

The Triumph of Anglo-Catholicism Challenged

Stanley Holbrooke-Jones

God is a spirit and they that worship him must worship him in spirit and in truth. John 4:24

Despite the impression often given, the ‘broad’ character of the Church of England has only generally existed for the past 100 years; before that it was, and the bench of Bishops, almost entirely solidly Protestant. The Anglo-Catholic movement began in the early nineteenth century but since that time it has permeated all aspects of the life of the Church so that some have described its progress as a ‘triumph’. What has led to the prominence of the Anglo-Catholic movement in the Church of England?

A Potted History of the Oxford Movement: Later called Ritualism, today Anglo-Catholicism

Before 1833 the Church of England was uniform—the same in doctrine and liturgical practice with the same simple black and white Reformation vestments worn at both the Ministry of the Word and the Sacraments, although for long there was a preference for the black Geneva preaching gown instead of the surplice. To ensure uniformity of doctrine, specially that which was preached from the pulpit, the new priest or presbyter solemnly subscribed to the Thirty-nine Articles of Religion which were neatly listed at the back of each Prayer Book for all to see.

Copes might be worn by Cathedral clergy—a doubtful privilege that could be traced back to the Elizabethan Settlement of the sixteenth century; and the Diocesan Bishop could produce his mitre—on top of his coffin at his funeral! In the meantime, while life and episcopal ministry lasted, he preferred to remain bare headed in New Testament style (1 Cor 11:4).

The Evangelical Party had been dominant for a century and the Church of England was an Evangelical protestant church, even if it did claim to be part of the Holy Catholic Church. Holy Communion was administered from a ‘table’ and no cross or candlesticks were placed on that table. The minister

stood at the north end of the Communion Table—as the Prayer Book rubric required. Her Anglo-Catholic critics allege that at this time there was a certain decline in church life; was there not a certain slackness in the way her services were conducted? In fairness I have to say I have not myself come across any evidence for this; at best the case is not proven!

What led to the inception of the Oxford Movement was the then Government's plan to suppress ten Irish bishoprics. On the 14th July, 1833 a sermon was delivered by John Keble from the University pulpit (hence the name Oxford Movement) on "National Apostasy". The chief object of the sermon was the defence of the Church of England as a divine institution, of the apostolic succession and the *Book of Common Prayer* as a rule of faith. These aims were realised, especially through the highly controversial *Tracts for the Times*, begun by J H Newman in 1833. The Movement, whose acknowledged leaders were Keble, Newman and E B Pusey, soon gained many articulate and able supporters among whom were R H Froude, R W Church, R D Wilberforce, C Marriott and I Williams. As a movement with close associations within a university, it made considerable contributions to scholarship, even if they were frequently highly controversial.

The liberal party in the University and the Bishops of the Church of England, soon began to attack the Oxford Movement. Among the early liberal opponents were T Arnold, R Whateley and R D Hampden.

The possible Evangelical opposition to the Oxford Movement, i.e., from what was then the 'orthodox' or 'establishment' platform which had more or less given the Church of England its identity since the Reformation, is often accused of lacking sufficient scholarship to deal with the challenge from the Oxford Movement. This is blatantly untrue. The Evangelicals had some outstanding scholarly champions, typical of whom was William Goode, the author of *The Rule of Faith* and a doughty opponent of baptismal regeneration in the Gorham controversy. Goode took part in the controversy with Anglo-Catholicism over the 'real presence'. John Harrison was another outstanding Evangelical scholar and opponent of Anglo-Catholicism, taking part in the controversy over the 'real presence': he recognised that the key shibboleth was whether the unworthy did or did not receive the body and blood of Christ. If yes, then some doctrine of the 'real presence' was taught (in the *Book of*

Common Prayer). If no, then no doctrine was to be taught at variance with Article 29 or the teaching of Reformers.

Other leading Evangelicals at this time were Lord Shaftesbury, well placed to express biblical and evangelical opinions in Parliament, and Benjamin Harrison, well qualified as an Evangelical theologian. He denied the supposed seventeenth century (the clerical followers of Archbishop Laud) precedent for the eastward position—the position of the celebrant at Holy Communion—one of the stated aims of the Oxford Movement—and quoted reforming Bishop Jewel as denying patristic precedent also.

Later Evangelical Anglican biblical scholars were undoubtedly Handley Moule and Robert Girdlestone. Moule was founding Principal of Ridley Hall, Cambridge and Girdlestone founding principal of Wycliffe Hall, Oxford. Both founded in 1870, these theological colleges were to be bastions of Evangelical truth.

The strongest Evangelical theologian was a man of outstanding ability, the Liturgiologist, Nathaniel Dimock. Although possessing no senior appointment within the Church (he held a number of livings in Kent: 1848–87) his was an influential voice at many important conferences on the ‘real presence’ and ritual. His writings were largely, but not exclusively, on liturgical matters; he also wrote, for example, on the Atonement.

The influence of the considerable writings of Francis Close (1797–1883), Dean of Carlisle (1856–81) who was hostile to Tractarianism and who saw in popery, whether Anglo-Catholic or Roman, one of the chief dangers of the age, must not be underestimated. Nor should we overlook Walter Walsh’s *Secret History of the Oxford Movement*. He draws attention to the influence of the Oxford Movement’s Religious Orders, the element of deceit in the teaching of the Oxford Movement which can be traced back to Newman himself (p. VII, Preface) and the possibly exaggerated abuses of Private Confession, reinstated in the Church of England unofficially by the Anglo-Catholics in 1843.

From whichever direction the opposition came, the Oxford Movement continued to flourish; despite the Gorham Judgement of 1850 when the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council held that an Evangelical

understanding of Infant Baptism was not contrary to the doctrine of the Church of England.

Within ten years (1833–43) Anglo-Catholicism, then known as Ritualism, was well established. Such was the hostility of the press, the general public and the Government to a return to the unreformed, medieval church and so obvious were the divergences from Church of England worship of the past 300 years, that in 1879 Parliament passed the Public Worship Regulation Act. The Act was intended to suppress the growth of Ritualism within the Church of England. It provided for the appointment by the two Archbishops of a barrister or ex-judge to try Ritual cases with an appeal to the Privy Council. Between 1877 and 1882 four priests were imprisoned—Arthur Tooth, 1877; Thomas Pelham Dale, 1880; Richard William Enraght, 1880–81; Sidney Faithorn Green, 1881–82. ‘This attempt at suppressing Ritualism so discredited the Act’ (in fact it created Anglo-Catholic martyrs) ‘led to it being regarded as virtually obsolete’. (*Oxford Dictionary of the Christian Church*). It was repealed by the Ecclesiastical Jurisdiction Measure of 1967.

Further legal action against Ritualistic clergy followed. In 1884 Bishop J C Ryle, first Bishop of Liverpool, was forced to take action against one of the clergy in his own Diocese, Bell Cox. The case dragged on and did not end till it had gone to the House of Lords. At last in May, 1888, the offender was acquitted through a technical peculiarity and went back to do in his parish all that he had done before. Not surprisingly Ryle was gravely troubled by the constant progress that men of the Bell Cox party were now free to make.

The most notable legal action was against Edward King, Bishop of Lincoln. Although of a saintly character he was a Tractarian high churchman and friend of E H Pusey and H P Liddon. The case began in 1888. In 1892 the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council upheld the Archbishop’s judgement in the Lincoln Case. This has since been called the Lincoln Judgement and seemed to recognise the very points of ritual which it was hoped it would flatly condemn. The whole finding was a cause of profound distress to all Evangelical churchmen because it seemed to prove that everyone could be right and nobody need be wrong.

By 1900 the influence of the Oxford Movement or Anglo-Catholicism was

general throughout the Church of England, e. g., only Bishops J C Ryle and Frederick Temple, among all the bishops of the Church of England, refused to wear a mitre for their episcopal duties.

Whatever the law may or may not say (however interpreted by the Judicial Committee of the House of Lords) the Oxford Movement, by now generally called the Anglo-Catholic movement, had inveigled its way into the inner counsels of the Church of England; it was home and dry. Or was it?

Evangelical Compromise

In the closing years of the nineteenth century and the opening years of the twentieth, Anglo-Catholicism appears to have been firmly established in most urban centres. The result was to present the Church of England, in the eyes of the world, as in a state of confusion—of both doctrine and liturgical practice.

It is estimated that by the early twentieth century one in ten parishes were Anglo-Catholic. But ninety per cent of parishes remained in faithful adherence to the Thirty-nine Articles in doctrine and the *Book of Common Prayer*, without any high church additions or subtractions, in liturgical practice. It was, in the eyes of Bishops in particular, a situation which could not be allowed to continue; for one thing it made the Church of England a pathetic laughing stock, especially in the eyes of major Christian denominations.

An official attempt to rationalise the situation occurred in the course of a debate in the Upper House of the York Convocation in 1912 when, as a consequence of the recommendations of the Royal Commission on Ecclesiastical Discipline (1906), the proposal was put forward that 'A distinctive vestment, that is to say a white chasuble, with a white alb plain, be permitted to be worn by the chief minister of the Holy Communion'. (*The York Journal of Convocation* 8/9/10th May, 1912). There were to be safeguards, chief among these being, 'That no alteration of the doctrine of the Church of England as set forth in Articles 28, 29, 30 or 31 is hereby intended.'

Particular interest is attached to the debate and is significantly relevant for this article. Not surprisingly several Evangelical bishops opposed the motion. One, Handley Moule of Durham, a leading Evangelical biblical scholar, supported it! In his speech seconding the resolution, he recognised it would legalise attire

connected with doctrines of the Holy Communion which were certainly not his convictions but 'To let things go on as they were was not merely dangerous but tended in the opposite direction of either worse anarchy or the calamity of disaster or disruption'. (*The York Journal of Convocation*, p. 135.)

He looked therefore for a middle way, and regarded the proposal as one that might meet 'a large number of the wiser and more temperate-minded men of the present Ritual school' without greatly displeasing many evangelicals and broad churchmen. His argument took an inclusive attitude to parties within the church, approached the problem pragmatically and regarded 'disruption' as a thing to be avoided at all costs. Again an inclusivist view was seen, when he stated that 'violence should not be done to any loyal element in the Church of England'. The logical chasm had been crossed when Ritualists could be called a loyal element in the Church.

E A Knox, Bishop of Manchester, moved an amendment which recommended no change in the official position and sought protection for 'parishioners from any unauthorised use of such Ornaments in parish churches'. 'The value of a symbol was that which worshippers attached to it...The Eucharistic vestments had been a symbol of the tenets of the Catholic party' (*The York Convocation Journal*, pp. 144-5).

Dr N D J Straton, Bishop of Newcastle, in seconding the amendment, declared that 'It was futile to talk of divesting such externals of doctrinal significance,' and also referred to the 'alteration as regards the whole order of ministerial duties which permission to wear a chasuble and alb would inevitably entail'.

Referring to the character of the Ordinal, Dr Straton asked, 'Could any thoughtful man fail to notice the prominence thus given to the ministration of God's Word, and the primary duty of the clergy to teach it?' If, in the face of the Reformers' emphasis on the primary importance of the Ministry of the Word, they should assign to one sacrament a mark of distinction over and above the ministering of the Word and the other sacrament, 'Surely it would be useless to say that that House intended no alteration thereby in the doctrine of the Church of England' (*The York Convocation Journal*, p. 149).

Dr J W Diggle, Bishop of Carlisle, declared that the question of vestments

could not be isolated from other matters, as the militant advocates of the vestments intended and hoped to modify, if not to uproot, the doctrines of the Church of England as the Reformers interpreted them. 'He had heard their leaders say that the Reformation movement was a movement to be lamented with tears and to be deplored in dust and ashes.'

The right solution to the crisis before them was not to allow this distinctive vesture which taught the unreformed doctrine of the medieval church. One argument which came frequently from supporters of concessions to Ritualists was the great danger that some disruption, separation or schism might result if the Ritualists were not allowed, at least to some extent, to do what they wanted to do. Moule treated it as axiomatic that disruption must be avoided at all costs. Diggle also dealt with this question.

He would keenly deplore any rupture in the Church of England. Still, there were worse things than rupture. The amputation of a limb was better than paralysis and death of the whole body; moreover he was far from being sure that rupture would be avoided by the adoption of this proposal. (*The Convocation of York Journal*, p. 200.)

When the vote was taken five bishops voted for and five against. Lang, the Archbishop of Canterbury, did not exercise his casting vote as he thought that it ought to be left on record that the House (of Bishops) was equally divided.

The Protestant and Evangelical case had been put in some fine speeches which drew out the definite doctrinal significance of the vestments, the importance of correct teaching as to the character of the ministry and the solution to the problem in correcting doctrine, enforcing discipline and not being afraid of secession. Bishop Moule, though a saintly man, was probably out of his depths in ecclesiastical affairs: his speech was sentimental rather than theological. It marked a yielding to pressure and it put its trust in safeguards which would soon be forgotten.

E A Knox wrote of this attempt to contain Ritualism by legalising white vestments: 'These good bishops were like men trying to turn tigers into tame cats by feeding them on buns!' (E A Knox p. 311). Bishop Knox's fears materialised with the passage of time. The Revised Canons of the Church of

England 1969 (B8) boldly state: ‘Whatever eucharistic vestments are worn by the priest, they have not doctrinal significance.’

Liturgical Revision

The influence of the rejected 1928 Prayer Book was much wider than understood at the time or in the immediate years that followed. Although officially rejected twice by Parliament, it was in fact, illegally it is alleged, authorised for use in most dioceses. I hazard a guess that a copy of the rejected Prayer Book was soon on the bookshelf of most clergy and readers. While it professed to be: ‘The *Book of Common Prayer*, with the additions and deviations proposed in 1928’ it plainly said on the following page in bold black type: ‘The publication of this Book does not directly or indirectly imply that it can be regarded as authorised for use in churches.’

While much could be said about the ethics of the widespread use of the 1928 Prayer Book despite Parliamentary rejection (and for some it raises the question of whether the State has any real control over the Church), Evangelicals saw the 1927/1928 attempt at liturgical revision as a disguised endeavour to accommodate Anglo-Catholic doctrine and practice. Certainly the 1928 Prayer Book included Prayers for the Dead, provision for the Reservation of the Sacrament and the alternative service of Holy Communion with its eastward position of the priest standing before the Holy Table. And the rejoining of the Prayer of Consecration with the Prayer of Oblation (self offering) BEFORE the Communion—something which Cramner had been at pains to avoid in 1552 and which was later incorporated in the 1662 Prayer Book as a truly Protestant Communion service with the emphasis being on Worthy Reception FOLLOWED by the Prayer of Oblation or Self Offering.

But if one could ignore the Anglo-Catholic interpolations, to many clergy the 1928 Prayer Book seemed, like the Curate’s egg, good in parts.

(1) It appeared to be a moderate and minimal revision in language in tune with the 1662 *Book of Common Prayer*.

(2) It softened the language of the service of the Solemnisation of Matrimony and made it a popular choice for many marriages.

(3) It added alternative Lessons for the Service of the Burial of the Dead although the Prayers for the Dead were offensive to Parliament and to the

Evangelicals.

(4) The alternative order for the Administration of the Lord's Supper or Holy Communion, while its return to an unreformed Canon of the Mass raised the hackles of many, included the now generally accepted endings and acclamations after the Epistle and before and after the Gospel.

The 1928 Prayer Book continued to be used throughout the intervening years until it became known as Series I, as opposed to Series II and III in the 1970s. During that time, despite its rejection by Parliament, the Upper House of Convocation illegally sanctioned the use of 1928 services. Likewise the old General Assembly and the General Synod re-authorised its use on a regular basis—for a further five-year period each time. But now (February, 2002) the Series I (1928) services have received permanent General Synod approval without a time limit.

Thus, despite the efforts of Church Association (later Church Society), despite Parliamentary rejection (twice), the 1928 decision has been subtly reversed. What was rejected by Parliament as unreformed i.e., unscriptural, is now deemed to be Church of England liturgical practice indefinitely.

Anglican religious Orders

At this point something must be said about another of the tangible results of the Oxford Movement—the revival of religious orders in the Anglican Communion.

As long ago as 1839 E B Pusey wrote to J Keble that he and J H Newman had independently been led to recognise the desirability of some Sisters of Charity in the Anglican Church, and on Trinity Sunday, 1841 he received the vows of Marian Rebecca Hughes who in 1844 became the first Superior of the Convent of the Holy and Undivided Trinity at Oxford. In 1845 he founded the first community at Park Village, Regent's Park, which later merged in the Society of the Holy Trinity, founded at Devonport by Priscilla Lydia Sellon in 1848 and now at Ascot. After this, communities followed in rapid succession. Among the most famous are the Community of St. Mary the Virgin, founded in 1848 with the help of W J Butler, Vicar of Wantage; the Community of St. John the Baptist, founded in 1852 at Clewer by T T Carter, with Harriet Monsell as first superior; the Community of All Saints, founded in 1851 by W. Upton Richards, Vicar of

All Saints, Margaret Street, London; and the Community of St. Margaret, founded in 1855 at East Grinstead by J M Neale. All these were 'active' or 'mixed' communities, combining the monastic life (with its centre in the daily recitation of the Breviary [!] Offices) with a life of service.

It was not until 1907 that, with the foundation of the first enclosed community, the Sisters of the Love of God, at Fairacres, Oxford, the 'contemplative' life was revived. In the previous year, however, the Sisters of the Community of the Holy Comforter, founded at Edmonton, London in 1891, decided to give up active work and adopt the rule of St. Benedict. After ten years at Baltonsborough, Somerset, they moved to Malling Abbey, Kent.

Communities for men developed more slowly. The first religious order for men was the Society of St. John the Evangelist, founded in 1865 at Cowley by R. M. Benson. The Community of the Resurrection, founded in 1892 by C. Gore, has been, since 1898, established at Mirfield. The Society of the Sacred Mission, founded by H H Kelly in 1893 was at Kelham from 1903 to 1974; it is now based at Willen Priory, near Milton Keynes. It should be noted that one of the chief works of these two orders has been the training of Anglo-Catholic ordinands.

The Benedictine life for men was first revived by Joseph Leycester Lyne, Father Ignatius, in 1869. The oldest surviving community, now at Elmore, near Newbury (from 1926 to 1987 at Nashdom), sprang from the Benedictine community at Caldey. The period immediately after the First World War saw the establishment of an Anglican Franciscan Order. In 1938 R C S Gofton-Salmond retired to a woodland property near Crawley, Sussex, where the Community of the Servants of the Will of God now follow a contemplative vocation of a semi-eremical type.

Walter Walsh, in his *Secret History of the Oxford Movement*, makes much of the influence of the Religious Orders of the Oxford Movement, particularly the Society of St. John the Evangelist and suggests they played a significant part in the development of the Oxford Movement within the Church of England. While one does not want to denigrate good work done by the Religious Orders, certainly in the East End of London, it is evident that Tractarian ideas were spread through their affiliation to certain theological colleges.

Undoubtedly the revival of the religious orders within the Church of England was a revival of the pre-Reformation system of first and second class Christians. That some Christians were able to fit themselves for the kingdom of God, as they thought, by service, prayer and fasting as opposed to the *hoi poloi* of the ordinary Christian constitutes a return to a religion of works rather than a biblical justification by faith—a central plank in the Church of England Reformers position.

The Success of the Parish Communion Movement

In the 1960's Morning and Evening Prayer—Matins and Evensong—were the most popular services in the Church of England. It is estimated that over ten million people were at worship on Sundays—more than those who attended football matches on Saturdays! Though it has to be said the Parish Communion or Sung Eucharist was the main service in a growing number of parishes which had replaced Matins with a Parish Communion or Sung Eucharist as the main service on Sundays. A further boost for the Parish Communion movement came at the National Evangelical Anglican Congress at Keele University in 1968 when an Evangelical leader, John Stott, publicly gave his support for the Communion Service 'as the one service instituted by Our Lord Himself' and therefore it should be the main service on a Sunday.

We see, with Evangelical or liberal Evangelical support, the almost universal replacement of Morning Prayer by the Parish Communion or Sung Eucharist. With the almost complete acceptance of this service the Church of England has come a clothing in many of the trappings of Anglo-Catholicism. It is as though the success of the Parish Communion movement has been used as a Trojan Horse for the advancement of Anglo-Catholicism in the Church of England. For with the Parish Communion or Sung Eucharist has come the veneration of the Altar, eucharist vestments, the omission of the Ten Commandments in favour of the summary of the Law or its replacement by the Kyrie Eleison, together with the unauthorised omission of the Gloria in Excelsis in Advent and Lent, in true Roman style.

It need hardly be said that the Parish Communion or Sung Eucharist is popular with many Anglican communicants. 'It can be like a foretaste of Heaven itself!' one incumbent explained. But the success of the Parish Communion movement, aided and abetted by many who call themselves Evangelicals, has

done much to transform the Church of England as the church of the English people into a religious sect for confirmed members of the Church of England. The obvious evangelistic benefits of Morning Prayer or Matins are no more. The vast majority of English folk who for one reason or another are not yet ready to commit themselves in Confirmation and Communicant membership are now excluded—to their soul's peril!

The Present Dominance of Anglo-Catholicism

Two areas where the dominance of Anglo-Catholicism in the Church of England today can be seen are the ARCIC discussions and the revisions to the Lectionary.

The ARCIC Discussions

ARCIC or the Anglican Roman Catholic International Commission was a joint commission of the Roman Catholic Church and the whole Anglican Communion. In 1966 Michael Ramsay, Archbishop of Canterbury and Pope Paul VI in a Common Declaration inaugurated a dialogue which it was hoped would lead to 'that unity in truth and faith for which Christ prayed'; such unity they explained as 'complete communion of faith and sacramental life'.

The International Commission, which consisted of nine members from each side, held a series of residential meetings lasting about nine days, generally once a year, in different places, beginning in 1970. As a result of these meetings a series of Agreed Statements was issued—

On Eucharistic doctrine (in particular the issue of Transubstantiation)
(Windsor, 1971)

Ministry and Ordination (Canterbury, 1973)

Authority in the Church (Venice, 1976)

Elucidations (1979)—an attempt to answer questions raised in the first two documents.

Final Report (Windsor, 1981)

The 1988 Lambeth Conference—and this gives some idea of the present state of the Church of England—resolved that the Statement on the Eucharist and Ministry were 'consonant in substance with the faith of Anglicanism'. The formal Roman Catholic response was made in 1991—while points of

convergence and agreement were acknowledged, ‘differences or ambiguities’ were judged to remain.

Before this, a new Commission (ARCIC II) was set up by Pope John Paul II and Archbishop Robert Runcie after a meeting at Canterbury in 1982. The commission issued further Agreed Statements on (i) Salvation and the Church (Llandaff, 1986); (ii) The Church as Communion (Dublin, 1990). The former document formulated agreement over the doctrine of justification by faith—a central issue at the Reformation and is, of course, of particular concern to Evangelicals in the Anglican communion.

In short, both Commissions, ARCIC I & II under the suffocating influence of Anglo-Catholicism, ‘discovered’ little disagreement over their relative positions—even a willingness to accept the Pope as *primus inter pares*—a sort of Chairman over a re-united Western Communion.

It needs to be clearly stated that despite this apparent convergence of views—hotly disputed by Anglican Evangelicals—in all the above issues the Roman Catholics have never formally accepted the ARCIC findings. Moreover it has been complicated by the Anglican ordination of women to the priesthood; the long ago condemnation of Anglican orders in 1896 by the then Pope and, I believe a timely reminder about the central importance of the Thirty-nine Articles as the still official statement of the Anglican position from the Pope himself!

Calendar and Lectionary

The Lectionary for 2003 and 2004 combines *Common Worship* and *Book of Common Prayer* lessons, etc. in one slim but handy booklet. There are some strange and unexpected names and occasions in the Combined Lectionary. For example, in Year 3:

- Dec. 3rd: Francis Xavier, described as a Missionary but actually a member of the Order of Jesuits who were fierce enemies of the Elizabethan Settlement and some of them actual plotters of the Tudor Queen’s assassination!
- Feb. 2nd: Presentation of Christ, etc.—CANDLEMAS!
- Feb. 6th: The Martyrs of Japan, 1597.
- Aug. 4th: Jean-Baptiste Vianney, Cure d’Ars, Spiritual guide, 1859.
- Aug. 15th: Festival of the Blessed Virgin Mary. (cp. The Annunciation)

	on March 25th)
Sept. 27th:	St. Vincent de Paul, Founder of the Congregation of the Mission (Lazaristes), 1660.
Oct. 15th:	Teresa of Avila, Teacher, 1586.
Nov. 23rd:	Christ the King
Jan. 24th:	Francis de Sales, teacher, 1662: one of the leaders of the Counter Reformation.

I appreciate the Black Letter saints listed in the 1662 BCP Calendar are part of our Catholic heritage. I also appreciate the commemoration of the Heroes of the Faith listed in Post Reformation times. But I find it strangely disturbing that Roman Catholic post-Reformation saints and heroes of the faith are also included. While I have the greatest admiration for many of them; especially for those Christian Japanese who suffered so barbarously in 1597, I note that they are all adherents of a still grievously unreformed Church, despite the best efforts of the Council of Trent. I suggest it is entirely inappropriate to include them in the Lectionary, even an Alternative one, of what, according to our historic Anglican formularies, is still a Protestant Church. I suggest our Reformation Fathers would have turned in their graves, if they had been permitted by their persecutors to have one, at the prospect of post-Reformation Roman Catholic saints, heroes of the faith and commemorations being included in an Anglican lectionary.

When I asked my friend and former colleague from Poole deanery, then Dean of Derby and instrumental in producing the Anglican Lectionary, how all this could take place in an Anglican Lectionary, he very kindly replied, ‘The Alternative Calendar counts as an Alternative Service and so the General Synod may authorise a Calendar; providing it is an alternative to the *Book of Common Prayer* rather than in its place. It is obviously then open to the (General) Synod to include post-Reformation figures.’

So we have the General Synod to thank for the Alternative Calendar with its post-Reformation Roman Catholic figures! What were the General Synod Evangelicals doing to allow this further instance of creeping Romanism? One can imagine Cromwell’s reaction! And in any case why isn’t the formulation of our Alternative Calendar in the hands of Evangelicals?

This is, I submit, yet another clear instance of Anglo-Catholic influence, even control, over one of the most frequently used features of the Church of England—the Lectionary! The Prayer Book Lectionary used to be a unifying feature in our worldwide Communion. That the Common Worship Calendar contains alien elements which undermine the Reformation Settlement and doctrines of the Church of England as defined in the Thirty-nine Articles of Religion bodes ill for the future.

Epilogue

In describing the rise of the Oxford/Anglo-Catholic Movement within the Church of England and its cloying influence on Anglican affairs to this day in the language of the man in the street, one keeps thinking of Tyndale's vivid imagery of Creeping Ivy. He used it to describe the rise of the Bishop of Rome in the fourth century to Supreme Pontiff and Head of the Western Church by the ninth century when he crowns the victorious Charlemagne Holy Roman Emperor. 'First, it creepeth along the ground, keeping low and humble for all to tread upon. Then it begins to climb the stem bit by bit, inch by inch, until it reacheth the top and begins to smother all that went before.' How applicable this is to the Oxford/Anglo-Catholic Movement: it began with a few able men. It grew inch by inch by sheer intransigence mixed with subterfuge and not a little stealth, until it too reached the top and began to smother much of that which had gone before.

I number several Anglo-Catholic priests among my friends and have a respect for the obvious commitment of numerous Anglo-Catholic laity but, at the risk of sounding patronising, I believe they know little or nothing of the Church of England except what they have been taught since childhood. I recall hearing one synodsmen ask his Anglo-Catholic vicar, 'What are the Thirty-nine Articles?' Furthermore, in researching this article I felt at times a conspiracy of silence, so much information was difficult to gather and material had to be dug out.

It would be inaccurate and certainly ungenerous not to place on record the good things directly attributable to the Oxford Movement/Anglo-Catholic Movement. They have made us take another, perhaps longer, look at our pre-reformation past—our Catholic heritage: the importance and significance of our great Catholic Creeds, some of the 1662 prayer Book Collects adjusted in a Protestant direction by Cranmer himself. The 1662 Prayer Book Preface with its quite plainly listed Black Letter Saints—including Lucian, Priest and

Martyr; Hilary, Bishop and Confessor; Prisca, Roman Virgin and Martyr; Fabian, Bishop of Rome and Martyr; Agatha, a Sicilian Virgin and Martyr. So one could go on—‘The noble army of martyrs’ are part of the Communion of Saints, as are living saints, ordinary Christians, at worship today.

Nor should we overlook the part played by the Oxford Movement/Anglo-Catholic Movement in restoring regular Sunday Holy Communion to us who have lived through their dominating influence. I for one appreciate the Sunday blessings of the early Communion—the 1662 Holy Communion service, said, and more or less untouched. Certainly the Anglo-Catholic movement has added colour to worship along with a lot of Ritualistic clap-trap: bells, smells, birettas and bowing and crossing. Whether it can be said they have added dignity to public worship is, as I have said before, an open question. As the Scots would say, despite a rumour to the contrary, it is a matter not proven.

What are we to do? Nothing? Anglican gentility—whether high church, middle of the road or just plain low church—has little patience with ‘ungentlemanly’ action; particularly against the vicar or rector who is still a generally respected figure—not least being a man or woman ‘of the cloth’. I believe the time for doing nothing—not rocking the boat—and the time for further Evangelical compromise has long since gone; the situation today is far too serious for that.

For ours is a Church, I believe, under judgement. Ironically the once ‘rich’ well-endowed Church of England is now up against it financially. Diocese after diocese is finding it more difficult to pay its way. Despite the generosity of many faithful worshippers, the present financial stringency is linked to falling numbers at Sunday worship. It is now estimated that Sunday worshippers throughout England amount to less than a million. Compare that with ten million at worship in the 1960s. I have already ventured to suggest that the success of the Parish Communion movement, aided and abetted by Anglo-Catholicism, is partly responsible for the decline in numbers, placing the emphasis upon communicant membership rather than outreach to the public at large in Morning and Evening Prayer.

Nothing less than a Root and Branch Reformation will do. We are already infinitely indebted to our first Anglican Reformers who worked so faithfully, some at the peril of their own lives, four centuries ago. Dyson Hague writes—

A noticeable thing...is the remarkable way in which our Prayer Book compilers carried out their deliberate intention to eradicate from the Prayer Book of the Church of England anything and everything that would be calculated in the slightest degree to perpetuate doctrinal corruption. With the Lamp of Truth in hand, they passed from service to service, and carefully swept away everything not in complete harmony with Scripture....They took away everything that referred to anything like human merit, or to the value of our good works as contributing in the smallest degree to our salvation....

We need a second and similar Reformation eradicating from Anglican liturgy and practice ‘anything and everything that would be calculated in the slightest degree to perpetuate doctrinal corruption’. A good start would be—

- (i) to switch back the emphasis from the Communion Table to the Pulpit; to preach not only the Gospel, first though that must be, but the whole counsel of God (Acts 20:27); the Good News of our justification and all we need of the Divine Wisdom and Counsel for the life that follows our justification preached to the widest possible audience in the parish.
- (ii) the once-for-all-ness of the Cross of Calvary as a unique atonement for the sins of the whole world (John 19:30; Heb 7:26, 27) rules out the possibility of any human boasting and everything like human merit or the value of good works contributing in the smallest degree to our salvation.
- (iii) such a Root and Branch Reformation would lead to the abandonment of any form of invocation of Saints, including that of the Blessed Virgin Mary in favour of our only and unique Intercessor ‘seated at the right hand of God’ (Heb 4:14ff; 7:25 and Art. 21, 22).
- (iv) such a Reformation would lead to the sweeping away of the Reservation of the Sacrament (Art. 25 last para.) and a title beloved of some clergy, ‘Father’, when compared with the clear teaching of Matthew 23:9; the abandonment of the wearing by man of a hat (mitre) in church as clearly required in 1 Corinthians 11:4, 7 and so much more!

Apart from ‘bells and smells’ (the outward show of Anglo-Catholicism), there are two deeper, more profound reasons why the very presence of the Anglo-Catholic Movement in the Church of England constitutes a grave scandal: the emphasis on the Ministry of the Word and the question of loyalty—a

clergyman should be seen to be a man (or woman) of integrity; he should mean what he says he means.

On the first issue, the Anglo-Catholic movement, like its larger role model the Church of Rome, focuses upon the Altar (their name for the communion table) rather than the Pulpit—the Mass or Eucharist is central. All else pales into insignificance. Dr N D J Straton, Bishop of Newcastle, in the 1912 York Convocation debate on the eucharistic vestments, referring to the 1662 Ordinal asked, ‘Can any thoughtful man fail to notice the prominence thus given to the ministration of God’s Word and the primary duty of the clergy to teach it?’

The 1662 Ordinal reflects the almost total emphasis on the importance of preaching and teaching in the New Testament—both in the Gospels, the first history of the church in the Acts of the Apostles and in the Epistles. Each candidate for the Priesthood or Presbyterate is reminded that, as in the New Testament, his ministry is primarily to preach and teach the Word of God! Hence, each candidate is handed not the chalice and paten, the *Porrectio Instrumentorum* of the unreformed Church, but a Bible from the hands of the Bishop as he says, ‘Take thou authority to preach the Word of God and to minister the holy sacraments in the Congregation where thou shalt be lawfully appointed thereunto.’ Word and Sacrament, yes, but Word takes priority and the sacraments of Holy Communion and Holy Baptism certainly not in any sense *ex opere operato*—functioning automatically.

In the more recent Ordinals the *Porrectio Instrumentorum* have most regrettably been restored—the chalice and paten are handed to each candidate for the Priesthood or Presbyterate. E.g., in the *Book of the Alternative Services of the Anglican Church in Canada* (1985). It is also allowed in the *Anglican Prayer Book of the Church of the Province of South Africa* (1989). More pertinent for this paper the deliverance of the chalice and paten will be restored to candidates using the *Common Worship* Ordinal. Yet again we see the work of the Reformers and Prayer Book compilers being undone. It is difficult to see how this could happen without the all-pervading influence of the Anglo-Catholic movement.

The second reason why the dominance, nay the very presence, of the Anglo-Catholic movement in the Church of England constitutes a scandal is on the

question of LOYALTY—loyalty to our historic Anglican formularies. At every Ordination to the Presbyterate or Priesthood and at Institution or Licensing, the candidate is reminded in the solemn words of the Bishop of his (or her) responsibilities as a Church of England priest or incumbent—

The Church of England is part of the one Holy, Catholic and Apostolic Church, worshipping the one, true God, Father, Son and Holy Spirit. It professes the faith uniquely revealed in the Holy Scriptures and set forth in the Catholic Creeds. Which faith it is called upon to proclaim afresh in each generation. Led by the Holy Spirit it has borne witness to Christian truth in its historic formularies, the 39 Articles of Religion, the *Book of Common Prayer* and the Ordering of Bishops, Priests and Deacons. In the declaration you are about to make will you affirm your loyalty to this inheritance of faith as your inspiration and guidance under God in bringing the grace and faith of Christ to this generation and making Him known to those in your care?

Notice the Church of England is firmly rooted in the universal Catholic church—it is not another Protestant sect! Yet her historic formularies testify to her Reformed nature. As Archbishop Cyril Garbett wrote many years ago—‘The Church of England is the Catholic Church of this land with its face washed!’ It is both Catholic and yet it is also Reformed to which the Thirty-nine Articles of Religion and the 1662 *Book of Common Prayer* bear witness.

The candidate replies to the Bishop’s solemn question, thus—

I do so affirm and accordingly declare my belief in the faith which is revealed in the Holy Scriptures and set forth in the Catholic Creeds and to which the Historic formularies of the Church of England bear witness and in public prayer and administration of the sacraments I will use only the form of service which is authorised and allowed by Canon.

It seems likely, at least by the evidence of their ensuing ministries, that hundreds of Anglo-Catholic clergy have no real intention of keeping the terms of this declaration. ‘Many of us make this Affirmation with our tongues in our cheek in order to get a job!’ said a Catholic vicar to me recently. I appeal to all such to respect their own personal integrity. Can they expect blessing on a

ministry founded on deception? Rather than this, surely, they would minister more happily in a sacramental church—the Church of Rome, perhaps?

I also appeal to the Bishops' Examining Chaplains to make every effort to weed out those they know have no intention of keeping their affirmation vows. Then perhaps we shall see the Anglo-Catholic theological colleges putting their house in order as true Anglicans, Catholic and Reformed, or doing the honest and straightforward thing—closing down altogether!

To those who have lost patience with the Church of England as it is today—apparently to a large degree showing the face of Anglo-Catholicism—and who are tempted to secede, I remind them of the words of that redoubtable fighter for biblical and Protestant truth, Bishop J C Ryle, faced with the late nineteenth Century advancement of Anglo-Catholicism all around him—

I charge my brethren not to listen for a moment to those who counsel secession from the Church of England. I have no sympathy with the rash and impatient man who recommends such a step. So long as the Articles and the Prayer Book (1662) are not altered we occupy an impregnable position; we have an open Bible and our pulpits are free!

The face of the Church of England may be Anglo-Catholic at the moment, but thank God, at heart she is still truly Protestant. What she needs is her face washing again; a new Reformation according to the Word of God!

Revd Canon STANLEY HOLBROOKE-JONES, M.A. Dip. Th. was formerly Rector of St James, Poole.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

E. A. Livingstone, (ed.) *Oxford Dictionary of the Christian Church*, 3rd edn., (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1997).

“Victorian Evangelical Theology,” Eric Culbertson, *Churchman*, Vol. 106.

“Illustration of Compromise in Church History,” D. A. Scales, *Churchman*, Vol. 106, No. 13.

Walter Walsh, *Secret History of the Oxford Movement*, 1898.

Marcus L. Loane, *John Charles Ryle: 1816–1900* (Hodder & Stoughton, 1983).

Dyson Hague, *Through the Prayer Book* (London: Church Book Room Press, 1948).