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:

https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology

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

But (as our author observes) this parsimonious grant was not adhered to by his successors, as John XXII. gave a hundred days' indulgence to any who recited the prayer, while the book on the Roman Stations, printed at Rome in 1475, and again at Nuremberg in 1491, does not scruple to declare that, "When the Veronica is shown in the Church of St. Peter in the Vatican, then the Romans have 3,000 years of indulgence, the Italians 6,000, the more distant countries 12,000."

I do not imagine that those who endeavoured to reintroduce the "Stations of the Cross" into our own Church were aware of the great blessings attached to the Veronica worship, or considered the temptation which it gave to indulge in it. Nor, perhaps, were the bishops and Courts which prohibited the stations "sufficiently acquainted with the privileges they were so sadly withholding from the faithful. In any case, Christians who follow the teaching of the Church in its better days will rejoice that this "image of jealousy" has been removed, with all its apocryphal accompaniments, including the falls of our Lord under the cross, and the sensational and romantic treatment of the passage of the suffering Saviour to His final and glorious triumph. Superficial observers may see no danger in the revival of such apocryphal illustrations; but we might do well to remember that the dipping of handkerchiefs in the blood of martyrs, or claimants to martyrdom, survived till within comparatively recent years, and that the objects themselves were regarded with a religious, or rather superstitious, reverence by devotees of every persuasion. The legend of the Veronica, its illegitimate origin, and morbid development may well caution us against suffering any such poisonous parasites to grow up around the narratives of the Evangelists, to the great injury and corruption of the "faith once delivered," and to the inevitable corruption of history by its contact with legend and myth.

ROBERT C. JENKINS.

ART. III.—THE ENGLISH CHURCH UNION AND THE BIRMINGHAM CHURCH CONGRESS.

THE President of the English Church Union possesses many charming qualities, which are alike the admiration of those who differ from him and of those who agree with him upon religious questions. He is a pleasant companion, and his private life is exemplary. As the head of a great religious organization, it is impossible that he should escape criticism. By his conduct and utterances he necessarily courts it. The

special elements of piety and devotion which are transparently conspicuous in his life, and which his friends note with satisfaction, create in the minds of others a suspicion that they verge on a mediæval and one-sided fanaticism. His religious vision is very limited and notably circumscribed. He does not seem to understand the exact position of men belonging to other schools of thought in the Church of England, nor has he much idea of legitimate tolerance of any opinions other than his own. If narrow to a degree in one direction, he is absolutely lawless in another. His advocacy of so-called reform has no claim to catholicity or to generosity; it is simply, solely, always retrograde and mediæval. The great and glorious Reformation, which had to do with England's cherished liberties and religiously was England's salvation, seems in his eyes to have been effected on very slender, if not trivial, grounds. In his speech at the Birmingham Church Congress, he said: "I am not one of those who look upon the Reformation as an unmixed good, or those responsible for it as absolutely infallible. If we are to say that the Churches of Jerusalem, and Antioch, and of Rome, are liable to error and practice, I cannot persuade myself that the same thing may not be true of the Church of England." Why is poor "Alexandria" left out of this sentence? (See Article XIX.) And why are words so adroitly manipulated? The Article does not say that the Church of Rome is "liable to error and practice," but "hath erred," and it adds, "not only in their living and manner of ceremonies, but also in matters of faith." Her boast is "semper eadem." What she was, she is. She has never repented of her evil deeds. When Lord Halifax had the words of this Article in his mind, it is a pity he did not refer to the clause relating to "ceremonies," because the drift of his speech was the revival of what he was pleased to call "Primitive and Catholic practice." Granted that the Reformers were not "absolutely infallible." Granted that they made some mistake —for example, leaving the word "Priest" in the Prayer-book when they beyond all question meant "Presbyter." Yet they acted on a clearly defined, invaluable principle; viz., that Holy Scripture was to be the supreme and final test of belief and practice (Art. VI.). Even the Ancient Creeds of Christendom were only "to be received and believed" because they could be proved "by most certain warrants of Holy Scripture" (Art. VIII.). In the preface to the Prayer-book, and in the special Articles following it, the reasoning is based upon the authority of the Bible. Such expressions as the following are to be noted: "The Word of God;" "The Holy Scripture;" "God's Word;" "The very pure Word of God;" "God's Law;" "Christ's Gospel." There are some thirteen or fourteen refer-

ences to the Scriptures. How many are there in Lord Halifax's speech? His references are to a will-o'-the-wisp called "Primitive and Catholic practice." Where is the Primitive and Catholic practice to be found? Archdeacon Farrar and other learned writers have proved that the so-called "Catholic practice" is not "Primitive." In the very earliest Christian books recently discovered there is not a single element of that Romish practice which is wrongly called primitive. High-sounding titles and names and confident claims must not lead members of the Church of England to leave the definite and solid ground of God's most Holy Word.

There are two features about the utterances of Lord Halifax worthy of notice; he never opens his mouth on religious subjects without unfortunate mistakes, and he utterly ignores defeat. The Church of England in the present solemn crisis owes a debt of gratitude to his Lordship, for he lets every now and then the sacerdotal "cat" of his advancing party "out of the bag." Not that any persons at all acquainted with the proceedings or writings of his special school of thought are in the least degree surprised or alarmed. His partisans may esteem his unshrinking temerity, not to say audacity, courage. It pleases them; it only hurts and grieves his truest friends, for it is an exhibition of ill-informed fanaticism, which verges on open disloyalty. That which he designates Catholic is Roman Catholic, and the alterations he designs are solely in the Romish direction. A writer in "The Church and the World" says: "Anglicans are reproached by Protestants with their resemblance to Romans; they say a stranger entering into a church where ritual is carefully attended to might easily mistake it for a Roman service. Of course he might; the whole purpose of the great revival has been to eliminate the dreary Protestantism of the Hanoverian period, and restore the glory of Catholic worship. Our churches are restored after the mediæval pattern, and our ritual must accord with the Catholic standard. Our Book of Common Prayer is no Protestant invention. It is not the creation of the sixteenth century. The Eucharistic office is only a variety of the Western rite. . . . The altar and its ornaments are nearly the same; the actions are the same; the habits and vestments of the priesthood are the same; the plainsong is the same. Is it any wonder that they should be mistaken?" (p. 212). These are the sentiments and aims of the school to which Lord Halifax belongs. But the public, and particularly the Protestant laity of England, are apt to forget the avowed designs of the President and of the "wire-pullers" of the English Church Union. They desire "visible unity" with the Church of Rome. Speaking as President of the English Church

Union, and, therefore, officially, on June 10, 1885, Lord Halifax said: "Peace among ourselves, peace with our separated brethren at home, the restoration of visible unity with the members of the Church abroad, East and West alike, but, above all, with the great Apostolic See of the West, which has done so much to guard the true faith in the incarnation of our Lord Jesus Christ, and the reality of His life-giving Sacraments—these things surely should be our object, the object nearest our hearts." Dr. Lee, writing to the *Tablet*, used the same kind of language: "Surely, therefore, to maintain and mend the Church of England without breaking it up, to regain what has been lost, to restore it to *visible corporate communion* with the Holy See (as did Cardinal Pole under Queen Mary), and not to destroy it, seems to me the right and proper policy to adopt." What change, it may be asked, has taken place in the Church of Rome that honest Churchmen should seek for "visible, corporate communion" with her? Has she withdrawn one of the twelve novel Articles which she added to the Creeds of Christendom at the Council of Trent? Lord Halifax, at Birmingham, referred to himself and those who act with him as "loyal members of the Anglican Communion." But to advocate "visible unity" with what he cleverly designates "the great Apostolical See of the West," when the see has by error forfeited her title to apostolic, is a curious way of showing loyalty. The great men who had much to do with the reformation of the Anglican Communion formed such an estimate of the Church of Rome as absolutely precluded the idea of union with her. In the Preface to the Bible (1611), in the Articles of the Irish Church (1615), in the Homilies, in the writings of such men as Cranmer, Latimer, Ridley, Hooper, Bradford, Jewell, the "Judicious" Hooker, the Pope is designated "the man of sin," or "Antichrist." Wicklif, "the morning star of the Reformation," refers to him as "Antichrist and his wicked clerks"; and Tyndale calls the Popes of Rome "the right Antichrists." The Articles reject the Apocrypha, works of supererogation, purgatory, "the sacrifices of Masses," transubstantiation, the worship and adoration of images, praying in an unknown tongue, denying the cup to the laity, traditions contrary to God's Word, etc. Such being the case to advocate "visible unity" with the Church of Rome in an unreformed state, is a very singular way of saving loyalty to "the Anglican Communion."

Equally strange is the loyalty which seeks to undo some of the most markedly beneficial works of the Reformation. "I advocated," said Lord Halifax, "at the Church Congress at Derby the permissive use of the first Liturgy of Edward VI. I do so still." His Lordship appears to be oblivious of the

fact that for such unbecoming advocacy he was at once sharply rebuked by Canon Hoare. "This day," the venerable Canon observed, "we have been told by Mr. Wood" (now Lord Halifax), "the President of the English Church Union, that our beautiful English Church Service is 'meagre'; that there is nothing more meagre than our existing Liturgy; that our Holy Communion Service—in which we have taken so much delight—is a mutilated, an inferior, and a defective service. [Cries of 'No, no!'] I say, 'Yes,' and this great assembly has heard what Mr. Wood has said. We have been told to-day that we are to go back to the Liturgy and to the Communion Office of 1549, instead of accepting that of the year 1552, and finally revised in 1662. We are told to-day that it was a falling off from the use of Sarum. We are, therefore, it seems, to look upon the use of Sarum, that old Popish Liturgy—I say that old Popish Liturgy—which existed in the diocese of Salisbury, as the model to which we are to aim. . . . Now, then, my Lord, we fully know our ground, and where it is we have to stand. We have therefore learned something at this Church Congress. We know where we are. We go home to-day knowing with what a power and with what an intention we have to contend. We know what Mr. Wood has told us. He has told us as plainly as possible that the object is to bring back the Church of England from the Reformed Church of 1552—to stop just a little by the way in the refreshment-room of 1549—and then we are to plunge head foremost right into the use of Sarum. . . . Shall we begin by half-and-half retrograde measures until we go right back into the arms of Rome? My lord, I say no more; but I wish to thank Mr. Wood for having spoken out so plainly on this subject, and for thus having let us know this day what are the real intentions of the English Union." Here, then, are two great and startling facts—the President of the English Church Union desires "visible unity" with the Church of Rome; and one means by which the unity is to be brought about is by an attempt to undo the work of the Reformation. No wonder with such a policy he does not consider "the Reformation as an unmixed good." It is time that the laity of England should open their eyes to the real aim and end of the English Church Union, and pay serious attention to the warnings concerning it of the most sober-minded of England's prelates. The judicial, calm, keenly critical, but temperate Bishop Thirlwall was compelled to use the following condemnatory language in 1866: "No Churchman who does not desire the subversion of our Reformed Church and its final absorption in the Church of Rome *can too deeply distrust or too strenuously oppose the proceedings of the English Church Union.*"

Lord Halifax at Birmingham returns again to his old friend the Ornaments Rubric, who has been thrust forward on every available occasion since the English Church Union was founded. He asked, "Is it not time that the provisions of the Ornaments Rubric should be more generally obeyed than is now the case?" And he subsequently added: "Our Communion office is, and will continue to be, the Mass in masquerade till it is performed with the externals accustomed to be used in the rest of the Western Church, and prescribed by the Ornaments Rubric of the Book of Common Prayer." "The Western Church!" Always the same pattern, always the same goal—"the Western Church." Rome from first to last, as the sum and substance of all good. To say plainly, "the Church of Rome" might frighten honest Protestants; it is, therefore, better to substitute "the Western Church" and "the Great Apostolic See of the West." But the late Bishop Wordsworth proved to a demonstration that "the Great Western Church" is "the Babylon of the Apocalypse." The Church of England, of which Lord Halifax claims to be a loyal member, agrees with Bishop Wordsworth, and in the "Homily on Peril of Idolatry" calls the Church of Rome "Babylon the Great." The Convocation of 1606 did not use careless or unguarded language. "Times of persecution had passed away. Far from being Puritanical in any degree, the Church, under the presidency of Bancroft, had begun to put forth very high notions of episcopal and kingly authority; and yet, even then, by a *Synodical Act*, she declared the Pope to be the man of sin. *It cannot be shown that any of the Reformers or Reformed Churches denied this truth.*" (Note in Blakeney's "Book of Common Prayer," p. 116.)

But Lord Halifax has already been ably and conclusively answered on this oft-repeated, threadbare subject by Canon Joseph Bardsley, though it is evident no argument and no incontestable evidence prevents his lordship from reiterating his statements. At the Sheffield Church Congress Mr. Bardsley said: "The Hon. Mr. Wood being a layman might be pardoned for not remembering what is the solemn vow made by every clergyman at his ordination, that he will 'give faithful diligence always so to minister the doctrines and sacraments, and discipline of Christ, as the Lord hath commanded, and as,' not only 'this Church,' but also as this 'Realm hath received the same.' When I heard Mr. Wood protesting so strongly against the right of Parliament to touch things sacred, I was greatly surprised to find that notwithstanding this earnest protest the only statement in his paper which he attempted to support by evidence, viz., the use of the vestments, etc., was founded on an appeal to the Ornaments

Rubric, which is avowedly based upon 'the authority of Parliament.' This being Mr. Wood's only alleged authority for the use of vestments, we might have naturally expected that by him at least the authority of Parliament in such matters would have been viewed with more favour." It is to be noted that several reforms took place without being submitted to the Church's "Sacred Synod." "'The Order of Communion," 1548; the order of council for the removal of 'all images,' 1548; and the Ordinal, 1550, were published without submission to them (*i.e.*, the members of the Lower House of Convocation). Moreover, the revisions in 1552, 1559 and 1604 were effected without Convocation." (Blakeney, p. 30, note.) Mr. Bardsley went on as follows: "I heard with some surprise the statement of Mr. Wood, viz., that the Latin and English services are essentially the same. Though I cannot agree in thinking this admissible, I may remark that even the first Prayer Book of Edward, which is the one the Ritualists much prefer, teaches us to pray that we may be delivered 'from the tyranny of the Bishop of Rome and all his detestable enormities.' Is it possible to conceive that the same men can be said to have given us a service identical in its teaching with the Latin service books, when in our Articles and Liturgy they condemn in the strongest terms the Romish doctrines of purgatory, pardon and the invocation of saints and angels; when they declare of transubstantiation that it is repugnant to the plain words of Scripture, overthroweth the nature of a sacrament, and giveth occasion to many superstitions; when they condemn the sacrifices of masses as involving blasphemous fables and dangerous deceits; when they affirm that to adore the consecrated elements of bread and wine is idolatry to be abhorred of all faithful Christians?" Lord Halifax assumes, like most sacerdotalists—though it would do him an injustice to charge him with ignorance of the contrary arguments—that the Ornaments Rubric sanctions the vestments. "The *ornaments of the Church and Minister* were regulated by Act of Parliament in 1559. The Statute of Uniformity of that year contained the following proviso: 'Provided always, and be it enacted that such ornaments of the Church and of the ministers thereof shall be retained, and be in use, as was in this Church of England by the authority of Parliament, in the second year of the reign of King Edward the Sixth, *until other order shall be therein taken by the authority of the Queen's majesty*,'" etc. "Other order" was formally taken in 1566. "The advertisements appointed the surplice as the Eucharistic Vestment, and this took order 'other' than of the book of 1549, which had appointed chasubles, albs and tunicles as Eucharistic vestments. This 'other order' was enforced as the law by

authorities of Church and State. The synods of the Church have recognised the advertisements. The Canons of 1571 refer to the advertisements. . . . The same Canons require preachers to use the vest such as is described in the book of advertisements. . . . The 58th Canon is framed upon the advertisements. . . . So completely was the surplice received by the Church as the Eucharistic Vestment that the Act of Uniformity of 1662, as it passed the House of Lords, contained certain clauses providing for its non-use under certain conditions by the Puritans, without any allusion whatever to the Mass Vestments." (Blakeney's "Doctrine of Reception," p. 6.)

"The Church of England has received and enjoined by her *canon law*, by the *official action of the whole Episcopate for three centuries*, and by her *uniform reception and practice*, not the chasuble and alb and tunicle, but the surplice as the Eucharistic vestment." The judges in the Ridsdale case observed: "No instance has been given of any person having acted on it"—*i.e.*, on the Ritualistic interpretation of the rubric. They add: "The practice has been *uniform, open, continuous*, and under *authoritative* sanction." "Loyal members of the Anglican Communion" ought to conform to its laws, as declared by the Courts of the Realm, and not to encourage disobedience by a one-sided, private, unauthorized, misleading interpretation of its rubrics.

In Canon Liddon's "Life of Dr. Pusey," Dr. Sikes is reported to have said, in 1833, to Dr. Pusey: "We now hear not a breath about the Church. By-and-by, those who live to see it will hear of nothing else." The people of the present generation have lived to see the shrewdness and accuracy of this prophecy. "The Church" and the "Eucharistic Sacrifice" are the great topics, the chief catchwords of the sacerdotal theology. The Holy Eucharist was Lord Halifax's main theme at Birmingham on "Church Reform." The doctrinal aspect of the question was ably dealt with by Sir C. Robert Lighton, a layman of no mean capacity. It is delightful to see one occupying his social position so clear-headed, so concise, pointed and transparent in diction, and so sound in doctrine, on one of the chief theological topics of the day. His paper is worthy of the most careful perusal, as it exposes sacerdotal pretensions and errors in a bold but becoming manner. Lord Halifax is enamoured with "the religious life of the Continent," as regards frequent Communions. He surely goes near to impertinence when he says, "Contrast Westminster Abbey with the cathedral at Cologne, or any French cathedral, and you will almost wish never to enter it again till a radical change has been effected in all its arrangements." But it may well be supposed that the authorities at Westminster Abbey do not think that the

Holy Eucharist is "the Church's one act of worship," or that the formalism, mere externalism and the general religious life of the Continent, or rather (for Lord Halifax has no eyes to see any Lutheran Christians) of Roman Catholics on the Continent, are examples to be copied in Christian England. "The Early Masses of a Continental Sunday," observed Sir Robert Lighton, "hurried over, that the people may have an unbroken day for worldliness and pleasure, will again be in our midst. May God long preserve us from the idea of a religious life that finds favour on the Continent!" Lord Halifax's view is that Christ comes near to men in the elements of bread and wine in the Lord's Supper—though he avoids so designating it, perhaps because of the recent controversy on evening Communion, and because of the supposed necessity of a fasting reception—and that "the Catholic Church" hath "power over the Lord's body." What a strange expression, and what does his Lordship mean? Does he mean that power is conferred upon any man to bring the Lord's body at his own will into any material substance in any and every Eucharist, or that when, in that substance, it can be moved about, carried on the shoulder, and used or abused? The Divinity of Christ cannot be separated from His body. Can a man possess power over God? But supposing there is no such power; supposing that Christ's body is in heaven, and must, as the Scriptures teach, remain there until the restitution of all things, then is the Eucharistic Sacrifice or the Sacrifice of the Mass a delusion, and the worship of Christ in the elements of bread and wine is gross idolatry. The Eucharistic Sacrifice, in the sacerdotal sense, requires a victim. What or who is the victim? Rome boldly faces the question and uses the word *immolate;* but Christ being risen from the dead, dieth no more; death hath no more dominion over Him. It is not a question of present, or represent, or re-offer; the question is, how is the victim sacrificed? The question is, Is Christ re-sacrificed? In the Eucharistic sacrifice, in the sacerdotal sense, is the Body broken? The bread is broken: is Christ's body broken? The sacerdotalists insist upon the word "do" in the expression, "Do this in remembrance of Me," being a sacrificial term. It has been said, "that a remembrance cannot be of a person present, but of one who is absent. I do not admit that 'do this' in the words of institution means 'sacrifice this,' for without entering into the question whether the word 'do' is a sacrificial term or not, the sentence would be simply absurd. It would mean, 'Sacrifice Me, in remembrance of Me!' Sacrifice One who is present, in remembrance of His absence!" It is painful to thus deal with a sacred subject; but when the splendour of the one Sacrifice, once for all offered, is interfered

with—when some species of immolation is necessarily involved in the sacrifice of a body that is broken, when adoration is paid to the body of a Divine person, supposed to be in the elements of bread and wine, but which is in heaven, and is consequently open idolatry, to be abhorred of all faithful Christians—silence is culpable, and apologetic words are out of place. A holy indignation sets on one side disgraceful compromises, and the mincing, soft, betraying strains of a spurious charity.

A. NORTHERN CHURCHMAN.

ART. IV.—CLERICAL INCOMES.

THE present condition of clerical incomes is, we are convinced, not merely a matter of anxiety to the clergy; it is one of serious interest to the laity also. The hopes that had been entertained that rents would rise, glebes be re-let, and tithe regain its proper level, have not been realized. We are told that this is the worst year the farmer has known in the half century. Trade in many quarters is depressed, and, as the corn averages have been sinking lower and lower, a further shrinkage in clerical incomes appears to be inevitable. It would seem that we have not yet touched the bottom; and some may even think that the only form of consolation applicable to our circumstances is that current among the students at Yale: "Cheer up! there is worse to come!" I do not share this view. There are sufferers amongst the clergy; but on all sides there is a desire to relieve their sufferings. Only let it be remembered that the clergy are not paupers; and I do trust that no scheme will be advocated which shall hurt, in any degree, their proper pride or impair their spirit of independence.

For the sake of clearness, I will divide what I have to say under three heads:

1. How the clergy can help themselves.
2. How the clergy can help each other.
3. How others can help the clergy.

In dealing with the first point, it should be recognised as a fact that there is probably no time in a clergyman's career (unless he be exceptionally fortunate) when he is likely to be better off than at its commencement. While the incomes of the *beneficed* clergy have fallen, the stipends of the *unbeneficed* (while young) have risen. Forty years ago the ordinary stipend of a curate rarely exceeded £100 a year; now