

# 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](https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_churchman_os.php)

# THE CHURCHMAN

April, 1921

## NOTES AND COMMENTS.

WE crave permission to say a word of very hearty  
"The Churchman." thanks for the most kind reception accorded to THE  
CHURCHMAN in its new style. The January issue was  
sold out before the end of the month, and the large number of  
letters expressing warm appreciation of its contents and good  
wishes for the prosperity of the enterprise was most encouraging  
and will prove a stimulus to future endeavour. The circulation of  
the present issue promises to be still more extensive, and we are  
sincerely grateful to the many friends who have rallied to our  
support. We venture to repeat the twofold suggestion we made  
last quarter, viz. : (1) that present subscribers should recommend  
the magazine to others, and so endeavour to secure a still larger  
circle of readers ; and (2) that, wherever possible, friends should  
subscribe for a copy to be sent to one of the younger clergy at  
home or to a missionary in the foreign field, and so help to strengthen  
the cause for which THE CHURCHMAN stands.

The Archbishop of York has begun his round of  
A Missionary Conferences with the Free Churches on the Lambeth  
of Reunion. proposals for Reunion, but it cannot be said that the  
opening Conference at Manchester, on Wednesday, March 9, afforded  
much ground for hope that the practical conclusions of the Lambeth  
Appeal will very readily be accepted by Nonconformists. Nothing  
was wanting in the courtesousness of the reception accorded to the  
Archbishop, or in the fullness of the expression of the desire for  
spiritual fellowship, but when it came to the vital point of Non-  
conformist Ministers accepting a commission through episcopal  
ordination as obtaining for them a ministry throughout the whole  
fellowship, the answer was an emphatic negative. The occasion was  
the annual assembly of the Free Church Council, and the Archbishop  
put his case before the members with clearness, precision and force.

He explained that the Appeal came from the whole Anglican episcopate, that it dealt with a world situation, that its aim was not to close doors but to open them, and that it was not a statement of the final terms of union with the Anglican Church. It was simply a plea for fellowship, so that they might become fellow travellers along the road towards a fuller life within a great united Catholic Church. Its ideal was unity through diversity and not through uniformity, and within this unity Christian communions, now separated, would retain much that had been distinctive in their methods of worship and service. Could they not, the Archbishop asked, help one another to reach a new starting-point at which old controversies could be left behind, and from which they could advance to a new communion with one another? In reference to the form of commission proposed, he urged, even as the Appeal urged, that no repudiation of past ministries would be involved in either case, but that which was proposed was rather "a new ordination power, with a new motive, to meet a new situation—the acceptance of a new call to wider service in a reunited Church."

**The Noncon-** The answer to the Archbishop's speech was delivered  
**formist "No."** by the Rev. Principal E. Griffith-Jones, of Bradford—not, perhaps, the happiest selection—and he was evidently determined that no one should misunderstand his position. He affirmed that the Lambeth definition of membership in the united Catholic Church was seriously faulty, since it imposed a ceremonial test alongside a spiritual one. He claimed that all the Evangelical Free Churches held the same essential Gospel as the Churches with which it was now suggested they should reunite, and said it was a disappointment that the Bishops, having gone so far, should not have gone farther. It was here that Dr. Griffith-Jones interpolated an alternative plan—

"Having gone so far, why had further ecclesiastical tests been imposed, such as reordination and the acceptance of a particular system of Church government? Why not explore the possibilities of a reunion on the basis of frank mutual recognition, with a Council of representatives for common policies, and practical co-operation in the functions of the Universal Church for the nations of the world? Here was a path worth investigating."

He was very emphatic in his rejection of the cardinal point of the Appeal—

“ They could not consent to any form of reunion which included a demand for reordination of their ministry. Acceptance of reordination would eliminate in the course of one generation every form of Church government but the Episcopalian. If it were a mere question of order and not orders they might be willing to submit to any formal rite of recognition as the price of reunion. But to be reordained was to receive a gift of grace, not conferred by their own ordinations, not merely spiritual in character, but sacerdotal. They did not believe in the existence of any such sacerdotal gift, and it would be an act of insincerity to submit to any such rite for the sake of reunion.”

Dr. Griffith-Jones noted, too, that the Anglicans were desirous of making overtures for reunion with the Roman and Greek communions, and he added that “ it was chiefly that attitude which gave them pause.” Taking, therefore, the Manchester reply as a whole the outlook is not promising for any immediate action towards unity ; but we decline to believe the difficulties to be insurmountable. One thing is certain, we can never go back to the old position. The Lambeth Appeal has given the Churches a new spirit, and we believe its effect will be seen in the formal and considered reply which leaders, representative of the whole of Nonconformity, will, it is reported, publish almost immediately.

“The We are thankful that the dull but destructive *Beginnings of Christianity*,” volume which professes to carry to a completion the constructive work of Lightfoot has received adequate criticism from Professor Headlam. No one acquainted with the work of the great Cambridge scholar can fail to feel indignant that his name should be associated with a method of approach and a style of criticism that are both foreign to his most cherished ideals. While the theories that Lightfoot combated, and a great many more as pretentious as these, lie buried in the cemeteries of Text Books that alone remind us of their existence, his refutation is still consulted by those who know the difference between pinchbeck and gold. Dr. Headlam proves by abundant instances that Drs. Foakes Jackson and Kirsopp Lake have adopted an unscientific criticism. They reject what does not please them and misinterpret what appears to fit in with their ideals. Their passion for modernity shows itself everywhere. Their particular type consists in the determination to prove that the man who spoke before them had not said the last word, and it is their duty to add to it. Truth is

not always with those who believe they are most in accord with truth, when they are uprooting well-grounded beliefs. As a rule they set up new idols that will be overthrown to-morrow. The greatest objection, however, to the work of the two Professors lies in the fact "that it evacuates the Personality of our Lord of all its force and power. When we read the account given of His person and His teaching in this work it does not seem to us conceivable that anything so meagre should have been the creative cause of Christianity. Let us put on one side the divine claims of Christ; we must still remember that there were His human claims, and it is inconceivable that anything so commonplace and unoriginal as the Christ that is left to us by this type of criticism should have been the cause of a great movement such as Christianity. Christianity could not have come into being without Christ, and the Christ of these volumes could not have caused anything." We strongly recommend our readers to study in detail the great article in the January *Church Quarterly Review*. To us the condemnation of the book so fairly dissected may be gained from the fact that its Jewish contributor speaks more warmly and sympathetically of our Lord than the two theologians who have migrated from the Cam and Isis to the "freer atmosphere" of the United States. Even there licence is sometimes considered synonymous with freedom.

Some years ago in a famous *Edinburgh Review* article Sir George Adam Smith uttered a warning against the acceptance of extreme views of Old Testament criticism. The pendulum had swung too far and credulity had passed from the traditionalists to the critics. The tyranny of great names and specious theories still has to be fought. "Assured Results" have to be re-investigated, and it is only in the study that they can be revised and set forward in a way that will commend the assent of candid minds. Already men who have studied from the beginning the theories that are now accepted by so many Hebraists declare "we have reached conclusions that will please no one. They will be rejected by the old-fashioned and will be considered old-fashioned by the critics." All this is to the good, and we commend to our readers *The True Value of the Old Testament*, a lecture by the Rev. A. H. Finn (The Bible League, Sixpence), and an extremely important article by Professor Konig of Bonn

which appears in the *Expositor* for February. He reviews very carefully the arguments brought forward to establish the non-existence of Abraham and the patriarchs and the polytheistic character of the early worship of Israel. On the first point he concludes, "We are entitled to give an affirmative answer to the question. The common testimony of the earliest sources, according to which the patriarchs *existed in reality and as distinct personages*, cannot be challenged except by unfounded and unmethodical arguments." He gives the grounds for his conviction that the modern view of the polytheistic character of the patriarchal religion rests on no evidence whatever, while much evidence can be brought against it. His analysis of the reasons why modern theories are so widely held shows that uncritical stress is laid upon these passages which appear to support the theories, while other passages are overlooked. Men are so obsessed by the glamour of prehistoric times that they take a flight into empty space. The doctrine of evolution in its universal application leads them to consider what is mentioned in the sources as an aberration, has equal authority with the prophetic faith. We have by no means reached finality in Old Testament studies, and a return to sanity is greatly to be desired. The discovery of different sources for a narrative is not the same thing as the proof that the story is unhistorical, and dates have been attributed to sources that have only a background of imagination. Even the advanced men are sometimes conscious of this.

Lord Buckmaster's Bill for extending the grounds of

The Divorce  
Question.     divorce seems to be in abeyance for the time, owing to the congestion of business in the House of Commons, but advantage will certainly be taken of Lord Gorrell's Bill now before the House of Lords to insert amendments which would have the effect of providing for such extension. In that case we assume that those Bishops who now support the measure would at once become its most resolute opponents. Indeed, the Archbishop of York stated that their support was limited to the Bill as it stands. Not a few thoughtful Churchmen, however, feel that the Bishops have already gone too far in the expression of their sympathy with Lord Gorrell, for, although his Bill purports mainly to give effect to those proposals for reform on which both the Majority and the Minority Reports of the Royal Commission were agreed, it un-

doubtedly does contain some very objectionable provisions. The all but unanimous vote in the National Assembly declaring that "it is not desirable to increase the grounds on which a divorce may be granted" represents, we are persuaded, the opinion of the overwhelming body of Churchmen, and from this position there can be no drawing back. The Church is bound by her Lord's teaching on the question, and those who have read Archdeacon Charles's new volume, *The Teaching of the New Testament on Divorce* (Williams & Norgate, 6s. net), will see that this is quite clear and unequivocal. In our Lord's day a controversy was raging over Deuteronomy xxiv. 1-2, between the school of Shammai, which held that the phrase "some unseemly thing" meant actual unchastity, and the Hillelites who interpreted the passage as giving the husband the right to divorce his wife on any ground whatever. When, therefore, Christ was asked, "Is it lawful for a man to put away his wife for every cause?" (St. Matthew xix. 3), it was really a test question, and the controversy, being based on the passage in Deuteronomy, had no reference to adultery, but to wider issues, for the law, which required the death of the adulterous woman, was still valid, and was recognized as such by our Lord. It is important to bear this fact in mind, when considering the apparent contradictions between St. Matthew and St. Mark. "The sin of actual adultery," says the Archdeacon, "is not so much as thought of in Mark. In Mark our Lord deals with divorce on grounds less serious than that of adultery," and when we recognize that fact the contradictions between the two versions cease to exist. "What is implicit in Mark is made explicit in Matthew. Both Gospels, therefore, teach that marriage is indissoluble for all offences short of adultery." The law as to the death penalty was abrogated later, and our Lord's words came to be regarded as forbidding divorce under all circumstances. "Now," says the Archdeacon, "it was just to correct such a grave misconception, or the possibility of such a misconception of our Lord's words, whether in Mark or other early documents, that Matthew (v. 32, xix. 9) edited the narrative afresh and inserted the clause, 'saving for the cause of unchastity. . . .' By the insertion of these clauses Matthew preserves the meaning of our Lord's statements on the subject for all subsequent generations that had lost touch with the circumstances and limitations under which they were originally made.

Matthew's additions are, therefore, justifiable. Without them the reader is apt to misunderstand the passage on divorce. Our Lord's teaching is, therefore, conveyed in the words, 'Every one that putteth away his wife, saving for the cause of unchastity, maketh her an adulteress, and whosoever marrieth her when she is put away committeth adultery.''' Adultery, therefore, is the one and only ground for divorce; and to extend it by a hairbreadth is to go beyond the words of Christ.

The debt we owe to some men is never fully recognized until they are dead. J. T. Tomlinson—an able surgeon—turned his great faculty for investigation from living man to his past history. He carried with him into his study the care and insight that marked his work on the human body. He loved truth, and because he saw the Church of England assailed from within by attacks that endeavoured to change its reformed character, he gave himself to the study of the sixteenth and seventeenth century, which he analysed with microscopic thoroughness. Men who opposed him had to acknowledge his ability and the range of his knowledge. Men who worked with him learned to know him as genuinely human, disinterested and anxious to give the most unselfish help to all who looked to him for it. He had none of that refined self-importance that attaches itself to many original investigators. He never imagined that because Tomlinson said something it had more weight than if it was said and well documented by an obscure worker. Many who sought his counsel gained a reputation through the materials he placed at their disposal. He never gave a thought as to its acknowledgment. All he had at heart was the unmasking of error or the establishment of truth. To him and Mr. Dimock more than to any other two men we owe the changed attitude of the Anglo-Catholics who now openly assert they cannot justify their position by appeals to our formularies, and demand their change to enable them to appear honest sons of the Church of England. When he died he saw the altered character of the great debate, and it lies with his successors to resist for the sake of Gospel Truth and the maintenance of primitive Scriptural Christianity the daring attempts to revolutionize the Church of England. The battle he fought has been won. A greater struggle lies before the men of the present generation.



The influence of the West for good or evil on Africa and the East is clearly brought out in the April number of the *International Review of Missions*. This influence often makes itself felt in strange and unexpected ways. Thus Dr. Wainwright, in an article on "Western Influence and Missionary Opportunity in the Orient," speaks of the remarkable change that has taken place in the Japanese language, which, in the shortening of its sentences, the modification of its syntax, and the incorporation of new idioms and metaphors, has been gradually approaching to the English language. In China, as Dr. Harlan P. Beach, another American writer, points out, the classical language is yearly diminishing in importance, and the Chinese canonical writings, for a millennium the foundation of China's religious life, are falling into the background. The permeation of Western thought, it is pointed out, can hardly be termed an "invasion," since the English language has been extended in large measure as the result of the demand of Japan and China for it. In an article on "Some Aspects of the Philippine Educational System," the influence of the West is shown in the realm of industrial education, rather than in that of language and letters. Two articles on Africa show the influence of the West being mediated through Colonial administration. In a paper on "Christian Missions and African Labour," Mr. J. H. Oldham outlines the main factors in the economic problems of British East Africa, and traces the history of the successive ordinances and memoranda that have turned round the subject of freed labour. In November of last year a deputation presented an appeal to the Government, pleading that the principle of trusteeship be not allowed to become a mere, empty phrase, but a vital fact translated into administrative and economic life, and urging that a Royal Commission be appointed to inquire into the guiding principles of imperial policy in the British East Africa Crown Colonies and Protectorates. An interesting commentary on this is given in an article by a Belgian, Dr. Henri Anet, who shows a permanent royal commission at work in the Belgian Congo, "charged to watch . . . over the protection of the natives and the betterment of their moral and material conditions."