

# Theology on the Web.org.uk

*Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible*

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

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



Buy me a coffee

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



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

[PayPal](#)

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

---

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

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

correctly explains as "adversary." This is doubtless the reason why we do not meet with the *apostasia*, which figures so largely in the treatise, e.g., V. 1, 1, and which represents in the system of Irenæus the rule of Satan.

An interesting coincidence in phrasing is found in the tract and the Collect for the Third Sunday after Trinity. The Collect is from the Sacramentary of Leo, Bishop of Rome (440), and it runs: "Grant unto all them that are admitted into the fellowship of Christ's religion, etc." In c. 47 of the tract we have: "His fellows are the prophets, the righteous ones, and the apostles, and all who have part in the fellowship of His Kingdom, that is, His disciples."

F. R. MONTGOMERY HITCHCOCK, D.D.

## CORRESPONDENCE.

### ST. JOHN XIX. II.

(To the Editor of THE CHURCHMAN.)

DEAR SIR,—With you I regret the death of the Rev. Werner H. K. Soames since his strictures on my paper on "John xix. II" were written, but I claim the right of a respectful though firm reply thereto.

1. I submit that it *is* "scholarship" and not "common sense," which is frequently at variance with the evidence of the senses, as in the case of the words of Institution in the Lord's Supper, that can decide "the true meaning" of this passage. Anyway the eminent authorities I adduced in support of my contention were not of this opinion; neither (may I add in all modesty?) are they who have since testified to the conclusiveness of my arguments.

2. I did not disclaim Pilate's "power" as being "ordained by God," for I wrote distinctly (p. 41): "Of course, primarily and ultimately, the power to judge and condemn Christ, to whomsoever given, came from God by actual concession or passive permission—as it does in all exercise of power here below, i.e., directly or indirectly," but my point was, "Why should, and how does, the power given to Pilate directly by God to work out His purposes accentuate the guilt of the deliverer or deliverers?"

3. Mr. Soames further seems to exonerate Pilate from all blame when he asserts that "he could *not* well *avoid* 'trying' any one brought before him. Hence he was not to blame (was *not* sinful) for so doing." But I never held that the act of trial constituted

guilt on Pilate's part, but that the act of condemnation did. What I did write was: "Pilate's guilt lay in his conscious condemnation of an innocent man" (*vv.* 4, 6). Besides, and this Mr. Soames curiously ignored, the Lord's words themselves attach some degree of blame or sin to Pilate: "He that hath delivered Me unto thee, hath the *greater* sin." Clearly then a lesser sin was attributed to Pilate, and which, unless it be his unjust condemnation itself? Finally, Mr. Soames asked: "Where is there any difficulty, or anything lacking in such an interpretation?" The "difficulty" is coined by Mr. Soames himself, and what is "lacking" is his strange oversight of the difference between trial and condemnation and his repudiation of a lesser sin in Pilate. Yours very truly,

J. B. MCGOVERN.

ST. STEPHEN'S RECTORY, C.-ON-M., MANCHESTER.

### QUAKERS AND SLAVERY.

(*To the Editor of THE CHURCHMAN.*)

DEAR SIR,—Bishop Ingham, in his article on "How the Empire Came to Us," rightly says, referring to slavery, "If Quakers and Puritans were concerned with the overflow to America, no less were they foremost in this matter (of slavery)."

He has, however, made a slip when he goes on to say how "Mr. Thomas Clarkson (a Quaker) happened to see on his College Notice Board at Cambridge that a prize essay was to be competed for on 'The Rights and Wrongs of Slavery.'" It is true that of the twelve individuals who composed the original Anti-Slavery Committee, nine were Quakers, but as a matter of fact, the two personages who came most publicly before the nation in this connection were Churchmen, Clarkson and Wilberforce. It was, however, an American Quaker, John Woolman, whose bi-centenary has just been celebrated, who may be looked upon as the man who first stirred men's consciences on the subject of slavery. He died in England when on a religious visit in this country in the year 1872, ten years before Clarkson wrote his essay at Cambridge.

Quakers, by the way, were of course, like all others who were not members of the Church of England, excluded from the older universities till little more than a generation ago. Yours faithfully,

HUBERT W. PEET.

140, BISHOPSGATE, LONDON, E.C.2.

