

THE CHURCHMAN

July, 1924

NOTES AND COMMENTS.

Matters of Principle.

ENGLISH Churchmen have recently been charged with paying little attention to Principles. They are said to be willing to compromise even on vital questions, if only they can get things to work. It is pointed out that Evangelicals especially are willing to agree to Anglo-Catholic principles inconsistent with the maintenance of their own position. Recent votes on the alternative forms of the Prayer of Consecration are given as examples of this spirit. No doubt those who voted for the "Orange Book" and "Grey Book" forms would be prepared to justify their action. But it is a serious feature in the present situation if the votes of Evangelical representatives in the House of Clergy tend to strengthen the powers of the section of the Church that has expressed its determination to undo the work of the Reformation. We would beg Evangelical Churchmen not to bring upon themselves the indignation of future generations of English Churchpeople, by any action that may open the way in days to come for the supersession of our present form of Communion Service by one in which either the doctrines of the Church of Rome are fully admitted, or in which the teaching of the New Testament on sacrifice and Communion are either ignored, or completely altered in character. There can be no doubt that this is a very real danger at the present time.

The Cheltenham Conference.

It is also fundamental to remember at the present time that there is a line of deep cleavage between the Church of England and the Church of Rome. However much we may desire to ignore differences, in a general desire to promote the unity of Christendom, it will not be of any ultimate advantage to ignore the fact that there are two conceptions of Christianity. The Church of Rome

represents one of these. Hitherto the Church of England has been regarded as the chief representative of the other. The Cheltenham Conference has this year performed a valuable service in setting out the respective positions of the two Churches. The papers read at the Conference, of which a considerable number are printed in the present number of the *CHURCHMAN*, deserve wide circulation and careful study. A generation has arisen which is unfamiliar with the points of difference, and the great principles underlying them. We hope that the able and constructive contribution to the consideration of the whole subject contained in these papers will help to bring to light once again the grounds upon which the Church of England position rests in contrast with that of the Church of Rome. Even those who sympathize with the Anglo-Catholic School are realizing that the appeal to Scripture has a force not sufficiently recognized in recent years. If the Conference has done nothing else, it has deserved well of Churchmen in bringing out the significance of this appeal. We naturally regard the Conference as having done much more than this.

Important Recent Appointments.

For many years Dean Wace filled the office of Chairman of the Executive Committee of the National Church League. On the death of Preb. Webb-Peploe, who was Chairman of the Council of the League, the Dean also undertook that office. The vacancies caused by his death were filled at the recent Annual Meeting of the Society. The Chairmanship of the Council was filled by the appointment of Bishop Knox. Since his retirement from the bishopric of Manchester, Bishop Knox has taken a keen interest in the progress of Prayer Book revision, and has recently felt able to take a more active part in the work of maintaining the Reformed character of our Church. This marked him out as the most fitting person to preside over the Council of the N.C.L., and the members are fortunate in securing the help of so able and experienced an adviser.

As Vice-Chairman a desire was expressed that the North of England should be represented, as so many of the Society's supporters reside in the Northern Province. The Council were fortunate in securing the consent of Dr. Dawson Walker, Residentiary Canon of Durham Cathedral and Professor of New Testament

Exegesis in the University of Durham. Canon Dawson Walker has been for many years a Vice-President of the League.

Previously the Rev. T. W. Gilbert, D.D., Rector of Bradfield, had been elected Chairman of the Executive Committee. Dr. Gilbert is well known as a scholar, and a writer on historical and theological subjects. He has rendered valuable services to the Church by his contributions to the understanding of its history and teaching.

With these three representatives of learning and Churchmanship in some of the highest offices, and with Sir William Joynson-Hicks, Bart., as President, and Sir Thomas Inskip, K.C., as Treasurer, the N.C.L. is provided with a band of strong and well-qualified leaders, who deserve the support of Churchmen of all Schools desirous of maintaining the principles of the Reformation.

Dean Wace House.

Much thought has been given to the most suitable way of commemorating the great services rendered by Dean Wace to the cause of Evangelical Churchmanship. An opportunity has arisen of securing a building in the City of London, close to Temple Bar which lends itself to the purpose of forming a central rendezvous, where Evangelicals can have their Headquarters, and it has been a happy thought to associate the building with the name of our late leader by calling it "Dean Wace House." The premises are large and roomy, and provide accommodation for a conference room, a library, an information bureau, a publication department and central offices for organization. Being close to the offices of the leading Evangelical Societies it will be convenient for those having business with them, and it will provide a much-needed meeting place where friends can come together for social and other purposes. In order to secure the building and adapt it for this work an appeal has been issued for £10,000. Towards this amount nearly £2,000 has already been subscribed, and we have no doubt that Evangelical Churchpeople who realize the value of the project and desire it to be associated with the name of Dean Wace will be glad to send substantial contributions to the fund. In order to promote the work of furthering Evangelical principles, an appeal is made for another £10,000 so that the scheme may be fully equipped. Gifts may be sent to Sir William Joynson-Hicks.

Bishop Knox Memorial.

The Memorial to the House of Bishops sent out by Bishop Knox in favour of maintaining the Communion Service in its present form, has received close on three hundred thousand signatures. This is a wonderful response, in view of the fact that so many people have a rooted objection to signing any document, however strongly they may feel in favour of the views it represents. The numbers show the widespread feeling that exists in regard to the proposed changes in the Communion Service. The country has been thoroughly stirred by the Bishop's Appeal. It has brought home to Churchpeople the significance of the alterations now before the House of Clergy. The success of the Memorial has produced a certain amount of unkindly criticism on the part of those who are afraid of the influence that it may have. Strong efforts have been made to arouse prejudice against the Petition, and every endeavour has been made to misrepresent it. The most common charge is that numbers of Nonconformists have been induced to sign it. This is not the case. In some Parishes there are Churchpeople who are debarred from attending their Parish Churches by the practices and teachings in them. It is possible that some of these may have signed the Memorial, and no doubt the Clergy in such Parishes would regard the Parishioners whom they have excluded from their Churches as non-Churchpeople. This would not, however, alter their standing.

Some Criticisms of the Memorial.

Some foolish things have been said about the Memorial by its own opponents. One ingenuous critic asserted that the Bishop had no right to start a Memorial, because he was not connected with any diocese, and the Church Assembly knew much better than he did what was for the good of the Church. Nothing could be more ludicrous than the suggestion made by the Rector of a Parish that the signatures should only have been obtained through him, although he expressed violent opposition to the Memorial. The signatures he assumed were of no value because they had not been obtained as he thought they should have been. To say, as one distinguished dignitary did, that the numbers must be weighed as well as counted was so obvious a truism that it was scarcely worth uttering. But it is absurd to imagine that out of nearly 300,000 signatories, includ-

ing Peers, Members of Parliament, Clergy, Churchwardens, Members of Parochial Councils, etc., the great majority can be regarded as nonentities. Whatever objections may be made the outstanding fact remains that it is the most impressive expression of opinion that has been given on any question of Church policy in England for a very long time. The Memorial cannot be ignored, and the supporters of Bishop Knox will have to be reckoned with in the further revision of the Prayer Book.

Objections to Alternative Forms of Services

Some of the arguments in favour of alternative forms in the Communion Service are more plausible than convincing. One newspaper writer draws a "simple analogy" from two travellers to London desiring to go by different routes. The alternative forms represent the two routes. The unfortunate fact for this analogy is that the two routes do not lead to the same place. If the present form of service may be said to lead to Canterbury, the new one leads—it may be by devious but none the less certain ways—to Rome. The same writer says, "The Prayer Book revisers do not ask them to burn the present book or force another one upon them," and he therefore thinks that "Bishop Knox's agitation has done so much harm" because "the chosen alternative Book will meet the needs of that large section of Churchpeople whose requirements are not met by the present Prayer Book." If they are not met by the present Book, it is clear that doctrine and practices are required that are not allowed by it, and it is obvious that the Church of England is not the spiritual home of such people, and while we are not asked at present to burn the present book, the writer ignores the fact that the provision of alternative forms is only a temporary measure, and that every effort will be made to make sure, when the time comes, that the form introduced now as a permissible alternative will be the only form in the future Prayer Book.

The Truth about the Bennett Case.

An attempt is now being made to claim that the Anglo-Catholic doctrine concerning the Real Presence of Christ in the consecrated elements cannot rightly be condemned as repugnant to the doctrine of the Church of England since the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council in the case of *Sheppard v. Bennett* confirmed the acquittal

of Mr. Bennett, who is said to have taught in the sixties the self-same doctrine that is taught by the Anglo-Catholics to-day. It is to be noted that this claim is advanced not merely by Anglo-Catholic priests—which would not be surprising except for the fact that it is a little odd finding them viewing favourably a decision of the Privy Council—but also by the distinguished lawyer who leads the Anglo-Catholic party in the House of Laity of the Church Assembly. But what are the facts? We should like to see this Judgment reprinted, with its Appendix; it constitutes a most masterly examination of the questions associated with the doctrine of the Real Presence; but in the meantime the main points of it may be referred to.

The Articles of Charge related to the writings of Mr. Bennett in a published letter to Dr. Pusey. The words used in the second edition were held by the then Dean of Arches (Sir R. Phillimore) to have “contravened the plain and clear intent of the formularies of the Church,” but they had been modified—it is believed at the request of Dr. Pusey—in the third edition, and the Dean of Arches held that, so modified, the words did not contravene the Articles. From this Judgment the promoter of the suit appealed to the Privy Council. The expressions originally used by Mr. Bennett were “the real actual and visible presence of our Lord upon the Altars of our Churches,” and again, “Who myself adore and teach the people to adore the consecrated elements, believing Christ to be in them—believing that under their veil is the sacred Body and Blood of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ.” These words were condemned even by the Dean of Arches and would most certainly have been condemned by the Judicial Committee, had it not been held that the case must be tested on the revised words. In the third edition the crucial passages were altered so as to read (1) “the real and actual presence of our Lord under the form of bread and wine upon the Altars of our Churches”; and (2) “Who myself adore and teach the people to adore Christ present in the Sacrament, under the form of Bread and Wine, believing that under their veil is the sacred Body and Blood of my Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ.” It was upon these carefully revised passages that the Judgment turned.

Passages from the Judgment.

Upon the first charge, that relating to the presence of the Body and Blood of Christ in the Holy Communion, the Judicial Committee

pointed out that "as to the mode of this presence the Church affirms nothing, except that the Body of Christ is 'given, taken and eaten in the Supper only after an heavenly and spiritual manner' and that 'the means whereby the Body of Christ is received and eaten is faith.'" Their lordships proceeded:—

"Any other presence than this—any presence which is not a presence to the soul of the faithful receiver—the Church does not by her Articles and Formularies require her ministers to accept. This cannot be stated too plainly. The question is, however, not what the Articles and Formularies affirm, but what they exclude. The respondent maintains a presence which is (to use his own expression) 'real, actual, objective,' a presence in the Sacrament, a presence upon the altar, under the form of bread and wine. *He does not appear to have used the expression 'in the consecrated elements' in his 3rd Edition; this is one of the points on which the language of the 2nd Edition was altered* [the italics are ours]. And the question raised by the Appeal is, whether his position is contradictory or repugnant to anything in the Articles or Formularies so as to be properly made the ground of a criminal charge. . . . We find nothing in the Articles and Formularies to which the Respondent's position is contrary or repugnant. . . . The assertion of a 'real, actual, objective' presence, introduces, indeed, terms not found in the Articles or Formularies; but it does not appear to affirm, expressly or by necessary implication, a presence other than spiritual, nor to be necessarily contradictory to the 28th Article of Religion."

The Judgment considered the "Declaration of Kneeling" and the alteration in 1662 of the words "unto any real and essential presence there being of Christ's natural Flesh and Blood" to "unto any corporal presence of Christ's natural Flesh and Blood" and the words "true natural Body" to "natural Body." Their lordships, however,

"could not advise the condemnation of a clergyman for maintaining that the use in 1662 of the word 'corporal' instead of the words 'real and essential' in the Declaration of Kneeling was an intentional substitution, implying that there may be a real or essential presence as distinguished from a corporal presence. The respondent has nowhere alleged in terms a corporal presence of the natural Body of Christ in the elements; he has never affirmed that the Body of Christ is present in a 'corporal' or 'natural' manner. On the contrary, he has denied this, and he speaks of the presence in which he believes as 'spiritual,' 'supernatural,' 'sacramental,' 'mystical,' 'ineffable.'"

On the second charge, relating to the adoration of Christ present in the Sacrament, their lordships pointed out that "the Church of

England has forbidden all acts of adoration to the Sacrament, understanding by that the consecrated elements," and their decision was given in these memorable words :—

" Upon the whole, their lordships, not without doubts and division of opinions, have come to the conclusion that this charge is not so clearly made out as the rules which govern penal proceedings require. *Mr. Bennett is entitled to the benefit of any doubt that may exist. His language has been rash* [italics ours], but as it appears to the majority of their lordships that his words can be construed so as not to be plainly repugnant to the two passages articulated against them, their lordships will give him the benefit of the doubt that has been raised."

What of To-day's Teaching?

We seem to have advanced far, in the matter of Anglo-Catholic teaching on the Sacrament, from the days of Mr. Bennett's " rash " language. Let our readers look again very closely at his words, obviously most carefully chosen for the purpose, yet held to be rash, and compare them with the teaching of Anglo-Catholics to-day. What is that teaching? To discover it we need not turn to the New Tracts for the Times issued by a Committee of Anglican Priests (helpful as they would be for the purpose); we prefer rather to quote so high an authority as Dr. Darwell Stone. The " Tracts " have been " repudiated," but Dr. Darwell Stone is vouched for by the Prolocutor of the Lower House of the Convocation of Canterbury; and this is what he says. In *Anglo-Catholic Congress Book, No. 28*, he writes, dealing with Reservation, " The Sacrament thus reserved is not other than the Sacrament which is on the altar after the consecration of the Mass. *It is the body of the Lord* [italics ours]: it is the presence of Him Who is our God as well as our Saviour." In his larger book, *The Reserved Sacrament*, Dr. Darwell Stone, writing on " the true doctrine of the Holy Eucharist," has this significant passage :—

" The Protestant divines of the sixteenth century had their clear answer to all such questions. The adoration of our Lord in the reserved Sacrament, like the adoration at the consecration in the Mass, was idolatry; those who took part in it were idolaters. From their own point of view they were perfectly right. If the consecrated elements are only bread and wine after consecration as before, whatever gifts or virtues may be attached to the profitable reception of them, those who imagine that they are worshipping our Lord are wholly wrong in seeking the object of their adoration in His presence

in the Sacrament. But, if it is true that *by consecration the bread and the wine become His body and blood, if our Lord Himself, eternal God, very Man glorified, spiritual, risen, ascended, is present in the Sacrament* [italics ours], then in the adoration there is no idolatry but rather the worship which is the bounden duty of a Christian."

It will be observed that Dr. Darwell Stone in both passages uses the word "Sacrament" when he is clearly referring to the consecrated elements. According to him the presence is in the elements; they "become," after consecration, "the body of the Lord," "His body and His blood." And it is now being seriously argued that the teaching of this doctrine is protected by the Bennett Judgment as containing nothing repugnant to the doctrine of the Church of England. Those who thus argue have either never read the Bennett Judgment or else—but we refrain from stating the alternative. "The real relation of the Judgment," said the Report of the Royal Commission on Ecclesiastical Discipline in 1906, "to Mr. Bennett's teaching has been frequently misunderstood. His language has been taken in the sense which the Court held that it narrowly avoided; and his acquittal has been treated as establishing the legality of doctrine which his language was held not to express." It is clear, therefore, that those who persist in misrepresenting this Judgment and its effect are altogether without excuse.

The Late Dr. Griffith Thomas.

The unexpected death of the Rev. W. H. Griffith Thomas, D.D., news of which reached this country from America on June 3, is a great personal loss to all associated with the CHURCHMAN, not only for what he was in friendship and fellowship to all who are seeking to uphold Evangelical truth, but also because he was for many years, prior to his going to Canada, its brilliant and honoured Editor, and afterwards continued to manifest the greatest possible interest in its welfare. In recent years he was a frequent and much valued writer in these pages, his *Life of the late Canon Christopher*—to mention only one contribution—being a remarkable illustration of the care and thoroughness in detail which marked all his work. His death has been widely recognized as a grievous loss to the whole Church. As a writer he had a considerable output, among his principal books being *A Sacrament of our Redemption* and *The Catholic Faith*, two books which are invaluable for their clearness and power in upholding the Evangelical position of the Church of

England. He was a Biblical commentator and expositor with great gifts which he used to the highest advantage in elucidating the meaning of the sacred text and in bringing its spiritual message home to the heart and life of the reader. Among these books many will recall with thankfulness *The Apostle Peter, Genesis, Romans* and *The Acts*; and there has just been published also a masterly work on the Epistle to the Hebrews, "*Let us go on.*" All his writings had the devotional spirit, and there were some which were wholly devotional, such as *Christianity is Christ, Life Abiding, and The Holy Spirit of God*. But, perhaps, more than all else, Dr. Griffith Thomas stood out as a champion—we might almost say the foremost champion—of the Bible itself as the true, inspired, authoritative and inerrant Word of God. His strong and able defence of the conservative position brought him into sharp conflict with "Higher Critics," but through good report and ill report—and the experiences to which he was subjected at Oxford often saddened him—he held on his way without deviating one hair's breadth from what he believed to be the Truth. Nor do we forget the splendid work he did as a parochial clergyman, Principal of Wycliffe Hall, Oxford, Professor at Wycliffe College, Toronto, and more recently as "a free lance" helping and encouraging churches in Canada, America, and the Mission field. He was a great man—great in his ministry, great as a scholar and writer and teacher, and great in his sympathies because he was great in his love and devotion to the Person of our Lord. He had a wonderful genius for friendship, and men loved and trusted him. He has been taken from us in the full vigour of his powers, but the recollection of what he was and what he did will long remain a fragrant memory.

"Three Million Lapsed Communicants."

Under this heading the *Times* of June 19 reported an address by the Rev. E. W. Sara, Director of the Bishop of London's Sunday School Council, at the Bradford conference of the Church of England Men's Society.

"Mr. Sara described the present-day drift away from organized religion as 'an appalling leakage.' It constituted a grave challenge to the Church. While Churchmen continued to think chiefly of the respectable few in the front pews, the young people were being lost. In the London diocese alone 16,000 boys and girls had been lost from Bible classes since the war, 16,000 from the Church Lads'

Brigade, nearly 4,000 from the Girls' Friendly Society, and 8,000 from the senior Bands of Hope. Those figures were typical of the whole country. There were 3,000,000 lapsed communicants, of whom the London Diocese alone counted 300,000. The overwhelming cause of this state of affairs was the lack of influence in the home. People overlooked the fact that the post-war adolescent was a different creature from the pre-war. They had skipped a whole generation. There was in the home to-day a conflict between youth and age which would not exist if youth were properly trained and age sympathetic. When they were up against the problems of life, our boys and girls did not want 'peptonized Sunday school lessons and wishywashy stuff.'

The facts to which Mr. Sara calls attention are serious enough, but it does not appear that he has any sure and certain remedy to suggest. References to "peptonized Sunday school lessons and wishywashy stuff" always make us suspicious that men who use such words are seeking after "some new thing" instead of placing their faith in the Gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ which is for every age and for every condition and circumstance of the times. The subject is too big to be dealt with in a Note: we mention the facts and hope to return to it later.

Report of the Commission on Church Property and Revenues.

The Commission of Inquiry into the Property and Revenues of the Church appointed in 1920 has issued its report. It is a document of great interest to all Churchpeople. There has long been an idea that the Church has vast hidden resources, and that if these were equitably divided there would be adequate incomes for all the Clergy, and funds for the maintenance of the Church's work. The Commission has gone into the whole matter and has produced a full statement of the revenues of the Church. The Recommendations made deal with the constitutions of the Ecclesiastical Commission and Queen Anne's Bounty, the future support of Cathedrals and Capitular Bodies, and lastly the incomes of the Parochial Clergy. They recommend the union of benefices, and the transfer of funds from richer benefices to help the poorer, but even with these changes they say that much will remain to be done before the financial position of the beneficed and unbeneficed Clergy can be regarded as satisfactory. Among the other satisfactory recommendations are that an adequate system of Clergy pensions should be arranged, that

the dioceses should undertake the management of glebe-lands and tithes, and that unbeneficed Clergy should receive suitable increase of stipend after years of service. Other recommendations deal with the incomes of Bishops and Archdeacons and the maintenance of episcopal residences. The Report is the beginning of a much-needed reform in the financial arrangements of the Church. It is a necessary preliminary to increased contributions on the part of the laity.

C.O.P.E.C.

The Conference on Christian Politics, Economics, and Citizenship recently held at Birmingham is an event of outstanding importance in whatever light some of its conclusions may be regarded. Representatives of nearly every section of Christianity met to consider the bearing of Christian ethics on the practical affairs of life. Its aim was to test all human relationships in the light of the principles of Christianity. Every one must sympathize with the earnestness and sincerity that inspired the meeting. Much good has undoubtedly been done by the discussion of so many subjects of vital interest. At the same time there is some justice in several of the criticisms that have been pronounced upon the gathering. It was evident that the undertaking was too vast for the occasion. It was impossible to deal wisely and adequately with all the subjects. In consequence several of the decisions were, as some of the delegates have emphatically declared, "hasty and unbalanced." One "lapse from prudence" has been acknowledged, but others can readily be discovered. The danger in such a Conference is that it may be "run" by individuals and organizations who have very little to do with its spiritual ends, but who are very eager and very adroit in snatching support for objects of their own." At times extremists seemed to capture the conference, with the result that "visionary theories unrelated to the hard facts of the real world" were mistaken for the ethics of Christianity. While admiring the courage and high purpose of its leaders, their mistakes are a warning against tendencies to "sloppy Idealism" that ought to be controlled in the future.

