

# *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 CHURCHMAN

July, 1917.

## The Month.

“Reserva-  
tion.”

THE question of the Reservation of the Sacrament continues to excite attention, and is, in fact, the most prominent feature of ecclesiastical controversy at the present time. The point at issue is not so much the right to reserve the Sacrament for the sick under due episcopal authority—although it should be noted that there is still a very large body of Church opinion opposed to Reservation for any purpose whatsoever—as the right to reserve it under conditions which must inevitably lead to its worship and adoration. The two points are quite distinct, in spite of some efforts to unify them, and in considering the question it is of the greatest importance to keep the distinction in mind. Much literature has been issued in regard to it. Dr. Darwell Stone's book (published by Mr. Robert Scott, 2s. 6d. net) has already been noticed in our pages. It is quite the ablest book on the extremer side, and is everywhere widely quoted. But what was needed was a careful statement on the part of those who while quite ready to accept the practice of Reservation for the sick are opposed most strongly to the worship and adoration of the reserved elements. Such a book we now have. It bears the simple title *Reservation*, and is published by Mr. Robert Scott at 2s. net. The genesis of the book may be briefly explained. There being some difficulty experienced over the question in the diocese of Chelmsford, the Bishop, Dr. Watts-Ditchfield, invited the whole of his clergy to a meeting, which was held in Easter week, and the Bishop of Oxford, Dr. Gore, attended on his brother bishop's invitation to address them. He not only consented to give the main address, but to answer questions. This little volume contains the

full report of the Bishop of Oxford's address, and also of the questions and answers and of the Bishop of Chelmsford's summing-up. The volume has been referred to by the Bishop of Durham as one of extraordinary interest ; we go even further and say it is a volume of extraordinary importance.

The Bishop of Oxford's position is well known. **Bishop Gore's Position.** The Bishop of Chelmsford said that Dr. Gore "has done probably more than any other man to advance the cause of Reservation and to bring it into the realm of practical politics," yet he is conscientiously opposed to the Reserved Sacrament being used for worship and adoration. Indeed the real subject of his address was "Access to the Reserved Sacrament for Prayer and Adoration," and we venture to say that the arguments he put forward in opposition to the practice are absolutely unanswerable. It is strange, indeed, that they should not be accepted by all those who have generally regarded him as their leader, but there is a section of extreme Churchmen who seem to recognize no law but that of their own inclination unless it be that of the Church of Rome, for let it be understood quite plainly that the right of access to the Reserved Sacrament for prayer and adoration is recognized by the Church of Rome and by no other Church in Christendom. The practice even in the Church of Rome is of comparatively modern origin. It is certainly not primitive ; nor can it rightly be called Catholic. We must refer our readers to the volume itself for a full realization of its illuminating pages, but we may say that the Bishop of Oxford insisted that what is at stake is not the doctrine of the Real Presence, or the real objective Presence, "but the use to which it is put." The Bishop gave it as his own experience that "the sense of the interior presence of *Christ in us* weakened the desire for the exterior visit" to the Sacrament, and he added that the putting of the Holy Eucharist to a new use "different from any use which is directly or indirectly suggested in the New Testament is something which has about it a great venturesomeness—a great presumption." He warned those who pleaded that they should be content with "visits to the Blessed Sacrament" and abandon the desire for the monstrance or for Benediction that "the whole impulse of logic and devotion renders these various uses so closely interconnected that, if we feel bound to make a stand

against the development as a whole, we must make it at the beginning and not at the later point." The Bishop's reference to "sophistical arguments"—of which we hear too many—was much to the point. He said:—

Then I do also very strongly urge that we should not suffer ourselves to use sophistical arguments. I think that our position is a position of very great difficulty. I have never been an optimist about the Church of England. I expect we have bad times in front of us, such as will test the faith and patience of the best of us. But it is all the more necessary that we should keep our minds unsophisticated. We need to keep honest consciences and maintain only fair arguments. It is absurd to say I am *only* reserving the Blessed Sacrament for the communion of the sick if, in fact, I am reserving it with another purpose prominent in my mind—if in fact it is the desire to have the Blessed Sacrament as an object of worship which is the dominant motive in those desiring Reservation; as is sometimes the case not only in religious communities but in parish churches also. We must not juggle with words. If we want Reservation only for the purpose of communion of the sick we can have it.

The Bishop of Chelmsford's summing-up was remarkably able. It dealt with the question from the practical side. In answer to the argument that many people found it "helpful" to have the Sacrament reserved in "our open churches," he asked those who argue from the standpoint that because something "helps" it is admissible and advisable in our Church "Where are we going to stop?" "People," he said, "who are communicants of the Church of England are telling me and writing to me saying that they are finding tremendous comfort in Spiritualism at the present time. They say that it is a great comfort to hold converse with 'husband' and with 'son.' They say that they find that they can even go to their Communion better on the following Sunday as the result. But, because some people say that they find it helpful, am I necessarily bound to tack on, say, Spiritualism to the Church?" Moreover, he wanted to know whether they were certain that "because fifty people are found in a church praying before the Sacrament that they are more men and women of prayer than the members of other churches without Reservation? Is Family Prayer so frequent? Is there a Prayer Meeting in that parish? Can any one say there is more real prayer in, for instance, All Saints', Margaret Street, parish than in St. Paul's, Onslow Square?" On the question of finality he again asked "Where are we to stop?" "To put it quite bluntly, if anybody eight or nine or ten years ago had told me that the

Bishop of Oxford would be regarded by any body of Catholics in this country as a 'back number,' I should not have believed it, and yet there are men to-day who say, shall I say, straight out, that the Bishop of Oxford is a Protestant and too Protestant for them. Some even say that Keble and Pusey are out of date and did not go far enough. The early Tractarians, rightly or wrongly, held that *all* they asked for was to be found within the Prayer Book, but is not that position openly abandoned by large numbers of clergy to-day? Now, when this is the case I ask my brethren where are we going to stop? What is the final stage? " This is not only a serious question, it is *the* question, and evidence is accumulating that there is a school of extremists in the Church of England who will stop at nothing short of reunion with Rome.

An instructive letter appeared in the *Guardian* of June 7 from Anglican, who bluntly and frankly declared that " the Church of England is being Romanized," and as evidence that there are in our midst men who are doing their utmost to Romanize the Church he called attention to the following facts :—

1. A layman, who was a sincere Churchman, had taken a house in a country parish. He went to church, but found that the services were quite strange to him. They were not the services of the Church of England. The rector, when he found he did not attend, visited him, and when he heard his reason for abstaining from worship, made no excuse but " hoped they would be good friends." The rector frankly acknowledged that he would have joined the Church of Rome had he not been married !

2. A distinctly High Church clergyman friend went to a Communion Service for clergy in a parish in the South of England. He confessed that he had no idea what the service was—it was all strange to him, and he resented the fact that he was not allowed to communicate, although he had been invited to the service.

3. A lady in the South-West of England was pressed by the vicar of the parish to join the Church of Rome. When she showed her surprise, he boasted that he had already persuaded a large number of women to " go over."

4. A High Church clergyman told the writer that as he came from church one day he was chaffed by the Roman priest, on the ground that he (the rector) was not very friendly to him. When asked what he meant, he was told, " You never send me any converts, while I always reckon to get a dozen each year from St. A's " !

5. At a certain well-known church in the South of England three of the clergy went over to Rome. The bishop of the diocese took the services on the following Sunday, and he declared that had he not gone and explained the position of the Church of England the whole congregation would also have " gone over." The clergy had been apparently educating the people for this purpose.

With this letter we may couple a paragraph from the *Church Times* of June 15 :—

We have received a glowing account of a procession of the Blessed Sacrament on Sunday last in the parish of St. Saviour, Hoxton, with Exposition at the high altar throughout the day, and Benediction after Evensong. It appears to have been, as we can well believe, a magnificent and edifying ceremony, a genuine act of worship in crowded and gaily decorated streets. These streets are normally among the meanest and most depressing in London. The description is instructive and suggestive. It shows what a real help to evangelic religion these ceremonies may be. But it provokes comment of another kind also. All was done, not only without ecclesiastical authority, but in open defiance of authority. Regarding it in this light, we cannot abstain from severe condemnation, and we fear that all the good which may have been done by the stimulation of devotion will be more than counter-balanced by the harm that is done to the cause of sacred obedience, and by the further weakening of that spiritual authority which is already in deplorable estate.

We are glad to read the protest of the *Church Times*. It is possible that men who refuse to acknowledge the rule of the Bishops may take a hint from the *Church Times*, although we should have been better pleased if that powerful journal had expressed its dissent from the practices referred to. The case has been brought to the attention of the Bishop of London by Mr. Kensit. We are not favourable to ritual prosecutions, but here is a case, if ever there were one, when the most drastic measures available should be applied.

The death of Dr. Denney is a great loss to the Christian Church and to the cause of Evangelical theology. He was connected with the Free Church of Scotland, but he belonged by his writings, which have helped many thousands, to the whole Christian Church. The Editor of the *British Weekly*, in a moving and sympathetic review of his career, says that Denney was in many respects "the first man in Scotland." At the Free Church College, Glasgow, he was much influenced by Professor A. B. Bruce. "He had a period of what might be called Broad Churchism, but when they came to the fork in the road Bruce took one way and Denney another. It was Denney's wife who led him into a more pronounced Evangelical creed. It was she who induced him to read Spurgeon, whom he had been inclined to despise. He became an ardent admirer of the preacher and a very careful and sympathetic student of his sermons. It was Spurgeon perhaps as much as any one who led him to the great

Death of  
Dr. Denney.

decision of his life—the decision to preach Christ our Righteousness.” Of his writings reference is made to his Commentaries on the Epistles to the Thessalonians and the Second Epistle to the Corinthians in the *Expositor's Bible*. He also delivered in America, and published in 1895, his memorable *Studies in Theology*. There followed his precious Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans in the *Expositor's Greek Testament*—perhaps the very best piece of work he ever accomplished—and his weighty volumes, *The Death of Christ* and *Jesus and the Gospel*. His book of sermons, *The Way Everlasting*, presents his characteristic thoughts with marked simplicity and power. This tribute of the *British Weekly* is one that every one who knows the work of the late divine will readily endorse.

**A Day of  
National  
Prayer.**

The *Record* has invited from a selected list signatures to the following declaration: “We, the undersigned, are in favour of the proposal that the Prime Minister should advise His Majesty to issue as soon as practicable, and in accordance with constitutional precedent, a Proclamation for a Day of National Prayer in connexion with the War.” There has been a remarkable response. A very large number of names have been published in the columns of the paper, and they are representative of all sections in the Church. The first list was, perhaps, the most noteworthy. Among those who have signed are the Archbishop of Armagh, the Primus of the Episcopal Church in Scotland, the Bishops of Durham, Chichester, Manchester, Oxford, Salisbury, Cashel, Down, Killaloe, Edinburgh, Barking, Crediton, and Kensington, as well as fourteen other Bishops, including the Chaplain-General, Bishop Taylor Smith. The Deans of Canterbury, Lincoln and St. David's have also signed, as have several Archdeacons. The Rev. Principal Selbie, the Rev. J. H. Shakespeare, and the Rev. Dr. Meyer—three eminent Free Church leaders—have also appended their names. The lay signatories include Sir Lewis Dibdin, Dean of the Arches, three Privy Councillors—the Right Hon. W. H. Dickinson, M.P. (late Chairman of the London County Council), the Right Hon. George Lambert, M.P., and the Right Hon. Sir Edward Clarke, K.C. (President of the National Church League); and several heads of Municipalities, including the Lord Mayor of London and the Lord Mayor of Bristol.