

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

June, 1910.

The Month.

Our
National
Sorrow.

THE sudden and unexpected death of King Edward, after a reign of only nine years, came as a great blow to us all, for somehow or other we hardly realized that he was approaching his seventieth year. The tributes of admiration and affection from all parts of the world testify at once to our profound loss, and to the splendid services our late King rendered by his truly marvellous insight, tact, and statesmanship. It is bare truth to say that we have not had so capable and influential a King since the days of William III.; and even this comparison does not affect the real glory of the nine years of King Edward's reign and work. King George V. inherits a great tradition and an immense responsibility in succeeding a Monarch so experienced, so trusted, and so beloved for his kingly qualities. But we believe that, in answer to the prayers for which our new King has asked, both he and Queen Mary will be granted "strength and guidance" by Him "by whom Kings reign." Our national sorrows are intended to nerve us to fresh endeavours and fuller determination to leave our country and Empire still more worthy than we have found them. So, while we must necessarily say, with affectionate sorrow, "The King is dead!" we are bound to add, with affectionate loyalty, "Long live the King!"

**The
Royal
Declaration.**
 It was inevitable that the question of the King's Declaration against Roman Catholicism should be raised with the death of King Edward, although we may well regret the characteristic lack of good feeling which prompted Mr. Redmond to write about it so soon after the King's decease. The efforts made to obtain an alteration in the Declaration in 1901 showed that there was a very strong feeling in favour of a change on the part of men of all political opinions, and of many whose Protestantism could not fairly be questioned. It is now understood that the Government intend to bring in a Bill to give effect to this very general desire, and we observe that it is supported by Unionist papers like the *Times* and *Spectator*, equally with those of the opposite political complexion. How, then, should Protestants meet this proposal? We are all practically agreed that a Declaration of some sort is essential, for it tends to renew with each reign that attitude of the King to Rome which has been the secret of much that is best in our national life since 1688. But it is quite another question whether the wording of the present Declaration is satisfactory, and for our part we do not hesitate to plead for an earnest consideration of the whole matter. We say at once that Rome deserves nothing at our hands. She is relentless and implacable in her hostility to everything Protestant, and her efforts to exercise political influence and obtain political supremacy are as persistent as ever. The oath required from the Queen of Spain, pronouncing those who oppose the Roman faith as "worthy of eternal anathema," might have been supposed to have kept Rome, for very shame, from making any reference to the far milder and very different Declaration of our King. But, in spite of this, we plead for an alteration in the wording, which as it stands is quite unsuitable. The King is the ruler of twelve millions of Roman Catholics, to whom their faith is necessarily dear, and we ought not to require him to stigmatize the doctrines of any of his subjects in the words of the Declaration. The following comments of the *Spectator* seem to us very much to the point :

“The notion that the State in its corporate capacity—for that is what happens in the case of the King’s Declaration—should declare the conscientious belief of any man, or body of men, to be superstitious and idolatrous is utterly hateful, and, in our view, utterly inconsistent with that tolerance and liberty of conscience for all men which is the cardinal doctrine of the Reformed Christian faith. The Declaration was due to panic, and even if excuses could be found for panic at the time when the Act was passed, none are to be found now.”

What is equally important, the Declaration is not fair to the King himself, for it demands from him an assertion of his own sincerity, which might easily seem a reflection upon his personal character at the very outset of his reign. Such a statement was doubtless necessary in the case of such untrustworthy and treacherous monarchs as were the Stuarts; but we are long past those days, and we ought not to require our King to protest his own freedom from hypocrisy in these terms. We saw how all this appealed to King Edward by the fact that he made the Declaration in an undertone. No Monarch nowadays situated as ours is should be expected to make such a pronouncement. It is hardly in accordance with the New Testament to argue that, because Rome pronounces against us in this way, we should therefore do the same, for two wrongs cannot possibly make a right. We would rather say that the most Christian thing to do would be to make wise alterations in the Declaration. By all means let us insist upon a Declaration in general, for on this we can have no discussion with Rome. But with a positive statement of the King’s attitude to the Roman Church we could well be content, and we fully believe that the large majority of Protestants in our country will strongly support this view.

We do not know who is responsible, but we cannot forbear expressing our profound regret that, at a time when all hearts should have been kept united in the presence of our national sorrow, a jarring note was struck by the introduction of prayers for the dead in the special forms of service provided for the day of the King’s funeral. It is well known that the Church of England

A Jarring
Note.

deliberately removed from her public services all such prayers, for the history of our Prayer-Book from 1552 to 1662 admits of no other interpretation, as is allowed by the most representative Churchmen. Whatever, therefore, individual Churchmen may think and do privately in regard to praying for the dead, we submit that such prayers cannot be legally introduced into our public services without proper and full legal warrant. Why, then, should the deepest convictions of very many Churchmen have been set at nought by this recent action? Was it another concession to a particular type of thought in our Church? And was it assumed that Evangelicals would accept the position in silence? Such a strain on genuine loyalty, to say nothing of deep conviction, should not have been permitted, and we cannot help entering our respectful but firm protest against the intrusion upon our deep sorrow of thoughts and practices which are alien to the letter and spirit of the English Prayer-Book and the services of the English Church.

**The World
Missionary
Conference.** Once again, on the eve of this great gathering, we ask our readers to remember it in their prayers. It will undoubtedly be fraught with far-reaching possibilities for the whole world. It is, of course, a great disappointment to many that the Conference has excluded from its membership missionaries in such Roman Catholic countries as South America, for if there are any workers that need sympathy and encouragement it is those who come from these lands. There is nothing more certain than that the Romanism of South America has done and is still doing untold harm, not only to the natives, but to the people of white races who have gone to settle there. Many in South America have no conception of any other sort of Christianity, and, there as elsewhere, Romanism has been the direct cause of Atheism and similar forms of opposition to the pure Gospel. But while we feel compelled to express our regret on this point, we are perfectly sure that the Conference is likely to prove an epoch-making gathering, and that the Missionary Societies of all

Protestant Churches will feel the benefit of its inspiration and derive immense help from its collective wisdom. The reports of the Conference will be a mine of wealth to all missionary students and workers for many a day. We rejoice to know that the S.P.G. has altered its former attitude, and decided to be represented officially at the Conference. This is a matter for great satisfaction, and we are confident that the Society will reap the fruit of its large-hearted action. Let us, therefore, unite in prayer that there may be such a movement of the Holy Spirit of God upon all the delegates of the Conference that a mighty work of grace may be manifested which shall be felt to the uttermost parts of the earth.

**Fasting
Communion.**

It may be remembered that we referred last month to the reason given by the Bishop of London for discouraging Evening Communion—that it was largely due to the disorderliness recorded in 1 Corinthians xi., and that the reason why the great majority of Church-people discourage the practice is because they believe the Holy Spirit guided the Church to make the Lord's Supper the first service in the day. We asked whether it was not rather the case that the desire for Fasting Communion is the reason why most people object to Evening Communion. We had hardly written the words when we observed a letter from the Bishop of London's Chaplain, written in the Bishop's name, in which it was said that "Fasting Communion is a duty urged upon us by the Church," and that "Fasting Communion is a proper mark of honour to our Lord." We venture to inquire as to the Scriptural and primitive grounds of these assertions. The Church of England nowhere lays down any such rule or makes any such appeal. It is worth while calling renewed attention to the remarkable words of Bishop Samuel Wilberforce, spoken in the course of an address delivered a little while before his death :

"It is not in a light sense that I say this new doctrine of Fasting Communion is dangerous. The practice is not advocated because a man comes

in a clearer spirit and less disturbed in body and mind, able to give himself entirely to prayer and communion with his God, but on a miserable, degraded notion that the consecrated elements will meet with no other food in the stomach. It is a detestable materialism. Philosophically it is a contradiction; because when the celebration is over, you may hurry to a meal, and the process about which you are so scrupulous immediately follows. The whole notion is simply disgusting." (Dean Burgon's "Lives of Twelve Good Men," ii. 56).

This is plain speaking, and it goes to the root of the matter. Those who have studied such a book as Bishop Kingdon's "Fasting Communion" and other similar authorities, know well that there is no warrant in Scripture or primitive antiquity for this practice, and the recent correspondence in the *Guardian* bore striking testimony to the intolerable burden of the rigorist view. It is deplorable that the practice of Fasting Communion should be pressed upon people as a rule of the Church when it is nothing of the sort.

Under the title of "The New Orthodoxy" a review recently appeared in the *Guardian* of that fine book, "Christus Crucifixus," by Dr. Simpson of Leeds (recently appointed Canon of Manchester). The review speaks of it as "one of a series of books which witnessed to a change of Orientation in orthodox theology." In a word, this change means a renewed emphasis on the Atonement, "and the reverse of the method made general by Westcott and the writers in 'Lux Mundi,'" by which the Incarnation was emphasized to the neglect of the Atonement. The *Guardian* review well points out that this excessive tendency to lay stress on the Incarnation leads in the long-run to something very like Pantheism, because it brings into prominence those doctrines of Immanence and Philosophic Idealism which in their essence are "completely subversive of the old belief either in man or God." The reviewer rightly praises Dr. Simpson's vigorous teaching because it lays special stress on the universal need of redemption, the depth and reality of sin, and the atoning efficacy of Christ's death on the cross. With the reviewer, we believe that "this book is a manifesto on the right side." The

The New
Orthodoxy.

works of Drs. Denney, Forsyth, and Simpson are among the most potent and valued forces in present-day thought. We are grateful beyond measure for very much that Westcott taught us, but the one thing that he did *not* teach is due emphasis on the centrality of the Cross as the very heart of the Christian Gospel.

Lord Morley's speech at the Royal Academy National Self-detraction. Banquet was a refreshing breeze of optimism in the midst of much that is pessimistic in current thought and life. The mood of self-detraction has been unduly prominent of recent years, and we heartily agree with Lord Morley and others who deny the existence of racial decadence, and who believe that the country taken as a whole is healthier, happier, more orderly, more prosperous to-day than in former times. To quote from an article in one of our weekly reviews :

"There is, when all is said and done, a better spirit abroad, a stronger sense of social justice, and undiminished energy in all directions of human activity. We have not built the New Jerusalem in the land—a new Jerusalem is not built in a day—but we are busily engaged in clearing out a great many dull spots from the least desirable quarters of the old Jerusalem, and the process bids fair to go ahead with not less speed in the future than in the immediate past.

But, as the article goes on to say, there are some grounds for the disadvantageous comparisons which have become so popular of late. Thus, our commercial position is not, and probably never can be, what it once was. Other nations have come to the front with immense resources, and we are now competing with them, sometimes on equal grounds, but sometimes at a disadvantage. Again, we are certainly being left behind in the matter of inventions. Modern developments in this respect are to be attributed to Germany, Italy, France, and America rather than to ourselves. While we have had our great thinkers, we have never been able to organize knowledge or correlate it with practice, as other nations have done. So also in regard to legislation. The article to which we refer points out that we have never performed a legislative feat com-

parable to the reorganization of the Civil Code in Germany, because we have no thinkers who plan things out in such a comprehensive way. Yet, notwithstanding all these things, it is perfectly obvious that we have ample national vitality, and there is no reason to become depressed and to complain of racial decadence. We must face our problems more thoroughly and resolutely, and leave no stone unturned to make the very best of our splendid opportunities. Above all, we must urge upon our people the absolute necessity of that righteousness which alone "exalts a nation," for if only our country is actuated by the fear of God, there need be, and will be, no other sort of fear.

Renewed attention was given last month to the subject of Prayer-Book Revision by the remarkable Memorial presented to the Archbishop of Canterbury by Members of the University of Oxford who hold the most diverse views on things ecclesiastical. In the face of all their acute and fundamental differences, they are agreed on the necessity of some revision which will tend to adapt our Prayer-Book to the conditions of the times. If only such a revision could be made apart from any doctrinal changes, it would be welcomed by all who wish to see our Church keep pace with the intellectual and spiritual needs of the day. But if by some deplorable misfortune the doctrines of the Prayer-Book are thrown into the melting-pot, those Churchmen who are indulging the optimistic hope of escaping discussion in the House of Commons will assuredly be undeceived. We believe the House of Commons would not concern itself seriously with any revision which was intended only for improvement and greater adaptation; but it would demand, and rightly demand, the full consideration of any proposed changes which would tend to affect the doctrinal character of the Prayer-Book. These are the plain facts of the situation which those who uphold the Establishment of the Church must face and accept, whether they like them or not.

Prayer-Book
Revision.