

accomplish the whole work, and not even if he lives for twenty years will he fulfil his boastful promise. He himself puts us in a terrible dilemma, and presents an awful alternative. "If Christian workers and philanthropists will join hands to effect this change it will be accomplished, and the people will rise up and hear them and be saved; if they will not, the people will curse them and perish" (p. 257).

I hope, nevertheless, that Church workers will hesitate to withdraw themselves from their own quiet and tried work in order to pursue a phantom, and that they will not be terrified even by the prospect of the "curse" to which General Booth so gracefully and charitably consigns them.

J. F. KITTO.



## ART. II.—SOME REMARKS ON THE ARCHBISHOP'S JUDGMENT.

BY the trade customs of monthly magazines MSS. for the January number must be in the printers' hands early in December. But the Editor of *THE CHURCHMAN* has requested me to contribute some thoughts on the Archbishop's judgment in the Lincoln case. A full investigation of this judgment is not to be looked for, probably, until February; and I hope it will be accomplished by a more competent man than I can pretend to be, as the vestment question—the only one which I have studied at all thoroughly—is not considered here. Still, some remarks may well be made at once.

First, the history of this case shows clearly that if, as some would have preferred, it had been referred to a court composed of the whole bench of Bishops of the province, it must have resulted either in a perfunctory judgment given by a majority, with no opportunity of a thorough personal investigation and little sense of personal responsibility, or in a stoppage, for an indefinite time, of the ordinary episcopal functions.

In trying to understand the judgment we ought to bear in mind not merely the specific questions directly and explicitly argued, but also the corollaries naturally and necessarily consequent on the answers given. And for this purpose I must refer to a leading article in the *Guardian* of the 19th inst. (two days before the judgment), which says: "The cause of trouble is not the ritual variety, but the doctrinal variety which exists behind it. And the problem is all the more difficult, because the doctrinal variety (which is really important) has

been pronounced legal, while the ritual variety (which is confessedly unimportant) has been pronounced illegal."

On the allegation that "the doctrinal variety has been pronounced legal," I must remark that the judgment of the committee of the Privy Council in the Bennett case (which, I suppose, is here referred to) affords a very weak foundation for that statement. Those who know most about that case think least of its authority.

And we know not how far the "doctrinal variety" may be extended. For in the same number of the *Guardian* to which I have referred there is a notice of some lectures by the late Aubrey L. Moore, in which the reviewer altogether abandons the Reformers and the Reformation period as in any respect the standard of authority for the Church of England. He repudiates the assumption that "the opinions and decisions of the Tudor Reformers are the final law and settlement of a Church which had to be reorganized afresh in the following century."

Now when we remember the deep respect and entire sympathy with which the Caroline Bishops spoke of those who compiled our liturgy, praising their wisdom and endeavouring to follow their moderation—when we read the account of the Savoy Conference or Bishop Sanderson's Preface to the Prayer-book—and, above all, when we remember that the Articles of Religion, which are now the chief authoritative declaration of the Church's doctrine, and to which our Bishops and clergy are pledged, are come to us from those Tudor Reformers, we say that we are justified in taking the Reformers of the sixteenth century as leading authorities on doctrine. If, as is maintained, and rightly, the continuity of the Church of England was not broken in the sixteenth century, certainly there was no breach of continuity in the seventeenth. The Churchmen of the Restoration were as truly Protestant as those of the Reformation.

But when we admit and maintain that the continuity of the Church was neither broken at one period nor the other, we must not forget that the changes made in the seventeenth century are utterly insignificant, both in number and importance, compared with those of the sixteenth. And both as to doctrine and ritual we are now, what before the Reformation the Church of England was not, under very stringent Acts of Uniformity, passed by the State at the urgent request of the Church. And our people have a right to the services as they were arranged at the last revision, as they were supposed and intended to harmonise with that doctrine. So if the ritual is illegally altered in a way which is, or is supposed to be, representative of a different doctrine, the people have a right to complain.

I may perhaps say here what I said fifteen years ago (in a

supplement to Dean Howson's "Before the Table") that "We are so constituted that it is as a general rule easier for us to *do without* something which we wish for, than to *bear* a positive offence or pain. . . . Those who oppose the eastward position do so on the ground that it is understood to represent a doctrine which they consider false; and they always *must* oppose it. Whereas those who hold that doctrine cannot say that they would be *committing a sin* by standing with their faces southward."

These remarks on what was passing in at least some men's minds before the judgment was delivered, lead me to notice some of the leading features in the judgment itself; and first, the attempt to get rid of the idea that there is any connection at all between ritual and doctrine. The Archbishop repudiates the force of the argument urged on this ground by the complainants as to the eastward position; though he admits that "there may be ill-informed recent maintainers of this position as essential who may be found to have alleged something of this kind."

In answer to this I might refer to Dean Howson's book mentioned above, to "Principles at Stake," edited by the present Bishop of Guildford in 1868, and to the first Report of the Ritual Commission in 1867.

But this is a matter in which the feelings of men in general, and not only the views of lawyers or theologians, should be heard; and I would, therefore, especially draw attention to a leading article in the *Times* of November 25 on this part of the judgment, where it is said: "It may be doubted whether any amount of learned exposition will explain away the assertions of eighty years of controversy. The practices in question are adopted by the Ritualists as the exponents of doctrine, and for the same reason resisted by their opponents. No plain man can doubt that they have the effect of assimilating the Holy Communion to the Mass, and are intended as a repudiation of Protestant doctrine on the subject."

The next thing I notice as appearing on the judgment is, that NOT ONE of the things the Ritualists contend for is *ordered* by the Church; not one is shown to have been otherwise than exceptional in practice since 1662. So that if the Ritualists continue to use them they do so from their own will and choice. They may leave them off if they like. This, indeed, is admitted. Lord Halifax, in his paper read at the Hull Church Congress, said: "I plead for no attempt to enforce upon clergy or laity against their will an unaccustomed ritual, though prescribed by the words of a rubric. According to the well-known principles of Canon Law, when things ordered have been allowed to fall into disuse, no one's conscience need be troubled at not using

them unless ordered to do so by the competent Ecclesiastical authority." And if the Ritualists are not *bound* to follow these practices which have given such offence, we may hope that they will lay to heart the loving caution with which the Archbishop concludes his judgment, reminding us that things which are lawful are not always expedient, and that the clergy, above all, should follow after things which make for peace. These counsels are too plainly good to need confirming. But yet I would add a similar one, left by one who has not long since gone to his rest—the late Bishop Wordsworth, of Lincoln :

Of this also I am persuaded that nothing profits without charity (1 Cor. xiii. i.) : and if any act which we desire to do, and which is not necessary to be done, is likely to give offence to others, it ought to be forborne in the spirit of love.—*Guardian*, Dec. 22, 1875.

In this connection I may make another remark. In a letter from Lord Halifax, published in the *Guardian* of November 26, he shows a truly Christian spirit in discouraging "any attempt to force unaccustomed ritual on unwilling clergy or congregations." But it must be remembered that our Church, founded on Bible principles, is national, not congregational ; and that the introduction into one parish, or one diocese, of a ritual which causes offence to a large body of Churchmen, even though they happen to reside elsewhere, has a tendency to weaken the whole Church. See also the 34th and 37th Articles.

Earnestly, then, would I hope that this counsel given by Lord Halifax, and confirmed by that of the Archbishop, may be followed in the larger sense as relating to the whole Church.

If the clergy refrain from unadvisedly *giving* offence, I hope the laity will not *take* it. Then any further prosecution of this suit will be unnecessary. And then whatever may be thought of the Archbishop's judgment on the several points of ritual, it will succeed in that which I am quite sure is nearest to his own heart and clearest in his own mind as "MAKING FOR PEACE."

But what ought we Evangelical Churchmen to do ?

I. I say nothing about the appeal to the Privy Council, on which the Church Association are said to have decided, except that I see nothing against it on principle. But there are other ways in which we may obey the command to "contend earnestly for the faith once delivered to the saints." And first I recommend our younger brethren, laymen as well as clergymen, to go again over the ground which we older ones had to explore, to settle in our own minds what that faith was ; to study the works of Goode and Vogan and Harrison, and Mozley, and I may now add of Dr. Salmon and Dean Lefroy, as well as those of the earlier writers, whose names, if not their works, are

familiar to us all. Next, I would say, that as we are all of one flesh and blood, redeemed by the same Lord, looking for the same salvation, worshipping the same God and Father, we should cultivate, not angry and bitter feelings towards one another, but tender and loving ones, remembering that we are none of us either infallible or impeccable. And then, with our minds enlightened by divine truth and our spirits made gentle and tender by the same Holy Spirit who has had compassion on us, let us cultivate intercourse with those whom we think to be mistaken, dealing with them as Newton did with Scott. Thus we may win their respect and love, and thus "one may edify another."

I may say, in this connection, that I have been trying for some years past, but especially in a correspondence in the *Guardian* last year, to get up a "committee of investigation," composed of three or four Ritualists and three or four Evangelicals, to consider the true legal interpretation of the rubric about the ornaments of the minister. I have not yet succeeded, but I hope it will be arranged. And if it is, if six or eight men can meet together, pray together, and compare books and notes together on the most burning question of the day, I believe it will very greatly help forward a restoration of peace in the Church. For one of our great weaknesses comes from the isolation in which we live. I mean PARTY isolation. Men associate with men of their own party. They read books and papers of their own party, and often no others. We do, indeed, come together in congresses and conferences; but these bodies are too large for *real* conference, for the free interchange of thought and feeling which would enable us to compare notes together, to test our view by those of others, and so to see how far each one is right and how far wrong. And here, I think, the moderate men of all schools of thought might afford much help if they would try not to *put aside* burning questions, but to *bring them forward*, with a view to the resolving and settling them.

II. Let there be no word, no thought, of a secession from the Church. Assuming, as I most firmly believe, that we are right and the Ritualists wrong, I say that we, clergy and laity alike, are "set for the defence of the Gospel," and for the truth of the Gospel—not for its surrender. "Set" in that position where, more than anywhere else, we can do this most effectually. Had the Dissenters or their ancestors in former times seen that it was their duty to "HOLD THE FORT" in which God's providence had placed them, instead of running away because they could not manage everything as they liked, we should have had no Ritualism and very little Romanism to contend with. For their influence, which was all on the Protestant side, would, by

God's blessing, have kept the Church straight; as, I think, we should have helped to keep them straight. Whereas now they have not only left us (as far as they are concerned) at the mercy of the Ritualists, but they have so used their political influence as to weaken Protestantism in the House of Commons, and even to set over us as Prime Minister the man who, while he was in office, did his best to flood the Church with Ritualists, and who is even now trying to get an Act passed to increase the already too great power of Rome.

Instead of the Evangelical Churchmen leaving the Church, I say, let the Dissenters come back to it; and then we may look for God's blessing on our Church and nation.

ROBERT W. KENNION.

ALDR RECTOR, *November, 1890.*



### ART. III.—THE THREE ABIDING GRACES, AS EXHIBITED IN THE BOOK OF PSALMS.

#### NO. 3.—CHRISTIAN CHARITY (IN PSALM CXXXIII.).

IT has often been supposed, and with great probability, that the fifteen Psalms immediately following the 119th, which the Jews called "the songs of degrees," were so named because used by pious Israelites in their journeys to Jerusalem for the three annual feasts.<sup>1</sup>

But as the word Jerusalem is frequently used in Scripture either as a figurative title for the glorified Church or as the name of the central metropolis on the earth renewed,<sup>2</sup> this series of Psalms must also have been intended for the refreshment of pilgrims, in various generations, since as well as before the desolation of the literal Jerusalem, on their way to the future "city of God."

And it is not difficult to discern the appropriateness to the spiritual pilgrimage of the subject prominent in each of those fifteen Psalms.

The first of them expresses patient endurance in uncongenial society: "Woe is me that I sojourn in Mesech." The last utters eager salutations at the journey's glorious end: "Lift up your heads in the sanctuary, and bless the Lord." And each intervening song contains a seasonable topic for servants of God who are looking on to that end.

<sup>1</sup> Another suggestion is that the priests sang these fifteen psalms as they slowly mounted the fifteen steps in the temple at Jerusalem, between the Court of the Women and the Court of Israel.

<sup>2</sup> See proof-texts in *THE CHURCHMAN* for December, 1890, p. 126.