

Theology on the Web.org.uk

Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible

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

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



Buy me a coffee

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



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

[PayPal](#)

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

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

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

THE CHURCHMAN.

FEBRUARY, 1908.

The Month.

The Vestments. ACCORDING to certain notices which appeared in the public press last month, there seems to be no longer any question that the Northern and Southern Committees of Convocation have decided by large majorities to recommend the legalization of vestments at the administration of the Lord's Supper. The idea of a plain white vestment of a distinctive character has apparently been quite set aside, and the chasuble, alb, etc., are, it is said, to be recommended for legal permissive use. The Dean of Canterbury will have the hearty support of a large body of loyal Churchmen in resisting these proposals, if they come before Convocation; while, if Convocation should be unwise enough to pass them, the consequences cannot fail to be serious to the peace and unity of the Church. We have good reason for the conviction that the present Parliament, at any rate, will not allow the proposals to become law, and we have already had the Prime Minister's assurance that nothing shall be done without Parliamentary discussion and sanction. Meanwhile, it ought to be known more clearly than it appears to be at present that on this point compromise is impossible. When the Royal Commission speaks in the plainest language of a "line of deep cleavage" between the Church of England and the Church of Rome, it is curious that Convocation should contemplate the legalization of a vestment which, perhaps more than anything else, would serve to indicate an essential agreement in ritual with the Roman Church. It was on this fact of continuity that the *Church Times* based its advocacy of the chasuble, and it is not possible

for English Churchmen to consent to these distinctive lines of demarcation being removed after over three centuries of most significant history.

The Education Question. Until we know the new proposals of the Government it is hardly possible to discuss this subject with any practical value. During the past month there has been a great controversy on the particular question of the training-colleges, evoked by the Archbishop of Canterbury's letter to Mr. McKenna, conveying counsel's opinion as to the new regulations in the light of the trust-deeds. The Principal of the Home and Colonial Training-College certainly had the best of the encounter with Dr. Macnamara over the figures relating to his own institution ; and the letters of Sir C. T. Dyce Acland, coming from so Liberal a Churchman, will receive, as they deserve, the most careful attention. It may be questioned, however, whether Sir Dyce Acland fully realizes all the conditions of the problem. One thing at least may be said—at the present moment it is essential for Churchmen to keep in view all the facts of the case, and not to allow themselves to overlook anything material to the situation. The root of all our troubles is the Act of 1902, which the Church accepted with a readiness which experience has shown to have been at once unthinking and perilous. The Act led to an inevitable demand for a school system under public control, and for the appointment of teachers free from denominational tests. These two principles have now been accepted by the Archbishop of Canterbury, and may be said to rule the situation. It is for Churchmen to find out how they can preserve the essential character of their schools in the light of the facts now mentioned. Nothing short of a policy of "contracting-out" can prevent these two fundamental principles from being applied to Church schools. As to the inviolability of trust - deeds, whether of schools or training - colleges, Mr. Balfour's well-known words in Parliament in 1902, in answer to Lord Hugh Cecil, are almost too familiar to need repetition. The conditions under which Government grants to

training-colleges have been increased, and the voluntary subscriptions to these institutions have been diminished, have introduced entirely new factors into the situation, and it is quite impossible for Church training-colleges to go on exactly as aforetime. Here again it is essential that Churchmen should face all the facts. It is unlikely, to say the least, that public control can be applied to schools, while leaving the training-colleges entirely intact. Meanwhile, as summing up the whole situation, and expressing what seems to us to be the only true and right attitude for Churchmen, we call special attention to the closing words of the Bishop of Hereford's letter in the *Times* :

"The fundamental teachings of Christian life, faith, and conduct, based on the Gospel revelation, are essentially the same for the different Christian denominations, and can without difficulty be given in common; and children and young people should be brought up to feel that they are the same, and that, in spite of all denominational differences, we are one body in Christ Jesus. The separatist, sectarian, denominationalist tendency to segregate our children into rival pens for all religious instruction may produce Pharisees, but hardly Christians. Indeed, this denominationalist spirit, which has taken such a strong hold on some sections of our clergy and a few laymen, is doing much harm to the national Church and the national life. It is quite foreign to the spirit of an enlightened Evangelical Christianity; and we should keep it as far as may be out of all our educational systems. Our aim and desire should be towards unity of spirit and friendly co-operation between the Established Church and the great Nonconformist bodies; and it is our plain duty to avoid everything that may deepen and widen the cleavage caused by the unhappy divisions of darker days."

If this spirit actuated all parties, it would not be difficult to solve the problem.

The subject chosen for this year's Islington Church and Clerical Meeting was a bold innovation on the Socialism. Islington traditions, and was thoroughly justified by its timeliness, and vindicated by the forceful and valuable papers read at the gathering. In the *Record* for January 18 a verbatim report appeared which will repay careful consideration. The attendance of clergy seemed to be as large as ever, though it was impossible to mistake the very large preponderance of the younger men, which is a good and

encouraging sign for the future. There is, of course, the obvious danger that the clergy may be diverted from their primary spiritual work of saving souls by taking up these social questions; but there is also danger in the continuance of the present social conditions and grave inequalities of wealth and poverty, and the apparent indifference to them of even the Christian rich, except so far as they are led to give of their substance in charity. It is simply impossible for any earnest-hearted clergyman to be at work in a slum parish without coming face to face with the problems of wealth and poverty, the unemployed, sweating, and the land. All of these and other similar questions have a direct moral and Christian bearing, and demand the earnest and prolonged attention of Churchmen. Hitherto Evangelicals have not taken their proper part in this matter, though our columns for years past and articles elsewhere testify to the deep interest in social questions shown by individual men in the Evangelical ranks. It is imperative that Churchmen should examine these questions with sympathy and earnestness, and do their part in the solution of them. It will only be by a true Christian Socialism that the evils of an un-Christian and anti-Christian Socialism will be averted.

The Eastern Church. Our note last month on Christian Reunion has had a significant illustration in the letter of the Patriarch of Jerusalem, which appeared in the *Guardian*, expressing his inability to recognize the validity of Anglican Baptism as at present administered. The courtesy, and even kindness, of the Patriarch's language cannot blind us to the definiteness of his refusal. It is no wonder that the *Guardian* is disappointed. We observe, however, that several of its correspondents express regret at the apparent anxiety on the part of the Anglican Bishop in Jerusalem and others associated with him for recognition by the Eastern Church. This anxiety looks as though we distrusted the validity of our position. Very truly does one correspondent, Dr. S. B. James, ask why

we should trouble whether Rome or Jerusalem or Constantinople recognizes the Anglican communion.

“Those honest Anglicans who, doubtful of our Orders and Sacraments, have crossed the Rubicon and gone over to Rome—even though some of them have retraced their steps—are to be thoroughly respected. But to stay in the English Church while hankering for Roman or Greek recognition is somewhat inconsistent and humiliating. Our only attitude—the attitude which would command the respect, uttered or simply felt, of our Roman and Greek brethren, as well as preserve our own self-respect—is to respond to any advances from other Churches, and meanwhile to be content to wait.”

As we remarked last month, our true policy will be to look for reunion in the direction of those with whom we have an intellectual, doctrinal, social, and even spiritual affinity far more real and close than with Rome and the East. We well know that the price of reunion with Rome is absorption, and something not very different would apparently be required for reunion with the East. If we learn from this the utter impossibility of laying down the same condition in any question of reunion with Non-conformity we shall do wisely and well. Reunion can never come at the expense of any genuine conviction, whether our own or other people's.

In a recent article in the *Nation* we have a useful contribution to the discussion of the subject suggested a year ago by the Bishop of Carlisle on the losses as well as the gains of the Oxford Movement. The writer says that one of the most conspicuous facts of the religious life in the last twenty or thirty years is the decline of the Oxford Movement as an intellectual force. As a product of the Romantic Movement, its strength consisted in its appeal to the imagination and the picturesque traditions of the past, but as soon as the truths of its teaching were absorbed in the general culture of the age, its weakness became evident and its force at length expended.

“It was inevitable that the decay of the Romantic Movement should be accompanied by the decay of the Oxford Revival, which formed in this country so prominent a part of it. It is true Tractarianism drags out a degenerate existence in the form of Ritualism. But the intellectual vitality has gone out of it; it has been superseded by a higher and deeper religious

synthesis; it exists, like other superannuated things, as a survival from the past. The causes which have led to the supersession of the Oxford Movement are intricate and multiform, but one of the most powerful of them has been the rise and triumphant development of historical criticism applied to Biblical and ecclesiastical literature. A purely historical study of the sources of the Christian faith and of the growth of the Church has irrevocably overthrown the Romantic conceptions of the rise and development of Christian institutions imagined by Pusey and his friends."

The writer goes on to say, in words that call for very special emphasis: "We cannot rest upon a past which history tells us never was present." In this is to be found the clearest possible condemnation of the general intellectual and theological position represented by the Oxford Movement. The more thoroughly the literature of Early Christianity is studied—by which we mean the New Testament and the writings of the second century—the more completely will it be seen that the ecclesiastical and theological position associated with the Oxford Movement is historically baseless. During the last sixty years there have been several valuable discoveries of Early Christian literature, and it is simple truth to say that not one of them has gone to prove the truth of any of the fundamental contentions of the Oxford Movement. On the contrary, everything has pointed in the direction of a close agreement with the primitive truths of the New Testament.

The
Lambeth
Conference. The whole Church is now looking forward with interest to the meeting of the Bishops of the Anglican Communion at Lambeth next July, which will prove, as on former occasions, a magnificent object-lesson of the extent and influence of Anglicanism all over the world. Hitherto none but diocesan Bishops, or Bishops holding specific episcopal commissions, have been invited to the Conference, but we understand that an exception is to be made this year in the person of Bishop Montgomery, the secretary of the S.P.G., who is to act as secretary of the Conference. We confess that we cannot quite see why this, or indeed any, exception should have been made to the former rule, unless the C.M.S. also was to be represented in the person of its home secretary, Bishop Ingham. It is somewhat difficult to under-

stand why the S.P.G. should have been singled out in this way, and also why Bishop Montgomery should have been appointed last year as a missionary representative to the Convention of the Protestant Episcopal Church of America. This is a point which Evangelical Churchmen should bear in mind, and representations might well be made, lest it should happen that in some way or other the S.P.G. were regarded as the official representative Missionary Society of the Church of England, when, from the extent of its work, the C.M.S. has at least an equal claim to this position. The present is no time for Evangelical Churchmen to let anything go by default. They must resolutely plead their own cause, and demand perfect equality and fairness as members of a great Church organization. It would have been a peculiarly happy arrangement to see Bishops Montgomery and Ingham side by side in the Lambeth Conference as secretaries. One has occupied a Colonial and the other a Missionary See, and the entire Church would have welcomed with pleasure this acknowledgment on the part of our highest authorities of the importance and prominence of missionary work in the persons of these two honoured Bishops.

A
Noteworthy
Step.

We are surprised that so little attention has been called to a significant action taken by the General Convention of the Protestant Episcopal Church of America last autumn. A canon was passed, making it legal on the invitation of clergymen, with the sanction of the Bishop, for a minister of any other denomination to occupy the pulpit of the Protestant Episcopal Church. This is a great step forward, and may easily have very far-reaching results. The decision has, of course, been received with very different feelings, though many of the broad-minded, large-hearted Episcopalian clergymen like Dean Hodges of Cambridge, Massachusetts, warmly welcome the new canon. In this connexion we notice that the Bishop of Sodor and Man, in replying to the address of welcome from the Manx Free Church Council, said that while earnestly desiring unity, he considered interchanges of pulpits between Anglican clergy and Nonconformist ministers hindered rather

than helped the cause. He thought that it lost them the sympathy of men who were longing for unity, but who did not agree with that particular way of bringing it about. There is, of course, very much force in the Bishop's contention, though it has already been pointed out that the experience of the various Nonconformist Churches among themselves shows that an interchange of pulpits does promote a closer fraternity, and we do not doubt that it will have the same effect in the relations of the Protestant Episcopal Church and other bodies in America. At any rate, our brethren across the Atlantic have taken a very remarkable step, and we shall watch with interest its effects. It is beyond all question that the crux of the reunion problem is almost entirely concerned with the question of ministerial ordination and status.

“A Churchman,” writing in the *Times*, calls attention to the announcement of a celebration of the Holy Communion for the repose of the soul of the late Prebendary Berdmore Compton, at All Saints', Margaret Street, and adds that “as a candid declaration of downright treason this would be hard to beat.” Mr. Athelstan Riley is very much surprised that Churchmen could be callous enough to use language like this at such a time, adds that “hitherto we have been allowed to perform the last offices for those we love without painful controversy.” It is scarcely possible to imagine a more confused issue than this stated by Mr. Riley. It means that in the English Church practices which are on the other side of a “line of deep cleavage” between us and Rome are to be permitted without let or hindrance. In other words, that we are to have Masses for the Dead in the English Church without any attempt to protest against the illegality. For our part, we are glad that “Churchman” called attention to this truly deplorable action. It only goes to show still more clearly the imperative need of putting into effect the first recommendation of the Royal Commission on Ecclesiastical Discipline.