

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

hearts may be kept at peace and their own characters developed into a beautiful whole. In Bishop Moberly's Bampton Lectures on "The Administration of the Spirit in the Body of Christ," there is, we think, no passage which brings out the essentially missionary character of the Church. He does, indeed, lay stress upon the oneness of the Church as the Spirit-bearing body, but not on this equally important correlative truth. On the other hand, Dr. Pierson, the American writer, in his book "The Acts of the Holy Spirit," announces as a discovery of his own that "the narrative of the Acts of the Apostles is a revelation of the Holy Spirit in His relations to believers as Christ's witnesses and to the Church as the witnessing body." This is true and valuable, though others have noted it as well as Dr. Pierson. But *he* puts forward no clear conception of the Church as the one living, organized body, and hence falls short of the requirements of truth on this side. We stand in need of one who shall set forth, in a manner that shall convince the intelligence of the Church and arouse its conscience, both these complementary truths, together with the abiding nature and perpetual need of the Pentecostal gift, and thus open to the Church of the future and to the hitherto unevangelized world a new and glorious era.

A. C. DOWNER.

(To be continued.)



ART. VII.—THE ARCHBISHOPS OF CANTERBURY SINCE THE RESTORATION.

CHARLES MANNERS-SUTTON.

THIS Prelate was born February 15, 1755, the fourth son of Lord George Manners, and grandson of the third Duke of Rutland, who died in 1779, aged eighty-three. When the boy was seven years old, his father succeeded to the estates of his maternal grandfather, Robert Sutton, Lord Lexington, and therefore took the additional name of Sutton. After early education at the Charterhouse, the lad was sent to Emanuel College, Cambridge, where, in 1777, he took the degree of Fifteenth Wrangler; his younger brother Thomas at the same time was fifth. The latter went to the Bar, became Solicitor-General, then Judge (when he received a Peerage), then Lord Chancellor of Ireland, from which office he retired in 1827. He had all through his career taken a staunch Protestant line, and incurred the formidable wrath of Daniel O'Connell. Charles, having taken Holy Orders,

received a family living, Averham-with-Kelham, in Norfolk, in 1785, and another, Whitwell, Derbyshire, which he held with it. His cousin, the fourth Duke of Rutland, had been a friend of Pitt while the two youths were pupils of Bishop Pretzman. In fact, it was the Duke who first brought Pitt into Parliament for the borough of Appleby, by means of an application to Sir James Lowther. Pitt was not forgetful of the favour. He made the Duke Viceroy of Ireland, and Lowther a Peer. In 1791 he made the subject of our memoir Dean of Peterborough, and next year elevated him to the Bishopric of Norwich, in succession to Horne. In 1794 he received the Deanery of Windsor *in commendam*. On his ordination he had married Mary Thoroton, the daughter of a Nottinghamshire squire. Both he and his wife gained high favour in the eyes of George III. and Queen Charlotte, and at the moment at which we are arrived this brought substantial recognition.

Pitt, as we have already seen, was the pupil of George Pretzman (afterward Tomline), an undoubtedly able and learned man, who had obtained the distinctions of Senior Wrangler and Smith's Prizeman in 1772. The friendship thus begun lasted through life. Tomline made great, though unsuccessful, endeavours to bring Pitt in as Member for Cambridge when he first aspired for a seat in the House of Commons. When Pitt became Prime Minister, in December, 1783, Pretzman, though now ordained, became his Private Secretary, and through his mathematical ability was of great service to him in formulating some of his most brilliant financial proposals. The Minister, in return, gave him substantial preferments, two rectories, and a stall at Westminster, and in 1787 proposed him to the King for Bishop of Lincoln. "No, no!" said the King; "too young—too young." Pitt replied that had it not been for Pretzman he would never have been Prime Minister. "He shall have it, Pitt—he shall have it!" exclaimed the King. So Pretzman became Bishop, and, though he gave up the secretarial work, he remained in closest intimacy with his friend, and was constantly summoned by him to London for advice and assistance. Most of the ecclesiastical patronage of the Crown was under Pretzman's advice as long as Pitt lived.

In the latter part of 1804, Pretzman, who had now taken the additional name of Tomline, in consequence of the bequeathment of a rich estate being made to him by a squire in his diocese named Marmaduke Tomline, almost a stranger to him, was anxious to succeed to the Primacy, it being known that Archbishop Moore was dying. And Pitt, who was again Prime Minister, after the short-lived ministry of

Addington, was anxious to get it for him, and let the King know as much. But the latter was determined against it. He said Pitt was making him simply his secretary, and allowing him no initiative at all. The course of events I give from a verbal account told to me by the late Dean of Windsor, Wellesley, in the course of a never-to-be-forgotten walk in Addington Park. I have heard one or two variations of the story, principally slight additions, but now tell it as I heard it. On January 19, 1805, the Bishop of Norwich was giving a dinner-party in his Windsor Deanery; his butler whispered in his ear that a gentleman wished particularly to see him, but wouldn't give his name. "Well, I can't come now in the middle of dinner." "Beg pardon, my lord, but the gentleman is *very* anxious to see you on important business." "Very well, ask him to sit down in my study." "Beg pardon, my lord, but I think you had better see the gentleman at once;" and the butler was so urgent and so significant in manner that the Bishop apologized to his company and went out. The gentleman who wouldn't be denied proved to be King George III. "How d'ye do, my lord? Come to tell you that you're Archbishop of Canterbury—Archbishop of Canterbury. D'ye accept—accept? Eh? eh?" The Bishop bowed low in token of acceptance. "All right," said His Majesty. "You've got a party—see all their hats here. Go back to them. Good-night—good-night!" And the King went off at a swinging rate. Next morning Mr. Pitt appeared, to inform His Majesty that Archbishop Moore died yesterday, and to beg to recommend to His Majesty the appointment of the Bishop of Lincoln to the vacant Primacy. "Very sorry—very sorry indeed, Pitt," quoth the King, "but I offered it to the Bishop of Norwich last night, and he accepted. Can't break my word." Pitt, according to Lord Sidmouth's account afterwards to Dean Milman, was very angry indeed; but the thing was done, as the King meant it should be, and so Dr. Manners-Sutton became Archbishop of Canterbury, and held the great office for twenty-three eventful years. During the first decade of his Primacy the figure which overshadowed all others in the eyes of men was that of Buonaparte. During those years he crushed for a time the powers of Austria and Prussia, took possession of Spain, invaded Russia, and was in turn crushed at Waterloo, June 18, 1815. He was carried away into exile, and six years later died.

But during these years there was also very important work being carried on in the religious life of England. We have seen something in previous periods of the rise of what is known as the Evangelical movement. Its history, as of all

other great movements, is complex. It is to be traced, in fact, to the Puritanism of the Commonwealth, modified by the conviction of its members that the threefold ministry was an Apostolic institution; partly it grew out of horror at the wicked lives of many who held high office in the State, and who thereby corrupted the whole of the public morality; it owed much, also, to the pious lives of some of the Nonjurors. It is notorious that Wesley's religious earnestness was generated by his study of Law's "Serious Call." And thus, during the indifferentism which came into fashion in the days of Walpole, and the worldliness which seemed to have settled down on the nation when the strife between Stuarts and Hanoverians came to an end, the earnestness of the early Evangelicals was like salt, preserving the religious life of the people. Some of the great leaders had passed away when the century began — Wesley, Beveridge, Romaine, Venn, Cowper. There still remained Newton, who died full of years in 1807; Cecil, who died in 1810; and Thomas Scott, in 1821. William Wilberforce, who was forty-one years old when the century began, lived till 1833. And with him we associate the honoured names of men like Thornton, Z. Macaulay, Stephen. But the name in the list which looms out most prominently is that of Charles Simeon. He became incumbent of Trinity Church, Cambridge, in 1790, and lived until 1836, a man of marvellous power, who, as Macaulay wrote to his sister, had "more influence than any Archbishop." It was he, beyond all men, who popularized Evangelicalism by impressing on the clergy that they belonged to a Church which not only held a pure faith founded on the Gospel, but also had a noble order and organization, and a great history. And he could boast of a memorable band of disciples and fellow-workers. Henry Martyn, first Senior Wrangler of the nineteenth century, James Scholefield, Josiah Pratt, Charles Bridges, the Venns, the Elliotts—they are all names held in deep reverence; and many more might be added. The great work which we have to chronicle in the present page is that of the foundation of the Church Missionary Society.

I cannot put its inception so well as by simply quoting Mr. Eugene Stock's summary of the state of religious matters at the beginning of the eighteenth century: "Europe—but for the ruling race in Turkey—is Christian by profession, Christian according to statistical tables. Asia is Mohammedan or heathen. In India the English conquerors have done almost nothing to pass on the great message to the multitudes lately come under their sway. A handful of Germans have laboured in the south, and gathered a good many small congregations of converts; and a self-educated English cobbler

has just settled in Bengal with a like object in view; and that is all. In Ceylon the Dutch *régime* has compelled thousands to call themselves Christians, who at the first convenient opportunity will slip back into Buddhism. China is closed, though within her gates there are scattered bands of men acknowledging 'the Lord of Heaven' and acknowledging the Pope of Rome. Japan is hermetically sealed: the Jesuit tyranny of the sixteenth century is one of the most hateful of national memories, and no Christian has been allowed to land for nearly 200 years. Africa is only a coast-line; the interior is unknown; and the principal link between Christendom and the Dark Continent is the slave-trade. South America, for the most part nominally Christian, is sunk in superstition; North America is Christian in a more enlightened sense; but neither in the south nor in the north are there any serious efforts to evangelize the red-men of the far interior, still less those towards the Arctic Circle or Cape Horn — though Europe has sent devoted Moravians to Greenland. The countless islands of the Southern Seas are not yet touched, though a band of artisan missionaries has lately sailed in that direction. Such in the closing years of the eighteenth century is the condition of God's earth; and standing in thought in England at that date, we may add, *Who cares?*"

This is bad enough, and true enough. And to it must be sorrowfully added the fact that for more than two centuries England was the chief slave-trading nation. She did not, indeed, begin; it was Spain and Portugal who did that, and a Papal Bull authorized the opening of a slave-market at Lisbon in the early years of the sixteenth century. But England had taken the traffic almost out of the hands of its founders. So late as 1772 advertisements of slaves to be sold appeared in the papers, as, for instance, in the following notice of a public auction: "Twelve pipes of raisin wine, two boxes of bottled cider, six sacks of flour, three negro men, two negro women, two negro boys, one negro girl." But in that memorable year Granville Sharp, then a clerk in a Government office, determined to test the legality of such things, and by the strength of unyielding perseverance, procured from the lips of Lord Chief Justice Mansfield the opinion that the power to own slaves had never been recognised by English law. "As soon as any slave sets his foot upon English ground he becomes free." This was one step, but it was only one. It had the effect of exciting religious men to a sense of duty towards the black races. It was in 1786 that a great movement began, comprising several distinct incidents. Isolated clergymen landed in India, and declared the need of a mission there. William Carey, the "self-educated cobbler" referred

to in the preceding paragraph, had got up at a Baptist meeting at Northampton, and spoke of their responsibility to the heathen, and was ordered by the chairman to sit down. It is well worthy of note that while Carey owed his first interest in foreign lands to reading Captain Cook's voyages, he also declared that he owed his spiritual fervour to Thomas Scott, the Church minister whom we have already named. Cardinal Newman makes a like avowal in his "*Apologia pro Vita sua*." The first shipload of convicts landed in Australia, and a chaplain with them. The same year the Bishop of Lincoln (Thurlow), preaching the annual sermon of the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel, appealed earnestly to the East India Company to recognise their responsibility towards the heathen millions in India.

In 1793 Carey, who was not annihilated by the rebuff he had received, but had given himself earnestly to acquiring languages for his purpose, sailed for India, the first missionary of the Baptist Missionary Society, which he had been the main instrument of founding the year before. Two years later the London Missionary Society was founded by two Church clergymen, and some Congregationalists and Presbyterians. It was on February 8, 1796, that Simeon opened a discussion, at a meeting of the Eclectic Society, on the "best method of opening a mission to the heathen from the Established Church." Seventeen members were present, but only two or three were favourable; the rest thought that it would be interfering with the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel, and that the claims on the Church at home were too many to allow the opening of fresh ground. But the minority did not lose heart. In 1799 Josiah Pratt, then a very young clergyman, afterwards the saintly incumbent of St. Stephen's, Coleman Street, started the *Christian Observer*, which at once became the main organ of the Evangelical divines, and in this the subject of missions was placed in a prominent position. As Mr. Stock says, the question was now raised, not "What ought the Church to do?" but "What can *we* do?" Small meetings and discussions were held, with the result that on Friday, April 12, 1799, the Church Missionary Society was established at a public meeting at the Castle and Falcon Hotel, in Aldersgate Street. The story, not only of the foundation, but of the early progress of the Society, is deeply interesting, but is hardly within our scope. But the following must in candour be reported. The new Society appointed a deputation, consisting of Wilberforce, Grant, and John Venn, to wait on Archbishop Moore with an account of the Society and a copy of its rules. They did not ask for his patronage, but in a written statement "humbly trusted that his Grace

would be pleased favourably to regard their attempt to extend the benefits of Christianity, an attempt peculiarly necessary at a period in which the most zealous and systematic efforts had been made to eradicate the Christian faith." This last clause referred to Paine's "Age of Reason," which was having a great circulation. The Archbishop does not seem to have received the deputation, but he corresponded with Wilberforce about it. The latter wrote that his Grace "appeared favourably disposed," but was "cautious not to commit himself." We have already seen incidentally how the majority of the clergy were opposed to the new school—"the serious clergy," as they were called. They were supposed to be impregnated with Wesleyan and Calvinistic theology, sour, narrow-minded, unfaithful to Church principles. One young man is said to have been rejected for ordination because he had read Wilberforce's "Practical View," and thought highly of it.

About a year later Wilberforce wrote to the committee: "I have had an interview with the Archbishop, who has spoken in very obliging terms, and expressed himself concerning your Society in as favourable a way as could be well expected. I will tell you more at large when we meet what passed between us. Meanwhile, I will just state that his Grace regretted that he could not with propriety at once express his full concurrence and approbation of an endeavour in behalf of an object he had deeply at heart. He acquiesced in the hope I expressed that the Society might go forward, being assured he would look on the proceedings with candour, and that it would give him pleasure to find them such as he could approve."

The reader may be inclined to smile at the Archbishop's caution, but it can hardly be realized to-day on what ticklish ground he stood. The old-fashioned High Church clergy, who had a noble list of predecessors to rejoice in, as well as the worldly men who hated "enthusiasm," were very suspicious, to say the least, of men who had been admirers of Wesley, and were looking less severely than themselves upon his unhappy schism. When we note that Simeon was blackballed when proposed as a member of the Society for the Propagation of Christian Knowledge, we realize that Moore hardly knew what line to take. But the committee did not lose heart. They used to meet regularly at St. Anne's Rectory, on St. Andrew's Hill, in the City. They made a library, opened correspondence, and collected a hundred guineas for the London Missionary Society, pending the time when they could send out men of their own. And for a good while the men were not forthcoming. Mr. Stock gives striking instances of the apparent apathy of even good and earnest men after

the Society was fully launched (vol. i., p. 73). Simeon could not get one in Cambridge, and exclaimed: "I see more and more WHO it is that must thrust forth labourers into His harvest." Anniversaries were held and sermons were preached at which ladies might attend; but it was considered improper for them to attend public meetings. A Bishop was publicly rebuked by a Judge for bringing his wife; and even when Blomfield was Bishop of Chester, a few ladies who attended a Society for the Propagation of the Gospel meeting in his diocese were smuggled in out of sight. The first secretary was Scott; but he resigned in the third year, on his appointment to the Vicarage of Aston Sandford, and was succeeded by Josiah Pratt, who held the office for twenty-one years, and was the instrument which raised the influence of the Society at home and the extension of its work abroad.

Archbishop Manners-Sutton was not likely to be more enthusiastic for the Church Missionary Society than his predecessor. His proclivities were strongly towards the old historical High Church party; and laying prejudice aside, it is pleasant to note that he had a keen eye for good men, and some of those whose memory we all delight to honour were men whom he brought forward. The names of Christopher Wordsworth, Master of Trinity, and ancestor of a distinguished family of loyal Churchfolk; of Joshua Watson, the pious layman, to whom the Church owed so much right down into the middle of the nineteenth century; of Howley; of Henry Vincent Bayley, Archdeacon of Stow; Charles Webb Le Bas; John Lonsdale, Bishop of Lichfield, all give lustre to his Primacy. They all belonged to the High Church party, and they were all his personal friends. And here again we have to note that both sides, in their common love to the Lord of the Church, learned through that love to understand each other for good, and to practise first forbearance, then active co-operation. I myself know of a case where a Bishop refused to preach for one of his clergy because he had a surpliced choir; and of an Evangelical clergyman who, going to take duty for a friend, found no black gown, refused to preach in his surplice, and did so in his great coat. Bishop Mant preached a sermon against the use of hymns in public worship, and F. E. Paget, in one of his religious novels, poured angry scorn upon extempore preachers. It is a subject not for ridicule, but rather for respect for what was in their narrowness of horizon a matter of principle, and what they thought needful for defence of orthodoxy. And for this reason it is unfair to think scorn of the two Archbishops before us if they hesitated over the supposed Church deficiencies of the Church Missionary Society. We can only note now that, before Arch-

bishop Manners-Sutton died, he had, at the instance of the Society, raised the mitred front of the Church in India. Thomas Fanshawe Middleton was consecrated first Bishop of Calcutta on Sunday, May 8, 1814, along with Murray, afterwards the good Bishop of Rochester. W. BENHAM.

(To be continued.)

ART. VIII.—THE HOUSES OF LAYMEN AND LAY REPRESENTATION: A NOTE.

THE proposal to create Statutory Houses of Laymen to help in administering the affairs of an autonomous Church requires more thought than it thus far seems likely to receive. At present there is some danger of large plans being made before a majority of intelligent Church-people are at all aware of what is being done in their name and in their assumed interests. It is proposed to give new and very serious powers to Convocation and the Houses of Laymen, but at present how many people know anything accurately about either? I fear that many Church reformers fail to understand the ignorance which prevails; but in order to test that ignorance I have made an experiment which may not be without interest and value.

I addressed the following questions to some Church laymen of my acquaintance:

1. What is the House of Laymen?
2. What are its powers?
3. How is it elected?
4. Does it represent the laity?
5. Ought it to have more power?

I chose my men carefully, with the view of getting the opinion of those who are not merely Church-goers, but men deeply interested in the welfare of the Church. I give the substance of the replies from four of them, which may, I believe, be regarded as typical of a much larger number.

The first reply is from a member of a Diocesan Conference. He did his best to conceal his ignorance on the subjects submitted to him, but finally hazarded the opinion that the House of Laymen is a sort of glorified Diocesan Conference which is elected by the Diocesan Conferences of the country; and if it did not represent the laity, well, it was the fault of the laity themselves for not taking more interest in Church questions. He was quite unable to define the powers of the House of Laymen, and therefore not in a position to say