

# THE CHURCHMAN

August, 1910.

## The Month.

THERE are many strong Protestants who, as we said last month, are in favour of some modification of the present wording of the Declaration, which will obviate the necessity of the King stigmatizing the faith of millions of his subjects in terms which both he and they feel to be unnecessary and unworthy. But it cannot be said that the new Declaration, as framed by the Government, will solve the problem, and it has already met with strong opposition from two very different quarters. Extreme Anglicans object to the Church of England being called "the Protestant Reformed Church." Nonconformists object to the novelty of requiring the King to declare himself a member of the Church "as by Law established." The only people who seem satisfied with the new wording are Roman Catholics, which some would regard as not quite an encouraging and hopeful feature of the situation. It is certainly curious that while the present Declaration calls upon the King to repudiate Roman Catholicism, the new wording should require him to declare himself a member of the Established Church. Before these lines appear in print, the question will have been debated by the House of Commons. Meanwhile we will once again express our hope

*The King's  
Declaration.*

and belief that it will be found possible to agree upon a statement that will enable the King to repudiate membership of, and obedience to, the Roman Church while avoiding the present stigmatizing of Roman doctrine in a way which cannot help being objectionable to Roman Catholics. The suggestions made in the *Times* of July 22 by the Bishop of Chichester seem to us to form a useful basis for a revised Declaration. This country is determined to maintain the Protestant succession to the throne, and whatever changes are made in the Declaration, there must be no weakening of safeguards against Romanism. The letter of the Bishop of Durham in the *Times* of July 18 goes to the heart of the matter :

“In the Declaration, whatever may be altered, the critical word ‘Protestant’ must be jealously retained.”

In the course of the recent discussions on the Divorce Question, several leading scholars seem to have shown a remarkable readiness to set aside the statements of St. Matt. v. 32 and xix. 9 in regard to the one exception to the indissolubility of marriage. According to these words, our Lord expressly allows divorce to be granted for adultery, but both the Bishop of Ely and Professor Paterson of Edinburgh, in their evidence, gave expression to critical views which quite discredit this exception as an authentic part of our Lord’s teaching. As an illustration of the effect of this criticism on ordinary people, we call attention to the reference to this matter in the current *Review of Reviews*, in which the writer points out how easy it is, whenever we are met with a text that is difficult, to describe it as an interpolation. As the note goes on to say, the real question is “whether Matthew or the Church was the culprit who tampered with our Lord’s sayings.” And then this concluding comment is made :

“Who can estimate the extent to which this way of getting out of it will undermine the confidence of the man in the street in the authority of Scripture, which, after all, is the chief foundation of his ethical belief ?”

It is always doubtful, and often very dangerous, when our view of an important subject happens to run counter to a passage of Scripture. In such a case nothing but the most overwhelming evidence should lead us to reject a passage on purely subjective grounds. For ages the Church has been faced with these words in the first Gospel as part of the teaching of Christ, and it will require something very much stronger than purely critical reasons for letting them go.

This attitude of certain scholars to the two passages in St. Matthew's Gospel has called forth <sup>A</sup> **Much-Needed** **Warning.** an important letter from Archdeacon Allen of Manchester, and in view of his well-known standing in the realm of Biblical scholarship, his words carry special weight. We make no apology for inserting the letter in full :

“ Churchmen of prominence are using an argument in connection with the question of the teaching of Christ on divorce which is likely to be turned against themselves in ways which they do not anticipate. They argue that the words in St. Matthew's Gospel, which permit divorce for adultery, are a Jewish-Christian interpolation into Christ's teaching. Of course, if they are prepared to accept other critical inferences reached by a similar line of critical argument, well and good; but if not, they are on dangerous ground. They make use in this case of a modern critical inference because it removes from the New Testament, as a basis of faith, a clause which is very inconvenient to their theory of the relation of Christ to the Marriage Question. But the very same critical method which would justify them here would also compel them to come to the conclusion that the Lord's Prayer has received interpolations in Jewish-Christian circles, and that St. Matt. xvi. 17-19 was in large part a Jewish-Christian interpolation.

“ On the same critical method, changing only the alleged motive, it might be argued that the Baptismal formula (St. Matt. xxviii. 19) is not a genuine utterance of Christ, but a formula put into His mouth in accordance with later Church usage. These are only three cases out of a multitude. I know of no greater injury that can be done to the faith of the members of our Church than to lead them to suppose that the Church is prepared to reject words of Scripture on critical grounds only when the words in question are inconvenient to ecclesiastical theory.”

As Archdeacon Allen says in another letter on the subject, “ The faith of the Church rests on the historical basis of the life of Christ as recorded in the Gospels, and not on anybody's

attempts to reconstruct that Life." And to quote the Arch-deacon yet again :

"I hope that the Church will never attempt to canonize a modern critical reconstruction of Christ's life and teaching. Such reconstructions rest on presuppositions which differ with the individual scholar, and create as many Christs as there are critics. Anyone who is acquainted with modern German 'Lives' of Jesus is aware of this."

If the Church should attempt "to canonize a modern critical reconstruction of Christ's life and teaching," it will lead to results which will make the present controversy about divorce appear a very trivial thing.

Certain Churchmen are fond of pointing out the dangers of Congregationalism by its emphasis on  
**Varieties of Episcopal Action.** Independency in virtue of the congregational unit.

But it would almost seem as though we Churchmen were in danger of a Diocesan Congregationalism which is fundamentally the same and open to similar objections. We have had some striking illustrations of this danger during the past month. (1) The Bishop of Winchester has vetoed the prosecution of a Vicar in his diocese whose doctrines and practices have been unblushingly Roman, as the letters of Sir Edward Clarke in the *Times* clearly show. (2) The Bishop of Truro has dealt with admirable firmness in disciplining an Incumbent in his diocese, and refusing him several opportunities and privileges of fellowship pending changes of ritual demanded by the Bishop. (3) The Bishop of Chichester has addressed to the diocese what may be fairly called one of the mildest of communications, in which he links together references to extreme Ritualism and to Evening Communion. Let anyone read the account in the *July Church Gazette* of a visit to "Three Brighton Churches" by a clergyman of experience who does not belong to any Protestant Society in our Church, and then ask himself whether the Bishop's letter is at all sufficient to meet cases of so absolutely Roman Catholic a character. (4) The Archbishop of Sydney has refused to appoint an

Incumbent to a church in his diocese unless he promises to abstain from the use of Vestments until they are declared legal, and the Archbishop, with statesmanlike courage, preached in the particular church, and told the people frankly, yet kindly, the reasons for his action. We naturally ask why the attitude of these four Bishops to Romanism should be so different. Are the illegalities and extremes such as are found in the Winchester and Chichester Dioceses to continue unchecked? Can they, on any fair and honest interpretation of our formularies, be regarded as coming within the limits of Anglicanism? Is not the action of the Bishop of Truro and of the Archbishop of Sydney much more in keeping with the "drastic action" which the Archbishop of Canterbury years ago declared to be necessary than the attitude of the Bishops of Winchester and Chichester? If only we had Prelates at home with the faithfulness and fearlessness of the Archbishop of Sydney, what a change would soon be brought about! The writer in the *Church Gazette* concluded his article in the following weighty words:

"Such things as I had seen and heard were entirely foreign to the genius of the English people, and I asked myself, for how much longer would they retain any respect and loyalty for an institution where behaviour of this kind was tolerated—behaviour false to the Scriptures, false to the Church herself, and false to them?"

"Not for long! And what then? God only knows!"

After the  
Edinburgh  
Conference.

We wish that all the echoes of the World Missionary Conference at Edinburgh were as hopeful and encouraging as those to which we referred last month. But truth compels us to record other results which are not so cheering. A good deal of attention has been given to the utterances of the Bishops of Southwark and Birmingham and Bishop Montgomery, in which they maintained a view of the Church of England which was definitely exclusive in the High Church direction, and quite plainly sympathetic towards the missionary work of the Roman Catholic Church. Now, it

ought to be said, with all possible respect, that these three well-known Bishops are not to be regarded as speaking for the Church of England as a whole, but only for that section of it with which their views coincide. After all, as Dr. Eugene Stock aptly said, there are such people as Evangelical Churchmen, and that they have done something for missions the letters "C.M.S." abundantly testify. They have as much right to speak as Churchmen as any others, and we cannot think that those responsible for the Conference gave Evangelical Churchmen their proper share in the deliberations. Thus, in the nine important Commissions which prepared material for the Conference the C.M.S. was not given one of the Chairmanships, though we observe the name of Bishop Gore as Chairman of one of them. Where were such Evangelical representatives of missions as the Bishops of Durham, Manchester, and Liverpool, that they should not be appointed to represent the C.M.S.? Then, again, how is it that in the two Committees dealing with the preparation of missionary candidates, two High Church Theological Colleges were represented in the persons of their Principals, while no Evangelical College was given a similar place? Why could not the Principal of St. John's Hall, Highbury, or the Principal of Ridley Hall, Cambridge, or the Principal of the Church Missionary College, Islington, have been included? Once more, though not referring to Evangelical Churchmanship, it was a surprise to many that the honoured name of Dr. A. T. Pierson, of Brooklyn, U.S.A., was not somewhere included in the membership and work of the Conference. He took so prominent a part in the New York Conference of 1909, and his knowledge and advocacy of missions are of such great importance, that we should have liked to see his name included. We sincerely hope that he was invited; but the absence of his name, together with other features, inevitably suggest that the policy of those responsible for the Conference was to include High Churchmen somewhat at the expense of Evangelicals. We are by no means alone in this surmise, as recent papers show. While we would welcome all who are

willing to join in a movement of this kind on terms of equality and fellowship with their brethren, we cannot help wondering if too high a price was not paid for the presence of those who represented the S.P.G. It is clear that the S.P.G., as such, is not to be represented on the Continuation Committee of the Conference. In view of this, it is difficult to see what practical permanent advantage can accrue from the representation of the Society at Edinburgh. We are not surprised to learn that an American delegate produced a tumult of applause by stating that "American Protestants were not prepared to apologize for the Reformation."

Some years ago Canon Knox Little wrote a book entitled "The Conflict of Ideals in the English Church." We have had a number of examples of this conflict during the last two or three years. One of the latest has arisen out of the words of the Archbishop of Canterbury at the Edinburgh Conference, when, as quoted last month, he addressed his audience as "Fellow-workers in the Church Militant, the Society of Christ on earth." On the same page of the *Guardian* the following words occur, which for clearness we put in parallel columns :

A Conflict  
of Ideals.

*Letter of Mr. Athelstan  
Riley.*

"With all respect to his Grace, I am obliged to say that this is not my view of the Catholic Church; that there are such things as heresy and schism, and that if I thought that the Church of England really taught that the Lutheran, Calvinist, and Baptist bodies, not to mention the infinite variety of sects, were all parts of the Church Militant, the

*Sermon of Dr. Donaldson, Master of  
Magdalene College, Cambridge.*

"Yesterday I received, with a request for my signature, a remonstrance protesting against the official recognition of the Conference by a well-known Church of England Society. I cannot refrain from expressing my earnest regret that any such document should be issued or any such action contemplated, for if the signatories had their wish, it would be the death-knell of the venerable S.P.G., and would also stay the progress and maim the influence of the Church of England indefinitely. The only possible justification of the action proposed would be the belief that

Society of Christ on earth, I should very soon cease to belong to her."

all Protestant bodies in England who are outside the Church of England do not belong to the Church of Christ, and are not members of the Body of Christ. Is there any sane man who can maintain so outrageous a proposition? And if we do not hold that, what right have we of the Church of England to claim a monopoly of the Truth, and to assert that we not only cannot co-operate with other Christian bodies in spreading the Gospel, but that we cannot even consult together as to the best methods to be adopted to prevent waste and overlapping, and to achieve what we all desire? Such a spirit seems to me to be entirely alien to the teaching and example of the early Church, and to the spirit of Christ Himself. May God deliver us from this uncharitable, this un-Christlike attitude of mind!"

There is no question about the conflict here, and it is quite obvious that both these ideals cannot be right. That Dr. Donaldson's view is the correct one can be proved by most certain warrants of English Church history up to the time of the Tractarian Movement, and by equally certain warrants of life and experience in the present day. With Dr. Donaldson, we cannot imagine "any sane man" thinking otherwise.

That the presence of High Churchmen at Edinburgh was capable of misunderstanding may be seen from an episode which occurred at the meeting of the Representative Church Council last month. Canon Hensley Henson, in speaking on the Education Question, expressed the belief that there was an underlying agreement among English Christians generally as to the elements of Christian faith and morals, and, on this being challenged by the Bishop of Birmingham, the Canon proceeded to say that the World Missionary Conference at Edinburgh was an absolute imposture at every point unless it could rest on the presupposition that all the distinguished and devout men who took part in it were conscious of a fundamental agreement of Christian faith. This brought the Bishop of Birmingham to his feet with the statement that "that assumption was deliberately not made," and he

Another Case  
in Point.



went on to explain that "there was no assumption of any kind or sort with regard to that subject made by those who took part in the Conference." Canon Henson maintained his position, and pointed out how members of the Conference were enabled to join together in Christian worship and to repeat together the Apostles' Creed. That the Canon was not far wrong we may see by a reference to this episode in the *Church Times*, which spoke of the Conference as a proof of undenominationalism, which concentrates on a common Christianity and leaves out everything characteristic of particular denominations. As the article went on to say, "the general opinion was that in this round between Prelate and Priest the latter came off easily victorious," and it also expressed its regret that the Bishop of Birmingham "should have weakened his courageous response to undenominationalism in the schools by the generous error of judgment which took him to Edinburgh." We turn from this to read, with particular interest, the address of the Bishop of Ossory to his Synod :

"At the World Missionary Conference there was continual reference to the Apostles' Creed. Never have I experienced anything more moving than when that vast assembly, composed of representatives of so many diverse types of men and of organizations, rose and repeated that ancient symbol with one voice and with one heart. For them there was no thought of that creed as anything but the expression of the faith which united them. When we realize that the faith is to be a bond to unite, and not a fence to divide we shall have gone a long way towards solving the problem of the reconciliation of liberty and unity."

This is a very different ideal of Churchmanship and Christianity, and it shows quite clearly what the Bishop of Ossory thought was intended by the repetition of the Apostles' Creed at the Conference. "For them there was no thought of that Creed as anything but the expression of the faith which united them." This is New Testament Christianity.

It is well known that extreme Anglicans hold in great abhorrence what they call Undenominationalism, and they never tire of quoting Mr. Gladstone's words which describe it as "a moral monster." But during the last few years, in connection with

Undenominational and Interdenominational.

the Student Movement, quite a number of extreme High Churchmen have been found at the Annual Summer Conference, taking part in the meetings and associating themselves with the members of various "denominations." But how has this been found compatible with the characteristic aloofness of High Anglicans to all such communities? It has apparently been made possible by regarding the Student Movement as "interdenominational," instead of "undenominational," and the former phrase is held to be the proper term for such gatherings. It is almost amusing to see the way in which "that blessed word 'interdenominational'" is now being used to explain and justify the action of High Churchmen in taking part in this fellowship. But the question naturally arises whether there is any essential difference between the old undenominationalism (so-called) as understood by Evangelical Churchmen and the interdenominationalism which is in favour to-day. Evangelicals have worked for many years in connection with such Societies as the Bible Society and the Religious Tract Society, and they have never had occasion to compromise their Churchmanship by any supposed undenominationalism. Their attitude has been essentially interdenominational. The same is true of Keswick and Mildmay—always interdenominational, never undenominational. About three years ago an extreme High Churchman addressed a company of Oxford men on the subject of the Summer Conference of the Student Movement, and assured his undergraduate hearers that Churchmen might go to the Conference quite safely without any harm to their Churchmanship! To those Churchmen present who had known, valued, and supported the Student Movement for the last fifteen or twenty years this was highly diverting, but it was received with evident attention as something quite novel by many undergraduates present. Yet this idea of interdenominationalism is only new to High Churchmen themselves, not to anybody else, and if it enables them to provide themselves with reasons for uniting with their fellow-Christians, well and good, for it will prove a spiritual blessing to them. Only we ought not to have it put before people as a brand-new revelation.