

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

THE CHURCHMAN

December, 1916.

The Month.

Dean Inge and Bishop Gore. A VERY pretty controversy is going on in the *Guardian* over the Bishop of Oxford's "Manual of Membership," entitled *The Religion of the Church*. It originated in a review by the Dean of St. Paul's of the Bishop's little volume, which Dr. Inge treated as "a manual of advanced Anglo-Catholic teaching, written purely from the pre-suppositions of that party." He commented with severity upon some parts which offend him and admittedly neglected "much that all Churchmen may read with profit." But the main interest of his article is in the determined attack he makes upon the advanced Anglo-Catholic position. The following passages from his article tell their own tale:—

The school to which the Bishop belongs plainly wishes at all costs to keep our communications open with Rome. Some extremists in this party are almost avowedly conspirators who wish to return to the "Roman obedience." The majority flatter themselves that they can pull to pieces the most closely knit and coherent structure ever raised by the wit of man, taking what they please from the Latin Church and rejecting the rest. For instance, they tell us, as the Bishop does in the first chapter of this book, that Christ meant to found a single Institution—one "fold" with one Shepherd—and that a plurality of Churches is an absurdity and a scandal. But when the Roman Church adds a perfectly logical corollary, and declares, as it does with great emphasis, that an Anglican Bishop is a layman and a heretic, we are to repudiate its authority. And on what grounds are we to repudiate it? In virtue of a theory of Catholicity which is rejected by all other Catholics, and which is peculiar to a sub-section of a sub-National Church on an island in North-Western Europe; a theory which divides all other Christians into those who unchurch us and those whom we unchurch!

The Dean contends that Latin Catholicism cannot be taken to pieces, and therefore "the joy-ride of the Romanizing Anglican must end in the fate of the lady of Riga." He admits the illogicality of his own countrymen, but adds that "there are limits to the inconsistencies which even an Englishman can swallow; and these limits have, I think, been nearly reached in the provincial and decapitated Latinism which is being thrust down the throats of

bewildered Anglo-Saxons. "Is it not," he asks, "a tiger in very truth with which our friends are playing?" The Latin Church, he affirms, would ruin and destroy every one of the ideals for which we are spending our blood and our treasure; and then follows a scathing comparison of the Roman and the Anglican systems:—

We wish, most of us—I am not sure that I do—to make Democratic Government a reality. The constitution of the Latin Church is a hierarchy of officials with an infallible autocrat at the top, and the duty of the laity is to vote as the priests bid them. We wish to reform our education from top to bottom, freeing it from all shackles and traditional prejudices. The Latin Church strangles education; it never for a moment relaxes its grip on the children—it sees that they are brought up in an atmosphere of ignorance, bigotry, and superstition which will keep them in mental slavery through their lives. Look at the state of education in Ireland, in Spain, in French Canada, and its results in the pitiable stagnation of the people, who are bled white to satisfy the greed of the priests, and deluded or terrorized to serve their lust for power. We wish to abolish the disabilities of women, and to recognize their claim to equal treatment. The Latin Church keeps women in subjection, insisting that every woman shall lay bare her conscience to a male director. How many abuses would have been prevented if the Church had wisely ordered that women may only confess to women and men to men! We wish to co-operate with all that is good and true in secular culture. The Pope has anathematized those who hold that there can be any reconciliation with modern ideas of progress. As for the monopolies which that Church has always claimed, and its denial of validity to the Sacraments of other Churches, these are a part of the claim to universal empire; they are also tricks of trade.

We doubt whether the most outspoken advocate of, let us say, the Protestant Alliance, has ever launched a more trenchant indictment against Rome than this; and who shall say it is not true? Well may the Dean ask, "Why should we Anglicans pay so much homage to this survival of Cæsar's Mediterranean Empire? What has it to do with us? And what resemblance has it to the teaching of Christ?" Instead of the Church of England truckling to Rome, Dean Inge thinks we ought to have the courage "to complete the emancipation which we almost won at the Reformation and to build our Church of the future on the One Foundation only." In the new life which will come into our religion after this crisis "we want no more revivals; we want new and free developments." All this is quite excellent, but how is it all to be brought about? In asking this question we touch the weak point of the Dean's article. He concludes by confessing that he has "no constructive policy"; in Church politics he has "no lead to give" but he is "convinced, that those English Churchmen who wish to bring up

again under the influence of Roman ideas and methods are taking not merely a wrong path, but the very worst path that it is possible to take." With this conviction we are in deep agreement, and we can only hope that the Dean will now give himself to the formation of a constructive policy—clear, reasonable and practical, such as the great body of Churchmen could accept. What steps, for example, would he advise should be taken for "completing the emancipation" which we "almost won" at the Reformation? We confess we do not understand the phraseology. The Church is waiting for a strong lead, and unless we get one soon, the driving power which the Anglo-Catholic party is arrogating to itself will become more and more dangerous to the welfare of the Church and the State.

The Dean's article has made the Bishop's friends
The Bishop's very angry, and columns of correspondence have
Reply. resulted. But the Dean has not been without his supporters, the most notable among them being the Dean of Durham, who is always at his best when crossing swords with Dr. Gore, his old colleague in the Westminster Chapter. Dr. Henson quotes a passage from chapter iv of the Bishop's *Manual*, and declares that "the Bishop here asserts that the Reformation effected no change in the mediæval doctrine. His words can bear no other meaning." He then adds:—

I invite the judgment of all competent historians on the Bishop's view of the English Reformation. I ask—What, on that view, was the Reformation, and why did it convulse the country for a whole generation (1530–1560) before a "settlement" was reached? Why were the Altars violently removed from the churches, and the service-books drastically revised? Does the teaching of the Thirty-nine Articles agree with the teaching of the mediæval Church? It is needless to pursue the paradox in detail. None can dispute its grossness. It is not my present purpose to examine the Bishop's *Manual*. I merely desire to point out the measure of its claim to be really a Manual of membership in the Church of England.

It was, of course, impossible for the Bishop of Oxford to remain silent under such a charge, and the *Guardian* of November 16 contained a letter from him in which he urged the plea of "misrepresentation." Here is his explanation:—

Why the Dean of Durham and the Dean of St. Paul's should choose to misrepresent me because they disagree with me, I do not wholly understand. But I think it right to point out that the doctrine which I affirm, in common with most of our theologians, to have been maintained by us unchanged through the Reformation is the ancient Catholic doctrine "which was be-

lieved and taught with astonishing unanimity for more than 1,500 years in Christendom," which of course does not include mediæval or Western accretions. These mediæval accretions the Dean of Durham must know perfectly well that I have consistently repudiated.

But it is not only against the two Deans that he protests; the Bishop has a grievance against the *Guardian* itself:—

May I note that you are pleased to head an extract from my message in the current number of the *Diocesan Magazine* "An Invitation to Revolt"? Any one reading the extract will see that it strongly discourages revolt and appeals for constitutional pressure by the main body of the Church. I do not believe you serve the cause which I suppose you desire to serve by palpable misrepresentations.

We quote this paragraph from the Bishop's letter, as it affords an excellent illustration of the tone of Anglo-Catholic controversialists whenever they find themselves in a tight corner. The *Guardian* makes a spirited reply in its leading columns, and fully justifies its position. "If," it says, "the English language means anything the Bishop's words are most assuredly an invitation to the laity to rise up against their ecclesiastical superiors and compel them to grant their demands. The distinction between such a rising and what in ordinary everyday language is meant by 'revolt' is so fine that it escapes us."

We quote from the *Oxford Diocesan Magazine* the "Organized Pressure." full text of the Bishop's words, not merely that our readers may judge whether or not they are an "invitation to revolt," but chiefly because of their] own inherent importance. The Bishop is discussing "the National Mission and its consequences," and he lays most stress upon the corporate repentance of the Church. He then proceeds:—

After the delivery of the message the question of questions will be whether corporate confession is going to be followed by corporate amendment. Such amendment will concern (a) our church services and church arrangements, (b) our organization and government. As to (a) we must bear in mind that no blessing will follow unfaithfulness to positive engagements solemnly contracted. The clergy must not reform the prayer book for themselves. They have solemnly undertaken to obey it. And obey it they must. They must look for reforms to such pressure as shall secure competent authority for necessary changes. As to (b) I hope we shall all understand that no real reforms will be procured except as the result of organized pressure from the mass of practising churchmen. That is the method by which alone reform can be made good in a democratic age. It is futile to keep on complaining about the bishops—"Why don't they do this or that?" "Why don't they give us a lead?" The bishops are like other Englishmen. They agree on the central faith, no doubt. But they hold very various opinion about other

important church questions ; and they are liable to the temptation of all hard-worked officials—the temptation to be content with “ carrying on,” which by itself means a busy life, and to postpone to a convenient season (which never comes) the necessary steps towards constitutional reform. The great reforms effected in the church in the past eighty years as a result of the Tractarian or Catholic movement, have been effected by pressure from below. Such pressure may be regulated and controlled. But any reasonable demand of a mass of churchmen, if they are resolute, will be yielded to. The obtaining of reforms of abuses and reforms in divine service requires that the ordinary churchmen should begin to take an interest and make his voice heard. It is not enough that he should complain about something which annoys him in his own parish. He must learn to understand church questions and demand the necessary reforms. It is, no doubt, difficult to bring this about. But I am persuaded that the National Mission will produce little permanent spiritual fruit unless it leads to deep reforms in organization and method, and that these reforms will only be brought about in response to demand from the main body of the church. That is the question of questions—do we mean business ?

If the Bishop of Oxford’s estimate of the position
 The Question of Resistance, is correct, the Church of England must be in a very bad way. Without leaders, or with leaders who cannot lead, which is the same thing or worse—without a policy ; can it be wondered at that enemies of the Church say that it has no message for the English people ? We believe that the great majority of sober-minded English Churchmen will read the Bishop of Oxford’s words with the utmost misgiving, not to say alarm. He leaves to conjecture the nature of the “ reasonable demand ” to which he refers, and he gives no indication of the character of the “ reforms in divine service ” he has in mind. He cannot blame any one, who knowing the trend of the Bishop’s own mind and the trend of the policy of the school of Churchmen to whom he primarily appeals and whose leader he is understood to be, comes to the conclusion that the Bishop’s Memorandum is a direct invitation to that party to resort to “ organized pressure ” as the one and only means for securing for their position the dominating influence in the Church of England. We do not believe that the Bishop of Oxford’s views are a true representation of the principles of the Church of England, for the Church is as assuredly Reformed and Protestant as it is Catholic and Apostolic ; nor do we regard the Anglo-Catholic school in any other light than that of a body of dangerous reactionaries whose ecclesiastical aims and aspirations are fraught with the gravest danger to the Church. On this view it is obvious that the schemes of the Bishop and his followers must be steadily and determinedly resisted if the Church of England is to

be saved from a closer assimilation to, and perhaps, ultimate absorption in, the Church of Rome. But then, whence is the strong resistance which will be needed to come? The Evangelicals have a great opportunity if only they had the power of using it, but they are far too much crippled by internal divisions to offer any successful opposition to the inroads of the advanced Anglo-Catholics. Is it not time that some clear and definite attempt were made to bring about a *rapprochement* between the older and the younger men with a view to united action? Given good-will on both sides it ought not to be difficult to come to a working agreement, and we should be glad to hear that a conference with that end in view had been arranged under the chairmanship of the Vicar of Islington, who occupies a central position. Unless something is done and done quickly to strengthen the Evangelical position the leadership of the movement for resisting the encroachments of the Romanizing party will, as the article by the Dean of St. Paul's and the letter of the Dean of Durham clearly show, pass into other hands.

**A Message
from the
Front.** What is to happen after the war? Will the Church of England have a message for the people that will win and keep the men when they return from the front? We praise God for all that the National Mission of Repentance and Hope has done and is doing to deepen the spiritual life of the Church, and we trust that as time goes on we shall find that our leaders are prepared with plans and suggestions for so simplifying the services, or some of them, that they will appeal more thoroughly than they ever have done to the masses of the people. But it is not alone simplicity that will be required. There must be a new heart, a new life, a new reality in the Church itself. The problem is not an easy one; let us see how it presents itself to a layman of wide experience, keen perception and true spirituality of mind and heart. Second-Lieutenant T. R. W. Lunt, R.F.A., Secretary of the Laymen's Missionary Movement, has been at the front for some time, and in the November issue of the *Laymen's Bulletin* is a recent letter from his pen written in snatches in the narrowing surroundings of a gun-pit at 3 a.m., but with a sweeping mental and spiritual horizon far overleaping the tragedy of war. Here is what he says:—

I do somehow feel that we fellows who have been in the carnal fighting

will need to be born again for the spiritual war. Perhaps we are getting some better hold unconsciously of the reality—but we have yet got to adjust life and its purpose in view of them. That, I fear, none of us gets leisure of heart or mind to do out here. Can we help the fellows to do it when peace comes, before those dangerous tides of reaction (how strong and passionate in almost every sense of the word they will be, one can, I think, only gauge out here) have swept the memory and sense of reality away?

Then the Church must be reborn if it is to win those who have learnt most in these dark days. Oh what a multitude of unrealities and “convenient” fictions we have got to shed if these men, whom months of war have broken loose from old traditions, fashions and habits, are to realize that the Church has, indeed, the LIVING WATER to offer. I sometimes think that we have almost as much to shed as we have to learn anew, and that one process is essential to the other. Dare we hold on to Christ and what He stood for as the apostles understood Him, and deliberately shake off from us all that isn't that and which, therefore, obscures men's view?

I think, again, of what has to go from our twentieth-century conventional church life with its class, its prejudices, its esteem of wealth, its smug respectability, its acceptance of outward for inward spirit, its insularity, its sectarian bitterness, its worldly methods of warfare, its race prejudice, its cowardice in denouncing sin, its shrinking faith in view of its great commission.

But what almost terrifies me about it all is that we can't any longer—we, for instance, in our happy “fellowships” formal and informal—can't go on now lamenting these things and studying their origins and harmfulness and let them continue to exist. Somehow we have in these next few months to get rid of them, to let the Holy Spirit rid the Church of them as characteristics of its life, so that these wild, good fellows (and that just about describes the millions who in this wilderness of destruction have been offering their all for England) are to see Jesus and to come into His Church to find there the realities of true life and goodness and courage and self-sacrifice and of nearness to God which they have dimly come to feel are the pearls of life.

Such is the position; and the urgency of it is being more and more realized. Is the Church prepared to deal with it? It will only be successfully dealt with in as far as the Church deepens in spirituality of mind and heart and service.

The munificent bequest of one hundred thousand

A Notable Bequest. pounds for the use of the Church in Wales by the late

Lord Llangattock is a noteworthy event, unquestionably intended to show his profound sympathy with the Church in Wales in the treatment it will receive at the hands of the despoiler as soon as the war is over, unless, as we hope and believe will be the case, the Welsh Church Act is repealed; and he probably hoped that his example might be followed by others. It should prove a stimulus in this direction, though there can be very few indeed in a position to give now anything like so princely a sum, and fewer still after the war is over. It will, of course, be said by the Liberationists

that the gift confirms their contention that the Church in Wales will comparatively speedily be re-endowed, and that, meanwhile, its members can and will find the £157,000 a year of which it will ultimately be despoiled by the secularization of its ancient endowments. But all who knew the late Lord Llangatock realized his great desire that the work of the Church in Wales should be extended in all directions in the Principality. He was strongly opposed to the Welsh Church Act for this among other reasons, that it would cripple existing Church work, and therefore prevent its much-needed extension. In other words, his munificent bequest, instead of being used to set on foot new work, will be applied, if the crash should eventually come, to make good a small portion of the amount of which the four Welsh dioceses are to be robbed. From this aspect it will be seen that the bequest, princely though it is, goes but a little way towards re-endowment. Assuming that it produce as much as 5 per cent. interest per annum, it will only reduce the loss of income to the Church by £5,000; in other words, from £157,000 to £152,000.

We may be permitted to mention some features of
 "The Churchman," the programme of THE CHURCHMAN for 1917. The

Rev. W. H. Griffith Thomas, D.D., will contribute a series of papers entitled:—"The Wondrous Cross: Studies in the Atonement." Another feature will be the inclusion month by month of "Preachers' Pages," containing "Studies in Texts," "Homiletical Outlines," "Illustrations," "Study Table Notes," etc., and it is believed that this feature, contributed by various writers, will be of inestimable service to clergy when preparing their sermons. On the lighter side the Rev. C. Courtenay will contribute a series of sketches entitled "The Clerical Subaltern." Literary Papers, Biographical Sketches, Sociological Articles, Ecclesiastical Discussions and kindred contributions are also arranged for. Reviews of all the best books will appear month by month, as well as an analytical list of the publications of the month.

