

# THE CHURCHMAN

March, 1909.

## The Month.

The  
Convocation  
Report. JUST as we go to press we have received the Report of the Committee of the Lower House of the Convocation of Canterbury appointed to consider "the Ornaments Rubric and Modifications of the existing Law relating to the Conduct of Divine Service." The Committee, as is well known, was appointed as the result of the issue of the King's Letters of Business, and it has been deliberating during the past two years. The two subjects in which Churchmen are most keenly interested are the Ornaments Rubric and the use of the Athanasian Creed. The recommendation as to the former is that the use of the Eucharistic Vestments should be permitted, the reasons assigned being that "the Eucharistic Vestments commonly so called cannot rightly be regarded as symbolic of any distinctively Roman doctrines," and that "the historical conclusions underlying the ruling judgments in regard to the Vestments appear to be liable to reasonable doubt." These two statements raise the entire question, for it is well known that in the light of history and of the testimony of those who now use the Vestments they are often regarded as symbolic of the distinctive Roman doctrines connected with the Mass. Whether the other reason urged in support of the permissive use of the Vestments will stand the test of examination is also open to serious question. The *Times* may well speak of "the seductive simplicity about the case for the legality of the Vestments as

put by a capable writer in the current number of the *Church Quarterly Review*." There is, indeed, a "seductive simplicity" about the writer's contentions, for it is so easy to make out a case by omitting all reference to the facts of contemporary usage and to the Visitation questions of the very Bishops who drew up the Rubric. When proof is found that the Vestments were ever used under the settlement of 1559 until after the rise of the Tractarian Movement, it will be time to reopen the historical question. The Minority Report, signed by the Dean of Canterbury and Canon Henson, possesses the great advantage of keeping quite strictly to the simple facts of the situation both past and present, and, as the *Times* rightly says, their reasons "will have to be faced."

On the question of the Athanasian Creed we will only now remark that the problem does not seem likely to be solved by altering the present Rubric from "shall" to "may," for this would leave the matter entirely in the hands of the officiating minister without allowing any regard to be paid to the wishes of his people. It would be far better to follow the Irish plan of omitting the Rubric altogether while retaining the Creed in the Prayer-Book, or else to omit the monitory clauses, as the Principal of Cuddesdon suggests. We shall return to the general subject of Prayer-Book revision, about which much that is useful and some things that are doubtful will be found in the Report. We can only just add that while the proposals for a new Burial Service are, on the whole, admirable, the insertion of prayers for the dead, even in very moderate form, will undoubtedly meet with strenuous opposition. The subject had better be left where our Church has wisely left it, by the entire absence of prayers for the dead in the public services. Not only will this be in every way safer and wiser, but, above all, it will be truer to Scripture and primitive Church history. The Report should, of course, be carefully studied by all Churchmen. It can be obtained for 1s. from the Oxford University Press, the Cambridge Press, the S.P.C.K., and the National Society.

The  
Education  
Question. . .

The address of the Primate at Maidstone, on January 27, afforded welcome proof that he has the courage of his opinions as to the recent attempts at compromise :

“ He was still firmly of opinion that the Churchmen of twenty-five years hence, discussing the same or similar problems, would say : ‘ It would have been better for the cause of religious education if they could have carried the suggested settlement.’ The opposite view was not only a tenable and arguable one, but it might conceivably be perfectly right ; but he thought quite clearly that the balance of advantage lay the other way, and he was bound to be honest and to say that if it all had to come over again, nothing that had since happened would lead him to speak, or write, or act differently to the way he had in the months past. One thing was certain, that it was not possible, in the present condition of English public life, to pass into law any educational scheme which would not be open to perfectly legitimate criticism and objection. He was certain that that fact was constantly forgotten. It was impossible to provide, in his belief, a scheme which was at once capable of attainment in the present conditions of English life, and really all-round fair, reasonable, logical, and all the rest. . . . The only thing possible was to take the best working plan that they possibly could, and, if it was possible, to unite forces for bringing it into action and working for the good of the children of the country. With regions so different in their conditions, in their popular desires and their administrative life—as, for example, Kent, the West Riding, the great Lancashire towns, the county of Durham, and that of Cornwall—it was impossible to bring forward any scheme which would not be open to some objection.”

We believe the Archbishop is right, and that even before twenty-five years are over Churchmen will see that they lost a fine opportunity in 1908 of doing the best that was possible for Church Schools. The harm likely to be done to the cause of truth as well as to peace is plainly visible in the action just taken by a body called the Joint Campaign Committee for Religious Education in Elementary Schools. In a letter issued to Churchwardens all over the country the inference is clearly found, as the Bishop of Carlisle points out, that the Primate and his supporters “ were advocates of a measure capable of being perverted to the religion or irreligion of the children in our elementary schools.” It seems almost hopeless to expect an understanding between Churchmen when such statements can be made, and we entirely agree with the Bishops of Carlisle and Hereford in deploring these methods of

controversy. We have learned to expect them from the English Church Union, but it is a very different matter when this Campaign Committee is supported by Societies like the National Society and the Church Defence Committee, which are supposed to represent the whole Church. Let us, at any rate, be accurate, even if we cannot agree. The absence of any reference to education in the King's Speech seems to make it imperative that Churchmen should continue to face the problem and endeavour to put an end to our unhappy differences. As the Archbishop of Canterbury so well says, no scheme can be brought forward which will not be open to some objection, and the one thing imperative is to unite all the forces available for bringing about the best results possible for the good of the children of our country. It is simply impossible and impracticable in the highest degree to imagine that the question is limited to the interests of Church Schools. Education has long been a national affair, and must be dealt with as a whole.

The Evangelical Alliance has just published a  
The Real  
Presence. booklet by that well-known Presbyterian scholar,  
 Dr. Orr, of Glasgow, entitled "The Real Presence"  
 (Evangelical Alliance, 7, Adam Street, London, W.C.; 1d.).  
 It is written with special reference to the recent Roman Eucharistic Congress, though it deals with the question as a whole. While the booklet is marked by Professor Orr's well-known clearness, fairness, and ability, we desire to call special attention to the closing words :

"There is, therefore, a most Real Presence of Christ in the Sacrament of the Supper on the pure Protestant view—not less real, but infinitely more so, because it is inward and spiritual, and involves no change in the outward substance of the bread and wine. This view, to sum all up, knows of a symbolical Presence of Christ in the elements, a proclaimed Presence in the word, a mystical Presence in the ineffable union between Christ and the members of His spiritual body, and a gracious Presence in the power and plenitude of the gifts of His Spirit. Beyond this, it will be difficult to show that Scripture recognizes any other."

We quote this, first of all, to show that those who are not ashamed or afraid to be called Protestants have a very definite, positive view of the Holy Communion as a means of grace ; that they believe in a doctrine of the Real Presence none the less real because it is in the ordinance, and not in the elements. Another valuable point is that the booklet affords proof of the real unity of belief on the subject of the Holy Communion between the Presbyterian Church and our own. In appealing for careful study of Dr. Orr's last two sentences, we wish to ask three questions : Is there anything in these words which is not found in our Prayer-Book? Is there anything *not* in them which is found in our Prayer-Book? Is there anything in them which is inadequate in the light of Holy Scripture? We believe the true answer to all these questions is an emphatic negative.

Reunion,  
with the  
East.

A recent article in the *Guardian* by the Rev. Leighton Pullan, of Oxford, urged that in the settlement of this question

"the matter of signs and ceremonies is not of great importance. . . . It is unity of doctrine, not of ceremonies, which really counts. . . . The first thing that the Oriental wants to know is not the cut of our coats, but if our belief is orthodox. We must not try to use ritual to cloak our differences."

Mr. Pullan rightly urges that, "whether we regard the differences between ourselves and the East as small or serious, we must urge that in all our Churches these differences be fairly faced." We should gather from his article that on such questions as the *Filioque*, the Eucharist, the Invocation of Saints, and the Authority of the Seventh General Council, he would be prepared to argue that the Church of England is either already in, or could be easily brought into, essential unity with the East. We ourselves do not so read our formularies on these subjects, and, leaving aside for the moment the problem of the *Filioque*, we believe that on the questions of the Eucharist and the Invocation of Saints our Articles reveal essential differences between us and the East, and express our doctrine in terms which no intelligent Eastern Churchman could possibly accept.

Meanwhile, we commend for consideration the following words of a thoughtful writer in the *Canadian Churchman*:

“A Greek priest was a prominent figure in the service at the consecration of the Bishop of Montreal a few weeks ago, and was photographed with the officiating Bishops. While he took no part in the service beyond being an honoured and interested spectator, the question arises, What is the exact relationship between the Orthodox Greek Church and the Anglican communion? We are, of course, reminded that the two Churches are in communion, but the further inquiry naturally arises, What constitutes communion, and is it reciprocal? It is evident, we think, that the close relationship suggested by intercommunion has been more apparent in theory than in practice; but is it wise to lay emphasis upon a formal recognition of orders and creeds when ideals and practices seem to be so far apart? The Greek Church, as represented in Russia, for example, according to what we have learned of it, is something of an ecclesiastical instrument for blessing the actions of the powers that be. The old prophetic spirit seems to have gone out of it, and the Christian ideals have been largely abandoned. Why should we hasten to proclaim our affinity with such an organization, particularly since we are so careful to differentiate ourselves from others more closely allied to us in purpose and service?”

Mr. Pullan pleads earnestly and wisely that any answer that we give to the East “must come from all the Churches in union with the See of Canterbury.” Here, then, is one answer which expresses what many Churchmen in all parts of the Anglican Communion are feeling. With the writer, we ask: “Is it wise to lay emphasis upon a formal recognition of orders and creeds when ideals and practices seem to be so far apart?” The question is fundamental.

In the current number of the *Church Quarterly* Theological Unrest. *Review* an article on “The Dearth of Clergy” discusses the causes in the light of the recent Report of the Archbishop’s Committee and the Lambeth Encyclical Letter. The writer is of opinion that the financial cause is not the primary and fundamental deterrent to men who contemplate taking Orders—that this is on the surface rather than fundamental. It is therefore urged that the change which has come over modern thought during the last twenty years will account for an even greater diminution in the number of ordinands than has been recorded.

“Doubts which would have been hardly conceivable twenty years ago, except amongst the most advanced thinkers, regarding the New Testament, the Church, the Creeds, are now felt on every side. In 1886 people were chiefly alarmed by the promulgation of somewhat extreme views about the origin of the Pentateuch, whereas now the most vital parts of the Gospel are publicly submitted to the most ruthless criticism. . . . The Bishops may have been perfectly right to exclude from their Encyclical all mention of this tremendous revolution of ideas as a cause of the falling off of candidates for ordination, and to dismiss it in the Report with a curt allusion to ‘the theological unrest of the present day’; yet we cannot but believe that this is the actual cause of the evil which they deplore. Why is it that the most intelligent class of our possible ordinands, who have all to gain socially and even financially, are unwilling to take Holy Orders? . . . It is not because men fear poverty, but because they distrust themselves that they hang back. They ask themselves, ‘What do I believe? What message have I to deliver? What do the Bible, the Church—nay, Christ—mean to me?’ and they not unnaturally refuse to devote themselves to a lifelong pledge to preach that which they fear that, as their knowledge increases, they may not be able to believe.”

One indication that the writer has rightly diagnosed the situation was afforded by the inaugural lecture of the new Oriel Professor of the Interpretation of Holy Scripture—Canon Cooke—at Oxford last month. In discussing some of the principles of Biblical interpretation, he said that, while it was the modern practice to write commentaries on the text, the ancient exegetes used to insert commentaries in the text itself. After giving examples of these editorial changes and additions, Professor Cooke used them to prove his contention that the Bible is to be interpreted as the *living* Word of God, and therefore as capable of being constantly added to and altered. The *Oxford Magazine* made the very pertinent remark that “such a method of commentary raises very difficult problems as to the historical character and trustworthiness of the documents which have been so edited, to say nothing of its relation to any theory of inspiration.” Surely there is a real difference in the religious value of a history which gives an accurate report of facts as they occurred, and a history which has been altered and modified to suit a subsequent religious conception. Is it not a simple fact that a re-edited work is often practically a reproduction of a later age? And if the books of the Old

Testament are of this character, it is vain to assure us that the actual date is of little consequence so far as the religious value of the books is concerned. The one question we have to face is whether we can trust the Bible—whether its representation of the Old Testament history and whether the facts of Christ as recorded in the New Testament are trustworthy for mind and heart. It is the absence of certitude on these points that prevents many young men from coming forward for ordination, while the free handling of Scripture without any consideration of the bearing of these problems on its Divine authority and inspiration tends to sow doubts and difficulties in many more who in any case are not thinking of ordination. Until our leading scholars give us valid and convincing reasons for trusting the Bible as it has been handed down to us from the Apostles through the Church, we must not be surprised if there is both a dearth of curates, and also a dearth of spiritual vitality and power in our Church life.

This was the title of an article in the *Guardian* after the “Evangelicals Islington meeting, “From Our Correspondent,”  
 in whose identity was not very difficult to recognize.  
 Transition.” He said that the Churchmen who were regarded not many years ago as Evangelicals are fast becoming curiosities, even to their more modern Evangelical brethren, and that this year’s Islington meeting showed how far things have changed, for the programme was “entirely occupied with definite and important Church subjects.” Prebendary Webb Peploe was also described as “the solitary representative of the old-fashioned Evangelicals who used to occupy the platform” at Islington. As we read the article we could not fail to be impressed with its inadequacy, and therefore with its inaccuracy as a faithful report or even impression of what took place, and we were glad to see in the next week’s issue a letter from “An Oxford College Tutor” criticizing the article as defective almost to the point of being misleading. The College Tutor also said it is quite unfair to speak of Evangelical transition without realizing the immense changes that are going on on the other side—changes that are



“directly due to the persistence, under conditions often disheartening, of the spirit and doctrine and even the methods associated with the ‘Clapham sect.’” And, as the writer went on to urge, the *Guardian* account of the Islington meeting would have been truer to fact if it had made clear the undoubted fact that Evangelical transition is “strictly limited” in scope, “and does not include any acquiescence in the doctrines and methods distinctive of the Oxford Movement.” Those who recall the Vicar of Brompton’s “brave and withering denunciation of the seminary system,” and the way in which these words were received by the meeting, will have no doubt as to where Evangelicals stand on all points of essential doctrine. No amount of “levelling-up” of Ritual, and, let us add, no amount of interest in Social Reform on the part of Evangelical clergymen, can ever make up for adherence to the old and distinctive paths of the Evangelical doctrines on grace. And if any professed Evangelical thinks that true Churchmanship consists mainly in assimilating the ritual of the ordinary High Church practices, and giving most of his time and strength to combating social evils, he ought to know that he will soon be in danger of ceasing to be Evangelical.

The opening of St. Christopher’s College, Black-

Sunday-  
Schools,      heath, as a Training College for Sunday-School Teachers was a noteworthy event. We congratulate the Sunday-School Institute on this new departure, and we hope it is an indication that our Church is becoming more alive to the immense possibilities of Sunday-school work. The Non-conformist Churches are far ahead of us in all that pertains to Sunday-school equipment. When, as the Archbishop of Canterbury said, we realize that one-fifth of the population of England and Wales is now under instruction in Sunday-schools, we can see what a factor they are in our life. In our next issue we hope to call further attention to this matter in an article on “Sunday-School Reform.” We heartily endorse Canon Papillon’s plea in the *Times* that we should use every effort to strengthen this important branch of Christian service.