

THE CHURCHMAN

April, 1914.

The Month.

“Hands off!” WE are not surprised that many are saying—and we doubt not that very many more are thinking—that the time has come when Churchmen should unite in a common cry, “Hands off the Prayer-Book!” Whatever views men once held about the wisdom of Prayer-Book revision, it is beyond doubt that the gravest alarm now exists as the result of the action of the two Convocations in regard to it. If we mistake not, the section of High Churchmen, led by Canon Newbolt, have all along been opposed to revision. They are content with the Prayer-Book as it is. In the light of what has happened, we cannot but feel now that it would have been well if Evangelical and Central Churchmen had adopted a similar attitude. They believed, however, that revision would proceed on sane and sober lines, and that the Prayer-Book would emerge from the process a stronger Book, and one more fitted to meet the needs of our time. That view found expression in our own pages, and we are still prepared to concede that a well-ordered revision, which remained faithful to the distinctive principles of English Churchmanship, might be advantageous. But that now seems to be impossible. Proposals have been agreed to in Convocation which, in our view, gravely affect the Reformed character of the Church of England, and many are agreed that they call for the most strenuous opposition. The immediately pressing problem is, What are Evangelical and Central Churchmen going to do? Are they prepared tamely to submit to this inroad upon their position, or will they unite in one strong

protest against the suggested changes? We believe that some of the leaders are counselling delay, urging that there is time enough yet, and that they must wait and see how things develop. We are never in favour of precipitate action, but if anything at all is to be done in this matter, we are confident that the time for action has come. A petition to the Archbishops—reasonably, yet firmly worded—praying that no alterations be made in the Prayer-Book would secure the signatures of thousands upon thousands of loyal Church-people.

It is not possible within the limits of the space at our disposal to indicate the full extent of the changes suggested by Convocation. We trust that before very long someone will find it worth while to co-ordinate the decisions of the two Houses of the two Convocations, and to give the Church at large the benefit of his labours. The result would be startling. Meanwhile it is enough for our present purpose to say that the Upper House of the Convocation of Canterbury has agreed that the use of Eucharistic Vestments should be authorized; it has sanctioned Reservation for the sick; and it has agreed to the shortening of the words of Administration, when the number of communicants is large, by using only the *first* half of the formula. These are changes of grave significance, and no amount of "enrichment" in the occasional services, or "adaptation" of the ordinary services, can make these new departures generally acceptable. The Upper House of the Convocation of York, by a majority of one, has also sanctioned a form of Reservation for the sick, taking, however, as we should expect, greater precautions against abuse than those which appear in the resolutions of the Southern body. Once more the Lower House of the Canterbury Convocation has resolved upon a rearrangement of the Communion Service, so as to bring its order into closer conformity, not only with that of the first Prayer-Book of Edward VI., but with the old Canon of the Mass. These changes are calculated to have a most

serious effect in more than one direction. They concede the principal demands of the extreme Anglican party, and put those who remember that the Church is Protestant as well as Catholic into an extremely difficult position, even in regard to such a matter as Church defence. The Dean of Canterbury has indicated his own difficulty in no uncertain terms. Writing in the *Record*, he says :

“ I wonder whether it ever occurs to the Bishops and their supporters that they are allowing the Church to drift into the gravest possible danger in respect to its position as a National Church. Let it be once rendered evident that changes are being made, or countenanced by the authorities of the Church, which expose every parish in the country to the action of Romanizing influences, and the sinews of resistance to movements for disestablishment will be cut. I do not hesitate to say that the mere proposal of the Bishops to authorize the Vestments will make it more difficult for many men, and among others for myself, to join with as whole a heart as hitherto in agitations for Church defence. I could not defend the continued establishment of a Romanized, or half-Romanized, Church; and matters have already gone so far, that I feel I do not even now know what it is I am defending.”

The difficulty expressed by the Dean is likely to be shared by many others, unless steps are taken to prevent the final and irrevocable authorization of the changes indicated. It is, therefore, of the highest importance that some counter-action should be resolved upon.

It is unfortunate that in the Upper House of the “Reservation”
Unnecessary. Canterbury Convocation there are so few Bishops with wide parochial experience, and not one amongst the English prelates who is in whole-hearted sympathy with the Evangelical view. The decision on “Reservation,” for instance, might have been different if the practical and doctrinal objections had been adequately pointed out. But the defect to which we have referred will soon be remedied. At the May group of sessions the new Bishop of Chelmsford will, we presume, take his seat, and, alike from his extensive practical knowledge of work amongst the poor, and his deep attachment to Evangelical principles, he will be a strong acquisition to the debating power of the House. In his remarkable book, “The Church in

Action," he has expressed his views on Reservation in no uncertain terms :

"The Prayer-Book does not provide for any 'reservation of the Sacrament' for the sick, but it does provide for a celebration in the sickroom. Therefore it is incumbent upon the priest to do everything in his power to give the sick that which they desire, and in the manner which the Church directs. There may be difficulties. The priest may himself have communicated earlier in the day, but, as the late Head of Pusey House points out in his 'Work in Country Parishes,' Bishops of the Early Church frequently celebrated several times a day. No opinions of the priest, as to fasting or any other question, can outweigh his obligation to administer the Holy Communion to the sick and the dying at any hour of the day or night. It is argued that the sickroom may not be a fit place in which to consecrate. My reply is that anything that makes a room unfit for the Consecration makes it equally unfit for the administration of the 'reserved' elements. Let us remember that the Lord, Whose service it is, was born in a stable, laid in a manger, and died upon a cross, and no room can be too squalid or poverty-stricken for Him to give Himself to the hungry souls of men in their hour of need. As one who has worked for many years in a poor district, I should like to bear my testimony to the unfailing readiness, even among the roughest of the rough, of relatives, friends, and neighbours, to do all in their power to make things 'decent' for the clergyman at a time of sickness. A table will be washed, quiet on the stairs will be preserved, neighbours will take the children away, and if the clergyman will wear his surplice, provide a white linen cloth, and take with him his own Communion set and other accessories, there is no reason why the service should not be conducted in a 'slum' room as reverently as in a cathedral. Dignity and simplicity *can* go together."

Dr. Sanday's
Tribute.

Dr. Sanday's tribute to the life-work of the late Professor Driver was, as we should expect, warm, sympathetic, generous, affectionate. The memorial sermon he preached in Christ Church Cathedral on March 8, the Sunday after the funeral, when all Oxford was mourning its great loss, has since been published (Oxford: Clarendon Press; 6d. net), and it will be highly appreciated for its careful and accurate analysis of the value, variety, and quality, of the Professor's remarkable work. These points hardly received sufficiently adequate recognition in some of the obituary notices which appeared in the Press, and Dr. Sanday has adjusted the balance. Even those who, like ourselves, have been unable to accept many of the conclusions to which his independent studies led him, acknowledge with gratitude the greatness of the

services Dr. Driver rendered to students of the Bible. If it stood alone, his work on the Revised Version would be sufficient to place him in the very front rank of Hebraists. Yet his contribution in this connection to the elucidation of the text of the Old Testament was only one incident in a life wholly given up to Biblical research. His most famous work was, of course, his "Introduction to the Literature of the Old Testament," first published in 1891. But the real charm of Dr. Sanday's tribute is in the beautiful picture it gives of the personal side of Dr. Driver's life. "Absolutely simple, absolutely sincere, absolutely without guile, single-minded and at the same time humble-minded, the Bible and the Home were the two centres of his being, and in both he had the fullest satisfaction. A happier or more united home could not easily be." And again: "Behind and between all that he wrote it was easy to see the outlines of his own simple but most genuine personal religion, itself derived straight from the Bible." Reference is made also to his "great kindness of heart," and his "never-failing readiness to spend and be spent in the good cause." Dr. Driver founded a school—"a school," so Dr. Sanday describes it, "as sound as any in Christendom, fully abreast of all the new knowledge, and yet sober, solid, full of ample promise for the future." He is succeeded in the Regius Professorship of Hebrew at Oxford by his best-known disciple, Canon G. A. Cooke, who since 1908 has been Oriel Professor of the Interpretation of Holy Scripture.

Dr. Ginsburg's death, following so closely upon that of Dr. Driver, is a still further loss to Biblical scholarship. He was one of the greatest Hebraists of his time, and, so far as he concerned himself with critical questions, his influence was almost wholly in a conservative direction. The *Guardian*, however, in a highly appreciative notice of him, says that the problems about the Old Testament which attract popular attention were not his business. "His ambition, or rather his religious passion, was for the perfecting of the tradi-

tional text of the Hebrew Bible. The great work of his life, the publication in three folio volumes of the Massorah, or Corpus of ancient Jewish textual tradition, was a magnificent prelude. Then came his 'Massoretico-Critical' edition of the Hebrew Bible in 1894, and the invaluable 'Introduction to the Hebrew Bible,' a treasury from which all subsequent writers of such Introductions have drawn. Of the Hebrew Bible, Professor Kantsch said in the Preface to his famous edition of Gesenius's 'Grammatik': 'I have learned to value this edition more and more in the course of the preparation of the present work.' In the second edition, which Dr. Ginsburg began in 1908, and which was being issued by the British and Foreign Bible Society as one of the memorials of its centenary, he collated the Bomberg text with some seventy Biblical MSS. and some twenty printed editions of earlier date. The notes at the foot of each page embody the principal results of this collation, and record in detail the source of each variation in orthography, vowel points, etc. Of this monument of exact scholarship the Pentateuch, Samuel, Kings, Isaiah, Jeremiah, and the Lesser Prophets, have been published. Yet all this is but a moiety of Dr. Ginsburg's long, unwearying life-work." His exposure of the fraudulent Shapira MS. in 1883 greatly impressed the popular imagination. Some attempt has been made since his death to question the part he took in the exposure, but it is established beyond doubt that the discovery was due entirely to the keenness of his genius. He was a Jewish convert, and for a time in his early years worked as a missionary of the British Society for the Propagation of the Gospel among the Jews. Not the least of the services he rendered to the Christian Church was his work as a member of the Old Testament Revision Committee.

The publication of a series of "Kikuyu Tracts" is warmly to be commended. The public mind has been deeply stirred by the questions which have arisen out of the Conference, and the moment is opportune for

"Kikuyu
Tracts."

discussing calmly, wisely, and reasonably, problems which have to be faced before a just decision can be reached. The names of the authors of these "Kikuyu Tracts" are a sufficient guarantee of the impartiality of their writings. Their desire is to elucidate the truth, and not to score off opponents. Four numbers have reached us. Professor Gwatkin's tract, "The Confirmation Rubric: Whom does it bind?" is an able exposition of the limited character of the rule: the rubric is meant for our own people only. Dr. Guy Warman's tract, "The Ministry and Unity," contains within a very narrow compass a mass of information on the question of Episcopacy, and points out that, with the Apostolic view of the Episcopate, "Episcopacy may become, as it was in the Primitive Church, a centre of unity and a bond of brotherhood." Chancellor P. V. Smith's tract, "The Limits of Ritual and Ceremonial in the Anglican Communion," discusses with legal exactness and precision a question upon which the best light available is earnestly desired. Of the Bishop of Durham's tract, "That They All may be One," it is sufficient to say that it is as beautiful in its expression as it is strong in its appeal. Like all the Bishop's writings, it takes us away from mischievous controversy, and centres our attention upon the Lord Himself. The publication of these tracts lifts the Kikuyu discussion to a higher plane. They meet a real need in an excellent spirit. Messrs. Longmans, Green and Co. are the publishers, and the tracts may be bought for the popular penny.

It is now announced that the Welsh Church Bill

The Welsh Church Bill. will not be taken in the House of Commons until after Easter. It must not be supposed, however, that the delay is indicative of any change on the part of the Government in their general attitude towards the question. If we may judge from Mr. McKenna's speech on Mr. Ormsby-Gore's Welsh amendment to the Address, and still more from Mr. Asquith's reply to the deputation of Welsh Nonconformists which waited upon him recently in support of the Nonconformist

protest against disendowment—a protest as remarkable as it was refreshing—the Bill is to be passed into law this session without the alteration of a single comma. The Welsh Libera- tionists demand satisfaction, and the Government dare not say them nay. We are not altogether surprised that events should take that course. A danger hitherto has been that the Government, by promising considerable modification of the disendowment clauses, should tempt the Church to compromise on the question of disestablishment. That, in our view, would be disastrous, for we agree with those who hold that of the two evils, disestablishment is infinitely the greater. We are confident that the Church will do well to fight this battle out to a finish. The Government may succeed in forcing the Bill into law under the provisions of the Parliament Act, but even so the Church will not be at the end of its resources. The General Election cannot be delayed beyond next year, and the demand for the repeal of the Welsh Church Act will be insisted upon. Indeed, the Unionists—should they be returned to power—are irrevocably pledged to the policy of repeal.

**Nonconformists
and
Disendowment.** The disendowment clauses of the Welsh Church Bill are as cruel as they are indefensible. The fact is recognized by large numbers of Nonconformists even in Wales. When we find 15,321 Nonconformists in the northern part of the Principality alone expressing their “conscientious opposition” to “the proposals to deprive the Church in Wales of her enclosed ancient churchyards, and to take away for secular purposes £157,000 a year of her ancient endowments,” we may be quite sure that their convictions have been deeply stirred. A similar protest is in course of signature in South Wales, and it is believed that it is assuming even larger proportions. Attempts have been made to impugn the genuineness of the North Wales protest, but they have signally failed; whilst, on the other hand, it has been established beyond all doubt that many of the signatories have been subjected to bitter persecution for their faithfulness to the dictates

of conscience. The Government may affect indifference to this unexpected opposition to their proposals, but it will weigh with the country. What many people are asking, however, is why is it that so few English Nonconformists give any sign of their disapproval of the Bill? There are two sections of Nonconformists—the political section and the religious section. The Church does not expect, nor does it desire, any help from the political section, but it is passing strange that the leaders of the religious section remain dumb in the presence of so grave a menace to the spiritual usefulness of the Church. The question they are bound to face is whether it can possibly be right to confiscate funds—in this case amounting to £157,000 per annum—which are used for religious purposes, and to devote them to purposes wholly secular, and without any connection with religion at all. If they allow this great wrong to be done, without any protest on their part, they will incur a responsibility from which even the most callous might well shrink.

A "Serious Disappointment."
 "This is the Bishop's only serious disappointment." The words are those of the Bishop of Bristol, and he uses them in a letter to his diocese concerning the decision of the Upper House of the Convocation of Canterbury on the Athanasian Creed. The Bishop says he has long been clear that the *Quicumque vult* should be restored to its proper place as a Canticle, to be said or sung *before*, not *instead of*, the Apostles' Creed. Convocation has decided by fifteen to seven that the Creed "shall" be sung or said at Morning Prayer instead of the Apostles' Creed, on Trinity Sunday only. The decision has pleased no one, and the *Times* has published a large number of letters protesting against it. The heaviest fire has come from Professor Emery Barnes, who, objecting to the damnatory clauses, says that if, as he contends, they are untrue, it is as wrong to repeat them on one Sunday as on several occasions. His letters cover more or less familiar ground; but in an article he contributes to the *Church Family Newspaper* he takes a broader view, and claims

that the clauses are untrue, for they traverse the teachings of Scripture :

“ ‘Whosoever willet to be saved——’ We know how the sentence would be completed in the Gospels: ‘Let him come unto Me (the Christ),’ or ‘let him believe on Me,’ or ‘let him eat of Me!’ Always comes the personal note; always the invitation to the poor human being to cast himself on the Divine-human Person! We know, again, what is the teaching of the Epistles. They do not say that salvation depends on holding propositions. ‘In Christ’ is safety. ‘He that hath the Son hath life, and he that hath not the Son hath not life.’ I dare not repeat the first clause of *Quicumque* because I have learnt from the New Testament and from the Prayer-Book (everywhere outside the ‘Athanasian Creed’) that ‘Whosoever willet to be saved, before all things it is necessary *that he be in Christ.*’ After that, if a man be a student of theology, he may assimilate with profit the teaching of *Quicumque vult* on the Trinity and on the Incarnation, but he will avoid the damnatory clauses to the uttermost if he desires as a pastor to

“ ‘Win straying souls with modesty again,
Cast none away.’ ”

This is a singularly fine passage, and should go far to arrest the attention even of those who claim that the damnatory clauses do not go beyond the teaching of Scripture. If the Bishops desired to deal with the matter at all, it seems a pity that they did not content themselves with changing the “shall” of the rubric into “may.” This would probably have satisfied all but the most extreme men.

The new volume of the *Official Year-Book of*
A Year's
Statistics.
the Church of England (S.P.C.K.) gives some extremely interesting statistics. The voluntary offerings of Churchmen for the year ending Easter, 1913, amounted to £7,900,230, against £7,764,777 in the previous year—a healthy advance. The statistics of Church work show some signs of retrogression; but it is well to remember, when comparing the number of communicants last Easter Day (2,328,767) with those for the previous year (2,428,933), that last Easter the weather was very wet all over the country. There seems no reason to believe that there is really any falling off in the number of the Church’s communicants. But we should all like to see a greater advance.