

# 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](https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_churchman_os.php)

# THE CHURCHMAN

January, 1909.

## The Month.

The "Churchman" for 1909. THE present number is the first of a new and enlarged series. The Magazine now consists of eighty pages, and the extra space will enable us to include longer articles than have hitherto been possible and to give more space than even before to notices of new books. There will also be some new features specially intended for Christian workers, and by these means it is hoped to make the Magazine increasingly useful to both clergy and laity. It is our earnest desire to serve the cause of the great body of central Churchmen to which the Bishop of Durham alludes in the kind letter of greeting which appears on another page. The coming year is likely to be fraught with grave issues for Churchmen, and it will be the endeavour of this Magazine to contribute to the discussion of these problems and to help forward their solution on right lines. We venture to ask for the hearty practical co-operation of our readers in our effort to increase the circulation, and thereby to extend the usefulness, of the CHURCHMAN. A specimen copy will gladly be sent by the publisher to any reader who can make effective use of it, and copies of the prospectus for the year can also be obtained for distribution.

The Education Question. In common with the great majority of Churchmen, we deeply regret the failure of the negotiations which seemed so hopeful as we went to press last month. Few things have been so striking in recent years as the way in which Churchmen of all schools responded

to the invitation to join the Education Settlement Committee, for it showed quite plainly the strong feeling against further strife and in favour of honourable peace. But hopes of peace have been wrecked by the short-sightedness of those who, as they could not get everything they wanted, were determined to defeat all attempts at compromise. We call this short-sightedness, for its advocates plainly close their eyes to patent facts. For what is it that rules the situation? Is it not the fatal policy of Rate-aid, due to Mr. Balfour's Act of 1902? When rates were so readily accepted by Churchmen, the doom of Church schools was sealed. It could only be a question of time, if that policy continued to be accepted by Churchmen. And it is the utter forgetfulness of this patent fact which has dominated the recent policy of the opponents of compromise. Relieved by the rates from the "intolerable strain" of school finance, they fondly imagine that all they have to do is to hold fast to what they possess and defy all attempts to alter the position of affairs. But you cannot dragoon almost half a nation, as Mr. Balfour's Act virtually did, and it is a simple fact that our troubles are largely due to the high-handed way in which that Act was passed by Parliament without any mandate or warrant, and to the readiness with which Churchmen accepted the financial ease granted thereby. It is to the discredit of Churchmen that they allowed their own interests to reign supreme over the higher and wider interests of fairness to others, and they must not be surprised if they have, since 1902, been reaping where they have sown.

Nothing could well be finer than the way in which the Archbishop of Canterbury, the Prime Minister, and Mr. Runciman conducted the negotiations which led up to the recent Bill. They come out of the conflict with enhanced reputations for far-sighted Statesmanship. We Churchmen owe a profound debt of gratitude to the Archbishop for the wise and courageous line he has taken, and we must not forget the splendid response made by such pronounced

fighters among the Nonconformists as Dr. Clifford and Sir George White. Sir John Kennaway voiced the feelings of many Churchmen when he said that, as it was due to Lancashire that Church schools had embarked on the slippery slope of Rate-aid, he was not too anxious to follow the lead of Lancashire in the present crisis. Like Sir John Kennaway, we believe that Mr. Runciman's Bill was "a fair and honest attempt to settle the religious question" and to avert the adoption of the secular system. The Bill would have provided Bible-teaching in all schools, together with facilities for denominational teaching on two mornings. This is more and better teaching than many Church schools now obtain. We commend to all opponents of the Bill the following words of a Conservative organ, the *Pall Mall Gazette*:

"Do Churchmen expect better terms from that Government which may, any day, supersede this of Mr. Asquith? If they do, we make bold to tell them that they are imagining a vain thing. They will not get better terms, except, perhaps, upon insignificant points of detail; for no settlement upon better terms for the Church is thinkable in view of the Nonconformist opposition, and, we will add, the disappointment of all moderate men at the breakdown of the present earnest effort to solve the problem. . . ."

This is salutary frankness, as events will show before long.

Our readers may remember that over a year ago we called attention to the way in which many Churchmen, in fighting for their own schools, were apparently oblivious of the fact that quite as many, if not more, Church children are being educated in Council schools, and that for these no provision for Church teaching was being made. And we urged that a true Church policy would take these facts into consideration. This is how Canon Scott Holland states the case in the December *Commonwealth*:

"There are thousands upon thousands of the children of the Church who are being educated in the provided schools. We all know it, yet we refuse to face it. It slips out of the discussion over and over again. Yet it is fast becoming the dominating fact. Every year is bound to increase the number. Provided schools must increase. Unprovided schools must decrease. . . ."

The Church children, then, in provided schools must of necessity present the largest and most urgent part of our educational problem. We cannot go on treating them as an accidental overflow, beyond the borders of the schools where our children lie within the folds that we have prepared for them. We cannot go on talking as if we had practically secured denominational teaching for Church children by loyally keeping our schools in our own hands and under our own freedom to teach them the Faith. . . .”

And, as the writer goes on to say, this is why the “fight for our schools” so lamentably fails us. It ignores the situation by concentrating attention on non-provided schools, which must necessarily be a diminishing quantity. And yet the Right of Entry was granted under the recent Bill. Nonconformists who had opposed it with might and main conceded it. Was not this an immense and far-reaching change in the situation? Yet what did the opponents of Mr. Runciman’s Bill do? Let us listen again to the *Pall Mall Gazette* :

“Oblivious of the fact that the future of population lies not in the country, but in the towns, that the urban schools must increase while the rural schools must decrease, they despise the invaluable ‘right of entry,’ which would have given them power to go to seek the lambs of their own flock in the wilderness of Cowper-Templeism. The short-sightedness of that policy is pointed out very forcibly in a letter to the *Times* by the Bishop of Exeter. ‘Our problem,’ he says, ‘lies to no small extent outside our Church schools,’ and this policy ‘involves the abdication of our duty to the majority of our own children.’ These are weighty words, and they ought to have prevailed. But, as we know now, they have not. . . .”

Notwithstanding the deep disappointment of all  
 What next? moderate men at the course of recent events, we are glad that the Education Settlement Committee is continuing its work. The spirit which actuated the leaders of the negotiations still abides, and the progress made is not to be destroyed even if it has been severely checked. The Representative Council only represents itself, or else, as the *Times* says, the E.C.U. ; it certainly does *not* represent the Church. The recent victory is significantly claimed by Mr. Athelstan Riley as very largely a victory for the E.C.U., and on it he bases an appeal for an increased membership of the Union. The petitions against the Bill were to be sent to an address in Russell Square, but it was not mentioned that this was the address of

the E.C.U. office. We are not surprised at the opposition of Lord Halifax and his party to the Bill ; they are making common cause with Rome against Bible-teaching. But with Dr. Eugene Stock, in his admirable letter to the *Record*, we confess to surprise at seeing the names of men who are not of Lord Halifax's party joining with the E.C.U. on the so-called Religious Equality Committee. Extremes, however, often meet, and the *Church of Ireland Gazette* referring to this question quotes some words of Dr. Salmon, that "when men of such divergent views agreed upon anything they were generally both wrong." So we turn to other quarters more truly representative of the great body of Church-people, and we observe with real satisfaction the attitude of the *Guardian* and the *Record*, and, not least of all, the *Times*. We are profoundly grateful for the way in which the *Times*, in a succession of leading articles, pleaded for peace on the basis of the Runciman Bill. And we heartily endorse the following words of the article on the withdrawal of the Bill :

"What has happened in the past few weeks has made it abundantly clear that on a basis of compromise alone can the long and mischievous struggle ever be ended. . . . This conciliatory tendency has been greatly strengthened during the last week or two, as the crisis of the attempted settlement drew near, by the mobilization of moderate public opinion which has been undertaken by the Settlement Committee. We do not believe that their good work has been in vain, and we trust that it will be continued with undiminished confidence and vigour. It is more certain than ever that the education question cannot be permanently left in its present unfortunate state, and the pacificatory efforts of a large and increasing body of responsible and influential opinion provide one of the surest means of reaching an ultimate settlement."

Churchmen must now ponder the situation in the face of all these facts. We welcome very heartily the Bishop of Liverpool's wise and statesmanlike pronouncement. It shows that even Lancashire is not wholly united in its policy. Every year, almost every month, makes the position of Church schools harder and more impossible. As the *Guardian* says : "Let Churchmen be candid with themselves, cast aside illusions, and look a decade or two ahead. The total of children in Church schools is constantly diminishing ; the schools themselves are falling off rapidly in

number. . . . That, after all, is the most significant fact of the situation." It is, indeed, if we would only realize it.

The action of the House of Lords in rejecting the Licensing Bill, has caused profound sorrow to all who are face to face with the gigantic evil of intemperance. It is intolerable that those who are so utterly out of touch with the realities of the situation should be able in a single day to destroy months of work by the House of Commons, which passed the Bill by such an enormous majority. Financial interests and party spirit dominated the situation. As the Archbishop of Canterbury truly said, there is "a great, perhaps unbridgeable, difference" between the way the House of Lords looks at the temperance question and the way in which it is looked at

"by men and women throughout the country who are engaged in facing, day by day and hour by hour, as their ordinary work, the problems of human sorrow, human weakness, human disease, and human sin, and who know them to be in a large measure the result of the multiplied temptations offered to the weak—temptations which this Bill sets itself in some measure to diminish if it can."

The root of the opposition, so far as it was not purely political, was the objection to the time-limit whereby the virtual monopoly of to-day would have been broken. The absurdity of the position of the House of Lords was seen most clearly when Lord Halsbury spoke of beer as "an important part of the food of a working man." We can imagine the working man indulging in a hearty laugh at this reference to his "food." How many working men frequent public-houses for the purpose of obtaining an important part of their food? This alone shows the hollowness of the action of the Lords. It was based on ignorance of the facts and on selfish concern for vested interests. It paid no regard to the overwhelming voice of temperance workers in all the Churches and philanthropic workers all over the land. "Proputty, proputty," was the one cry; the wail of the wife, widow, and children of the drunkard went for little or nothing. It is not for us to enter into the purely political aspects of the

case, but the constitutional question affects us all, and we are bold to say that a decision to reject this Bill taken at a private party meeting cannot possibly be regarded as a legitimate way of exercising the responsibilities of the Second Chamber. In urging this we are supported by influential organs like the *Spectator*, even though strongly opposed to many provisions of the Bill. It will be seen before long that the House of Lords, by its bitter hostility to this Bill, has over-reached itself. Meanwhile, the cause of Temperance Reform will go on and increase in strength every year, and will gather such force that not even the House of Lords will dare to resist it. For the moment it seems as though the powers of drink and vested interests are enjoying a permanent victory, but there are far stronger forces than these at work, and it is not temperance workers who need to be afraid.

In a sermon preached recently at Oxford, Pro-  
 fessor Inge gave expression to what many have  
 been feeling for some time :

The  
 Church and  
 Social Reform.

“ Among all the changes which have come over religious and theological teaching within living memory, none seems to me so momentous as the acute secularizing of the Christian hope, as shown by the practical disappearance of ‘the other world’ from the sermons and writings of those who are most in touch with the thoughts and aspirations of our contemporaries. You may look through a whole book of modern sermons and find hardly a reference to what used to be called the Four Last Things, except perhaps in a rhetorical peroration at the end of a discourse. The modern clergyman certainly need not be afraid of being nicknamed a ‘sky-pilot.’ The New Jerusalem which fills his thoughts is a revolutionized London. As for the old appeals to hopes and fears beyond the grave—the scheme of government by rewards and punishments on which Bishop Butler dilates—they are gone. Our generation will not listen to them. ‘Give us something to help us here and now,’ is the cry. ‘Tell us how to remedy social evils, and especially how to reduce the amount of physical suffering. Show us how the toiling masses may be made more comfortable. Listen to what the working man is saying, and you will find that he wants no cheques upon the bank of heaven.’ ”

As Dr. Inge went on to say, the change is a momentous one, for never before has the Gospel been preached in this way. And for this reason he, with many others, views with the gravest



apprehension the tendency to put Social Questions in the front of Christian endeavour. The one question is, What did Jesus Christ put in the supreme place? What is the "Gospel" according to *Him*? If we preach that, and live that, we shall never fall into the error against which Dr. Inge so truly warns us. We rejoice in this trumpet-call to first principles. It needed uttering, and we believe its echo will abide with us.

The Status of Curates. Following the discussion at the Church Congress, the *Guardian* has been doing good service by calling attention to the deplorable anomalies connected with the status of Curates. An article which appeared on November 4 was an informing and valuable treatment of this vexed question. It was shown that, though it is so often ignored, the status of the Curate is really defined by the Legislature: "Whereas Incumbents are established and endowed, Curates are not. It is idle to talk about the equality of priests when this fundamental distinction imposed by the State is overlooked." If, therefore, we are to have such an equality, "either the Curate must be established and endowed, or else the Incumbent must be disestablished and disendowed." The writer naturally prefers the former alternative. We are also reminded once again of the very real hardship of the Curate being liable to be dismissed at six weeks' notice by an incoming Incumbent. Of course, for any change of status Parliamentary action is necessary; but to mention this is to fill Churchmen with the despair of getting anything done, for, as the Bishop of Worcester said at Manchester, Parliament will neither pass Acts for our better efficiency nor allow us to pass them for ourselves. Not the least important point is that Curates should be represented in Convocation, and, though at present that body is about as unrepresentative as it can well be, yet the exclusion of Curates should come to an end. It is sometimes said that though the Church of England believes in three orders of the ministry, they are not Bishops, Priests, and Deacons, but Bishops, Vicars, and Curates. There is sufficient

truth in the taunt to make us determine to put an end to the glaring injustices which are now associated with the Curate's position. It is astonishing that they have been tolerated so long, and it is earnestly to be hoped that recent discussions will help to stir Churchmen to bring about a better state of things. The writer of the article in the *Guardian* thinks that this improvement will never be brought about unless action is taken by Parliament at the instigation of Curates themselves. We would rather say that action should be taken by Incumbents and Curates together, and we have reason to believe that an organization for this purpose is now being formed. We have had instances of the futility of Curates' Unions and the like, but a Union of Incumbents and Curates, with representative laymen associated with it, would prove irresistible—a threefold cord which could not be broken.

In the course of the last month we have read

Facts and  
their  
Meanings. several reviews of Dr. James Gairdner's great work, "Lollardy and the Reformation," of which we hope to have a notice by a competent authority next month. The *Times*, the *Spectator*, the *Nation*, and the *Scottish Review* all call attention to the grudging and unsympathetic way in which Dr. Gairdner speaks of the undoubted facts of the Reformation. Thus the *Times* says that "Dr. Gairdner concludes by an almost reluctant recognition that the Reformation, after all, is an accomplished fact, and that it has its advantages." The *Spectator* describes him as writing of fifteenth-century events with a fifteenth-century mind. Dr. Herkless, in the *Scottish Review*, and Professor Pollard, in the *Nation*, write in a similar strain of his bias and prejudice. But perhaps the most striking proof is afforded by Dr. Gairdner himself in a letter to the *Times* in reply to the review. He is referring to Article VI., and remarks that not even that Article "says that the authority of the Bible is superior to that of the Church, though perhaps this might be inferred by some from Article XX." We call special attention to the last clause, and

for the purpose of discovering the truth we will put the statements in parallel columns :

## DR. GAIRDNER.

“Not even Article VI. says that the authority of the Bible is superior to that of the Church, though perhaps this might be inferred by some from Article XX.

## ARTICLE XX.

“The Church hath power to decree Rites or Ceremonies, and authority in Controversies of Faith : And yet it is not lawful for the Church to ordain any thing that is contrary to God's Word written, neither may it so expound one place of Scripture, that it be repugnant to another. Wherefore, although the Church be a witness and a keeper of holy Writ, yet, as it ought not to decree any thing against the same, so besides the same ought it not to enforce any thing to be believed for necessity of Salvation.”

Can anything be plainer than the Article? And can anything be clearer than Dr. Gairdner's inadequate statement of its plain teaching? What a pity that we will not let facts speak for themselves and lead us wherever they clearly point. As the Bishop of Sodor and Man truly says in his article in this number, “it is important first and foremost to recognize the full force of evidence which ever way it tends.” The Articles give no uncertain sound as to the relations of the Bible and the Church, or as to the facts of the Reformation. And in the long-run we do ourselves harm, and no one else, if we refuse to face facts, whatever they may be and wherever they may lead. Learning and scholarship, however great, can never set aside facts. They are far too “stubborn” for this.



NOTE.—With this number is included Title page and Index for last year's volume.