

# 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)

19). The initiative in loving and self-giving is with God, and as a result our answering love is called out. Here in the Holy Communion is the gift of God and the response of man, in that order. Once the gift and the response are identified and merged into one, the grace of God is in danger of becoming merely an addition to graceful living and acceptable worship and not, as it most surely is, something wholly other than ourselves, redemptive, and of which we stand in need. Our natural eagerness to do something for God and to offer ourselves obscures the fact that before ever we can do or offer anything for Him we must in the true humility of self-revelation in the light of the Cross, receive everything from Him.

---

## Correspondence

### THE CHURCH OF SOUTH INDIA

To the Editor of *The Churchman*.

Sir,

Your readers are all indebted to the Rev. F. J. Taylor for his lucid exposition of some of the theological factors that must enter into our thinking about the C.S.I. I hope you will allow me to add one or two simple and practical considerations.

The Ministry of C.S.I., particularly during the "interim period" of thirty years, presents certain really grave anomalies: and so (to some people) does the fact that that Church remains necessarily in communion with her non-episcopal parent Churches. These are the two chief difficulties in the minds of many Anglicans. But against them we ought to set two facts: the first, that the Ordinations and Consecrations as at present administered in C.S.I. are undoubtedly sufficient in form, matter, and intention, and therefore should be recognized as such: the second, that in the words of Archbishop Temple, "the fundamental anomaly is that any two disciples of Our Lord should not be in communion with one another"—a consideration which ought to overrule all lesser anomalies.

I would add further that the theologians who were appointed to enquire into the orthodoxy of the Church have expressed themselves as wholly satisfied. On grounds therefore of Faith and Order it is our duty to press for the "recognition" of the Holy Orders conferred in C.S.I., and to work steadily towards that full intercommunion which would remove the "fundamental anomaly". This is a call based not on sentimentalism but on orthodoxy, and on loyalty both to Our Lord and to His Church.

Yours faithfully,

St. Leonards-on-Sea.

DOUGLAS F. HORSEFIELD.

To the Editor of *The Churchman*.

Sir,

May I, as one who recently had opportunities of personal contact with the Church in South India, add a few comments to Mr. Taylor's valuable article in your issue of September last?

Mr. Taylor rightly stresses the determination of the Church of South India not to break off the full communion which it now enjoys with its

non-episcopal "parent-churches". It strongly resents the requirement laid down by "Lambeth, 1948", that if its bishops and presbyters (even when ex-Anglicans) wish for permission to celebrate Holy Communion in our churches in England, they must first undertake *not* to do so in any non-episcopal church here. The C.S.I. bishops have refused to give any such undertaking; and so they are at present unable in practice (even when "born, bred, and ordained" as Anglicans) to "celebrate" in their own Mother Church at home.

There is certainly a trend in the Church of South India towards liturgical worship, and increasing outward ritual, and a widespread appreciation of the pastoral value of bishops, especially in the simple village congregations. But this should not lead us to suppose that the C.S.I. is prepared to accept meekly the 'admonitions' of the Church of England. On the contrary, it is confident that South India has "blazed a trail" in response to the call of God, and that it is up to the older Churches to follow, if they dare. At present, the C.S.I. feels that it has a more unrestricted fellowship with the non-episcopal Churches than with us; for while *they* have given the C.S.I. the right hand of fellowship unreservedly, *we* are still hesitating, and trying to impose further conditions. If we continue to hesitate, we shall be in danger (as the Bishop of Derby has warned us) of finding ourselves isolated in Christendom, between on the one hand the intransigence of Rome and Orthodoxy, and on the other hand our own refusal to recognize the Churches of the Evangelical tradition.

There is one point in Mr. Taylor's excellent article which I think is liable to misunderstanding. He writes:

"The formularies of the C. of E. together with its unbroken practice do not allow of any doubt about its view of episcopacy as a necessity to the Church".

Now it is of course quite true that the C. of E. normally requires all its ministers to be episcopally ordained. But (as Bishop Hunkin, Professor Norman Sykes, and the recent Westcott House volume, *The Historic Episcopate* have clearly shewn) it has not been "the *unbroken* practice of our Church" since the Reformation to insist upon this in all cases. Moreover, even High Churchmen (such as the late Bishop Gore and the present Bishop of Derby) have admitted that the necessity of episcopacy cannot be proved by 'any sure warrants of Holy Scripture'; and therefore, according to our Article VI, it is not "to be required of any man as an article of the faith". If it were really the case that (as Mr. Taylor writes): "The C. of E. cannot properly make any agreement with another Christian communion which infringes in any way on its own insistence on episcopacy", then indeed full communion with the C.S.I. would be illegitimate. But I doubt if the majority of Evangelical churchmen would endorse so strict a view of episcopacy.

Great Shelford, Cambridge.

E. C. DEWICK.

#### INTERCOMMUNION

To the Editor of *The Churchman*.

Sir,

As a step to reunion why not some definite movement towards intercommunion?

Lambeth 1948 subscribed to the agreement (Bonn 1931) between the Anglican Communion and the Old Catholic Churches on the basis that—  
 “Intercommunion does not require from either Communion the acceptance of all doctrinal opinion, sacramental devotion or liturgical practice characteristic of the other, but implies that each believes the other to hold all essentials of the Christian faith”.

Why should not this agreement be adopted in relation with the Free Churches? A majority of the Bishops at Lambeth appears to have recognized that their ministries are true ministries and their sacraments true sacraments.

The rubric at the end of the Confirmation service constitutes no barrier. That it is purely domestic in its intention was clearly held by Bishop Cosin in his advocacy of the acceptance of members of the continental Reformed Churches. At least five Archbishops and many Bishops in modern times have held the same view.

The rubric, indeed, could not have been directed against members of the Free Churches since they did not, as such, exist when it was originally framed.

North Cheriton, Somerset.

Yours truly,

WILLIAM N. CARTER.

#### MASONRY AND ASTROLOGY

The Editor of *The Churchman*

Sir,

In reading the Rev. J. Stafford Wright's interesting and informative article dealing with deviationists (“Fragmentary Truths”) I received a couple of shocks. First, when he suggests that Masonry should be included among the deviations, such as Jehovah's Witnesses, Christadelphians, etc., and describes Rev. Walton Hannah's last tirade on the subject as ‘devastating’. Mr. Hannah denies that Masonry can be harmonised with loyalty to Christ and Mr. Stafford Wright tells us that “it is useless to shut our eyes to his criticisms”. The members of the Masonic brotherhood can afford to be amused at such outrageous statements, just as they are at Mr. Hannah's announcement that he was offered £1,000 to stop the publication of his first book.

Secondly, Mr. Stafford Wright seems convinced of the importance of Astrology. According to him it has a residue of hard fact, and “it is little use producing proofs that those things cannot be so”. Anything more contrary to the Christian religion than this childish superstition that human beings are subject to the influences of the stars can hardly be imagined. Had it even a residue of fact Christ is no longer far above “all power and dominion”. The members of His body are not free to master their destinies through His Holy Spirit. Is the New Testament to be supplemented by Zadkiel's Almanac? Is Nostradamus to rank as a Father of the Church?

Yours,

EPISCOPUS.

*The Rev. J. Stafford Wright writes :*

I do not think that I can say anything more about Masonry. The evidence, as supplied by the Rev. Walton Hannah and Canon Box, is now available, and Christians must make up their minds in the light of this. If I had had more space I should have made myself clearer about Astrology. I was certainly not commending it for Christians,

but I believe that all branches of Occultism, including Astrology, have a reality behind them, and cannot be dismissed by armchair statements that these things cannot be so. Episcopus mentions Nostradamus, and if he was an Astrologer, there is certainly something in Astrology; since in the middle of the sixteenth century he named people who were prominent in the French Revolution of 1789. I checked this myself in the British Museum in a copy of *The Centuries*, dated on the title page 1605. The facts about Nostradamus are available in James Laver's Biography of him in the Penguin Series.

---

## Book Reviews

### THE HOUSEHOLD OF GOD.

*By Leslie Newbigin. S.C.M. 21/6.*

“The doctrine of the Church,” writes Bishop Newbigin, “has come in recent years to occupy a central place in theological discussion”. Three main reasons are advanced for this statement. The first is the simple fact of the breakdown of Christendom. It is no longer a question of the Church considering its position over against other churches: the Christian faith cannot to-day claim to be the commonly accepted touchstone of life and action. The Church stands faced by a pagan world, the background of which tends to become more and more secular. The second fact is the missionary one—“The Experience of the Christian Mission”. The expansion of the Church in the nineteenth century brought the Christian Gospel to every quarter of the world. The existence of native indigenous Churches makes vital the whole question of Christian unity. In the missionary setting the divisions of the Church are seen to be intolerable. We cannot preach and proclaim Christ's reconciling work with power and conviction, if we ourselves remain unreconciled, divided and apart and content to be such. The challenge of the missionary situation raises the whole question of the nature of the Church. The third factor is the rise and development of the oecumenical movement. This year has seen the second great assembly of the World Council of Churches at Evanston in the U.S.A. It was the missionary work of the Church, and the fact that divisions which had no historical justification there were being brought to the mission field, which was the impetus of the movement which resulted in the formation of the World Council. The bringing of the Churches together, and the fresh discovery of the reality of their fellowship in Christ, led to a new examination of the doctrinal divisions which prevent reunion. The result at first is a sharpening of differences as each Church lays hold afresh on the great historic traditions of their faith. This is an inevitable stage which should lead on to a real union. The Church of South India is such an experiment in re-union for there the various Churches have come together under the guidance of the Holy Spirit to create something new. Bishop Newbigin is emphatic that to be content to work for a mere federation of Churches is wrong. It is theologically wrong: “. . . to speak of a plurality