

message, a glorious positive. It gives us the certainty that for every human heart that asks for God, this wonderful Christ, personal, eternal, human, divine, is quite immediately accessible. The hands of need and trust have but to be lifted, and they hold Him. And He is the SON. In Him we have the Father. We do indeed "*draw nigh* to God through Him."

Therefore we will do it. The thousand confusions of our time shall only make this divine simplicity the more precious to us. We will continually and quite directly take Jesus Christ for granted in all the fulness and splendour of His high-priesthood after the order of Melchizedek. It is for ever so; it is as new and young to-day in its virtue as if the oath had but to-day been spoken, and He had but to-day sat down at the right hand.

Happy we if we use Him thus. He blesses those who do so with blessings they cannot analyze, but which they know. Many years ago a Christian lady, daughter of a devoted Non-conformist pastor in the west of Dorset, told me how, in a now distant time, her father had striven to teach a sick man, a young gipsy in a wandering camp, to read, and to come to Christ. The camp moved after a while, and the young man, dying of consumption, took a Bible with him. Time rolled on, and one day a gray-haired gipsy came to the minister's door; it was the youth's father, with the news of his son's happy death, and with his Bible. "Sir, I cannot read a word; but *he* was always reading it, and he marked what he liked with a stick from the fire. And he said you would find one place marked with two lines; it was everything to my poor lad." The leaves were turned, and the stick was found to have scored twice at the side Heb. vii. 25: "He is able also to save them to the uttermost that come unto God by Him, seeing He ever liveth to make intercession for them."

H. C. G. MOULE.



ART. V.—THE PROTESTANT REVIVAL: WHAT HAS IT DONE?

ALL who have taken a part in, or have openly encouraged, opposition to the growth of extreme ritual within the English Church, know what it is to be told that they have erred. They have been accused of breaking the peace of their Church, as though until the year 1897 or 1898 all had gone smoothly within her. They have been charged with sowing discord between Bishops and clergy, between clergy

and people, as though up till that period the relations in either case had been entirely ideal. They have been told that they have imperilled the spiritual growth of the Church, as though nothing could be so conducive to the spiritual life as the unrestrained dissemination of false doctrine, and an attitude of studied neutrality towards the sowers. They have even been told that they were making their own party unpopular, as though it were the first and last duty of the Christian man to secure as far as possible prosperity, place and preferment for those who agree with him.

If we may judge by their actions, the persons whose policy is impugned do not seem to have been much affected by these accusations. It is certain, however, that they must sometimes ask themselves whether their action has been justified by events. The lull in the storm which invariably comes with the approach of the holiday season may perhaps be deemed a convenient time for retrospect and inquiry.

But first, it is only fair to ask what provoked the agitation. The Protestant revival of the last few years has occasionally been spoken of as though it had originated in mere wanton love of strife, and had broken into a period of peace during which the progress of extreme opinions within the English Church was steadily losing its force. Nothing could be more untrue or more unfair. A large number of Protestant Churchmen, some of them intimately connected with the Church Association, the National Protestant Church Union, and other organizations, had never ceased to oppose to the best of their power principles which they deemed inconsistent with loyalty to the Church. But it can hardly be said that they had public opinion behind them. Indeed, for something like ten years many Evangelical Churchmen stood apart from all such work. The appeal to the law seemed so far to have failed that they were willing enough that other methods should be tried. Perhaps, it was urged, if active opposition were lessened, the Bishops would quietly but firmly put down the more serious extravagancies of the clergy. It was at least an honourable view. And there was, at the time, something to be said for such a policy. At all events it was tried, and very fully tried. The indisputable evidence of its disastrous failure alone drove again into controversy many Churchmen who desired nothing better than to live in peace with their neighbours.

In truth, there was no resisting the conviction that the years of comparative peace had been used by the extreme High Churchmen to advance their position on all sides. The evidence of this is decisive. The years of comparative quietude were years in which the spread of extreme ritual

went on with ever increasing rapidity. The following figures from the *Tourist's Church Guide* need no commentary:

	1884.	1888.	1892.	1898.
Churches using the eucharistic vestments	396	599	1,029	2,026
Churches using altar lights ...	749	1,136	2,048	4,334
Churches using incense ...	22	89	177	381

These figures fail, however, to tell the whole of the story, for they convey no information as to the rapid growth of resort to the more extreme manifestations of Roman proclivities.

If it be asked why progress went on at this accelerated pace, we can only say that the pressure of public opinion being to a great extent removed, the pressure of authority became equally relaxed. A Bishop is but mortal, and he is commonly a very much overworked person. It was not likely, therefore, that he would act in advance of public opinion, or, save with some assurance of support, rush into conflict with men who have hitherto shown the utmost tenacity in resisting the authority of their Bishops.

When at last the absolute failure of the neutral policy became apparent, very little inquiry was needed to prove how urgent the necessity of action had become. The investigations conducted by the *Record* showed that the evil had reached a height of which the main body of Churchmen were quite unaware. Some of them in their innocence supposed that any Protestant indignation was directed against such comparatively familiar facts as the use of the Mass vestments and of altar lights. Some were even known to conjecture that it was choral services, frequent celebrations, and the use of the surplice in the pulpit, which were exciting the anger of stupid Low Churchmen. Even many persons, long honestly indignant at the growth of extreme practices, had not the smallest suspicion of the lengths to which the movement had gone. If conducted to a typical church, they were amazed to find a holy-water stoup, confessional-places, images of saints, evidences of reservation, and all the appurtenances of a well-arranged Roman Catholic church. They did not know these things had arrived. If present at a series of services, they were equally astonished to find the Book of Common Prayer displaced by a mixture of our own Communion Office and the Roman Missal. They were not prepared for All Souls' Day celebrations, the Mass of the Pre-sanctified, the blessing and imposition of ashes, the blessing of palms, the *Tenebræ*, creeping to the cross, and other characteristics of latter-day Neo-Anglicanism. Few who could be induced to look candidly into the facts as they were needed much argument to convince them that action was inevitable. Some Low Churchmen, disliking all con-

troversy, dreading lest it should hinder spiritual work, and fearing that they might be supposed to sympathize with disorderly proceedings in churches, found themselves unable to favour even the most cautious agitation. But they were in a minority. In the main Low Churchmen, Moderate Churchmen and Broad Churchmen agreed that the position had grown intolerable, and that some effort at restraint must at last be made.

Into the details of what was done it is needless to go. That wisdom, propriety, tact, charity marked it all no one will pretend; but in view of the evil existing perhaps we might have looked for more, and not fewer, mistakes. It is time to ask, looking at the movement as a whole, whether it has justified its existence. What has it done? I pretend to no exhaustive statement, but here are some more or less obvious facts:

1. The agitation has made the public aware of the lengths to which extreme doctrine and practice have gone.

There is good reason to believe that many of the Bishops knew nothing of the more fantastic developments in certain churches of their dioceses. The general public, as I have shown, were even worse off. The exposure, not only of ritual excess, but of the attempt to enforce the confessional, of the use of unauthorized services and of pernicious manuals, came as a shock to the majority of people in the nation. But now that the facts are known the danger is to some extent lessened. People are, or should be, on their guard.

2. The agitation has compelled the attention of Parliament to the condition of the Church.

With the sympathies of the Prime Minister on the side of the High Church party, it was but natural that he should move reluctantly, and trust rather to the slow assertion of episcopal authority than to any awkward reminder of the lay power residing in Parliament. But enough has happened to make it clear that Parliament is on the side of "law and order" within the Church. Perhaps we may claim that the general feeling of the House of Commons was well expressed by Mr. A. J. Balfour, when, speaking at Bristol on November 29, 1898, he said: "Obviously it is the plain right of every member of the Church of England to have a service in accordance with the Prayer-Book of the Church of England. Equally manifestly it is the duty of every clergyman of the Church of England to give the laity a service in accordance with the Prayer-Book."¹ That right Parliament expects the Bishops to secure to the people.

¹ *Record*, December 2, 1898, p. 1179.

3. The agitation has set the Bishops as a body in official antagonism to extreme practices.

Nothing is more natural than that any person or persons in authority should dislike the appearance of being influenced in the execution of their duty by outside pressure. Let us by all means allow for that feeling; but the fact remains that whilst (with a few honourable exceptions) the Bishops for years left things to drift, they have since this agitation been brought into line against excesses. There is scarcely a prelate who has not issued most edifying directions in regard to the services of the churches, and there are some who insist on seeing that these directions are obeyed. The position of the Bishops is admittedly one of great difficulty, but there are welcome signs that the gravity of the situation is now appreciated by them.

4. The agitation has produced the decisive pronouncements of the Lambeth tribunal in regard to reservation and the use of incense.

Without in any way attaching undue importance to the authority of this quasi-court, it is still impossible not to recognise the value of the definite statements there made by the two Archbishops after the most careful inquiry.

5. The agitation has stimulated inquiry into the doctrinal questions at issue, and has made for an intelligent appreciation of their gravity.

The Round Table Conference has shown the gulf between the two schools of thought. The recent work of Canon Gore has reminded us that some High Churchmen are not upon the farther side of that gulf. Moreover, one undoubted result of the Protestant movement has been the wider diffusion of popular literature bearing on the subject, and a better knowledge of the historical, doctrinal, and moral aspects of the question. In comparison with the Higher Anglicans, Evangelicals are slow to appreciate the value of literature, and, as a result, very remiss in the use of it. But the revival of Protestant feeling has, at least, shown some of them the folly of neglecting an agent so energetically employed on the other side.

6. And, lastly, the agitation has convinced some of the extreme men of the necessity of caution and restraint.

Not the least remarkable result of the Protestant upheaval has been the cleavage it has created within the ranks of the extreme High Churchmen. Whilst many of them stoutly protest that the movement against them is as nothing, and that the process of development cannot be too energetically pushed forward, others are wise enough to perceive that danger is ahead. It must not be assumed that these all think

the development has now gone far enough. It is probable, if not certain, that this is true of some extreme men, as well as of a large number of more moderate High Churchmen, who have hitherto given their warm sympathy to a movement the progress of which they have personally shrunk from keeping in step with. But the Churchmen of whom I am now speaking are those who are quite willing that the advance should continue, only they perceive that the times are now unpropitious. That conviction, it is scarcely needful to say, could hardly have prevailed if the policy of toleration had still persisted.

The leader of this party is the Rev. Henry Linklater, whom Mr. Gladstone sent to succeed an Evangelical incumbent at Holy Trinity, Stroud Green. He developed his policy in a three-column letter, which appeared in the *Church Times* of April 26. Dr. Linklater, in that letter, was at great pains to set out his devout thankfulness for the "present condition" of the Church, and the great advances in teaching and ritual which he has observed. Then he frankly outlines his policy thus: "I venture to think that the calm review of our remarkable advance may well suggest to my reverend brethren that it may be wise policy, true charity, and good generalship to cry 'halt' for a time, both that we may reap the due reward of our victories in the sweeping in to the fold of the Church the millions that are still outside her, who are only waiting to be gathered in, and also, and very specially, that we may give time for the rearguard of our vast army to catch us up, and form close order for further advance and conquest by-and-by. Otherwise the enemy will surely find our Church an easy prey—the advanced guard so very far ahead, the rear so far behind. Is not this bad generalship on our part, and are we not simply playing into the hands of the enemy? Can we wonder if we are intercepted and divided?"

Passing by the plain admission in the closing words of this paragraph, that the extreme men are feeling the impact of the Protestant revival, and the many paragraphs in which, with marked complacency, Dr. Linklater recalls his personal services to the cause of advanced Anglicanism, let us see what his policy is. He applies the general principle of the paragraph I have quoted to the two subjects now under the Episcopal ban—reservation and the ceremonial use of incense. In both he thinks his party should yield—for the present. He has some subsidiary arguments to offer. One is the desirability of being gentle with the new Bishop of London. As to Bishop Creighton, "I have," said Dr. Linklater, "my own opinion about the treatment offered to our late Bishop, and its effect upon his health. I believe we took the heart.

out of him—broke his heart; I am tempted to say, killed him." A second reason is the awkward fact that "we have not proved that our present Prayer-Book sanctions either of these customs." A third is that the people are not quite ready for them. "Is it," he asks, "right (I mean fair to our people) to carry our Lord through our streets until our people are prepared to worship as Jesus of Nazareth passeth by?"

Such was Mr. Linklater's policy, and the grounds upon which he urged it. Its bare statement is a sufficient witness to the force of a movement which some extreme Churchmen have persistently declared has effected nothing.

Now let us mark the spirit in which this appeal was received, and the result which seems to have issued from it.

In the succeeding number of the *Church Times* (May 3) the advanced men at once fall upon Dr. Linklater tooth and nail. If his critics had been some of those terrible Orangemen by whose controversial methods the extreme Anglican affects to be so shocked, they could scarcely have assailed him with more bitterness. The Rev. Arthur Tooth, of St. James's, Hatcham, fame, led the way. Doubtless his valiant plea for insubordination may have suggested the fable of the rat who lost its tail; but in any case all the correspondents of May 3 were against Dr. Linklater. On May 10 a few voices were uplifted on his behalf, one especially deprecating "any kind of cleavage among Catholic priests." On May 17 Mr. Athelstan Riley arrived to tenderly inform Dr. Linklater that his proposal, instead of bringing (temporary) submission, might only "stiffen" those whom the Bishop of Rochester so happily stamped as the "nonconforming" clergy. Mr. Paul Swain, an aggressive Plymouth layman, denounced the letter as "mischievous," predicted a Cave of Adullam, and invited laity who did not agree with Dr. Linklater to pour their sorrows into the sympathetic ear of himself (Mr. Paul Swain).

The storm still raged on May 24 and on May 31. By the latter date Mr. Athelstan Riley found it needful to appear again. He sharply reminded Dr. Linklater that obedience has grave dangers for extreme men; or, as he puts it in his own charming way: "I should have thought that the mere motive of self-preservation would have led him to pause before weakening the position of his friends in front. How long does my dear, inconsistent, ritualistic doctor think his bowings and his sacring bells will be secure when the first line of defence has gone down? Then it will be his turn to feel the pinch, and somebody else's to call him 'extreme,' and to proclaim that genuflections and bell-rings will inevitably wreck the Church of England if persisted in." By this time it has occurred to Mr. Riley also that division has its dangers

for the cause, and he proceeded : " I deprecate the ' advanced ' men attacking Dr. Linklater quite as much as the latter attacking the former. 'Sirs, ye are brethren;' the Catholic cause in England is not to be furthered by splitting up our great army into nasty little commandoes, sniping at each other."

Dr. Linklater's defenders have been few in number. Judging from experience of what happens under such circumstances, we may fairly infer that many of those who agreed with him and were for (temporary) obedience, finding the policy unpopular, saw no virtue in publicly identifying themselves with the losing side, and held their tongues. It is unnecessary to pursue the subject further, but the whole correspondence shows that the campaign against extreme practices has been effective. It is something to have made offenders feel that public opinion will not endure much more at their hands. It is something to have made it plain that a certain number of clergy and laity are quite inaccessible to appeal, threat, and even the discipline of their Bishops, and mean at any price to go on.

Perhaps one of the most striking witnesses to the results already obtained is found in a letter from Mr. Paul Swain in the *Church Review* of May 30. He is referring to Dr. Linklater's appeal, and he commends the following consideration to the attention of clergy and laity who are in sympathy with the extreme men :

" 1. We have already lost one of the six points for the gain of which those who went before suffered imprisonment and persecution.

" 2. Reservation trembles in the balance, and there are priests to be found who only need a little jogging to give it up.

" 3. There are not wanting signs (*vide* leading article in this week's *Guardian*, and the latest popular work on the Eucharist) that the rights of the laity to be present at the Holy Sacrifice will be challenged.

" 4. The reverence due to the Blessed Sacrament is being called in question. The abortive attempt to explain away the English Church Union declaration has again been made in another form, and we are left in doubt as to whether the author of this last attack believes in any presence of our Blessed Lord in the Sacrament outside communion.

" 5. A deliberate attempt is now being made to form a combination of priests to undo the work of the last forty years."

Here I must leave this inadequate survey of the subject. But I do not think the facts will leave on any unprejudiced mind the conviction that the revival of Protestant feeling was uncalled for, or that up to this point it has been ineffectual.

A. R. BUCKLAND.