

The Viscount Halifax (Charles Lindley Wood) and the
Transformation of Lay Authority in the Church of England
(1865-1910)

By Ronald B. Young

Submitted in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for the degree of
Master of Sacred Theology

The General Theological Seminary
New York
March, 2003

Reproduced by permission of the author on Project Canterbury, November, 2003.
© 2003 Ronald B. Young

Abstract

The nineteenth century was a period of great change for the Church of England. The dominant liberal political ideology promoted a concept of increasing secularism. The end of political disabilities on non-Anglicans and the increase in the electoral franchise that accompanied the passage of the Reform Acts changed the operation and character of English political and ecclesiastical institutions. The Church of England increasingly was marginalized from the life of the nation. The Victorian and Edwardian Church of England struggled to adjust to these social, political, and religious developments.

These factors forced a revolution in character and operation upon the Church of England. The existing parliamentary-ecclesiastical axes of authority lost both legitimacy and effectiveness. It was increasingly untenable for Parliament to remain the effective legislature for the Church of England. The Church of England struggled to define new models of authority and then revive and create new institutions for autonomous governance during the second half of the nineteenth century. A fundamental question in these developments was what was the proper role and authority for the laity in the governance of the Church of England.

The definition and acceptance of new models of lay authority was an evolutionary process. A transitional element in this process was the rise of the ecclesiastical layman: laity fully involved in the life of the church but independent of the older parliamentary based authority. The second Viscount Halifax, Charles Lindley Wood (1839-1934), was the most significant of these ecclesiastical laymen and an instrumental figure in the development of these new models of lay authority. This study examines and assesses Halifax's role and contribution in the development of new models of lay authority in the Church of England. Halifax was the lay leader of the catholic revival in the Church of England. He led the defense of catholic principles through lobbying, speaking, and writing as president of the English Church Union, the first modern interest group in the Church of England. Halifax was a key ecclesiastical politician who exercised unofficial political authority and thereby modeled and legitimated new models of lay authority in the Church of England.

Table of Contents

- I. Introduction
- II. The Historical Context for the Development of New Models of Lay Authority
 - The Displacement of the Church of England
 - The Catholic Revival in the Church of England
 - The Changing Nature of Lay Authority in the Church of England
- III. Charles Lindley Wood, Viscount Halifax: Aristocrat and Churchman
 - Halifax as Aristocrat
 - Halifax as Churchman
- IV. Halifax and the Defense of Catholic Principles
 - The Era of Ecclesiastical Legalism: 1868-1890
 - The *Lux Mundi* Crisis: 1889-1892
 - Incense and Reservation: 1899-1902
 - The Royal Commission on Ecclesiastical Discipline
- V. Halifax and the Reform of the Governance of the Church of England
 - The Context for Church Reform
 - Halifax on the Role of the Laity
 - Halifax and the Establishment of the Church of England
 - Halifax and Church Reform
- VI. Halifax and the Quest for Reunion
- VII. Conclusion
 - Bibliography

Chapter I Introduction

The nineteenth century was a period of great change, both externally and internally, for the Church of England. The emergent liberal political ideology embraced a concept of increasing secularism under the cover of increasing religious toleration. The end of political disabilities on non-Anglicans and the increase in the franchise accompanying the passage of the Reform Acts changed the operation and character of English political and ecclesiastical institutions.¹ The presence of increasing numbers of non-Anglicans in Parliament destroyed the legitimacy of Parliament as the effective legislative assembly for the Church of England. The interests of the Church of England were increasingly no longer central to the objectives of the government of the United Kingdom. The operation of the reformation settlement of the Church of England was made increasingly unsustainable by the rise of pluralism and representative government. The governing social oligarchy of the aristocracy and landed gentry that had provided the leadership for both church and state, lost influence to the rising professional and middle classes. Politics became grounded in mass movements, the emerging political parties rather than a small political aristocracy. The Victorian and Edwardian Church of England struggled to adjust to these social, political, and religious developments. These factors forced a revolution in character and operation upon the Church of England. The church lost its mythic character as an exclusive national church and increasingly assumed the characteristics of a voluntary society. The old models of ecclesiastical authority, that of Parliament as legislature and bishops as the executive for the Church of England became untenable. New institutions of church government were created and old institutions revived to fill the need.²

The operative model of ecclesiastical government from the Reformation Settlement to the mid-nineteenth century had been a complex blend of state institutions, Parliament, and church institutions, Convocation, under the common headship of the monarchy. The reformation settlement gave both voice and vote to the laity of the Church of England through the monarch and Parliament. The suppression of Convocation in 1717³ disrupted this balance, but further enhanced the role of the laity as Parliament became the effective legislature for the Church of England. Erastianism dominated the eighteenth century Church of England. The nineteenth century socio-political revolutions destroyed this settlement. Competing ideologies and theologies emerged for the reform of the government of the Church of England. Was it to be governed by the synods of the clergy, or by synods of clergy and laity, or by reaffirmation of the Reformation Settlement? The resolution of these questions required articulating and accepting new models of authority and developing new institutions of church polity. A critical element for this transition was the development of new models of lay authority within the Church of England.

¹ Owen Chadwick, *The Victorian Church 2 vols*, (London: SCM Press, 1966), vol. I, 7-47 and Edward R. Norman, *Church and Society in England 1770-1970* (Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1976), 71-123.

² Detailed histories of the church reform movement are given in Kenneth A. Thompson, *Bureaucracy and Church Reform* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1970) and Eric W. Kemp, *Counsel and Consent* (London: SPCK, 1961).

³ The Convocations of Canterbury and York continued to formally meet, but no business was transacted.

The concept of authority is complex and multi-faceted and even more so in the changing environment of nineteenth-century England. The most common form of authority is associated with a formal position within an organization. Formal authority is often endowed with specified powers to effect the decisions of the organization. The coercive police power of a state is perhaps the prime example of official executive authority, but such power exists within most organizations, including the church. But within most organizations there also exists unofficial authority. This authority uses influence and persuasion to effect change. Political authority can be exercised both through participation in the institutions of governance such as electoral politics and/or the operation of independent interest groups.⁴ Political authority can be either official or unofficial. The full exercise of internal authority within an organization is the combination of official and unofficial authority operating within the constitution and customs of an organization. External authority is that authority which is exercised on behalf of an organization with other organizations. External authority requires official authority that has by virtue of office legitimacy and power to act. The difference between external and internal authority is the difference between a statesman and a politician. This study focuses primarily on the development and operation of models of internal unofficial political authority.

During the second half of the nineteenth century, the Church of England struggled to define new forms of formal and political authority.⁵ The existing parliamentary-ecclesiastical axes of authority lost both legitimacy and effectiveness. Parliament continued to involve itself in church affairs throughout the period of this study but on a diminishing basis. The marginalization of the Church of England necessitated church reform, but the process of ecclesiastical reform was slow and evolutionary. The traditional institutions of ecclesiastical governance, the Convocations of Canterbury and York, were revived and then joined to new institutions that gave laity a voice in church affairs.⁶ However, the natural conservatism of the English with respect to political institutions and the political and theological divisions delayed the full development of autonomous church government until 1919.⁷ The Enabling Act created the Church Assembly that established a synodical polity in which bishops, clergy, and laity all participated in the governance of the church. However, the concept of institutional development does not capture the scope of the development of new models of authority within the church, particularly with respect to lay authority. The institution of new models of formal lay authority was preceded by the development and exercise of unofficial lay authority within the Church of England. Owen Chadwick in his work, *The Victorian Church*, characterized the manifestation of the laity's new role by what he termed the emergence of the *ecclesiastical layman*.⁸ Chadwick defines these ecclesiastical laymen as laity fully engaged in the life institutional church. They were church workers. They were leaders of independent religious societies. They were experts in specific fields such as mission, church work in the slums and prisons, ecclesiastical

⁴ This study uses the terms interest group and pressure group interchangeably.

⁵ Thompson, 91-128, 156-178.

⁶ Kemp, 187-234.

⁷ Robert E. Rodes, Jr., *Law and Modernization in the Church of England* (Notre Dame: Notre Dame Press, 1991) 317-362 and Thompson, 156-178.

⁸ Chadwick, vol. II, 364-365.

law, history, liturgy, and even theology. They wrote and spoke on these issues. And although Chadwick's term is gender-specific, the rise of lay authority, especially unofficial authority, was certainly not restricted to men.⁹ As formal structures for institutional participation were subsequently created, these ecclesiastical laymen embraced and participated in these bodies. They served as members of parochial councils, deanery synods, diocesan conferences, and the Houses of Laity at the provincial and national levels. These ecclesiastical laymen differed from previous lay leaders in the Church of England by their participation in the church as a religious society rather than as the religious society within a confessional state. The work of these ecclesiastical laymen served as a transition between the old models of lay authority centered in the old confessional state in Parliament and the formal institution of lay representation in the governing councils of an autonomous Church of England. These pioneering ecclesiastical laymen gave legitimacy to emergent models of lay authority.

The second Viscount Halifax, Charles Lindley Wood (1839-1934) was the best known and most influential of Chadwick's ecclesiastical laymen.¹⁰ Halifax is perhaps best remembered for his leadership in the Anglican discussions with the Roman Catholic Church in the 1890s and 1920s. Halifax's role as an *ecclesiastical layman* and more importantly as an *ecclesiastical politician* is undervalued. However, Halifax was a key transitional figure from the prior parliamentary-based lay authority to a formally constituted lay authority in the Church of England. Halifax exercised his ecclesial, albeit unofficial, authority to help bring about a diverse, voluntarist, and autonomous Church of England. There is a paradox in Halifax. The conservative and aristocratic Viscount Halifax legitimated new models and forms of authority and particularly lay authority within the Church of England. His status was very dependent upon his class, connections, and wealth, and he exploited these factors. Halifax embodied a strong reformist even revolutionary character under a seemingly reactionary shell.

This essay shall demonstrate Halifax's substantive contribution to the development of new models of lay authority in the Church of England. It will examine his methods and manner of lay leadership in the Victorian and Edwardian church and assess the significance of his contributions. The essay will focus only on three aspects of Halifax's ecclesiastical activities: the defense of catholic principles, church reform, and the quest for reunion with Rome.¹¹ The common theme of these activities is the catholic movement within the Church of England (i.e., Anglo-Catholicism) that was the focus of Halifax's personal faith and the focus of his activity in the Church of England. This essay shall first examine the historical context for the transformation of lay authority in the Church of England. This chapter will define the primary parameters of the study. The next chapter will introduce Halifax and provide a short biographical sketch within the two poles of

⁹ The importance of women is not limited to the rise of the sisterhoods and the revival of deaconesses, but extends to lay women's home mission and charity work. The slow increase in the number of women speaking at the Church Congress throughout the nineteenth century is another indication of the extension of increasing lay authority among women.

¹⁰ Charles Lindley Wood succeeded his father as second Viscount Halifax in 1885. However for consistency of terminology, he shall be referred to as Halifax throughout this work. However, references to Halifax prior to 1885 as well as his writings prior to 1885 do refer to him by his name (Charles Wood) rather than his title.

¹¹ Halifax's involvement in social issues (e.g. divorce, marriage, education, etc) is not as relevant for the purpose of this study.

Halifax's life: Halifax as aristocrat and Halifax as churchman. The objective is to demonstrate that Halifax's personal status as an aristocrat was instrumental in the effectiveness of his lay authority. The work will then consider three aspects of Halifax's participation in the life of the Church of England as an ecclesiastical politician: the defense of catholic principles, the reform of the church, and the quest for reunion with Rome. The examination will illustrate Halifax's sources of authority and the modes of his operation and will offer an assessment of the effectiveness of his authority. This chapter will illustrate Halifax's use of the tactics of the modern political pressure group and his inclusive ecclesiology. These shall demonstrate both the substantive and instrumental contribution that Halifax made to the life of the Church of England and the development of lay authority within the Church of England. In accomplishing this objective, the study will develop a mildly revisionist view of Halifax. Recent historical studies have de-emphasized Halifax's role in the catholic movement and the life of the Church of England. It is hoped that in some small way this study may serve a corrective to the assessments of Halifax's contribution to the life of the Church of England.¹²

¹² That Halifax functioned primarily within the ecclesiastical sphere is indicated by the fact that Halifax almost never figures substantially in the autobiographies and biographies of the leading political leaders of the era (Gladstone, Disraeli, Salisbury, Roseberry, and Asquith, Baldwin, etc.). This reflects the marginalization of the Church of England within British political society as seen through perspective of the politicians and their biographers of this period. Halifax however figures significantly in the records of the ecclesiastical leaders of the Church of England.

Chapter II

The Historical Context for the Development Of New Models of Lay Authority

The nineteenth century was a century of enormous change for England and the Church of England. The industrial revolution and the urbanization of England were matched by social and political revolutions. The political sphere took on new shape as liberal political ideology manifested an increasingly secular state. Religious toleration, an increased franchise, and the development of mass political parties were some of the marks of the new liberalism. Non-Conformity, newly enfranchised, found political strength in the new industrial areas and in the Liberal Party.¹ In an increasingly secular age, religion remained strong. The strong public religiosity of the Victorian era existed in tension with the development of secular education systems and the loss of religious control of many institutions of public life. The number of churches and clergy of the Church of England dramatically increased through the Victorian age.² The clergy became increasingly professionalized with the advent of new theological colleges, the broader recruitment of clergy, and the slow decline of the old squire-parson.³ Theology was revived and radicalized with the catholic revival, the importation of historical criticism from Germany, and the debate with Darwin and the new science. The Church of England was transformed itself from a national church into a worldwide and eventually multi-cultural communion. Within two generations, the Church of England became the Anglican Communion as the Church of England in the leading colonies (e.g., Canada, Australia, New Zealand, and the Cape Colony) achieved autonomy.⁴ This was the world that bore and nurtured Halifax and in which he operated.

Exploring the breadth of the historical context in any depth is beyond the scope of this study. The reader is referred to the following works for varying perspectives on the changing social and religious context. Frances Knight's *The Nineteenth Century Church and English Society* provides an introduction to the history of the church through the perspective of its average or typical members.⁵ Owen Chadwick's two volume set, *The Victorian Church*, provides an indispensable detailed survey of the history of religion in the United Kingdom.⁶ And finally E.R. Norman's *Church and Society in England 1770-1970* places the history of the Church of England within context of the larger social framework.⁷ However, in order to examine Halifax properly within his historical environment three overarching themes must first be identified. The first is the increasing denominational and voluntarist character of the Church of England. The Church of England was displaced from the central focus of English societal and political life and gradually acquired many of the characteristics of a voluntary society: one religious

¹ Hugh McLeod, *Religion and society in England 1850-1914* (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1996), 91.

² Chadwick, vol. II, 319.

³ *Ibid.*, 382-383.

⁴ William L. Sachs, *The Transformation of Anglicanism, From State Church to Global Community* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991), 191.

⁵ Knight, Frances, *The Nineteenth Century Church and English Society* (Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1995).

⁶ Chadwick.

⁷ Norman, E. R, *Church and Society in England 1770-1970* (Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1976).

denomination within a pluralist society.⁸ The second theme is the catholic revival in the Church of England. Anglo-Catholicism, the descendant of the Oxford Movement, provided the focus for Halifax's participation in the life of the Church of England. The dominant society of the catholic revival, the English Church Union, was the vehicle by which Halifax developed and exercised his authority in the Church of England. The third theme is the demise of the old Parliamentary-based lay leadership for the Church of England. The demise of the confessional state provided the opportunity and necessity for new models of lay authority.

The Displacement of the Church of England

Since the suppression of Convocation in 1717 the Church of England had been governed directly through Parliament.⁹ Church matters were regulated by statute. The relative small scale of eighteenth century English politics and its closely knit connections made this feasible. The clergy were closely connected to the political order.¹⁰ Erastianism was accepted by both clergy and laity. A simple model of lay domination of the Church of England should not be assumed. The situation was made complex by the participation of the ecclesiastical leadership in civil society. All English and Welsh bishops and four Irish bishops after 1801, sat in the House of Lords. The Church of England had a voice in its own affairs and the affairs of the state though episcopal appointments were made on solely political grounds.¹¹ The service of many clergy as justices of the peace provided a local complement to episcopal participation in the national political institutions. The national church model functioned adequately throughout the eighteenth century and the early part of the nineteenth century, even as the national church continued only as a myth.¹² This manner of establishment and regulation of the Church of England quickly disintegrated in the third decade of the nineteenth century with the onset of liberalism. The reformers, many of whom were dissenters, grew in numbers. Unable to modify the establishment from within, they developed a powerful movement which compelled the political order to acknowledge their aspirations.¹³

The Test and Corporation Acts were repealed in 1828. Catholic Emancipation was achieved in 1829.¹⁴ Lord Grey led the passage of the Great Reform Act in 1832, establishing the dominance of the House of Commons, a reform of representation based upon population (i.e., the end of the rotten boroughs), and a limited extension of the franchise. The liberal reform was not limited to the political order but extended to the church. The government suppressed one archbishopric and 12 Irish bishoprics to

⁸ This reflects a trend rather than an absolute change in nature. The debate over disestablishment of the Church of England continues into the twenty-first century.

⁹ Kemp, 169.

¹⁰ Norman, 72.

¹¹ A.F. Pollar, *The Evolution of Parliament* (London: Longmans Green and Co. Ltd, 1926), 311-312 and R. B. McDowell, *The Church of Ireland 1869-1969* (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1977), 7.

¹² Norman, 77. The Act of Toleration ended the formal construct of the national church model. The passing of Acts of Indemnity throughout the 18th century to mitigate the disabilities of non-conformists served to reinforce the mythic quality of a unity of church and state.

¹³ Sachs, 34.

¹⁴ Chadwick, vol. I, 24-27.

rationalize the affairs of the Church of Ireland.¹⁵ The Ecclesiastical Commission was created, and a number of important reform acts were passed throughout the 1830s and 1840s to modernize and rationalize the Church of England.¹⁶ However, these reform efforts were accompanied by the slow movement of ecclesiastical business from the center stage of British politics.

Parliament was no longer a body of Anglicans, either in theory or in practice. Dissenters and Roman Catholics, Quakers, then Jews and even atheists entered Parliament in increasing numbers.¹⁷ By the third quarter of the nineteenth century, the Liberal Party was dominated by non-conformists especially from the industrial cities of the midlands.¹⁸ The increasingly non-Anglican nature of Parliament destroyed its legitimacy to legislate for the Church of England. The Oxford Movement and the later Anglo-Catholics argued that the business of the Church of England should not be managed or even influenced by non-conformists, Roman Catholics, or non-Christians in Parliament. However, the practical effect of liberal dominance was even more severe than the issue of theoretical ecclesiastical legitimacy. Parliament was increasingly disinterested in ecclesiastical matters. The Church of England became increasingly peripheral to the focus of Parliament. The effective government of the Church of England became less interested in its charge. The last Parliamentary grant to the church, for church building was in 1824.¹⁹ Peel contemplated a further grant in 1841, but he did not proceed with the proposal because of the uproar it would cause with dissenters.²⁰ Gladstone stated in 1851 that "If the State cannot formally and exclusively support the Church of England, it must treat all religious groups equally."²¹ The reality was by 1851 that the state could not support the Church of England formally and exclusively.

The increasing marginalization of the Church of England in Parliament was mirrored by the transformation of the episcopate at mid-century. The prelatial model of the English episcopate rapidly transformed into a pastoral model.²² The equalization of incomes, the rise of episcopal residency within dioceses, the professionalization and then bureaucratization of administration changed the nature of the episcopate. Bishops no longer played a major role in the House of Lords. When attending the House of Lords they tended to confine their remarks to ecclesiastical and social issues. Thus the political influence of the bishops declined. The bishops were unable to stop Irish disestablishment, the repeal of compulsory church rates, and the Education Act of 1870. By 1870, only Archbishop Tait and Bishop Wilberforce of London were regularly attending the House of Lords. Tait was the last Archbishop who according to his biography relished his role within the House of Lords.²³ The retreat of the bishops from the Lords and the marginalization of the bishops in the House of Lords assisted in the decline of a legitimate *political* authority for and within the Church of England.

¹⁵ Sachs, 82 and Chadwick, vol. I, 56.

¹⁶ Thompson, 56-57.

¹⁷ Chadwick, vol. I, 484-486 and P. T. Marsh, *The Victorian Church in Decline* (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul Ltd., 1969), 257.

¹⁸ McLeod, 91.

¹⁹ Rodes, 96.—This grant added one half million pounds to the grant of 1818 for new church construction

²⁰ Norman, 97-98.

²¹ Sachs, 81.

²² M. A. Crowther, *The Church Embattled* (Newton Abbot: Archon Books, 1970), 141-151.

²³ Marsh, 264 *passim*, especially 289

The marginalization of the church from the interests of Parliament was accompanied by increasing demands for the restoration of church autonomy. This shall be discussed in some detail in Chapter V. However, no consensus existed on alternative arrangements for church administration and Parliament continued to legislate for the Church, increasingly relying on the revived Convocations. The last burst of Parliamentary ecclesiastical focus was in 1872-74. In 1872, Parliament enacted a large number of ecclesiastical acts: to amend the Act of Uniformity, to amend diocesan boundaries, to abolish baptismal fees, and to provide for the resignation of deans, canons and bishops.²⁴ The parliamentary session of 1874 was dominated with the Public Worship Regulation Act, but this would be the last Parliamentary session so devoted to ecclesiastical business.²⁵ For the remainder of the century and throughout the reign of Edward VII, it became increasingly difficult to push through Parliament bills necessary to the good management of the Church of England. Ecclesiastical business was sidelined by lack of interest by the political leadership and religious partisanship. New forms of management and governance of the Church of England were recognized as being necessary.

The Catholic Revival In the Church of England

The occasion of the inauguration of the Oxford Movement, the origin of the catholic revival in the Church of England, was the suppression of the Irish Bishoprics by the liberal Whig government of Lord Grey. On July 14, 1833, John Keble preached his Assize Sermon on National Apostasy.^{26,27} The apostasy, according to Keble, was the immoral and illegal interference of the state in the spiritual interests of the church. The Oxford Movement was a philosophical reaction to the rise of liberalism and the fear of marginalization or displacement of the Church of England. The Oxford Movement soon grew from a university-based movement to the parishes in the cities, towns, and even villages of England. The original focus of the movement was to recover the catholic heritage and the apostolic and sacramental character of the Church of England. By the 1850s an emphasis on ritualism developed, focused particularly on the ceremonial character of the Holy Communion. However, the catholic revival within the Church of England should never be confused with Ritualism. The movement was always larger than ritualism.²⁸ The Oxford Movement was from its beginning regarded as both a radical and a reactionary movement. The movement posited a radical reinterpretation of English church history, the nature of the church, and the place of the church within society. The movement was reformist in looking back towards a golden age of Christianity in the antiquity of the early church. However, the movement also manifested elements of nineteenth century liberal principles, specifically individualism, diversity, and

²⁴ Marsh, 110.

²⁵ James Bentley, *Ritualism and Politics in Victorian Britain* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1978), viii.

²⁶ Chadwick, vol. I, 70.

²⁷ Bentley, 20-21.

²⁸ Nigel Yates, *Anglicanism Ritualism in Victorian Britain 1830-1910* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999), 43. Yates provides a concise summary of the different strands of thought and interest within the catholic revival

toleration.²⁹ The movement was highly individualist in spite of its corporatist character, internally diverse, and tolerant of diversity within and without the catholic movement. The romantic radicalism of the Oxford Movement manifested itself in two characteristics important for this study: the social status of its adherents and the fierce opposition to the catholic revival within English society.³⁰

Queen Victoria was disturbed that the Oxford Movement attracted followers of high social rank. Certainly the movement attracted many of such position, particularly in its early years. Many of the early ritualist clergy were rich enough to remain as unpaid curates throughout their careers. The younger brother of the Queen's Private Secretary was a ritualist clergyman. Archdeacon Denison was himself the son of a Member of Parliament, and his brothers included the Speaker of the House of Commons, a Bishop of Salisbury, and a Governor General of Australia. The Archbishop of York had two successive ritualist Deans, both of whom were aristocrats.³¹ The status of the catholic revival's early lay followers was similar. However, the aristocratic status of the movement must be qualified. The movement's main attraction was not to the members of the great aristocratic families. John Reed in his social history of Anglo-Catholicism states that the "breeding ground for Anglo-Catholicism could be found between the two highest strata (i.e., the great families and the conventional upper middle class) of the social hierarchy of the Victorian city." The movement appealed to the new upper middle class: the university educated professions, the high civil servants, artists, intellectuals, the lesser nobility, and the urban gentry.³² This nuanced description is useful as it identifies the source of adherents as a portion of society most positively and negatively affected by the changing dynamics of Victorian society. The romanticism of the lesser nobility for the old order and a romanticism for certitude among the newer urban classes found a common home in the catholic revival. Halifax's affinity to the catholic revival was characteristic of the movement's attraction to his social class.

The second critical characteristic of the Oxford Movement relevant to this study was the strong opposition it generated within the Church of England and English society. The radicalism of the Oxford Movement disturbed the historical balance of power between the Evangelicals and the High Church Movement.³³ The ritualists disturbed the uniformity of the Prayer Book services that could encompass both the High Church and Evangelical Parties. The ritualists departed in the words of W. S. Gilbert from the "service plain and unpretending" of the Church of England.³⁴ The catholic revival looked for a religious understanding of the church that extended beyond England and the Reformation Settlement and therefore beyond the concept of the national church. The ideals of the catholic movement were seemingly foreign and particularly *Romanish*. Thus, English anti-Roman Catholic prejudices were directed toward the catholic revivalists. This opposition took various forms, including prosecutions under various ecclesiastical discipline acts, public demonstrations including during services (e.g., the

²⁹ Yates, 336-337. Yates provides examples of the diversity in Anglo-Catholic practices in the second phase of the movement

³⁰ Yates, 48.

³¹ Bentley, 23.

³² John Reed, *The Glorious Battle* (Nashville: Vanderbilt University Press, 1996), 174.

³³ Yates, 150-199. Yates provides a detailed study of the response of Anglican Clergy, laity, and bishop to the emerging catholic movement within the Church of England.

³⁴ W. S. Gilbert, "The Fairy Curate"

Kensit-ites), and the publication of many anti-ritualist articles, essays, pamphlets, and books. The opposition to the catholic revival ignited a fierce partisanship within the Victorian Church of England.

The fear that the Church of England would be marginalized led to the development of church defense organizations. Originating in Bristol in 1848 these local church defense unions were established to defend the interest of the established church within society. The unions were a grass roots reaction to the first wave of rationalization and feared marginalization of the Church of England. The supporters of the first church defense unions tended to come from the traditional High Church party and some members of the Oxford Movement.³⁵ However after an initial surge of popularity, these church defense unions dwindled in size and activity in the 1850s. They were revitalized in the late 1850s under the leadership of the catholic revivalists. The re-energized church defense unions not only wanted to defend the traditional understanding of the church interests, but also the catholic principles of the Oxford Movement. The church defense unions were effectively captured by the catholic movement in the first era of fierce ecclesiastical partisanship. In December 1859, the Hon. Colin Lindsay, the founder and president of the Manchester Church Society, called for representatives from church defense unions across England to meet and discuss a central organization. A national organization would be more effective in representing the interests of the unions than a collection of local societies. Although the meeting was poorly attended, a number of the local unions agreed to form a central structure under the Church of England Protection Society. This national organization was soon renamed the English Church Union.³⁶ It would become the primary mass organization to defend the principles of the Oxford Movement.³⁷ A rival Protestant organization, the Church Association was soon formed. For many years the Church Association and the English Church Union were similar in size and resources, but after 1880 the English Church Union outstripped the Church Associations in size, financial capability, and legitimacy.³⁸

The English Church Union, at its founding, was a small and primarily aristocratic organization. Lindsay himself was the fourth son of a Scottish Earl.³⁹ Membership was quite small, only 203 in 1860 and had risen to only 3,000 in 1866. Halifax assumed the presidency in 1868 and the Union grew to 7,000 in 1870 and by 1886 it numbered 17,000 laity, 2,600 clergy and fourteen bishops. Membership in the English Church Union peaked at approximately 40,000 in 1900.⁴⁰ Halifax transformed the English Church Union from a small organization of high social status to a mass movement within the Church of England. The union served as a voice for the defense of catholic principles, a defense fund for clergy prosecuted for ritual offenses, and the defense of Church of England interests with respect to the increasingly secular state.⁴¹ The union was plainly

³⁵ Crowther, 188.

³⁶ Crowther, 190.

³⁷ J. G. Lockhart, *Charles Lindley Viscount Halifax 2 vols.* (London, Geoffrey Bless, 1935),vol. I, 190. Lockhart summarizes the principles of the English Church Union

³⁸ Yates, 152.

³⁹ Crowther, 190.

⁴⁰ Ibid.

⁴¹ George Bayfield Roberts, *The History of the English Church Union 1859-1894* (London: Church Printing Company, 1895). This classic work provides a detailed history of the activities of the English Church Union during through 1894 from an internal perspective of the Union.

an interest group or pressure group within the church. It was the first mass interest group within the Church of England.⁴² The English Church Union utilized the modern techniques of interest groups: lobbying, personal influence, and public actions. The English Church Union was the vehicle that legitimated Halifax's political authority within the Church of England.⁴³

The Changing Nature of Lay Authority in the Church of England

Laities exercised substantial authority in the post-Reformation Church of England. The royal supremacy, as articulated by Hooker to be the Crown-in-Parliament rather than the person of the monarch, signified the institution and exercise of lay authority.⁴⁴ The crown nominated bishops and most other senior ecclesiastical appointments. While originally exercised by the monarch, by the nineteenth century these appointments were made by the Prime Minister, although Queen Victoria continued to make her influence felt.⁴⁵ Parliament had its place in this settlement. It legislated with the estates of the clergy—the Convocations—for the church. After the suppression of Convocation in 1717, Parliament legislated for the church. The existence of widely dispersed ecclesiastical patronage at the parochial level gave laymen substantial influence in many parishes. Thus the model of lay leadership within the post-Reformation Church of England was that of the squire at the local level and the Crown in Parliament at the national level. Thus the exercise of lay authority in the Church of England was indistinguishable from the aristocratic governing oligarchy of the nation. The marginalization of the church from the interests of the state in the second half of the nineteenth century ended both the operation and legitimacy of this model of authority. The Erastian parliamentary model of ecclesiastical government was not sustainable in a liberal and increasingly pluralistic society. The rapid decline of the parliamentary-based model of lay authority can be observed in examining the records of the Church Congresses. In the early years of the Church Congresses, many of the lay speakers were Members of Parliament. However, between 1872 and 1880, the number of MPs speaking at the Congresses declined greatly.⁴⁶ The fall in the number of Members of Parliament speaking at Church Congresses mirrors the increasing difficulty in getting Parliament to focus on ecclesiastical matters. The affairs of the Church of England were no longer central to the role of a Member of Parliament. The disappearance of the active parliamentary-based lay authority also aided the development of a vacuum of effective authority for the governance of the Church of England. This era of transition was the context for Halifax's entry into ecclesiastical politics.

⁴² Missionary organizations do not fit the category and are excluded.

⁴³ A third organization, the Church Defense Institution was also formed to represent the interests of the church in opposing disestablishment, particularly the Liberation Society. The Church Defense Institution was less partisan than either the Church Association or the English Church Union and often dominated by the formal ecclesiastical leadership. See also M. J. D. Roberts "Pressure group Politics and the Church of England: The Church Defense Institution 1859-1896" *Journal of Ecclesiastical History* 35 (October 1984): 560-582.

⁴⁴ Richard Hooker, *The Laws of Ecclesiastical Polity*, VIII ii 17.

⁴⁵ George Bell, *Randall Davidson Third Edition* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1952), 163 passim. Bell describes Queen Victoria's interest in ecclesiastical appointments and her interventions into the system of ecclesiastical appointment

⁴⁶ This author's analysis of speakers and authors at Church Congresses in the period 1868-1900.

One example of the old form of parliamentary lay authority that stands in contrast to the increasing lay political authority exercised by Halifax is that of W. E. Gladstone. Gladstone is the last great example of the traditional form of parliamentary-based lay authority for the Church of England. Gladstone was truly interested in ecclesiastical matters and a loyal churchman. He wrote two classics on the subject of church-state relations: *Church Principles* in 1838 and *The State in Relation to the Church* in 1840. Both writings were defenses of the church and establishment, but they were more than political writings. MacCaulay described the *State in Relation to the Church* as a profound theological treatise.⁴⁷ Gladstone embodied a comprehensive and interdependent model of lay authority: personal as a lay theologian and formal through his Parliamentary participation and leadership. However, Gladstone described by Archbishop Tait as “the one time great lay high priest of the Oxford School” embraced modern political liberalism.⁴⁸ Gladstone’s move towards a pragmatic liberalism is best demonstrated by the disestablishment of the Church of Ireland in 1869. Vidler succinctly captured Gladstone’s movement away from the parliamentary-based concept of lay authority. “In 1847 Gladstone could still speak as a churchman and a statesman as it were in one breath, he came in the end to speak in two voices.”⁴⁹ Gladstone’s acceptance of the mantle of secular statesman occurred as Halifax entered into leadership of the English Church Union. The decline in the internal ecclesiastical authority of Gladstone, marked by the increasing separation of his ecclesiastical and political roles, stands in contrast to the increasing political authority of Halifax within the Church of England. Gladstone became a secular politician⁵⁰ and Halifax became an ecclesiastical politician. Gladstone provides the example of the parliamentary lay authority giving way to a new model of lay authority grounded in a voluntarist ecclesiastical body.

⁴⁷ Alec Vidler, *The Orb and Cross* (London: SPCK, 1945), 83.

⁴⁸ Marsh, 282.

⁴⁹ Vidler, 153.

⁵⁰ Gladstone as Prime Minister continued to exercise authority over the church, but ecclesiastical affairs were increasingly peripheral to his secular political role

Chapter III

Charles Lindley Wood, The Second Viscount Halifax: Aristocrat and Churchman

Charles Lindley Wood, the second Viscount Halifax, served the Church of England for nearly seven decades. His public ecclesial life stretched from the mid-Victorian age to nearly the end of the reign of George V. Numerous and foundational theological, social, political, and economic changes occurred through the long life of Halifax. The rise of middle class professionalism would end the aristocratic domination of English society. The nobility and landed gentry were pushed out of their positions of assured leadership by the new political and economic realities. The church, law, medicine, the civil service, the armed forces, and even business would be transformed by the rise of middle class professionals.¹ The era of bureaucracy, administration, and management had arrived. Electoral politics were dominated by mass movements and not the continuation of the Whig settlement. Halifax's life was circumscribed by this social transformation. Halifax was simultaneously both an aristocrat and a leader of a modern, in a nineteenth-century context, mass-movement pressure group within Church of England. As an aristocrat he saw the traditional authority and leadership of the old order eroded culminating in the passage of the Parliament Act of 1911. However, Halifax's position as an aristocrat of the old order gave him the standing, access, and the legitimacy necessary for his role as ecclesiastical politician and leadership for the English Church Union. As president of the English Church Union, Halifax exemplified new models of lay leadership within the Church of England. He was an ecclesiastical politician, an organizer, a lobbyist, and a propagandist. This chapter will consider these two aspects of Halifax's life: Halifax as aristocrat and Halifax as churchman. The purpose of this chapter is not to provide a comprehensive biography of Lord Halifax but instead to identify a few key aspects of his personality that influenced the transformation of lay authority within the Church of England. The chapter will conclude by examination of a few examples of the intersection of Halifax's role as aristocrat and churchman.

Halifax as Aristocrat

Charles Lindley Wood, the second Viscount Halifax, was descended from an ancient Yorkshire family. The family emerged as landed gentry after the Reformation and in the eighteenth century began the climb from the landed gentry to the aristocracy. Halifax's grandfather, Francis Lindley Wood, was educated at Emmanuel College, Cambridge, and served as the Vice Lieutenant of the West Riding of Yorkshire and the High Sheriff of Yorkshire. He was essentially a country gentleman, and he inherited from his uncle a baronetcy that had been created in 1784.² The Woods at this time were firmly part of the landed gentry, playing their role within the leadership of the county although not on the national stage of politics.

¹ David Cannadine, *The Decline and Fall of the British Aristocracy* (New York: Vintage, 1999). A comprehensive, if opinionated, history of this social transformation

² Lockhart, vol. I, 3.

Sir Francis Wood's eldest son, Sir Charles Wood (1800-1885), later the first Viscount Halifax, transformed the status of the family from county landed gentry to membership in the national aristocracy by pursuing a political career. He was educated at Eton College and then at Oriel College, Oxford, where he took a double first.³ His academic brilliance soon led him to a parliamentary career, being first elected as member for Grimsby in 1826.⁴ Charles embraced political life and quickly advanced in politics. Wood's marriage to the daughter of Lord Grey, the leader of the Whigs and of Reform Bill fame certainly did not hurt his political prospects. His first ministerial position was Secretary to the Treasury, and he served off and on in numerous Whig/Liberal ministries for over forty years. Charles Wood served at times as Chancellor of the Exchequer, President of the Board of Control of India, First Lord of the Admiralty, Secretary of State for India, and finally Lord Privy Seal.⁵ Wood stood firmly within the Whig establishment, never making the transition to mid-Victorian Liberalism as did his friend Gladstone. Wood was ennobled as Viscount Halifax in 1865 after a career more noted for its endurance rather than its successes. However, through Sir Charles' political career, the Wood's had crossed the permeable English barrier from country gentry to nobility as part of the last generation of the Whig political aristocracy.⁶ It was within this privileged setting that Charles Lindley Wood was born in 1839.

Charles Lindley Wood (Halifax) was the second child and eldest son of Charles and Lady Wood. His childhood was spent between the family estate, Hickleton, in Yorkshire and London as his father pursued his political career.⁷ Halifax was sent to Eton, as his father had been. While at Eton he had been selected as a suitable friend for the Prince of Wales. Friendship grew between the young Prince of Wales and young Charles Lindley Wood.⁸ In 1858, Halifax went up to Oxford. He was not noted as a scholar during his university career, being more interested in the social side of university life as was normal for his social set. Halifax left Oxford with only a fourth class degree in the Honor School of Law and Modern History in contrast to the academic brilliance of his father.⁹

Halifax's increase in faith and piety began while he was at Oxford. However, a more traditional career path was expected by his family.¹⁰ He secured the appointment as private secretary to the Home Secretary, his cousin. This was viewed as an initial step to a political career. In 1865, Charles was appointed as Groom of the Bed Chamber in the new household of the Prince of Wales.¹¹ This was a nominal and honorific position. Halifax's appointment demonstrated not only his friendship with the Prince of Wales, but also his social standing within the establishment. However, his parents were increasingly

³ Ibid., vol. I, 11.

⁴ Ibid., vol. I, 12.

⁵ Ibid., vol. I, 16-19.

⁶ The Woods remained an active part of the British political establishment through the twentieth century. Halifax's heir, later the first Earl of Halifax, served as Minister of War, Secretary of State for India, Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, Viceroy for India, and finally Ambassador to the United States. Halifax's grandson, the younger son of the first Earl of Halifax, served as a Conservative Member of Parliament, holding a number of minor Government offices and later was created a life peer.

⁷ Ibid., vol. I, 25.

⁸ Ibid., vol. I, 47ff.

⁹ Ibid., vol. I, 73.

¹⁰ Ibid., vol. I, 107.

¹¹ Ibid., vol. I, 99.

concerned with his pre-occupation with religion. They believed that such enthusiastic interest would endanger a promising political career for their son.¹²

Halifax joined the English Church Union in 1865 and was elected to the council, the governing body of the Union in 1867.¹³ The founding president of the English Church Union, the Hon. Colin Lindsay, resigned from the union in 1868, prior to his submission to Roman Catholicism.¹⁴ On April 21, 1868, Dr. Pusey wrote to Halifax, "I am asked to urge you to accept the Presidency of the English Church Union to which the Council has unanimously elected you."¹⁵ Halifax certainly was very young and inexperienced to be offered the leadership of the union. There was suspicion, especially by his father, that Halifax had been offered the presidency on the basis of the Woods' social standing. The fear was likely merited. Halifax's social position was attractive to the struggling English Church Union. He was not only the son of a leading politician, of high social status, and a member of the Prince of Wales' household, but he also had the potential of a promising political career. However, Halifax was not elected to serve as titular aristocratic leader, the so-called pro-consular role for the aristocracy, but as the aristocratic leader for an essentially aristocratic movement. His aristocratic standing was essential to his entry into the presidency of the English Church Union, but his activities as president were not typically aristocratic.

Halifax certainly did not view his leadership of the English Church Union as a nominal responsibility. Halifax devoted his life to the Union. He wrote to his father, "I might do more for the Church as President of that Society than I could do as a mere member of Parliament even supposing (*per impossible*) that I was ever given office."¹⁶ He willingly sacrificed his promising political prospects for service to the church through the presidency of the English Church Union. Years later Canon Liddon wrote of Halifax:

He might have entered into political life as a young Liberal MP with the best of introductions and prospects. He was willing to forgo this in order to take up an unpopular and discredited course out of his love for Our Lord and Savior.¹⁷

Halifax would not follow the traditional path for a scion of the political aristocracy. Nor would he follow the path of taking Holy Orders, a socially acceptable path, though usually not for the eldest son. Instead, Halifax as a layman took up the leadership of a church defense movement—a popular movement—an interest or pressure group with the Church of England.

Halifax's commitment to the English Church Union is unquestionable. For decades he led an unpopular movement that only acquired acceptance in the period 1906-1914. The ritualist, the Anglo-Catholic, or the catholic revivalist was distrusted and even feared by much of the English ecclesiastical and political establishment. Nonetheless, Halifax persevered in his leadership of the English Church Union. However, he continued to lead much of the privileged life common to the aristocracy of his age. He had his

¹² Ibid., vol. I, 110.

¹³ Ibid., vol. I, 141.

¹⁴ Ibid., vol. I, 145 and also Yates, 151.

¹⁵ Ibid., vol. I, 43.

¹⁶ Ibid., vol. I, 145.

¹⁷ Gwendolen Stephenson, *Edward Stuart Talbot* (London: SPCK, 1936), 44-45.

estates and townhouse and suitable income. He traveled abroad often. Upon succeeding his father as Viscount Halifax in 1885, Charles Lindley Wood attended the House of Lords regularly.¹⁸ He spoke on primarily ecclesiastical or semi-ecclesiastical issues (e.g., education, moral issues, etc). Thus, he carried on the tradition of the aristocracy participating in the councils of government. Halifax even accepted an appointment as Ecclesiastical Commissioner in 1886 at Gladstone's invitation.¹⁹ This singular appointment represents his sole political appointment on a national level. He avoided—or the national political leadership avoided appointing him to—the typical service of the 'great and good' of the English aristocracy the period. Halifax was not invited into service of any political ministry nor was he called to service in the empire. Thus while he spoke in the House of Lords, Halifax spoke primarily as a churchman, even the voice of the catholic movement and the English Church Union.

Halifax's dedication to the service of the church and the catholic movement within the Church of England is well demonstrated by his resignation as Groom of the Bed Chamber in the household of the Prince of Wales. The controversy surrounding the defense of ritualists had become heightened after the passing of the Public Worship Regulation Act in 1874. In 1877 in the midst of the controversy concerning Mr. Tooth, the first of the clergymen imprisoned for contempt of court under the implications of the act, Halifax wrote to the *Church Times* in which he said, "Disobedience is sometimes the truest test of loyalty to win back former liberties."²⁰ This public statement put the Prince of Wales in a very difficult political position. A member of his household, and a friend, was advocating disobedience to the law of the land. Politically the royal household could not tolerate such public statements by Halifax. Any association of the royal household with the views expressed by Halifax would be perceived as incompatible with the constitutional position of the crown. An impasse was reached after much communication and many attempts to reach a compromise between Halifax and His Royal Highness' household. Halifax would not compromise his defense of catholic principles. On May 14, 1877, Halifax finally resigned as Groom of the Bed Chamber. Even his friend the Prince of Wales thought it advisable to do so.²¹ The resignation indicates Halifax's primary commitment to the service of the church through the English Church Union above all traditional aristocratic appointments.

Halifax as Churchman

The complement to Halifax as aristocrat is Halifax as churchman. In the previous section Halifax's decision to accept the presidency of the English Church Union and his subsequent resignation from the Prince of Wales household were clear indications of his commitment and churchmanship. However, it is useful to understand Halifax's religious foundations and commitment in order to appreciate his activity in the service of the church. Halifax's family exhibited the typical religiosity of the early Victorian age.²² Halifax was not particularly interested in religion as a youth or while at Eton, but his faith

¹⁸ Lockhart, vol II, 192.

¹⁹ Ibid, vol. II, 3.

²⁰ Ibid, vol. I, 206.

²¹ Ibid., vol. I, 206-213.

²² Ibid., vol. I, 75.

grew while at Oxford. Scudmore's *Steps to the Altar*, and other advanced Anglo-Catholic works were significant in his religious development.²³ He was immediately attracted to the catholic revival and became acquainted with the leaders of the movement at Oxford, particularly Pusey and Liddon. Soon after leaving Oxford, he participated in the meeting that would lead to the founding of the Society of Saint John the Evangelist.²⁴ Very early in his public life he was in the company of important religious figures within the catholic movement in Anglicanism such as Pusey, Fr. Benson, and Bishop Forbes of Brechin. Halifax was drawn to the contemplative, the monastic, and even the medieval religious experience. He did not join the nascent religious order for men, supposedly at the insistence of Fr. Benson, but he maintained an association with the order throughout his life.²⁵

Halifax's early connection with Dr. Pusey and Dr. Liddon was not an aberration but the beginning of two long-term and productive friendships. The success of these friendships traces Halifax's rise and acceptance into the leadership of the catholic party in the Church of England. For example, Liddon wrote 490 letters to Halifax between 1864 and his death in 1890.²⁶ The correspondence reveals the close working of Liddon and Halifax over decades to secure the acceptance of the principles of the Oxford Movement within the Church of England.²⁷ Halifax's relationship with Dr. Pusey is of the same magnitude but of even greater importance. It was Pusey who urged the young Halifax to accept the presidency of the English Church Union. Dr. Pusey would serve as Vice President of the English Church Union under Halifax for many years until his death in 1882.

The formal professional relationship of Pusey and Halifax was complemented by a deep personal friendship and mentorship. Halifax became Pusey's heir within the catholic movement. The substance of this relationship is demonstrated by Pusey's nomination of Halifax to succeed him on the Council of Keble College in 1879.²⁸ Pusey's letter to the council praises Halifax's sense, moderation, sagacity, and orthodoxy, all qualities that Pusey recognized as essential to the unity of the catholic movement within the Church of England. Pusey's nomination of Halifax to succeed him on the Council of Keble College, a critical Anglo-Catholic institution, was also Pusey's nomination of Halifax as his successor as leader of the Oxford Movement. The founding triumvirate of Newman, Keble, and Pusey, all clerical dons, gave way to the leadership of the layman Halifax.

A portrait of Halifax that only serves to discuss the political-ecclesiastical focus of his life fails to do justice to his deep religious faith. Halifax's public role in the catholic movement within the Church of England was the manifestation his personal beliefs. His personal piety and his attendance on religious services are well known, but he also manifested his faith actively beyond the service to the English Church Union. In the London cholera epidemic of 1865, the young aristocrat worked as an aide in Pusey's hospital. Mother Sellon, of the Davenport Sisters, recorded that Halifax was indefatigably

²³ Ibid., vol. I, 80.

²⁴ Ibid., vol. I, 119.

²⁵ Ibid., vol. I, 179.

²⁶ Chandler, Michael, *The Life and Work of Henry Parry Liddon* (Herefordshire, Gracewing, 2000), 145.

²⁷ See Chandler, for examples of Liddon appealing to Halifax for support (72) and Liddon using Halifax's support as leverage with more recalcitrant ritualists (70)

²⁸ Lockhart, vol. I, 154.

energetic in his ministrations.²⁹ In 1871 Halifax volunteered as a medical aide in Sedan in the international effort to relieve the suffering in the aftermath of the Franco-Prussian War.³⁰ These were acts of humble Christian service. The sincerity of Halifax's faith was recognized and understood by both the public and the leadership of the Church of England. Francis Paget, later Bishop of Oxford, writing at the time of the trial of Bishop King of Lincoln compares the holiness and unworldliness of Halifax to that of Bishop King and Fr. Benson.³¹

Halifax's religious reputation was certainly not without criticism. Gladstone, the original "lay high priest" of the Oxford Movement recognized Halifax's devotion, but was concerned that his faith was outdated and was stuck in the mode of the 1840s.³² Edward Benson, then Bishop of Truro, was even harsher in his assessment. Benson wrote in 1877 that "I have been staying in the same house with the President of the English Church Union and like him extremely. He is a truly religious man, but I cannot help feeling in the party there is something that is very far from heavenliness and apostolicity"³³ Benson's assessment, linking Halifax to the perceived shortcomings of the catholic revival, was made in the heat of the early Ritualist controversy and reflects the harsh partisanship of the era as seen through the lens of a broad churchman.

This short introduction into the life of Halifax described two intersecting spheres of his life: aristocrat and churchman. Halifax entered into public life with the privileges of the mid-nineteenth century English aristocracy. He both sacrificed these privileges and used them to the service of the Church of England and the catholic movement within it. Halifax's accession to the Presidency of the English Church Union was aided by his social position. Halifax used his status throughout his career to aid the cause. The three following examples illustrate the different ways in which Halifax used his status as aristocrat to complement and assist his role as leader within the movement.

Halifax's support for religious orders has already been mentioned with respect to both the establishment of the Society of St. John the Evangelist and the Davenport Sisters. Although such orders were beginning to find gradual, even grudging, acceptance with the Church of England, they were regarded with suspicion by much of English society. The Davenport Sisters had suffered from this opposition when royal support had been withdrawn from their order in 1849.³⁴ The royal family's patronage reflected the low church orientation of the Queen. However, Halifax was instrumental in renewing royal patronage for the charitable activities of the Davenport Sisters. In 1866 Halifax secured the financial support of the Prince of Wales, his childhood friend, and the Lord Mayor of London, along with Bishop Tait of London for the work of the Cholera Hospital operated by Dr. Pusey and Mother Sellon.³⁵ In 1879 Halifax persuaded the Princess of Wales to become Patroness of the St. Andrew's Hospital at Clewer operated by the Davenport sisters.³⁶ The latter event is more interesting because it follows

²⁹ Williams, Thomas Jay, *Priscilla Lydia Sellon* (London, SPCK, 1965), 249-250.

³⁰ Lockhart, vol. I, 166-172.

³¹ Stephen Paget and J. Crum, *Francis Paget* (London, MacMillan and Co., 1913), 113.

³² Michael Foot, and H. G. Matthew (eds.), *The Gladstone Diaries* 14 vols. (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1994), vol. 6, 319 (Dec. 17, 1864).

³³ Arthur Christopher Benson, *The Life of Edward White Benson* (New York: MacMillan Co., 1899), 436.

³⁴ Williams, 250.

³⁵ *Ibid.*

³⁶ *Ibid.*, 299.

Halifax's resignation as Groom of the Bed Chamber in 1877. By 1879 Halifax was a major public figure in the ritualist controversy as President of the English Church Union, nonetheless he was still able to secure the patronage of a senior member of the royal family for an overtly catholic cause, the work of a religious order within the Church of England. The influence exercised by Halifax in these matters depended primarily on his personal status and association with the royal family.

The import of the personal status of Halifax can be contrasted with the influence he exercised with respect to his presidency of the English Church Union. This may be termed the professional or political influence of Halifax. He was in frequent communication with the political and ecclesiastical leaders. Halifax was not afraid to offer his advice and counsel. Some recent historians such as Cannadine discount the influence of what he terms "ecclesiastical grandees" of the era.³⁷ However, as the catholic movement gained influence in the Church of England, the influence of Halifax and his advice cannot be so quickly discounted. Halifax led a large, albeit a minority movement, within the church. His high social status reinforced the legitimacy provided by the presidency of the English Church Union. Halifax's social status provided the access and relationship to make his influence even more effective. A clear example of this influence is Halifax's influence on ecclesiastical appointments. In January 1885, Halifax took it upon himself to write to the Prime Minister, Gladstone, to recommend that Canon King be appointed to the vacant bishopric of Lincoln and that Canon Liddon be appointed to the see of Exeter.³⁸ Gladstone quickly responded by asking for additional information on Canon King. King was subsequently nominated by Gladstone to the see of Lincoln. While there is no explicit evidence that causally links Halifax's recommendation of Edward King to Gladstone's nomination, the evidence is suggestive that Halifax's recommendation was instrumental in King's elevation to the episcopate. Halifax had a long relationship with Gladstone originating with the first Viscount Halifax, and Gladstone shared many of Halifax's religious sensibilities. These personal associations are balanced by Halifax's reputation and leadership of a substantial movement within the Church of England. If Gladstone wanted to appoint a high churchman to the see of Lincoln, as he eventually did, it would seem reasonable to listen to the advice of the acknowledged leader of the catholic movement within the Church of England. Gladstone's rapid reply to Halifax's modest, even timid, suggestion suggests willingness on Gladstone's part to accept the advice of Halifax. Halifax's influence was brought to bear by the intersection of his aristocratic status, which provided him access to the Prime Minister, and his leadership of the English Church Union, which provided legitimacy for the advice.

While Halifax's letter to Gladstone represented a private communication, Halifax was not above using the public media to accomplish similar objectives. In 1890 Halifax wrote to the *Pall Mall Gazette* complaining that the magazine had been ungenerous in criticizing the appointment of Randall Davidson to the see of Rochester.³⁹ Davidson was a friend of Halifax's, even though he certainly did not share Halifax's churchmanship.⁴⁰ Halifax's public letter to the *Pall Mall Gazette* provided both personal and professional

³⁷ Cannadine, 497.

³⁸ Andrew S. Leak, Andrew S., "Halifax Apostle of Unity", *One in Christ*, 20 (1984): 120.

³⁹ Bell, 202-202.

⁴⁰ Bell, 390, and Lockhart, vol. II, 370.

support. The publication of the letter acknowledged that Halifax—and by extension the catholic movement—could accept Davidson as a bishop even though he was closely tied to the royal family and the late Archbishop Tait, both pillars of the opposition to the catholic movement. Halifax’s public support for Davidson transcended friendship. It was also a signal of moderation and conciliation by Halifax as leader of the catholic movement within the Church of England.⁴¹

The third example of Halifax’s use of personal influence also concerns Randall Davidson. In 1903 when Davidson was nominated to be Archbishop of Canterbury, Halifax wrote a portentous letter of seventy-six octavo pages to the archbishop designate. The complete text of the letter is reproduced in an appendix to Lockhart’s official biography of Halifax.⁴² The letter, a plea for toleration of diversity and catholic practice within the Church of England, is distinctive in that it is at once solicitous, paternalistic, and authoritative. Halifax asked only to say a few words to one who is about to become “*alterius orbis Papa*”, but then paternalistically provided a comprehensive assessment of the state of the church and the direction that the new archbishop must take. Halifax vigorously asserted the spiritual independence of the church, “The church has nothing to expect or wish for from Parliament except to be left alone.”⁴³ What distinguishes this letter from the paternalism of the old aristocracy is the political authority that Halifax demonstrated in this letter. Halifax informed Davidson that it was entirely due to his intervention that catholic clergy testified at the Archbishops’ hearing on Incense and Reservation in 1899.⁴⁴ Halifax was not afraid to demonstrate his *professional political* authority as leader of the catholic movement to the archbishop-nominate. The letter is more than a letter to a friend, or from a Lord Temporal to a Lord Spiritual. It was a letter from one ecclesiastical politician to another ecclesiastical politician. Neither Halifax’s biographer nor Randall Davidson’s biographer George Bell records Davidson’s response to this letter. However much of substance of the letter would later reflect developments of the English Church in the period of the first decades of the twentieth century under Davidson’s leadership.

These examples serve to show that Halifax’s influence represented a conflation of his aristocratic status and his professional status as president of the English Church Union. Halifax used both to secure the interests of the catholic movement within Church of England. And he did so as a new type of leader, not holding substantive parliamentary or ecclesiastical office, but as a layman leading a private church-related interest group.

⁴¹ A parallel situation existed in Halifax’s support for the appointment of Sir Lewis Didbin, an evangelical, as Dean of the Arches. See E.S.S. Sutherland, *Didbin and the English Establishment* (Edinburgh: Pentland Press 1995), 66.

⁴² Lockhart, vol. II, 377-390.

⁴³ *Ibid.*, vol. II, 390.

⁴⁴ *Ibid.*, vol. II, 386.

Chapter IV

Halifax and the Defense of Catholic Principles in the Church of England

The previous chapter introduced the person of Halifax and the two themes of aristocrat and churchman. The nexus of these two themes was Halifax's presidency of the English Church Union. Halifax served as president of the Union from 1868 until 1919 and again from 1930 until 1934. His tenure spanned not only decades of time, but the transition from oppression of the catholic movement in the Church of England to toleration in the early decades of the twentieth century and even to its age of triumph in the inter-war years (1918-1939).¹ Halifax was the guiding force, the instrumental leader, and the astute ecclesiastical politician that led the English Church Union through this transformation. While Halifax certainly deserves credit for this leadership through this period, it is acknowledged that the change in the status of the Anglo-Catholic movement reflected the interaction of many complex forces within the Church of England, within Christian theology, and within English society. Toleration, individualism, and even diversity were becoming recognized as positive values in society at the expense of uniformity and conformity within English society and English Christianity.

Halifax's leadership was necessary for the success of the catholic revival within the Church of England. Without his leadership the movement could have easily brought about its own failure. Firstly the movement could have been crushed within the Church of England as was the intent of the Public Worship Regulation Act of 1874. Disraeli stated his purpose for the act was, "to put down Ritualism."² Anglo-Catholics within the Church of England would have either conformed to the liturgical and theological uniformity of the established church or submitted to Rome. Another possibility was the secession of the Anglo-Catholic movement from the Church of England to form a new denomination. The seceding body would have wandered into the morass of denominationalism and sectarianism on the Scottish model of the 'Wee Free' Presbyterians of the early nineteenth century. Neither alternative occurred. The catholic movement substantially remained unified and temperate under the strong leadership of Halifax. This chapter examines Halifax's leadership of the English Church Union in the defense of catholic principles.

This work is not a history of the catholic movement or the ritualist controversy within the Church of England. Nigel Yates, James Bentley, and M. Crowther have all written useful general histories of the period and controversies.³ However, it is useful to summarize what is meant by catholic principles as understood by Halifax and the English Church Union. The Church of England was part of western Christianity; the Reformation did not establish a new church. The movement espoused high doctrines of sacraments and ecclesiology. The objective value of the sacraments and the sacred or divine character of

¹ Yates, 251 passim. He provides as summary of the post war triumph of Anglo-Catholicism within the Church of England.

² Machin, 70.

³ Previously cited but repeated for clarity. Nigel Yates, *Anglican Ritualism in Victorian Britain 1830-1910* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999), James Bentley, *Ritualism and Politics in Victorian Britain* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1978), M. A. Crowther, et al., *The Church Embattled* (Devon: Newton Abbot, 1970).

the church were pillars of the movement. The church was a sacred and divine society and certainly not, as one Erastian Sir William Harcourt would remark, a creation of Parliament.⁴ Moving from theology to praxis, the catholic revivalists believed that liturgy of the church should reflect the catholic sacramental theology of the church. The existing services of the Prayer Book were deficient in both form and application. The liturgy of the Church of England should better conform to the western rite customs in both the canon and the ceremonial of the Eucharist. The details of ceremonial practice, such as vestments, the eastward position, lights, crucifixes, reservation of the sacrament, use of incense, and the mixed chalice, were often the occasions of conflict.

However, the catholic movement was not monolithic. The summary above masks the diversity of theology and practice in the catholic movement in the Church of England. Wide variations in theology and practice existed among the followers and descendants of the Oxford Movement. Therefore, it is difficult to summarize the principles of the catholic movement because there was no normative expression. The adherents of the catholic movement ranged from the traditional High Church school to radicals who voraciously copied contemporary Roman Catholic customs and practices. Halifax, for example, was often regarded as a “more advanced” Anglo-Catholic, being attracted to very ritualistic services, liturgical reform, and liturgical devotions not found in the prayer book.⁵ Keble on the other hand was reputed to retain the North side celebration of the Holy Communion. This diversity within the movement is a complex phenomenon. It certainly at minimum reflects the influence of nineteenth century individualism and provides a continuing source of conflict within the movement.⁶ The external situation was quite different. The catholic movement did not seek to impose its theology and ceremonial practices on all within the Church of England, but sought only toleration and acceptance of its principles. Certainly this reflected a practical understanding of its minority standing within the Church of England, but it also reflected the acceptance of diversity and individual choice as positive societal values. The Anglo-Catholics believed that through their witness within the church, the Church of England would regain its catholic identity.

The objective of this chapter is restricted in view. The focus is on the method and manner of Halifax’s leadership in the defense of catholic principles. What were the characteristics of Halifax’s leadership of the English Church Union? What were his methods? How did he use his authority? And, most importantly, why were these important to the transformation of lay authority? This chapter will examine four critical periods in the history of the movement to develop key themes of Halifax’s leadership. The first section will consider the period from Halifax’s accession to the presidency of the English Church Union through the trial of Bishop King of Lincoln—1868-1890. This section will focus on the development and exercise of Halifax’s authority. How did Halifax use his position to attempt to influence the Church of England and the government’s policies toward catholic principles? The second section will consider the internal controversy within the catholic movement over the publication of *Lux Mundi*

⁴ Bell, 329.

⁵ Halifax’s parish church at Hickleton used, with permission, the 1549 service of Holy Communion

⁶ Yates, 336-337. There is a strong element of crypto-congregationalism within the catholic movement worthy of further study. One manifestation of these views was the proliferation of published customaries for the Eucharist.

(1889-1892). This section will focus on Halifax's leadership within the catholic movement in the effort to preserve unity. The third section will consider the period from 1899 to 1902 and the response to the Archbishops' decision on incense and reservation. The focus of this examination will be to identify the emergence of new themes within Halifax's leadership of the English Church Union. The final section shall consider the period of the Royal Commission on Ecclesiastical Discipline in 1906 to illustrate the legitimation of Halifax's unofficial political authority in the Church of England.

The Era of Ecclesiastical Legalism

The first period of this study is marked by ecclesial legalism. The theological debates of the Oxford Movement were transformed into a series of legal proceedings in which the practice of catholic sacramental theology came into conflict with the normative liturgical expression of the Church of England. The conflict concerned the nature of the ecclesiastical courts as much as the so-called ritual abuse. The foundation for the former was laid in 1832 by the passing of the Privy Council Appeals Act, which abolished the Court of Delegates, the supreme ecclesiastical court, and transferred appellate jurisdiction to the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council⁷ and the passing of the Church Discipline Act of 1840.⁸ This ecclesiastical court structure was an affront to the followers of the Oxford Movement and their successors, the Anglo-Catholics. The Judicial Committee of the Privy Council was, they argued, a secular court, without legitimate ecclesiastical jurisdiction. Ecclesiastical offenses should be tried by their bishops or courts established by and under Convocation.⁹ The Judicial Committee of the Privy Council was merely a creation of Parliament, an Erastian creation similar in character to the actions that had spurred Keble to deliver his Assize Sermon in 1833. The opposition to the jurisdiction of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council ignored the fact that some senior bishops were always either members of the council (i.e., Canterbury, York, and London) or bishops sat with the judges or bishops as assessors. Thus the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council never was a purely secular court.¹⁰ The catholic opposition to the appellate jurisdiction of the Privy Council was as much a matter of practical policy as theological opposition. Decisions of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council rarely favored the catholic cause. And by the mid-1860s onward, the decisions of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council were increasingly against the catholic cause.

The ecclesiastical court system was plagued by many problems. It was slow, expensive, and the penalties often ineffective. By the early 1870s, the ecclesiastical court structure was deemed unsatisfactory by all parties. In 1874 Archbishop Tait presented a proposal for reform of the ecclesiastical courts that eventually resulted in the passing of the Public Worship Regulation Act. Tait's reform was intended to simplify and make more effective the ecclesiastical court system. However, the passage of the Act reflected the confluence of a number of factors in addition to the desire to reform the ecclesiastical courts. The Queen pressured Tait to limit the influence of the ritualists. Disraeli, the new Prime Minister exploited the popular sentiment against ritualism and strongly supported

⁷ Chadwick, vol. I, 257.

⁸ Yates, 212.

⁹ Ibid., 215.

¹⁰ Bentley, 20.

the bill. Gladstone opposed the bill, but after considerable debate and expenditure of parliamentary time, even he finally acquiesced to the bill.¹¹ The bill created a new court with jurisdiction in both the provinces of Canterbury and York to hear all cases of ritual irregularity subject to the bishop's veto. The court had a quasi-ecclesiastical character as its sole judge, Lord Penzance, also held the position of Dean of the Arches, the judge of the court of the province of Canterbury.¹² The actions of this court were the centerpiece of controversy from 1877 when the Rev. Mr. Tooth was imprisoned for contempt to 1887 when the Rev. Mr. Bell Cox was the last of the five clergyman imprisoned under the consequences of the Act. By 1888, the failure of the act to "crush ritualism" was recognized and no more prosecutions were permitted by the bishops during Victoria's reign.¹³ The episcopal veto was used in the attempt to secure peace, liberty and toleration within the Church of England.¹⁴

This move towards toleration was unacceptable to the radical anti-ritualists of the Church Association who initiated a prosecution against the new Bishop of Lincoln, Edward King. The case against Bishop King was weak, centering on minor issues such as the eastward position.¹⁵ Archbishop Benson decided to hear the case in his, the Archbishop's Court, last used in 1699. This reluctant decision was taken to counter the objections by the catholic movement that Lord Penzance's court was a secular court. Archbishop Benson, sitting with five bishops as assessors heard the charges against Bishop King at Lambeth Palace.¹⁶ The affair gave rise to Dr. Stubb's famous quip that this was not a court but the Archbishop sitting in his library. While Benson formally found against King on two charges, and this judgment was later upheld by the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, the judgment was essentially a victory for toleration of catholic principles. The evangelical party was seriously damaged by the injudicious prosecution of Bishop King.¹⁷ This ended the first stage of the ritualist controversy.

Throughout this period, the English Church Union under the leadership of Halifax was the primary popular organization defending catholic principles.¹⁸ The union certainly raised money and paid for the defense of many prosecuted ritualist clergy, but the activities were much more than simply reactive or defensive to ritualist prosecutions. The English Church Union was an interest group within the Church of England and English society. It promoted the interests of the catholic movement to the church and the state using a range of techniques to communicate its message, to assert its strength, and to secure its objectives. This section shall examine four examples of Halifax's leadership of the English Church Union during this first period of ritualist controversy. The English Church Union tried to influence the political and ecclesiastical leadership through

¹¹ See Crowther, chapter 5 and 7 for a complete examination of the pre 1874 ecclesiastical court cases and the story of the passing of the Public Worship Regulation Act.

¹² Lord Penzance would cause additional controversy by refusing to subscribe to the ecclesiastical requirements to hold the position of Dean of the Arches. Penzance believe his authority derived from statutory authority of the Public worship Regulation Act.

¹³ Bentley, 121.

¹⁴ Chadwick, vol. II, 348-352.

¹⁵ Chadwick, vol. II, 353-354.

¹⁶ Bentley, 118.

¹⁷ Chadwick, vol.II, 354 and Bentley, 120.

¹⁸ The popular nature of the English Church Union stands in contrast to smaller and more clerical catholic societies such as the Society of the Holy Cross (S.S.C.).

electoral pressure and lobbying. Secondly, Halifax maintained coherence and unity within the union. It could only be influential if it maintained its unity. Thirdly, the Union under Halifax's exerted its political authority through public meeting and demonstrations. Fourthly, the Union, and in particular Halifax, tried to persuade the church and society by theological-historical arguments.

Halifax as President English Church Union first attempted to secure toleration of catholic principles by influencing the policies of the church and state. The establishment of the Church of England and the continuing, although declining, influence of Parliament in ecclesiastical matters made it necessary to work with both the institutions and leaders of the state and church. The English Church Union was never in the Victorian era, and could never have been, a purely religious institution. The English Church Union recognized the reality that political influence in Parliament would help secure the objectives of the catholic movement in the Church of England. Although the union did not take a particular political stance, favoring one political party over another, Halifax made it clear that members of the union should make clear their influence to Parliamentary candidates. In 1868, soon after assuming the presidency of the union, Halifax wrote to a local branch:

It seems to me that our correct course is to do what we can as individuals to influence the candidates with whom we may be brought into contact: remembering that our support at the present time to whichever side we accord it will be a reason henceforth for strongly urging our wishes upon our representatives in Parliament.¹⁹

Halifax wanted parliamentary candidates throughout England, both Liberal and Conservative, to take cognizance of the union. It was certainly advantageous to this strategy that many members of the union at this time were socially influential. Halifax recognized the value of the English Church Union as an interest group both within the church and national electoral politics. However, the union was relatively small and weak in this period. The national mood did not favor the cause of the catholic revivalists. Moreover, the influence of individual members of Parliament was rapidly declining in value with the rise of the modern political parties following the Reform Act of 1867. Thus, Halifax's strategy did not produce positive results to protect the catholic interests. The Supreme Judicature Act (1870) and the Public Worship Regulation Act demonstrated the weakness of the catholic movement. The passage of the act to disestablish the Church of Ireland demonstrates that the weakness was not confined to the catholic interest but extended to the Church of England in general. The important factor in this example is not Halifax's success, for they were very few, but the adoption of modern strategies of political action relative to influence the ecclesial life of the Church of England.

Halifax understood the value of the complementary approach to attempting to influence electoral politics: the direct influence of political and ecclesiastical leaders. He used and exploited his aristocratic status to benefit his position as defacto leader of the catholic movement in the Church of England. This was very important in the early years of the catholic defense movement when the English Church Union was weak and not well respected in the church. The personal status of Halifax gave the union entry into the

¹⁹ Crowther, 192.

political leadership. In 1874 Halifax attempted to bolster Gladstone's opposition to the proposed Public Worship Regulation Act. Halifax appealed to Gladstone's natural liberalism by comparing the bill to Bismarck's measures in the *KulturKampf*.²⁰

Gladstone strongly opposed the bill. He attacked the content and nature of the bill. Gladstone tabled six resolutions that outline the principles of ecclesiastical legislation. However even Gladstone eventually acquiesced to the bill and withdrew his resolutions.²¹ Halifax could not maintain Gladstone's opposition to the Public Worship Regulation Act. Clearly Halifax had limited influence on parliamentary ecclesiastical politics at this time. Halifax also recognized that position of the Church of England with respect the state was changing. The church was becoming peripheral to the interests of the state. The passage of the Public Worship Act of 1874 would represent the last parliamentary session dominated by ecclesiastical legislation. Halifax therefore turned his primary efforts to the church leaders, the archbishops, bishops, and leading churchman. Halifax could not ignore and did not ignore the leading politicians, as demonstrated in his recommendation of Edward King to Gladstone in 1885, but the focus of Halifax's lobbying efforts turned to church leaders.²²

An early example of Halifax's lobbying the ecclesiastical leadership was his proposal to seek a compromise over the Public Worship Regulation Act. From 1877 until 1881, Halifax repeatedly corresponded with Archbishop Tait with proposals to find a compromise of the ritualist crisis. Halifax proposed that clergymen be allowed to celebrate as they wished at the early celebrations of the Holy Communion as long as they celebrated at midday without vestments or candles.²³ Tait could not agree to these proposals as it would signify acceptance of measures deemed illegal.²⁴ What is significant is that Halifax, a layman without official standing in the church, was attempting to work out a compromise with the Archbishop over a number of years. It is difficult to judge whether Tait seriously considered Halifax's proposals, however, Tait maintained a correspondence with Halifax on these issues for many years. These exchanges establish that Halifax was intimately engaged in ecclesiastical politics of the Church of England, not as Parliamentary leader, for he was not a member of the Lords at this time, but as an unofficial lay leader of the catholic movement.

In order for the English Church Union to be the effective representative voice of the catholic movement within the Church of England, unity was essential. The inclination of the catholic movement toward internal conflict and potential fragmentation has been already discussed. The tendency towards rash actions and reactions by significant members of the union required a moderating guiding force. Halifax provided such leadership to the movement. Halifax did so maintaining a broad coalition, selecting his battles wisely, and demanding support of the union for his moderating position. His vision was that union should be able to encompass traditional high churchmen with leanings to the Oxford Movement such as Canon Gregory of St. Paul's, as well as radical ritualists, such as the Reverend Messrs. Tooth and Mackonochie. An example of

²⁰ Michin, G., *Politics and the Churches of Great Britain 1860-1921* (Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1987) 73.

²¹ *Ibid.*, 74.

²² As was mentioned in a footnote in Chapter 1, the Halifax does not figure significantly in political memoirs and biographies, but he does increasingly become significant in ecclesiastical memoirs and biographies.

²³ Marsh, 238-239.

²⁴ And Tait certainly was unwilling to legalize ritualist practices.

Halifax's unifying leadership is found in a complementary aspect to the previously discussed Tooth case. Halifax had resigned as a Groom of the Bed Chamber from the establishment of the Prince of Wales because his public statements implied advocacy for civil disobedience. Another more potentially damaging resignation was threatened over the same issue, but with a very different result.

The first prosecution under the Public Worship Regulation Act against the Rev. Mr. Ridsdale ended with an ecclesiastical sleight of hand. Ridsdale at first refused to recognize the judgment of Lord Penzance's Court, but he did accept the dispensing authority of his ecclesiastical superior, Archbishop Tait. Ridsdale accepted the judgment of the court because Tait dispensed him from following his interpretation of the Ornament Rubric in the Prayer Book.²⁵ However, the second clergyman prosecuted under the act was not so tractable. The Rev. Mr. Tooth was charged with a number of ritual offenses, some akin to the Ridsdale case others previously condemned by the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council. Mr. Tooth was issued a monition to conform, but he ignored Lord Penzance's judgment and even refused to appeal the decision. The bishop ordered the church closed, but Tooth and his churchwardens ignored this order.²⁶ In late 1876, the English Church Union drafted a resolution in response to the judgment of Lord's Penzance's court.²⁷ The proposed resolution declared that the decisions of Lord Penzance's court were illegitimate and unjust. The Public Worship Regulation Act was null and void and by extension the decisions of Lord Penzance's court would not be binding on the clergy of the Church of England. The proposed resolution before the English Church Union Council was not different in substance from Halifax's public statement that praised disobedience to the act as a higher responsibility. However, the proposed resolution was deeply troubling to Dr. Pusey, a vice president of the English Church Union and the remaining founder of the Oxford Movement active in the Church of England. Pusey wrote to Halifax on 28 December 1876 stating that the proposed resolution shifted the question from a particular wrong decision (the previous Purchas case) to question the legitimacy of all authority (in this the Tooth case) and that he felt it necessary to resign as vice president and as a member of the English Church Union. Pusey could not assent to such rampant disregard for legitimate authority. Pusey stated that the resolution would be in opposition to the principles of the Oxford Movement. Halifax, however, could not tolerate the loss of Pusey from the union. It would have been a major blow to the legitimacy of the union. Pusey's standing was immense. His resignation would destroy the unity and the comprehensiveness of the movement. Halifax intervened in the deliberations of the council. He would not accept Pusey's resignation, and he secured modifications of the resolution by the council. The condemnation of what Pusey viewed as legitimate authority was removed from the resolution. The changes were acceptable to Pusey, and he rescinded his resignation.²⁸ Halifax understood the damage that Pusey's resignation from the union would cause so he moved to preserve the English Church Union, even when he would not preserve his own position in the Prince of Wales' household. By maintaining unity, Halifax strengthened his position within the English

²⁵ Marsh 225.

²⁶ Marsh, 225-227.

²⁷ The action of the English Church Union preceded the imprisonment of Mr. Tooth.

²⁸ Edward Parry Liddon, *The Life of Edward Bouverie Pusey* 4 vols. (London: Longmans, 1903) vol. IV, 285-286.

Church Union and thereby his increased his political authority within the Church of England.

Successful influence of the catholic movement depended on maintaining the unity in order to lobby for recognition of the legitimacy of catholic principles. However the influence of the English Church Union on the Church of England more importantly required the ability to show its strength. The personal influence of Halifax was important, but its value was limited to his ability to persuade. In the mid-to-late Victorian era, the ways in which interest groups attempted to publicly demonstrate their strength were petitions and public meetings. Petitions provided a vehicle to show the numerical strength in support of a particular position. Petitions sought redress for grievances, to right a wrong, or to make positive change. The number of signatories and the quality of the signatories were the marks of a successful petition. The petitions were often delivered publicly to ensure maximum publicity within the press in order that the recipients, the political and ecclesiastical powers, would be forced to acknowledge the strength of a movement. England had a long history of the use of these public petitions, and the English Church Union under Halifax made use of them extensively. A complement to the public petition was the public meeting. A hall would be hired, a rota of speakers assembled, and members encouraged to attend. The speeches, often polemical in form, served to stir up the followers of a movement for additional action and to receive publicity for the meeting. The success of a public meeting depended upon a large attendance, an impressive list of speakers, and significant publicity.

Halifax and the English Church Union made extensive use of the public meeting. Ordinary public meetings of the English Church Union, generally two per year, were held in London in which specific topics would be addressed. Extraordinary meetings would be scheduled to address issues of high visibility. Public meetings were often also held to coincide with the annual meeting of the Church Congress.²⁹ These meetings represented a catholic movement side-session from the comprehensive orientation of the Church Congresses. Advance publicity, often weeks or months, in the catholic press usually the *Church Union Gazette* and the *Church Times* preceded the meetings. The organization of the meeting copied a political rather than religious model. A committee of the “great and good” was assembled on the podium. Certainly this included the leadership of the English Church Union but was often extended to include prominent sympathizers to the subject at hand, particularly parliamentarians and members of the peerage. Halifax generally opened these meetings with a presidential address or at least comments on the subject. In the early period of catholic defense, the tone of Halifax’s address was often strong and strident. The meeting would then continue with other speakers, a mixture of clergy and laity. The meeting would often end with a debate and passing of a formal resolution on the position of the English Church Union on the subject. The goal of such a meeting would be that the public and the political and church leadership would read and hear of the strength and vigor of the movement and recognize the arguments and strengths of the union.

The annual Church Congresses, begun in the early 1860s, provided a second public forum for the English Church Union. Halifax attended and regularly spoke at the

²⁹ Based on an analysis of reports in the *Church Union Gazette* and *Church Times*. Two ordinary meetings were scheduled; one usually in January and the other in June.

Church Congresses throughout the period of this study.³⁰ He would present papers, speeches, and engage in discussions. Halifax often would use these venues as a way of securing a larger and more comprehensive audience for the views of the English Church Union because the Church Congresses had a substantial attendance and received extensive coverage in both the secular and religious press. Halifax's presentations to the Church Congresses often read as summaries or digests of previous speeches of the English Church Union. This is not surprising as the presentations to the Church Congresses were the union attempting to speak to the wider Church of England. As the official minutes of the Church Congresses often record audience reaction or the chairman's interventions, such speeches are particularly informative on the reception of Halifax and the English Church Union. They demonstrate the sensitivities of a large audience of interested churchmen and churchwomen to Halifax's public statements. Audience reactions to ideas or even to particular words (e.g., Mass) are useful in judging the legitimacy of the catholic movement in the Church of England.

Throughout most of the period from the Public Worship Regulation Act up to the trial of Bishop King, Halifax's uses of public action to secure support for the catholic cause were not very successful. The Public Worship Regulation Act was passed, and clergymen were prosecuted under the Act. Neither the public meetings of the English Church Union nor the private approaches to Archbishop Tait made a substantive difference.³¹ Halifax's public language in this period was strident, vociferous, and combative. In 1878 Halifax addressed the Church Congress in Sheffield on the comprehensiveness of the national church. Halifax proclaimed that, "Catholic ceremonial and the freedom of the church from the interference of the Privy Council are our right and the world will one day acknowledge them."³² He continued later in the same speech:

We cannot, I will add, we dare not surrender the ritual and ceremonial of the church which experience has shown to be so necessary a bulwark of the faith... We can never consent in the interests of popular Protestantism to be treated like a department of the civil service.³³

Halifax presented the advanced catholic position in a strongly combative tone, recalling both the Public Worship Regulation Act controversy, the legitimacy of the catholic movement within the Church of England, and the illegitimacy of the Erastian model for church government that had functioned from 1717 to the mid-nineteenth century. His speech was interrupted a number of times by hecklers. Finally the chairman, the Archbishop of York, had to interrupt, calling upon the audience to respect the speakers.³⁴ The disruptions of the audience indicate Halifax's standing within the church at this time. Halifax was not only a controversial figure, but he did not (yet) command respect from a wide cross section of the church. Nonetheless, Halifax's use of these techniques demonstrated his adherence to modern political modes of action.

³⁰ Halifax spoke as earlier as the Church Congress of 1868 and his last public speech was the Church Congress 1907. Derived from examination of the speakers lists and indices of the official reports Church Congresses.

³¹ Marsh, 180.

³² *Official Report of the Church Congress 1878 (Sheffield)*(Sheffield: Pawlsons and Brailsford, 1879),119.

³³ *Church Congress 1878*, 121.

³⁴ *Church Congress 1878*, 116.

Public reaction against the imprisonment of clergy as a consequence of the Public Worship Regulation Act and the extremism of the Church Association had the consequences of strengthening the English Church Union.³⁵ The union grew substantially throughout the period. Periods of greatest growth for the union were the times of greatest conflict over ritualism. By 1880, the English Church Union overtook its Protestant counterpart, the Church Association, in membership.³⁶ The increasing strength of the English Church Union, coupled with an increasing desire for ecclesiastical peace, gave the English Church Union more influence. The public demonstrations and the public meetings of the English Church Union could no longer be ignored by the leadership of the church. Strength and legitimacy had made the English Church Union a growing force within the Church of England. Halifax and the English Church Union recognized and made increasing use of this power. An example concerning the trial of the Bishop of Lincoln, from the end of this period of ecclesiastical legalism, illustrates the change in the efficacy of Halifax's use of public action as a political tool in ecclesial politics.

A short summary of the events surrounding the trial of the Bishop of Lincoln has already been mentioned in the introduction to this chapter. Archbishop Benson's decision to use the Court of the Archbishop was not made precipitously. Benson had consulted the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council to ensure that jurisdiction lay with his court. The Judicial Committee of the Privy Council gave an opinion that the Archbishop did have jurisdiction in this case.³⁷ Archbishop Benson's biography further records that the Lord Chancellor told the Archbishop:

That the Archbishop had jurisdiction over his Suffragan Bishops; that he ought to exercise it in person. It is not proper that he should merely remit it to his judge, the Vicar General, *propter dignitatem* of the Bishops.³⁸

Nonetheless, the Archbishop was seemingly willing to remit the case to the Vicar General, sitting with the episcopal assessors. Dr. Deane, the Vicar General, wanted to sit alone. Whether this reflected personal ambition, the desire to spare the Archbishop from the indignity of a trial, or consistency with the normative practice of nineteenth-century ecclesiastical courts of the Church of England is not known. However, the Archbishop decided to sit as judge of his court. The reason he gave was not the advice of the Lord Chancellor, but the agitation of the clergy and the influence of Halifax. Randall Davidson, then Dean of Windsor, wrote on February 8, 1889,

This morning I was summoned to Lambeth by telegram to meet with the Archbishop, the Bishop of London, the Vicar General, and Hassard [the Registrar General of the Province of Canterbury- ed.] to discuss the Lincoln case arrangements. The Archbishop, the Bishop of London, and I had a half hour's talk first, and decided that the Archbishop should not yield to Dr. Deane's wish to sit alone (as Vicar General) when the Court opens next Tuesday. The Archbishop felt the present excitement amongst the clergy, and especially after Lord Halifax's

³⁵ Crowther, 191.

³⁶ Yates, 152.

³⁷ Bell, 132, quoting *The Life of Archbishop Benson*, ii, 329.

³⁸ cited in Bell, 132.

violent Clifton speech, it would never do to let it be said that the Bishop of Lincoln was simply brought before Dr. Deane.³⁹

Halifax's speech to the English Church Union at Clifton was a significant factor in the Archbishop's decision. It is not known why Benson considered Halifax's speech "violent." Nonetheless, policy of the Church of England was changed in response to the public action of Halifax as president of the English Church Union. The effect of this *violent* speech by Halifax was a significant victory for the principles of the English Church Union. A clergyman was to be tried by his ecclesiastical superiors rather than by a layman as judge, even in the Court of the Archbishop. The political authority of Halifax had succeeded.

Halifax's influence in determining the nature of the trial is an important factor that is often overlooked. Historians usually focus on the details of Archbishop Benson's decision. However it was the manner of trial that provided Benson the opportunity to judge Bishop King on historical and theological precepts rather than strict legal precedent.⁴⁰ A typical trial in an ecclesiastical court would have been based on the jurisprudential principles of common law and would have had to uphold the previous decisions of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council.⁴¹ Benson's decision would have had to be strongly against catholic interests. Davidson's account clearly demonstrated the influence of Halifax on Benson's decision to preside at the trial and the subsequent effect of the judgment to advance the interests of the catholic movement.

The study of Halifax's mode of operation in the early period of the ritualist controversy has so far focused on his *political* activity as President of the English Church Union, the preservation of the unity within the catholic movement, the use of lobbying techniques both personally and corporately, and the use public demonstrations. These all relate to the use of political authority. However, Halifax did not acquire and use power for power's sake. As described in the previous chapter, Halifax's personal faith was an essential and defining element of his character. Halifax's leadership of the English Church Union was built upon his religious faith. An important element of his leadership of the English Church Union was the public exposition of the theological and historical principles of the catholic movement in published articles, pamphlets, and books. Halifax wrote as an historian and a theologian over many decades. This is not to argue that Halifax was an original theologian or historian but rather that he gathered and assembled arguments to ground the catholic movement in principles. It was important that the catholic movement was not seen as an affection or fashion but as reflecting the principles of orthodox Christianity and English history. What is important to this study is that these theological and historical arguments were not being made by clergyman, neither in the ecclesiastical hierarchy or the universities, nor by the old Parliamentary lay leadership of the Church of England, such as Gladstone, but by a partisan lay leader.

The character of Halifax's theological and historical writing is very different from many of his polemical public speeches as President of the English Church Union. Halifax develops his position with reference to known and accepted theological and historical authorities. He offers not only criticism but also positive suggestions. He couches his

³⁹ Ibid., 133-134.

⁴⁰ Rodes, 284.

⁴¹ Ibid., 259.

demands with reasonableness. Halifax is foremost an irenic apologist who seeks to find a common ground. The theme of stereotypical English common sense is never far from the surface of these writings. Many appeared as publications of the English Church Union. Other writings were presented to the Church Congresses and again these were often in sharp contrast to the polemical and controversial speeches that he also delivered in these same venues. And still others were published for public sale by secular publishers.

In this period of ecclesiastical legalism one subject of Halifax's writings was the reformation of the ecclesiastical courts. It was not sufficient to protest the injustice of the current system but necessary to provide a foundation for reform. Halifax did so in two important writings. In 1880 he issued a letter to the members of the English Church Union on the difficulties of Church and State.⁴² He followed this pamphlet by a paper delivered to the Church Congress of 1882 in Newcastle-upon-Tyne as part of a session on ecclesiastical courts.⁴³ The content of the papers are similar but the Church Congress papers has been expanded to include a more complete theological exposition of his argument. Halifax made his argument that the existing ecclesiastical courts are invalid by an historical analysis. The Henrician Statute of Appeals was not intended to hand over spiritual matters to the king. Halifax argued that the Court of Delegates was established to hear the appeals that would have been transferred to Rome in the pre-Reformation church. These were never—rarely—spiritual cases but were instead matrimonial, testamentary, tithe, and patronage cases. Halifax then argued that the Crown may rightly exercise coercive jurisdiction but not spiritual jurisdiction. He cites authorities for his argument including Lord Coke, Elizabeth I, Charles I, Bacon, Richard Hooker, and even Jeremy Taylor to make his point. Then he argues that the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council was exercising spiritual jurisdiction, a situation not conceived of by Lord Brougham in the court reform of 1832.⁴⁴ Halifax then provides the example of the spiritual independence of the established Church of Scotland.⁴⁵ The General Assembly of the Church of Scotland was the supreme ecclesiastical tribunal for that established church. Halifax clearly shows that a legitimate and viable alternative ecclesiastical court structure, one that guaranteed spiritual independence, already exists within the United Kingdom.⁴⁶ Then Halifax made his “moderate and reasonable” suggestion. The episcopate of the Church of England, in consultation with the lower House of Convocation, should be made the formal assessors to the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council. The Judicial Committee of the Privy Council would act only on the advice of the Church in spiritual matters.⁴⁷ Halifax's proposal sought a compromise that would adhere to the catholic ecclesiology but also could function within the structure of the judicial

⁴² Charles L. Wood, (Lord Halifax), *The President's Letter to the English Church Union* (London: English Church Union, 1880).

⁴³ *The Official Record of the Church Congress 1881* (Newcastle-upon-Tyne) (London: John Hodges, 1882), 281-283.

⁴⁴ Halifax, *President's Letter* (1880), 2-4.

⁴⁵ Halifax quotes Lords Benholme (Lord of Session of the Scottish Supreme Court of Judicature, “ Within their the department, the law of the land gives the Assembly (e.g. the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland –ed.) and exclusive and final jurisdiction, 9.

⁴⁶ In order to preserve his view that spiritual matters are the subject of the clergy, Halifax argues that the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland is a purely clerical body consisting of teaching and ruling elders both fully and equally ordained.

⁴⁷ Halifax, *President's Letter* (1880) ,10.

system of England. The moderation and reasonableness of Halifax's proposal stands in stark contrast to his near-contemporary polemic on the Erastian nature of the church cited above or his "violent" speech before the trial of the Bishop of Lincoln. Halifax used his writings of this type to establish an intellectual legitimacy based on scholarship that would complement his formal leadership of the English Church Union. The publication and discussion of the subject provided the intellectual legitimacy, not the acceptance, of the proposals. Halifax's works of this type are reminiscent, though certainly not of the same quality, as Gladstone's *Church Principles* and the *State in Relation to the Church* or even Gladstone's *Letter of the Royal Supremacy*.

The *Lux Mundi* Crisis 1889-1892

In November 1889, the collection of essays entitled *Lux Mundi* was published. The collection was edited by Charles Gore, the Principal Librarian of Pusey House, and consisted of essays by a new generation of younger high churchmen and Anglo-Catholics. Ten of the twelve essayists were Oxford men, many with association to the academic bastion of and monument to the catholic movement –Keble College.⁴⁸ The essayists' purpose was to theologically engage the Church of England with the new social, scientific, and intellectual movements of the age. Although written with more reverence than *Essays and Reviews* a generation earlier, the publication of *Lux Mundi* precipitated a crisis within the Church of England and particularly in the catholic movement. Stalwarts of the catholic movement, particularly Liddon and Denison, felt betrayed by the publication of *Lux Mundi*. Liddon, shortly before his death, wrote (14 January 1890) to Halifax that *Lux Mundi* represented "the abandonment of the ground won by the Oxford Movement in favour of church authority."⁴⁹ Denison then undertook a campaign against *Lux Mundi*. Chadwick outlines the controversy within the church and within the catholic movement between 1889-1892.⁵⁰ It would be at the end of this period that the English Church Union and Halifax were dragged into the controversy.

In 1891 Gore presented the Bampton Lectures in which he revisited his *Lux Mundi* topic, the nature of inspiration. Although Gore had published a new preface to *Lux Mundi* and in the Bampton Lectures attempted to clarify his understanding of kenosis, such clarifications were not sufficient for many of the more traditional Anglo-Catholics led by Denison, the long-serving Archdeacon of Taunton. On May 11, 1892, Denison a member of the council of the English Church Union moved a resolution to condemn the "new criticism". The Rev. E. G. Wood, no relation to Halifax, moved an amendment to specifically name *Lux Mundi* as the subject of the condemnation.⁵¹ Such a resolution would have divided the catholic movement within the Church of England. The resolution would have condemned not only Charles Gore, but many of the new young bright lights of the catholic movement. The liberal catholics, as they would be called, brought a new sense of theological legitimacy to the catholic movement that resonated with the broad

⁴⁸ Talbot was the Warden of the college, Lock was Sub-Warden, Campion and Moore were tutors of Keble College, and Illingworth and Lyttleton had been tutors at Keble College.

⁴⁹ John Octavius Johnson, *The Life and Letters of Henry Parry Liddon* (London: Longmans, Green, 1904), 370-371.

⁵⁰ Chadwick, vol. II, 101-111.

⁵¹ Lockhart, vol. II, 39.

and liberal churchmen. This intellectual and academic respect was fostering increased toleration. The new criticism indicated that the catholic movement was not a totally reactionary movement. The condemnation of *Lux Mundi* would have driven these young theologians from the movement. The strength of the movement as demonstrated in the events surrounding the trial of Bishop King would have been weakened significantly by the loss of a generation of leading theologians. Halifax could not tolerate such an event, and he opposed the Denison-Wood resolution. Halifax spoke to the council:

There are only two methods of condemning the holder of such views. It could either be done authoritatively or by critical answer. As regards authority, the Union has no authority in such matters and if they attempted to assume it they would look ridiculous. If they proposed a reply, were the members of the Union a competent body to put out a reply to the very difficult theological questions then before the public.⁵²

Halifax carried the council with him, signaling that he was willing to preserve the unity of the catholic movement even at the very high cost of sacrificing Archdeacon Denison. The motion having been defeated, Denison resigned from the English Church Union.⁵³ Halifax was also willing to sacrifice his personal beliefs to the cause of the catholic movement. He did not agree with *Lux Mundi*, but he believed it was neither the place of the English Church Union to condemn the book nor was it in the interest of the union to condemn the authors. Halifax would write many years later “The longer I live the more right I think Liddon was about *Lux Mundi*.”⁵⁴ Halifax had a long, difficult, even exasperating friendship with Charles Gore. As leaders within the movement, they could not escape a relationship. They mutually disappointed each other. Halifax’s biographer writing soon after the death of both Halifax and Gore wrote that

Halifax had no great sympathy with the two great objects of his [i.e., Gore’s—ed.] life—the re-interpretation of belief in terms of modern thought and the application of Christian teaching to social problems.... He (Halifax) disliked Gore’s Liberal Catholicism which he suspected as being the first cousin to modernism.⁵⁵

Halifax’s natural political and theological conservatism was certainly at odds with Gore’s liberalism, socialism, and even suspected modernism. Halifax’s actions in 1892 were the action of an astute and pragmatic leader. Chadwick argues that it was likely that a majority of the catholic movement would have been willing to condemn *Lux Mundi* at the time, but Halifax realized the inevitable cost of such action.⁵⁶ Halifax acted against the immediate desires of the catholic movement and wisely led the English Church Union to bridge a critical generational-theological-intellectual gap. The result was to strengthen

⁵²G. L. Prestige, *The Life of Charles Gore* (London: William Heineman, 1935), 114.

⁵³Ibid.

⁵⁴Lockhart, vol. II, p. 34.

⁵⁵Ibid, 35-35.

⁵⁶Chadwick, vol. II, 105. Note Chadwick erroneously places the ECU controversy in 1894. Both Halifax’s and Gore’s biographer place the controversy in 1892.

Halifax's position as leader of the unified catholic movement. The younger generation of liberal catholics had no reason to challenge his leadership.

Incense and Reservation 1899-1902

The trial of Bishop King marked a turning point in the acceptance of the catholic movement within the Church of England. The decision, although, formally against Bishop King, was regarded as a vindication for the moderate catholic position in the Church of England. The agitation by the radicals within the Church Association for the prosecution of Bishop King only increased the desire for peace within the church. Bishops continued to veto prosecutions under the Public Worship Regulation Act in an attempt to secure some peace within the church.⁵⁷ The episcopate tried to work with and regulate the catholic movement. The change in the attitude of the episcopate reflected an increasing number of high churchmen on the episcopal bench and the acceptance within the Church of England of many of the original occasions of controversy. For example, the eastward position of celebration of Holy Communion became normative by the middle of this decade. Altar candles were present in just under half of English and Welsh churches. And even almost of quarter of English churches were using eucharistic vestments by 1894.⁵⁸ However, the radical Protestants were unwilling to accept the growing acceptance of the catholic movement. New occasions of opposition to the catholic movement were found. This reflected both the need of the anti-ritualists to identify new objectionable practices and increasing liturgical radicalism within the catholic movement. Auricular confession, the use of incense, and reservation became the foci of this renewed controversy.⁵⁹ The opposition to confession, while popular, was problematic as the Book of Common Prayer specifically allowed it in the Office for the Sick. Reservation of the sacrament was understood to be prohibited by the twenty-fifth Article of Religion.⁶⁰ Incense had fallen out of use for centuries and perhaps was even banned by an Act of Parliament. While not widespread, the use of both incense and reservation was growing, especially in London.⁶¹ The Church Association used the continuing application of the episcopal veto as the context for renewed public agitation against these *new* ritual abuses. The association demanded that since the bishops would not act, then Parliament should act on behalf of the church. Anti-ritualism was still popular among the public and the demand for parliamentary action was a threat to the catholic cause. The proposed Church Discipline Bill of 1899, led by Sir William Harcourt, an anti-ritualist and a self-proclaimed Erastian, received ominous support.⁶² The proposed bill would have not only eliminated the episcopal veto and strictly enforced conformity with the rubrics of the prayer book but would also have prohibited clergymen from referring to the Holy Communion as the Mass and enjoining regular confession.⁶³ The latter two prohibitions were intended as particularly cruel, but symbolic, attacks upon the catholic movement;

⁵⁷ Chadwick, vol. II, 353.

⁵⁸ Chadwick, vol. II, 319.

⁵⁹ Chadwick, vol. II, 256.

⁶⁰ "The Sacraments were not ordained of Christ to be gazed upon, or to be carried about, but that we should duly use them."

⁶¹ Yates, 279 (Reservation) and Chadwick, vol. II, 319 (Incense).

⁶² Chadwick, vol. II, 357.

⁶³ Ibid.

intended to distance the Church of England with catholic Christendom and reinforce a Protestant character to the Church of England. These clauses were also personal attacks on Halifax, who was widely associated with both the promotion of confession and reclamation of the term Mass.

Halifax flexed his ecclesiastical muscle and called for public demonstrations by the English Church Union. He attacked the Erastianism of the proposed bill. He declared, “I would rather see the Church of England disestablished and disendowed at once (loud and prolonged cheers) than thus made ridiculous and contemptible in the eyes of Christendom.”⁶⁴ Halifax threatened disobedience if the members of the English Church Union were ordered to violate their catholic principles.⁶⁵ Halifax wrote, “We never admit that only that which is specifically enjoined by the words of the Prayer Book and the Articles is lawful in the Church of England.”⁶⁶ The response both from the church and society was strong and immediate. Halifax recorded in a speech in March 1899 that “The Members of this society have been accused in the most public manner, both in and out of Parliament of lawlessness and disloyalty, of treachery and falsehood, and of violation of obligations solemnly entered and accepted.”⁶⁷ However, the attacks were not solely from the anti-ritualists. Halifax’s strong public opposition had incurred the displeasure of Archbishop Fredrick Temple who courageously promoted a doctrine of toleration for catholic principles including the doctrines of the Real Presence, confession, and prayers for the Dead. Halifax had challenged the irenic Archbishop Temple with not only disobedience, but also with the specter of disestablishment.

Halifax responded to the Archbishop’s ire, by requesting a meeting. Halifax records the following note to summarize his meeting with the Archbishop:

I went to Lambeth and said:

Your Grace had made a most serious charge that a Bishop could make against any man. If it is true I ought to repent and make amends. If it is not deserved it ought to be withdrawn. I am here to know what your grace has to say.

Allocution 20 minutes

Proved to him he was wrong

Reconciliation, and his Blessing,

But it was an experience.

Send me back the letters.

Our E.C.U. Demonstration has been a perfect success.⁶⁸

Halifax “success” in the conservation is overshadowed by the implications of the meeting with respect to changing conceptions of authority within the church.⁶⁹ The lay leader of an interest group had the standing to challenge the Archbishop of Canterbury. Halifax challenged Temple, not as an aristocrat—Lord Halifax to Lord Archbishop. Halifax challenged Temple as the leader of the English Church Union: a Christian layman to his (Christian) Archbishop. Halifax’s comment that the demonstration was successful

⁶⁴ *The Church Union Gazette* 30 (January 2, 1899): 9.

⁶⁵ Chadwick, vol. II, 356.

⁶⁶ Lockhart, vol. II, 129.

⁶⁷ *Church Union Gazette*, 30 (April 6, 1899): 118.

⁶⁸ Lockhart, vol. II, 129. –original format preserved

⁶⁹ Halifax’s relationship with Archbishop Temple remained strained after this confrontation.

indicates that the meeting with Temple served the interests of the Union. Halifax had the authority to confront and, in some limited sense, even defeat the Archbishop.

The focus of the controversy soon moved from the proposed Clergy Discipline Bill to the two issues of Reservation and Incense. The Archbishops of Canterbury and York decided to conduct hearings on the legality of both practices within the Church of England.⁷⁰ The prelates hoped that a quasi-judicial procedure conducted by both provincials would be acceptable to all parties within the church. The Anglo-Catholics had long argued for the acceptance of the *ius liturgicum* of the episcopate and these hearings would be an instantiation of such a policy.⁷¹ This policy did not satisfy many followers of the catholic movement who objected to the Archbishop's hearings fearing that the Archbishops would condemn both incense and reservation. Halifax countered this anti-episcopal privatism within the catholic movement by intervening with the catholic leaders to participate in the hearings. However, the Lambeth Opinions, as the Archbishops' rulings were called, were as many Anglo-Catholics feared adverse to the catholic cause. The Archbishops ruled against the liturgical use of incense and followed this up by a ruling against reservation. The English Church Union initiated public demonstrations against these decisions.

On October 9, 1899, the English Church Union held a public meeting to demonstrate its opposition to the opinion on incense and the expected Archbishops' ruling on reservation. Over 7,000 people attended the meeting in St. James Hall in London. Reporters for the *Church Union Gazette*, the journal of the English Church Union and therefore not an unbiased source of information, claimed that the meeting could have filled the Albert Hall if it had been available. The meeting was addressed first by Halifax, then Canon Gore, Canon Body, Canon Knox-Little, Sir Theodore Hope, the Rev. R. R. Dolling, and Mr. Athelstan Riley.⁷² Halifax had arranged a unified catholic front: moderates to radicals, Liberal Catholics and traditionalists, and lay and clerical. It was a mass political rally worthy of and comparable to the contemporary inaugural meeting of the Labour Party. The strength of the English Church Union as demonstrated by this public meeting certainly contributed to the quick failure of the Lambeth opinions, but what is distinctive and critical about this meeting is not the size of the meeting or the impressive array of speakers but a fundamental change in the tone of Halifax's speech.

Halifax began his speech in a traditional manner. He declared, "I am unable to accept an Act of Parliament as determining the ceremonial law of the Church of England."⁷³ This statement is a formulaic exposition of the catholic principle of the spiritual independence of the church. However, Halifax then reframes the conflict between the catholic and anti-ritualist parties of the Church of England,

The policy of Sir William Harcourt and his followers, the policy of the Church Association, is identical with that of the obstructionists who in civil and political matters resisted the reform of the Criminal Law, Roman Catholic Emancipation,

⁷⁰ Bell, 340-350.

⁷¹ Halifax had spoken on the *ius liturgicum* at a church congress as early as 1882

⁷² *Church Union Gazette* 30 (November 1, 1899): 339.

⁷³ *Ibid.*, 340.

the Reform Bill of 1832, the Repeal of the Corn Laws, and every useful reform which has been won by patient and persevering effort in the last century.⁷⁴

Halifax has recast the catholic movement from an association with the old(er) establishment order to the liberalism of the nineteenth century with its emphasis of liberty, toleration, and representation. Halifax continued,

The world has entered an entirely new phase. The past will not return. It is an age of liberty, civil and political. It is the age—can we doubt it?—of democracy. Those who hold the masses reign. The masses are held by intellect and heart. Religion must be popularized as far as principles permit.⁷⁵

Halifax was stating that the church must conform to the new order as had the rest of English society. The spiritual independence of the church must embrace these qualities of the new age. Halifax's language implies acceptance of a new concept of legitimate authority based upon the liberal themes of justice, equality, liberty, representation. Halifax appropriated the language of liberal England and the Liberal Party to the service of the catholic movement. The anti-ritualists within the late nineteenth-century Church of England are, according to Halifax, like to those obstructionists who denied political liberty, toleration, and representation to the English political order. The implication is that liberty, toleration, and representation are appropriate and legitimate models for the church. And by extension, the old structure, whether exercised through Parliament or simply by the episcopate, is no longer adequate for the Church of England. This new order would necessitate new forms of institutional governance for the Church of England.

The issue must be addressed whether Halifax's speech represented a mere rhetorical use of the language rather than an expression of a new concept of legitimate authority. Halifax's natural conservatism and his displeasure at the Parliament Act of 1910 suggest that he had a weak commitment to the full expression of the concept of representative democracy. Examination of Halifax's responses to the political crisis of 1910 confirms Halifax's displeasure with the Parliament Act but also confirms his commitment to pragmatic political action that required foundational institutional change.⁷⁶ Halifax eventually supported the Parliament Act rather than accept the government to force the creation of new peers and the passing of the Parliament Act. On one level, the same pragmatism applies to the issue of spiritual independence of the church in 1899. Halifax was not only an astute politician, but he had also accepted as necessary a new order for the church. He continued:

Surely we should appeal to English sense and English justice, we should ask on behalf of the church a measure of liberty and such opportunities for supplying her own needs as has been bestowed on members of the state in regard of civil and political matters... It was the false policy of restriction and restraint which in past days lost this country the United States of America.⁷⁷

⁷⁴ Ibid., 341.

⁷⁵ Ibid., 342.

⁷⁶ Lockhart, vol II, 198-199.

⁷⁷ *Church Times*, 43 (November 1899): 716.

The means of applying the necessary justice are available only through a new ecclesiastical order that must mirror the new political order. However, Halifax's public adoption of the liberal icons reflects more than pragmatism. It also reflects the subtle influence of liberal ideals on the catholic movement within the Church of England. The diversity of liturgical practice and the individualism of the many members of the movement demonstrate the strong influence of modern (nineteenth century) thought on the seeming conservative and even reactionary character of the catholic revival of the Church of England. Thus Halifax's statements reflect more the public adoption of the language of liberalism than the acceptance of new ideas. This is not to suggest that the ideals did not clash with the traditional ideals of the catholic movement. Anti-modernism was held in tension with the acceptance of liberal ideals.⁷⁸ One example of such tension concerns church reform and the place of laity in the government of the church and will be discussed in the next chapter.

The Archbishops' decision against reservation and incense was regarded initially as a major loss to the catholic movement. However, the Lambeth Opinion was regarded as a failure almost at once. The tenor of the church and the episcopate soon aligned itself with the justice-freedom-toleration motif as expressed by Halifax in the above mentioned speech. Bishops did not strictly enforce the ruling. Bishops, such as Winnington-Ingram of London, worked with his clergy to accommodate the moderate proponents of incense and reservation.⁷⁹ Even Halifax urged the moderate Anglo-Catholics to cooperate and urged the radicals, such as the Rev. Myddleton Evans, of St. Michaels Shoreditch, to defer to their bishop.⁸⁰ New episcopal appointments such as Gore, Paget, and Winnington-Ingram, showed the increasing influence of the catholic movement or those sympathetic to it. A new way of dealing with toleration of liturgical diversity needed to be found in the Church of England. The forum for that issue would be the Royal Commission on Ecclesiastical Discipline of 1904-1906.

The Royal Commission on Ecclesiastical Discipline: 1904-1906

The call for church reform that Halifax implied in his speech in 1899, cited previously, was only part of a larger movement for church reform. The Church of England since the re-establishment of functional Convocations in the mid-nineteenth century had begun a long process towards both autonomy from Parliamentary control and a reshaping of the governing institutions of the church. The reform efforts accelerated after the Archbishops' Lambeth Opinion on Incense and Reservation. In 1903-05 the Church of England on its own initiative created the Representative Church Council—the Convocations of both provinces together with their respective Houses of Laymen sitting together.⁸¹ The Representative Church Council lacked statutory authority, but represented the church's attempt to provide a unified, representative, and national voice for the

⁷⁸ T. J. Jackson Lears, *No Place of Grace* (Pantheon, NY, 1981). Lears develops the concept of this modern anti-modern tension in the American context through the example of Vida Scudder

⁷⁹ Yates, 324.

⁸⁰ Ibid.

⁸¹ Rodes, 339.

church.⁸² Parliament still retained effective control. In 1903-04, the anti-Ritualists continued to press Parliament for new measures to control the catholic movement in the Church of England.⁸³ There was a move within the House of Commons to establish a select committee to inquire into ecclesiastical disorders. However, the establishment of a Select Committee of the House of Commons was unacceptable to many within the church and not just those of the catholic movement. The English Church Union opposed such a plan as constituting a blatant Erastian measure.⁸⁴ Randall Davidson, the Archbishop of Canterbury, also opposed a select committee on both practical and theological grounds. The existence of such a committee would serve to anger many of the clergy as the committee could certainly contain non-churchman and even members hostile to the church. It was felt that bishops answering questions of a committee of the House of Commons was incompatible to their episcopal position as Father-in-God to the clergy. A select committee would also be a challenge to the proposed Representative Church Council. After consulting other bishops, Davidson convinced the Prime Minister, A.J. Balfour, that a Royal Commission would be a far better manner for inquiry. A Royal Commission would be less political and could be appointed with only churchman. Precedents existed for such a form of inquiry: the Ritual Commission of 1867 and the Ecclesiastical Courts Commission of 1881. Balfour finally agreed and in March 1904, announced the appointment of the Royal Commission on Ecclesiastical Discipline.⁸⁵ The commission contained fourteen members, mostly lay, and met for two years, finally reporting in 1906.⁸⁶ The first conclusion of the Royal Commission was that, “the law of public worship in the Church of England is too narrow for the life of the present generation.”⁸⁷ The need to tolerate and even to value liturgical and ceremonial diversity was recognized. This was a great victory for the catholic movement. It vindicated their long calls for liturgical diversity and liturgical reform within the Church of England and would, first, bring immediate increased toleration for catholic practices and, secondly, started the process of prayer book revision.

The conclusions of the Royal Commission, crafted mostly by Sir Lewis Dibdin, the low church Dean of the Arches, and the high church Bishop of Oxford, Dr. Paget, reflected a position long held and expounded by Halifax and the English Church Union. Throughout the 1890s, Halifax had been calling for acceptance of liturgical diversity. At the Church Congress at Hull in 1890, Halifax stated in his paper on the due Limits of Ritual, “I submit that in the present circumstances to make any attempt to lay down a definite standard of ritual with the object of enforcing anything like ritual uniformity is impossible.”⁸⁸ And again at the Church Congress of 1897, Halifax spoke on the topic of “The Expediency of Allowing Within Limits a Variety of Uses within the Same Church.” He pointed out the existence of diversity within branches of the communions of the catholic church—the English and Scottish rites within the Episcopal Church of Scotland and the Mozarabic and Ambrosian rites within the Roman Catholic Church. Halifax

⁸² T. C. Hope and F. Holiday, *The Representative Church Council* (London: Church Printing Company, 1905), 3-12.

⁸³ Yates, 327.

⁸⁴ Lockhart, vol. II, 143.

⁸⁵ Bell, 352-362.

⁸⁶ Yates, 327.

⁸⁷ *Royal Commission on Ecclesiastical Discipline (Report)* Item 400.

⁸⁸ *Official Record of the Church Congress 1890 (Hull)* (London: Bemrose and Sons, 1891), 420.

prophetically wrote that modification of the Book of Common Prayer or the Act of Uniformity through parliamentary action was not practical. He, again, prophetically called for the use of the episcopate's *ius liturgicum* to make necessary corrections to the liturgy.⁸⁹ The Royal Commission seemingly offered Halifax and the English Church Union not only a forum to present their views but a way of achieving substantive gains in their position.

However, Halifax and the English Church Union maintained a highly ambivalent relationship with the Royal Commission. But it is the ambiguity and its resolution that provides significant insight into Halifax's position within the Church of England.

Halifax described the proposal to appoint a Select Committee of the House of Commons as sheer impertinence. He thought the Royal Commission a better idea, but he wrote to Hill, the Secretary of the English Church Union, that the authority of the Royal Commission should not be recognized.⁹⁰ This attitude is certainly borne out in the Minutes of Evidence of the Royal Commission. The Church Association presented fifty-one official witnesses to eventually only two official witnesses from the English Church Union.⁹¹ Well-known Anglo-Catholics, such as the Rev. Percy Dearmer and Fr. Frere of the Community of the Resurrection, testified as independent witnesses. In June 1904, Athelstan Riley, testified before the Royal Commission as an independent witness. Riley was Halifax's confidant, friend, and colleague. He was also Vice President of the English Church Union as well as chairman of the Alcuin Club, a member of the House of Laymen of the Representative Church Council, and a member of the London and Truro Diocesan Conferences. However, Riley stated his need to appear as an independent witness, "I do not think for a moment that the Union will appear."⁹² Riley then went on to testify about the failure of many *Protestant* clergymen to observe the rubrics of the Prayer Book. Nine months later H.W. Hill, the Secretary of the English Church Union, did testify. Hill was asked by the chairman, "Why has no organized effort been made by the English Church Union or other societies with which you are connected to produce evidence as to omission or neglect in church services?" Hill's response was that "throughout the history of the union the idea has been not to interfere with other people... It has always been the policy of the English Church Union not to make reprisals."⁹³ And Hill, as opposed to Riley's indictments of clergymen's failings, maintained the doctrine of toleration held the union. However, the chairman's question is illustrative that the absence of official English Church Union was noticeable. The English Church Union had, by this time, not only a recognized voice but an expectation to present evidence to the Royal Commission. Hill's testimony in March 1905 represented a shift in the position of the English Church Union with respect to the Royal Commission.

Halifax eventually testified before the Royal Commission. He did so on two occasions in July 1905. His testimony was unusual in that he insisted in reading a prepared written statement before and at the conclusion of his testimony.⁹⁴ Halifax's biographer records that Halifax answered 619 questions of the commission on a range of

⁸⁹ *Official Record of the Church Congress 1897 (Nottingham)* (London: Bemrose and Sons, 1897), 123-125.

⁹⁰ Lockhart, vol. II, 143.

⁹¹ *Minutes of Evidence, The Royal Commission on Ecclesiastical Discipline*, 4 vols. (London: Wyman and Sons Ltd, 1906).

⁹² *Ibid*, vol. I, 64.

⁹³ *Ibid*, vol. II, 88.

⁹⁴ *Ibid.*, vol III, 367 *passim*.

practical and theological subjects.⁹⁵ What is illuminating of Halifax's testimony is not the content. A reading of the testimony indicates that Halifax added little new to the discussion. He was often on the defensive. He was an amateur historian and theologian facing learned theologians, historians, and lawyers. Halifax's testimony is not mentioned in Yates' nor Bentley's nor Michin's discussion of the Royal Commission. The significance is that Halifax did testify; not in what he said, but when he testified. Halifax testified in the third and final round of meetings of the commission. This round of testimony was primarily devoted to testimonies of officials and particularly bishops of the church. Other laymen testified during this third round of hearings, such as Sir Lewis Dibdin and Sir W.G. Phillimore, but these were both ecclesiastical legal officials. The majority of the twenty Bishops of the Church of England, and the (unexpected) American Bishop of Albany (W. C. Doane) testified during this final session of the Royal Commission.⁹⁶ Halifax did not testify in the company of his counterparts in the Church Association or other societies. He testified among the bishops and the senior ecclesiastical legal officers and not among the leaders of independent church societies.

It is not known why Halifax testified when he did. Did it represent a political strategy to enhance his position? Did it represent an evolution of Halifax's attitude towards the Royal Commission? Both are important questions deserving answers. However, what is more important for this study is that Halifax's position was accepted among the ecclesiastical and legal officers. Nothing was recorded in the minutes objecting to Halifax's testimony in the third and final round of hearings. Halifax seemed to be accepted by the Royal Commission as having the status and (political) authority to testify among the bishops and legal officers of the Church of England. Halifax testified only as President of the English Church Union. The manner of Halifax's testimony before the Royal Commission was a public and even official recognition of Halifax's lay political authority, albeit an unofficial authority, within the church.

Conclusion

This chapter has traced the development of Halifax's authority and the modes by which he exercised authority as leader of the English Church Union in defense of catholic principle in the Church of England. Halifax's social position helped him secure the leadership of the English Church Union and helped provide him with continued access to the political and church leaders of the mid-to-late Victorian era. However, it was Halifax's long and wise leadership of the English Church Union that established his legitimacy and authority within the Church of England. Halifax kept the catholic movement unified under the banner of the union. Through his actions, Pusey was not allowed to resign, and Gore was protected. Halifax effectively used personal persuasion and public action to demonstrate the power of the English Church Union. And he evolved his message to resonate with the changing ecclesiastical and political climate. Halifax changed the tenor of his speeches from strident demands for toleration to demands for justice that should be found within a construct of liberal democratic society. And at the heart of Halifax's message was that the old form of establishment, that is parliamentary

⁹⁵ Lockhart, vol. II, 146.

⁹⁶ *Minutes of Evidence of the Royal Commission on Ecclesiastical Discipline*—compiled from lists of witnesses.

Erastianism, was no longer valid either theologically or politically. Spiritual independence and autonomy for the Church of England was required. And thus, paradoxically, the natural conservative Halifax would become an enabler of church reform and the formal institutions of self government for the Church of England.

Chapter V

Halifax and the Reform of the Government of the Church of England

The examination of Halifax's leadership of the catholic movement within the Church of England demonstrated the development of models of unofficial political lay authority operating within the context of a pressure group. The authority of the English Church Union, and Halifax personally, depended on its status, access, and strength. Halifax demonstrated such models of lay leadership in the era in which the autonomy of the Church of England was emerging as both necessary and inevitable. This developing autonomy of the Church of England required not only the evolution of unofficial political authorities but then the establishment of new modes of formal institutional authority in revived and new governing structures. This study now shifts to the second of these developments. This chapter examines Halifax's beliefs, actions, and influence on the reform of the government of the Church of England. It will demonstrate that Halifax's beliefs in the spiritual independence of the church, his pragmatism in ecclesiastical politics, and his convictions in the community of the church in which all active members have voice substantively aided the development of representative synodical government in the Church of England.

Halifax is most often regarded as a staunch defender of the established socio-political order. A natural conservative, Halifax's opposition to the Parliament Act of 1910, mentioned previously, exemplifies his affiliation and preference for the established traditional political order. Halifax was known as a stickler for old customs and proprieties. Halifax's biographer recounts that his relative Lady Grey once said to him when he was inveighing against modern tendencies, "But things change Charlie." Halifax responded, "But I like the old things."¹ Halifax certainly was comfortable with the established socio-political order that had served his interests, but he was also willing to be an agent of change. His modern political pragmatism and the skillful use of interest group politics in defense of catholic principles has been shown in the previous chapter. Thus there is a paradox in Halifax, or perhaps better titled, a tension between the modern and traditional or anti-modern. This tension is clearly expressed in the ambiguities of Halifax's ideals for reform of the government of the Church of England.

It is important to assess properly Halifax's contribution to the development of synodical institutions of church governance within the larger historical context. Many have argued -and this author agrees with the position—that the repeal of the Test and Corporation Acts, Roman Catholic Emancipation, and the rise of representative governance demonstrated by the Reform Act of 1832 set in motion the slow, but inevitable, development of synodical government with lay participation for the Church of England.² Church reform was necessary and the English liberal concept of political order made it necessary that any reform would include lay participation. This evolutionary process took almost a century. It must be acknowledged that Halifax was not a primary champion or leader in the cause for radical church reform. Charles Gore, for example, played a much more substantive role in the cause through his leadership of the Church

¹ Lockhart, vol II, 103.

² Sachs, 191.

Reform League.³ Halifax's contributions to church reform were facilitory in nature. He articulated the right of the laity to have voice in all matters of church affairs, and he kept the catholic movement active in the debate for institutional reform of the Church of England. Halifax's engagement of the issue legitimated the discussion and participation in the question of church reform within the catholic movement.

This chapter considers four topics. The first examines the context for church reform in the nineteenth century Church of England and, in particular, the original position of the catholic movement towards reform. While there was broad and growing support in the church for increased lay participation in church councils, reform of Convocation, and autonomy from parliamentary control, many in the catholic movement strongly opposed any church reform that involved formal lay authority. Church government, especially in matters spiritual, was the sole responsibility of the episcopate and the presbyters. The second and third sections consider Halifax's personal views on the general question of lay authority and the establishment of the Church of England. These two subjects bound the question of Victorian church reform. The fourth section examines Halifax's position and actions with respect to the reform of institutions of church governance. What proposals did Halifax advocate? How did he and the catholic movement participate in the emerging synodical institutions of church government? And finally, how was Halifax instrumental in the creation of the Church Assembly?

The Context for Church Reform

The quest for reform and autonomy for the Church of England arose out of the forces of social and political change that produced Roman Catholic Emancipation, the admission of non-conformists to Parliament, and the Reform Bill of 1832. Samuel Taylor Coleridge, Thomas Arnold, and Lord Henley produced plans for moderate reform of the church in the 1820s and 1830s.⁴ None was anti-establishment in character, but all embraced characteristics of liberal reform: modernization and rationalization. Arnold and Henley embraced the new liberalism wanting to make the church more effective in its mission. Arnold proposed small dioceses, the equalization of episcopal incomes, and the creation of diocesan councils with lay and clerical members as the cornerstone for church reform. The laity should, Arnold wrote, have a greater share in the ordinary government of the church.⁵ These advanced and theoretical proposals were followed by practical parliamentary-initiated reforms such as the Ecclesiastical Commission and the passing of a number of acts that restricted pluralities, reformed cathedral chapters, and equalized bishops' stipends. The 1840s saw a growing interest in the revival of Convocation as the appropriate forum and the means to bring about both church reform and the spiritual independence of the church. This proposal was greatly strengthened by the Gorham judgment of 1850 which united diverse opinion to support the revival of Convocation. Throughout the 1850s in the Province of Canterbury and in the 1860s in the Province of

³ Prestige, 187-190.

⁴ Samuel Taylor Coleridge *On the Constitution of the Church and State According to the Idea of Each*, (London, J.M. Dent and Sons Ltd, 1972)—original publication 1830, Thomas Arnold, *Principles of Church Reform* (London: SPCK, 1962)—original publication 1832, and Eden Robert Henley (Lord Henley), *A Plan for Church Reform* (London, 1832).

⁵ Arnold, 122-124.

York, Convocation was gradually revived.⁶ Soon after the revival of the Convocation, in 1857, the issue of whether laity should have a voice and vote was discussed.⁷ However, the proposal received no strong support.

In the mid-nineteenth century, the question of the proper role of the laity in the government of the Church of England was a complex subject in which theology, the heritage of the Establishment, and new models of political legitimacy competed for dominance. Theologically, the evangelicals supported the concept of lay representation in the councils of the church on the basis of the extension of the doctrine of the priesthood of all believers. A later evangelical summarized their consistent theological position,

There is priesthood of all. Laity encompasses all the people of God without distinction... The laity by means of parish councils, diocesan synods, and a national assembly would resurrect the position they had in the early church.⁸

Archbishop Sumner, an evangelical, in 1853 recognized this principle in his Colonial Churches Bill of 1853 in which he proposed a structure of synodical government for the Church of England in the colonies.⁹ While the bill passed only the House of Lords, nevertheless the principles in the bill served as an important basis for the development of synodical government for the churches in Canada and Australia. However, the attachment to the Establishment, with parliamentary authority as an apex of church government was very strong among the Evangelicals and many of the emerging broad churchmen. To these groups, Parliament still represented the voice of the laity in the affairs of the Church of England. Parliament could and should work with the revived Convocations to govern the Church of England. There was also a practical consideration. Support for the established role of Parliament in the government of the Church of England was also a means of opposing the rising catholic movement. Parliamentary control served as a brake on the radicalism of the catholic revivalists.

The position of the catholic movement on church reform was more complex. The opening salvo of the Oxford Movement, John Keble's Sermon on National Apostasy, was a response to the government's suppression of the Irish bishoprics without the approval of the church. This Erastian measure was compounded, in the minds of the leaders of the Oxford Movement, by the loss of legitimacy of Parliament as the legislature for the Church of England. Parliament after 1832 was no longer an assembly of churchmen. The unitive ideal of society expressed by Hooker and accepted into the national myth, that every member of the commonwealth is also a member of the church, was destroyed.¹⁰ The Oxford Movement adopted the concept of the spiritual independence of the church as

⁶ Kemp, 180-187. The Lower House of Convocation was not a body representative of the clergy in a modern sense of representation. Most members of the lower house were or represented the so called higher clergy—Dean, Archdeacons, and representatives of cathedral chapters. The elected clergy proctors were dominated by the ex officio members

⁷ Thompson, 106.

⁸ Thompson J. Denton, "The Priesthood and the Laity" in *Church and Reform, Essays Relating to the Reform of the Government of the Church of England* (London: Bemrose and Sons, 1902).

⁹ Henry Lowther Clark, *Constitutional Church Government in the Dominions Beyond the Seas and in Other Parts of the Anglican Communion* (London: SPCK, 1924) 12, 241.

¹⁰ Somewhat surprising the existence of Presbyterian (Church of Scotland) members from Scottish constituencies is often ignored.

the pillar of church reform. Spiritual independence for the church would not destroy the Establishment, but only the Erastian character applied to Establishment. The established church should be an equal partner with the state through its own institutions, convocation on the provincial level and synods of the clergy on the diocesan level. Pusey wrote, "The Church and State are co-extensive. The Parliament of England with the Convocation thereto annexed."¹¹ The catholic movement insisted at a minimum on the restoration of the pre-1717 Reformation Settlement. It was the interference with the spiritual privileges of the church by secular authority that was intolerable.¹² The application of secular authority in spiritual matters, as in the case of appeals from ecclesiastical courts going to the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, was illegitimate and invalid. However, such restoration was really radical change to many nineteenth-century churchmen.

The adherence to the principle of spiritual independence of the church together with a high view of the priesthood by the catholic revivalists made the inclusion of the laity in the councils in the church problematic. Pusey provided the Oxford Movement's response to the initial demands for increased lay involvement in the government of the church in his book, *Councils of the Church*, in 1858.¹³ Pusey set out to demonstrate from an historical analysis of the early church that the laity had no place in the councils of the church on the level of equality with the clergy. Pusey argued that the influence of the laity was to be indirect through the appointment of bishops and other senior appointments and that the civil assembly should give civil sanction to temporal matters as decided by the church. Spiritual matters must, Pusey argued, be left to the ecclesiastical body, that is, Convocation.¹⁴ Pusey recognized that the bishops of the Scottish Episcopal Church had voted in 1852 that admission of laymen into ecclesiastical synods "is not inconsistent with the word of God and in not contrary to the pure constitution of the church."¹⁵ Nonetheless, Pusey would condemn the constitution of the Protestant Episcopal Church of the United States as having abandoned a bulwark of the faith in the function of the office inherited by bishops. "The admission of laity to governance belongs to bodies that reject the apostolic succession."¹⁶ Pusey would conclude at the end of his introduction that:

The admission of laymen to a coordinate voice in the church is not a heretical act, yet it is an innovation upon that rule which the inspired apostles left with the church. To depart from the rule must needs be the commencement of a perilous course, the issue of which God Alone knoweth and from which He may preserve us.¹⁷

Pusey was not alone in his opposition to the admission of laity into the councils of the church. Bishop Forbes of Brechin, the first Tractarian bishop, was even more vociferous in his opposition. He charged that the influence of laity upon church government, as

¹¹ R. F. Wilson (ed.) *Letters by the Late Rev. J. Keble, MA, Letters of Spiritual Counsel and Guidance* (Oxford: James Park, 1870), 233.

¹² William E. Gladstone, *The Royal Supremacy* (London: John Murray, 1877).

¹³ Published a year after the first proposal to admit laity to a reformed Convocation.

¹⁴ Edward B. Pusey, *The Councils of the Church from the Council of Jerusalem to the Council of Constantinople Chiefly as to their Constitutions* (Oxford, John Henry Parker, 1858), 2-9.

¹⁵ *Ibid.*, 8.

¹⁶ *Ibid.*, 25.

¹⁷ *Ibid.*, 27.

demonstrated by the Church of Ireland and the Church of Canada, was pernicious.¹⁸ Forbes feared, and perhaps with some justification, that lay authority would result in the evangelical domination and suppression of the catholic movement.¹⁹ But Forbes' opposition was not merely reactive to the political situation. He thought it absurd that unlearned men should speak and vote on subjects in which they have no training.²⁰ Spiritual matters belonged with the clergy; to those who were theologically trained. The laity must be relegated to assist in management of the purely secular work of the church. Pusey, Halifax's mentor, and Bishop Forbes, his friend, feared the introduction of laity into church government as a dangerous and irregular development. The admittance of laity would be a challenge to catholic order and the catholic character of the church. However, Pusey and Forbes both recognized and accepted lay cooperation in what was termed secular matters. The limits of such lay cooperation and the distinction between matters spiritual and temporal will become an important consideration as Halifax's involvement in church reform is developed.

It is important to recognize that this description of the catholic movement's attitude oversimplifies the situation. The catholic movement's attitude toward church reform was neither monolithic nor static. The statement of the Episcopal Church of Scotland bishops mentioned above and the subsequent admission of laity into representative church bodies of this church in 1876 indicates that there was not complete opposition to lay participation in synodical government.²¹ Charles Gore would become a leader for church reform in the 1890s under the principle that "laity must be associated with the clergy at every stage of government from top to bottom."²² However, Gore's position did represent an evolution and even radical departure from the original orientation of the catholic movement within the Church of England with respect to church reform. This increasing diversity of the response of Anglo-Catholics to church reform parallels Halifax's evolutionary response to church reform.

Halifax on the Role of the Laity

Halifax's attitude on the position of the laity within the life of the church is no better demonstrated than by his own actions. He did not articulate a formal theology of the laity in his writings so his actions speak to the subject. Halifax participated fully in the life of the church as a leader and as an ecclesiastical politician, as theologian and historian, and even as an unofficial emissary of Anglicanism in his quest for unity. He represented church interests, particularly the catholic interest, in the House of Lords. He even took part in the emerging councils of the church as a member of the House of Laymen in the Province of York. This particular participation will be examined in a later section of this chapter. He was willing to confront ecclesiastical and political authorities on issues that

¹⁸ A. P. Forbes, Bishop of Brechin, *A Charge to the Synod at Brechin* (Dundee: Winter, Duncan and Co., 1873), 4-6.

¹⁹ The situation would be reversed a generation later when some Evangelicals would support the establishment of the Representative Church Council in an attempt to control the catholic movement.

²⁰ *Ibid.*, 8.

²¹ Rowan Strong, *Episcopalianism in Nineteenth Century Scotland, Religious Reponse to a Modernizing Society* (Oxford : Oxford University Press, 2002), 7.

²² Gore, Charles, *Reform of the Church of England, Being a Speech Delivered at Cambridge on February 1, 1899* (London: Church Reform League, 1899) Issue 18.

were not simply temporal matters. Halifax's articulation and defense of catholic principles represented full involvement in the spiritual matters of the church. Halifax concerned himself with doctrine, discipline, and liturgy of the church, the traditional hallmarks of the spiritual matters Halifax's high view of the laity within the life of the church was clearly illustrated in a speech from 1878 that was reprinted in the American church magazine, the *Church Eclectic*. In the midst of the debate over the Public Worship Regulation Act, Halifax found himself in opposition to episcopal authority. He wrote:

Nothing can well be so painful to us as being placed in apparent opposition to the least member of the episcopate, but if such a position should be forced upon us let us remember, that it was, I quote the words of Dr. Neale, "a single bishop who addressed the patriarch of the church with the *Anethema tibi proevaricatur liberii*, when that Pope tolerated Arianism, they were simple priests who appealed against the Second Patriarch of the Church; and him too a saint when Dionysius of Alexandria appeared to deny the Catholic faith concerning the Son of God. It was a simple layman who attacked the second Patriarch of the Church concerning his errors on the Incarnation: and bishop, priests and laymen have received eternal honor as having been valiant for the truth on earth."²³

Halifax clearly held that every person, regardless of order within the church has the responsibility and right to defend truth. This justified Halifax's opposition to the English episcopate, but also by reference it justified Halifax's involvement in the spiritual matters of the church. The laity had a full right of voice in the spiritual matters of the church: a right grounded in the defense of truth.

The relationship of this statement to the views of Pusey and Forbes raises a number of challenges. The Anglo-Catholic movement, once it emerged from the confines of the university, always had a significant lay leadership. The catholic revival was never a clergy-only or clergy-dominated movement. The English Church Union is a clear example. Leadership and representation was shared among the clergy and lay members and the founding and second president were laymen.²⁴ However, the leaders of the catholic movement articulated a distinction between the authority of the laity and the clergy in spiritual matters. However, Halifax's statements and actions as leader of the movement challenge the absoluteness of the distinction. The acceptance of Halifax's understanding made the original opposition to lay authority on matters of doctrine, discipline, and liturgy increasingly artificial and untenable. The maintenance of this artificial distinction between the informal exercise of authority and the formal exercise seems strangely reminiscent of Bagehot's distinction between dignified and effective authority in the English constitution. The concept of movement is critical in this observation. The change was not immediate, but there was a slow moderation of the original antagonism to lay participation in all range of church affairs.

Halifax's understanding of the role of the laity cannot be understood solely in terms of rights. Halifax understanding of the role of the laity was based upon rights of participation dependent upon fulfillment of responsibilities. Membership in the church

²³ Wood, Charles L. (sub. Lord Halifax)," A Speech to the English Church Union", *The Church Eclectic* 6 (August 1878): 364.

²⁴ Yates, 70.

was not coterminous with membership in the commonwealth. One element of this position originates in the increasing illegitimacy of Parliament to act for the church. Halifax would insist “upon her (i.e., the church) inherent and indefeasible right to govern herself according to her own principles free from the interference of those who do not belong to her communion.” But Halifax coupled this right, almost immediately with the condition for its proper exercise. “However extensive and important the rights of the laity may be, the exercise of those rights is strictly dependent upon fulfillment of the obligations imposed upon the laity as members of the church.”²⁵ The obligations were communicant membership and conformity with the canons of the church. Thus, Halifax applied the model of a voluntarist society rather than a national church. The church is a separate holy and sacred society and is not coterminous with the commonwealth of English society. Visible signs of membership are required to participate in the society. However, Halifax held this understanding of the nature of the church in tension with continued support for the establishment of the Church of England.

Halifax and the Establishment of the Church of England

Halifax had, like many within the catholic movement within the Church of England, a tenuous and strained relationship with the conditions of establishment. Pusey reaffirmed Hooker’s model, which was itself based on Thomistic concepts, of a unitary notion for religious and civil society united under the Crown.²⁶ The proper form for this structure was the annexing of Convocation to Parliament and not the Parliamentary domination of the Church of England in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. The spiritual independence of the church was essential to its sacred character. But the national character of the church remained important to Halifax. In a paper delivered at the Church Congress in 1878, he stated that the “National Church is the Church of God sent to the nation, not some merely human compromise of Parliamentary origin.”²⁷ The divine character of the national church is primary; its means of establishment is secondary. However, the church was not an organ of the state but part of the Church of God affiliated with the state in that particular land. The Erastian model that functioned in England after the suppression of Convocation in 1717 was the manifestation of Protestant influence at the expense of the catholicity of the church. Halifax found this model of church establishment illegitimate. He declared, “We can never consent in the interests of popular Protestantism to be treated like a Department of the Civil Service.”²⁸ While Halifax was using strong rhetoric, the Erastian concept of the church as a parliamentary creature remained alive. Sir William Harcourt was described by Balfour’s niece as “an Erastian undiluted” and Halifax was even less charitable describing him as a nineteenth-century Titus Oates.²⁹ Halifax’s affinity towards establishment may be explained by the confluence of Halifax’s traditional conservatism and his understanding of the catholic nature of the church. However, understanding Halifax’s partiality for establishment is complicated by his threats of disestablishment. The potential threat to support

²⁵ Lord Halifax, “Letter to the English Church Union”, *Church Times* (London) 45 (March 15, 1901): 330.

²⁶ Edward, B. Pusey, *The Royal Supremacy* (Oxford, John Henry Parker, 1858).

²⁷ *Church Congress 1878*, 116.

²⁸ *Ibid.*, 121.

²⁹ Bentley, 64.

disestablishment of the Church of England remained a strong subtext of the Anglo-Catholic movement throughout the latter years of Victoria's reign. Radical Anglo-Catholics already had formed the Liberationist Society to campaign for disestablishment as the means of preserving the sacral character of the church.³⁰ Halifax did not support the aims of the Liberation Society, but he was willing at many times to use the threat of disestablishment as a political weapon. Thus, Halifax's understanding of the establishment of the Church of England was only a contingent formulation for good order, never an absolute.

The understanding of the nature and manner of the Church of England was a theme that permeated Halifax's defense of catholic principles. The opposition to secular courts trying spiritual cases and the concept of spiritual independence was constructed on a concept of establishment. Pusey and Gladstone had both written on the issue of royal supremacy which framed the position of the catholic movement within the Church of England.³¹ Pusey argued for the legitimacy of royal supremacy, properly constituted, from ancient precedents on the Constantinian and Carolingian models. Gladstone argued for a properly constituted established church based upon the ideals of the English Reformation. Halifax used these models of establishment in the early years of the Ritual controversies. In 1899 Halifax published his pamphlet, *The Rights of The Church of England under the Reformation Settlement*.³² There were three factors that prompted Halifax's publication. The anti-ritualist Church Discipline Act of 1898 had failed but had stirred interest in the functioning of ecclesiastical courts. The Archbishop of Canterbury was preparing a church-sponsored bill to revise the operation of the ecclesiastical courts. And thirdly, Gladstone and Pusey had both died; their works were a generation out of date, and the idea of establishment needed restatement to meet the needs of the contemporary debate. The pamphlet was an attempt by Halifax to positively influence the Archbishops' proposed revision of the ecclesiastical courts.

Halifax's position is quite simple. The way to proceed with church reform is to apply the great reformation statutes as they were intended.³³ The constitutional organization of church and state affected at the time of establishment of the reformed religion was carefully crafted to respect the needs and responsibilities of the two societies—the church and the commonwealth. The fundamental character of the original settlement was to preserve the spiritual independence of the church. “Church authority was a true self governing authority.”³⁴ The problem was, according to Halifax, that the original construction of the Reformation settlement had been distorted and the great reformation statutes misused. Halifax argued his case using an historical rather than a theological framework. He ignored the theological and philosophical arguments for establishment, accepting these as normative. He examined the relevant statutes of the reformation period, in particular the Henrician Statute of Appeals and latter statements by monarchs that ed the spiritual independence of the Church of England. Halifax presented

³⁰ Marsh, 28-30.

³¹ Gladstone,—originally published as a letter to the Lord Bishop of London in 1850 and E. B. Pusey, *The Royal Supremacy* (Oxford: John Henry Parker, 1850).

³² Lord Halifax, *The Rights of the Church of England under the Reformation Settlement* (London, English Church Union, 1899).

³³ Lord Halifax, *The Rights of the Church of England Under the Reformation*, 4.

³⁴ *Ibid.*, 11.

the Reformation era as a golden age that had been corrupted over time.³⁵ However, Halifax was selective in his use of historical evidence. One such example is Elizabeth I's message to the Commons on May 22, 1572, which stated, "The Queen says it is her pleasure that henceforth no bill concerning religion shall be preferred or received into this House unless the same shall be first considered and liked by the clergy."³⁶ However, Halifax does not interpret Elizabeth's statement with regard to other religious regulatory actions in her reign, such as the Injunctions or Advertisements, which were issued without consulting Convocation.³⁷ Such historical selectivity suggests two possible causes. The first is that Halifax is more attached to the nostalgic concept of the Establishment and the ideals of the Reformation Settlement than the actual history. The Establishment is important because it is part of the national heritage and Halifax, the conservative, favored the ancient constitution for its antiquity. But this explanation is not sufficient, because Halifax is recommending change, albeit a restoration. Halifax's argument for establishment cannot be separated from the defense of catholic principles. Halifax's argument, his historical examination, serves as a political and polemical defense of the rights of Church of England as understood by the catholic movement. However, Halifax's nostalgic and idealistic views on establishment constrained his understanding of the need for church reform.

Halifax and Church Reform

Halifax's most basic concept of church reform was the reclamation of the spiritual independence of the Church of England through the proper restitution of the powers of Convocation, the proper ordering of the ecclesiastical courts, and the revival of diocesan synods of the bishop and clergy. This was a romantic anti-modernist ideal. This section focuses on Halifax's attitudes and actions with respect to the specifics of church reform and in particular the proper role of lay representation in the councils of the church. This section shall demonstrate that Halifax's attitude toward lay participation in the government of the church evolved slowly, building upon his concept of the inherent rights of the laity to speak on matters spiritual and temporal. Halifax's attitude toward lay cooperation inevitably led to Halifax's acceptance of the need for formal lay participation within the government of the church.

The evolution of Halifax's position of lay authority was extremely gradual. Halifax long opposed the granting of laity any say in matters of doctrine, discipline, or liturgy. In this regard, Halifax continued the model established by Pusey: spiritual matters should rest with the bishops and clergy although secular matters could and perhaps should require formal lay participation. As early as 1872, Halifax voiced his own opposition to the introduction of laity into synods at a paper delivered at the Church Congress at Leeds.³⁸ He maintained this formal attitude throughout the Victorian and early Edwardian periods. In 1901, when the idea of a national synod for the Church of

³⁵ Many Anglo-Catholics were ambivalent to the Reformation. Halifax does not give any impression that he hold this view. The argument is made without irony.

³⁶ *Ibid.*, 13.

³⁷ J. H. R. Moorman, *A History of the Church of England* (Harrisburg: Morehouse Publishing, 1980) 214-215.

³⁸ *Official Report of the Church Congress 1872 (Leeds)* (London: Thomas Ponsby, 1872), 55.

England that would develop into the Representative Church Council was first being discussed, Halifax reiterated his position that in such a national synod there should be no legal powers for the representatives of the laity.³⁹ And in 1904 Halifax led the English Church Union to pass a motion that opposed the plan to give the laity veto over questions of doctrine and discipline in the Representative Church Council.⁴⁰ The constitution of the Representative Church Council allowed for the House of Laity to have veto, without amendment, over these matters as passed by the House of Bishop and the House of Clergy.⁴¹ Halifax's attitude toward the formalization of lay participation in church government was remarkably consistent over four decades. However, the situation is more complicated than Halifax's opposition suggests.

Halifax himself fully participated in the debate over the matters spiritual. As President of the English Church Union he represented a movement that articulated and fought for particular doctrines, changes to the liturgy, and the manner of ecclesiastical discipline. He clearly recognized the right of the laity to make their voices heard through the unofficial channels of communication such as the English Church Union. Even more importantly, Halifax long supported the creation of formal structures by which lay representatives could give formal voice to their order in the councils of the church. In the same speech at the Church Congress at Leeds in which Halifax opposed the admittance of the laity into synods, he advocated the establishment of diocesan conferences consisting of lay and clerical representatives. Halifax proposed that "every question of doctrine, discipline, ritual, or administration should be open to discussion" by the diocesan conferences. Moreover "nothing should be submitted to synod until the matter had been discussed at conference."⁴² The freedom of discussion of all subjects, and not just those of a secular character, is a substantive move away from Pusey's understanding of the role of the laity in the government of the church. Halifax argued that at minimum the laity has the right of voice and influence through formal representative bodies. The laity should have a formal right of consultation. Halifax's acceptance and advocacy of the model of diocesan conferences, which became normative in the period, was itself a major advance for lay authority.

This would be the model that Halifax would continue to promote. In 1901 when he opposed the granting of formal authority to the laity in a national synod, he did not oppose a House of Laity, but only the granting of formal powers.⁴³ Similarly in 1904, Halifax exercised a moderating influence of the English Church Union's opposition to the proposed Representative Church Council. Many members of the union wanted to condemn the concept of a national synod for the Church of England. Halifax led the union to pass a moderate motion that asked that the proposed Representative Church Council exclude doctrine and discipline from its area of responsibility, require communicant status for electors, and define the responsibilities of the new body.⁴⁴ This statement is a far cry from outright condemnation of the concept of a synod with authoritative lay membership for the national church.

³⁹ *Church Union Gazette* 32 (July 1901): 212.

⁴⁰ *Church Union Gazette* 35 (July 1904): 59.

⁴¹ *Representative Church Council Constitution and Canons* (London: National Society, 1905), 10-12.

⁴² *Church Congress (1872)*, 58.

⁴³ *Church Union Gazette* 32 (July 1901): 212.

⁴⁴ *Church Union Gazette* 35 (July 1904): 199.

A constant theme of Halifax's model for formal lay cooperation, to use his expression, was indicated in the second part of the English Church Union motion on the Representative Church Council. Electors should be communicant members. Halifax first articulated this position as early as 1872 in a paper presented at the Church Congress when he proposed that diocesan conferences should be elected by bone fide communicants.⁴⁵ And it remained a critical element of his view of church government throughout his life. The management of the affairs of the church is the responsibility of the clergy and lay communicants working together.⁴⁶ Such a requirement was certainly based in the sacred character of the church. The church as a divine institution may be annexed to the state or nation but was not coterminous with the state. This position had practical advantages in that it restricted non-churchmen from influence in the affairs of the church. The model of the open vestry and the refusal of these vestries to pass church rates early in the nineteenth century under the influence of non-conformists and non-churchmen had left bitter memories.

The exclusive character of communicant membership as the basis of electoral participation also had an inclusive and radical component. If communicant membership was to maintain the Pauline ideal of universality and equality, then no differentiation should be made on the basis of gender. The English Church Union, under Halifax's leadership, established a position that "Women who are communicants and of full age must not be excluded because of their sex from taking part in the choice of those who shall act as representatives of the laity of the parish."⁴⁷ Supporting the right of communicant women to vote in parochial elections was one advanced position in the Church of England in 1904 especially for a movement branded as anti-modern and reactionary. However the position cannot be judged as innovative as the women's suffrage movement was already well-established and unmarried women and widows holding the proper property qualification had already secured the vote in local government elections in 1882. Nonetheless, the English Church Union's position represents an inclusive view of lay participation in the government of the church. Greater inclusivity represented greater lay authority.

At this point, it has been established that Halifax, and by extension the English Church Union, favored the establishment of formal representative institutions that would give voice to the laity. These institutions, with broad support, began to take shape within the Church of England in the 1870s and 1880s. Diocesan Conferences consisting of representatives of the clergy and laity become normative. In 1886, the Province of Canterbury established a House of Laymen, followed in 1892 by the Province of York.⁴⁸ These diocesan and provincial institutions were exactly the model as advocated by Halifax and the English Church Union. They gave voice to the interests of the laity. The institution of the Representative Church Council represented a further development in which lay representatives had concurrent authority or veto authority with the House of Bishops and Clergy.⁴⁹ But the Representative Church Council was a creation of the

⁴⁵ *Church Congress (1872)*, 58.

⁴⁶ *Church Union Gazette* 31 (February 5, 1900): 46-48.

⁴⁷ *Church Union Gazette* 35 (February 1904): 51.

⁴⁸ For the story of these developments see Thompson, Kenneth A., *Bureaucracy and Church Reform* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1970), Kemp, Eric W., *Counsel and Consent* (London: SPCK, 1961) and the *Diocesan Revival in the Church of England 1800-1870* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999)

⁴⁹ *Representative Church Council Constitutions and Canons*, 12.

church; formal authority remained in Parliament and the Convocations.⁵⁰ Internally the Church of England had settled the question of lay authority, although formally the reform of the government of the Church of England would need to wait until the passing of the Enabling Act of 1919 that established the Church Assembly. Regardless of the criticism of lay authority in the councils of the church, Halifax and the catholic movement embraced these representative church institutions. Halifax himself was a member and even vice chairman of the House of Laymen in the Province of York until he was defeated in 1901.⁵¹ Halifax ran and was elected to the Canterbury House of Laymen in the 1906 Representative Church Council elections for the Diocese of London. *The Church Union Gazette* was pleased to report that that in this election for the diocese of London there were sixty-six candidates for thirty-six seats and that thirty of the candidates represented the catholic movement and that twenty-three were elected, including Halifax, Athelstan Riley, Lord Stanmore, and Lord Hugh Cecil of the English Church Union.⁵² Thus Halifax and his colleagues within the catholic movement provided legitimacy for these new representative institutions by participation.

Halifax's positive attitude and activity toward lay participation in the deliberative assemblies of the Church of England may be surprising to some readers who have focused on the reluctance to grant formal authority to lay representative as the signature mark of the opposition of the catholic movement toward lay authority. However, the positive attitude towards lay participation is consistent with both the principles and pragmatic needs of the organization. Halifax believed in the right of all believers to speak the truth. The emerging institutions of lay representation also served the pragmatic need of providing a voice for the catholic movement within the Church of England. The appointments of bishops and the higher clergy by the government resulted in few Anglo-Catholic appointments to the bench of bishops, deaneries, archdeaconries, or canonries. At late as 1901, Gore greeted his nomination to the see of Worcester with surprise given his affiliation with the catholic movement and the English Church Union in particular.⁵³ The strength of the catholic movement was in the parishes and among the parochial clergy. Therefore institutions such as diocesan synods and conferences gave increased voice to the catholic movement by both its lay and clergy supporters. The House of Laymen in both provinces did the same even more so than Convocation. Thus these institutions furthered the catholic interest in the Church of England while at the same time advancing lay authority within the church.

The story of Halifax and church reform reached its climax in 1913. After a number of years of operation of the Representative Church Council, it was clear to many in the church that the unofficial status of the Representative Church Council structure required resolution. Parliament continued to block bills such as the Sheffield Bishopric Bill and ignored necessary church business. Divisions within and without the Church of England prevented liturgical reform from being properly addressed. Few within the church wanted Parliament to examine these matters in detail. On June 23, 1913, Halifax wrote his old friend Randall Davidson, the Archbishop of Canterbury, that the time was

⁵⁰ Although by acceptance of the Representative Church Council, the Convocations had bound themselves to work collectively with the laity.

⁵¹ *Church Times*, 45 (January 25, 1901): 95.

⁵² *Church Union Gazette* 37 (April 10, 1906): 128.

⁵³ *Prestige*, 228.

appropriate to set forth a movement which should enable the church to manage its own affairs. Halifax, with the support of Sir Alfred Cripps and Lord Wolmer, called for full church self-government.⁵⁴ Davidson credits Halifax with the initiative. Even Cannadine, fiercely dismissive of Halifax, credits Halifax, Cripps, and Cromer with convincing the Representative Church Council to establish the Archbishops Committee of Church and State.⁵⁵ This committee began the process that led to the Church Assembly (Powers) Act of 1919, the enabling act that formalized semi-autonomous synodical government for the Church of England. Halifax did not conceive the church as a democratic institution. Sovereignty did not originate with the people of the church, but with God. Halifax wrote that the government of the church comes from above not from below.⁵⁶ But by 1913, Halifax could not have been ignorant of the implications of his proposal. Self-government for the Church of England was going to formalize lay authority within the deliberative and legislative bodies of the church.

Halifax is significant to the development of lay authority in the Church of England in three respects. His theological model for the role of the laity empowered him and all laity to fully involve themselves in ecclesial affairs. He embodied this principle as president of the English Church Union. The extension of his model gave substance to his support for formal institutions to provide voice for the laity. Halifax not only accepted these institutions, he used them to further the catholic movement within the Church of England and in doing so he increased the legitimacy of the development of diocesan conferences and the Houses of Laymen. These institutions were as or even more important to the interests of the Anglo-Catholics than to the Broad Churchmen or even the Evangelicals. Church reform was not categorically condemned. Instead, moderating criticisms were made to improve reform plans in accordance with catholic principles. He kept the catholic movement participating and active in the church reform movements. Halifax's distinction between lay influence and formal lay authority was increasingly difficult to sustain. Supporting the right of the laity to discuss all subjects including spiritual matters is in itself a substantial acknowledgement of lay authority. Acceptance of the right of formal voice led to the breakdown of the distinction between lay voice and formal lay authority. Even Halifax manifested such a change by acceptance of the Representative Church Council and eventually to Church Assembly.

⁵⁴ Bell, 956.

⁵⁵ Cannadine, 494.

⁵⁶ *Church Union Gazette* 31 (November, 1901): 308.

Chapter VI Halifax and the Quest for Reunion

The previous chapters have examined Halifax's positive and successful contributions to the development of new models of lay authority in the Church of England. Halifax manifested a positive model of personal lay leadership as president of the English Church Union. And he certainly deserves substantial credit for such leadership, which led to increasing acceptance of the catholic movement within the Church of England. Halifax also embraced and participated in the institutional reform of the Church of England that provides first a voice and then a vote for the laity in the governance of the Church of England. However a study of Halifax and lay authority would be incomplete without an examination of his activities in the quest for the corporate reunion of the Church of England and the Roman Catholic Church.

The reunion of Western Christendom was a dominant and continuing influence in Halifax's life. From his first presidential address to the English Church Union in 1868 to his last significant writing, *The Good Estate of the Catholic Church* in 1930, the theme of corporate reunion permeated Halifax's theological reflections and his actions. Reunion, according to Halifax, was essential for the wholeness of the catholic church. And to Halifax's credit the wholeness he desired was not only with Rome, but also with the Eastern Churches and even the non-conformists within England. He wrote in 1868:

Neither let us forget in our yearning for external communion with the rest of the catholic church both East and West (which may God grant in His own good time!), the duty we owe to our separated brethren at home, whose alienation from the church is largely due to our own shortcomings. For union alone can restore to the whole church of Christ that power of witnessing the truth which is so grievously marred by the divisions of Christendom.¹

However, Halifax's emphasis on reunion with non-conformists decreased, and he focused on reunion with Rome. In this manner he reflected the dominant orientation of the catholic movement within the Church of England. Halifax's quest for reunion would manifest itself in two significant sets of events: discussions on Anglican orders in the mid-1890s and the Malines discussions of the 1920s. The former led to the publication of the papal letter *Ad Anglos* and the papal decree *Apostolicae Curae* that declared Anglican orders invalid. The effort was considered a failure at the time and by modern historians.² Blame is attributed to Halifax's informal and unofficial meddling in formal institutional politics. The examination will focus on these events. The Malines conversations are beyond the scope of this study and will be dealt with only in summary.

The catholic movement within the Church of England was certainly interested in "things Roman." The submissions of individual Anglican catholics—from Newman and Manning and even Colin Lindsay, the first president of the English Church Union—continued through the period of this study. The flow from Canterbury to Rome was

¹ Wood, C. L. (Lord Halifax), *Reasons for Union, An Address to the English Church Union* (London: English Church Union, 1868), 12.

² See Benson, Bell, Leak and Cannadine for contemporary and current estimates of the failure of Halifax's efforts.

always more of a trickle than a flood, but the significance of the individuals made the flow seem more important. Another aspect of interest in things Roman was the incorporation of Roman Catholic practices into Anglican liturgy. John Reed in his book, *The Glorious Battle*, describes the interest of some of the more advanced ritualists in copying contemporary Roman ritual and ceremonial.³ Such liturgical imitation and incorporation was manifest in the Purchas' *The Directorium Anglicanum* (1865) and the many editions of Cairncross and Lamburn's *Ritual Notes*, first published in 1894. Both attempted to conflate the services of the English Book of Common Prayer with the ceremonial and rites of "Western Use." The third strand of interest in things Roman was that of interest and support for corporate reunion between the Church of England and the Church of Rome. In 1857 the Association for Promoting the Union of Christendom was formed. By 1864 the organization had 8,000 members, including 300 Orthodox and 1,070 Roman Catholics. The organization was regarded with suspicion by the Roman Catholic hierarchy within England, particularly Cardinal Manning and Archbishop Ullanthe. In September 1864, the Holy Office condemned Roman Catholic involvement in the association ending the first ecumenical organization devoted to corporate reunion of Anglicanism and Roman Catholicism.⁴ Nevertheless, informal contacts continued. Pusey and Bishop Forbes of Brechin continued considerable personal correspondence with leading French liberal Catholics, in particular Archbishop Darboy of Paris and Archbishop Dupanloup of Orleans.⁵ Halifax's interest in corporate reunion was not unique but had a foundation within the advanced thought of Catholic movement within the Church of England. However, the interest in corporate reunion did not extend through the Church of England. The focus on Christian unity within the Anglican Churches was with reunion with Protestant denominations. The Chicago-Lambeth Quadrilateral was intended to provide a basis for discussion of reunion with Protestant Churches. The Committee on Reunion of the Lambeth Conference of 1878 concluded that "under present conditions, it was useless to consider the question of reunion with our brethren of the Roman Catholic Church."⁶ The essence of the situation had not significantly changed in 1890 when Halifax began his discussions with the Abbé Portal.

The details of the story of Leo XIII and Anglican orders, as Halifax himself would term the events, are long and complex. It is a story of much correspondence, many meetings and conversations, uncertain motives, and old prejudices, and questions of national identity, and even international politics. Halifax himself told the story in his book, *Leo XIII and Anglican Orders*, and the biographies of Halifax, Benson, and White provide summaries and interpretations of the story.⁷ The details need not be repeated here, except to state that the initiative was Halifax's. It was a personal effort, a personal crusade. He encouraged the Abbé Portal to write on the question of Anglican Orders. Halifax encouraged the Archbishop of Canterbury to write to Leo XIII. Halifax encouraged the Pope to write to the English Archbishops. In the end, Halifax forced the question, whether Anglican orders were valid to the Roman Catholic Church. And

³ Reed, 194.

⁴ Bernard Pawley Margaret Pawley, *Rome and Canterbury Through Four Centuries* (New York: Crossroads, 1975), 191-193.

⁵ *Ibid.*, p.198.

⁶ *Ibid.*, 232.

⁷ Lord Halifax, *Leo XIII and Anglican Orders* (London; Longmans Green, 1912). See also Lockhart, Benson, and Bell.

Halifax received his answer in the papal bull *Apostolicae Curae* that declared Anglican orders invalid. What is significant with respect to the issue of Halifax and lay authority in the Church of England is the manner in which Halifax conducted his effort. He did so with naiveté to the interests and concerns of both Rome and Canterbury. And he coupled this naiveté with the exploitation of his status as an aristocrat, as a friend of ecclesiastical leaders in England, and as leader of the catholic movement within the Church of England. Halifax used and perhaps even abused his authority as the leading layman in the Church of England on this personal crusade.

Halifax's desire for reunion blinded him to the political realities of the situation within his own church and within the Roman Catholic Church. Halifax certainly did not understand the opposition of the Roman Catholic hierarchy in England to his quest for corporate reunion. The Catholic hierarchy in England wanted only individual submissions to Rome. Initially, Cardinal Vaughan had tolerated Halifax's interest in the subject of reunion because he thought that it might lead to Halifax's submission.⁸ But it is incorrect to believe that Halifax was misled by Roman Catholic authorities for long on this issue. Halifax recorded a discussion with Cardinal Vaughan in 1892. Halifax had assumed that he would discover in the Cardinal an "anxiety for corporate reunion equal to his own." The Cardinal disabused Halifax of such a notion. The operative question according to Cardinal Vaughan was Rome, the exact opposite course that Halifax had advocated.⁹ Such a rebuff made little difference to Halifax. In February 1895, in a speech to the English Church Union, Halifax said, "Who can doubt that the present Pope (Leo XIII) is prepared to take the largest and most generous measure in regard to all such matters. If rumor is to be trusted, he is sincerely desirous to do justice to the English Church."¹⁰ Halifax's optimism was to be shattered by the Roman response to his overtures.

Halifax was not only naive with respect to Roman Catholic attitudes; he misjudged the support for his initiative within the Church of England. Halifax drastically underestimated the Protestant orientation of the Church of England. He saw the Church of England only through the eyes of the catholic movement. He thought that his dream was the dream of the Church of England. Archbishop Benson wrote to Halifax on December 14, 1894,

And I must be pardoned for saying, what is only the part of friendship to say, that you have lived for years so exclusively with one set of thinkers, and entirely into the usages of one class of church, that you have not before you the state of religious feeling and activity in England with which anyone attempting to adjust the relations between churches ought to have the phenomena of this side (sic) closely and minutely before him.¹¹

Benson's criticism, even exasperation of Halifax's efforts, went unheeded.

Halifax's blind determinism caused a series of abuses of his authority and influence. He attempted to force the hand of Archbishop Benson to act. Halifax used his

⁸ Lockhart, vol. II, 42.

⁹ Ibid., vol. II, 45.

¹⁰ *Church Eclectic* 22 (April 1895) 42.

¹¹ Benson, 611.

friendship with Benson to request a meeting and then arrived with Abbé Portal. Halifax expected Benson to formally respond to an unofficial emissary.¹² Benson's response was harsh. Halifax was trying to make him commit himself and the Church of England when the Pope had not committed himself.¹³ Halifax drafted a letter for Archbishop Benson to send to the Pope. Benson neither agreed with the contents nor the suitability of sending a letter to the Pope. Halifax continued to urge the Archbishop to send the letter. Benson finally had to rebuke Halifax.¹⁴ Halifax then turned from attempting to influence his own church to attempting to influence the Roman Church. He traveled to Rome and presented his ideas on the letter that the Pope should send to the English Archbishops. Many of the suggestions Halifax made were accepted by the curia, but not in the way he intended. The letter *Ad Anglos* was addressed not to the English Church, but the English people.¹⁵ The existence of the Church of England was ignored. The position of Cardinal Vaughan triumphed.

All of Halifax's attempts to aid the interests of corporate reunion failed with the publication of *Apostolicae Curae*. Anglican orders were declared null and void by the Roman Catholic Church. The Roman response was not only a defeat for the cause of corporate reunion but also a blow to Halifax. The Roman response was an attack on his beloved Oxford Movement. In 1897 Halifax had to tell the English Church Union that a Roman Catholic publication intended for French readers had said that the "representatives of the Oxford Movement in England are puppets in the hands of Satan."¹⁶ Halifax distanced himself from the Roman position by emphasizing the good faith that Anglicanism offered to non-conformists, an ongoing attempt to recognize their best side, to do justice to their work.¹⁷ This statement is indicative of the integrity of Halifax's intentions but does not indicate that Halifax understood the nature of his failure.

Halifax asserted a personal authority to lead the quest for corporate reunion. He did so without official sanction or institutional support. He claimed for himself a role as emissary for the Church of England that by the nature of the task demanded official status and backing. He had neither. His lack of official status made him suspect in both Rome and Canterbury. The lack of formal status denied him the guidance of the institution on the political realities of the Churches of England and Rome. Instead, Halifax only had his idealism and his personal status. Halifax was not the impartial mover, untouched by official status; he was the meddler in a complex relationship between competing ecclesiastical institutions. The result was mismanagement of very delicate discussions. Thus, Halifax's involvement in the question of Anglican Orders represented a misuse of his internal political lay authority within the Church of England. It was the application of internal authority when external official authority was required. Halifax's failure was that he did not recognize the essential difference between political authority exercised within an organization and the formal authority required to negotiate between independent organizations. Halifax, the ecclesiastical politician lacked the status of ecclesiastical statesman.

¹² Lockhart, vol. II, 50.

¹³ Benson, 598.

¹⁴ *Ibid.*, 608.

¹⁵ Lockhart, vol. II, 64.

¹⁶ *The Church Eclectic* 24 (July 1897): 343.

¹⁷ *Ibid.*, 345.

Although there is no indication that it was seen so at the time, in retrospect it is interesting to wonder whether such reckless action by Halifax did not in some perverse way assist the cause of lay authority in the Church of England. Halifax's example certainly demonstrated the limitation of personal independent action under the guise of the institution of the Church of England. Lay involvement, if it would occur, needed to occur through official channels rather than the personal initiative of influential persons.

Halifax's quest for reunion did not end with the publication of *Apostolicae Curae*. In 1921 Halifax and his friend Abbé Portal entered into informal discussions with Cardinal Mercier. Halifax was responding to Mercier's favorable response to the call for reunion adopted by the 1920 Lambeth Conference. Halifax received the guarded support of the Archbishop of Canterbury. Davidson wrote to Mercier to clarify Halifax's position. Halifax was not a formal ambassador or representative of the Church of England. Halifax's statements would only be an expression of his personal opinion.¹⁸ Davidson clearly sought to avoid again the controversies of 1890-1896. Halifax was now more politically astute and respectful of the differences between internal and external authority. He pressed that the Anglican delegation should be put on a formal footing. This was done during the Second Malines conversation when Halifax officially led the delegation from the Church of England.¹⁹ Halifax, the layman, led a delegation consisting of theologians including Bishop Gore. This was in itself a manifestation of a new mode of lay authority. The Malines conversation would end with the death of Cardinal Mercier in 1925 without visible success. However, the memory of the Malines discussions would keep alive idea of ideal of corporate reunion as a model for post-Vatican II Anglican-Roman Catholic dialogues.

¹⁸ Bell, 1255.

¹⁹ Ibid, 1257. Halifax wanted the Archbishop to formalize the Anglican delegation on the basis of the invitation of Cardinal Mercier. Davidson refused to do so until Mercier received official support from the Holy See.

Chapter VII Conclusion

Recent scholarship has either ignored or harshly judged Halifax's contributions to the Church of England. Halifax's quest for reunion of the Church of England with the Roman Catholic Church generated some scholarly interest in the whirlwind of the ecumenical movement in the 1960s and 1970s. However, Halifax's role as leader of the catholic movement has not been a significant focus of historical study. Halifax is not a central figure in recent histories of the catholic revival of the Church of England. Halifax figures less in the historical studies of Yates, Bentley, and Crowther than he did in the literature of the period.¹ Others, such as Cannadine in his *The Decline and Fall of the British Aristocracy* have judged Halifax harshly. This study provides a useful model to understand the contemporary assessment of Halifax. Cannadine finds little value in the contributions of the "ecclesiastical grandees" such as Halifax. He concludes that they "never held the ecclesiastical initiative."² Halifax is left as a footnote of British history because "history takes little note of people who have failed."³ Cannadine disparages Halifax's character. Cannadine wrote, "And for all their [i.e. that of the ecclesiastical grandees such as Halifax—ed.] intimacy with prelates and bishops, it is clear that Benson, Davidson, Lang, and Temple often found their sectional opinions, their reactionary views, and their endless harping criticisms extremely tiresome."⁴ Cannadine's assessment of Halifax is wrong because he fails to recognize Halifax's contribution to the catholic movement and the development of lay authority.

Halifax certainly held at least one of the ecclesiastical initiatives of the second half of the nineteenth century. Halifax was the leader of the catholic revival within the Church of England. The catholic revival within the Church of England, and later Anglicanism, was a significant ecclesiastical initiative that changed Anglican theology and practice. Halifax played an instrumental role in this movement leading the English Church Union from a period of persecution and prosecution to a period of acceptance and even triumph. As has been demonstrated in this work, Halifax transformed the union into a mass interest group within the Church of England using the techniques of a modern interest group leader. He lobbied publicly and privately. He led mass demonstrations. Halifax was a fundraiser for the English Church Union legal defense fund. He wisely and astutely maintained the unity of the catholic movement in the English Church Union in spite of a seemingly inherent desire within the movement for fragmentation. Halifax embraced modern principles of justice, toleration, and liberty to serve the interests of the catholic movement. Halifax was a more effective ecclesiastical politician because he exploited his aristocratic status for his cause. Halifax position as a member of the aristocracy gave him both access and legitimacy within the movement. Marshalling all of these factors, Halifax became, on the death of Pusey, the undisputed leader of the catholic movement within the Church of England. He was called the "Lay Pope" of England both

¹ Yates, Bentley, Marsh, Crowther

² Cannadine, 491.

³ Ibid., 499.

⁴ Ibid., 498.

by his friends and by his opponents and this title is more than a humorous sobriquet. It is a reflection of his lay authority.⁵

A judgment of Halifax as a reactionary, as implied by Cannadine, is a simplistic and inaccurate representation. Unfortunately the characterization of Halifax as reactionary seems to be a judgment of his theology. This work has demonstrated that the situation is far more complex. Halifax manifested both modern and anti-modern characteristics in both thought and action. Therefore, Halifax should be seen as a transitional figure in a period of great social change in England. Cannadine so well and so accurately describes the general decline of the English aristocracy. But he undervalues the role that individuals like Halifax played in the transition of England from the old aristocratic order to a modern society. Halifax was simultaneously both conservative aristocrat and modern professional ecclesiastical politician in the Church of England of his era. Halifax straddled the ages of aristocratic leadership and representative government both in society and in the church.

A characterization of Halifax as a theological reactionary ignores the complexity of his thought and attitudes within the catholic movement. The importance of sacramental and liturgical tradition was coupled with a radical acceptance of necessary change. While Charles Gore would become a socialist as would a substantial number of followers of the catholic movement, Halifax's radicalism was that of participation. Theology was too important to be left to the clergy. All should have voice within the church. He embraced the need and the right for laity and clergy to work cooperatively in the councils of the church. Halifax encouraged the establishment of diocesan conferences, and he and the catholic party participated in the emerging governing institutions of the Church of England. Halifax carried the catholic movement to eventual acceptance of new models of autonomous polity for the Church of England.

Cannadine's assessment of Halifax reflects the secular and political orientation of his scholarship. Cannadine underestimates Halifax because he undervalues Halifax's position as *ecclesiastical layman*. Halifax left the accepted stage of the English political aristocracy—that of Parliament, the diplomatic service, the colonial services, or the military services—and entered the ecclesiastical stage. And he participated in the life of the Church of England not as an aristocratic clergyman, nor through the parliamentary establishment, but as a laymen functioning within the church. The old model of lay authority, that of Gladstone, had passed to a new model, that of Halifax.

The final assessment must be how instrumental Halifax was in the emergence of new models of lay authority within the Church of England. Halifax was not alone in his service to the church. Chadwick's identification of the development of the *ecclesiastical layman* reflected the emergence of a class rather than an individual. They ranged from the catechist and the prison visitor to the likes of the ecclesiastical grandees such as Halifax, Lord Salisbury, Lord Selborne, and, from a slightly earlier era, Lord Shaftesbury. Halifax stood out above these ecclesiastical laymen for his leadership of the English Church Union. As the title "Lay Pope" of the movement indicates, Halifax exercised authority greater than any other of the contemporary ecclesiastical laymen. And in doing so he manifested a new model of lay authority, one not limited to formal institutions of church

⁵ W. R. Inge, *Diary of a Dean 1911-1934* (London: Hutchinson, 1949) August, 18, 1911. Inge's autobiography provides a broad churchman's perception. August 11, 1911 "You ought to join the Roman Church and of course you won't. You don't know what it is to obey. You are a lay Pope here"

government but extending to pressure group politics. Halifax's political authority in the church was informal but nonetheless substantive. The exercise of this authority supported the development of formal institutions of lay authority in the Church of England.

Assessing Halifax's influence on the development of formal lay authority within the Church of England is problematic. Reform of the government of the Church of England was inevitable after the mid-century. The emerging pluralism and secularism of the post-1832 English political establishment portended the increasing marginalization of the Church of England from the center of parliamentary focus. The Church of England was acquiring an increasingly voluntarist character that required the development of autonomous institutions of church government. The trend towards lay participation was well established even before Halifax's emergence as a leader of the catholic movement within Church of England. The concept of representation as necessary for legitimacy within English society and the emerging Anglican patterns of polity in the colonies and dominions made it inevitable that a reformed church government would include lay representation. The trend towards the representative model of synodical government was too strong to be resisted even by the most clericalist among the Anglo-Catholics. Within this broad context of the Church of England, Halifax was certainly not a radical with respect to church reform. Halifax' primary contribution to church reform was to move the Anglo-Catholic party to accept the emerging institutions of lay participation in church government by articulating a theology and ecclesiology that supported lay participation in all church affairs. Halifax supported the development of diocesan conferences in which clergy and laity would and did discuss all subjects of church life, including spiritual matters. Halifax himself participated, and he led the catholic movement to participate in Houses of Laymen and later in the Representative Church Council. In doing so, he moved the catholic movement to accept the legitimacy of lay participation in church government. Although he long maintained a distinction between consultative and formal authority of the laity, eventually this distinction would become artificial and unsupportable even to Halifax. The maintenance of this distinction is most reflective of his modern/anti-modern tension. This tension reflects the transitional nature of Halifax's life within the Church of England. Thus Halifax complemented his model of lay authority as exercised by the English Church Union with increasing support for the right of the laity to fully participate in the government of the Church of England.

Halifax certainly does not deserve the judgment of Cannadine. Halifax played an important, although somewhat paradoxical, role in the development of the modern Church of England. The influence of the catholic movement on the Church of England was not limited to liturgy and sacramental theology but included the advancement of new models of lay participation in ecclesiastical politics. Halifax's life modeled a modern concept of Anglican ecclesiology and polity in which all orders of the church participate in the life and mission of the church both through participation in formal institutions of governance and through unofficial pressure groups. Halifax's contribution to the life of the Church of England was grounded in his steadfast faith. On the Fiftieth Anniversary of the English Church Union, Halifax stated the focus of their common efforts,

Let us indeed labor for the building of Jerusalem not expecting to see the results of our labors but if God shows us His work that He should reveal to our children His glory.⁶

Halifax's life as ecclesiastical layman, as a lay politician of the Church of England, was lived in fulfillment of this commitment.

⁶ *Church Times* (London) 45 (June 21, 1901): 746.

Bibliography

Halifax Writings Consulted

Halifax, Lord (Wood, Charles Lindley). *The Reasons for Unity: An Address to the Annual General Meeting of the of the English Church Union*. London: English Church Union, 1868.

_____. *Priest, Sacrifice, and Altar*. London: G. J. Palmer, 1879.

_____. *President's Letter to the Members of the English Church Union*. London: English Church Union, 1880.

_____. *The Rights of the Church of England under the Reformation Settlement*. London: English Church Union, 1899.

_____. *The English Church Union: Its Future Viewed in Light of Its Past*. London: English Church Union, 1901.

_____. *Catholic Unity and the Relation of National Church to the Church Universal*. London: English Church Union, 1902.

_____. *The Address Delivered by the Viscount Halifax at the Fifty-first Anniversary of the English Church Union June 14, 1910*. London: English Church Union, 1910

_____. *Leo XIII and Anglican Orders*. London: Longmans, Green, 1912.

_____. *The Good Estate of the Catholic Church*. London: Longmans, Green, 1930.

Periodicals

The Church Union Gazette (London, The English Church Union)

The Church Times (London, G. Palmer)

The Church Eclectic (Milwaukee, Young Churchman)

Works Consulted

Arnold, Thomas. *Principles of Church Reform*. London: SPCK, 1962.—original publication 1832

Bebbington, David. *William E. Gladstone: Faith and Politics in Victorian Britain*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1983.

- Bell, G. K. A. *Randall Davidson*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1993.
- Benson, Arthur Christopher. *The Life of Edward White Benson*. New York: MacMillan and Co., 1899.
- Bentley, James. *Ritualism and Politics in Victorian Britain*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1978.
- Burns, Arthur. *The Diocesan Revival in the Church of England*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1999.
- Cannadine, David. *The Decline and Fall of the British Aristocracy*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1990.
- Cecil, Lord Hugh. *Lord Hugh Cecil on the Reform of the Church*. London: Church Reform League, 1901.
- Church and Reform, Being Essays Relating to Reform in the Government of the Church*. London: Bemrose, 1902/
- Chandler, Michael. *The Life and Work of Henry Parry Liddon*. Herefordshire: Gracewing, 2000.
- Chadwick, Owen, *The Victorian Church* 2 vols. London: SCM, 1977.
- Clark, Henry Lowther. *Constitutional Church Government in the Dominions Beyond the Seas*. London: SPCK, 1924.
- Coleridge Samuel Taylor. *On the Constitution of the Church and State According to the Idea of Each*. London: J.M. Dent and Sons Ltd, 1972.
- Creighton, Mrs., *The Life and Letters of Mandell Creighton*. London: Longmans, Green and Co., 1904.
- Crowther, M. A, et al. *The Church Embattled*. Devon: Archon Books, 1970.
- Dark, Sydney. *Archbishop Davidson and the English Church*. London: Phillip Allan and Co., 1929.
- Davidson, Randall and William Benam. *Archibald Campbell Tait*. London: MacMillan and Co., 1891.
- Eden, Robert Henley (Lord Henley). *A Plan for Church Reform*. London: 1832.

- Foot, Michael and Matthew, H. G. (eds.) *The Gladstone Diaries* 14 vols. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1994.
- Forbes, A. P. Bishop of Brechin. *A Charge to the Synod at Brechin*. Dundee: Winter, Duncan and Co., 1873.
- Gladstone, W.E. *Church Principles*. London: John Murray, 1841.
- _____. *The State in Relationship to the Church*. London: John Murray, 1841.
- _____. *The Royal Supremacy*. London: John Murray, 1877.
- Gore, Charles (ed.). *Essays in Aid of the Reform of the Church*. London: J. Murray, 1898.
- _____. *Reform of the Church of England, Being a Speech Delivered at Cambridge on February 1, 1899*. London: Church Reform League, 1899.
- Greenacre, Roger. *Lord Halifax*. London: Church Literature Association, 1983.
- Harlow, Carol and Richard Hastings. *Pressure Through Law*. London: Routledge, 1992.
- Hope, T. C. and F. Holiday. *The Representative Church Council*. London: Church Printing Company, 1905.
- Inge, W. R. *Diary of a Dean*. London: Hutchinson and Co., 1949.
- Johnson, John Octavius. *The Life and Letters of Henry Parry Liddon, 2 vols.* London: Longmans, Green and Co., 1904.
- Kemp, Eric W. *Counsel and Consent*. London: SPCK, 1961
- Knight, Frances. *The Nineteenth Century Church and English Society*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995.
- Lake, Katherine. *Memorials of Williams Charles Lake, Dean of Durham*. London: Edward Arnold, 1901.
- Lea, Walter. *May Laymen Have Decisive as Well as Consultative Votes in the Sacred Synods of the Church*. Edinburgh: Grant, 1873.
- Leak, Andrew S. "Halifax: Apostle of Unity", *One in Christ* 20 (1984): 111-128.
- Lears, T. J. Jackson. *No Place for Grace*. New York: Pantheon, 1981.
- Liddon, Edward Parry. *The Life of Edward Bouverie Pusey* 4 vols. London: Longmans, 1903.

- Lockhart, J.G. *Charles Lindley Viscount Halifax* 2 vols. London: Geoffrey Bless, 1936.
- Lockhart, J. G. *Cosmo Gordon Lang*. London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1949.
- Machin, G. I. T. *Politics and the Churches of Great Britain 1860-1921*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1987.
- Makower, Felix. *The Constitutional History and the Constitution of the Church of England (translation)*. New York: B. Franklin, 1960.
- Marsh, P. T. *The Victorian Church in Decline*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul Ltd., 1969.
- Massingberg, Francis, Charles. *A Real Diocesan Synod as a Remedy for the Present Difficulties: A Letter to the Lord Bishop of London*. London: Longmans, 1869.
- Mayer, Richard, "The State in Relation to the Church as Seen by W.E. Gladstone" PhD dissertation, Northwestern University, 1982.
- McDowell, R. B. *The Church of Ireland 1869-1969*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1977.
- Minutes of Evidence, The Royal Commission on Ecclesiastical Discipline*. 4 vols. London: Wyman and Sons Ltd, 1906.
- Moorman, J. H. R. *A History of the Church of England*. Harrisburg: Morehouse Publishing, 1980.
- Norman, E. R. *Church and Society in England 1770-1970: A Historical Study*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1976.
- O'Connor, Thomas P. *Lord Beaconsfield*. London: Chatto & Windus, 1884.
- Official Record of the Church Congress 1865-1920*.
- Olson, Alison G. *Making the Empire Work*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1992.
- Paget, Stephen and J. Crum, *Francis Paget*. London: MacMillan and Co., 1913.
- Pawley, Bernard and Margaret Pawley. *Rome and Canterbury Through Four Centuries*. New York: Crossroads, 1975.
- Pollar, A.F. *The Evolution of Parliament*. London: Longmans Green and Co. Ltd, 1926.
- Prestige, G. L. *The Life of Charles Gore*. London: William Heineman, 1935.

- Provost and Walf eds. *Power in the Church*. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1988.
- Pusey, E.B. *The Councils of the Church*. Oxford: John Henry Parker, 1858.
- _____. *The Royal Supremacy*. Oxford: John Henry Parker, 1858
- Representative Church Council Constitution and Canons*. London: National Society, 1905.
- Robert, Andrew. *Salisbury a Victorian Titan*. London: Weidenfeld & Nicholson, 1999.
- Roberts, George Bayfield. *The History of the English Church Union 1859-1894*. London: The Church Printing Company, 1895.
- Roberts, M. J. D. "Pressure Group Politics and the Church of England: The Church Defense Institution 1859-1896". *Journal of Ecclesiastical History* 35 (October 1984): 560-582.
- Rodes, Robert. *Law and Modernization in the Church of England*. South Bend: Notre Dame, 1991.
- Rush, Michael ed. *Parliament and Pressure Groups*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1990.
- Sachs, William. *The Transformation of Anglicanism*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993.
- Stephenson, G. *Edward Stuart Talbot*. London: SPCK, 1936.
- Strong, Rowan. *Alexander Forbes of Brechin, The First Tractarian Bishop*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1995.
- Strong, Rowan. *Episcopalianism in Nineteenth Century Scotland, Religious Response to a Modernizing Society*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002.
- Sunderland, E. S. S. *Didbin and the English Establishment*. Edinburgh: Pentland Press, 1995.
- Taylor, John. *British Monarchy, English Church Establishment and Civil Liberty*. Westport, Greenwood Publishing, 1996.
- Thompson, Kenneth. *Bureaucracy and Church Reform*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1970.
- Vidler, Alec. *The Orb and Cross*. London: SPCK, 1945.
- Williams, Thomas Jay. *Priscilla Lydia Sellon*. London: SPCK, 1965.

Yates, Nigel. *Anglican Ritualism in Victorian Britain 1830-1910*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999.