

# THE CHURCHMAN.

---

MAY, 1907.

---

## The Month.

**Vestments  
and  
Doctrine.** THE *Guardian*, in referring to our comment of last month, still adheres to the view that vestments are not necessarily expressive of doctrine, and, alluding to the Lincoln judgment, writes as follows :

“ We have been told that the Archbishop’s declaration that the eastward position has no doctrinal significance makes all the difference. We ask once more, Would an official declaration that the chasuble had no doctrinal significance have a similar effect ?”

We would remind the *Guardian* that the exact wording of the Lincoln judgment on the eastward position is as follows :

“ The Court is, however, distinctly called upon to state—the point having been urged with a view to guiding its judgment—that none of the alternative positions (*e.g.*, the eastward) which have been mentioned as adopted by different authorities in accommodating this rubric to the present situation of the holy table convey any intrinsic error or erroneous shade of doctrine.”

It is obvious that the phrase “intrinsic error or erroneous shade of doctrine” can be read either way according to our particular type of Churchmanship, and the High Churchman, for example, would maintain that, from his point of view, the eastward position does not “convey any intrinsic error or erroneous shade of doctrine.” Let us, however, bring the matter to a definite issue by asking the *Guardian* the following question : Will High Churchmen agree to a declaration that the use of the chasuble at the Holy Communion does not connote the doctrine of a presence of our Lord in or under the elements by virtue of consecration ? If such a declaration were put forth, Evangelical Churchmen would not be slow to respond in the right spirit. The one question, stripped of all side issues, is whether there is any presence of Christ in the elements as the

result of the consecration prayer. Evangelicals maintain that from the Prayer Book of 1552 to the present day, such a doctrine has never found a place in our Prayer Book and Articles, and in support of this contention they confidently appeal to such authorities as the Bishop of Edinburgh (Dr. Dowden) and the Rev. N. Dimock, together with the well-known works of Waterland, Goode, and Vogan. Until these authorities are refuted, Evangelicals will continue to oppose even the permissive use of any vestment which has been, and still is, associated with the doctrine of the presence of Christ in the elements.

The revelations of the Montagnini papers have formed one of the most striking events of the past month. It does not require a man to be a narrow or bigoted Protestant to point the obvious moral. In the new weekly organ of Liberalism, *The Nation*, edited by Mr. H. W. Massingham, the following comment is made :

**The Papacy  
in France.**

“ Three reflections suggest themselves on this miserable business. First, at Rome, truth, for its own sake, is not a virtue. Not one word that these men say can be believed. Solemnly, repeatedly, they have assured us that the Pope’s action in the matter of the Separation Law was taken on the all but unanimous advice of the French bishops. It was not so; and the highly placed ecclesiastics with whom the statement originated knew that what they were stating was untrue. Second, the tremendous power of the Papacy. During the last two pontificates the episcopate has been reduced to a cypher; to-day we see the hierarchy of the first Catholic nation in Europe acting against its judgment, against its interests, against the religious welfare of the people committed to its charge, at the bidding of the Pope. It is difficult to blame them. Had they done otherwise, not a sacristan would have followed them. As things stand, Rome is the Church, and the Church is Rome. Third, it is impossible that such a system should be lasting; the feet of the colossus are clay. To urge that it represents religion is the merest sophistry. From first to last there is not a word of religion in this correspondence—of piety, of goodness, of zeal for souls. It is politics, corruption, and intrigue throughout. The power behind it is one with which the ideal and material forces at work in society are alike incompatible, whose claims the development of the conception of the State has made it impossible for any modern Government to admit. The Montagnini papers have at least this merit, that they put the issue clearly. No one can doubt now what Rome means. The conflict is between two ideals of civilization, the dead and the living; sooner or later—sooner, probably, than later—the living will win.”

Coming from a source which advocates Home Rule for Ireland, this criticism of Rome is all the more significant. It is no spirit of obscurantism that opposes the handing over of the Government of Ireland to a Roman Catholic majority which might go far to repeat the recent experiences in France.

“Promptly  
made to  
Cease.”

It is now over nine months since the Report of the Royal Commission on Discipline was published. As is well known, the first recommendation of the Commission with reference to certain Roman practices in the Church of England was that they should be “promptly made to cease by the exercise of the authority belonging to the Bishops, and if necessary by proceedings in the Ecclesiastical Courts.” With the exception of one action by the Bishop of Oxford, and the announcement of action by the Bishop of Liverpool, the public has not been made aware of anything done by the Home Episcopate to carry out this recommendation, and in view of the revelations made last month in the *Layman* and the *Record* of illegal practices at Broadstairs, Plymouth, Doncaster, Edmonton, Tunbridge Wells, and Upton Park, it is evident that there is still a great opportunity and necessity for putting this recommendation into force. While the abuses associated with these churches are continued, it surely seems almost ridiculous to discuss new rubrics and the necessity of greater freedom of ceremonial. The Bishop of Bombay has taken action on the lines of this recommendation, and deserves the gratitude and sympathy of all loyal Churchmen. His Charge is moderately worded and is certainly not partisan, and yet his counsels have been received by the extreme party in his diocese by flat refusals to obey. Such an attitude can only hasten the movement towards the parting of the ways, a result in comparison with which even Disestablishment would be a small event.

“As Others  
see Us.”

At the recent meeting of the Free Church Council at Leeds, Dr. Robertson Nicoll read a paper on “The Ritual Commission and the Duty of the Free

Churches," in which he summed up his position in the following words :

"Should not Free Churchmen be content to include the old High Church party in the Church of England as there by right, and confine their opposition to the admission and continuance of men who regard the principles of the Reformation as things to be repented of in ashes and with tears? We cannot, I believe, give any help in Parliament to any attempt to increase the privileges of Romanizers, but it is no part of our duty, I humbly submit, to attempt the expulsion of all but Evangelicals from the Church of England."

Evangelicals have no wish whatever to expel all but themselves from the Church of England. From the Reformation there have been representatives of different schools of thought in our Church. What Evangelicals maintain is that, as the *Guardian* recently admitted, the Oxford Movement introduced an entirely new element into the Church which was in no real sense the lineal descendant of the old High Church party. If Nonconformity will help in opposing the men who "regard the principles of the Reformation as things to be repented of in ashes and with tears," they will be doing good service to themselves, to the Church of England, and to the nation. It is a curious and inexplicable fact that very frequently extreme Anglicans are "written up" in Nonconformist papers, and their sermons and books praised without any reference whatever to their extreme teaching. There is very little doubt that Nonconformity often flourishes in exact proportion to the prevalence of Ritualism. A Baptist minister whose church was situated in a district comprising four Evangelical parishes once said to the writer, "We should do better if you men were Ritualists." Quite so. In the face of full Evangelical Gospel preaching in the Church of England, there is often very little opportunity for Nonconformity except it be of a strongly political type.

The paper above referred to was met by an  
 Mr. Lathbury and  
 Dr. Nicoll. article in the *British Weekly*, written by Mr. D. C. Lathbury, formerly Editor of the *Guardian* and of the *Pilot*, in which he seems to us to prove conclusively the essential and fundamental differences between the

old High Church party and the modern extreme Anglicans. Thus, Mr. Lathbury writes :

“If the Bread and Wine after consecration are the Body and Blood of Christ, in what essential does the offering of them in the Communion Service differ from the Sacrifice of the Mass?”

This is a large “If,” and for our part we meet the assumption with the challenge of a direct negative, and say that the Bread and Wine after consecration are *not* the Body and Blood of Christ, because, apart from other reasons, the Consecration Prayer itself speaks of our “receiving these Thy creatures of Bread and Wine.” They cannot be both Bread and Wine, and the Body and Blood of Christ. And we will go further and say that Mr. Lathbury will find it utterly impossible to prove his position from the Prayer Book and Articles, or from any of the leading exponents of the Church of England from the Reformation until the rise of the Oxford Movement. Mr. Lathbury goes on to express the opinion that “the points which really excite popular ill-will, such as Confession and the Real Presence, are those which in theory at least are common to both sections” of the High Church party. If this be true it only means that the moderate or historic High Church party has ceased to exist, for certainly such men as Burgon, Goulburn, Meyrick, and Vogan were High Churchmen, and yet not High Churchmen of Mr. Lathbury’s type. We are glad, however, that the issues are being more and more narrowed down. This can do nothing but good in view of the great and epoch-making struggle which is evidently not far away.

In the current number of *The East and the West*, the Rev. C. F. Andrews, of the Delhi Mission, has a striking article on the contrast between home and foreign work. He points out that in India in one district there is one clergyman to a million souls, while in one locality at home six clergy are ministering to 415 people. This is only one out of almost innumerable cases that could be adduced. If we take Oxford, for example, and consider the number of churches and clergy to the population of the city, we see at

Home Needs  
and Foreign  
Claims,

once a deplorable overlapping and waste of money and men. As Mr. Andrews rightly says, vested interests and legal difficulties apparently prevent any alteration at home ; and so we go on year by year, and are surprised at the powerlessness of the Church to do her Master's work. The present scarcity of clergy for large centres of population is part of the same problem, and the very difficulty will perhaps prove a blessing, if it leads to our being compelled to take action to put an end to the present unsatisfactory state of affairs in our own land. Parishes could and should be grouped, the money saved, and the clergy set free for foreign work. We shall never solve the problems of clerical poverty, and the scarcity of clergy, until we face them resolutely in a statesman-like way.

At a recent meeting of the Additional Curates  
 Society, the Bishop of Birmingham, with his  
 characteristic frankness, gave expression to the  
 following interesting and suggestive opinion :

Buildings  
and Agents.

He constantly found, and supposed it was the experience of all Bishops, that people would give more readily for buildings than for incomes to support living agents. People were still more ready to contribute to the adornment and decoration of buildings. He would not be accused of disparaging the importance of buildings, or of having any desire that buildings for the worship of God should be meagre and undecorated—though he could wish that a great deal of the decoration were absent. If all the brass work used in the Church of England for the last twenty years could be at one stroke obliterated, they should be better off. Hooker said, in one consummate utterance of common sense: “The duties of religion performed by whole societies of men ought to have in them a sensible excellency, correspondent to the majesty of Him whom we worship.” Let them build churches and make them correspondent. But it was remarkable that there was almost nothing in the New Testament about churches, and nothing at all about decorating churches, or about the ceremonial of worship. That was not, as he continually told his diocese, because they were not to build churches or decorate them, but because the New Testament directed their attention to things which were supremely important, and left other things to be settled in the course of ages by the wisdom of the Church, guided by the Spirit. But the New Testament did direct their attention to things which were primary, and amongst those primary things was the necessity of the living agent.

These words deserve to be “ writ large ” for the guidance and counsel of Churchpeople. It is a very familiar and even trite

remark, but it is worth repeating for the sake of many who seem to forget it, that in the New Testament the word "Church" is never applied to buildings, but only to people. If we kept this simple and fundamental fact in view, it would save us many a difficulty and enable us in our Church life to keep "first things first."

**The C.M.S.** For nearly twenty years the C.M.S. has acted on what has become known as "the Policy of Faith," which means that every offer of service which has appeared suitable has been accepted in the full confidence that the means would be forthcoming. But, unfortunately, the income has not kept pace with the offers of service, the latter having been quadrupled while the former has been only doubled. A new policy has therefore been adopted. The situation is to be considered soon after each anniversary, and a decision made as to the number and locations of missionaries, according to the needs of the moment and the funds available. The Committee had no alternative but to adopt this new policy in view of the seriousness of the financial situation, and we believe their action will be endorsed by the whole body of the membership. We are also of opinion that the new arrangements will do more than anything else to call attention to the pressing needs of the foreign field. To keep back missionaries for lack of funds would be a shame and disgrace on our Christian life at home. If only all communicants, or even three-fourths of them, gave something to missions deficits would be unknown. There is plenty of money in our churches, if only it could be obtained. The few give splendidly, and cannot do more, but the many give practically nothing to the cause of world-wide evangelization. The "one thing needful" is a revival of spiritual religion. When hearts are opened to the incoming and indwelling of the Holy Spirit, hands and purses soon become open also. This should be the burden of our Whitsuntide prayers; a Pentecostal blessing of opened heart, open lips, and open hands.