
A table of contents for *The Churchman* can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_churchman_os.php

THE

CHURCHMAN

JULY, 1900.

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

VII. THOMAS TENISON (*concluded*).

THE accession of Queen Anne seemed to bring for the time being considerable changes in both Church and State. The centres of gravity were shifted, though things after a while returned to the former settlement. William III. won the sincere respect, but never the love, of the nation which invited him to rule it. His manners were shy, cold, even repellent. His religious creed was a narrow, sour Calvinism. But he was scrupulous and earnest in following out his convictions and fulfilling the duties which he believed to be laid upon him. Ever since the accession of the Stuarts there had been struggle and confusion as to the relative powers of the Crown and the Parliament, Charles I. was not more conscientious than James II. in asserting his prerogative. And the nation had learned by its experience of the Commonwealth that the Parliament could be tyrannical as well as the King. It was William III. who really solved the problem of constitutional monarchy, and did so in the face of difficulties which might have appalled most men. A Stadtholder in Holland, with Republican forms, he was invited to become a king over England and Scotland, with constitutions which had never been defined. English, Scotch, Irish, Dutch, all had separate interests, instincts, and animosities; his Ministers he could not trust with safety; he was at war almost uninterruptedly with the greatest power in Europe, or undermined by its intrigues, which were even more dangerous. And yet with all these terrible difficulties, added to sickliness of body which kept him in perpetual suffering, he built up the British constitution, and proved himself a very great king.

From that day, in spite of all drawbacks, things have worked uninterruptedly. In the very centenary of his accession the French Revolution broke out, and whilst almost every country was convulsed by throes of that earthquake, England remained loyal and peaceable, thanks, under God's guidance, first to the foresight of William III., and secondly, to a very different man, to whose times we hope to come, John Wesley.

But when King William died he was probably more unpopular than he had ever been. Queen Anne at her accession was thirty-eight years old, uneducated, and at this time as much under the tutelage of Sarah, Duchess of Marlborough, as if she had been a girl in the schoolroom. But she had strong convictions. She was firmly attached to the Church of England, and she detested the Whigs both for their political and their religious principles. The Tories had taken her part when she got into conflict with King William, and even the Jacobites had been civil to her by way of showing their animosity to him. So the Ministers of the late King found themselves for the most part in the cold, and Tories took their places. Archbishop Tenison, of course, crowned her, but she let him see that he was not in favour. Her coronation sermon was preached by the High Church Archbishop of York, Sharp. When she met her new Parliament, in which the Tories had an overpowering majority, she spoke in the highest of High Church tones, and was warmly congratulated as the champion of the Church of England. A resolution was passed thanking her for having through the Duke of Marlborough "*retrieved* the ancient glory of this English nation." The Whigs, seeing that this was a slur on the dead King, moved to substitute the word "*maintained*," but were altogether beaten. Burnet says truly enough that this was ungenerous and ungrateful.

This reign is largely occupied with events and incidents which will not come within our scope. We have little or nothing to do with the great war with which the names of the Duke of Marlborough and some of the ablest of French generals were connected, the war wherein were fought the Battles of Blenheim, Ramilies, Malplaquet; nor have we with the question, "What good came of it at last?" Neither have we much to do with the great outburst of literature which undoubtedly contains illustrious names, but which falsely arrogated to itself the title of the "Augustan Age." We have just to mention the rivalries of bedchamber women, Sarah, Duchess of Marlborough, and Abigail Hill, because they had much to do with the variations of the Queen from Tory to Whig politicians and back again. All these things have to be taken into account in the history of Queen Anne, but we

pass them over lightly, since our subject is the life of Archbishop Tenison.

As we have seen, when the Queen mounted the throne the Tories were paramount. Parliament no sooner met than they brought in their "Occasional Conformity Bill," the professed object of which was to prevent hypocrisy, but which was really intended to destroy King William's Toleration Act. It provided that all who should receive the Sacrament and test in qualification for office, and afterwards attended any worship not according to the liturgy of the Church of England, should be disqualified from holding their employments, and also liable to fine. Few men seemed to see as yet that the test itself was bad, the forcing of the most solemn and divine of sacred mysteries on those who doubted or disbelieved in its efficacy. So we can hardly accept Burnet's comment on it, though the concluding words as to the intention are no doubt true enough. "The preamble of this Bill asserted toleration, and condemned all prosecution for conscience sake in a high strain. Some thought the Bill of no consequence, and that, if it should pass into a law, it would be of no effect; or that the occasional conformists would become constant ones; others thought it was such a breaking in upon toleration as would undermine it, and that it would have a great effect upon Corporations; as, indeed, the intent of it was believed to be the modelling elections, and by consequence the House of Commons. On behalf of the Bill it was said the design of the Test Act was, that all in office should continue in the Communion of the Church; that coming only once to the Sacrament for an office, and going afterwards to the meetings of Dissenters was both an eluding the intent of the Law and a profanation of the Sacrament. . . . Those who were against the Bill said, the nation had been quiet ever since the toleration; the Dissenters had lost more ground and strength by it than the Church; the nation was now engaged in a great war; it seemed, therefore, unreasonable to raise animosities at home in matters of religion, and to encourage a tribe of informers, who were the worst sort of men; the fines were excessive, higher than any laid on Papists by law; and, since no limitation of time nor concurrence of witnesses was provided for in the Bill, men would be for ever exposed to the malice of a bold swearer or wicked servant." The Bill passed the Commons by a large majority, but was in trouble as soon as it reached the Upper House. It was a characteristic circumstance that the Queen, who was strongly in favour of the Bill, made her husband vote for it, though he himself was an "occasional conformist"; he kept Lutheran chaplains and attended their ministry, but received the

Sacrament of the English Church to qualify him for the office of Lord High Admiral. The secular peers were on the whole hostile, so were the bishops, almost to a man. But they were ready to pass the Bill with some modifications. Burnet says that they introduced these as a plausible way of getting rid of it altogether; the two chief objections were the high fines, with which the Commons declared that the Lords had no business, and the additional safeguards which they inserted about informers. The Commons refused the amendments, the Lords insisted on them, and so the Bill was lost. Burnet comments thus: "Angry men took occasion from hence to charge the bishops as enemies to the Church, and betrayers of its interests, because we would not run blindfold into the passions and designs of ill-tempered men." We may note in passing that the Bill was brought into the House of Commons by Henry St. John, afterwards Lord Bolingbroke, who had been educated a Dissenter, but had now no religion at all, but he had attached himself to the Tory party, and therefore adopted their scheme. Marlborough threw all his influence on the same side, thereby ingratiating himself not only with the majority in the Commons, but with the Queen. "Always sacrifice your principles to your selfishness," was the unchanging resolve of that great captain. But even at this moment the cleavage between him and the Tories was beginning, for they were resisting the Queen's desire, instigated by his wife, to increase his money grants. As time passed on he became their bitter enemy.

In the first meeting of the new House of Convocation the same demonstration against the Whiggism of the previous reign was at once made. Aldrich was chosen prolocutor of the Lower House, and an address to the Crown was drawn up, worded so as to cast reflections not only on the dead King but on the bishops. After a contest lasting some days a form was agreed to in which both Houses expressed their sense of "the Divine favour in placing Her Majesty on the throne of these realms." The Queen, in her reply, expressed her confidence that this concurrence was a "good presage of their union in all other matters, which was very desirable for her service, and for the good of the Church." The result showed that she was over sanguine. The Lower House then requested that measures should be taken to put an end to the disputes about privilege, which had disturbed the previous Sessions, so that the work of the Church might be carried on. The Bishops replied that they were anxious to terminate all differences, and that therefore, though the right of prorogation was with them, they would use it in such a manner as should conduce to amity; that a committee of Bishops had been

appointed by them to meet deputies from the Lower House for the adjustment of differences; and that meanwhile the Lower House might appoint committees who, during the intervals of Session, might prepare matters for deliberation, which the Archbishop would take care should receive time for discussion. Many of the rank and file were satisfied with this, but the majority were not; they insisted on their right to sit independently. The Bishops answered to this that they could not give up the Archbishop's right. Then the Lower House proposed a joint address to the Queen praying her to adjudicate on the question through such persons as she might appoint, and the Bishops replied that the rights which the Constitution of the Church had vested in them were trusts which they were bound to bequeath to their successors as they had received them, and, therefore, could not be referred to anyone. They added that it would be a strange sight, and acceptable to their enemies, to see the Convocation pleading its rights before a committee of the Privy Council. Then the clergy sought the assistance of the House of Commons, but the Tory majority there would do no more than promise to support them in all their just rights. This proving a failure, they resorted to the extreme measure of making a separate appeal direct to the Queen desiring her protection, as if the Bishops were so many heathens. To this she returned no reply.

By this time their action had exposed them to the taunt that was thrown at them, that they were really Presbyterians, insubordinate, and despisers of Episcopal rule. To meet this they drew up a Declaration that they "acknowledged the Order of Bishops as superior to Presbyters, to be of Divine Apostolical Institution," and they sent this up to the Bishops with a request that they would concur with it and make it a Canon of the Church. But here again there was an intention of putting the Bishops in a difficulty. No new Canon could be made without the Royal License previously obtained. As a matter of fact, in the eyes of all reasonable men, the opening words of the Preface to the Ordination Service contains all that they were contending for, but the more turbulent spirits hoped that the Bishops, by refusing, might lay themselves open to the charge of favouring Presbyterian opinions. The Archbishop, after due consideration, replied that the Ordination Preface contained all that they were affirming, commended their zeal for Episcopacy, and hoped that they would continue to act in accordance with it. It was a clever answer, and a puzzler for their antagonists. Soon afterwards Parliament and Convocation were prorogued for the season, but the war of pamphlets grew hotter than ever. But the

only really important work, a book which is still regarded as authoritative, is Gibson's "Synodus Anglicana," which contains in full the registers of the Upper House in 1562, 1640, 1661, and the journals of the Lower for 1586 and 1588, and treats the whole question with strict moderation, and comes to conclusions which have never been refuted.

It would be impossible to follow in detail the history of the continuous quarrel, for such it was, between the two Houses. The Lower House certainly were not unreasonable in their desire to have their rights recognised, but that they claimed more power than the Constitution gave them is also clear. Their condemnation of Burnet's book was *ultra vires*, and the terms of that condemnation were such as no man would admit as just to-day. They took steps to protest against the union with Scotland in 1707, and were only prevented from carrying out their purpose by Tenison's proroguing the Convocation for three weeks by the Queen's command. Before they reassembled the Act of Parliament was passed. Thus the breach continued to widen. In 1708 they were prorogued by Royal Writ even before the customary sermon had been preached. But in 1710 they met for despatch of business, and the Queen, who had shaken off the Whig influence of the Duchess of Marlborough, and was returning to her Tory views, sent down a number of questions for them to discuss: the growth of infidelity and profaneness, the establishing rural deans where such were lacking, the preparing a form for the visitation of prisoners, the proceedings in excommunication, the regulation of marriage services, with a view to preventing clandestine marriages, the preserving exact terriers, and accounts of glebes. All this pointed to a sign of favour towards the clergy, which was further indicated by a change in the form of license. Instead of the nomination of the Archbishop as President, it named certain Bishops as a quorum, before whom all matters were to be brought. The fact was that Atterbury was in the confidence of the Premier, and his hand was now visible. Two strong Tories, Blackhall and Dawes, were raised to the Episcopal bench. The former, ordered to preach before the Queen, enunciated the duty of passive obedience, and was answered by a man afterwards to become notorious, Benjamin Hoadly, Rector of St. Peter-le-Poer. Again the tide of public opinion turned to the Tory side.

The cry of "the Church in danger" was again raised; the Whig Bishops were denounced, and a crisis was reached, of absorbing interest for the time being, though we can afford to laugh at it now. Dr. Henry Sacheverell, incumbent of St. Saviour's, Southwark, a man of handsome presence and

with a fine voice, had obtained the character of a High Churchman by violent sermons delivered in a striking, energetic manner. One of these sermons, preached at Oxford in 1702, had called forth Defoe's celebrated pamphlet "The Shortest Way with the Dissenters." On November 5, 1709, he preached before the Lord Mayor at St. Paul's, on the words "perils among false brethren," a violent tirade against the Dissenters and Whig Churchmen. Burnet and the Earl of Godolphin were both pointedly denounced. A proposal that it should be printed was rejected by the Court of Aldermen, but Sacheverell printed it on his own account. For this he was impeached by the Whig Ministry then in power, and his trial before the House of Lords in Westminster Hall became a matter of such importance as had never been seen since the day of the Seven Bishops. Prayers were said for him in many London churches, vast multitudes cheered him as he went down to the Hall, and the Queen, who went in a private manner to listen, was greeted by the crowd with cries: "God bless your Majesty and the Church! We hope your Majesty is for Dr. Sacheverell." He defended himself with much ability; Macaulay says that the defence was written for him by Atterbury. The Lords voted him guilty by sixty-nine to fifty-two; of the thirteen Bishops who voted, seven were for guilty, six for acquittal. Sentence was given that his sermon was to be burned by the common hangman, and he was suspended from preaching for three years, but might perform all other clerical duties, and might accept preferment. Such a result was really a triumph for him, and the ovation which he received was only second to that of the Seven Bishops. Ladies hastened to the churches where he was announced to say prayers, and besought him to christen their children with his own name. In a word, the Whig party was for the time ruined by this impeachment, and Sacheverell died a rich man. The discomfiture of the Whig party was so complete that the restoration of the Stuarts was as near as possible brought about.

The immediate result was that the Church party rose at once to higher power and influence than ever. Some of the divines of that time added to our permanent literature. The ablest of them, without doubt, was a man who had chosen his vocation wrongly, Jonathan Swift. The marvellous ability of his writings was even surpassed by their grossness and ribaldry. And consequently, when he looked for a mitre as the reward of his brilliant pamphlets, the Queen firmly refused it, and he had to be content with the deanery of St. Patrick's and departed thither with fierce rage in his heart. But Bingham, the author of the "Antiquities of the

Christian Church," Wall, of the great and exhaustive treatise on Infant Baptism, and Prideaux, of the "Connexion of Sacred and Profane History," all claim high mention. Bull and Beveridge, Bishops of St. David's and St. Asaph's, stand in the front rank of our divines both for learning and piety.

As soon as the Convocation of 1711 met, a resolution of loyalty was drawn up as usual. But the Lower House, rejoicing in the flowing tide of the High Church triumph, contrived to introduce into it a severe reflection on the late Administration. The Bishops rejected it, and framed another. This being in turn rejected by the Lower House, the resolution fell through. But now a serious question came up, and called for settlement.

Whiston, Mathematical Professor at Cambridge, published a work entitled "An Historical Preface to Primitive Christianity Revived," for which the University deprived him, on the ground that it contained doctrines subversive of the Catholic faith. He published a vindication of himself, and dedicated it to Convocation. The Lower House drew up a document condemning the book, and sent it up to the Bishops. Tenison addressed the Bishops with moderation. He considered that it was a proper subject for Convocation to take in hand, but that a condemnation for heresy could only pass under license from the Crown, and the Court of High Commission had been suppressed. He suggested two alternatives: the Archbishop might hold a court of audience, his suffragans being present, or the Bishop might cite the offender into his own court. As the case was involved in difficulties, the Upper House presented an address to the Queen, stating that Whiston was charged with contradicting the Nicene Creed, and that they were desirous of defending the faith, but wished to be resolved on the question whether an appeal would lie from the Convocation to the Crown, or whether Convocation was a final court. They prayed Her Majesty to submit the case to the judges. She did so, with the result that eight of the twelve judges concurred in opinion that the Convocation had jurisdiction in cases of heresy, but that there was a right of appeal from it to the Crown. The other four judges were of opinion that not Convocation, but the Episcopal Courts, were the right tribunal in charges of heresy. The opinion of the majority was adopted, and Convocation proceeded to examine the book. The Bishops began, and declared that certain passages were Arian in their tendency, and therefore contrary to the creeds and the decisions of the first four Councils. This was sent down to the Lower House, which concurred with it. But Whiston having sent to the Convocation House a request to be heard in explanation, he was cited to appear. Before he

could do so Convocation had closed, and when it reassembled, in the following winter, the Queen had lost the paper of censure, and it could nowhere be found. And thus Whiston escaped condemnation. Burnet expresses his satisfaction, but one can hardly join in it, so far as the method of procedure goes. Some resolutions respecting the other matters were agreed to, but there was still constant friction. The question of Lay Baptism came under much discussion. The Bishops declared that baptism otherwise than by persons in Holy Orders was irregular, but that when administered by lay hands in the name of the Holy Trinity it was valid. The Lower House rejected this declaration, on the ground that the Catholic Church had always avoided any synodical determination of the question, and that at present it was ill advised to appear to undervalue the work of the Christian Ministry. And thus the matter remained as the Church had previously left it. Once more the Occasional Conformity Bill was brought forward, not, as before, in the Commons first, but in the Lords. They had previously wrecked it, but now passed it without a division, sent it down to the Commons, and it became law.

Again another question of heresy. Dr. Samuel Clarke, a man of learning and a royal chaplain, published a treatise on the doctrine of the Holy Trinity which there can be no doubt was in fact semi-Arian. This in turn was taken up by Convocation; but Clarke, who certainly had no intention of contravening the teaching of the Church, withdrew his book, and the subject was dropped.

We must not omit here mention of the constitution of the fund which is still known as Queen Anne's Bounty. From ancient times it had been required of the receivers of all spiritual preferments that they should pay the whole of the first year's income, and a tenth part afterwards, to the Pope. At the Reformation this payment was transferred to the Crown. Burnet urged King William to restore this to the Church, and the King had acknowledged the justice of the appeal, but the many difficulties in which his wars had involved him barred his action upon it. Queen Anne threw herself warmly into the scheme, and Parliament passed readily the Bills necessary to carry it out. Instead, however, of simply relieving the clergy of their payments, which would have enriched the large livings and done nothing for the small, the money was formed into a central fund for the augmentation of livings of small value, under the management of a body of "Governors of Queen Anne's Bounty," and thus it remains to this day.

One other proposal which might have had important conse-

quences unhappily came to naught, that of the union between the Lutheran Church of Prussia and the Church of England. In 1701 the electorate of Prussia became a kingdom, and the new monarch, Frederick, was anxious to introduce into it the liturgy, doctrine, and discipline of the Anglican Communion. Through Dr. Ernest Jablonsky, who was thoroughly acquainted with the latter through long stay in this country, he made his proposals. He would certainly have accepted the English Episcopate. But the scheme fell through. Sharp, Archbishop of York, was keen for it, but Tenison, whether through indolence or indifference, appeared so hostile that the Prussian monarch, in disgust, threw up the design. The modification of this design—or, rather, its repetition in different form—in 1841 will meet us when we reach that year.

Things seemed now to look hopeful for the exiled Stuarts. The Tories were in full power; the Queen, though political exigencies had led her to accept the doubts which were cast on the birth of her brother, knew in her heart that he *was* her brother, and secretly wished him to succeed her, for she hated the House of Hanover. But the Tory party split on the question. Harley was for Hanover, Bolingbroke for "the Pretender," and with him went Atterbury and Swift. The former of these two clever politicians had now become Bishop of Rochester, and he brought a Bill into the House of Lords providing that every tutor and schoolmaster in Great Britain must sign a declaration that he would conform to the Church of England, and that he must obtain Episcopal license. It actually passed both Houses, and received the royal assent, but was never acted upon. The result was a quarrel within the party, and the dismissal of Harley. But so powerful for the moment was the victorious party that Bolingbroke was meditating the public designation of James as the Queen's successor, and Anne was now so popular that if it had been then and there done it would have been successful; but she died before the arrangements were completed. On her deathbed she placed the white staff of the Treasurer into the hands of a Jacobite, the Earl of Shrewsbury. But the friends of the Elector of Hanover had also been active, and in spite of Atterbury's eager endeavours and vehemence of language, George I. ascended the throne without opposition. From that day his Crown was never seriously menaced. He was uncouth and disagreeable, could speak only wretched English, and was surrounded by vulgar German mistresses. The country clergy were Tories, and by preaching hereditary right strove to spread discontent; yet the dread of Popery was stronger than all these adverse influences. Tenison, who, we need hardly say, had supported his claims against the Jacobite

Prince, crowned him in Westminster Abbey on October 20, 1714; and he followed this by issuing a declaration, which thirteen other Bishops signed, expressing his horror of the Rebellion of 1715, and the danger which would ensue from the accession of a Popish Prince.

Tenison died at Lambeth, December 14, 1715, and is buried in the chancel of Lambeth Church. James II. called him "that dull man," and the epithet stuck. Swift, who hated him not only for his views, but for his having opposed his elevation to the Episcopate, wrote of him as "a very dull man, who had a horror of anything like levity in the clergy, especially of whist," and is reported by tradition to have said that "he was hot and heavy, like a tailor's goose." Calamy the Dissenter, and Evelyn the High Churchman, both speak of him as a man of deep piety. "I never knew a man," says the latter, "of more universal and generous spirit, with so much modesty, prudence, and piety." Everything that we gather about him confirms this estimate. He had neither the handsome presence nor the brilliant eloquence of his predecessor, but he is said to have been popularly called in his lifetime "the Rock," because of his steadfast, heavy character. We have had occasion to mention his zeal for public libraries. In addition to this, we have to note that he bought the library of Robert Grey, Vicar of Islington, and made it the nucleus of the Chapter Library of St. Paul's Cathedral, and that he gathered a most valuable collection of books and MSS., which he placed in the library of Lambeth. "They embrace a mass of miscellaneous information—historical, topographical, genealogical, legal, and polemical—as various perhaps as those which comprise the far better known, but scarcely more valuable, Harleian Collection. The most important of them is probably that portion which contains the Archbishop's own extensive correspondence with the leaders of the different Protestant and reforming bodies in France, Germany, and Geneva, from which may be obtained the clearest and fullest insight into the real state of religion and the various phases of religious opinion through which the nations of Europe were passing between the times of the Commonwealth and the Revolution" (J. Cave Browne). There are no less than 289 volumes of Tenison's MSS. in the Lambeth Library. The fine portrait of him in the guard-room at Lambeth is by Simon du Bois.

W. Benham.