

THE CHURCHMAN

September, 1910.

The Month.

WE quoted last month the Bishop of Durham's words in a letter to the *Times* that "In the Declaration, whatever may be altered, the critical word 'Protestant' must be jealously retained." We are glad and thankful to know that this has been done in the amended form which received Royal Assent on August 3, and is now the law of the land. The King solemnly and sincerely professes, testifies, and declares, in the presence of God, that he is "a faithful Protestant," and will, according to the intent of the enactments to secure the Protestant succession to the throne, uphold and maintain these enactments to the best of his power. While a large number of Protestants inside and outside the Church of England would have welcomed a more explicit Declaration, including the repudiation of certain distinctive Roman Catholic doctrines, we are quite ready to accept the new form as giving to us substantially all that we need, without anything that can be regarded as insulting to Roman Catholics. It is unnecessary to recall in detail the proceedings in Parliament on the subject beyond one or two references. Mr. Birrell, as one able Liberal writer said, contributed "an amazing speech—one of those speeches which make his friends wonder occasionally whether they have ever understood the man, or rightly fixed his place." How so jocose and even rollicking a speech could have been made under these circumstances is probably only explicable by Mr. Birrell himself, for the main

substance was altogether unworthy of so serious and momentous an occasion. The chief point of importance in the debate was the speech of the Archbishop of Canterbury, who, in accepting the new version, expressed the opinion that under the conditions of to-day the King will be as clearly bound by the Declaration in its new form as he would have been by the Declaration in its old form. Then the Archbishop said :

“Reduced to its simplest terms, the Declaration supplies the specific purpose for which it is wanted, and sets it out in a way that everybody can understand, and which cannot hurt the most sensitive member of the Roman Catholic Church. I believe we have need of a Declaration of this sort. I believe so, not because I think that the Protestant succession is not adequately secured under the Bill, because I think it is under the Bill of Rights, the Act of Settlement, the Coronation Oath, and other Acts. It is needed because to abolish that Declaration altogether would inevitably be misunderstood as indicating some new departure.”

The matter will not have been raised in vain if it enables Roman Catholics and others to see that the country is determined to maintain inviolate the Protestant succession. Even the opposition to the new form will have done service in reminding all whom it concerns that there is a very strong Protestant feeling in the country which is ready to express itself and maintain its essential position whenever required.

In the course of the debate in the House of
The Word
“Protestant.” Commons the Prime Minister naturally referred to the way in which extreme Anglicans have been taking exception to the use of the word “Protestant” as a prefix to the Church of England :

“The truth is that this sensitiveness as to the use of the word ‘Protestant’ shown in some quarters in these days is of undoubtedly modern growth. The great Anglican divines of the seventeenth century—people like Bishop Andrewes, Bishop Jeremy Taylor, and Archbishop Laud himself—gloried in the name of Protestant, and were not ashamed or reluctant to use the term ‘Protestant’ as a term descriptive of the Church of England. I believe it would not be proper on this occasion to go into any antiquarian discussion, but as a matter of history I believe that the objection to the use of the word ‘Protestant’ is as late as the Tractarian Movement, and, if not invented, it was fostered and fomented by the promoters of that movement. It is no part, and never was a part, of what I may call the tradition even of the High Church party in the great Anglican community. I therefore find it

very difficult—and I am satisfied that the great majority of English Churchmen would agree with me—to understand why there should be any resentment, or even any reluctance, in connection with the application of the word ‘Protestant’ to the Church.”

The vast majority of English Churchmen will heartily endorse these forcible words of Mr. Asquith, and, indeed, will find it difficult to understand why there should be any question on the subject. It is of course quite true that the word “Protestant” is not found in the Prayer-Book and Articles; but it is not the word, it is the thing, that matters; and no one can seriously question the essential Protestantism of the teaching of those Articles which are directed against Roman Catholic doctrine. When we observe the plain references in such Articles as VI., XIII., XIV., XX., XXII., XXV., XXVIII., XXXI., XXXIV., XXXVII., to the distinctive doctrines of the Roman Church, it is almost incredible that anyone should think it necessary to raise what must be regarded as a quibble about the absence of the *word* “Protestant.” The Bishop of Durham, Dean Wace, and Canon Hensley Henson, have shown in their recent letters to the *Times* that in the history of our Church from the sixteenth century to the rise of the Tractarian Movement, all English Churchmen regarded our Church as essentially Protestant, and, as Mr. Asquith says, the “sensitivity” to the word is undoubtedly to be connected with the Tractarian Movement, which aimed at assimilating the Church of England to that of Rome. But, as Lord Hatherley remarked on one occasion in the House of Lords, in words that are often quoted, “I am a Protestant because I am a Catholic.”

The Bishop of Birmingham is always refreshingly candid, whether we agree with him or not.

“The Stupid Party.”

In his *Diocesan Magazine* he has some interesting notes of his experiences at the recent World Missionary Conference at Edinburgh, and he tells us that the dominant feeling with which he came away from Edinburgh was—

“That those who are not interested in Missions to-day are nothing else than the stupid party.”

This is plain speaking, and as welcome as it is plain. If only the idea could be impressed on all congregations during the next few months, in the light of what happened at Edinburgh, it would perhaps do more for Missions than anything else. There are many in our congregations who are almost supercilious in their indifference to world-wide evangelization, and yet when the subject is viewed from the standpoint of genuine spiritual religion, as recorded in the New Testament, and expressed in the lives of the noblest and best Christians in all ages, Bishop Gore's view of Missions is undoubtedly the true one when he says that—

“The Conference itself, in which I took part, left in my mind a profound impression of the supreme value and importance of the work of Missions among the non-Christian peoples of the world as it is going forward to-day.”

Another of the Bishop of Birmingham's im-
pressions is worthy of special notice :

Anglicans
and
Missions.

“It was especially good for us Anglicans to have to do with the Conference. We are insular. We like to ignore both Rome and the Protestant bodies. It is good for us to feel how small a proportion of what is being done in the name of Christ all the world over is being done by the Anglican Communion; and then also to be made to realize how indisputably important is the special witness of our Communion, standing as it does between Rome and Protestantism. Just that witness which we are commissioned to bear for a Catholicism which is Scriptural and liberal is the witness which is needed to-day in the nations which are awakening to the Christian claim. Every missionary knows that the new Churches will not perpetuate our old divisions. The nearer the day comes when indigenous Churches shall arise in the East and in Africa, the more important does the mediating position of our Communion appear.”

We are afraid that we cannot endorse the Bishop's view as to the mediating position of the Anglican Communion in relation either to Rome or to Protestant Churches. Rome simply ignores Anglicanism, and regards even the Bishop of Birmingham himself as a layman. And Evangelical Nonconformity will never accept that view of Reunion which involves absorption, and reordination by Bishops, and which is generally associated with Bishop Gore's school of thought. We have only to read the words of great scholars like Dr. Fair-

bairn, Principal Lindsay, and Professor Stalker to see that Presbyterians have no intention whatever of accepting "the mediating position of our Communion." Meanwhile, therefore, the Anglican Church remains in its isolation and insularity. On the one hand, neither the Roman nor the Greek Church will accept our Orders, and on the other hand, extreme Anglicanism holds itself aloof from Evangelical Nonconformity because of its supposed defect and invalidity in regard to Ministry and Sacraments. And this is the present position, after three centuries of Christian life and service. We are thankful, however, to realize that Evangelical Churchmanship, as associated with the C.M.S., has much more hope of helping forward the cause of reunion, for one of the laws and regulations of the C.M.S. which has been in existence for a century is that—

"A friendly intercourse shall be maintained with other Protestant Societies engaged in the same benevolent design of propagating the Gospel of Jesus Christ."

It is along this line, as ably suggested in the August *Church Missionary Review* by a contributor (p. 454), and also by the editor (p. 504), that Anglicanism will do most to bring about Reunion. Unity can only come from New Testament truth, and this is essentially Evangelical.

At the great Convention of the Student Volunteer
Missions and Unity. Movement held in Rochester, New York, last year, a dignitary of the American Protestant Episcopal Church made the following suggestive remarks :

"We have for long years been trying to find a basis of unity for the Christian Church along theological lines, and our efforts seem only to have added fuel to the fire. We have tried to unite under some form of Church government, and have failed. I verily believe that unity is coming in our common obedience to our Lord's command: 'Go ye into the world and preach the Gospel to every creature.'"

There is much food for thought here, and it is in this direction that we believe the recent Edinburgh Conference is likely to prove exceedingly fruitful. Those who have read Principal Lindsay's great work, "The Church and Ministry in the Early

Centuries," will remember how often he is able to illustrate principles of Church life in the early ages from what is going on to-day in the mission-field. We at home, with our cast-iron methods of government and work, are not likely to make any very serious changes, at any rate, at present; but missionary organization is necessarily in a much more fluid condition, and we believe it is in the mission-field that some of our greatest problems will be solved. Indeed, next to the primary work of world-wide evangelization, missions will pretty certainly make their greatest contribution to Christianity in their influence on the cause of unity.

Home and
Foreign
Missions.

At the C.M.S. Summer School in June, the Archbishop of York referred to the oft-used argument against Foreign Missions based on home claims :

" We are surrounded by a great argument that it is necessary to convert the heathen at home before we go abroad. I will repeat what I have said before—that, knowing as much as anyone does about the need for the conversion of the East End of London, I unhesitatingly say that the Church which has not the faith and courage and heroism to take its own share in the task of converting the whole world is not the Church which has the slightest chance of making any headway in the East End of London."

These words should be repeated on every hand by workers for missions, for, as the Archbishop also said: " There can be no life in a Church which is not primarily missionary." We do not believe it is true, except in the very smallest degree, that zeal on behalf of missions has ever tended to the neglect of home evangelization, even in the poorest parish. On the contrary, proof after proof can be adduced to show that wherever the missionary cause has been strongly emphasized in the poorest parishes, the work of evangelizing the parish itself has gone forward with earnestness and vigour.

Roman
Catholic
Missions.

In one way or another during the last few weeks the question of Roman Catholic Missions has been brought to the front, and as there seems to be not a little ignorance as to what the Roman Church is doing in regard

to Foreign Missions, it seems worth while to call attention to a valuable article on this subject by Dr. Eugene Stock, which appears in the "Protestant Dictionary." The following words of Dr. Stock seem particularly important just now :

"The Roman missions of the past eighty years have to a large extent been directed to those fields which Protestant missionaries had already entered. Church of England Societies and Nonconformist Societies alike have suffered from this cause. The S.P.G. history contains many illustrations. . . . While, therefore, we are bound to acknowledge the self-denial and devotion of many of the Roman missionaries, and not to doubt that there have been among them not a few who, knowing Christ as their own Saviour, have earnestly preached him to the heathen, it is impossible to shut our eyes to the plain facts of history as recorded by themselves, or to the actual circumstances of the mission-field at the present time. With every desire to show large-mindedness and charity, no well-instructed Christian can suppose that, as regards a very large portion of Roman missionary work, both in the past and in the present, its character could command the Divine blessing."

Facts like these should be carefully borne in mind when we endeavour to appraise, at its proper value, the work of the Roman Catholic Church on behalf of world-wide evangelization.

In the forthcoming Convention in October of
A Change
of Name. the Protestant Episcopal Church of the United States, a great effort is once more to be made to change the title, in order to get rid of the word "Protestant." It is thought to be narrow and unnecessary, as well as inadequate as a description of our Episcopal brethren in America. In a recent number of the *New York Churchman* Archdeacon Davis of Rochester thus refers to the subject :

"We may claim to be the Church in America or the Church of America, but we can set it down as a fact that the Church for America will be, not the one which assumes the title, but the one which does the work. Our pedigree is all right, and can take care of itself, but unless Apostolic succession is backed up by missionary progression it will not cut much of a figure in the evangelization of the world. We of this branch of the great Church Catholic have been unduly impressed with the *symmetry of our figure*, and the time has come when, figuratively speaking, we must break our ecclesiastical looking-glasses, pull off our cloak of self-righteousness, and go to work. Like the Chinese nation, we have been too much given to the worship of ancestors."

His words are not only applicable to his own Church, but to ours also. We might almost say, "What's in a name?" Men judge

a Church not by its past, but by its present, and if we follow the Jews in merely claiming Abraham for our father, we must not be surprised if God raises up children unto Abraham in other Christian Churches who will put us, with all our ancestry, to utter shame. Is it not sad for us Churchpeople to realize that at the recent Edinburgh Conference the missionary work of Anglicanism only represented one-seventh of the whole gathering ?

This subject of present-day reality as the greatest proof of true Churchmanship is very ably and forcibly stated in a new book which deserves the careful attention of all Churchmen—"Studies in Apostolic Christianity," by the Rev. A. F. W. Blunt (J. M. Dent and Co.). After pointing out our Lord's great principle, "By their fruits ye shall know them," and showing that this was St. Paul's final test of his own ministry, Mr. Blunt proceeds as follows :

The
Supreme
Test.

"And, surely, this is ultimately the only worthy theory of Sacerdotalism, the only worthy conception of a Divinely ordained ministry. A Divine society can live neither upon its past history, nor upon its present externals. A Christian Church cannot safely base its claims upon any unspiritual hypothesis of mechanically transmitted grace, especially when those hypotheses are artificial and destitute of proper historical foundation. . . . The test of 'results,' in the widest sense of the word, is the final test whether a system shall continue to be regarded as Divinely ordained, or whether we must infer that the Providence which established it is also superseding it. The real grace of a ministerial system is the grace of useful Christian leadership and service" (pp. 119, 120).

This is only another way of saying what needs to be said often—that the final and crowning test of Apostolic succession is Apostolic success.

The controversy between the Bishop of Chichester and the Vicar of St. Bartholomew's, Brighton, has provided another illustration of the fundamental difference between the two ideals of Anglicanism represented

More
Conflicts of
Ideals.

respectively by the Ritualists and by all other Churchmen. The letters of Mr. Cocks, in which in the most unequivocal terms he speaks of the reservation of the Sacrament and its exposition and adoration, together with the insistence upon the observance of such festivals as Corpus Christi, the Assumption, and All Souls' Day, clearly indicate, not merely the extent to which St. Bartholomew's, Brighton, has gone, but also and chiefly the absolute impossibility of reconciling these doctrines and practices with any teaching or regulations to be found in the authorized formularies of the Church of England. All loyal Churchmen will feel grateful for the way in which the Bishop of Chichester has exercised his authority, and we shall all look forward to further developments in view of the fact that such doctrines and practices are to be found in other churches in Brighton, and also elsewhere in the Chichester Diocese. Meanwhile we commend to the attention of all our readers the striking comment of the *Guardian* on Mr. Cocks's action :

“ His resignation leaves the impression that he retires to his tent because he cannot have his own way. He has acted from no intelligible principle . . . He simply does not like the directions he has received . . . Many good Churchmen, when they read the correspondence on the subject . . . will anxiously ask themselves, What is the kind of authority which the 'extremist' is prepared to obey? He repudiates the jurisdiction of secular Courts, and in doing so he carries with him the sympathies of many who have no great liking for the course of action which has brought him under review in those Courts. He asks for a tribunal of spiritual origin, presided over by a spiritual Judge, and the great majority of Churchpeople are satisfied of the complete legitimacy of the demand. The case of Mr. Cocks has been before just such a Judge, yet he is still disinclined to obey the judgment. He is not prepared to defy it, as he might perhaps defy that of a secular Court, but he will not bow to it—that must be for his successor.”

We entirely agree with the writer that this attitude of mind is deplorable, and will tend to justify the complaint that extreme men are prepared to obey only when they agree with the authority which commands. It is a long time ago since the days of Sydney Smith, and yet his cynical words about the Ritualist of that day seem to be equally applicable now. “ He is only for the Bishop when the Bishop is for him.”

What is the Explanation? We wonder how it is that Romanism and Ritualism are associated from time to time with practices which cannot on any fair interpretation be regarded as coming within the limits of honesty. We take two recent examples. In the *Spectator* for July 16 the following remarks occur in the course of an able review of Cardinal Vaughan's life :

“The question of Anglican Orders is gone into at some length, and with considerable frankness; and, again, we must point out a revelation which is worth noting. Manning's ‘Life’ showed us that the oath of secrecy imposed on the Council was dispensed by Pius IX. for purposes of intrigue. This ‘Life’ tells us that ‘absolute secrecy was imposed on all members of the Commission appointed’ (to examine Anglican Orders), ‘and an armed sentry stood before the doors’ (vol. ii., p. 202); ‘yet Vaughan was kept informed by letter of everything that went on.’”

And in connection with the controversy between the Bishop of Chichester and Mr. Cocks of Brighton, the Bishop feels compelled to call attention to the fact that on August 9, 1895, Mr. Cocks wrote to Bishop Durnford, stating that the Sacrament reserved for the sick was used for no other service, and yet that Mr. Cocks thought it right in November, 1895, shortly after the Bishop's death and during the vacancy of the see, to alter the existing state of things and to introduce the service of Exposition of the Reserved Sacrament. Mr. Cocks considered that when Bishop Durnford died the particular issue was over, and then commenced Exposition and encouraged people to come to chapel for the adoration of the Sacrament, and he has continued the practice for fourteen years. It is difficult to reconcile this with the ordinary laws of honour, for we should have thought that the Bishop's death, especially as Bishop Durnford wrote just before leaving home that he would go into the matter on his return, would have made it impossible for Mr. Cocks to do other than continue the practice which he assured the Bishop was in vogue in August, 1895. While we would not for a moment generalize from particulars, it is impossible to resist the uncomfortable impression made by these two instances, that there would seem to be some connection between Roman doctrines and practices and the absence of straight-

forwardness. But whether this be so or not, one thing is perfectly clear : whatever we are, Evangelicals, or High Churchmen, or extreme Anglicans, if our doctrines and practices do not at all points square with righteousness, truth, honesty, straightforwardness, they stand condemned as essentially unchristian.

In the report of a recent address on the subject of Biblical Criticism, the writer made the following comment :

**Extremes
Meet.**

“ The theories enunciated were popular a generation ago . . . before the Higher Critics had paved the way for a return of Catholic views.”

This is a very significant comment. If through an acceptance of the higher critical position we are compelled to alter our view of the authority of the Bible, and to believe that it is untrustworthy in its history, uncertain in its facts, and not always clear in its doctrine, we must needs have some infallible guide to point out the errors and to support the soul with the assurance of a Divine revelation. When the higher critical position on the Bible is accepted, we are left either to the uncertainties of reason, or to the fact of an external authority. Such an authority is necessarily found in what is claimed to be the historical Church, and thus once again Rationalism may be said to play direct into the hands of Rome. Renan once expressed the opinion that the Church of Rome had done wisely in withholding the Bible from the laity, and said that it was—

“ The most magnificent stroke of policy on the part of that grand institution to have substituted herself . . . living and acting, for a mute authority” (Bernard, “ The Word and Sacrament,” p. 158).

We have been recently reminded in the *Times* of the way in which Romanism in Spain is causing the reaction of godless Rationalism, and so it must always be if the Bible is not allowed its place and part in the human life as the Divine authority in things spiritual. Men who are shaken by criticism can hardly help crossing over to the authority of the Church. But those who know of a surety that the Bible is indeed the Word of God will be preserved from the errors of Rationalism and Romanism,

and find certitude in fellowship with Christ, through the Word, by the Spirit.

Comparative Religion. The study of Comparative Religion is occupying a very prominent place in the thought of to-day. Christianity is being compared with other religious systems in order to discover if possible the grounds on which uniqueness is claimed for it, and at the same time, many scholars are endeavouring to show that Christianity can be accounted for like any other religion on the basis of a natural evolution through centuries of history. A recent letter on this subject in the *Nation* makes an important point in saying that an impartial investigation into the evidence of Christianity is humanly impossible, because no theologian can really expound Christian doctrine without treating the Resurrection as a fact :

“ Facts upon which the whole fabric of Christianity depends cannot be investigated as if they were a mere antiquarian curiosity, such as the exact site of King Charles I.'s execution. The truth is that the study of comparative religion can never be a science, because the essential conditions of scientific research are lacking. Science seeks the ascertainment and application of calculable laws in a definite subject-matter. In religion the subject-matter is *ex-hypothesi* infinite, and the establishment of absolute rules is incompatible with the postulate of free will. All study of religion is bound to be dogmatic, since the assumption that there can be a religion without dogma is itself a dogma.”

These words call attention to a truth that is only too apt to be overlooked. The experience of the heart is as essential as the consideration of the mind when we are discussing the nature of Christianity and its relation to other religions, and this being the case, absolute impartiality—as impartiality is regarded in physical science—is naturally and necessarily impossible. Christianity takes every faculty of human nature into consideration, and before we can compare the Gospel with other religions we must find out what it and they can do for human nature in every part. If, as Luther says, “it is the heart that makes the theologian,” it is equally true that the heart makes the true Christian student of comparative religion.

Civil Marriages. With a large number of Churchmen of various schools of thought we cannot help expressing our regret that the Bishops of St. Albans and Birmingham seem to have given their approval to the old suggestion of a complete separation of Church and State in the matter of marriage. Lord John Russell, in 1836, recommended the policy of universal civil marriage, "leaving the parties concerned to add any religious ceremony or ceremonies they may think proper." Canon Hensley Henson has very forcibly pointed out that this arrangement would not touch the core of the difficulty so long as the Church of England is an Established Church. It would be intolerable that citizens who contracted marriages permitted by the law should be excluded from communion in the national Church as "open and notorious evil livers." This is a point of the greatest importance, and needs much more consideration than has at present been given to it. In addition to this, there are many and grave reasons why the Church should be the last to suggest the policy of universal civil marriage, for it is pretty certain that many parties would not add any religious ceremony whatever. For the purity of our home life, which King George V. has truly said is at the foundation of our national welfare, we must continue to do our utmost to associate marriage with religious ceremony.

Personal. This number is the last under the present editor. He desires to express his most grateful thanks to the numerous readers who have written such warm letters of appreciation from time to time, and who have thereby made the editorial work a pleasure and a privilege. The Rev. Professor Dawson Walker, D.D., and the Rev. Principal F. S. Guy Warman, B.D., will take charge of the magazine with the October issue.

