If the suffrage were granted to women the vast majority of these unfortunates would have the lodger's vote. There would be London constituencies where they held the elections in their hands—nay, further, I believe there would be at least one where by themselves they would have an absolute majority." The closing sentence of the letter contains these words: "To me it has been a sad spectacle, relieved most emphatically by a strong element of humour,

* As regards these figures there are no official returns, but Mr. W. A. Coote, Secretary of the National Vigilance League and Deputy Chairman of the London Council for the Promotion of Public Morality, in his evidence before the Royal Commission upon the duties of the Metropolitan Police (1908) said: "They (the figures) are not reliable, but I should put the outside, myself, engaged in this public prostitution—both English, foreign, and everything—at 8000. . . . I do not think that there is anything like the number that there are reported to be."

to see these poor ladies" (the pleaders in the woman's franchise clause) "gesticulating and clamouring that they may be taken from the pedestal on which their sex is raised." Pedestal indeed! We will assume that this "Barrister-at-law" himself at least has had no share in the "fall" of these "200,000 women"; that he has placed no brick and laid no mortar in the building of this "pedestal"; even we will credit him, when "the element of humour" overcomes him, with the excuse of momentary forgetfulness of the statistics to which he had so recently referred. But as to these statistics being an argument against suffrage for women, may it not rather be urged that on these grounds alone there would be reason for asking it? According to the most reliable authorities the above figures are enormously exaggerated, but to meet the argument, let us suppose them approximately correct. I would go so far as to say, the greater the proportion of these women—and the greater, consequently, their representation on a fair electoral basis—the more cause there is for the women's voice to be heard. For surely this proportion is a barometer that accurately registers the degree of disregard as to women's welfare, and plainly exposes the disadvantages to both men and women of neglecting that welfare. "Barrister-at-law" would exempt these women from the franchise; does he think then that their trade is not an exchange? Is it honourable to buy in the market where, according to universal opinion, it is so ignoble to sell? If to provide the supply be so criminal, what about the demand? Does he propose to disenfranchise the many more than 200,000 men who have helped to run up these hideous statistics?

I would remind him of another point which has been forcibly put by an abler pen than mine: "There is a vital difference . . . between the position of the woman and the man in this market of vice. The man is not driven by poverty, by the denial of the right to work, to this traffic. The woman often is. The sweated woman worker, who cannot earn a sufficient pittance on which to exist, is driven into the army of the street. The season worker, whose wage when work can be got is too low to permit of saving, finds the same degradation. Thousands of other working women—the domestic servant turned suddenly out of a place, the shop assistant dismissed without a character, the pretty girl tempted once and then eternally banned by society—fall a ready prey to the sharks that prowl ever on the outlook for victims."* Can it be said that it is a fanciful stretch of the imagination to suppose these matters would be affected for the better in course of time by the enfranchisement of women?

Sir Edward Clarke at an Anti-Suffrage League Meeting the other day expressed himself as "delighted to see the successful efforts that were being made to disprove the assertions of the 'suffragettes' that they represent either the majority of women or the best-informed and most public-spirited among them." He believed "that neither assertion is well founded." Shortly after this speech was made, the Association of Registered Medical Women in Great Britain and Ireland asked Mr. Asquith to receive a deputation of their representatives "in

* *Towards Woman's Liberty*, by Teresa Billington-Greig. 4d. "Women's Freedom League," 1, Robert Street, Adelphi, W.C.

favour of the extension of the suffrage to women." In making this appeal they wrote: "When receiving a deputation of Members of Parliament in last May on the same subject, you invited an expression of opinion from the women of the country. In response to this invitation we have written to all the registered medical women residing in the United Kingdom, asking whether or not they are in favour of woman suffrage. The results of this enquiry are as follows: In favour, 538; against, 15." Mr. Asquith was too busy to receive the deputation, but asked for their representations to be made in writing. In reply a statement was sent, signed by nineteen women practitioners (whose names in themselves are an argument), and the whole document constitutes one of the most impressive official appeals yet made on the subject.* It contains this sentence: "In the course of our work we come into contact with many classes of women, and we have special opportunities for realising the disabilities which attach to their lives through lack of effective representation. In hospital practice we observe the miserable condition of some of the women of the poorer classes. We see at close quarters the lives of the underpaid, the unemployed, and the exploited, and also of the criminal, degenerate, and intemperate, *and we recognise that closely associated with the economic condition of woman's labour is the whole question of prostitution with its far-reaching attendant evils.*" I have placed the last words in italics. Sir Edward Clarke, Mrs. Ivor Maxse, and others of the Anti-Suffrage League will doubtless read this document

* See *The Times*, Dec. 14th, 1908, p. 6.

unmoved, but it may be recommended to those of an open mind who are seeking for guidance on the subject.

In no direction has the long era of solely male legislation shown itself more injuriously than in the resultant influence on women themselves. Bred in an atmosphere of one-sided morality their training reacts on their sons and daughters with a cumulative force which a rational training in other respects is often unable to counteract. Working women, unshielded by social privilege, remain in some respects in closer touch with the natural elements of life and see with more directness than those in the leisured classes the effects and counter-effects of behaviour. Their morality may sometimes be lax, but when, for whatever reason, this is so, they pay full price for that laxity, and consequently sex-differentiation is comparatively absent from their code of family morals. But in those spheres of society where privilege helps to cripple conscience, the attitude of many women—in other respects often good and high-minded women—upon certain customs would be revolting were it not pathetic. How frequent here is the ready connivance on the part of mothers at the shibboleth that the "social evil" is the only means whereby the health and virility of their sons may be maintained. If this were truly believed, one would expect to find these mothers urging their own daughters to this service as benefactors of the race. There is, however, an inconsistency in their practice which commends their judgment while it undermines their doctrine: they leave the ranks of this calling, which they maintain is so necessary, to be filled by other women's daughters, who

are mostly hounded thereto by poverty, social degradation, and despair.

Finally in the region of immediate practical politics we are told that the Woman Suffrage question has come to a deadlock because it is not a party question, because, though no whole party is against it, yet no party as a whole is for it. But sooner or later, if there is any meaning whatever in the demand, it will become a matter of political life or death to the Ministry in power. Not a party question? Why need it ever be this? Are either party anxious that it should be championed solely by their opponents? It is a national question, a racial question. Was ever a political party weakened by backing such a cause?

It is thought, perhaps, that the expression "fight" is an absurdity in this matter, that those prepared to fight for woman's franchise are only women, and that these have no power to seize political freedom, however great the need, however arbitrary the refusal of it. But it must be remembered that the women who back this movement show a quite other spirit from that of the Members of Parliament who in the course of the last forty years have pledged themselves to the principle of the political equality of men and women. The women in this movement are pledged to it by their belief in it, by their devotion to it, by their service for it. The greater the call for their labours and their heroism the greater their response. The more the sphere of legitimate action is narrowed for them, the greater the pressure of their cramped enthusiasm, and, whatever the cost, they do not yield.

32 "No Votes for Women"

In 1867 the women's franchise cause first appeared before Parliament in the shape of an amendment to the Reform Bill of that year. In 1870 the first Bill was introduced by Jacob Bright. Since then Bills, and amendments to Reform Bills, have succeeded each other almost incessantly. Petitions, meetings, resolutions, deputations, greater in number and in their representative character than those of any other franchise reform, have failed so far to produce any practical results. A majority of the Members of the House of Commons have for years been in favour of it. Cabinet Ministers of either party have spoken stoutly on its behalf. As Mr. Herbert Gladstone remarked: "On this question experience showed that predominance of argument alone—and he believed that had been obtained—was not enough to win the political day." * What further conditions have to be fulfilled? For forty-two years the ever-increasing injustice of this political situation has appealed for redress; for how much longer will it have to appeal to the mother of Parliaments, to this country, boastful of its love of justice and fair play, to British sentiment, famed throughout the ages for sober but deep-rooted chivalry?

* Speech on Mr. Stanger's Bill for Women's Enfranchisement, 1908.

THE END

WILLIAM BRENDON AND SON, LTD.
PRINTERS, PLYMOUTH

d

242.8

22^{1/2}

22369✓



Prayer Card.

The League of the
Church Militant.

umin-
ower,
l Wis-
lency,
nt us
ds to
name,

d of
pray
Thy
, and
ee to
aiting
ngth,

has t
and
union
Body
ve us
e in

PRAYERS.

GRANT, O Lord, to the members of this League the guidance of Thy Holy Spirit; guard us in thought and word and deed from reliance on ourselves: give us boldness and patience, wisdom and humility, insight and self-control, that being led by Thee we may endeavour so to seek Thy will that we may obtain Thy promises: through Jesus Christ our Lord.

O LORD Jesus Christ, in whom there is neither Jew nor Greek, bond nor free, male nor female: grant that all the members of Thy Body in mutual care one for another may serve Thee in the Unity of the Spirit, according to the right working in due measure of each several part, to the increase and building up of the same Thy Body in love: who livest and reignest God for ever and ever.

O ETERNAL LIGHT, illuminate us: O Eternal Power, strengthen us: O Eternal Wisdom, instruct us: O Eternal Mercy, have pity upon us: and grant us with all our hearts and minds to seek Thy face and to love Thy name, through Jesus Christ our Lord.

O GOD, the Sovereign Good of the Soul, deliver us we pray Thee from all sloth in Thy work, all coldness in Thy cause, and grant us by looking unto Thee to rekindle our love, and by waiting upon Thee to renew our strength, through Jesus Christ our Lord.

ALMIGHTY GOD, Who hast called us Christian men and women into one communion and fellowship in the mystical Body of Thy Son, Christ our Lord: give us grace faithfully to serve Thee in

this League in honour preferring one another; give us strength to do, patience to bear, courage to persevere; and in Thine own good time answer our prayers, and crown our efforts with success; through Jesus Christ our Lord. *Amen.*

OUR FATHER which art in Heaven, hallowed be Thy name. Thy kingdom come. Thy will be done in earth as it is in Heaven. Give us this day our daily bread. And forgive us our trespasses, as we forgive them that trespass against us. And lead us not into temptation, but deliver us from evil: for Thine is the kingdom, the power and the glory, for ever and ever. *Amen.*

Printed by J. E. FRANCIS, Breams Buildings,
Chancery Lane London, E.C.4.

