

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.

FEBRUARY, 1907.

The Month.

The
Education
Question.

THE exigencies of publication before Christmas prevented us from referring last month to the rejection of the Education Bill by the House of Lords, but even now it is not out of season to dwell upon what, in our judgment, was an unwise and unfortunate action. The *Spectator*, whose Unionist political views give special point to its opinion on this subject, said that the Bill was

“lost owing to the unwillingness of the Unionist leaders to assent to the provision forbidding the teacher in single-school rural areas to give the denominational lesson. . . . It is nothing short of a national disaster that the opposition to the Bill was maintained on this narrow decision.”

We commend these words to the earnest consideration of our readers. The point on which the Bill was wrecked is all the more remarkable when it is remembered that in single-school rural areas the clergy of the parishes would have been ready at hand for the purpose of giving denominational lessons. Unlike their brethren in the towns, they may fairly be presumed to have sufficient time for doing this work.

The Present
Situation.

There are other words from the same article in the *Spectator* to which we desire to call attention :

“When those who have refused to accept the Government concessions begin to take stock of the situation, we cannot believe that they will long continue satisfied with their action. . . . No one can suppose that the education controversy will now die away, or that things can be left as they are.”

These words receive strong confirmation from the comments and correspondence in the press during the last month. The *Morning Post* spoke very strongly against Mr. Balfour's tactics, as also did some well-known Conservative politicians. It is always a pity when the Church is used for political ends by any party, more particularly as there is no guarantee that she will not be thrown over in the end by political leaders. The correspondence in the *Times* has also shown that the victors are by no means happy in their hour of triumph. Very many Churchmen, even among those who were opposed to several provisions of the Education Bill, consider the present situation to be one of "intolerable strain," which calls for immediate attention. We are only sorry that they did not realize these facts before the House of Lords threw out the Bill. Anything more prejudicial to the best and permanent interests of the Church of England than the wrecking of the Bill, in view of the Government concessions, can hardly be imagined. To quote the *Spectator* once more :

"It is practically impossible that a Bill more favourable to the Church of England will ever be presented to Parliament. At the same time, it is idle for the clergy to imagine that the *status quo* of the Act of 1902 will be permanently maintained."

The Real
Cruz. The one question is how to reconcile the public control of the schools with the maintenance of their Church character. Two representative Church opinions have been expressed during the past month, which will doubtless receive the attention they deserve. The Bishop of Liverpool in his New Year's Letter says :

"We are prepared loyally to accept the express wish of the country that our elementary education should in the future pass under public control, and that tests for teachers should be removed."

To the same effect Sir John Kennaway writes to the *Times* :

"It is abundantly clear that the present state of things cannot continue, being inconsistent with the general acceptance of the principle of complete public control in the abolition of tests for teachers which followed on the result of the last Election."

These are frank admissions as to the "mandate" given to the Government at the last Election. While both the Bishop and Sir John Kennaway were opposed to the recent Bill, the problem still remains how to devise a Bill which will respect the two principles thus admitted, and yet assure to our children a religious foundation for their life. As Sir John Kennaway goes on to say :

"Unless we can arrive at such an agreement on the elements of Christianity as will permit of some common instruction being given in the State schools, secularism is practically inevitable."

The Bishop of Carlisle, with that clear grasp of first principles which characterizes his utterances, writes to the *Times* expressing a fear "lest the persistent reiteration of the phantasy that the religious teaching allowed by the Cowper-Temple clause may result in the establishment of some new form of religion is beginning to tell by sheer force of repetition, even on minds naturally counted clear, fair, and firm." Dr. Diggle points out that this clause was moved and carried by Churchmen in 1870, in order to safeguard Board schools from secularism ; and as he rightly says, "Only those who allow a nickname to do duty for an argument are affrighted by the pseudonym of Cowper-Temple religion." And then the letter closes with these words :

"The Cowper-Temple clause permits the full Bible to be freely taught, and taught in the way the Bible teaches it. Its motto implicitly is, 'The Bible our lesson, and the teacher to teach it.' As a Churchman and lifelong lover of liberty, I am in favour of every denominational facility which equity will permit ; but after more than thirty years' experience on a considerable scale of the religious teaching in our Provided schools, I am fully persuaded of two things—(1) that those who love the religion of Jesus Christ have little to fear from the Cowper-Temple clause ; and (2) that the statement that there is no such treasure for children as a simple common Christianity is out of harmony with well-established fact."

It was because of our strong conviction that the recent Education Bill pointed in the right direction, and could by mutual arrangement have been made perfectly satisfactory to the vast body of Churchmen, that we ventured to plead for careful consideration instead of uncompromising hostility.

A False Issue. The seriousness of the situation is clearly seen in the following words of Lord Hugh Cecil :

“Curiously, the difficulty of an educational basis common to Judaism and Christianity, and even to Romanism and Protestantism, is generally recognised. Why should the difficulty in the case of Churchmen and Nonconformists not be equally admitted?”

Could anything be more illogical than this statement? The two situations are entirely different, and it is this confusion of vital issues that makes the situation so grave. We are grateful to Sir John Kennaway for saying plainly that Lord Hugh Cecil has no right to speak for the whole Church of England. If Evangelical Churchmen were to accept Lord Hugh Cecil's position and allow him to be their leader on the Education Question, they would at once and for ever stultify their position in regard to the Bible Society, the Tract Society, the Evangelical Alliance, Mildmay, and Keswick, and other methods of expressing our common Evangelical Christianity. We often find ourselves in serious theological disagreement with Canon Hensley Henson, but we gladly acknowledge the convincing character of his reply to Lord Hugh Cecil on “The Fallacy of Anglican Exclusiveness” when he says :

“I do not doubt, of course, that there are very many clergymen who would like to make the difference between Churchmen and Nonconformists as sharp and unyielding as that between the Jew and the Christian, and between the Romanist and the Protestant, but I insist upon the fact that neither in the past nor in the present do the facts justify that reading of English life.”

What is Christian Teaching? The controversy between the Dean of Canterbury and Dr. Clifford has shown very clearly that the present Education trouble is due to extremists of the type of Lord Hugh Cecil and Dr. Clifford. Dr. Clifford's view of Christian teaching is miserably inadequate, and we are glad that Dean Wace has raised such a definite issue, and kept Dr. Clifford so persistently to the point. If we believed that Evangelical Nonconformity was truly represented by Dr. Clifford's view, or that the Church of England was truly represented by Lord Hugh Cecil, we should utterly despair of any proper

settlement ; but we believe neither to be the case. As for Nonconformity, Mr. Watts Ditchfield has well pointed out that other and equally prominent leaders have shown within the last few months that their view of the Christianity to be taught in the schools is that which is expressed in the Apostles' Creed, even though they do not favour the use of that formulary in elementary schools. It need not be said that this attitude is in exact agreement with the position of Evangelical Nonconformists, with the Bible Society, and other similar platforms ; and we believe that if such leaders could meet Dean Wace they would soon come to an agreement as to the fundamental Christianity to be taught to the children. We heartily endorse the suggestion of Dr. Headlam, of King's College, of a meeting of Churchmen and Nonconformists to discuss the whole situation.

There is something of much more vital importance at stake than the immediate question of education. It is the relation of the Church of England to the Bible. In the *Spectator* for January 5 we read the following :

A Still Wider
Issue.

“Lord Hugh Cecil declares that the faith of the Church and simple Biblical undenominational teaching are directly opposed. . . . It would be difficult to exaggerate the danger to the Church that must arise from insistence on this view. Once persuade the people of England that simple Bible Christianity and the Church of England are in opposition, and her days are numbered. . . . Let the English people get it into their heads that the attitude of the National Church to the Bible is analogous with that of the Roman Church, and the Anglican communion will inevitably lose the sympathy of the majority of the nation. . . . Once persuade the electorate—as Lord Hugh Cecil evidently desires to persuade them—that they must choose between the Church and the open Bible, and the conclusion is foregone.”

We need add nothing to these comments except to say that our attitude to the Bible and our conception of its relation to the Church affects and controls literally everything at issue between the Church of England and the Church of Rome, and also between the teaching of the Prayer-Book and Articles and that of extreme Anglicans.

**The Religion
of Parents.**

In the Archbishop of Canterbury's New Year's Letter the following words occur :

“We contend that every parent in England ought to be able, if he so desires, to count absolutely upon securing for his child, in the school to which he is compelled to send him, such elementary Christian teaching as is suited to the child's growing capacity to receive it.”

This view is described as one of the principles for which Churchmen have “contended throughout this long-drawn controversy.” The Archbishop's words clearly refer to all parents, whether Church or Nonconformist, and yet we do not remember to have heard of Churchmen contending for this position on behalf of Nonconformists in 1902. We notice, too, that the Archbishop only asks for “such elementary Christian teaching as is suited to the child's growing capacity.” Does this include Church teaching? Later on in his letter he speaks of “a religious education upon the lines of corporate Christian life.” Does “corporate Christian life” refer to Nonconformists, many of whom believe in it as strongly as do Churchmen? The practical question is, how the rights of parents are to be recognised in one-school areas, whether those schools are Provided or Non-provided. As the Dean of Carlisle recently said, such a proposal is a new venture in our national education; and, like him, we doubt whether it is practicable in its working or consistent with school discipline, but we are quite willing to put it to the test so long as it is an all-round test. It will, of course, mean that Nonconformists must have their children taught in one-school areas of a Church of England type by members of the school staff (not outsiders) who believe what they teach, and Church of England parents have their children taught in one-school areas of a County Council type by members of the school staff who believe what they teach. The mere statement of this shows the difficulty and complexity of the situation from an educational and practical point of view, and may well lead Churchmen to ask themselves again whether they were wise in rejecting the Bill of 1906.

The Object
of
Tractarianism.

In a recent article in the *Guardian* on "Is Tractarianism a Spent Force?" there are some interesting and significant statements which seem to deserve further attention :

"Be it remembered that Tractarianism was not quite the same thing as what is termed 'old-fashioned High Church.' The latter, a product of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, has, indeed, wellnigh died out. . . . On several counts Tractarianism was a revolt against it. . . . Moreover, it laboured for a definite and avowed object, often lost sight of by those who review the history of the movement. This object was the reunion of the English Church with Western Christendom. By the levelling up of practice, and by laying sole and constant stress on what was of strictly Catholic origin in the faith and the organization of the Church of England, the leaders of the movement hoped that within a generation or two the way would be sufficiently paved for a *rapprochement* between the ancient primatial see of the West and English Catholicity."

It is well to have this so definitely stated. It goes far to justify a good many things said by those whom the *Guardian* would doubtless designate as "extreme Protestants." Into the wisdom or even morality of this "definite and avowed object," in view of certain plain statements in our Articles, we need not now enter. It will suffice to note the *Guardian's* frank admission of the entire lack of success in the attainment of the object, and the belief that the breach has widened rather than narrowed. We are fain to confess, too, to a great satisfaction when so representative an organ as the *Guardian* can write as follows :

"Ardently as every Christian man must long for reunion, we do not hesitate to say that reunion with Rome as it is to-day would be an irreparable calamity to the English Church. Some day we would fain hope that the position may be quite different."

This hope will only be realized when Rome relinquishes her boast of *semper eadem*.

In the course of the same article the *Guardian* has some very suggestive remarks on Evangelical Churchmanship. After speaking of its attitude to ritual, it goes on to say of Evangelicalism that

"It has yielded to the fashion of the hour, and in many instances has sacrificed reluctantly, but irretrievably, the Puritan plainness of its worship

in its desire to meet the popular demand for a 'bright and hearty service.' The older Evangelicalism, with its simplicity, its tenderness, its austerity, has had to make way for a type of service which lacks the historic sanctions and the stateliness of the High Church models from which it copies some of its details, and has lost the emotional appeal which lay in the individual and personal character of its own worship."

These words are as true as they are important, and we commend them to those whose object is to have a "bright and hearty service." This desire, perfectly innocent and natural, has, nevertheless, a tendency to blind Evangelicals to the far-reaching effect of approximating to High Church usages. As the *Guardian* truly points out, Evangelicalism lacks the very sanctions for these services which are essentials of the High Church position. It will be an evil day for Evangelical Churchmanship when it loses the "emotional appeal" which lies "in the individual and personal character of its own worship." In the light of the Bishop of Manchester's charge, referred to last month, it is obvious that "bright and hearty services" are not in themselves all clear gain. Popular demands may easily lead to irretrievable loss. There is a salutary lesson here if Churchmen will only learn it.

The
Islington
Clerical
Meeting.

This well-known and now time-honoured gathering met in stronger force than ever on January 15, and gave striking evidence to the numbers and vitality of Evangelical Churchmanship. The topic discussed was "The Royal Commission on Ecclesiastical Discipline," and the Dean of Canterbury gave a clear and strong lead on the question of vestments, showing the impossibility of any legalization of vestments which were never used in the Church of England for three hundred years, and which stand condemned by the highest courts. There were other valuable and welcome pronouncements, as, for instance, one by the Dean of Norwich on the rights of the laity, and another in the form of an appeal by Canon Barnes-Lawrence for joint action with Moderate High Churchmen. The main question now is whether Evangelicals will follow the lead so definitely given.

There were clear indications among younger men present that they will not be behind in their response if only they are led with intelligence, sympathy, large-heartedness, and courage. We commend the admirable report of the meeting given in the *Record*, and trust that in its pamphlet form it may be scattered far and wide. The Royal Commission has so fully justified the position and contentions of the Evangelical and Moderate Churchmen that it would be deplorable if they do not take full advantage of the situation. There is a tide in the affairs of Church parties and schools of thought, as well as of individuals, and if Evangelicals do not take this at the flood it is hard to conceive of their getting another so entirely satisfactory and promising.



The Date of Deuteronomy.

BY THE REV. HENRY A. REDPATH, D.LITT., M.A.

IN the *Journal of Theological Studies* for July last, Dr. Kennett, Regius Professor of Hebrew at Cambridge and Examining Chaplain to the Bishop of Ely, propounded a theory that the Book of Deuteronomy is exilic in date, and proposed to place it about 520 B.C. We have always been led to believe by those who are called Higher Critics that one of the *established results* of their system is that the date of Deuteronomy is a few years anterior to its discovery in Josiah's reign. So much, then, for established results, which we are bidden to accept. The Professor has come down upon one of them and disestablished it.

I propose in the present paper to attempt to show that, while Dr. Kennett effectually disposes of many of the arguments in favour of the date rather earlier than Josiah assigned to the Book of Deuteronomy, he at the same time brings forward such inconclusive arguments in favour of his own hypothesis that we are almost of necessity thrown back upon the traditional date for the main body of the book.