

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.

DECEMBER, 1907.

The Month.

**The
Deceased
Wife's Sister
Act.** THE past month has seen quite a number of Episcopal pronouncements on this important subject. Among these the letter of the Archbishop of Canterbury to his Diocese is the weightiest contribution. The gist of it is that, while the clergy should use the liberty granted to them by the Act, and not celebrate these marriages or allow the use of their churches, the parties, when married, are not to be denied Holy Communion or Christian burial. The counsels of the Diocesan Bishops take this line for the most part, though some of them adopt a severer attitude. We shall doubtless hear more when Convocation meets in February, but meanwhile the present position is eminently unsatisfactory. Nothing could well be more illogical than the advice to the clergy not to celebrate these marriages, and yet not to refuse the Holy Communion to those who have been so married. If the marriages are wrong, then the full weight of Canon 99 should be brought to bear upon the parties. If the Holy Communion is permitted to those who contract the marriages, then no one can fairly say that the marriages are un-Christian, or even in the legal sense "incestuous." We are glad to know that the Archbishop will "in no way regard . . . as absolutely disloyal or disrespectful" any incumbent who, "after carefully weighing the whole circumstances," comes to a different decision from himself; but we have had a sharp reminder of what is likely to take place when clergy feel conscientiously at liberty to celebrate these marriages in the censure of the Vicar of Dartmouth by his Ruridecanal Conference. Liberty and conscience must not be allowed on one side only. The present contradiction between the statute law of the land and the rule expressed in the Table of Kindred and

Affinity cannot possibly continue, and some definite settlement must be made which will prevent each diocese from having different rules, according to the judgment of its Bishop. This matter cannot be fairly said to come within the limits of those questions which are left to the Ordinary for decision ; it must be decided by and for the whole Church. We are accustomed to speak strongly against Congregational independency, but we must be careful that we do not ourselves fall into Diocesan independency. The difference between the Congregational and the Diocesan unit is not one of kind, but only of degree. Independency is independency in every case, and this is not the Church of England position.

The excommunication of Father Tyrrell is a **Modernism.** reminder that Rome still wields the same weapons as of yore. We have no sympathy with some of Father Tyrrell's distinctive views on things Biblical, for we see little or nothing to choose between him, Harnack, and Loisy on these subjects. They all represent the same rationalizing tendency. But we are perfectly sure that these dangers are not to be met by repression or vanquished by excommunication ; they must be allowed to come in the open without fear or favour. Scholarship must be met by scholarship, and argument by argument, for truth has nothing to fear from inquiry and examination. Criticism is not to be crushed, but to be vanquished by fact, knowledge, and argument. In his remarkable article in the *Times* Father Tyrrell describes the official Roman Church in the following terms :

“ The Roman Catholic Church, with the Papacy, the Sacraments, and all its institutions and dogmas, was, in its entirety, the immediate creation of Christ when upon earth. There has been no vital development, but only mechanical unpacking of what was given from the first. The Scriptures were dictated by God, and are final in questions of science and history. All doctrinal guidance and ecclesiastical authority is mediated through the infallible Pope from God to the Church. The Church is the purely passive recipient of the guidance so received. The Bishops are mere delegates of the Pope ; the priests of the Bishops. The laity have no active share of any kind in ecclesiastical concerns, still less in the so-called growth of the Church's mind. Obedience and pecuniary succour are their sole duties. Science is subject to the control of scholastic theology ; secular government

is subject to the control of ecclesiastical government in mixed matters. Their jurisdiction is in the same order, only in different departments."

We might almost imagine ourselves reading the words of a strong Protestant instead of a member of the Roman Church, for no Protestant could use stronger language in describing the Church of Rome as it is to-day. The astonishing thing is that Father Tyrrell cannot see that this picture of his Church is the only logical and possible one, and that his own view is hopelessly illogical and impossible. Newman's theory of development fascinated the minds of many of his contemporaries, and did effective service for Rome, but it is now bringing forth the inevitable fruit that many anticipated, and recoiling on the heads of its supporters. We do not suppose for a moment that Rome will be unwise enough to put any of Newman's works on the Index, or declare his views to be heretical, but no one can doubt that the recent Encyclical is directed against some of Newman's characteristic positions as maintained by him and his disciples. Modernism in the Roman Church cannot possibly exist as long as Rome boasts that she is *semper eadem*, and it is a thousand pities that earnest men like Father Tyrrell cannot see the utter untenableness of their position.

As the time draws nearer for the introduction of

The
Education
Question.

the new Education Bill, Churchmen do well to give attention to all the pronouncements of representative men, especially of those with whom they are not accustomed to agree. Dr. Macnamara, speaking from the standpoint of a member of the Government, who is also an educational expert, recently said that three courses were open to the State, which desired to be fair all round. First, the local authorities might make provision for denominational teaching in school hours and pay for it. This he regarded as strictly logical, but hopelessly impracticable, the cost of providing teachers putting the proposal entirely out of court, even apart from the effect of such a claim upon the discipline of the school. The second course was a common ground of agreement for simple Christian teaching. This has been done in Board Schools for thirty-six years with

no little success, and since the Voluntary Schools were put on the rates in 1902, it would seem as though there were no alternative before the Government but to make these schools conform to this form of undenominational teaching. But the attempt to do this in 1906 broke down, because Roman Catholics and many Anglicans considered that it was unfair to all but Nonconformists. Dr. Macnamara added that if denominationalists still insisted that the main lines of the 1906 Bill create an abiding sense of injustice, there was only one course left, that of pure secularism, which he would regard as a counsel of despair. We believe these three courses practically sum up all the possibilities of the situation. As the President of the National Union of Teachers remarked a little while ago, if the Roman Catholics hold to their claim of "Roman Catholic religion taught by Roman Catholic teachers in Roman Catholic schools, well, then they must add also, with Roman Catholic money." The same plain speaking will have to be adopted with regard to all others outside the Roman Church to whom simple Bible teaching is "corrosive poison." We believe with Dr. Macnamara that "the unseemly squabbles of the last few years have enormously strengthened the forces in favour of the adoption of secularism," and unless we come to some agreement, and that speedily, the inevitable result will be that religion will be driven entirely out of the schools.

**The Church
and
Sectionalism.** Among the valuable points made by the Bishop of Carlisle in his recent address to his Diocesan Conference, was the following reference deprecating any alliance of the Church with either the poor or the rich :

"The welfare of a nation depends on all classes alike sharing duly their rights and discharging duly their corresponding duties. To favour or to flatter either poor or rich, employers or employed, was social sectarianism. Yet so inveterate and deep-seated had the sectarian spirit become in the Tractarian Movement that some of its most illustrious disciples were proclaiming it a kind of sin to possess property and a kind of piety to be poor, thus materializing the very foundations of religion. They were not only threatening the Church with disestablishment and disruption, if they could not have their own interpretation of doubtful rubrics and their own way on the 'six points' (not one of the whole six being even as much as mentioned

in the New Testament), but, instead of making the Gospel equally a Gospel for all, they were proclaiming it to be preferentially on the side of one class in the nation to the depreciation of other classes. Under cover of humanitarianism the most disintegrating of social and ecclesiastical forces were being industriously introduced into the life of both the English Church and the English nation, to the great narrowing of the Church and the great dividing of the nation."

This is a salutary reminder and warning. We must undoubtedly show all possible sympathy with the poor, and must face the present problems of the social order with resoluteness, but we must also endeavour to get the rich and well-to-do to face these problems themselves, and to assist in their solution. If the Church ranges itself on the side of the rich for fear of Socialism and spoliation, or on the side of the poor for the purpose of obtaining favour with the democracy, the result will be in every way inimical to spiritual religion. It is for the Church to keep close to the preaching of the great principles of the Gospel, and to apply those principles both to rich and poor.

The Bishop of Newcastle has not been long in his new diocese without experiencing the difficulties of his position. In his insistence on the Rev. Vibert Jackson obeying the law, Bishop Straton will have the cordial sympathy and gratitude of all loyal Churchmen. The questions at issue are by no means limited to the vestments; they include the stations of the cross, reservation, and the crucifix. And the Bishop has rightly insisted, as the Royal Commission plainly laid down, that the law "should be obeyed." As the very definite language of the Commission puts it, that a section of clergymen should "conspicuously disobey the law, and continue to do so with impunity, is not only an offence against public order, but also a scandal to religion." If only action of the kind taken by the Bishop of Newcastle had been taken generally years ago, we should not now be in our present state of chaos. The attitude of the extreme party to Bishop Straton ever since his appointment has been nothing short of deplorable, for it has transgressed all bounds of honourable expression of differences of opinion; and the way in which some

The Newcastle
Trouble.

of the salient facts of the present case have been omitted from certain reports of the incident is not the least significant illustration of their methods of ecclesiastical controversy. The Bishop will have the warm sympathy, hearty goodwill, and strenuous support of the great body of loyal Churchmen within and outside his diocese. The time has come for definite action along the lines of loyal obedience to the declared law of the Church. The days of inaction are past, and it remains for those who are in authority to insist that the law shall be obeyed, and lawlessness "promptly made to cease."

About
Ourselves.

With this number we close the second year of the enlarged series of the CHURCHMAN, and we take the opportunity of expressing our grateful thanks to all our subscribers for their continued help and interest. We would also acknowledge the appreciative notices given to the magazine by various organs of the press. In the current number will be found the programme for next year, and we venture to appeal to all our readers to help us to make the CHURCHMAN still more fully known among the clergy and laity. It is our constant desire and aim to appeal to the large and powerful body of central Churchmen who are the strength of our communion, and to provide in every possible way for the expression of those fundamental principles which are dear to all loyal Churchmen. We would lay especial stress on the opportunity afforded by the CHURCHMAN to keep our brethren in the Colonies and the mission-field in touch with what is going on at home. We should welcome the help of our readers in supplying copies of the magazine to missionaries and other workers abroad. This is already being done by individual subscribers, and, as one example, we have recently received a grateful acknowledgment from a reader in Manitoba, who desires to express his thanks to the unknown donor in Manchester who regularly sends the magazine. We should much like to extend this mission of usefulness. The publisher would be glad to give particulars of the plan to any of our readers who apply to him.