

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

perhaps help him out of the stores of their experience to proceed still further with his work.

A. E. LOVE.

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

WILLIAM HOWLEY (*concluded*).

THE causes which led up to the momentous publication of the "Tracts for the Times" had their origin in various directions, and the quest is a complicated one. The sloth and self-indulgence of a large number of the clergy in the previous generation had become manifest to all men, and had caused deep scandal. The "fortunate" ones held a plurality of livings, were non-resident, paid their curates a mean pittance, went foxhunting by day and played whist late into the night. They were ardent Tories, almost to a man, and saw no need of any reform. It was all this, coupled with the dearness of food and consequent severe distress of the labourers, which gave such power to the writings of William Cobbett, whose "History of the Reformation" was all through a fierce and reiterated cry that the Reformation had substituted worldliness for saintliness, and that the abolition of the monasteries had led to the establishment of pauperism in their place. He put all this in language as nervous and lucid as it was false and unscrupulous, and it had a most powerful effect on the opinion of the working classes, who were becoming better educated and more assiduous readers than their fathers had been.

A strong and earnest endeavour had been made to improve Churchmanship by the Evangelical party, but it was trailing off into an excess of religious sentiment over learning and study. Sydney Smith, to whom religious enthusiasm was always somewhat of an offence, wrote mischievous, because clever and humorous, articles against the missions to the heathen, which the Evangelicals had started in faithful obedience to the Lord's command, and which in our day have abundantly justified themselves by the confessed success which they have attained. In a similar spirit he attacked the Tory clergy for seeking after the young enthusiastic preachers, who he foretold would "preach them bare to the very sexton." He was one of the most prominent of the Whig pamphleteers, and his sentiments were shared by Whig Parliamentarians. As I have already noted, the Church was

identified with their enemies by the hot and triumphant Reformers of 1832.

But amongst these Reformers were some who were by no means disposed to overthrow the Church. They would fain reform, not destroy. Such a one was Lord John Russell, who may be fairly designated a Conservative Whig. He never desired the disestablishment of the Church; as we shall see presently, he sought, according to his lights, to strengthen it. Mr. Gladstone, who was in acute opposition to some of his religious acts, declared after his death that he never knew a more conscientious and religious politician.

But the Whig theory of the Church did not rise above that of an Act of Parliament Church. The idea of a divinely-constituted body, with a ministry ordained by Christ, and a grace given through the Word and the Sacraments, hardly entered into their minds, as it did into the minds of such men as Heber and Simeon and Melvill. It was a religion of morals rather than of faith.

We must not forget, either, another school of divines which was rising into some importance, and in our time has won a great success. These divines may be regarded as the successors of the Platonists of the latter part of the seventeenth century. They comprised men who were keenly alive to the progress which scientific knowledge was making, as well as to the great impetus given to Biblical criticism by German divines. They were men of widely different views. The greatest of them was Samuel Taylor Coleridge, a man of profound learning and the keenest critical acumen, thoroughly versed in German scholarship, of deep religious feeling, but feeble both in health and in will. He had been a Unitarian, but came, through study, meditation and prayer, to a firm and steady conviction of the truth of the Catholic creeds. In the same school we must perforce put Whately, the Whig Archbishop of Dublin, a master of clear, lucid English, friendly to the critics, and without sympathy with the religious enthusiasm of the Low Churchmen; and, above all, beyond measure contemptuous of Coleridge and what he regarded as the moony mysticism of the Germans.

And to all these must now be added another party. A body of friends in Oxford, deeply religious, strongly impressed with the earnestness of the Evangelical clergy, and shocked at the worldliness of others, were watching with anxious eyes the progress of events, and wondering in themselves whither these things would grow. The three most prominent were Keble, Hurrell Froude, and John Henry Newman. The latter tells us in his autobiography that he was one of the first subscribers for the establishment of the

Record newspaper. They were all steeped in patristic lore, emphatically *Oxford* men, satisfied with its curriculum of studies, and not going beyond it. "If Newman had known German," said A. P. Stanley, "the course of religious thought in England would have been altogether different." That may or may not have been; but certain it is that Newman, full of zeal for the Church of England, and also full of fear and anxiety, went off to the Continent at a time when political excitement both at home and abroad was great. A second Revolution in France had finally overthrown the Bourbon dynasty, and set up one who gloried in calling himself the Democratic King. Newman was a man not only of earnest religious feeling, but of warm poetic temperament; he was attracted by the Roman Catholic services, and, with characteristic subtlety of intellect, contrived to persuade himself that he could have no part or lot with it. He came back to England burning with desire to serve the Church by raising it above worldliness and setting forth the spirituality of its faith and doctrine. And even now there was a corresponding contemporary movement. Archbishop Howley was gathering around him a number of men pious, learned, and of the old High Church School, amongst them Hugh James Rose. He and some others who thought as he did, Joshua Watson, Archdeacons Bayley and Harrison, Christopher Wordsworth (Master of Trinity), and Dr. D'Oyly, entered into correspondence with Newman.

Two or three hands have described the preliminary meeting at Rose's Rectory at Hadleigh, and so the famous Tracts were started in the latter part of 1833, and were continued in rapid succession. A very few years passed and two of the originators died—Froude and Rose. The former, like Newman (they had been companions together in the Continental journey), had been much impressed with the Church of Rome, as the posthumous publication of his writings showed. Rose was never shaken in his allegiance to the Church, nor was Dr. Pusey, who after some time joined the writers. It was not long before steady Churchmen took the alarm, for the Tracts were seen to be moving on lines into which Newman had been drawn by his Continental experiences. According to his own account he was not conscious whither he was moving, but with all his fascination of style one is puzzled to make out the stages of the transition. His letters have been published since his death, and interesting as some of them are, this book is, one might almost say, worthless, because of the omissions of matters which might seem injurious to the opinions which he held at the end of his life. One feels sure nowhere of the firmness of the ground one is treading, or

the exact truth of the facts. But in his "Apologia," with which I am at present concerned, he says in one place that he "fearfully suspected" as early as 1838 that the Church of England was not of Divine institution; in another that there had been for some time a conviction in his mind that he had not found his true resting-place. But, on the other hand, he writes that in the spring of 1839 he had a supreme confidence in his position, and that this confidence was broken partly by his study of the Arian controversy, which led him to see that the Arian movement exactly resembled the Protestant Reformation, and partly by an article of Dr. Wiseman, which revealed to him that the Donatist schismatics were counterparts of the English Reformers. Still, he said nothing of these growing convictions, but went on with the Tracts, until in 1841, the ninetyeth number, written by him, was a contention that a man might hold the doctrines of the Roman Church and yet remain in the Church of England. Such an outcry arose over this that the Bishop of Oxford requested that the Tracts might be stopped, and this was done. But Newman followed his own teaching, resigned his living of St. Mary's, Oxford, and after retirement for a year or two at Littlemore, joined the Church of Rome in October, 1845.

That Archbishop Howley took a keen interest in what was going on is certain, but neither he nor any of the other Bishops made any sign until the publication of Tract 90. Then one after another "charged" against it. It was in 1845 that the Archbishop published "A Letter addressed to the Clergy and Laity of the Province," in which he urges peace and freedom from excitement. That the excitement and anxiety consequent on Newman's departure rose to considerable height there is no question, and for a while it held back the movement, but it did not stop it. In the first place, the religious men who had hung so eagerly on Newman's sermons, and felt their power, and so many of whom were now engaged in ministerial work all over the country, took courage as they saw that Pusey, Keble, Isaac Williams, Hook, and W. J. E. Bennett, stood fast to their principles. Newman says in his "Apologia" that "Pusey was never near the Catholic Church." Keble's "Christian Year" was already the most popular of religious manuals; and Samuel Wilberforce, who became Bishop of Oxford the same year that Newman left the Church, took with Philpotts of Exeter the position of leader of the Oxford party. Then very much was done, more than is commonly remembered, for the popularizing of its doctrines by writers of fiction. The religious novels of Paget and Gresley, and a little later of Charlotte

Yonge, have had an enormous influence on the rising generation. And thus we may say that the High Church movement, though the defection of Newman seemed to quiet it for a brief space, steadily continued through Howley's life.

But we must now go back to the early days of the Archbishop's primacy to take note of other important matters.

The Reform Bill of 1832 was followed by the suppression by the Whig Government of ten Irish bishoprics. The Bishops seemed powerless. They had incurred national distrust by opposing the Reform Bill, and the distrust of the clergy as well by not attempting to make any terms for them as regards the powers of Convocation and of self-government. And they made no sign when the Irish Church was now attacked. Next, Earl Grey, the Whig Premier, appointed a Commission "to inquire into the revenues and patronage of the Established Church." This Commission issued its report in 1833, a good-sized octavo volume, which now lies before me, and has much valuable information concerning the state of the temporalities of the Church at that time. The Commission was renewed from year to year, and in 1836 the *Ecclesiastical Commission* was made a permanent corporate body, to hold property, to receive Episcopal and Capitular incomes, and to redistribute them for ecclesiastical purposes. All the Bishops were by another Act (1840) constituted members of it. To this Commission Archbishop Howley gave his approbation, under the guidance of Blomfield, Bishop of London, whose advice he now almost always took. The Commission was assailed with marvellous power and scorching wit by Sydney Smith in his "Three Letters to Archdeacon Singleton." His wrath was mostly directed against the suppression of cathedral prebends and the seizure of their patronage, while Bishops were left alone. Much of what he said was repeated by Archbishop Benson a few years ago, namely, that the cathedral canons, instead of being suppressed, ought to have been charged with educational and other duties, so as to make our cathedrals instruments of life and light to their dioceses. There can be little question that too many of the canons remained drones, taking their money and doing nothing for many a long day, while the cathedrals were of no use at all as regards Church activity.

Other ecclesiastical legislation by the Whig Government followed. The *Pluralities Act* forbade pluralities except under certain circumstances, enjoined residence in each parish, and empowered the Bishop to require two full services with sermon each Sunday, and in certain cases he can order a third service. The *Episcopal Act* redistributed both dioceses and episcopal incomes. Some bishoprics (*e.g.*, Durham) had

been enormously rich, and others had little or no income. The incomes of all were paid into a common fund, out of which the poorer ones were endowed. All had a fixed sum. The Bishopric of Ripon was created out of the See of York, and its income was found by uniting the Sees of Gloucester and Bristol. Later, in 1847, Lord John Russell, who had become Prime Minister, passed a Bill for the Bishopric of Manchester, and appointed Dr. James Prince Lee its first Bishop.

One very serious matter, as subsequent events have proved, though nobody thought it so at the time, must now be told. When Henry VIII. broke with the See of Rome, appeals to the Pope were of course forbidden. The King established in 1533, instead of such appeal, a Court of Delegates (so called because appointed by himself) who had a jurisdiction superior to the Archbishop's Court of Arches. The delegates were to be ecclesiastics, who were to be assisted by lawyers both of the Chancery and Common Law Bar. This Court of Delegates existed for exactly three hundred years, during which time only six cases of doctrine were brought before it, and with one exception Bishops formed an important part of the court. This exception occurred in 1775, when a clerk was accused of depraving the Prayer-Book and Articles. Convocation was at that time silenced; it was a season of apathy, and for the first time there was no Bishop on the Court, but three Common Law judges and five civilians. In 1832, under the influence of the Lord Chancellor, Brougham, the Court of Delegates was abolished and superseded by the Privy Council, next year by "the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council." It was hastily carried through, some Bishops were placed upon it, but indefinitely, and their authority was not defined either. Lord Brougham afterwards declared that he intended it for Admiralty and Colonial cases only; but if so, he in some wise blundered, for it became, and still remains, the court of final appeal in Church matters. The first great cause in which it was concerned belongs to a later time than that with which we are now concerned.

The establishment of the Committee of Council on Education by the Melbourne Government in 1839 was strongly opposed by the Archbishop. This Committee was to administer whatever sums were voted by Parliament for the education of the young in England and Wales. The first secretary and chief adviser of the new Committee was a very able man, who had given many years to educational methods abroad, Dr. J. Philips Kay, afterwards better known as Sir James Kay-Shuttleworth. One of the provisions of the newly-formed Council was that the right of inspection would be

insisted on in all cases where a grant was made. The Archbishop so far carried his point that it was agreed that all schools connected with the Church of England should be inspected by clergymen approved by the Archbishop, while the British and Foreign School Society should be inspected by laymen approved by the Committee. There was also a project for establishing a State training-school, but this was abandoned on the objection of the Bishops to any school without definite religious teaching. The result was that the National Society took this matter in hand, and St. Mark's College and Battersea were established in 1841, and flourish till this day. A few years later the college for mistresses was established under the same auspices at Whitelands. In 1846 the Minutes of Council were issued by the Russell Government, which aimed at improving the system already on foot. It was, on the whole, an excellent move, and worked well in the succeeding years.

We can only glance at other memorable events during his primacy. In the morning of June 20, 1837, King William IV. died at Windsor. The Archbishop was present, and was called on to start at once for Kensington to acquaint the Princess Victoria of her Accession. The scene has often been described. On June 28 the next year he crowned her, and on February 10, 1840, married her to Prince Albert. In 1841 Sir Robert Peel became Prime Minister, and in July, 1846, gave place to Lord John Russell. In the end of 1847 the latter, who had given much satisfaction to Churchmen by creating the See of Manchester, incurred the fierce anger of the majority of English Churchmen by appointing Dr. Renn Dickson Hampden, Regius Professor of Divinity at Oxford, to the See of Hereford, the latter having been placed under censure of his University in 1836 for his supposed unorthodoxy. A bitter struggle followed, which may as well be forgotten now. The Archbishop, as Lord John Russell stated, had been told of the latter's intention to nominate him to a bishopric, and had made no objection. However, before Hampden could be consecrated the Archbishop died, on February 11, 1848.

I must not omit to mention that Howley was an indefatigable builder. We have seen what he did at Fulham Palace. At Lambeth he found an incongruous collection of ugly buildings on the east side, which had been the work of some of his predecessors of the eighteenth century. He swept them away, and under the management of Mr. Blore rebuilt the present range of buildings, extending eastward from Cranmer's Tower, as well as the whole of the courtyard entrance. It is really one of the handsomest of modern buildings, though no doubt it is

open to the criticism of artists who have acquired a profounder knowledge than was attainable at that time. The lofty corridor, 130 feet long, is part of his work. He also made considerable improvements in the chapel, though its present beautiful condition belongs to a later date. He half rebuilt the episcopal residence at Addington, and restored the parish church there, which is described in an old guide-book shortly before his time as "extremely dirty and indecent." He also provided a water-supply for the village of Addington, and built the commodious schools. He lies buried under the chancel arch of the village church, his wife beside him. She was very rich, Mary Frances, daughter of John Belli, E.I.C.S. To her great fortune was owing the fact that, notwithstanding his munificence, he left £180,000. His wife was evidently anxious that his name should not be forgotten. She placed three different memorials to him in the church. It excites a smile to note that she placed a recumbent figure of him by Westmacott on an altar-tomb on the north side of the chancel, but then coming to the conclusion that it was lost in the little village, she had it transferred to Canterbury Cathedral, where it may now be seen on the north side of the sacarium. Howley bequeathed his library to his former chaplain, Benjamin Harrison, whom he had made Archdeacon of Canterbury. The Archdeacon, on his death, left it to the Cathedral library there, stipulating that a separate apartment should be provided for it under the designation of *Bibliotheca Howleiana*.

W. BENHAM.

ART. V.—JOHN HUSS.

MOST English men and women know little more of Huss than his name, as that of a reformer, and his tragic fate. No brilliant novelist has placed us among his audience or introduced us to his cell; no classic volumes issued from his pen to find their place on every shelf; no powerful nations waited for his word or followed him to victory. He was, indeed, far from being one of those who are described as born to greatness; but his lot was cast in days when Western Europe was waking to new ideas, of which he was among the first to catch a glimpse. The man himself stands forth worthy of all honour for his loyalty to the light he saw, and the pathos of his story has touched the hearts of men in later days when they have learnt how he died for believing in the light by which they lived.

His faithfulness to what he believed to be true has made