

# 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)

THE  
CHURCHMAN

---

OCTOBER, 1892.

---

ART. I.—THE LINCOLN JUDGMENT.

THE long expected judgment has been pronounced, and amongst thinking Churchmen it will be received with quiet satisfaction, if not with exulting gratitude. No sooner was it whispered that all the court but one were desirous to go behind the previous judgments of the Privy Council, than most men were prepared to know that in some points, at any rate, those judgments would not be upheld. Fresh light had unquestionably been thrown upon the recondite questions in the dispute. It was not in vain that the present masters of ecclesiastical learning on either side had searched further than their predecessors, that they had examined conclusions which were confessedly weak, and that they had lived in a later year when the fire of party fierceness was burning low, and the human judgment was permitted to assert its prerogative and to readjust its balance. No one perhaps has contributed more to this than the Archbishop of Canterbury. When the trial was going on, he showed himself familiar with every turn of argument and the minutest details of evidence. Old points—forgotten of all the world—old books, old extracts, he had drawn from their hiding-places, and laid open before the sun. No man in England is more completely vindicated to-day than he. It was necessary, indeed, that appeal should be made, because there were grave doubts as to the validity of his court. But the Church Association has proved to the whole country his high ability and quiet independence, whilst it has conferred upon the Church at large the hope of a permanent and well-established peace.

For the judgment is a promise of peace. The two great parties of the Church have been struggling, after their own fashions, for what they believe to be truth. They represent two types of mind that have been always prominent in the

history of human thought; and, strange to say, the more aggressive members of the one were sprung from the families and born in the homes of the other. The old home influences, indeed, have never been completely lost. They have shown themselves in the evangelical unction of the Wilberforces and the startling contradictions of Newman. Both parties have been intensely in earnest. Both looked back to the past. One of them made survey of the Church at the beginning of the century, and felt satisfied with the vision. It was a Church ennobled by the fervour and hallowed by the piety of men who had watched the revival of the Wesleys and had learned to preach as they had done. It was a Church associated by the most intimate relations with the Hanoverian succession and the Protestantism of the State and the throne. It had not forgotten the Forty-five when two-thirds of Scotland and one-third of England were Jacobite, and when both kingdoms were threatened with a popish king and with statesmen willing to undo the work of Queen Elizabeth. It felt how little would have turned the scale when Charles Edward was at Derby, and how soon the Mass and the Legate would have reappeared at the court of St. James's. It was a Church of individualism. Personal religion was its watchword and its goal. To make each man by himself holy was the end of all its energy. It entrenched itself within the defences of the spiritual life. It admitted no gate across the avenues which led to the eternal throne, and it acknowledged no channel so direct for the grace of God as the trackless path by which the Holy Spirit sped of His own will towards the soul of man. All this had its necessary effect upon the outward life of the Church. The sacred buildings of the country, unsurpassed for their modest dignity, their appeal to those senses which win the heart heavenward, and their beautiful situation by wood and stream, fell silently into decay. They were forgotten throughout the week. They were unswept, untidy, stuffy, and damp, bald and colourless, the bappy home of mouse and rat, of spider and owl. The chancels bore the marks of early violence. The holy table fulfilled the ode of Horace, and was obtrusively *simplex munditiis*. The sacrament, of which it was the shrine, was so jealously guarded that it came to be considered the profession of the rich and the saints, rather than the comfort and strength of the sinners and the poor. The robes of the minister kept pace with the neglect of the sanctuary. His university gown was of higher importance than his ministerial surplice, his sermon took precedence of the prayers. The sacrifice of praise was a forgotten mystery. While men talked loudly of the priesthood of the laity, they revolted against the laity taking any active part

in the service. They objected that the congregation should be represented at the altar by a priest; they had no objection that they should be represented in the desk by a clerk. There was splendid material for music in the village orchestra, but the orchestra, like the ringers, had fallen upon evil times. It was not yet the age of hymns, and the psalmody of the Prayer Book was reduced to the uninspiring rhymes of Tate and Brady and half a dozen common measure and long measure tunes. With all this it seemed strange how the serious and earnest religion of our fathers lasted as it did.

But there came a rude awakening. It was so sudden, so rough, and it was attended with such disastrous events, that the whole Church rose as at an alarum bell. The party of 1833 was, perhaps, unwise in policy, and rash and precipitate in action. But it was marked by a piety as deep and as personal and individual as that which has distinguished Simeon or Wilberforce. No one nowadays will venture to impugn the holiness of the author of the "Christian Year," or of the author of the "Minor Prophets." These men, and all who were associated with them, came to the conclusion that the prevailing notions respecting the Church were not the teaching of Christ and His Apostles. They, too, were looking to the past. They knew that whilst the Church of England was Protestant, it was also Catholic; and they emphasised its unbroken continuity from the time of the Britons to the age of William and Victoria. They looked below the outward ordinances to their inward significance, and they boldly re-proclaimed that Christ was no formalist, that it was He who gave us the Church itself, and that every ordinance and all its ministry was a means of grace as definite and as certain as private prayer and public discourse. Thus they elevated the conception of the Church as a Divine society, like the heavenly Jerusalem, let down into the world; the ministry of the Church as a Divine institution, whose authority was received from above; and the Sacraments as direct channels for conveying the highest spiritual blessings to the world.

It was inevitable that these ideas should, like their predecessors, take outward shape. They assumed, therefore, the form of reverence towards the house of God, and they instantly assailed the squalor, decay, and neglect of the churches as vigorously as Cromwell's soldiers had torn down the images of saints, or scattered the pipes of organs. They invested the ministry with robes which marked its priesthood, and the holy table with coverings which proved the honour they paid to its great service. The Holy Communion itself became gradually more and more important. It grew to be more frequently celebrated, and to be surrounded with more

dignified environment ; whilst music and the murmurous voice of the people were heard in many a quiet corner where clerk and squire and people had been accustomed to sleep.

But along with this came practices and doctrines which had for many a year been identified with Rome, as Rome had been identified by prelate and preacher with the Harlot of the Seven Hills. Auricular confession came to be faintly whispered, and the presence of our Lord in the Eucharist to be taught in phrases that savoured of popery, rank and foul. Newman had been playing, men thought, with Roman tools, and had finally plunged into the Roman workshop. Manning, too—equally prominent, and higher in rank—went over. One who bore the honoured name of Wilberforce was lost to us, and Rome began to exult, whilst England wept and grew angry in her sorrow.

No one looking back upon these last fifty years can fail to see that conflict was unavoidable. The old order was still vigorous : the new was hostile and determined. England is not quickly moved, nor easily convinced. It was to no purpose that the great Divines of a century before were quoted, that editions of the Fathers in English were published, that proof after proof was culled from the Bible, that the plain commands of the Prayer Book were produced. The hard Saxon head remained obdurate. It had one argument—that these doctrines and these practices had led many to Rome, and that, therefore, it rejected both.

Hence the Law Courts were opened. For all the while Convocation remained under her enforced silence. If a rubric was ambiguous, a Convocation with some automatic power might have written a new one. There were no Conferences in the dioceses, and many of the dioceses were unwieldy, and their diocesans bewildered. So English Churchmen formed, as they have so often done, their voluntary associations to fight the matter out. Suit after suit was entered ; decision after decision was pronounced. But an unhappy fate hung upon the appeal to law. There was much ignorance of Church history, of the principles of the Reformation, and of public worship. When the law was declared, men, able and learned and resolute, broke it at once. Nay, the disease spread faster than the attempt at sanitation. Ritualism had become a fact, and mere curiosity, if nothing else, filled the ritualistic Church. No one came to London without visiting St. Alban's in Holborn, just as he went to the Tabernacle in Newington Butts.

The Bishops grew uneasy, and it was hard to find any escape from their embarrassment. One of them lectured a clergyman of his diocese in terms which he had practised as

headmaster of a great public school, and was met with the reminder that it was many years since the clergyman had left the fifth form. Another endeavoured to dispossess a ritualistic vicar of his living, and found himself involved in costs to the amount of a thousand pounds.

The decisions of the courts, too, were not harmonious. There were contradictions here and there, and what was declared illegal this year became afterwards a matter of permission, if not of necessity. It was difficult, also, to move the courts, and for these two reasons a new Bill was introduced into Parliament, and a ready method to repress the ritualist was discovered in the Public Worship Regulation Act. Alas! for human hope. The aggrieved parishioner and the un-vetoing Bishop had a short day. Maconochie and Purchas, and Ridsdale and Green became names to conjure with. The Judicial Committee of the Privy Council was as dissonant with itself as the inferior courts. Moreover, every judgment and every act of harshness was followed by an increase in the membership of the English Church Union, and by an increase in the practices which were assailed.

The Church Association has thus produced an abundant harvest of the fruit it sought to destroy. It has been the unintentional but persistent ally of the cause which seemed the cause of Rome; it looks upon a far higher and more widely extended ritual in England to-day than there would have been had it never existed; and so keen in this land is our sympathy for the persecuted, that we have come to regard with favour the heroes of the opposing host.

The fact lies, however, deeper than this. Both sides have discovered not alone the personal virtue of the other, but the truths which the others sought to advance. The evangelicism of Simeon and Venn has impregnated the Church; the Churchism of Jebb and Pusey has shaped and disciplined the loose and unorganized forces that made for personal religion. If you seek a disciple of Newton or Cecil in the pulpit, you will often ask for men whose names tell that they belong to a different party. We are hardly going too far when we say that the fervour, the unction, the appeals to the heart and the conscience, the preaching of conversion, the upholding of the Atonement, the passionate declaration of free grace, which used to be characteristic of the Low Church party are now to be found with almost equal power amongst those who are styled of the High Church. The evangelical revival has done more than it ever expected. Its truth has been and is invincible.

But, on the other hand, loyal Churchmanship, which recognises the Church of England as the one Church of the land, which teaches the evil of dissent and schism, which upholds the

Church as the society ordained by Christ and filled by His Spirit, within which man's salvation begins, within which it is fostered and fed, and within which it is committed in peace to the great and dread eternity ; all this is heard everywhere, by whatever names men may call themselves. The one party and the other have broadened out in the knowledge of the truth, and have found themselves to be essentially one.

These forces have been operating whilst the trial of the Bishop of Lincoln proceeded. Indeed, it may be boldly asserted that the trial hastened the recognition of this welcome fact. For as soon as we knew that a Bishop was to be tried, that it was possible he might be condemned as a breaker of the law, that he might refuse to obey what was thus declared to be the law of the Church in England because of a previous law derived from the Church universal, that he might possibly be imprisoned, that a schism might be effected in our land, cutting off from the Church men as noble as the non-jurors and more valuable than they, and that the only power to gain any advantage would be the Church of Rome, earnest men began to draw breath heavily, and to stand aghast. Meetings of moderate Churchmen were held again and again, to consider what ought to be done. Even members of the Islington Annual Meeting, which the Ritualists considered outside the range of hope, began to yearn after unity with their brethren. Questions which were looked upon with dislike before came to be calmly and judicially considered. Men sought out arguments and facts in favour of and against practices which were so zealously contested, and the learning which has so often sweetened the acerbities of men, stood us once more in good stead.

There was a sigh of relief that, at any rate, a holy Bishop was not condemned in any important particular, that he was not admonished, that there was no possibility of shutting him up in prison. And the sigh has been repeated now by those upon whom the Church will most depend, both for work, for spirituality and for defence.

Let us see how the matter stands, and what the practices are which the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council has not condemned—

1. The first in order is the administration of the mixed chalice. The mixing of the chalice during the service has not been under the consideration of the committee. It was condemned by the Archbishop, and there it rests. But it was an entirely different question whether, if the wine was mixed with water in private, and the wine thus diluted were carried into the church and consecrated and administered, such acts were illegal. The origin of the mixing of the chalice is the practice

of the Jews, which was probably followed by our Lord at the Last Supper. No doctrine, therefore, is involved in the practice. It is neither High Church nor Low Church. And, as the Lord Chancellor pointed out, all wine contains and has received a certain quantity of water, and no rubric, canon or Act of Parliament specifies the necessary alcoholic strength of the wine to be used in the Sacrament. It is to be real wine, that is all. And the vicar who dilutes the wine in the vestry is merely doing what the merchants had done already in Xeres or Oporto.

2. The act of consuming the bread and wine which may remain after the celebration is one of the most Protestant in the whole services of the Church. The rubric which commands it is in direct condemnation of the Roman practice of the Reserved Sacrament. It was framed in 1661, to make such reservation impossible. No bread, no wine may be carried out of the church, not even into the vestry. There can be no doubt that this law has been violated in thousands of churches. Sometimes the consecrated wine has been sent to the sick, and the consecrated bread irreverently eaten by the sexton whilst he folded up the fair linen cloth. We know of one instance in which a new rector consecrated too much wine, and when he asked his churchwarden to assist him in consuming it, the warden drank it to the rector's health, and remarked that it was good for a cold morning. The Church Association never proceeded against practices like these. But a reaction against such irreverence was to be expected. Hence the ceremonious act of Ablution. It aims at gathering up every atom of bread, every drop and fraction of a drop of wine. It pours pure water upon the paten and into the chalice, and it drinks the water. The court determined that the ritual which the Bishop used was intended for the obeying of the rubric, and that he did not add another ceremony to those prescribed. Even excessive care and scruple cannot be construed into an ecclesiastical offence. Every celebrant, therefore, is left to his own judgment in this matter, and such liberty will be the chief security against excess.

3. More important than these is the singing of the *Agnus Dei*. The hymn itself is not only harmless but excellent. It is a prayer to the Lamb of God for mercy, and we say it in the Litany at least three times a week. But it involves the question of the legality of all hymns excepting those which are specially printed in the Prayer Book for any service, and it suggests a belief in transubstantiation. It was for this latter reason that the hymn has been so strenuously opposed, and the promoters of the late suit must be upheld in their desire to make the teaching of that sensuous and materialistic doctrine

impossible. But does the singing of this hymn assist the doctrine? It has been urged that it is addressed to the Lamb of God, that according to the Roman doctrine the Lamb of God is then upon the Holy Table, and that therefore the hymn is addressed to the newly consecrated elements. But, first, we must ascertain whether any hymn at all in that place would be objectionable. Suppose that Toplady's "Rock of Ages" had been selected. This would be equally addressed to our crucified Lord; but does anyone imagine that a suit to test its legality would have gone before the Privy Council? In the words of the judgment, the singing of the hymn would not be "abused to any kind of idolatrous adoration, except by those who would make for themselves other opportunities for it."

The objection, therefore, resolves itself into this: whether a hymn may be introduced between the prayer of consecration and the Lord's Prayer. Here we have the old custom of James I. to help us, "that during the time of administering the blessed sacrament of the Lord's Supper, there is some psalm or hymn sung;" and we have the monition of the statute of the 2nd and 3rd year of Edward VI., that "in using openly any psalms or prayer taken out of the Bible at any due time" no part of the service shall be "let" or omitted. There is no contention that the hymn hinders the service, that any portion of the service is omitted, that the occasion is out of due time, or that its words are not derived from the Bible. Is, therefore, the singing of any hymn at any point where neither canticle, psalm, or anthem is prescribed, an illegal act?

This opens a serious question in the face of customs which are equally popular and commendable. Are we prepared to denounce our six or seven hymns each Sunday as illegal acts, and are we ready, if they are pronounced illegal, to abandon them? Yet the argument holds good against every hymn which was urged against the *Agnus Dei*. One of the strongest Bishops upon the bench is said to object strongly to any hymn whatever during the communion service, because that hitherto the *Agnus Dei* has been considered illegal. But he is a clear-headed man and he is consistent. For the rule which opposed the *Agnus Dei* opposes the most evangelical hymn that Watts or Wesley ever composed. The permission, if we may so style it, to use the *Agnus Dei* opens a broad and agreeable margin of liberty for ordinary metrical hymns, concerning which John Wesley exclaimed at an early celebration one day in the North country: "How beautiful it was! I wonder we never thought of having a hymn before."

4. The eastward position at the prayer of consecration was pronounced legal in the Ridsdale judgment, and it is no wonder

that neither the Committee nor even the *Record* could understand why the promoters of the appeal should assail that position in the earlier part of the service. In the former it might have some meaning, in the latter it has absolutely none. If it is right to face towards the east in the act of consecrating the elements, it must be equally right to do so in saying the prayer for purity. True, the rubrics show countenance to two positions—the “north side” and “before the table”; but this distinction, if it grants the eastward position at the consecration, removes the controversy from the region of broad-minded theology to that of trifles and quibbles, and these are at all times unworthy of serious consideration or of earnest dispute in the Church. The promoters, indeed, were near to an unexpected and fatal blow, for the argument of the Committee was so much in favour of the west side of the holy table that they had specially to guard themselves against declaring the north end to be utterly and completely outside the permission of the law. It certainly is a satisfaction to High Churchmen as well as to Low that the Judgment did not go so far as this, and that we may still consider the north end perfectly legal.

5. It is a pity that the last matter in dispute was not settled upon its merits. The Committee’s opinion upon lighted candles would have been valuable and possibly conclusive. But they shielded themselves behind the responsibility of the incumbent and they refused to hold the Bishop bound by all the accessories to worship in any church he might visit. The refusal to condemn candles, however, is at least suggestive, and we need not be startled if the suggestion develops into acts.

We turn, then, from specific points to consider the Judgment in other and fresher lights.

For many years an association of able, wealthy, and earnest men have appealed to the courts of law for decisions upon matters of dispute in the ritual of the Church. The tide bore them awhile upon the very crest of the wave; now they find themselves deserted even by the ebb, and stranded upon the mud banks of a lone and forsaken estuary. Thousands and tens of thousands of pounds have enriched ecclesiastical lawyers at the expense of the mighty undertakings which the Church has in hand. Bitterness and hatred have too often supplanted confidence and charity, and co-operation between the two great parties has been equally unwished for and impossible. Party spirit and party action invaded every region of Church work. They divided our missionary societies, they split up dioceses, they tainted our

highest synods. We could not elect members for a ruri-decanal conference, nor appoint a diocesan committee without consulting their uncanny and unhallowed ghosts. No man could peaceably become the vicar of a parish unless he belonged to the party which was dominant there; and it has been hinted that even some Bishops had a bad time amongst those of their clergy who belonged to the opposite faction.

Nothing has from time to time paralysed the Church so much as this. It has thieved its heart, its energy, its very soul. It has left it impotent to contend, at the very moments when contest meant victory, with the persistent and encouraged forces of ignorance, unbelief and sin. And yet we fought vigorously on, and thanked God when we had gained something against our brother.

The Church, and all the best and noblest spirits within it, has longed for peace with a longing and yearning that no words can express or explain. In the light of peace these men have, perhaps, overlooked some of the difficulties of narrow-minded brethren; but they have seen the vision before them of wrong done to their Master by divisions and disputes, and they have looked beyond these to the magnificent fields of action, of holiness, and of sacrifice which were awaiting our occupation. It is not too much to hope that we shall now have peace. The judgment of the Judicial Committee sounds as we read it like a satire upon our quarrels. Let us understand one another, discover the good, and learn to love even when we also—like the angels in old time—are unable to agree.

The Judgment also makes towards a greater liberty. For many and many a year this has been desired. No men sought it more eagerly than low Churchmen, and in many cases at the beginning of this century they found it by flagrantly violating the directions of the Prayer Book. The Amendment to the Act of Uniformity was passed to create it, and all have been thankful that we are able to do many things which our fathers could not do. We can preach a sermon in the church now without holding a long service before it; and we can separate the three great services which used to constitute the Sunday's morning prayer. That liberty in matters purely ritual would be demanded most could foresee. Such a demand was included within the research of every liturgiologist who turned to the Prayer Books of other Churches, and who mastered the worship of any period in Church History. It lay within the new and vigorous life of the clergy and the people, and the new England which the steam-engine, the loom and the railway were creating. On both sides, therefore, a liberty is granted which the Church has not enjoyed since Elizabeth's Act of Uniformity. It

remains for men on either flank to use their liberty with consideration for the weakness and prejudice of others, and to remember that whilst they have liberty to act they have also liberty to refrain. We can hardly doubt that such liberty, when it is recognised on all sides, will prevent extravagance. It is the old story of the Florentine over again. He was condemned to death, but he was set free on the condition that he would always remain within the city, and he was told that if he passed through any of its gates his life would be instantly forfeited. The fascination was stronger than love of life: he went out only to return to the block.

Restrict men too much, fill the air with the din of proclaimed restraint, and fancy and wish will make laws for themselves. We look, therefore, to this wider liberty for closer co-operation. We shall not find ourselves withdrawn from holy men because they do not conform entirely to our canons of taste. It will be enough that they hold as dearly as we the faith delivered once for all, the creeds, the discipline, the Divine authority, the due and constituted order of the Church. We shall feel encouraged by the knowledge that all are as anxious to guard the independence of the English Church from Roman intrusion as they are anxious to preserve its doctrine from Roman error. Spiritual union is that which most of all the Church wants now. It has been preaching the return of Non-conformity to its ancestral home; it must prepare that home in such beauty and peace that it will be a constant attraction to every wanderer. It is confronted by an infidelity which, though it is shallow, is far extended over the low-lying marshlands of intellect. It must drain this by its energy and enterprise, and gather up the meagre current into the deep river of reasonable faith and holy life. It must throw its full heart-love and fervent zeal into the apathy and ignorance which mark whole classes and whole neighbourhoods. It must not be deterred by the incapacity of some of its agents, or the unfitness of parts of its system. The one end for which it was created must be kept steadily in view, until in truth and peace and liberty the whole of the land is won for Christ.

---

Since this paper was finished I have read the able and interesting article by Mr. Philip Vernon Smith in last month's *CHURCHMAN*. With the greatest part of that article I thoroughly agree, and I am particularly happy to find that so acute a thinker as Mr. Smith has likewise emphasised the advantage of the liberty granted, and of the far wider liberty suggested by the recent Judgment. It is remarkable that

he perceives in that liberty the hope of solving the great problem of Nonconformity. Mr. Smith has already done good service to the Church by advocating in this magazine a Declaratory Act as the means for reforming our Convocation. I hope he will add to that service by following into detail his modification of the parochial system. This portion of his paper will startle many; for few, perhaps, have discovered that the Act of Uniformity was a blunder when it was passed, and has been a hindrance to the Church ever since. It is now growing rapidly into old age, but it is dying hard.

WILLIAM MURDOCH JOHNSTON.



## ART. II.—HILDEBRAND, LANFRANC, AND BERENGARIUS.

IN the history of the Western Church, as it passed from the darkness and confusion of the Middle Ages to the clearer atmosphere of the twelfth century, the three greatest characters that present themselves to the eye are those of Berengarius, Hildebrand, and Lanfranc—oftener seen in conflict than in union, and originating conflicting influences on the Church of every later age. In Hildebrand we see the great master-builder of that pontifical system whose finished structure (if the developing powers of the papacy can ever enable it to give a finishing stroke to the already over-weighted building) we see existing still among us. In Berengarius we recognise the apostle of that freedom of thought and critical investigation of fact and doctrine which has even a more active development in the present Church; while Lanfranc as faithfully represents the severe conservatism and the devotion to the mere literal sense of Scripture which have still so many votaries even among those who most strenuously resist the doctrines to which it led him, and which gave fatal proof in the deaths of thousands of martyrs in later ages, that “the letter killeth,” while the “spirit” alone “giveth life.”

In the storm of religious controversy which burst over Europe at the time of the Reformation the true features and characters of these remarkable men were so entirely misrepresented, and even distorted, that until our own age they may be said to have been seen “as through a glass darkly.” For every advocate either of the papacy or of the Reformation has accepted the traditional view of them adopted in the heat of the controversy from the earlier combatants, and the historical picture in the hands of controversialists speedily became rather a caricature than a truthful delineation of character and real