---

A table of contents for *The Churchman* can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_churchman_os.php

This is the point which needs to be most strongly insisted upon, and we must ask leave to return to it for a while in a concluding article.

N. DIMOCK.

(*To be continued.*)

## ART. VI.—ENGLISH CHURCH HISTORY:

### A REVIEW OF MR. WAKEMAN'S RECENT BOOK.

NEVER was it more necessary that English Church-people should understand the true history and doctrine of their Church. Perhaps never was there a time when men were more anxious for information upon these two important subjects. How important, then, that seekers after truth should be able with confidence to gratify this most laudable desire! Lately there has been published a new "History of the Church of England." The book covers the whole period of English Church history—from the planting of the Gospel in Britain to the present time. It is clearly and attractively written; it is well printed, and sold at a moderate price. It has already met with a large sale, for within a very short time it has run into a second edition. It is advertised as recommended by bishops, divinity professors, and heads of theological colleges; and within a short time we venture to prophesy it will become a recognised "text-book" of English Church history in High Church theological colleges. It will be required to be "got up" by many candidates for ordination, and it will probably be largely used in the upper forms of some of our public schools.

As far as the giving of mere historical facts are concerned, we have little fault to find with the book. But very few so-called "histories" are content to deal simply with facts. History is rarely written *merely* to give a list of events in purely chronological sequence. Where history is so written it is little read, except by the professed historical student. Such books are not popular, and they do not run into second editions within a few weeks of their publication.

In most histories the facts are presented, and naturally so, from the writer's particular point of view, whether political or religious. The present volume is no exception to this rule. In it, as in many other instances, not only are the facts so given, but the deductions made from those facts, and the reasons given for the sequence of events are biassed by the writer's theological standpoint and predilection to a most

remarkable degree. We know how the relative importance of events and movements may, with the greatest ease, be magnified or diminished. This is especially true when the writing is picturesque, when these events and movements are artistically grouped upon the writer's canvas. But to magnify and diminish at will *out of all due proportion* is not to write history. It may be the part of the advocate or the showman; it is not the office of the historian properly so called.

Let us now turn to Mr. Wakeman's book. After a careful perusal of it, we have no hesitation in saying that a more thoroughly dangerous book it has rarely been our lot to read. A coarse and virulent attack upon evangelical truth carries its own refutation with it; not so a book like this, full of literary art, and therefore pleasant to read—full, too, of learning and of interesting information, and therefore bound to captivate the attention of the reader. But how very few who read such a book have the knowledge requisite to detect the falsity of its deductions, and to guard themselves against the effects of the whole *atmosphere* with which the story is clothed.

The following examples of Mr. Wakeman's method of writing history will, we think, be quite sufficient justification of our strictures. The period of the Reformation is treated in three chapters, entitled "The Royal Tyranny" (xii.), "Growth of Protestant Influences in the Church" (xiii.), and "Alterations in Religion" (xiv.). Between the two last is inserted a long note upon "The Eucharistic Controversy."

The second paragraph in this note reads as follows:

"*The Doctrine of the Real Presence.*—In the early ages of the Church it was held by all Christians, whether orthodox or heretical, that the bread and wine offered and consecrated in the Liturgy, or Service of the Holy Eucharist, were by consecration made to be truly and really the Body and Blood of our Lord Jesus Christ; but as to the manner in which His Body and Blood came to be thus present in the Sacrament nothing was defined or affirmed, except that it was in an ineffable and spiritual manner. This is the doctrine which, according to Anglican theologians, is intended to be taught by the formularies of the Church of England, as reformed in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries."

From the fourth paragraph we read:

"*The Receptionist Doctrine.*—Calvin . . . asserted that the Eucharist was not a mere commemorative rite, but that Jesus Christ did communicate the benefit of His Body and Blood to the soul of the worthy receiver when the bread and wine was received by the mouth. The presence, therefore, became only a subjective presence in the soul of the worthy receiver, and not an objective presence in the Sacrament itself. . . ."

Here we have two doctrines of the Lord's Supper clearly and distinctly stated. But the first is said to be that "according to Anglican theologians intended to be taught by the formularies of the Church of England as reformed in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries." The second is described as the view of Calvin. In the first we have not a hint of the grace or benefit of this Sacrament depending in any way upon the faith or the spiritual condition of the recipient. Were the framers of our articles Anglican theologians? Was Bishop Overall, who drew up the portion of the Catechism, an Anglican theologian? We suppose not. Were Richard Hooker and Daniel Waterland Anglican theologians? Yet from the first we read ("Eccl. Pol.," v. 77, 6), "The real presence of Christ's most blessed body and blood is not, therefore, to be sought for in the Sacrament, but in the worthy receiver of the sacrament." "There is no sentence of holy Scripture which saith that we cannot by this Sacrament be made partakers of His body and blood, except they be first contained in the Sacrament, or the Sacrament converted into them." And Waterland writes in "The Sacramental Part of the Eucharist Explained": "God may co-operate with the elements so as to affect the soul, while they affect the body; but His operation and power, though assistant or concurrent, are not inherent or intermingled, but are entirely distinct; and are as truly extrinsic to the elements as the Deity is to the creature." "Shall we fill the elements with Deity like as our Lord's personal body is filled? A vain thought! . . . Shall we . . . endeavour to enrich the elements with grace-giving or life-giving power? That would be sacrificing the Divine attributes . . . with the additional absurdity of abstracting them from the essence, and placing them in a creature"—an inanimate creature.

The real truth of the case is, that the doctrine described by Mr. Wakeman as the "receptionist" is the doctrine taught by the formularies of the Church of England in her present Prayer-Book. That this is not so we challenge Mr. Wakeman to prove.

In the chapter entitled "The Strengthening of the Church," and which describes the period from the accession of James I. to the final revision of the Prayer-Book, Mr. Wakeman's *rôle* of the advocate and special pleader finds full play. Reviewing the influence of Bishop Andrews, he writes:

"Andrews, with a wise toleration, was content with enforcing upon others a minimum of decency and reverence in public worship, while he claimed for himself the right to set them the example of displaying in his own chapel the full ceremonial system of the Church. The list of altar-furniture which has come down to us shows that the Bishop was

accustomed to use copes and lights and incense, and the mixed chalice and wafer-bread at the celebration of the Holy Eucharist. . . . He forms, therefore, a very strong link between the old and the new state of things in England. The old race of priests ordained before the breach with Rome was hardly extinct before Andrews was himself ordained. The torch of Catholic doctrine and practice had hardly died into embers under the blustering onslaught of Elizabethan Puritanism before it burst forth again into renewed and purified life in the steady hand of Andrews" (pp. 361, 362).

What Mr. Wakeman means by "the new state of things" is made clear four pages later, where we read: "The succession passes on in an unbroken line through the greatest names of the English Church—from Andrews to Laud, and Jeremy Taylor, and Cosin, and Ken, and Butler, to Keble, and Newman, and Pusey, and Church. No one of them had a wider intellectual and moral grasp of her character, or truer loyalty to her principles, than had William Laud" (p. 365). This is a somewhat different estimate of Laud to that of his first employer (James I.), when the Duke of Buckingham asked for him the far-distant bishopric of St. David's. "He hath a restless spirit," said the old King, "which cannot see when things are well, but loves to toss and change . . . take him with you, but, by my soul, you will repent it." It is a very different estimate to that given by J. R. Green, in this respect a most impartial critic, who describes Laud as "cold, pedantic, ridiculous, superstitious," and who further writes that, "The secret offer of a cardinal's hat proved Rome's sense that Laud was doing his work for her."

But it is in the last two chapters of his book, those headed "Methodism and the Evangelical Revival" and "The Oxford Movement," which may be said to form the peroration of Mr. Wakeman's appeal to the potential and incipient young Anglo-Catholics of to-day, that his genius for colouring and special pleading (shall we say for distortion?) rises to its highest point. The Evangelicals are described interpreting the Prayer-Book "in the light of their own prepossessions"; they "cared little for its history and tradition," and "ignored much of its teaching and ritual"; "they put out of sight whole regions of Christian thought and practice which had been common enough in the Church of England since the Reformation"; "the social and corporate duties of religion were forgotten"; "the clergy were merely the ministers of the congregation, and not the stewards of the mysteries of God." Yet, even in the face of all these charges, Mr. Wakeman feels compelled to own that Evangelical Churchmen, "however limited may have been their powers of sympathy

and their intellectual grasp of the Church system," by "the genuine love which they have evinced for the Church of England, and the splendid work among souls which they have done for her, have vindicated their right beyond all question to be her legitimate children." We only wish the same could be said of all her so-called children, and that the proof of the legitimacy of all who claim her bosom as their home was as incontestable.

We pass over such sneers as those contained in the remarks that "the popular clergy almost to a man ranged themselves under the banner of Evangelicalism," and "that to be religious meant . . . to sit under a popular preacher on Sundays," and "to be interested in" foreign missions, and that "their best men . . . set up proprietary chapels in fashionable watering-places," only noticing that the tone of these remarks serves admirably to heighten the contrast between this chapter and the next, in which Mr. Wakeman proceeds to describe "The Oxford Movement."

Here the author evidently feels himself at home and in perfect sympathy with his subject. We are told in triumph that "during the last five-and-twenty years the High Church revival has become the dominant force in the Church of England"; that this movement "sought to take the whole of man and deal with him, not only one portion of him"; that "it recognised that man's capacities are intellectual, moral, æsthetic, social, as well as spiritual and humanitarian"; and that "it strove to show that in the Catholic Church all these capacities found their appropriate home."

From Mr. Wakeman's particular point of view, all these remarks may be justifiable. But we ask in sorrow and amazement, Is any man who professes to write history justified in stating that

"No man has become the weaker for submitting himself to the Oxford Movement. There are many whose moral failure dates from their renunciation of it"? (p. 492).

We should like the author's definition of "weaker" in the first sentence. If the teaching of habitual confession, non-communicating attendance, and of a priestly mediatorship of a class of men between the ordinary man and God, does not tend towards moral weakening, we have indeed read history and experience in vain.

The assertion about "moral failure" demands proof. Has not many a man been led to scoff at religion by assumptions, not always in good taste, of superior sacerdotal power on the part of some not very learned young priest? Has no one been led into staying away from church from seeing its simple, solemn service turned into an ornate spectacle of form and

ceremony, in which, by its intricacies, if by nothing else, he has been prevented from taking part? Has no man left his parish church in sorrow, if not in disgust, when he has witnessed the transformation which has taken place in its services? We think the remark about "moral failure" had, in the interests of Mr. Wakeman's cause, been better omitted.

We have surely extracted sufficient from this work to show that it is at once something more and less than a mere history of the Church of England. We can only say in conclusion that we deeply regret its publication.

W. E. CHADWICK.

# Short Notices.

*The Victory of Christ over Satan.* By the Rev. J. RATE. Pp. 147 Nisbet.

SIX discourses delivered during Lent in Belgrave Chapel, Pimlico, in the year 1845, and now for the first time printed. We think that clergy who intend dealing with such a topic in the coming Lent will do well to purchase this little volume. Practically all that the Scriptures contain on this subject is here presented in suitable order, and without either rhetoric or imaginative interpretations. Beneath the simplicity of language there is evidence of much knowledge, and Note C, dealing with causation, or the relation of mind to matter and force, contains a useful list of quotations from such men as Newton, Herschel, President Edwards, Lord Brougham, etc., and goes to prove that "the laws of nature are the laws which He, in His wisdom, prescribes to His own acts."

*Our Journey to Sinai.* By Mrs. R. L. BENSLY. Pp. 185. R.T.S.

A description of a journey to Mount Sinai to transcribe the Syriac Palimpsest of the Four Gospels previously discovered by Mrs. Lewis and Mrs. Gibson in the Convent of St. Catarina. The brightly-written pages of observant travel will please those who take no interest in the ultimate object of the journey; while students of Biblical manuscripts will value this description of so important a document, and will be glad to have the chief points of Mr. F. C. Burkitt's able paper, read at the Church Congress of 1895, in a permanent form in the last chapter. The excellence of the letterpress and illustrations, the eminent Oriental learning of at least four of the party, and the pathos of Professor Bensly's sudden death, and his wife's blindness so soon after their return, all give this little book a special and merited place of interest among recent publications.

*Jesus the Poet.* By the Rev. J. REID HOWATT. Pp. 279. Price 6s. Elliot Stock.

At the outset we were a little prejudiced against the title. But the author's apology in the preface, and the many striking excellences of his pages, made ample amends. Poetry, we are reminded, is neither rhyme nor metre, but the fit clothing of noble thoughts. The thoughts of Christ are the grandest the world has received, and their verbal raiment is perfect in suitableness. In this volume is presented practically everything in the nature of image, illustration, metaphor, or simile used by our Lord,