

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

Religious Tract Society. Simple, suggestive, scholarly, deeply spiritual. *The Story of Passion Week* belongs to the same useful series, which, so far as we know, is unique.

From Messrs. T. and T. Clark, Edinburgh, we have received the second volume of Hagenbach's *History of Doctrines*.

The Rev. Charles Bullock has published his Sheffield Church Congress Paper, *Popular Recreation* (Hand and Heart Office, 1, Paternoster Buildings, E.C.). In the same little volume appears an article on "The Theatre as it is," reprinted from *Hand and Heart*, and a faithful protest against the Ober-Ammergau Passion Play.

THE MONTH.

THE annual gathering of Evangelical clergymen at Islington took place on the 11th, the Vicar, Prebendary Wilson, in the chair. In the course of his opening address,¹ the Chairman referred to this Magazine. THE CHURCHMAN, he said, "is taking the place of the *Christian Observer* with great success. I have read with the greatest interest the various papers which have appeared in it from its first publication, and I do not hesitate to bear my warm testimony to the fidelity and ability with which it is conducted, and would urge upon my brethren to promote its wider circulation." The subject for consideration was "Ministerial Efficiency," and the first Paper—a very valuable one—was read by the Bishop of Rochester. We hope that all the Papers, with the impressive Address, will be published.

The Archbishop of Canterbury, in a reply to the Memorial written by the Dean of St. Paul's, and signed by a large number of clergymen,² refers to a letter sent by his Grace to Canon Wilkinson. In this letter, dated December 31, we read:—

¹ Mr. Wilson spoke of the large body of faithful clergy, who set their face against "dangerous innovations. They are firmly attached to the Church of their fathers, they gladly obey the godly notions of those who are set over them in the Lord, and they alike resolutely oppose all sceptical views on the one hand, or Romanizing tendencies on the other. These are to my mind the great hope of the Church. The laity, as a body, are with them. Common sense is with them. Our Articles and Liturgy are with them. Above all, our Divine Master is in their midst. It is true that some among us are sorely tried by the pressure from without. Our younger friends are in danger, more especially, of yielding to the prevailing taste of the day. Still, I believe that the influence of Evangelical truth is gradually spreading in our midst."

² The Memorial deals first with "questions of ritual." The five Deans, (St. Paul's, Durham, Manchester, Worcester, and York) say:—"Having regard to the uncertainties which have been widely thought to surround some recent interpretations of ecclesiastical law, as well as to the equitable claims of congregations placed in the most dissimilar religious circumstances; we cannot but think that the recognized toleration of even wide diversities of ceremonial is alone consistent with the interests of true

It is a peculiarity of the present troubles that the clergymen who have fallen under the penalties of the law in a way we all much regret, have come under the authority of the Provincial Courts of Canterbury and York as the result of their having positively refused to conform to the admonition of their Bishops; and, indeed, so far as I know, no case of prosecution for ritual has (at least for many years past) been allowed to proceed in the case of any clergyman who was willing to comply with such admonition. It certainly may fairly be taken to show that there must be some exceptional difficulty in present arrangements when clergymen of otherwise unimpeachable character think it their duty to run the risk of having their usefulness in their parishes rudely interrupted by the authority of the law, rather than yield to those set over them in the Lord that degree of willing obedience which seems to most men to be enjoined alike by the traditions of their Church and by the written words of the Prayer-book (in the Preface "Concerning the Service of the Church") as well as by their promise of canonical obedience.

The Archbishop alludes, further, to the Report of the Committee of the Lower House of Convocation of Canterbury, appointed in 1877 "to consider the constitutional relations between the authorities ecclesiastical and civil in this realm, and the best method whereby common action may be taken by them in matters affecting the Church." His Grace adds:—

I have already . . . publicly alluded to this exhaustive and most carefully drawn report, and as soon as the forms of Convocation allow it I propose to call the attention of my brethren of the Upper House to the information it contains, and its suggestions for the improvement of our present laws. I can have no hesitation in assuring you that, while of course I cannot approve of much that has been said and written (often, I presume, under excitement) in the present controversy, and while I have been unable as yet to obtain any authoritative expression of united opinion as to what is wanted, still, I cannot but respect the evident earnestness of many who are disturbed as to the alleged grievances which attach to our present condition.

In commenting on the appeal for toleration in matter of ritual, the *Times* remarks:—

To do the Ritualists justice, they and their recognized leaders are perfectly frank in the matter. The colour of a vestment or the fashion of a ceremony are nothing to them save as they represent a definite Eucharistic doctrine. Of that doctrine it is sufficient to say that it is

religion, and with the well-being of the English Church at the present time."

The second point in this Memorial is ecclesiastical jurisdiction. "Our present troubles are likely to recur, unless the courts by which ecclesiastical causes are decided, in the first instance and on appeal, can be so constructed as to secure the conscientious obedience of clergymen who believe the constitution of the Church of Christ to be of Divine appointment; and who protest against the State's encroachment upon rights assured to the Church of England by solemn Acts of Parliament."

deeply repugnant to the vast majority of English Churchmen, and, therefore, it is idle to ask for toleration of the ritual which represents it, unless a like toleration is claimed for the doctrine itself. But to ask for a toleration of the Eucharistic doctrine involved in the service of the Mass, or in anything at all closely resembling it, is virtually to ask that the work of the Reformation in England should be undone. . . . The Ritualists, for whom toleration is now claimed, are, in fact, the chief disturbers of the recognized and long-established order of public worship. They act with a definite purpose, and that purpose they avow. To ask Englishmen at large to tolerate practices avowedly revived or invented for the furtherance of such a purpose is surely to exhibit a strange misconception of the whole spirit of their civil and ecclesiastical history.

The plea of the Memorial, in fact, says the *Times*, is either "superfluous, or we regret to have to say it, disingenuous."¹ It is worthy of note that the Rev. J. de la Bere, on whom sentence of deprivation has been pronounced (on the 8th), in a letter to the Primate remarks that the Ritualistic practices (for the sake of which he set at naught his Bishop and the Church Courts) "are not trivialities" to him. He writes:—"My practice in the introduction of any new point of ritual was fully to explain its value and its meaning."

On Saturday, the 15th, after five days' hearing, before Lords Justices James, Brett, and Cotton, in the "matter of the Rev. T. P. Dale's imprisonment for contumacy, under the Public Worship Act, and in a similar matter of the Rev. R. W.

¹ In a letter to the *Times* the Hon. and Rev. W. H. Fremantle says:—Though the memorial is vague, it is only the more calculated to do harm by fostering unreasonable discontent among the clergy. It assumes that "the State" has "encroached on rights assured to the Church of England by solemn Acts of Parliament." Where, I ask, are such Acts to be found? The preamble of the Statute of Appeals (24 Henry VIII., cap. 12), to which allusion is usually made by the advocates of clericalism, and to which alone, I suspect, allusion can be made, contains no such assurance, as may be seen by any one who will read that preamble by the light of the Act itself, and the supplementary Act of the next year (Submission of the Clergy and Restraint of Appeals, 25 Henry VIII., cap. 19). It is an assertion of the independence of the temporality and spirituality of England against the Court of Rome, but contains not a word which gives rights to the clergy as against Parliament. Still less does it distinguish, as the memorial does, between "the Church" and "the State." The real greatness of the English Church is, that it has, ever since England became one, been able to entwine itself with the nation so as to be indistinguishable from it. The mistake of a section of the clergy (for it is the clergy, not the Church, who profess to be aggrieved) has lain in their inability to perceive and trust loyally to this central fact. They have always wished to have a class power separate from or co-ordinate with that of the nation. This claim has always been resisted, and, I hope, always will be. It would, if allowed, do violence to a conviction, equally sincere and deep with that of the memorialists, and which is not that of some of the clergy and of the friends of clericalism, but that on which the Reformation settlement itself is grounded.

Enraght," judgment was given. A technical defect had been discovered,¹ and Messrs. Dale and Enraght were accordingly released from their imprisonment. The uncertainty of the law was thus once more exemplified, "at the cost of that common whipping-boy of statutory legislation, the Public Worship Regulation Act." The *Times* of the 17th summarizes as follows:—

When all the purely ecclesiastical questions had been disposed of adversely to the imprisoned incumbents, . . . the rectors of St. Vedast and Bordesley suddenly have found themselves at liberty, ingloriously victorious. The two testifiers against the jurisdiction of a Parliamentary Court owe their momentary escape from its grasp to the sort of technical defect through which a fraudulent debtor might have eluded punishment.

The real point which the appellants were anxious to prove was, that they were the victims of a *parvenu* usurping Court which had disguised itself in the feathers of the venerable Court of Arches and Provincial Court of York. They might reluctantly allow that Lord Penzance is Dean of Arches and Official Principal of York, though how one who has not subscribed the Canons should hold those high dignities they cannot understand. But they will not be persuaded that, sitting to exercise jurisdiction under the Public Worship Act, he is not holding a new office, and disentitled, therefore, to avail himself of the old procedure. As Dean of Arches, if he be Dean of Arches, he might have issued his monitions; he might have followed his monitions by inhibitions, and enforced his inhibitions by *significavit* and writs *de contumace capiendo*. In the suits against Mr. Dale and Mr. Enraght he was acting under the Public Worship Act; the Public Worship Act, though it permits its Judge to admonish, and inhibit, and deprive, does not say it empowers, and therefore does not mean to empower him to compel submission to its orders by imprisonment for contumacy. Deprivation after three years' disobedience is, according to this argument, the instrument in the hands of the Public Worship Judge for guarding his jurisdiction. If the parishioners who have moved the Court against their clergyman desire to stop his interference meanwhile with the services, they may take their chance of proceeding against him as a stranger for the time being, and a brawler in church, by a summary statutory process before a police magistrate. This is the only part of the controversy which can be of substantial theoretical interest to the rebellious rectors. The whole of this position the Queen's Bench Division emphatically repudiated before Christmas. The Court of Appeal repudiates it still more vehemently.

¹ Lord Justice James said:—"By law a man is obliged to wear a particular vestment, and he is obliged to do it. By law the writ ought to be opened in a particular place, and before particular persons. If one law is to be obeyed, the other law is to be obeyed also, and I am of opinion that the writ was defectively issued from the Court of Queen's Bench after it had left the Petty Bag Office, and, that being so, that Mr. Dale is entitled to be discharged from that writ, that having been improperly issued, and the consequence will follow with respect to Mr. Enraght that he will be entitled to his rule for a *Habeas Corpus* in order that he may also be discharged."

The defendants, concludes the *Times*, have won a triumph, not over the Court and jurisdiction they detest, but over some lawyer, whom three legal sages pronounce to be all in the right and three others pronounce to be all in the wrong:—

Not a point has been decided in their favour which has the remotest bearing on the doctrines for which or against which they have been striving. Their obstinate resistance to Lord Penzance's decrees has ended in the affirmation of the powers they denied him by the High Court of Justice first, and now again by the Court of Appeal. If the success they have gained in the struggle on technicalities proves anything to the public mind, it is not that justice has been vindicated by the immunity for a day or a week of two recalcitrant clergymen from a penalty they have incurred, but that the threats and injunctions, of which they have shown how difficult it is to chastise the contempt, ought to be changed for sharper and swifter penalties. The practical lesson impressed by Saturday's absurd collapse is only that the existing process is so long as to multiply superfluously the chances of a weak link. For a tenderness of clerical consciences so excessive as to forbid obedience to a judicial decree of silence in church the proper remedy may be thought to be the severance of a tie which galls the necks of parishes, if not of their pastors.

We are not inclined to disagree with the *Guardian* in its remark (Jan. 19) that "the release of Mr. Dale and Mr. Enraght will be welcomed by most people as a temporary solution of a difficulty that was apparently almost insoluble." We were glad that Mr. Dale felt himself able to enjoy his Christmas holiday; and we sincerely trust that both these gentlemen will, to quote the *Guardian's* words, "reconsider their position calmly and dispassionately." The *Guardian* has no warrant for its assertion that the Evangelical school "has now thrown off the mask and openly avowed the design of driving the Ritualists and their friends out of the Church." The "design" of Evangelicals has been to drive out of the Church an illegal Ritualism. They have said that the Ritualists must submit to the law, and they say so still.

In regard to a reconstruction of our Ecclesiastical Courts, we are ready to discuss any sensible schemes come from whatsoever quarter they may.¹ But with regard to such "toleration" as shall legalize the ritual of the Mass, Evangelical Churchmen of every shade, we believe, will offer a resolute and unflinching opposition.

Several letters have appeared in the *Times* on Ritualistic lawlessness. Dr. Pusey has been answered on a matter of fact

¹ That any great improvement will be effected, or that the ultra-Church section will become satisfied, we have little hope. The statements of Dr. Blakeney, in his able Paper read at the Swansea Church Congress, have not yet been answered.

by the Secretary to the Church Association, on the Bennett case, by the Rev. Joseph Bardsley, Canons Hoare and Bell, and others, and in regard to Ritualistic clergy being urged on by their congregations by the Dean of Peterborough.¹

Parliament was opened on the 6th. The report on the Address was brought up on the 20th, after weary and fruitless debates. Never has obstruction in the House of Commons been so persistent and so pernicious. The condition of Ireland is truly terrible; and the Prime Minister seems bewildered in the presence of difficulties for which his rash rhetoric in no small degree is responsible. A vigorous and statesmanlike speech has been made by Lord Hartington.

¹ The Dean of Peterborough (Dr. Perowne) writes:—Dr. Pusey tells us that “all along those who have closely observed the ritual movement have seen that it has been especially the work of the laity. While the clergyman has been hesitating, his parishioners have often presented him with the vestments which they wished him to wear.” This, no doubt, is perfectly true, and this Dr. Pusey evidently considers a sufficient justification for any change in dress or ritual; it is for the people to say what they will have, it is for the priest to hearken to their voice. I will not stop to argue how far the clergyman may have begun the work by instilling into the minds of the laity what he is pleased to call “Catholic principles.” I will accept Dr. Pusey’s view. I will admit that it is a vulgar error to suppose that the priest leads the people, when as a matter of fact the people dictate to the priest. The history of all religions furnishes instances in point. But there is one memorable scene in history which Dr. Pusey ought not to have forgotten, and which would have furnished him with an admirable illustration of his position. More than 3,000 years ago a congregation was gathered at the foot of the awful mountain which their great Lawgiver had ascended in order that he might receive the commandments of God. Impatient at his delay, eager for some sensible representation of the Invisible Majesty, they accosted their priest in these words:—Up, make us gods which shall go before us; for as for this Moses, the man that brought us up out of the land of Egypt, we wot not what has become of him.” It was then that the priest, yielding as has been generally believed unwillingly, “hesitating” as Dr. Pusey tells us the modern clergyman does when solicited to wear vestments, asked for the golden earrings of the people, which he fashioned into a calf, which became the object of the national idolatry. It was the people who cried when they beheld it, “These be thy gods, O Israel, which have brought thee up out of the land of Egypt.” It was the priest who when he heard them thus salute their deity built an altar before it; and doing his best to disguise the idolatry when he proclaimed a feast in its honour, said, “To-morrow is a feast to the Lord.” Need I draw out the parallel? I may leave so practised a theologian as Dr. Pusey to do it for himself. That he should appear as the advocate of a naked congregationalism is surprising enough; that he should think it sufficient excuse for any aberration in ritual, any extravagance in vestments, to say, “my people love to have it so,” may be evidence of that “charming simplicity” which, as Mr. Llewelyn Davies has shown in his admirable letter, makes him blind to the most indisputable facts of history, but it is certainly a strange surrender of his solemn responsibility as a religious teacher, and a disgraceful admission that popular clamour, not principle or truth, is to govern the worship of the Church.