

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, 1909.

The Month.

Father
Tyrrell.

THE death of the great English Modernist has naturally called renewed attention to the relations of the Modernist movement to the Roman Church. While we have no sympathy with the attempt of Rome or of any other community or individual to stifle criticism and to crush inquiry by excommunication, yet it has always been difficult to understand the position of Father Tyrrell in remaining in the Church of Rome. If his intellect was as acute and powerful as his friends make out, it is certainly astonishing that he could not see the inconsistency of his position. A friend of his, writing in the *Westminster Gazette*, tells us that Father Tyrrell admitted his reasons for remaining in the Church of Rome were not a development of those he had for entering it, and that he had come to regard these original reasons as "a tissue of ignorance and sophistry." And to show how inaccurately he gauged the religious situation both in the sixteenth century and in the present day, we have only to read what he said to another friend: "What we need is to recognize the Reformation and the counter-Reformation as two false solutions of the sixteenth-century problem—to go back behind Trent and pick up the path of Erasmus." Everyone who has even a fair knowledge of the facts knows well that of all the names and policies connected with sixteenth-century reform, that of Erasmus was the most futile and impossible. To crown all we have but to

read Father Tyrrell's statement about the Roman Church published a year ago in his *Medievalism* to see the impossibility of his position. After speaking of "that all-permeating mendacity, which is the most alarming and desperate symptom of the present ecclesiastical crisis," he goes on in these words :

"What would it avail to sweep the accumulated dust and cobwebs of centuries out of the house of God ; to purge our liturgy of fables and legends ; to make a bonfire of our falsified histories, our forged decretals, our spurious relics ; to clear off the mountainous debts to truth and candour incurred by our ancestors in the supposed interests of edification ; what would it avail to exterminate these swarming legions of lies, if we still keep the spirit that breeds them ? In a generation or two, the house swept and garnished would be infested as before. The only infallible guardian of truth is the spirit of truthfulness. Not till the world learns to look at Rome as the home of truthfulness and straight dealing will it ever look to her as the citadel of truth. It will never believe that the spirit of Machiavellian craft and diplomacy is the spirit of Christ. Can the same fountain send forth bitter waters and sweet ?"

After such a statement, coming not from an Ulster Protestant, but from a priest in the Roman Church, it is hardly surprising that Tyrrell was excommunicated. The truth is that the tendency of the Modernist movement is essentially rationalistic, as may be readily seen from a striking article by the Reverend C. W. Emmet in the *Expositor* for August on Loisy's latest book. We commend this to any who think there is hope for the Roman Church in the Modernist movement. Modernism as represented by Loisy, and also to a great extent by Tyrrell, is neither Roman Catholicism nor Evangelical Christianity, and it is curious that Tyrrell could not see what others with much less acute intellects could see quite plainly.

We take the following from the August number
 A Word in
 Season. of the *Mission Field*, the monthly magazine of
 the S.P.G. :

"More than one of the supporters of the S.P.G. tell us that if the land-tax proposals now before Parliament are enforced, they will be unable to subscribe again to the work which the S.P.G. is doing. We would venture

to point out to our correspondents, and to others who sympathize with the expression of their views, that no law, which this or any other Government could pass, can in any degree weaken our obligation to co-operate with God in the work which He is doing to extend His kingdom to foreign lands. If a law were passed the effect of which was to consign every landowner in the country to the workhouse, they would be under quite as real an obligation to help Foreign Missions as they now are. . . . The fact that such a suggestion as that which we have referred to has arisen shows that the writers have not realized that it is their duty to contribute some definite proportion of their annual income towards promoting religious work at home and abroad. Let us imagine that *A* has been accustomed to contribute a tenth, and that *B* has been accustomed to contribute a hundredth part of his annual income towards such purposes, and that each has an income of £500, and that by new legislation it was to be reduced to £400. The result will be (if we assume that each continues to realize the same obligations) that in future *A* will contribute £40 instead of £50, and that *B* will contribute £4 instead of £5. We feel quite certain that God's work, whether at home or abroad, will never be properly supported until all Christians accept the fact that it is their duty to contribute a definite proportion of their income, and till they cease to expand and contract their contributions according as their feelings are moved."

This strikes a true and welcome note, and we rejoice in its frankness and fearlessness. The great principle of proportionate giving needs strong and constant emphasis from our pulpits. As we remarked last month in another connection, there is a world of difference between giving *out of* and *according to* our means, and only when the latter is realized as our one and absolute Christian duty shall we ever prove ourselves in this respect to be Christians in deed and in truth.

Quite recently we have had a fresh and striking **Continuity.** testimony to the meaning of continuity in the minds of extreme Anglicans. The preacher at the anniversary service of the Confraternity of the Blessed Sacrament, the Reverend F. F. Irving, Vicar of All Saints', Clevedon, stated his view of continuity as follows :

"Do we not stand for continuity with the Church of Augustine, of Lanfranc, of Anselm, and of Becket? This very week has seen at the historic palace of the Bishop of this diocese an eloquent and picturesque expression given to this claim. But if our opponents are not to twit us, as they have not been slow to do, with unreality, if it is a claim to be made and sustained seriously, it must be founded not in the mere outward trappings of Church

pomp, not merely in the possession of the historic episcopate, which many heretical and schismatic bodies, frankly outside Catholic Communion, can lay claim to equally with us; nor even in the actual possession of the ancient sees, for this alone proves nothing, for it may be but the mere cuckoo descent of those who have ousted the rightful occupants. But we must be prepared to show, over and above all this, identity with the past in all essential doctrine, all that has been held throughout the ages by the whole Catholic body, East and West. And at the centre, where the heart beats and the life-blood is warmest, we find enshrined the Mystery of the abiding Presence of Jesus with His own, under the visible and outward forms of His appointment."

We are glad to have the issues so clearly stated. It shows that there is no real halting-place between union with the Roman and Greek Churches and the Protestant Reformed position of the sixteenth century. We are more than content that the alternatives should be so definitely laid down, for it will enable us to emphasize fundamental differences still more effectively. One of the most urgent tasks incumbent on true Churchmen to-day is to accentuate in every lawful way the essential divergencies between the position of the Anglican Church as a Reformed community, and the Roman Catholic Church as expressed in such a statement as is quoted above. It is of no use whatever attempting to bridge over the differences, for the two positions cannot both be true.

The
Education
Question.

Although there is a lull at present in the education controversy, it is impossible for it to last much longer. For this reason we call attention to the important speech recently made by the Bishop of St. Asaph. The Board of Education has supplied the Bishop with the following information: Between 1903 and 1908 the number of children in average attendance at Church schools in England and Wales has decreased by over 100,000. The number of Church of England schools closed in that period is 403, and the number transferred to local authorities is 294. Thus we see not only that Church Schools are being closed or transferred, but also that they are being weakened and emptied by the competition of Council Schools. The Bishop

declared his belief in the great loss sustained by the Church in being shut out of Council Schools, and felt convinced that if we could only have had right of entry it would have enabled the Church to obtain solid religious instruction for her children in every elementary school in the kingdom. We are not at all surprised to read that the Bishop's speech made a profound impression, and in view of the resumption of the controversy before many months are over, we commend the careful consideration of these figures to all Churchmen. The facts tell their own sad and significant story, and certainly call for definite, united action.

We have read with great satisfaction the letter
addressed by the Committee of the Church Pastoral
Aid Society to all Grantee Vicars on the necessity
of doing spiritual work in spiritual ways :

**Spiritual
Methods,**

“ The Committee regret to observe that the practice of raising money for Church purposes by dances, theatricals, bridge, and whist-drives, is rapidly growing, and they regard the fact as a serious menace to the spiritual influence of the Church. In seeking what they can do in the matter, they naturally turn for help to the Grantees of the Society, and they now make an earnest appeal to all their friends to unite with them in discouraging these methods in connection with Church work. The Committee believe that if the parishes aided by the Society's grants take a firm and united stand in these matters, broadly scattered as they are over the whole country, the influence of their example and protest will be widely felt in the Church at large.”

That such an appeal should be needed is itself a serious reflection on a good deal of our Church work. We are glad to learn, however, that the response to the letter has been very gratifying, and we would fain regard this as a token for good in connection with Evangelical Churchmanship. Coming so soon after the strong words of the Archbishop of York and the Bishops of Liverpool and Wakefield, recently quoted in these columns, we are particularly thankful for this fresh insistence on the true idea of Church work. It is well for us from time to time to ask ourselves what is the purpose of Christian life, whether in an individual or corporate capacity. Is it not this,

and this only, that God's twofold work of evangelization and edification may be fully and widely accomplished? And in the light of the New Testament as well as of universal experience this work will never be done by worldly methods, but only "By My Spirit, saith the Lord of Hosts."

A year ago the Board of Education appointed a **Half-Time Labour** Committee to inquire into the whole subject of half-time labour. The Committee has now issued its Report, and the recommendations are very far-reaching. The most important of all is that, in the opinion of the Committee, all "partial exemption" should be abolished from January, 1911. While the Committee do not accept the wide generalizations made by some of the witnesses as to the universally demoralizing influences on the children by their early commencement of mill-life, yet they are fully convinced that there is a good deal of truth underlying these convictions. It is impossible to avoid the conclusion that half-time employment tends to demoralize the character, affect the health, and lower educational efficiency. It is particularly interesting and significant to have the Committee's proof that the system is no method of relieving poverty. After reviewing all the conditions surrounding half-time, the Committee are unable to recommend its continuance; and it is also urged that all half-time exemption under thirteen shall be abolished, and that children should not be allowed to leave school altogether merely on an attendance certificate. These findings are all the more remarkable when it is realized that the Report is unanimous, and it even recommends the abolition of half-time in rural areas. Every lover of his country—to say nothing of everyone interested in child-life—will rejoice at this Report, and will hope as well as work for the carrying out of its recommendations. The abolition of half-time employment would have many beneficial results—personal, social, and economic; and we shall hail the day when it can be seen that we are determined to do everything in our power to foster the highest and best interests of our children.

Our readers will remember that in our February number Mr. G. G. Coulton commented severely on Dr. James Gairdner's new book, "Lollardy and the Reformation"; and both in our columns and elsewhere he showed that the book contained not a few indications of inaccuracy as well as of bias against Wycliffe and the Reform movement. It is satisfactory to find that Dr. Gairdner now admits the truth of Mr. Coulton's contention in regard to medieval monasticism, for in an article in the *Nineteenth Century* for July he makes some very significant admissions. The great reputation of Dr. Gairdner and the way in which his book has been regarded as an authority must be our apology for quoting at such length from his article :

"I must confess that my treatment of monasticism is exceedingly defective. . . . There are both defects and errors in my treatment of this subject which I very much regret. First, I feel that I should have said something about such a well-known fact as the decline of monasticism before Henry VIII.'s time, shown, among other things, by the almost entire cessation, at the close of the Middle Ages, of those vigorous literary productions which were the glory of former times; and, further, by a number of sporadic suppressions of monasteries which were no longer needed. This ought certainly to have been shown, for it is a matter to be weighed. And a further matter, in which I am sorry to find my remarks have been misleading, calls just for a few words here by way of retractation. My estimate of the general morality of the monasteries, I fear, was rather too high. The St. Albans case I admitted. It was an exceptionally bad one, and though I made a mistake (which I rectified elsewhere) about the particular Abbot whose misrule was so disgraceful, I never attempted to palliate the facts. I have come now to see, however, that the moral decline of St. Albans after Whethamstede's day was a gradual one, and had only reached the lowest depths of scandal when Archbishop Morton obtained visitation powers to correct that and some other monasteries which had the privilege, under ordinary circumstances, of exemption from episcopal jurisdiction. . . . But the general laxity of monastic rule was, I fear, rather greater than I supposed on the eve of the Reformation. . . . I certainly did not wish to weigh down the scales on either side, but Mr. Coulton has convinced me that I have misinterpreted some things, and thought too lightly of the real meaning of the findings in certain particular cases. Among other things, at p. 103, where I have said that 'one monk was a dandy,' I ought, I find, to have said, 'One monk dressed in indecorous fashion,' and this indecorous dressing in long hose—not 'long boots,' as I have made it on p. 97—was a thing that would really be a police offence nowadays. So I fear that there is much to be said about the state of matters in a considerable number of monasteries to show that they were no good schools of delicacy or chastity.'

It is important that the widest possible publicity should be given to these admissions ; and we would fain believe that, when Dr. Gairdner has given further consideration to other points, as, for example, his unfair treatment of William Tyndale, we may have further acknowledgments in the same direction. The one great need in all these inquiries into history is to have the facts, all the facts, and nothing but the facts, and then to be allowed to draw our own conclusions from them. Thus alone shall we arrive at the truth and follow whithersoever it leads.

Dean Lefroy. We desire to lay a wreath of affectionate regard on the tomb of our honoured friend the Dean of Norwich. From the days of his strenuous work in Liverpool Dean Lefroy was a well-known figure in Evangelical Church circles, and his influence at Norwich has been real and great for the last twenty years. It is well known that the success of the Church Congress at Yarmouth was largely due to his strong will, boundless energy, and unflinching persistence. His contributions to our pages in years past were always welcomed by our readers, and he had promised us more articles, which now, of course, we shall not be able to enjoy. His Evangelical Churchmanship was of a convinced and robust type, far too little in evidence to-day, and in view of his great powers as a preacher and an organizer, it is impossible not to regret that the opportunity of elevation to the episcopal bench did not come to him before age seemed to prevent his acceptance of it. He was a distinct and definite power for true, spiritual, Evangelical religion, and has left our Church and country much the poorer for his death.

