

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

September, 1914.

The Month.

A Righteous Cause. IF ever a nation had to take up arms in defence of a righteous cause it is now, when the lustful aggressiveness of Germany, and the overweening vanity of its Emperor, have menaced all Europe, and gravely threatened the stability and safety of our own country. "We know you now, war lord," to quote William Watson's words; and we see clearly enough that Germany's refusal to come into the London Conference to settle the small outstanding difficulty which remained after Servia's answer to Austria's ultimatum was of set purpose to make an excuse for taking up arms. We need not pursue the rest of the story. Germany's wanton invasion of the neutrality of Belgium left England no alternative but to fulfil its treaty obligations to that country, unless we were for ever to be discredited and disgraced in the councils of Europe. There may have been some who, like the Archbishop of York, did not find it easy at first to convince themselves that we were right to intervene, but the publication of the correspondence which passed between our own Government and that of Germany quickly removed every doubt. We may "hate war," we may regard it as "the bankruptcy of Christian principle," yet, when all the circumstances are fully weighed, and we remember how earnestly and courageously England strove to preserve peace, we are forced to the conclusion that it is an act of righteousness to bear our share in this great conflict. We agree entirely with the Archbishop of York, who, in his sermon in the Minster, after explaining how his earlier doubts had

disappeared, said that "every Christian man may give his whole-hearted loyalty to his King and country in this war, and yet honestly believe that in so doing he is not disloyal to the Kingdom of God." "I dare to say," his Grace added, "that we can carry this cause without shame or misgiving into the presence of Him Who is the Judge of the whole earth and ask Him to bless it."

The Church of England, as the National Church of the country, has a great part to play in a national crisis of this kind, and it must gratefully be acknowledged that our leaders have risen splendidly to the opportunities and responsibilities of the occasion. When the war-cloud first appeared the two Archbishops called the nation to pray for the preservation of peace, and such was the response that there was hardly a church in the land where such prayer was not made. We feel no doubt that it was the prompt action of the Church's leaders at this early stage which contributed not a little to that steadiness and restraint on the part of the people which have been the admiration of all. The Archbishop of Canterbury, fresh from preaching before the King, came to Westminster Abbey, and there delivered a sermon full of reassuring thoughts and disciplinary counsels. He repudiated the suggestion that war is so inveterate and essential a habit of the peoples of the earth that to look for peace was a fanatical and baseless dream. "To think so," he said, "would be to belie Christian faith, Christian promises, Christian hope." "The thing," he added, "which is now astir in Europe is not the work of God, but of the devil." It was just conceivable that for us in England the storm-cloud might roll by unbroken, but "the searching discipline has in any case come to us for our abiding good." (The sermon has since been published as a penny pamphlet by the S.P.C.K., with the title, "On the Eve of a Great War.") Then, when war was declared, a Special Form of Intercession was prepared by authority of the Privy Council for use in church, and this is being used continuously

at all our services. The two Archbishops again called the nation to prayer, this time appointing a Special Day, August 21, which it was hoped would be observed by the Roman Catholic Church and the Free Churches as well as by the Church of England. Once more: there has been issued through the S.P.C.K. "Forms of Prayer for Public and Private Use in Time of War," supplementary to those previously set forth. Thus the Church's leaders have done everything possible to centre the mind of the nation upon God, Who is alone our Refuge and Strength, and our ever-present Help in trouble. He will defend the right; He it is Who will vindicate our cause. It needs be added that these calls to seriousness, watchfulness, and prayer have awakened the consciences of great numbers of our people, and parochial clergy are so arranging their services that there may be a great volume of intercession ever going up to Heaven in connection with this most lamentable war. It is only by such means that we can look for decisive victory in the field, and the early restoration of the blessings of peace.

It is sometimes said that we have lost the capacity for framing Forms of Prayer such as distinguished divines of old, and that modern compositions will not bear comparison with ancient collects. The criticism is not wholly unwarranted; but it must be admitted that the Form of Intercession and the Supplementary Forms of Prayer are marked by dignity and grace of style and tenderness and sympathy of expression. They touch the hearts of the people; they give utterance to the most ardent longings; they emphasize our deepest needs. It is not for nothing that confession of sin occupies a prominent place, for realizing, as we must do, that war is one of God's sore judgments, we need to humble ourselves before Him for our misdoings, both personal and national. It is only when we have acknowledged our transgressions and truly repented of our sin that we can with confidence approach the Throne of Grace for ourselves and for others. The prayers which follow for the King and

**The Forms of
Intercession.**

for those in authority, for our sailors and soldiers on service, for the sick and wounded, for doctors and nurses, and for those in anxiety and sorrow, poverty and need, have a pathos of their own, and we pity the men or the women who can read these prayers and not feel their own heart stirred with emotion. Finally, prayer is asked for the restoration of "a rightful and abiding"—the words are well chosen—peace, and that the present distress "may be overruled for the advancement of God's Kingdom." Assuredly this is no conventional phrase. "God is working His purpose out," and, although it may not be given to us to see how this war may hasten the reign of eternal righteousness, we can humbly believe that He Who maketh the wrath of man to praise Him can so direct and control events that even the clash of armies will not hinder the progress of His Kingdom. And, believing this, we do right to pray. It has been pointed out that the earlier Form of Intercession contained no reference to our Allies and no prayer for victory. These omissions are rectified in the Supplementary Forms of Prayer, which seem to meet every need. These "Forms" are supplied in a pamphlet issued by the S.P.C.K. which contains Prayers for Use in Church Services and Schools, Family Worship, and Private Devotion, as well as suggested topics for prayer and a list of passages from Holy Scripture suitable for use at Intercession services. We regard with much favour the provision of prayers for family worship, and trust that the troubles and anxieties of the war may lead to a much-needed revival of a wholesome practice which has been fast falling into disuse.

It will not have escaped notice that in both "The Fallen." forms of intercession provision is made for prayer for those fallen in battle. In that issued by the authority of the Privy Council there are two references. At Holy Communion prayer is asked commending to the mercy of God "those who fall in the service of their country"; and in the general prayers, following intercession for the sick and wounded, comes the

petition, "and in Thy redeeming love have mercy on the fallen." In the Supplementary Forms there is the suffrage "for all who die in battle or through sickness in this war : that Thou wouldst receive their souls into Thy holy keeping, and grant unto them a merciful judgment at the last day." Then in the "memorial of such as have fallen in the service of their country" there is a prayer commending "into Thy hands of mercy, most merciful Father, the soul of our brother [. . .] now departed : beseeching Thine infinite goodness to give us grace to live in Thy fear and love, and to die in Thy favour : that when the judgment shall come, which Thou hast committed to Thy well-beloved Son, both this our brother and we may be found acceptable in Thy sight." We hope we shall not be misunderstood, but we feel bound to ask whether these supplications are justified by the teaching of Holy Scripture or the practice of the Church of England? We know the great difficulty which surrounds the whole question of prayers for the dead, and we fully recognize that, when loved ones have fallen in battle, away from home and kindred, the human heart, wounded and stricken in sorrow, yearns to say : "O God, have mercy upon them ; O God, bless them!" Such a feeling awakens our tenderest sympathy ; but it is necessary to point out that, in the arrangement of public services, important considerations arise which do not affect private aspirations, and it seems to us that these have hardly received sufficient attention at the hands of the authorities. We should deprecate most strongly the stirring up of the controversial spirit over such a subject and at such a time, but we may, perhaps, be permitted to express our deep regret that those responsible for the special services were not content to keep the public references to those fallen in battle within the careful and restrained language used in its every mention of the departed in the Book of Common Prayer.

The Central Consultative Committee of the
 The Kikuyu Question. Lambeth Conference duly met to consider the
 Kikuyu Question, and tendered to the Arch-
 bishop of Canterbury certain advice which will enable His Grace

to make a communication to the East African Bishops, and this he hoped to do "at as early a date as possible." That, however, was before the war broke out. The situation is now so entirely changed—not that there is any alteration in the condition or purpose of the issues at stake, the change is rather in the mind of the Church—that we venture to express the earnest hope that at least the publication of the Archbishop's decision may be deferred until quieter times come to us. We have great confidence in the sage and alert statesmanship of the Archbishop ; but it is practically certain that, although his whole energy may be devoted to finding some *modus vivendi*, his decision must cause uneasiness and controversy on one side or the other, or perhaps on both. In view, therefore, of the grave crisis in which the nation finds itself, and of the absolute necessity for Churchmen to be as united as possible, it would be safer and wiser to let the matter stand over till a more convenient season. There is no immediate hurry for the decision, although we feel very strongly that the matter cannot be shelved indefinitely. The issues are exceedingly grave, and the matter will need the most careful attention. It will generally be admitted, however, that this is not the time when a controversy of the very first importance can be given the consideration it requires.

We have read with profound interest and un-
 "Steps Towards
 Reunion," speakable gratitude the statement prepared for
 the Consultative Committee by the Bishops of
 Mombasa and Uganda. It is published in pamphlet form under
 the title of "Steps Towards Reunion" (Longmans, Green and
 Co. ; 1s. net). The following summary of its principal contents
 may be appended :

"The Bishops take their stand on Resolution 12 of the Lambeth Conference of 1888, which 'earnestly requested' constituted authorities to hold themselves in readiness to enter into conference with representatives of other Christian communions, 'in order to consider what steps can be taken' towards reunion. The proposals formulated by the Kikuyu Conference 'owe their existence to the pressure of actual necessity,' and throughout the negotiations the four conditions of the Lambeth Quadrilateral were kept

steadily in view. The first three conditions, which relate respectively to the Scriptures, the Apostles' and Nicene Creeds, and the Sacraments, have been satisfied, although the third condition was not secured 'without the loss of some missionaries who, but for it, would have entered the federation.' The fourth condition offered greater difficulty. 'A general acceptance of episcopacy has not, indeed, been fully secured,' 'and for this reason,' it is added, 'not reunion, but only federation is proposed,' but 'there are indications that the African Church of the future will be organized on episcopal lines.' The Bishops then vindicate their action in regard to the celebration of Holy Communion at Kikuyu; and on the larger question of the reception of members of non-episcopal Churches who wish to attend an Anglican Communion, they point out that three courses are open. They may be excluded, or allowed as visitors, or invited, and it is of this third course that the Bishops say 'such liberty seems to be demanded by any principle of missionary comity.' The question of attendance at Communion in non-episcopal Churches is admittedly more difficult. The advice offered to converts may be negative, neutral, or positive, but in any case 'it is important that no federated Church should repel the communicant from another federated Church who is in good standing in his own Church.' The Bishops then examine other proposals. The Bishop of Oxford's plea for isolation 'is not the position taken by the Lambeth Conference'; and the Bishop of Zanzibar's proposal for a Central Missionary Council is dismissed because 'its doctrinal basis is deficient,' and its proposed regulations as to the Holy Communion 'make its general acceptance an impossibility.' Finally, the Bishops hold that 'no fear of consequences'—*e.g.*, endangering the cohesion of the Anglican Communion—'ought to deter from a positive duty,' and they submit that the Kikuyu proposals have been framed 'in entire loyalty to the spirit of the Lambeth Conference' and, 'in humble obedience, as we believe, to the will and purpose of our Divine Lord.'"

"The Case
Against
Kikuyu."

The Bishop of Zanzibar also has published the statement he prepared for the Consultative Committee, and it appears in pamphlet form as "The Case Against Kikuyu" (Longmans, Green and Co.; 1s. net). In summing up "the case urged by me against the Kikuyu Conference," Bishop Weston thinks it may make for simplicity if he does so in a set of questions, in answering which "a man can easily discover the underlying principles involved in this grave issue." His questions are as follows :

1. Did our Lord Jesus Christ found a society called the Church?
2. Did our Lord institute the Apostolate, to be His Body of Witnesses?
3. Did our Lord will that the Apostolate should be continued after the death of the Twelve?
4. Is the Episcopate the legitimate continuation of the Apostolate, according to our Lord's will?
5. Is fellowship with the Episcopate

rightly representative of fellowship with the Apostles? 6. Is fellowship with the Episcopate the evident condition of present full membership in the Visible Church? 7. Is a man to be invited to the Church's Altar who deliberately refuses to have fellowship with the Episcopate, and is therefore not maintaining his membership in the Visible Church? 8. Is such a man to be ranked as a teacher under episcopal sanction? 9. Is a society of such men, *as a society*, to be regarded as a living, organic branch of the Catholic Church? 10. Is such a society to receive the approval of the Episcopate in closing for ever to the Catholic Church the door into its present sphere? 11. Are the Sacraments ministered in such a society, by men who have no episcopal ordination, to be regarded by the Church as on the same level as the Catholic Sacraments? 12. Is not a Catholic Bishop bound to preach faith in the Holy Catholic Church to all men, and to require of them that they both seek and exercise the same? 13. Is there any Divine authority for any modified theory of Episcopacy other than that of the undivided Church? 14. May any one Bishop, or group of Bishops, declare new terms of communion with the Catholic Church? 15. Is there any revealed basis of reunion other than the Episcopate?

These questions are quite fairly put, but they admit of a very short and easy answer. We fear, however, that the reply we should make to them would hardly satisfy the Bishop of Zanzibar.

**The Welsh
Church
Inquiry.**

The action of the House of Lords in appointing a Select Committee to inquire into certain important issues connected with the Welsh Church Bill commended itself to every lover of equity and justice. The way the Government in the House of Commons ignored almost every argument against the Bill was little short of a public scandal; and this inquiry, limited as it was, will do something to set matters right. The terms of reference to the Committee were as follows: "(1) Whether the constitution of the Convocations of the Church of England has ever been altered by Act of Parliament without the assent and against the protest of Convocations; (2) whether the memorials alleged to have been signed by Nonconformists in Wales against the Disendowment of the Church represent a real and increasing objection on the part of Welsh Nonconformists to disendowment." Evidence on the first point was given by Sir Lewis Dibdin, Dean of the Arches, the Archbishop of Canterbury, the Dean of Wells (Dr. Armitage Robinson), Lord Parmoor, and others, and all agreed that the

proposal to dismember the Church by excluding the Welsh Bishops and clergy from Convocation is unconstitutional. Sir Lewis Dibdin showed that while the Submission of the Clergy Act of Henry VIII. provided that Convocations should not meet without the King's writ, or pass any canon without his licence, the agreement of Convocations to that change was recorded in the Act. In the present case the Government are proceeding not only without the consent of Convocation, but against its very determined protest. The evidence on the petitions against disendowment was conclusive as to their significance. These petitions were from Welsh Nonconformists, and completely cut away the ground upon which professional "Liberationists" have been wont to stand. The Report of the Committee is awaited with interest.

At the time of writing there is not a little anxiety concerning the course the Government propose to take with the Bills which, under the provisions of the Parliament Act, should become law automatically at the end of the present session. The war has completely changed the situation, and we note that the *Manchester Guardian*, the strongest and the ablest paper on the Government side, in an article headed "Generosity in Politics," says, in regard to the Home Rule Bill, that "with the Amending Bill indefinitely postponed, we certainly could not feel that it would be quite fair to Unionists that the Home Rule Bill itself should come into force automatically at a date which might not leave time for its possible qualification by a reviving Amending Bill." The case against proceeding with the Welsh Church Bill is even stronger. The Report of the Lords' Select Committee has not yet been issued, and if in these circumstances the Bill were forced through, it would cause the bitterest resentment amongst Churchmen everywhere; they would feel that the Government had taken advantage of the war crisis to inflict a damaging blow upon the Church in Wales, and the inevitable result would be to impair the national unity.

**Women and
Church
Councils.**

The quidnuncs amongst us have not been slow to express their strong disapproval of the decision of the Representative Church Council to give women votes for and seats on Parochial Church Councils. But in spite of their show of superiority, we are persuaded they do not really express the mind of the general body of Church-people. When we remember how large a part women fill in the life and work of the Church to-day, it is difficult to imagine on what grounds they can legitimately be refused a place in any representative Church body which is open to the laity, whether it be the Ruridecanal Conference, the Diocesan Conference, the House of Laymen, or the Representative Church Council. We should like to see all these bodies thrown open to women, but the recent discussion shows us that the time is not yet. The Dean of Durham, who is generally "on the side of the angels," expressed his willingness to give the franchise to women, but said he would vote against their admission to "legislative assemblies." But has he not mistaken the character of these bodies? They are purely voluntary associations with no legal status and no "legislative" powers, as Dr. Henson would probably be the very first to tell us if, say, the Representative Church Council proposed to "legalize" vestments. The voting on the women's question showed that the Bishops are far and away the most "progressive" order in the Representative Church Council, and on this occasion we feel inclined to say "Bravo, Bishops!" We observe that the authority of St. Paul is invoked against giving this particular franchise to women. If there were anything in the teaching of the Apostle which clearly and unmistakably governed the issue, it would be necessary at once to defer to it, but the arguments advanced do not convince us. Is there anything in the New Testament which, in the remotest degree, corresponds to these "representative" bodies of the Church?

