

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

July, 1912.

The Month.

The
Transport
Workers,

It seems probable that before these notes appear in print, either the dispute of the Transport Workers will be ended, or the country will again be in the throes of a great National strike. It would be out of place for us to discuss the points at issue. Only the responsible leaders on both sides, who are fully conversant with all the facts, are competent to do that. We are in warm sympathy with any wisely-conceived and rightly-directed effort to improve the lot of the working man, and to make the conditions of life more tolerable for him. But in the present conduct of affairs there are two conspicuous elements which are rapidly tending to alienate the sympathies of all right-thinking men. One is the rapid multiplication of strikes in wanton violation of previously made agreements. To strike first, and try to bargain afterwards, appears now to be an axiom. The other ill-omened feature is the tyrannous attempt to crush the "free" labourer out of existence by methods of terrorism. "Peaceful persuasion" is now becoming a synonym for brutal violence. The present attempts to produce hardship and discomfort for those sections of the populace least able to bear it, and then to protest with simulated zeal against the determination of the Government that these poorer classes shall not be so made to suffer, would be ridiculous if it were not also full of evil presage for the future.

A letter of very great interest to Christians in general and to English Churchmen in particular appeared in the *Times* for June 6, as a reprint from the *Parish Magazine* of Holy Trinity, Bordesley. It is the vindication, by the incumbent of the parish, the Rev. F. H. Gillingham, of his position as a county cricketer, against the strictures of some of his parishioners. We know nothing of this controversy from the inside, and are simply dependent on the information supplied to the press. But we feel fairly safe in offering two observations upon it. The present writers have had the pleasure of knowing Mr. Gillingham for many years, and are therefore quite sure that he would take up no sport, and that, having taken it up, he would pursue it in no such way as to be incompatible with his position as a minister of Jesus Christ. Our other observation is on the game itself. Thomas Hughes, in "Tom Brown's School Days," makes his hero say of cricket: "It's more than a game; it's an institution." This may perhaps be regarded as the language of an enthusiast and devotee. But it may well be urged that in these days, when so many forms of sport are unhealthy and comparatively demoralizing, one who can encourage his young men and lads in the pursuit of so clean, healthy, and manly a recreation as cricket is, has in his hands an instrument for good which he would be very unwise to relinquish. But when this has been said, there is just one thing that needs to be added. The Warden of the Caius Mission has said it for us in a racily written, and in many ways suggestive, book, "A Parson's Defence." He writes:

"The truth is that, if the priest wishes to be a man, it is not necessary to leave off being a priest. Father O'Flynn claimed licence to be an Irishman too, and it is not even possible to be a man of God unless you are, to begin with, a man. As a matter of fact, it takes much more manhood to beard your rich parishioner and tell him to his face that he really ought to double his subscription to the Missionary Union than it does to play cricket. To play cricket you only want to be a boy, which is comparatively easy."

Mr. Gillingham has shown that he agrees, for we even find him more earnest about the first things than about cricket. It does, however, occasionally happen that a clergyman gets so

absorbed in external things that his real work suffers. Cricket is a hobby, a recreation, a means to an end—all three if you like—but the work of the ministry is a life.

The greatest interest has been aroused by the publication of the biography of King Edward VII. in the Second Supplement to the "Dictionary of National Biography," from the pen of Sir Sidney Lee, the general editor of the whole work. Our readers will probably be, by this time, familiar with the main outlines of the biography, either from a reading of the work itself, or from the notices and reviews which have appeared with great profusion in the press. Our aim here is not to add a further notice to those which have already been published, but to point out the tremendous significance of the narrative for parents, teachers, and all who are in any way interested in the education of children. We only wish that the article could be reprinted in a cheap and handy form for general use. There can be no doubt that the late King was trained on a thoroughly wrong principle in his youth and early manhood, and that, rightly or wrongly, the same principles of treatment were applied to him till he was a man of advanced middle age. One quotation is most significant :

"History, the chief subject of study, was carefully confined to bare facts and dates. Fiction was withheld as demoralizing, and even Sir Walter Scott came under the parental ban. In the result the Prince never acquired a habit of reading. Apart from the newspapers, he practically read nothing in mature years."

No more striking example could be given of a wrong system producing its own inevitable Nemesis.

Those who are hoping to see the Divinity Degrees of the older Universities set free from the limitations at present imposed upon them may well be content with the degree of success that has hitherto been attained. It is very much better in a matter of this kind to proceed slowly and surely. We may have to wait for some

Degrees in
Divinity.

time before actual enactments can be placed on the respective Statute books of the Universities. The most encouraging thing at present is the strong expression of opinion, coming from so many different quarters, that change is desirable. At Cambridge a sharp difference of opinion has emerged; not as to the end, but simply as to the best means of securing it. Many feel that the proposal in its present form is too sweeping, and may result in de-Christianizing the Degrees altogether. They are quite willing to consider the removal of the present restrictions; but they want to make it secure that the holding of the Degrees shall, of necessity, involve a profession of the Christian faith. With this desire we have the warmest sympathy, and we hope that the most careful consideration will be given to it. It would be suicidal policy to act in such a way as to throw all these good and enlightened men into the ranks of the opposition.

In the *Times* Educational Supplement for June 4 Dr. Headlam's View. the Principal of King's College makes an interesting and suggestive contribution to the discussion. We may best express Dr. Headlam's views by transcribing one paragraph of his important letter:

"Nonconformists, equally with Churchmen, should enjoy the benefits of our Universities. That is a principle from which on no grounds should we go back. They ought to be able, not only to attend our Universities, but to obtain theological degrees in them. They have themselves met the situation in an entirely proper way by founding in connection with Universities theological schools of their own, and it remains for the Universities to meet them by giving these schools and the teachers and students in them a proper *status* in the University. There are two ways in which this can be done. The one is by having two or more Faculties of Theology. This is the method in several of the German Universities. The other is that in which several schools of theology are united in one Faculty, so that the training is given in different schools, while the examinations are conducted and the degree given by the University. This is the system which has been pursued in the University of London; and, writing from my experience of the last nine years, I desire to emphasize my belief that it is entirely satisfactory, and that it secures full liberty for denominational teaching with adequate University control. In all subjects of examination there is quite sufficient unity of belief between ourselves and the Nonconformists to make the common system of

study and examination real. On such a basis complete co-operation can be secured, and I would express a hope that both at Oxford and Cambridge it may be found possible to adopt this solution."

The urgency of great questions like Home Rule and Welsh Disestablishment overshadows just now the educational controversy. When the time comes for this question to be reopened, we trust that those who are really concerned in a satisfactory solution of it will be found to have drawn perceptibly nearer together. We say "those who are really concerned," because so long as the question simply is regarded as a pawn on the political chessboard, no hope of a settlement can possibly be entertained. At the recent annual meeting of the National Society Lord Hugh Cecil went so far as to say :

"Religious equality and the parents' rights had been finally and definitely adopted by the Church. They should also frankly offer to Nonconformists an alternative form of religious education if they desired it. Although it was a very disagreeable necessity in a quiet country parish, and a very serious and often undesirable sacrifice to make, it was, in his view, necessary and right."

It would surely seem that if the two principles of parental control and of full religious equality can be secured, the end of our difficulties should be within sight at last.

We have already referred in these notes to Mr. Carpenter's book, "A Parson's Defence." It is a good book, though occasionally flippant ; but it sometimes forgets its purpose, and especially so towards the end. It ceases to be in general terms a parson's defence, and becomes the defence of the vagaries of a particular type of clergymen. Mr. Carpenter seems to feel that many of our difficulties would be got over if we made Holy Communion at eleven o'clock the principal service of Sunday. Mr. Carpenter has a right to his view ; he has no right to present a caricature of what he calls Matins, and compare that with a Communion Service ; he has no right to quote as an argument Mr. Marzon's

Educational
Peace.

The Sunday
Services.

unpleasant saying, "Our Lord did not say, 'Suffer the little children to come unto Matins'"; nor has he any right to suggest that clergy who have morning prayer at eleven disparage or overshadow the Lord's Supper. Mr. Carpenter admits that Celebration at eleven as a general use would tend to frequent non-communicating attendance. He then goes on to tell us that "You must do what the Lord said you were to do in remembrance of Him. And you must do it at what people still insist as considering the principal occasion." We should like to tell him that our Lord made no provision for non-communicating attendance, and that no intelligent study of the records of Institution or of the New Testament generally can claim a place for such attendance. Indeed, our Lord's words, "Drink ye *all* of this," definitely rule out such a practice from the Church's list of permissible things. We neither disparage nor overshadow the Lord's Supper. We believe that the opportunity of coming to it and of *partaking* of it should be given at all convenient hours—morning, noon, or night. We attach no importance to a particular hour or to a particular order, but we feel, and we want to put our feeling as clearly and yet as considerately as possible, that the tendency to establish an ornate celebration of Holy Communion, with a large non-communicating attendance, as the principal service of Sunday, is a tendency which will in the long run cost us much of the spiritual value of the Sacrament, and will indeed disparage and overshadow it.

We extend a very warm welcome to the new *The Prayer-Book Dictionary*, which Canons Harford and Morley Stephenson have edited and Messrs. Pitman published. It is a large book, but a very full and exhaustive one, and its appearance is particularly welcome in these days of Prayer-Book controversy. Unless we are seriously mistaken, the book will take its place at once amongst our indispensable works of reference. It is a great and scholarly achievement, and we are none the less glad to welcome it because we note

that the contributors are in the main men of strenuous active service in the workaday life of the Church, and not mere students. Liverpool, a great working diocese, contributes, as the Bishop who writes the preface is quick to notice, no less than twenty-three of them, and amongst them some who make thus their first incursion into the realms of the Church's literature.

It is almost becoming hackneyed to suggest Steps Toward
Unity, that unity will come to us from the Churches beyond the sea. In a recent number of the *New York Churchman* the story is told of some recent efforts in the direction of unity made by the Bishop of Honolulu, who is described as "a strong positive Churchman." The Bishop began by having joint gatherings of the English-speaking congregations in Hawaii and joint efforts of an evangelistic and missionary kind. So well has his policy worked that the minister of the strongest Nonconformist church in the island—a church with one thousand members—expressed himself and his people as willing to elect Bishop Restarick, as Bishop of Honolulu, as overseer and leader in the Christian work of the city coming under the federation. On Good Friday the Bishop conducted a three hours' service in the Cathedral with five Protestant ministers sitting in the choir. We venture to quote two paragraphs from our distinguished namesake in New York, and to commend them to the thoughtful examination of our readers. Further,

"The Bishop proposed in one country district, where there is a Union church and one of our own, that this plan be followed. The Bishop said: 'I will send an acceptable man who shall on one Sunday morning have the regular services of the Prayer-Book in the parish church. On the other Sunday he shall go to the Union church and have a simple service with hymns, Scripture reading, prayers and sermon. Providing always that baptism and the Holy Communion be always according to the provisions of the Prayer-Book.' The chief laymen were heartily in favour of this, although the time was not then ripe for it, but with the present feeling we believe it could be carried out. At one Union church we have regular Sundays where we have the services.

"This brings up the whole question of administering the Holy Communion

to people not confirmed. But no one can understand what conditions are in the islands without living here. As an illustration, in many places we have the only service in English. Christians of all names gladly worship with us, often in buildings provided by the sugar plantations. They have no objection to the Prayer-Book; they receive the Bishop gladly; there are among them many faithful, earnest, devout souls. When these hear the invitation read, 'Ye who do truly and earnestly repent you of your sins,' etc., and accept it, who is to prevent their coming to receive the Blessed Sacrament? If they come they are almost sure to seek confirmation later on. If repelled, they decline to come to worship with us again. They accept the Bishop's care and the ministry of his representatives, they hear the invitation and accept it, and policy is to lead, not to repel. Anyone would modify or change his ideas on the subject if brought before conditions here. People are not confirmed not because they object, but because they never had an opportunity, and so are like the people of the colonies previous to the Bishops' coming to America."

Perhaps in the homeland we must move more slowly; but unless we move in sympathy and brotherly love we are in danger of being left behind.

