

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/robbadshaw>

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

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

Cardinal of York was one of ignorance, superstition, immorality, and priestly tyranny.

Here and there, we observe, Professor Brewer has made a mistake, and Mr. Gairdner (of whose editorial notes we should have been glad to see some more) gives the needful correction. For instance, in vol. ii. p. 218, we read, "The divorce, if Pole may be trusted, was suggested by the Boleyns and their advisers; and if Cranmer was one of them," a summary process would have been preferred. Again, p. 223, Mr. Brewer writes that "the Boleyns seemed to have been chiefly guided by Cranmer." The editor proves, however, that the "chaplain of my lord of Rochford" referred to, was Barlow.

ART. IV.—THE NORTHERN CONVOCATION AND THE DIACONATE.

THE long dark lane has reached its "turning," and that one from whence we seem to discern daylight at the end. The Diaconate is at last declared open. So sounded the silver trumpet of the Upper House of the Southern Convocation, which now finds its exact echo in a united session of the Northern. Indeed, the report of the Committee on this great question in the latter may be said to have given the key-note to both resolutions; which we observe with thankfulness to have been unanimous. So widespread is the conviction that the pressing needs of the Church, whatever else they may require in the way of Lay agency, require beyond dispute this—the relief of our overburdened clergy by the increase of ministrations within the Sanctuary. Nor is this conviction the less remarkable because it has been reached by slow degrees, and, notwithstanding side-winds, by a growing harmony among men of different schools of thought. From the veteran Bishop of Winchester, who for thirty years has advocated such an enlargement of the Diaconate, to the Dean of Ripon and Canon Jackson, the Nestor of the movement at York, there is positively no difference of view, even as regards the details of this proposal.

Another noticeable feature in the conclusion is (as Dean Fremantle observed), that it was arrived at in the Southern Upper House *indirectly*, through a preliminary conference in London between the Committees of the two Convocations. These met, indeed, on the Diaconate; but merely as a part, and, in the eyes of many of the Southern Committee, a very secondary part, of a larger scheme of Readers. Yet the result

was, to the surprise of all, a *unanimous* verdict in the Upper House in favour of the Extended Diaconate; whereas certain points in the Reader scheme were hotly contested on legal and other grounds, and left virtually undecided. The secret of this preference lies, as we must believe, in the simplicity as well as unimpeachable orthodoxy of the resolution on the Diaconate. It will be seen by examining¹ its cautious phraseology that it asks for no change in the law, but simply urges upon the Bishops the necessity of exercising their inherent right, and opening wider the doors of admission, so that volunteers or senior men of established character and approved spiritual gifts may be no longer debarred from responding to that call to the ministry which may have come to them at whatever age; nor tempted by the undue restrictions of our Church to drift away (as the Dean of Ripon forcibly put it) to the voluntary evangelizing agencies of Nonconformity.

Again, while explicit and emphatic on the overwhelming need of an increased Diaconate, the resolution abstains from defining too closely either the "other means of living," or the "competent knowledge of Holy Scripture, of the Book of Common Prayer, and of theology in general;" thus leaving it entirely to the discretion of the individual Bishop what modicum of learning he will require, and whether he discards (as would the Bishop of Newcastle) the man secularly employed, or admits him, as would the Bishop of Durham, who has never objected on principle to the secular avocation,² and, moreover, pledges himself (a most graceful concession) to a loyal carrying out of the Extension.

We propose briefly to review the debate at York; and then

¹ The text of the Resolution is as follows :

"That this House is of opinion that, in view of the overwhelming need of increase in the number of the Ministry, and the impossibility of providing sufficient endowments for the purpose, it is expedient to ordain to the office of Deacon men possessing other means of living, who are willing to aid the clergy gratuitously; provided that they be tried and examined according to the Preface to the Ordinal, and in particular be found to possess a competent knowledge of the Holy Scriptures, of the Book of Common Prayer, and of theology in general; provided also that they be in no case admitted to the Priesthood unless they can pass all the examinations which are required in the case of other candidates for that office, and that they shall have devoted their whole time to spiritual labour for not less than four years, unless they are graduates before they present themselves for these examinations."

² See, for instance, *THE CHURCHMAN*, vol. vii., p. 351. In his Charge, Bishop Lightfoot said: "I do not see how I can find fault with the pursuit of secular avocations in the Ministers of a Church whose chief Apostle was a tentmaker. Precedents in later ages are sufficiently frequent to justify this combination of the spiritual office with the secular work."

draw some practical deductions as regards the future working of the measure.

The subject had been so thoroughly talked out on previous occasions that little of novelty could be expected on the affirmative side. Nevertheless, the Bishop of Manchester, who, as chairman of the Joint Committee, presented its report on Lay Readers and the Diaconate, brought out in strong relief, as against the Southern scheme of a superior class of Lay Readers, the conviction of the York delegates, that no such Readers could fully meet the present necessities of the Church. As to the proposed appendix to that scheme, which would allow these Laymen to officiate in consecrated buildings, his Committee judged it "neither legal nor desirable." Deacons alone can do Deacons' work; and more Deacons, therefore, whether *in transitu* or in permanence, were urgently required. The pressure followed us up to the Holy Table, where, as he had himself found this last Easter, the clergy fell lamentably short in proportion to the communicants. Many an over-worked priest will echo the truth of the Bishop's remark. Indeed, there is hardly a stronger argument for increasing the staff of clergy, *i.e.*, for ordaining more Deacons, than this. Multiply Readers as you will, they do but make the more work for the Ministry proper. A successful Mission near London, conducted by a gifted Layman (we write with a case in view), sends up Sunday after Sunday its one hundred communicants to the parish church. In other words, that Layman and his faithful band increase the work of the Sanctuary to the extent of another Deacon. Why should not he himself be the man? Then, by the simple expedient of allowing him Deacon's Orders, this godly Reader would minister the Word of Life and the Cup of Salvation to his own converts within the holy walls, and strengthen the drooping hands of the parish clergy, while he himself would go forth to his out-door labours, not only an Evangelist, but, like Philip of Caesarea, a Deacon-Evangelist, how greatly strengthened by the laying-on of hands!

In view of this obvious and sacred fact, we almost shrink from recording one Bishop's counter-opinion expressed at York; namely, that such a man would be weakened, *quād* no longer Layman, in his influence with the world. Familiar enough is the proverb, "Example better than precept." But there is something novel, not to say startling, in the prejudication, "Lay example and ministration better than Ordained." Fancy the early Church thus arguing with respect to an Origen! and yet the Laity in the Church needed then, fully as much as now, the godly example of the Layman.

In this connexion—although three other speakers inter-

vened—we prefer to notice next the speech of the Dean of Ripon. Strongly and clearly in favour of the Extension, he advocates it chiefly on this ground, that Ordination alone can meet the present need, and that to propose other than spiritual persons, lawfully called and sent, for the work of the Sanctuary, argues a want of confidence alike in Holy Orders and in the Divine call. “If we believe,” he asks, “in a Divine call to the office of the Ministry, why restrict this gracious work of the Holy Spirit to men under thirty or forty years of age? In the mysterious and sovereign providence of God, men may be chosen and called to the office at thirty-five, forty-five, or even after fifty years of age; and there seems to be no reason why they should not undertake the work of a Deacon, and do it well, better probably than their juniors; going forth in many cases as went St. Paul, taking nothing of the Church. And in virtue of having thus solemnly received the outward sign and seal of their holy call, they will experience a sympathy of brotherhood and social equality, fencing them alike against mutual rivalries and against temptations to assume an independent attitude, to which the licensed Layman would be far more exposed.”

A lively episode in the debate on the first day was the passage of arms between the Bishop of Liverpool and Canon Trevor. The former, strange as it may appear, is so afraid of the risks involved in having “Deacons and Deacons,” that he prefers, as an alternative, an order of Subdeacons. This, as the Canon caustically remarked, would be to add an order to the unalterable threefold Ministry, and that not only an unscriptural order, but a Popish order. Beyond doubt, the medieval Subdeacon was (to quote the able appendix to the Report of the Exeter Conference) a “mere ritualistic accessory” in the Roman Church, “bearing the chalice and the dish at Mass.” The Bishop’s vulnerable point was obvious. His Subdeacons were a well-meant contribution; but, like the white tents and horses of Rhesus bringing succour to beleaguered Troy, they were too conspicuous. And the Canon, like another Diomed, pounced upon them by the way:

*Ardentesque avertit equos in castra, priusquam
Pabula gustassent Trojæ, Xanthumque bibissent.*

Canon Tristram, resuming the debate, saw no reason, from the law of the Church or the land, why the Diaconate should not be permanent in some, and in others a transitory office on the way to the Priesthood. The House should encourage and urge the Bishops to admit to Holy Orders men who possessed great spiritual qualifications and gifts, but who were unable to devote their whole time to the work. He maintained that no

such entire self-devotion was demanded by the Church of the Deacon, as it is of the Priest. In Syria and Armenia he had himself seen the clergy following the plough's tail. And in the Middle Ages, if a Deacon's stipend did not amount to so many nobles, he might adopt some other calling, provided that he did not set his mind on filthy lucre. This speaker's valuable suggestion, that the oversight of these Deacons would be a "splendid archidiaconal function," would, if adopted, be a real relief to the Bishops under their increased responsibilities, as well as a fit revival of ancient practice *pari passu* with that of the primitive Diaconate itself.¹

The President, the Archbishop of York, though not very sanguine as to its producing any very great results, could not obstruct, or vote against, a resolution unanimously adopted by Canterbury. He foresaw difficulties, but none beyond such as the Bishops were well able to guard against. Even the repeal of an Act of Parliament, forbidding Deacons to trade, needed only to be asked of the Legislature. And as to the scholarship required of Deacons in examination, it was nothing very appalling, nor in itself decisive of the bad or the good parish clergyman.

In welcoming this powerful voice, which has at last spoken and not against us, we rejoice especially in his supplementary observations next day on the subject of Lay Readers. Then his Grace distinctly denied the right of any Upper Reader, licensed or unlicensed, to invade by preaching or ministering the services of the Church, which are limited to Deacons and Priests. Very soon, were such encroachment permitted, would the congregation begin to think it did not matter whether a man was ordained or not. For the necessary result of putting a very zealous Layman alongside an average curate in the Church would be to obliterate the respect at present felt for Holy Orders. Moreover, the thing was illegal. Here the Archbishop emphatically pronounced in favour of Sir Fitz-James Stephens' opinion, given by Mr. Sydney Gedge in *THE CHURCHMAN* of last September. The Twenty-third Article, he said, taken in connexion with the terms of the Ordinal, clearly limited the "lawful calling and sending" to Ordination; and as clearly implied that none but Deacons or Priests could preach or minister in churches. Nothing short of some fresh power and an essential alteration of the Act of Uniformity, even as it now stands, could effect an enlargement. What is this (our readers will remark) but an indirect acceptance of

¹ The Archdeacon's office of old bore a special relation to deacons and their oversight. He was also the Bishop's immediate minister and attendant.

the *only enlargement possible in the functions of God's House*—an Enlargement or Extension of the Diaconate?

The Bishop of Durham was the next speaker. For many months his attitude towards the question has been by no means easy to understand. More avowedly in favour of the principles of the measure than many even of its supporters, he has, nevertheless, held aloof from it in undisguised mistrust of its expediency. It now appears that he views it as a bar to the development of the ministerial agencies of the Church in the direction of Lay-help. "He feared that, if the House allowed itself to be absorbed in the one idea of the Diaconate, it would be only following a will-o'-the-wisp, and neglecting a real substantial improvement in our Church organization." Next day he repeated this argument. "The great need of the English Church was to employ Laymen as Laymen: this would enable them to realize that they were members of a Royal Priesthood. And to this end, while he suspended his opinion on 'the legality,' he could not doubt 'the desirability' of admitting Readers to conduct services within the walls of churches." In other words, the multiplication of clergy, who shall minister by virtue of their Ordination, is not to be pressed, for fear of discouraging Christian Laymen from exercising their Royal Priesthood in the same indoor ministrations! Surely here is anti-sacerdotalism pushed to its furthest limits—not to add, quasi-sacerdotalism. It takes away our breath almost, in this jealous claim on behalf of the laity, to hear the unconscious echo of that ancient plea for encroaching on the most sacred functions—"Seeing all the congregation are holy, every one of them."

A safer theology will render to all their dues; and while affording full and free scope to Lay Readers and other authorised Church-workers in their labours of love and out-door ministrations, will reserve the sacred precincts for the Deacons and Priests, as distinguished from all "insacra*ti* ministri."

We cannot protest too earnestly against all confusions between the properly Lay and the properly Clerical functions in our Church. And this on two grounds: (1) Because never since the days of Origen, that eminently gifted Reader, has the Church countenanced any such claim of Laymen to preach and minister in the congregation, as would tend to confuse men's minds on the great principle of Holy Orders.¹ "We have no such custom, neither the Churches of God." And (2)

¹ Unless the Readers mentioned in the instructions of Archbishop Parker be an exception; the well-meant expedient of disturbed times when many parish churches would otherwise have been shut up, for lack of clergy.

Because the real Diaconate—that one only door through which the ranks of the clergy can be reinforced and the pressure of work inside our churches relieved—is embarrassed by this extravagant claim for the laity, while it is obscured in the eyes of the laity as the one true field in which they might aspire to exercise the higher spiritual ministrations. Not indeed but that the Lay Churchman's instinct is true and strong against treading upon holy ground; but the diversion of thought is unfortunately inopportune just now. Surely the advocates of the Diaconate, who have carefully piloted that Apostolic measure for so many years and through so many perils, have the most reason to be jealous. A counter wind is never more trying than when all hands are on deck in sight of harbour.

The Dean of Chester supported the resolution on the ground of ecclesiastical consistency. Its adoption would be a recurrence to the principles of the Primitive Church, and would tend to bind together clergy and laity, as also to drain Dissent of much that constituted its present strength. His sanguine belief that, if we returned to the principles of the Early Church, we might expect God's fullest blessing on our efforts, ought to be shared by all who apply the teaching of the Acts in simple faith to our modern times and necessities. "Would we strengthen our cords and lengthen our stakes, we must throw ourselves unreservedly on the lines laid down for the Church by the Holy Ghost." Such was in effect the utterance of a Colonial Bishop, who had himself worked with encouraging success the revived Diaconate.

Canon Jackson, who was called upon for the last word, anticipated the unanimous acceptance of the measure with a hearty expression of thankfulness that he had lived to see this issue of so many years of prayer; and with his own peculiar felicity in combining the practical with the spiritual, he observed that during the three years which had elapsed since he had been deputed by his Diocesan Conference¹ to bring the subject before Convocation, a million souls had been added to the population, and he should like to know whether there had been anything like an adequate increase in the number of the Clergy. In other words, while we have been arguing and hesitating, to the astonishment of the freer colonial mind, about this revival of the Diaconate, such has been the recent growth of our home population that we have needed about 150 fresh clergymen a year, *i.e.* about three a week, to cope with it (to

¹ This was in consequence of an able and convincing paper on the subject, read at the Ripon Conference at Leeds, 1880, by Rev. C. H. Sale, Vicar of Kirby-on-the-Moor, Boro'bridge.

say nothing of colossal arrears).¹ A large reinforcement indeed! We can only hope, with the Canon, that the need will be promptly reduced by a wisely chosen and able contingent of volunteers.

Convocation at least has now cleared itself from the charge of having kept a door locked which ought long ago to have been opened. For this important issue our Church has great reason to render thanks to her Supreme Head, who "keeps her by His perpetual mercy."

We would now draw some practical deductions.

I. *To the Bishops* the Church of England owes, a special vote of gratitude, for upon the Bishops (as the advocates of this plan have been fully aware) will devolve no slight anxiety, burden, and responsibility. Yet it is a burden which, if we refer to Apostolic precedent, no shoulders but theirs should or can bear. Into their ears the cry has long gone up, telling of neglected multitudes and overburdened clergy; and many of the latter at least are now rejoicing in this unexpectedly near prospect of relief. An Episcopal consensus was the first thing absolutely needed to make the scheme workable. For while it was taken up by one Bishop and ignored by his neighbour, the Deacon, accepted on the understanding that he should for some years at least go no higher, would sometimes be tempted to cross the border both of his diocese and his bond. The real problem, said the President at York, was to get the Bishops strictly to bind themselves not to ordain to the priesthood Deacons admitted by their right reverend brethren under special circumstances. We presume that this reciprocal engagement will now obtain on the Bench. Thus an exodus from one diocese into another will be prevented, such as hampered the experiment in the hands of Bishop Philpotts, thirty years ago. Not that we can for one moment admit the Archbishop's parenthesis, that the experiment at Exeter was "a complete failure." Individual failures there may have been among the Deacons ordained by that Bishop under pledge to remain such for a period of years. But the palmary example of the African Bishop, Edmund Steere—who but for the bold venture at Exeter would never have entered holy orders—must for ever redeem that "extension of the Diaconate" from the charge of failure.

In addition to the loyalty to the measure which the Bishop of Durham has so freely promised, and which we may predicate of all his right reverend brethren, the Church may fairly hope

² In Leeds alone, said Canon Jackson, there was one parish of 12,000, another of 8,000, and another of 6,000, the Incumbents of which were unable to obtain help from any society whatever.

that they will not be too rigorous in the requirement of Latin scholarship, knowledge of the Fathers, and minute theology from men of age and position, well-versed in Holy Scripture, and possessing undoubted spiritual gifts. A man's Latin may be rusty, while the power of teaching and preaching, due perhaps in some degree to that Latin grounding, may be still at its height. We gather from the wording of the Resolution that the stricter test both of theology and scholarship will now be, where it ought always to have been, at the entrance to the Priesthood. The Bishop of Durham's observation in his Charge, that he usually found men better prepared at the first than at the second examination, is in itself a striking proof of the abeyance and all but effacement of the true Diaconate. Their Deacon's year is so oppressed with duties properly belonging to the Priest's office, that they have no time for reading. This overpressure will be lightened by the multiplication of Deacons; for while some will remain in that Order all their lives, others will eventually, after four or more years, go on to the Priesthood, the first stile having been eased to them, and a longer space of preparation authorised before the second. But the preliminary *easing* is a *sine quâ non*, whatever the amount of extra caution in selection it may entail on recommending Vicar and ordaining Bishop. Men of age and social standing will shrink from the risk of being "plucked" on the ground possibly of imperfect acquaintance with Church History or the Fathers. The Latin test—necessarily imposed by Canon 34 in days when *conversing* in Latin (they must often have been the dog-days) was adopted during examination—will now become a slight, or an evanescent quantity for such candidates; while Canon 35, "on the Examination of Ministers," will amply cover the case of senior or professional men. Not but what there are numbers of these last whose knowledge of the Greek and even of the Hebrew Scriptures can compete with that of the most advanced candidates for Holy Orders. But the measure, to be thoroughly effective, must of course cover the widest possible field.

II. *The Clergy*.—This unanimous verdict of Convocation will be followed, we trust, in some instances by an authoritative request, by way of Bishops' Pastoral to the Clergy, to "look out men of honest report," who may be ordained to the Diaconate. In other cases there will be a tacit understanding that the way is open to the clergy thus to recommend candidates. It is of supreme importance that they should nominate, for their earliest experiment at least, only men of the first position in spiritual and social gifts. The Bishop of Durham's latest apprehension—the risk, namely, of the gratuitous volunteer lapsing into an acceptor of guineas, must be scrupulously

avoided. For though, as a general principle, the workman is worthy of his hire, here is a plain call to relieve the pressure on the Church by making the Gospel, so far as possible, without charge. And the men singled out as pioneers should be, at all events in the first stage of the experiment, raised alike above the practice and above the need of remuneration. Former failures, if indeed they can be substantiated, were in all probability due to incaution of this kind in the selection. In this new start the primary rule should be, "Fiat experimentum de corpore *non vili*." "It is true," writes the Vicar of Ilkley, "that to the Diaconate only do we propose to admit men who have received a less elaborate classical and theological education than is expected from Presbyters. But we do not propose, at least at present, to admit men below the rank of the existing clergy. So far from lowering the prestige of the clergy, we would have it elevated by the elevation of the Diaconate to its true position in the Church."

III. *The Laity.*—Our chief appeal must be to the faithful laity, not to let this open door remain ineffectual for lack of applications. Some few, it may be feared, will be attracted by a prospect of being allowed in these days of latitude to minister as Laymen in the congregation. But the majority will have almost as great a reluctance to undertake such ministering as to be ministered to. Numbers of them are as fully convinced as any clergyman, who has learnt rightly to "magnify his office," that in this lies a sacred reality of commission, as distinct from a mere Episcopal License as the seal of the Ordaining Spirit is from every human charter. If their labours have been blessed already among the streets and lanes of the city, or in the wide outskirts of the large rural parish, *à fortiori* will they be blessed when the "gift is in them," and they minister side by side with the other clergy at the Lord's Table and in the congregation. If their Royal Priesthood, in virtue of their realized baptism, has been accepted, how much more, when they have been enabled "to make full proof of their ministry" in a sacred Order! Now, then, is their opportunity to prove the truth of their convictions, to their own blessing and that of the Church they love. Centuries have passed by since any field so rich as this has ever been opened to the faithful labourer of Christ. Centuries may roll on before any such opening occurs again, if the gate now just ajar be not pushed wide against the accretions of disuse which still encumber it.

Misgivings will naturally arise—fears of unworthiness or unfitness—doubts of scholastic capability—a certain strangeness of feeling in modifying fixed secular habits and associations; but the Church looks to her Laymen for this sacrifice

of self to her highest needs; many a hard-worked Vicar's voice will be at their ear, "Come with us and do us good;" while above all the Master's voice will be heard (dare we doubt it?), "Who will go for us?" and for love of souls, and from a strong desire to put in the sickle to His harvest, the response will be ready, "Here am I; send me."

JACKSON MASON.

ART. V.—OUR SUNDAY SCHOOLS.

THE purest gold has its alloy, and the brightest light throws the deepest shadow. The same law attaches to our best and holiest works, and Sunday Schools are no exception to the rule.

Sunday Schools, with their 5,200,776 children and 593,427 teachers, in this country alone, exclusive of those which belong to Roman Catholic Schools, stand high among the most potent agencies for good in the whole Church. They give to those who occupy the higher grade of society an opportunity to consecrate their own better education, and a noble work to do for Christ, to the good of others, and no less to their own great benefit—for it is truly said that we know nothing as we ought to know it till we teach it, and the promise is sure, "he that watereth shall be watered also himself." They bring the rich and poor into a happy and intimate relationship, and they give a pleasant and easy access to the homes, and an influence over the hearts, of the whole working population of the country. And, more directly, they place the minds of children, at the time when they are most malleable, in a very attractive way, under the power of refinement, love, and truth.

Blessed and owned and honoured of God, however, as are our Sunday Schools, they bear the stamp of a fallen world, and they carry their own special dangers and abuses. But that would be no garden of the **LORD** into which no evil found an entrance, and therefore we may be glad, and accept it as a token for good, and thank God, that Sunday Schools are not free from attendant dangers. Nevertheless, the injurious consequences are real, and demand careful consideration.

The first evil to which Sunday Schools are subject lies in the question, Do they not practically supersede, or at least interfere with, the highest duty of the parents of the children whom we instruct? For what are the results? The parents are deprived of a very high motive to read and study the Bible themselves; and one very strong reason why they should