

Zeitschrift: Revue internationale de théologie = Internationale theologische Zeitschrift = International theological review
Band: 13 (1905)
Heft: 51

Artikel: Anglicana
Autor: [s.n.]
DOI: <https://doi.org/10.5169/seals-403629>

Nutzungsbedingungen

Die ETH-Bibliothek ist die Anbieterin der digitalisierten Zeitschriften. Sie besitzt keine Urheberrechte an den Zeitschriften und ist nicht verantwortlich für deren Inhalte. Die Rechte liegen in der Regel bei den Herausgebern beziehungsweise den externen Rechteinhabern. [Siehe Rechtliche Hinweise.](#)

Conditions d'utilisation

L'ETH Library est le fournisseur des revues numérisées. Elle ne détient aucun droit d'auteur sur les revues et n'est pas responsable de leur contenu. En règle générale, les droits sont détenus par les éditeurs ou les détenteurs de droits externes. [Voir Informations légales.](#)

Terms of use

The ETH Library is the provider of the digitised journals. It does not own any copyrights to the journals and is not responsible for their content. The rights usually lie with the publishers or the external rights holders. [See Legal notice.](#)

Download PDF: 30.03.2025

ETH-Bibliothek Zürich, E-Periodica, <https://www.e-periodica.ch>

ANGLICANA.

* **Roman Catholicism in Great Britain.** — According to figures given in the *Tablet* the number of Roman Catholic priests in Great Britain this Christmas is 3,794, as against 3,711 a year ago, the increase of eighty-three being partly due to “an influx of most desirable aliens.” Again, the increase is more largely with the regular than the secular clergy: the former actually number 1,280, the latter 2,514. The number of churches, chapels, and stations in Great Britain has risen during the twelvemonth from 1,954 to 2,008. The greatest addition to the number of priests is in the diocese of Portsmouth, which has twenty-one more, to the number of Missions (which our contemporary inclines to regard as the more important sign of growth) in that of Newport, which has twelve more. The French clergy who have come amongst us do not, of course, as a rule, undertake missionary work, most of them being unfamiliar with our language. Scotland counts 521 priests, against 506 last year, and is “one Mission to the good.”

We read in the “Church Family Newspaper” (April 7, 1905): The constant increase of Romanism, and especially the extraordinary growth of the monastic Orders in this country, are matters which bear so directly in our judgment upon the future welfare of England as to call for the most serious attention. It is all very well for men like minded with Lord William Cecil to speak of the French religious Orders now settled here as martyrs to their faith, and to claim for them a sympathetic welcome, but it must be remembered that they do not come to us as peaceful refugees, but with the avowed purpose of undermining, if possible, the national faith and converting England to the creed of the Vatican. In the near future difficulties will arise over educational questions connected with schools under the control of monks and nuns. Already, it is asserted that in England and Wales they receive considerable grants which practically assist in maintaining conventual establishments, whilst in Ireland elementary public instruction is in large measure, and secondary education is completely, ab-

sorbed by them and thereout suck they no small advantage. How exclusively the Roman hierarchy in England, whilst constantly appealing for Protestant support and claiming every possible concession on the plea of religious liberty, devotes its whole energies to proselytism is manifest in manifold ways. The contributions of the Roman Catholic Churches in London to a great national charity like the Hospital Sunday Fund are absolutely scandalous when compared with the immense sums they can spend upon churches and buildings for religious purposes. The huge cathedral at Westminster is only one example of the vast and costly edifices they are raising in every direction, yet they are too poor, or too mean, to supply the wants of their own sick poor. These facts should be remembered when fascinating Sisters come begging—as they are constantly doing—for Protestant charity. We are sincerely desirous not to speak uncharitably, but those who are prudent learn from the experience of others, instead of drifting on and suffering from their own. The history of every European country in which the religious Orders control education should be a sufficient warning for all who are acquainted with it.

* **The Church of England and the Higher Criticism.** — An important Church movement is announced in a manifesto, just issued, signed by nearly a hundred clergymen, with the object of securing recognition of the results of Biblical criticism, and greater tolerance for advanced ideas with regard to such matters as the Virgin Birth and the Incarnation. The following is the text of the manifesto: — 'We, the undersigned clergymen of the Church of England, observing (a) on the one hand the present unsettled condition of religious opinion, which, while due in the main to the general trend of modern thought, specially connects itself for the clergy with the critical study of the New Testament, and (b) on the other hand a counter-tendency to treat the full discussion of many questions arising from such study as inadmissible for our Church, and so to commit us as a body to non-critical views of the New Testament Scriptures, desire to record — (1) Our sense of the grave and manifold religious issues involved in the present critical discussions, and of the urgent need for English Churchmen to combine an earnest faith in the Holy Spirit who guides into all truth with as earnest an effort to contribute to a solution of these problems. -- (2) Our desire that as many of the clergy have already, with advantage to Christian faith, and with a general assent on the part of their rulers, welcomed important results of a patient, reverent, and progressive criticism of the Old Testament, so the clergy, as Christian teachers, may now receive authoritative

encouragement to face the critical problems of the New Testament with entire candour, reverence for God and His truth, and loyalty to the Church of Christ. — (3) Our fear lest the door of Ordination should be closed to men who patiently and reverently apply historical methods to the Gospel records, and so an increasing number of men, both spiritually and intellectually, should be lost to the high office of the ministry. — (4) Our conviction that it is not without grave responsibility and peril that any of us should build the faith of souls primarily upon details of New Testament narrative, the historical validity of which must ultimately be determined in the court of trained research—although many of us, until such final decision take shape, may cling devotedly to the traditional details in question. — (5) Our confidence that the Faith of the Church in the years to come, whatever historical revisions may await us, will stand, without risk and without discontinuity, upon spiritual foundations to which Christian experience and the creed of the Church alike bear testimony.’

A Counter-Declaration. — The Committee of the Bible Students Union have issued a counter-declaration, in which they say:— ‘Presumably the cause of the above Declaration (the manifesto) is to be found in the serious anxiety which is being felt as to the fate of Higher Criticism; for since Baxter’s unanswered reply to Wellhausen ten years ago something like 300 books have been written on the defence side, showing in one way or another the unscientific character of modern Biblical Criticism, and the consequent untenability of its “results;” but probably this anxiety was brought to a climax by Dr. Emil Reich’s articles in the “Contemporary Review” (February and April), under the title, “Bankruptcy of Higher Criticism.” ‘So long as they remain on their own ground, whether Lower or Higher Criticism, the critics are comparatively safe: but when they leave that ground and invade the region of the Christian Faith, and require of the latter that it shall shape itself to fit in with their suppositions, then they challenge the entire Christian community.’

Premature Comment. — The following statement has been sent to ‘The Times’ for publication:— ‘One hundred and one clergymen of the Church of England have sent, or are sending, to all their brother clergy of the Anglican Communion, at home, in the Colonies, and abroad, the Declaration on Biblical Criticism (with request for signature), which has already appeared in our columns. The document, marked “private and confidential,” has been subjected to what its promoters, with great respect for their opposers, hold to be premature and mistaken comment. The com-

mittee, numbering twenty-one members, courteously decline at present to correct these criticisms; but when, after the lapse of some weeks most of the replies shall have come in, they will give to the matter entire publicity, and will afford full opportunity for debate, and, wherever there may be error, for refutation.

* **An Appeal for Broadmindedness.** — The Bishop of Birmingham, in the course of a Lenten address delivered at his Cathedral on Wednesday last week, made an appeal to Churchmen for reunion and a better realisation of their own shortcomings. Christendom, it was said, had become sundered into a thousand fragments, and therefore what was the use of talking about the obligation of membership into one visible body? There were great and deep transformations going on in religion in Europe. We knew not what might come about in the course of ages, but it was true that a sudden or rapid attempt to reunite divided parts of Christendom was destined to certain failure. What, he thought, every Christian of every denomination or part of Christendom should do was to lay to heart that in our divisions we contradicted the evident purpose of Christ. If every Church recognised that we were meant to be one body, however sundered we were now, and made it a matter of prayer and thought for some ten years to come, at the end of that time we might all be more penitent, be more ready to own our shortcomings and failures, and there might be a more hopeful opening for reunion. Meanwhile, he was sure what our duty was. It was to try and realise within the region of our own immediate responsibility within the Church of England the idea of Church membership, and what it meant. It was quite certain we could not be fit to play our own part towards the divided portions of Christendom abroad or at home until we had better realised our own unity within ourselves. One method of escape from the responsibilities which belonged to membership of the Church was to say that the Church of England was only part of a greater Church, the Catholic Church, that it was only two provinces out of a vast number which made up a universal society, and that we ought to hear more about the Catholic Church than about the Church of England. To a certain extent there was a great deal of truth in that. *No doubt we were insular* because we belonged to an island, but that had a dangerous effect on our politics, literature, and religion. Englishmen were always apt to forget the great world outside the Anglo-Saxon race and language. It had been in literature and in education an extraordinary hindrance to us, and it had been equally a hindrance to us in the matter of religion. Would to God that Englishmen would know more of

what was going on in religion outside the range of the Anglo-Saxon language. Of course, it was fundamental that we should acknowledge that there were elements of Christianity which were older than the Church of England, and which had wider and deeper authority than could belong to any part of the Church, which we were bound to accept and which we could not alter; and he was only using the official language of the English Church when he recognised those elements as being the creeds, the canon of Holy Scripture, the threefold ministry and the administration of the Sacraments. St. Paul's idea of the Church was not so much that it was a great confederacy, a great variety of Churches lying side by side, as that each particular Church was the local embodiment of what was more local than general, and he found all the discipline of membership in those matters which arose within the scope of the particular Church. And it was in the trials of our own particular Church that we were to find the test of our loyalty, and it was in our relations with one another who were in communion with one another that we were to find the test of our membership. Individualism was the disease of individuality; it had run riot in the Church of England. In conclusion, he said that the unit of Church organisation for the Episcopal Church was the diocese and not the parish. He asked the clergy and laity before Whitsuntide to read once carefully through the Book of Common Prayer, which would produce a great deal of practical good. The qualities which St. Paul in his time saw to be necessary for Church membership were necessary for Church membership in ours.

(Church Family Newspaper, April 20, 1905.)

* **The Bishop of Fond du Lac to the Editor of the « Russian Orthodox American Messenger »** (*April 1905*). — « . . . The English people have not the logical acumen of the French nation, nor the love of subtleties that marks the Latin church. It is a practical people. They do not look for logical consistency in their complicated form of government or in their system of law. So far as the Anglican Church is concerned it has had but few great theologians, but had great students of Holy Scripture, and Ecclesiastical history. The practical result of the Anglican Church's teaching is seen in the large number of believing christians found in her Parliament, among her leading statesmen and jurists, in the high moral standard of her clergy, the rise of her Religious Orders, and in the sanctity of not a few who may be called saints. It is not with the English nation, but with the Anglican Communion that fellowship is sought. Now the life and faith of this practical church which extends for beyond England, cannot be ar-

rived at by an examination of the Thirty Nine Articles. In America they form no part of the Prayer Book proper, and no one of the clergy or laity is asked to sign them. In England they are regarded not as symbols of the faith. They are not therefore to be expected to be full statements of doctrine. Nor are they to be construed apart by themselves, but as subordinate to the Prayer Book, Creeds, Liturgy, and Catechism. And since the church declared at the Reformation that she did not intend to depart from the Catholic faith, these Articles must be construed in a Catholic sense. That they are capable of this has been demonstrated time and again as see Bishop Forbes on the Articles. So long as such a meaning can be given them, they form no barrier to a formal recognition of each other, by the Holy Eastern and Anglican Churches. »

* **Church of England League. Speeches of Dean Wace and Lady Wimborne.** — The chairman reviewed the work of the League during the year. He said that work had been maintained during the past twelve months with even greater activity than in years past. In some respects the League had been doing more important work than ever. He would like to mention more particularly that during the past year the League in conjunction with the National Protestant Church Union had done, he hoped, very considerable service by laying before the Royal Commission now sitting to inquire into Ecclesiastical Discipline a series of very carefully prepared and moderately stated evidence as to the disorders which undoubtedly were lamentably prevalent throughout the Church of England at the present time. He could say on behalf of the Committee of the League that they had taken the most scrupulous care that that evidence should be presented without any extravagance, and without any bitterness and he hoped that evidence prepared with that care and in that spirit would have—he doubted not it had had—its due effect upon the Commissioners, and that it had convinced them, at all events, that whatever measures it might be necessary to take, there were very grievous evils in the present state of the Church of England. In the work to which he had just referred the League had, by taking its part, realised the first part of the title. It was for the defence and promotion of the Reformed Church of England. The League was, in the first place, for defence, but he was particularly anxious to insist that the League did not exist for the promotion of one set of views or for the support of merely one party in the Church. They were anxious to live and let live within the Church, only it must be the Church of England, which even Archbishop Laud

had declared to be Protestant. Archbishop Benson in the last few weeks of life, when paying a visit to Ireland, saw displayed before him on a platform as the motto of the Church of England the words „Catholic, Apostolic, Reformed and Protestant,” and the Archbishop said with great emphasis that we cannot spare one of these words, certainly not the last word „Protestant.” Speaking on the movement to appeal, first of all, to the Scriptures and subject to that to the example of the first six centuries of the Christian era, he wished to make it quite plain that the League as such had no responsibility for that movement. But at the same time, he was grateful to say, the League had looked with a benevolent eye upon that movement. About that movement there had been some hasty and extraordinary misconceptions. It had been said in some quarters that to appeal to the first six centuries was to agree with everything that was done in those six centuries. Well, there had been a good deal of talk lately about the improvement of English education. There was one thing, he wished they would teach people what was logic, because if there had been an adequate knowledge of logic in the country no misconception of that sort could have arisen. A horse is an animal with four legs, but it did not follow that every animal with four legs was a horse. He had always carefully explained that he did not suggest that everything done in those centuries could be considered Catholic. What he did suggest was that what was carefully and authoritatively done by the general consent of the best Fathers of those times should be considered now. Why did the League look with favour on a suggestion of that kind? Because it was conceived in that spirit of fairness which the League desired to cultivate.

Lady Wimborne: They were met in a time of crisis, a time when the condition of things in the Church was so serious that the Government had been obliged by the force of public opinion to inquire into the disorders and illegalities in the Church. The Church of England was in a state of anarchy with clergymen, in spite of their solemn oath, defying the Law Courts and ignoring their bishops. In many towns and villages there was a growing alienation between the clergy and the poor, while chapels were being built and rapidly filled. The object of the party of disorder was to bring about reunion with Rome—to hand the Church of England over as a present to the Pope.

„We intend to frustrate that scheme,” Lady Wimborne continued, „its realisation would be fatal to our country. We are following in the footsteps of our great Anglican divines. We can have beauty and reverence in our services without going to Rome

for them. We have, indeed, to fight again the battle of the Reformation. We have to fight over again the battle that our fathers fought. In fighting for Protestantism they fought for the great principle at the root of our national greatness, freedom; freedom from the rule of the Church in the person of the priest. We only gained this freedom and can only keep it by the open Bible. We shall lose it if we permit the priest or the sceptic to destroy it. Reunion with Rom, the Ritualistic party openly proclaim as their darling wish. They know their present platform will not long hold them. When they have accepted the Roman creed they must bow to Roman rule. But if they will not be content with the Church our Reformers left, they must seek in that Church they so much admire the fulfilment of their desires. The Church of England is Protestant and Catholic. We do not mean to be defrauded out of one of those titles or defrauded out of the other. We call our opponents Mediævalists and make them a present of the Dark Ages to which they appeal." In conclusion Lady Wimborne said that instead of seeking reunion with Rome, the Church of England might well strive and pray for reunion with the Nonconformist bodies, which were one with the mother Church in all essentials of faith and doctrine.

(Church Family Newspaper, May 12, 1905.)

* **The Anglican Communion towards all Christendom. — South Africa.** — At a recent meeting of the Cathedral Chapter of Grahamstown, and at the Missionary Conference of the diocese, the Bishop consulted those present on the subject of certain questions which had been submitted by the United Boards of Missions in London to the Bishops of the Anglican Communion for their consideration.

The following are the answers which Bishop Cornish has returned, after careful considerations of the various suggestions made to him:—

Question 3. — What, in your opinion, is the duty of the whole Anglican Communion as one Body, acting together, in order to make some supremely important advance in the fulfilment of our grave responsibilities towards our own people, towards all Christendom, and towards the whole world?

The healing of our own divisions.

Strict loyalty to the Catholic Creeds.

The careful consideration of the Report of the Committee of the Lambeth Conference of 1888 appointed to consider the subject of authoritative standards of Doctrine and Worship.

The reunion of Christendom.

A consideration of the principles upon which, and of the methods by which, reunion may be accomplished, *e. g.*:—

1. Between the Anglican, Roman, and Eastern Communions, by „explanation.”
- 2, With non-Episcopal Bodies on the basis of principles laid down at the Lambeth Conference of 1888.

A real faith in the Gospel message and in the power of Christianity with a true conception of the Kingdom of God.

That Christian principles should be paramount in our international, civil, social, and domestic relationships—*e. g.*, the sanctity of marriage, home religion, etc. *(March 31, 1905.)*

* **The English Church Union.** — In a publication at the occasion of the forty-sixth anniversary of the foundation of the English Church Union, we read the following Words: “Whatever may have happened in the past, the faithful members of the Church are now determined that the Church of England shall be governed neither by Parliament nor even by Bishops administering merely the law of the State and enforcing decisions of civil tribunals. They are determined that the Church of England shall be free, and shall be governed in accordance with the common law of the whole Catholic Church of Christ, on which the legitimate exercise of ecclesiastical authority depends. It may be that the faithful will have to suffer in the future as they have done in the past in vindicating those principles. They will be ready to do so. Suffering has won its victories before; it will win them again.”
