

# THE CHURCHMAN

January, 1910.

## The Month.

**The Church  
and Politics.** THE political situation created by the rejection of the Budget is full of difficult problems for Churchmen. On the one hand, there is the view ably and forcibly stated in our present issue by the Dean of Canterbury in justification of the exercise of the veto by the House of Lords. On the other hand, there is the view stated with equal force and weight by Sir Frederick Pollock in the *Spectator*, that the action of the Lords is "the most audacious attempt to subvert the foundations of Parliamentary Government which has been made since the Revolution of 1688." What, then, are Churchmen to do? The obvious reply is that everybody should be fully persuaded in his own mind. Some, like the Bishops of Lincoln and Bristol and the Dean of Canterbury, favour the action of the House of Lords. Others, like the Archbishop of York, are opposed to it. While still others, like the Archbishop of Canterbury, take up a position of neutrality. What we wish to urge is that each of these attitudes should be regarded as quite consistent with true Churchmanship. It is a fatal mistake, as two or three Bishops have recently pointed out, to identify the Church with any one political party, as has been too often the case in the past. We must insist on absolute freedom for Churchmen to be either Conservative or Liberal, without any reflection on their true loyalty to the Church. Like Sir Frederick Pollock, in referring to the position of Unionist Free Traders, Churchmen must not presume to judge and condemn

other Churchmen who take different views. We must "respect one another's convictions, retaining freedom to act on our own."

One issue at the present moment which is liable to become greatly confused is the question of Socialism. It is probably true to say that many people are opposed to what they call Socialism who do not possess any clear idea of what they mean by that term. Many earnest-minded people are charged with being Socialists, when all that they mean and want is social reform. We commend to all concerned the fine words of the Archbishop of York in his recent speech in the House of Lords :

"It is in an atmosphere of hopelessness and resentment against the social conditions existing, that the extreme and bitter Socialism we all deplore is engendered and flourishes. Give a man a better chance, give him a feeling that the social system is not against him but with him, for him, and on his side, and then his own individual instincts of energy and enterprise will be a more effective check against the development of Socialism than all the arguments that could be urged against it by more fortunate persons."

This strikes the right note. Social reform is one thing, the advocacy of cut-and-dried economic theories is quite another. Social reform will do more than anything else to destroy wild and impossible Socialistic schemes; while Socialism, as it is understood by many to-day, will undoubtedly do much to hinder true humanitarian and social reform. It is the special value of the Christian Social Union that it seeks to bring Churchmen together in the endeavour to consider existing circumstances with a view to social reform. It ought not to be impossible for us to unite in an effort to arrive at the best conclusion and to work with devotion for the true well-being of the people.

*The Deceased  
Wife's Sister's  
Case.*

The decision of the Court of Appeal confirming that of the Court of Arches has reopened this unhappy controversy, and revealed once more the apparently inextricable confusion of the situation. One plain fact is that the Law of the State is at variance with the existing Law of the Church, and yet Church and State remain united.

Another plain fact is that it is impossible to regard Mr. and Mrs. Banister as coming under the category of "notorious evil livers." Yet another plain fact is that Canon Thompson has as much right to his conscientious opinion on the subject of these marriages as anyone else. And so, on the one side, we have the Bishop of Birmingham pleading earnestly for the freedom of the Church, and, on the other, the *Record* deprecating the Bishop's action as detrimental to the continued relations of Church and State. It certainly seems impossible for the Bishop to obtain the freedom he demands without severing the bonds by means of Disestablishment. And thus confusion reigns all round. To those who believe that these marriages are not contrary to Scripture, and who remember that they are legal in other branches of the Anglican Communion, the objection to Mr. and Mrs. Banister's presence at Holy Communion is inconceivable. But there it is, and has to be reckoned with. The Archbishop of York the other day recommended that, while these marriages should not be celebrated in church, those who contracted them should not be refused Communion. We cannot think that this position is really tenable. Churchmen earnestly and anxiously await further developments, and it would not be surprising if the present difficulty led us much nearer to Disestablishment than we have been before.

The new Convocation which will come as the result of the new House of Commons will soon be faced with the thorny problem of Prayer-Book revision. The latest development in this connection will be found in the words of the Bishop of Birmingham at the recent Diocesan Conference. He called attention to a suggestion of Lord Halifax, and gave it his own endorsement. The point is so important that we must have the exact words :

"Any well-considered scheme which, leaving the Prayer-Book untouched, should give us, under the Additional Services Act, the legal right to use Prime and Compline and the Communion Office of the First Prayer-Book of King Edward VI., together with the Office for Anointing the Sick in that book, and which by sanctioning Prime should restore the Athanasian Creed

to its ancient place in Prime—I say any well-considered proposals of this sort I, for one, should welcome, and I am sure you would welcome too.”

Bishop Gore, in accepting this proposal, expressed the opinion that it is not “chimerical to hope that it might be fruitful of results.” He believes that there are a great many people, not all of one school of thought, who would welcome the permission for the use of the older Communion Office, and he also thinks that “there is a greatly increasing number of people within our Church, many of them Evangelicals, who feel that the sick have a right to appeal to the directions of St. James and to claim on Scriptural grounds the ministry of anointing.” We are not convinced that the Bishop of Birmingham has any solid warrant for thus speaking on behalf of Evangelicals, while we are perfectly certain that the anointing of the sick for which Lord Halifax pleads has little, if anything, to do with the Scriptural reference in St. James. Already the relegation of the Athanasian Creed to the Office of Prime, as proposed by Lord Halifax, has met with opposition by members of his own school, while Evangelicals are equally opposed, on very definite grounds, to the permissive use of the Communion Office of 1549. Indeed, it may be said that to the vast majority of Evangelicals it is absolutely “chimerical” to hope that these proposals will be fruitful in results. They will be satisfactory to none, and will be strenuously opposed by many. The sooner this is realized the better. It is certainly not this way that ecclesiastical peace lies.

Considerable attention has been given of late to the state of Evangelicals in the Church of England. By some the Evangelical party is said to be undergoing rapid disintegration, though we incline to think that in the case of those who express the opinion the wish is father to the thought. By others it is contended that Evangelicalism is really more influential to-day than ever. It should certainly never be forgotten that Evangelicalism has always been more of a pervasive influence than a definite

Evangelical  
Churchman-  
ship.

power as a party, and it is probably true to say that the essential principles of Evangelicalism have permeated the Broad Church and High Church schools in a very real way. The *Guardian* thinks that a new Evangelicalism is rising to which such questions as the Eastward Position, Coloured Stoles, Choral Celebrations, and Lighted Candles are matters of practical indifference. We are not so sure as the *Guardian* is that this is the case, because the Eastward Position, at least, is usually associated in the minds of Evangelicals with a doctrine of sacrifice in the Holy Communion which is repugnant to the Evangelical position. But the real question is, What is essential Evangelicalism as distinct from High Churchism? It is along such a line of inquiry that we shall truly discover whether Evangelicalism is a constant force. Here, for instance, are two cardinal questions: (1) Is the ministry properly and essentially described by the term "presbyter" or "priest" (*πρεσβύτερος* or *ιερεύς*)? (2) Does the act of consecration in the Holy Communion associate a presence in, with, or under, the bread and wine which was not there previously? On the answer to such fundamental inquiries the problem of Evangelicalism really turns.

As Others  
See Us.      The question of Evangelicalism has created interest outside the Church of England, and it is useful to see how it is regarded by others. This is what one of the able organs of Methodism, the *Methodist Recorder*, says:

"Speaking as sympathetic outsiders, we feel that the Evangelical party needs leadership—glowing, courageous, inspiring—and statesmanship. The Evangelical thought has vitality in itself, apart from any sacramental setting. Its vitality is being proved abundantly every day in other communions, and we are fully assured that its day has not gone by in the Church of England. Among the members of that Church it is still mightily influential. The Church Missionary Society is the fullest and finest expression of it, and that Society is *facile princeps* among Missionary Societies. It implies an enormous Evangelical backing among members of the Church of England, and those members under adequate leadership can still demonstrate that the Evangelical party is *not* in a state of rapid dissolution. Where are the Evangelical Bishops who combine high courage with real statesmanship, and who at much cost of obloquy (for that is certain) will place themselves at the head of the hosts of Anglican Protestants who wait for the ringing message of a real leader?"

Nothing could be truer than these words. Evangelical thought indeed has "vitality in itself," and this vitality is being proved in a variety of ways. It only requires definite expression, constant emphasis, and true leadership, and with our contemporary, we would inquire where are the leaders, Bishops or others—but of course preferably Bishops—who will place themselves at the head of the hosts of Anglican Protestants? We do indeed "wait for the ringing message of a real leader."

**Evangelicals and Low Churchmen.** One of the commonest errors made by many in the present day is the confusion of Evangelicals with Low Churchmen. Dr. Eugene Stock has recently rendered great service by again calling attention to this serious mistake, and he shows that this strange confusion has led to the popular but erroneous idea that Evangelicalism was dominant in the Church in the first half of the nineteenth century. As a matter of fact, Low Churchmanship was dominant, not Evangelicalism. Readers of that excellent book, "A History of the Evangelical Party," by the Rev. G. R. Balleine, will recall this important point :

"It is necessary to emphasize the fact that the Low Churchmen and the Evangelicals were quite separate bodies. The clergy who only gave their flock a service once a fortnight, the clergy whose churches were falling to pieces through dirt and dampness and decay, the fashionable, card-playing clergy of the towns, the sport-loving, fox-hunting squarsons of the villages, were all Low Churchmen to a man, but some of them would have used very strong language if they had been called Evangelicals. Indeed, the whole Evangelical movement had been a protest and a struggle against the Low Church system, and the Low Churchmen had been the bitterest opponents of the Evangelicals."

However convenient the use of the terms High, Low, and Broad, may be, it would be well if Evangelicals always refused to be called Low Churchmen.

**A Fundamental Distinction.** From time to time we observe definite attempts to identify the Protestantism of the English Church with the rationalistic Protestantism of the Continent. The late Father Tyrrell's opposition to Protestantism is vitiated by this confusion, which was astonishing in so acute a thinker

and so well-informed a theologian. Several leading men of the extreme party in our Church constantly confound the two aspects of Protestantism in this way, and we are sorry to have to confess that the Bishop of Birmingham in his new book has not escaped the snare. But we wish to call special attention to a recent utterance of Bishop Hall of Vermont, U.S.A., who was formerly a Cowley Father. He takes the same line, and actually goes as far as to say that the ethical standard of Protestantism is lower than that of the Anglican Communion, and that it is "the absence of any fixed standard of Christian morals, or the practical failure to bear witness to it, or the substitution of some other to the Christian standard which is so deplorable in modern Protestantism." No wonder that our contemporary, the *New York Churchman* speaks out plainly in the following words :

"Of course Bishop Hall believes this. Nothing short of personal conviction would lead him to make such a reckless statement. It is simply astounding that an American citizen should make a claim so unfortunately exposed to the charge of Phariseism. Even Roman Catholic authorities freely bear witness to the work accomplished by Protestantism in ethical leadership. No Bishop of the American Church should be allowed, without protest, to charge Protestantism with this kind of failure and exalt his own communion as the standard-bearer of public morality. How can such sentiments forward Christian unity? They can only make the position of the American Church more difficult and paralyze its ministry of reconciliation."

Nothing could be more untrue to the facts of experience than the position adopted by Bishop Hall and those who think with him. On the contrary, we believe that the ethical standard in Evangelical Protestantism is decidedly higher and also truer to that of the New Testament than that of Anglo-Catholicism or Roman Catholicism. We have only to look round and test those countries and communities where Catholicism, Roman or Anglican, has chief sway.

Instead of reflecting on the supposed low standards outside our own Communion it would be in every way more salutary and useful to do a little self-examination. In the last number of the *Church Quarterly*

A Frank  
Confession.

*Review*, Professor Newsom of King's College, in an article on the late Father Tyrrell, refers to the way in which Tyrrell, during the last year of his life, felt himself drawn to the Church of England. Then he asks these pertinent questions :

"If he had joined us, what would he have found? Freedom from obscurantism in pulpit, press, and council? Clear solutions of his two great problems, 'What is revelation?' and 'What is Church authority?' Absence of legalism, Medievalist, Protestant, and Erastian? Superiority to shibboleths, a text, an Article, an Act of Parliament, a point of ritual, a dogmatic symbol, the catch-words of the third, or fourth, or sixth century, or of that line across Church history, mythical as the 'line' of the equator, which is called the undivided Church? We trow not."

This is the true way of facing facts and distinguishing things that differ. We believe that the words of Professor Gwatkin in his great work, "The Knowledge of God," are far truer to life when he remarks that "Evangelicals and Nonconformists are still the backbone of serious religion in England." And he goes on to say that "If they will only thank God and take courage they have it in them to represent religion more worthily than any who have gone before them" (vol. ii., p. 246).

The recent correspondence between the Bishop of Massachusetts and the Archbishop of Canterbury, on the proposed Consultative Body for the Anglican Communion, derives much of its value from the fact that it shows with great plainness the determination of the American Church to preserve its own independence in relation to the See of Canterbury. Any primacy which would in any way interfere with that independence will not be tolerated for an instant. This is how the New York *Churchman* characteristically puts it :

"The English Church and the Archbishop of Canterbury have so long assumed primacy over other Churches that it is difficult for English Churchmen and American Churchmen to look at these questions from the same standpoint. American Churchmen have, in their relations with the English Church, allowed themselves to be placed upon a Colonial basis so long that it is surprising to what lengths they allow courtesy and deference to lead them. How many American Churchmen realize and object to a situation so one-sided that while the American Church accepts a clergyman on letters from

a Bishop in England, American clergymen cannot be received in England, except under the terms of the Colonial Clergy Act, which are exceedingly humiliating even to Colonials themselves?"

There is great force in this contention, and it raises the question whether the provisions of the Colonial Clergy Act can much longer remain as they are. It is only on terms of absolute equality that the various branches of the Anglican Communion can live together and make true progress.

**Bishops and the Church.** We are also interested in the above-named correspondence because of the light thrown on the relations of Bishops to the whole Church. The main objection of our New York contemporary to the Consultative Body lies in the fact that the Lambeth Conference as at present organized is limited to Bishops only, instead of including representatives of each Church, Bishops, clergy, and laity, on an equal basis :

"The American Church, it is safe to say, will never accept what was asserted in the letter and in various resolutions and reports of the Lambeth Conference—namely, that the Episcopate represents the whole Church and possesses inherent authority to act for it; nor will it agree that Bishops possess any inherent power to organize the Churches from whom they receive their consecration, and to whom they are responsible."

This expresses New Testament truth on this important subject. The government of the Church was not given even to the Apostles, much less to Bishops or clergy. As St. Paul himself said, "Not that we have dominion over your faith, but are helpers of your joy." The government of the Church is placed in the Church itself.

---

NOTE.—If any of our readers have copies of the number of the CHURCHMAN for January last which they are willing to spare, we shall be glad to pay for all that may be sent. Address : C Department, 62, Paternoster Row, E.C.