

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

February, 1909.

The Month.

A Timely
Message.

THE Archbishop of Canterbury gave Churchmen a very appropriate word in his New Year's Letter. He called special attention to the way in which the Pan-Anglican Congress and the Lambeth Conference have reminded us by their fresh and wide outlook that "well-worn grooves and smooth lines of rails are fraught with danger as well as with gain," and also that "placid contentment with our accustomed way of doing things sometimes accompanies a curious forgetfulness that the customs are now quite other than those in which the 'one good custom' had its wise beginning long ago." The Primate illustrated this truth by the two important subjects of our Poor Laws and Elementary Education. After remarking that the direct duty of relieving the necessities of the very poor has been taken up by the State in a way that was unknown in former generations, the Archbishop proceeded to dwell in particular on the similar change in connection with education :

"When the State began, some seventy years ago, to take the task in hand, it was by supplementing, not superseding, the duties for which the Church, as represented mainly by different Christian societies, had made itself responsible. Bit by bit the State has accepted and (well or ill) has discharged larger and yet larger educational responsibilities, and not the most roseate painter upon ecclesiastical canvas of the bare facts as they stand to-day could describe the elementary schools of England as being now the work of the Church supplemented, and only supplemented, by the State. In these conditions a special obligation lies upon the historic Church of England to readjust itself to the new conditions, and—without diminishing by the

weight of a single ounce the trust which is involved in the injunction, 'Feed My lambs'—to make the right and full discharge of that trust correspond to the conditions, not of a generation ago, but of to-day. This may call for a resetting of familiar usages, a recasting of familiar rules and privileges, and it is ours, in the name of the Lord, to go forward in quietness and confidence upon that path."

These are weighty words, and should be pondered by Churchmen. The Church must indeed "readjust itself to the new conditions," and make the discharge of its trust "correspond to the conditions, not of a generation ago, but of to-day." Recent events in the education world show that the Archbishop of Canterbury is fully alive to these necessities, and it behoves the Church as a whole to take up the same position. Events move rapidly, and it is quite impossible for our educational system to remain where it has been for so long. Churchmen must be ready to face the future in the spirit of the Archbishop's counsel, "listening with a ready ear for the guiding voice of God, and eager to work for His children in His appointed way, though the especial work-field and the fences which prescribe its bounds may perhaps be a little different from those which we have known of old." Actuated by these principles, not only shall we fear no ill, but go forward with every certainty of increased blessing and power.

During this month we shall be celebrating the
 "To the
 Jew First."
 Centenary of the London Society for Promoting
 Christianity amongst the Jews, the oldest and
 largest Missionary Society for Israel. To those who have not
 seen it we earnestly commend the Centenary volume, written by
 one of its Secretaries, the Rev. W. T. Gidney, giving the history
 of the Society. It was reviewed in the pages of our December
 issue. And we would also call special attention to an article by
 the other Secretary, the Rev. F. L. Denman, which appears in
 the present number. The words of the Chaplain to Frederick
 the Great are often quoted. When that monarch asked for the
 evidence of Christianity in a single sentence, he received the
 reply: "The Jew, Sir." This is true. And yet how com-

paratively few Christian people are interested in Jewish Missions! It is not as widely known as it ought to be that, in proportion to the money expended and the missionaries employed, the results of Jewish Missions compare very favourably with those of work in Heathen and Mohammedan lands. To all those who study their Bible carefully, the question of Missions to Israel cannot but occupy a prominent, if not a predominant place, and we hope and pray that the Centenary of our oldest Church Society may find many accessions to her ranks of those whom God has led to "pray for the peace of Jerusalem."

Two noteworthy pronouncements on this subject have appeared during the past month. In the course of a fine article on "What does the New Year Promise?" our New York contemporary, the *Churchman*, calls attention to the way in which the standard of brotherhood is being erected everywhere, and how its wide and growing recognition affects every institution or society founded on individual or corporate selfishness. Then the article points out the bearing of this on the kingdom of Christ by showing that a divided Christendom has lost the power to witness to universal brotherhood in Christ, and that its divisions witness to a denial of this greatest revelation of the Incarnation. Then comes the inquiry as to what part is to be played in the work of unification by the Episcopal Church of America. Will it cling to "Protestant Episcopal isolation, with its 3 per cent. increase, as a mere incident in the nation's life, scarcely felt as a national force," or will it enter into its "full inheritance as a reconciling Church, a living truth of God's universal kingdom"? These are very plain and pointed questions, and have a direct and definite application to our own branch of the Anglican Communion. As the article goes on to say:

"The questions cannot be evaded. This Church must become more Catholic or more sectarian. Apostolic claims, without adequate expression of the things claimed, will discredit a Church that professes what it does not practise. We claim membership in a Divine Church and to be descendants of Apostolic order. We do well to make these claims. But unless the

reconciling power of the Apostolic Church is manifest, the claims will but react upon us and discredit themselves. Specific demands are made that this Church shall prove the Catholicity it professes by transcending the sectarianism that isolates it and keeps it back from Apostolic Christianity."

We wish these words could be pondered by all those who seem content to rest in the present state of Anglican isolation. If we believe our Church to be Apostolic and Catholic, we certainly ought to prove it in some very definite way.

The other pronouncement on the subject of
 A Call to
 Thought. Christian Reunion was the pregnant paper of the
 Dean of Westminster, read at the Islington Clerical
 Meeting. Two things, said the Dean, should be at once
 attempted: First, we must seriously study and then earnestly
 proclaim the ideal of the corporate life which we find in the
 New Testament:

"We must get a firmer hold on the truth which is expressed in the fifteenth chapter of St. John's Gospel—the vine and its branches; and in the First Epistle to the Corinthians and the Epistle to the Ephesians—the body and its members. We must familiarize ourselves with the ideal thus revealed to us, and we must insist on judging our whole lives and all our thoughts about the Christian Church in the light of it."

A careful study of these important passages would do much to give us the true idea of the Church Catholic as "the blessed company of all faithful people." Not the least important result of such a study would be that, through the conception of the Church thus gained, we should be able to test all subsidiary ideas of visible and national Churches. The second point emphasized by the Dean was the following:

"A great step in advance would be taken if we would abandon the old maxim, 'Minimize your differences,' and put in its place, 'Study your differences.' If on all sides people would try to understand the points of difference which separate one Christian communion from another, to get at the underlying principles, to find out what the history of these differences has been, and whether in practice they mean now what they meant once, then we should be on the way to that precious thing—a mutual understanding. Ignorance is our enemy—our ignorance of others, and the ignorance which prevents others from understanding us."

Here again is wisdom to which we shall all do well to take heed. The symposium now proceeding in our pages will, we hope, contribute something to the realization of the Dean's desire. It is our bounden duty, as he urged, to propagate the idea of Christian unity, and thereby to prepare the way for that reunion which is one of the most urgent needs of the Church.

A Refreshing Pronouncement. The pronouncements of the Bishop of Bristol are invariably characterized by candour and courage. His readers have no difficulty in understanding his meaning, whether they agree with him or not. His recent address on the question of clerical oath-taking was a welcome reminder of some matters of fact which are only too apt to be overlooked :

“He was afraid some of the clergy and some of the laity were not sufficiently alive to the force of that oath. He seldom read Church newspapers, but when he did he sometimes found contemptuous words used in regard to judgments of the Privy Council. He wondered how any clergyman who had taken the oath of allegiance to the King could go away and say that he would have nothing to do with the decisions of the King's own special Council, at which in theory His Majesty always presided. He could not understand how, when a man had sworn allegiance, he could say he was not going to be judged by the Privy Council because it had nothing to do with the Church. The Privy Council did not attempt to deal with or give decisions on purely spiritual questions. What they had decided was the statutory force of statutory words.”

This is good reading, and the way in which the Bishop's words have been received in particular quarters shows that his telling points have gone home. The attitude of a certain section of Churchmen to the Bishop of Newcastle, because he has insisted upon exactly the same thing, has been quite deplorable, and yet here we have another Bishop also emphasizing obedience to plain obligations. As Bishop Browne rightly said, the question of the Privy Council judgment is constitutional, not spiritual, and one that seeks to do justice between man and man. And then the Bishop significantly added that, in regard to the oath of obedience to the Bishop, he never found the slightest difficulty in any diocese until there came to be a difference of opinion between the Bishop and the clergy. “Then it was singular

how the conscience of the clergyman was given as an adequate reason for non-attention to the monition and advice of the Bishop." It is very curious, as the *Times* recently said, that, while the Church of England in the opinion of a considerable section of its members is incapable by Divine decree of any other sort of government than that of Bishops, it does not always follow its Bishops, even though they are in a great majority, and "those who set most store by the Divine right of episcopacy are the first and the loudest in denouncing a Bishop when his decision is against their view." These are candid words, both of the Bishop of Bristol and of the *Times*, and they ought to do good in bringing back to paths of common sense and simple matters of fact and obligation those who are only too apt to ride off into byways of casuistry and impossible theories.

Hopeful
Signs.

Two meetings in London last month revealed in a quite unmistakable way the real strength of Evangelical and Central Churchmanship. At the Church House on January 13, a meeting was held under the auspices of the National Church League, which was not only very largely attended, but was remarkable for the representative character of its audience, younger clergy being particularly in evidence. The tone of the addresses was in every way encouraging, and revealed a clearness of statement, a width of outlook, and a spirit of determination, which were distinctly hopeful for the future. The National Church League, under the chairmanship of the Dean of Canterbury and the able secretariat of Mr. W. Guy Johnson, is increasingly becoming a rallying-point for Central Churchmen. We expect to hear much more of it during the coming year, when we seem likely to be faced with serious and grave problems which will call for wise statesmanship, clear guidance, firm decision, and large-hearted unity. The other encouraging feature was the record attendance at the Islington Clerical Meeting, which is becoming more widely recognized each year as the most important

gathering of Evangelical Churchmen. The papers were able, strong, definite, and far-sighted, and in the pamphlet form issued by our able and enterprising contemporary, the *Record*, they will bear careful reading and study. They represent a type of Churchmanship which, if accepted and followed, would be at once true to the best Anglican conditions, and also productive of the best spiritual results in the life of our Church and nation.

We are often reminded of the ways in which people holding very different and even divergent opinions find points of contact among themselves, even though such contact is about the last thing they expect or desire. The latest illustration of this was given by the Dean of Canterbury in his able paper at the Islington Clerical Meeting, when he discussed "The Estimate and Use of Holy Scripture in the Anglican Communion." He was dealing with Hooker's controversy with the Puritans, and showed how our great Anglican thinker laid stress on the simple power of the reading of Scripture in our Church Services as against the Puritan contention that God's Word was mainly inculcated by preaching rather than by reading. Then Dean Wace added :

Extremes
Meet.

"Perhaps you may be reminded, in recalling this controversy between Hooker and the Puritans, of a catch-phrase which has become common of late, particularly in High Church circles : 'The Church to teach, the Bible to prove.' That is precisely the position of the Puritans in Hooker's day. The Divine message, in their view, was entrusted to preachers. Sermons, they said, were the ordinance of God ; the Scriptures 'dark,' and mere reading too easy. Of course the Church is to teach ; but to keep the Bible in the background, as though its chief functions were to prove what the Church taught, is contrary to the essential genius of the English Church."

There is scarcely any phrase which is a greater favourite with, or is more frequently used by, several leading Churchmen than this : "The Church to teach, the Bible to prove." Of course there is a truth in it, but, as it is frequently employed, it is untrue to fact and dangerous in effects. It tends to exalt the Church and to depreciate the Bible. It makes the Church the teacher,

with the Bible as a mere collection of proof texts. And yet it would be equally true to say : " The Bible to teach, the Church to learn." Everything depends upon what we mean by the word " Church." " Church " and " clergy " are not synonymous terms. Let us therefore beware of slavery to a phrase.

We have already called the attention of our Literature for Churchmen. readers to the valuable series of penny manuals now now being issued by Messrs. Longmans and Co., under the editorship of Canon Wright, Dr. Dawson Walker, and the Rev. J. E. Watts-Ditchfield, entitled " English Church Manuals." The first fifteen have appeared, dealing with quite a number of pressing subjects, and we hear with great satisfaction that they are having a good circulation. Another effort in the same direction has just been commenced by the issue of a series of " Anglican Church Handbooks," also published by Messrs. Longmans and Co., at the popular price of 1s. net. They will be reviewed in these columns in due course, but meanwhile we desire to direct special attention to them. The object of the series is to present in a cheap and readable form a trustworthy account of the history, faith, worship, and work of the Church of Christ in general, and of the Church of England in particular. The first four volumes are " Christianity and the Supernatural," by the Bishop of Ossory ; " Social Work," by the Rev. W. E. Chadwick, D.D. ; " Pastoral Work," by the Rev. R. C. Joynt ; and " The Joy of Bible Study," by the Rev. Harrington C. Lees. Quite a number of other volumes are in active preparation, and we believe they will be found useful both to clergy and laity. They deal with some of the most important topics of the present day, and their study will conduce to an intelligent and well-informed Churchmanship. The clergy are earnestly asked to recommend these handbooks and manuals to their people through the medium of their parish magazines and in other ways. It is only by combined effort that success can be assured, and we venture to appeal to our readers to second the effort of

those who are engaged on this important and responsible enterprise. In view of the constant publication of books which, to say the least of it, cannot command the confidence of Churchmen, it is imperative that our congregations should be well armed and ready to give a reason of the hope that is in them.

A striking article with this title appeared in the "The Eucharist and the Papacy." *Guardian* for December 16, from the pen of Father Tyrrell, the well-known excommunicated Modernist. Attention is called to a tract "Concerning Devotion to the Pope," written by a French Curé, and issued with the imprimatur of the Archbishop of Tours. A comparison is instituted between our Lord and the Pope, so that in a certain sense, the author remarks, it may be said that, as the Tabernacle is the home of Jesus the Victim, so the Palace of the Vatican at Rome is the home of Jesus the Teacher :

"What can be more beautiful or touching than this parallelism? When we prostrate ourselves at the tabernacle before the sacred Host therein contained, we adore our Lord in His Eucharistic Presence, which is substantial and personal; when we fall at the Pope's feet to offer him the homage of our mind and to accept his teachings, it is again, in a certain way, Jesus Christ whom we adore in His doctrinal presence. In both cases we adore and confess the same Jesus Christ. Whence it follows, by rigorous consequence, that it is as impossible to be a good Christian without devotion to the Pope as without devotion to the Eucharist."

It is almost incredible that such a comparison can be instituted, and yet this tract has received the Pope's approval as a work of "intelligent piety." Protestants are frequently charged with misjudging the Roman Church and attributing to her views that are altogether unwarranted. In the face of these statements, it is obvious that it would be scarcely possible to exaggerate the extent to which the Church of Rome has departed from the simple truth and purity of Apostolic Christianity. Is it conceivable that those who know and love their Bible can entertain a thought of union with a Church that allows these things to be taught?