

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

JANUARY, 1905.

1904:
SPECTABILIS ANNUS.

THE year 1904 has been crowded with big events, both civil and ecclesiastical, which are pregnant with possibilities. Few of them have as yet reached their full accomplishment. Many of them, however, are filled with promise. All are of great interest and importance. It may, therefore, be profitable for us to review them, so that we may define our actual position, and as far as possible make a reasonable prevision of the future, remembering, nevertheless, that among all the changes and chances of this life, in which human waywardness and obstinacy are such disturbing elements, no forecasts are wholly reliable, and events have a provoking way of disappointing every promise and of deferring hope.

The chief event of the last year, which still dominates the politics of the whole world, has been the outbreak and continuance of the war between Japan and Russia. This had been long foreseen by all wise observers who knew the facts. On one side, "an old and haughty nation proud in arms," to use a Miltonic phrase, which had assimilated all that is best and most progressive in modern civilization, has been driven to fight for its continued liberty, its most cherished institutions, and even its national existence. On the other side, we find calculating aggression, immeasurable ambition, broken promises, intolerable methods of diplomacy, even more odious methods of administration, and, at the same time, an unpreparedness which would be inconceivable if it had not been exposed, and which is only explicable first by the known corruption of the Tsar's officials, and secondly by their insolent and blind contempt for the Japanese. The course of the war has been very much what the best judges have expected. We have no direct interest in its political results, except in

so far as they must affect ethical and religious problems. We are not prejudiced against the Russian people, nor are we reckless admirers of our allies. Whatever the final issue of the war, we hope it may cause the reformation or the ending of the Tsar's despotism, both in Church and State. Facts oblige us to hold that the Russian bureaucracy is nothing less than a crime against human nature and the rights of man. It is an outrage against everything which we value most as Englishmen, and which cost our ancestors so much to win. We are the friends of the Russian people when we hope they may conquer the same rights, and so may take that place which their nature and high gifts deserve in our European civilization. If these ends are to be compassed the Orthodox Church must be reformed as well as the Russian State. We have no desire for reunion with the corrupt and obscurantist Russian Church as it shows itself to-day: the opposer of education, the encourager of persecution and of ignorance, the patron of superstition, the instrument of tyranny at home and of conquest abroad. We should, however, welcome the restoration of such a purged and renewed Orthodox Greek Church as our Formularies have longed for since the sixteenth century, and with which we might probably be in communion, to our mutual advantage. Such is one aspect of the war, and of its possible consequences. Another is that the example of Japan, whether she win or lose, must affect and stir profoundly the whole East. We have no desire to see Asia a second-rate imitation of Europe, or even of Anglo-Saxondom. Japan is assuredly not that. We hope neither India nor China will become so. But we do hope that everything which is best in the Oriental nations may be developed to the full, along its natural lines of growth, influenced and helped, no doubt, by much that we have to give them, though not dominated and overwhelmed by it. At any rate, we hope that the splendid Liberalism of Japan, its generous toleration, its scientific mind and methods, its high example of efficiency, its superiority to sectarianism and prejudice, its subordination of party to patriotism; all of which are a lesson and warning to ourselves; may spread through Asia. In that case we may hope for a real and fruitful harvest in ethical and religious matters. If the East have something to learn from Europe in these spheres, our own religious world may find a great deal that it might copy from the methods and spirit of Japan, and something, also, that it may acquire to its great advantage from the depth and richness of Oriental thought, as well as from the reserve and dignity of Oriental manners.

Looking nearer home, our chief interest and sympathy must

go to France. We welcome that understanding which makes us more than the allies of our kinsmen and nearest neighbours, whose fortunes have been so closely intermingled with our own for longer than a thousand years. Between the eleventh century and the fifteenth it was often doubtful whether England were only a province under French rulers, or whether France were destined to be an appanage of English kings. Our languages, our institutions and laws, our governing classes, were inextricably mingled, to the greater benefit of England. For many centuries the French and English were not two peoples, but one, ruled by different branches of the same family. Since then, if there have been rivalry and wars, there have also been admiration and imitation on both sides, with much give and take of the best that either country was able to impart. We hope the two great free and progressive nations of the West, who are so necessary to complete the well-being and perfection of one another, may ever be more cordially and closely joined. We have followed carefully the significant and promising events which have occurred in France during the last five years. At the beginning of that period, the Nationalists and Clericals made a despairing, and we hope a last, attempt to undermine, and if possible to explode, the Republic. The Dreyfus scandal, which was one of their offensive weapons, turned ruinously against themselves. It exposed to the whole nation the aims and methods of the Vatican and the serious danger of the State. These disclosures were the cause of that awakening which has restored France to sanity and strength. The Religious Orders were dealt with first, as being the chief instrument of Rome, the propagators of disloyalty to the existing Constitution, the corruptors of youth by obscurantist and reactionary methods of education, a disturbing and treacherous influence upon the army and the civil services, the encouragers of superstition and disaffection among the populace. Their abominable press is an outrage to common decency, and is more damaging to religion than all the attacks of its professed enemies. The firm, just policy of the Government alarmed and irritated the Vatican, which was impelled by its real masters, the Generals of the Religious Orders, to provoke an open quarrel. The Papal claims, whenever they are pushed to their logical conclusion, are incompatible with the freedom and sovereignty of every Civil Power. The Concordat was only endurable so long as each side was anxious to avoid a rupture. It allowed the Vatican far more jurisdiction than had been admitted by the ancient kings. It had been consistently and astutely violated and encroached upon by the Papacy all through the Restoration, the Monarchy of July, and the Second Empire.

Under the Liberal Governments of Napoleon III. and of the existing Parliamentary Republic, France had become really democratic and educated. The ideals of modern civilization, of all that was best and most necessary in the Revolution of 1789, have been almost fully realized. The result has been a wider breach than ever between the French nation as it really is, at the head of modern civilization, and the so-called French Church, which still places its ideals in the past and its destinies in the hands of an Italian autocrat. Modern society and the present methods of the Vatican cannot be reconciled with one another. Pius IX. was right when he proclaimed this in his uncompromising Syllabus. The French Government are equally right, and are far wiser, when they draw the inevitable conclusion, and resolve that the Church and State must be divorced. A Bill for that purpose was introduced by the Prime Minister on November 10. This is an open declaration that the Church of France has been left behind by the State in its onward and liberalizing progress. The consequences may be, as we hope, to renew and purge religion; to diminish materially the income of the Vatican, and so to lessen its diplomatic and political importance; to reveal the true numbers and impotence of the Clerical party. These revelations must be advantageous, since it is always wholesome for the truth to be acknowledged as it really is. Meanwhile, there is a large and growing Liberal party among the French Romanists, both laity and clergy. Some of them have been stirred by the intellectual movements of our time, which have penetrated more surely into the strongholds of the Church than the Clerical Reaction had into the schools and armies of the State. Others of the clergy, again, are returning towards a revived Gallicanism or an ecclesiastical Nationalism, which is replacing the discarded and impossible Vaticanism of 1870. We must remember always that the Vatican Council is only adjourned, and was not dissolved, so that the decrees of 1870 are not necessarily its final word. There is no insuperable barrier to their revocation; and France, in the past, has several times revoked engagements which were more binding than the Vatican decrees. Without committing ourselves in any way to the private or theological opinions of French Liberals, we are bound to sympathize with them in their struggle against the Papacy, since they are striving for precisely those liberties which our forefathers extorted, and which we ourselves possess, either to abuse or use. Their abuse is no argument against their lawfulness; and no individuals avail themselves more largely of this freedom, both in print and practice, than some of our extreme High Churchmen, especially those who combine medievalism in ritual

with the wildest theories of the Higher Critics. The organs of these hybrid theologians, which are violently anti-Papal so far as Anglicanism is concerned, are no less violent and unfair in their condemnation of the French Government. No Englishman should be deluded by these fallacies, which are manufactured, not in the interests of religion or of liberty, but of the narrowest ecclesiasticism.

Italy has experienced the first year of a new Pope. Pius by nature as well as name, personally well meaning and attractive, his policy has, nevertheless, been more reactionary in some directions than that of Leo XIII. The social and democratic societies which Leo encouraged and hoped to manipulate have been condemned by his successor. An open war has been declared against the foremost champion of Liberalism among the French clergy. The Curia has either steered or drifted into a conflict with the Republic. The administration of Leo XIII. and Rampolla, which was at least professional and adroit, has been replaced by the bungling of novices, who are more at home in the sacristy than in diplomacy. Pius X. appears to be ruled by two fanatical Spaniards and a half-breed; viz., Father Martin, the General of the Jesuits, the Franciscan Cardinal Vives, and the amateur diplomatist Merry del Val. The combination is of evil omen, and may bring back the errors and violences of Pius IX. During the thirty-four years since the occupation of Rome, the Italian Government has become stronger and the Papacy weaker. Three generations of Italians have grown up thinking that the clergy, or at all events the Curia, are the natural enemies of their country. The Papacy dare not organize a Clerical party like the German Centre, lest its weakness and loss of influence in Italy should be too openly revealed to the Roman Catholic world. The Temporal Power is a lost cause, at any rate, among the Italians; and the rulers of the Vatican see this clearly, though they will not say it. Meanwhile, the recovery and progress of Italy have been wonderful, in spite of many political errors. She is almost alone at present, among her neighbours, in having satisfactory finances. The recent election is a victory for both stability and progress. Every year the margin of taxation grows more elastic through the increase of trade, of manufactures, of shipping. The good fortune and security of Italy will probably increase even more rapidly now it has come to a political and commercial agreement with France. We wish continued good fortune to the two great progressive Latin countries, who now are both our sincere friends, whose lands and peoples always have been the admiration and delight of all that is most civilized and best among us.

Of Spain we hear little, and most of us know less. The Church is a burden to the people. Its income is out of all proportion to the resources of the State and the numbers of practising Catholics. A just retrenchment of the Secular clergy and a reformation of the Regulars were impeded by Leo XIII. Spain is watching the ecclesiastical reformation in France, and her own policy is almost certain to be guided by the example and experiences of her neighbour.

Austria is, as usual, in a state of smouldering combustion and of approaching disintegration. The jealousies of the various nations which live under the Hapsburg monarchy are producing, among other disturbances, that movement called the *Los von Rom*, which is more political than theological, but which is drawing large numbers out of the Papal Church, and which we regard, therefore, with sympathy and hope. A monarchy in which Italians, Czechs, Slavs, Germans, and other races are all moved by incompatible desires and interests, and whose only common attribute is a distrust of one another, is assuredly condemned to trouble, if not to civil war. Anti-Semitic prejudice is unusually active in many parts of the Empire, and is a continual pretext for riot and sedition. The Roman Catholic Germans gravitate in sympathy towards the new Germanic Empire. The King of Prussia is half flattered by their advances and half afraid of them. He cannot welcome without misgiving the addition of more than 20,000,000 Roman Catholics, with their proportion of voters, to the forces of the Centre. That Clerical party already dominates the Reichstag, and possesses the Bavarian Lower Chamber. The present condition of Romanism among the German States is ably discussed in the *Edinburgh Review* for October, 1904, and we refer our readers to that illuminating article, as well as to another on the position and prospects of Catholicism in France. The Roman Catholic Centre holds the balance of power in German politics. Every Chancellor is forced to make terms with it, or the Imperial Government could not be carried on. The relations between Berlin and the Vatican are most ominous for the future of Germany and for the quiet of the world. We have no desire to be alarmist or bellicose, but it would be nothing less than criminal if we shut our eyes and mouths entirely to the armaments and policy of the Prussian Government, and still more to the violent utterances of the Pan-Germanic organs, which breathe out threatenings and slaughter against the British Empire. Prussian diplomacy has the worst record in Europe for treachery and want of scruple. It is all the more dangerous because individual Germans have inherited a tradition for honesty and candour. Voltaire says of Frederick II.: "It is his nature to do always

the opposite to what he says and writes, not entirely through dissimulation, but because he writes and speaks excitedly, and acts afterwards in quite a different temper." Such a Sovereign is a standing danger, both to his own people and to the world; and Voltaire's description is still applicable to the Hohenzollerns. It is fatuous not to be guided by the plain lessons of the past; and the experiences of Poland, Denmark, Austria and France, should be unmistakable warnings to ourselves.

Our chief bulwark against these dangers is to be found in the prosperity and strength of our kinsmen across the seas. We welcome with the utmost satisfaction the results of the Presidential Election. It is a set back to corrupt and reactionary influences in politics. It is a triumph of English ideals and institutions as against those of various foreign elements. It guarantees the fuller exercise of American diplomacy upon international affairs, and it will draw still more close the happy friendship between the United States and the British Empire. The visit of the Archbishop of Canterbury has made the past year memorable in the intercourse of the two kindred peoples. His office renders that visit historical, and his Grace's personality has made it fruitful. It has gone far to undo the ecclesiastical blunders and timidity of George III. and his advisers. We hope the time is not distant when their political blunders may be not only forgotten, but utterly abolished in their effects.

To the Australian Commonwealth we wish more population, more revenue, less taxation and expenditure, fewer politicians, and many propitious seasons. We hope that the feet of the South African colonies are set in the way of prosperity and peace.

At home we have experienced many political excursions and alarms, which have produced little more than noise. A threatened Government has not only lived, but worked. We owe it our thanks for the agreement with France, for a better understanding with many of our neighbours, and for behaving both firmly and moderately under severe provocation and on several critical occasions. Our thanks are due to our best and most influential diplomatist, His Majesty the King, whom God preserve, and to his able Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs. Some results of the Education Act must modify the thoughtless jubilation with which too many Churchmen received it. That measure is charged with difficulties, which may yet lead to serious disasters for the Church. The fervid opposition to it is caused, as we think, by distrust for the extreme teaching of certain clergymen, and we share cordially in that distrust without committing ourselves to any approval of the methods chosen for expressing it. The most flagrant

evil in our national life has been dealt with by legislation. No Act of Parliament is or can be perfect. It is possible to discover flaws or to raise difficulties in any conceivable course of action. Wise men will meet and overcome difficulties as they occur; it is less wise to magnify them into an excuse for doing nothing. We have no sympathy, nor even common patience, with those temperance fanatics who assert perpetually that no bread is better than half a loaf, and who, by so talking, have not only obstructed all reform, but have added immeasurably to its cost and difficulty. We accept, therefore, what we have got, resolving to make the best of it, and also to use it as a secured position for getting more. We remember, however, both in temperance and religious education, that the first can only be promoted effectually by reforming the individual, and the second chiefly by being cared for and provided in the home. People cannot be made sober or godly by Act of Parliament or by Government officials. By these means they can only be restrained from opportunities of evil; they cannot be established in goodness or strengthened in character.

With regard to that important question which has rent, and is still agitating, the domain of politics, we have no party bias. We only record our grave warning against the misuse and deceit of words. We have not at present, and we never have had, Free Trade in any real meaning of the phrase; and the effects of our present methods in trade are certainly unfair. No one has proposed to re-establish Protection, and still less to restore the methods of the Corn Laws. We have only been asked to consider very seriously the conditions of our home and foreign trade, and our relations with various communities which are supposed to form parts of a United Empire. It has been suggested that the bonds of union should be made real instead of remaining theoretical, that they might be practical as well as sentimental. It does not follow that this process would turn them into a bondage, or that "the crimson thread of kinship" would be thereby hardened into a sordid and servile chain. It should be remembered that the Germanic States were united commercially long before they were federated politically, and that the only separate communities which have almost complete Home Rule and absolutely unfettered Free Trade among themselves, viz., the United States of North America and the Federated States of the Australian Commonwealth, have obtained these advantages solely through their political unification. Before federation there were frontiers and irritating fiscal barriers between every colony in Australia. Under federation there is complete Free Trade between all

the States. It should not be impossible for a race which prides itself upon its successes in politics and commerce to evolve a scheme which would give it all the advantages of complete Free Trade among its various possessions, and at the same time preserve it as a whole from the disadvantages and losses of its present unscientific methods and obsolete procedure. For good or evil, the peoples of the world are grouping themselves into large and more rigorously exclusive units; and these undeniable tendencies of political and economical gravitation must result in loss, or even ruin, to our whole Empire, unless we seize the fleeting opportunity of turning them to our advantage.

We hope earnestly that the opportunity may also be taken to place our Parliamentary representation upon a just numerical basis, so that numbers and local interests, if not intelligence, may have a more equitable weight and influence. It might be considered seriously, in these days of instantaneous publicity, of the press, of the referendum, whether party government as we have known it hitherto, and Parliamentary debate as it exists at present, are any longer necessary to our well-being, or are even compatible with efficiency and progress.

In ecclesiastical affairs, we have to record the assembling of a Ritual Commission, and we wait with both curiosity and expectation for their verdict and its consequences. There are some recent signs of promise, which give us better hopes of the result than we had at the beginning of the past year. We notice various signs, too, which make us believe that the ritualistic tide has reached its height, and that its excesses are already beginning to decline. We welcome with great thankfulness and hope the formation of a Central Church party, though we only use the word "party" under protest, and because there is no other. The appeal to all moderate Churchmen to unite upon a common basis of historical Catholicity, as it may be found and proved by the first six centuries of ecclesiastical history, provided that what is so found be approved and tested further by the standard of Holy Scripture, is no party movement. It is an appeal to the great body of our Church, both lay and clerical, as we feel convinced. It is a vindication of our historical and theological position as we have received it from our best reformers and divines; from Cranmer, Ridley, Jewell, Hooker, Andrewes, Barrow, Taylor, Bull, Waterland, Routh, to choose no other names. We have no desire to narrow the Church to either of its extremes. We hold, and we always have held, that there is no incompatibility of principle, but only of expression, between scholarly Evangelicals and the old school of High Churchmen.

There is not only room for both in the Church, but it is well for the Church that it should contain both. Their common standard of belief is Scripture. Their common foundation and rule of practice is the Primitive Church, as interpreted by Scripture, according to the declaration of all the Fathers, who, in Milton's phrase, disclaimed all independent authority for themselves and their own times. Both Evangelicals and High Churchmen gloried in the name of Protestant, and united in repudiating the usurped Papal authority and that corrupt medieval theology which was at once a cause and consequence of Popery.

We believe that history and scholarship are undermining the position upon which alone Ritualism can stand. They are showing us, more clearly than ever before, that the Primitive Church, and not the Medieval, is our true foundation and exemplar; that we cannot be firm in our historical and theological position unless we be faithful to that example, and follow lines of development which are logically compatible with it. There is no other way of being loyal to our Anglican traditions and formularies, and at the same time of developing lawfully both in our thought and practice, as every Church must if it is to bear living fruit. With regard to any appeal to the first six centuries, we must be clear as to what it is able to effect lawfully, or we may find ourselves cheated of our first principles, surrendering vital positions, and engendering worse misunderstandings than exist at present. Such an appeal, we are firmly persuaded, excludes the chief Roman and medieval doctrines, such as the Papal authority, and all developments of it since Gregory I. It excludes transubstantiation, the medieval theory and development of Orders, the medieval theory and the modern practice of enforced private confession and of sacerdotal absolution. It excludes the sacrifice of the Mass for the living and the dead, as well as all the current theories of Indulgences and Purgatory. It disallows current and extreme theories of Mariolatry, and many popular devotions to the saints. In all these matters the results of such an appeal would be positive and clear.

We must allow, however, that there are other and secondary matters in which its results would be, by themselves, negative and even dubious. Many practices which are non-Scriptural, if not anti-Scriptural, came into use long before the sixth century, and were prevalent in some Churches, if not throughout the Church. Among such practices were the use of lights, of incense, of lustral water, of oils and chrisms, of vestments and utensils, of prayers for the dead, of solemnities in honour of saints and martyrs. As to the existence of all these matters,

we get a wide consensus of testimony, though the words and opinions of the Fathers are various and even contradictory, and the practice of the Churches was by no means uniform. It is to these matters that our saving clauses apply. We require, first, before we admit any belief or practice, a clear proof of Catholic, that is of universal and authoritative custom; and we require, secondly, even though the first condition be fulfilled, that every accepted practice should be justifiable by Holy Scripture, by the canonical books of the New Testament; or, in other words, by the example of the only Apostolic Church of which we have any certain or sufficient knowledge.

We look forward, then, with good hope to the ecclesiastical future; and we include in our hopes many of our fellow-Christians whose organizations we prefer to describe as alongside the Church rather than outside it. Their present opposition is caused, as we feel convinced, chiefly by extremists among ourselves, to whom we also are opposed; who may be with us, but are not really of us; who misrepresent the true Church of the English people. As we look round and look forward, we cannot but see the healing and reuniting possibilities of sound scholarship and scientific history. And we must not forget that ecclesiastical differences, grave as they are in their causes and effects, are not the chief dangers that confront us. We may be warned and helped even by an opponent. About sixty years ago Cardinal Wiseman foretold to a class of theological students that in half a century "the professors of this place (Oscott) will be endeavouring to prove, not transubstantiation, but the existence of God." He meant that, not the details, but the foundations and substance of Christianity would be the most urgent subject of preoccupation and defence. These times have come upon us; upon Romanists and Protestants alike. Our opponents have realized the fact, and have not lost the opportunity. Most Christians and all the Churches have ignored the fact, and have not utilized the time of preparation. It is high time that the Churches composed their differences, and made ready to defend their common position against an enemy who will strike hard at their foundations.

In conclusion, we pray for an abundant blessing on our Church and Nation during the next year. We hope the peace of the world may be restored and be more firmly re-established, and that the various matters of good promise which we have tried to summarize and forecast may be directed to their highest and fullest accomplishment.

ARTHUR GALTON.