Frederick Dennison MAURICE: Still a prophetic voice today?
A paper for St Aidan's Fellowship, November 2010
By Derek Pratt

I. Introduction

If you are a regular Facebook user you will know that down the right hand side of the home page there are frequent advertisements for things such as how to flatten ones belly or quizzes to help understand ones self-development. Last year I answered a set of questions which then informed me that I would best fit into a Dominican monastery were I to a become a religious. A few weeks ago I found a quiz, which promised to tell me which Anglican theologian I was. After answering a set of ten questions it informed me that F. D. Maurice was the Anglican theologian I was closest to. My report stated:

> You are fully convinced that the Scriptures and the Fathers are important to Anglican life and witness. However, social justice is important to you, too - and social justice tends towards some sort of non-revolutionary socialism, and towards an emphasis upon education. Liturgy is at the Church's heart, and both it and the calendar ought to be taken more seriously. Taking these seriously, however, means neither detracting from them nor adding to them. Thus, you have a traditional but not excessively high view of aesthetics. The Gospel is about Christ, and Christ is about grace - perhaps even for all. Therefore, you believe, theology should begin with the Incarnation. Bishops are the successors of the apostles, but you like to remind your friends that the Church is also embedded within a larger political community whose stability it must help to secure.[1]

This summarized my theological stance quite well and I can now say that, after doing some reading on F. D. Maurice, it summarises his theology too.

F. D. Maurice was not completely unknown to me before doing this quiz. While researching for my Master's thesis I was surprised to find that Archdeacon Thomas Fothergill Lightfoot, of St Paul's Bree Street from 1858-1904, had a very liberal attitude to other faiths. I had been under the impression that a more open attitude to other faiths was a 20th Century phenomenon. I therefore researched Anglican attitudes to other faiths in the 19th Century and I came across F. D. Maurice's book, **The Religions of the World**, published 1868 and I quoted the following in my thesis:

> In the Boyle lecturers of 1842 [Maurice] said that the greatest form of unbelief was 'the tendency to look upon all theology as having its origin in the spiritual nature and facilities of man'. He insisted that God, not human minds, imaginations, or energies, had raised Islam, Hinduism and Buddhism. He criticised missionaries for forcing the honouring of important European teachers rather than the indigenous ones: 'in other words, the wish to make us Europeans, to bring us over to their modes and habits of thinking'. Thus he saw other faiths as part the working out of God's purpose. He saw Christianity, however, as the key to the reconciliation of religions. To a certain extent this was the approach adopted by Lightfoot. He accepted the Muslims as they were and simply brought into their household the love of God without attempting to force conversion.[2]

The other source of my knowledge about Maurice occurred each 1st April when he is commemorated in the ACSA. Here emphasis is placed on two aspects of his life – being one of the founders of so-called Christian Socialism movement and the fact that he was dismissed from his position as professor at King's College London for heresy.

---

[1] http://apps.facebook.com/qwhich-anglica-bhjec/
[2] Derek Pratt, *The Anglican Church's Mission to the Muslims in Cape Town during the Nineteenth and Twentieth Centuries. A study in the changes of Missiological methods and attitudes.* Unpublished MTh thesis Rhodes University.: 1998. p.78

In spite of Horton Davies claiming him, rather than Newman, to be 'the dominating figure of the Anglican Communion in the nineteenth century'[3] many people have not heard of Maurice. Alistair McGrath editor of a recent book, *The SPCK Handbook of Anglican Theologians* does not even include him[4].

Having been told that my theology matches that of F. D. Maurice, I decided to read up more on him and present some of these perspectives on his theology to you this morning. As I began reading quotations from his works and sermons, commentaries on his theology and his attitude to liturgy, the sacraments and church parties in the Church of England I began to realise the vastness of his writings. Vidler informs us that his writings 'extend to considerably more than 16 300 octavo pages and contain nearly 5 000 000 words'[5].

The vastness of Maurice's writings presented some problems for this paper and me. Firstly, he never wrote a systematic theology where his beliefs were clearly summarised. The closest he gets to this is an early book, *The Kingdom of Christ* published in 1838 and revised and altered in 1842. This was before the development of Christian Socialism (about 1848), his dismissal as professor from King's College, London (1853) or his election to the Knightsbridge Professor of Casuistry and Moral Philosophy at Cambridge University (1866).

Secondly, Maurice tends to be what I call a situational theologian. His theological opinions developed from the situations in which he found himself. Thus his sermons, lectures and essays show the development of his views and should be carefully examined before any attempt is made to understand his position. Very few of his writings are still in print and besides at archival websites, such as Project Canterbury[6] or Google Books, it is hard to get copies[7].

This leads to the third problem. I tend to like good, logical and clear "boxes" in which I can place people. With Maurice this is practically impossible. No sooner did I find him moving in a particular doctrinal or church party direction than I would come across another quotation from a sermon stating the exact opposite view. This could be because he disapproved of "Church Parties" which tended to 'box' people and were so strong in the Church of England in the 19th Century. He tended to choose the best of all the parties (Evangelicals, Anglo-Catholics and Broad Church or Liberals) and view the outcome as being the natural and national Church in England as it had been, was then and is today.

In this paper I feel obliged to look briefly at his role in, the meaning of and the ongoing influence of Christian Socialism as well as the issue of his dismissal from King's College and how his stance influenced later publications which changed theology and belief in the Church of England such as *Essays and Reviews* (1860) and *Lux Mundi* (1889). But the main thrust of this paper will be to look at Maurice's view on ecclesiology and how this could influence us Anglicans today as the Church of England looks at the way forward on women bishops and the Anglican Communion makes decisions on the Anglican Covenant.

II. The rise of Christian Socialism
To understand why F D Maurice was interested in social reform one needs to know his family background. Frederick Denison Maurice was born in Normanstone near Lowestoft on 29th August 1805. His father, Michael Maurice, worked with Joseph Priestley, as a Unitarian minister in Hackney in London.

Frederick was educated by his father and was taken to meetings of the Anti-Slavery Society and the Bible Society by his father who also encouraged his son to idolise social reformers such as Sir Francis Burdett, Henry Brougham and Joseph Hume.

---

[3] Horton Davies, *Worship and Theology in England: from Watts and Wesley to Maurice 1690-1850*. Eerdeman, 1996. p.283.
[4] Jeremy Morris, *F.D. Maurice and the crisis of Christian Authority* OUP, 2008 quoted from footnote pg 2.
[5] Alec R. Vidler, *Witness to the Light: F D Maurice's message for today* Charles Scribner pg. 228.
[6] http://anglicanhistory.org/
[7] Thank Goodness, as Victorian theological prose and F D Maurice's writings tend to have long convoluted sentences that take much time and repeated reading to unravel.

Maurice began his studies at Trinity College, Cambridge in 1823. Not being a member of the established church at that time, and unwilling then to subscribe to the Thirty Nine Articles he was not allowed to graduate. While at university he edited the *Metropolitan Quarterly Magazine* and also contributed to the *Westminster Review* in 1827 and 1828. He met John Stuart Mill while at Cambridge[8]. In 1828 Maurice was appointed editor of the highly regarded journal, *Athenaeum.*

By 1831 Maurice had become a member of the Church of England and decided to seek ordination. He studied at Exeter College, Oxford and was ordained in January, 1834. After a short spell as a curate in the country (Bubbenhall, near Leamington), he was appointed chaplain to Guy's Hospital where he worked among the sick poor. Thomas Guy (1644-1724), a publisher of unlicensed Bibles who had made a fortune in the South Sea Bubble founded the Hospital in 1721. It was originally established as a hospital to treat "incurables" discharged from St Thomas' Hospital.

Influenced by the ideas of Samuel Taylor Coleridge, Maurice wrote *The Kingdom of Christ* (1838) where he argued that politics and religion are inseparable and that the church should be involved in addressing social questions. Maurice rejected individualism, with its competition and selfishness, and suggested a socialist alternative to the economic principles of laissez faire.

Maurice was attracted to the socialist and educational ideas of Robert Owen[9]. These political views were expressed in the Educational Magazine, a journal he began editing in 1839. The Educational Magazine ceased publication when Maurice was appointed Professor of Literature at King's College, London in 1840. In 1848 Maurice and a small group of tutors at King's College established Queen's College in Harley Street aimed at training women to be teachers.

Maurice was a supporter of Chartism[10] and after the decision by the House of Commons to reject the Chartist Petition in 1848 he joined with J.M. Ludlow, Charles Kingsley and Thomas Hughes to form the Christian Socialist movement.   Ludlow had lived in France and had studied the French Revolutionary movements. He had seen the revolutions that were happening in Europe in 1848 and what has been called "the hungry forties" had led to justifiable unrest in Britain[11]. Ludlow saw the need to Christianise socialism and socialise Christianity and he introduced to Maurice the co-operative movement that had been developed in France.

The Christian Socialist movement began in 1850. Associations or self-governing workshops were started for tailors, printers, bakers, boot makers and builders. Central Co-operative Agency and stores were set up for the sale of their goods. These were the forerunner of the Co-Operative Wholesale Society set up in Rochdale.   It appeared that a co-operative system with both production and distribution would be practicable but it soon ran into difficulties when the manufacturers locked out the workers and money was moved from the co-operative movement into supporting the striking workers.

This convinced Maurice that the time was not yet ripe for widespread labour reform. The Co-operative movement had however won protection through an act of Parliament (1852). Maurice then moved into higher education for the working class. In the workers' colleges, the co-operative movement and in Christian Socialism Maurice can be commemorated for bringing change to the workers and for starting what later become the Labour Movement in England during the 20th Century.

---

[8] John Stuart Mill (1806–1873) was a British philosopher & influential contributor to social theory, political theory, and political economy.
[9] Robert Owen (1771–1858) was a social reformer and one of the founders of socialism and the cooperative movement.
[10] See Appendix A for notes on Chartism
[11] Charles Earle Raven, *Pillars of the English Church* (Mowbray; London, 1934) p83

III. Eternal Life and Eternal Damnation

F. D Maurice disliked the Evangelical's obsession with the depravity of humankind. This dislike most probably developed from the fact that his mother was a Calvinist and felt that she had no hope of salvation. Evangelicals of Maurice's day started their theology from the sin of Adam and 'some of them fixed themselves there.'[12] Priscilla Maurice was number amongst these. Maurice believed that theology should begin not from original sin but original righteousness and the Lordship of Christ[13]. He wrote to his mother, "You are under the law of love; you know you are, and you are fighting with it."

Maurice opposed the Evangelicals presentation of salvation that suggested that the Father's justice demanded the Son's sacrifice as a transaction to be completed before the Father's love could be shown. Maurice believed in 'the sacrifice offered by Christ, but he preferred to speak of Christ as men's representative – as "the Head and King of our Race" into whom we are incorporated as one body rather than of Christ as the substitute for men's sin'.[14]

The consigning of persistent sinners ('and infidels'[15]) to everlasting punishment was also a typical Evangelical position. Although they merely echoed the belief of most other Christians, they seemed to sentence more people to this fate because they concluded that unless one put ones trust in Christ's appeasing sacrifice before death, they would face the wrath of God and the eternal punishment of hell.

In an essay that appeared in *Theological Essays* (1853) – 'Eternal Life and Eternal Death' argued that eternal death was a contradiction to the revelation in the bible, where the Greek word *aionis* means 'eternal' and not 'endless duration'. As 'eternal life' means to know God and God's Son Jesus Christ, eternal death means to be separated from God and both happen in the present reality and not at some future date. The fear among most church leaders was that if belief in the threat of endless torment of hell was removed, morality would lose it most powerful weapon. When Maurice wrote this essay, he knew he would be criticized for his viewpoint.

The response came from King's College in London. In 1840 Maurice had been elected to a professorship at King's. It had been founded as 'an Anglican reply to the "godless" University College of London'[16]. A board of trustees most who were devout peers controlled the College and its principal from 1844 was Dr Richard W. Jelf, a former fellow of Oriel College and Canon of Christ Church Oxford. Alec Vidler describes him as a 'an amiable but weak and accommodating man'[17]. He tried to persuade Maurice to resign but Maurice was convinced of the righteousness of his cause and refused. On 27 October 1853 the Council of the College met. They refused the suggestion of Bishop Blomfield that competent theologians should examine Maurice's writings and rather decided by a large majority that the views expressed in the essay on Eternal Life, especially those referring to 'the future punishment of the wicked and the final issues of the day of Judgement, are of a dangerous tendency, and calculated to unsettle the minds of the theological students of King's College'[18] and Maurice was dismissed.

Many of Maurice's supporters believed that the decision was not one made by the peers 'deeply involved in the metaphysical foundations of the intellectual problem of conceiving eternity'[19] but by the threat posed by Christian Socialism and worker strike action. In 1852 there had been a major industrial dispute occurring because of the founding of the first modern trade union – the Amalgamated Society of Engineers as well as the exposure of working conditions by Charles Kingsley in book, *Cheap Clothes and Nasty* (1850). The peers on the council of the College were fearful that if the threat of endless punishment for those who

---

[12] David I. Edwards, *The Leaders of the Church of England: 1828-1978* Hodder and Stoughton 1978 p173
[13] Edwards, p173.
[14] Edwards, p173.
[15] Alec Vidler, *The Church in the Age of Revolution* Pelican 1961 p86
[16] David I. Edwards, *The Leaders of the Church of England: 1828-1978* Hodder and Stoughton 1978 p174
[17] Vidler, …*Age of Revolution* p86.
[18] Vidler …*Age of Revolution* p87
[19] Edwards, p175

rebel against authority was removed then the lower classes could start unrest as had been experienced over the rest of Europe in 1848.

After his dismissal Maurice offered his resignation to both clerical positions he still held, Chaplain of Lincoln Inn and the incumbent of St Peter's, Vere Street. These offers were refused and he became the 'persecuted underdog' with a close circle of sympathetic friends.

Maurice turned his attention to the education of the working classes. In 1854 he opened the Working Men's College. The College's other founders with Maurice (the first principal), were John Malcolm Forbes Ludlow, Charles Mansfield and Charles Kingsley (author of amongst other novels, *The Water-Babies)*. Notable early supporters were Thomas Hughes (the author of Tom Brown's Schooldays)[20], John Stuart Mill[21], Frederick James Furnivall, Dante Gabriel Rossetti and John Ruskin, while later including G.M. Trevelyan, E. M. Forster, and C.E.M. Joad.

Maurice's liberal stance on 'Eternal Damnation' was to find acceptance less than twenty years later when two contributors to the book *Essays and Reviews* (1860) were prosecuted for heresy. H.B. Wilson was charged with denying hell and Rowland Williams for practising biblical criticism and denying substitution atonement. By 1864 both had been cleared by the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, which concluded that there was nothing in the Anglican formularies to require such beliefs.

A further twenty years later the book, *Lux Mundi: A series of Studies in the Religion of the Incarnation* was published. This was a collection of 12 essays from liberal Anglo-Catholic theologians edited by the future Bishop of Oxford, Charles Gore, in 1889. Maurice's influence can be seen in this work.

IV. Maurice's Ecclesiology: understanding "Church" and Anglican Church
a. The Church and the World
For Maurice, Christ is the head of the whole human race (and not just only a portion of it), 'since all men [sic] are created in Christ and have been redeemed by Him, and since Christ is the Head of every man, no place is left for what the New Testament calls the Ecclesia or Church as a distinct society.'[22] What Maurice appears to be saying is that 'Church' and 'world' are alternative names for humanity. But Maurice differentiates the two in his *Theological Essays*:

> The world contains the elements of which the Church is composed. In the Church, these elements are penetrated by a uniting reconciling power. The Church is therefore, a human society in its normal state; the World, that same society irregular and abnormal. The world is the Church without God; the Church is the world restored to its relation with God, taken back by him into the state for which He created it. [23]

Maurice refused to see Church and World as being dualistically separated and the two as rivals. For Maurice the temptation of religious people was to think the two separated. They saw:

> …the world of men from which the Church is separated, against which it [the church] exists to protest. In baptized nations she has a right to claim these men as her own. But her power over them is disputed by kings who want them as their citizens, by parents who want them to transmit their names. With these the Church finds herself in conflict.[24]

---

[20] Hughes wrote: "The world has only three great theologians, Augustine, Luther and Maurice, and the greatest of these is Maurice" quoted in Edwards p164

[21] Mills was not so fanatical in his support. He considered that Maurice's 'great powers of generalization, rare ingenuity and subtlety, and a wide perception of important and unobvious truths' served him "not for putting something better into the place of the worthless heap of received opinions on the great subjects of thought, but for proving to his own mind that the Church of England had known everything from the first' quoted in a footnote in Jeremy Morris, *F D Maurice and the Crisis of Christian Authority* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005), 1

[22] Alec Vidler, *Theology of F D Maurice*, (SCM Press: London 1947) p64

[23] F D Maurice, *Theological Essays* quoted in Vidler *Theology* p65

[24] F D Maurice, *Lincoln Inn Sermons* quoted in Vidler, *Theology* p66

The world to Maurice did not mean the state or the secular order opposed to and set over against the Church. For him the Church was the witness to the only foundation of states, nations, families and all human order.

In many respects the relationship between the World and the Church has become more sharply delineated now that it was in Maurice's day. As Vidler suggests 'the number of baptized nations has diminished. Kings, or their modem counterparts—dictators, social engineers, planners- exercise more power over men and are less inclined to share their power with the Church. Everywhere, in Europe anyhow, the cleavage between the Church and the world, thus regarded, threatens to become sharper.'[25]

Maurice saw families and nations as part of the universal church and only as part of the world 'in an evil sense (as the Church itself may become a world) only in so far as they set themselves up to pursue their own end, in so far as they become organized selfishness, refusing to confess that they have one foundation, one centre one bond…

> The Universal Church, constituted in its Universal Head, exists to protest against a world which supposes itself to be a collection of incoherent fragments without a centre…which treats every man as his own centre. The Church exists to tell the world of its true Centre of the law of mutual sacrifice by which its parts are bound together. The Church exists to maintain the order of the nation and order of the family, which this selfish practice and selfish maxim are continually threatening[26]

b. The Family, the Nation and the Church

If the Church is universal, as Maurice believed, then for him it followed that it could not be a gathering of like-minded believers. For him the Church was not a group who share common beliefs, but a family whose members are bound by deeper ties than verbal formulae. In his *Kingdom of Christ*, Maurice uses the model of the Patriarchs of the Old Testament who were first and foremost relatives. The story of Jacob, argued Maurice, witnesses to the fact that God's people were founded on family relationship and not choice.[27] Thus, just as in a family, in the Church there would be differences and tensions but a single catholicity. The strength of a family is dependent on the tensions that are within it, so too it is the strength of the Church. Maurice saw the "kingdom" of Christ as a "family" and hence the title of his book (*The Kingdom of Christ* 1838).

Maurice's other concept was the connection between the Church and the nation. For him nations were part of the divine purpose and that life in a national community was essential for the preservation of faith in a living God. Israel's history gives us 'the divine specimen of national life' – its call to be a holy nation precedes all nations to this divine call.

> I believe that we have as much right to call England a holy nation as the prophets had to call Judea a holy nation. I believe that it is holy in virtue of God's calling; that the members of it are unholy when they deny their calling and their unity ... Would to God that we could all preach this doctrine, that we could claim every Englishman, whatever his caste or occupation may be, as a sharer in the covenant, in the holiness, in the blessedness of the Nation![28]

This concept of a national Church worked well in England where the Church of England was established. It could be easily called 'the National Church' but could this approach work where no such 'established' church operated and where many voluntary churches co-existed? Furthermore, in England there were non-conformist Churches and sects and even in the Church of England itself there were numerous 'church parties'. Maurice's understanding of the catholicity of the Church or Universal Church was that all these

---

[25] Alec Vidler, *Theology…* p66

[26] F D Maurice, *Lincoln Inn Sermons* quoted in Vidler, *Theology* p68

[27] F D Maurice, *Kingdom of Christ* as quoted by Stephen Pickett
http://www.george-macdonald.com/gmsociety/nw/21/nw21_prickett.html

[28] F D Maurice, *Kingdom of Christ* as quoted in Randall Nolan, *A Mediating Tradition: the Anglican Vocation in Australian Society* (PhD Thesis: Griffith University 2007)

churches, sects, denominations and church-parties made up the National Church. Only national churches could embody the sense of belonging to one universal church. The Roman Catholic Church being universal across various nations contradicted the national principle by denying the link between church and nation. Thus for Maurice the Church of England was the clearest expression of the universal society it was called to represent.

In *The Kingdom of Christ* Maurice explores what he calls 'signs' of Catholicity in Roman Catholicism and the Church of England, namely: baptism, eucharist, scripture, creeds, the apostolic ministry and liturgical tradition[29]. Maurice disapprove of the non-Catholicity of the church which he said had 'ism' at the end of their name (e.g. Lutheranism, Calvinism, Roman Catholicism etc) because these denominations or sects:

> …have been established generally by earnest and devout men, conscious of some great task which has been forgotten, of some great duty which has been neglected, eager to assert the one and perform the other. They have flourished; they have drawn proselytes and devotees to them, for the truth and the duty have been felt to be divine. But the counsel and the work were of men; therefore the strength of the society decayed often as its outward prosperity increased; at last it came to utterly nought.[30]

But the Church of England too had its own 'parties, schools and orders'[31]

> Our Church has no right to call herself better than other Churches in any respect, in many she must acknowledge herself to be worse. But our position, we may fairly affirm, for it is not a boast but a confession, is one of singular advantage … Our faith is not formed by a union of the Protestant systems with the Romish system, nor certain elements taken from the one and of certain elements taken from the other. So far as it is represented in our liturgy and our articles, it is the faith of a Church, and has nothing to do with a system at all.[32]

c. Maurice and Church Parties

During the 19th Century the Church of England was divided into many so-called 'Church Parties' or what Maurice called 'systems'. These are generally held to be the Catholic, Evangelical and Liberal parties. When Maurice began writing the parties of the Church of England were known as the Tractarians, the Evangelical and the Broad Church Parties. [33]

It seemed to Maurice that the principles to which the Church of England was called to witness was being denied by these wings of the Church. The Liberal believed that the Church is a living body, not being tied down by the system of the past age.

> It must have an expansive power; it must breathe and move; it must be able to throw off the results of partial experiences; it must be able to profit by all new experiences! With what sympathy do we listen to him, when he says that the Church is meant to comprehend and not exclude. [34]

For Maurice the Evangelical believed that it is the mission of the Church to proclaim a Gospel and to evoke conscious faith in a personal Saviour. Evangelicals were convinced 'that God had interfered on behalf of His creatures and was interfering on behalf of them still; that there was a real relationship between the creature and the Creator; that there is a real power coming forth from the Creator to succour His creatures, and to enable them to do his will.'[35] Maurice goes on to criticise the evangelical stance in an ironical fashion:

> Go forth and tell men that their baptism is not an admission into the privileges of God's spiritual Church, that they are not to take this sign as a warrant of their right to call

[29] As summarised by Jeremy Morris, in his article *'He was an inspiration for social witness'* in Church Times, 20 May 2005.
[30] F D Maurice, *Acts of the Apostles* as quoted in Vidler, *Theology…* p84
[31] F D Maurice, *Acts of the Apostles* as quoted in Vidler, *Theology…* p84
[32] F D Maurice, *Kingdom of Christ* as quoted in Vidler p214
[33] See Appendix B for a brief introduction to these parties
[34] F D Maurice, *Kingdom of Christ* as quoted in Vidler, *Theology* p217
[35] F D Maurice, *Kingdom of Christ* as quoted in Vidler, *Theology* p219

themselves members of Christ and to pray to God as their Father in Him. Go and tell them that they are not in a real relation with God but only in a nominal one; go and tell them that if they are ever to enter into that relation they must bring themselves into it by an act of faith, or else wait till an angel comes down and troubles the waters, go and tell them that the Eucharist is not a real bond between Christ and His members, but only a picture or likeness, which, by a violent act of our will, we may turn into a reality; go and make these comfortable declarations to men, and mix them well with denunciations of other men for not preaching the Gospel, thus you will fulfil God's commission; thus you will reform a corrupt and sinful land.[36]

Finally for Maurice the Catholic had hold of the truth 'that there is indeed a Church in the world, which God Himself has established; that He has not left it to the faith and feelings and notions of men; that He has given us permanent signs of its existence; that he has not left us to find our way into it but has Himself taken us into it; that being in it we are under others who share the same privilege with us; that we are not bound to form ourselves into circles and parties and coteries; that we belong to the Communion of Saints, and need not seek for another, ' but for Maurice the Catholic branch of the Church, in its determination to separate itself from the state, could no longer be called a National Church.

One other danger Maurice was concerned about was that by refusing to join any church party one could end up establishing a 'No-Party' Party, which would likewise fall into the same errors as the existing parties. Maurice found both positive principles and misleading development in each of the main 'parties' in the internal division of the Church of England. Jeremy Morris claims that for Maurice, 'by implication, the Church of England was greater than the mere sum of its parts. It needed each of the main parties; yet it needed to rise above their conflict.'[37]

Maurice's 'embracing a God of radical inclusion flowed from his acceptance that 1. God is the source of all good; 2. each person experiences God directly; 3. this experience includes God's will for them; 4. each person is united to God by God's own loving decision; and 5. thereby God creates the Kingdom of Christ, that is the universal and spiritual church, that is, the body of Christ that is, humanity'[38]

Because of this stance taken by Maurice there has developed an Anglican ecclesiology of 'comprehensiveness' and diversity. This was achieved by acknowledging the Catholicity of the Church of England (and one can add, looking ahead from Maurice's time, the Anglican Communion) through Maurice's six 'signs' of Catholicity. Through these Maurice anticipated the development of the Chicago-Lambeth Quadrilateral of scripture, creed, sacraments and episcopacy, which has been the guiding principle in Anglican inter-Church relationships for more than a hundred years. This Chicago-Lambeth Quadrilateral was developed by William Reed Huntington of the Episcopal Church and adopted by the Lambeth Conference in 1888 as an understanding of what is required for full communion among Anglican Churches and other Christian traditions alike.[39]

d. Diversity and Comprehensiveness
Busk does point out that Maurice shunned comprehensiveness and cohesion in his theology and had antipathy towards systematic theology. He quotes Vidler in saying that one should read Maurice not for structure but for insight[40]. But Anglican theology as a whole is known for it's unsystematic character[41]. He suggests that this is both a virtue and a weakness. Maurice's understanding of Church and his description of the Church of England does seem to imply that Anglicanism is the best kind of Christianity and for some

---

[36] F D Maurice, *Kingdom of Christ* as quoted in Vidler, *Theology* p219
[37] Jeremy Morris, in his article *'He was an inspiration for social witness'* in Church Times, 20 May 2005.
[38] Michael C. Busk, *F.D. Maurice: The Radically Inclusive God* from Anglican and Episcopal History, Mar 2009.
[39] W. Christopher Evans, *Comprehensively beautiful, not tightly consistent*
http://www.episcopalcafe.com/daily/anglican_communion/comprehensively_beautiful_not.php
[40] Busk, *F D Maurice* footnote 23.
[41] Paul Avis, *Vocation of Anglicanism: The Richard Hooker Lecture 2009:*

this leads to Anglican 'smugness'.[42] However the recent development in the Anglican Communion certainly make it impossible to be triumphantist about Anglicanism.

V. Frederick Dennison Maurice, Anglicanism today and the Anglican Covenant

Maurice's interpretation of the National Church being the essence or foundation of the Catholicity of the Church strongly influenced the current structures of the Anglican Communion which Wikipedia describes as 'an international association of **national** and regional Anglican churches. There is no single "Anglican Church" with universal juridical authority as each national or regional church has full autonomy.'[43] [my bold print]

Maurice saw the Protestant and Catholic strands within the Church of England (and one can say subsequently in the differing 'National Churches' that are the Anglican Communion) as contrary but complementary, both maintaining elements of the true church, but incomplete without the other. Maurice believed that a truly catholic and evangelical church might come into being by the union of opposites and not by either being the *via media* between Catholicism and Protestantism or by taking the best of each to create a new Church[44]

This position depends upon ones understanding of Catholicity and whether the National Church can be both national and universal. On this point Stephen Sykes disagrees and he criticises Maurice for 'his whole-hearted commitment to the theory of national character and destiny'. [45] Sykes goes on to comment:

> No one will be able to understand Maurice nor, what is more important, the English Church and the Anglican Communion, who presupposes that the Catholic Church and National Churches are incompatible, or that as a Church becomes more Catholic it becomes less national, or who doubts that the Kingdom of Christ consecrates the life of nations. The Anglican Communion is confessedly a fellowship of national or regional Churches which 'are independent in their self-government as integral parts of the Church Universal.' Its existence is a living protest on behalf of the principle of nationality and of the direct responsibility of bishops and rulers to Christ, and against the notion of a visible head of the Church and a centralised government.[46]

Stephen Sykes regards this 'extraordinary annexation of the romantic nationalism of Maurice's theology to the very raison d'etre of Anglicanism' as a distortion of the meaning of catholicity — or, at the very least, a redefinition of it 'to fit a new, Anglican, theory of the church'. [47] This is part of Sykes' attack on comprehensiveness and is why he accuses Maurice of being 'the producer of a "synthetic" ecclesiology … since Maurice could be read as arguing that comprehensiveness presumed the co-presence of mutually incompatible ecclesiologies within a greater synthesis'[48].

Sykes's continues his attack on comprehensiveness by saying it allowed the fundamental doctrines of the Christian faith to be questioned or marginalized by ordained Anglican theologians such as Maurice Wiles, Don Cupitt or Denis Nineham with impunity. For Sykes comprehensiveness was not an answer: 'it was itself the question. It needed rigorous justification. The notion of complementarity of truths, borrowed from quantum mechanics, could not do this. "Lots of contradictory things may be said to be

---

[42] Paul Avis *Vocation…*

[43] http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Anglican_Communion

[44] Stephen Sykes, *The Integrity of Anglicanism* (1978) as quoted in http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Anglicanism also Jeremy Morris, 'Newman and Maurice on the Via Media of the Anglican Church: Contrasts and Affinities' in *Anglican Theological Review,* Fall 2003.

[45] Stephen Sykes, *Integrity …* as quoted in Randall Nolan, *A Mediating Tradition: the Anglican Vocation in Australian Society* (PhD Thesis: Griffith University 2007) p.115

[46] Stephen Sykes, *Integrity …* as quoted in Randall Nolan, *A Mediating Tradition: the Anglican Vocation in Australian Society* (PhD Thesis: Griffith University 2007)p.116

[47] Stephen Sykes, *The Integrity of Anglicanism* as quoted in Nolan. P116

[48] Jeremy Morris, *F D Maurice and the Crisis of Christian Authority* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005), p201

complementary by those with a vested interest in refusing to think straight" says Sykes (p. 19)' [49]. For Paul Avis, Sykes had 'unfortunately hitched his onslaught on comprehensiveness and complementarity rather substantially to the theology of F. D. Maurice which he seriously misunderstood'[50].

Nolan acknowledges Sykes' claim that Maurice reflected many of the presuppositions of his own time and he further quotes Rowan Williams who expressed similar misgivings: 'We need to read Maurice "a little more suspiciously", he claims, pointing in particular to "the hierarchical assumptions that sit comfortably in his social thought and his theological positivism, about the state as divinely instituted".'[51]

Jeremy Morris, in *F D Maurice and the Crisis of Christian Authority* suggests that the relationship between Church and State as found in Britain, being missing in overseas countries, could lead to Anglicans developing 'something like a sense of Anglicanism as a distinctive church culture which might even lend itself to a distinctive or at least coherent description.'[52] The question then arises: 'Isn't this exactly what the Anglican Covenant is attempting to do?' Morris goes on to discuss what constitutes Anglicanism and he includes (as does the Anglican Covenant) things found in the Chicago-Lambeth Quadrilateral as well as the Book of Common Prayer (one of Maurice's "signs" of Catholicity) and the Thirty Nine Articles – something Maurice thought particularly important and wrote on them frequently, to the extent that his friend, Thomas Carlyle satirized him in a short poem:

> Thirty-nine English Articles,
> Ye wondrous little particles,
> Did God shape his universe really by you?
> In that case I swear it,
> And solemnly declare It,

Jeremy Morris concludes that the acute divisions of Anglican Churches over homosexuality and women's ministry may have brought the dominance of Maurice's ecclesiology to an end but he highlights the influence it has had over the last hundred and fifty years. Morris also acknowledges that Anglicanism has 'a remarkable capacity to re-invent itself and to uncover new sources of justification and of inspiration … in a distinctive subculture within the Christian world.'[53]

It was interesting to 'google' F.D. Maurice and to get the whole gamut of Anglican responses. Those – usually Evangelicals – who opposed his rejection of penal substitution theory of atonement inevitably started their comments on Maurice with the words, 'The former Unitarian…' thus casting doubts on his orthodoxy right from the start.   The liberal anti-Anglican Covenant web pages stressed Maurice's 'comprehensiveness' while ignoring his own reliance on the Thirty Nine Articles and the Book of Common Prayer.

The Modern Church formerly the Modern Church People's Union has a web page entitled 'A very un-Anglican Covenant' that begins with: 'The proposed Anglican Covenant is an attempt by some leaders of the Anglican Communion to subordinate national churches to a centralised international authority, with power to forbid developments when another province objects.' [54] Are National Churches threatened by this 'centralised international authority'? Will local adaptations as accepted in the Chicago-Lambeth Quadrilateral for the Episcopal office, be threatened not only concerning bishops but other local adaptations? Is F D Maurice's Ecclesiology a thing of the past?

[49] Paul Avis, *Anglicanism and the Christian Church* (T&T Clark: London 2002) p321
[50] Paul Avis, *Anglicanism and the Christian Church* (T&T Clark: London 2002) p321
[51] Randall Nolan, *A Mediating Tradition: the Anglican Vocation in Australian Society* (PhD Thesis: Griffith University 2007) p.116
[52] Jeremy Morris, *F D Maurice and the Crisis of Christian Authority* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005), p199
[53] Jeremy Morris, *F D Maurice and the Crisis of Christian Authority* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005), p201
[54] http://www.modchurchunion.org/resources/mcu/cp/index.htm

APPENDIX A
Chartism[55]
Chartism was a movement for political and social reform in the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland during the mid-19th century, between 1838 and 1850. It takes its name from the People's Charter of 1838, which stipulated the six main aims of the movement as:

1. A vote for every man twenty-one years of age, of sound mind, and not undergoing punishment for crime.
2. The secret ballot. - To protect the elector in the exercise of his vote.
3. No property qualification for members of Parliament - thus enabling the constituencies to return the man of their choice, be he rich or poor.
4. Payment of members, thus enabling an honest tradesman, working man, or other person, to serve a constituency, when taken from his business to attend to the interests of the Country.
5. Equal Constituencies, securing the same amount of representation for the same number of electors, instead of allowing small constituencies to swamp the votes of large ones.
6. Annual parliaments, thus presenting the most effectual check to bribery and intimidation, since though a constituency might be bought once in seven years (even with the ballot), no purse could buy a constituency (under a system of universal suffrage) in each ensuing twelve-month; and since members, when elected for a year only, would not be able to defy and betray their constituents as now.

The 1848 petition
On 10 April 1848, Fergus O'Connor organised a mass meeting on Kennington Common, which would form a procession to present a petition to Parliament. The estimate of the number of attendees varies depending on the source (O'Connor estimated 300,000; the government, 15,000; The Observer newspaper suggested 50,000). According to John Charlton the government was well aware that the Chartists had no intention of staging an uprising as they had established an extensive network of spies. However, they were very afraid that they could have been misinformed or that a revolution would start spontaneously. To counter this threat they organised a very large show of force. 100,000 special constables were recruited to bolster the police force. In any case, the meeting was peaceful. However the military had threatened to intervene if the Chartists made any attempt to cross the Thames.

The original plan of the Chartists, if the petition was ignored, was to create a separate national assembly and press the Queen to dissolve parliament until the charter was introduced into law. However the Chartists were plagued with indecision, and the national assembly eventually dissolved itself, claiming lack of support.

The petition O'Connor presented to Parliament was claimed to have only 1,957,496 signatures – far short of the 5,706,000 he had stated and many of which were discovered to be forgeries (some of the false signatories included Queen Victoria, Mr Punch and 'Pugnose'). However, O'Connor argued that many people were illiterate, and did not know how to write their own signatures, and so had to copy someone else's. O'Connor has been accused of destroying the credibility of Chartism, but the movement continued for some years, with the final National Convention being held in 1858.

Christianity and Chartism
During this period the Christian churches in Britain held "that it was 'wrong for a Christian to meddle in political matters.'...All of the denominations were particularly careful to disavow any political affiliation and he who was the least concerned with the 'affairs of this world' was considered the most saintly and worthy of emulation." This was at odds with many Christian Chartists. Christianity was to them above all practical, something that must be carried into every walk of life. Furthermore there was no possibility of divorcing it from political science. Rev. William Hill wrote in the Northern Star "We are commanded…to love our neighbours as ourselves…this command is universal in its application, whether as friend, Christian or citizen. A man may be devout as a Christian…but if as a citizen he claims rights for himself he refuses to confer upon others, he fails to fulfil the precept of Christ". The conflicts between these two views led many to see Britain's churches as pointless.   Historian H.U. Faulkner states "The 'political preacher,' in the

---

[55] Summarised from http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Chartism

modern sense of the term, first came into prominence in the agitations incidental to the Anti-Corn Law and Chartist movements."

The Chartist where especially harsh on the Church of England for unequal distribution of the state funds it received resulting in some bishops and higher dignitaries having grossly larger incomes than other clergy. This state of affairs led some Chartists to question the very idea of a state sponsored church, leading them to call for an absolute separation of church and state.

APPENDIX B
Tractarianism (http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Oxford_Movement)
The immediate impetus for the movement was a perceived secularization of the church, focused particularly on the decision by the government to reduce by ten the number of Irish bishops in the Church of Ireland following the 1832 Reform Act. Keble attacked these proposals as 'national apostasy' in his Assize Sermon in Oxford in 1833. The movement's leaders attacked liberalism in theology. Their interest in Christian origins led them to reconsider the relationship of the Church of England with the Roman Catholic Church.

The movement postulated the Branch Theory, which states that Anglicanism along with Orthodoxy and Roman Catholicism form three "branches" of the one "Catholic Church". Men in the movement argued for the inclusion of traditional aspects of liturgy from medieval religious practice, as they believed the church had become too plain. In the ninetieth and final Tract, Newman argued that the doctrines of the Roman Catholic Church, as defined by the Council of Trent, were compatible with the Thirty-Nine Articles of the sixteenth-century Church of England. Newman's conversion to Roman Catholicism in 1845, followed by Manning in 1851, had a profound effect upon the movement.

The Oxford Movement was attacked for being a mere "Romanising" tendency, but it began to have an influence on the theory and practice of Anglicanism. It resulted in the establishment of Anglican religious orders, both of men and women. It incorporated ideas and practices related to the practice of liturgy and ceremony in a move to bring more powerful emotional symbolism and energy to the church. In particular it brought the insights of the Liturgical Movement into the life of the Church. Its effects were so widespread that the Eucharist gradually became more central to worship, vestments became common, and numerous Catholic practices were re-introduced into worship. This led to controversies within churches that ended up in court, as in the dispute about ritualism.

Partly because bishops refused to give livings to Tractarian priests, many of them ended up working in the slums. From their new ministries they developed a critique of British social policy, both local and national. One of the upshots was the establishment of the Christian Social Union, of which a number of bishops were members, where issues such as the just wage, the system of property renting, infant mortality and industrial conditions were debated. The more radical Catholic Crusade was a much smaller organisation than the Oxford Movement. Anglo-Catholicism, as this complex of ideas, styles and organizations became known, had a massive influence on global Anglicanism.

Evangelical Party (from http://www.victorianweb.org/religion/brdchrch.html)
Evangelical, a term literally meaning "of or pertaining to the Gospel," was employed from the eighteenth century on to designate the school of theology adhered to by those Protestants who believed that the essence of the Gospel lay in the doctrine of salvation by faith in the death of Christ, which atoned for man's sins. Evangelicalism stressed the reality of the "inner life," insisted on the total depravity of humanity (a consequence of the Fall) and on the importance of the individual's personal relationship with God and Savior. They put particular emphasis on faith, denying that either good works or the sacraments (which they perceived as being merely symbolic) possessed any salvational efficacy. Evangelicals, too, denied that ordination imparted any supernatural gifts, and upheld the sole authority of the Bible in matters of doctrine.

The term came into general use in England at the time of the Methodist revival under Wesley and Whitefield, which had its roots in Calvinism and which, with its emphasis on emotion and mysticism in the spiritual realm, was itself in part a reaction against the "rational" Deism of the earlier eighteenth century. Early in the nineteenth century the terms "Evangelical" and " Methodist" were used indiscriminately by opponents of the movement, who accused its adherents of fanaticism and puritanical disapproval of social

pleasures. The Evangelical branch of the Anglican Church coincided very nearly with the "Low Church" party.

Evangelical Christianity has special importance to Victorian literature because so many major figures began as Evangelicals and retained many attitudes and ideas, including notions of biblical symbolism, even after they abandoned their childhood and young adult beliefs either for another form of Christianity or unbelief. Elizabeth Barrett Browning, Robert Browining, Thomas Carlyle, Thomas Hardy, Gerard Manley Hopkins, John Henry Newman, and John Ruskin.

Broad Church Party (from **http://www.victorianweb.org/religion/brdchrch.html**)

Unlike the Evangelicals and the Tractarians who opposed them, the comparatively tiny Broad Church party never formed an organized, much less essentially homogeneous, group. This loosely associated group of intellectuals in the Church of England in many ways represent what has become liberal twentieth-century Protestantism. Working under the direct or indirect influence of German liberal thought, Broad Churchmen emphasized that the Bible, though in some sense divinely inspired, was not, as Evangelicals and Tractarians believed, literally true in every detail, and that therefore the scriptures should be read metaphorically or even mythologically.

To many Broad Churchmen, biblical truth, together with the evidences of the natural world (as in Paley's Evidences of Christianity, 1794, and Natural Theology, 1802), mediates the correspondences between the divine and human orders and is communicated through figures of speech and analogies. . . . To the literalist Evangelicals, the natural world is a snare and a delusion, anticipating in the deleterious effects of the Fall; to Broad Churchmen, the empirical facts of the natural world are read analogically as revelatory of God's nature and the divine plan for the world. . . . The Broad Church position locates the analogies not in the relation between the design of the world and the divine nature but in correspondences between human life and experience and aspects of the divine order, ultimately between the human heart and the divine spirit.

These beliefs appeared in the intensely controversial, even infamous, *Essays and Reviews* (1860) and Bishop Colenso's *The Pentateuch Critically Examined* (1862). Some Broad Churchman, like the headmaster of Rugby Thomas Arnold (father of the critic and poet) and the Christian Socialist F. D. Maurice also emphasized a social gospel -— that is, that one could worship Christ only by working for social justice.

The intensely personal, idiosyncratic beliefs embodied in *In Memoriam* suggest that Tennyson is best described as a Broad Church Anglican. (One feels uncomfortable describing anyone as a "member" of such a loosely organized group.)

Bibliography

Books:

Avis, Paul, *Anglicanism and the Christian Church: Theological resources in historical perspective* (T&T Clark, London, 2002).

Carpenter, James, *Gore: a study in Liberal Catholic Thought* (Faith Press, London, 1960)

Cockshut, A. O. J. *Religious Controversies of the Nineteenth Century: Selected Documents* (Methuen & Co, London, 1966).

Davies, Horton, *worship and Theology in England: Vol III: from Watts and Wesley to Maurice* (William B. Eerdsman, Grand Rapids Michigan, 1961 reprint 1996).

Deane, A.C., Carpenter, S.C., Raven, C.E., MacKay, H.F.B., *Pillars of the English Church: Biographical Studies of Eminent Churchmen,* (A. R. Mowbray & Co., London, 1934)

Edwards, David L., *Leaders of the Church of England: 1828-1978* (Hodder & Stoughton, London, 1978)

Maurice, Frederick Denison, *Reasons for not joining a party in the church. A letter to the Ven. Samuel Wilberforce, Archdeacon of Surrey: suggested by the Rev. Dr. Hook's letter to the Bishop of Ripon, on the state of parties in the Church of England*. (J. G. F. & J. Rivington, London, 1841).

Moorman, John R. H., *A History of the Church in England* (Adam & Charles Black, London, 1953).

Morris, Jeremy, *F. D. Maurice and the crisis of Christian Authority* (Oxford University Press, Oxford, 2005 obtained from www.googlebooks.com)

Neill, Stephen, *Anglicanism* (Penguin Books, Harmondsworth, 1958).

Nolan, Randall, *A Mediating Tradition: the Anglican Vocation in Australian Society* (PhD Thesis, Griffith University, 2007 obtained on internet).

Pratt, Derek, *The Anglican Church's Mission to the Muslims in Cape Town during the Nineteenth and Twentieth Centuries: A study in the changes of Missiological methods and attitudes*. (MTh thesis, Rhodes University, 1998).

Vidler, Alec R., *The Church in an Age of Revolution:1789 to the present day.* (Penguin Books, Harmondsworth, 1961).

Vidler, Alec R., *The Theology of F. D. Maurice,* (SCM Press, London, 1947).

Online Journal Articles:

Morris, Jeremy, 'He was an inspiration for social witness', *Church Times*, 20 May 2005.

Busk, Michael C., 'F.D. Maurice: The Radically Inclusive God', *Anglican and Episcopal History*, Mar 2009.

Morris, Jeremy, 'Newman and Maurice on the Via Media of the Anglican Church: Contrasts and Affinities' *Anglican Theological Review*, Fall 2003.

Online Articles

http://www.george-macdonald.com/gmsociety/nw/21/nw21_prickett.html
> F. D. MAURICE: THE MAN WHO RE-WROTE THE BOOK Stephen Prickett: Presidential Address given at the 2002 Annual General Meeting of the MacDonald Society

http://www.episcopalcafe.com/daily/anglican_communion/comprehensively_beautiful_not.php
> W. Christopher Evans, Comprehensively beautiful, not tightly consistent

www.exeter-cathedral.org.uk/_.../vocation%20of%20anglicanism%20%5Blonger%5D.doc
> Paul Avis, Vocation of Anglicanism: The Richard Hooker Lecture 2009:

Other Websites used:

http://apps.facebook.com/qwhich-anglica-bhjec/
http://anglicanhistory.org/
http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Anglican_Communion
http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Anglicanism
http://www.modchurchunion.org/resources/mcu/cp/index.htm
http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Oxford_Movement
http://www.victorianweb.org/religion/brdchrch.html
http://www.victorianweb.org/religion/evangel2.html