

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

As we look back on the greatest century of Missions as yet known, and forward into a century that promises to be yet greater, the conviction should deepen in every Christian heart that a living Church must be a missionary Church, and that a missionary Church cannot fail to become an united Church.



The Attack from Within.

By T. H. S. ESCOTT.

THE second volume of Lord Beaconsfield's official biography, to be looked for during the present year's first half, should incidentally contain an as yet entirely unwritten chapter in the ecclesiastical and religious history of his time. In and after 1837, at the most impressionable period of his early life, the illustrious subject of Mr. Monypenny's adequately executed memoir lived much at his father's country home at Bradenham, near Wycombe. The second Pitt's personal connection with his rival and successor, Addington, originated in the accident of the latter statesman's father having been the Pitt family's medical attendant. Scarcely less eventful proved the circumstance that Dr. Rose, of Wycombe, became the social counsellor as well as medical adviser of the Disraelis. That was the most impecunious of the younger Disraeli's earliest years, and private intelligence that the sheriff's officers were on his track for debt produced from Dr. Rose a warning message to his Bradenham friends, winding up with the words, "Hide Ben in the well." Dr. Rose, whose son became one of Lord Beaconsfield's executors, was highly thought of in private life by the chief families living under the shadow of the Chiltern Hills. Amongst these none surpassed in consideration the ancient Berkshire stock immemorably settled at Pusey House, near Farringdon. Long before there seemed much chance of "Ben's" political ambitions being realized, Dr. Rose had secured for him the *entrée* of Pusey House, then about to become one of the rallying

centres for the Protectionist organization. In the early thirties, however, the hospitalities of Philip Pusey's roof were not exclusively, for a year or two not even chiefly, political. At the very beginning of the thirties E. B. Pusey's influence with his relatives who owned the family seat had made Pusey House the cradle of the Oxford Movement. For that, preparations were still in progress when Isaac Disraeli's son, about the age of five-and-twenty, first rubbed shoulders with Philip Pusey's clerical guests, among them E. B. Pusey himself, occasionally Keble, and, much more infrequently, Newman.

It would be difficult, were the words in which afterwards Disraeli recalled the gloomy anticipation of the alarmed Churchmen, to exaggerate the blackness of the ecclesiastical outlook in 1833, when the Oxford Movement began. Since 1828-29, Dissenters and Papists had been eligible for seats in Parliament. The two Houses, therefore, hitherto outposts of the Established Church, had been transformed into secular or, as the Churchmen called them, heathen assemblies. At the same time, the 1832 Reform Act had given a new political power to the classes credited with most animosity to the national faith. The Tory Bishops had always resisted and thwarted reform. They and their colleagues generally were now punished for their contumacy by a warning from the Whig chiefs to "put their houses in order." For close on a century and a half—that is, ever since the change of dynasty in 1688—the omnipotent Whigs had depressed the national clergy because of their Tory traditions and principles.

Between 1830 and 1840, the suppression of ten Irish bishoprics, and the newspaper rallying of Nonconformists, Secularists, Latitudinarians, and Agnostics against a religious establishment, filled the whole Anglican body, clerical and lay alike, with mingled terror and disgust. If, said the champions of Orthodoxy—among whom young Disraeli found himself at Pusey House—the Church of England escape destruction, it will only be by conversion into a department of the Civil Service. These were not the only alarms in the air when the

young visitor from Bradenham began to be at home with the Church and State celebrities who assembled at Pusey House, with whose ideas he has sprinkled his novels, but his authentic and personal reminiscences of whom his biographer may now, perhaps for the first time, see his way to give.

The Lord Beaconsfield that was to be had scarcely leaped into notoriety with "Vivian Grey" when his visits to the Berkshire country house, already mentioned, told him of more than one clerical protest, first in writing, then in action, designed by his Berkshire friends as a counterblast to the prevailing Erastianism. At Pusey House was planned and drafted the address to Archbishop Howley, signed by 7,000 clergymen, and assuring the Primate of their attachment to the Apostolical doctrine and polity of the National Communion, and of their desire to promote whatever, by reviving ancient discipline, might strengthen an alliance between laity and clergy in defence of the Church against her enemies, not only without, but within; for at this epoch the old Evangelicals had lost much of their energy and fervour, while the old High Churchmen, with some notable exceptions, such as H. H. Norris and Joshua Watson—comfortable and prosperous in the enjoyment of pluralities—passively acquiesced in whatever the Government of the day might propose. The ecclesiastical awakening, begun under the social conditions now described, completed itself in 1833 by the appearance of the first of the "Tracts," and by Keble's assize sermon on national apostasy.

The Anglicanism thus fairly brought into operation four years before the Victorian age, in its first beginnings and environments, was not only Conservative, but eminently exclusive and aristocratic. That character it maintained till at least the year 1846, when Keble's curate at Hursley wept because the introduction of Free Trade had compelled his squire, Sir William Heathcote, to put down one of his carriage horses. The men who promoted the address to Archbishop Howley and the Oxford "Tracts" prided themselves on their direct ecclesiastical descent from the sober and learned seven-

teenth-century Fathers on the Isis—from Andrewes, Bishop of Winchester, from Jeremy Taylor, and from Hooker of the "Ecclesiastical Polity." To remove abuses and to secure efficiency in the National Church were their chief and, indeed, sole-declared purpose. When, in 1828, J. H. Newman became Vicar of St. Mary's, Oxford, he would not allow candles on the Communion table. Oakeley's church, Margaret Chapel, soon afterwards famous for its advanced ritual, knew nothing at first of incense, vestments, and all other decorative symbolism in millinery and furniture. In "Coningsby" Disraeli made himself the novelist of that Anglicanism whose chiefs he had begun to know in his boyhood, and has rescued from oblivion at least one of their most picturesque disciples. Eustace Lyle is the name which he wears in the story. In real life he was known as Ambrose de Lisle, of Garendon and Grace Dieu. Nine years before the "Tracts" began he had gone over to Rome, so that he could look with calm indifference on the tempests which convulsed the Church of his birth and nurture before, in 1846, she received from Newman's secession the blow that, as Disraeli put it, caused her so long to reel.

The great feature during the earlier stages of Anglicanism's Romeward tendency was the future Cardinal Newman's complete self-effacement. He had become a Fellow of Oriel in 1822, and shortly afterwards a tutor, with, for his best-known colleague, Dornford,¹ who had settled at Oxford after having served in the Peninsular War. Provost Coplestone called him to account for the mutilation, by his bad carving, of a venison haunch at the high table, and the undergraduates who were in his lecture played upon him pranks, which he ignored with stoical indifference. It is entirely a mistake to speak of him as having drifted from advanced Anglicanism to Popery. Newman began with Evangelicalism closely resembling that of John Wesley. He held meetings for prayer and Bible-reading in his rooms. After some dalliance with Liberalism, he eagerly threw himself into a project which he hoped might restore to the spiritual

¹ Lord Malmesbury's "Memoirs of an Ex-Minister," vol. i., p. 17.

power some of its lost temporal prerogatives. But of Anglo-Catholicism, as it had shaped itself to Pusey, and had been expounded by the *Christian Remembrancer*—writers whom J. B. Mozley had trained—he never had any real apprehension. Newman's most important service to Tractarianism was that he made Pusey its recruit. As regards Disraeli's "reeling" effects of Newman's submission to Rome, Anglicanism would have been in a much more perilous plight if that had never taken place. Between 1845 and 1850 the old High Church organization was completely broken up. The "Tracts" had come to an end even before 1845. The High Churchmen were quarrelling among themselves about the proper attitude to the Roman and Greek Communions respectively. The Gorham Decision had placed the Privy Council's authority above any ecclesiastical court. Manning and others at once went over to Rome. Even Pusey and Keble seemed to qualify their Anglican loyalty by discountenancing declared hostility to the Pope. William Palmer laboured for union with the Eastern Church rather than with the Latin. Archdeacon Denison insisted on the impossibility of friendly dealing with a Pontiff who, like him of the Vatican, heaped scorn upon Anglican Orders. Meanwhile, the two Wordsworths, Christopher, afterwards Bishop of Lincoln, and Charles, who died Bishop of St. Andrews, were the active champions of pre-Tractarian Anglicanism. Together with Professor Blount of Cambridge, they showed, in a circumstantially convincing manner, that the Book of Common Prayer, the whole Liturgy, and the Thirty-Nine Articles gave the Church of England a better claim than any other Communion to be considered the true successor of the primitive Church.

Profoundly dissatisfied with the Privy Council's trespass on the ecclesiastical province, Pusey had now offended and alienated many of his old-fashioned and steady-going adherents by adapting to the English popular use some of French Popery's most sentimental and sickly manuals. Even thus, no innovations had been made very extensively in public worship. Without excep-

tion the early Tractarians were as indifferent to ritual as, it has been seen, was Newman himself. Intonation of the service and improvement of Church music were the two chief, if not only changes, up to the year 1850. At the same time, what is now called Ritualism had asserted itself at least a decade in advance of the date usually given for its appearance—1866. Ten years before that the parish of St. George's-in-the-East had been thrown into uproar and confusion by the Eucharistic rites and vestments with which Mr. Bryan King had signalized his rectorship. This episode brought to the front the remarkable man who now took, and throughout his life retained, the Ritualistic leadership. The most devoted and enterprising of Bryan King's curates, A. H. Mackonochie, had met with rough treatment from the mob in its assaults on the church where he ministered, and had not, it was said, been properly defended by the police. He speedily became at once the hero, martyr, and chief of the Anglican anti-Protestants, no longer in the capacity of East End curate, but as Vicar of St. Albans, Holborn. Many social classes were represented among his devotees. The best brains and least self-seeking energies of the High Church party, however, held aloof. Butler of Wantage had recently formulated, and by his beneficent exertions illustrated, the maxim that "prayer and grind can do most things." He now exercised his justly great influence and authority to discourage the devotional extravagances arranged by Mackonochie at St. Albans.

Meanwhile, Ritualism was securing for itself unexpected alliances in high quarters. Smart and popular pens, interpreting the artistic and theological minds of Beresford Hope and Welby Pugin, in the *Saturday Review*, poured contempt upon Protestantism by showing that it was a synonym for Philistinism. But for one churchgoer whom the cleverest section of the High Church Press converted into an Anglican æsthete, a dozen partisans were gained to the new decorative ecclesiasticism by its popularity, real or supposed, with English royalty and its hangers-on. Disraeli's phrase, "Mass in masquerade," was first used in 1874. Six or eight years earlier the thing itself had

been welcomed as a sign that the long-expected reaction from rationalism in faith and Puritanism in ceremonial had begun, if not at the Palace, at the residence of the Heir-apparent. Whatever their doctrinal relations, the visible differences, social and ceremonial, between English and Continental Protestantism are much greater than is at all generally realized. The present Queen Alexandra, as Princess of Wales, brought, in 1863, from her Northern home, a natural liking for the most decorative features in the Lutheran ritual—for lights, music, and quick changes of many coloured robes. High Church doctrines receded to the background. The old Tractarianism had quite gone out; the new Ritualism took its place, and came into fashion and favour with the numbers always waiting to adopt Court modes in matters of taste or faith. The surplice, it was now pointed out, could not be distinguished from the white robe traditionally assigned to the Apostles and early Fathers, and admittedly of a sacrificial significance. Between the Lutheran consubstantiation and the Roman transubstantiation little practical difference could be discerned. Each really and almost equally involves that sacrifice of the Mass on which Pusey had always insisted, which formed the central doctrine of his school, and which, in 1871, the Privy Council, when adjudicating on *W. J. E. Bennett*, of Frome, had declared consistent with the Anglican formularies.

Since then all Church prosecutions have not ended equally well for the Romanizers. All censures of Ritualism, however, subsequent to Disraeli's Public Worship Act, have proved mere waste of breath. Before the Victorian era's close the Lincoln Judgment, in 1892, constituted a kind of guarantee against future litigation about ceremonies and rites. Stormy controversies once centred round Edward VI.'s Prayer-Book and the continued validity of its Ornaments Rubric. On that head no definite decision has been given or maintained; nor is there likely to be forthcoming any which the anti-Protestants will accept. One cannot, however, force an open door, and none of the so-called attacks from within can be delivered upon a surrendered position. The aggrieved parishioner, if he ever

did so, has long ceased to protest against any external displays, whether allowed by the Ornaments Rubric or not. Episcopal rebukes of generally prohibited and notoriously illegal usages are not, and never again will be, followed by imprisonment of the offenders. The successors of the Tractarians, Faber and Oakeley, weak men and fond of show, first introduced Roman practices in the forties, and are the real founders of Ritualism as it is in evidence to-day. Their twentieth-century successors parade their uncompromising resolve never to acknowledge the usurpation of the judicial committee, but are really in little danger of finding themselves in conflict with it. Their methods are less those of assault upon an institution than of a demonstration, intended to show the demonstrators' superiority to law, order, and old-fashioned prejudices of appearance. There may, of course, be in words much discontent with the connection between Church and State, and loud talk of readiness to join Radicalism in any disestablishment scheme. But, taken altogether, it scarcely constitutes one of those attacks from within sufficiently organized to threaten a crumbling of the foundations as well as a disturbance of the superstructure. It is rather a passing ebullition of calculated priestly petulance, unsupported by the deep conviction and the learning of High Churchmanship in the thirties.

Disestablishment, a free Church in a free State, anything rather than subjection to the judicial committee, is the Church Union Brigade's watchword. Those who have caught it up now talk of deliverance from the Thirty-Nine Articles, objected to as being Articles, not of faith, but of religion, and of secular origin. What are the facts here? Let the Bishops give us our orders, and we will take them, say the objectors to the Privy Council, in the same breath that, if instituted in a benefice, they try to evade the reading of those Articles. But these formularies are of purely Episcopal origin. Reduced from forty-two to their present number, they were drawn up by a committee of Bishops in 1571, without any of the political interference, royal or parliamentary revision, so often alleged. Queen Elizabeth,

indeed, made one addition with her own hand. That was entirely in the interest, not of State, but of Church; for the twentieth Article, the royal handiwork, insists on the Church's authority to decree rites or ceremonies in controversies of faith. Consequently, the practical acceptance of these definitions of conduct and belief, promulgated in 1571, is really a touchstone of sincerity on the part of those who, while persisting in mutiny against the judicial committee, profess all loyalty to the Bishops, whenever and whatever they may have spoken. The truth is that the commotions now referred to, dignified occasionally by the description of "attacks from within," are really so many surface skirmishes and bids for notoriety, having absolutely nothing in common with the work undertaken by the able, erudite, and earnest men who worked with and under Pusey.

A hostile movement, especially if of the nature of a forlorn hope, requires not only a rank and file to fight, but picked men to lead. Whence are these to come? Not from Anglo-Catholicism's recognized chiefs. For it was not so long since, at a meeting of the English Church Union, that Canon Newbolt protested against the rising taste for Roman innovations on the part of the younger clergy. On the occasion now referred to Mr. Newbolt was surrounded by speakers who, declaring their personal devotion to him, echoed his resolution against assimilating the Anglo-Saxon to the Latin Communion. All were prepared to maintain the National Church, "as by law established."

Disraeli, while yet influenced by his youthful impressions of the man, intelligibly overrated the consequences of Newman's secession. The more masculine of his disciples never followed their master. The representatives of the old High Church school like Pusey furnished, as Pusey himself boasted, no recruits to Rome. Such of them as may now survive have only found themselves in the same clerical camp as the Ritualists under the pressure of a common persecution, which is now a thing of the past. The original High Anglicanism was, as has been seen, largely a patrician affair. The

Ritualism which poses for its successor is as democratic as the Primrose League, many of whose tactics it imitates. The cause now banding callow curates against the judicial committee is one of externalism alone. An analogous controversy agitates other Protestant Churches, notably the Congregationalists. The domestic differences of these about the æsthetics of devotion are to some extent shared by Presbyterians and Wesleyans as well. As for the true significance and the probable results of the superficial restlessness and discontent which malignant extremists might wish used as a leverage for rending Church and State asunder, the English Church Union will perhaps not disregard Canon Newbolt's already quoted warning, and seriously ask itself whether its energies cannot find more dignified, if not useful exercise, than in trying to do for the Established Church in the twentieth century what was vainly attempted against it in the nineteenth.

The central novelty in the situation is that while in the Victorian age the Established Church had only to fear its declared or thinly-disguised enemies, to-day it must reckon with a combination of secularists and sacerdotalists, both animated by different aims, but both agreeing that the preservation of Church discipline is a greater evil than disestablishment, and the uncurbed excesses of an irresponsible priesthood which would necessarily follow. Not, indeed, that the ecclesiastical anarchy would be of long continuance. The Anglo-Catholics of to-day may make common cause with the survivors from the Liberationists of former years. With the learning, tradition, discipline, and organization of the Church of Rome, the Church of England, as Disraeli once said, has alone proved able to cope, and that only when supported by the courage of a determined and devoted people. In the ecclesiastical polity of the present day there may be, unfortunately, less to inspire and sustain such a national temper. If that be so, events themselves now confirm and repeat the warning given by the Conservative leader in 1868. The present is, above all things, as Dr. Bright has shown in the last volume of his English history, the age of reaction. The most

sanguine of Ritualistic law-breakers now despair of "union with Rome" as absolutely as the Oxford remnant in the forties abandoned all hope of an alliance between the English primate and the Greek patriarch after William Palmer's abortive pilgrimage to the Russian holy places. In 1704, for the first time, by refusing to accept the orders of John Gordon, a Scottish Bishop and Jacobite refugee, the Vatican first recorded its decision to treat Anglican Orders as null. To that precedent the Pope still adheres. None the less, the Roman opportunity would be looked for in the chaos which would follow the organic and ruinous changes in the position of the English Establishment that those enemies who belong to its own household talk so lightly of preferring to a reasonable obedience.



"In Earthen Vessels."

By MISS A. E. WOODCOCK,
Langholm, Bishop's Lydiard, Taunton.

"THE Vicar mentions the difficulty of securing enough Sunday-school teachers, and comments on the indisposition evinced by many to taking up work which demands regularity and self-denial. . . . The parish has a population of over 20,000."

These words, from a London daily paper, caught my eye, and arrested my attention at once. The paper fell unheeded, for my thoughts had flown to a little parish in Wiltshire under the shadow of the Great Downs. I could recall the pungent scent of the box-hedges along the chalky white roads and the song of the larks "rising and falling as on angels' wings." I could see the cloud-shadows passing softly over the downs that were now green, now gold with dandelions, while the village lay dusty-white at their foot. I could see, too, the shy, inexperienced teacher who, for many successive Sundays, trembled