

# 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](https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_churchman_os.php)

for me, which prayeth for you to God. To whom be all honour, empire, majesty, and glory. Amen."

There remains Sir Thomas More. It is quite in the spirit of More's time to say with all gravity, "There is no room for more."

G. F. BRISTOL

---

### ART. III.—THE ARCHBISHOPS OF CANTERBURY SINCE THE RESTORATION.

JOHN MOORE.

THE *Annual Register* for 1805 begins its biography of our present subject thus: "This amiable prelate was a native of the city of Gloucester, where his father was a butcher, and in circumstances that would not permit him to give his son that liberal education which he desired and deserved. He was therefore brought up at the free-school of his native city; and on account of the docility of his behaviour and promising talents, some friends procured him a humble situation in Pembroke College, Oxford, whence he some time afterwards removed to Christ Church in that university." This summary of his early years has, however, been in part disputed. A descendant, if I mistake not, of his, the late Canon Scott-Robertson, once wrote to me with reference to a short paper of mine, "You are mistaken in supposing that Archbishop Moore was the son of a butcher." I could only reply that I found it in the *Annual Register*. His rejoinder was very short: "He was not the son of a butcher." The reader must weigh the evidence for himself. On the one hand we have a biography written at the time of the prelate's death, when there must have been plenty of living memories of his young days. On the other, the testimony of one who probably had family archives. His father, Thomas Moore, is called "Mr." in the parish register, and "gent" in the Gloucester municipal records in 1761, where John's name was entered on the free-men's roll. All probability seems to point to his having been, like Shakespeare's father, a possessor of some land and a grazier, with which he combined the business of a butcher. The son was baptized in St. Michael's, Gloucester, on January 13, 1730, educated at the Free Grammar School of St. Mary de Crypt in the same city, and then, assisted by whomsoever it may have been, to Pembroke, Oxford, where, however, he also assisted himself by gaining a scholarship. He took his B.A. degree in 1748, and his M.A. in 1751. Meanwhile a somewhat

romantic incident had occurred. The Duke of Marlborough (son of the great General) came to Oxford to look for a tutor to his two little sons, and the authorities there recommended certain young men who had taken good degrees. He inspected them one by one, and did not seem to care for any of them. Whilst he was still in doubt, he was walking with one of the dons down the High Street, when he saw a very handsome young man walking towards them, and being taken with his appearance, asked who he was. "His name is Moore," was the reply, "but he is nothing of a scholar, though a very respectable, well-behaved man." Probably the Duke did not care for high scholarship; anyway, he knew enough to have taken his degree, and without any difficulty he engaged him, and away they went to Blenheim, the Marquis of Blandford, his eldest pupil, being then just ten years old. Moore took Orders and became chaplain to the Duke, and Macaulay may very likely have had him for one in mind when, in his well-known third chapter, he described the humiliating condition of the "young Levites" who acted as chaplains in great men's houses. The Duchess of Marlborough was a very proud and haughty personage, a daughter of Lord Trevor, and she would not allow the young chaplain to sit at her table; he had to take his place with the upper servants. This continued for ten years, at the end of which the Duke died, three months before his son attained his majority. By this time the feelings of the Duchess towards the handsome young tutor had undergone a complete change, and in a very few months she offered him her hand. But he declined the honour, and acquainted his former pupil of the proposal. The Duke was full of gratitude to him, and eager to prove it; he settled upon him an annuity of £400, and from that time he lost no opportunity of pushing his fortunes with the great. This Duke did credit to his tutor in the way of scholarship and general attainment, and was a connoisseur of considerable taste in the fine arts. He was Lord Privy Seal in the Grenville Ministry. In 1761 Moore received a prebendal stall at Durham, in 1763 a canonry at Christ Church, Oxford. On that occasion he took his D.D. degree. In 1771 he was made Dean of Canterbury, and in 1775 Bishop of Bangor. When Archbishop Cornwallis died the primacy was offered to Lowth, but he pleaded old age and recommended Hurd. He also declined, and then the Prime Minister asked them both to recommend somebody. They joined in choosing Moore, who thereupon received his translation in April, 1783.

He owed his good fortune to powerful Court influence, for he was neither a great scholar nor theologian. But he was a respectable Primate, amiable, of dignified presence and manner,

assiduous in the administration of his diocese, and also in the promotion of the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel in Foreign Parts. In his time the establishment of Sunday-schools took place. Robert Raikes, a printer of Gloucester, who had already done good work by his endeavours to ameliorate the condition of prisoners and to compass their conversion, saw what was the most likely instrument in the hands of God for this end. He opened a Sunday-school in 1780, and it was most successful. Three years later he published an account of it in the *Gloucester Journal*, a paper which he edited, without mentioning his own share in the work. It attracted much attention, and imitation so quickly followed that in 1786 it is said there were 200,000 Sunday scholars in England. In 1785 a London Society for the Establishment of Sunday-schools was started in London. Jonas Hanway and Henry Thornton were members of the original committee. Archbishop Moore very warmly took up the work, as did also Porteus and Shute Barrington, Bishops of Chester and Salisbury. Wesley urged his followers to do all in favour that they could. Adam Smith wrote to Raikes that "no plan so promising for the improvement of manners had been devised since the days of the Apostles." Another wise and far-seeing ecclesiastic, a few years later, looking back on the progress of the movement, declared that nothing so important for the improvement of popular intelligence had been devised since the invention of printing. The movement quickly spread in Scotland, Wales, Ireland, and the United States.

The great movements for popular education which came in the early part of the nineteenth century somewhat lessened the necessity of the Sunday-schools, but it would seem as if they have yet a very important part to play in forwarding the knowledge of the doctrines of the Church and of definite Christianity.

We have to turn aside for a while to consider an act of Wesley's, which was really an abandonment of his old principles, and which was very mischievous in its consequences. He began as a High Churchman, a very High Churchman. He owed his religious impressions principally to the Nonjuror Law. The hymns of his brother Charles on the Holy Communion are some of those most eagerly quoted by the High Churchmen of our own time, as they were also by the authors of the early Oxford Tracts. Wesley's first idea was to constitute a body of lay-preachers who were to work in harmony with the clergy, to receive the Sacrament regularly in the parish churches, and not to hold their services or prayer-meetings in the hours of the Church service. They were not to wear clerical costume unless they were ordained, as some of his

preachers were. But things went crooked. The clergy opposed him, some because they saw that his doctrine of conversion might be turned into most unscriptural and mischievous channels, others because they preferred sloth and indifference to earnestness and self-denial. There was unseemly violence of language, such as in these less rough and coarse days we should flee from, used on both sides. Thus Whitfield in America called Tillotson "a mitred infidel"; and Warburton had called the preachers "a crew of scoundrels," and talked of "dusting the rogues' jackets for them." And thus a very serious cleavage began. And unfortunately Wesley was not drawn to the Evangelical clergy, who were arrived at great influence before his death. For they were repelled by his High Sacerdotal and Sacramental views; they were Calvinistic, after Whitfield, which Wesley detested. They were ardent admirers of the sixteenth-century reformers, he of the Primitive Church. They were sticklers for their parochial rights, he never had any scruple about going into any man's parish. And the result was that he was more and more isolated, became irritated and disgusted, and yielded to the spirit of separation which his followers had long been urging upon him. In the years following Moore's translation to the See of Canterbury, Wesley took his first great departure from Church order. Hitherto he had ruled with absolute power over the whole movement, but in 1784 he executed a Deed Poll, substituting for himself a permanent governing body of a hundred members, to be known as "the Conference." He chose the first hundred all himself, out of the 191 preachers in full connexion.

But his next step was still more decisive. A Dr. Coke, who in 1777 had been dismissed from his curacy for giving notices of Wesley's meetings in defiance of the rector's orders, and from that time had entirely thrown in his lot with Wesley, urged him now to ordain ministers for America, and to appoint *superintendents*, or, in other words, *bishops*, over them. Wesley hesitated much, but at last he agreed, justifying himself by Peter King's treatise on *the Primitive Church*. Curious that a man, now eighty-one years old, should be led to such an error by the writings of a young man of twenty-one, and writings which, after all, condemned the step he was taking. But Wesley was really failing in mental power. He and Dr. Coke, and another clergyman named Creighton, who had also turned methodist, ordained two "presbyters" for America, and Coke went out as superintendent. He drew up a liturgy for them to be used on the Lord's Day; they were to use the Litany every Wednesday and Friday, pray extempore on the other days, and to administer the Lord's Supper every

Sunday. Such was the beginning of American "Episcopal Methodism."

If it be said that the English Bishops were slow to act, it must be said in their defence that it was the Americans themselves who had thrown obstacles in the way. Before the Declaration of Independence in 1776, they had looked upon the English endeavour to establish the Episcopate as a plan of strengthening royalist sentiments and weakening their liberty. If Wesley would have waited in accordance with his own innermost convictions, things would have come right and a schism been prevented. The acknowledgment of the Independence by England was made on November 30, 1782, and this made a great alteration in the position. The majority of the clergy had remained faithful to the English Crown, but a considerable minority had been in favour of the Declaration. When the first Congress was opened, an Episcopal clergyman had acted as chaplain, and all through Pennsylvania the neglect of any clergyman to read the prayer for Congress was immediately followed by the congregation rising and leaving the church. In some cases the royalist churches were shut up. Thus was brother set against brother and friend against friend. But the amity is deep and heartfelt now between those whose forefathers believed it their duty to fight to the death.

When the war came to an end and the great republic took its place among the nations, the Church was in the very lowest state of depression. Most of the churches were in ruins or deserted, the few clergy who were left were hated as supposed Royalists, and their incomes had all disappeared. When the war began Virginia had 164 churches and 91 clergy. At the end 95 churches had been destroyed and only 28 clergy remained. But the zeal of these and of their brethren in the other States was unabated—was even enlarged, and they were more than ever crying to God for the Episcopate. Two names rose above all others—Samuel Seabury and William White. Seabury had graduated at Yale in 1748, and had studied medicine in Scotland, but finally chose Holy Orders; was ordained by Sherlock, Bishop of London, in 1754, and became Rector of Christchurch, New Brunswick, New Jersey. During the war he remained loyal to King George, and for part of the time acted as chaplain in the royal army. When the English cause was seen to be hopeless the other side had so great a respect for him that the Churchmen readily welcomed him in his endeavour to restore the life of the trodden-down Church. It was in Connecticut that the clergy were the first to rally to the rescue of a cause which to the world seemed lost, and they saw at once that the

first step to be taken was to have a Bishop among them. They met "in a house still standing in Woodbury, Connecticut," says an American writer, "an interesting relic of a great epoch in American ecclesiastical history," and unanimously elected Seabury to be their first Bishop. He started immediately to England for consecration, arriving in June, 1783. But here he met with most serious difficulties, which nothing but unflinching determination could have surmounted. Moore, who had only just become Archbishop, and the other Bishops were willing to consecrate, but without an Act of Parliament it could not be, because no subject of a foreign State could take the oath of allegiance, and the Archbishop had no power to dispense with it. What was to be done? Parliament might provide for the emergency, but it must take time, and Seabury was determined not to go back until he had obtained the boon for which his countrymen were pressing. He went to Scotland, to the country already familiar to him, and where he had worshipped in the Episcopal Church, which the Nonjurors had supported when Presbyterianism was established. He found a splendid supporter in George Berkeley, a son of the great Bishop, who had shown such sympathy for the Americans in past years. Berkeley was a man of high character and position, a Canon of Canterbury, who had been an intimate friend of Archbishop Secker, and had two years before refused an Irish bishopric. Bishop Skinner, in his turn, made difficulties. The English people, he said, were suspicious of the Scottish Episcopal Church for having received their succession from the Nonjurors, and would hate and persecute them now if they found them corresponding with the revolted colonists. But Berkeley reassured him. The Scottish Church, he said, was a proof that an Episcopal Church could exist without an Act of Parliament, and if there, why not in America? He assured him also that Archbishop Moore would not disapprove of the consecration, and so, on November 14, 1784, Samuel Seabury was consecrated in Aberdeen as first Bishop of Connecticut.

Meanwhile, in America the Churchmen were still busy. In May, 1784, a meeting of delegates from the States of New York, Pennsylvania, and New Jersey met at Brunswick, New Jersey. The meeting was presided over by Dr. William White, a most pious and holy man, mild and meek of manners, and withal firm in holding his views. On the outbreak of the War of Independence he had at once joined the American cause. He is said to have been the only Episcopal minister left in the State of Pennsylvania at the end of the war. Washington was a regular worshipper at his church

and had unbounded confidence in him, and it was felt all round that he would show wisdom in the difficult task of constructing an American Church.

The work proceeded carefully, as was needful over ground new and untrodden. Difficulties were pointed out, and White, by his courage, to which keen discernment was also added, met them successfully. They drew up some resolutions, and then adjourned till Seabury should return. The principal fear was the prominence given to the laity in the needful legislation; the clergy feared lest the Book of Common Prayer should be unduly tampered with. The Convention met September 27, 1785—sixteen clerical and twenty-five lay delegates from seven States. Seabury had returned, but was not present, and Dr. White presided. The Liturgy, as altered by that Convention, is known by American Churchmen as "The Proposed Book." The principal matter, however, was the Episcopate. Most of the delegates accepted the validity of Seabury's consecration, but there was a unanimous desire that the Episcopate should be obtained from the English Bishops also, and an address was drawn up to the Archbishops and Bishops of the Church of England, declaring their desire to perpetuate a union with the loved Mother Church, and asking them to consecrate such divines as the delegates might send. The meeting then adjourned until June, 1786, in order to give time for the reply. The English Bishops made strong objections to some features of "The Proposed Book." Some parts differing from our own use they approved—notably, the Communion Service, which was like that of the Scottish Church, and, in fact, like the First Book of Edward VI. But they objected to the omission of the Nicene and Athanasian Creeds and of the article of Christ's descent into hell in the Apostles' Creed. If these obstacles were removed, the Bishops expressed their belief that Parliament would remove the legal difficulties.

When this message was laid before the Convention the fears were great that it would result in shipwreck, but the fears were not realized. The debate was unrestrained and earnest, but never angry. The other changes objected to were abandoned, but the Athanasian Creed was put into the same category as the Articles, and not ordered to be used in public worship. Three divines were selected for new Bishops—Dr. White; Dr. Provoost, of Trinity Church, New York; and Dr. Griffith, of Virginia. The two former started for England; the last-named was prevented by home difficulties at the last moment. They made the voyage in eighteen days, the shortest time in which the Atlantic had yet been crossed, and were consecrated in Lambeth Chapel

on Sunday, February 4, 1787. From that day till now the chapel has been specially dear to the American Church. They returned at once, and landed on a bright Easter day. This was a happy day in Archbishop Moore's life, and he certainly deserves much honour for his patience in carrying out the good work. On August 12 in the same year he consecrated Charles Inglis as Bishop of the American Colonies which had remained faithful to the English rule. Charles Inglis, Bishop of Nova Scotia, may thus be regarded as the first missionary Bishop sent out by England. During the war many of the clergy of the States had fled thither. On July 7, 1793, Moore consecrated Jacob Mountain as first Bishop of Quebec.

But there was yet more to be done. At the first General Convention the clergy of New Hampshire petitioned that the Rev. Edward Bass, whom they had elected Bishop of Massachusetts, should be consecrated forthwith. The Convention acted promptly and wisely. They resolved that the Church in the United States was now possessed of a complete order of Bishops, through both the English and Scottish lines, who were fully competent to consecrate others and to perform all other episcopal functions, and invited the Church of New England to accept their fellowship. They also drew up an address to the English Bishops gratefully acknowledging what they had done, and requesting their approval of the present proposals, and they made some modifications of their constitution. To their address Archbishop Moore replied that it would be well for them to have the English succession complete, and as it was usual to have at least three Bishops to unite in the act of consecration, he suggested that they should elect another Bishop and send him to England. They did so, choosing James Madison, President of William and Mary College, Dr. Griffith having died. Moore, assisted by the Bishops of London and Rochester, consecrated him on September 19, 1790. But the Americans were, to their honour, careful to recognise the full validity of Seabury's consecration, and no discordant voice was raised when he took his seat in the House of Bishops. The President, George Washington, was greatly delighted. In 1792 they consecrated Thomas Claggett Bishop of Maryland. That year there were 176 clergy in the States to a population of 3,100,000 people. Since then the Church has increased rapidly. The late Dean Stanley once expressed to me his belief that the Episcopal Church of America would in the end carry all before it. Bishop Seabury died in 1796. His mitre is still preserved at Trinity College, Hartford, Connecticut. White lived till 1836, and no man is more held in honour by his countrymen. Though he was of

the theological school of Tillotson and Burnet, he supported Seabury loyally in retaining the Athanasian Creed in the Prayer-Book, though without any rubric enjoining its use. He also supported Seabury in voting for the placing in the Communion Service the prayer of invocation and oblation after the use of the Scottish Church; and he set his face firmly against any relaxation of the law of divorce. When he died the city of Philadelphia went into universal mourning, and a portrait of him was placed by public subscription beside that of Washington in Independence Hall.

Events of vast importance occurred during the primacy of Archbishop Moore which it is necessary to glance at. The same year which saw his translation to Canterbury saw the notorious coalition Ministry of North and Fox; next year saw the beginning of that of Pitt, which lasted with one slight interruption until his death in 1806. We may note the famous trial of Warren Hastings in 1787, and the commencement of settlements in Australia in 1788. But the stupendous event which changed the politics of Europe was the French Revolution, which began in 1789. When the King was put to death in 1793, England entered into an Austrian alliance against France. Bonaparte was made First Consul in 1799. The hollow peace of Amiens in 1802 was followed by the renewal of a war which was only ended at Waterloo in 1815. The victories of Nelson at Copenhagen and the Nile, and the early victories of Sir Arthur Wellesley in India, the union of England and Ireland, all came within Moore's lifetime, the abolition of the slave trade in the year following his death.

Archbishop Moore was twice married, first to the daughter of Robert Wright, Chief Justice of South Carolina, secondly to Catherine, daughter of Sir Robert Eden, of Auckland. Her brother, Thomas Eden, was great-grandfather of the present Bishop of Wakefield. The reproaches which have been poured upon Moore for his nepotism have this palliation, that he followed the prevalent custom of his time, and had greater opportunities than most Bishops. One of his sons, who died not many years ago, held the rich living of Hunton in Kent for more than seventy years. His father placed him in it on the first day that he was old enough according to the canon, and he lived some years past ninety. He had a canonry and other fat livings besides. At the time of the Reform Bill agitation he rather rashly promised to speak at a public meeting held against the Bill. Some wag on the other side published a poster announcing that the meeting would be addressed by a Canon of Canterbury and the Rector of A, B, C, etc., naming all the parishes of which he held the

incumbency. Everybody enjoyed the joke, and Mr. Moore exercised a wise discretion by staying away.

The Archbishop died at Lambeth, January 18, 1805, and is buried in Lambeth Church. There are two portraits of him at Lambeth; that by Romney in the guardroom shows him as a remarkably handsome man. In the smaller dining-room beside the long corridor is another, full length, but in profile. And tradition has it that this was so painted because in later years the Archbishop had a large wen growing on his face, to his disfigurement, and therefore that side of it is turned away from the spectator.

W. BENHAM.

---

#### ART. IV.—JESUS CHRIST'S USE OF THE TITLE "THE SON OF MAN."

OUR Lord's self-description as "the Son of Man" has been spoken of as "a riddle which has come down to our own day."<sup>1</sup> This may, perhaps, need some measure of qualification if it is to escape criticism on the score of overstatement; but it is, at any rate, the case that the title, as we meet with it in the Gospels, has been felt to be not free from serious difficulty. If we found it there alone, it would indeed surrender itself to more or less easy and satisfactory explanation; but the source of the perplexity, of course, is that we do find it elsewhere, and that we are at a loss to determine the real relationship between its employment outside the Gospels with the application that it receives in their pages. Was it, as Jesus Christ made use of it, "a new title"? Did it, as Godet<sup>2</sup> says, "spring spontaneously from the depths of Jesus' own consciousness"? Or did our Lord directly borrow it from the literature of a preceding generation? If He did, what was the new colouring that He gave to it? Was it recognised in His day as a Messianic phrase? Did He adopt it because it was admittedly Messianic in its character?

Such questions suggest themselves at once to every careful reader of the New Testament; but directly he turns to critical books or commentaries for assistance, he finds them mutually contradictory. If he opens Canon Liddon's Bampton Lectures, he sees the phrase dealt with as conveying a clear claim to be the Messiah: "It was in itself, to Jewish ears, a clear assertion of Messiahship. . . . As habitually used by our Lord, it

---

<sup>1</sup> Beyschlag, "New Testament Theology," English translation, i., 60.

<sup>2</sup> On Luke v. 24.