

# 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)

draws up the draft for the perusal and correction of the judge, who is responsible for every point of the argument, and for the turn of every expression. It is noteworthy he calls himself *Πέρπος*; St. Paul spoke of him as *Κηφᾶς*; St. James as *Συμεών* (Acts iv. 14).

ROBERT CUST.



#### ART. IV.—THE PROSECUTION OF THE BISHOP OF LINCOLN.

##### A REJOINDER.

**I**T is a serious and perilous thing to criticize the action of the Church Association. You may hold the same Evangelical doctrines. You may be equally attached to the Protestant principles of the Reformed Church of England. You may have devoted your time and dedicated your talents (if you have any) to the promulgation of those doctrines and the maintenance of those principles. You may have stood up boldly at one Church Congress against any approach to reunion with the Church of Rome, as a thing not even to be discussed. At another you may have argued strenuously that laymen are as much spiritual persons as the clergy, and that to “preach the Word” is more effectual for conversion and edification than to celebrate choral or fasting communions. You may, to the extent of your poor ability, have been active in the committee-room or on the platform in the cause of all the distinctly Evangelical Church Societies, and of the Religious Tract Society and Bible Society; but if you have ventured to suggest that a particular course of action taken by the Church Association for the attainment of objects, which you in common with every true Evangelical have at heart, is unwise, and likely to defeat its purpose; and if you have adduced facts and arguments in support of this shocking contention; if, though you pronounce Shibboleth with precisely the same accent as the council of that eminent body, you decline to make war upon those whose intonation is different, why then, indeed, you must “look out for squalls.” All that you have said and done goes for nothing. You are what a moderate drinker is in the eyes of a teetotaler—worse than a drunkard. You have found fault with the action of the Church Association, and must be silenced at any cost. Your arguments will be misrepresented and your language misquoted. Words you never used will be imputed to you in inverted commas. The *English Churchman* will read you out of the Evangelical party. It will open its columns to personal attacks upon you

and your father, and the secretary of the Church Association will circulate a pamphlet, informing all who take the trouble to read it that you are a foolish and ignorant layman, who prays in vain for the teaching of the Holy Spirit! With the fear of such dire consequences before his eyes, it is no wonder that the writer in the *Record* of the following sentiments conceals himself under the signature "A Septuagenian":

I have no sympathy with the Church Association, or with the present or former prosecutions. To give my reasons would require more space than you could allow me. I must simply express my feeling that no good has come or could come from them. Confessedly, in spite of all partial victories, Ritualism is unchecked and confident. It will never be checked by antagonism of this kind. And this partly on the general ground that no body of earnest men, strongly imbued with what seems to them vital principles, can ever be put down by external force; partly, also, because their spiritual instinct rebels against the authority of secular courts in matters spiritual. On this point, and on this only, I regard the Ritualists as having a sound principle on their side.

Before accepting the last paragraph I must have a definition of the word "spiritual." The Ritualist would perhaps define it by "clerical." To my mind converted men, lay or cleric, are spiritual; unconverted men, though ordained or even consecrated, are not. The rest of the paragraph fairly represents my own views, and those, I have good reason to believe, of the great majority of Evangelical Churchmen.

Let me now turn to Mr. Miller's pamphlet, which first appeared in the June number of the *CHURCHMAN*. It is called a reply to Mr. Sydney Gedge's "Attack upon the Church Association;"—a curious misdescription of my article, which contained stronger language against the Bishop of Lincoln than against the Church Association.

Neither Mr. Miller nor the *English Churchman* has taken the trouble to realize the object for which my article was written, or to understand my line of argument. My purpose was to show, first, that the prosecution of the Bishop of Lincoln is a proceeding so mischievous to the Church, that both his lordship who provoked it, and the Church Association which instigates and supports it are greatly to blame; and, next, that the prosecution is a blunder from the point of view of the Association, because it is calculated to have the opposite effect to that desired by the promoters, and to increase rather than diminish Ritualism, and to spread the Romish doctrines of which Ritualism is the exponent.

The object of the prosecution is stated by Mr. Miller himself to be to establish the falsehood of six doctrines which he specifies, all and each of which I repudiate as heartily as he does, and I am conceited enough to believe that "I and my friends *have* an intelligent acquaintance with the existence of

these six-root heresies." And we have also as earnest desire as Mr. Miller has to eradicate them from our beloved Church.

But the question with me was a practical one: Will the prosecution tend to this end? Looking at it from this practical standpoint of utility, I gave my reasons for answering this question in the negative. I set forth, as fairly as space allowed, the considerations which are urged on either side. The illegality of the Bishop's conduct was pointed out and made the subject of severe comment, and he was urged to consider the grave inconsistency of his position as an officer of the Church, who disobeys its laws. The cumulative force of the six or seven practices "circling round the Holy Communion" was duly noted, as well as their direct relation to Romish false doctrine; and I urged that they should be combatted by all lawful methods which were likely to be successful. I approved the aim, the purpose and the principle of the Church Association, and adopted them as my own; but of the means used and the way taken to win the battle, I gave cogent reasons for my disapproval. My contention was, and is, that whatever be the issue of the prosecution, it will neither stop nor diminish Ritualism; and it will not touch the six-root heresies, or any of them. And I showed that if these momentous doctrinal questions be dragged by the Church Association into the fight, if the Ark of God be brought down into such a battle-field, then failure to win the legal conflict about the rites may involve the allowance of the heresies, and the Ark will fall into the hands of the Philistines.

My contention was supported by *à priori* reasoning, based upon the nature of the case, the character and position of the parties, and the effect upon the minds and sympathies of ordinary people of prosecutions of such persons for such offences. This *à priori* reasoning was confirmed by a review *a posteriori* of the results which have followed the series of prosecutions for which the Church Association is responsible.

With this argument neither Mr. Miller nor the *English Churchman* has made any attempt to grapple. Indeed, they seem to me rather to have dipped into the article, and fished up anything they could find disparaging to the Association of which they are the secretary and organ, than to have mastered its scope and purport. Their point of view is marvellous. They seem to care not for the effect of the prosecution upon the Church of England, but for the effect of my article upon the Church Association.

Will my readers bear with me while I deal seriatim with Mr. Miller's principal statements and arguments?

1. He imputes to me the assertion that every one of the doctrines which he declares to be involved in the six points of ritual is true. What I asserted was that the doctrines

now symbolized were, so far as I could ascertain, so and so, and that these doctrines are true. Mr. Miller has not ventured to deny their truth, but he enters into an historical inquiry to show that three hundred years ago other doctrines, not true, were also symbolized. This may be so, but we are dealing with the present time, and with ordinary people. Mine was not an historical inquiry, but a practical investigation into the effect in the nineteenth century of these ritual practices upon the minds of the "men in the street," who have not had occasion to make themselves professionally acquainted with ecclesiastical lore. Taking myself, if I may do so without conceit, as a fairly good specimen of the average worshipper, with regard to knowledge of such matters, my very ignorance of the recondite meanings so plain to Mr. Miller, proves this point of my argument. Further, this part of my manuscript was submitted to two friends—one lay, very high Church; the other an "old-path Evangelical" clergyman, a man of considerable theological learning. Each assured me that my statements were correct as to the doctrines symbolized. Unless Mr. Miller and his council prefer paganism to ritualism, they should follow the example of the Quakers, and consistently write the 5th day of the week, and the 12th day of the 1st month, rather than Thursday, the 12th of January; for does not the last expression recognise two false gods, Thor and Janus? Are we bound as practical men and women to be always searching into the origin of practices which, by themselves, are harmless? Shall the yule-log and the mistletoe be forbidden at Christmas-time because they originally were adjuncts to a feast in honour of Odin? Must we be continually asking questions for conscience' sake? A little more robustness in our Christianity would do it no harm. Let us lay fast hold of essentials, and courageously deal as we please with things of minor importance.

2. Mr. Miller in his pamphlet, and Mr. du Boulay in a letter to the *English Churchman*, accuse me of "the fallacy of isolation." Surely they cannot have read the long paragraph (pp. 454-5) in which I carefully pointed out that it is the circling of all these individually harmless things round the Holy Communion, and their combined significance of reference to the bread and wine upon the Lord's Table, which make them objectionable as converging towards certain false doctrines—Mr. Miller's "root heresies"—which ought to be resisted unto blood. Where is the "fallacy of isolation" here?

3. I have not the time, and can scarcely hope for the space, to track out and expose Mr. Miller's misstatements of my language under his different heads, one to six. I will ask the readers of the *CHURCHMAN* to compare, paragraph by paragraph, what I wrote and what he imputes to me. One instance shall

suffice. As to the sixth charge, that the Bishop cleansed the chalice with wine and water, and drank the wine and water in the face of the congregation, I wrote that anyone ignorant of Church controversies would probably allow the plea that this act was but great carefulness in obeying the directions that "if any of the consecrated wine remain it shall be reverently drunk in the Church." Contrast this with Mr. Miller's version (the italics are mine; they show his ingenuity in misquoting):

That the officiating clergyman should *ostentatiously* drink the *rinsings* of the chalice, *and of his own fingers (over which water is poured lest a crumb or drop of the deified "substance" should adhere to them)*, Mr. Gedge regards as a proof of great carefulness in obeying the direction of the rubric to consume reverently. *What Mr. Gedge*, as a matter of taste, calls "reverent," the Primate of the Northern Province more justly characterized as "disgusting."

Mark the unfairness of Mr. Miller's way of putting it. I might as fairly attribute to him the statement that the bread and wine had become God.

4. With regard to the "grave responsibility incurred" by me in "making rash and inaccurate statements which ought not to be published," I quoted the *ipsissima verba* of Bishop King and Lord Halifax in relation to the matter in question. If these words are "a misrepresentation of their well-known public utterances," the misrepresentation is theirs, not mine, who do not pretend to be acquainted with all their speeches and writings. If Bishop King does teach the six doctrines set out in Mr. Miller's pamphlet, he teaches what I believe to be false. But the present prosecution has nothing to do with them; he may be condemned on every one of the six points of ritual, and yet be free to teach and preach all these root-heresies. Their truth or falsehood will not affect the judgment, or be affected by it.

5. As to the use of the surplice in the pulpit, which I asserted to have been established by the Church Association, justice can only be done to the reasoning and tone of Mr. Miller's reply by giving it at length:

Now, since the dress of the preacher has never been made the subject of litigation or of a judicial decision, this alleged fact would, on the Gedgeian (*sic*) system of "reasoning," go to show that it was the absence of "persecution" which had caused the change; that does not help Mr. Gedge's contention very much.

This is a mere quibble. Few on reading this statement would know that the gist of it lies in the word "preacher," and that Mr. Miller begs the question altogether when he silently assumes that *preaching* is not *ministration*.

In "*Hebbert v. Purchas*," one of "the subjects of litigation and judicial decision" was the vestments of the minister in the administration of the Holy Communion and in other ministra-

tions. The Privy Council, after a careful summary of the arguments on both sides, decided that the cope is to be worn at certain times and in certain places in administering the Holy Communion, and the surplice *in all other ministrations*.

An attempt has been made to get out of this decision by those Church Association men who do not like it, by a contention that preaching is not a ministration; but they have very wisely abstained from submitting this question to the decision of a court of law. And the fact remains that, in consequence of the judgment in "*Hebbert v. Purchas*," a large majority of the Evangelical clergy have shown their loyalty to the law as apparently laid down by the Privy Council and wear the surplice in the pulpit. "Old-path Evangelicals" have done this at the request of their Evangelical bishops, in order to set to the other side an example of obedience to the law. Thus my assertion was true that the action of the Church Association against Mr. Purchas has established the use of the surplice in the pulpit.

6. Next comes the most astounding of all Mr. Miller's charges. My statement that the Church Association has "obtained from the highest courts the declaration that it is lawful to affirm three specified definite propositions," is enlarged by Mr. Miller into a general statement that it is lawful to affirm "Mr. Bennett's doctrines," and characterized as "an extraordinary statement for a lawyer to make, showing a want of candour and fairness in a gentleman who *professes* Evangelical principles." My statement was true; the Court of Appeal did decide what I said it did, and I quoted the precise words of the judgment. "But," says Mr. Miller, "the judge of the *inferior* Court was brother-in-law of Archdeacon Denison!" and "Mr. Gladstone had pitchforked two brand-new judges into the Court of Appeal within a week of the trial."

Well done, Mr. Miller! This out-Herod's Herod! The Ritualists make to the decisions of Lord Penzance and of the Privy Council the respectable objection that they are secular courts meddling with spiritual matters; but it is reserved for the secretary of the Church Association to object to a decision which he dislikes, of a Court to which he has himself appealed, and to stigmatize as unfair and uncandid a dry statement of the fact that the decision was given, because of the family relationship of one judge and the recent elevation to the Bench of two others. An Irish M.P. declaiming against two resident magistrates as creatures of Mr. Balfour is comparatively reasonable. Nor is Mr. Miller more happy in his next sarcasm at the poor lawyer whom he is refuting. He imputes to me this dictum: that "a verdict of not proven means the pronouncing lawful everything charged against the person acquitted, as though one murderer acquitted proves the lawful-

ness of murder." Not so, Mr. Miller! Mr. Bennett *was* proved to have affirmed the propositions which I quoted, and it was decided that those propositions were not contrary to law. The exact analogy is rather as follows: Mr. Miller was proved to have shot a man who was burglariously entering his house by night, and the court decided that this was not murder, but justifiable homicide. Therefore, it has been decided to be lawful to shoot a man who is entering your house burglariously by night; but it has not been decided that murder is lawful.

The force of my article in no way depended upon the name, position, reputation, or character of the writer. It might have been published anonymously with the motto of the writer of "Imitatio Christi." "Ne quis hoc dixerit sed quid dicatur attendas," and its effect would have been the same. I have no pretence to authority in such matters. I give the reasons for my opinion: let them be weighed and their proper value ascertained. The Church Association paid a high compliment to my article when they set to work, through their organ in the press (the *English Churchman*), and their secretary, Mr. Miller, to run down the writer. They faithfully followed the instructions given to the defendant's counsel: "No case; abuse the plaintiff." My article was to be "read between the lines," my private friendships exposed, and my dark designs and sinister conspiracies dragged to light!

"A Watchman" wrote in the *English Churchman* (May 16): "It is well known in London that Mr. Sydney Gedge and certain of his co-advocates of concession have *intimate, personal, and official relationship* with the Archbishop of Canterbury and the Bishop of Rochester. Mr. Sydney Gedge and his Grace are old schoolfellows. Since his Grace's accession to the See of Canterbury those relations, I am informed, have become more intimate than ever." The Protestant readers of the *English Churchman* are then warned of the plot to traitorously surrender to the Ritualists which these prelates, and Mr. Gedge and his friends, had concocted, but this "Watchman" had discovered and revealed. On the 23rd May I replied that this "well-known" story was a pure fiction. Note this "Watchman's" apology (*English Churchman*, May 30): "I call attention to the words 'and certain of his co-advocates of concession'—words which Mr. Sydney Gedge has overlooked. I was well aware that he alone had no official connection, and did not intend to imply it." Need I waste any words in further exposing the misstatements of such a mendacious writer as this "Watchman"?

Mr. Miller brings a more serious charge against me. He asserts that at every crisis at which the Church has had to cope with her enemies I have been found a consistent supporter of

compromise with error, in order to save the Establishment. This is about as cruel an accusation as could be brought against a Christian man. No honest man would make it, unless he believed it to be true, nor would he believe it to be true unless he knew facts to justify his belief. I, therefore, in the July CHURCHMAN, challenged Mr. Miller to send me a statement of these facts, that it might be published with my reply. He has refused to do so! I am left to grope in the dark, aided by such light as the "Watchman" gives me, and I have thus reason for believing that he referred to my action as a member of the committee of the Church Missionary Society.

There have been four great questions upon which that committee (*quorum pars fui*) have adopted a line of policy, which has been strenuously opposed by those of its members who are more or less identified with the Church Association. They are as follows:

1. The Society's general relation to the High Church Bishops, such as the Bishops of Lincoln or Bombay.
2. Its particular relations with the Bishop of Colombo.
3. Its taking part in the endowment of the Bishopsrics in Japan and Jerusalem.
4. The service in St. Paul's Cathedral last year after the unveiling of the reredos.

With regard to (1), The principle upon which the great majority of the committee acted is that principle which I, for one, imbibed from the teaching of that "Old Path Evangelical," Henry Venn; viz., that we are a Church society, bound to be loyal to Church principles and Church laws, that we deal with bishops as officers of the Church, and must treat them officially, all alike, whatever may be their peculiar views. We do not alter our principles or our practice to suit the taste of any bishop, and if a bishop likes to come to us and accept office on our own terms, we give him his official position, and do not go behind his acceptance of it.

(2). The same principles guided our conduct towards the Bishop of Colombo. The bishop of a diocese in which we have missions is a *fact* with which we have to deal. We cannot, if we would, do away with him or ignore him. We go to his lordship for episcopal ministrations, and ask him to ordain and license our missionaries, and to confirm our candidates, etc., and then, when he attempts to exercise episcopal supervision and authority, are we to snap our fingers in his face, on the ground that he has no coercive jurisdiction? Such conduct would be a sin and a blunder. Though the courts of law and the policeman might not enforce the bishop's authority, he would have at his back the whole weight of the entire ecclesiastical system of the Church of England. If we had treated the Bishop of Colombo

in the manner which a few ardent spirits desired, our missions in Ceylon must have been abandoned, and the Bishop, who now welcomes our missionaries with both hands and assists their work, would have been confirmed in the belief with which he entered his diocese, that the sooner they were got rid of the better for the cause of the Christian Church.

(3). Similarly with regard to the bishoprics in Japan and Jerusalem. The committee agreed to pay a part of the incomes of these bishops, although the selection was in the hands of the Archbishop of Canterbury. By so doing they established a strong moral claim to the appointment of a man who would not impede their work, and they helped to pay for services which their work required. A shabby refusal to contribute would have placed their missionaries in a most invidious and painful position towards the Bishop under whose overseership they are placed alike by the voice of the Church and the laws of the Society.

These three questions had certainly no connection with the maintenance of the Establishment. With regard to the reredos—whose removal from St. Paul's would give me great joy—it seems very hard that the Church Missionary Society should be so abused for holding a service in its presence, when the Bible Society did the same without rebuke. Apart from other reasons for not countermanding the service at the last moment, it seemed to me clear that if we refused to hold it in the nave because of the reredos in the chancel, we must consistently decline to allow our young Islington men to be ordained in the chancel, kneeling down in the very front of all the statues or graven images upon the reredos. Evidently the result would have been that they must have gone out to the mission-field unordained, and not improbably would have failed to obtain ordination there.

Such were among the practical considerations which guided an overwhelming majority of the committee after frequent prayer and anxious deliberation to the decision to which they came; and I thank God they have no reason to be dissatisfied with the result. An abundant blessing has followed them both at home and abroad. Salisbury Square is still the centre of the best evangelical influence, and from that centre the circle is enlarging and the circumference expanding. More numerous and better qualified candidates come forward; larger sums are poured into the treasury. Our principles remain the same as those of our founders; our practice, if there be a change, is not quite so "churchy" as theirs; our reports breathe the same spirit, and show each year increasing results. To God be all the glory.

I am nearly at the end of my task, but one thing more remains

to be said. Mr. Miller claims that his association has for many years been the only motive force for Protestantism in the Church, and charges that "Mr. Sydney Gedge and his friends" have not done one single thing to resist Ritualism and the root-heresies. Taking that expression "Mr. Gedge and his friends" to mean those Evangelicals who have not joined the Church Association—with some few notable exceptions, such as my late dear friend, Edward Auriol—I claim that we have done more to prevent the spread of Romish doctrines, and its outward expression in Ritualism than all the prosecutions instituted by the Church Association. I specify two things.

1. Despite the disloyal, but, thank God, the unsuccessful attempts of some of the leading members of the Church Association to break up the Church Missionary Society, we have doubled its income and its work.

2. We have also founded the two theological halls—Wycliffe Hall, at Oxford, and Ridley Hall at Cambridge, where many of the choicest of University graduates have received at the hands of Canon Girdlestone and Mr. Handley Moule such sound Biblical and religious instruction as has, by God's blessing, so permeated their minds and filled their hearts as to leave no room for Sacerdotalism, Ritualism, or Latitudinarianism. These heresies do not flourish in parishes or missions where clergymen trained at Wycliffe, at Ridley, or at the Church Missionary College in Islington, teach, preach and exhort. We have done what we could, and could have done much more if the large sums lavished on the cost of prosecutions had been spent in assisting these good works, and if the Evangelical cause had not suffered so sorely from the bitter spirit and intolerance of the leaders of the Church Association towards all who differ from them. It may be that that body comprises all the ninety-nine sheep which went not astray. Does that justify them in hounding every sheep that has wandered from the fold into the remoter wilderness? Would it not be better, by the display of a little of the Christian forbearance and love that thinketh no evil and rejoiceth not in iniquity, to tempt the sheep back into the fold, than to lock the door against it, and to treat as a goat any sheep which has a little pity and would fain make the way easy for the wanderer's return?

What said the great Missionary Apostle? "Some, indeed, preach Christ of contention, not purely, imagining that they add affliction to my bonds. What, then, except that in every way, whether in pretence or in truth, Christ is preached: and in this I rejoice, yea, and will rejoice!" St. Paul reprov'd error and demonstrated the truth: but he overlooked the wrong in his joy that the Gospel of Christ was proclaimed. May we Evangelicals have grace to do the same!

SYDNEY GEDGE.