

THE CHURCHMAN

January, 1918.

The Month.

The New
Bishop.

THE Dean of Durham has been nominated to the the Bishopric of Hereford. It is in many ways a striking and a picturesque appointment, and he will undoubtedly bring a large measure of intellectual vigour to the episcopal bench. But Dr. Henson does not belong to the type of men who are usually made bishops. Prime Ministers have been supposed to have a preference for "safe" men, and the Dean can hardly be said to be included in that category. His career has shown him to be bold, courageous, daring, and there has always been a sort of uneasy feeling "What will he say or do next?" But he has shed many of his earlier "views," and without a doubt has, during the last few years, greatly strengthened his hold on the popular mind. He has vindicated the right of episcopally ordained clergy to preach in Nonconformist chapels, and as recently as last March occupied the pulpit at the City Temple, Holborn Viaduct. It was expected that the Bishop of London would interfere—even as Dr. Henson's old friend Bishop Gore interfered a few years previously—to prevent him from doing any such thing, but the Bishop of London is too wise a man to court a failure, and any inhibition would most certainly have been defied, even as was Bishop Gore's attempt to stop him preaching at Carr's Lane, Birmingham. It is an open secret, however, that correspondence passed between the Bishop and the Dean relating to the whole question. It was "private and confidential" and has never seen the light, which is a pity as it is understood that the Dean's letter contains an unimpeachable exposition of the principles governing his action.

It is not easy to place the new Bishop in any ecclesiastical category. He would refuse, we expect, to be classed as an Evangelical, although Evangelicals were very glad of his help in the Kikuyu controversy, and some of them are leaning heavily on his great powers of argument to defeat the Report of the Archbishops' Committee on Church and State. Nor would he now be satisfied to be placed as a High Churchman, whatever the tendency of his earliest views may have been. Moreover, he does not seem to be interested overmuch in matters of ritual controversy. Whether he would agree to be called a Broad Churchman, we do not know, but of these three schools he has certainly seemed to be nearest to the "Broad" party; although, here again, it must be stated that what were at one time regarded as "Modernist" views are believed to have been largely laid aside, and that on all fundamentals of the faith he is nearer now to the old orthodox position than he has ever been. If, then, he is neither an Evangelical Churchman, nor a High Churchman, nor a Broad Churchman, in the commonly accepted sense of those terms, what is he? Is he (to quote a phrase much loved by Archbishop Benson) a "Deep Churchman"? Frankly, we cannot say, because we have never quite understood the meaning of the term, but of Dean Henson's loyalty to and love for the Church of England we have no doubt. Perhaps the title "Independent Churchman" would fit him best, for the character of the "free lance" seems to be most congenial to him.

The Appointment Justified. For ourselves we are sincerely glad that Dr. Hensley Henson has been designated for a bishopric. Not that we agree unreservedly with his opinions—far from it; but because we feel that a man of his individuality and of his type should certainly be upon the episcopal bench to represent a class of opinion and a line of policy which needs to be given a voice in the government and administration of the Church. When he was appointed to the very pleasant and highly lucrative Deanery of Durham there was a feeling in some quarters that this would involve his being "shelved" so far as the infinitely more important work of the episcopate is concerned, but happily the fear has been falsified. There are great and anxious questions before the Church which will need for their settlement the help of the acutest minds

in the Church of England. It is fortunate, too, that his appointment has come in good time for the next Lambeth Conference, when the forces of reaction and the forces of progress enter upon what may be a decisive struggle. How nearly there was a hitch over the appointment to the Bishopric of Hereford will probably never be known, but the very long delay in making the announcement suggests that things did not go with their usual smoothness. As soon as Dr. Percival's resignation was announced it was freely stated in influential quarters that the Dean of Durham was to be his successor, and for weeks an announcement was expected. It is not to be supposed that the forces opposed to him were idle, and it is even stated that two Diocesan Bishops were asked in succession to fill the vacancy. They both refused, and the official offer was made to the Dean, it is believed, only a few days previously to the announcement. If the see had been filled by translation, would Dr. Henson have been appointed to the vacancy thus created? That would depend upon the nature of the see. If the appointment could have been by Letters Patent—probably yes; if the Bishop-designate had needed election by the Dean and Chapter—possibly no. At Hereford, of course, where the members of the Cathedral body are believed to be in sympathy with the nomination there need be no uneasiness about the election, and we assume that the various incidents of the appointment will go through in the normal way. A conflict between the Crown on the one hand and a Dean and Chapter on the other would be very awkward in the present state of the Church of England.

Nevertheless, the wish to upset the appointment is clearly manifested in some quarters. The opposition

*The Voice of
Opposition.*

of the *Church Times* can be understood, however much it may be regretted, for it represents a great constituency; but why a gathering of clergy in the diocese of Oxford, held to elect a proctor for Convocation, should deem it a duty to protest, we are at a loss to understand. These clergy passed a resolution protesting against the appointment on the ground that Dr. Henson "has frequently talked and written in a way that shows that he held principles widely divergent from the teaching of the Church of England, and praying the Dean and Chapter of Hereford to refuse to accept the nomination." This resolution is to be sent to the Prime Minister,

who would be well advised to tell these interfering clerics to mind their own business. The *Church Times'* attack is severe and is calculated to do mischief, but it is impossible to believe that even if the opposition were ten times as serious it would be successful. The protest against Dr. Gore's appointment, when he was nominated in the late Lord Salisbury's time to the Bishopric of Birmingham, failed; and the present opposition will fail. Crown nominations to bishoprics are not easily upset.

Matters of Interest. Canon Barnes-Lawrence's new volume *A Churchman and his Church* deals, according to its sub-title, with "matters of interest at the present day." More

than this, the questions dealt with may well be described as matters of the deepest moment, and this "Manual for Churchmen" offers guidance and direction in regard to each one of them. And it comes at the right time. As the author says in his Preface, "the great struggle which convulses the world finds its counterpart in the conflict within the Church. In both arenas principles are at stake, so great, so far-reaching, that they forbid the antagonists to lay down their arms." But the conflict is not new: it has been going on and yearly gathering in strength ever since the rise of the Tractarians, who sought to foist upon the Church of England a new conception of what the Church is in itself and in its relation to other parts of Christendom. In more recent years a school has arisen which has left Tractarian teaching far behind and is now openly attempting to assimilate the doctrine and preaching of the Church of England to the doctrine and practice of the Church of Rome. And many souls have been entrapped, largely for want of adequate knowledge of what the Church of England is and what it teaches. A wide acquaintance with Canon Barnes-Lawrence's book will do much to strengthen and establish the faith and position of Churchmen in their own Church—their Church as it is, Catholic, Apostolic, Reformed, Protestant, and not, as some would have it, a Church of pre-Reformation principles and practices, a Church Roman in everything but name. He deals in successive chapters or addresses with "The Church and the Bible," "The Church," "The Christian Ministry," "Holy Baptism," "Holy Communion," "The Prayer-Book," and "The Relative Importance of the Means of Grace"—questions which go to the very root of

most of our present-day controversies. As indicating the style and scope of the volume, we quote the following passage from the chapter on "The Church":—

It is probable that more misery has come to Christian men through the spell of a false conception of the Church than from any other single cause. In actual experience it has probably been the most potent of instruments for enslaving the souls of men. In the third century Cyprian said: "There is no salvation outside the Church," meaning the visible Episcopal communion. The Romanist to-day says exactly the same, meaning his own exclusive Church. The modern Anglican, with wider charity but equal confusion, says: "Outside the Anglican, Greek, and Roman communities, which together constitute The Church, there is no security of salvation." Bishop Gore, the honoured spokesman of his school, writes: "Membership in the true Church depends on membership in the visible [*i.e.* the Episcopal] Church on earth." I trust that no word of mine may depreciate the importance of unity, visible unity, or of episcopacy its safeguard, when I say that such statements are alike opposed to reason, to experience, to the Prayer Book, and to the New Testament. The question which tortures thousands of souls to-day, which is the wailing keynote of Newman's *Apologia*, "In what Church is salvation to be found?" is based on fundamental error.

Nor has that error enslaved men's bodies less than their souls, for it has led to effort, repeated again and again, to compel all Christ's flock into *one* fold. Such efforts have always disastrously failed, they always must. Look back over the pages of Church history which tell of such efforts, and you will find that they are more deeply blood-stained than any other. Think of Simon de Montfort and the Albigenses; of the Revocation of the Edict of Nantes and the Massacre of St. Bartholomew; of Philip II, Alva, and the Netherlands; of Mary and the Protestants; of Elizabeth and the Romanists; of Laud and the Puritans; of Charles II and the Scottish Covenanters. Look around you and think of the Stundists of Russia, of the Protestant congregations and their disabilities in Roman Catholic States. Sum up your observations and you will confess that the only visible results of such compulsion are the martyrdom of some, the hypocrisy of others, the sullen resistance of many, and the undying hatred of all.

The book is of compelling interest, and of its importance no one will doubt. We hope it will be widely circulated. It is calculated to help the Churchman to give a reason for the faith that is in him.

There are movements towards unity both in Church and Nonconformity. They may be slow, they may be slight, but that they exist there is no doubt at all.

What was the meaning of the "Findings" of the Cheltenham Conference if they did not represent a longing desire for closer fellowship among Christians? But proposals have now come from the Nonconformist side, bolder and more far-reaching than the most pronounced optimist on the Church side has ever dreamed of.

In a letter to *The Times* Dr. H. Arnold Thomas, the greatly respected Nonconformist of Bristol, wrote :—

Would it not be possible by means of a conference summoned by Parliament, and composed of representative men of all Churches, to ascertain whether all Christian people, or the great majority of them, could not be included in the English Church of the future? The Savoy Conference failed to maintain comprehension, but to-day religious men are of another temper, and it would surely be an unspeakable gain if a new conference could restore what the former one failed to preserve.

What is chiefly needed is to secure for individual congregations some measure of liberty in regard to the Form of Public Worship. There might be a recognized standard form, but if the liberty which is taken without leave to-day were frankly and generously conceded the difficulty in the way of many Nonconformists would be removed.

No doubt the question of re-ordination is a serious one. But I take the Prayer Book to mean that in ordination the Bishop recognizes a call to serve in the Church which has already been given by the Holy Spirit. Would it not be possible for the Bishops in council formally and solemnly to recognize those who believe themselves to be thus called, and are willing to accept office in such a reconstituted Church as is now being contemplated? It is well known that the mode of ordination has varied from time to time, and in different Churches. There is no reason, of course, why individual ordination should not be the custom of the future.

Strange indeed is it that such a wide-spirited letter should have attracted so little attention. At the time of writing it has not met with a single response from any leading representative of the Church, and from Nonconformity the only substantial recognition of the proposal has come from Dr. Dinsdale T. Young, who said the letter "will awaken a cordial response in many hearts and minds":—

"A New Savoy Conference" would be a golden gift of God at this period of history. Everywhere there is a deep longing for a vividly expressed unity among Christian communities. This war—the most righteous ever fought—has accentuated the ardour of truly catholic desire. Is it not possible to secure a great English Church? Many of us can be content with no inferior type of unity. Has not Christian love warmed to such a degree as to make possible an English Church? Mr. Arnold Thomas makes suggestions which command my whole-hearted consent. I believe that many will echo his words.

We are in full agreement with the main purpose of the proposal. Whether Parliament, in its present state, is the best body for convening such a Conference may be open to doubt, but it ought to be possible, assuming goodwill on both sides, for such a Conference to be called. Dr. Thomas's letter opens up a prospect of reunion more bright than anything yet suggested. The proposal about ordination is admirable, and seems to offer a solution of one of the most difficult questions which, up till now, has baffled everybody.

But we are tempted to doubt whether there is yet a sufficiently strong feeling on either side to justify the belief that there are strong aspirations after unity. But these will come in time ; and everything that can be done to prepare the way is to be encouraged.

An Unfortunate Pronouncement. Whatever chances the movement represented by "the British Council of the World Alliance for Promoting International Friendship through the Churches" had of success have been hopelessly destroyed, we should imagine, by the most unfortunate pronouncement made, at what we suppose was the opening conference, by the Dean of St. Paul's. Just at the time when we are being exhorted by the Prime Minister and others to stand firm and to endure to the end the Dean comes forward with a resolution stating that a just and lasting peace could be secured only by the application of Christian principles of reconciliation and the brotherhood of mankind to all relationships between nations. These are high-sounding phrases and are calculated to mislead people who do not think, but they bear not the remotest relation to the actual facts of to-day. We are all for the brotherhood of mankind, but how is it to be realized when one Power is determined—if possible—to acquire world-domination and to crush the people of other nations under its iron heel? It should be obvious to every one that there can be no lasting peace in the world until the brutal arrogance of that Power has been destroyed beyond all recovery. But the Dean of St. Paul's says that the programme of destroying German militarism "was always hopeless ; we now see it is absurd." It will require more than the word of Dean Inge to induce the English people to accept that dictum ; and it is amazing how the Dean, at this grave crisis in the nation's history, could bring himself to utter such words. They are not calculated to hearten the English people ; moreover, they were entirely uncalled for. Nor was he more fortunate in his comparison between the two systems of government :—

On the one side is the Prussian system—efficient, economical, and honest—which ends in putting the civilian under the heel of the soldier with his brutal blundering diplomacy and methods of frightfulness, until that nation now stands without justice, chivalry, generosity, sympathy, or mercy. Nevertheless, Germany is in many ways the best-governed country in the world, and if, after the exhibition we made of ourselves before the war, we suppose that the Germans regard our system with envy and admiration and would like to copy it, we are vastly mistaken.

On the other side there is a squalid anarchy of democracy—wasteful, inefficient, and generally corrupt—with a government which quails before every agitation and pays blackmail to every conspiracy, and in which sooner or later those who pay the taxes are systematically pillaged by those who impose them, until the economic structure of the State is destroyed.

The contrast suggests the question: Would the Dean rather live under the Prussian system with its tyranny, than under the English system with its freedom? We should like to hear his answer. But then his views are, to say the least, singular. He thinks, for example, that after the war “the whole world will be eager to forgive and forget if only they feel they can live in peace and security.” What we shall “feel” depends upon the result of the war. A peace which is not brought about by the Victory of the Allied Cause would offer anything but security. As to forgiving and forgetting, we do not see how that is possible or even desirable unless and until Germany shows contrition and offers reparation for the unspeakable crimes it has committed in this war. The brutal and diabolical murders committed with cold calculating devilry in the submarine campaign, and the attacks by Zeppelins and other aircraft against innocent civilians will never be forgotten or forgiven by this generation. War is one thing, and an honourable foe can readily be forgiven; murder is something very different.

The Archbishop of Canterbury, supported by other religious leaders of the country, has issued a Memorial protesting against the proposed alteration in the Marriage Laws. It may be doubted whether the public at large have any conception of the nature of the change suggested or of the results which would follow if it were to receive statutory sanction, and it is right that a calm and temperate statement of the facts, such as this Memorial contains, should be brought under public notice. Stated in brief terms, the proposal is that separation orders issued by a magistrate, on whatever grounds, may, after the lapse of three years of continuous separation, have the effect of decrees of divorce. Thus any man or woman could apply for a permanent divorce from his or her partner on the mere ground that the couple had been continuously separated for three years, whether by mutual agreement or for any other reason. “This,” says the Memorial, “would apparently mean that marriage might be during pleasure only.” The proposal is one of the most drastic character,

and we feel no hesitation in saying that when once the facts are fully appreciated, the moral sense of the country will rise in revolt against so pernicious a suggestion. It is difficult to see on what solid ground the proposal rests. That there are hard cases cannot be questioned, but hard cases proverbially make bad laws, and to change the fundamental characteristic of marriage would be to sap the foundations of the moral life of the nation. The proposals, it must be remembered, run clean counter to Divine law, which the nation is bound to respect and revere. The Memorial bases its opposition on the highest grounds. The signatories include, besides the Archbishops of Canterbury and York and some of the Bishops as representing the Church of England, Cardinal Bourne, several Free Church Ministers and a large number of distinguished laymen, such as the Duke of Northumberland, the Marquess of Salisbury, the Earl of Selborne, Lord Parmoor and General Sir William Robertson. They regard the proposals as "running counter to the consistent teaching of the Church of Christ from the beginning," and they assure those who are rightly indignant at such proposals that "the most strenuous opposition will be offered to any attempted legislation of that character." Every care will be taken to make the opposition representative and effective. A Marriage Defence Committee, with offices at 8, Dean's Yard, Westminster, S.W.1, has been formed, and we sincerely hope, as we firmly believe, that this body will receive such a large measure of sympathy and support from all sections of the community that this most mischievous proposal will be defeated.

The Forms of Prayer and Thanksgiving to be used
on January 6, the Day appointed for Intercession on
Behalf of the Nation and Empire in this Time of War,
issued under the authority of the Archbishops of Canterbury and
York, are now published by the S.P.C.K. (68, Haymarket, S.W.1).
The four Forms of Service are made up into an eight-page pamphlet,
which is published at 3s. 6d. net per 100. The first of the four
Forms relates to Holy Communion. When there is more than
one celebration a special Epistle (Rev. xix. 11) and Gospel (St.
Luke xxi. 25) may be used; and before the Prayer for the Church
Militant a special Bidding to Thanksgiving and Prayer in connexion
with the war is provided. The second Form merely provides for

Day of
Prayer.

special Psalms and Lessons. At Morning Prayer Psalms xlvi. and lxxii. and Lessons Isaiah lx. and St. Luke iii. 15-23 or 1 Tim. ii. 1-7; and at Evening Prayer Psalms lxxxiii. and xcvi. and Lessons Isaiah xlix. 13-24 and St. John ii. 1-12 or xvii. 15. The third and the fourth Forms are alternative. The third may be said after the Third Collect for Morning or Evening Prayer or in the Pulpit before "or in the place of" the Sermon, and is comparatively brief; the fourth is longer, and may be used after the Third Collect "or at such other time as the minister in his discretion shall judge convenient." Provision is made for the reading of the Royal Proclamation at all Services.

The Rev. William Temple, writing as Chairman
 "Life and Liberty." of the Life and Liberty Movement, has expressed disappointment at the result of the discussion in the Representative Church Council on the Church and State Report. But there is really no ground for complaint. Such important changes as the Report proposed cannot be carried through in a hurry, and it was the highest wisdom to refer the matter to a specially appointed Committee. That Committee is to report at the next meeting of the Council, and if they support the principles of the Report of the Archbishops' Committee, it will greatly strengthen the position and open the way for application to Parliament on those lines. All Churchmen, in common with Mr. Temple, would deprecate unreasonable delay, but there is no ground for supposing that the new Committee will lose time in getting to business.

