

# 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

August, 1920.

## THE MONTH.

Anglo-Catholics in Conference. THE Anglo-Catholic Congress has come and gone, and has left the Church unmoved. Great things were expected of it; it was to explain what Anglo-Catholics are out for; it was to convince the bishops of the Lambeth Conference that the Anglo-Catholic movement must be reckoned with; and it was to do a hundred and one other things in support of the Anglo-Catholic position. But, in fact, it has accomplished very little; it wholly failed to capture the imagination of Churchmen; it told us very little we did not know before of the aims of the party; and we believe we are correct in saying that, in regard to some at least of the bishops, its proceedings provoked mild amusement rather than anything else. So far as the Congress set itself to vindicate the Christian faith against the attacks of Modernism, we could watch its proceedings with interest and sympathy, although the description given by one speaker of the Bible as "that volume of rustic Semitic folk-lore" seemed strangely out of place in such an assembly. We can and do admire the zeal displayed for foreign missions, when men and women in response to impassioned appeals gave not only money but also emptied their jewels into the collecting plate, with the result that more than £25,000 of the £50,000 asked for was subscribed. Hitherto the interest of Anglo-Catholics has not been markedly shown in the sums contributed to foreign missions, and we hail with delight this new departure. But concerning the doctrinal position of Anglo-Catholicism and the insistence upon a ritual (e.g., at the celebration of "High Mass") which, like the doctrine it represents, is wholly alien from the teaching of the Church of England, we can only say that the Church will have none of it. The attempt to undo the work of the Reformation can never be tolerated. It had been proposed

that the Congress should be answered by a counter-demonstration, but wiser counsels prevailed. It is not by demonstrations that the truth is forwarded, but rather by quiet, patient, plodding work. The nature and extent of the Romeward drift is now generally acknowledged, and it is for Evangelical and other loyal Churchmen to counteract it by clear, definite and steady teaching in their parishes and elsewhere as opportunity may offer. Anglo-Catholicism will have no chance with well-instructed Churchmen.

It is good to note the widespread interest taken in the gathering of bishops for the Lambeth Conference.

As a mere historical event an assembly of nearly 300 bishops from all parts of the habitable world is of great significance, showing as it does how far-reaching is the influence of the Anglican Communion. But it is not in appeals to the imagination that the chief importance of this great gathering consists. The assembled bishops have before them for discussion some of the gravest problems which are agitating the mind of the Church at the present time, and the resolutions of the Conference in regard to these are being awaited with anxious interest. Pre-eminent among such questions is that of Reunion, upon which the Church, not only at home but in the mission field, is looking to the Lambeth Conference for wise guidance and strong leadership. It is not necessary in these pages to restate the nature of the issues at stake. The papers read at the Cheltenham Conference which appeared in our last number, taken together, presented a wide conspectus of the Reunion problem such as is to be found nowhere else, and it is difficult usefully to add anything to what was there set forth. Indeed, there is a strong feeling in many quarters that the time for talking and writing has passed and that the hour for action has struck. Whether action is possible, and, if so, of what nature it should be, must depend very largely upon the decision of the Lambeth Conference. We cannot believe that the bishops will be indifferent to the strong and earnest pleas, which come from so many quarters, that some plans may be devised by which those Christian Churches which have so much in common may be able to practise true Christian fellowship one with another as a step forward towards the much-desired goal of a fully-united Christian Church. On the contrary, we believe they will view them with sympathy, but, to be

of any real value, sympathy must be translated into action, and action will depend upon how far the bishops may feel able to go forward from the position they took up in 1908. The difficulties are many, and there are enemies not a few, but we earnestly hope that the outcome of the Lambeth Conference—the object of so many prayers—will be a real advance towards intercommunion and fellowship between all who love the Lord Jesus Christ.

We congratulate the Bishop of Manchester upon **The Bishop's Triumph.** the triumph he has won in the action brought against him by the patron of the Sacred Trinity, Salford. Sir J. Gore-Booth, having presented to that living a clergyman whom the Bishop did not think was (in the legal phrase) "a fit and proper person," his lordship' refused to institute him, and the patron began a suit of *quare impedit*. The case was heard before Mr. Justice Coleridge, and counsel for the Bishop urged the grounds upon which it was held that the patron's nominee was not "a fit and proper person." It was alleged—and indeed, was not denied—that in his present cure the clergyman used vestments, incense and lights, and reserved the Sacrament, and refused to give an undertaking not to introduce such practices at the Salford church. These practices being illegal, it was argued that they constituted a valid ground for refusal to institute. Mr. Justice Coleridge upheld the Bishop's contention, and dismissed the action with costs. The plaintiff gave notice of appeal, but two days before the appeal was in the list for hearing his solicitors gave notice that he would not proceed with the appeal, for the reason that the Bishop had given notice of his intention to collate a clergyman whom the patron regarded as quite satisfactory, and that therefore his object in bringing the action was attained. This statement was made in court on July 16, and his counsel said that as he was instructed not to argue the appeal, he must consent to its being dismissed. Counsel for the Bishop expressed the surprise with which his clients had heard of the decision not to proceed with the appeal, explained that the clergyman whom the Bishop proposed to collate had not engaged, nor had he any reason to suppose he would engage, in the practices admitted by the patron's nominee, and asked that the appeal be dismissed with costs. The court, consisting of three judges, accordingly dismissed the appeal with

costs. It is not necessary to examine too closely the reasons given for abandoning the appeal; more to the point is it to emphasize the fact that the English Church Union—the power behind the plaintiff in this case—has hesitated to face the Court of Appeal on the question whether or not a bishop has the right to refuse to institute a presentee who is known to have practised illegalities and refuses to give an undertaking not to do so in the parish to which he is presented. According to Mr. Justice Coleridge—who followed well-established decisions—a bishop is entitled so to refuse, and the Bishop of Manchester deserves the thanks of all loyal Churchmen for vindicating this position. It now remains to be seen whether other bishops will be equally courageous and say “No” definitely and decisively to any patron who presents for institution a clergyman who is known to be guilty of illegalities.

**National  
Church  
Assembly.** Evangelical Churchmen have no reason to be dissatisfied with the general result of the elections to the House of Laity in the National Church Assembly. It is much to be regretted that, in the London diocese, a few of the candidates who have rendered the Church splendid service in the past failed to secure election, and they will be very greatly missed. But, taking the country as a whole, it may safely be said that Evangelical and Moderate Churchmen have been returned in large numbers, and that they will make their influence felt in the new Assembly, which has held its first session, and the tone of the proceedings was admirable. Several Committees were appointed, and one at least—that charged with the preparation of the Parochial Church Councils Bill—has already begun its work in real earnest. The question is one of some complexity, but there is reason to believe that in the result a measure will be produced which will give real power to the Councils.

