

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

March, 1914.

The Month.

As these notes are being written there has come into our hands from Messrs. Macmillan a copy of the Archbishop of Canterbury's Answer to the "Formal Appeal" made by the Bishop of Zanzibar. The terms of that Answer are now widely known: That there is to be no trial for heresy, but that two important questions are to be referred to the Consultative Committee of the Lambeth Conference, the Committee to meet in July this year. The two points of reference have to do with the proposed Scheme of Federation in East Africa and with the Communion Service held at Kikuyu. We venture to think that in this matter the Archbishop has acted with his usual caution, fairness, and statesmanship. Our earnest hope is that the Committee will fairly and frankly face the point without any temporizing or well-intentioned evasions of it. The *Spectator* has expressed this sentiment admirably, and we quote its words with warm approval:

"We have only one fear, and that is, lest the Consultative Committee, out of a dread that if they spoke too plainly they might cause schism among the extremists, should refrain from boldly facing the problem of the open Communion, and deciding what is the law of the land and of the Church, and shelter themselves behind irrelevant talk as to what should be the Church's policy, and as to whether open Communions are desirable, and so forth, and so on. Such evasion, however well meant, would be an untold disaster. The Committee have a great opportunity and a great responsibility, and they must not shirk it. They must tell us in plain terms what the law is, and not what they or somebody else would like it to be, or think,

in all the circumstances, it is expedient it should be. Without fear or favour, and without any weak doubts as to the consequences, they must go forward and give us the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth. They must tell us whether a clergyman is acting legally or illegally when he administers the Communion to persons who are without episcopal confirmation. Here is a clear question and a clear issue. Let us have a clear answer, be the consequences what they may."

It is interesting to observe in the public press **A Strategic Device,** the methods of controversial strategy that are being employed. At present we are at the stage of memorials—memorials to dignitaries and memorials to Convocation. Professor Sanday has uttered a protest in the *Times* against the memorial that is to be submitted to the Upper House of the Canterbury Convocation. One can hardly expect, perhaps, to prevent memorials from being signed and submitted, but one can observe carefully their construction and drift, and in this connection we desire to speak a word of earnest warning to our readers. It seems to be the design of the supporters of the Bishop of Zanzibar to link the ecclesiastical question of the Communion very closely with the question of "Higher Criticism," and so to mask the attack they are making on the Reformed and Protestant character of the Church of England, under the shield of a defensive propaganda against "Modernist" views of the New Testament and theological laxity generally. In this way they may confidently hope to capture the sympathy and support of many Evangelical Churchmen. Those who feel distressed at the existence of what they would regard as "advanced" views on the Virgin Birth and the Resurrection may be inclined to join forces with the High Churchmen in their onslaught on these views, and may regard this work as of such importance that for the present they must sink the point of ecclesiastical difference, or agree to some form of compromise.

Now, we ourselves hold no brief for these **A Necessary Warning.** "advanced" views; we can therefore all the more emphatically urge on our readers that the two sets of questions ought to be kept absolutely apart, and treated as

entirely distinct. Those who are most keen in the defence of Holy Scripture against "critical" views may stand their ground, and may be thankful for the protests that are being uttered against such views. But they must not allow themselves to think that the Protestant view of the Church, the Ministry, and the Sacraments, is bound up with theological laxity, and that if they hold the former they will be liable to the latter. The fact that the Bishop of Zanzibar and his friends are attacking Modernist views must not make anti-Modernist Protestant Churchmen sink their Protestantism in order to join in the anti-critical onslaught. Each question will have to be decided on its own merits. To link the two together in inseparable conjunction is clever strategy. It is to be hoped, however, that Protestant Churchmen generally will not be misled. They have come to a point, as they have repeatedly been told, when they must stand firmly for, and, if necessary, do battle for, the Reformed and Protestant character of their Churchmanship, unless they are to barter away their birthright and betray their sacred trust.

In the controversy that has arisen concerning
 Archbishop Kikuyu, Archbishop Tait's letter to Canon Carter
 Tait. has been more than once referred to. A Communion Service had been held at the Abbey for the Revisers of the Bible, and a Unitarian had accepted the invitation and communicated. A number of clergy protested, and Canon Carter sent the protest to the Archbishop. The earlier portion of his reply dealt with the particular case of the Unitarian minister, and has only slight bearing on the issue of the so-called "open communion" at Kikuyu. The latter portion, however, faces the general issue of the admission of Non-conformists, and the words are so weighty that we think it well to reproduce the section of the letter in full. It is quoted from the present Archbishop's "Life of Tait," vol. ii., pp. 71, 72, as follows :

"But some of the memorialists are indignant at the admission of any Dissenters, however orthodox, to the Holy Communion

in our Church. I confess I have no sympathy with such objections. I consider that the interpretation which these memorialists put upon the rubric to which they appeal, at the end of the Communion Service, is quite intolerable.

“As at present advised, I believe this rubric to apply solely to our own people, and not to those members of foreign or dissenting bodies who occasionally conform. All who have studied the history of our Church, and especially of the reign of Queen Anne, when this question was earnestly debated, must know how it has been contended that the Church of England places no bar against occasional conformity.

“While I hail any approaches that are made to us by the ancient Churches of the East and by the great Lutheran and Reformed Churches of the continent of Europe, and while I lament that Roman Catholics, by the fault of their leaders, are becoming farther removed from us at a time when all the rest of Christendom is drawing closer together, I rejoice very heartily that so many of our fellow-countrymen at home, usually separated from us, have been able devoutly to join with us in this holy rite, as the inauguration of the solemn work they have in hand. I hope that we may see in this Holy Communion an omen of a time not far distant, when our unhappy divisions may disappear, and, as we serve one Saviour, and profess to believe one Gospel, we may all unite more closely in the discharge of the great duties which our Lord has laid on us of preparing the world for His second coming.”

So far the Archbishop. How he would have rejoiced had he lived to see the many movements all the world over, of which Kikuyu is only an example and a type, albeit an important one, all of which are tending to bring nearer and nearer together all who love the Lord Jesus Christ in sincerity and truth!

In Archbishop Tait's letter, quoted above, he refers to the reign of Queen Anne. It is a curious fact that ordination candidates, the clergy of the future, only carry their study of Church history to the accession

of that monarch. Queen Anne is dead, and Church history is ended, so the implication seems to be. Canon Scott Holland, writing to the *Times*, told us in his inimitable way that the "dear old 'Ecclesia Anglicana'" is moving on, making progress, muddling along, perhaps, but still doing more than ever before to fulfil her mission. Is it not time that we all, particularly the clergy, and especially the younger clergy, studied a little more carefully the history of our Church for the last hundred years or so? A few weeks ago an important committee of the Church, charged with the consideration of missionary study, recommended that in our theological colleges more attention should be given to missionary studies, and that candidates for the priesthood—and here is the significant point—should study the history of the Church for the last hundred years. The fact of the matter is that we are unfit to face such a problem as that of Kikuyu unless we have learned something of the movement of the finger of God in the history of the Church, and particularly of that history as the Church has had to adapt itself to the growing needs of modern life. Adaptation need not mean sacrifice of principle or change of front; it must mean energy and enthusiasm, wisdom and prudence, sympathy and consideration, courage and faith.

The *Via Media*. Among the various points of excellence in the sermon recently preached before the University of Oxford by the Dean of Durham, one of the most noteworthy was his criticism of the term *Via Media* as applied to the Church of England. The phrase, the Dean points out, is of recent origin, and dates from the beginning of the Tractarian Movement. As generally used, it characterizes the Church of England as standing midway between the spheres of Catholicism and Protestantism, with a mediating function between the two. To think so of the Church of England is to hold a dangerous fallacy. The truth is that, so far as Catholicism means Romanism, whether medieval or modern, the Church of England is totally and entirely Protestant. She

does *not* stand halfway between Roman Catholic Christendom and Protestant Christendom as a sort of neutral *tertium quid*. Since the Reformation she has belonged wholly and entirely to the sphere of Protestantism. The Dean is able to quote the words of the late Bishop Stubbs in his Fourth Visitation Charge: "I think there ought to be no hesitation in admitting that the Church of England since the Reformation has a right to call herself, and cannot reasonably object to be called, Protestant." It is well to recall this, as a corrective to the fallacies which lurk in the fashionable use of the term *Via Media*.

It is not our common custom to make personal references in our pages, but one of the new Bishops has so endeared himself to us and to our readers that for once common custom has to yield. Mr. Watts-Ditchfield and his work at Bethnal Green have been for years proof positive that the old Gospel in all its fulness and all its simplicity is as powerful as ever, despite the appalling difficulties and the overwhelming temptations of East London life. Mr. Watts-Ditchfield goes to Chelmsford because he has shown he is a real shepherd of souls in his smaller sphere, and so he enters the larger followed by much prayer and many hopes. Of himself we must say nothing—he would not wish it—only this, that if devoted service, unbounded energy, high ideals, intense spirituality, deep love for the souls of men, go to the making of a modern Bishop, the new diocese of Chelmsford may thank God and take courage.

It is possible that some of our readers who have not hitherto concerned themselves with matters of controversy may be thinking that they ought to inform themselves a little about the various points at issue. More especially they will turn to their Prayer-Book, to the Communion Office, and to the Confirmation Office, with their respective rubrics. Possibly they may turn to the Articles to see what definition they contain as to the position of the

**The Tutorial
Prayer-Book.**

Church of England and its relation to other Christian bodies. To all such we cordially recommend the new and revised edition of the "Tutorial Prayer-Book," published by the Harrison Trust. The first edition of 5,000 copies was quickly sold out, and the call for a second edition gave the editors the chance of making improvements and additions. The work is of composite authorship, and so represents the results of a body of collective learning under the direction of capable editorship. The book is drawn up with clearness and system. It is pleasant to read, and it has an index. Many who love their Prayer-Book as a means for worship have never troubled to investigate the history that lies behind it and the problems that gather round its pages. If they wish to be better informed on these matters they will do well to take the "Tutorial Prayer-Book" for their guide.

[N.B.—The word "Esq." should not have appeared after H. A. Dallas in our last number, as the writer of the article under that name is a lady.]

