

**Zeitschrift:** Revue internationale de théologie = Internationale theologische Zeitschrift = International theological review

**Band:** 9 (1901)

**Heft:** 33

**Artikel:** Recent developments of the so-called catholic movement in the Church of England

**Autor:** Ince, William

**DOI:** <https://doi.org/10.5169/seals-403498>

### **Nutzungsbedingungen**

Die ETH-Bibliothek ist die Anbieterin der digitalisierten Zeitschriften auf E-Periodica. Sie besitzt keine Urheberrechte an den Zeitschriften und ist nicht verantwortlich für deren Inhalte. Die Rechte liegen in der Regel bei den Herausgebern beziehungsweise den externen Rechteinhabern. Das Veröffentlichen von Bildern in Print- und Online-Publikationen sowie auf Social Media-Kanälen oder Webseiten ist nur mit vorheriger Genehmigung der Rechteinhaber erlaubt. [Mehr erfahren](#)

### **Conditions d'utilisation**

L'ETH Library est le fournisseur des revues numérisées. Elle ne détient aucun droit d'auteur sur les revues et n'est pas responsable de leur contenu. En règle générale, les droits sont détenus par les éditeurs ou les détenteurs de droits externes. La reproduction d'images dans des publications imprimées ou en ligne ainsi que sur des canaux de médias sociaux ou des sites web n'est autorisée qu'avec l'accord préalable des détenteurs des droits. [En savoir plus](#)

### **Terms of use**

The ETH Library is the provider of the digitised journals. It does not own any copyrights to the journals and is not responsible for their content. The rights usually lie with the publishers or the external rights holders. Publishing images in print and online publications, as well as on social media channels or websites, is only permitted with the prior consent of the rights holders. [Find out more](#)

**Download PDF:** 04.02.2026

**ETH-Bibliothek Zürich, E-Periodica, <https://www.e-periodica.ch>**

# RECENT DEVELOPMENTS OF THE SO-CALLED CATHOLIC MOVEMENT IN THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND.

---

The present state of controversy in the Church of England in regard to doctrine and ceremonial practices, more especially as connected with the Holy Eucharist, can hardly be made intelligible to members of foreign Churches without some preliminary account of the circumstances which have led up to it. Its origin is to be traced to that remarkable religious movement which began in Oxford nearly 70 years ago. This movement arose concurrently with a revival of romanticism in literature and art, such for instance as was manifested in the admirable novels of Sir Walter Scott, and in an increasing interest in the study of medieval history. It was a reaction against a spiritual deadness in religion and a predominantly secular view of the Church as 'the Establishment', i. e. as an institution which was only one out of many departments of State administration, and so far on a level with the Army or Navy. Doctrinally this movement began with a re-assertion of the doctrine of the existence and claims of the Holy Catholic Church as a Divine Society, instituted for the spiritual and moral training of Christian people, entrusted with the ministration of the Word and Sacraments, the custodian of a definite body of doctrine, which was none other than 'the faith once for all delivered to the Saints'. It urged Churchmen to regard the clergy not merely as the accredited teachers of the National religion, but as successors of the Apostles with an exclusive divine commission for the ministration of the Word and Sacraments. It insisted on giving more prominence to Sacra-

ments than to Preaching. For the common popular notion had been that the liturgical services of prayer, and confession, and praise, and intercession, were merely introductory to the great function of the Sermon. The celebration of the Holy Communion had been very infrequent, in towns mostly once a month, in very many country parishes once a quarter, or only at the three great Festivals of Christmas, Easter, and Whitsunday. The Tractarians (so called from the series of Tracts by which the promoters of the new school of thought carried on their propaganda) paid more attention to the solemn and frequent performance of the Public Services of the Church; inculcated both by precept and example adherence to the rubrical directions of the Prayer Book, which in many particulars had been generally neglected or openly violated; established daily services and weekly communions, and careful observance of Festivals of Saints and Fast Days. Discussions turned largely on such questions as the Authority of the Church; the study of the Fathers and of early Church History was assiduously pursued. The three great leaders of the movement were Newman, Pusey and Keble. In 1845 Newman had gradually convinced himself that the rightfulness of the claim of the see of Rome to supremacy in the Church was established by Scripture and by history, though he substituted a theory of legitimate development in Christian doctrine for the old contention of the Roman Church, that her whole cycle of doctrine was apostolic and primitive. He concluded therefore that the rejection of the Papal Supremacy by the Church of England at the Reformation was an unjustifiable schism, and gave effect to his new convictions by seeking admission into the Church of Rome. This conversion, or as others would regard it, this perversion, of the ablest and most influential of its leaders was a staggering blow and discouragement to the party. Newman's secession was followed by that of many of his attached disciples, though his intimate friends and colleagues, Pusey and Keble, remained firm in their allegiance to the Church of England. Another heavy blow fell upon the surviving party in 1850, when in consequence of a decision given by the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, the Supreme Court of Appeal in ecclesiastical cases, allowing the tenableness of what he deemed heretical views on the doctrine of Baptism, Manning, then Arch-

deacon of Chichester, joined the Church of Rome, and was followed by many others, notably R. I. Wilberforce, a brother of the famous Samuel Wilberforce, Bishop of Oxford.

The greatest controversy of faith between the Tractarians and their opponents had been concerning the doctrine of the Eucharist. The popular view among the ordinary religious Church people had been of a somewhat Zwinglian type. They looked upon the Sacrament as mainly a divinely ordained act of commemoration of the sacrifice of the death of Christ, a representative ceremony embodying grateful acknowledgment of the high benefits derived from that death, and further as a pledge of the mutual love of members of the congregation. The solemnity of the rite was even held to be enhanced by its infrequency. Any *special* presence of Christ in the Sacrament was for the most part ignored. The Tractarian School had urged much higher doctrine. They had revived much of the rhetorical and oratorical and often exaggerated language used by the Fathers (especially of the Eastern Church) before any formal enunciation of sacred doctrine on the subject had been adopted by the Church. They magnified the power of the consecration of the elements of bread and wine by the priest, as effecting the presence of Christ's Body and Blood in or with or under the elements: they affirmed a change not merely of use and destination in reference to the communicants, but of the elements themselves independently of their reception. They protested at the same time against the doctrine of Transubstantiation as an unwarranted rationalistic explanation of the Presence. The most remarkable public proclamation of the doctrine of the new school of thought had been a famous sermon preached by Dr Pusey before the University of Oxford in 1843, for which he had been suspended by a sentence of an antiquated and anomalous University Court of six Doctors of Theology, on the ground that the view of the Eucharist contained in the Sermon was at variance with the doctrinal standards of the Church of England. Pusey published the Sermon and defended his doctrine in two copious volumes in which he endeavoured to prove by an elaborate catena of patristic and anglican theologians that the doctrine of the Real Presence, which he had advocated, was the immemorial doctrine of the Catholic Church of the first six centuries and of the Church of England from



the time of the Reformation. The new, or as its upholders would say, the revived old doctrine, was systematically expounded in a dogmatic Treatise on the Eucharist by R. I. Wilberforce in 1850, and from about that time forward was known by the name of the Real Objective Presence of Christ in the Sacrament. Exception has justly been taken against the employment of the term *Objective* in such a connection, for in the course of the history of philosophy the terms objective and subjective have exactly interchanged meaning, and the believers in a Virtual and Efficacious Presence of Christ in the administration of the Sacrament are fully entitled to call the Presence which they hold objective in the modern sense of the term, as it comes to them from without. It may be added incidentally that the expression Real Presence has no claim to antiquity, for it has not been traced to an earlier date than the beginning of the 16<sup>th</sup> century.

From this time forward the doctrine of the Eucharist continued, and still continues to be, the chief controversy of faith in England, on account of its intrinsic importance and of its bearing on the ceremonial of Public Worship. The question of the true legal interpretation of the formularies of the Church of England, which the Church and the Nation have accepted as standards of doctrine, has been brought before the ecclesiastical Courts on two occasions during the last half-century. In 1856 Archdeacon Denison was tried by the Pro-Diocesan Court at Bath, presided over by the then Archbishop of Canterbury, Dr Sumner, and condemned to deprivation of his preferments, because he refused to retract statements made in three Sermons preached in the Cathedral of Wells and subsequently published that (1) to all who came to the Lord's Table the Body and Blood of Christ are given, and by all who came to the Lord's Table the Body and Blood of Christ are received; and (2) that worship is due to the real though invisible presence of the Body and Blood of Christ in the Holy Eucharist under the form of bread and wine. The Archdeacon was supplied with arguments in defence of his positions by Pusey and Keble, who took the most intense personal interest in the issue of the proceeding. The Court pronounced that by such teaching the Archdeacon had advisedly maintained and affirmed doctrines directly contrary and repugnant to some of the Articles of the

Church of England. This judgment and sentence were finally quashed on appeal by a judgment of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council in February 1858, on the technical ground that the original suit had not been commenced within two years after the alleged offences in respect of which the suit was instituted. This Supreme Court at the same time expressly stated that they intimated no opinion upon the question of heterodoxy, or commission of an ecclesiastical offence. The Bath judgment has never been reversed on its merits in regard to the real question at issue. Neither side could consider this as a satisfactory conclusion. In 1872 the questions of the Real Presence and Adoration in the Eucharist were brought before the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council in the case of the Rev. W. J. E. Bennett. This clergyman had said that "he himself adored and taught the people to adore Christ present in the Sacrament under the form of bread and wine, believing that under their veil is the sacred Body and Blood of Christ". The Committee declared that the Church of England has forbidden all acts of adoration of the Sacrament, understanding by that the consecrated elements. But upon the whole, not without doubts and division of opinion, they came to the conclusion that the charge against Mr. Bennett was not so clearly made out as the rules which govern penal proceedings require. They therefore gave him the benefit of the doubt, admonishing him that his words were rash and ill-judged, and perilously near a violation of the law. They at the same time declared that any presence which is not a presence to the soul of the faithful receiver, the Church of England does not by her Articles or formularies affirm, or require her ministers to accept.

A few years before this last suit, in 1867, a memorial or declaration was addressed to the then Archbishop of Canterbury, Dr Longley, by 21 clergy, in defence of the doctrines of the Real Objective Presence, of the Eucharistic Sacrifice, and of the Adoration of Christ in the Blessed Sacrament. The Memorialists declared that they repudiated the opinion of a corporal Presence of Christ's natural Flesh and Blood, that is to say, of the Presence of His Body and Blood as they are in Heaven, and also the conception of the mode of His Presence which implies the physical change of the natural substances of the bread and wine, commonly called Transubstantiation. They

believed that in the Holy Eucharist, the Body and Blood of our Saviour Christ, the inward part or Thing signified, are present, really and truly, but spiritually and ineffably, under 'the outward visible part or sign', or 'form of bread and wine': and also 'that Christ Himself, really and truly, but spiritually and ineffably, Present in the Sacrament, is therein to be adored'.

This doctrine of a Real Objective Presence differs from the doctrine of the Church of Rome, as formulated by the 4<sup>th</sup> Lateran Council and re-affirmed by the Council of Trent, by repudiating the scholastic theory of Transubstantiation, which supposed that by virtue of their consecration by the priest the substances of the bread and wine disappeared, their accidents only remaining, and were replaced by the substances of the Body and Blood of the Lord, but it agreed with the Roman doctrine by asserting the Real Presence of our Lord Jesus Christ, of His glorified Body, His Soul, and His Godhead, in or with the bread and wine, or under the forms of bread and wine. It approximates perilously to a materialistic and local theory of the Presence, and is further full of ambiguities. The Presence is declared to be spiritual, and spiritual Presence is explained to be presence after the manner of a spirit. But a Body thus present would not be a Body at all in any true sense, and it would be impossible for a material Body, such as even Christ's, even supposing it to be possible for it to be present as a spirit, to be present at the same time in many thousand places, which this doctrine of the Real Presence requires. The presence which the upholders of this declaration maintained might be more correctly called Consubstantiation, if we had regard to the etymology of that term, for it asserts the contemporaneous presence of the substances of bread and wine and the substances of the Body and Blood of Christ; but the term Consubstantiation has been usually employed (though not by Luther himself) to express the Lutheran theory, which however differs emphatically from the Real objective theory, because the Lutherans affirm that the real presence takes place not at the moment of consecration, but only at the time of the reception of the consecrated elements by the communicants.

The doctrine of the Declaration of 1867 was severely criticised by one of the ablest and most acute theologians of the time, Thirlwall, bishop of St. David's, who concluded his des-

tructive criticism, not without a touch of satire, by saying that the only one of the adjectives which the advocates of the theory employed in describing the Presence, in which all might agree, was that it was 'ineffable'.

The first leaders of the Tractarian movement devoted themselves mainly both in the pulpit and in the press to the advocacy of higher views of Sacramental Grace as conveyed in Baptism and in the Eucharist, and to the discussion of the complicated questions of Church authority and ecclesiastical jurisdiction, which inevitably arose in a Church so closely connected with the State as is the Church of England.

Their innovations or revivals in the department of rites and ceremonies and vestments were comparatively few and insignificant. At this distance of time it is almost inconceivable that a fierce controversy should have been raised by their use of the surplice as the appropriate dress of the priest when preaching, as well as when saying the prayers or administering the Sacraments. The surplice was denounced as 'a rag of Popery', and its introduction into the pulpit even led to public riots in some large towns. But except in a very few parishes, the special eucharistic vestments were entirely unknown. In those early days Newman and Pusey used the simplest ritual, the most observable innovations were the use of lighted candles on the altar at the time of celebration of Holy Communion, and the gradual adoption of the eastward position of the priest at the Holy Table, instead of what had hitherto been customary or almost universal, at the north end; this position being preferred as symbolising that the Eucharist had a Godward as well as a Manward aspect, being an offering to God as well as a Gift from God to man. As time went on, Tractarianism developed into a movement which led to its advocates receiving the unhappy and inaccurate name of Ritualists, for Ritualist in English usage had hitherto signified a writer who had dealt as an archæologist with the history of rites and ceremonies in Divine worship, and not one who as an officiant practised and laid special stress upon their employment.

Urged forward partly by many of the younger clergy, and partly by some influential and wealthy laymen, the old-Tractarianism came to be known as Ritualism, and in this its newer form gradually demanded as its outward expression what are

now known as 'the Six Points', these being, The Eastward Position of the Priest, The Eucharistic Vestments (chasuble, alb, amice &c.), Altar Lights, Wafer Bread, The Mixed Chalice, Ceremonial Use of Incense. Almost all these Six Points have been the subject of litigation, many prosecutions having been brought against the clergy who have adopted them. Somewhat conflicting judgments in reference to them have been pronounced by the Supreme Court, or by the Special Court erected under the Public Worship Regulation Act in 1874. In most cases these judgments were adverse to the contention of the Ritualists—and the whole controversy between them and their opponents was embittered by the fact that several of the prosecuted clergy, refusing to recognise the spiritual authority of the State Courts, chose rather to suffer imprisonment than comply with the monitions and orders of the Courts.

These controversies about ceremonies in worship as well as about ornaments permissible in churches, have unfortunately monopolised too largely the attention of English Churchmen, when very much more important questions about the fundamental truths and facts of the Christian Faith, and the authority of the Bible, and even the very existence of God were, in the general unsettlement of religious belief, pressing for careful and sympathetic treatment. These legal controversies have been fostered and embittered by the action of two antagonistic Societies, the English Church Union and the Church Association. The latter society was instituted for the purpose of upholding the Protestant character of the Church of England as embodied in the Prayer Book and the 39 Articles, and promoted the greater number of these prosecutions for alleged ritual offences. The English Church Union was founded for the purpose of asserting and maintaining what it professed to be the Catholic heritage of doctrine, discipline, and worship in the Church. Its motto was Defence, not Defiance; it therefore refrained from any reprisals such as initiating prosecutions of the other side for ritual violations or omissions, but vigorously defended the accused clergy in the Press and by large subsidies of money in the payment of the expenses incurred in the law courts. Many thoughtful and moderate Churchmen have deeply lamented the existence of these two Societies, and have held that the peace of the Church would be promoted by their dis-



solution, but there is little likelihood at present that such a wish should be accomplished. Other Societies have been founded by the Ritualist party, which have for their objects the inculcation and propagation of what are assumed to be Catholic views of Eucharistic doctrine and ceremonial; such are the Confraternity of the Blessed Sacrament, and the Society of the Holy Cross. Under such influences the Catholic movement has in recent years made large strides. It manifests itself in many forms. It is seen in the increasing adoption of medieval and pre-Reformation phraseology, which gratuitously but openly speaks of what the English Prayer Book calls the Lord's Supper or Holy Communion as the Mass, and by an unwarrantable limitation of a general term calls the community life of brotherhoods or sisterhoods the *religious* life, and freely extends the name of Sacrament to Confirmation and Penance, though the Prayer Book practically limits the term to the two great Sacraments of the Gospel instituted by Christ Himself. The same tendency is seen again in the extraordinary emphasis laid upon the two parts of the Blessed Sacrament, Communion and Sacrifice, and upon their distinction and separation. It is in pursuance of this principle that since fasting reception is insisted upon as a necessary rule, violation of which involves mortal sin, and not merely as an ancient laudable custom where circumstances permit, people are urged to be present at an early morning service of Mass or Holy Communion, when they partake of the sacred elements, and then to be present at the High Celebration or Solemn Eucharist at a later hour, when communion by the worshippers is strongly discouraged and in some cases rendered practically impossible. This non-communicating attendance is recommended for the purpose of Sacrifice and Worship of Christ present in the consecrated elements under the form of bread and wine. So the utterly unscriptural and uncatholic practice of 'Hearing Mass' is substituted for the Lord's own ordinance for "shewing His death by eating the bread and drinking the cup". The same pseudo-catholic imitation is discernible in the introduction of certain ceremonies unknown to the Prayer Book, and unknown for at least a thousand years in the Church, such as the elevation of the elements for purpose of worship, the ringing of a bell at the moment of consecration, ablutions with wine and water, numerous genuflec-



tions and prostrations both by priest and people. And naturally in connexion with such innovations upon authorised Anglican usage has followed the interpolation of portions of the unreformed Sarum Liturgy (which imply a doctrine repudiated by the English Reformers) either secretly by the priest, or openly before the congregation. Another innovation has been the introduction of Children's Eucharists, where congregations of unconfirmed children are brought together, and if we may judge from some of the manuals compiled for use on such occasions, indoctrinated with most unspiritual materialistic notions of the presence of Christ by means of prayers and hymns put into their mouths <sup>1)</sup>.

It is claimed for all these 'innovations', or as their advocates would say, 'revivals', that they are 'catholic' practices. This is an entire abuse of the term. What is Catholic? The famous definition given by Vincentius Lirinensis in the earlier half of the fifth century was that it was what was held and taught *ubique, semper, et ab omnibus*. This referred to *doctrine*. It would be difficult to apply the criterion of *ab omnibus*, for the heresies originated with members of the Church; but a Catholic doctrine must at least have been held *semper*, universally from the time when the Church was founded, for the Church claims to be Apostolic. The doctrine of the Eucharist however, as now enunciated and proclaimed to be a Christian verity, cannot be proved to have been held *semper*. No controversy requiring a formulated expression of belief on the subject of Christ's Presence in the Holy Sacrament arose till the 11<sup>th</sup> century, when certain local Councils in France and Italy drew up certain tests of what they supposed to be true doctrine; it was reserved for the fourth Lateran Council held in 1215 to give authoritative

---

<sup>1)</sup> The extent to which there has been a studious imitation of the ornaments and furniture of a Roman Catholic Church in an Anglican Church may be illustrated by the fact that the Chancellor of the Consistory Court of Chichester has just ordered the removal from a well-known Brighton Church of the 14 Stations of the Cross, three Confessional Boxes, two water stoups for holding holy water, several crucifixes, two tabernacles for the reception of the Reserved Sacrament before which red lights are kept continually burning, an image of the Virgin Mary, placed on a pedestal with candles and vases of flowers and with a canopy, crown, and star over it, images representing the Sacred Heart and St. Joseph &c.

expression to the materialistic theory of Transubstantiation, which had been gradually growing up in an age when the clergy as a body were ignorant of the Greek of the New Testament and of the works of the early Christian writers, especially those of the Eastern Church. And most of the ritual ceremonies which are passionately insisted upon as the appropriate expression of 'catholic' doctrine were first introduced for the purpose of supporting the theory of Transubstantiation. They do not go back to primitive antiquity, they are only medieval. The opponents of these pseudo-catholic doctrines and practices contend that the standard of doctrine and ritual for the Church of England is to be found in the Prayer Book and the Articles, to which all Anglican clergy are bound by their Ordination vows, and that the clergy as officers of the Church have no right at their individual caprice and following their own private interpretation of disputed rubrics, to introduce strange ceremonies on the alleged ground that they are 'catholic'. It does not even follow that because a particular usage was at its first introduction instructive and profitable, it continued to be so under changed circumstances. One of the English Articles most truly declares that "it is not necessary that traditions and ceremonies be in all places one, and, utterly like; for at all times they have been divers, and may be changed according to the diversities of countries, times, and men's manners, so that nothing be done against God's word". And the same Article claims the inalienable authority of every particular or national Church to ordain, change, and abolish, ceremonies or rites of the Church ordained only by man's authority, so that all things be done to edifying, a principle which students of ecclesiastical history will remember was emphatically laid down by Pope Gregory in his advice to St. Augustine at the time of the first foundation of the national Church of England. No one authority in Christendom has the right to legislate on such matters for all Churches.

During the last few years two ritual practices have come prominently forward in discussion, the ceremonial use of incense in public worship for censuring both persons and things, and the reservation of the Sacrament for the communion of the sick. A short time ago it is said that the use of incense had only been introduced into about 10 churches, now it is used in three

or four hundred. Many clergy in charge of large parishes maintain that it is practically impossible to administer the Blessed Sacrament to the sick and dying without irreverence, owing to the squalid and noisy surroundings of their houses and the length of time required for a full service with consecration, unless permission is given for the reservation in the Church of a portion of the consecrated elements for use in such cases, and so in several churches tabernacles have been constructed for such reservation. The legality of these two practices has been loudly challenged. Certain test cases were selected for the purpose of trying the questions involved. As the Ritualists have steadily persisted in their refusal to acknowledge the spiritual authority of the existing Supreme Court of Appeal, i. e. the Judicial Committee of the Queen's Privy Council, the Archbishops availed themselves of a provision contained from the very earliest time in the English Prayer Book that when doubts have arisen in the use and practice of the prescribed rules for service of the Church, then for the resolution of all such doubts "the parties that so doubt, or diversly take anything, shall alway resort to the Bishop of the diocese, who by his discretion shall take order for the quieting and appeasing of the same, and if the Bishop of the diocese be in doubt, then he may send for the resolution thereof to the Archbishop". By common consent the two questions of incense and reservation were referred to the Archbishops of Canterbury and York, who had the two questions brought before them on separate occasions by a large array of counsel and experts on either side, and by elaborate documentary evidence prepared beforehand. After some considerable delay, in order to allow full time for due weighing of the arguments and evidence submitted to them, the Archbishops pronounced opinions or judgments adverse to the legality of the two practices. They held that they were forbidden by the Act of Uniformity of Public worship, and the latter of the two by a clear rubric of the Office for Holy Communion, which enacts that "if any of the consecrated bread and wine remain after the celebration it shall not be carried out of the Church, but the priest and such other of the communicants as he shall call to him, shall immediately reverently eat and drink the same". This resolution of doubts by the decision of the highest spiritual autho-

rities of the Church caused grievous disappointment and dismay to many of the leading men of the 'catholic' party. The weakness of the archiepiscopal judgments is that they cannot be enforced by the coercion of law: they have a moral, not a strictly legal force. Some of the stalwart spirits both by example and precept counsel disobedience—some ultra-clerical laymen openly urge the people to 'stand by their priests'. It is difficult to see how such a policy of insubordination is compatible with the promise made by each clergyman at his ordination to reverently obey his Ordinary, and other chief ministers, following with a glad mind and will their godly admonitions, and submitting himself to their godly judgments, and that in Public Prayer and ministration of the Sacraments he will *use the form prescribed by the Book of Common Prayer, and none other*, except so far as shall be ordered by lawful authority. In a well ordered society it is impossible for each individual to be allowed to be his own interpreter of the law. Of course he is at liberty to agitate for the alteration of the law, if he think it desirable.

The confusion produced in the Church is pitiable. The Bishops, whose position is very difficult, are endeavouring by moral suasion to induce the clergy, who have hitherto adopted practices now pronounced to be illegal, to render obedience to their monitions and conform themselves to the standards of their own Church. How far they have been, or are likely to be, successful in their efforts it is unsafe to pronounce. Some are more sanguine about results than others. Meantime we are informed that a proposal which was made at the recent London Diocesan Conference, that a Conference should be held between representative men of the 'Catholic' and the opposing parties in order to endeavour to find common points of agreement on the doctrine and ritual of Holy Communion, is to be carried into effect, under the presidency of the Bishop of London early in October next. Such a conference would obviously have no binding force in the London, or indeed in any other Diocese. It might pave the way for a better understanding of the sentiments really held by each of the opposed parties. For myself I confess I hardly see how agreement can be reached. As long as all are agreed upon one substantially uniform mode of service in Public Worship in accordance with the simple provisions of such a common standard, all could harmoniously worship



in the same Church, being still at perfect liberty to hold varying opinions on questions of doctrine, which both Scripture and their own Church had left undetermined, and which are in no way essential elements of the faith once delivered to the saints. But when a special theory of Christian dogma is to be emphasised by a sensuous and minutely ceremonial ritual, repugnant to the feelings of thousands of devout worshippers, the case is widely different. In a large town with many churches, individuals can select their own type of service, in small country towns or villages possessing only a single church this is impossible. Unhappily the tendency of the present state of things is to make Churches congregational, not parochial in the true sense.

The decisions of the two Archbishops on the last two points of ritual have within the last few weeks had another result. Lord Halifax, a layman, the President of the English Church Union, and the Council which manages the affairs of that society, have with some audacity arrived at the conviction that some of the official utterances of the Archbishops when delivering their judgment were of such a nature as to render some counterblast absolutely necessary, lest the Church of England should be committed, by acquiescence, to false doctrine; and accordingly at the annual meeting of the Union last June they issued for the adoption of their members a Declaration of what they themselves believed to be the true doctrine of the Church on the subject of the Real Presence. They have not been deterred by the reflection that it is, to say the least, somewhat presumptuous for a voluntary unofficial society to attempt to formulate a doctrinal decision on the mystery of the Eucharist, and to declare this to be part of the faith and teaching of the one Holy Catholic and Apostolic Church. The declaration adopted by these present at the meeting was that they desired, in view of present circumstances to reaffirm their belief—that in the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper, the Bread and Wine, through the operation of the Holy Ghost, become in and by consecration, according to our Lord's institution, verily and indeed the Body and Blood of Christ, and that Christ our Lord, present in the same most Holy Sacrament of the Altar under the form of Bread and Wine, is to be worshipped and adored—and further that they would abide by all such teaching and

practice as follow from this doctrine of the whole Catholic Church of Christ. It is noticeable that though this Declaration emanated from what professes to be an English Church Union, the notes which were appended in justification of its statements made no attempt to show that this was the doctrine asserted in the doctrinal standards of the Church of England, and evidently presupposed that this exposition of doctrine was held alike by the Latin and the Eastern and the Anglican Churches. The truth of this Declaration has been loudly challenged. Even a number of the members of the Union, who were not present at the meeting, headed by some influential and well-known theologians, have dissociated themselves from it by a public protest addressed to Lord Halifax. They say that its terms seem to them to be open to grave objection, inasmuch as they do not guard against materialistic conceptions of our Lord's Presence in the Blessed Sacrament. Further that its conclusion is indefinite, and may be made to cover practices with which they have no sympathy, and that there is in it a tone of defiance of the Church's spiritual rulers, which seems to them to be as unwise as it is wrong in spirit. Dr King, the revered Bishop of Lincoln, who has always been regarded as a champion of the Ritualist party, while not himself signing this protest, has written to the promoters a letter expressing his thankfulness, shared, as he believes, by many other members of the Union, that some such protest has been made.

But the whole of the Evangelical party in the Church and very many of those who for want of a more distinctive name may be called the Moderate High Church party, or the old Historic High Churchmen, protest still more strongly against this Declaration of the English Church Union. They maintain that it is in essence scarcely distinguishable from the doctrine of the Roman Church as laid down in the 13<sup>th</sup> century and subsequently stereotyped by the decrees of the Council of Trent. They deny that it is a true statement of the doctrine of the ancient Fathers, and can only be represented as such, by ignoring a whole mass of passages in which the Fathers balance passages, which taken apart exhibit a materialistic tendency in speaking of the consecrated elements, by repeated assertions elsewhere that they are figures, types, signs, images, symbols, autitypes, pledges, of the Body and Blood of



the Lord. They feel that to say that Christ our Lord present in the Sacrament of the Altar under the form of bread and wine, is to be worshipped and adored, is perilously near an encouragement to idolatry and giving honour to the creature, which is only due to the Creator. They object to the manifest ambiguity of an assertion that the Bread and Wine *become* in and by consecration *verily and indeed* the Body and Blood of Christ. What is the meaning of this becoming? Is it a change of substance, a change of the elements in and by themselves apart from their reception by the communicants? The various words which have been employed by the Fathers to indicate the change which takes place are general, and by no means necessarily imply such a change as transubstantiation, which by the Roman and the Neo-Anglican hypotheses demands a miracle to be wrought at each consecration. The frequent terms used by the Latin Fathers are *benedicere*, *consecrare*, *sanctificare*, *transferre*, which imply that the elements are set apart and elevated from a common and purely material state to a higher sacramental and spiritual use, in such a way that those who receive them worthily are made partakers of the Body and Blood of Christ—they *become* not in themselves but *to us* (*fiunt nobis*) the Body and Blood. The objectors to the Declaration urge still more strongly that its statements go beyond and in some points contradict the authoritative doctrine of the Church of England as expressed in its formularies. The English Prayer of Consecration, to guard against possible misconception, deliberately rejected the wording of the old Missal, and as it now continues to stand, prays that we receiving God's creatures of bread and wine in remembrance of His death and passion may be partakers of His most Blessed Body and Blood. It contains no words indicating any change in the elements themselves as apart from their reception—nor does the Liturgy contain any rubrics directing the elevation of the elements for the purpose of adoration by the people. The more precise and formal enunciation of doctrine is contained in the Articles which teach that "to such as rightly, worthily, and with faith, receive the Sacrament, the bread which we break is a partaking of the Body of Christ, and likewise the cup of blessing is a partaking of the Blood of Christ. The Body of Christ is given, taken, and eaten, in the Supper, only after an

heavenly and spiritual manner. And the mean whereby the Body of Christ is received and eaten in the Supper is Faith". The Sacrament of the Lord's Supper was not by Christ's ordinance *reserved*, carried about, lifted up, or *worshipped*. Another article teaches that "the wicked eat not the Body of Christ in the use of the Lord's Supper, in no wise are they partakers of Christ: but rather to their condemnation do eat and drink the sign or Sacrament of so great a thing".

A very significant proof of the extent of the dissatisfaction caused by the Declaration is found in the fact that the Lower House of the Convocation of Canterbury, at its recent session, passed by a very large majority a resolution deprecating the pronouncement by voluntary societies of declarations, such as that put forth at the Meeting of the English Church Union, in terms which may be interpreted to suggest resistance on the part of the clergy to their spiritual rulers.

It perhaps need hardly be said that this Declaration, of which so much has been said, has no legal validity whatever: it is only a private expression of opinion. Nay it cannot even in strict accuracy be described as an official manifesto of the English Church Union itself; for it is very noticeable that, whereas when it was first drafted and published in the newspapers, it professed by its opening words to be a resolution of the whole body—"We, the members of the E. C. U." this heading was altered on the day of meeting to 'We, members of the E. C. U.', thus only committing the members who were actually present and signified their assent.

A departure from the strict chronological order of narrative is necessitated, if we are to be in a position to estimate the distinct Romeward tendency of many of those who have taken a part in the present ecclesiastical movement. They have been earnestly working and praying for corporate re-union with the Church of Rome, not as an immediate possibility indeed, but as a gradual result of mutual explanations and a reconciliation of supposed antagonisms. We learn on undoubted authority that some among them used urgent solicitations with the late Archbishop of Canterbury (Dr Benson) that he should pave the way for friendly overtures, by sending presents to the Pope on occasion of his jubilee and by writing a letter to the Pope announcing his own accession to the Primacy of the Church

of England. The Archbishop refused to betray his position, and commit his Church by any such private and individual action to negotiations which might be grievously misinterpreted. Desirous as he was of Christian Unity on sound principles, he yet keenly resented the sending of an Italian Mission (as he called the intrusive Roman hierarchy) to attack the ancient Church of England. But in 1894 the idea of a practical rapprochement between the English Church and the Church of Rome was brought prominently before him by Lord Halifax, the President of the English Church Union. Lord Halifax had formed an intimate friendship with the Abbé Portal, and had for some time discussed with him (1) the means of kindling and spreading a desire for union between the two Churches and (2) the discovery of some definite point of contact for the authorities on both sides. Lord Halifax received M. Portal as his guest in England, and took him to visit many of the churches notorious for their high advanced ritual, and introduced him to the knowledge of many of the Anglican religious communities, brotherhoods and sisterhoods; and this naturally produced in the Abbé an impression that this phase of Church life was characteristic of the whole Church of England, and that there would be no serious obstacles to the union of the two Churches, if there were a desire for it on both sides. The point of contact for opening negotiations was found in the question of the validity of English ordinations. M. Portal, under the assumed name of Dalbus, wrote a pamphlet on this subject, in which he denied their validity. On the other hand the Abbé Duchesne in a review in the *Bulletin critique* affirmed their validity. Lord Halifax shortly afterwards brought M. Portal to a private and unofficial interview with the Archbishop, which led to no result, for the Archbishop evidently thought that an attempt was being made to compromise himself as the official chief of the Church of England.

M. Portal was shortly after invited by Cardinal Rampolla, Secretary of State at the Vatican, to visit Rome. On arrival there, he had an audience with the Pope, in which he suggested that the Pope should himself write to the two English Archbishops and so open communications. The Pope, it is said, seemed to welcome the idea, and would have done so, had he been left free to follow his own desire, but was overruled

by his entourage. It was announced to M. Portal that the Pope intended to desire M. Duchesne to prepare a memorandum on the subject of English orders for his information. M. Portal, returning hurriedly to England, was brought again by Lord Halifax to an interview with the Archbishop (without leave previously obtained) when absent from home on his holiday, and narrated to the Archbishop all the incidents of his mission to Rome. The Archbishop received the representations of the Abbé and of Lord Halifax unsympathetically. He thought that an attempt was being made to entrap the Primate of the English Church into committing himself to some statement advancing the cause of Rome and damaging the Church of England. He was deeply annoyed and made no attempt to disguise his feelings. Lord Halifax asked the two Archbishops to write him a letter which he might take to Rome, even sketching it out for them, and went so far as to suggest that Archbishop Benson would 'make the great refusal', if he did not embrace this opportunity. The Archbishop truly said that Lord Halifax was like a solitary player of chess and wanted to make all the moves on the board himself on both sides. When finally declining to be drawn into these negotiations with Rome, he told Lord Halifax that he had lived for years so exclusively with one set of thinkers, and entered so entirely into the usages of one class of churches, as not to have before him the state of religious feeling and activity in England with completeness, and declared his own fixed determination not to enter on secret diplomacy, contrary to the genius and sense of the English Church<sup>1)</sup>.

It is not surprising that the Archbishop should have firmly rejected the proposals made to him, for at that very time Cardinal Vaughan, the chief representative of the Church of Rome in England, had been proclaiming the necessity of absolute and unqualified submission to Rome on the part of the English Church, before any reconciliation could take place. It is beyond the present purpose to trace the further progress of these negotiations. It is sufficient to say that they came to an abrupt

---

<sup>1)</sup> The authority for all this narration of Lord Halifax's negotiations with Rome will be found in the Life of Archbishop Benson by his Son. Vol. II, ch. XI.

end, when the Pope on June 29 1896 issued the Bull 'Apostolicæ Curæ' pronouncing against the validity of English Orders.

In the foregoing pages attention has been almost exclusively directed to one aspect of the more recent developments of the Ritualist party, its approximation towards the medieval doctrine of the Real Presence of Christ in the Eucharist and towards the re-introduction of ceremonial observances, which are the natural outcome of this doctrine, such as the elevation and adoration of the consecrated elements. It must not however be supposed that this is the only department of theology in which there has been a gradual approximation towards medieval teaching and practice. Following close upon the revival of the doctrine and ritual of the Mass has been the revival of the Confessional, and the insistence upon theories of Absolution and Penance, which are not primitive, but originated in the thirteenth century.

The Church of England in its authorised Prayer Book recognises the propriety and usefulness, under certain limitations, of private confession to a Priest or minister of God's Holy Word, when any one is unable to satisfy his doubting conscience before coming to Holy Communion, or again when a sick person, perhaps in the prospect of death, feels his conscience troubled with any weighty matter, but it contains no provision for any minute inquiry by the Priest into the circumstances and number of the sins committed by the penitent—and it leaves confession on the part of the penitent wholly voluntary—it contains no such stringent enactments as those of the Lateran and Trent Councils making private confession compulsory at least once a year on pain of terrible spiritual penalties; it nowhere speaks of a Sacrament of Penance. But many of the clergy of the advanced school make Confession to a Priest, where it may be had, necessary to the forgiveness of sin, they enforce it as a qualification for the admission of candidates for Confirmation, they encourage habitual Confession as a rule for the higher spiritual life, they assert the highest views of sacerdotal prerogative. In some Churches Confessional Boxes have been openly erected, though they have been declared illegal by ecclesiastical courts. The revival of the Pre-Reformation Service of the Mass (whether after the old English Use of Sarum or of Rome) and of the



discipline of the Confessional are strongly resented by the great majority of the English people, and are the chief causes which have brought about what is called the "Church Crisis". That Church Crisis is producing an effect on secular politics, which it is difficult to make clearly intelligible to foreign Churchmen living under wholly different conditions. The Church Association, which is the most influential organisation of the ultra-Protestant party in the Church, is appealing for a subscription of twenty thousand pounds to enable it to conduct a campaign for the return to Parliament at the impending new election of the House of Commons of candidates who will pledge themselves to support a Church Discipline Bill inflicting heavy penalties of suspension and subsequent deprivation of benefice on clergy who persist in the observance of all such ceremonies in Divine Worship as have been declared illegal by the highest Courts of the land. 'Protestant Hundreds' have been formed in many constituencies. This political movement is strongest in the North of England; in Liverpool, one of the largest towns there, it has already led to the retirement from candidature of a Cabinet minister, who refusing to comply with the pledge would have no chance of re-election.

I have written thus far in compliance with the wish of the Editor of the *Revue internationale de Théologie*, that I would give its foreign readers some account of the present state of things in the Church of England. I confess that it with some feelings of shame and lamentation that one has to place on record such a narrative of intestine dissension and division, which can only be destructive of true religion, and injurious to the fulfilment of the infinitely more important duties of the Church in the evangelisation of the multitudes of her vast home populations, and of the heathen nations brought within the range of her influence, to say nothing of all the contemporary social problems in the solution of which she ought to take her part. It is sad that, as many think, her foes should be those of her own house. But one thing I venture to maintain is certain. The great majority of the English people, the overwhelming majority of the laity, will never consent to the corporate re-union of the National Church of England with Rome. The nation is thoroughly Protestant at heart. No negotiations of Archbishops and Bishops, or of Convocations, or of



large private associations, will ever effect re-union with Rome, so long as Parliament, the supreme representative of the English people, has the final voice in legislation for the National Church. If the forces of the party within the Church, who, in the interests of an autonomy which would be mainly clerical, are ready to overthrow the Reformation settlement, and of the various Dissenting religious bodies, and of the hostile secularists, laying aside their differences for a time, should combine, they might bring about the Disestablishment and Disendowment of the Church; and it is more than probable that the then Disestablished Church might split into two or three divisions, a disruption which would convulse the country, and only be a triumph for the compact and aggressive Church of Rome. And it is an idle dream to suppose that the Church of Rome will ever abate one jot of its proud pretensions to lordship, or consent to any terms of re-union short of complete surrender. The policy of the present Pope, who has the reputation of being one of the most gentle and sympathetic of any who have occupied his great position, shows the folly of any optimistic expectations of joint deliberations which might issue in a return to the really primitive and catholic doctrine and practice of the Christian Church: for in his letter to the English people Leo XIII. has ignored the very existence of the English Church, he has spoken of England as bereft since the Reformation of that holy faith in which it had rejoiced and found liberty; he has treated Englishmen as if they were heathens, and prays for their return to his Church. England will not be won by such contemptuous treatment. She will not purchase Unity at the price of Truth and Liberty which, spite of all confusions, she gained for herself at the time of the Reformation.

*Oxford.*

Prof. WILLIAM INCE, D. D.

---