



Durham E-Theses

Authority in liberal catholic Anglicanism

Daykin, Timothy Elwin

How to cite:

Daykin, Timothy Elwin (1980) *Authority in liberal catholic Anglicanism*, Durham theses, Durham University. Available at Durham E-Theses Online: <http://etheses.dur.ac.uk/8066/>

Use policy

The full-text may be used and/or reproduced, and given to third parties in any format or medium, without prior permission or charge, for personal research or study, educational, or not-for-profit purposes provided that:

- a full bibliographic reference is made to the original source
- a [link](#) is made to the metadata record in Durham E-Theses
- the full-text is not changed in any way

The full-text must not be sold in any format or medium without the formal permission of the copyright holders.

Please consult the [full Durham E-Theses policy](#) for further details.

ABSTRACT

AUTHORITY IN LIBERAL CATHOLIC ANGLICANISM

Timothy Elwin Daykin

The Anglican view of authority, set out in her more recent official documents, owes much to the influence of liberal catholicism; more especially to that of the generation younger than Gore who had themselves been influenced by the concept of authority espoused by certain Roman Catholic modernists.

Radical movements in philosophy, literature, and science during the eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries created a climate of suspicion and doubt. By the mid-nineteenth century the accepted view of authority within Anglicanism could no longer sustain the weight placed upon it by the effects of these movements.

Liberal catholicism emerged in the 1880's with a view of authority which allowed a certain liberality for the exploration of new ideas without compromise to the historic and catholic basis of Anglicanism.

Within Roman Catholicism the modernist Tyrrell was opposing the official concept of authority which imposed upon the faithful dogmas defined by the hierarchy. Tyrrell maintained that the faithful themselves, in their collective spiritual experience, guaranteed the authority of dogma.

The importance of spiritual experience, and hence of the consensus fidelium, was siezed upon by the younger generation of liberal catholic Anglicans. Incorporating the modernist view of authority they produced a neo-liberal catholicism as catholic as Gore's, but with a greater degree of liberality.

The emergence of neo-liberal catholicism was catalysed by a period of crisis within Anglicanism immediately prior to the Great War.

The Doctrine Commission, appointed in 1922, included a number of neo-liberal catholics. Amongst them was A.E.J.Rawlinson and Will Spens. Rawlinson, as Bishop of Derby, also participated in the 1948 Lambeth Conference. In so far as they deal with authority both the report of the Doctrine Commission and the report of Lambeth 1948 show a marked dependence upon the neo-liberal catholic view of authority.

AUTHORITY IN LIBERAL CATHOLIC ANGLICANISM

Timothy Elwin Daykin

Thesis submitted for the degree of Master of Arts

University of Durham Department of Theology

1980

The copyright of this thesis rests with the author.
No quotation from it should be published without
his prior written consent and information derived
from it should be acknowledged.



14. MAY 1984

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

I would like to express my gratitude to Professor S.W.Sykes for his continued encouragement, kindness, and support throughout the preparation of this thesis.

T.E.D.

Contents

	page
<u>Introduction</u>	6
<u>Chapter 1. The Liberal Catholic Response to the Crisis of Anglican Authority</u>	
1. Introduction	10
2. Movement towards liberalization	10
3. Liberal Catholicism	20
4. Gore's concept of authority	26
5. Controversies illustrative of Gore's concept of authority	31
6. Conclusion	34
References	35
<u>Chapter 2. The Influence of the Modernist Movement on Liberal Catholic Anglicanism</u>	
1. Introduction	41
2. The modernist movement in the Roman Catholic Church	41
3. Tyrrell's method	51
4. Modernism and Anglicanism	63
5. Conclusion	68
References	69
<u>Chapter 3. The Emergence of neo-Liberal Catholicism</u>	
1. Introduction	77
2. Background to the issues raised by Weston	78
3. Weston's open letter	88
4. Official proceedings on clerical orthodoxy and the Kikuyu question	94

	page
5. Clerical veracity	99
6. Conclusion	104
References	104
<u>Chapter 4. Authority in neo-Liberal Catholicism</u>	
1. Introduction	109
2. Rawlinson: The formative years 1912-1915	109
3. Spens: Belief and Practice	118
4. Rawlinson: After the war	128
5. Conclusion	140
References	141
<u>Epilogue</u>	147
References	152
<u>Appendix</u>	
Sketch Biography of A.E.J.Rawlinson	153
References	155
<u>Bibliographies</u>	
1. Primary Sources (Books and Pamphlets)	156
2. Secondary Sources (Books and Pamphlets)	157
3. Newspapers, Periodicals and Reference Works	158
4. Published works of A.E.J.Rawlinson	159

INTRODUCTION

The philosophies of the eighteenth century Enlightenment are generally characterized by their emphasis upon reason, observation and experiment as the methods for the attainment and maintenance of truth. This marked a movement away from the older ideas of confidence in authority and tradition and inevitably brought many philosophers into conflict with the Church. Jean-Jacques Rousseau, whose work was widely influential, forbade all doctrinal intolerance and would only admit those religions which did not lay claim to absolute truth. His political theory, that a just state rests upon the general will of the people expressed in its laws, gave impetus to both secular, as in the case of the French Revolution, and sacred movements for greater liberality.

During the early years of the nineteenth century new schools of thought in theology and biblical criticism began to emerge, especially in Germany. These new schools questioned the traditional understanding and interpretation of the Bible and Christian theology, and provided alternative interpretations of both the Bible and primitive Christian documents.

The evolutionary ideas of Darwin and T.H.Huxley conflicted with the traditional doctrine of creation. Their ideas indicated the importance and reliability of scientific method. Thus the teaching of the Church in matters touching the physical world was no longer regarded by many as final.

The demand for greater liberality by dissenters gathered momentum as the nineteenth century advanced. They desired to be freed from the obligation, if they wished to hold public office or teach in one of the older universities, to conform to the creeds and formularies of the Church of England.



These were the four main factors which motivated a movement towards liberalization in mid-nineteenth century Anglicanism. They were however, for the greater part, met with strong resistance, especially from those traditionalists who maintained that the clergyman's declaration of assent to the creeds and formularies of the Church of England committed him to a pre-critical and pre-evolutionary view - though they could not always agree as to what such a view should be, as in the Gorham case. Mid-nineteenth century Anglicanism is characterized as a climate of suspicion and doubt between those who advocated the new ideas and those who resisted them.

Liberal catholicism was born in the 1880's out of a desire for a guarded acceptance of certain of the new ideas but without compromise to the creeds and formularies of the Church of England as the factual basis of faith. Chief amongst the exponents of liberal catholicism was Charles Gore.

In the first chapter of this thesis we will trace the development of the movement towards liberalization in mid-nineteenth century Anglicanism and the subsequent birth of liberal catholicism. Gore's concept of authority is examined and controversies illustrative of that concept described.

Within the Roman Church the new ideas were met with sharp condemnation by the authorities. Some of those who did adopt any of the new ideas were to be found within the modernist movement. This was a movement which originated in the 1870's after the formalization of the doctrine of papal infallibility and the publication of the decrees of the Vatican Council. The more conservative of the modernists, in the theological and biblical sense, had a profound influence in certain Anglican circles. In the second chapter of this thesis we will consider the view of authority espoused by the modernist

George Tyrrell and the influence he exerted over members of the Church of England.

A.M.Ramsey has argued that the generation of liberal catholics who succeeded Gore took liberal catholicism beyond the lines which Gore had drawn. The evidence examined in this thesis tends to support this view. For this second generation, which included A.E.J.Rawlinson, Will Spens, and E.G.Selwyn, we shall use the term neo-liberal catholic.(1)

Ramsey further notes that the second generation of liberal catholics conceded a little more 'to the spirit of Catholic Modernism than Gore could ever have allowed'. Thus the modernist view of authority, and in particular that of Tyrrell, is particularly important in a discussion of the liberal catholic view of authority.

The third chapter concerns a period of crisis within the Church of England during which neo-liberal catholicism emerged. The publication of theologically liberal books in England and events involving unorthodox clerical behaviour of various kinds both at home and overseas in the years prior to the 1914-1918 war, raised in an acute form the question of authority within the Church of England. As the debate, which concerned the Church's authority in both doctrine and order, progressed, it became evident that the younger generation of liberal catholics had advanced well beyond the position of Gore.

In the final chapter we will describe the view of authority espoused by two leading neo-liberal catholics, A.E.J.Rawlinson and Will Spens. Of the two Rawlinson is considered in the greater depth. A sketch biography of Rawlinson is included as an appendix.

The neo-liberal catholic view of authority has been formative for twentieth century Anglicanism. Official Anglican documents, published within the last forty years, show a significant dependence

upon the neo-liberal catholic view of authority. This assertion is supported by reference to the Report of the Commission, set up in 1922 to investigate the Church of England's doctrine, which published Doctrine in the Church of England in 1938 and the report of the Lambeth Conference held in 1948.

Reference

1. A.M.Ramsey, From Gore to Temple (London, 1960), pp. 97, 101.

Chapter 1.

The Liberal Catholic Response to the Crisis of Anglican Authority

1. Introduction

Authority was, perhaps, the single most important issue which Anglicanism faced during the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. This chapter is concerned with the series of controversies which occurred during the mid-nineteenth century which taken together constituted a movement towards liberalization in the Church of England. These were the parliamentary debate of 1840, the Hereford Bishopric, the Gorham Case, Essays and Reviews, and the Colenso affair. Against this background the publication of Lux Mundi and the birth of liberal catholicism is described. The chapter concludes with a discussion of Gore's concept of authority and controversies illustrative of that concept.

2. Movement towards liberalization

The nineteenth century was punctuated by a series of controversies which focused on the morality of subscription to the creeds and formularies of the Church of England, especially the Thirty-Nine Articles. 'The Victorian conscience was torn between two moral commitments; viz., to a scrupulous intellectual loyalty and the demand of forthright assent to the creeds and formularies of the Church of England.'(1) Until the 'Clerical Subscription Act' passed into law in 1865 all men entering Anglican orders had to acknowledge 'all and every article to be agreeable to the word of God'. This was a requirement of the 36th canon of 1604.(2) In 1871 the Gladstone government passed the 'Universities Tests Act' which abolished the requirement that candidates for degrees and appointments in

the universities of Oxford, Cambridge and Durham must subscribe to the Thirty-nine Articles.(3)

A movement in favour of the liberalization of subscription to the creeds and formularies of the Church of England had existed since the seventeenth century. However, it was during the nineteenth century that this liberalization was secured.

In May 1840 a petition 'The Liturgy and Articles of the Church' was introduced in the House of Lords by Richard Whately, Archbishop of Dublin.(4) The Church of England and the Church of Ireland were united until 1869 when Gladstone passed a bill to disestablish and disendow the Irish Church.(5) The petition was signed by thirty members of the Church, half of whom were clergymen. They petitioned for certain of the Articles of Subscription and the Liturgy to be altered. They 'prayed their Lordships would consider what measures should be adopted to render the articles consistent with the practices of the clergy, and the acknowledged meaning of the Church'.(6)

The petition was introduced in the House of Lords because Convocation had been prorogued by Royal Writ in 1717 after the so called Bangorian controversy.(7) Hence the Lords was the only place where such ecclesiastical matters could be pursued. The call for convocations to discuss business was made by a number of speakers in the debate following the introduction of the petition.

Replying to Whately the Bishop of Lincoln, John Kaye, sought to place the petition in the context of the Church of England as he saw it. He 'did not consider that a desire for alteration now existed with any considerable portion of the community'.(8) Neither did the Archbishop of Canterbury, William Howley, agree with the petition: 'if there were such practices in the Church of England as he (Whately) alluded to, they were confined to a small number

of clergy'.(9) He reminded the House that he had himself presented a petition, signed by over five hundred clergy, against any alteration in the Articles of Subscription.(10) The Bishop of Norwich, Edward Stanley, offered a 'few observations on the point of subscription'.(11)

The Church had a sort of elasticity, which allowed and graduated the differences that existed. Those who accomplished the Reformation were placed in very different circumstances - they had to satisfy a body of persons that included very different feelings. The articles of the Church, therefore were framed on a reference to the opinion of a very wide basis for a large body that differed on many points. There was a sanction for this opinion in the speech of a noble Lord, a distinguished statesman, with which their Lordships were familiar, who had said that the Church of England had a Calvinistic creed, and an Arminian clergy. And there were those who would infer from the same evidence, that to Arminians the creed was sufficiently satisfactory, and that it allowed the admission of Calvinistic clergy. In fact, the Church was so constituted that it was calculated for all who agreed in the broad distinguishing features, and in the salutary doctrines of the Christian Church. This being taken for granted, what ought they to do? He would recommend that they should honestly and boldly meet the difficulties, not only because the Church was founded upon liberty of conscience and the right of private judgement, but because it gave the greatest - he would not say latitude - but privilege to private judgement. Therefore in extending subscription he was persuaded that they would be granting a boon and a benefit to many scrupulous and tender consciences that were amongst the brightest ornaments of the Establishment.(12)

Stanley's speech drew from the Bishop of London, Blomfield, the retort that the Catholic Church was founded upon truth and not upon liberty of conscience. Asked Blomfield: 'What was the expansion that was required? It was this; that when a clergyman declared ex animo, he should be understood as declaring only in what sense he pleased. This was expansion with vengeance'.(13)

This speech outraged many members of the Church of England, particularly the tractarians, and contributed to the growing

climate of suspicion and doubt. Newman's Tract XC, published in 1841, was in part a tractarian answer to Stanley representing an attempt to defend the catholic basis of the creeds.(14)

Between 1840 and the 'Clerical Subscription Act' of 1865 there occurred four incidents of particular interest in the context of this thesis. They all served to perpetuate the climate of suspicion and doubt and each was attended by considerable anxiety and anger.(15)

Renn Dickson Hampden, a Whig clergyman and friend of Whatley and Thomas Arnold, was appointed Principal of St. Mary's Hall, Oxford in 1833. In 1836 he became Regius Professor of Divinity at Oxford, against considerable tractarian opposition.(16) A year later these same tractarians, who suspected Hampden of holding unorthodox views, secured his suspension from the board which nominated the University Select Preachers. Whilst at St. Mary's Hampden led the party at Oxford which proposed that a form of declaration of assent should replace the current form of subscription to the Thirty-nine Articles.(17)

In 1847, Lord John Russell, who had become prime minister the year before, offered Hampden the See of Hereford. 'The appointment was declared to be a gratuitous insult to the church, an aggression, that Russell should select for a bishopric the only clergyman whose orthodoxy was stamped by the stigma of authoritative censure'.(18) Thirteen bishops, including Blomfield and Phillpotts of Exeter, publicly remonstrated with the prime minister about the appointment. The Dean of Hereford, John Merewether, also disapproved of Hampden's appointment. Together with one prebendary he voted against Hampden at the chapter election.(19) Samuel Wilberforce, Bishop of Oxford, sanctioned a suit against Hampden, in whose diocese he was an incumbent, so that allegations made against Hampden's Bampton Lectures of 1832 could be tested in the Court of Arches. The suit,

for heresy, brought Wilberforce royal disfavour, Prince Albert encouraged greater liberality in matters of doctrine. The eventual withdrawal of the suit brought Wilberforce the disfavour of tractarians who suspected Hampden of unorthodoxy.

Hampden's election was confirmed, amid uproar, in Bow Church. Two of the objectors at the confirmation subsequently applied to the Queen's Bench for a hearing to petition for a mandamus to compel the Archbishop of Canterbury, or his Vicar-General, to hear the objections made to Hampden's appointment. In the event the mandamus was refused; though Hampden's consecration was delayed until after the hearing. The death of Archbishop Howley, a few days after the result of the hearing was published on 11 February 1848, put an end to speculation that the Archbishop might refuse to consecrate Hampden.

Hampden was consecrated by the new Archbishop of Canterbury, Sumner formerly Bishop of Chester, in Lambeth Palace Chapel on 26 March 1848.(20)

The Gorham Case concerned the doctrine of baptismal regeneration. Its two chief protagonists were the high church Bishop of Exeter, Phillpotts, and the low church and anti-tractarian George Cornelius Gorham an incumbent in Phillpotts' diocese. After a lengthy examination, solely concerned with the doctrine of baptismal regeneration, Phillpotts declared that Gorham's doctrine was unsound and refused to institute him to the living of Brampford Speke. Gorham had been presented to this living by its patron Cottenham the Lord Chancellor. In June 1848 Gorham asked the Court of Arches to compel Phillpotts to institute him to the living of Brampford Speke.(21)

There were two important issues at stake in the Gorham Case, they were the same two which had surfaced during the Hampden affair.

First, the right of a patron to present whomsoever he pleased to an ecclesiastical appointment, without regard to any objection from the Church. Secondly, the right of the Church to exclude from any teaching office an individual whom it was held maintained heretical views, that is views contradictory to the creeds and formularies of the Church; and what authority should determine whether or not the views held by an individual were heretical.

The judgement of the Dean of Arches, Sir Herbert Jenner Fust, delivered 2 August 1849, in the Gorham Case supported Phillpotts. Fust concluded that Phillpotts had sufficient reason to refuse to institute Gorham because the doctrine of baptismal regeneration held by Gorham was opposed to that of the Church of England.

Gorham appealed to the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council. His appeal was upheld as they were not satisfied that his doctrine of baptismal regeneration contradicted that to be discerned from the creeds and formularies of the Church of England.

The outcome of the Gorham Case pleased neither evangelicals nor tractarians. To evangelicals the judgement of the Court of Arches was seen to favour a tractarian interpretation of the creeds and formularies of the Church of England and hence represented a threat to their liberty in the Church. On the other hand many tractarians were concerned that a secular court should be the final court of appeal in an ecclesiastical matter. They were even less pleased with that court's judgement.

The Gorham Case was a factor in the secession from the Church of England of both evangelicals and tractarians. The Free Church of England, an evangelical sect, owes its origin to the Gorham Case. A number of tractarians joined the Church of Rome.

A volume of seven essays entitled Essays and Reviews was published in 1860.(22) It was the outcome of a desire felt by

the essayists who sought a more open discussion of biblical criticism. The controversy which followed the publication of Essays and Reviews was not so much concerned with the contents of the essays as with the moral honesty of the essayists, six of whom were clergymen of the Church of England.

Bishop Wilberforce, in an extended criticism published in The Quarterly Review, remarked: 'holding their views, (the essayists) cannot, consistently with moral honesty, maintain their places as clergymen of the established Church'..(23) Wilberforce did not, however, wish to suppress free thinking, the condition of which was that it should be compatible with revealed truth and honest teaching..(24) In February 1861 Sumner, on behalf of all the bishops, issued a declaration: 'They could not understand, said Sumner, how clergymen could consistently hold such opinions and honestly subscribe the articles of the Church of England'..(25)

Only two of the clergymen who contributed to Essays and Reviews were beneficed and hence were the only two who could be prosecuted for heresy. After certain misgivings Sumner and their diocesans allowed H.B.Wilson and Rowland Williams to be sued for heresy. The Dean of Arches, Stephen Lushington, gave judgement in both cases on 25 June 1862. This judgement may be seen as an important step in the movement towards liberalization.

The question, he declared, was not whether Rowland Williams contradicted the Scriptures, or the doctrines of the ancient church, or the consensus of learned Anglican divines. The sole test which the court could apply was compatibility with, or contradiction of, the legal formularies of the establishment: articles, liturgy, canons. All questions not plainly decided by those formularies must be held to be open questions, on which a clergyman may teach as he thinks fit. It was possible that in a book like Essays and Reviews there might be much for Christian men to censure, and yet that the law could not reach it..(26)

Lushington held that both Williams and Wilson had contradicted the Thirty-Nine Articles. Wilson in describing the Bible as "'an expression of devout reason'" which Lushington held violated the articles declaring the Bible to be God's word written. And Wilson for denying inspiration and eternal punishment.(27) However, the majority of charges brought against Williams and Wilson were not upheld. Lushington suspended both clergymen from their livings for one year. The judgement of the Court of Arches was reversed by the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council to whom Williams and Wilson had appealed. Tractarians who had been disturbed that a secular court should have jurisdiction over an ecclesiastical court in the Gorham Case were strengthened in their resolve that secular courts should have no power to decide matters of doctrine by the outcome of Williams and Wilson's appeal. Essays and Reviews was condemned in both houses of the Convocation of Canterbury in April 1864.

After reading Essays and Reviews John William Colenso, Bishop of Natal, began to study the pentateuch with the aid of German scholarship. The results of this study were published as The Pentateuch and the Book of Joshua Critically Examined, in parts between 1862 and 1879.(28) Colenso concluded that parts of the pentateuch were unhistorical, and that it was a compilation of different sources. He claimed that the Anglican attitude to doctrine 'must be broadened if it was to meet intelligent men. The essential truth of the Bible did not depend on the historical truth of all its narratives'.(29) In an earlier book Colenso had published on Romans he formally withdrew belief in eternal punishment and proposed 'lax views of Biblical inspiration'.

The decision of the Judicial Committee in the Williams and Wilson case convinced Colenso that he could remain a loyal Anglican

without sacrificing his views on the Bible; that he should remain in his see to 'prove the liberty which the Church of England permitted'.(30) Inevitably there were many who did not share Colenso's view and a long controversy followed. The importance of the Colenso affair in the context of this thesis is to illustrate that by the 1860's Anglicans were claiming a hitherto unsanctioned degree of liberality in matters of doctrine, though it was a claim resisted by many.

The four incidents we have briefly described illustrate how the climate of suspicion and doubt was created and sustained in mid-nineteenth century Anglicanism. Anglicanism had reached a point of crisis for its concept of authority, both in doctrine and Church order.

In June 1863 a resolution was introduced in the House of Commons by Buxton under the Uniformity Act: 'That in the opinion of this House, the subscription required from the clergy to the Thirty-Nine Articles, and to the Prayer Book, ought to be relaxed'.(31) During the subsequent debate Buxton sought 'to further deprecate the idea that the recent stir caused by various theologians had had anything whatever to do with his proposal'.(32) This remark may be taken to indicate that the desire of relaxation of subscription had more general support and was not confined to theologians.

A Royal Commission was set up in 1864 to investigate the matter of clerical subscription. Upon its recommendation a bill was presented to Parliament the following year entitled: 'A Bill to simplify the Subscriptions and Declarations required to be made by the Clergy of the United Church of England and Ireland'.(33) The bill, which passed into law that same year, provided for the clergy to make a general Declaration of Assent, in place of a particular form of subscription, to the creeds and formularies of

the Church of England.(34) The change relieved many consciences, particularly those of broad churchmen such as Arthur Stanley and Henry Sidgwick. They preferred to remain within the Church of England as they held that the best place to achieve reform was from within.(35) However, it was not the end of controversies concerning clerical orthodoxy, and the trials for heresy continued. Neither had the question of where Anglican doctrine was to be decided and upheld been resolved. Further, both evangelicals and tractarians were concerned at the degree of liberty allowed to clergymen in matters of doctrine and Church order.

Bishops had, and exercised, the right to sanction the men they were to ordain, or were to hold office in their diocese. Some bishops were stricter in their requirements than others. After the controversies we have described above and the replacement of subscription with a form of assent a trend developed which saw men who openly espoused liberal views ordained. Eventually this extended to men who held a suspended judgement on such cardinal issues as the virgin birth and the physical resurrection. There was not a unified policy amongst the bishops, each had his own requirements.

Owen Chadwick notes that Victorian England saw a slow, but steady, decline in standards of morality, a trend which some writers have attributed to the decrease in religious observance. At the same time scholars and thinkers were attempting, under the influence of European philosophy, to conceive a morality that was independent of religion.(36) A generation of Anglicans, whose formative years were those of the controversies we have described, came to realize that the concept of authority as it stood within Anglicanism must be modified, in consequence of events both inside and outside the Church, if it was to retain its

credibility. Of this generation we are particularly concerned with Charles Gore, born 1853, and the liberal catholicism he espoused.(37)

3. Liberal Catholicism

The tractarians were opposed to 'rational theology'. Only Newman had been interested in the relation of revelation and philosophy.(38) However, the younger men amongst the tractarians at Oxford were less shy of this issue. They were also aware of the importance of the work of Darwin, Driver, Wellhausen and others; which should be met, not with a firm assertion of the Church's traditional doctrine, but with reason. They recognised that religious understanding is inevitably influenced by natural reason; and began 'to look for such a reconciliation between faith and reason as their religious forbears would have suspected'.(39) A group of these younger Oxford anglo-catholics met regularly between 1875 and 1885 to put "'the Catholic faith into its right relation to modern intellectual and moral problems"'.(40) The investigations of Lightfoot and Westcott provided for them a renewed confidence in the historical character of the New Testament. The influence of the philosopher T.H.Green assured them that philosophy 'could contribute to a spiritual view of life'. In a less direct way than these two the Christian socialism of F.D.Maurice provided a moral urgency to their discussions.(41)

The volume of essays Lux Mundi, edited by Gore and first published in 1889, was the work of these younger Oxford anglo-catholics. It was Gore's essay 'The Holy Spirit and Inspiration' that 'constituted the sensational feature of the book'. The other essays did 'strike a new note as compared with the earlier theology of the Catholic revival, but there is nothing new in them which constitutes a

formal departure from the accepted standards of orthodoxy'.(42) In his essay Gore draws three conclusions concerning the issues raised in Lux Mundi. First, that 'Inspiration guarantees the truth of the Scriptures, but not necessarily their historical truth'. Secondly, 'We may recognise the presence of dramatic literature among the various inspired writings'. Thirdly, 'We need not deny the presence of myth, the germ of history, poetry and philosophy, in the earliest Jewish writings, as in those of other races'.(43)

Of the older tractarians H.P.Liddon was perhaps the most influential at the time Lux Mundi was published. He regarded it as 'the betrayal of everything for which Pusey and the Tractarians stood'.(44) Liddon's grief was compounded by the fact that he was largely responsible for the appointment of Gore as the first principal of Pusey House in 1884. Another veteran tractarian Archdeacon Denison attempted to have the English Church Union, a society founded in 1859 to further high church principles, condemn Lux Mundi. A committee was set up by the Church Union to investigate the book. Its report was shelved for two years and eventually allowed to drop. However, not all the older tractarians were opposed to Lux Mundi. Bishop Edward King of Lincoln publicly supported Gore. Neither was the book condemned in the Church Times, which generally supported a tractarian cause.(45)

Controversy over Lux Mundi was at its height between 1889 and 1892. Chadwick comments:

The attack pressed upon the charge that Gore endangered belief in the divine nature of the Lord. But the general attitude to the Old Testament was in question; whether it could be accepted that prophecy did not predict; whether inspiration could be maintained if the Bible was admitted to contain legend and pseudonymous books. The general unsettlement over the Old Testament was given a focus.(46)

Conservative tractarianism also had supporters amongst the younger generation, men like Darwell Stone. From the publication of Lux Mundi it is possible to distinguish two schools within anglo-catholicism: the conservative school, men like Stone, which sought to maintain the teaching of the original tractarians; and the liberal or Lux Mundi school. This latter school, known also as liberal catholicism, has been perhaps the single most important influence upon the development of Anglicanism in the twentieth century. 'Gore did more than any other single person to carry high churchmen into the modern age.'⁽⁴⁷⁾ Lux Mundi 'delivered Christians from the desperate duty of ignoring the scientific teaching of the modern world'.⁽⁴⁸⁾ In 1894 Gore was appointed to a canonry at Westminster Abbey, this was interpreted as indicating official approval of liberal catholicism.⁽⁴⁹⁾ This new temper of inquiry, and the desire to take seriously the findings of biblical criticism, gave rise to a new series of biblical commentaries, the 'Westminster Commentaries'.⁽⁵⁰⁾ These soon replaced the existing standard works and were a significant factor in the influence of liberal catholicism.

The terms liberal and catholic are both capable of a variety of interpretations. Attempts have been made to describe the sense in which Gore was catholic and the sense in which he was liberal, these are described below. However, it is important to note that the term liberal catholicism, as used by Gore, cannot be satisfactorily reduced to its constituent elements. Rather it stands alone as descriptive of a distinctive Anglican tradition.⁽⁵¹⁾

Gore maintained that the Catholic Church, however imperfect, is a visible society, as the redeemed Israel of God.⁽⁵²⁾ As a visible society it is held together by certain 'manifest and external institutions'.⁽⁵³⁾ Thus Gore emphasized the importance

of the institutional aspects of Christianity. He considered the three chief characteristics of catholicism to be, its episcopate, its creeds, and its canon of scripture.(54) These three are of equal importance and must be equally accepted by the catholic. Gore contrasted catholicism with protestantism and Romanism. Protestantism he considered to be fundamentally individualistic; and Romanism to be a one-sided distortion of catholicism, based upon a dogmatic claim which could not be substantiated.(55) In Catholicism and Roman Catholicism, published in 1923, Gore declares:

I mean by Catholicism what is generally meant by the term in histories of early Christianity, viz. that way of regarding Christianity which would see it not merely or primarily a doctrine of salvation to be apprehended by individuals, but the establishment of a visible society as the one divinely constituted home of the great salvation, held together not only by the inward Spirit but also by certain manifest and external institutions.(56)

Carpenter points out that for Gore the institutional elements of Christianity, important as they are, do not exhaust the possibilities of catholicism. Rather 'they point beyond themselves to their source and norm, the catholicity of our Lord and of the Gospel'.(57) Gore considered the catholicity of the Church to be the expression 'of all the length and breadth and height and depth of the divine Love'.(58) These four dimensions of catholicism are discussed by Carpenter to describe Gore's catholicism.

The 'length' of catholicism is understood in terms of the age-long divine purpose which finds its fulfillment in Christ. Gore admitted the synthetic character of the Christian faith, a point taken further by the second generation of liberal catholics.(59) In consequence Gore stresses the validity of natural theology and opposed the distinction made by Aquinas between natural belief and supernatural belief. Gore's catholicism is thus inclusive of 'all the good in the world'. The witness and tradition of the

Jews, Gore concludes, has played a particularly important part in the history of divine revelation.

In virtue of its 'breadth' catholicism is inclusive of all men and the whole universe. Catholic Christianity is based upon an appeal 'to the heart and conscience of the common man'.(60) Carpenter concludes that it is this facet of catholicism which led Gore to adopt a strong moralism in his liberal catholicism. Further, it is the notion of the 'breadth' of catholicism which caused Gore to reject the exclusive claim of the Church of Rome to catholicity.

Tractarian theology, being influenced by Latin theology, was a dogmatic system which existed between two poles, sin and redemption. Gore inherited this system and in consequence spoke of the 'depth' of catholicism: 'for God has reached a hand of mercy down to the lowest gulfs of sin'.(61)

Finally, catholicism reunites men with God, this is its 'height'. Redemption is thus 'growth toward fuller and fuller union with God'.(62)

Vidler suggests four connotations of the term liberal when it is used of a catholic Anglican. These are political, ecclesiastical, theological, and personal.(63) To be liberal in the political sense is to be in favour of constitutional political liberties and for the separation of Church and State. Liberty for the Church is the desired end. In its second connotation, ecclesiastical, liberty in the Church is desired. Members of the Church, both cleric and lay, must be free to explore new ideas uninhibited by ecclesiastical authority. The aim of such liberty in the Church is to derive a consensus which is genuinely free. To be liberal in the theological sense is to hold theological views and opinions which differ from those traditionally held by the Church. The personal connotation of the term liberal refers to

the way in which liberal views, or conservative views, are held, that is with an open, or liberal, mind. Vidler concludes that it is possible to be called a liberal catholic, liberal being understood in its personal connotation, without necessarily being liberal in the other three connotations. Thus the opposite of liberal catholicism is not orthodox or illiberal catholicism but intransigent catholicism.

This model is then used by Vidler to determine the sense in which Gore may be described as liberal.(64)

First, in the political sense Gore may be fairly described as a liberal. He moved from a position of indecision over the matter of disestablishment of the Church of England during the 1880's to advocating it by 1914. Secondly, Gore stood for liberty in the Church, that is ecclesiastical. Each national Church should be allowed to develop along its own lines dictated by local conditions and apprehension of the Christian tradition. Further, that each national Church, especially the Church of England, should 'glory in comprehension'.(65) That is: 'Given agreement in regard to fundamental articles of the faith, he said the Church should "draw lines as seldom as possible"'.(66) Gore was opposed to mechanical concepts of authority within the Church, maintaining that the Church should be open to the light of truth whensoever and wheresoever it comes. Further, he claimed that churchmen should not only have freedom of liberal thought, but also the freedom to express such thought. Thus Gore maintained that prophecy has a legitimate place in the Church. Thirdly, the theological connotation. Here Vidler notes that after the publication of Lux Mundi Gore's theology stabilized; never again was he a reformer in the field of theology. Gore held strict standards of membership and discipline for the Church. Vidler thus suggests that Gore was neither high, nor

liberal, nor catholic enough. In the early years of the twentieth century Gore sought from Convocation various declarations of theological orthodoxy to be required of clergymen. Finally, Gore's belief in decisive statements and definite theological conclusions make it difficult to describe him as a liberal in the personal sense.

4. Gore's concept of authority

The similarity between Gore's treatment of authority in The Holy Spirit and the Church and Newman's lectures On the Prophetical Office of the Church has been noted by N.P. Williams in his contribution to Northern Catholicism, 'The Theology of the Catholic Revival'. Williams notes that both Gore and Newman appeal to the patristic theory expounded in the Commonitorium of St. Vincent of Lérins. (67)

The same cardinal points emerge in both books - the primary and controlling authority of Holy Scripture, as against those who would rest all upon ecclesiastical infallibility; the real function and importance of Catholic tradition in the interpretation of Scripture, as against the partisans of 'the Bible, and the Bible only'; the appeal to Christian antiquity as the witness to the authentic form of the Catholic tradition, in opposition to the appeal to a 'Living Voice' emanating, here and now, from an individual prelate or committee of prelates; the preference for the word 'indefectibility' rather than the word 'infallibility' as expressing the characteristic quality of the teaching office of the Church. (68)

Carpenter notes two differences between Newman's work and Gore's. He concludes that Gore's appeal to scripture 'does not have quite the same force as Newman's' because he had to consider the findings of biblical criticism. Secondly, that Gore's 'treatment is marked by a far more rigorous appeal to reason!'. (69)

Thus the normativeness of scripture is an important element in Gore's concept of authority. The question of the inspiration

of scripture was dealt with by Gore in Lux Mundi.(70)

Gore maintained that the Bible contains one consistent doctrine, that biblical criticism has not invalidated the claim of the Old Testament 'to be a self-disclosure of God through the prophets'. Christ is the climax of this self-disclosure. Belief in God represents Gore's attempt to substantiate this view. The second volume of his trilogy, Belief in Christ, is an attempt to show that whilst the New Testament presents a wide variety of points of view and distinctions of emphasis it nevertheless 'presents essentially one doctrine', viz., the doctrine of the Incarnation which has grown out of the faith of the disciples in 'Jesus as Master'.(71)

The finality of the apostolic interpretation of Christ is also upheld by Gore: 'there can be no fuller or completer revelation of God, given under the conditions of this world, than is given in Him in whom the Word is made flesh'.(72)

However, the question may be raised that if the apostolic interpretation of Christ is final what need is there of tradition? In answer to this question Gore does not allow that the notion of finality is a capitulation to the protestant view of the supremacy of scripture. He notes that the results of biblical criticism have been more severe in protestant circles than they have been in catholic circles. This is because, Gore concludes, the catholic bases his doctrine upon the creeds, which in the case of the Apostles' Creed is considerably older than the canon of the New Testament. Thus an assertion of the finality of the apostolic interpretation of Christ is not inconsistent with the importance of the Church's tradition.(73)

Carpenter points out that there is a certain ambiguity in Gore's understanding of the relation of scripture and tradition. Gore's support for the theory of Apostolic Succession is not based

solely upon the supremacy of the New Testament but upon the "threefold authority of reason, of history, and of the Church as guided by the Spirit of Christ", and yet in his criticism of the Roman theory of authority Gore 'tends to exalt Scripture as the absolute standard of doctrine'.(75)

Gore's assertion of the normativeness of the New Testament enables him to base his concept of authority upon the teaching method of Christ as it is portrayed in the scriptures. Christ taught with authority: 'Verily I say unto you'. Gore notes that this form of expression also indicates a certain infallibility on the part of Christ. Thus he proposes that the model of authority emerging in the New Testament is one based on the ideal of parenthood; a model of authority designed to develop sonship. Yet Gore rejects the notion of external authority as the ground of Christian belief. What is required is a concept of authority which nourishes the believer and instructs him via the normal educative process. Thus the Church is called upon to be liberal in the exercise of its authority. It may however, as a last resort, take authoritative action against one of its members. At this point Carpenter detects a note of severity in Gore's concept. Gore maintained that it was the duty of the Church to lay down certain guide lines in both doctrine and morals within which it could expect its members to remain. One practical result of this trend in Gore's thought was his demands to Convocation to issue declarations on clerical orthodoxy.(76)

For Gore the Word of God was infallible. Scripture is the record of the Word of God, and the task of the Church is to convey the Word of God. Neither scripture nor the Church are by themselves infallible. Rather Gore speaks of the Church as possessing a "God given authority" and indefectibility'.(77) Thus the Christian may

rely with confidence upon decisions of ecumenical councils, but he may not regard them as infallible.

The claim to infallibility advanced by the Church of Rome Gore describes as 'in violent contradiction to the regula fidei of the Ancient Church; moreover, it is morally crippling, derogating as it does from personal responsibility for the truth'.(78)

The effect of the Roman claim is to allow authority to supersede history in establishing dogma. Hence such dogmas as the immaculate conception and the dogma of papal infallibility itself have come to share equal status with the dogma of the resurrection. The Roman claim seeks to make the Church the organ of continuous divine revelation. Rather, Gore asserts, the function of the Church 'is not to reveal truth; its duty is to hold fast to what it has received'.(79) Gore claims the support of Vincent of Lérins and the Fathers in this assertion.

Newman's theory of doctrinal development, viz., that Christianity came into the world as an idea rather than as an institution, is rejected by Gore as a possible basis upon which the Roman claim to infallible authority can be justified. This is not to say that Gore was unwilling to admit that developments have taken place. But such developments as have taken place may have been an exaggeration of some feature or tendency of the original. Thus Gore considers that Roman Catholicism is undoubtedly a development of the original Christian Church, but it may not be the only development, or even the best development, it may even admit of some deterioration.(80)

The only safeguard against such one-sided developments is the appeal to antiquity and scripture. For: "'Progress in Christianity", he said, "is always reversion to one original and perfect type, not addition to it: it is progress only in the understanding of Christ"'.(81)

Gore makes a distinction between faith and theology; an important distinction characteristic of modernist theologies. The distinction is supported by quotations from Tyrrell. Thus Gore allows that developments may take place in theology but not in dogma and faith. Further, the divine self-disclosure is not confined to the biblical record, but may also be perceived in contemporary culture. Theology must in consequence be fashioned in the light of its own age.(82) The liberal catholicism of Gore may thus be said to limit the dogmatic function of the Church.

Carpenter notes that Gore's confidence in reason is an important element in his concept of authority.(83) 'The fundamental assumption is that "the best evidence that the message of the Church is really the word of God lies in its being able to liberate and satisfy the reason which is God's original gift to man"'.(84) It is the reason that substantiates the beliefs first accepted by the individual upon some form of external authority. This is a point that the second generation of liberal catholics were to take further.(85) Gore, however, paid little attention to the function of experience in the verification of belief, indeed Gore asserted that too much was claimed by some for the authority of experience.(86)

Two tests of reason are applied by Gore to the Christian faith. The first is the test of 'rational coherence', that is to say that the fabric of Christian belief follows a rational sequence. All Christian doctrines cohere to the central need of redemptive activity on the part of God because man is absolutely dependant upon God.(87) The second test is that of 'rational congruity'. Christianity, Gore concludes, has a rational superiority over all other fields of knowledge in 'its ability to account for more facts of life and experience than any other world-view'.(88)

5. Controversies illustrative of Gore's concept of authority

In 1886 there appeared a book entitled The Kernal and the Husk: Letters on Spiritual Christianity by the author of "'Pilochristus" and "Onesimus"'. The author was in fact Edwin Abbot, headmaster of a London school, disciple of F.D.Maurice, and friend of J.R. Seeley who had denied that the supernatural was an integral part of the Christian faith.(89) Abbot proposed that 'a candidate for Holy Orders, or a clergyman who, having lost part of his former creed, still desires to continue his Ministry, must really believe that Jesus is the Eternal Son of God and the proper object of worship (p. 361). But he is to be dispensed from believing in Miracles'..(90) This dispensation included belief in the virgin birth and the physical resurrection. Abbot remarks:

It is one thing, in my judgement, to repeat the prayers of the Church and to read passages from the sacred books of the Church, as the mouthpiece of the congregation, and rather a different thing to stand up and say - not only as the mouthpiece of the congregation, but in your individual character, as a Christian and as a priest as well - 'I believe this or that!', and to take money for so saying; while all the time you are saying under your breath, 'But I only believe it metaphorically'..(91)

Abbot proposed that this difficulty may be resolved by "'publicity" and a "general understanding" (pp. 344-348), and in the case of future ordinations by the acquiescence of the Bishops. They are, in fact, to dispense men, so as to allow them to say the Creed without believing the Miracles they assert (pp. 360-361)..'(92)

The following year the Fortnightly Review published an article entitled 'The New Reformation. Part ii, Theology under its Changed Conditions'. The author was Freemantle a canon of Canterbury. The new conditions which Freemantle identified were: "'(1) Those inspired by the advance of science and (2) of criticism; (3) those caused by the altered state of Church life (4) those caused by

social and democratic progress".(93) Gore maintained that the conclusion Freemantle reaches is a denial of the whole idea of revelation as being something made unnecessary by these new conditions.(94) Such a denial, Gore claims, is in total contradiction to the formularies, the creeds and articles, of the Church of England.(95)

On Trinity Sunday 1887 Gore preached the University Sermon at Oxford. He chose this opportunity to attack Abbot and Freemantle. The sermon was published as The Clergy and the Creeds. It was welcomed by Dean Church, himself a 'veteran leader of English Liberal Catholicism'.(96)

In this sermon Gore spoke of a new danger to the Church of England 'which threatens our very foundations, by blurring all the clear issues of truth which make doctrinal unity intelligible and possible'.(97) Nothing less than the cohesion of the Church of England was, in Gore's opinion, at stake.(98)

Against the proposition of Abbot and Freemantle, Gore maintained that Christianity is a religion of revelation: 'A Revelation of the Being and Character of God'.(99) In the first place it is a revelation of 'quite intelligible import' in that it reveals to us something of the character of God. In the second place it is a 'supernatural' revelation, in that Christianity provides a fuller revelation of God in the historic person of Jesus Christ than may be ascertained through natural religion alone.(100)

This revelation, Gore continues, is an incomplete revelation: 'While it gives us all that we can need to make faith sure, and hope firm, and love active, leaves a great many questions, which intellectual curiosity suggests, unanswered'.(101) Hence within the unity of the Church there is, as there always has been, room for difference of opinion.

Gore suggests three possible attitudes towards the faith and

belief implied by the creeds and formularies of the Church of England. First, they may be believed. Secondly, and with equal sincerity, they may be disbelieved. Thirdly, it is possible to doubt them. But Gore notes that a new attitude is now proposed by Abbot and Freemantle. Gore does not describe it as hypocritical, 'but it is a frank claim to make public and solemn professions of dogmatic belief in what is with equal publicity either utterly denied or declared uncertain'.(102)

Against this new attitude Gore makes two general appeals. First, that the Church should put the truth before any desire to compromise; secondly, that the Church should make a 'plain and explicit expression of her mind such as shall make clear her determination to hold at all costs to the truth of the Revelation which is her only ground of existence'.(103)

Gore pursued his appeal for a declaration on clerical orthodoxy, an appeal which had wider support in the Church of England than just within the liberal catholic section. In December 1902 a clergy conference, under the chairmanship of the Dean of Canterbury, the low churchman Wace, passed two resolutions calling upon the bishops to reassure the Church of the truth of the virgin birth and the physical resurrection.(104)

Randall Davidson was enthroned Archbishop of Canterbury in February 1903. The next day, 13 February 1903, Gore wrote to Davidson suggesting that Convocation 'do something to reassure a great number of people that the Bishops would not connive at men being Ordained who did not believe in the Articles of the Creed; particularly the Virgin Birth?'(105) Davidson asked Gore to furnish 'facts and references' of the works which he considered were contrary to the creeds.(106) The issue was raised at a private meeting of the bishops and the matter of a declaration

adjourned.

In a lengthy correspondence with Gore, Davidson made it clear that he was not in favour of a declaration. However, the lower House of Convocation, meeting in May 1903, sought to bring pressure to bear upon the bishops to 'consider what measures may seem best to reassure all men that the Church of England holds the Virgin Birth of Our Lord and his Resurrection from the Dead as cardinal doctrines of the Catholic Faith'.(107) The bishops decided that the two archbishops should write a joint letter. Nothing came of this proposal.

In the same year J.Armitage Robinson, Dean of Westminster, published three lectures entitled Some Thoughts on the Incarnation. These argued that it is utterly alien to the spirit of the English Church to close the doors of inquiry by the hand of authority.(108)

Gore's involvement in the demand for a declaration of clerical orthodoxy that followed the publication of Bishop Weston's open letter is described in the third chapter of this thesis. Gore was again involved with controversy about clerical orthodoxy in 1917 when H.H.Henson was appointed to the Hereford Bishopric.(109)

6. Conclusion

Liberal catholicism emerged as an attempt to resolve the tension which existed in the Church of England between the demands for greater liberality and the desire to retain the creeds and formularies as the factual basis of faith. There were those who thought that liberal catholicism did not go far enough in its provision of liberality; equally there were those who considered it a betrayal of the tractarian ideal. However, Gore, liberal catholicism's chief exponent, became an influential figure within Anglicanism and his concept of authority formative.

Whilst liberal catholicism was emerging within Anglicanism the modernist movement in the Roman Catholic Church was gaining momentum. Though Gore gave little weight to the authority of religious experience the modernists, in particular George Tyrrell, considered it to be of primary importance in the authentication of dogma. The generation of liberal catholics who succeeded Gore were influenced by the modernist view of authority. Thus before we can proceed to a discussion of the concept of authority held by the second generation liberal catholic Anglicans it is necessary that we consider the modernist view of authority. This we will do in the next chapter.

References

1. J.C.Livingston, The Ethics of Belief: An Essay in the Victorian Religious Conscience (Tallahassee, Florida, U.S.A., 1974), p. 2.
2. The Constitutions and Canons Ecclesiastical, (made in the year 1603, and amended in the year 1865) to which are added the Thirty-nine Articles of the Church of England (S.P.C.K., London), pp. 22-23.
3. Owen Chadwick, The Victorian Church Part II 2nd ed. (London, 1972), p. 443.
4. Hansard, Parliamentary Debates 3rd series (London, 1840), vol LIV, pp. 552 ff.
5. For a discussion of the disestablishment of the Irish Church see J.R.H. Moorman, A History of the Church of England (London, 1953), p. 382.
6. Hansard, 3rd series, vol LIV, p. 552.
7. The Bangorian controversy was caused by a sermon preached in 1717 by Hoadly, the Bishop of Bangor, before King George I. Hoadly attempted to show that the gospels gave no support of any visible Church authority. The King, in order to save Hoadly from condemnation and not to emphasize the opposition of the largely high church clergy to the government and whiggish bishops, prorogued the convocations. The convocations met formally until 1852 when the Convocation of Canterbury began to discuss business again. see 'Convocations of Canterbury and York' in F.L. Cross and E.A. Livingstone ed., The Oxford Dictionary of the Christian Church 2nd ed. (London, 1974), p. 342. see also 'Bangorian Controversy', *ibid.* p. 126.

8. Hansard, 3rd series, vol LIV, p. 552.
9. *ibid.* p. 555.
10. *ibid.* p. 556.
11. *ibid.* p. 556.
12. *ibid.* p. 557. The 'noble Lord' referred to by Stanley was the Earl of Chatham, William Pitt, who spoke in the House of Lords on 19 May 1772 in a debate on a bill promoted by Richard Price to relieve Dissenters from the statutory obligation of subscription to the Thirty-Nine Articles. During this debate Pitt declared: 'We have a Calvinistic Creed, Popish Liturgy and Arminian Clergy'. see B.Tunstall, William Pitt Earl of Chatham (London, 1938), p. 442.
13. Hansard, 3rd series, vol LIV, p. 562.
14. M.A.Crowther, Church Embattled: Religious Controversy in Mid-Victorian England (Newton Abbot, 1970), p. 19. see also Livingston, The Ethics of Belief, pp. 2 ff.
15. For an informed discussion of the Gorham case, Essays and Reviews, and the Colenso affair see A.O.J.Cockshut, Anglican Attitudes (London, 1959).
16. Owen Chadwick, The Victorian Church Part I 3rd ed. (London, 1971), pp. 112 ff. see also 'Hampden' in Oxford Dictionary of the Christian Church, p. 617.
17. Chadwick, The Victorian Church Part I, p. 113.
18. *ibid.* p. 238.
19. *ibid.* pp. 241-242.
20. *ibid.* pp. 242-249.
21. *ibid.* pp. 250 ff. see also Crowther, Church Embattled, p. 20.
22. Chadwick, The Victorian Church Part II, pp. 75 ff.
23. S.Wilberforce, 'Aids to Faith' in The Quarterly Review (London, 1862), vol 112, p. 431. cited by Livingston.
24. S.Wilberforce, 'Clerical Subscription' in The Quarterly Review (London, 1865), vol 117, p. 463. cited by Livingston.
25. Chadwick, The Victorian Church Part II, p. 79.
26. *ibid.* pp. 80-81.
27. *ibid.* p. 81.
28. *ibid.* pp. 90 ff.
29. *ibid.* p. 92.

30. *ibid.* p. 92.
31. Hansard, 3rd series (1863), vol CLXXI, pp. 574 ff.
32. *ibid.* p. 575.
33. Hansard, 3rd series (1865), vol CLXXIX, pp. 560 ff.
34. Chadwick, The Victorian Church Part II, p. 133.
35. Livingston, The Ethics of Belief, pp. 12 ff.
36. Chadwick, The Victorian Church Part II, pp. 119 ff.
37. Prestige, Gore's biographer, suggests that it may be more correct to describe Gore as a 'Christian rationalist'. see G.L.Prestige, The Soul of a Prophet (London, 1948), p. 14. cited by A.R.Vidler, Essays in Liberality (London, 1957), p. 127. and by James Carpenter, Gore: A Study in Liberal Catholic Thought. (London, 1960), p. 42.
38. Chadwick, The Victorian Church Part II, p. 99.
39. *ibid.* p. 99.
40. W.Knox and A.R.Vidler, The Development of Modern Catholicism (London, 1933), p. 96. see also Vidler, Essays in Liberality, p. 137. and Carpenter, Gore, pp. 59-60, 95-96.
41. Chadwick, The Victorian Church Part II, pp. 99-100. see also A.M.Ramsey, From Gore to Temple (London, 1960), pp. 2, 9-10. and Knox and Vidler, The Development of Modern Catholicism, p. 96. T.H.Green was concerned to rethink the philosophical doctrines of Idealism, particularly those of Kant and Hegel. He was much influenced by the German theologian F.C.Baur, a protestant of the Tübingen school, and F.D.Maurice. Green maintained that God was realized in each individual and that art, morality and religion all pointed to the spiritual nature of reality. Ramsey points out that some writers exaggerate the dependence of the Lux Mundi essayists upon Green. He notes that Gore was the least amongst them to be influenced by the school of idealistic philosophy. see From Gore to Temple, pp. 9-10.
42. Knox and Vidler, The Development of Modern Catholicism, p. 104.
43. *ibid.* pp. 107-108. see also Ramsey, From Gore to Temple, pp. 5-7. and Carpenter, Gore, pp. 96 ff.
44. Chadwick, The Victorian Church, Part II, p. 101. see also Ramsey, From Gore to Temple, p. 7.
45. Chadwick, The Victorian Church Part II, pp. 103-104. see also Knox and Vidler, The Development of Modern Catholicism, p. 111.
46. Chadwick, The Victorian Church Part II, p. 102.

47. *ibid.* p. 104. see also Ramsey, From Gore to Temple, pp. 11-13. and Vidler, Essays in Liberality, p. 137.
48. Knox and Vidler, The Development of Modern Catholicism, p. 116.
49. Chadwick, The Victorian Church Part II, p. 106.
50. Knox and Vidler, The Development of Modern Catholicism, p. 123.
51. Carpenter, Gore, pp. 47-51. see also Vidler, Essays in Liberality, pp. 132-133, 138-151.
52. Charles Gore, The Holy Spirit and the Church (London, 1924), p. 300. cited by Vidler, Essays in Liberality, p. 135.
53. Charles Gore, Catholicism and Roman Catholicism (London, 1923), p. 1. cited by Vidler, Essays in Liberality, p. 135.
54. Charles Gore, The New Theology and The Old Religion (London, 1907), pp. 159 ff. cited by Carpenter, Gore, p. 45. Carpenter notes that Gore varies the order and number of the characteristics of catholicism, sometimes including sacraments as a separate category. see also Vidler, Essays in Liberality, p. 135.
55. Vidler, Essays in Liberality, pp. 135-137.
56. Gore, Catholicism and Roman Catholicism, p. 1. cited by Vidler, Essays in Liberality, pp. 134-135.
57. Carpenter, Gore, p. 46.
58. *ibid.* p. 47. Carpenter quotes from Charles Gore, St. Paul's Epistle to the Ephesians (London, 1898), p. 15.
59. See the discussion of Will Spens, Belief and Practice (London, 1915) in chapter 4 of this thesis.
60. Carpenter, Gore, p. 50.
61. *ibid.* p. 52.
62. *ibid.* p. 53.
63. Vidler, Essays in Liberality, pp. 132 ff.
64. *ibid.* pp. 138 ff.
65. Charles Gore, Our Place in Christendom, p. 184. cited by Vidler, Essays in Liberality, p. 139. (Vidler does not cite the date and place of publication of this work)
66. Prestige, Life of Charles Gore, p. 245. cited by Vidler, Essays in Liberality, p. 139.
67. N.P. Williams and C. Harris, Northern Catholicism (London, 1933), p. 136. The Commonitorium of St. Vincent of Lérins (who died before 450) embodies the so called Vincentian Canon: 'quod ubique, quod semper, quod ab omnibus creditum est'. St. Vincent maintained that 'the final ground of

- Christian truth was Holy Scripture, and that the authority of the Church was to be invoked only to guarantee its right interpretation'. 'Vincent of Lérins', Oxford Dictionary of the Christian Church, p. 1442. and 'Vincentian Canon', ibid. p. 1443.
68. Williams and Harris, Northern Catholicism, p. 137.
 69. Carpenter, Gore, p. 116.
 70. see page 20 of this thesis.
 71. Carpenter, Gore, pp. 131-133.
 72. ibid. p. 133.
 73. ibid. pp. 133-136.
 74. ibid. p. 136. Carpenter quotes from Charles Gore, The Church and the Ministry (London, 1936), Appendix D, pp. 398-408.
 75. Carpenter, Gore, p. 136.
 76. ibid. pp. 118-121.
 77. Charles Gore, The Reconstruction of Belief (London, 1926), p. 826. cited by Carpenter, Gore, p. 122.
 78. Gore, Reconstruction, pp. 804, 847. cited by Carpenter, Gore, p. 123.
 79. Charles Gore, Roman Catholic Claims (London, 1884), p. 37. cited by Carpenter, Gore, p. 124.
 80. Carpenter, Gore, pp. 125-127.
 81. Charles Gore ed., Lux Mundi (London, 1887), p. xxx. cited by Carpenter, Gore, p. 127.
 82. Carpenter, Gore, pp. 129-130.
 83. ibid. pp. 136, 142.
 84. ibid. p. 137. Carpenter quotes from Gore, Reconstruction, pp. 802-803.
 85. see Chapter 4 of this thesis.
 86. Carpenter, Gore, p. 139.
 87. ibid. pp. 139-140.
 88. ibid. p. 141.
 89. 'Seeley' in Oxford Dictionary of the Christian Church, p. 1256.
 90. Charles Gore, The Clergy and the Creeds (London, 1887), p. 35. see also Prestige, Life of Charles Gore, pp. 81 ff.

91. Edwin Abbot, The Kernal and the Husk: Letters on Spiritual Christianity (London, 1886), p. 346. cited by Gore, The Clergy and the Creeds, pp. 35-36.
92. Gore, The Clergy and the Creeds, p. 36.
93. *ibid.* p. 36. Gore quotes from Freemantle's article.
94. *ibid.* p. 37.
95. *ibid.* p. 39.
96. Prestige, Life of Charles Gore, p. 84.
97. Gore, The Clergy and the Creeds, p. 7.
98. *ibid.* p. 9.
99. *ibid.* p. 9.
100. *ibid.* pp. 9-18.
101. *ibid.* p. 19.
102. *ibid.* p. 27.
103. *ibid.* p. 31.
104. G.K.A. Bell, Randall Davidson (London, 1935), p. 395.
105. *ibid.* p. 396.
106. *ibid.* p. 396.
107. *ibid.* p. 397.
108. London, 1903.
109. Bell, Randall Davidson, pp. 851 ff.

Chapter 2.

The Influence of the Modernist Movement on Liberal Catholic Anglicanism

1. Introduction

The modernist movement in the Roman Catholic Church was a complex one. It originated in the latter part of the nineteenth century, and was 'snuffed out to all intents and purposes in 1910'.(1) Our interest is directed towards those modernists, and those aspects of modernism, which attracted the attention of the younger generation of liberal catholic Anglicans.(2)

The greater part of this chapter is devoted to a discussion of the modernism and method of George Tyrrell. Tyrrell was the modernist most attractive to the anglo-catholic section of the Church of England. In many respects he was a conservative, particularly in regard to liturgical practices, and considerably less advanced than other modernists in his acceptance of criticism. Further, Tyrrell spent most of his time in England and was neither silent about his views nor about the treatment he received from the Roman authorities.

Two smaller sections of this chapter are devoted to the view of authority espoused by the influential Roman layman Baron Friedrich von Hügel, and the relationship of modernism and Anglicanism.

2. The modernist movement in the Roman Catholic Church

It must not be assumed that all who chose to call themselves modernists held common views.(3) Writing in The Times following the publication of Pascendi Tyrrell points to 'the danger of driving into one line the left and right wings of the religious movement. He foresaw that, however fundamental might be their differences,

"adversity makes strange bed fellows", and that men may become united in opposition who were not united in conviction'.(4) In Medievalism Tyrrell notes that one of the chief characteristics of the modernist movement is that it is not a party in the sense that its members claim one particular point of view. Rather the modernist claim is for liberality to explore all views and theological parties both within the Church of Rome and outside of it: 'Modernists wear no uniform'.(5) The modernists were, as Vidler remarks, 'a highly diversified collection of individuals with inchoate and inconsistent ideas'.(6)

The syllabus Lamentabili was published on 3 July 1907; followed by the encyclical letter Pascendi gregis on 8 September 1907.(7) Therein modernism was 'crushed and condemned en bloc, and its leaders, unnamed, but described, held up to obloquy, as the enemies of religion'.(8) Later, in 1910, an anti-modernist oath was imposed on all Roman clergy suspected of holding modernist views. Nearly all of those involved in the modernist movement considered the term modernism as employed in Pascendi to be ambiguous and misleading.(9) Tyrrell maintained that not only was it used of those who sought a synthesis between faith and criticism without damage to either, but it was also used of those who considered modernism to be fatal to catholicism. Of this latter group Tyrrell remarks: 'No one who has lost faith in the mission and destiny of the Roman Church and in the advantage of being identified with it is a Roman Catholic'.(10) For Tyrrell modernism was not a movement away from the Church, as it was often portrayed, but firmly within it.(11)

Illustrative of the differences which existed between the modernists, and the forms of modernism they espoused, is the contrast between Tyrrell and the French priest Alfred Firmin Loisy. Petre, Tyrrell's friend and biographer, comments that Loisy 'is probably

as consistent, given his actual point of view, in abandoning the cause of Catholicism, as Father Tyrrell was consistent in maintaining it'.(12) Elsewhere Petre summarizes Loisy's modernism as proposing 'a religion of Humanity, closely allied to the Positivist religion of Auguste Comte, but with a far deeper sense of the spiritual beyond'.(13) Tyrrell himself, writing in the preface of his last book Christianity at the Crossroads, claims: 'Between the Modernism of these (pages) and that of L'Evangile et l'Eglise there is scarcely a thought in common'.(14)

In what sense then may we describe Tyrrell a modernist ? And what are the characteristics of his particular form of modernism ?

Cardinal Mercier, Roman Catholic Primate of Belgium from 1907 until his death in 1926, in a Lenten Pastoral letter of 1908 traces the origins of modernism concluding that they lie within protestantism. Medievalism was Tyrrell's reply to Mercier's Pastoral.(15) By the term protestant Tyrrell assumed that Mercier meant anyone who did not accept the claims to papal infallibility. Such a definition Tyrrell points out would inevitably include the great Orthodox Churches of the east, not usually thought of as protestant.(16) Mercier made a sharp distinction between those who considered that each individual acted independently in matters of faith and doctrine, these in general were the protestants, and those who demanded absolute subjection of all individuals to the supreme authority of the Church in matters of faith and doctrine, these in general were the catholics. For Mercier there could be no position between these two. Yet it was the very middle ground that the modernist sought to defend.(17)

In his Pastoral Mercier accused Tyrrell of repeating in his works 'the fundamental error of Döllinger; that is to say, the parent-idea of Protestantism'.(18) In reply Tyrrell claims that

Mercier had completely failed to understand Döllinger who had in fact suffered to defend the 'fundamental principle that divides the Catholic from the Protestant conception of the Church'.(19) Neither may it be claimed that Döllinger was founder of the modernist movement, as Mercier had done; indeed Döllinger was less of a modernist than Newman, observes Tyrrell. The charge that modernism involves the individualism normally associated with protestantism is frankly denied by Tyrrell; he insists that it is for the whole Church collectively to witness to God's revelation.

What then for Tyrrell were the differences between protestantism and catholicism? The criterion he applied was the acceptance of tradition. The protestant selects only a proportion of the Christian tradition and considers the Bible alone to be the supreme authority in matters of faith and doctrine. The catholic accepts all tradition as bearing a unique authority of its own. However, in both protestantism and catholicism a certain personal acceptance of an objective rule of faith is necessary. Thus even the most extreme protestant can never be entirely an individualist. The modernist is then, in Tyrrell's view, one who recognises both the rights of authority and the rights of personality as complementary and not conflicting ideas.(20)

Though a modernist Tyrrell remained a faithful catholic. His dispute was with the official view of catholicism. He did not contend with the need for, and the existence of, ecclesiastical authority, but with its proper limits. 'To deny every sort of ecclesiastical inerrancy is, I think, to give up Catholicism, which is distinguished from Protestantism in holding that the united body of the faithful is the organ of the development of Christian truth, and that isolated inquiry has no divine guarantee.'(21)

Tyrrell observes, that in contrast to the present state of

the Roman Church, the divisions within protestantism are evidence of the energy and vitality that there exist. The doctrine of authority as currently practised by the Roman hierarchy will, in Tyrrell's view, do little to encourage a similar vitality within catholicism. "'The Protestant nations are sick", but the Catholic nations are dying.'(22)

Mercier describes Tyrrell in the Pastoral as 'the most penetrating observer of the present Modernist movement'. Tyrrell describes his own work as one of 'vulgarization'; claiming that it was through journalistic pressure that he had become a prominent figure in the movement. Following the publication of Pascendi Tyrrell was invited by The Times to express his views through their columns. This he did in two articles, the first published in late September 1907 and the second in early October of the same year. Petre comments: 'To answer the Pope at all was bad enough; to answer him in a Protestant newspaper was much worse'. By the end of 1907 Tyrrell had been deprived of the sacraments, though he was never formally excommunicated.(23)

Tyrrell described a modernist as 'a churchman, of any sort, who believes in the possibility of a synthesis between the essential truth of his religion and the essential truth of modernity'. Yet of his belief in tradition and modernity 'his belief in tradition has a certain priority'.(24) The particular aspects of modernity with which Tyrrell was concerned were science and criticism. His volume of essays Through Scylla and Charybdis is largely concerned with the relationship of science and faith.(25) They were also an attempt to reconcile the claims of liberal theology with those of catholic theology.

Liberal theology here stands for the theology which walks hand in hand with science, and works according to its principles; the principle of

science being a principle of unfettered growth, can theology admit, in itself, a like principle, while remaining faithful to the laws of its own nature? The answer is No, it cannot; theology is bound to the past, science has to do with the present; the task of theology is to preserve, the task of science is to discover; theology has for its subject matter the record of realities beyond the reach of reason, science is dealing with facts in front of it, that control its action at each moment in its progress.(26)

Having thus recognised the importance of contemporary thought and discovery the subsequent task for the modernist is to arrive at a synthesis between these and the essentials of Christianity.

The modernist claim was that science is but one aspect of revelation, and thereby provides a more certain basis for the very idea of revelation.(27) For the modernist both historical and biblical criticism, though condemned by Pascendi, were the products of scientific discovery. They should therefore be welcomed. The Church must stimulate the further advance of science in the interest of the attainment of truth. This the Church had not only failed to do, but by the exercise of her authority had in fact inhibited the advance of scientific discovery.

This task of synthesis, between faith and contemporary culture, is a continuing one. The modernist denied the possibility of ever reaching a final conclusion; for both faith and culture, particularly the latter, are involved in a continual process of discovery and change. God, the modernists claimed, is revealed in the general culture of the world, as well as in the Church. The task of the Christian is then to scrutinize, carefully, all that contemporary culture is throwing up that its new and true values may be absorbed into the catholic organism.(28) Tyrrell comments: 'Modernism, as I understand it, professes belief in the Church as well as in the Age; in the possibility of a synthesis which shall be for the enrichment of both, the impoverishment of

neither. To sacrifice either to the other is to depart, rightly or wrongly, from the Modernist programme'.(29)

Set against this modernist concept of synthesis is that which Tyrrell calls 'medievalism'. This is the idea that the primitive expression of catholicism is its final expression, nothing more may be added and nothing taken away. Modernism is relative; medievalism is absolute. Modernism does not maintain, as does medievalism, that the task and process of synthesis came to an end in the thirteenth century; and accordingly the modernist distrusts absolutism of every sort.(30)

However, Tyrrell explains that the modernist may not give unqualified support to all new discoveries and developments. He recognised that there is evil and error in society as well as good and truth. The modernist is then one who seeks to develop the highest ability to distinguish the one from the other, the good and true from the evil and erroneous. But that is not to say that error has no value at all. All experiences, of whatever nature, have some value. The errors of the past have their part to play in the determination of truth.(31) Thus in order that the synthesis may proceed uninhibited modernism demanded that science be allowed complete freedom in order that her discoveries which are true may be distinguished from those which are false. Modernism, unlike medievalism, was not then a finished theological system. Further, the modernist challenged the right of the medievalist to demand of him theological definitions and conclusions.(32)

In the Pastoral Mercier claimed that Tyrrell's scientific ideas were the product of the influence of Darwin's evolutionary thought. In his reply Tyrrell commented: 'The idea of evolution was not derived from the Darwinian hypothesis and then extended to the mental and social evolution of man, but contrawise. Human evolution

is not an hypothesis, but a self-evident fact'.(33). The art of criticism was in existence long before Darwin's theory of evolution. 'That the Bible and the Church were not created complete by a Divine fiat, that they have grown with the growth of man, is not a matter of hypothesis and inference but of observation.'(34)

That which Tyrrell was to call medievalism was in fact the very groundwork of his own theological education. His early years in the Jesuit Order were spent in 'assiduous and hopeful study of scholastic philosophy and dogmatic theology; St. Thomas Aquinas being his chief master and teacher'.(35)

Tyrrell's teaching has been characterized in the following seven categories:-

1. A very strong sense of the transcendental character of religion.
2. A definitely Catholic, as opposed to an individualistic outlook.
3. As in the 'Philosophy of Action' a firmly anti-intellectualist temper.
4. A full, at times almost too full, recognition of the part played by the will in an act of faith.
5. A deep sense of the supremacy of conscience and the sense of the sense of righteousness, as a basis of religion.
6. A profound spirit of mysticism.
7. A perception of the needs and rights of the ordinary mind, and of the duty of religious teachers to minister to those needs and respect those rights.(36)

Concluding his reply to Mercier's Pastoral Tyrrell points to the dangers of repressing a movement such as modernism. This is more dangerous, he suggests, because so many younger men, both laymen and priests, are being attracted towards the movement. For it is within the modernist movement that they find the recognition of the 'two deepest characteristics of the new order...the scientific spirit and the democratic movement'. Instead of repressing it the authorities may discover that their action has given rise to a popular revolt for greater liberty.(37) Despite these difficulties,

and despite the treatment he received from the Roman hierarchy, Tyrrell remained a convinced Roman Catholic.(38) Writing in the introduction to Tyrrell's Christianity at the Crossroads

Petre comments:

He finds that the Catholic Church has, on the whole, preserved the message of Christ more faithfully than any other; and he believes that in Christianity is to be found the germ of that future universal religion for which we all look. The Church has fulfilled her end, because she has kept for us the Christ of the Gospels; not a modernised Christ, made up to meet the latest requirements, but the Christ who spoke in the categories of His place and time, while His message was for all men of all places and all times.(39)

Modernism was but one of Baron Friedrich von Hügel's many interests. He exercised a considerable influence in both the Roman and non-Roman sections of the community through his writings on philosophy and mysticism.(40) His importance in the modernist movement may be illustrated by a letter, cited in A Variety of Catholic Modernists, which Vidler received from Maude Petre subsequent to the publication of his The Modernist Movement in the Roman Catholic Church:

"There is one gap in your history, and that is a more emphatic presentation of the hidden, but pervasive and persistent influence of the Baron...He is essential to any account. Without him Fr. Tyrrell would have been a spiritual and moral pioneer, but not strictly a modernist".(41) Vidler himself describes von Hügel as the 'chief engineer of the modernist movement'. The Baron acted as liason between the modernists, commenting on their works, and ensuring that they received favourable reviews.(42)

In 1904 the London Society for the Study of Religion was founded. This was largely the product of von Hügel's dissatisfaction with the Synthetic Society, of which he had been a member for some time and which he considered no longer fulfilled the needs

of the moment.(43) This new society brought von Hügel 'into touch with thinkers and scholars of the most diverse views'.(44) Both Tyrrell and A.L.Lilley were members.(45) Speakers at the meetings of the London Society for the Study of Religion included A.C.Headlam, who became Regius Professor of Divinity at Oxford in 1918, and the French liberal protestant theologian and sympathizer with the modernist movement, Paul Sabatier.(46)

The importance of von Hügel's contribution to the cause of modernism is related to his position as a renowned Christian thinker who had many opportunities to express his views and to secure a sympathetic hearing of the views of others, especially the modernists.

In 1904 von Hügel was invited, probably at the suggestion of Lilley, to address a group of Anglican clergymen known as 'The XII Silent Men'.(47) The address was entitled 'Official Authority and Living Religion'. It concerned the most important issues which Tyrrell had raised in his The Church and the Future.(48) Although the address was received by only a few clergy, and not published until 1924, it may reasonably be assumed that it reflects the Baron's general thought on the question of ecclesiastical authority at this period in his life; thought which would also have found expression in his conversation and other addresses.

'Official Authority and Living Religion' was concerned not with the 'context, the matter (to speak scholastically), of the difference between officialism on the one hand and the living forces of religion around us and within us on the other, but the very frame, the form, of this difference'.(49) The term officialism is used by Tyrrell in The Church and the Future to describe the Roman doctrines, especially that of authority, maintained by the Vatican. The terms officialism and medievalism are very closely related in Tyrrell's writings. Towards the end of 'Official

Authority and Living Religion' von Hügel comments:

In a word, official Authority will thus get recognised and treated both by its bearers and its subjects as a part, a normal necessary part, but ever only a part, of the total religious life; as a means, one of the normal necessary means, but not as the end or even as one end of that life; as directly Christian and Divine, only in its germinal and most elementary features and functions; and as directly busy with bearing its share in helping on that ever growing, ever-renewed experience and embodiment of these sacred realities from which Authority itself derives all its rights and duties, and of which it is but the consecrated, ceaseless servant.(50)

The modernist movement was then comprised of a number of individuals who did not necessarily share common aims and objectives. They were united by the fact that the Roman hierarchy were opposed to their holding, and expressing, views which departed from the official teaching of the Roman Church. Thus inevitably the issue of authority was of primary concern to the modernists. It should further be noted that when the term modernism is used it generally needs some qualification as to what form of modernism is being considered.

3. Tyrrell's method

In this section we will undertake an analysis of the method Tyrrell used to arrive at a concept of ecclesiastical authority that was at variance to that of official Roman Catholicism. It is Tyrrell's method that exerted a profound influence not only within his own communion but upon the younger generation of liberal catholic Anglicans.

The first step in Tyrrell's method finds its clearest and most concise expression in an article, first published in The Month, November 1899, entitled 'The Relation of Theology to Devotion'. This article Tyrrell 'regarded as the keynote of his

philosophy, and as the kernel of whatever original contribution he had made to religious thought'.(51) The central thesis of the essay is that a distinction must be made between the 'philosophical and the vulgar way of conceiving and speaking about things'.(52) The former is orderly and artificial; the latter concrete, disorderly and natural. The philosophical way of speaking arises from the need men have to classify their experiences. Yet at the same time 'the world at large refuses to be harnessed to our categories, and goes its own rude unscientific way'.(53) To explain this distinction Tyrrell gives as an example the means by which a man may achieve an understanding of nature. It is possible to study nature in a museum, this would lead to a philosophical understanding. Alternatively, a vulgar understanding would be derived from a life lived, for its whole, in the backwoods. Both the philosophical and the vulgar understanding are imperfect: 'Yet it is less misleading to take a confused, general view of an object, than to view one of its parts or elements violently divorced from the rest'.(54) Hence in the world 'what is scientifically true in the abstract, may be practically false in the concrete'.(55)

Tyrrell recognises that if understanding the physical world is attended by these problems then the spiritual and supernatural world will present even greater difficulties. For 'we can think and speak of it only in analogous terms borrowed from this world of our sensuous experience'.(56) Thus 'all our "explanations" of spiritual activity are, however disguisedly, mechanical at root; thought is a kind of photography or portraiture; free-will a sort of weighing process; the soul itself, in so far as it is not described negatively, is described in terms of body...Still more when we try to explain that world beyond experience, internal or external, ought we to be on our guard lest we forget the merely

analogous character of our thought'.(57)

The role of the Church, Tyrrell concludes, is then to act as the guardian of the truth; and to resolve the tension which inevitably exists between the philosophical and vulgar understandings. The Judaeo-Christian revelation has been communicated in vulgar, not philosophical, terms and modes of thought. 'God has revealed himself, not to the wise...but to the profanum vulgus, and therefore He has spoken their language...The Church's guardianship in the matter is to preserve the exact ideas which the simple language conveyed to its first hearers'.(58) Tyrrell considered this original revelation to be the corrective by which 'the Church ever recalls the lex orandi and the lex credendi to the original tradition and 'Preserves the balance between them and makes them help one another'.(59) 'It is important to remember the abstract character of certain theological conclusions, and the superiority of the concrete language of revelation as a guide to truth.'(60) This theme is further developed and restated in Tyrrell's last book Christianity at the Crossroads. Here Tyrrell remarks: 'concrete imagery is of more universal significance than conceptual language'.(61) With the aid of an illustration Tyrrell explains how the two forms of understanding may interact upon each other:

Allowing that life and action, involving as they do a confused consciousness of the truths they imply, are more important than the analysis and statement of those truths in doctrinal form, yet a slow reaction of doctrine upon life and action cannot be denied. If the root affects the branches, powerfully and directly, the branches may affect the root, slowly and indirectly, but no less really.(62)

'The Relation of Theology to Devotion' is particularly concerned with the Church's abuse of the philosophical mode of understanding, by insisting that it alone conveyed the entire truth. 'The use

of philosophy lies in its insisting on the inadequacy of the vulgar statement; its abuse, in forgetting the inadequacy of its own, and thereby falling into a far more grievous error than that which it would correct'.(63) Hence Tyrrell concludes that: 'Neither the metaphysical nor the vulgar idea is adequate, though taken together they correct one another; but taken apart, it may be said that the vulgar is the less unreal of the two'.(64)

In his Pastoral Mercier claimed that modernism involved the rejection of revelation.(65) This Tyrrell strenuously denied. He claims that Mercier had confused the notion of revelation with that of theology; faith with theological orthodoxy; preaching the gospel with teaching theology. Distinguishing revelation and theology in Medievalism Tyrrell states: 'Theology is human; Revelation is Divine. Revelation is a supernaturally imparted experience of realities - an experience that utters itself spontaneously in imaginative popular non-scientific form; theology is the natural, tentative fallible analysis of that experience'.(66) For Tyrrell the erreur fondamentale of medievalism is its 'confusion of faith with orthodoxy; of revelation with theology. It is the notion of the Church as an organ of intellectual enlightenment...her mission is to the heart and not to the head...the Gospel convinces by ideals not by ideas'.(67)

We may summarize the first step in Tyrrell's method in the following way: God has revealed himself through means which all men may perceive and understand. Before proceeding to the final step, a discussion of the implications of this first step for the concept of ecclesiastical authority, it is necessary that we consider an intermediary step, the nature of religious experience; that is the means by which that perception and understanding of

God's revelation is achieved.

Christianity at the Crossroads contains a comprehensive expression of Tyrrell's thought on the nature and importance of religious experience. He states that Jesus Christ himself drew his knowledge of heavenly things from the prophetic and mystical writings and from his own 'mystical experience'.(68) Thus the system of catholic theology began to emerge when the Church began to translate the revelation of Jesus into conceptual form. Thus the vulgar understanding began to give way to a philosophical understanding: 'Jesus imposed, with the authority of Divine revelation, and as a matter of life and death, that vision of the transcendent which the Church has clothed in a theological form. If He did not impose philosophical formulas He imposed the revelation, the imaginative vision, which they formulate'.(69)

Of the nature of religious experience Tyrrell remarks in a chapter in Christianity at the Crossroads on 'The Truth-Value of Visions':

God can be revealed to us in experiences, just as our fellow-men are. He is an object of that faith which enters into our simplest judgements - the faith by which we believe in an objective world, or in minds other than our own. I do not find my fellow-man in, but through my experience; by a work of spontaneous interpretation. If my idea of him be not merely a symbol, it is because I have an adequate measure of him in myself; whereas God does not belong to the world of external sense, nor is His nature expressible properly in terms of my own. The first instinct of thought is to treat everything as another self - to exalt what is below us, to abase what is above us, to that level. 'Differentiation is the slow work of experience and reflection' - a work which can never be complete...By his inward experiences of felt harmony or discord with the transcendent, man can test the value of his religious notions and the conduct they dictate. It is in those experiences that God guides him directly. There is no other language between the soul and God. The spontaneous or deliberate symbols, in which those experiences take mental shape, serve directly to embody and retain the

experience; to make it in some way communicable; to fix the direction of life, the tone of feeling, suggested by it. Like the hypotheses of science, they serve to co-ordinate and control phenomena, and in the measure that they do so they are founded in and represent reality - albeit symbolically. When we realise how purely symbolic even our best and most fruitful scientific hypotheses must be, on how infinitesimal an experience of the whole they are founded, we can see that revelation involves no violation of the usual processes of thought, nor calls for any sort of special faculty.(70)

Thus in order to speak of the spiritual and supernatural the language used is, of necessity, symbolic and analogous.(71) Tyrrell maintained that religious experience is also a form of symbolism: 'Hence all our theology...deals not with transcendent realities but with the visions or revelations in which they are symbolised'.(72) However, Tyrrell recognised that not all men would be willing to admit the symbolic character of their religious experience: 'To admit that their God, their Satan and their Heaven are symbols is, for them, to deny the reality of their spiritual life'.(73)

Tyrrell conceived the institutional Church as the place where the religious experience of each member is moulded together as a unified whole. The function of the hierarchy is thus to bring into focus the "'countless rays of spiritual illumination"'.(74). Hence, 'it is within the Church where, experiences of so many people and so many cultures are united and compressed and forced into harmony, that the Gospel-spirit seeks experimentally to embody itself in the best form of external religious institution'.(75) Thus the bishop has an equal part to play with the other members of the community, as does the Pope. The special function of the episcopate is to be representative of the whole. It is necessary that all who live in a community have some share in its actions and aims, all should feel responsible to some degree, Tyrrell concludes. But the Vatican Council and Pascendi explicitly took away the

right of citizenship from the catholic laymen and priest. Their only function was simply to obey the hierarchy.(76)

For Tyrrell theology was about drawing ideas from experience; his struggle was for a 'living theology that continually proceeds from and returns to that experience of which it is the ever tentative and perfectable analysis'.(77) He was aware that the Church should present the gospel in a way that men would understand and respond to.(78) Concluding 'The Relation of Theology to Devotion' Tyrrell warns: 'Theology is not always wise and temperate...and has itself often to be brought to the lex orandi test...Where it begins to contradict the facts of the spiritual life, it loses its reality and its authority'.(79)

The final step in Tyrrell's method is the application of the distinction between the vulgar and philosophical understandings to the notion of ecclesiastical authority.

The exercise of authority is clearly concerned with establishing the dogmas of the faith. The Roman Catholic Church had come to view this function as the particular responsibility of the episcopate, and more especially of the Pope. We have noted above Tyrrell's distinction between original dogma and theological opinion.(80) Reason alone, Tyrrell maintained, is inadequate to arrive at an understanding of original dogma: 'What reason has built up reason also can frequently demolish; one mind can argue out the mitigations which another mind has argued in'.(81) It is then through faith, ('not as the antithesis of reason, but as the sense of the great world of spiritual reality in which each fact of revelation is rooted, and in the midst of which alone it can find its proper explanation') not reason, that the original dogma may be discovered. Thus the pronou[^]ncements of the Church hierarchy, for which authority is claimed, are only valid in so far as they express the original

dogma and not merely theological opinion.(82)

The orthodox theory of catholicism, as Tyrrell referred to it, states: 'The doctrines and essential institutions of the Catholic Church have always been identically the same...delivered in detail by Christ to His Apostles and by them to their successors'.(83)

Of this official view Tyrrell remarks in The Church and the Future:

'According to "officialism" Christ instituted the Church so as to secure for future ages and all nations the same privileges in the way of doctrinal guidance enjoyed by His first disciples'.(84)

In addition to the actual explicit beliefs of the faithful there are also those which, at any one point in Christian history, have not yet been given explicit and formal expression. These are implicit actual, though not stated, beliefs.(85) Tyrrell notes that under the cover of ambiguity the word implicit has come to stand for a new conception of tradition, which has been quietly substituted for the old. Thus implied actual belief no longer means simply that belief in the truth is implied by an explicit belief, but an implied potential belief. Hence a man 'is said to believe and admit, in spite of his explicit denial, all that is implied by his data, then every avowed atheist is a theist, and every heretic an orthodox'.(86) The following illustration is given by Tyrrell to clarify the distinction.

If I say I attended a friend's funeral it is not necessary to say that he is dead. That is stated implicitly. Yet it is not my potential, but my actual, belief; my actual belief in his death is implied by my actual belief in his burial. There are many more or less remote consequences of his death which I could, but do not, infer. These I believe potentially but not actually - i.e. I do not believe them. I may even deny them. They are implied but my belief in them is not implied by my assertion of his death.(87)

The practical consequences of this new concept of tradition are seen in the 'official' notion of the Depositum fidei: 'all the Majors and Minors of modern Catholicism were revealed to St. Peter and passed on to St. Linus, who, had he been Socratically interrogated about any of the dogmas or Sacraments, would have answered in substantially the same way as a D.D. of the Gregorian University. We may call this the "explication", as distinct from the "development", of dogma'.(88)

Tyrrell further maintains that this new concept of tradition has given a new meaning to the ecumenical councils. They have become a forum for theological debate; the innovation becomes an open question and the protagonists take sides; ultimately a vote decides the day.(89) Yet, Tyrrell claims in opposition to this new view, the early Church was concerned with the doctrines the Apostles actually held; novelty was the definition of heresy.

When such novelties arose and spread, bishops met in council, not to debate an open theological question and impose their vote on the faithful, but to bear witness as to the actual faith of their flocks; not to decide what their flocks should believe for the future, but to declare what they did believe at present and had always believed; not to make the innovation heretical, but to declare that it was so already, as being a departure from the actual and morally universal belief of the faithful; not to define an open question, but to declare that it was never open.(90)

The old concept of tradition maintained that revelation was 'guarded by the infallible memory of the faithful'.(91) This concept found its formal expression in the Vincentian Canon: 'That which is believed by everybody everywhere, and has always been so believed'.(92) The new concept, on the other hand, maintains that revelation is 'guarded by the infallible understanding of the episcopate in ecumenical debate - infallible in deducing the logical consequences of the faith of the past generations,

and adding them to the ever growing body of explicit and actual beliefs'. This new orthodoxy of 'dialectical development had long superseded the old apologetic of actual identity and unchangeableness when Newman appeared on the scene with the theory of doctrinal development...a radically different and irreconcilable system'.(93) Tyrrell concludes that Newman was neither a modernist nor an ultramontanist: 'The whole aim of his apologetic was the integrity of the Catholic tradition of the Roman Church; its preservation against the corrosive atmosphere of rationalism and liberalism'. Newman did not, perhaps, see the 'ultimate connection between methods and results; that the new could not defend the old...So far, and it is now very far, as the Roman System has been created by scholasticism, it can only be maintained and defended by scholasticism'. Thus 'in virtue of his methods Newman did as much for unbelief as for belief...Others may not share his religious experience or, if they do, may seek their explanation in psychology rather than in divinity; and for those his method is a two-edged sword'.(94)

Medievalism was primarily concerned with countering this new concept of tradition, the ultr^amontane view of the authority of the Church, given formal expression and assent by the Vatican Council 1869-1870 and propounded by Mercier in his Pastoral. This medievalism, Tyrrell observed, sets the Pope apart from the rest of the Church; bishops, priests and laymen can do nothing but listen to him and obey.(95) The ultramontane view proposed the complete obliteration of the ancient catholic principle which sees in the Pope merely the witness to, and the representative of, the collective mind and will of the Universal Church.(96) As a result the theological unity of the Church is ensured by referring all questions to the one infallible theologian, the Pope.

Even the bishops no longer have any real authority, they may only follow where the Pope leads. However, Tyrrell finds it hard to understand why the Church did not discover this truth about Papal authority until 1870.

On 29 September 1900 the English Roman Catholic hierarchy issued a Joint Pastoral Letter entitled The Church and Liberal Catholicism.(97) The main point it sought to make, and which Tyrrell was quick to seize, was that the authority of the Church had a divine origin. It set out the distinction between the Ecclesia Discens and the Ecclesia Docens. Tyrrell criticised this distinction in that it split the Church into two quite separate bodies, 'the one all active, the other all passive, related literally as sheep and shepherd'.(98) The Pope, alone, is the Ecclesia Docens. He is outside and above the Church, to be identified with Christ. This mechanical concept of authority had become the 'badge of orthodoxy'.(99) In contrast to this mechanical concept Tyrrell sought a concept of authority which was organic, in which all, both ordained and lay, would be part of a living whole.(100)

The model of the Ecclesia Discens and the Ecclesia Docens was used by Tyrrell in Medievalism to illustrate the contrast between the view of the Church conceived by the Vatican Council, and the concept of the Church derived from authentic catholicism.(101) Tyrrell believed that when writing the Pastoral Mercier understood that 'tradition lives exclusively in the collective episcopal conscience, or still worse in the single conscience of the Pope'.(102) He further notes that in the view of Mercier, that is the ultramontane view, the Pope is accorded the same status as the Bible is in certain forms of protestantism. Ultramontanism had turned the whole structure of the Church upside down; the bishops became merely the principle representatives of the Ecclesia Discens.

whilst the Pope is the Ecclesia Docens.(103) The practical consequence of this is that in every diocese there are two bishops, the diocesan and the Pope.(104)

When the Church was founded there was not a teaching Church and a learning Church, but a 'teaching Church and a learning world... Every Christian by virtue of his baptism was a teacher and Apostle'.(105) As with Jesus himself so with the early Church, its authority lay in the strength of its teaching and personality; its teaching of the light of new revelation; of a new experience of a new life; of a new ideal of human personality. As the Church developed so certain centres developed as the most expeditious ones to which appeal might be made for a decision on a question of theology which could be regarded as representative of the whole Church. Rome became the most important of these centres. And yet, claims Tyrrell, it eventually came to abuse its position, using it as a means of coercion. So much so that in his Pastoral Mercier ascribes to Pascendi equal authority to that of the Nicene creed. Where will it all end, asks Tyrrell? 'Have we yet to learn of the immaculate conception of the Pope ?'(106)

Tyrrell's concept of authority involved the participation of every member of the Church, both the teaching Church and the taught Church were, together, the 'organ and depository of a Divine tradition'. The teaching Church is the 'bishops in council, free and representative of their dioceses', whose task it is to produce a consensus of the whole body of believers; their guide is tradition, which is to them what the law is to a judge, 'a rule set above them by a higher authority'.(107) 'The true Teacher of the Church is the Holy Spirit, acting immediately in and through the whole body of the faithful, - lay and cleric; the teaching of the episcopate consists in dispensing; in gathering from all.

and distributing to each, with the authority, and in the name of, the whole Divine Society.'(108)

4. Modernism and Anglicanism

George Tyrrell, who was born of Irish protestant stock, entered the Church of Rome during his teens. The relationship of Roman Catholicism and Anglicanism was of considerable interest to him, and an issue to which he returned from time to time in his writings.(109) In the two years 1895-1897 he wrote a number of articles on this topic. In 'The Prospects of Reunion', July 1897, he suggests a number of grave objections to the reunion of Romanism and Anglicanism, concluding that the 'abiding distinction between Protestantism, in the strict sense, and Catholicity, in the true sense,' lies in their 'conception of the Church as a supernatural society'.(110)

Commenting on Anglicanism in The Church and the Future Tyrrell describes it as 'that most illogical and impossible of compromises, hardly imaginable outside England'.(111) 'The aspiration of Anglicanism is at least to be respected, however its failure as a via media may be deplored'.(112)

In a paper, written in April 1905, entitled Anglican Liberalism, Tyrrell describes liberal Christians of all denominations as being faced with the same problem, namely, reconciling intellectual sincerity with ecclesiastical authority. The idea of Anglicanism providing a bridge between protestantism and catholicism finds expression in this paper. Herein Tyrrell describes the comprehensiveness of the Church of England as being at once her glory and her shame.(113) A few months after Tyrrell's death there appeared in the Contemporary an article written by Tyrrell and entitled 'The Dearth of Clergy'. This article was also concerned with the Church of England.(114)

Petre remarks that Tyrrell's desire to return to the Church of England reached its high water mark in 1908: 'The system and discipline of the Church of England might indeed have saved him from some of the difficulties he experienced in the Church of Rome; but it might not have saved him from such trials as those of the Rev. J. M. Thompson'. (115) Tyrrell never in fact returned to the Anglican Church.

It was at about this time that Tyrrell took a considerable interest in the Old Catholic Church. 'His idea was to promote an Anglican, Old Catholic entente, with the purpose, first, of counteracting the Romanizing tendency in a certain section of the Anglican body; next...of frightening thereby and annoying the representatives of the tyrannical authority in the Roman Church; lastly and chiefly, of forwarding a movement towards the reunion of Christendom'. These attempts had no lasting results, apart, perhaps, from making certain Anglicans and Old Catholics more aware of one another than they had previously been. (116)

The influence of the modernists, and of the various forms of modernism, upon Anglicanism is a point upon which a number of writers have commented. (117)

The Anglican clergyman A. L. Lilley, was, perhaps, the greatest exponent of modernist thought during the actual period of the controversy that surrounded the publication of Pascendi. It may be noted that when Petre came to prepare her biography of Tyrrell she depended more upon the advice of Lilley than upon that of von Hügel. (118) Alfred Leslie Lilley was born at Clare, County Armagh in 1860; educated at Trinity College, Dublin; ordained to a title in the Church of Ireland which he served for two years; between 1900 and 1912 he was Vicar of St. Mary's, Paddington Green;

made a canon of Hereford in 1911; in 1913 he became Archdeacon of Ludlow. 'His ecclesiastical and theological orientation was congenial to the modernists, for he had graduated from Ulster protestantism via anglo-catholicism (neither of which was conducive to width of sympathy) to a churchmanship that was liberal without being liberal protestant.'(119)

In 1908 Lilley compiled a collection of previously published articles for publication, with addition of some new material, under the title Modernism: A Record and Review.(120) The volume was dedicated to Tyrrell, Lilley's 'dear friend and fellow-countryman'. Its purpose was to popularize modernist ideas within the Church of England. In his 'Epistle Dedicatory' to Tyrrell, Lilley remarks : 'I have addressed these pages primarily to what I conceive to be the needs and the opportunities of my own Communion'.(121) Of the implications of modernist thought for Anglicanism Lilley remarks:

It is because the Anglicanism in which I have found my own spiritual home has tenaciously held to both of these apparently contradictory principles, liberty and authority, in virtue of an instinct deeper than its intellectual grasp of the method of their reconciliation, that I have dared to hope that the great constructive enterprise which you (Tyrrell) have taken in hand might find the most immediate and sympathetic recognition within our own borders. We have idly dreamed of a Reunion which would have sacrificed all the hard gains of life and even life itself to the exigencies of an absolutism henceforward unassailable because at last universal. You have opened up for us the path to a Reunion which would preserve everything that life has acquired, and strengthen it against sterility on the one hand and disintegration on the other and against the decay which is the inevitable issue of both.(122)

In his section on Lilley in A Variety of Catholic Modernists, Vidler quotes part of a letter Lilley wrote to Loisy dated 4 April 1908.

In the main there is a portentous hush in Anglican circles. Our so-called scholars are, I feel sure, radically unfriendly and bitterly resent the slightest concession to the positions demanded by honest criticism... Meanwhile the younger men are profoundly disturbed, and are not to be satisfied by the dogmatic assurances of Gore & Co. that criticism is tending more and more to conservative conclusions!(123)

The work of A.L.Lilley is then of significance in any study of the relationship of modernism and Anglicanism, for it is largely as a result of his efforts that modernist views were propagated in the Church of England.

Gerald Christopher Rawlinson was, in Vidler's view, after Lilley 'the anglican priest who was most attached to the modernists'.(124) He was an establishment figure within the anglo-catholic movement and a regular contributor to the Treasury and Church Times.(125) It was because of Rawlinson's articles, and of T.A.Lacey's, that the Church Times 'appeared for several years to be remarkably sympathetic to the modernist cause'.(126) G.C.Rawlinson, who was no relation of A.E.J.Rawlinson, was ordained in 1893 to a title at Byfleet, Surrey under a tractarian vicar whose 'influence had a definite effect on Rawlinson's development'.(127) Rawlinson made a special study of French theology, and especially that of the modernists.(128) However, he was by no means an uncritical admirer of modernism. Yet he 'greatly regretted the indiscriminating treatment of Modernism by Anglo-Catholics'.(129) The Church Times was the primary organ of anglo-catholicism, it was through its pages that Rawlinson gained a sympathetic hearing for the modernists in an otherwise hostile environment.

Both Lilley and Rawlinson were attached, in differing degrees, to the anglo-catholic wing of the Church of England. Vidler cites a list of Oxford teachers who were, in differing degrees, interested

in modernism; the list includes S.R.Driver and Hastings Rashdall.(130) Their obvious sympathy with modernist views may, ultimately, have influenced their students. Their students including the younger generation of liberal catholics, which at Oxford during the period when the modernist controversy was at its height included A.E.J. Rawlinson.

In 1907 seven Cambridge men wrote to Tyrrell to express to him that his present situation caused them a 'deep sense of grief'. The seven were H.L.Pass, Will Spens, E.G.Selwyn, G.H.Clayton, W.L.Mackinnal, S.C.Carpenter and J.C.How.(131) Both Spens and Selwyn were amongst the younger generation of liberal catholics.

Another anglo-catholic priest, who exercised considerable influence and who was sympathetic to modernism was J.N.Figgis. In 1907 John Neville Figgis, then aged 41, joined the Community of the Resurrection. Previously he was Rector of Marnhall, Dorset, and previous to that Lecturer at St Catherines and Chaplain to Pembroke College, Cambridge for seven years.(132) In 1908-1909 Figgis gave the Hulsean Lectures at Cambridge. These were entitled The Gospel and Human Needs.(133) The notes appended to these lectures include references to a number of modernist works and works about modernism. They include Lilley's Modernism(134), Tyrrell's Lex Orandi (135), von Hügel's The Mystical Element...(136), H.C. Corrance (137), and Loisy (138). In these lectures Figgis sought a balance between individualism and rationalism, on the one hand, and the denial of the possibility of personal discovery, on the other, in matters of faith and order.

Published with the Hulsean Lectures were four sermons preached by Figgis between November 1907 and September 1908. One of these, preached in Exeter Cathedral on 18 June 1908, is entitled 'The Need of Authority in the Church'.(139) Figgis continues the theme

of his Hulsean Lectures in denying the authority of the Church to the extent claimed by the Roman Catholic Church for the Pope, and also denying that Christianity is purely a religion of the spirit. Figgis, however, insists that authority is essential to the life of the Church.(140)

The claim of the Church to authority rests upon two principles - the social nature of man and the lordship of Christ. As Christians we are disciples, pupils, learners, and we owe loyalty to our teacher; and we are also Churchmen, members of a fellowship, inheritors of a kingdom, and owe allegiance to the great community whose life we share. Through the Church we become 'heirs of all the ages,' and enter into the whole religious experience of the race. To attempt to do without it, to throw it off as useless is as idle and as wrong as it is to hide our talent in a napkin, and leave men unenriched by the special gifts of our day and generation.(141)

In the preface to Figgis' Civilisation at the Crossroads, four lectures delivered at Harvard University in 1911, we again note the relationship of Figgis' thought and that of Tyrrell.(142)

The title of the whole course and certain criticisms in the first lecture might seem to imply that I desire to controvert the main thesis of the late Father Tyrrell's famous work. This, however, is not the case. Too greatly am I in debt to all the writings of that arresting author and especially to his posthumous work to have any such thought. But I do desire to point out that the problem can be studied from more standpoints than one. Something is crumbling all around us. That is clearer every moment. I write this on the day of the introduction of the Bill for a Minimum Wage. Is it Christianity that is decaying, or civilisation in its existing shape?(143)

5. Conclusion

In this chapter we have attempted to do two things, first, to describe the concept of authority espoused by the modernist George Tyrrell, and, secondly, to demonstrate that this concept

had a certain currency in Anglican circles. When we come to discuss the neo-liberal catholic view of authority it will be seen that it makes appeal to religious experience in much the same way as does Tyrrell. It is in this respect that neo-liberal catholicism owes most to the modernists of the Roman Catholic Church.

The emergence of neo-liberal catholicism was catalyzed by a series of events in the years prior to the First World War. We must now consider this period.

References

1. A.R.Vidler, A Variety of Catholic Modernists (Cambridge, 1970), p. 1. For a general discussion of the modernist movement see A.R.Vidler, The Modernist Movement in The Roman Catholic Church (Cambridge, 1934).
2. The term neo-liberal catholic is here used for this younger generation, including A.E.J.Rawlinson, Will Spens and E.G.Selwyn.
3. The terms modernism and liberalism are often confused. In this thesis the term modernism is used in its strict sense to describe those Roman Catholics who were condemned by the decree Pascendi.
4. M.D.Petre, Autobiography and Life of George Tyrrell (London, 1912), vol II, p. 351.
5. G.Tyrrell, Medievalism (London, 1908), pp. 106, 158-160.
6. Vidler, A Variety of Catholic Modernists, p. 15.
7. Petre, Autobiography and Life, vol II, pp. 332 ff. For an English translation of Pascendi see P.Sabatier, Modernism (London, 1908), pp. 309 ff. For a discussion of the authorship of Pascendi see Vidler, A Variety of Catholic Modernists, pp. 16-18.
8. M.D.Petre, Modernism: Its Failures and its Fruits (London, 1914), p. 7. see also L.F.Barmann, Baron Friedrich Von Hügel and the Modernist Crisis in England (Cambridge, 1972), pp. 183 ff.
9. Vidler, A Variety of Catholic Modernists, p. 15.
10. Tyrrell, Medievalism, p. 145. see also Petre, Modernism, pp. 1-2. see also G.Tyrrell, Christianity at the Crossroads (London, 1963), pp. 35, 81. This edition is printed with

a Foreword by A.R.Vidler. First published in 1909 after Tyrrell's death. In Christianity at the Crossroads Tyrrell is concerned with both the Christological and the Ecclesiastical problems as he perceives them within the Roman Church. In the preface he remarks: 'In these pages I have asked myself frankly what I should consider the essence of Christianity were I not acquainted with the results of criticism; and how much of criticism I should admit if I cared nothing for Christianity'. p. 19. Further, Tyrrell is here concerned with the doctrinal rather than the practical aspects of modernism. p. 28.

11. Tyrrell, Christianity at the Crossroads, p. 21.
12. Petre, Autobiography and Life, vol II, p. 353.
13. Petre, Modernism, pp. xiii, 15-24, 42-54.
14. Tyrrell, Christianity at the Crossroads, p. 20.
15. Petre notes that she had once been told by an English bishop that Mercier had previously made 'certain efforts in Tyrrell's behalf'. In the light of Pascendi, published the previous September, Mercier, in his 1908 Pastoral, was making his position clear with regard to modernism. see Petre, Autobiography and Life, vol II, pp. 360 ff. see also Tyrrell, Medievalism, p. 22. The Lenten Pastoral was, with Mercier's consent, printed, together with an English translation, in the same volume as Medievalism. Petre, Autobiography and Life, vol II, p. 362.
16. Tyrrell, Medievalism, pp. 40-42, 141.
17. *ibid.* pp. 88-95.
18. *ibid.* p. 9.
19. *ibid.* p. 88.
20. *ibid.* pp. 97-117.
21. G. Tyrrell, The Church and the Future (London, 1910), pp. 12-14, 117-124. The Church and the Future was written between 1902 and 1903 and first published under the pseudonym of Hilaire Bourdon. It first appeared, for private circulation, in 1903, but was published with an introduction by Petre and under Tyrrell's own name in 1910. Barmann concludes that it was: 'Tyrrell's most synthetic and important book at the time it was first printed, and perhaps, of all his works to the time of his death. It included the great themes and insights of his 'The Relation of Theology to Devotion', his scattered reflections on the Joint Pastoral, his soon to be published Lex Orandi, and most of his other works too - all worked into a careful synthesis on the meaning and constitution of the church'. Barmann, Baron Friedrich Von Hügel, p. 155. see also Petre, Autobiography and Life, vol II, pp. 142, 186-191, 210.
22. Tyrrell, Medievalism, pp. 31-32, 101.

23. *ibid.* pp. 9, 105 ff. see also Petre, Autobiography and Life, vol II, p. 335.
24. Tyrrell, Christianity at the Crossroads, pp. 25-26, 146.
25. Petre, Autobiography and Life, vol II, pp. 196-203.
26. *ibid.* vol II, p. 212.
27. Tyrrell, Medievalism, pp. 123 ff.
28. *ibid.* pp. 147, 161-172.
29. *ibid.* p. 168.
30. *ibid.* pp. 141-148.
31. *ibid.* p. 151.
32. *ibid.* pp. 152-155.
33. *ibid.* p. 113.
34. *ibid.* p. 115.
35. Petre, Modernism, p. 55.
36. *ibid.* pp. 54 ff. For a discussion of the 'Philosophy of Action' see *ibid.* pp. 29-42. see also Vidler, A Variety of Catholic Modernists, pp. 118-120. Tyrrell was concerned with the needs of all men. He considered that the Church had bewildered many of the unlearned and disinterested many of the learned by her teaching. see Petre, Modernism, pp. 11-12.
37. Tyrrell, Medievalism, pp. 120, 130, 163-167. see also Tyrrell, Christianity at the Crossroads, p. 29.
38. Petre, Autobiography and Life, vol II, pp. 373 ff.
39. Tyrrell, Christianity at the Crossroads, p. 17. For examples of Tyrrell's devotion to catholicism see *ibid.* pp. 143-147, 167, 187. see also Tyrrell, Medievalism, pp. 183-188. see also Petre, Autobiography and Life, vol II, pp. 404 ff.
40. Vidler, A Variety of Catholic Modernists, p. 110.
41. *ibid.* p. 111.
42. *ibid.* pp. 113-115.
43. Michael de la Bedoyere, The Life of Baron von Hügel (London, 1951), p. 169. see also 'von Hügel' in F.L.Cross and E.A. Livingstone ed., The Oxford Dictionary of the Christian Church 2nd ed. (London, 1974), p. 1449.
44. 'von Hügel' in Oxford Dictionary of the Christian Church, p. 1449.
45. Barmann, Baron Friedrich von Hügel, pp. 182, 188.

46. see footnote on ibid. p. 91. see also de la Bodoyere, Life of von Hügel, p. 177. see also 'Sabatier, Paul' in Oxford Dictionary of the Christian Church, p. 1216.
47. Barmann, Baron Friedrich von Hügel, pp. 154 ff.
48. 'Official Authority and Living Religion' was included in the second series of von Hügel's Essays and Addresses (London, 1926), pp. 1-23.
49. ibid. p. 4.
50. ibid. p. 23.
51. Republished in G.Tyrrell, The Faith of the Millions (London, 1901), pp. 228 ff. see also Petre, Modernism, p. 12. Barmann, Baron Friedrich von Hügel, pp. 144-145. Petre, Autobiography and Life, vol II, p. 98.
52. Tyrrell, The Faith of the Millions, p. 228.
53. ibid. p. 229.
54. ibid. p. 231.
55. ibid. p. 231.
56. ibid. p. 231.
57. ibid. p. 234. see also Tyrrell, The Church and the Future, pp. 83-88.
58. Tyrrell, The Faith of the Millions, pp. 238-239.
59. ibid. p. 240.
60. ibid. p. 243.
61. Tyrrell, Christianity at the Crossroads, p. 41. For a discussion of the process by which ideas become catholic see ibid. p. 137.
62. ibid. p. 28.
63. Tyrrell, The Faith of the Millions, p. 237.
64. ibid. pp. 234-235.
65. Tyrrell, Medievalism, pp. 116 ff.
66. ibid. p. 129.
67. ibid. pp. 175-176.
68. Tyrrell, Christianity at the Crossroads, p. 72.
69. ibid. p. 72.
70. ibid. pp. 83 ff.

71. see page 52 of this thesis.
72. Tyrrell, Christianity at the Crossroads, pp. 121-122, 125-126.
73. *ibid.* p. 132. For a discussion of the symbolic character of the resurrection see *ibid.* p. 109.
74. Tyrrell, Medievalism, p. 132. see also Tyrrell The Church and the Future, p. 95.
75. Tyrrell, Medievalism, pp, 177, 185.
76. *ibid.* pp. 134-136.
77. *ibid.* p. 47.
78. This point may be illustrated by the following extract from 'The Relation of Theology to Devotion'
 'Again, what is called the Hidden Life of our Lord in the Sacrament, is a thought upon which the faith and devotion of many saints and holy persons has fed itself for centuries; yet it is one with which a narrow metaphysics plays havoc very disastrously. The notion of the loneliness, the sorrows, and disappointments of the neglected Prisoner of Love in the tabernacle may be crude and simple; but it is assuredly nearer the truth than the notion of the now passionless and apathetic Christ, who suffered these things by foresight two thousand years ago, and whose irrevocable pains cannot possibly be increased or lessened by any conduct of ours. I have more than once known all the joy and reality taken out of a life that fed on devotion to the Sacramental Presence by such a flash of theological illumination; and have seen Magdalens left weeping at empty tombs and crying: "They have taken away my Lord, and I know not where they have laid him".'
 Tyrrell, The Faith of the Millions, pp. 245-246.
79. Tyrrell, The Faith of the Millions, pp. 251-252.
80. see page 51 of this thesis. Tyrrell further develops this idea in The Church and the Future, pp. 80 ff.
81. Petre, Autobiography and Life, vol II, p. 126.
82. *ibid.* vol II, pp. 128 ff.
83. Tyrrell, Christianity at the Crossroads, p. 36.
84. Tyrrell, The Church and the Future, p. 57.
85. Tyrrell, Christianity at the Crossroads, p. 36.
86. *ibid.* p. 36.
87. *ibid.* pp. 34-35.
88. Tyrrell, The Church and the Future, p. 27.
89. *ibid.* p. 102.

90. Tyrrell, Christianity at the Crossroads, p. 33.
91. *ibid.* p. 37.
92. *ibid.* p. 34.
93. *ibid.* p. 41.
94. *ibid.* pp. 41-44. see also S.S.O'Mahany, Tyrrell and Newman (Bristol Univ. M.A. thesis, 1977).
95. Tyrrell, Medievalism, p. 31.
96. *ibid.* p. 43.
97. A summary of the main points of the Joint Pastoral is given by Petre, Autobiography and Life, vol II, pp. 150-153.
98. *ibid.* vol II, p. 153. see also G.Tyrrell, The Church and the Future, pp. 100 ff.
99. Tyrrell, The Church and the Future, p. 93.
100. Petre, Autobiography and Life, vol II, p. 155.
101. Tyrrell, Medievalism, pp. 52 ff.
102. *ibid.* p. 53.
103. *ibid.* pp. 57-61, 140-141. see also Petre, Modernism, pp. 2-3.
104. Tyrrell, Medievalism, pp. 61, 86, 165.
105. *ibid.* pp. 62-63.
106. *ibid.* pp. 67-71.
107. *ibid.* pp. 54-55.
108. Tyrrell, The Church and the Future, p. 101.
109. Petre, Autobiography and Life, vol II, p. 366.
110. This article was republished in The Faith of the Millions, pp. 40-67. cited by Petre, Autobiography and Life, vol II, p. 61.
111. Tyrrell, The Church and the Future, p. 124.
112. *ibid.* p. 125.
113. Petre, Autobiography and Life, vol II, pp. 366-367.
114. *ibid.* vol II, pp. 375, 421.
115. *ibid.* vol II, pp. 373-375. The Rev. J.M.Thompson was deprived of his licence following the publication of his book Miracles in the New Testament, (London, 1911).

116. Petre, Autobiography and Life, vol II, p. 379.
117. *ibid.* vol II, p. 360. see also Vidler, A Variety of Catholic Modernists, p. 2. A.M.Ramsey, From Gore to Temple (London, 1960), p. 65. J.K.Mozley, Some Tendencies of British Theology (London, 1951), pp. 30 ff. Vidler, The Modernist Movement in The Roman Catholic Church, pp. 251 ff. W.L.Knox and A.R. Vidler, The Development of Modern Catholicism, (London, 1934), p. 225.
118. Vidler, A Variety of Catholic Modernists, p. 124.
119. *ibid.* p. 127.
120. London, 1908.
121. Lilley, Modernism, p. vii.
122. *ibid.* pp. xii-xiv.
123. Vidler, A Variety of Catholic Modernists, p. 129.
124. *ibid.* p. 178.
125. G.C.Rawlinson, An Anglo-Catholic's Thoughts on Religion (London, 1924), p. xxii.
126. Vidler, A Variety of Catholic Modernists, p. 179.
127. Rawlinson, An Anglo-Catholic's Thoughts on Religion, p. xv.
128. *ibid.* pp. xxii ff.
129. *ibid.* p. xxvii.
130. Vidler, A Variety of Catholic Modernists, pp. 180 ff.
131. Petre, Autobiography and Life, vol II, p. 371.
132. 'Figgis, John Neville' in Oxford Dictionary of the Christian Church, p. 512.
133. London, 1909.
134. Figgis, The Gospel and Human Needs, p. 172.
135. *ibid.* p. 183.
136. *ibid.* p. 183.
137. *ibid.* p. 185. For a discussion of the contribution of H.C.Corrance to the modernist cause see Vidler, A Variety of Catholic Modernists, pp. 160 ff.
138. Figgis, The Gospel and Human Needs, p. 185.
139. *ibid.* pp. 136-144.

140. *ibid.* p. 139.

141. *ibid.* pp. 140-141.

142. London, 1912.

143. Figgis, Civilisation at the Crossroads, p. ix.

Chapter 3.

The Emergence of neo-Liberal Catholicism

1. Introduction

In November 1913 the Bishop of Zanzibar, Frank Weston, published an open letter addressed to the Bishop of St. Albans, Edgar Jacob.⁽¹⁾ It consisted of a challenge to the Church of England to return to the principles upon which it had been founded. Three issues had attracted Weston's attention and provoked him to write the open letter; each of these issues touched upon the doctrine of the Church and especially its authority. The issues were modernism, intercommunion and episcopal jurisdiction, and the observance of liturgical rubrics.

It is difficult to assess the full impact of Weston's challenge upon twentieth century Anglicanism. Some have considered him a prophet, others an impetuous and ill-informed bigot.

It was during the period that we are considering in this chapter, November 1912 to July 1915, that the second generation of liberal catholics began to emerge as a distinctive group within Anglicanism. Differences became apparent between the liberal catholicism of Gore and the Lux Mundi school, and that of the generation of A.E.J. Rawlinson and Will Spens. It is for this second generation of liberal catholics that we shall use the term neo-liberal catholic.

This chapter is concerned with the issues raised by Weston in his open letter; with reaction to its publication; with the official proceedings that were adopted to deal with the issues; with a discussion of four short works that concerned the aspect of the controversy that touched upon clerical veracity.

2. Background to the issues raised by Weston

Foundations, sub-titled 'A Statement of Christian Belief in Terms of Modern Thought by Seven Oxford Men', was published in November 1912, having been completed the previous summer.(2) In his introduction B.H.Streeter, who had edited the volume, reviews the developments that had taken place in theology, biblical criticism and psychology concluding that these 'touch the foundations of old beliefs'.(3) He describes the essayists as 'those who believe that Christianity is no mere picturesque survival of a romantic past, but a real religion with a message for the present and the future'.(4) Their purpose was to re-examine the foundations of their religion and, if necessary, to restate their beliefs in the light of modern knowledge. Foundations was an experiment, carried out by men who considered that their position within the Church of England gave them the 'responsibility of making experiments', in contrast to those who 'cannot speak at all except with authority' and hence 'can rarely venture on experiments outside the sphere of practice'.(5)

The essayists intended their work to appeal equally to the educated layman and the non-theologians amongst the clergy as well as those in theological circles. The first edition of Foundations sold for ten shillings and sixpence, at a time when most popular books sold for a tenth of that price and many theological books for half a crown. However, a reprint was necessary only one month after the publication date.(6)

The idea for such a collection of essays did not originate with Streeter and the Oxford men. It was the brain child of the Cambridge anglo-catholic H.L.Pass, who earlier had signed the letter of sympathy to Tyrrell. Pass proposed that a collection of essays, displaying a distinct anglo-catholic bias, should be

published, each essay was not to exceed thirty pages. W.H.Moberly was invited to contribute an essay on 'The Being of God'; however, he was not satisfied with either of the conditions laid down by Pass as to length and bias. Brook and Parsons suggested to Moberly that Oxford men might produce a volume which would have neither of these limitations. Streeter was consulted and Rawlinson, Talbot, and Temple drawn into the group.(7)

It would be misleading to describe Foundations as a liberal catholic work. Rawlinson and Talbot were the only two members of the group who could, at that time, have been described as entertaining liberal catholic sympathies.

The seven essayists formed a 'Holy Lunch' party and met regularly to circulate drafts of their essays. Iremonger describes them as 'completely frank and reasonably patient with one another's heresies'.(8) Thus the volume displays, to a considerable extent, the common mind of its contributors. Streeter notes in his introduction: 'The book is put forward not as a collection of detached studies but as a single whole, and is, in the main, the expression of a corporate mind'.(9)

An exception to this corporate mind was Streeter's essay 'The Historic Christ' in which he dealt with the resurrection appearances. This he described as an 'individual impression'.(10) In the controversy that followed the publication of Foundations it was this essay that attracted the most attention.

One notable omission from the volume was an essay devoted to the virgin birth. This was because some of the group held reservations about its historicity. However, they were agreed that it was not a foundation upon which the Christian faith should be built. This omission implies that the essayists had departed from the view that each statement of the creed was foundational

for the faith.(11)

J.M.Thompson, author of Miracles in the New Testament which denied the miraculous character of the gospels, was inhibited by the Bishop of Winchester as the result of the views advanced in this book.(12) After the publication of Foundations Gore, who was now Bishop of Oxford, considered what action he might take against Streeter who held his licence. However, Streeter's essay contained nothing that was in direct conflict with the creeds and formularies of the Church of England. The essay was intended by Streeter to be a challenge to those bishops who had resolved to prevent the ordination of anyone who denied the physical resurrection, especially Gore and Winnington-Ingram, Bishop of London.(13) Streeter maintained that "if episcopal action denies to Churchmen the necessary conditions of genuine historical investigation, thoughtful men in the future will inevitably conclude that if they wish to know the truth about the life of Christ they must seek it from scholars outside the Church".(14) On the advice of H.S.Holland, Gore abandoned the idea of cancelling Streeter's licence.

At about the same time that Gore was contemplating what action he might take against Streeter he also had to cope with the declaration from William Sanday, made in private, that he no longer believed in the miraculous as commonly understood.(15)

The Guardian, the Church weekly, reviewed Foundations in its 20 December 1912 edition. The review merited a front page headline. The author of the review welcomed the book, though noted that three of the essayists seemed 'unduly negative'.(16) He described the views 'propounded by Mr Streeter as worse than erroneous'. But the book, as a whole, might convince 'a large number of complacent Churchmen that there are real chestnuts in a blazing fire, and that

somehow or other they have got to be pulled out if Christianity is to be retained'. He considered Rawlinson's essay 'The Principle of Authority', likely to 'excite much animadversion', nevertheless he welcomed it as 'a courageous attempt to state what needs stating in a form that will carry conviction to this age'. The review did not excite much correspondence in the following issues of the Guardian.

A leading article appeared in the 28 February 1913 edition of the Guardian, by which time Foundations had been reprinted a second time. The leader writer, Rev. Arthur W. Robinson, described Foundations as 'hopefully aggressive'; it was more than just an apology for Christianity, 'there is a natural confidence that conviction and energy may go on and win'.(17)

Ronald Knox supplied the most comprehensive critique of Foundations. Knox remained an Anglican until 1918 when he seceded to the Church of Rome. Knox knew all the contributors to Foundations and during the later stages of its preparation wrote a comic parody of Dryden's 'Absolom and Achitophel' about the essayists entitled 'Absolute and Abitofhell'.(18) Knox was accused of using the methods of 'guerilla warfare' instead of producing a serious reply.(19) In response to this criticism Knox published Some Loose Stones.(20)

Knox, a conservative anglo-catholic, considered the theology of Foundations, and modern theology in general, to be 'hopelessly discontinuous with the tendencies of historical Christianity'.(20)

A detailed discussion of Rawlinson's essay 'The Principle of Authority' is to be found in Chapter 4 of this thesis.(21) Its publication marked the new trend in Anglican theology that we have called neo-liberal catholicism.

Inter-communion was an issue far more acute on the mission field than it was in England during the early years of the twentieth

century. In 1913 the British Protectorate of East Africa had a population of some four million people. It consisted of one Anglican diocese, Mombasa, whose bishop was assisted by fewer than thirty priests. The largest Christian mission in the Protectorate was that of the Roman Catholic Church. The Roman mission, like the Islamic mission (Islam is constantly referred to as Mohammedanism in contemporary literature), was united throughout the region. This was not the case with the protestant missionary societies who policed strict territorial boundaries. The protestants envied the unity of the Roman mission and the advantages that unity gave to it. With increased mobility of the population, due to the railway, a protestant who left the area in which he had been converted to live and work in another area may well have found himself estranged from the protestant mission there because it belonged to a different society to the one in which he had been converted. The native could not be expected to understand why he, unlike a Roman Catholic in a similar position, was accepted by the Church in one area, and rejected in another.

These circumstances gave rise to a burning desire among the protestant societies for a united mission. Several conferences were held between 1904 and 1913 to explore the possibility of a united mission. However, none of these were fruitful. In June 1913 representatives of four missions met in conference at Kikuyu, a remote village in the heart of the Protectorate some seven hundred feet above sea level. The missions represented were, the Church Missionary Society, the Church of Scotland Mission, the Africa Inland Mission, and the United Methodist Mission. The Bishop of Uganda, J.J. Willis, was elected to the chair, and the Bishop of Mombasa, W.G. Peel, secretary. The Universities Mission had been invited to send a representative, but they declined. (22)

Weston had been sent out to Africa as a missionary priest by the Universities Mission, ^{and} he maintained close links with them after his consecration.

The Kikuyu conference adopted a series of proposals, which were never adopted as concrete plans, for a federated Church in British East Africa. The aim was not to dissolve the individual missionary societies, hence the use of the term federation. Each member of the federation would remain loyal to his own society and communion. The aim of the proposals was to provide the basis for a united native protestant Church, and not to 'perpetuate English Sectarianism'.(23)

The fundamental provisions of the federation proposals were:

- (a) The loyal acceptance of Holy Scripture as our supreme rule of faith and practice: of the Apostles' and Nicene Creeds as a general expression of fundamental Christian belief: and in particular belief in the absolute authority of Holy Scripture as the Word of God: in the Deity of Jesus Christ, and in the atoning death of our Lord as the ground of our forgiveness.
- (b) Recognition of common membership between the Churches of the Federation.
- (c) Regular administration of the Sacraments, Baptism and the Lord's Supper by outward signs.
- (d) A common form of Church organisation.(24)

Other provisions concerned a common form of worship, order of ministry, and a common stance on such matters as heathen customs.

In addition to the adoption of proposals to form a federation the conference decided upon an immediate recognition of one another's ministries, further, that inter-communion should take place between the societies represented at the conference, the condition being that all communicants must be baptised and in the case of Anglicans confirmed.

The climax of the conference was a joint communion service held in the Presbyterian Church at Kikuyu. The celebrant was

the Bishop of Mombasa, who conducted the service according to the Book of Common Prayer.

Commenting on the contribution of Willis and Peel to the conference Maynard Smith, Weston's biographer, remarks:

They were conscious of the opposition of the Roman Church and hoped to overcome it by federating all the Protestant sects; but they had forgotten to ask themselves if the Church of England was a Protestant sect; and they had forgotten that in Zanzibar the Bishop was maintaining the Catholicity of the Church of England, also in opposition to Rome.

They were eager to prove their friendliness for religious bodies with whom they agreed in almost everything except their separation. They forgot that their proposals would embarrass the Bishop of Zanzibar in the friendly relations which he had hitherto maintained with the Society of Friends and the members of the Lutheran Mission. They were forcing him to speak out in a way which might antagonise them.

They were faced with the great difficulty of the Christian native who travelled from one district to another, who ought to find a spiritual home. They forgot that the Diocese of Zanzibar was bounded on the north and west by that of Mombasa, and that on the east communication was easy and frequent by sea. The Zanzibar Christian had also some claim to consideration when he moved out of his diocese.(25)

Weston did not consider the Kikuyu proposals to be a sound basis on which a native Church might be built: "To him the scheme seemed to be designed rather with a view to the susceptibilities of conflicting sects, than from any consideration for the needs of Africans'.(26)

The first report of the Kikuyu conference appeared in the Scotsman on 9 August 1913. The article, 'A Great Day in British East Africa', was written by the Rev Norman Maclean who had been visiting Africa and attended the conference, though only as an observer. Maclean describes the presence of the Church of England as 'surprising', and hailed the conference as solving the 'problem

of how to coalesce Episcopacy with Presbyterianism'.(27)

Davidson, Archbishop of Canterbury, to whom Willis, Peel and Weston, owed canonical obedience, received a letter from Weston, dated 5 August 1913, concerning the Kikuyu proposals. Weston wrote to inform Davidson that many of his staff were very distressed at the reports they had heard about the Kikuyu proposals and the action his fellow bishops had taken in 'federating the Protestant Sects with their Churches'. At the time of writing Weston did not have a copy of the Kikuyu proposals to study. However, the tone of his letter would have given Davidson cause for concern. Weston declared: "'There is no shadow of a doubt that this Diocese will refuse communion with the dioceses of Mombasa and Uganda"'.(28)

Weston also wrote to Gore about the issues that were causing him some concern. He expected to find in Gore an ally, for he was now asking similar questions to those which Gore had for some time been pressing about the distinctive teaching of the Church of England. In his letter to Gore, Weston accused Willis and Peel of heresy and schism, and indicated that he was to make a formal charge against them on these grounds addressed to the Archbishop of Canterbury. Gore had considerable sympathy with Weston and joined him in deploring the views of Willis and Peel. However, Gore did not think 'that they were formally heretical, nor that "indiscriminate ideas of communion" could reasonably be called schism'. Replying to Weston Gore remarks: "'I cannot conceal from you that I think you have behaved in this matter unwisely"'.(29) This was advice Weston did not heed.

It may be noted that whilst relations between Weston and Willis were cordial, those between Weston and Peel were not. Peel had once refused to ordain a candidate presented to him by Weston on the basis that he had not been taught the true Anglican

doctrine by Weston.(30)

On 30 September 1913 Weston wrote again to Davidson formally requesting that a 'Synodical Court' be constituted to investigate the orthodoxy of Willis and Peel.(31) If they would not recant, Weston declared, he would resign his see: 'On the ground that heresy has been condoned in the sight of the Missionary Churches'. With this letter Weston enclosed a formal indictment of the two bishops, accusing them of 'propagating heresy and committing schism'.

Davidson's reply, dated 22 October 1913, points out that there was no precedent for such a Synodical Court. However, a proper tribunal could be 'established to handle' the matter. Davidson told Weston that it was his own responsibility, as Archbishop of Canterbury, to decide whether or not the charge should go forward. Willis was due to arrive in England in November which would enable Davidson to consult him about the matter.(32)

Weston wrote again to Davidson, letter dated 29 October 1913, explaining that Willis had stayed with him in Zanzibar and that as a result of their meeting he might wish to amend his charge. This letter was received by Davidson on 18 November 1913 who immediately sent a telegram to Weston telling him to return to England as soon as possible.(33)

A few days before the publication of Weston's open letter the Guardian printed a letter from H.H.Henson, now Dean of Durham, entitled 'Anglican Exclusiveness'.(34) Henson felt compelled to enter the controversy because he had been involved in two earlier debates on reunion.(35) Further, Bishop Tucker, Willis' predecessor, was now in Durham and Henson felt that out of loyalty to Tucker he should not keep silent.

Henson's letter was a timely contribution to the debate.

Hitherto little had reached the press about the events at Kikuyu, with the notable exception of the Scotsman article, and Weston's charge against Willis and Peel. First, Henson's letter alerted the public to the fact that the Kikuyu conference had caused a considerable controversy in Church circles, and thereby represented a potential threat to the unity of the Anglican communion. Secondly, it helped make clear what the most important aspects of the controversy were. Henson points to two issues of particular importance:

'The one is concerned with the proper limits of episcopal action in negotiations with non-episcopal Churches; the other is concerned with the very character of the Church of England as an Evangelical or Reformed Church. The first is of relatively little importance; the last is not less than vital'.

The third issue raised by Weston in his open letter concerned the observance of liturgical rubrics and the practice of extra-liturgical activities in the Church of England. The case referred to in the open letter was the St. Albans inhibition case of 1913. The clergyman concerned was Dr. Richard Lloyd Langford-James, Vicar of St. Mark's, Bush Hill in the Diocese of London.

Langford-James was until April 1913 a member of the anglo-catholic Guild of the Love of God; the Guild claimed to have 2,692 members at that time. The Guild's work was described by one observer as 'Freemasonry in Religion'!(36) Early in 1913 a split in the Guild resulted in the resignation of Langford-James. (J.N.Figgis was a member of the Guild's consultative committee).

Another group, The Catholic League, having similar objectives to those of the Guild was founded by Langford-James in the summer of 1913. This new society held an inaugural service at Corringham Church on 5 July 1913. The procession to the service was accompanied by the 'Litany of Our Lady'. The League planned to hold further

services in the dioceses of St.Albans and London.

The Bishop of St.Albans, Edgar Jacob, in whose diocese Corringham was, carried out an investigation into the activities of the League and Langford-James in his diocese. As a result of his findings Langford-James was inhibited by Jacob and delated to the Bishop of London. Langford-James was invited to resign from the League by the Bishop of London. In his judgement Jacob remarked: 'Discipline is at an end in the Church of England if these proceedings are to be tolerated, and I think it due to the diocese that I should say at once that I will not tolerate them'.(37)

Invocation of the Virgin and the saints together with prayers for the departed did not become the general practice of anglo-catholics, and other Anglicans, until after the Great War.

3. Weston's open letter

Ecclesia Anglicana: For What Does She Stand ? was published in late November 1913.(38) We may suggest three reasons why Weston published it as an open letter whilst he awaited reply from the Archbishop to his formal charge against Willis and Peel. First, unlike Willis, who was now in London, Weston was not able to represent and expound his views personally in England. Secondly, Weston was keenly aware that as a bishop of the catholic Church he had a particular responsibility for the maintenance of doctrinal purity. Thirdly, Weston considered that the Church of England was losing her power of self expression. The publication of an open letter was a means by which Weston could ensure that the issues of concern to him were given the widest possible consideration and discussion.(39)

The open letter was addressed to the Bishop of St.Albans not because Weston had any particular link with Jacob, but because

he had been ordained by Jacob's predecessor; Jacob also had official ties with both Streeter and Langford-James.

The first section of the open letter is devoted to a discussion of Foundations. This volume Weston describes as a modernist publication. In the strict sense this is not the case. Though some of the contributors to Foundations may have been influenced by modernism it was not a modernist book.

For Weston the 'chief value of the book is not in its theology nor its philosophy; but rather in the revelation it affords of the official attitude of the Bishops implicated towards heresy and unorthodox speculation'.(40) Each of the essayists held, or had held, posts as chaplains to various bishops. The implication of Weston's comment is that a bishop is not merely responsible for the theological orthodoxy of his clergy but is bound by their conclusions, including those which are unorthodox. Weston sums up his criticism of Foundations:

Thus it is allowed by the Seven to any priest to deny the Trustworthiness of the Bible, the Authority of the Church, and the infallibility of Christ...For if Episcopacy, Sacraments, the Bible, and the Lord Christ Himself are on the official list of Open Questions, what is there left in the Deposit that we are to hand on to Africans?(41)

Weston recognised three types of argument that may be advanced in defence of the Foundations essayists. The first concerns the comprehensive nature of the Church of England. However, Weston maintains that any communion can only permit certain individuals to remain within its borders if they agree with its basic dogmas. The essayists, in Weston's view, no longer fulfil that condition. Further, if such conditions are not enforced then the Church would not be, in any true sense, an organism, it would be merely a 'Society for shirking vital issues'.(42)

The second type of defence that may be advanced is that it is 'the will of God to purify the Church by permitting these heresies to abound within her borders. If we are patient, all will be well'. Against this argument Weston considered that his consecration oath, 'to banish from my diocese any erroneous doctrine', demanded that he condemn Foundations.

The third argument, that 'it is an excellent thing that our young men should make experiments in reconciling the Faith with Modern Thought', is met by Weston with the assertion that the theologian and the modern thinker inevitably enter upon their enquires from different standpoints. His criticism of Foundations is that its essayists, in seeking to share common ground with the modern thinker, have abandoned the limits imposed upon them by the creeds.(43)

Weston's treatment of the Kikuyu proposals in the open letter leave the reader with the impression that he had not fully understood their precise nature. The conference had only adopted a set of proposals; Weston creates the impression that the Church of England had been committed to an irreversible course of action. Thus he is led to the conclusion 'that there has not been a Conference of such importance to the life of the Ecclesia Anglicana since the Reformation. For it has brought us to the parting of the ways that we have so long dreaded and sought to avoid'.(44)

Weston's criticisms of the proposals for a federation were:

- (a) It does not contain the Creed commonly called the Creed of St. Athanasius.
- (b) It does not contain the Rite, or Sacrament, of Confirmation.
- (c) It does not contain the Rite, or Sacrament, of Absolution.
- (d) It does not contain Episcopacy.
- (e) It does not provide a Priest for the Celebration of Holy Communion.
- (f) It does not contain a rule of Infant Baptism.

- (g) It does not know the Catholic Church, or the Communion of Saints, except in such a general sense as is already admitted by the four Protestant bodies that have joined the Federation.(45)

It is his consideration of the teaching such a federation of Churches might give that leads Weston to his now famous remark: 'For what does a Bishop of the Ecclesia Anglicana stand ?'(46)

The ground of Weston's complaint over the third issue raised in the open letter, that is the practice of liturgical^g customs not usually associated with the Church of England, is that Jacob had publicly inhibited Langford-James whereas Streeter, one of Jacob's chaplains, had been invited to resign after the publication of Foundations in private. Langford-James was, in Weston's view, upholding the ancient catholic traditions of the Church, traditions which were encouraged in the Diocese of Zanzibar. Weston comments: 'Mr Streeter's theory is a million times more dangerous to souls and more harmful to the Church's witness than is the action of Dr. Langford-James'.(47)

The Guardian greeted the open letter with the front page headline: 'Bishop Accused of Heresy - Manifesto From The Bishop of Zanzibar'.(48) The report of the open letter, made up largely of extracts, appeared on an inside page under the same title as had previously been used for Henson's letter: 'Anglican Exclusiveness'.

In the edition of the Guardian published a week after the report of the publication of Weston's open letter there appeared a further letter from Henson. This letter dealt with the position of the Church of England in relation to the Church as a catholic whole. Henson claimed that to view the Church of England in isolation from the other reformed Churches was a product of the tractarian version of Anglicanism. He further claimed that inter-communion has very deep roots within the Anglican tradition;

that the path to reunion lies, at least in part, in the rediscovery of those roots.(49)

After his arrival in England Willis visited Davidson and subsequently published a statement, to which was appended the text of the Kikuyu proposals.(50) The Guardian described the statement as an 'exceeding interesting and highly important document'.(51) The statement is divided into numbered paragraphs which cover the reasons for the proposals and how they might work in practice.

On 4 December 1913 The Times carried a leading article entitled 'Kikuyu'.(52) The writer compared the conference held at Kikuyu to those held at 'Constantinople and Nicaea, Trent and Augsburg and Dort, Hampton Court and Savoy'. He suggested that the name Kikuyu would rank side by side with these other great milestones in the history of the Church. Kikuyu, he comments, is a continuation of the initiative of the Lambeth Quadrilateral, the Edinburgh Conference of 1910, the conferences held at The Hague and Swanwick; it is a further step along the road towards 'greater and more effective oneness'. Weston he describes as showing 'signs of some mental excitement'. Willis and Peel he commends for their 'Christian courage'. Perhaps the writer overstated the importance of the Kikuyu conference, but he is correct in detecting that it was prompted by the moves towards greater unity amongst the missionary societies emerging from the various conferences he names.

There followed a lengthy correspondence in The Times which lasted well into 1914. Contributors included Handley Moule the Bishop of Durham, Henson, Tucker, Mason of Canterbury and sundry other clerics and laymen.

The Times, Christmas Eve 1913, carried a further article entitled 'Kikuyu'. Here the readers were reminded of Westcott's prediction

that 'reunion, when, it comes, will come from the circumference rather than from the centre'. Kikuyu, the writer suggests, is an indication of the zeal many Churchmen have for reunion. Though we may judge Willis and Peel, he continues, to have pursued their zeal in the wrong way by participating in the Kikuyu conference, we must not attempt to 'quench' this zeal.

The same edition of The Times carried a letter from Lord William Gascoyne-Cecil. Cecil declared himself in favour of reunion, nevertheless he was critical of the Kikuyu proposals. These were designed, he detected, to unify protestantism in order that it might better fight the Roman Catholic Church. This was a destructive plan: 'We want reunion, we do not want renewal of war'. He continues: 'I feel that at the present day we need more than ever to rest on the authority of the Church, and that the Church of England with the emphasis on the Primitive Church and its wide compromise between Catholic and Protestant has a message which she must give to the world'.

A few days later The Times printed a letter from Gore. The purpose of Gore's letter was to express his 'cordial sympathy with the main purpo^rt' of Cecil's letter: 'The importance of the Church of England holding together in order that it may do the special work which it is intended to do among the religious fellowships of Christendom'.(53) However, Gore was concerned that the Church of England would be disrupted, and its cohesion damaged as a result of the activities of particular groups within it. These were the critical school, who were 'maintaining that it is legitimate for a clergyman to hold his official position while repudiating in published writings the miracles in which he must affirm his belief each time he says the Creed'; the extreme school, that is those amongst the anglo-catholics who 'seem to be adopting ..

a position from which the familiar ideas of Evangelical Churchmen must be pronounced strictly heretical'; the third school is that within the 'evangelical portion of the Church', who in their 'zeal for union among Protestants' are giving 'approval to the "Open Communion" at Kikuyu, and in part, supporting the proposals of the Conference...To the great mass of High Churchmen such an open communion seems to involve principles so totally subversive of Catholic order and doctrine as to be strictly intolerable, in the sense that they could not continue in a fellowship which required them to tolerate the recurrence of such incidents'. This letter anticipates the argument advanced by Gore in The Basis of Anglican Fellowship, published a few months later.(54)

4. Official proceedings on clerical orthodoxy and the Kikuyu question

Hitherto Gore had failed in his attempts to get Convocation to make a declaration on clerical orthodoxy.(55) The publication of Weston's open letter, and the public debate of the issues it raised, brought more general support for Gore's demands. A memorial was presented to the Upper House of Convocation on 17 February 1914 by the Bishop of London. The memorial was signed by 676 priests of the Diocese of London; the priests were described by the Bishop as a 'very representative body of clergy, not what some would call men of extreme views, but men of great gravity and weight'.(56) The memorial was an 'expression of grave anxiety... First in consequence of the unrebuked denial of certain fundamental truths of the faith by some who hold office in the Church; and, second, in consequence of the widespread tendency to approach the problem of reunion among Christians in a way that is clearly inconsistent with belief that Episcopal Ordination is essential to a valid ministry of Word and Sacraments'. However, the bishops did not

consider that the matter should be discussed in Convocation until the Archbishop had decided what action he would take in the matter of Weston's charge against Willis and Peel.

After the February Convocation Gore was asked by the Bishop of London to assist in drafting a motion to be presented to the next Convocation in April. The draft submitted to Winnington-Ingram by Gore included a quotation from the declaration of the 1908 Lambeth Conference: 'We feel it to be our duty solemnly to affirm that we can give no countenance to what we cannot but regard as seriously contrary to that sincerity of profession which is specially necessary for the Christian Ministry'.(57) A copy of Gore's draft was sent to Davidson who replied to the Bishop of London: 'Have you considered how you could practically act on it, if it were adopted by the House'. Bell, Davidson's biographer, suggests that the Archbishop considered resigning during this period.

Davidson turned to Bishop Chase of Ely and asked him to produce a draft declaration to present to Convocation at the April session. Like Gore, Chase included in his draft the declaration of the 1908 Lambeth Conference. However, the wording did not imply, as Gore's had done, that those who no longer believed 'the historical facts of the Creeds' would be required to leave their orders. This draft was not acceptable to Gore who subsequently informed Davidson that he intended to submit an alternative declaration. Davidson feared that adverse publicity would do great damage to the Church of England if rival resolutions were entered on the Convocation agenda.

After further consultations between Talbot, Bishop of Winchester, Winnington-Ingram, Gore and Davidson, during which Gore insisted that any declaration should leave no doubt as to their intentions,

Chase sent a further draft to Gore. A final draft resolution was found to be acceptable to all parties after yet further consultation between Gore and Davidson.

The resolution presented to the Upper House of Convocation on 29 April 1914 was as follows:

Inasmuch as there is reason to believe that the minds of many Members of the Church of England are perplexed and disquieted at the present time in regard to certain questions of Faith and of Church Order, the Bishops of the Upper House of the Province of Canterbury feel it to be their duty to put forth the following resolutions:-

1. We call attention to the Resolution which was passed in this House on May 10, 1905, as follows:- 'That this House is resolved to maintain unimpaired the Catholic Faith in the Holy Trinity and the Incarnation as contained in the Apostles' and Nicene Creeds, and in the Quicunque Vult, and regards the Faith there presented, both in statements of doctrine and in statements of fact, as the necessary basis on which the teaching of the Church reposes'.

We further desire to direct attention afresh to the following Resolution, which was unanimously agreed to by the Bishops of the Anglican Communion attending the Lambeth Conference of 1908:- 'This Conference, in view of tendencies widely shown in the writings of the present day, hereby places on record its conviction that the historical facts stated in the Creeds are an essential part of the Faith of the Church'.

2. These Resolutions we desire to solemnly re-affirm, and in accordance therewith to express our deliberate judgement that the denial of any of the historical facts stated in the Creeds goes beyond the limits of legitimate interpretation, and gravely imperils that sincerity of profession which is plainly incumbent on the ministers of the Word and Sacraments. At the same time, recognising that our generation is called to face new problems raised by historical criticism, we are anxious not to lay unnecessary burdens upon consciences, nor unduly to limit the freedom of thought and enquiry, whether among clergy or among laity. We desire, therefore, to lay stress on the need of considerateness in dealing with that which is tentative and provisional in the thought and work of earnest and reverent students. (58)

A number of petitions were presented to the Upper House at the April Convocation. The first, presented by Davidson, carried 45,371 signatories, including that of Dean Wace of Canterbury. This petition was in favour of the bishops making a declaration. The second petition presented called upon their lordships to consider 'whether or no an ordained Minister of the Church of England is free to continue to exercise his ministry after he has deliberately come to the conclusion that any historical statement of the Apostles' and Nicene Creeds is not true'. This petition was signed by seventeen Members of Parliament. A third petition, signed by members of the committee of the Churchmens Union, including Rashdall and Gardner, was also opposed to a declaration. This petition reminded the members of the Upper House of Archbishop Temple's words: 'If the conclusions are prescribed, the study is precluded'. Further petitions were presented by the Bishops of London, Winchester, Hereford, Truro, Oxford, and Southwark. This last petition, opposing a declaration, carried the signatures of Sanday, Inge, Streeter, Burkitt, Foakes Jackson and other prominent Churchmen and scholars.

The Resolution was introduced by the Bishop of London. There followed a debate which lasted into the second day of the Convocation. The Bishop of Norwich regretted that all the Resolution did was to re-affirm previous ones, pointing out that the situation had advanced a great deal since 1908. The Bishop of Hereford did not consider it to be an opportune time for the bishops to make a declaration, doubting the validity and effectiveness of such declarations. Davidson shared the doubts expressed by the Bishop of Hereford, but considered that a declaration was necessary.

The Resolution was passed with the unanimous vote of all twenty five bishops present at the debate.

This declaration has a hint of the liberality that was later to be enshrined in other formal Anglican documents.

Weston arrived in London from Zanzibar on 6 February 1914. He was interviewed by Davidson the following Sunday, 8 February 1914. After their meeting Davidson noted that Weston considered 'Gore's opinions on Kenosis were to his mind as bad as the things said in Foundations, and yet Gore was his friend and guide in all these matters of Modernism'.(59)

The day after this meeting Davidson published a statement in which he announced what action he intended to take to resolve the charge made by Weston against Willis and Peel.(60) He proposed to summon a meeting of the Central Consultative Committee of the Lambeth Conference, of which Davidson was chairman. Two questions would be addressed to them. The first concerned the proposed scheme for federation adopted at Kikuyu. Davidson wished to know whether or not the proposals 'contravene any principles of Church Order'. Secondly, he wished the Committee to consider whether or not the service of Holy Communion held at the conclusion of the Kikuyu conference was 'consistent or inconsistent with the principles accepted by the Church of England'. The Archbishop refused to allow the trial of Willis and Peel for heresy and schism.(61)

Between the publication of Davidson's statement and the meeting of the Committee, in July 1914, a number of works on the controversy appeared. Willis and Peel published a defence of their action at Kikuyu.⁽⁶²⁾ Weston published a treatise on the place of episcopacy in the Catholic Faith.(63) A.J.Mason, a canon of Canterbury, was asked by Davidson to prepare a statement on the Anglican view of episcopacy; this has become a standard work on the subject.(64)

In its answer to the Archbishop, the Committee stated that

the Kikuyu scheme was to 'be regarded as a stage in negotiation still incomplete, rather than an arrangement that has been definitely adopted'.(65) However, they considered that the proposals went further than was proper having 'a constitutional or semi-constitutional character'. They noted that despite declarations of autonomy 'federal authority often is, or increasingly becomes, dominant over federated units'. They further recognised that no part of the Anglican Communion may act in isolation of the whole; what had been done at Kikuyu might be followed elsewhere. In answering the second of Davidson's questions they asserted that the open communion was not to be taken as a precedent. They refused to pass judgement on Willis and Peel because of their purity of motive; further, the service held at the close of the conference had been 'unpremeditated, and prompted by an impulse of a deeply Christian kind'.

War between England and Germany was declared in August 1914. Weston returned to Zanzibar in early September. Before his departure he described the findings of the Committee as 'wholly wrong'. He intended to await Davison's formal reply to his original charge before considering what further action he might take. Because of the War Davison's reply, published as Kikuyu, did not appear until Easter 1915.(66)

5. Clerical veracity

Gore's The Basis of Anglican Fellowship was published as an open letter to the clergy of the Diocese of Oxford at Easter 1914. Three reasons may be suggested for its publication. First, the issues that Weston had raised in his open letter were issues upon which Gore had previously spoken, issues upon which he shared Weston's concern.(67) Secondly, the prospect of a declaration

on clerical orthodoxy had been raised at the February Convocation, The Basis of Anglican Fellowship supports Gore's view that such a declaration was necessary. Thirdly, Bethune-Baker had written an open letter to Gore entitled The Miracle of Christianity.(68) The Basis of Anglican Fellowship was Gore's reply.

Early in May 1914 William Sanday published a reply to Gore's open letter, Bishop Gore's Challenge to Criticism.(69) Sanday explains in the prefatory note that his personal convictions about miracles had advanced considerably since his last published book. Since then he had moved towards the liberal school in matters of theology and biblical criticism. His purpose was to 'deprecate the declaration asked for by Dr.Gore'.(70)

T.B.Strong, Dean of Christchurch, Oxford, came to Gore's defence in a pamphlet The Miraculous in Gospels and Creeds.(71) Strong considered that it had fallen to Gore to maintain a 'difficult and unpopular position'. With this position Strong found himself in agreement. Unlike Sanday's, towards which he was at 'profound and fundamental difference'.(72)

The final contribution to the debate here to be considered is that of A.E.J.Rawlinson. Dogma, Fact and Experience, published in July 1915, contained an essay on 'Clerical Veracity'. This Rawlinson considered to be a matter of ecclesiastical importance. His argument shows similarities to that advanced by Gore in The Basis of Anglican Fellowship, however, there is a note of liberality and toleration about Rawlinson's treatment which is absent from Gore's..(73)

In the introductory section of The Basis of Anglican Fellowship, Gore maintains that 'the zealous love of principles characterizes every period of real spiritual progress and power in the Church'. But notes that: 'We Church people have of recent years shown ourselves

unmistakenly anxious to avoid questions of principle'.(74)

With this 'incitement to clear thinking on first principles' Sanday was in agreement with Gore.(75) However, Sanday felt that Gore 'directly impugns the sincerity of a number of persons' when, like Weston, he denies that this rethinking of first principles may lead to the restatement of a doctrinal position.(76)

Whilst Gore admits that Weston did the Church of England a great service in raising the matter of principles he did not wish to base his letter on that controversy alone, but rather upon the basis of the Church of England as it stood 'objectively in history'.(77) That is for 'a liberal or scriptural catholicism'. Gore remarks:

That is to say it has stood to maintain the ancient fundamental faith of the Catholic Church, as expressed in creeds and conciliar decisions of the undivided Church, and the ancient structure of the Church, as depending upon the successions of bishops, and the requirement of episcopal ordination for the ministry, and the ministration of the ancient sacraments and rites of the Church by the methods and on the principles which it believed to be primitive'.(78)

It is, according to Gore, this 'liberal or scriptural catholicism' which has determined the unique place of Anglicanism within Christendom, standing between Rome and protestantism and independent of both whilst maintaining links with both.

Gore devoted a section of his open letter to each of the three issues raised by Weston. It was, however, the section on liberalism, not described as modernism as Weston had done, that excited the greatest response.

In this section on liberalism Gore attacks those who had denied the factual truth of the nature miracles, the virgin birth, the physical resurrection, the second coming of Christ, and the infallibility of Christ. He maintains that some of the clergy



who hold such views do not consider them to be incompatible with the exercise of their ministry; Gore did.(79)

Sanday felt that Gore had not fully understood the liberal interpretation of the miraculous events recorded in the gospels. He remarked: 'In every single case there is some important limitation or qualification ^hwhich ought to be borne in mind whenever the charge is repeated'.(80)

In The Basis of Anglican Fellowship the declaration of assent, made by all candidates for ordination, is qualified by Gore in the following way: 'In all justice it must be held not to bind him to particular single phrases...Rightly or wrongly, but at any rate in fact, it expresses only a general assent'.(81)

In his essay 'Clerical Veracity', Rawlinson examines the problems associated with declarations of assent in some detail.(82) Like Gore, Rawlinson maintains that the clergy are not bound by the strict letter of the declaration. However, the question put to candidates at the 'Making of Deacons' ('Do you unfeignedly believe all the Canonical Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments?'), as it stands, gives the impression that the clergy are committed to a pre-critical view of the Bible. Yet the universal acceptance of the methods of biblical criticism and historical criticism make it necessary that candidates for ordination answer the question in a more general sense. Of declarations and articles of belief Rawlinson remarks: What we 'commonly know as the dictionary meaning of a word represents only a kind of average of its value in current usage'. Thus the meaning of declarations and articles varies between individuals. A clergyman is therefore committed to no more than a 'broadly Anglican position' when he makes the oath of assent.(83)

It is the recitation of the creeds in public worship that

Gore considered to be the most 'precise doctrinal obligation of the clergy'.(84) In this way the clergyman indicates in a 'precise and simple' form his belief in 'the occurrence of certain events in history, and those in part strictly miraculous'. In addition to recitation of the creeds the clergyman is required to lead the congregation in certain collects and propers which affirm similar beliefs. Gore maintains that the time has come when the bishops should no longer tolerate the recitation of the creeds by those who have ceased to believe their contents.

That there are limits to membership of the Church of England is a point taken up by Strong.(85) He illustrates the point by describing a man who is employed by the Church Association, a conservative evangelical body, to preach on their behalf suddenly becoming convinced of the claims to papal infallibility. Whilst still in the employ of the Church Association he begins to propogate these new views, subsequently he is dismissed. But he claims 'I have a high and austere sincerity which belongs to me as a scholar, and which compels me to set out the highest truth I can find'. However, Strong comments, the Association were justified in dismissing him. Strong is drawing an analogy with the Church of England as a whole, he does however recognise that such a view has difficulties, the chief one being the determination of the proper limits of membership.

Sanday disputed the idea advanced by Gore that the Christian takes his ideas, authoritatively, from the creeds.(86) Rather, Sanday claimed, creeds are 'summaries of Scripture'. For Gore they were considerably more than mere summaries of the gospels, for the antecedents of the creeds had been formulated before the canon of the New Testament had reached its final form. Further, their function is to make explicit doctrines which are only to

be found implicitly in scripture. Thus Gore ascribes to the creeds a very special Apostolic authority.

Rawlinson points out that the recitation of the creeds is the mandatory preliminary to the reception of Holy Communion for both clergymen and laymen. Thus either would be dishonest to receive the sacrament having recited a creed he did not fully believe. But, Rawlinson maintains, the creeds have ceased to be tests of orthodoxy and have become symbols of the Church's common faith, with which clergy and laity alike desire as worshippers to be identified. 'They have become symbols of corporate worship, expressions rather of loyalty to Christ and His Church than of detailed orthodoxy, doxologies rather than declarations of individual doctrine'.(87)

6. Conclusion

The identification of A.E.J.Rawlinson with the publication of Foundations and the views espoused in his essay 'Clerical Veracity' clearly mark the emergence of a new school within liberal catholic Anglicanism. The events we have here described, that took place between 1912 and 1914, especially the publication of Weston's open letter, acted as a catalyst for the emergence of this new school, and, at the same time, compelled the Church of England to consider again her concept of authority.

We may now turn to a discussion of the view of authority held by the neo-liberal catholics, in particular A.E.J.Rawlinson and Will Spens.

References

1. Ecclesia Anglicana: For What Does She Stand ? (London, 1913).
2. B.H.Streeter ed., Foundations (London, 1912).
3. Streeter ed., Foundations, p. vii.

4. *ibid.* p. vii.
5. *ibid.* p. x.
6. Guardian, 24 December 1912, p. 1714.
7. F.A.Iremonger, William Temple (London, 1948), p. 156.
8. *ibid.* p. 156.
9. Streeter ed., Foundations, p. viii.
10. *ibid.* p. 80.
11. Iremonger, William Temple, pp. 156-157.
12. G.L.Prestige, The Life of Charles Gore (London, 1935), pp. 342-346.
13. see page 19 of this thesis.
14. Prestige, Life of Charles Gore, p. 345. see also Roger Lloyd, The Church of England 1900-1965 (London, 1966), pp. 106 ff.
15. Prestige, Life of Charles Gore, p. 347.
16. Guardian, 20 December 1912, p. 1683.
17. Guardian, 28 February 1913, p. 272.
18. Ronald Knox, Essays in Satire (London, 1954), pp. 55-61. First published in the Oxford Magazine. see also Iremonger, William Temple, pp. 158-159.
19. Ronald Knox, Some Loose Stones (London, 1913), p. viii.
20. *ibid.* p. ix.
21. see page 109 of this thesis.
22. Guardian, 21 November 1913,
23. H.Maynard Smith, Frank Bishop of Zanzibar (London, 1926), p. 148.
24. 'The Proposed Scheme of Federation: Embodied in the Resolutions of Conference' reprinted in J.J.Willis, The Kikuyu Conference (London, 1913).
25. Maynard Smith, Frank Bishop of Zanzibar, p. 150.
26. *ibid.* p. 152.
27. G.K.A.Bell, Randall Davidson (London, 1935), pp. 690-692.
28. *ibid.* p. 692.
29. Prestige, Life of Charles Gore, p. 359.

30. Maynard Smith, Frank Bishop of Zanzibar, pp. 153 ff.
31. Bell, Randall Davidson, pp. 692-694.
32. *ibid.* p. 695.
33. *ibid.* pp. 695-696.
34. Guardian, 21 November 1913, p. 1447.
35. H.H.Henson, Retrospect of an Unimportant Life (London, 1942), p. 160.
36. Guardian, 25 April 1913, p. 519. see also *ibid.* 2 May 1913, p. 576. *ibid.* 16 May 1913, p. 641. *ibid.* 23 May 1913, p. 669.
37. *ibid.* 8 August 1913, p. 1000.
38. London, 1913.
39. Weston, Ecclesia Anglicana, pp. 7-8.
40. *ibid.* p. 9.
41. *ibid.* pp. 10-11.
42. *ibid.* p. 11.
43. *ibid.* pp. 12-13.
44. *ibid.* p. 17. see also 'The Junior Clergy and the CMS Bishops' in Guardian, 5 December 1913, p. 1537.
45. Weston, Ecclesia Anglicana, p. 17.
46. *ibid.* p. 18.
47. *ibid.* p. 22.
48. Guardian, 28 November 1913, p. 1477.
49. *ibid.* 5 December 1913, p. 1576
50. J.J.Willis, The Kikuyu Conference (London, 1913).
51. Guardian, 5 December 1913, p. 1520.
52. p. 9.
53. The Times, 29 December 1913, p. 3.
54. London, 1914.
55. see page 33 ff. of this thesis.
56. Convocation of Canterbury, The Chronicle of Convocation (London, 1914), p. 5
57. Bell, Randall Davidson, pp. 675-676.

58. Chronicle of Convocation, (London, 1914), pp. 260 ff.
59. Bell, Randall Davidson, p. 697.
60. Guardian, 13 February 1914, p. 207. Davidson's statement is here printed in full.
61. Randall Davidson, Kikuyu (London, 1915), pp. 4-5.
62. Steps Towards Reunion (London, 1914).
63. The Case Against Kikuyu: A Study in Vital Principles (London, 1914).
64. The Church of England and Episcopacy (London, 1914).
65. Davidson, Kikuyu, Appendix B, p. 42.
66. Bell, Randall Davidson, pp. 702-703.
67. Prestige, Life of Charles Gore, p. 359.
68. London, 1914.
69. London, 1914.
70. Sanday, Bishop Gore's Challenge to Criticism, p. 3.
71. London, 1914.
72. Strong, The Miraculous in Gospels and Creeds, p. 3.
73. Rawlinson, Dogma, Fact and Experience, pp. 164-207.
74. Gore, The Basis of Anglican Fellowship, p. 3.
75. Sanday, Bishop Gore's Challenge to Criticism, p. 5.
76. *ibid.* p. 5.
77. Gore, The Basis of Anglican Fellowship, p. 4.
78. *ibid.* p. 4.
79. *ibid.* pp. 8-27.
80. Sanday, Bishop Gore's Challenge to Criticism, p. 17.
81. Gore, The Basis of Anglican Fellowship, p. 12.
82. Rawlinson, Dogma, Fact and Experience, pp. 187 ff.
83. *ibid.* pp. 193-195.
84. Gore, The Basis of Anglican Fellowship, p. 12. see also the discussion of Gore, The Clergy and the Creeds on page 32 ff. of this thesis.

85. Strong, The Miraculous in Gospels and Creeds, p. 7.
86. Sanday, Bishop Gore's Challenge to Criticism, p. 7.
87. Rawlinson, Dogma, Fact and Experience, p. 203.

Chapter 4.Authority in neo-Liberal Catholicism1. Introduction

In this final chapter we are concerned with the view of authority actually held by the neo-liberal catholics, in particular Will Spens and A.E.J.Rawlinson. Some biographical material about Rawlinson is included as an appendix to this thesis.

Both Spens and Rawlinson admitted the influence of modernism upon their own view of authority. Here we will attempt to detail the points at which this influence can be recognised. This will serve to support Ramsey's argument that the second generation of liberal catholics conceded a little more 'to the spirit of Catholic Modernism than Gore could ever have allowed'.

2. Rawlinson: The formative years 1912-1915

Rawlinson's essay 'The Principle of Authority' was primarily an attempt to isolate the notion of authority from other closely related concepts, namely inspiration and infallibility.(1) He comments on the vogue which denigrates the, so-called, religion of authority in favour of the religions of the spirit.(2) The reason for this development, Rawlinson suggests, lies in the fact that the idea of authority has become confused with that of infallibility. He further notes that the two ideas of authority and inspiration have, through-out the history of Christian thought, been intertwined.(3)

For the purpose of his essay Rawlinson supplies this definition: "Authority" attaches in general to the utterances of "authorities", that is to say, of persons of wide experience and expert knowledge

in the spheres, of whatever kind, in which they are "authorities". This usage is distinguished from that which understands authority simply as the power to coerce.(4) The implication of Rawlinson's definition is that ideas imposed upon the individual, and accepted by him on authority, may subsequently be verified in his own experience. This is a universal principle, though particularly difficult to apply in the field of religion. However, Rawlinson notes, the present complication in the Church's understanding of authority has arisen because Christian authorities have generally been thought to be inspired, a tendency which if taken for granted renders the authority infallible.(5) Further, it is this tendency, based on a false presupposition, that has given rise to the dogma of a mechanical infallibility in the Church, particularly within the Roman system.

Within the early Church a problem soon arose with regard to inspiration and authority since different prophets, with equal claims to inspiration, were saying different things, sometimes even contradictory. The tradition of the apostles' teaching thus became the standard by which claims to inspiration might be verified. Rawlinson observes that as prophecy declined and was discredited authority rested more and more upon Church order; orthodoxy in matters of faith and the interpretation of scripture were judged by the tradition of the apostles, as maintained by the episcopate. The claim to infallibility is thus a development of the notion that the episcopate is the deposit of the apostolic tradition. For the episcopate, and especially for the Pope, is claimed a particular form of inspiration. In the Roman Church this development was given official recognition by the Vatican Council of 1870. 'It is not extravagant to suggest that this represents a one-sided development of the idea of authority, which however explicable

historically is none the less disastrous in its outcome'.(6)

Equally one-sided is the development within protestantism which has replaced an infallible Church with an infallible book, the Bible.(7) Upon this basis Rawlinson thus proposes a new concept of authority to meet the objections he puts forward to the other concepts. It is this new concept of authority that characterizes neo-liberal catholicism. It is also here that we may detect the influence of Tyrrell's method.

What is needed is rather a restatement of the principle of authority which shall avoid either confusing it with infallibility or legalizing it as despotism. Our suggestion in this essay is that such a restatement may profitably find its starting-point in a return to something nearer akin to the classical meaning of the word 'auctoritas'. When St. Augustine writes 'evangelio non crederam, nisi me catholicae ecclesiae commoveret auctoritas', is not his meaning much more nearly represented by some such rendering as 'corporate witness,' or even 'inspired witness' of the Catholic Church, than by the paraphrase 'infallible voice'?(8)

For Rawlinson, as for Tyrrell, experience plays a primary role in authority. It is through his experience that the individual may verify what has hitherto been imposed upon him, and believed by him, solely on the ground of some form of external authority. Thus the individual reaches a point where he no longer accepts a certain proposition because he is told that it is true, but because his own experience has confirmed its truth. This Rawlinson calls "'the concrete freedom of voluntary assent"'.(9)

In 1913, the year following the publication of 'The Principle of Authority' in Foundations, an article by Rawlinson, 'Religion and Temperament', appeared in the Interpreter. Here Rawlinson again touched on the nature of religious experience.(10) A clear distinction is drawn between religious experience in its fullest sense, and particular conscious experiences at particular times

and in particular places. Emotional or quasi-mystical experiences, which some individuals have and others do not, should not be identified with the experience which all men have of the God who is their creator. This is religious experience in its fullest sense. Religion, Rawlinson asserts, is not centred in man but in God. However, once this has been recognised, it is a matter of individual experience when we consider what response should be made to God's revelation of himself.(11) But this experience is that of the whole of life, not just particular moments within it. The essence of religion consists of an attitude of the personality as a whole - especially the will.(12) The individual will have emotional ups and downs, he may experience extremes of religious manifestations, as did Christ.(13) And 'because men's temperaments vary, religion will be variously manifested'.(14) Each manifestation is equally valid, and together they ensure the catholicity of the Church.(15) As Tyrrell had conceived of the Church so Rawlinson conceived her as the place where these various manifestations are brought together. In Foundations Rawlinson comments:

Broadly speaking, it may be taken as an axiom that the community is wiser than the individual, and that authority attaches to the corporate witness and the common mind of the spirit-bearing Church as against individual aberrations. It should be the individual's aim (under the guidance of the Holy Spirit of truth), both during the transition period and subsequently, to appropriate and make his own; in so far as he may, the whole complex fact of the Christian life as historically manifested in the experience of the Church - the living concrete whole of which the formal pronouncements of official 'authority' (creeds, and conciliar decisions, and judgments as to the inspiration of Scripture) are the intellectual symbols; not necessarily concluding that such elements as he has already been able personally to assimilate and justify represent all that is of truth and value, and that the rest is husk and dross.(16)

The ⁿtransition referred to by Rawlinson is that from the state of

acceptance of propositions on external authority to that of personal verification.

Though Rawlinson concludes that we are not committed to the theologies of the past, nevertheless they have a certain authority in that they are derived from the spiritual experience of their authors.(17) For Rawlinson theology is 'the process of drawing out and formulating in intellectual terms the inferences, historical and metaphysical, which are legitimately involved in the present and past experience of spiritual persons; and more especially, no doubt, in the experiences - "classical and normative" for Christianity - of the apostolic age!'.(18) This is similar to Tyrrell's notion of theology, viz., theology 'continually proceeds from and returns to that experience of which it is the ever tentative and perfectable analysis'.(19)

In addition to the relationship of authority and truth 'The Principle of Authority' is also concerned with the relationship of authority and Church order.(20) The doctrines of ministry within the catholic and protestant traditions are compared by Rawlinson. The catholic doctrine, he concludes, is primarily sacerdotal; at ordination a special gift, or charisma, is conferred; the institution is the medium of the Spirit's operation. The protestant doctrine views ordination as the recognition, by the Church, of a gift already given; the primary function of the ministry is prophetic. Rawlinson notes that whilst the catholic view has a certain historical strength, the protestant view provides a reasonable alternative hypothesis.(21) However, to compare them purely on the basis of history only serves to highlight the unreliable nature of historical conclusions.(22)

Protestantism claims that the gospel, the Christian revelation of salvation and forgiveness, is the central theme of the New

Testament. The sacraments occupy a subordinate role as 'seals' or 'covenant rites'. Christian individuals, not the sacraments, are the true extension of the incarnation; in the last resort sacraments may be dispensed with altogether. The Christian community is to be sought not, primarily, in institutions, but where two or three Christians gather together. The catholic notion of the primacy of the sacraments is an aberration of the original Christian idea, the place strictly occupied by the word.(23)

Whilst Rawlinson admits that the protestant position is a strong one, nevertheless he claims that the catholic may criticize it on the grounds that it is one-sided, based solely on personal religious experience. Modern protestantism, which owes much to Ritschl, is a denial of intellectual rights, tending to deprecate theology and eschew metaphysics. The result of this tendency is that religion may become no more than a spiritual glow. Further, it represents an attempt to isolate the Spirit from the forms in which it is mediated. Against this trend Rawlinson asserts that there is an important and essential material aspect of religion.(24)

Moreover, catholics do not admit that their emphasis on sacraments is a lapse into a sub-personal category from a personal one. Rather they describe the sacraments as points of personal contact with Christ. This sacramental tradition, which Rawlinson claims to be the mainstream of Christian thought, holds that each celebration of the Eucharist involves the whole Church, and thus necessitates a ministry which is representative of the whole Church and commissioned by the Church as a catholic whole. Thus, in the catholic view, the ministers of the sacraments exercise their ministry not in virtue of any personal gift but as a living instrument of the whole Christian body.(25)

The idea of participation by the whole Church in every sacramental act is represented by the historic episcopate, as a principle of continuity with the past, and as a representative of the authority of the Church which is thus wider than the individual local Christian community.(26) However, Rawlinson detects that various parodies have emerged during the history of the Church. Episcopacy, in the strict sense, does not involve the notion of a vicarious priesthood, because the whole Church is the vicar of Christ. Nor does it involve an ecclesiastical parallel to the divine right of kings. Against prelacy, Rawlinson pleads for smaller dioceses. Against autocracy, he urges greater participation by the laity in the appointment of bishops.(27) Finally, the laying on of episcopal hands does not impose the grace of orders in a magical sense, but rather is the sign of a spiritual gift.(28)

Rawlinson is led to the conclusion that the path to Christian unity need not be determined by the past.(29) Any scheme for reunion must take into account the great diversity of Christian experience, with mutual recognition of the validity on all sides. Thus the greatest hope for reunion lies in a future synthesis of the catholic and protestant traditions. It is within this context, being as it is between catholicism and protestantism, that the Anglican Church has a particular contribution to make to the synthesis.(30)

Rawlinson's Dogma, Fact and Experience, published in 1915 and described by Ramsey as 'a significant instance of Catholic Modernist influence upon Anglican thought', is a collection of five essays, two of which had been previously published.(31) 'Dogma and History' first appeared in the Irish Church Quarterly. In this essay Rawlinson set out to 'define some of the issues raised by the "modernist" controversy'.(32) He sums up the purpose

of the modernists as an attempt 'to sever the link between History and Dogma by combining an affirmation of the spiritual and religious truth of the dogmas of the Historic Church, with the claim of freedom to deny any or all of the alleged facts of history with which the said dogmas had hitherto been held to be implicated'.(33)

Criticism of historical documents, including the Bible, had created the climate in which modernism had developed. Here, as elsewhere, Rawlinson points to the unreliable nature of historical conclusions in order to illustrate that criticism inevitably led to a distinction being drawn between facts and their interpretation.(34)

Whilst this distinction may have its limitations:

It may be granted that it is not nonsense to speak, with a certain relative validity, of a distinction between fact and interpretation; and that in particular it is plausible to draw a certain distinction between facts, real or alleged, which are at the basis of the Christian creed, and the interpretation which, in that creed, the Church is putting upon the facts. Will the facts bear the interpretation? Or, even if they will bear it, do they necessitate it?(35)

From such a distinction it is thus possible to base a method of inquiry upon an emphasis of fact, or an emphasis of interpretation. The two methods would be expected to yield different results. Rawlinson concludes that the method adopted by the liberal protestants is one which concentrates upon facts and ignores their interpretation. On the other hand, the method employed by the catholic modernists concentrates upon interpretations whilst ignoring the facts and professing indifference towards historical criticism in religious matters. Taken as a whole both these schools are extremely complex. Rawlinson may be open to a charge of over-simplification in drawing such a sharp and general distinction between the two schools.(36)

The form of modernism espoused by the French writer Edouard Leroy is chosen by Rawlinson as 'the ablest statement of the

modernist view of dogma'.(37) Leroy proposed that dogma is negative, rather than positive, in its function; that above all dogma has a practical significance. Rawlinson points out that such a view is saved from being merely religious pragmatism by its assertion that dogma is seeking to describe something concerned with ultimate reality. Hence it is the duty of every Christian to engage in dogmatic inquiry.

'Leroy's is by far the ablest, the least inadequate, the most carefully thought-out, of all the various forms of Catholic modernism'.(38) Considered 'purely as a philosophy of the significance and function of dogma in the life of the Churchman', comments Rawlinson, 'I am disposed personally to accept his view. It does not, however, go to the root of the question of truth; it merely raises it and leaves it unanswered. "Dogma interpreted as a rule of conduct involves the implicit affirmation that ultimate Reality is such as to justify the conduct prescribed"'.(39) Though he considers this to be an adequate basis on which a devout Christian may maintain his devotion whilst remaining agnostic as to ultimate questions, Rawlinson does not consider that it constitutes an effective basis for missionary propoganda. 'There is all the difference surely between religion advocated as a possible view of the universe and a helpful attitude to life, and religion proclaimed as the truth of God Himself and the very core of what life means; between Pantheism grown sentimental, and the Gospel of the living God'.(40) The procl^amation of the Christian message has been as a 'Gospel of Fact rather than as a theory of metaphysics'.(41)

Modernism arose, Rawlinson concludes, at a time when orthodox Christian doctrine was being threatened on one side by 'metaphysical theories inconsistent with its idea of God', and on the other by 'historical science affecting to dissolve away into myth and legend

its basis of reputed fact'.(42) Yet, as an attempt to remove faith from the arena in which it was threatened modernism had not been entirely successful.

On the one hand, it is possible to accept Leroy's interpretation of the nature of dogma, and to agree with the modernists in taking the proven efficacy of Christianity in the spiritual experience of the Church as the starting-point of any argument with regard to its truth. On the other hand, it does not appear that the divorce of dogma from history can be made absolute, in the manner in which the Roman "modernists" desired. Christianity is, and must incorrigibly remain, an historical religion...We may take the efficacy of Christianity and the witness of Christian experience as our starting-point; but as we pursue the argument, we shall be driven either to asperse the validity of that experience, and to deny that it is what it appears and claims to be, or else to affirm the truth of the Gospel, at once historical and dogmatic, as the only sufficient ground and explanation.(43)

In these concluding words from Rawlinson's essay 'Dogma and History' we have the basis of neo-liberal catholicism in a nutshell.

4. Spens: Belief and Practice

In 1915 there appeared a collection of lectures by Will Spens, later Sir Will Spens, published under the title Belief and Practice.(44) They were delivered in 1913 whilst Spens was a tutor at Corpus Christi College, Cambridge.(45) In Ramsey's view Belief and Practice is 'the most notable of Anglican works which owe much to Catholic Modernism'.(46)

Belief and Practice represents an attempt to provide a foundation for the idea which, taken broadly, considers religious experience to be the basis upon which Christian dogma is formulated and authenticated.

The fundamental issue is not whether certain doctrines are true or false, but as to our conception of doctrine. We have to consider whether theology should not regard, as its data, experience rather than propositions. Revelation is none the less real if we conceive it as given in experience, and especially in the experience of the Apostles and Apostolic witness. It is not minimized if we regard it as a revelation of, rather than about, God.

We have already indicated the similarity between the concept of dogma espoused by Rawlinson with that of Tyrrell. Here it may be seen that the same method is adopted by Spens, for whom dogmas are 'inferences from experience'.(47)

The need of authority in religion and the importance of the institutional Church are not challenged by Spens in Belief and Practice, rather, they are secured and strengthened.(48) The question here raised is not as to the need of authority, but as its proper basis. Further, the question is the more acute because of the inability of the extant claims to ecclesiastical authority to sustain the weight placed upon them; for example, in the Roman Church certain pronouncements, for which infallibility has been claimed, subsequently proved to be erroneous, thus calling into question the basis of authority on which they were made.(49) Belief and Practice was an attempt to promote an organic conception of authority, to fill the gap created by the breakdown of the various mechanical conceptions of authority.

Spens regarded dogma primarily 'as an assertion and summarization of religious experience'. He described this as a criticism of the position advanced by Rawlinson in 'The Principle of Authority', and that advanced by Tyrrell.(50) It was Tyrrell's method, that of drawing a parallel between science and religion, that provided the starting-point for Spens' view of dogma. 'What was no doubt in Father Tyrrell's mind...was the truth that theories of science

have their significance in large measure, and their primary authority, in the fact that they express, relate, and enable us to predict available experience'.(51) The scientist may understand the truth of a particular theory in one of two different ways. First, a theory may be an exact account of the phenomenon it is devised to explain, without any element of symbol. Secondly, it may be the best means of explaining that phenomenon, even though it is itself merely symbolic. In both cases the theory is true in that it represents the best possible explanation of the phenomenon available at the time.

Tyrrell claimed that dogmas, like scientific theories, explain, in a more or less satisfactory way, available experience of a very important nature. He claimed no more than this for the parallel between science and theology; Spens considered that yet more was involved.

Spens considered that the adoption of a particular scientific theory implies a general outlook: 'We have to add to, and include in, the content of a scientific theory, not merely its power to rationalize particular facts, but its power to produce a sound general outlook'.(52) It is not uncommon, continues Spens, that a theory designed to explain one phenomenon will, with minor modifications, explain another. That is to say that the general outlook implied by the first theory, if substantially correct, would be expected to apply to other theories. Advances in science are often made when the scientist, relying on his instinct educated by his general outlook, creates a theory to explain a newly observed phenomenon, in advance of verification, which is substantially correct. Thus scientific theories 'represent not merely summarization of facts, but the achievement of an outlook which is capable of general application and involves a certain insight'.(53) This

general outlook Spens calls the 'sense of fitness'.

However, Spens finds it necessary to make a distinction between physical experience and spiritual experience. The former does not, in the ordinary sense, depend upon individual expectations; the latter, to a greater or lesser extent, does. This distinction had given rise to the charge that spiritual experience is purely the outcome of self-suggestion. Spens counters this charge with three arguments... First, spiritual experience is not always in accordance with the expectations and beliefs of the individual concerned. Secondly, if belief is considered to be the source, not merely the condition, of spiritual experience, then the strength of that belief, not so much its character, is important. The study of comparative religions has shown that particular beliefs, strongly held, crop up in different directions and in different forms. Thirdly, one particular doctrine may give rise to a wide variety of religious experience. Each of these three arguments indicate that the doctrines, upon which belief is based, have a special relation to reality.(54)

Thus Spens is led to the conclusion that dogmas in religion occupy a function parallel to that of theories in science; that 'the dogmas of religion have a real significance in the measure in which they successfully indicate possible experience'.(55) His interpretation of Rawlinson's proposed view of authority is that 'the truth must mediate religious experience as well as explain it'.(56) This is for Spens the fundamental assumption upon which his view of authority is built, and represents an advance on the position of Rawlinson in 'The Principle of Authority', the advance being the inclusion of mediation of religious experience.

It may be argued, Spens indicates, that it is possible to affirm the fundamental assumptions of science on the basis of

individual experience. However, such are the claims of the religious instinct, that the same may not be said for the fundamental assumptions of religion. Though a valid distinction, it is of limited value. For the scientist would assert that an assumption affirmed relates not merely to the experience in question, but to the reality behind that experience. In both science and religion the affirmation of assumptions is based upon our 'sense of fitness', educated by our general experience, not merely by our acceptance of what is apparently logical.(57)

Nevertheless it must be recognised that the 'sense of fitness' is itself limited. In all fields men will hold different assumptions which may even be contradictory. The criterion for the determination of correct assumptions thus becomes the scope upon which the 'sense of fitness' is based. The larger the field of experience, the more reliable the 'sense of fitness' will be. Again the possibility of error must be admitted. Yet whilst a particular assumption may be incorrect, the insight dictating that assumption may be sound. The implications of this conclusion for theology are first, the fundamental assumptions which have resulted from the educative process may be accepted; secondly, the affirmations which are based upon these assumptions are not final and may even be erroneous, but they do embody real insight.(58)

We may summarize the argument advanced by Spens in the following way. Within the field of science theories are devised to explain experience of physical phenomena. From these theories certain fundamental assumptions may be drawn which enable the scientist to predict future possible experience. The veracity of these predictions depends upon the 'sense of fitness' of the scientist concerned. Even though a particular theory may be incorrect, it may still embody real insight because its fundamental assumptions

are sound. A parallel may be drawn with theology such that physical experience is replaced by spiritual experience, and that theories are replaced by dogmas. Thus neither science nor theology may claim to be exhaustive, but both may claim to embody real insight as to ultimate reality.

This general argument is made the basis for a plea by Spens for the adoption of a liberal catholicism within the Church.(59) For it is the catholic tradition that represents the greatest diversity and resource of religious experience. Thus the 'sense of fitness' based upon catholic experience will be more reliable than any other. For catholicism embodies experience drawn from the major antecedents of Christianity, Jewish apocalyptic and Hellenistic religion. It has successfully indicated the possibilities of religious experience to a large number of individuals. It has had an exceptional value in determining ideals in morality, when taken as a whole. Whilst protestantism may have been a desirable phase in history, there is present in catholicism all the positive values of protestantism; Quakerism in protestantism may be equated with Quietism within catholicism. Further, catholicism embodies the main types of religious experience, both Christian and non-Christian. It may therefore be concluded that catholicism is the most synthetic of all religious traditions, and hence justified in its claim to the most reliable 'sense of fitness'.(60) Spens regards

the Catholic tradition of thought as having been evolved in close dependence on religious experience; as expressing, with marked and exceptional success, the possibilities of religious experience; as embodying a very wide range of such experience, and presenting by far the best available synthesis; as issuing in conceptions which have proved able to cover different fields of experience.(61)

However, Spens is aware of the inherent danger in the catholic tradition, viz., treating as final conclusions which are inevitably only partial, so as to rule out any experience which appears to contradict those conclusions.⁵(62) He suggests two safeguards against this danger. First, 'our allegiance is fundamentally to Catholic thought as an organic whole, rather than to a series of particular propositions'.(63) Secondly, 'if theological thought is to possess any high degree of authority, not only must such thought be closely related to experience, but the consensus of opinion must be a free consensus'.(64) It therefore follows that the greatest care must be taken in the exercise of ecclesiastical discipline.^c Again a point of similarity with Tyrrell's view of authority may be noted here.(65) The notion of the free consensus is characteristic of liberal catholicism, and a basis of the claim that the twentieth century Anglican view of authority is largely influenced by liberal catholicism.^L

The general argument is applied to particular areas of theology in Belief and Practice. These are Christology, the catholic doctrines of prayers for the departed and the Eucharist, and the doctrine of the Church. It is this last area that is of particular interest in this chapter.

Tyrrell, in The Church and the Future, makes a distinction between that charismatic phase of the Church and the institutional phase of the Church. This same distinction is adopted by Spens who notes that the charismatic phase is merely earlier, not higher, than the institutional, or ecclesiastical, phase; that it is the latter phase which has produced the climate in which mutual contact of religious experience may create the necessary conditions for healthy theology to develop.(66) A further implication of this distinction concerns the importance of external Church unity:

'Synthesis in theology, together with the temper of mind necessary for this, and necessary no less to Christian charity, have proved inseparable from a strong sense of the supreme importance of external unity'.(67)

On the basis of a comparison between government of a nation and the sovereign nature of the Kingdom of Heaven, Spens is able to conclude that the government of the Church has a divine sanction. However, the necessary condition of this conclusion is that, in some real sense, the Church was established by Christ himself.(68) Such a condition would be met if the apostles had received a special commission from Christ. This Spens concedes. But, the authoritative character of the apostles' ministry was of a 'special and transitory character'. At their death 'a local ministry had emerged, or was emerging; and it is clear that, if this was not always by their express direction, there must have taken place a general extension of, and adjustment to, what the Apostles enjoyed. It follows that the ministry, to which their death made over the Church, possessed, or secured, the substantial sanction of their authority'.(69) This is an important conclusion for it gives to the historic ministry of the Church a significance which is denied to spontaneous ministries. The former may claim some continuity with the apostles; the latter may not. This is the basis upon which Spens admits the notion of apostolic succession, represented by, and solely by, the historic episcopate.

The historic episcopate is the present embodiment of a government established by Christ to govern in his name; and acceptance of it becomes a consequence of belief in the Incarnation, and of belief that the Scriptures do not misrepresent the ministry of the Apostles. The claim of the historic ministry becomes a witness, and a necessary witness, to such belief. Our religion is from heaven, not of men, and brought into being at the Incarnation: its institutional expression embodies these facts.(70)

Both Romanism and Anglicanism are considered by Spens in Belief and Practice. On the one hand it may be recognised that the Roman system has a close connection with a large resource of thought and experience, yet on the other, the operation of ecclesiastical discipline and the insistence upon Papal infallibility destroys its claim to rational authority. As it stands the Roman system facilitates neither theological reconstruction nor mobility of thought.(71) Whilst Spens acknowledges the importance of the contribution of the Roman modernists, particularly Tyrrell, he is, however, critical of their defence of Romanism as the only sound catholic tradition, for all its faults. The modernists claimed that the true Roman position was overlaid by its ultramontane presentation. But Spens goes further to claim that Vaticanism, that is the ultramontanism formalized in the 1870 Vatican Council, is to be identified with the whole Roman system, and thus the failure of the ideal Romanism proposed by the modernists to be realized constitutes a real flaw in their argument.(72)

The claims of the patriarchal see of Rome are themselves open to further question. Transference of authority to the patriarchal sees originally took place because they were important centres, both in the secular sense and in the sense of religious orthodoxy. Spens claims that in the case of Rome this transference has now lapsed. For its claim has developed from being a patriarchal see to being a monarchic papacy. Further this development has not been with the consent of the whole Church, indeed it was, at least in part, responsible for the schism between the Church of Rome and the Eastern Church; even in the west it does not command universal consent.

Thus it may be said that the Roman claim to monarchy and infallibility is of a charismatic, rather than of an institutional nature.(73)

Such a basis for so important a claim is, suggests Spens, irrational, and therefore the claims of modern Rome cannot be maintained.

Again the scriptural basis of the papacy is a matter of dispute.

It may be argued that the position occupied by Peter amongst the apostles was one of primacy, but it was not one of supremacy.(74)

About Spens' treatment of Anglicanism there is a definite note of optimism. Anglicanism asserts the normativeness of the experience contained in the New Testament, and thus asserts the authority of the Bible. It has made no attempt to compel assent, or to admit infallibility, and hence it has not interfered with the free consensus. Yet this it has combined with the definite assertion of certain cardinal doctrines. The Reformation settlement was substantially good in what it secured for the Church of England. However, Spens has a warning for Anglicanism. It must not seek to be opportunist, simply holding people together, rather than reaching sound conclusions. Against the background of the current controversies, (described in Chapter 3 of this thesis) Spens attaches particular importance to this point, concluding that as some questions are being opened up others must be closed. His optimism lies in his support for liberal catholicism as providing a unique opportunity for Anglicanism to contribute to a reunited Church of the future. On the one hand it must not identify itself with ultramontaniam or protestantism, on the other, it must be inclusive of all catholic experience; it must not rest upon compromise and comprehensiveness. Such is the aim of the movement towards liberal catholicism.(75)

The strength of the Anglican position thus lies in its assertion that theology has no finality, and that it has no exhaustive title.

Almost the most helpful element in the Anglican position is that it involves the admission, and assertion, that ecclesiastical government has gone astray - a view which alone can the

present state of Christendom be fairly faced without doubting Christianity. Its unique claim consists in its existence as a large racial Church, which combines such an admission with a preservation of the historic government in so far as, in the West, this can still claim authoritative character. And, within that Church, theological thought, however imperfect, is free almost to excess; and able to build up, in contact with Catholic experience, a scientific theology.(76)

Anglicanism thus has a special responsibility in seeking reunion with the rest of Christendom. Like Rawlinson, Spens does not consider this to be a matter of regaining the mediaeval position, but rather of a future synthesis of all catholic experience.(77) Further, Anglicanism must consider the desire for greater unity amongst the protestant Churches. Thus it may be forced, by consideration of catholic experience to be found in the non-conformist Churches, to reconsider the prelacy of its bishops, its fetish of the parochial system, and move towards the introduction of synodical government. The non-conformists, for their part, must recognise that only ministers episcopally ordained should celebrate the Eucharist.(78)

Belief and Practice is an important factor in the influence of neo-liberal catholicism in the twentieth century. Knox and Vidler comment: it 'put on record the views which were influencing' a group of anglo-catholics at Cambridge prior to the outbreak of the Great War. 'The date of its publication and to some extent the obscurity of its style prevented it from obtaining the circulation it deserved'.(79) The further recognition of the value of the neo-liberal catholic view of authority was, in some large part, due to the works of A.E.J.Rawlinson.

4. Rawlinson: After the war

During 1915, the year in which Belief and Practice and Dogma, Fact and Experience were published, Rawlinson left Oxford to serve

as a temporary Chaplain to the Forces, followed by a year in a London parish. He returned to Oxford in 1918.

In 'The Principle of Authority' Rawlinson had introduced his discussion of authority by reference to the contemporary vogue to oppose the religion of authority to the religions of the spirit. The treatment of authority in his works published after 1918 begins from a more definite and historical basis. This represents a shift from the method Rawlinson had employed when writing 'The Principle of Authority', in favour of the method employed by Spens, that of emphasising the historical importance of the catholic tradition.(80)

Rawlinson's lectures on Authority and Freedom were delivered at New York's General Theological Seminary, of the Episcopal Church, in 1923. In the first lecture Rawlinson describes the nature of the problem. The misuse of authority by teachers of religion had given rise, in the eyes of the plain man, (by which is meant the individual who by choice or lack of opportunity has not studied theology in any depth) to a negative attitude towards much in traditional Christianity; whilst at the same time a readiness to accept new doctrines which stand apart from the Church's tradition.

Quite clearly, if the Christian Church is to proclaim the Gospel with power in the modern world, not merely to the docile children of orthodoxy but to the multitudes, she needs to recover both the capacity and also the moral right to speak with authority in the name of the living God the authentic message of spiritual truth.(81)

An echo of the criticism made in 'Dogma and History' of modernism may here be detected.(82)

Rawlinson contributed an essay, 'Authority' to the volume Essays Catholic and Critical. This opposed the view of Harnack, asserting that Christianity is a "positive religion", that it came into the world in a particular context, and as a result of

a particular historical process'..(83) The term Christian is one which for the historian possess a

definite content, discernible from history. And because Christianity is thus an historical and positive religion, it is impossible, in the first instance, for the individual to know anything about it at first hand. He must be content to derive his knowledge about it from authority, whether the authority in question be primarily that of a living teacher, or of past tradition.(84)

This point may be further illustrated by the stress Rawlinson places on the historical character of St.Mark's Gospel in his Westminster commentary. The following are quotations from the introductory section on 'The Religious Value of the Gospel':

'The historical story of Jesus is adapted to serve as the spiritual ideal of the religious life-story of the Christian disciple'; and, 'the Gospel brings before us also the figure of Jesus in the concrete reality of His historical life'.(85) It is this same stress, a high regard for the historical character of scripture, that underlies Rawlinson's treatment of authority.

Rawlinson's sermon on 'Authority', published in The Coming Catholicism, and his development of the idea that the Church is the redeemed Israel in The Church of England and the Church of Christ, display his high regard for the historical character of the scriptures.(86) In both cases the essential dependence of Christianity upon its historical antecedents and upon the incarnation as an actual historical event, is what distinguishes it from other mystery religions contemporary with the emergence of the Church.(87)

Christianity does not, however, claim to be merely a historical religion, but a religion of revelation. 'The Lord, as a matter of actual historical fact, astonished people by teaching independently of the scribal tradition, with the unhesitating "authority" of immediate inspiration'.(88) This unique authority, possessed by

Christ, derived from his "'anointing" by the Spirit' at Baptism. Christ is thus the "'Son of David"' understood in terms of 'the pictures of the Davidic King in the earlier part of the Book of Isaiah', and ' in the light of the pictures, in the second half of the book, of the Lord's Servant'. The implications of this view are, concludes Rawlinson, twofold. First, royalty must be understood in terms of service; secondly, that his authority as a teacher was akin to that of a prophet, not that of a lawgiver.(89)

An important element in Rawlinson's view of authority is the continuity he admits between the authority of Christ and that of the apostles and the Church. The Church, that is the redeemed Israel of God, is entrusted with the same mission as Christ, and hence with the same authority. In support of such a view Rawlinson quotes this saying of Christ: "'As the Father hath sent Me, even so send I you"'.(90) Drawing on this understanding of the nature of the Church's authority Rawlinson concludes:

The Church is not primarily a society for spiritual or intellectual research, but a society of which it belongs to the very essence to put forward the emphatic claim to be the bearer of revelation, to have been put in trust with the Gospel as God's revealed message to mankind, and to have been divinely commissioned with prophetic authority to proclaim it as God's truth to all the world, irrespective of whether men prove willing to hear and give heed to the proclamation, or whether they forbear.(91)

From this initial statement we may move to the subsequent problem, viz., what is the place of authority in the contemporary Church? The model of the Ecclesia Docens and Ecclesia Discens, used by Tyrrell, is employed by Rawlinson to answer the question.(92) Further, the argument used in 'The Principle of Authority' is again invoked in Authority and Freedom to justify the notion that the individual will pass through a stage of tutelage, during which time he will believe certain things upon external authority, to

a stage when these beliefs must be verified in his own experience.(93) That is to say, beliefs first accepted upon authority must subsequently mediate [↓]spiritual experience.(94) This dynamic is an affirmation of the principle lex credendi lex orandi : 'prayer and belief are two principles which mutually determine one another'.(95) In Essays Catholic and Critical Rawlinson lends support, with qualification, to Tyrrell's emphasis upon the importance of spiritual experience in the authentication of dogmas. His model of the Ecclesia Docens and Ecclesia Discens is in consequence an organic one, not static or mechanical.(96) Theology must take account of spiritual experience, for it is upon that experience that it may be vindicated.

There is always the danger of theorising upon too narrow a basis of experience: and the intellectual interpretation of the theologian must be controlled by the experience of the saint. The Christian theologian whose work is to be of any value must aim at taking account, not only of the spiritual values inherent in the tradition in which he has personally been brought up, but of the spiritual significance of the whole manifestation of Christianity in history. He must reckon with the spiritual auctoritas of every one of the various forms of Christianity.(97)

It is of note that Rawlinson's reference to the required breadth of experience is similar to Spens idea of a 'sense of fitness'. Both, then, place the authority of the Church on the widest possible basis. Authority, that is auctoritas, is thus the 'spiritual, intellectual and historical content of divine revelation, as verifiable at the three-fold bar of history, reason and spiritual experience'.(98) In addition the Church must allow freedom to its members in order that this verification may take place, and a free consensus achieved.(99)

Rawlinson supports his emphasis on the continuity of the authority of Christ with that of the apostles and the Church with the text: "As the Father hath sent Me, even so send I you". (This saying,

Rawlinson maintains, is to be understood as 'an expression primarily of the mission of the Church, rather than of a sacerdotal caste within the Church'.(100) Nevertheless Rawlinson confirms that the view of the ministry contained in the New Testament is theocratic rather than democratic. In the sub-apostolic period bishops were appointed to serve particular localities under the jurisdiction of itinerant apostles and prophets. The picture of Church order presented by the Didache is favoured by Rawlinson to that found in the letter of Clement. But this intermediate phase was short lived,^{and} by A.D. 110, the Epistle of St. Ignatius of Antioch bears witness to the common and unified three-fold hierarchy of the ministry. As Christianity spread so new congregations emerged, sometimes more than one in a particular location. However, these new congregations did not appoint their own bishops, but remained under the jurisdiction of sees already in existence. In this was the diocesan system evolved; certain ministerial functions being delegated by the bishops to the priests and deacons.(101)

The ministry of the local church was linked on with, and commissioned by representatives of, the ministry of the Church Universal. And that is one great point of episcopacy as it exists today. It stands in broad principle for a Catholic and historical, as distinct from a merely local or sectional, system of ministry and order in the Church. It carries continuity with the past as well as wide extension in the present. But it also symbolizes and means that the authority of the minister does not proceed from the contemporary Church or any part of it, but from Christ the Head, for whom each apostle and bishop acts by commission.(102)

The notion of Apostolic Succession is admitted by Rawlinson in the sense of transmission of ministerial authority from ordainer to ordained. He claims that such a view goes back to the very early days of the Church, before the doctrine was formulated in theological language, when it was generally assumed that the proper

minister of ordination was the bishop.(134)

The assessment of Romanism and protestantism by Rawlinson is once again firmly based on historical grounds. Like Spens, Rawlinson asserts that Rome became a centre both of secular power and influence, and theological orthodoxy. The latter he admits until the fifth century. Because of the nature of the Christian religion, that is a religion of revelation, it was inevitable that an ecclesiastical system, based on authority, would eventually emerge. Until the middle ages western civilization was dominated, and held in harmony, by the authority exercised by the Church. It functioned to bring together natural truths discover^{ed}, and spiritual truths revealed, into one unified system.(104) Since the middle ages the system of ecclesiastical authority, and in particular the doctrine of oracular infallibility, have developed as an attempt to retain the power and influence of the Church. However, upon historical grounds, these developments cannot be justified.

The papacy, which cannot lay claim to universal assent, as defined by the Vatican Council of 1870, is, Rawlinson demands, incapable of being read back into the ministry exercised by St. Peter.(105) 'The claim of Rome is still not merely to inspire and guide, but to dominate, upon the basis of ecclesiastical control'.(106) Thus the doctrine of infallibility must be rejected on the basis that it is a development, which has a pragmatic, rather than a historical purpose. Rawlinson rejects the notion of infallibility as applied not only to the pap^acy but also to the Bible, the creeds and councils.(107)

Rawlinson remains convinced, as he first stated in 'The Principle of Authority', that the path to reunion lies not in regaining the mediaeval position, but in the future synthesis of all valid religious experience.(108) He looks forward to the day when a Papa angelico

of the order of St. Francis will occupy St. Peter's chair: 'Refusing the white garments, the triple ^atira, the Fisherman's ring, refusing equally the homage of the Cardinals and the sedes gestatoria, he shall first do penance, clad only in the rough habit of his order, at the tomb of St. Peter for the crying sins of his predecessors in the Papacy'.(109)

Two of the Authority and Freedom lectures are devoted to a consideration of protestantism. Rawlinson concludes that the essential feature of protestantism is the subordination of the Church and its sacraments, to the Bible as the word of God.(110) Drawing on the writings of Troeltsch and Auguste Sabatier, Rawlinson presents an historical account of the development of protestantism from the Reformation to his own day. Again the historical approach is used.

At the outset protestantism set about a modification, not an abandonment, of catholicism. Eventually the protestant Churches were formed, but only because Rome had excommunicated the reformers, and formed against the reformers' will. Adopting the usage of Troeltsch, Rawlinson describes this as the era of 'Church' type protestantism, the main Churches being Calvinist, Lutheran and Evangelical or Reformed.(111) However, this initial confessional phase eventually broke up and a new type of protestantism emerged - the 'Sect' type. This was the age of the so-called Step children of the Reformation, and in Britain the Commonwealth.(112) During the transition from the 'Sect' type of protestantism to the type of protestantism of Rawlinson's own day, the influence of Scheiermacher, and the modern comparative and historical method, were formative. Yet, after Scheiermacher, whose theory of religion was based 'upon an analysis of the data of the religious consciousness', the infallibility of the Bible was again asserted in the new-Lutheran

attractions, inspiring missionary endeavour and the advance towards social Utopia.

However, Rawlinson criticizes the theology of Ritschl because of its identification of the coming of the Kingdom with one particular generation. Rather, Rawlinson presses the opposite view, that the world is dependent upon God; God does not depend upon the world.(118) The Ritschlian trend in protestantism had forced worship, prayer, and devotion into a subordinate role; it had repudiated authority and replaced it with individualism: 'Faith in faith would appear to be a very inadequate substitute for faith in the reality of God'.(119)

Neither Romanism nor protestantism provide for Rawlinson the answer to the needs of the Church:

What appears clear is that just as we saw no hope of remedy for the spiritual sickness of the modern world in a régime of Authority without Freedom, so neither is there any solution of our problems to be found in a mere insistence upon Freedom without Authority. There is need of the authority of corporate historical tradition - the tested and criticised experience of the past. There is need, in an even more vital sense, of the authority of Revelation.(120)

In June 1922 Rawlinson read a paper to the Anglo-Catholic Congress at Birmingham entitled: Catholicism with Freedom: An Appeal for a New Policy; it was subsequently published as an 'Open Letter to all Members of the Church of England, and particularly to those who profess and call themselves Catholics'.(121) Herein Rawlinson describes the anglo-catholic movement as standing at the 'parting of the ways', between, on the one hand, a die-hard conservatism, inelasticity, fear of critical methods, catholicism but 'not invariably for intellectual freedom', and on the other, an acceptance of critical methods, the recognition that 'Modernism' is a necessity, that is to say that the modernisms thus far proposed have been

directed aright but have failed to achieve the desired goal, that the traditional concept of authority based on a mechanical interpretation of Holy Scripture and Holy Church must be replaced with a more spiritual, that is to say organic, concept of authority. Anglo-catholicism must make the transition from 'a stubbornly conservative to a modern and critical attitude in relation to tradition and to the conception of authority'.

Rawlinson considered that the anglo-catholic party had a unique contribution to make to the life of the Church of England, presenting 'historical Christianity in modern terms for modern men', because of its basis in catholic experience. However, the exploitation of this opportunity requires that the party incorporate the notion of freedom into its theology, to share the same basis as authority. The system of theology which may result from such a 'Catholicism with Freedom' could do for the twentieth century what St. Thomas Aquinas did for the middle ages. But to this hope is attached a warning. The admission of such freedom is inevitably to permit the development of errors and heresies, negative as well as positive movements in theology, false starts of one kind or another. But these must be tolerated; for truth will inevitably triumph over error and heresy.(122)

It is clear from Catholicism with Freedom that Rawlinson no longer considered himself committed to the style of liberal catholicism espoused by Gore; this was the liberal catholicism he described as 'a modernised version of ^{ad} Tractianism'.(123) Of the emergence of neo-liberal catholicism Ramsey remarks:

A new version of liberal catholicism appeared. It included more radicalism in Biblical studies, more consideration of the place of experience in theology, and sometimes (though not invariably) more tendencies towards Latin ways of worship. With these tendencies the meaning of the term 'Liberal Catholicism' somewhat shifted. It meant less the Anglican appeal as such than an appeal

to a particular synthesis of religion and contemporary scholarship: less an appeal to Catholicism as the institution of the undivided Church than an appeal to Catholicism as the phenomenon of sacramental religion down the ages. A little more is conceded to the spirit of Catholic Modernism than Gore could ever have allowed.(124)

Ramsey's point may be illustrated by reference to an article by Rawlinson written in response to the publication of Gore's The Holy Spirit and the Church in 1924.(125) Here Rawlinson concludes that Gore has satisfactorily argued to establish the New Testament as a Catholic book, that is to say that the New Testament represents a united Church, against the anti-ecclesiasticism of some protestants.(126) However, the method employed by Gore in his argument will not satisfy the critical historian. The question Rawlinson brings forward is: 'At how early a stage did Christianity begin to be "catholicised"?'(127) The answer provided by Gore in The Holy Spirit and the Church is essentially conservative and confident. Gore is "quite certain" of his conclusions. The younger generation, Rawlinson remarks, are unable to share this confidence; to be "quite certain" is morally wrong'.(128) Thus Gore may not be acquitted of a charge of historical dogmatism.

Against Gore's assertion that Christ legislated for His Church, and that all possible subsequent questions are anticipated by the New Testament, Rawlinson lays down two principles for a sound doctrine of development. First, the significance of Jesus can only be fully understood in the light of history. Secondly, revelation, of God, is made through channels other than those which are specifically Christian. The function of the New Testament is thus to be a 'standard and touchstone by which later developments require to be continually tested'; the authenticity of such later

developments must be judged on the basis of their accord with the spirit of the gospel and 'whether they are capable of mediating in experience a type of spiritual life which is genuinely Christian'.(129)

The neo-liberal catholics asserted that no faith or tradition has a monopoly of truth, that the task for the future is one of synthesis.(130) Their hope was for a 'free and evangelical presentation of Christianity as the Catholic Religion of mankind', Evangelical in that it insists on the normativeness of the New Testament, Catholic in that it represents a complete synthesis of all possible and valid religious experience.(131)

Anglicanism, and especially anglo-catholicism, is considered by Rawlinson to have a special role to play in the future of Christendom.(132) It is no longer merely a national sect, but an international communion.(133) It has maintained the historic episcopate and the catholic tradition. It stands with the four great types of confessional Christianity, Roman, Orthodox, Lutheran, and Calvinist. It is, in its best form, that is its neo-liberal catholic form, sufficiently flexible to build bridges with each of these major types. Thus it may lead the way to the reunited Church.(134)

5. Conclusion

The neo-liberal catholic view of authority, with its emphasis upon religious experience, owes a great deal to modernism, and to Tyrrell in particular. Their view of authority enabled the neo-liberal catholics to advance a distinctly optimistic view of the future of Anglicanism. Both Spens and Rawlinson became influential figures within the Church of England, as did other members of the school. Thus the neo-liberal catholic view of authority has become, to a large degree, the official Anglican view.

References

1. B.H.Streeter ed., Foundations (London,1912), pp. 361 ff.
2. see also J.N.Figgis, 'Need of Authority in the Church' in The Gospel and Human Needs (London,1909), p. 139. see also A.Sabatier, The Religions of Authority and the Religion of the Spirit (London,1904). First published Paris,1899.
3. Streeter ed., Foundations, p. 366.
4. *ibid.* p. 366.
5. *ibid.* p. 367. In his essay 'The Bible', Foundations pp. 25-71, Richard Brook makes the following remarks about inspiration:
'We shall therefore no longer think of revelation as the communication to man from without of certain pieces of information about God, but rather as an act of God within. It is not so much that God speaks to one man and not to another, as that the one man has the capacity to hear and the other has not. What we call inspiration is the quickening and intensifying of this religious sense, an increase in the gift of the Spirit, which produces the religious genius, as, for example, the quickening and intensifying of the poetic faculty produces the great poet'. (pp. 56-57).
6. *ibid.* p. 371.
7. *ibid.* pp. 371-372.
8. *ibid.* p. 373.
9. *ibid.* p. 376.
10. Reprinted in A.E.J.Rawlinson, Dogma, Fact and Experience (London,1915), pp. 1-21.
11. *ibid.* pp. 1-9.
12. *ibid.* pp. 12-13.
13. *ibid.* pp. 11, 14-15.
14. *ibid.* p. 18.
15. *ibid.* p. 20.
16. Streeter ed., Foundations, p. 378.
17. *ibid.* pp. 378-379.
18. *ibid.* p. 380.
19. G.Tyrrell, Medievalism (London,1908), p. 47.
20. Streeter ed., Foundations, pp. 381 ff.
21. *ibid.* pp. 382-383.

22. For a fuller discussion of the nature of historical conclusions see an earlier article by Rawlinson, 'The Question of Miracle in the New Testament' in Interpreter (London, 1912), vol VIII, pp. 32-33.
23. Streeter ed., Foundations, pp. 387-389.
24. *ibid.* pp. 389-391.
25. *ibid.* pp. 391-393.
26. *ibid.* pp. 393-396.
27. Rawlinson supported the 'Life and Liberty' movement which sought greater lay participation in Church affairs. This movement was launched in 1917. see A.E.J.Rawlinson, Religious Reality (London, 1918), pp. 78-81. see also F.A.Iremonger, William Temple (London, 1948), pp. 220 ff.
28. Streeter ed., Foundations, pp. 397-400.
29. *ibid.* p. 385.
30. *ibid.* pp. 403-407.
31. A.M.Ramsey, From Gore to Temple (London, 1960), p. 65.
32. Rawlinson, Dogma, Fact and Experience, p. 22.
33. *ibid.* pp. 22-23.
34. *ibid.* p. 25. see also Rawlinson, 'The Question of Miracle in the New Testament' in Interpreter (London, 1912), vol. VIII, pp. 32-33.
35. Rawlinson, Dogma, Fact and Experience, p. 28.
36. *ibid.* pp. 29-32. see also A.R.Vidler, A Variety of Catholic Modernists (Cambridge, 1970), p. 15.
37. Rawlinson, Dogma, Fact and Experience, p. 32.
38. *ibid.* p. 36.
39. *ibid.* p. 37.
40. *ibid.* pp. 38-39.
41. *ibid.* p. 41.
42. *ibid.* p. 49.
43. *ibid.* pp. 51-52.
44. London, 1915.
45. W.L.Knox and A.R.Vidler, The Development of Modern Catholicism (London, 1935), pp. 235-254.

46. Ramsey, From Gore to Temple, p. 65.
47. Spens, Belief and Practice, pp. 7-8. see also Streeter ed., Foundations, p. 380. Tyrrell, Medievalism, p. 47.
48. Spens, Belief and Practice, pp. 11-13.
49. *ibid.* pp. 17-19.
50. *ibid.* pp. 21-22, 71. see also Knox and Vidler, The Development of Modern Catholicism, pp. 248-250. Spens also notes that the theologies of the past are limited by the range of experience of their authors. Belief and Practice, pp. 22-23.
51. Spens, Belief and Practice, p. 23.
52. *ibid.* pp. 24-26.
53. *ibid.* p. 28.
54. *ibid.* pp. 33-37. This point concerning self-suggestion is further developed by Spens in an appended note to the 2nd ed. in reply to a criticism made of Belief and Practice by Dr. Tennant.
55. *ibid.* p. 38.
56. *ibid.* p. 39.
57. *ibid.* pp. 41-44.
58. *ibid.* pp. 45-48.
59. *ibid.* pp. 81-82.
60. *ibid.* pp. 52-59. Spens also asserts that non-religious experience is important in the determination of dogma. This idea may also be found in Tyrrell, see Medievalism, pp. 143-148.
61. Spens, Belief and Practice, p. 61.
62. *ibid.* pp. 69-71.
63. *ibid.* p. 72.
64. *ibid.* p. 73.
65. see page 46 of this thesis.
66. Spens, Belief and Practice, pp. 188-190.
67. *ibid.* pp. 190-191.
68. *ibid.* pp. 211-212.
69. *ibid.* pp. 213-214.
70. *ibid.* pp. 217-218.

71. *ibid.* pp. 74-75.
72. *ibid.* pp. 196-202.
73. *ibid.* pp. 220-224.
74. *ibid.* pp. 227-228.
75. *ibid.* pp. 77-82.
76. *ibid.* p. 232.
77. see also Streeter ed., Foundations, pp. 385, 403-407.
78. Spens, Belief and Practice, pp. 231-241.
79. Knox and Vidler, The Development of Modern Catholicism, p. 235. see also Ramsey, From Gore to Temple, p. 65.
80. Particular examples are: A.E.J.Rawlinson, 'Authority' in W.S.Swayne ed., The Coming Catholicism (London, 1920), pp. 47-55. this volume was published by the Liberal Catholic Union. A.E.J.Rawlinson, Authority and Freedom (London, 1923). A.E.J.Rawlinson, 'Authority' in E.G.Selwyn ed., Essays Catholic and Critical (London, 1926), pp. 83 ff.
81. Rawlinson, Authority and Freedom, p. 2.
82. Rawlinson, Dogma, Fact and Experience, pp. 38 ff.
83. Selwyn ed., Essays Catholic and Critical, p. 85. see also Rawlinson, Authority and Freedom, pp. 13-14.
84. Selwyn ed., Essays Catholic and Critical, pp. 85-86.
85. A.E.J.Rawlinson, St.Mark (London, 1925), pp. lvi, lvii.
86. London, 1930, pp. 1-25. see also Rawlinson, Dogma, Fact and Experience, p. 51.
87. A.E.J.Rawlinson, 'The Historical Grounds of Christian Belief' in Church Congress Report (London, 1921), pp. 54-60. Reprinted in A.E.J.Rawlinson, Studies in Historical Christianity (London, 1922), pp. 120 ff.
88. Selwyn ed., Essays Catholic and Critical, p. 86. see also Swayne ed., The Coming Catholicism, pp. 47-48.
89. Swayne ed., The Coming Catholicism, pp. 50-54. see also Rawlinson, Authority and Freedom, pp. 141 ff. see also the chapter 'Inspiration' in Rawlinson, Studies in Historical Christianity, pp. 60-79.
90. Swayne ed., The Coming Catholicism, p. 48. see also Rawlinson, Authority and Freedom pp. 21-24. Rawlinson, The Church of England and the Church of Christ, pp. 1-3. Selwyn ed., Essays Catholic and Critical, p. 87. Rawlinson, Studies in Historical Christianity, p. 19. Rawlinson, Religious Reality, p. 78.

91. Selwyn ed., Essays Catholic and Critical, p. 87. see also Rawlinson, Authority and Freedom, pp. 24-25.
92. Rawlinson, Authority and Freedom, p. 3. see also page 61 ff. of this thesis.
93. Rawlinson, Authority and Freedom, p. 3. see also Selwyn ed., Essays Catholic and Critical, pp. 90-91.
94. Selwyn ed., Essays Catholic and Critical, p. 92.
95. Rawlinson, Authority and Freedom, p. 5.
96. *ibid.* p. 10.
97. *ibid.* pp. 12-13.
98. Selwyn ed., Essays Catholic and Critical, p. 95.
99. *ibid.* pp. 95-97. see also Rawlinson, Authority and Freedom, pp. 15, 17.
100. Rawlinson, Studies in Historical Christianity, p. 19.
101. *ibid.* pp. 20-27.
102. *ibid.* pp. 28-29. see also Rawlinson, Religious Reality, pp. 77-78. Rawlinson, Authority and Freedom, pp. 145-146.
103. Rawlinson, Studies in Historical Christianity, pp. 31-32. see also Rawlinson, Authority and Freedom, p. 145.
104. Rawlinson, Authority and Freedom, pp. 29-31, 38-39, 42-44. see also Spens, Belief and Practice, pp. 220-228.
105. Rawlinson, Authority and Freedom, p. 40.
106. *ibid.* p. 44. see also Selwyn ed., Essays Catholic and Critical, p. 94.
107. Selwyn ed., Essays Catholic and Critical, pp. 94-95. see also Additional Note 'The Doctrine of Ecclesiastical Infallibility' in Rawlinson, Authority and Freedom, pp. 188-189.
108. Rawlinson, Authority and Freedom, pp. 29-31. see also Streeter ed., Foundations, pp. 385, 403-406. Spens, Belief and Practice, pp. 231-241.
109. Rawlinson, Authority and Freedom, pp. 48-53.
110. *ibid.* p. 55.
111. *ibid.* pp. 54-60.
112. *ibid.* pp. 60-62. see also L. Verduin, The Reformers and their Stepchildren (London, 1964).
113. Rawlinson, Authority and Freedom, pp. 63-65.

114. *ibid.* pp. 66-71.
115. *ibid.* p. 79.
116. *ibid.* p. 84. The quotation is from W.Adams Brown, The Church in America, p. 20. cited by Rawlinson.
117. Rawlinson, Authority and Freedom, p. 85.
118. *ibid.* pp. 85-90. see also Rawlinson, Dogma, Fact and Experience, pp. 1-9.
119. Rawlinson, Authority and Freedom, p. 103.
120. *ibid.* p. 105.
121. London, 1922.
122. Rawlinson returned to this theme in a Cambridge sermon Freedom within the Church: A Sequel to Catholicism with Freedom (London, 1928).
123. A.E.J.Rawlinson, 'An Apology for Anglicanism' in The Review of the Churches (1921-1925), p. 389.
124. Ramsey, From Gore to Temple, p. 101. see also A.R.Vidler, Essays in Liberality (London, 1957), pp. 146 ff. In his A Variety of Catholic Modernists Vidler notes that he was attracted to the type of anglo-catholicism of the generation of Rawlinson in preference to that of the generation of Gore. p. 2.
125. Rawlinson, 'An Apology for Anglicanism'.
126. *ibid.* p. 391.
127. *ibid.* p. 392.
128. *ibid.* p. 393.
129. *ibid.* pp. 394-395.
130. Rawlinson, Authority and Freedom, p. 168.
131. *ibid.* pp. 164-165. see also Rawlinson, Studies in Historical Christianity, pp. 1-6.
132. Rawlinson, Authority and Freedom, pp. 175-182.
133. Rawlinson, The Church of England and the Church of Christ, pp. 77, 86 ff. see also A.E.J.Rawlinson, 'The Anglican Communion' in Theology (London, 1930), vol 22, pp. 98 ff.
134. Rawlinson, The Church of England and the Church of Christ, pp. 98-107. see also A.E.J.Rawlinson, The Genius of The Church of England (London, 1945), pp. 13-14.

Epilogue

In this thesis we have attempted to trace the development of the liberal catholic Anglican view of authority. We have demonstrated that liberal catholicism was born out of a desire, in the second half of the nineteenth century, to secure greater liberality for members of the Church of England without compromise to its traditional basis of authority in the creeds and formularies. Gore's view of authority was found to reflect this position.

An important factor in the development of the liberal catholic view of authority was the influence exerted by the modernist movement in the Roman Catholic Church. We have seen how the appeal to spiritual experience, an important feature in the neo-liberal catholic view of authority, owes its origin to the modernist view of authority, especially that of George Tyrrell. An understanding of the method Tyrrell employed to vindicate this appeal to spiritual experience in the process of the authentication of dogmas, has been found to be essential to a proper understanding of the development of the liberal catholic view of authority.

The series of events which occurred between 1912, after the publication of Foundations, and 1914, until the outbreak of the Great War, acted as a catalyst to the development of the neo-liberal catholic view of authority. Thus it is possible from this period to distinguish two distinct schools within liberal catholicism.

In the final chapter of this thesis we described the neo-liberal catholic view of authority, as it may be discerned from the writings of A.E.J. Rawlinson and Will Spens. We attempted to show that this view owes much to modernism, and in particular to the view of authority espoused by George Tyrrell.

The manner in which we have traced the development of the liberal catholic view of authority enables us to support Ramsey's view that before Gore's death a 'new version of liberal catholicism appeared'. This new version was the neo-liberal catholicism of Rawlinson, Spens, Knox, Selwyn and others.

An appreciation of the liberal catholic view of authority is important because it has been formative for recent Anglican documents. Two such documents, Doctrine in the Church of England(1) and The Lambeth Conference 1948, in so far as they deal with authority, may be said to display a marked dependence upon the neo-liberal catholic view.

The Doctrine Commission, set up in 1922 by the Archbishops of Canterbury and York partly in response to the controversy that followed the conference of the Churchmen's Union at Cambridge in 1921, was asked: 'To consider the nature and grounds of Christian doctrine with a view to demonstrating the extent of existing agreement within the Church of England and with a view to investigating how far it is possible to remove or diminish existing differences'.(3) The report of the Commission was not intended to be an authoritative statement of the Church of England's doctrine, but to advise the bishops of the Commission's perception of that doctrine.

In an attempt to make the Commission representative of the whole its members were chosen from within the different traditions of the Church of England. Those members whom we may describe as neo-liberal catholic included A.E.J.Rawlinson, Will Spens and W.L.Knox.(4)

The Prolegomena of the report is entitled 'The Sources and Authority of Christian Doctrine'.(5) It is within this section that the Commission's view of authority is to be found.

The Commission affirm^{ed} that for Anglicanism scripture is normative.

They understood the notion of inspiration not as 'a dogma imposed as a result of some theory of the mode of the composition of the books, but a conclusion drawn from the character of their contents and the spiritual insight displayed in them'.(6)

This understanding of inspiration resembles that proposed by Brook, in his Foundations essay, and endorsed by Rawlinson, also in Foundations.(7) Further the Commission did not consider the work of the Holy Spirit to be confined to Israel or Christendom, but diffused throughout creation.(8) This is an idea familiar in Gore, Tyrrell and the neo-liberal catholics.(9)

Perhaps the most important contribution of the neo-liberal catholic view of authority to the Commission's report is to be found in the emphasis the report places upon spiritual experience. They conclude that the estimation of the relative spiritual value of biblical passages the criterion is 'the Mind of Christ as unfolded in the experience of the Church and appropriated by the individual Christian through His Spirit'.(10) When considering the authority attaching to the Church's doctrine the Commission again emphasize the personal appropriation of faith, in thought and experience, in contrast to acceptance of those doctrines merely upon external authority.(11)

Thus, the report concludes, the authority attaching to the Church's doctrinal formulations is dependent upon their acceptance by the whole body of the faithful. 'The weight of the consensus fidelium does not depend on mere numbers or on the extension of a belief at any one time, but on continuance through the ages and the extent to which the consensus is genuinely free'.(12)

In Catholicism with Freedom, published in the same year as the Commission began its work, 1922, Rawlinson appeals for a

greater degree of liberty to be allowed to members of the Church of England, and particularly by those within the anglo-catholic wing.(13) However, he predicts that such liberty will inevitably permit the emergence of heresies, negative movements in theology, and false starts of various kinds. These, he states, must be tolerated in the confidence that in time the truth will prevail, for such errors in fact aid the discovery of that truth. We may interpret the Commission's report as endorsing Rawlinson's view: 'The Church should also recognise as necessary to the fulness of its own life the activity of those of its members who carry forward the apprehension of truth by freely testing and criticising its traditional doctrines'.(14)

The two sections of the report devoted to 'Anglican Formularies' and 'On the Application to the Creeds of the Conception of Symbolic Truth' reflect the argument advanced by Spens in Belief and Practice, viz., that whilst a particular form of expression may not be strictly correct it may embody a real insight into the truth. This is the general view which the Commission propose the Church of England should take in order to retain the creeds and formularies.

The committee of bishops reporting on 'The Anglican Communion' at the 1948 Lambeth Conference considered 'The Meaning and Unity of the Anglican Communion'.(15) They described the authority inherited by the Anglican Communion as single, 'in that it is derived from a singly Divine source', and dispersed, rather than centralized in that it is distributed 'among Scripture, Tradition, Creeds, the Ministry of the Word and Sacraments, the Witness of saints, and the consensus fidelium'.

Significantly these 'elements in authority' are described to be in 'organic relation to each other...Catholic Christianity presents as with an organic process of life and thought in which religious experience has been, and is, described, intellectually

ordered, mediated, and verified'. They are described in scripture, defined in creeds, mediated in the ministry of word and sacraments, and verified 'in the witness of the saints and in the consensus fidelium'. Further, 'the crucible in which these elements of authority are fused and unified in the fellowship and power of the Holy Spirit' is the 'offering and ordering of the public worship of God'. And it is the Anglican adherence to episcopacy which is the 'source and centre of our order'; and to the Book of Common Prayer as 'the standard of our worship'. Taken together these reflect this ^S essentially Anglican authority.

The notion of the elements of authority existing in organic relationship is to be found in both the neo-liberal catholic view of authority and in Tyrrell's view of authority. It further allows for the type of conflict which Rawlinson anticipated in Catholicism with Freedom. (16)

We may thus conclude that there are three main elements in the Anglican view of authority, as expressed in her more recent documents, in particular Lambeth 1948, which find their antecedent in neo-liberal catholicism. They are, first, the appeal to spiritual experience in the authentication of dogmas; secondly, the admission that an organic model of authority will inevitably result in a degree of conflict as the various strands of spiritual experience interact upon each other; and thirdly, that the consensus fidelium, if it is to be reliable, must be achieved by allowing to members of the Church the greatest degree of liberty possible. A significant addition to the neo-liberal catholic view of authority in the 1948 Lambeth Report is the emphasis upon liturgy as the crucible in which the organic relationship is formed.

It may thus be stated with some confidence that the Anglican view of authority, as it now stands, owes a great deal to the influence

of neo-liberal catholicism.

References

1. London, 1962. First published 1938.
2. London, 1948.
3. Doctrine in the Church of England, p. 19. see also G.K.A. Bell, Randall Davidson (London, 1935), pp. 1139-1150.
4. For the complete list of the members of the Commission see Doctrine in the Church of England, pp. 19-20.
5. *ibid.* pp. 27-39.
6. *ibid.* p. 27.
7. B.H. Streeter ed., Foundations (London, 1912), pp. 57-57, 367.
8. Doctrine in the Church of England, pp. 30-31.
9. see pages 23, 46, 118 ff. of this thesis.
10. Doctrine in the Church of England, p. 32.
11. *ibid.* p. 36.
12. *ibid.* p. 35.
13. London, 1922.
14. Doctrine in the Church of England, pp. 36.
15. The Lambeth Conference 1948 (London, 1948), pt. II, pp. 84-86. cited by S.W. Sykes, The Integrity of Anglicanism (London, 1978), pp. 112-114.
16. Sykes, The Integrity of Anglicanism, pp. 87 ff.

AppendixSketch Biography of A.E.J.Rawlinson

Alfred Edward John Rawlinson was born at Newton-le-Willows, Lancashire in 1884 into a Congregationalist family. He was educated at Dulwich College and went up to Corpus Christi College, Oxford in 1904.(1) When he arrived at Oxford he was an agnostic. It was during his under-graduate years, 1904-1907, that he was attracted towards Anglicanism, and in particular towards anglo-catholicism.(2) Rawlinson was made a deacon in 1909, and ordained priest a year later. He remained at Oxford, occupying various academic posts, until 1929, with the exception of two years, 1915-1917, as a temporary Chaplain to the Forces, and one year, 1917-1918, as Priest-in-Charge of the parish of St.John Evangelist, Wilton Road, London.

The first of Rawlinson's works to attract attention was his contribution to the volume of essays Foundations. He had published at least one previous article.(3) The Foundations essay 'The Principle of Authority', was described by Rawlinson's obituary writer in The Times as 'level headed'.(4) Rawlinson is often associated with the advance of New Testament scholarship, not without justification, but, he is also amongst the first rank of apologists of Anglicanism in the twentieth century.

In 1921 Rawlinson was awarded the degree of Bachelor of Divinity at Oxford, and in 1925 an Oxford Doctorate of Divinity. Later in 1927 when the Lady Margaret Professorship of Divinity fell vacant Rawlinson was one of the four candidates for the post. However, the chair went to N.P.Williams with 31 votes to Rawlinson's 29.(5) These two had been associates and friends since 1907, when they met shortly after a retreat at Pusey House which they had both

attended. Williams was elected to a Fellowship at Exeter College in 1909, a post for which Rawlinson was also a candidate.(6) It would appear that failing to achieve the Lady Margaret Professorship in 1927 indicated to Rawlinson that he had reached the climax of his Oxford career. In 1929 he left Oxford for Durham to take up the post of Archdeacon of Auckland. Henesley Henson, then Bishop of Durham, commented, at the time of his appointment, that Rawlinson was a more convinced anglo-catholic than the position as Archdeacon might suggest.(7) Rawlinson married Mildred Ellis, only daughter of Rev. P. A. Ellis, sometime Vicar of St. Mary's, Westminster, in 1919 when he was aged 35.(8)

Rawlinson was consecrated Bishop in 1936; remaining in the See of Derby until 1959. His obituary writer comments:

The announcement that the new Bishop of Derby was to be Archdeacon Rawlinson was received with favour among the Anglo-Catholic section of the clergy. Gradually, however, a rift appeared between the diocesan and many of his clergy, and a sense of disappointment was most clearly felt among the very Catholics who had welcomed him. For one thing, he took a stand on extra-liturgical devotions that was not expected, and though other bishops did this, there was a certain pre-emptoriness about Dr. Rawlinson that antagonized a good many of his clergy'.(9)

The impression created is that the freedom advocated by Rawlinson whilst at Oxford, in matters of doctrine and worship, was somewhat modified by the experience of becoming a diocesan bishop.

The twenty four years Rawlinson spent at Derby were marked, on the one hand, by economic depression, war and reconstruction, and on the other, by the debate over the Church of South India and relations with the non-episcopal Churches. He supported the South India scheme and chaired the committee of the 1958 Lambeth Conference which reported on 'Relations with the Presbyterians'.(10)

After his retirement, in 1959, Bishop and Mrs Rawlinson moved

to the home of their son in Hampstead. The Bishop died on 17 July 1960, aged 76.

References

1. 'Rawlinson, Alfred Edward John' in Who's Who (London, 1960), p. 2495.
2. I am grateful to Bishop Michael Ramsey for this information about Rawlinson. Ramsey's paternal Grandfather was a Congregational Minister at Dulwich. see also 'Rawlinson, A.E.J.' in Crockford's Clerical Directory (Oxford, 1960).
3. London, 1912. see also 'The Question of Miracle in the New Testament' in Interpreter (London, 1912), vol VIII, p. 27 ff.
4. The Times, 18 July 1960.
5. The other candidates were C.J. Shebbeare (21 votes) and H.N. Bates (13 votes) see E.W. Kemp, N.P. Williams (London, 1954), p. 45.
6. Kemp, N.P. Williams, pp. 17-19.
7. H.H. Henson, Retrospect on an Unimportant Life (London, 1943), vol II, p. 250.
8. Who's Who (1960), p. 2495.
9. The Times, 18 July 1960.
10. A.M.G. Stephenson, Anglicanism and the Lambeth Conferences (London, 1978), pp. 201, 206.

Bibliographies1. Primary Sources (Books and Pamphlets)

Edwin Abbot, The Kernal and the Husk: Letters on Spiritual Christianity (London, 1886).

J.F. Bethune-Baker, The Miracle of Christianity (London, 1914).

Church of England, Constitutions and Canons (made in the year 1603 and amended in the year 1865) to which are added the Thirty-Nine Articles of the Church of England (S.P.C.K.).

Church of England, Doctrine in the Church of England (London, 1962).
First published in 1938.

Randall Davidson, Kikuyu (London, 1915).

Alfred Fawkes, Studies in Modernism (London, 1913).

John N. Figgis, The Gospel and Human Needs (London, 1909).

John N. Figgis, Civilisation at the Crossroads (London, 1912).

Charles Gore, Roman Catholic Claims (London, 1884).

Charles Gore, The Clergy and the Creeds (London, 1887).

Charles Gore, Lux Mundi (London, 1889).

Charles Gore, St. Paul's Epistle to the Ephesians (London, 1898).

Charles Gore, The New Theology and the Old Religion (London, 1907).

Charles Gore, The Basis of Anglican Fellowship in Faith and Organisation (London, 1914).

Charles Gore, Catholicism and Roman Catholicism (London, 1923).

Charles Gore, The Holy Spirit and the Church (London, 1924).

Charles Gore, The Reconstruction of Belief (London, 1926).

Charles Gore, The Church and the Ministry (London, 1936).

Charles Gore, Our Place in Christendom.

H.H. Henson, Retrospect of an Unimportant Life (London, 1942).

Ronald Knox, Some Loose Stones (London, 1913).

A.L. Lilley, Modernism: A Record and Review (London, 1908).

A.J. Mason, Episcopacy in the Church of England (London, 1914).

H. Maynard Smith, Frank Bishop of Zanzibar (London, 1926).

- W.G.Peel and J.J.Willis, Steps Towards Reunion (London, 1914).
- Maude D.Petre, Autobiography and Life of George Tyrrell (London, 1912).
- Maude D.Petre, Modernism: Its Failures and its Fruits (London, 1914).
- Gerald C. Rawlinson, An Anglo-Catholic's Thoughts on Religion (London, 1924).
- Auguste Sabatier, The Religions of Authority and the Religion of the Spirit (London, 1904).
- Paul Sabatier, Modernism (London, 1908).
- William Sanday, Bishop Gore's Challenge to Criticism (London, 1914).
- Will Spens, Belief and Practice (London, 1915).
- B.H.Streeter ed., Foundations (London, 1912).
- Thomas B. Strong, The Miraculous in Gospels and Creeds (London, 1914).
- J.M.Thompson, Miracles in the New Testament (London, 1911).
- George Tyrrell, The Faith of the Millions (London, 1901).
- George Tyrrell, Medievalism (London, 1908).
- George Tyrrell, The Church and the Future (London, 1910).
- George Tyrrell, Christianity at the Crossroads with Foreword by A.R.Vidler (London, 1963).
- Friedrich von Hugel, Essays and Addresses second series (London, 1926).
- Frank Weston, Ecclesia Anglicana: For What Does She Stand? (London, 1913).
- Frank Weston, The Case Against Kikuyu: A Study in Vital Principles (London, 1914).
- J.J.Willis, The Kikuyu Conference (London, 1913).

2. Secondary Sources (Books and Pamphlets)

- L.F.Barmann, Baron Friedrich von Hugel and the Modernist Crisis in England (Cambridge, 1972).
- G.K.A.Bell, Randall Davidson (London, 1935).
- James Carpenter, Gore: A Study in Liberal Catholic Thought (London, 1960).
- Owen Chadwick, The Victorian Church pt. 1. 3rd ed. (London, 1971).
- Owen Chadwick, The Victorian Church pt. 2. 2nd ed. (London, 1972).

- A.O.J.Cockshut, Anglican Attitudes (London, 1959).
- M.A.Crowther, Church Embattled: Religious Controversy in Mid-Victorian England (Newton Abbot, 1970).
- Michael de la Bedoyere, The Life of Baron von Hügel (London, 1951).
- F.A.Iremonger, William Temple (London, 1948).
- E.W.Kemp, N.P.Williams (London, 1954).
- Ronald Knox, Essays in Satire (London, 1954).
- W.L.Knox and A.R.Vidler, The Development of Modern Catholicism (London, 1933).
- J.C.Livingston, The Ethics of Belief: An Essay in the Victorian Religious Conscience (Tallahassee Florida USA, 1974).
- Roger Lloyd, The Church of England 1900-1965 (London, 1966).
- J.R.H.Moorman, A History of the Church of England (London, 1953).
- J.K.Mozley, Some Tendencies in British Theology (London, 1951).
- S.S.O'Mahany, Tyrrell and Newman unpublished M.A. thesis (Bristol, 1977).
- G.L.Prestige, The Life of Charles Gore (London, 1935).
- G.L.Prestige, The Soul of a Prophet (London, 1948).
- A.M.Ramsey, From Gore to Temple (London, 1960).
- A.M.G.Stephenson, Anglicanism and the Lambeth Conferences (London, 1978).
- S.W.Sykes, The Integrity of Anglicanism (London, 1978).
- B.Tunstall, William Pitt Earl of Chatham (London, 1938).
- Leonard Verduin, The Reformers and their Stepchildren (London, 1964).
- A.R.Vidler, The Modernist Movement in the Roman Catholic Church (Cambridge, 1934).
- A.R.Vidler, Essays in Liberality (London, 1957).
- A.R.Vidler, A Variety of Catholic Modernists (London, 1970).
- N.R.Williams and Charles Harris ed., Northern Catholicism (London, 1933).

3. Newspapers, Periodicals and Reference Works

Crockford's Clerical Directory (Oxford, 1960)

Church Congress Report (London).

F.L.Cross and E.A.Livingstone, The Oxford Dictionary of the Christian Church 2nd ed. (London, 1974).

Fortnightly Review (London).

Guardian (London).

Hansard, Parliamentary Debates (London)

Interpreter (London).

Oxford Magazine (Oxford).

The Chronicle of Convocation (London).

The Quarterly Review (London).

The Review of the Churches (London).

The Times (London).

Theology (London).

4. Published works of A.E.J.Rawlinson

(Those marked with an asterisk are referred ^{to} in this thesis)

'The Revelation of St.John' in Church Quarterly Review, 1911, vol. 73, pp. 89 ff.

'The Question of Miracle in the New Testament' in Interpreter, 1911/12, vol VIII, pp. 27 ff.*

'The Principle of Authority' in B.H.Streeter ed., Foundations (London, 1912), pp. 361 ff.*

'Religion and Temperament' in Interpreter, 1912, vol IX, pp. 154 ff.* reprinted in Dogma, Fact and Experience.*

Dogma, Fact and Experience (London, 1915).*

'The Communion of Saints' in G.K.A.Bell ed., The Meaning of the Creed (London, 1917), pp. 209 ff.

Religious Reality (London, 1918).*

'Authority' in W.S.Swayne ed., The Coming Catholicism (London, 1920), pp. 47 ff.*

'The Historical Grounds of Christian Belief' in Church Congress Report (London, 1921), pp. 54 ff.*

Catholicism with Freedom: An Appeal for a New Policy (London, 1922).*

Studies in Historical Christianity (London, 1922).*

'Is there a True Religion?' in The Anglo-Catholic Congress Books (London, 1923). vol 1-16, pp. 2 ff.

Authority and Freedom (London, 1924).*

'An Apology for Anglicanism' in The Review of the Churches, 1921-1925, pp. 385 ff.*

St. Mark (London, 1925).* in the Westminster Commentary Series.

'Authority' in E.G.Selwyn ed., Essays Catholic and Critical (London, 1926), pp. 83 ff.*

The New Testament Doctrine of Christ (London, 1926).

'St. Mark' in John Stirling ed., The Study Bible (London, 1926).

'The Kingdom of God in the Apostolic Age' in Theology, 1927, vol 14, pp. 262 ff.

Freedom Within the Church: A Sequel to 'Catholicism with Freedom' (London, 1928).*

ed., Essays on the Trinity and Incarnation (London, 1928).

'KYRIOS' in Theology, 1928, vol 17, pp. 229 ff.

The Church of England and the Church of Christ (London, 1930).*

'Lambeth Conference Review IV - The Anglican Communion' in Theology, 1930, vol 22, pp. 98 ff.*

'The Character of Christian Sacramentalism' in Theology, 1930, vol 22, pp. 323 ff.

'Mathæan Studies' in Church Quarterly Review, 1932, vol 113, pp. 108 ff.

'In Spirit and in Truth' in Expository Times, 1933, vol 44, pp. 12 ff.

'The Christian Belief in Christ' in W.R.Matthews ed., The Christian Faith (London, 1936), pp. 141 ff.

The Church and the Challenge of Today (London, 1937).

'The World-View of the Bible and the World-View of Today' in Expository Times, 1939, vol 50, pp. 102 ff.

'The Faith in the Life of Today' in Expository Times, 1939/40, vol 51, pp. 31 ff.

Holy Communion: How it Began and What it Means (London, 1941).

'History and Eschatology' in Theology, 1942, vol 44, pp. 90 ff.

Christ in the Gospels (London, 1944).

The World's Question and the Christian Answer (London, 1944).

'The Divine Healer' in Expository Times, 1944/45, vol 56, pp. 180 ff.

'The Unity of the New Testament: The Doctrine of Christ' in Expository Times, 1946/47, vol 58, pp. 200 ff.

Christian Initiation (London, 1947).

The Financial Straits of the Clergy (Derby, 1947).

The Genius of the Church of England (London, 1947).*

The Future of Anglicanism (London, 1948).

'Priesthood and Sacrifice in Judaism and Christianity' in Expository Times, 1948/49, vol 60, pp. 116 ff.

The Study of Christian Doctrine (London, 1949).

Intercommunion: Report of Conversations between Representatives of the Archbishop of Canterbury and Representatives of the Evangelical Free Churches (London, 1949).

Problems of Reunion (London, 1950).

The Church of South India (London, 1951).

Episcopacy and the Anglican Tradition (London, 1954).

The Anglican Communion in Christendom (London, 1960).

This bibliography of the published works of A.E.J. Rawlinson is more comprehensive than that to be found in the British Museum Catalogue of Printed Books (London, 1961), vol 199, pp. 243-245.

