

# Theology on the Web.org.uk

*Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible*

This document was supplied for free educational purposes. Unless it is in the public domain, it may not be sold for profit or hosted on a webserver without the permission of the copyright holder.

If you find it of help to you and would like to support the ministry of Theology on the Web, please consider using the links below:



Buy me a coffee

<https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology>



**PATREON**

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

**PayPal**

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

---

A table of contents for *The Churchman* can be found here:

[https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles\\_churchman\\_os.php](https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_churchman_os.php)

## THE MONTH.

THE reports of the proceedings in several Diocesan Conferences have been read with lively interest. Among the chief subjects discussed were the Houses of Laymen, Parochial Councils, Tithes, the Archbishop's Patronage Bill, and the Bishop of Peterborough's Parish Churches' Bill. The Bishop of Manchester devoted a portion of his address to an admirably constructed argument against Free Education.

In the Exeter Conference, Bishop Bickersteth gave as key-note "Life more abundantly."

Referring to the Bishop of Liverpool's opening address, the *Guardian* says:

There is real ground for three out of the four warnings which he gives to the Church of England. . . . We quite agree with him that amid the multiplication of churches and services the teaching given in the churches and the dispositions brought to the services are too often regarded as of secondary importance. Again, philanthropy does tend to obscure dogma. . . . The third point on which we find ourselves in accord with the Bishop of Liverpool is his description of the present state of ecclesiastical discipline. We do not say that it can be remedied at this moment. It will be necessary to arrive at something more like agreement both as to the standard of ritual and as to the courts by which that standard should be applied before the existing anarchy can be removed. But this necessity ought not to blind us to the danger and disorder which that anarchy involves. "We stand before the world in the position of a Church content to have no discipline." That is a position which we may be forced to accept for some time longer, but we ought not to accept it contentedly.

At Chichester a motion in favour of "an extension of the Diaconate," moved by the Rev. W. O. Purton, seconded by Prebendary Mount and supported by Archdeacon Walker (the Bishop's examining Chaplains), was carried unanimously. The Patronage Bill (the provisions of which were explained in a lucid paper by Archdeacon Hannah) was accepted "as a basis."<sup>1</sup> The majority were in favour of shelving the Parish Churches Bill.

There has been considerable discussion concerning the Church House. In a letter to the *Times*, the Bishops of London and Carlisle say:

It must not be supposed that the Bishops and others who are promoting the erection of a Church House are indifferent to the sufferings of the clergy. The subject has, and will have, their most anxious consideration; although they cannot think that anything done in this behalf can be made a fitting memorial of the blessing the Church has enjoyed and the work the Church has been able to do during the fifty years of the reign of Queen Victoria.

The Dean of Gloucester (Dr. H. Montagu Butler), we note with pleasure, has been appointed to the Mastership of Trinity College, Cambridge, and Canon Spence, Vicar of St. Pancras, is appointed to the vacant deanery. Sir Thomas Fowell Buxton has been elected Treasurer of the C.M.S. Due tributes of respect have been paid to the memory of that much esteemed veteran, Captain the Hon. Francis Maude, R.N.

The election of members of the House of Laymen, in the Dioceses of London and Rochester, has been eminently satisfactory.

A *Times* article on Bishop Hannington's Diary, contains some telling observations. A "Life" of the Bishop is just published.

<sup>1</sup> At Liverpool, Chancellor Espin criticized the Bill. The Bishop "entirely objected to the Board of Presentations," and Canon Lefroy's motion "That this Conference, while giving a general support to the Church Patronage Bill, desires to record its opinion adverse to the constitution of the council of presentation," was carried almost unanimously.