

# 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

November, 1909.

## The Month.

The Church  
Congress.

THE meeting of the Church Congress at Swansea was a distinct success both in point of attendance and also of general interest and usefulness. The Archbishop of Canterbury struck a fine keynote in his sermon when he pleaded for that spiritual vision which comes from communion with God, and without which all organization and activity will be useless, and even perilous. The Bishop of St. David's presidential address also dealt with its topics on the high level of spiritual principle rather than on the lower level of ecclesiastical polemics. All this was most welcome, and may be said to have safeguarded beforehand the possible danger wisely indicated by the *Times* when it said that the "engrossment of a gathering of Church people in the externals of Church life, and still more, in socialist, or industrial, or Poor Law problems is a tendency to be watched, for it means a risk of placing first what did not and does not come first." We are therefore profoundly thankful that the opening utterances of our leaders were characterized by so genuine and lofty a spiritual tone. The papers as a whole were useful, even if nothing of outstanding brilliance appeared, and the reports in the *Record* and the *Guardian* merit careful perusal and study. We heartily concur in the plea of the *Record* that the time-table should be reformed by the abolition of the afternoon meetings,

and the Jubilee gathering of the Congress at Cambridge next year would certainly be an appropriate and admirable opportunity for making the change. Quite apart from the physical and mental strain of three sets of meetings for four successive days, the concentration on a few subjects would be infinitely more valuable to the Church than the present treatment of a large number of heterogeneous topics. As the Congress will doubtless continue to be a yearly gathering, though we notice and incline to favour a fresh hint in the *Guardian* as to the wisdom of making it triennial, it is becoming somewhat wearisome to see the same or very similar subjects repeated year after year. Experience of Swansea conclusively shows that fewer subjects and the omission of the afternoon meetings would have made the gathering still more valuable.

“Two Voices” is the way in which the organ of extreme Anglicanism described the Church Congress, prompted mainly by the Bishop of Carlisle’s sermon, which it calls a “miserable harangue,” while the *Record* describes it as a “courageous sermon.” We are not sorry that such a contrast should be instituted, because it will serve still further to show that the conflict of ideals which has been emphasized in several ways during the past few months is a real and pressing problem. We are not surprised that extreme Anglicans should regard Bishop Diggle’s sermon as a “miserable harangue,” for nothing could have been more entirely opposed to some of the fundamental positions of that party. From the standpoint of those who believe that a decided break in the continuity of doctrine and ritual did take place in the sixteenth century, a break permanently enshrined in our Prayer-Book, the Bishop’s sermon was a welcome, refreshing, and noble utterance. We are thankful to have a Bishop who is not afraid of facing facts and of speaking his mind. Perchance if we had had a little more of this frankness and courage a few years ago it would not have been possible for the Royal Commission to have spoken about practices in the Church of

England being "on the Romeward side of a line of deep cleavage" between the two Churches. It is only by such candour that we shall ever arrive at a settlement of the controversies which are distracting our Church. There *are* "two voices" in the Church of England to-day, and obviously they cannot both be right. The sooner this is seen and acted on the better. We are therefore thankful to the Bishop of Carlisle for helping afresh to make this point clear.

Poor Law Reform.      The Archbishop of Canterbury rendered valuable service when he called the attention of the House of Lords to the condition of the people as revealed by the recent Report of the Poor Law Commission. The facts are undoubted. Poverty, distress, unemployment, the dangers of out-relief, the dreariness in many cases of the workhouse accommodation, are but a few indications of a very sad state of affairs, and the Archbishop "absolutely challenged the statement that these difficulties could be met except by a new system under a new law." Everything in the evidence shows conclusively that things are deplorably and radically wrong, and call for drastic alterations. In view of the overwhelming pressure of other public business, it is hardly to be expected that this or any other Government can deal at once with all the recommendations of the Commission, especially as such an attempt would be faced with the rival and seriously opposite suggestions of the Majority and Minority Reports. Meanwhile, as Canon Barnett has pointed out, there are certain things which are possible at once, and which the Government could put into force without the fear of any political or other opposition :

"The Government might at once adopt certain recommendations on which there is general agreement, and which would not involve the immediate substitution of a new body of administration in the place of the Guardians. It might, for instance (1) establish compulsory continuation schools ; (2) make adequate provision for the feeble-minded ; and (3) develop some method of training for the able-bodied and able-minded who have lost their way in the industrial world."

It would be an immense gain to the community if these proposals were adopted, for the results would very soon be seen. It is in every way depressing and disheartening to contemplate the thought that nothing is to be done unless a complete scheme of Poor Law Reform be devised. The evils are so gigantic and far-reaching that we must necessarily proceed slowly and point by point, and we sincerely hope that the efforts of the Archbishop of Canterbury and Canon Barnett to call attention to the need and best method of taking action will meet with the success they deserve.

**C.E.T.S.** For some weeks past the Church of England Temperance Society has been engaged in what it well calls a Forward Movement, endeavouring to bring before the minds and consciences of Churchmen their duty in regard to the temperance problem. Recent controversies over the Licensing Bill cannot be allowed to obscure the fact that there is a gigantic evil in our midst, and, in the words of the late Royal Commission, "hardly any sacrifice would be too great which would result in a marked diminution of this national degradation." There is a very serious danger at the present time of relaxing our efforts, and of thinking that such encouraging progress has been made that we need not be unduly concerned about the immediate future. But this is to go quite contrary to the facts of the case. To cease or even to slacken work now would easily bring matters into a worse condition than before, and it is the purpose of the Forward Movement of the C.E.T.S. to make it clear to Churchmen that there is a great wrong to be righted and an immense work to be done. The Society has done noble service in the past, and is doing equally good service in the present. We are fully aware of the severe criticism that was passed upon it in connection with last year's Licensing Bill; but, as the Bishop of Croydon said in an article in the *Church Family Newspaper* for September 17, the accusation is more than unfounded; it is ungenerous, unjust, and untrue. Besides, the Committee and Council of the

C.E.T.S. are purely representative bodies, and the matter is therefore in the hands of Church people to see that only those are placed in authority in whose judgment they have confidence. We sincerely hope that all friends of temperance in our Church will rally round the Society, and do all that is possible to remove from our land the moral stigma and curse of intemperance.

**Socialism.** The discussion of Socialism at the Church Congress was not particularly helpful, and only served in great measure to bring into relief the different and discordant views of Churchmen. But this disagreement about Socialism and the attitude of Churchmen to it must not hinder us from realizing the need of Social Reform. It is of course perfectly true, as the *Times* said, that our Lord "occupied Himself with the regeneration of the individual, and never propounded any comprehensive scheme for remodelling the world." But this is no reason why Christian teachers should not show the bearing of these individualistic principles on the social questions of the day. The trouble is that there are Christian men who do not seem to see that their Christianity has a definite application to such economic and moral problems as those of housing, unemployment, overcrowding, etc. We must show both to rich and poor the importance of individual character, but we must also point out the importance of conditions as well, and the way in which conditions act and react upon character. A little volume just issued by our valued contributor, Dr. Chadwick, "The Social Principles of the Gospel" (S.P.C.K.; 1s. 6d.), very effectively points out the fact that the social problem has mainly arisen through the forgetfulness of Christian principles among all classes of society, and that, therefore, the solution of the problem can only come through an insistence on these same principles :

"The Church must furnish that deeper thought and that wider application of her faith to the problems of life for which the modern mind is seeking and the modern heart is yearning."

This is the true line to take, and we warmly commend the book and its purpose to the prayerful thought of Churchmen.

It is usually well to give heed, whether we agree  
 A Noteworthy  
 Review. or not, to a careful review of a theological book found in a responsible organ like the *Times*, and it is for this reason that we call attention to a recent notice, extending to over a column, of Mr. Darwell Stone's new book, "A History of the Doctrine of the Holy Eucharist" (Longmans, 2 vols. ; 30s. net). When it came out some months ago the book was praised in no measured terms by more than one organ of the religious Press, and this gives all the greater point by contrast to the opinion of the *Times'* reviewer. Here are some of his statements made about it :

"For writing the history of any doctrine he is clearly unfitted by the constitution of his mind. . . . With whatever century Mr. Stone is dealing, his categories are the same. . . . He is a dogmatist pure and simple. . . . Mr Stone's notes on *ποιεῖτε* and *ἀνάμνησις* illustrate very pointedly the difference between learning and scholarship. . . . A mind capable of drawing such a conclusion from such premises is impervious to what is ordinarily meant by argument. . . . It is impossible to give many examples in a short review of Mr. Stone's extraordinary gift for misinterpretation. . . . Enough has been said to show that Mr. Darwell Stone is not to be trusted as a historian of doctrine."

A review taking very largely the same line appeared in another well-informed paper, the *Westminster Gazette*, and as these opinions come from organs that are not necessarily or usually prejudiced in favour of Evangelicalism, their statements deserve all the greater weight, for they cannot be charged with ecclesiastical bias. We hope to show in an early number of our Magazine, in an article by the Principal of Ridley Hall, Cambridge, that the opinions of these reviewers are confirmed by a discussion of one of the important subjects connected with the doctrine of the Holy Communion ; and we refer to the matter mainly because Mr. Darwell Stone is well known to hold the view that on all essentials the Anglican and Roman doctrines of the Holy Communion are virtually the same. His earlier book

on the Holy Communion, and his more recent utterances at the Manchester Church Congress and elsewhere, clearly show this. It is therefore important that we should face the problem, and see whether Mr. Stone's view is true to the facts of history. Certainly no well-informed Roman Catholic would dream of saying that the statements of our Prayer-Book and Articles were in fundamental agreement with the doctrine of his Church, and he is just as surprised as Evangelical Churchmen are that such a statement can be made.

The Voice  
of the  
Church.

In a recent article on this subject the *Times* called special attention to the necessity and importance of the Church of England being able to express its mind through a really representative body of members. The article went on to show that neither in Convocation, nor in the Houses of Laymen, nor even in the Representative Church Council, can this true representation be said to exist, and the following very frank opinion was expressed with regard to the present composition of some of these bodies :

“Both the Houses of Laymen, and, to some extent, the elected element in the Houses of the Clergy, contain a disproportionate representation of a single party in the Church, which is well organized, has a powerful society at its back, and in its van has leaders working in close accord with the society in question.”

Those who know best the facts of the case are well aware that all this is perfectly true ; and although it is, of course, quite legitimate for any body of Churchmen to do their utmost to obtain such a representation as will enable its views to be emphasized, the fact remains, as the *Times* says, that there is still the old need

“of some means of welding the large mass of Christian opinion in the Church of England which disagrees with the views we have referred to, and which resents not so much the expression of these views as their disproportionate representation.”

This necessity is all the more urgent in view of the important subjects that will come before the Convocations next year. Prayer-Book Revision, the Use of the *Quicumque Vult*, and the



Vestments, are all such burning subjects, affecting the entire Church, that it would be disastrous if only one view were predominant in Convocations, the Houses of Laymen, and the Representative Church Council. What is required above all things is not the expression of the opinion of any one party, but that which will truly represent as far as possible the voice of the whole Church.

We have been much interested in a valuable Missionary Problems. article in a recent number of the *Guardian* on "Modern Hinduism" by a well-known S.P.G. missionary in India, the Rev. J. A. Sharrock. There is one point in the article to which we desire to draw special attention. Mr. Sharrock asks the question whether we are looking in the right or wrong direction for the apostle of India, and, still more, whether we are justified in looking for one at all. He points out that the late Father Goreh was a Brahman of the Brahmans and a most devoted Christian, and that we are never likely to see a higher type of convert; and yet it is impossible to assert that this distinguished disciple ever became in any full sense an apostle of India. Then it is shown that when a Brahman becomes baptized he becomes a pariah, and his influence is very largely set aside, and that the Brahmans are, after all, a numerically small body, numbering only fourteen millions out of a total of two hundred and seven millions of Hindus. Then Mr. Sharrock puts forth the following suggestive opinion, which we do not hesitate to quote in full:

"The future of India lies in the hands of the huge mass of Sudras. They have not wakened yet, either politically or religiously, but when they do wake—and with the din from the clash of East and West in their ears that wakening cannot be delayed much longer—there will be such a revolution in India as the world has seldom witnessed. Christianity has already reached three millions, mostly of the lower classes, and when it has to any appreciable extent leavened this mass of Sudras there will rise in India a new power that will sweep all before it, including the Brahmans, who now exercise such enormous influence through their priestcraft. Democracy and priestcraft cannot breathe and live in the same atmosphere; and the problem that the practical missionary has to solve is, Are we wise in spending so much energy

in the quest, or the development, of an apostle from the Brahmans, or ought we to look to the Parable of the Leaven for the right method to pursue for the conversion of India? A Brahman convert, however eminent, may be despised and ignored, but when a body of thousands of real, living Christians has been raised up; when caste—the poison that has reduced so many of our Christians to a comatose state—has been purged from the native Church; when they have elevated themselves by an advanced education in the mental, social, and, above all, the moral scale, there will then be a power in the land that no Brahman can sneer into insignificance, or drag down into impotence. Is not this the direction in which our eyes should be turned? Different missionaries will give different answers, but surely this side of the question has not received the attention that it deserves.”

This proceeds along very much the same line as some recent opinions of the Bishop of Madras, and we cannot help saying that it seems to us worthy of the most careful attention, even though, as Mr. Sharrock admits, missionaries will give different answers to the questions. Is it not, at any rate, a striking fact that in the history of the Christian Church all movements of importance have been from below upwards, and not from the higher social scale downwards?

The Bishop of Carlisle in his Church Congress sermon said that the characteristic notes of New Testament churchmanship were comprehensiveness and simplicity :

True  
Church-  
manship.

“True Churchmanship makes no requirements, either in morals or discipline, beyond those set forth in the New Testament; but these requirements it demands with a fierce energy. Whosoever does not strive to keep the New Testament commandments in all their tenderness and power, and does not constantly pray in the Holy Ghost for help so to do, the truth is not in him. He is both a false Christian and a false Churchman.

If we were content with these requirements, neither more nor less, how simple many of our present-day problems would become! And how powerful our witness for God would be!

