

THE CHURCHMAN

August, 1914.

The Month.

The Kikuyu Inquiry. MONDAY, July 27, was the day fixed for the opening of the Kikuyu Inquiry before the Central Consultative Committee of the Lambeth Conference, and we do not doubt but that all true friends of missions will have this gravely important matter much upon their hearts and in their prayers. The Central Consultative Committee consists of eighteen members, and represents practically every branch of the Anglican Communion. The Church in America is entitled to send four members, but has not at present done so. The fourteen members are as follows: The Archbishop of Canterbury (*ex-officio*); the Bishop of Exeter and Bishop Ryle (elected by the Bishops of the Southern Province); the Archbishop of York (elected by the Bishops of the Northern Province); the Archbishop of Armagh (Church of Ireland); the Bishop of Brechin (Primus of the Episcopal Church of Scotland); the Archbishop of Rupertsland (Canada); the Archbishop of Sydney (Australia); Bishop Wallis (formerly Bishop of Wellington, New Zealand); the Archbishop of the West Indies; the Bishop of Winchester (elected by the Provincial Synod of the Province of South Africa); Bishop Copleston (formerly Metropolitan of India); the Bishop of St. Albans (elected by Bishops in China, Corea, and Japan); and the Bishop of Gibraltar (elected by extra-Provincial Bishops under the jurisdiction of the Archbishop of Canterbury). No exception can be taken to the composition of this Committee;

it is eminently representative of the Anglican Communion, not only in its several parts, but in its varying degrees of Churchmanship, and its opinion will carry weight. It should be remembered, however, that its functions are purely advisory; the real responsibility—"grave responsibilities" the Archbishop of Canterbury called them—rest with the Metropolitan, and "those responsibilities," the Archbishop said, he should "endeavour to discharge." The facts relating to the Kikuyu affair are too well known to need recapitulation in detail. It was at first seriously proposed to the Archbishop that the Bishops of Mombasa and Uganda, for their share in it, should be put upon their trial for heresy and schism. It may be said at once that if such a step had been decided upon it would have spelt disaster for the Church of England, and the Archbishop of Canterbury, with that wise, far-seeing judgment which ever distinguishes him, ruled, without hesitation, that he would not be justified in allowing the inquiry to take that form; it would be, indeed, as he added, "wholly out of place." But inquiry there must be, and we do not think that anyone can complain of the form in which the Archbishop proposes to submit the issues to the Central Consultative Committee.

There are two distinct matters: one the pro-

The Two Questions. posed scheme of Federation of Missionary Societies, drafted—and it is well to emphasize that the scheme is only in draft—with a view to ultimate union of the Native Churches, which the Bishop of Uganda has now formally submitted to the Archbishop as his Metropolitan; and the other, the administration of the Holy Communion according to the order of the Book of Common Prayer, to members of the Kikuyu Conference, some of whom had not been episcopally confirmed. Upon these facts the Archbishop has submitted two questions to the Central Consultative Committee:

1. "Do the principles of the proposed scheme contravene any principles of Church order, the observance of which is obligatory upon the Bishops, the clergy, and the lay-workers of the Church of England at home and abroad? If so, in what particulars?"

2. "Whether, due consideration being given to precedent, and to all the circumstances of the case, the action of the Bishops [Mombasa and Uganda] who arranged and conducted the admittedly abnormal service in question, was, in the opinion of the Consultative Body, consistent or inconsistent with principles accepted by the Church of England?"

Upon the answer returned to these questions hang most momentous issues. It has been said that upon the result of the inquiry depends the question of peace or war within the Church of England; and, indeed, it may be that we are entering upon the great struggle which must come sooner or later between the two divergent forces. Such a conflict no one who loves the Church of England can look upon with anything but the most serious misgiving, however necessary it may be. The Archbishop of Canterbury is the last man not to realize the extreme gravity of the crisis; but he has courage, wisdom, and strength, and we may be sure that he will not hesitate to act when once he is convinced of the necessity for action. It is possible, of course, that the Central Consultative Committee may recommend that the questions be referred to the Lambeth Conference. We should deeply regret that course, as we do not see, as at present advised, what would be gained from a further postponement. The problems are already ripe for settlement. It is high time that the voice of authority made itself heard.

Ever since the issue of the Bishop of Zanzibar's "The Quarterly" and "Open Letter" the printing press has been kept busy rolling off pamphlets and articles designed to throw light upon the issues raised thereby, and more particularly upon the two contending views of episcopacy. It is generally admitted that in what has been called "the battle of the pamphlets" the victory has clearly and easily been with those who take the larger, broader, and less restricted view. They have shown that their case is overwhelmingly strong, and that the greatest authorities in the Church of England, both ancient and modern, are on their side. The latest contribution to the discussion is a very important article by Professor Emery Barnes of Cambridge, which appears in the current issue of the *Quarterly*.

Review. He takes three of the Bishop of Zanzibar's criticisms upon the proposed scheme, and answers them effectively. The proposals, said the Bishop, offer no safeguard for the retention of the Athanasian Creed. No, says the Professor, for the Lambeth Conference has never included that Creed among the articles described as supplying a basis for reunion; and if the Bishop wishes to go behind the decision of the Episcopate of 1888, "he risks bringing about disunion within the Church of England itself." Nor is this all. The Professor refers to the case of the Church in the United States, the Church of Japan, and the Church of Ireland; and adds that "if any fact is plain, it is plain that the retention of the *Quicumque vult* cannot be made a condition of intercommunion among the Churches which claim kinship with Canterbury. But, says Bishop Weston, the proposals do not safeguard episcopacy. To this the Professor answers that the question was not raised. "The subject proposed at Kikuyu was, How can a Church, acknowledged to be Episcopal, co-operate on right lines with Churches or Christian bodies acknowledged to be non-Episcopal?" But the Bishop's criticisms were intended to cut deeper: "The proposals contemplate the recognition by an Episcopal Church of the ministrations of non-Episcopal Christians." Upon this the Professor admits that the principle definitely accepted by authority in 1661 was that none may minister *in the Church of England* without Episcopal Consecration or Ordination; but he very aptly asks: "Is the principle, so clearly formulated in 1661, to be the last word to be said in the British East Africa of the twentieth century and the mission-field generally? Is no rider to be attached, when the principle is applied along the Uganda Railway and when Episcopal Englishmen meet Presbyterian Scotsmen outside Great Britain?" The Ordinal, he points out, deliberately abstains both from condemning other systems and from denying the efficacy of the ministrations of non-Episcopal Churches. "Does the Bishop of Zanzibar," he asks with fine irony, "regard the Ordinal as therefore, by defect, heretical?"

Is a Priest
Necessary?

The Bishop of Zanzibar's third objection to the scheme was that it "does not provide a priest for the Celebration of the Holy Communion." To this objection Professor Emery Barnes makes decisive answer :

"Those who wish to prove to demonstration that the presence of a priest has been held necessary by the Church from the earliest times to secure a valid Eucharist, set themselves an impossible task. Can they explain the implication of such a passage as Matt. xviii. 20 without most serious mis-giving? Can they turn back the evidence of Didache X with its direction that 'prophets' (who may or may not be 'priests') are to be allowed to offer the Eucharist in any terms they please? Can they feel quite sure that Tertullian expresses only the Montanist view when he writes ('De Exhort. Cast,' 7), 'Ubi tres, ecclesia est, licet laici'? Can they be certain that the statements asserting the priesthood of the laity which occur down to the fourth and fifth centuries were merely otiose? Did laymen never act upon them? and, if they did so act, did they indeed draw upon themselves any ecclesiastical censure for the action? Doubts on these points are too deeply founded to be set aside. The doctrine that the action of a priest is necessary to secure a valid celebration of the Eucharist is not, in the full sense of the word 'Catholic.'"

Nor can we omit the Professor's closing paragraph. It states so clearly the seriousness of the issues at stake :

"A crisis big with the future of East and Central Africa has overtaken religion in these opening years of the twentieth century. If at such a time an unproved theory of orders, or of the efficacy of the Sacraments, is allowed to prevent Christian federation and so to check the progress of Christian Missions, East Africa in its present state of semi-awakening may fall back either into a revived heathenism (with Voodoo practices !) or into superficial Mohammedanism."

We ventured in our last issue to suggest a doubt "All Parishioners." about the soundness of the contention of "A. C." in his *Spectator* articles that "all parishioners" have a statutory right to present themselves to receive the Lord's Supper within the Church of England. The *Church Times*, on the other hand, admitted its accuracy, and frankly said that the law must not be obeyed; and certainly if "a Parsee or a Mussulman or a Mormonite" had this statutory right—as the *Church Times* seemed to argue—a clergyman would be bound to refuse to recognize it. But a writer in the *Times*, of as great legal eminence—if we identify him aright

—as “A. C.,” shows that the *Spectator* writer has “left out of account one or two facts which vitally affect his conclusions.” “A. C.” only recognized the exceptions indicated in the initial rubrics of the Communion Service; but, says the *Times* writer, that is plainly a mistake. “It would be more correct to say that these are the only grounds on which a clergyman may repel summarily, on his own authority, without waiting for any formal decision. The reason for certain offences being thus singled out is that they must, from their nature, be notorious, and that to admit the offenders notwithstanding might create grave scandal. Prompt action is therefore directed as the only alternative.” There are five classes whom “it is indisputable” a clergyman cannot lawfully receive to Communion. These are: (1) Excommunicated persons; (2) non-Christians; (3) children too young or ignorant for Confirmation; (4) persons “that refuse to be present at public prayers according to the orders of the Church of England” (Canon 27) (“A. C., although he has quoted other parts of the 27th Canon, has overlooked these words”); (5) depravers of the Royal Supremacy. The *Times* writer makes good his contention that “the words ‘every parishioner’ in the rubric will not bear the weight of significance which ‘A. C.’ seeks to place on them”; and to make assurance doubly sure he mentions another reason which seems fatal to “A. C.’s” contention:

“He [A. C.] asks us to read words of the long past as if they had been written with reference to the circumstances of to-day. Even if we disregard all qualification of the words ‘every parishioner,’ they could not, at the date when the rubric was drawn up, have been intended to include Nonconformists, because Nonconformity was not then recognized. Everybody was by law compelled to be a member of the Church of England and to conform to its practice. There were, of course, many who disliked the Prayer-Book and revolted against its use; but the time of toleration was not yet, and by a long series of statutes (1 Elizabeth, cap. 2, sect. 14; 35 Elizabeth, cap. 1) all parishioners were required to attend church and ‘there to abide orderly and soberly during the time of the Common Prayer,’ etc. Every parishioner was, whether he liked it or not, a member of the Church of England, amenable to its discipline and bound to observe its ordinances, including attendance at Holy Communion, unless by his act or default he was disqualified.”

We felt sure that "A. C." had opened the door far too widely, and clergy will be relieved to know that there is nothing which prevents them repelling from Holy Communion Parsees, Mussulmen, and Mormons whose "statutory right" exists only in the imagination of the *Church Times*.

Confirmation
and
Communion. But, of course, the really practical question is whether the ordinary Christian Nonconformists of to-day have the "statutory right" to present themselves, and upon this point we wish that the *Times* writer had been more definite. But whilst he does not say specifically "Yes" or specifically "No," the tendency of his argument in the passage just quoted is distinctly adverse to such a suggestion; and in a second article he does, in fact, decide against that contention. Can they, then, be received at all? We are thankful to find that in this respect the *Times* writer supports "A.C." in holding that the rubric requiring Confirmation as a condition of Communion does not apply to "persons professing the Christian faith who have been baptized and grown up outside the Church of England," but is confined in its operation to those who have been baptized in the Church of England. "There is no trace of any canon or rubric which lays down the same rule for others. On the other hand, the claim for special treatment under special conditions seems far stronger in the case of members of other Christian bodies who in mature age are brought into friendly contact with the Church, and seek to share, perhaps temporarily, in its services, than in the case of those who have been brought up under its rule, but have not conformed to it." What, then, is the conclusion of the whole matter?

"It is perhaps not to be regretted that the law of the Church of England leaves the question, as it affects devout and catholic-minded Nonconformists, thus frankly open. For, to sum up, Nonconformists are not entitled to communicate simply as members of the public; they cannot be excluded merely because they are unconfirmed; and, thirdly, if they cannot honestly join in the worship or use the formularies of the Church of England they have no right to intrude themselves at its altars. But, subject to these general conclusions, each case is entitled to separate consideration, in which all special circumstances must be allowed due weight."

We have dealt with these questions at what we feel to be quite inordinate length, but the momentous importance of the issues at stake must be our excuse. We submit it is now abundantly clear that on at least the second question submitted to the Central Consultative Committee the Bishops of Mombasa and Uganda are entitled to a verdict.

Women and
Church
Councils.

We must confess that we do not share the alarm which has been rather freely expressed at the action of the Representative Church Council in giving Churchwomen some share in the work of Church Councils. It has decided that communicant Churchwomen over twenty-one years of age are to be given the franchise for Parochial Church Councils, and are also to be allowed to sit on these bodies. We are not greatly shocked at this innovation, for, seeing that women who possess the necessary qualification are eligible as churchwardens—the only lay office in the Church recognized by the law—they cannot do much harm as members of Parochial Church Councils. Probably—we think certainly—they will do a great deal of good. If once they can be got to take the thing seriously, they will put work into it, and show interest and enthusiasm, which in too many cases men will not do. An effort was made to restrict the women membership of these Councils to one-third, or not more than one-half, of the total number, but the proposal failed. It is possible, therefore, for a Parochial Church Council to consist, in its elected element, wholly of women. This, we agree, would be unfortunate, but the men cannot complain; they have had their chance and have often spurned it. The election of women to Parochial Church Councils gives them the franchise for the lay members of the Ruridecanal Conference, but we gather that they are not themselves eligible for membership of that body, which seems to us a pity. The Ruridecanal Conference elects to the Diocesan Conference and the Diocesan Conference to the House of Laymen, membership of which carries with it a seat in the Representative Church Council.