

THE  
CHURCHMAN

---

APRIL, 1890.

---

ART. I.—THE PROTESTANT CHURCHMEN'S ALLIANCE.

THE new association of Churchmen calling itself by this title came into existence about nine months ago, at a great meeting held in Exeter Hall. The scheme had been carefully considered by friends of Reformation principles in both Provinces, and the holding of the conference, at which it was launched, had received the approval of many persons in eminence, both in Church and State: among these last may be mentioned the Dukes of St. Albans, Manchester, and Westminster; the Marquises of Exeter, Abergavenny, and Hartington; Earls Annesley, Grey, of Darnley, Tankerville, and Roden; Lords Ebury, Tollemache, Stalbridge, Wolseley, Powerscourt, Middleton, Trevor, Kinnaid, Claud Hamilton, R. Montague, and Forester, as well as Sir J. Kennaway, Bart., M.P., Colonel Bridgeman, M.P., General Fitzwygram, M.P., W. Johnston, Esq., M.P., T. B. Royden, Esq., M.P., Abel Smith, Esq., M.P., Ed. Whitley, Esq., M.P. Some of these, and many other persons of note, have subsequently joined the Alliance. None have openly disapproved of the steps taken at the meeting. Lord Grimthorpe promptly placed himself at the head of the movement by presiding at the meeting; and has, throughout, both in its inception and during its progress, given it the benefit of his guidance and counsel. His lordship's prompt method of conducting business, his keen appreciation of the weak points of an argument, his directness and readiness of retort, his amazing knowledge of every branch of ecclesiology—though not always relished by friends, and not unfrequently resented by opponents—have proved of the greatest possible value. As a mark of their appreciation of these qualities, he has been unanimously appointed by its members the first President of the Alliance.

The constitution of the Alliance may be briefly described as follows. There is a pretty large council, composed of members representing the various dioceses in both Provinces of Canterbury and York, with an executive committee formed out of the council for business purposes. All peers, members of Parliament, Bishops, Deans, and Archdeacons, and presidents of local branches, are ex-officio vice-presidents, if members of the Alliance. Members, both men and women, are enrolled in diocesan rural deaneries or local branches on declaring themselves, in writing, willing to promote the objects of the Alliance, and subscribing a minimum sum of one shilling annually. Arrangements are also made for associates, without powers of voting. It is hoped and desired that Churchmen of various schools of thought and shades of opinion will see their way to join the Alliance, who are not unwilling to be called Protestant in the true meaning of that word, and who are ready to act together in brotherly union for the promotion of the avowed policy of the Alliance.

The *objects* which the Alliance desires to carry out, and the need for a new organization for the promotion of these objects, may now be stated. The first of these is as follows :

To afford a basis of union, and opportunities for consultation and concerted action for all Churchmen who desire to maintain the principles of the Reformation, the present Prayer-book and Articles, and the Acts of Uniformity as their standards of doctrine and ritual, and especially the non-sacerdotal character of the ministry of the Church of England.

It may be at once asked, is any action needed at the present time to maintain the principles of the Reformation, and are not existing organizations sufficient for the purpose? It is only necessary to point in reply to the immense and rapid strides taken of late years to promote sacerdotalism, to the powerlessness of the Bishops, even if they all had the wish, to check its advance ; and the hold which the extreme party of innovators has gained upon the popular imagination, especially of young people. Nor does any organization at present exist possessing the confidence or securing the adhesion of the great mass of the friends of the Reformation in the Church. The "Church Association" cannot, from the very nature and limits of its work, rally to its standard the great bulk of those who are favourable to Protestantism. It does not at least succeed in doing so ; whether rightly or wrongly, it is beside the mark to argue. The "Protestant Alliance" is a mixed body of Churchmen and Dissenters, allied for their common interests, and as such is incompetent to deal with purely Church questions. The "Clerical and Lay" unions are local in their influence, non-aggressive in their policy, and are mainly composed of clergy and laymen of the upper classes ; other and smaller societies exist for special purposes. We have

been told, on very high authority, that we *must unite* if our influence is to be felt in the councils of the Church; that we must no longer be content to act as units; that union on the one side must be met by united action on the other; that we must be willing to sink minor differences, waive petty preferences, put aside our sometimes excessive exercise of the right of private judgment, and, in defence, not defiance, maintain the principles which, in common, we hold so dear.

The *second* of our objects runs thus :

To adopt whatever means may, from time to time, seem desirable to inform and instruct the public as to the true history and principles of the Church of England and the Book of Common Prayer, as based on the teaching of God's Holy Word, with a view to secure and maintain their attachment to the Established Church, and to prevent the alienation of the people by misrepresentations of her doctrine and discipline.

No one can say that this line of action is unnecessary, or that the work has been so effectively done as to leave nothing further to be attempted. We take our stand upon the Prayer-book as we have it: we want people to know the difference between the two Prayer-books of Edward VI.; how sacerdotalism and the Mass, and the errors of the Church of Rome, were deliberately rejected by our Reformers; what entire agreement exists between the Prayer-book and Articles and the Word of God. It is hoped that when these views prevail, the attachment of our people will be further secured to the Church and confidence in her strengthened; it being well known that the working-classes in many large towns are beginning to doubt whether or not, as things are, the Church is really worth defending.

The *third* and *fourth* objects may be grouped together, the last being mainly ancillary to the preceding ones :

To obtain by Parliamentary action the abolition of the episcopal veto on suits for the maintenance and enforcement of the law; and in cases of contumacy to provide for summary deprivation, with a view, as far as possible, to avoid imprisonment.

To make better provision for the furtherance of the above objects in Parliament and the Press, and, while recognising the comprehensiveness of the National Church, within the limits of her authorized standards, to deprecate and discountenance, as inimical to her maintenance and defence, whatever is taught or practised in violation of the principles of the Reformation, the directions of those standards, and the decisions of the Queen's Courts thereon.

Undoubtedly we get here upon what may be considered debatable topics, even by many in the main friendly to our views. Still it has been thought well to have some definite work before us, if we are to ask practical men for their support, and here are two obvious anomalies which it is desired to remove. Want of space prevents any lengthy argument upon these points, but it may

be asserted with regard to the episcopal veto, that such a provision is absolutely unknown to, and would not be tolerated in, any other community outside our Church; that it is a modern invention designed for a particular purpose; that under its protection unlawful practices are fearlessly carried on; and that in the interests of truth, and for the protection of the lay members of the Church, we desire its removal. As to imprisonment, it is felt to be a rough and barbarous method of punishment for wrong-headed ecclesiastics, whose transgressions have nothing in common with burglary and violence; that removal to another place for their operations is the proper treatment for those who persist in teaching doctrines, and practising ceremonies, which are not those of the Church of England, in churches belonging to our communion. We believe that this view will increasingly commend itself, when understood, to the intelligence of the bulk of our fellow-countrymen. At the same time it may be stated that we have ourselves, as a body, nothing to do with the prosecution of individual clergymen, nor do we apprehend that such prosecutions will necessarily—if we succeed in these objects—increase in number. Clergymen who do their duty and obey the laws of the Church, in faithful fulfilment of their contract to do so, have nothing to fear from the laity.

A few facts may be of interest as to *what we have accomplished*, and what we are attempting, towards carrying out these objects:

(1.) *Literature*.—As a great part of our work is educational, we have thought it right to print and circulate a large number of pamphlets and leaflets, on such subjects as The Lord's Supper, Sacerdotalism, The Differences between the two Prayer-books of Edward VI., Absolution, etc., and before long we expect to have manuals upon the great subjects in controversy, ready to be placed in the hands of our busy clergy as text-books, which they may use in instructing classes of young Churchpeople. A good deal of material already exists in this direction, and will, where possible, be utilized.

(2.) *Lectures*.—These are being arranged, amongst other places, in London to ladies, and at Cambridge; and various clergymen are undertaking more definitely this way of systematically instructing their people.

(3.) *Public Meetings*.—As the movement is a popular one, and public attention has been aroused, it has been thought desirable largely to use this method of making our objects widely known. The result has been remarkable in every point of view. Many meetings have been held, and have been invariably largely attended by interested, appreciative, and often enthusiastic audiences. The oratory, while always fervid, has been usually restrained, and argumentative moderation of tone

towards opponents has been always attempted, and mere declamation and clap-trap avoided as inconsistent with the seriousness of the subjects discussed and the soundness of our position. In Lancashire especially the "Protestant outburst" has been proved a reality, and a determination has been avowed to put principles before party, and to let any Government feel that their appointments and their policy must be at least impartial as regards Protestantism if they desire the popular vote. The impression has taken root that only scant recognition has of late years been given to the services of the great body of quiet and loyal and industrious clergy, when patronage has had to be distributed.

(4.) *Organization.*—This has been quietly going forward during the interval since the formation of the Alliance. Many lay Churchmen have joined, and subscribed liberally. Working-men have come forward in thousands, especially in the North. Perhaps in proportion to its size, supposed influence and population, the North has gone ahead rather faster than the South. The first impulse came from that part of the kingdom, but now there is little to choose between the two portions of the kingdom in this friendly rivalry. Northern hardihood and robustness are combining with Southern culture in this great loyal movement.

In conclusion let it be distinctly understood that, whatever is said about our Alliance, it does not desire or intend to act in any narrow, or sectarian, or jealous spirit, nor does it plead guilty to having done so. We desire men of all so-called "parties" to join us. We recognise the immense services, the scholarship, the historical position of the old High Church party in the Church of England. It would be the most unpardonable impertinence to do otherwise. We believe many of that body to be truly Protestant. A late seceder from the E.C.U. to the Church of Rome—a Mr. Vane Packman—recently declared that his "growing conviction of the inherent Protestantism of the Anglican Church, as displayed more particularly by the High Church school," led him to submit to the Church of Rome. If they are, Why not call themselves Protestant Churchmen? We know that what are called Broad Churchmen are at one with us in nearly all our objects, especially in their alarm at the growth of superstition. They do to a great extent already act with us. We are in no sense or way acting in antagonism to existing societies. Some of these are getting into line with us, and forming with us a kind of federal union. We fail to see anything in our constitution, objects, or methods, to prevent multitudes of Churchmen of all ranks from joining us, who are at present content to watch—whether prayerfully or critically—our progress. We hope and desire that our new Alliance may prove to be conducive to the promotion of "Truth, unity and concord," and more especially for the advancement

of the Master's kingdom, and for the good of our beloved Church.

H. G. HOPKINS,  
Secretary for the Northern Province.

Clifton Vicarage, York.

---

ART. II.—THE LAW OF THE SABBATH.

PART III.

TO the testimony of Holy Scripture, with which our former papers have been wholly occupied, our present purpose is to add the evidence of sub-Apostolic times, with a view to ascertaining the practice of the early Church in connection with the Christian Day of Rest. Our excursion into this field must necessarily, be a hasty one. It will be followed by a glance into the records of some ancient nations, to seek for indications of the universality of a weekly day of religious restraint; the question of the substitution of the first day of the week for the seventh will bring our inquiry to a close.

As in gathering our evidence from the Gospels, we will first offer the reader a catena of passages from the early Fathers, postponing comment until afterwards. We shall find the day called by various names—fearlessly spoken of by the heathen name of "Sunday," as we name a god in the name of each day of the week, and feel no sanction of idolatry is involved in doing so.

*Ignatius*, at the beginning of the second century, thus writes to the Asiatic Church of Magnesia:

If, then, those who were brought up in the old order, have come to the possession of a new hope, no longer observing the Sabbath, but living agreeably to the Lord's Day, on which also our life sprang up again by Him and by His death . . . how shall we be able to live apart from Him?<sup>1</sup>

*The Epistle of Barnabas* (middle of the second century):

Moreover, He says: "Thou shalt sanctify it with pure hands and a pure heart." If, therefore, any can *now* sanctify the day which God hath sanctified, except he is pure in heart in all things, we are deceived. Behold, therefore, *resting aright*,<sup>2</sup> we shall sanctify it, having been justified and received the promise, iniquity no longer existing, but all things having been made new by the Lord, shall we not then be able to sanctify it, having been first sanctified ourselves?" Further, he says to them: "Your new moons and your Sabbaths I cannot endure" (Isa. i. 13). Ye perceive how He speaks. "Your present Sabbaths are not acceptable to Me, but that in which I have made, namely, this, when giving rest to all things, I shall make a beginning of the eighth day, that is, a beginning of

---

<sup>1</sup> Ep. ad Magnes, c. 9. The phrase, "observing the Sabbath," is — "σαββαρίζοντες," "*sabbatizing*"—slightly contemptuous.

<sup>2</sup> We follow here the reading of the Codex N.