

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

will soon give us an opportunity to express an opinion. Here and there occurs a remark which will probably be perverted. For instance, on page 33¹ our honoured friend says, "the bread and wine we present are not consecrated:" the Prayer Book word, however, is not *present* but *place*. It is important to bear in mind, as we have more than once observed of late, the Rubric says of the alms, "*humbly present and place*," but of the elements, simply "*place*." About the word "*then*" [when there is a Communion the Priest shall then place], compared with the same word in the Baptism Rubric [the font "is then to be filled"], something might be said, with justice, in refusing to make a change; but, for ourselves, we do not forget the Liddell judgment.

Other points in this interesting pamphlet invite attention. But we desire to recommend the "*Thoughts for To-day*," and we hope it will be widely read. The subject is one of immediate importance.

Reviews.

The Official Report of the Church Congress, 1882. Bemrose & Sons.

THE Church Congress at Derby has been admitted on all hands to have been a great success. In many ways, no doubt, it thoroughly deserves this meed of praise. The arrangements gave universal satisfaction; there was not a single breakdown or failure or hitch in the management. From the first the Bishop of the Diocese took the liveliest interest in it, watched over all the work of the committees, and at last presided in such a way as to win golden opinions from all who were present. There was an elevated tone of thought maintained throughout the majority of the meetings. Never, we believe, has the attendance been so well sustained all through the week, and the attention so continuous. The financial results also were satisfactory. Though the price of tickets was lower than on many occasions, and no expense was spared to secure the comfort

¹ Mr. Bickersteth here quotes from the Bishop of London's Primary Charge, 1871. His lordship said:—"May not a clergyman . . . when rebuked for the introduction of some unauthorized ceremony, feel some natural indignation when he observes his neighbour continually violating the Rubric which provides that 'when there is a Communion, the Priest shall *then* (*i.e.* after presenting the Alms, and before saying the prayer for the Church Militant) place upon the Table so much bread and wine as he shall think sufficient'? This Rubric is perfectly plain and undoubtedly binding. If it had at one time fallen into desuetude, its vigour has been revived in a decision of the Final Court of Appeal. It is practically without difficulty under almost any conceivable circumstances. It has about it no taint of superstition."

of the guests, a balance of £170 was handed over to the Southwell Bishopric Fund; and to sum up all, the Report, often sadly behindhand, was in the possession of subscribers on December 1st. All this may be fairly called success. Such a gathering demonstrates the energy of the great Church of England, and we should suppose that at Derby an impression of this vitality and power must have been produced.

The subjects of paramount interest were discussed, as was fitting, in the Great Hall. These were: "Unity of Belief in Relation to Diversities of Thought," "Evangelistic Work at Home and Abroad," "The Church and Modern Thought," "Political Relations of the Church," "The Church and other Communions," "The Liturgy," "The Church in Relation to Domestic and Social Life," and "The Devotional Life." It was noteworthy that on these subjects Evangelical men, or men, if not so called, yet imbued with Evangelical thought, occupied prominent places. No one who was present can forget the ablest and most interesting of all the discussions on the relations of the Church to modern thought. The papers and addresses of Mr. Wilson of Clifton, Professor Stokes, the Bishop of Bedford, and Mr. Welldon, deserve to live, and will live. Cambridge had no occasion on that day to be ashamed of her two senior wranglers and her senior classic, who did their work so well. Mr. Welldon's brief speech was full of fine feeling, and moved the audience as the heart of one man.

These were the topics discussed at the Congress which touched those who had minds and hearts to appreciate them. Other questions of far inferior interest and moment were relegated to the Temperance Hall. In many of these discussions High Churchmen predominated, but on the most exciting occasion there were not more than two hundred present. On the subject of Church Courts, to which we refer, the selection of readers and speakers happened to be singularly one-sided. Canon Gregory, Canon Trevor, Mr. James Parker, Mr. Dodd, Dr. Wirgman, Dr. Belcher, and the Rev. T. O. Marshall,¹ seven doughty champions, followed one another in quick succession; and yet when Canon Lefroy rose to say a word on the other side, the audience refused to listen, but turned the place into a Babel of confusion, and actually shouted him down. It does not say much for the judicial calmness which is to be expected if Canon Gregory and his friends have their way; fortunately, it need not trouble us, for so long as the Church is established by law, any change of Courts must have the sanction of the House of Commons, who are not likely to sell themselves and their fellow-laymen to sacerdotal government.

On the Thursday morning the subject handled was "The Church and other Communions—is Re-union or Inter-communion possible with Rome or Dissent?" In the afternoon this was followed by the discussion on "The Liturgy—whether any, and if so, what, changes are desirable?" These are kindred subjects, and their relation to one another are plainly indicated. The papers and addresses at the first of these meetings were somewhat disappointing; the second of the meetings will live in the memory of all who were present. It was admitted in the morning that union and communion with Rome is out of the question, that the breach has widened considerably since the Reformation, and that by *her* action, *not by ours*. It was as plainly admitted that it would be indeed a blessing to our land if the breach between us and our Nonconformist brethren could be healed. In the afternoon there was presented to us, on the one

¹ This gentleman is designated organizing secretary of the E.C.U. His speech (pp. 182-3) should be read as a specimen of what he wants to bring upon us. He would like to have "another Laud" and "another Becket"!

hand, a proposal for the alternative use, with Episcopal sanction, of the First Prayer Book of Edward VI. ; and, on the other hand, it was mildly suggested by Mr. Butcher that there were Churchmen who would desire Liturgical changes in the opposite direction, in order to promote conciliation with certain of the Dissenting bodies. The two discussions were so far parallel. But no one reminded the meeting of the lesson of History on the subject. It cannot be for a moment doubted that the mind of England has, since the Reformation, moved decidedly away from Rome in the direction of Evangelical freedom. Never was the proportion of Romanists to the population so small as at the present time, while Dissent has stolen from the Church not less than one-third of the mass of the people. Is it likely, under these circumstances, that the English people will make a retrograde movement, and go back ever so little behind the lines of the Reformation? Is it not certain, on the contrary, that any move the Church may make must be in the direction of Protestant truth and liberty?

This discussion was the occasion of that which we may call the Wood-Hoare episode. After Mr. Beresford Hope, in a cynical tone, had enumerated the advances of the Ritual he loves, Mr. Wood suggested, as we have just mentioned, the introduction of Edward's First Prayer-Book¹ for alternate use. It is to be observed that his proposal was that, having in view the little regard already paid to the Act of Uniformity, the *Bishops* should allow this. He admits that Legislative sanction is not likely to be obtained for his scheme, and hopes that our Episcopal rulers will thus sanction lawlessness. The Bishop called on Mr. Hoare, out of his arranged position, to follow Mr. Wood; and no one who heard his speech, and marked the effect it produced, will ever forget it; an effect which was afterwards heightened by the contrast of the—what shall we say?—unhappy style of Canon Gregory. Mr. Wood's suggestion was, as their own organ admits, the manifesto of the party he leads, and had been submitted to his choice counsellors. But we hardly think the very Ritualists themselves would wish to adopt all that they would gain by the innovation. The Holy Table is called, almost in the same page, *the Altar and God's Board*, which plainly indicates the state of transition under which the book was produced; and they would have to pray that God will deliver us "from the tyranny of the Bishop of Rome and all her detestable enormities." One thing is quite certain, the Evangelical body in the Church of England will never tolerate such a step backwards, from light into darkness. Canon Hoare will leave behind him many happy memories. His gentleness, goodness, power of sympathy, and skill as a teacher, have endeared him to many; but he will be remembered, we venture to say, more especially as he stood forth in the Drill Hall at Derby, a good old soldier of the Cross, a veteran warrior for the truth of God, whose eye was not dim, nor his natural force abated.

There is much in the Report of real interest—many a thought that will live and work in the minds of men; but on the manifold details of the multitudinous subjects discussed, or attempted to be discussed, it is impossible to enter; our space forbids it.

The papers on the "Devotional Life" would require, to handle them properly, separate discussion. Dr. Norman Kerr's noble article on "Inebriates" deserves careful reading. The speeches on "The Political Relations of the Church" are full of interest. The debates on "Evangelistic Work at Home and Abroad" ought not to be put aside. It is delightful to see that men of all schools of thought are desirous to bring the Gospel, as far as they understand it, to bear on the masses of the people, though

¹ P. 391.

we cannot see any special virtue in cassocks¹ for itinerant preachers, or that texts selected from the Lessons of the day are necessary to prove their Churchmanship; and we confess we were sorry to have the subject lowered to a recommendation as to the note² on which it is proper to intone.

We should like to add a word or two on the relation of Evangelical Churchmen to these gatherings. In the first place, we would point out a danger which they bring. A Church Congress is apt to soften off the edges of distinctive truth, and to persuade men to cry Peace where no peace is possible; for how can we have peace without truth?

It is not true, *e.g.*, as Mr. Wycliffe Gedge³ seems to have persuaded himself, and wishes to persuade others, that the Baptismal controversy is forgotten, and all men think alike on that subject. The High Church dogma of Baptismal Regeneration is doing abundant evil amongst us today. It is not many years since one of Mr. Gedge's colleagues, a prominent Diocesan school inspector, attempted to cram it, in its most offensive form, down the throats of the pupil teachers of his district; and wherever the theory is maintained of a seed implanted and lying dormant, confusion must take place, which hinders many a soul from grasping the plain doctrines of the Gospel. It is not true, as Mr. Randall Davidson's⁴ speech might lead some to believe, that you could go *blindfold* into any London church, at the time of service, and not know to which section of the Church it belongs. His experience must be small, or his powers of discrimination very imperfect. Our fate last summer, during a brief holiday tour, does not support him. At more than one favourite watering-place we heard "*pernicious nonsense*" which, we venture to say, no Evangelical would propound to his people: the crudest view of Baptismal Regeneration, the foundation of all the teaching of the pulpit, and the Lord's Supper pressed on all present who desired to obtain pardon of sin; while there was not one word to guide an inquiring soul into the way of peace, no exaltation of Christ, no mention of the work of the Holy Spirit.

It is most injurious that such fallacies should be propounded, and grievous that they should receive Episcopal sanction⁵ and unless a champion of the truth is at hand, and the Chairman is willing and able to give him the chance, the error is disseminated to do its deadly work.

But it is, in the next place, to be remembered—and on this we would insist—that a Church Congress is not the voice of the Church, nor of a Diocese, and has no binding authority. Each assembly of the Congress originates, we believe, not in a public meeting, openly called, but by the operation of a sub-committee chosen no one knows by whom. The only safeguards are—first, that the Bishop in whose Diocese the Congress meets, is responsible for it, and, in some sense, for all its utterances, and that he ought therefore to have, as he has, a paramount influence in its direction; and secondly, that the voice of public opinion is the weightiest force in England, and has many ways of making itself felt.

Yet, though Church Congresses have no authority, they are of great importance, because the audiences they assemble are large and representative. It is to be hoped, then, that Evangelical men will throw themselves vigorously into them, and though they may feel that it is not pleasant to speak to an assembly not wholly sympathetic, be ready to stand forth for the truth of God. At the Derby Congress it was reported that much influence was lost by the refusal of not a few Evangelical leaders to undertake the work assigned to them. This surely ought not to be. Everything is really in our favour. The truth of God we know is with us; and the law of our Church, as again and again indicated, is on our

¹ P. 91.² P. 85.³ P. 52.⁴ P. 47.⁵ P. 48.

side. The Prayer Book, in its true and honest interpretation, is ours. We do not ask for any change in it. Our cause must prevail. By putting forth fearlessly the truths, to the inculcation of which we owe our name, we shall leaven, still more largely than we have already, all parties in the Church with Evangelical opinions. Our cause, we repeat, must and will prevail; but the victory may be postponed if we of this generation fail to rally for the battle and to do our part in it.

PREBYTER.

Short Notices.

Modern Atheism; or, The Heavenly Father. By ERNEST NAVILLE, Corresponding Member of the Institute of France (Academy of the Moral and Political Sciences), late Professor in the University of Geneva. Translated from the French by HENRY DOWNTON, M.A., Rector of Hopton-by-Thetford, formerly English Chaplain at Geneva. Second Edition. London: James Nisbet and Co., 21, Berners Street, 1882.

A member of the French Institute has a right to be listened to, and when the lectures which make up this volume were delivered at Geneva, they excited, as was natural, great interest. This was nearly twenty years ago, at which time the atheistic principles now so prevalent, or at least making so much noise in England, were doing the same in Switzerland and Germany. It takes twenty years for a wave of thought to travel from the continent to this country, and Professor Naville's lectures could not have appeared in a second edition at a more appropriate time than the present. It is a book admirably adapted to meet those various shades of atheistic opinions which encounter us everywhere, in book-stalls and drawing-rooms, in newspapers and reviews, and are more or less disturbing the faith of numbers. Nothing can be more sound than M. Naville's reasoning or more triumphant than his conclusions.

Few French writers have the good fortune to be translated into readable English—Mr. Downton's translation leaves nothing to be desired. No one who did not know the fact would imagine it to be a translation. Even the morsels of French poetry are represented in the text by lines of English poetry, in most cases, to say the least, not inferior to the originals, which are given in foot-notes. Those who are acquainted with Mr. Downton's well-known hymns will not be surprised at this.

Ernest Naville has written many other books on Christian truth and doctrine, which we have not read, but in the present volume there is nothing but the one subject which the title indicates. It is not a defence of Christianity but of Theism. He himself does not hesitate to assert publicly that his "hopes for time and eternity are based on the gospel of Jesus Christ as it is preached to the old women and the little children." But the book before us has to do only with the existence and goodness of God. He does not deal in these lectures with "the grand doctrinal foundations of our faith," nor with the existence of evil, the reality of which