

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.

NOVEMBER, 1908.

The Month.

Irreconcilable. THE paper read by the Rev. Darwell Stone, Librarian of the Pusey House, at the Church Congress naturally created great interest through its perfect frankness. Mr. Stone expressed the view that there is no essential difference between the Roman, Greek, and Anglican Churches on the subject of the presence of our Lord in the Holy Communion; that the importance of the Vestments lay in the fact that they bore witness to this identity of view, and that, therefore, so far from Vestments meaning very little, in reality they mean very much. We are glad to have so unequivocal a statement of the extreme Anglican position, because it helps us to understand more clearly the issues at stake. As the Dean of Canterbury rightly said during the discussion, it will surely be impossible now for any Bishops to say that the Vestments have no doctrinal meaning. Mr. Stone's paper will have another salutary effect if it helps to remove the impression created in some quarters that the Pan-Anglican Congress was going to bring us all into a delightful unity. The idea of unity among Churchmen was a dream of unduly optimistic souls who failed to see what the Dean of Canterbury so plainly stated at Manchester—that the differences between those whom Mr. Stone represents and the main body of English Churchmen are irreconcilable. For our part we welcome all such plain-speaking, because it will prevent us from continuing to foster the illusion, or rather delusion, that unity is possible between men holding such diverse views. This is no difference between High Church and Low Church; it is a question of what constitutes the Anglican position. If there is no essential difference on the Holy Communion between Rome, the Greek Church, and our-

selves, we naturally ask why Cranmer and Ridley died. Yet it is a simple fact that they did die, and that the views for which they laid down their lives are now enshrined in our Prayer-Book and Articles. If, too, there is no essential difference between the three Churches, how is it that no well-informed Roman Catholic or member of the Greek Church will accept the statements of our Prayer-Book and Articles as identical or sufficiently in harmony with their own? Unless, therefore, we are prepared to deny the history of the last 350 years, Mr. Darwell Stone's position is an entire impossibility, and the sooner the question is faced by Churchmen, the better it will be for all concerned.

**Biblical
Criticism.**

The utterances of Professor Burkitt at the Church Congress are a fresh reminder of the impossibility of stopping short with the criticism of the Old Testament while leaving the New Testament intact. The Professor showed that St. Paul's teaching is based on Genesis, and as modern criticism has set aside Genesis it naturally sets aside St. Paul also. Professor Burkitt was quite frank in his repudiation of the Apostle's view of sin and death, and we have no doubt that other views of the Apostle will be similarly criticized and rejected. And yet there still remains the question of St. Paul's authority as an exponent of the Divine will, in the light of his claim to be God's special messenger and mouthpiece. There arises, too, the problem of the relation of the Church of England to Apostolic teaching, for our Prayer-Book and Articles are confessedly based on the Apostle's view of the origin and fall of man. It will thus be seen how grave are the issues which have been raised by Professor Burkitt's words, and we are not surprised to learn that Mr. Watts-Ditchfield, in dealing with secularism, told the Congress that such utterances would do more harm in his work in the East End than all the views of Mr. Blatchford and other sceptics. But here again good will undoubtedly result from this frank statement of the critical position. Professor Burkitt has the logic and courage of his convictions. We much prefer a bold, outspoken statement

like his to any halting, balanced opinion by men who have accepted the critical position, but who are afraid to draw the obvious conclusions. A writer, referring to another paper read at the same meeting, said that the speaker "in his more subtle way implied all that Professor Burkitt stated, but his position was so draped in words that the Congress did not seem to realize it." Whether this view is correct or not, we are certainly coming as quickly as possible to the parting of the ways on Biblical criticism, and men will soon have to declare where they stand and what are the limits of criticism for Christian people. It is impossible to halt much longer between two opinions.

Reunton. The long correspondence in the *Times* has now been brought to an end for the present, and all who value truth are indebted to Dr. Rashdall and Canon Henson for their trenchant and unanswerable letters on the subject. Notwithstanding the studied and significant moderation of the letters of "A Principal of a Theological College," his position leaves us just where we were before, with no approach whatever on the part of Churchmen to Nonconformists, and, of course, no possibility of any approach of Nonconformity to ourselves. And, as the *Times* very truly said, in its leading article summing up the correspondence, we are left face to face not merely with the letters of "Principal," but also with the same opinion expressed in the cruder form preferred by popular manuals—that "there never has been a Church without a Bishop, and there never can be." The matter cannot possibly rest here. We must go forward, and investigate what is essential and what is not essential in the ministry, however ancient, honoured, and universal the latter may be. We commend the following comment of the *Times'* article as summing up the truth on this important question:

"Those who would make the Apostolical Succession the sole channel of ministerial grace and power cannot affect to be surprised if it is urged that the "dogma" appears to break down at the start. Our Lord's gift to His followers was not a ready-made constitution and a carefully-graded hierarchy, but a Spirit of guidance. We lay no stress on the fact that the only recorded consecration to the Apostolate took place before the full out-pouring of the

Spirit, but it is at least worth notice that no similarly formal consecration is recorded in the case of St. Paul. His ordination as a missionary is clear, but his position as the equal of St. Peter and 'those who were reputed to be somewhat' was won in the teeth of those others. He received the right hand of fellowship only when they saw the grace that was given to him, and, if they had withheld it, the Apostle must have gone to his work all the same. There are many to whom it seems that, after this, the mists which enshroud the post-Apostolic development of Church government are not to be marvelled at, though it is the obvious duty of the investigator to scatter them if he can."

Meanwhile, we would again call attention to the distinction between an invalid and an irregular ministry, and would urge with the *Church Quarterly Review*, already quoted in these pages, that it is time for us to cease to consider the question of validity as entirely beyond our investigation, and to concentrate attention on the problem of regularity. We shall then be occupying the only true position from which to face the problem of Reunion.

One of the results of the recent Lambeth Conference has been the appointment of a Consultative Committee of experts to co-operate with the Archbishop of Canterbury. This committee, it would seem, is to fulfil the functions of an Advisory Board on questions submitted to it from the various parts of the Anglican Communion. Beyond this there is a dream indulged in by not a few Churchmen of a virtual Patriarchate of Canterbury, with large opportunities of giving counsel and pronouncing decisions of policy. Already our contemporary, the *Churchman* of New York, has sounded the warning note, and will have none of this Consultative Committee, which it regards as either an impossibility, or, if a possibility, likely to encroach upon the liberty of particular branches of the Anglican Communion. Here are the words of the article :

"The principle involved is not dependent upon what the Consultative Body is to do. The object of its organization is control. History, ecclesiastical or otherwise, justifies us in saying it would be safer that any authority committed to it should have the authority of law, rather than that of advice. We know what law is, and can deal with it, but the dominion of advice is

The
Central
Consultative
Committee.

unknown and irresponsible. That the American Church for itself will ever consent to such conditions no man of sane mind will imagine. That it will desire to have any of its Bishops, on their own responsibility, accept office on such a body no reasonable person would admit."

We observe that the *Canadian Churchman* takes the same general line of strenuous opposition, and urges that such a consultative body would be detrimental to the interests of an autonomous Church like that of Canada. It is impossible to doubt that consultation in such a case will mean virtual control, and we are not surprised to find American and Canadian Churchmen opposing the project. We should not be surprised if this attitude of opposition would be more than sufficient to prevent the Consultative Committee from being anything but of the slightest practical service, unless it be between the Church of England and the Anglican Church in the Colonies. The conditions of distance and the differences of race and circumstances are likely to prevent such a project from being fully realized, to say nothing of the deeper considerations involved in such a departure from the position of national Churches, which many feel to be the most serious objection. In the meantime the further developments of the project will be watched with keen interest in all parts of the Anglican Communion, and we should not be at all surprised to find that the present project comes as far short of realization as the earlier proposals emanating from the Lambeth Conference of 1897 have been. And if so, no harm will be done.

Vestments. A valuable contribution to the discussion of this important subject appeared in the *Times* of September 10, in a review of the well-known book by Father Braun, S.J. The reviewer's words are so important that we make no apology for quoting them at length. Speaking of the recent Report of the five Bishops to the Southern Convention, the writer said :

"In this report the Bishops arrive at a general conclusion as creditable to their scholarship as to their episcopal discretion. 'As regards the ornaments of the minister,' they write, 'we believe that the evidence here

collected indicates that they cannot rightly be regarded as expressive of doctrine, but that their use is a matter of reverent and seemly order.' From the liturgical standpoint this conclusion is strictly accurate; from the point of view of practical Church politics it had the advantage of enabling the Bishops to avoid a pronouncement which would inevitably have offended one or other of the warring schools into which their flocks are divided. It is for this latter reason that the 'conclusion' may perhaps be suspected of just a touch of well-intentioned disingenuousness. If Vestments are not 'expressive of doctrine,' why were the reformers so careful to reject some and to retain others? And why, after they had passed out of 'the reverent and seemly order' of the Church for nigh on 300 years, did the rejected Vestments reappear in connection with the revival of the very doctrines which had been cast off with them at the Reformation? The truth is that, while it is strictly accurate to say that (with two or three possible exceptions) the liturgical Vestments are not, and never have been, symbolical of any particular doctrine, they have been from time immemorial so closely associated with acts of worship implying distinctive teaching (such as the Sacrifice of the Mass) as to justify a strong presumption that where they are deliberately introduced they are intended as the outward sign of the maintenance of that teaching. This, indeed, would be admitted by High Churchmen as readily as it is maintained by members of the Church Association. The chasuble, in itself the most innocuous, if not the most beautiful, of garments, is loved or loathed as the 'Mass vestment' *par excellence*; and it is beside the mark to explain that it was once worn 'at all times of their ministrations,' as well as in ordinary life, by the clergy of all degrees, and that earlier still it was no more than the everyday cloak of common folk and slaves."

These considerations will be of real service in the forthcoming discussion in Convocation. Read together with Mr. Darwell Stone's paper at Manchester they show the utter impossibility of dissociating Vestments to-day from doctrinal teaching. It is astonishing that this simple fact is not allowed to have weight with those who are striving for peace by evacuating the chasuble of all the meaning that its users insist on associating with it.

Echoes of the Eucharistic Congress have been heard during the month, and we are glad to observe that the vast majority of sober-minded Englishmen have welcomed the intervention of the Government as saving us from a situation which could only have led to irreparable trouble and disaster. The Congress has naturally been the occasion of calling renewed attention to the essential position of

Roman
Catholicism.

the Roman Church, and for this reason we wish to call attention to some words of the *Nation* :

“Catholicism, though a survival on a vast scale, is a survival; its disappearance or transformation is a matter of time; the Reformation was the turning-point. The evolution of religion pursued its way; nothing could arrest or deflect it. But ‘the other disciple outran Peter’: the Churches of the Reformation took over the birthright which Rome definitely, and once for all, declined. Since then, the jetsam of the tide, she has remained unmoved in the movement of humanity; the stream of life has flowed in other channels and into other seas. The progressive elements in the system—and there are such—are not those that appear on the surface. This, imposing as it is, is the mask of dissolution; it has the name of being alive, but is dead.”

We commend this to those who dream of reunion with Rome. As the writer truly says, Rome as it is to-day must either disappear or become transformed. In the latter case it would no longer be what we now know as Roman Catholicism. We are not unmindful of all the elements of truth and goodness in Romanism, and we would not for a moment forget all that it has done for individual lives and for the world; but at the same time we do not hesitate to say that as a system Roman Catholicism is not Christianity.

The Unemployed. It has been evident for several weeks that the problem of unemployment will be very acute this winter, and indeed it is already acute. For this reason the statement made by the Prime Minister outlining the Government proposals for dealing with the problem has received a very general welcome. It goes far to remove concern, and it fully recognizes the seriousness of the situation. The carrying out of the plans outlined ought to lessen a good deal of the sufferings of this winter, as well as to bring to a large number of the unemployed the assurance of relief which will be at once fairly adequate, and not humiliating. Of course, these measures are only palliative, and do not touch the root of the difficulty. Until, however, the underlying causes of unemployment can be dealt with, there seems to be no other step possible except the provision of temporary work by public authorities. The problem itself is to be faced next session, and will call for the earnest and

prolonged attention of the entire community. It is the bounden duty of the country to do its utmost to seek for permanent remedies. After all, it is not doles, but work, that men need and should have. In the meantime it is possible to accomplish a good deal by private and local effort on behalf of the unemployed in particular neighbourhoods. By careful thought and combined effort, individuals, Churches, and municipalities can do much to relieve pressure this winter, and at the same time, by obtaining experience, to prepare in the best possible way for attacking the gigantic general problem which undoubtedly is at the very foundation of our nation's welfare.

**English
Church
Manuals.**

We desire to call the special attention of our readers to a new series of English Church manuals which has just been commenced. They are intended to provide Churchpeople with trustworthy information and clear guidance on the many questions now affecting Church life. Four manuals have just been published: "The Church and Social Subjects," by the Rev. Henry Lewis; "Family Prayers," by the Rev. A. F. Thornhill; "The Vocation of Women," by Georgina A. Gollock; "Hard Words in the Prayer-Book," by the Rev. Canon Girdlestone. It will be seen that they deal with a variety of subjects, and the treatment will be found clear and telling. Clergymen and Church-workers should make a point of obtaining these manuals and circulating them in their parishes. There is a constant call on the part of Evangelical Churchmen for suitable manuals for instruction and information. Here the need is supplied in an admirable way. The price, one penny, brings them within the reach of all; they are in the capable editorial hands of Canon Wright, Dr. Dawson Walker, and the Rev. J. E. Watts-Ditchfield; and they are published in the attractive form which we have long learned to associate with Messrs. Longmans. We bespeak for these capital manuals the attention and circulation they deserve. We understand that a large number more are in active preparation, and altogether they will provide the Church with an armoury of teaching and inspiration.