

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, 1913.

The Month.

Divinity
Degrees.

FOR the time being, at least, Oxford and Cambridge have settled the question, but they have settled it in different ways. At Cambridge, in a House of 600, a ten per cent. majority was in favour of the change. At Oxford, in a House of upwards of 1,200, two votes to one were cast against it. But it must not be imagined for a moment that the question is settled. We believe that in the interests of Christian charity and of Christian scholarship—nay, more, in the interests of Christian justice—the Degrees and Examinerships in Divinity must be thrown open to those Christian students and teachers who stand outside the Established Church. Moreover, we have reason for believing that the vote at Oxford was not really brought about by any disinclination to grant Degrees and Examinerships to Nonconformists. Of course, there are many who, in the interests of a narrow but mistaken ecclesiasticism, would confine the Degrees to the Church of England, many who believe with the *Church Times* that “undenominationalizing” means, logically, secularizing. Frankly we do not take that view, and we believe that many who voted *non-placet* last month do not take it either. It seems to us that the Oxford scheme suffered a good deal from its details and its wording, and a good deal more from the language used in its defence by its friends. In his speech against the Decrees, the Dean of Canterbury, probably the most influential of all their opponents, contended that a Christian thesis can be broadly determined to be such, and we venture to agree that with a

little more care and thought a new set of Decrees can be evolved, which will bring many of the 800, and amongst them the Dean, to the *placet* side.

It ought to be clearly understood that the vote was not, as some of the Nonconformist papers have suggested, a mere piece of narrow-mindedness. Just now official Nonconformity has little right to lecture the Church of England on the subject of sectarian bitterness. At the same time, two blacks do not make a white, and the 800 who voted against the Decrees were few, if any, of them influenced by the Welsh Disestablishment Bill. Orthodox Nonconformity has contributed too much to Christian scholarship and Christian theology for Churchmen to forget the debt. We look forward to the day when a fresh set of Decrees shall be submitted to Convocation, framed in such a way as will win the support of all moderate and really Catholic Churchmen.

**Church
Finance.** Canon Bullock-Webster, the Secretary of the Archbishop's Committee on Church Finance, has issued a pamphlet on the place of Missions in the reform scheme. We hope the pamphlet will be repudiated in due course by the Central Board of Missions; until that is done it is bound to do serious mischief to the progress of the scheme. There are obvious dangers and difficulties in that scheme, but we have felt that as loyal Churchmen, Evangelicals should do their best not only to acquiesce in its general principles, but loyally to share in the work of carrying it into effect, using their best endeavours at the same time to overcome the difficulties and to avoid the dangers. Canon Bullock-Webster in the four pages of his pamphlet makes a startling and most unwelcome suggestion. Put in plain words, it is the abolition of the Church Missionary and other Missionary Societies. The C.M.S. for more than a century has stood at the centre of Evangelicalism, and has represented all that is truest and best amongst us. It has done, moreover—and we say it in no invidious way—more service in the cause of Missions than any other society of the Church of England. If in the real furtherance of the Kingdom

of God the time has arrived to cast the C.M.S. upon the scrap-heap, no Evangelical will complain. But the time has not arrived, nor will it, so long as Evangelicalism is true to its Master and to itself. The pamphlet in question is an incitement to murder living organisms, and it is essential that its purpose be frustrated. We hope that in every diocese that Evangelicals will do their best to facilitate the working of the Diocesan Board of Finance and the general organization of the new scheme, but we do most strongly protest against this effort to undermine the labours of our Missionary Societies. Canon Bullock-Webster has thrown out a feeler; let our answer be a clear and pointed refusal to be parties to his plan.

We were very glad indeed to notice some sentences which fell from the lips of the Bishop of St. Albans at the annual meeting of the Church Missionary Society. Dr. Jacob is a warm-hearted and wise-headed veteran in the cause of Missions, and a reassurance from him gains additional force. He told his audience that he was anxious to dissipate the understanding upon this matter, and he added: "It has never entered into the minds of the Board of Missions to do anything other than help the Societies, and we mean to help them. It has never been in the minds of the Archbishop's Committee on Finance to do anything whatever to supplant a Society." This reassurance, coming from one who has been intimately connected both with the Board of Missions and the Committee on Finance, goes far to dispel our anxiety. As, however, silence on the subject might be taken to mean indifference, we feel bound to make our protest against the bare suggestion of Canon Bullock-Webster's pamphlet.

China. The Government of China has officially asked for the prayers of the Christian Church. If that sentence had been printed in this magazine fifty or even twenty years ago, we should have been accused not only of falsehood, but of folly. It is easy to exaggerate its importance. It does not mean that China is won for God. It does not mean that

Christianity is to become the official religion of China, either now or in the near future. But it does mean that all the years of Christian work and witness, all the patience and self-sacrifice, all the suffering and martyrdom, are at last beginning to gain their rightful influence upon the slow-moving mind of China. It does mean the opening of the door of opportunity in a way in which it has never been opened yet. Christianity and Christian missions are beginning to count in China. What of the homeland? We still have to deplore the absence of a sense of proportion in the matter of missions. Funds have increased, but never in proportion to the need, and the present position gives cause for real anxiety in many directions. This news from China comes to us just when we most need to hear the clarion call of opportunity.

The Report of the Royal Commission upon the
 University of London has just been issued, and, as
 we should expect from the calibre of the Commis-
 sioners, it is a document of the weightiest importance. For us
 in the Church of England who are concerned with the education
 of our future clergy—and no loyal Churchman can be uncon-
 cerned—it has special significance, in view of the Resolutions of
 the two Upper Houses of Convocation requiring a University
 degree from candidates for Holy Orders after 1917. It is
 important to remember that you can gain a University degree
 without a University education, and that you can receive a
 University education without necessarily gaining a University
 degree. The Report of the Royal Commission makes this fact
 quite clear, and the leader-writer of the *Times* sums up the
 position in a paragraph of particular sagacity :

“When we say that a man has received a University education, do we mean that he has set the seal upon his studies by taking a degree conferred by a recognized University on the results of an examination, or do we mean something more indefinite, but much wider in its scope—that he has acquired by association with fellow-students and teachers that spirit and love of learning which is an end in itself, and enables the student to apply his knowledge throughout his life in an ever-widening circle? If we mean the first, then the ‘external’ side of London University, which has admittedly

done such good work in the past, is still of paramount importance ; then it is sufficient for undergraduates to pass examinations upon set syllabuses and to work either alone, aided by needful coaching, or in a variety of unrelated and independent institutions, vaguely grouped under the general ægis of a University. But if we mean the second—and no one can doubt that this should be our meaning, even if it is not—‘external’ examinations diminish in importance ; it is the ‘internal’ life which becomes essential.”

We are wholly at one with the writer of these lines. Education is always more important than examination ; University education infinitely more valuable than graduation. The whole problem of education in England is as complex as any problem that man has had to face. The problem of elementary education has not yet been settled. We have changed many things in connection with it during the last forty years, but we have very much yet to do. The problem of clerical education is almost as difficult, and hurried changes are not necessarily reforms. The weighty Report of the Royal Commission has added one more factor which must be taken into account.

We make no apology for once more returning to this subject. Some Evangelicals had grave misgivings, which we scarcely shared, about the enabling Bill. That Bill has been withdrawn, and a special Bill for Sheffield and East Anglia substituted. It is perfectly clear to all who know anything of the work of a modern Bishop that the three new dioceses involved are urgently needed in the interests of the progressive work of the Church. The new Bill is not open to the possible objections of the old, and yet its progress has been blocked. Its opponents are some of them Nonconformists, and we deny the right of Nonconformity to prevent the expansion of our work ; there is little of Christian charity in such opposition. Some of the opponents, however, are Churchmen, and they oppose the Bill, to put it shortly, because the present bench of Bishops has not done its work, because abuses unchecked by Episcopal authority have been allowed to creep into the Church of England. We profoundly regret this opposition. Reformation churchmanship will never

gain anything by a policy of stupid obstruction. To overwork the Bishops that we have because some of them have not done as much as they might to exercise their proper oversight of the Church can only in the long run discredit those who are parties to such action, and can never make the smallest contribution to the real welfare of the Church. We yield to none in our loyalty to the Reformation settlement, but we repudiate as firmly as we can the misguided policy which would find vengeance for one injustice in the perpetration of another.

**The End of
the Opium
Traffic,** Those who have taken interest, whether theoretical or practical, in the anti-opium crusade may well be happy at the announcement made in the House of Commons on May 7 by Mr. Montagu that the Government has decided to send no more Indian opium to China. There are, it is true, some 20,000 chests of opium now at the Treaty ports which have in some way to be absorbed by China, but this is the last of the traffic so far as the introduction of supplies under British auspices is concerned. It is hardly putting the matter too strongly to say that an end has been put to a state of things which was a blot on our national record. The *Times*, which handles the matter with characteristic balance and detachment, admits frankly that the Indian opium traffic with China is an unpleasant page in British history, and expresses its pleasure that Great Britain has done with it. It now remains for patriots and reformers in China to continue their crusade with unabated energy against the consumption of the drug by their fellow-countrymen. We earnestly trust that the Divine blessing will rest on their efforts. It is something, at any rate, that their hands will not be fettered by shackles placed there with the approval and sanction of the British Government.

**Wealth and
Religion.** There are clear indications to the thoughtful observer that many features of our national and religious life are just now presenting matter for grave concern. To realize this it is only necessary to put

various newspaper announcements side by side. We are told, on the one hand, that the great missionary societies, Anglican and Nonconformist, are faced by serious falling off in income ; we read, on the other hand, a letter from Dr. Clifford, which the *Times* prints under the significant heading, "The Growing Wealth of Nonconformity." The newspapers speak in general terms of the greatly augmented holiday traffic, especially to the Continent. That facilities should be increased for leisure and recreation to those who do the serious work of the world is no matter for regret ; but we cannot resist the impression, to which many are giving utterance, that there is abroad, throughout all grades of English society, a more mundane spirit, a preoccupation with pleasure and a demand for excitement, which, in the end, is bound to cause real deterioration in our national character. When material prosperity is on the whole increasing, as it appears to be doing, and the various Christian organizations have to struggle with increasing deficiencies, it is difficult to avoid the conclusion that these things are causally connected—that the voice of the world is drowning the call of the Kingdom.

A recent letter in the *Daily Mail* ought to bring

A Man's
Best Years. comfort to those who have reached middle life, and
who are inclined to be depressed at the thought
that their best period of activity and service has passed by. The writer of the letter warmly repudiated the suggestion that a man's best days are over at sixty. He has collected statistics about the great works of some four hundred of the world's leading men, with reference to the time of life at which the works were done. He finds that some 35 per cent. of their great achievements fall between the ages of sixty and seventy, and 23 per cent. between seventy and eighty, and after eighty 6 per cent. ; so that 64 per cent. of their great performances fall after the age of sixty. On the other hand, only the proportion of 1 per cent. falls below the age of forty. There are, of course, exceptions. Deeds requiring the power of youthful energy, such as the conquests of Alexander, belong rather to youth, and the

lyric inspiration of a Shelley or a Keats. To the clergyman, in his capacity as pastor and teacher, the statements of this letter may bring some cheer and encouragement. In these departments of life a man is not "too old at forty." It may well be that in ripeness of experience and maturity of thought he has a service to render, impossible at an earlier age. It would be well, too, if this consideration were to have due weight with the laity in their estimate of ministerial life and worth.

