

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

performed either by our Lord or His Apostles, finding here one worthy for whom it should be done. Surely it all teaches us that it is not the form which it assumes, nor the dimensions which it attains, but the spirit in which it is done and the motive from which it springs that is the true measure of work. In that lies the greatness of work. As it is with gifts, so it is with actions. "Many that were rich cast in much," but "a certain poor widow" who "cast in two mites," "cast in more than they all." In that lies the eternity of work. The work of Dorcas has lived on earth. "Wheresoever this gospel" has been preached in the whole world, there has this that this woman did been told for a memorial of her. And when the world has passed away, "he that doeth the will of God," in however obscure and unpretending a sphere, "abideth for ever." "The true Infinite, the real Eternal is Love. When all that economist, historian, philosopher can calculate is gone, the love of Dorcas will be fresh and living in the eternity of the illimitable mind." Lacking that, whatever you may seem to have achieved "you will leave no record of yourself upon earth, except a date of birth and a date of death, with an awfully significant blank between."¹

T. T. PEROWNE.



ART. III.—CHURCH REFORM AND THE BISHOP OF WORCESTER'S CHARGE.

THE Charge of the Bishop of Worcester, delivered last June, has not met with the consideration which it deserves.² Before placing on record our thoughts upon one important subject—the subject of Church Reform—we should like to quote the deeply interesting and pathetic passage from the early part of the Charge. Those who are acquainted with the internal condition of the diocese of Worcester, know well with what single-hearted and indefatigable zeal the Bishop has behaved for many years. Some have had reason to regret that he never saw his way to preside at a Church Congress, or to summon his Clergy and Laity together for conference and discussion. Some, again, have wished that the Bishop had favoured the design of making Birmingham or Coventry an independent

¹ F. W. Robertson.

² A Charge delivered to the clergy and churchwardens of the Diocese of Worcester, at his visitation in June, 1886. By HENRY, Lord Bishop of Worcester. Rivingtons.

See. All, however, who have known anything of the simple life, the unostentatious liberality, and the ever friendly sympathy of the Bishop, have gladly united from time to time to pay their tribute to his many excellencies, and the sentences which we now quote must have come home to the hearts of the Clergy and Laity of the Diocese.

When I compare [says Dr. Philpott] the amount of work of administration which now comes before a Bishop daily with what I was called upon to do when I entered upon office, I see reason for abundant satisfaction at the increase of activity in our Church in all departments. The labour of the Bishop has increased because the labours of the clergy and of the laity, who find pleasure in helping our clergy, have become more abundant. Efforts are made in all directions to extend the influence of "the saving health" of the Gospel among our people; and though the field of labour in many of our large parishes and crowded towns is still so wide and so uncultivated as almost to daunt the hearts of those whose duty it is to enter upon it and till it, it cannot be denied that during the last quarter of a century great and real progress has been made; and the review of such progress ought to be allowed to give us courage. The course of events and the tenor of public discussions during the past year have shown, in a manner not to be mistaken, the strength of attachment of our people to the Church of England. An earnest desire has been manifested also that imperfections and hindrances, if any, which impede the free action of the Church, should be removed; that the stakes should be strengthened and the cords lengthened which fix the tent of the Lord's House in our land—a building which may not be removed, but standeth fast for ever. Cheerful, however, as is the retrospect of the work of a quarter of a century in the light in which I like to view it, and grateful as I have reason to be to our heavenly Father for the measure of health and strength which has made my work a pleasure, it is not possible to suppress a feeling of sadness of heart and disappointment also. Life, with its many opportunities, has slipped away; and I have been able to do so little for the cause to which I have wished my life to be devoted. Too many instances occur to me of leaving undone what I ought to have done; perhaps, also, of doing what I ought not to have done. Too many hopes and aspirations remain unfulfilled. Too many opportunities have been lost. Knowledge of Divine things, which has been my unceasing earnest aim, and which, perhaps, more patient and devout inquiry might have put me in possession of, has been attained only in part and communicated imperfectly to others. The things of heaven are still seen too much "through a glass darkly," though waiting, let me say, in humble trust for the fulness of joy in seeing "face to face" hereafter. Amidst all the imperfections and infirmities, however, of which I am deeply conscious, I take comfort in the thought that in the service of a gracious Master I am

"But as the hind
To whom a space of land is given to plough,
Who may not wander from the allotted field
Before his work is done."

Let me ask your indulgence, my brethren, as I would ask our heavenly Father's pardon, for all that I have left undone or done amiss; and let me ask your prayers and the continuance of your indulgence for the future.

The temper and tone of this admirable passage will prepare

the reader for the calm consideration which the Bishop bestowed upon many questions of public interest. It is, however, to the question of Church Reform, and the practical suggestions which the Bishop makes, that we now desire to turn our attention. After admitting that there is hardly any reasonable hope that many practical reforms, admitted generally to be pressing, are likely at present to be fully discussed in Parliament, the Bishop alludes to an important letter to one of his own Archdeacons, which contained his views on the subject of a General Church Council, "in which laymen duly elected to represent the lay members of the Church should have a substantial voice, and which should have authority to regulate matters of internal administration, as well as to prepare such schemes as may be thought necessary for greater changes, for the sanction of the Crown and Parliament." The steps taken for the institution of Houses of Laymen are noticed favourably by the Bishop, as indicative of the desire of the Clergy to assign to the Laity influence and authority in the settlement of all Church questions. The letter, which is contained in the appendix of the Charge, carefully considers the condition of the Irish Church Synod, and expresses the Bishop's belief that the constitution of the Church of Ireland provides fully and effectually for the voice of the lay members of the Church in all Church Councils. It is well known that the Bishop of Worcester has never attended the meetings of Convocation. Possibly if he had done so, he might have expressed his feeling regarding the action of the Convocations somewhat less severely than he does in a second letter to the late Archdeacon of Coventry, which is also to be found in the appendix of the Charge. No doubt there is something anomalous in the present position of the Convocations, but we are inclined to think that the discussions and debates, although they have their weak side, have at least proved that it is possible for ecclesiastics to confer and debate freely, with temper and dignity.

We are surprised that the very impartial proposal of the Bishop of Worcester, has not attracted more attention. Before examining it somewhat in detail, it may be well to recount what has happened during the last few years, as to the position and privileges of the Laity. Many years ago, in the admirable Charge of the late Bishop Cotton, delivered in 1862, a desire was expressed for a General Church Legislature. Even Arnold, said the Bishop, would admit that his theory of the identity of Church and State has ceased to be applicable to England, since our Parliament is no longer, even in profession, exclusively Christian. Bishop Cotton added :

If, then, our Church in its collective capacity ought no longer to be a dumb Church, but should speak out on the great questions of the day, not merely through the learning and piety of its great divines, but as a body, we must entertain the vision of some general assembly capable of regulating its services and announcing its decrees. Such an assembly should represent all the countries in which our Church has extended its branches, and all the orders of men which compose it; not only England and Ireland, but India and the colonies; not only bishops, priests, and deacons, but also laymen. The laity must have seats in it, as in the American and Colonial synods, for their rights in the Church of Christ are indisputable; we cannot prize too highly the help of their knowledge, practical sense, and sober piety, and a synod consisting wholly of clergy would be as one-sided as a parliament consisting wholly of lawyers.

Since these striking words were written much has happened. The very important Bampton Lecture of Bishop Moberly claimed for the Laity a place and influence in Church Councils. Diocesan conferences and synods have effected much, jealousy of the action of Laymen is gradually disappearing, and the prominence now given to all questions of practical reform, whenever Churchmen meet together, seems to indicate a readiness to deal with the subject in a practical way. The suggestion of the Bishop of Worcester assumes a readiness on the part of the advisers of the Crown and Parliament to delegate to a Church Council very considerable liberty of action. It would be little less than the establishment of a body not unlike the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland. It must be remembered, further, that the "consideration and determination of all questions" covers a great deal of ground, and that if such a Council were established by authority of the Crown and Parliament, it might not be easy to restrain the discussion and determination to merely practical matters. Here, however, we have at last a definite proposal—a scheme for the amelioration of our condition. At the present moment we are fast bound by precedent and custom. The Convocations meet, reports are presented, discussions take place, but the great machine moves not at all. Were such a vision as that of the Bishop of Worcester or Bishop Cotton realized—were what the Bishop of Durham desires to see, a really representative body formed—there might be some hope of an intelligent Ornament Rubric, and a practical carrying out of many of the minor reforms, on which most of our wisest thinkers are agreed.

In the very interesting survey of recent events in the Church of England, appended to the republication of his narrative regarding the "Tracts for the Times," the late Sir William Palmer briefly reviews the revival of Convocation, and the establishment of Diocesan Conferences. Sir William Palmer, desiring to see Church Synods enlisting the services of the attached and loyal Laity, describes the general movements of

congresses and conferences as giving the Church "a voice in the management of its affairs." He concludes the chapter on the revival of synodal action with well-weighed words, which, coming from a theologian well read in Church history, are entitled to great consideration :

It has been proposed, and no doubt the proposal will take effect in time, that a General Council should be established to represent all the Diocesan Conferences, and bring their united strength to bear on questions affecting the Church. It is difficult to calculate the effects which such a concentration of the laity and clergy may hereafter have. Perhaps in times of danger before us, when all institutions may be shaken to their centre, it may furnish a rallying-point to the endangered cause of religion. It will be well to have the Church of England knit into one body. We see the effects of concentration in other communions.

The question will probably arise, Is it at all likely that the authorities of the State, even upon such general petition as the Bishop of Worcester contemplates, would consent to allow the practical management of Church affairs to pass out of the hands of Parliament? According to some thinkers it is impossible to believe that any modification in the present relations of Church and State can be contemplated. Part of this question has been dealt with in an able pamphlet¹ by Mr. Robert Moberly, entitled "Is the Independence of Church Courts really Impossible?" Mr. Moberly's chief object is the consideration of the question of the Final Court of Appeal. Into that part of his argument we do not propose to follow him. He is not in cordial agreement with the resolution of the Lower House of the Convocation of Canterbury, recommending acquiescence in the recommendations of the Royal Commissioners, provided that in all cases of doctrinal import the spirituality should be consulted. His words, however, on the relation of the State are valuable and important. "The State will best maintain its own dignity and authority," he writes "and the order and contentment of all its citizens, not by retaining in its own hands the maximum of direct authority, but rather by devolving as much as possible, retaining so little only as is indispensable. Every step in the practical independence of churches is a step, not to say a stride, in the direction of national contentment and security. The nation as such, and from its own point of view, ought earnestly to desire such a consummation."

It is impossible to expect that Parliament would ever grant to the Church of England the same measure of independence claimed and used by the Established Church of Scotland. But surely in what may be called all matters of practical arrangement, a definite sphere for the operations of a repre-

¹ Is the Independence of Church Courts really impossible? By R. C. MOBERLY, M.A. Parker and Co., Oxford.

sentative Council could be found. The self-expansive and self-adjusting force which Mr. Bosworth Smith, in his remarkable letters to the *Times* in 1885, claimed for Christianity, may surely be looked for, if delegated authority were entrusted to it, in the deliberations of a Council composed of the really earnest clergy and laity. We are apt sometimes to leave out of sight the extraordinary efforts and results of Church work in the last half century of English history. There is hardly anything like it in the history of any religious community. In spite of the fierce controversies which have sometimes almost threatened to rend the Church asunder, there has been a steady recognition of the extraordinary position which the Church of England occupies in the world. "Within her reach," says Dr. Westcott, "are placed the three great springs of power, which have been given separately to other Churches—the simplicity of a pure creed, the strength of a continuous organization, the freedom of personal faith." At no moment of her history has the Laity, as a body, been more earnest in pressing the necessity of practical reforms. What is wanted, however, is a legitimate sphere of action. Diocesan conferences and synods, and the House of Laymen, are not enough. If to such a Council as is suggested a real authority were entrusted, an impulse would be given to all such efforts as are now only the isolated work of individuals. Such efforts, we mean, as Lord Nelson's indefatigable labours for Home Reunion, or Mr. Gedge's admirable advocacy, wielded so lately in London, for the extension of interest in missionary work. A wise relaxation of the Act of Uniformity, the revision of hotly-contested rubrics, the expansion of the Diaconate, and a legitimate expression of the feelings and wants of parishioners, are a few of the results which we might confidently hope to see achieved by a really representative Council of the Church of England. The present time is favourable to a well-directed effort in this direction.

In spite of the bluster of many of the Liberationists, we do not believe that there is any really general desire for disestablishment. It would be well to use the pause before the coming storm, if storm there must be, as a period of reconstruction and deliberation. The Bishop of Worcester, in his letter upon the subject, makes an appeal to those who look favourably on disestablishment, and expresses his belief that the desire of those who seek to make the Church of England more comprehensive and more efficient would be attained by the establishment of such a Council. All who share that belief, and who feel that the destruction of the Established Church would be a national calamity, are bound to do everything in their power to advance that glorious

liberty, under the control of law, which is the special characteristic of the Church of England. "The particular question"—we again quote from Mr. Moberly—"of the admission of laymen to a place in Church Councils, appears to be a burthen laid specially upon the Churchmen of our own generation." The establishment of such a Council, so far from interfering in any way with the old notion of the Royal Supremacy, would really vindicate what Mr. Gladstone declared in 1850 was the true idea of the constitutional theory, that in making Church law the Sovereign's task was "to ratify the acts of the Church herself, represented in Convocation—and if there were need of the highest civil sanctions, then to have the aid of Parliament also; and in administering Church law he was to discharge this function through the medium of bishops and divines, canonists and civilians, as her own most fully authorized, best-instructed sons, following in each case the analogy of his ordinary procedure as head of the State."

We are quite prepared to be met with the objection that such a scheme is utopian, but we need not despair. Many visions which were called utopian a hundred years ago are now realized ideals. Let us hope that a standing General Council of the Church of England may take its place beside these before the present generation has entirely passed away. The present occupant of the chair of St. Augustine has expressed his strong desire for a true representation of the Church of England. Let him be assured by a general movement on the part of all who desire to maintain the true dignity of the clergy and the true rights of the laity, his labour will be lightened, and the goal will come in sight.

G. D. BOYLE.

Appended is the passage in the Bishop's letter on the Irish Church Synod:

"The Establishment of the Church of England has availed to provide a system of Parochial Organization by which religious teaching and ordinances are placed within reach of everyone in all parts of the country. It has secured a continual succession of Clergy to administer God's Holy Word and Sacraments in every parish. It has given us an authorized rule of doctrine for our Clergy, and an authorized Form of Public Worship in every Church. It has maintained the supremacy of the Crown as an effectual guarantee against Ecclesiastical usurpation.

"The constitution of the Church of Ireland, as settled after the Establishment was put an end to, provides a General Synod, consisting of three distinct Orders, the Bishops, the Clergy, and the Laity; every Diocese returning a specified number of Clerical Representatives elected by the Clergy and a specified number of Lay Representatives elected by the Synodsmen (such Synodsmen themselves having been elected by the several Parishes—for attendance at the Diocesan Synod), yet so that the whole number of Clerical Representatives (208) should be exactly one-half of the whole number of Lay Representatives (416).

"All the members of this Synod are to sit together, except in certain

specified cases, for deliberation and for the transaction of business. The Bishops are to vote separately from the Representatives. The Representatives are to vote, Clerical and Lay together, unless, when a division is called, ten members of either Order require the voting to be taken by Orders.

“To this General Synod is entrusted supreme power to make regulations for the order, good government, and efficiency of the Church of Ireland; special provision being made for deliberate care and caution in altering the Articles, Doctrines, Rites, and Rubrics in the Formularies of the Church.

“If those among our Legislators and Statesmen, who are disposed to look with favour, or at least with indifference, upon proposals for Disestablishment because they think that they see obvious defects in the internal arrangements of the Church, or faults which estrange some of our people from its communion, would consider whether a cure for such faults and defects might not be found in the constitution of a General Synod for the Church of England, similar in its main features to the General Synod of the Church of Ireland, yet in due subordination to the control of the Crown and Parliament, they would deserve the best thanks of those who desire to make the Church of England more comprehensive and more efficient, and yet maintain unimpaired the connection between Church and State which they regard as fruitful in blessings to both bodies.

“If our Legislature would be content to commit to such a General Synod the absolute determination, within well-defined limits, of matters of detail, the settlement of which is of great importance to the well-being of the Church, but for which it cannot be contended that it is desirable to seek the action of Parliament, even if Parliament were willing to undertake the task; and if at the same time the duty were imposed upon it of preparing with due care measures, which lie beyond such limits, for discussion and final determination in Parliament, might we not hope that a way would be thereby opened for accomplishing such Reforms and such extension of the limits of communion with the Church as present and future circumstances may seem to call for?

“The constitution of the Church of Ireland presents to my mind in one respect a pattern worthy of imitation in that it provides fully and effectually for the voice of the lay members of the Church in all Church Councils. No principle is more worthy of adoption by the Church of England. No measure more vital for its maintenance as an Established Church than one which would ensure the united action of Clergy and Laity in all Church matters.”



ART. IV.—DR. DÖLLINGER AND DR. REUSCH ON CARDINAL BELLARMINÉ.

SINCE he published his collection of documents as a contribution to the history of the Council of Trent, Dr. Döllinger has given to the world nothing more considerable than the six articles on Madame de Maintenon, a digest of which was laid before our readers in the March number of the CHURCHMAN. The Tridentine documents were published