

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.

SEPTEMBER, 1907.

The Month.

The Train-
ing-College
Regulations.

THE Education controversy has been suddenly re-opened by the issue of the new regulation requiring a conscience clause in connexion with denominational training-colleges for elementary teachers. This regulation necessarily carries with it the right of entrance to Church colleges on the part of all applicants, and no one may be refused admission on the ground of creed alone. The reopening of the Education question in this particular form ought not to have surprised anyone, for it must have long ago been evident to all who know the state of the case that the position and power of the denominational training-colleges constitute one of the most pressing of Nonconformist grievances. It was therefore inevitable that in any attempt to settle the Education question the problem of the training-colleges would have to be faced, and faced squarely. This has now been done by the Government, and, in view of the results of the last election, no one can be surprised. Whether they have faced it in the proper way is, of course, a matter of opinion ; but what we are now concerned to point out is that Churchmen must be prepared to expect the Government to deal with the question in some way, and that it is quite impossible to ignore it in any attempt at settlement of the controversy. If this point is kept in view by Churchmen, it will help materially in framing our true policy, and save us from anything like panic or unreasoning opposition. The training-colleges had to come up for consideration, and

Churchmen will only do their cause harm if they proceed on the opposite assumption. What, then, is the present position of affairs? Denominational colleges have been established at great cost and trouble to provide for denominational students—Church of England, Roman Catholic, Wesleyan—and on the part of the owners of these colleges it is contended that no other students should necessarily be allowed to avail themselves of the advantages, which should be reserved only for those who can conform to the religious requirements of each place. Now, the Government position is that this would be perfectly fair and intelligible if the colleges were able to pay their own way; but inasmuch as they can only go on if the Government provides most of the current expenses, the nation has a right to require the colleges to receive candidates irrespective of denominational differences. If the colleges are to be kept strictly denominational, then the denominations should raise all the money; but if they are subsidized so largely by the State, the State ought to be able to feel that no citizen is prevented on religious grounds from entering institutions which are so largely supported by public money. And what the Government now requires is that a conscience clause shall be in operation in training-colleges, just as it has been in elementary schools since 1870. Their denominational management and “atmosphere” are left intact. This is the position, and it is for Churchmen to face it with a due regard to the facts of the case.

**The Facts of
the Case.**

We sincerely hope that our leaders will not repeat the deplorable mistake made last year, and meet these new demands of the Government with an unyielding opposition. The matter is eminently one for sober consideration and reasonable compromise. For how stands the matter? There are some 5,000 teachers who win scholarships each year, and about 4,300 residential places in training-colleges have been hitherto reserved for those who can subscribe to a denominational test. The result is that, if the student is a Nonconformist, he finds it very difficult, and often

almost impossible, to obtain entrance to a residential college. And if he fails to gain entrance he has either to be content with a non-residential college, if he can find one convenient, or else start his educational career as "untrained"—that is, not college trained—and this in spite of the fact that he has obtained a good or even high place in the scholarship examination. But it is urged that the Church colleges were built by Church money; and the Archbishop of Canterbury recently said that "the whole purpose of our building is that it shall be denominational, and nothing else." It is, of course, perfectly true that, apart from substantial building grants from the State between 1842 and 1864, the Church has provided very large sums for building these colleges. It is also true that in the early days the Church contributed liberally to their annual maintenance; but it is equally true—and Churchmen should keep it in mind—that of recent years the proportion of subscriptions to the entire income of these colleges has steadily gone down, until last year it represented only 4·9 per cent. Now, we would ask Churchmen whether matters can fairly go on as though these facts did not exist? Can our Church colleges be almost maintained by the State and yet retained by us as a Church preserve? Let the matter be reversed, and let any Churchman try to picture himself in the position of a Nonconformist parent whose son has gained a high place in the scholarship examination, and who, nevertheless, cannot obtain the advantages of a residential college training without abjuring his Nonconformity. If it be said there are residential undenominational hostels in connexion with Church colleges, we would enquire whether such a position is really tolerable. Does not the hostel system create a distinction that ought not to be allowed, and involve a position in which no self-respecting teacher should be placed? We beg Churchmen to ponder these facts quietly and honestly, considering themselves if they were in the position of many Nonconformists to-day. We believe they will see the fairness and force of these contentions, and soon arrive at a right decision.

**The True
Church
Policy.**

Canon Morley Stevenson, one of the best known of the principals of Church training-colleges, has admitted that the time has come when "some place must be found within their colleges for those who belonged to other denominations"; and he has also said that "they accepted the spirit of the conscience clause." Well, if the "spirit," why not the "letter"? And yet the "letter" of a conscience clause did not seem to be at all accepted by the Church deputation to the Prime Minister. Surely the truest, wisest, and best policy for Churchmen is the full acceptance of the conscience clause and the free admission of all duly qualified applicants. We believe that in the interests of the Church itself this would be the truest course to pursue. But we advocate it because we are convinced that it is the only honest and right course. While Church training-colleges are obtaining nearly all the cost of maintenance from the State, how is it possible to keep them for Church students only? We repeat that this question must have inevitably arisen on any due consideration of the education problem, and, this being the case, it is not for Churchmen to adopt an attitude of unqualified opposition, but to seek to understand the present conditions of the situation, and frame their policy accordingly. It is perfectly certain that the training-college question will not be settled by the temporary expedient of the hostel system or of the day college plan. The advantages of residence during those two formative years far outweigh anything else, and we plead for "equality of opportunity" for all students as the only right policy for Churchmen.

**The Fear of
Socialism.**

The Colne Valley Election has given rise to a perfect flood of comment on the new portent of a political candidate winning his election as one who is perfectly independent of all parties, and who advocates Socialism as the solution of our national problems. Mr. Grayson's Socialism, however, is nothing new, for there are other men in the House of Commons whose views are scarcely less advanced than his. But we are not sorry that his election

has given rise to so much consideration, for it will provoke thought on the part of many who might otherwise have gone on in practical indifference as to what Mr. Grayson's election really means. We do not for one instant believe that those who elected him are advanced Socialists, or that they know very much of what advanced Socialism stands for. But they are somehow conscious that our present social order is lacking in many essential respects, and they intend by this and similar recent elections to emphasize the fact for the careful consideration of all. It is only a very sharp and definite way of putting what social reformers and those represented by the Christian Social Union have been saying for years. Here are some of the questions raised in Mr. Grayson's address to the electorate of Colne Valley. He asked

“whether it was the last word of civilization that half the land of England should belong to one hundred and fifty men and half the land of Scotland to about a dozen; that thousands should not be able to find work, though women and children are being sweated and ruined in physique to run prosperous industries; that multitudes of working men and women must become a burden upon their children or the State in their old age, whilst a wealthy class draws £350,000,000 in rents; that the drink traffic should be allowed to demoralize the nation; and that railways should half throttle agriculture to benefit a section of the community.”

Now, making full allowance for obvious exaggeration, there is more than enough of truth in all this to give food for thought on the part of us all. It is true that all Churchmen hold that a secular and anti-religious Socialism, such as is found on the Continent and elsewhere, would provide a remedy for these ills which would be far worse than the disease. But what we would venture to urge is that a *Christian* answer to these questions ought to be forthcoming. Some reply must be given; and if the Christian Church does not provide one, we may be sure that a very different answer will come before long. It is in this connexion that we have welcomed the recent report and discussions in Convocation on “The Church's Witness on Economic Subjects,” and for the same reason we call attention to Canon Lewis's paper in the present issue. Socialism, as repre-

sented by Mr. Grayson, may be very far removed from what we believe to be true, but a movement that has provided political inspiration for the recent successes of the Labour Movement is clearly deserving of the thoughtful consideration of Churchmen. The result of our consideration may be opposition and rejection, but at least let us consider it, and give some answer to the problems it raises and endeavours to solve.

The Real Presence. The controversy started by the Bishops of Oxford and Gloucester and Lord Halifax and Mr. Athelstan Riley has been continued mainly by others during the past month, but we are as far off as ever from arriving at any definite agreement on the terms and issues involved. The Royal Commission clearly condemned the practice of Adoration, which Lord Halifax and Mr. Riley uphold, and in this simple fact lies the crux of the situation. What form of Adoration, if any, is allowable in the Church of England, according to the Commission? We know what they condemned; but what do they permit? Until this point is settled it is impossible to come to any definite conclusion. It is evident that in the attempt to avoid pronouncements on points of doctrine the Royal Commission were betrayed into a weakness which is patent to all. The ceremonial condemned by the Commission has doctrinal significance or it means nothing. When, therefore, the ceremonial is condemned, surely the doctrine associated with it is condemned also. This is the point pressed by Lord Halifax and Mr. Riley, and it is impossible not to admit the logic and justice of it. And if there is no essential distinction (as surely there is not) between the doctrine of the Real Presence in the Church of Rome and that held by Churchmen of Lord Halifax's type, we still want to know what it is that the Royal Commission condemned. If they condemned, as they certainly did, certain practices associated with the Roman view of the Real Presence, they must necessarily have condemned the virtually identical view of the extreme Anglicans. We, for our part, believe they did this, and for this reason we have claimed the Royal Commission as essen-

tially on the Protestant side. But if, by their reference to the view associated with the Bennett Judgment, they think they have avoided such a condemnation, it will not be long before the untenableness and impossibility of their position will be seen. There can hardly be any doubt that we are coming quickly to the parting of the ways, and the real test will be, as we remarked last month, whether by Consecration any Presence attaches to the Elements. Everything else will be settled by the answer to this question. And the true position of the Church of England is found in the well-known words of Archbishop Temple, that Consecration attaches to the Elements, not a Presence, but a Promise. This view agrees with our formularies as they are now, and with all the representative names of our Church from 1552 to the rise of the Tractarian Movement. As Vogan, in his great work, "The True Doctrine of the Eucharist," so convincingly shows, the view associated with the name of Pusey was entirely novel in the Church of England. And therein lies its condemnation by all loyal Churchmen.

The True Anglican Position. The most noteworthy contribution to the discussion on the Real Presence was made last month by the Bishop of Birmingham in the new preface to his book, "The Body of Christ." Bishop Gore rejects the opinion that the ceremonial condemned by the Royal Commission is to be condemned because it is opposed to the teaching of the English Church, even though it may be condemned on other grounds. Nor can the Bishop find any "line of deep cleavage" between Rome and ourselves, though in order to obtain this result he has to predicate agreement between the "least Protestant" Anglican and the "most moderate" Roman Catholic. Is not this a curious position? We should have thought that he would naturally have gone to our Prayer Book and Articles for Anglican teaching, and to the official formularies of Rome for Roman teaching. But we notice that Bishop Gore regards the Anglican formularies as "in certain respects defective, and even misleading, when taken by themselves." He, therefore,

insists on "a larger background by going back behind the Reformation and the Middle Age upon the ancient Catholic teaching and upon the Bible." All this is very interesting and significant, but it is also puzzling, and we are not surprised that an "old-fashioned Anglican," in the *Guardian*, asks for some explanation. We hope to return to the subject more fully next month, but meanwhile we content ourselves by saying that we are not sorry for the pronouncement. It is another indication that the ground is being cleared for the great struggle which cannot be far off.

Parochial
Continuity.

A great deal of attention has been given to the case of St. Saviour's, Hoxton, where the Crown appointed an Evangelical to succeed an extreme High Churchman, with the result that the outgoing Vicar withdrew his resignation. The Bishop of London upheld the action of the Vicar on the ground of parochial continuity. This introduces a novel feature into Church appointments, and one which has not hitherto obtained recognition. Judging by the list of the Bishop's appointments given in the *Layman*, it cannot be said that he himself has always been strict in the observance of it. The virtue of such a rule is that it must be applied always and indiscriminately, or else it is useless. Canon Scott Holland, who wrote supporting the Bishop's view, says that "every honourable patron would try to secure coherence and consistency in religious work." We shall now look with great interest to future appointments of the Dean and Chapter of St. Paul's. This new-found principle must be applied to Evangelical Churches as well—the very thing that has notoriously *not* been done in many cases of recent years. Indeed, we cannot help wondering what would have happened if St. Saviour's, Hoxton, had been held by an Evangelical and the Crown had appointed a Ritualist. At any rate, the principle has more than one application.

