

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

What, then, is the conclusion of the whole matter? Will not a comparison between the life and work of town and country clergymen make it evident that each sphere has its own peculiar difficulties and drawbacks? *Per aspera tendo* must be our motto in both. *Ta παθήματα* everywhere may become *μαθήματα*. In the Christian ministry, as in other departments of human life, there is a wonderful compensation between good and evil, joys and sorrows, encouragements and trials. Happily, some men are naturally adapted to one line of service, some to another. It is very unfortunate when the square pegs are forced into the round holes, as is too often the case through the want of system in our Church patronage. Sudden changes from town to country, and *vice versa*, are not always productive of the best results. Occasional interchanges of duties between town and country Parsons may be most beneficial all round. In any case, God's work must be carried on everywhere alike, and if it be faithfully done with a single eye to His glory, Christ's presence and blessing are assured to all His servants.

W. BURNET.



THE MONTH.

THE Bishop of Chester's open letter to the Archbishop of Canterbury is one of the evident indications of the near approach of the Report of the Royal Commission on Church Discipline. We are also being favoured with forecasts of the document which may be safely disregarded; but the Bishop of Chester's letter is a clear summons from one in authority to face possible results of the Report, and to frame our policy accordingly. There can be little doubt that the question of Vestments will be the *cruz* of the situation, and it is to this point that the Bishop's letter directs our attention. He pleads for a *maximum* and a *minimum* of ritual, and urges that both uses should be made legal. At the same time he seeks to show that the doctrinal meaning of the vestments is of very secondary importance, and that those who insist on their symbolism are in reality occupying themselves with a very rudimentary and non-spiritual form of Christianity. The Bishop's letter will doubtless receive the attention it deserves from the writer's high position, but we confess we are inclined to agree, though on very different grounds, with the *Church Times* when it expresses its fear that Dr. Jayne's letter will not conduce to peace in the Church. For, on the one hand, nothing will ever permit Evangelical Churchmen

to agree to the policy of a *maximum* and *minimum* of ritual; the historical and doctrinal position of the Church of England is far too clearly defined and assured to allow of this. On the other hand, nothing that the Bishop of Chester or anyone else may say will ever make the Ritualists regard the doctrinal meaning of the vestments as merely secondary and unimportant. Have we not been told again and again by Lord Halifax and his followers that the vestments are used only for the sake of the doctrine they express and symbolize? It is because the chasuble has always been associated with Roman Catholic doctrine that Evangelical Churchmen will never tolerate even its permissive use in the Church. To grant this would be to admit that the doctrines associated with the Roman Mass can find a legitimate place in the Church of England. While, therefore, we cannot help thinking that the proposals of the Bishop of Chester will prove futile, we are not sorry they have been brought forward, because they will enable both parties to realize more clearly the grave issues at stake. If the Royal Commission should introduce any proposals tending towards the permissive use of the now illegal vestments, and these proposals should be made the basis of Parliamentary action, we make bold to say that it would go far to rend the Church of England in twain.

We confess to a great astonishment that the *Times* should favour the introduction of a permissive Ordinance, and more particularly when it describes that Ordinance as one "which in its simplest form would merely contemplate the difference between 'fine linen' cut one way and 'fine linen' cut another way." Neither extreme Anglicans nor Evangelicals are contending for the mere material or cut of a garment. The Dean of Canterbury, in writing to the *Times*, states the true position in the following words:

"The aesthetic considerations to which allusion has been made are quite irrelevant to the practical issue. The sole question which many of us would have to consider, in the contingency you contemplate, is whether we could retain our ministry in the Church if vestments were formally authorized, which, in the circumstances, we could not but regard as involving the definite sanction of Roman doctrine respecting the Holy Eucharist."

In thus writing Dr. Wace voices the convictions of a large body of Churchmen.

The discussion in the *Daily Mail* on "Should Clergymen Criticise the Bible?" has elicited a number of valuable contributions from leading scholars, as well as a mass of significant letters from the rank and file in the Church. The

question has, of course, turned on the precise meaning to be attributed to the word "criticise," for the answer to this will naturally decide whether, and how far, the clergy are free to criticise Holy Scripture. It must be evident to all that men who have at the solemn moment of Ordination declared that they "unfeignedly believe all the canonical Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments" are not in the position of those who have never laid themselves under any such obligation. Consequently, there must be some limits to Biblical Criticism in the case of the clergy, and due regard must be paid to the precise attitude to the Bible expressed by their ordination vows. The real problem, as Dr. Sanday rightly said in one of his letters to the *Daily Mail*, is, "Where are we to draw the line" between a legitimate and an illegitimate criticism by the clergy? Dr. Sanday himself pleads for "a margin, and perhaps a rather large margin, for experiment and inquiry," and he bases this on the contention that this is "a time of transition." But is not every age one of transition even in relation to criticism? And in the meantime are not plain and ordinary believers to have some grounds of certitude and some assurance that the margin left for experiment and inquiry is not misused or extended almost without limit? Dr. Sanday also thinks that Biblical Criticism will not end in the destruction of the Christian faith, but in its "modification and readjustment." We naturally ask, in what respects and to what extent? What doctrines will be modified and which will need readjustment? In all this discussion on Biblical Criticism we are far too apt to forget that the Church, and therefore every individual Christian, is but "the witness and keeper of Holy Writ," not its judge; and it is surely significant of much that in the one place where the Greek word for "critic" is found in the New Testament it is the Word of God which is declared to be the "critic" of man's heart, not man the critic of God's Word. If this fact were borne in mind a little more often and more definitely in certain quarters than it is to-day the results would be vastly different, both to scholars and the whole of the clergy.

Reverting to Dr. Sanday's question, "Where are we to draw the line?" it seems to us that it ought to be possible to discover some criterion by means of which we may test the legitimacy of criticism applied to the Old Testament. Can such a criterion be found? We believe it can, and for our part we have no hesitation in finding it in the testimony of our Lord and His Apostles. If it be preferred, we are ready to limit the statement to the testimony of our Lord, and to

say that no criticism of the Old Testament should be entertained for an instant by the clergy which conflicts with anything that has been uttered by our Lord. Let the true meaning of His words be once obtained, and then that view of the Old Testament will be the right one, and any criticism which conflicts with it will stand self-condemned. It is in this way that we would narrow and define the issue, and in so doing we believe that we are taking up the only true and possible position for those who acknowledge the infallibility of our Lord and His Divine authority as a Teacher. We would much like to see this point discussed by leading scholars of all schools in our Church: Is the testimony of Christ to the Old Testament to be regarded as the determining factor in criticism?

The discussion on the Higher Criticism has also been taken up in the pages of the *Record*, and not the least point of interest both in the *Daily Mail* and in the *Record* is that Dr. Driver has entered the arena. It is evident that Dr. Reich's recent utterances could not be ignored, and we are profoundly thankful that the attention of leading advocates of the new criticism should be directed to the task of meeting Dr. Reich's contentions. Dean Wace, with characteristic plainness, puts the issue very clearly when he urges that the essential question is as to the trustworthiness of the Bible. It is no mere question of philology or accurate chronology, nor of the precise ways in which the Bible is similar to, or different from, other books. The fundamental problem is whether the Old Testament is reliable, whether, in a word, the Bible is true. Dr. Driver does not seem to have met this contention so far, and the following words of the Dean of Canterbury sum up the whole matter:

"The acceptance of the Higher Criticism involves the conclusion, not merely that there are errors of detail in the Old Testament Scriptures, but that the representations of the main outlines of that history, as given both in the Old and the New Testament, are so erroneous that they must be revolutionized in order to obtain a true view of it. To my mind that admission amounts, on grounds of historical criticism alone, to a *reductio ad absurdum*, and is sufficient to prove that there is some radical error in the critical methods which lead to such results."

Our own pages deal this month with certain aspects of the problem of candidates for Holy Orders. The Bishop of Birmingham has recently expressed himself in his own refreshingly unconventional way on the same subject. He considers that we have been guilty of "a new kind of simony" in practically limiting the ministry to those who are provided

with the necessary means. Bishop Gore consequently urges the importance of finding provision for training as many as possible suitable candidates of whatever social position, who cannot afford to pay for their own training. There is undoubted truth in the Bishop's contention, but there seem to be other considerations which it would be wise not to overlook. We are all well aware of the feelings with which many who are in the Italian and French priesthood, to say nothing of the Irish, are regarded by their well-to-do flocks. It would be a dire calamity for our Church and land if this attitude should ever become prevalent in our midst. Chancellor Lias, in the course of a thoughtful letter to the *Church Family Newspaper*, seems to us to indicate the true and wise line to take. While he would welcome all suitable candidates from the social positions referred to by the Bishop of Birmingham, he considers that there would be great danger if these ever became the majority of the clergy. The question is one which can hardly be discussed without appearing to make class distinctions which should have no place in connection with the ministry, and yet there are certain patent facts of human nature which cannot be ignored. The wise and right policy will be to make all possible provision for suitable candidates, whatever be their social position, and to see to it that no one is ever kept out of the ministry simply and solely from lack of means. This would avoid the charges made against our Church by Bishop Gore, and at the same time prevent us from incurring troubles that are too obvious to mention.

It is well that Lord Hugh Cecil's Church Reform Bill should be carefully studied and discussed, even though the possibilities of its acceptance by Parliament and the Church are remote even to the vanishing-point. Several of its most characteristic proposals, especially those which refer to the settlement of ritual questions, will never command wide support. Apart from this, the real problem of all Church reform lies in the question of lay representation. What constitutes a lay member of the Church of England? The answer is not so easy as it appears. The *Guardian* gives four possible answers to this question—the communicants; those who are baptized and confirmed; the baptized who profess membership in the Church of England; and rate-payers. Obvious objections can be raised to all these suggestions, because the problem is involved in that of the Establishment and cannot be discussed on its merits as a purely ecclesiastical question. We may rest perfectly assured

that as long as Parliament has the controlling voice, the qualification for the Church franchise will not be a narrow one, and it is just here that the difficulty arises. On the one hand, the Church will not tolerate a purely secular qualification such as that of paying rates; and on the other, Parliament, as the *Guardian* rightly says, will never acquiesce in a purely communicant franchise. Abuses of past days have made this impossible. And yet, if the Church were disestablished or unestablished, it is difficult to say what more effective condition of Church membership could be obtained than that which is involved in Baptism, Confirmation, and Holy Communion. It will be interesting to see what the Representative Church Council, which is to meet in November, will decide on this subject. Mr. Lucius Fry, that ardent Church reformer, writing to the *Guardian*, urges that in our churchwardens and sidesmen we have a properly constituted lay franchise ready to hand. He calls attention to Canon 90, which states the qualification for sidesmen which the Incumbent and Vestry are to have in mind when electing them. The Canon requires them to be "discreet persons," and Mr. Fry is of the opinion that the electors have it absolutely in their power to affirm that no one is a "discreet person" unless he is a communicant of the Church. The effect, according to this theory, is that the two churchwardens, elected respectively by the Vicar and the Vestry, and the sidesmen elected by the Vestry, according to Canon 90, would constitute the proper lay franchise for the Church. We are afraid that Mr. Fry's scheme does not meet all our difficulties, especially in regard to the churchwarden who is elected by the entire parish, but his letter is a useful contribution to the discussion of a very thorny subject. Church Reform is assuredly one of our most pressing needs, but how it is to be brought about in conjunction with the maintenance of the Establishment and the present ruling authority of Parliament is the problem to which all our ecclesiastical leaders and statesmen are addressing themselves. And it has to be confessed that the solution seems at present far to seek.

This is the season of the year for the appearance of the annual reports of our various Missionary Societies, and the perennial question suggests itself as to how far they are really read and used. We fear it must be confessed that they are read by a very small proportion of the supporters of the societies, and that they soon go to swell the ranks of books on remote shelves, even if they are not at once consigned to a very different and much lower sphere of usefulness. To

prevent this loss of valuable information, some societies like the C.M.S., the Bible Society, and the Religious Tract Society, have prepared popular illustrated accounts of the operations of the year suitable for general circulation, and the advantages of such a plan are many and obvious, especially in connection with young people and those whose interest in missionary work is not of the keenest. The cost of the production and circulation of the large volumes of annual reports must be very great, and we are not surprised that from time to time the question has been raised as to the necessity for their publication. In these days of retrenchment and economy it might almost seem that the popular story of the year's work would suffice for general circulation, and that other and much less expensive means should be taken to preserve the fuller information now given in the annual reports. But this apart, those who will take the trouble of going through a report like that of the C.M.S. or the C.P.A.S. will be amply rewarded for their pains. Incidents of deep interest, facts of great value, and considerations of pressing importance, meet the eye continually, and stir the heart to thanksgiving and renewed prayer and effort. Speakers and preachers are often in need of new and unused points and illustrations for sermons and addresses. They should direct their attention to this quarry, where a mine of wealth awaits them.

Within the last few weeks a book has been issued, written by Mr. Athelstan Riley—"A Guide to High Mass Abroad"—and it is described as "A Manual for the Use of English Churchmen attending the Celebration of the Eucharist in Roman Catholic Countries." It is also stated to be "for the use of those members of the Church of England travelling on the Continent of Europe who, from their inability to follow the Celebration of the Eucharist in its Latin form, must often find themselves deprived of any opportunity of liturgical worship." A review of this book by the *Spectator* was as follows :

"We have no comment to make, but we cannot help wondering what Andrewes, or Laud, or Cosin, not to speak of Jewel or Parker, would have said to such a book."

To very many Churchpeople, and these by no means of an extreme Protestant type, the title and statements about the book will seem very strange and unfamiliar, and entirely unlike what they have been accustomed to associate with the Church of England. Here we have High Mass and non-communicating attendance at the Roman Mass implied and

provided for, although, as is well known, no English Churchman would be allowed to communicate in a Roman church if his Churchmanship were known to the officiating priest. May we not therefore ask whether such a book and such an attitude are fair or loyal to our Church? Can any self-respecting Churchman take part in a service where his membership in the Catholic Church is denied and his claim to participation in the Holy Communion would be refused? The *Spectator* may well call attention to the essential and fundamental difference between this position and the High Churchmanship of the Caroline divines. Nothing could more clearly show the falsity of the contention that the Churchmen of Mr. Athelstan Riley's school are the lineal descendants of the High Churchmen of the seventeenth century. The incident conveys its own clear lesson to all loyal Churchmen.

There are few matters of greater moment to Churchmen than the provision of the best possible education for the children of the middle and upper classes. The recent influx of foreign Roman Catholic Orders has made this question a very pressing one, for secondary and middle class Roman Catholic schools are springing up on all sides. It is a great satisfaction to realize what is already being done to meet the needs of Churchpeople and to prevent our children from being captured by those whose views are so opposed to our own. We have received the annual report of the "Evangelical Church Schools," a corporation which is responsible for two well-known public schools, Trent College in Derbyshire and Weymouth College. The object of these schools is to provide a public school education in harmony with the principles of the Reformation and of our Church of England, and at the same time to make all possible provision for the sons of poor clergy and needy laymen who from one cause or another cannot give their children a suitable education. This twofold purpose is evidently being admirably realized in these schools, and the report tells of effective work and a good share of prosperity. The schools are deserving of all possible support by Evangelical and Moderate Churchmen, and we have the greatest satisfaction in calling attention to their work and needs. The treasurer (Lieutenant-Colonel Seton Churchill, 3, Clifton Road, Wimbledon) will gladly forward the interesting report to any applicant. In this connection we do not forget two other institutions—the South-Eastern College at Ramsgate and Monkton Combe School, Bath—which, as separate organizations, are doing similar effective work on right lines. Then, again, the Church Education

Corporation, associated with the Church of England League, is providing schools for girls and a training college for secondary teachers. All this may sound a great deal, and it is, but it is, nevertheless, very little compared with the needs of the country and with what others are doing in opposite directions. We fear it must be said that rich Evangelical and Moderate Church folk do not realize the special opportunity offered to them for the use of their wealth in providing for the education of the sons and daughters of the clergy and the laity of the middle classes. That Churchmen of the extreme Anglican type are alive to the importance of this work may be seen from the extent to which the Woodard Schools are covering the country. The gravity of the situation is evident, and we should rejoice to know that a largely increased income were available for the institutions we have now mentioned. The possibilities of development are limited only by the means available, and in this fact is the measure of our responsibility and duty.



Notices of Books.

The Corrected English New Testament. Issued by SAMUEL LLOYD. With Preface by the BISHOP OF DURHAM. London: Samuel Bagster and Sons, Ltd. Price 6s. net.

Recent years have brought us several modern versions of the New Testament, such as the Twentieth Century New Testament, Fenton's New Testament, the American Revised Version, and Weymouth's "New Testament in Modern Speech." The last-named, apart from an occasional tendency to degenerate into paraphrase, is an admirable rendering, fresh, suggestive, and reverent. Considerations of copyright do not allow the American Revised Version to be circulated in this country, but those who use it know well its great value, both in regard to the Old and also to the New Testament. And now comes the present volume, which is issued by a Life Governor of the Bible Society in connection with the recent Centenary celebration. The Bishop of Durham prefaces the volume with a discriminating yet hearty commendation, and an explanatory introduction informs us of the principles on which the translators have gone. The Greek text is that of Nestle, who is followed very slavishly, even to the admission of that surely impossible reading of John i. 18, "God only Begotten." The work is to all intents and purposes a new translation, though based upon the Authorized Version, and the aim has been to give a simple idiomatic English rendering without diluting the Greek text into an English paraphrase. We believe the aim has been accomplished, and