

# 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)

innocent of anything, greater or less, in this Article or any part of it" ("Troubles and Trial," p. 413).

"I have hindered as many from going to the Roman party and have reduced as many from it, and some of great quality and some of great learning and judgment, as, I believe, any divine in England hath done" (*ibid.*).

"I am as innocent in this business of religion, as free from all practice or so much as thought of practice for any alteration to Popery or any way blemishing the true Protestant religion established in the Church of England, as I was when my mother first bare me into the world" (*ibid.*).

"For my faith; I die as I have lived, in the true orthodox profession of the Catholic faith of Christ, foreshadowed by the prophets and preached to the world by Christ Himself, His blessed Apostles, and their successors; and a true member of His Catholic Church, within the communion of a living part thereof, the present Church of England, as it stands established by law" ("Last Will and Testament").

We may add that in Laud's Visitation Articles there is no encouragement of vestments, but there is a strict inquiry as to the zeal of the minister in converting Popish recusants.

If even Archbishop Laud had such a firm hold of Protestantism as is exhibited in the above extracts, can those who look back with desire to the doctrines and practices of the unreformed Church be regarded as legitimate successors of the seventeenth-century divines? Can even the Laudian school be appealed to in justification of their present claims? And if not in the Laudian school, where else can they find a sanction in the history of the Church of England since the Reformation?

F. MEYRICK.



#### ART. IV.—THE ARCHBISHOPS OF CANTERBURY SINCE THE RESTORATION.

##### VI. THOMAS TENISON (*continued*).

THE eighteenth century opened ominously for the peace of Europe. Charles II. of Spain was nearing his end; he had no children. By the secret treaty of partition between Great Britain, France, and Holland, it had been agreed that the Electoral Prince of Bavaria should succeed to the greatest part of the Spanish monarchy, *i.e.*, to Spain and the Indies. The Netherlands and the dominions in Italy were to be divided between Germany and France. It now became necessary to make a fresh arrangement, and accordingly it

was agreed that the portion which had been allotted to the Electoral Prince should be transferred to the Archduke Charles of Austria. Archbishop Tenison wrote to King William protesting against this arrangement, which he declared most seriously threatened the peace of Europe; the Emperor of Austria, he said, would be furious when the treaty was made known, and the French king was playing him false, his object being to draw on the Spaniards to resist the dismemberment of their monarchy. His anticipation was well founded. Charles II. died November 1, 1700, and it was then found that Louis XIV. had obtained a will making the Duke of Anjou heir to the whole. King William immediately began to take steps not only to break the intended union of France and Spain as fatal to the balance of power, but also to secure the Protestant succession in England. For this year the Duke of Gloucester, the Princess Anne's only child, had died. Parliament, though it was angry at the Treaty of Partition, which had been kept a secret between the powers till now, recognised the wisdom of the King's present proposals by voting supplies for the defence of the liberties of Europe, and also by settling the succession on the house of Hanover. Momentous consequences followed, which, though they do not belong to these pages, cannot be ignored hereafter as we pass along.

As usual, a new Convocation of the clergy was summoned along with the new Parliament, and here also trouble immediately began. For many years it had never been called to work, but was prorogued by the President at the beginning of each session. This—so said the authorities—“was designed for the ease of the Clergy in not obliging them to a fruitless and expensive attendance, when there was no occasion to justify their absence from the duty of their cures.” Not unnaturally some of them grumbled at being thus muzzled, and debarred of their rights and liberties. The Nonjurors actively fomented the discontent, but it was also strong among the High Church clergy, who were dissatisfied with the Government, though they had given in their allegiance to it. In 1697 “A Letter to a Convocation Man,” published anonymously, gave vigorous utterance to the discontent, maintaining that the clergy should have the right of meeting and debating simultaneously with the sitting of Parliament, and also that the irreligion and immorality which were confessedly so rife must be attributed to this silencing of the clerical voice. Answers to it were published by two or three pamphleteers, but the most learned was by Wake, Rector of St. James's, Westminster, an intimate friend of Tenison, and destined to be his successor. Wake's essay was entitled “The Authority of Christian Princes over

their Ecclesiastical Synods." It brought into the field one of the most remarkable and brilliant men of his time. Francis Atterbury, Student of Christ Church, Oxford, handsome of presence, attractive in manner, eloquent, a fair scholar, but who had an extraordinary power of appearing deep in places where he was only shallow, had already won himself a name as a controversialist. At Christ Church he was quite the right-hand man to the Dean, Henry Aldrich, a man, says Macaulay spitefully, "only known now by his catches."<sup>1</sup> Atterbury had written an able reply to Obadiah Walker, the Papist whom James II. had intruded into the Mastership of University College, and who had published an attack on the Reformation. Atterbury's next controversial essay was on a very different subject. He had the temerity to attack the great Bentley, in defence of his pupil, Charles Boyle, who had edited and annotated a forgery pretending to be the Epistles of Phalaris, tyrant of Agrigentum, B.C. 500. Bentley had declared the work spurious, and Atterbury must needs defend it because it emanated from Christ Church, and Boyle was his pupil. So began a controversy keen and amusing for the time, for Atterbury, though really he had not a leg to stand upon, was so skilful, versatile, and witty, that a great many people, for the time being, were taken in. This controversy is now dead; no one doubts that Bentley was right.

Atterbury had now taken Orders, and at once gained high repute as a preacher, his sparkling style being aided by a very musical voice. Bishop Compton had given him a London lectureship. Whilst the "Phalaris" controversy was still proceeding, Wake's essay appeared, and Atterbury saw his opportunity. He was conscientiously convinced that the clergy were being ill-used, and that Wake's pamphlet was calculated to urge the civil power to strain its prerogative into oppression. So he published a treatise on the "Rights, Powers, and Privileges of our English Convocation." Wake, he wrote, "represents those Clergy who desire a Convocation (that is, by his leave, the far greater part of them) as if they were irregular in their lives, violent in their tempers, and factious in their principles, and the Government is excited to take vengeance upon them, as men embarked in a separate interest." The book was received with a chorus of approbation; it was witty in style and vigorous in its denunciation. The University of Oxford at once voted him an honorary D.D. Wake himself, though he declared that it did not answer him, said it was a pattern of charity and good humour. Certainly,

---

<sup>1</sup> Some of Aldrich's services and anthems are still deservedly popular in our cathedrals.

whatever might be thought of Wake's book, Atterbury's principles were unsound, as Hallam has shown.<sup>1</sup> He assumed that the Parliamentary writ and summons of the clergy was identical with the Convocation writ and summons of the clergy, whereas they were two distinct things. The former was an invention of Edward I., who wanted to get representatives of the clergy into Parliament because he found them so difficult to manage in the way of supplies. The latter was the ancient ecclesiastical summons to a Church synod issuing from the Archbishop. By confusing the two, Atterbury made out that the clergy were as much entitled to be summoned as the Members of Parliament, and had the same rights. No wonder that the clergy were enthusiastic, and the Ministry was so moved by his pamphlet, that it stipulated with the King that a Convocation should be summoned and allowed to debate. Atterbury had just been made Archdeacon of Totnes, and therefore was summoned among them. Burnet, White Kennett, and Hody, had all written against his historical mistakes, but at present he was regarded as master of the situation.

On Monday, February 10, the new Convocation of Canterbury met in St. Paul's Cathedral. As usual, the Litany was said in Latin, after which Dr. Haley, Dean of Chichester, preached a Latin sermon. Then the Archbishop, according to custom, bade them choose a Prolocutor, which they did, namely, Dr. Hooper, Dean of Canterbury; and so ended the day's proceedings. On the 25th, when they assembled again, the Archbishop's customary schedule of Prorogation was brought down to the Lower House. In reply to this they continued sitting, and after some discussions of no moment, ended by adjourning to Henry VII.'s Chapel, instead of going to the Jerusalem Chamber to complete the prorogation. Here evidently was incipient rebellion, and the Archbishop called them to explain. The Prolocutor, after discussion, returned answer "that the Lower House was preparing somewhat to lay before his Grace and the Upper House concerning the methods of Prorogation and some other things of form." Tenison returned a civil answer, that he was ready to receive what should be offered by them, but in the meanwhile the Upper House would continue its usual practice. The Lower House at once appointed a committee to search the records on the subject of prorogations, and on March 6 delivered their report. It stated first that the common usage had been to continue sitting till the Prolocutor should adjourn them, with their

---

<sup>1</sup> Hallam's "Constitutional History of England," vol. iii., p. 245.

own consent. And they instanced cases in which they had not been prorogued or adjourned on the same day with the Upper House. Further, that they had always had the privilege of meeting in a separate place, from which they attended their lordships both when they had business of their own motion, and when they were summoned by their lordships by a special messenger. And then, without further discussion, they went back to their chamber ("persisted in their contumacy," says Burnet), and proceeded to examine Toland's book, "Christianity not Mysterious," but found that legally they had not sufficient authority to censure it judicially without the royal license.

Tenison endeavoured to stop the breach by proposing a conference between equal numbers selected from the two Houses, which might settle affairs amicably. It was a fair proposal, but the Lower House rejected it, "did not think fit to appoint such a committee," whereupon the Bishops declared that they would receive nothing more from it until these irregularities were settled. "If you have anything to offer, we cannot receive it till the late irregularity of refusing to meet the committee of Bishops to inspect the books of the Convocation be set right." Open war was now declared, and there is no doubt that Atterbury was the moving spirit. After a short consultation with his brethren, the Prolocutor returned answer that he was ready to wait on their lordships concerning an irregularity which they desired to put right, and thereupon he was requested to return. He did so, and at once informed their lordships that concerning "the supposed irregularity they had thought fit to complain of, they were ready to give their lordships satisfaction when thereunto called," but in the meantime they had another grave irregularity to complain of, namely, the Bishop of Salisbury's book on the Articles. This was, of course, like throwing a shell upon the floor. The paper had been carefully and secretly drawn up, and, no one will question, was disingenuously produced by the Prolocutor. It stated: "(1) That the said book tends to introduce such a latitude and diversity of opinions as the Articles were framed to avoid; (2) that there are many passages in the exposition of several Articles which appear to us contrary to the true meaning of them and to other received doctrines of our Church; (3) that there are some things in the said book which seem to us to be of dangerous consequences to the Church of England as by law established, and to derogate from the honour of its Reformation. All which particulars we humbly lay before your lordships, praying your opinions herein." Burnet, who felt strong enough to take care of himself, entreated the Archbishop to waive precedent,

and to receive the paper. But Tenison was firm. After a short time of withdrawal the Prolocutor was again called in, and informed that his Grace and his brethren adhered to their resolution not to receive anything from the Lower House until the irregularity of which they had complained had been set right.

At the next session (June 6) the Archbishop again addressed the recalcitrants. "I cannot," he said, "according to the order of the House, receive anything from you until the irregularity complained of be set right. But it appearing from the paper you read on May 30 that you had something to offer relating to the Bishop of Sarum's Exposition of the Thirty-nine Articles, I and my brethren, without prejudice to our former order, and at the repeated and earnest request of the Lord Bishop of Sarum, are now willing to receive the said paper." The Prolocutor replied that he had not that paper with him, but had brought one "concerning the irregularity." Whereupon his Grace bade him leave that in his hands and go and fetch the other. Then the Bishops read the answer, which is described as "full of accusations against their lordships, rather than acknowledgments of their misfortune in falling under their lordships' displeasure." It was afterwards answered by Tenison in a very tender and gentle manner.

"The whole Convocation," he said, "is but one body. They meet together first in one place, before the Archbishop as President, sitting *pro tribunali*, as it is always expressed; and though afterwards the lower clergy have, by the appointment of the President, a particular place assigned to them to treat and debate in apart, yet whenever the President pleases they are obliged to return to the Upper House where they first assembled, and both Houses are always continued and prorogued by one instrument and Act." This is the true doctrine of the status of Convocation, and to this day is fully admitted.<sup>1</sup>

But now the paper respecting Burnet's book was again brought forward and read, after which the Archbishop replied: "Your paper of complaint contains only generals, and therefore we must require you to bring up particulars of your charge." After an interval the Archbishop sent down a messenger to ask if their charge was ready, and received this short answer in writing: "This House returns their lordships their humble thanks for their message, and is preparing business, but are not yet ready with it."

It was not unnatural if the Bishops were somewhat irritated

<sup>1</sup> See *Church Quarterly*, April, 1882.

by this curt reply. Whether they were or not, they drew up the following declaration: "I. It is our opinion that the Lower House of Convocation has no manner of power judicially to censure any book. II. That the Lower House of Convocation ought not to have entered upon the examination of a book of any Bishop of this Church without first acquainting the President and Bishops. III. That the Lower House of Convocation censuring the book of the Bishop of Sarum in general terms without mentioning the particular passages on which the censure is grounded is defamatory and scandalous. IV. That the Bishop of Sarum by his excellent 'History of the Reformation,' approved of by both Houses of Parliament, and other writings, hath done great service to the Church of England, and justly deserves the thanks of this House. V. That though private persons may expound the Articles of the Church, yet it cannot be proper for the Convocation at this time to approve and much less to condemn such private expositions." To this they added that those members of the Lower House who had recognised the President's authority by absenting themselves after his prorogation had acted in a dutiful manner, and that the others, both by their disregard of it, and also by refusing the proposed committee, were guilty of disobedience and contempt. Soon afterwards the Convocation was dissolved together with the Parliament.

Then began a fast and furious war of pamphlets, in which by consent of all calm judges the Bishops' party came off best. Gibson, Kennett, Hody, were all strong and learned men. Atterbury wrote to his Bishop (Trelawny) complaining that he was not properly supported, and was deeply mortified that the new Convocation which met at the close of 1701 was by no means so amenable to his views as the preceding had been. "Our majority," he wrote, "is much sunk to what it was, and there are other discouragements both within and without." One of these "discouragements" was that Hooper refused the prolocutorship, and Atterbury carried his new nominee, Dean Woodward, of Sarum, against Beveridge, by only a majority of eight. Woodward was chosen because he was known to be hostile to his own Bishop, Burnet.

When the new House met there seemed some hope of peace. Beveridge had solemnly addressed the Prolocutor beforehand: "Mr. Prolocutor, I call upon you in the name of Jesus Christ not to open our first meeting in contempt and disobedience to the Archbishop and Bishops, and in giving offence and scandal to our enemies." This had its effect. The Prolocutor spoke, and the Archbishop replied, in terms of goodwill and conciliation. But the hope of peace was soon seen to be in vain. As soon as they got to their place of meeting, Atterbury



moved that the phrase about prorogation hitherto in use, in which the Prolocutor intimated that this Convocation was continued, should be changed, so as to declare that the Prolocutor, and he only, continued and prorogued the Lower House by his own right. On this an angry debate arose, and a compromise was come to, that the old form should be used, but that the House need not be adjourned until the day's business was ended. It was an abortive *via media*, but both sides for the moment were satisfied. Then the Prolocutor fell ill and asked for a deputy. Atterbury moved that Aldrich should fill the place, and was met by the contention that the Archbishop's consent must be obtained, and this would be admitted now. But at the moment a great tumult followed in Henry VII.'s Chapel. The news of it reached the Archbishop in the Jerusalem Chamber, who summoned the Lower House thither. "An incident of great moment has happened," he said, "we must take time to consider it; the Convocation is prorogued till Saturday, February 14." This was a sudden blow to Atterbury, but his spirit was too intrepid to yield tamely. As his brethren left the chamber he called them to come back to their own House, and even pushed some of them bodily before him. Forty-two went with him, ready to defy the prorogation and to act independently. But a terrible calamity fell upon them the very next day. The Prolocutor died. He had been selected, as we have seen, because he was opposed to his own Bishop, Burnet, and his death prostrated the High Church party. Without a head they were powerless. According to Atterbury's account of the sequel, Tenison was somewhat cynical about it. Instead of issuing his license to them to choose another Prolocutor, he prorogued them, and recommended them sarcastically to go back to their cures, and catechize their people in preparation for Easter. Forty-five of them, headed by Atterbury, went back to Henry VII.'s Chapel, and chose a temporary chairman, though they hesitated to choose a Prolocutor. Atterbury proposed to draw up a protest and publish it, but this again was thought to be raising a standard of revolt. In the midst of the conflicting recommendations, Gardiner, Bishop of Lincoln, the Archbishop's Commissary, came to prorogue them. The debates which arose out of this were in full progress when another event finished the controversy for the time being effectually. William III. died on March 8, 1702, and the Convocation was thereby according to law dissolved. The High Churchmen were filled with hope, for the new monarch, Queen Anne, was known to favour them. Atterbury declared his satisfaction to his clergy on his return to Totnes.

The struggle between High Church<sup>1</sup> and Low Church now assumed a different phase. But we must postpone this to the next chapter. There are other subjects yet to be taken up, and those very important and interesting ones, belonging to William III.'s reign; and they are out of the regions of strife and contention.

The Society for the Reformation of Manners, which came before us in our last chapter, was simply repressive; it aimed at putting down vice by legal procedure, and the members of it, recognising this fact, now determined to go deeper, and to reform practice by the teaching of positive truth. March 8, 1698-99, was a real epoch in the religious history of England, for on that day was founded the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge. The prime founder was Dr. Thomas Bray, one of the most zealous and able divines of his time. Bishop Compton had sent him across to Maryland to organize the English Church there, and the zeal which he displayed for extending the knowledge of the Gospel both abroad and at home never flagged. His whole biography is a beautiful record of unselfish zeal and Christian love. Having successfully accomplished his American mission, he returned to England, and whilst he was consumed with zeal for giving effect to the resolutions concerning our Colonies which experience had taught him, he also threw himself into this movement for teaching our people at home. He had made marvellous exertions in America for promoting public libraries—in fact, he seems to have stipulated that the English Bishops should help him in this work before he would consent to go to America. The first was founded at Annapolis, the capital of Maryland, so called after the Princess Anne, and she gave him “a noble benefaction” towards the valuable library there. He founded thirty-nine of these libraries in America, besides others in foreign parts. And it was this desire of promoting libraries which led him on to the foundation of the Christian Knowledge Society. He met with difficulties, red-tape and otherwise, of course; but he carried his point. The Society was formed, and the following is the preamble of it, drawn up by Bray: “Whereas the growth of vice and immorality is greatly owing to gross ignorance of the principles of the Christian religion, we whose names are underwritten do agree to meet together as often as we can conveniently to consult, under

---

<sup>1</sup> The words “High Church” came into use during this controversy. “These men,” says Burnet, “who began now to be called *the High Church* party, had all along expressed a coldness, if not an opposition, to the present settlement. They set up a complaint of the want of Convocations, that they were not allowed to sit nor act with a free liberty, or consider the grievances of the clergy, nor the danger the Church was in.”

the conduct of the Divine Providence and assistance, how we may be able by due and lawful methods to promote Christian knowledge."

There was afterwards a resolution to meet, at all events at first, weekly. And they state that their first objects shall be to propagate Christian knowledge "by encouraging charity schools and distributing good books." Twelve Bishops, or men who afterwards became so, signed the minutes of the first meeting, the most eminent of whom were the saintly Thomas Wilson (Sodor and Man, 1698-1755), Kennett, Patrick and Gibson. Robert Nelson's name also appears among the signatories. The minutes and correspondence of the Society from 1698 to 1704 have been edited by Mr. McClure, and make a volume of very interesting reading. Archbishop Tenison's name appears incidentally three times as approving and furthering its work, but he did not attend any of the meetings. The last mention of him is that Mr. Nelson reported that he had seen the Archbishop, who "did design to give the Society some particular encouragement."

This good work of Dr. Bray was followed by another not less important. He had been hampered in his American mission by legal difficulties. The Governor and Assembly of Maryland had determined to divide the province into parishes, and to appoint a legal maintenance for each minister. Part of Compton's commission to Bray had been to make all needful arrangements for this, but the Act of Establishment had failed because the preamble "wrongly stated that the laws of England were in force in Maryland." This and kindred difficulties caused a delay of eight years. But Bray had, as we have seen, not been idle. He had done a noble work towards educating the clergy who were to be appointed in the Colonies, and when he returned to England he found the library movement which he had set on foot so growing that before his death there were no less than eighty libraries in England, and he now saw his way to another development. He obtained from William III. a charter for the incorporation of the "Society for Propagation of the Gospel throughout our Plantations." This was granted in June, 1701. The Archbishop, as in the case of the "Reformation of Manners," had been urged to remedy this shocking neglect. Dean Prideaux had written him a very earnest letter, pointing out that the Roman Catholics had made a start in the good work, and that the Dutch had also done so in their settlements. When the East India Company had been incorporated, Robert Boyle had in vain endeavoured to get the spiritual provision made part of the charter; he had shown his earnestness for the same object by bequeathing, in 1691, £5,000 to promote it.

When the new Society was launched, the names of the two Archbishops (Tenison and Sharp) appear among the founders, as well as Bishops Wake, Potter, Compton, Patrick, Burnet, Beveridge, Hough, Gibson, Gastrell, Wilson; and Dean Prideaux, Evelyn and Robert Nelson. Burnet gives praise, not undeserved, to the King for the zeal which he displayed on behalf of the new Society. But it must be confessed that the Society bore one sign of its time greatly to be lamented. There was no provision for a Colonial Episcopate, though one of the cries of the Colonists was for supervision and union. For many a long year the American clergy had to come over to England to be ordained.

W. BENHAM.

*(To be continued.)*



## ART. V.—NATIONAL REPENTANCE.

### II. MATERIALISM.

THE Bishops of England, in the united call to prayer during the last year of the dying century, to which I drew your attention in the last paper, used the following language: "The spirit of materialism which has invaded national and social life, the consequent relaxation of the sense of personal responsibility, the power and influence of sins which lower national character, such as intemperance, gambling and self-indulgence, and the thoughtless and indolent acquiescence in grave public evils—these things, which sadly contrast with the blessings and advantages given to us by God, loudly call us to prayer."

It is to Materialism and its moral consequences that I would address myself in this number.

The Bishops do not mean that a great number of persons have consciously become Materialists. Materialism is so terrible a doctrine, and so few people think things out for themselves, that it is most improbable that many would take such an awful step as that. But there is generally some particular philosophy that prevails in the centres of thought of any particular country, such as the Universities and the scientific schools; and about thirty years ago, when the last generation was flourishing, there was a school of materialistic teaching in England which has greatly affected, and is still greatly affecting, the life of the country. That school has, thank God, given way to a wiser and better school, which does not think that an account of matter and its laws is a