

# 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.

---

JULY, 1908.

---

## The Month.

**The Anglican Communion.** WRITING these lines in the midst of the Pan-Anglican Congress, it is a matter of extreme thankfulness to observe the abundant signs of interest in the gathering on the part of the whole country. The Congress is already a great success, and is proving a splendid object-lesson of the wide extent and far-reaching influence of the Anglican Communion. We cannot but believe that its deliberations will prove a means of spiritual blessing to the entire Anglican world. It is impossible for so many and important subjects to be discussed by Christian men without making deep and lasting impressions of spiritual reality and power. There has been the apparently inevitable beating of the Anglican "drum" in certain quarters, but this has been insignificant compared with the quietness and power of the meetings themselves and the usefulness of many of the contributions to the discussions. The object of the Congress, as declared by its promoters, has not been the glorification of Anglicanism, but the extension of Christ's kingdom by means of the Anglican Communion; and in spite of many things that Evangelical and Moderate Churchmen would wish to have seen different in the Congress, we are sure that Christ will be magnified and His kingdom extended by it. It was a great disappointment to many that illness prevented the Bishop of Birmingham from being present. His contributions to present-day discussions are always noteworthy and welcome, not the least to those who often find themselves unable to agree with him. If, as is generally understood, the conception of the Congress is due to

Bishop Montgomery, he must have been abundantly rewarded by the magnificent results of his statesmanlike proposals. The report of the Congress, when it is issued, will prove a mine of information and suggestion for all students of Christian thought and life. Meanwhile we thank God for the gathering, and pray that His continual pity may cleanse and defend our Communion and preserve it evermore by His help and goodness.

The  
Historic  
Episcopate.

In a sermon preached on the eve of the Pan-Anglican Congress, Canon Henson called attention to the way in which almost all the papers written for the Congress laid stress on the Episcopate as essential to the existence of the Church. He considered this emphasis "excessive, unwarrantable, and full of ill-promise," and he stated the problem in the following words :

"If the exclusive validity of an Episcopal ministry be part of Christ's revelation of truth, then at all hazards we must assert it, and endure whatever results shall follow. Can we rightly continue to place the 'historic Episcopate' on the same level of importance as the Scripture, the Sacraments, and the Catholic Creeds? On the answer to that question everything really at this juncture depends."

This is a very refreshing pronouncement, because it moves in the realm of fact, and not of theory. There is scarcely anything more untrue to Scripture, to primitive history, to the action of the English Church in the sixteenth century, and to the marks of the Holy Spirit in non-episcopal Churches to-day, than the insistence upon Episcopacy as essential to the being of the Church. And he is not a "bad" Churchman, but a "good" one, who is determined to rest his advocacy of Episcopacy on facts, not on theory. Canon Henson is absolutely correct in saying that on the answer to the question whether Episcopacy is of the *esse* of the Church everything depends at the present juncture. If Scripture, primitive antiquity, and present-day facts count for anything, it is simply impossible to place the historic Episcopate on the same level of importance as the Scripture, the Sacraments, and the Creeds as essential to the

being of the Church. The more widely and thoroughly these alternatives are faced the better it will be for the cause of truth.

**National Churches.** Canon Henson in the sermon now referred to had a useful word about National Churches :

“The Anglican Communion, we are repeatedly assured, is a ‘federation of National Churches.’ Of these there are said to be nine or ten, each completely organized on the ‘Catholic’ model. The ‘National Church,’ however, is to be understood in every case to consist only of those who are in communion with the Anglican Episcopate. In Scotland and in America these form but a fraction of the Christians; yet they are to be credited with all the attributes of nationality, and exclusively reckoned with. Is this a procedure which will minister to a better feeling between the separated Churches of Christendom? Can it be justified at the bar of reason, or of charity, or even of policy? Of what use is it to speak of reunion to the Scot, proud—and justly proud—of his National Church, when you begin by assuming that that National Church is a misnomer and a sham? Is there not an element of actual absurdity in speaking of ‘a great National Church such as the Church of the United States,’ when all you have in your mind is a small denomination, which is hardly known by name to great multitudes of American Christians? Nothing can be more certain than that this notion of ‘National Churches’ is quite novel in the experience of the Church of England.”

These are facts to which we do well to take heed. A National Church in Article XXXIV. is of course the Church of a nation. Where is there such a National Church to-day? The term was true in the sixteenth century; it may be questioned whether it can be accurately used to-day. We have “particular” Churches now rather than national, and this should give us pause in our often too summary treatment of non-episcopal Churches. The cause of Christ will never be furthered by ignoring plain facts. The attribution to a small denomination of only about 140,000 members of the term “National Church,” to speak only of the Episcopal Church in Scotland, is surely impossible. And the same thing is equally true of America and our Colonies. As Canon Henson rightly says: “Insistence upon episcopacy as essential to the Christian Church has rendered hopeless that reunion of Christians for which the Anglican Church constantly professes to be labouring.” It is well known that our Bidding Prayer, which dates from

1604, includes a petition for the Presbyterian Church of Scotland. It is also known that the Church of England in the sixteenth century recognized in the fullest possible way the true character of the other Reformed Churches, and that between 1552 and 1662 Presbyterians were admitted to incumbencies in the Church of England without reordination. We should much like to see all those Churchmen who believe in this truly Anglican and undoubtedly primitive view of episcopacy banded in strong union to uphold and propagate their principles. It is not too much to say that everything practical and practicable in Church matters to-day turns on this question.

The Education Bill. As there is evidently a truce at present on this subject, we wish to do no more than record our intense gratification with the admirable and statesmanlike letters which have appeared in the *Times* during the last month from the Headmaster of Eton, the Dean of Manchester, Canon Beeching, and Dr. Eugene Stock. Not only do they breathe the spirit of peace, but they have the great virtue of recognizing all the facts of the situation, especially those that have been brought about by the Act of 1902. It is only by a full recognition of all the pertinent facts that we shall ever arrive at a true solution. We wish it were possible to reprint in full the letter from the Headmaster of Eton which appeared in the *Times* of June 11. It is one of the ablest and most statesmanlike that has appeared during this unhappy controversy. This was followed by one of equal value from Bishop Welldon, of which we give the concluding words :

“It is my earnest hope, then, that Christians, and above all Churchmen, will not set themselves against elementary Biblical Christian teaching in schools. At present, as the Headmaster of Eton has shown, the Church is fighting to retain denominational teaching in her schools; but she is gradually losing the schools themselves. The theory of parents' rights, if it implies that all children must be religiously educated in exact accordance with the denominational beliefs of their parents or not religiously educated at all, would break up every public school in England.”

In our endeavours to maintain the Church schools let us not

forget the Church children now in the Provided schools. As the Headmaster of Eton says :

“The total excellence of the religious teaching in all Church schools is not likely to be seriously impaired if they were so far surrendered to the State as to give us the right of safeguarding the religious teaching in the Provided schools—that is to say, the right of Church parents of interposing and supplementing the teaching when defective.”

At the moment of going to press the result of the Education Conference at Manchester has been published. While the immediate prospect is not particularly hopeful, yet the fact of such different and differing men having agreed on the resolutions is itself a good omen, and we shall watch with great and prayerful interest all further developments in the direction of peace and unity. We still contend that a peaceful and honourable settlement is possible, and we cannot believe it will prove beyond the sanctified common sense of the various Christian denominations to accomplish it.

On July 6 the fifth decennial gathering, known as the Lambeth Conference of the Bishops of the Anglican Communion, will assemble. Things have moved since the days of Archbishop Longley in 1867, when some of our leading Bishops were afraid of the project and would have nothing to do with it. Now, however, it is one of the most valuable means of realizing what is meant by the Anglican Communion. We have observed with the greatest possible satisfaction the appointment of Bishop Ingham as co-secretary with Bishop Montgomery. This is as it should be, and we rejoice in an arrangement so thoroughly in harmony with the feelings of Evangelical Churchmen. It would have been in every way more appropriate if the appointment could have been announced at the time when Bishop Montgomery was appointed, for the original arrangement left room for the unwelcome thought, which was expressed in more than one quarter, that the S.P.G. is somehow regarded as the official organization inclusive of the whole Church, and the C.M.S. as

the non-official organization connected with one party. Nothing could be further from the facts on either side; but "all's well that ends well," and we are glad that as a result of representations made several months ago the Archbishop of Canterbury appointed Bishop Ingham in January last. We shall all regard it as our duty to bear this momentous gathering before God in our prayers. Some very grave questions are to be brought before it which will affect the entire Anglican Communion, and we shall look forward to the issue of the Lambeth Encyclical Letter in the hope of deriving from it light and leading on some of the acutest problems of the day.

A notable contribution to the discussion on this important subject was made last month by the publication of the Report of the York Convocation. As <sup>The</sup> Vestments. it is the Report of a Committee of the whole House, it is, of course, more representative than the Report of the Five Bishops of the Southern Province. In substance it proposes the permissive use of a white Vestment, together with a statement that such permission is not to be understood as affecting in any way the teaching of the Prayer Book and Articles. With all respect to the desires and motives of those who are responsible for the Report, we are bound to confess that it does not seem to be in any sense practical politics. This is abundantly evident from the way in which it has been received by those who wear Vestments as well as by many who oppose them. The Report admits the very serious dangers attending the use of a distinctive Vestment for Holy Communion, and yet recommends the adoption of it. Already the advocates of the Vestments have ridiculed the idea of being limited to a white one, and it is perfectly clear that this Report will satisfy nobody. Meanwhile, as these Reports will not be considered by Convocation for several months to come, it is imperative that all Churchmen should give the matter their most careful consideration. What is needed is information and study and a determination to follow the truth, whithersoever it leads. The case for the Vestments

is found in the Report of the Five Bishops and the York Convocation Report, and the opposition to them can be studied in the pamphlet by Mr. Tomlinson, to which we called attention last month, "An Examination of the Report of the Five Bishops" (Robert Scott; 1s.). We are glad to observe that the substance of Canon Nunn's three articles in our columns has been issued in pamphlet form with the title "The Ornaments Rubric Explained" (Heywood: Manchester; 6d. net). This pamphlet contains a great deal of valuable material in a clear and telling form, and should be studied by everyone. There is also a smaller pamphlet by Dr. Willoughby, entitled "Vestments and the Law" (C. J. Thynne; 1d.), which is a very clear and extremely useful compendium of information. With these three pamphlets, those who are opposed to the introduction of the Vestments will find themselves equipped with adequate information, especially on points which have evidently been overlooked in the Report of the Five Bishops. The one great requirement is to discover the theory of the Vestments which will fit all or most of the facts. In a striking article which appeared in the *Liverpool Courier* for May 18, the writer, referring to Mr. Tomlinson's position, which is also in substance that of Canon Nunn and Dr. Willoughby, said that "it is the only one which entirely explains all the known facts and pays due regard to the overwhelming preponderance of undisputed data." It is impossible to say this of any of the rival theories, and we may be perfectly certain that no settlement will ever be accepted by the main body of English Churchmen which sets aside the history of our Church from 1559 to the beginning of the Tractarian Movement.

At the Reunion of the Students of St. John's  
**Narrowness.** Hall, Highbury, in May, the Principal, Dr. Greenup, reminded his hearers of an address given by Dr. Boulton, the first Principal of St. John's Hall, in 1872. It contains a reference to a subject that is often before the minds of Churchmen to-day as to what constitutes narrowness and



breadth. Dr. Boulton's words are so valuable that we propose to preserve them by quoting them in full :

“ This word ‘ narrow ’ is a word which this age has, for some reason of its own, chosen to fasten peculiarly upon those whom the previous age nicknamed Evangelicals, and whom this age abuses for having accepted the name. It is one of those things which one can never understand. You may be a ritualist, and drive out half your parishioners by your antics, and you won't be called ‘ narrow,’ though you may posture within the smallest of circles. You may be a stiff High Churchman and coolly deny to your Presbyterian brother any Church standing whatever. Yet you are not called ‘ narrow,’ though you are entrenched within the most unyielding bounds of Apostolical Succession. But if you are a Churchman according to the definition of our trust deed, holding boldly and fully what you know to be the definite teaching of your own Church, which you are also persuaded is firmly based on Holy Scripture, you are ‘ *narrow.* ’ You are faithful to your own, without unchurching others. You meet a wide circle of brethren of other ecclesiastical opinions in upholding the Bible Society, in circulating Gospel and useful tracts, nay, sometimes, in the prayer meeting where the common burden of sin and the knowledge of the same Saviour bring hearts together. Never mind, they who do none of these will call you ‘ narrow.’ All this is a strange paradox. There are men of narrow and illiberal minds in all circles and in all sects and parties. But this of which we speak is another thing. It is a name fastened by some on the whole of a large party.”

Nothing truer on this subject has been spoken. As the Principal of Ridley Hall, Cambridge, said a little while ago, it is not the man or the society that stands for a definite policy that is really narrow, but the man or society that claims to speak for the whole Church, and yet all the while favours men of one type only. There is scarcely any subject on which we have greater need to clear our minds of misconceptions than on this subject of narrowness. It is only too easy to dub another man narrow, and yet all the while to show the most intense narrowness oneself.

