

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

November, 1910.

The Month.

By the time that these notes appear in print it will be old news that the trouble at St. James's, Sydney, has been satisfactorily ended by the appointment to the living of the Rev. W. Wentworth-Shields, a son-in-law of the Bishop of Ripon. The *Sydney Daily Telegraph* of August 22, in commenting on the appointment, refers to "the opinions expressed by the more regular of the worshippers, who not only think that Dr. Wright has done excellently in the choice of a successor to the Rev. W. I. Carr-Smith, but declare their intention of loyally standing by the newly appointed rector."

Some English Church newspapers have commented adversely on the Archbishop's action. A correspondent writing in the *Guardian* of September 23 says: "There can be no doubt that it has done serious injury to the Church's position in Sydney, if not throughout all Australia." In view of this and similar suggestions, it may be of interest to English readers to see the comments of the Archdeacon of West Sydney, published in the *Sydney Daily Telegraph* of August 22. Archdeacon Boyce, who is one of the Diocesan nominators, maintained, in the face of some bitter criticism, an absolute silence while the matter

was still under discussion. When the appointment was made he felt free to speak out :

"The contest," he says, "was not between High and Low, as it had been publicly put, but over the appointment of a High Churchman or a Ritualist. . . . I draw a clear distinction between a High Churchman and a Ritualist. The latter is an extremist, and very near the Church of Rome in his opinions. The wearing of the Vestments is one of his distinctive features, and the advocacy and use of the Confessional is another."

In reply to the question, "Do the Vestments, you think, mean anything beyond the mere dress?" the Archdeacon said :

"Yes. One of the St. James's nominators told me distinctly that they did not care for them as a mere dress, but for what they symbolized. While I admit some clergymen have worn them without attaching any meaning, in the majority of cases they are used to indicate the Mass, or Transubstantiation."

In reply to the question, "Do you think the new clergyman will be supported?" the Archdeacon said :

"Yes; within a year St. James's will be in as good a position as ever, if not better. It will accord with its long history since 1825, for it was never ritualistic until recently. . . . There has been a storm, but in the long-run the whole difficulty will make for peace. . . . The Archbishop has shown no narrowness, but a broad mind and a thorough grasp of the whole position."

**Trade Unions
and Secular
Education.**

One of the significant features of the recent Trade Union Congress at Sheffield was the debate on a motion urging the Parliamentary Committee to continue their efforts to secure Parliamentary and municipal recognition of the Trade Union education policy, "which demands a national system of education under full popular control—free and secular, from the primary school to the University." This resolution was carried by 827,000 votes to 81,000. Such a majority for secular education is an ominous symptom. We take leave, however, to doubt whether on this point the vote of the Congress fairly represents the opinion of working men and women throughout the country. Still, one point is clear: it is more incumbent on us than it ever was to bring to the highest point of efficiency the institution we already have for teaching the truths of Christianity to the children of the land—the Sunday-school.

The National
Society and
Sunday-schools.

In this connection the National Society is inaugurating a new scheme, which appears to contain great possibilities of future good. The idea is that Sunday-school work should be treated in a scientific spirit and be organized on up-to-date lines. Sunday-schools are to be properly graded into classes or sub-sections, from the kindergarten to the Bible-class. The *School Guardian* is to contain a "religious instruction" section, and this will provide not only materials suitable for the talks or addresses of the superintendent, but lesson-outlines exactly appropriate for teachers in the various divisions of the kindergarten, the middle school, and the upper school. We feel sure that, if the clergy will bring this scheme before their helpers, and assist them in putting it into practice, not only will the Sunday-school become, more than it has been before, an effective ally of the Church, but the serious leakage of elder scholars from the Communicant membership of the Church will be checked.

Educational
Settlement.

The recent scheme propounded by the Educational Settlement Committee cannot be said to have received a warm welcome. We hope, however, that those who are labouring for a final solution of the vexed question will not throw up their hands in despair, for there is little doubt that such an extremity will be the Secularist's best opportunity. Professor Sadler, writing in the *Contemporary Review*, under the title "High Churchmen and the Crisis in Religious Education," says: "Strong forces are pushing English education into secularism; we are being driven step by step into a policy that is repugnant to most of us." He finds the chief element of uncertainty about the future in the division of opinion among the members of the Church of England. Professor Inge, writing in the *Nineteenth Century and Afterwards*, makes an earnest appeal for a temper of reasonable compromise. "Only," he says, "by a spirit of conciliation and willingness to compromise non-essential differences can a disaster be averted which would inflict an indelible stigma on the too combative Christians who

made it inevitable." He points to the "disaster and disgrace if, in consequence of sectarian quarrels, the name of God were banished from the official school-teaching in the most Christian country of Europe."

School Managers in the Bristol Diocese. The present crisis, then, is not a time for giving up the problem in despair, but for setting about the solution of it with renewed determination. A most interesting example of what is possible in this direction has been supplied by the Voluntary Association of Church School Managers in the Bristol Diocese. The Association has advised managers in single-school areas to supply alternative forms of religious teaching where parents desire it. We cannot help wondering whether this system, if universally adopted in single-school areas where the Church school is the only school, would not go very far to meet any real and legitimate grievance that our Nonconformist brethren may have. The managers, at any rate, have the matter under their own control, for the Board of Education has no legal right to interfere with the religious education given in a school.

The Apocalyptic Element in the New Testament. Of the various subjects discussed at the Cambridge Church Congress, none seems to have kindled a greater degree of interest than "The Apocalyptic Element in our Lord's Teaching." So crowded was the Examination Hall that an overflow meeting had to be arranged. It was fitting—and in a sense necessary—that this topic should find a place in the Congress programme, for Schweitzer's book, known to English readers by the title "The Quest of the Historical Jesus," was a challenge to English scholarship. The discussion of the subject was helpful and satisfactory. To make selections when all is excellent is difficult and a little invidious, but we may say that on the whole the papers of Dr. Bernard and Professor Charles were the most directly illuminating—in the former case, because Dr. Bernard set himself to give an answer to certain plain, crucial questions ;

in the latter, because Dr. Charles brings to bear on this particular question a wealth of expert knowledge probably unequalled by that of any living scholar.

Anything like a summary is out of the question here, but we may call attention to one or two of the more significant points. There was general agreement that our Lord did expect a future manifestation of Himself in judgment. The Apocalyptic element in His words cannot be explained away. A further point—emphasized by Dr. Bernard—was the help to be gained from a critical investigation of the Synoptists. For it seems indisputable that if St. Matthew were our *only* authority for certain of our Lord's sayings, there would be no escaping from the conclusion that He anticipated a manifestation of the Son of Man, which, in fact, did not take place. To this Dr. Bernard replies that when once the principle is admitted that St. Matthew is a secondary authority as compared with St. Mark, and when we find that in the case of at least two important sayings St. Matthew, in the course of editorial rearrangement, has transposed sayings from the context in which St. Mark gives them, the difficulties tend considerably to disappear.

A third question—put frankly and directly by Dr. Bernard—is: "Is the imagery which our Lord used, when speaking of the last things, to be pressed as literally descriptive?" Both he and the Bishop of Birmingham subscribed to the view that our Lord was using the ordinary language of Apocalyptic, familiar to the men of His generation, and that this language, echoing that of the prophets, is to be regarded as highly figurative.

Dr. Charles's paper is a *multum in parvo*, and should be treasured as a permanent possession, not only for its searching *critique* on Schweitzer, but for the amount of exact and detailed information it contains. We can only call attention here to one point. The writer remarks that Apocalyptic had strong affinities with the Wisdom literature; further, that the Apocalypticist was a genuine seer, a beholder of visions, and that the combination of these two characteristics led naturally to mysticism. "That

such a mystical school existed in Palestine," he says, "we have the incontestable evidence of the New Testament Johannine literature."

To this evidence we have lately had an addition of the most far-reaching importance. Some time ago Dr. Rendel Harris came into possession of certain Syriac MSS. from the neighbourhood of the Tigris. These MSS. lay for some two years unused on his shelves. On looking over the MSS., Dr. Rendel Harris found them to contain what seemed to be Christian mystical compositions of a poetical character. Along with them was a new Syriac MS. version of the Psalms of Solomon. The whole was published by Dr. Harris in 1909 under the title of "The Odes and Psalms of Solomon." So far as the Odes are concerned, Dr. Harris has attempted to show that they are a Christian production, and were written in the latter half of the first century of the Christian era. This year Harnack has attacked the topic with his wonted brilliancy and erudition, and has published an exhaustive pamphlet on *Ein Jüdisch-Christliches Psalmbuch aus dem Ersten Jahrhundert*. He does not agree with Dr. Rendel Harris that all, or nearly all, the Odes are of Christian authorship. He concludes that in the Odes we have a Jewish Psalm-book, written in Palestine, in Hebrew or Aramaic, late in the first century B.C., or early in the first century A.D., and that this book was subsequently worked over by a Christian hand not later than A.D. 100. He would himself assign about one-eighth of the whole collection to Christian authorship.

For the criticism of the Fourth Gospel it is no exaggeration to say that this discovery is epoch-making. For this reason: We have long been familiar with the assertion that some of the ideas distinctive of this Gospel—Life, Light, Truth, Knowledge—are Hellenic in origin, with the inevitable inference that a document which bears traces of Hellenic speculative thought must be late in date. The presence of all these ideas in the

Odes shows that these ideas are not Hellenic, but Jewish. The Odes, in fact, are a connecting-link between the Jewish mystical piety of the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs and the Johannine literature of the New Testament, and Harnack suggests that the writer of the Fourth Gospel may have been a mystic of this type before he became a disciple of Christ.

It is obvious that we have before us a most fascinating field of speculation and research. The Odes must be taken into account in any discussion of the date and theological contents of the Fourth Gospel, as well as of the historical value of the portrait of Jesus which it presents. To those who are so far interested in the matter as to seek fuller and more detailed information, we commend most warmly an article by the Rev. R. H. Strachan in the *Expository Times* for October. He there exhibits clearly the correspondences between the leading ideas of the Fourth Gospel and the relevant passages of the Odes, ending with most suggestive and illuminating comments on the general significance of this, our newly found treasure.

The Rev. Arthur Cocks and the Rev. H. F. **The trouble at Brighton.** Hinde of Brighton have made their submission to the Church of Rome. The *Times* of October 6 has a leader on the matter, from which sundry passages are well worth reproducing :

“On the whole, it will not be unfair to say that nothing in their service to the Church of England became them like the leaving of it. . . . The event, in our judgment, will do good in the main. . . . But if it is possible to take their departure to another sphere in a philosophical spirit, it is less easy to be patient with them as men who could ever have supposed that they might honestly stay where they were. Even assuming that their intellectual equipment is less remarkable than their zeal in the pastoral office, we find it hard to imagine a state of mind in which they could consider it the duty of English clergy to uphold by word and deed ‘the Catholic doctrine of Transubstantiation.’ . . . The entire incident returns in the end to the question of discipline. . . . It is not, we suppose, doubtful that the Brighton incumbents, two or three in number, who have kept their benefices and have surceased from the ceremonies of ‘Benediction’ and ‘Exposition’ still retain and are inculcating the views for which their now separated brethren were astonished to find no authority in the Church of England.”

The *Times* is right. Disaster is inflicted on the Church of England, not by the Romanizers who go over to Rome, but by those who remain within her own borders.

The "Church Times" and Brighton. In a long paragraph the *Church Times* discusses the perversions to Rome which have been the upshot of the Brighton trouble. Our contemporary is of opinion that the perverts in question, if they be "persons capable of arguing difficult questions for themselves," must have been already for some time at heart and in reality Roman :

"It is almost impossible to believe that these are cases of sudden conversion, and if they are not, then we are left to the conclusion that the gentlemen in question could not much longer have remained within a communion the catholicity of which they were ready to deny on the first occasion of their being thwarted in pursuing their own line of conduct."

We entirely agree ; most moderate Churchmen have felt for years that St. Bartholomew's, Brighton, and churches of its type have been centres of permitted Romanism in the Church of England. St. Bartholomew's, by means of its well-known Church Tracts—tracts which, if we mistake not, have had the approval of the *Church Times*—has been permitted to spread un-English teaching beyond its own borders. No word of disapproval has come from the organ or the leaders of the so-called Catholic party. But when Messrs. Cocks and Hinde are compelled by the wise and necessary action of the Bishop to take the only logical course, the *Church Times* asks, "Why did they not go over to Rome before?" We are glad to see that the *Church Times* is beginning to realize that Romanism has no place in the Church of England.

The Bishop of Norwich's Sermon. The new Bishop of Norwich preached an interesting sermon at the opening of the Church Congress. It was a plea for spiritual religion and for a wider outlook. It wisely combined the cry, which we so often hear, of "Back to Christ!" with the necessity of adapting ourselves to the needs of to-day. He pleaded for Bible study, and one of his sentences warned us of a real danger :

“In our Bible study we run the risk of failing to see the wood for the trees; of the trees—the trees which still stand—we may get a very precise plan, and number them all with accuracy and care, and yet we may know nothing of the glory of the forest, and only view it with eyes of a timber merchant.”

Criticism of the Bible may all too easily make the Bible merely an object for criticism, and the Bishop's warning is wholly apposite. Precision of thought, scientific criticism, ecclesiastical organization—all have their value. They are excellent, as the Bishop said, for the concentration of effort; they cannot create the spirit of service. In the educational life of the Church and in its parochial life there are many things that help and improve, but behind them all there is the prime necessity that we should be living and working according to the mind of Christ, and at the beginning of a Church Congress it was well to be reminded of it.

It is doubtful if the discussion carried us far. **The Congress and Unity.** Professor Whitney made an academic plea for Episcopacy as the only basis of unity. Bishop Kempthorne pleaded for a better understanding between Churchmen and Nonconformists of each other's positions, and for co-operation in study, social reform, philanthropy, and missionary enterprise. Canon Welsh and Bishop Ingham both looked at the matter from a point of view which went beyond the Mother Country, and the three papers which followed Professor Whitney's carried us away from the inelasticity of the first paper. The Archbishop of York pleaded for prayer, for intercourse, for study, and especially for patience. The Bishop of Gippsland spoke hopefully of the Australian movement for Reunion, and one was reminded of Bishop Westcott's prophecy that Home Reunion would only come into being through the influence and example of the daughter Churches abroad. So far the discussion had gone hopefully and happily, but the Bishop of Birmingham closed it with a note that saddened many. He put the position with which his books have made us familiar, and threatened the rending of the Church in twain

if any departure were made from it. It seems to be clear that Episcopacy is the great cause of difficulty, and that before any real steps towards reunion can be effectively taken we must spend years in study and discussion of this difficult question.

Church Con-
gress and Social
Questions.

Despite the fact that the number of subjects was limited this year, two sessions were given to social problems. At one, three points from the Reports on the Poor Law were discussed in practical fashion—boy labour, widows with children, the treatment of young unmarried mothers. At the other meeting, hereditary and social responsibility were considered, with special reference to the feeble-minded and to parentage. Perhaps the most striking paper of all was that by Mrs. Pinsent, who was a member of the Royal Commission on the Feeble-Minded. She brought home to the meeting in most forceful fashion, using diagrams of family trees in the process, the serious danger to the community which the feeble-minded present. She alleged that the unfit were being produced faster than the fit, and, indeed, at the expense of the production of the fit. Her remedy was segregation, and the applause of the meeting seemed to endorse her conclusion. The question is a difficult and delicate one, but it is the business of the Christian Church to face delicate and difficult problems. Mrs. Pinsent's paper will cause many to think ; that she is largely right we are convinced. Prevention is always better than cure ; but it must be wise prevention ; and it is abundantly clear that, without any danger to the individual, and with much advantage to the community, the segregation of the unfit could be carried many steps farther than it is carried at present.

