





BISHOP GRISWOLD

SOLDIER AND SERVANT SERIES

Alexander Viets Griswold
and the
Eastern Diocese

By Julia C. Emery

Childhood and Youth in Simsbury

CHURCH MISSIONS PUBLISHING CO.

45 CHURCH STREET, HARTFORD, CONN.

See "Life of the Rt. Rev. Alexander Viets Griswold, D.D. Bishop of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the Eastern Diocese," by John S. Stone, D.D. Published by Hopkins, Bridgman & Co., Northampton, 1854. Also "A History of the Eastern Diocese," by Calvin R. Batchelder. Published by Church Printers, Claremont, N. H., 1876. These volumes may be borrowed from the Library at the Church Missions House, 281 Fourth Ave., New York, N. Y.

ALEXANDER VIETS GRISWOLD

AND THE

EASTERN DIOCESE

By JULIA C. EMERY

CHILDHOOD AND YOUTH IN SIMSBURY

In 1633 William Holmes packed the framework of his house on board a boat and sailed with it from Plymouth around Cape Cod, past Narragansett Bay and up the Connecticut River. There, at a point near the entrance of the Farmington, he set up his home anew — the first house in the Connecticut colony. Two years later, in 1635, sixty men, women and children, members of the Rev. John Wareham's congregation in Dorchester, Massachusetts, made their hard and tedious journey overland through the Connecticut wilds and planted at Windsor the first white settlement of the colony. "It was an honorable company," the old histories say, and certainly one full of intelligence and decision; for in 1638 the inhabitants of Windsor, Hartford and Wethersfield drew up "the oldest truly political constitution in America," known as "the Fundamental Orders of Connecticut."

By 1640 Mr. Wareham had followed his pilgrim flock to Windsor and had settled as first pastor of the congregation there, and among that congregation was an Edward Griswold whose descendant, Samuel, removed from Windsor to Simsbury and bought a farm of 500 acres. There, on a beautiful height sloping to a point in a bend of the Farmington River, he built his house, backed by hilly woodlands and looking across acres of rich meadows shaded by graceful elms to "this most lovely stream just where it plunges into its wild mountain pass."

Upon Samuel's death this choice farm came into the possession of his son Elisha, and became the home of his family of eight children, among the younger of whom was Alexander Viets Griswold, the subject of this sketch.

* "The first written Constitution known to history that created a government": Fisher's Beginnings of New England, p. 127.

The name Alexander Viets came from the mother's side of the family, and takes us back again to 1634 when Dutch colonists from New York disputed the Massachusetts settlement and were defeated in their attempts to share it by order and action of the British parliament. The fame of the goodly country did not pass, however. When, a century later, copper mines were discovered in Simsbury, Dr. Alexander Viets threw up his profitable practice in New York, disposed of his property there, and bought the tract in which the mines lay. The venture failed. Dr. Viets lost everything, resumed the practice of his profession and died poor. He left a son John, however, as enterprising and more prosperous, who, notwithstanding her parents' disapproval because of his lack of means, won "the daughter of a respectable neighbor" for his wife, retrieved the fallen fortunes of the family, recovered the property about the mines, and left a valuable farm to each of his sons. So, when his daughter Eunice married Elisha Griswold, "two of the most considerable families and estates in the town were brought together."

The Massachusetts English Griswolds were Congregationalists, the New York Dutch Viets, Presbyterians. Eunice had a brother Roger, a bookish boy, whom his father sent to Yale, designing him for the Presbyterian ministry. He entered college at thirteen — a mere child — but the experience of his few years there influenced not his life only, but that of his family and friends and, in years to come, the Church life of New England. For while in college on a certain Sunday he was seized with the desire to attend service at the "English Church," as the Episcopal church was then called. With "great difficulty" he obtained the president's permission to go once; but from that time he went again and again, procured works on the Church from the college library, and finally declared himself an Episcopalian, and wrote his father, asking permission to become a clergyman of the English Church. And, like Philander Chase in later days, he not only overcame all opposition, but lived to see his father and all his family earnest members

of the Church to which they had been opposed.

After graduating from college Roger Viets ventured the long and perilous voyage to England, and, in Priest's Orders, returned, about 1766, to Simsbury. There had been a parish there since 1740, for when, after Dr. Viets' failure, a Boston company took the copper mines, their superintendent, Mr. James Crozier, "a zealous Episcopalian," interested rich men in Boston and Newport to give funds for a church and glebe. The Rev. Mr. Gibbs came from Boston as the first rector, and young Roger Viets succeeded him. For some years after his return he lived in the house of his sister Eunice Griswold, and it was in the year that he came there, on the twenty-second of April, 1766, that his nephew Alexander Viets was born.

The child grew up from infancy in the atmosphere of a religious, intelligent and strictly disciplined home. His mother was the earliest teacher her children had, and she was gifted with "a wonderful power of inspiring love for and fixing the rudiments of knowledge in her children's minds." Later, while they were still very young, she had a teacher come to the house for them and for other children of the neighborhood, and later still they went to a sort of parish school taught in the winter season by their uncle Roger.

By the time Alexander was three years old he could read fluently. At his mother's Sunday evening catechisings he was distinguished above the other children by his love for and understanding of the Holy Scriptures. From these earliest years he was passionately fond of reading and study, and though ready enough to join his brothers and sisters at their play, would often slip off to enjoy some favorite book.

But this absorbing interest had many an interruption. If Alexander had a passion for reading, his mother had a passion equally strong for continuous industry. She would have her children constantly busy, and the little boy had to help in the lighter work of the farm, as gathering fruits and nuts and "riding horse" at ploughing. Nor, when these tasks were over, was there any leisure. Of this time his grandmother said, "Eunice

was too severe. There was Alexander, as good and amiable a boy as ever lived; and yet how severe she was with him! Whipping him for the most trifling transgressions, and keeping him every moment when not otherwise employed, knitting, knitting, knitting!" This knitting was of *bone lace*, "a kind of netting composed of a great variety of stitches, and then very much in use." Alexander began upon this work when not more than five years old, and many gloves, caps, capes and aprons his little fingers wrought. And the "transgressions" for which he was so often punished were the occasional stealing away for a game or a book.

Soon after the boy's tenth year his uncle Roger begged that this favorite pupil of his might come to live with him, and during much of the next nine years the parsonage at Simsbury was his home. They were the troublous years of the war of the Revolution, and during their course both Elisha Griswold and Roger Viets, together with many other Churchmen, clerical and lay, differing from most of their brethren in the South, who were strongly Patriot, took the neutral ground, which marked them as Tories among their countrymen, kept Mr. Griswold confined within the limits of his farm, and sent Mr. Viets to jail in Hartford for many months. But through these years Alexander had the advantage not only of his uncle's scholarly help, but of the use of his library, one of the largest and best in the neighborhood, and also of the parish library of considerable value, which had been given by the founders of the parish.

His inborn love of reading thus had full scope. While he farmed the parish glebe for his uncle, he would take his book from his pocket and pore over it as he rode along the furrow. "I recollect nothing in my childhood and youth more remarkable," he wrote, "than the rapidity with which I learned the lessons given me. . . . In about three days after the Greek grammar was first put into my hands I had, without any other teaching, written, in Greek characters, the first chapter of St. John's Gospel, interlined with a literal and verbal translation into Latin." Not only was his progress in Latin and

Greek remarkable, but he highly distinguished himself in mathematics also. He read everything within reach, and when his days were crowded with toil, from a very early age he would pass the great part of the night in reading, while the rest of the family slept. He delighted in works of the imagination, and in plays. When seven years old, in an exhibition among the neighborhood children, he took the part of the page in "Fair Rosamond," and when fifteen, that of Zanga in Dr. Young's "Revenge," to the delight of the Simsbury audience who declared that no actor in the American Company, then performing in Hartford, could compare with him. Also, in his later boyhood, he wrote many a verse whose playful sarcasm reflected upon his school companions.

In 1785 came changes which cut short all prospect of future school or college training. The many taxes and fines of the years of war had so straitened his father that he could not give his son a full college course, and when, later, Alexander might have entered the Senior class, other circumstances had intervened. The times no doubt had dealt hardly also with the Church's work in Simsbury. In 1774 the parish had stood third in the State, in the number of its members, Newtown having 1084, New Haven 942, and Simsbury 914; but now after the conclusion of peace when the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel offered its missionaries continued and increased stipends if they would take work in the British dominions, Mr. Viets was among those who accepted the offer, taking a parish in Digby, Nova Scotia. He could not bear to leave behind the nephew to whom he was so tenderly attached, and begged him to accompany him. Alexander was only nineteen years of age, but already he had engaged himself to Elizabeth Mitchelson, a girl of sixteen, the daughter of one of his neighbors. There were many delays and indecisions, but finally all idea of college was abandoned, the marriage took place in the latter part of 1785, and it was settled that the young couple should accompany the uncle's family to Digby. In 1786 Mr. Viets visited his new home, and the next year removed thither,

with his family and a young sister of Alexander. But Alexander himself did not go. His wife's parents had heard such unfavorable reports of the climate of Nova Scotia as made them seriously opposed to the move, and, as Alexander had only consented, through regard to his uncle, to leave his native land and the pleasant and fertile valleys of Connecticut for a new settlement in a bleak and unpromising and foreign country, he probably with the greater readiness gave up the idea. Once, in 1789, he went with his uncle as far as Boston on his way to Digby, and so for the first time visited the city in which his latest years were to be spent.

CHOICE OF PROFESSION AND MINISTRY IN LITCHFIELD COUNTY

With his marriage and his uncle's departure from Simsbury his boyhood closed. At nineteen he was a man, with a man's responsibilities, but with a most uncertain outlook upon his future. While living with his uncle, reading and studying with him, going with him to visit his clerical neighbors, he had naturally thought of the ministry as his calling. But now, with a young and rapidly growing family to care for, his first thought had to be given to their support. And, as to his final destiny, his rich and varied gifts were such as to draw him strongly in different directions. Though modest and retiring beyond most men, he knew that such habits of industry and economy as he possessed, if devoted to business pursuits, must result in providing ample means, and for a while his mind lingered on the possibility of a business career. But already he felt such an indifference to wealth, that its acquisition could not really hold his thoughts. A habit of arguing and debating had given him the title of "lawyer" among his young companions, and when, after his uncle's departure, he joined a debating club, his quick wit, his keen perceptions and clear judgments led his friends to urge him to make law his profession. For two or three years he gave part of his time to that study, but the cultivation of literature was his real delight. In his busiest years he found

or made time for reading, and he followed closely the rules of Drexilius: "1. Begin the work early in life. 2. Do it continually. Read no book without marking. 3. Often read over what you have written. 4. Always keep in view the end of your studies." Long years afterwards a friend wrote of him, "He was always a hard student, and one of the most perfect and balanced scholars with whom I have ever been acquainted. I could never consult him on any question in any branch of study, without finding him perfectly acquainted with it. In languages and in history, as well as in the abstract sciences and in theology, he was fully prepared for every occasion."

These perplexing questions as to his course in life lay like an under current through the constant daily toil of some ten years, during which he worked a small farm, which was his property at this time and for many years thereafter. Meanwhile parish affairs and interests still occupied him. When twenty years of age he became a communicant, and was among those confirmed by Bishop Seabury on his first visit to Simsbury. A Mr. Todd had succeeded Mr. Viets as rector, and he often turned for counsel and help to the young man who knew people and place so well. When the parish was vacant or the minister absent Mr. Griswold would help in the services, and he says of himself, "My knowledge of music and practice of Psalmody — as there were then very few organs in the country — made me of use both in teaching and leading the choir."

Thus it was not strange that before long Mr. Todd and other friends began to urge upon young Griswold that he should again consider entering the ministry. The plea was made just at a time when he had begun to think of "rising in the world," and when it was difficult to give up those hopes of temporal honors and advancement which had not loomed in the far off horizon of his uncle's day.

The decision cost him a painful struggle, but it was finally made, and in June, 1794, he offered himself as a candidate for Holy Orders to the convention of the diocese assembled in New Haven. He was received, and, according to the prevailing

custom in Connecticut, began at once to officiate in a small parish twelve miles from his home. For the candidate of those days was expected to have the qualifications — literary, scientific, theological, moral and religious — of the deacon of today, and was licensed to preach his own sermons and was open to election as minister of a parish.

That was an over-full year between his reception as a candidate and his ordination to the diaconate. Mr. Griswold spent it in daily work upon his farm, while at night his hearth was his seminary. Unable to afford adequate lights, there he stretched himself before the fire, and, "with his books before him, by the light of pine knots, as they blazed in the chimney corner, pursued his studies for hours after his wife and children were asleep."

During this year also he had to decide where his first settled ministerial work should be. Waterbury, one of the best parishes in the state, called him, promising him a new church building and a larger salary than was offered from elsewhere. Reading, in Fairfield County, also sent a call. But he declined both these in favor of the three parishes of St. Matthew's, East Plymouth, St. Mark's, Harwinton, and Trinity, Northfield, in Litchfield County, which were nearer to his home and the farm which still needed his oversight.

In June, 1795, during the meeting of diocesan convention, at Stratford, he was ordered deacon, and in October of the same year, when the bishop and some of his brother clergy were with him at Plymouth for the consecration of a new church, the clergy suddenly suggested to the bishop and to him that the opportunity be taken to advance him to the priesthood. So, without previous thought or expectation of such an event, the ordination took place — a year and a half from the time when he first resolved upon the work of the ministry. This ordination was the last which Bishop Seabury held.

For ten years Mr. Griswold served in Litchfield County. His salary was £100, practically \$300, one hundred from each of his three parishes. He had chosen the work which offered least money and, in one sense, most labor, though he seems to have

been free from some of the heaviest burdens of a spiritual father, since he testifies that his people "were mostly religious and all comparatively free from vice." Constant visiting, Sunday services, "preaching lectures" in private houses during the week, funerals, continual horseback riding over hilly country and bad roads, where carriages were "scarce thought of," and "the small wagon, since so constant in New England, had not come into use." would seem to have been sufficient to fill his days. But to these must be added, in addition to the occasional training of a young man for the ministry, the duties of a district school teacher in winter, of a day laborer in summer, and of fisherman at night. One of his parishioners, who for five years lived in his house in Plymouth, said of him, "The parson and myself have often worked out together as hired men in harvest time at seventy-five cents per day. He was among the best day laborers in town, and one day's work of his was worth as much as that of two common men."

This same person also said, "I have labored for many of the neighboring farmers, as well as for others who are not farmers, and have partaken at their board as one of the household, but I have never lived with any family at which the daily, habitual fare was so poor and coarse as that on Mr. Griswold's table." And yet among his parishioners their parson was remarkable as given to hospitality, and one says of him, "I have seen our minister when a negro asked charity, after ordering the table set with such cheer as was at command, though it was not his usual meal hour, sit down and partake with him, lest the poor African should feel himself slighted."

To loan his horse to a Congregational neighbor and walk himself to his day's duty; to ride through terrible storm and drifting snow to hold service, and, returning at midnight, to go supperless to bed rather than disturb his sleeping family; to spring into a swollen stream, weighted with his winter clothing, to rescue a drowning boy; in his best suit to jump over a garden fence in order to lend his "almost herculean" strength to raise a rock which had defied the united efforts of several men, are among

the stories which have come down to us of the years spent in Litchfield County.

They were years in which party spirit in the country was running high. Beveridge, in his "Life of John Marshall," records of them. "Actual secession of the Northern and Eastern States had not been openly suggested . . . but now one of the boldest and frankest of their number (the Federalists) broadly hinted it to be the Federalist purpose, should the Republicans persist in carrying out their purpose of demolishing the national courts. . . . 'There are states in this Union,' Roger Griswold of Connecticut exclaimed, 'who will never consent and are not doomed to become the humble provinces of Virginia.' "

Alexander had a brother Roger, but there is nothing in his memoirs to show that he was this zealous partizan, and through life, both as priest and bishop, Alexander was remarkable in his abstinence from any share in the political controversies of the day. While many ministers of the Gospel took an active part in politics, his parishioners could not tell which side he held. At last one of them determined to make him state his opinions, and after using every indirect method without effect, put the direct question. "To which side in politics do you belong?" To which, "My Kingdom is not of this world," was the mild and only reply.

Yet while so reticent in the expression of his political views, Mr. Griswold was influenced by the practice of his brothers in the ministry in preaching on sectarian divisions. The Church during long years in New England had left in "every step she took the track of a *hunted thing!*" In Connecticut there had long been a "deep rooted and violent opposition to Episcopacy." A spirit of sectarianism and controversy was rife long after Bishop Seabury's consecration, and it bred among Church people themselves a "proud contempt of the Puritans" and a strong prejudice against their doctrines. From the beginning of his ministry Mr. Griswold began the "never-remitted habit" of sermon writing, and these sermons, often prepared in hours

stolen from needed sleep, were, he declared later, "too frequently in defence of the distinctive principles of the Protestant Episcopal Church, to the great neglect of the essential doctrines of Christ and of the necessary duties of Christians "

For five years Mr. Griswold and his family lived in East Plymouth, and he gave half his time there and a quarter to Northfield and Harwinton each. In 1800 he removed to Harwinton where a parsonage had been provided, and from that time on divided his time equally among the three parishes. Occasionally also he would cross the Massachusetts border to visit and minister to the few church folk in the little town of Blanford.

So ten quiet years passed on. The parishes all gradually increased until they numbered 220 communicants. There was never any contention or "unkind dispute" between pastor and people. All were "exceedingly kind" to him and his. "He was the idol of all the little children of his parishes." A country farmer said of him, "He was an uncommonly perfect man. You could find no fault in him, no way."

In 1803 Mr. Griswold took the first real holiday of his life. A friend invited him to visit Bristol, Rhode Island, and he passed a fortnight there, preaching each Sunday in St. Michael's Church. The parish at that time was over eighty years old, and was then without a rector, and before Mr. Griswold's visit ended, he was urgently asked to take the charge. He declined, but in the fall, and again in the winter, men made the long journey from Bristol to Harwinton to beg him to reconsider, and at last he accepted the repeated call. This was with the consent of Bishop Jarvis, who, however, said that, after a few years' absence, he should expect him to return to Connecticut.

The reasons for Mr. Griswold's final decision are not fully known; but he had made himself responsible for a third part of the £500 paid for the glebe and parsonage at Harwinton; he had become involved in business enterprises made, against his judgment, by his brother Roger; an annual \$300 could not both support his family and free him from debt; he had already

thought of removing to some milder climate and less arduous work; the call thrice made from Bristol came at last to mean to him a Providential leading; and when his parish released him from his contract with them and took the glebe engagement off his hands, he left them with all the deeper sorrow but with a free mind and heart

EARLY MINISTRY IN BRISTOL

In the spring of 1804 John D'Wolf of Bristol, who had once rounded the northwest coast of the continent, and so was known to his townsmen as "Northwest John," fitted out one of his coasting vessels, and, like William Holmes 170 years before, sailed through Long Island Sound and up the Connecticut River to Hartford. There leaving his boat, he travelled by hired team the twenty miles and more farther on in search of the new rector of St. Michael's, whom, with his family and his belongings, he was to take back with him to Bristol.

With surprise Captain D'Wolf found Mr. Griswold at his plough; "a farmer in the field, under a broad brimmed hat, with patched short clothes, coarse stockings and heavy shoes." But this was the last time he was to appear in such a garb. His new home and parish were a great change from Litchfield County and its mountain missions. The fine old town on Narragansett Bay had a style of its own. Its people had interests across the seas and especially with the West Indies. The retired captains built large, substantial mansions crowned with the "captain's bridge," on which their owners paced to and fro on many a starry night, watching the heavens and the waters of the bay; their wives and daughters had a town air and fashion different from the quiet, diligent habit of the Connecticut farming families.

The parish had been organized in 1719, but when Mr. Griswold became rector, there were but twenty-five families connected with it, and about twenty communicants. An endowment brought in a salary of \$600, and the people seemed to feel this sufficient, and made no effort to increase the amount, so

again Mr. Griswold had to find other means by which to add to his income, and for that purpose opened a select school.

If, among his hopes in changing his parish, was the idea that he would have time to resume some of his favorite studies, that hope had to be abandoned. On entering the ministry he had written, "I found that my hopes of leisure for much reading were not to be realized without a neglect of the very duties to which I was pledged. . . . I was constrained to relinquish some studies in which I had very much delighted; especially music and mathematics, natural philosophy and chemistry," and now he had cause to repeat the words. At the same time, however, came a fresh impetus to enter more deeply than ever before into the study of those things peculiar to his sacred calling. For he found in Bristol a new need among his people, and at the same time a new spirit seemed to awaken within himself — a new softening of heart called forth not only by his people's need, but by the first of those visitations of the dread disease, consumption, which was to take from him in rapidly succeeding years, ten of the twelve children who were the fruit of his early marriage.

In beginning his new ministry he found that those sermons which had been most applauded in Connecticut gave offense to the Rhode Island people, and drove from the Church some of the "most pious of her members" to attend meetings held by Methodists who had lately settled in the town. In order to meet this problem Mr. Griswold destroyed many hundreds of the sermons he had prepared so carefully and under such difficulties, and bent his energies of heart and mind to the preparation of others. After much persuasion he prevailed upon his vestry to allow the church to be opened for a third service, on Sunday evening, when it was soon found that more came to that service than came to the two others, some of them attending that only. For thirty years — so long as he had a parish under his care — Mr. Griswold continued this practice, which he was the first of our clergy in New England to adopt. It was a method "exceedingly disliked" by many of our Church people, and the

bishop of Connecticut had once said, "night preaching and pulpit praying are two things which I abhor." That Mr. Griswold decided upon the practice so speedily after realizing the need of some unusual means to hold his people and to strengthen his parish evidenced to the firmness of character that was often to be shown when, under trying circumstances, he did what he judged to be right.

For five years he continued the course he had undertaken, in sole charge of a large school during the week, preaching three times each Sunday, and preparing occasional lectures in Lent. At the close of this period he started on a second vacation, this time going from Rhode Island to Connecticut instead of from Connecticut to Rhode Island.

It was in the heat of summer, the journey by chaise was tedious and very fatiguing; before he reached its end he was taken ill, and arrived at his mother's house in Simsbury in such a condition that there was no hope of his life being spared. He recovered, however, but by slow degrees, and in his enfeebled health returned home, to find his school and parish work beyond his strength. The recollection of Bishop Jarvis' words returned to him, that he would spare him to Bristol for a few years only, and he went back to Connecticut, evidently thinking that, should the way open, he would settle there again. The opening came in a call to St. Michael's, Litchfield, near his old cures of Northfield and Harwinton. He decided to accept, and arranged the time for his return, but, as in the case of Digby twenty-four years earlier, the change was never made. For, in the year 1809 came the great call which bound the remainder of his life with that solitary experiment in the American Church — the Eastern Diocese.

When Mr. Griswold came to Rhode Island, that diocese was without a bishop. On November 18, 1790, its infant convention — of two clerical and five lay delegates — had declared Bishop Seabury of Connecticut to be their bishop. Two years after his death, in 1798, they elected Bishop Bass of Massachusetts. After his death, in 1803, three years passed, during

which no effort was made to secure a successor. By that time Mr. Griswold had been added to the list of clergy, and was chairman of the committee appointed by the convention of 1806 to ask Bishop Moore of New York to take the churches of the diocese under his care. How few were the bishops, and how slowly the growing need was met, are shown in Bishop Moore's reply. South Carolina also had just called him to care for that diocese; the duties of his own diocese were so many and so pressing, he could not add to them the charge of these others.

THE EASTERN DIOCESE AND ELECTION OF BISHOP

It was at this time that Bishop Parker, who had succeeded Bishop Bass in Massachusetts, after an eight months' episcopate with no episcopal acts, was nearing his death, and the movement now began, which resulted in the formation of the Eastern Diocese. Apart from Connecticut the territory of New England was composed of four so-called dioceses, without bishops and in sad need of episcopal leadership and supervision, yet each one of them so weak as to feel unable to support a bishop of its own. Massachusetts, indeed, had had two bishops, and Vermont had made two ineffectual attempts to secure one, but even in Massachusetts, where the Church was strongest, the bishops had been obliged to retain their parishes in order to receive adequate support. That state naturally took the lead in suggesting a diocesan union and in the convention of 1805 it first recommended that this union be made with Rhode Island and New Hampshire. The convention of 1801 requested its president to correspond with the clergy of those states upon the subject, but it was not until 1809 that, at an informal meeting of some of the principal clergymen of Massachusetts and Rhode Island, the plan of the Eastern Diocese was discussed and formulated. The Rev. William Montague of Christ Church, Dedham, Massachusetts, seems to have been a chief mover in this enterprise. It was he who called this meeting and who, before the diocesan

convention upon May 30, rode a thousand miles, visiting the clergy and pressing the subject upon them.

The Massachusetts conventions of May and August adopted the plan and sent invitations to New Hampshire, Rhode Island and Vermont to a joint convention to be held in Boston on May 29, 1810. The Rhode Island convention of June 7, 1809, appointed Mr. Griswold chairman of the committee of correspondence upon this matter, which appointment must have been made just before his trip to Connecticut and the serious illness which determined him to remove thither. By the spring of 1810 his plans were so far made, that he was about starting for Litchfield to complete them, when the illness of his travelling companion delayed the journey.

This accidental "happening" changed the whole current of Mr. Griswold's life. As he had expected to have no personal connection with the proposed new diocese, he had not thought of attending the convention that had been called; but as this time was now left free he decided to take the opportunity to visit Boston and have the pleasure of meeting such an unusual number of his fellow Churchmen, almost all of whom were strangers to him.

As he pursued his way, his mind turned to the purpose for which these men were gathering, and the importance of the meeting impressed him more and more. We can easily picture him — a solitary traveller, entering Boston for the first time since his youth — absorbed in prayer that God would guide the convention to a right choice. His thoughts fixed on John Henry Hobart of New York, the young and ardent rector of Trinity Parish, through his writings and activities the most widely known parish clergyman in the Church. But on reaching Boston he was told that Mr. Hobart had already been approached and had declined to have his name mentioned. The Rev. John S. J. Gardiner, then Rector of Trinity Church, Boston, the leading church within the limits of the proposed new diocese, was opposed to having any one from outside elected, as the new episcopal head. He himself would have been the natural choice,

but he would not consider an election, and described the kind of man who he thought should be chosen in such a way as to show that he felt the position one far from ease and honor. They should choose some one, he said, of middle age and "capable of enduring the fatigues of travelling, and of patiently submitting to the hardships and mortifications incident to the office in such an extended territory and under such unpromising circumstances."

Six clerical and sixteen lay delegates from Massachusetts, two clerical and two lay from Rhode Island, one clerical and two lay from New Hampshire, one clerical and three lay from Vermont, came together for this joint convention, and on the day preceding it two of the lay delegates, Mr. Chipman from Vermont and Mr. Halsey from Rhode Island, decided upon Mr. Griswold as their choice. On the evening of this day some of the delegates met informally together, and when Mr. Gardiner described the kind of man needed for their new bishop, the Rev. N. B. Crocker of St. John's Church, Providence, proposed Mr. Griswold. The Rev. Abraham Bronson, the only clerical delegate from Vermont, who had known him in Connecticut, was in hearty accord with the proposal, and with Mr. Crocker sought out the Rev. Daniel Barber, the sole clerical delegate from New Hampshire. He had known Mr. Griswold from childhood, and warmly approved the nomination.

On Tuesday, May 29, 1810, the convention met. Mr. Bronson and Mr. Griswold were appointed on a committee to draw up a constitution for the new diocese, which committee was to report on Thursday. As their work ended, Mr. Griswold asked Mr. Bronson if he had heard any one named for the bishopric. Mr. Bronson asked if he had heard of their choice, Mr. Griswold said "No," when Mr. Bronson rejoined, "Then let me tell you, *thou art the man.*"

This announcement came to Mr. Griswold not only as a complete surprise, but as a great shock. That he was present at the convention at all was unexpected. His mind had been fully made up to leave Rhode Island and return to the quiet

hill country of Connecticut; his thoughts had already settled in a region of pleasantness and peace and comparative leisure. And here was opened before him an untried and difficult future, with ever growing responsibilities and cares. For a moment he was thrown into "wild agitation," and then, collecting himself, he declared to Mr. Bronson that he was unfit for the office and that they must choose another man. "Sir," said Mr. Bronson, "you must be the candidate, or we shall have no election."

On Thursday, May 31, the convention re-assembled. The constitution for the new diocese was adopted, and the bishop elected. In the proceedings the delegates from the four states had an equal vote and secured for the Church in each state equal rights; but while the delegates were appointed by the conventions of the separate states, the Eastern Diocese itself was considered not "a confederation of distinct and independent dioceses," but as "one proper diocese, with a convention from the Churches of the four several states." And for this new diocese, unprecedented in the history of the Church, by the vote of every member save one of the convention, Mr. Griswold was chosen bishop.

Through the day he had been sitting, absorbed in thought and heedless of what passed on around him. When the votes were declared, his first feeling was "that the Lord in displeasure had suffered such an election." Greatly moved, he rose and declined the honor. He wanted no time for consideration, he could make his decision there and then. But the convention adjourned for three months, and when the first emotion had passed, he began to consider the Providential guidance which had led him to this unlooked for task, and to consult old friends in Connecticut upon the matter. In June, 1810, Bishop Jarvis sent him a letter of congratulation in behalf of the convocation of his clergy; Mr. Bronson wrote from Vermont and Mr. Barber from New Hampshire, urging him to reconsider and accept; the one dissenting vote was withdrawn, and on September 12 he gave his acceptance, and on the 25th the adjourned meeting of the preliminary convention was held and the letter of acceptance read. This convention then dissolved, and on the

succeeding day the first convention of the Eastern Diocese opened and Mr. Griswold preached the sermon.

Up to that time he had hardly spoken save in the home church in Simsbury, in the three country churches in Litchfield County, in the Blanford schoolhouse and in his parish church of St. Michael's, Bristol. Now in Trinity Church, Boston, on the threshold of his new office, before a congregation of strangers, he preached from II Timothy iv. 1-3, "Preach the word; be instant, in season, out of season; reprove, rebuke, exhort, with all long-suffering and doctrine." "Who is the preacher?" asked a leading Congregational minister of Boston, and when told it was the bishop-elect of the Eastern Diocese, he exclaimed, "I can only say that if such is the general character of his preaching, he is worthy to be made *arch*-bishop of Christendom."

But though so unanimously chosen and so greatly needed by his diocese, it was May 29, 1811, before Mr. Griswold's consecration took place. General Convention met in New Haven from May 21 to 24, and his testimonials and those of Dr. Hobart, as assistant in the Diocese of New York, were signed and their consecration expected. But of the six bishops who then composed the House of Bishops, only Bishop White of Pennsylvania and Bishop Jarvis attended the convention, and it was ordered that the bishops-elect should proceed to New York, in the hope that Bishop Provoost of that diocese might be able to join with the others in the consecration.

The day was set, May 29, the place, Trinity Church; Bishop Provoost, not fully recovered from a recent illness, was prevailed upon to make the effort to attend, and the consecration took place. What must have been a pleasure to Bishop Hobart must have been a disappointment to Bishop Griswold. The former was elevated to this high office in his own church, among his own people, by his diocesan and by the presiding bishop who had baptized and confirmed him; while the latter, who might naturally have looked forward with pleasure to his consecration in the state of his birth and among friends and relatives,

received it in a strange place and among strangers. Perhaps the loneliness of his position reacted on his serious and reflective mind, and made him dwell more than otherwise he would have done upon two circumstances attendant upon the service.

In the laying on of hands Bishop White, as he says in his *Memoirs*, "inadvertently" omitted the words "In the Name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost." This led to much discussion and questioning as to the validity of the orders conferred, but with regard to Bishop Hobart only — Bishop Griswold being so unknown and unconsidered by New York Churchmen, that seemingly they were indifferent as to how this same oversight might affect him. Nor did this criticism die away until Bishop White had shown that the words did not occur, in that place, in the Church of England until the time of Charles II, and that they were "not to be found in the liturgies of the Primitive Church or in the Roman Pontifical of today."

The other circumstance which Bishop Griswold records in his autobiography was, that, although his election had preceded Dr. Hobart's by nearly a year, and he had been elected bishop of a diocese while Dr. Hobart had been chosen as assistant bishop only, Bishop White had laid his hands in consecration first upon Dr. Hobart, with the result that in the order of the episcopate Bishop Hobart always outranked him, and, but for his death, earlier than that of Bishop White, would have become the presiding bishop of the Church.

Bishop Griswold was not an ambitious man. He was silent, reserved and shy, modest and self-contained; but he was essentially clear minded and just. He disliked position and publicity, and when Bishop Hobart's early death led to his holding for seven years the place of presiding bishop, it was only his strong sense of duty that made him consent to preside in the House of Bishops. But if the precedency given to Bishop Hobart should have been his, he felt that this should have been admitted; and it is evident that his judgment could not yield to Bishop White's explanation that he laid his hands first on Dr.

Hobart because of his *degrece*, precedency in England being given according to priority of date in university degrees. It is possible that this occurrence which, in Bishop Griswold's mind, marred the complete harmony of his consecration day, on occasion had no little influence in his future attitude; but his chief comment at the time was, "The whole business has been much blessed to me in the subduing of a proud heart."

The honors lacking at the date of his consecration soon came to the new bishop. In October, 1811, the College of New Jersey, at Princeton, conferred on him the degree of Doctor of Divinity, and in the same year he received that degree from Brown University, Providence, which in 1812 made him a Fellow and in 1815 its Chancellor.

Meanwhile Bishop Griswold had returned from New York to review the field of his work and to enter upon its duties.

In the four states which made up his diocese — Massachusetts, then including Maine, Rhode Island, New Hampshire and Vermont — there were twenty-two parishes and sixteen officiating clergymen. Trinity, Boston, St. John's, Providence, and Trinity, Newport, were the only really strong parishes; Christ Church, Boston, St. Paul's, Newburyport, St. Michael's, Bristol, St. Paul's, Narragansett County, St. John's, Portsmouth, and St. James' Great Barrington, all ante-dated the Revolution and supported their rectors, but could do little towards the endowment of the episcopate. Some of the clergy had grown lax, but most of them rallied to their bishop and gave him and their work a faithful and diligent service. And to them his heart opened with a tender warmth. He had felt them to be his brethren and friends; they now became his children.

PAROCHIAL AND EPISCOPAL CARES

Heavy family griefs doubtless increased this feeling. A daughter twenty years of age had lately died; his oldest son and daughter were both slowly fading away. Sorrowful but calm and uncomplaining he went out to meet the spiritual needs

of the larger family which the Church had given to his care. A strong sense was growing upon him that he was an instrument for his people's good. And what he felt for all his people came home to him with peculiar force for the people of his parish.

In the six years in which he had ministered in Bristol the number of communicants had increased from twenty to forty only. Now with redoubled intensity he labored in their behalf. Working his garden by day and writing his sermons by night, to his three services on Sunday he added a Wednesday evening sermon and soon noticed an increased seriousness in his congregations. Some of them began to come to him expressing their awakened consciousness, and once or twice a week their bishop-rector met them for special prayer. The interest spread throughout the town. There was a veritable revival. Forty-four adults were baptized and a hundred were added to the number of communicants, more than half of whom had been attending worship elsewhere or not at all.

For nineteen years longer he continued to be the rector of St. Michael's. In 1809 the Massachusetts convention had voted that a fund be raised for the support of a bishop, and an incorporation, known as "Trustees of Donations to the Protestant Episcopal Church" was established. The objects of this incorporation were the support of the bishop of the Eastern Diocese and the care of such funds or property as might be entrusted to it for the benefit of churches or church institutions within the diocese. Subscriptions for the bishop's fund were opened in September, 1810, after Mr. Griswold had accepted his election, and it had gained the amount of some \$15,000, which gave the bishop a yearly income of about \$900. This amount, however inadequate for the purpose, came almost entirely from Massachusetts, and it was natural that appeals should soon come from that diocese that the bishop should settle there. He was living too far from Boston — "the centre"; the clergy in Portland felt themselves too remote from his help and influence and begged him to move to some point nearer them; the parish of St. Peter's, Salem, weary of a succession of "cold and uninter-

esting readers" who could "not administer the necessary rites of the Church," sent him repeated calls. In 1816 another effort was made. The feeling continued and increased that their bishop should be in closer touch with his people and freer for diocesan duties. He was urgently called to Cambridge, and, in addition to other reasons, the personal advantages were set before him of the use of "the large and valuable library of the university" and the society of "learned and amiable men employed in the government and instruction of that institution."

On both occasions Bishop Griswold took months for consideration and both times in the end sadly disappointed his petitioners. He could not make up his mind that the advantages to the diocese would outweigh family and parish claims, and he felt that as long as the bishop could not be supported by the diocese in a manner befitting his office and position, the more retired the situation he occupied the better. No doubt his disposition and the quiet tenor of his life made him shrink from the proposed change; in any case he found it "difficult if not impossible" to leave Bristol, where he was bound to his parishioners "by years of most perfect harmony. with ties of gratitude and affection," where he had managed to acquire a house and garden for his family, and where, perhaps strongest claim of all, the graves in the churchyard held him with a compelling force.

So, from 1811 to 1830, with the cares and labors of the diocese and the general Church increasing yearly upon him, he continued to pour out that constant flow of instruction to the people of his parish and community, which he enumerates in his autobiography — a course of eighty or ninety lectures on the four Gospels. "in the way of harmony," a series of thirty-three discourses on the Acts of the Apostles, twelve on the Catholic Doctrine of the Trinity, ten on the Ten Commandments with five on Our Lord's summary of the Decalogue, several on the Catechism and the Apostles' Creed, one on the Book of the Revelation of St. John considered chapter by chapter, and seventy upon the Pentateuch. All of these lectures were delivered on Sunday evenings — that practice so "abhorred" by

the Bishop of Connecticut, and were considered by Bishop Griswold as "among the most efficacious of (his) pulpit labors." And all this was in addition to the sermons, of which he had on hand, after destroying twelve or fourteen hundred, more than he could ever use in the future. The Rev. John Bristed, his successor in St. Michael's, who had lived in his house and studied under him, and who was himself an author and an accomplished critic, wrote of the Bishop's preaching, "To a very high order of human talent he joins the profoundest and most comprehensive acquaintance with *Scriptural Doctrine*. I have heard some of the greatest preachers on either side of the Atlantic . . . but I never sat under a minister from whom I received so much and so varied instruction in the Word of God." And a parishioner testified that his life responded to his teachings. "It was a remark often made (in Bristol) respecting him," she wrote, "that there was *one* specimen of *perfection* in the world".

With such service as this as a parish priest Bishop Griswold combined the duties of his episcopate. Even before his consecration a call had come to him to visit Lanesborough, Massachusetts, not only to confirm but to remain "a number of days, not less than four," in order to settle serious parish difficulties. The month after his consecration, in June, 1811, he started on his first visitation, responding to this call and going to Lenox and Great Barrington also, in the valley of the Housatonic. No bishop had ever visited these parishes, and he found the whole body of communicants and many not already communicants awaiting confirmation. Other parishes which Bishop Bass had visited had been for eight years without episcopal visitation, and in these he was equally needed and equally welcome. It was not strange that when, in 1812, he was approached on the subject of adding to his present office that of coadjutor to Bishop Jarvis of Connecticut, with the prospect of becoming bishop of that diocese, he could not consider such a proposition. His lot was cast with that of the Eastern Diocese.

And so began that long succession of journeys made under conditions that would tax the strongest frame and most deter-

mined will. They included not only the usual visits to parishes and attendance upon conventions of his diocese — biennial up to 1820, and annual from that time on — but also upon the annual conventions of the four separate dioceses — five, after the organization of Maine, in 1820, contained within the bounds of the Eastern Diocese, as well as upon the sessions of General Conventions held in either New York or Philadelphia, from 1814 to 1841 inclusive. He never failed in keeping appointments, again and again hazarding health and even life to do so. He would respond to what seem to have been unreasonable and inconsiderate appeals, as from a candidate and lay reader in Guilford, Vermont, to come to that parish in the winter of 1818 to consecrate the church. The bishop on December 16 had just finished his visitations, but if the matter were of sufficient importance and would help in the upbuilding of the Church in Guilford he “would not hesitate at all”; though travelling in stages, when the weather was cold and the nights were long, was “inconvenient to people advanced in life,” and he had meant to spend the winter in his study and the duties of his parish. Also the expenses of the year, to the amount of some hundreds of dollars had outrun his scanty income, and it would be difficult immediately to get the means of meeting those for a new journey. Still, he “particularly desired that no regard to (his) convenience should induce any dereliction of the interests of religion”; and accordingly to Guilford he went. So again and again, “fearful lest *any* interest should suffer through his neglect,” he would let “neither distance of place, inclemency of season, enfeebled strength, exhausted purse, fondness for home or love of study” keep him from the work which claimed a bishop’s care.

On one occasion a violent storm prevented the regular ferry boat making its eight-mile trip across Narragansett Bay, and he bribed a boatman to take him in his open boat. Midway the boatman declared they could go no farther. “If she carried more ballast,” he said, “she might perhaps live through the bay.” “Would it help,” asked the bishop, “were I to lie down in the boat?” “No better ballast than that could she have,”

said the boatman; and the bishop cast himself on his face, and the weight of his strong frame — “much heavier than that of common men”— proved sufficient for the need. So, wet and encrusted with gray brine, he arrived scarcely recognizable among his waiting flock.

Or again the bishop would travel uncomfortably rather than inconvenience others. In a journal of 1818 he wrote of a trip to Rutland, Vermont, “In order to save trouble to my friends take a seat in a wagon, going by night. May I ever imitate St. Paul, and, as far as is practicable, avoid being burthensome to the Churches, and the giving of pain, trouble or expense to my people.”

The bishop’s “almost numberless journeys,” though so arduous and trying to his health, were made without accident, and seemed sometimes, by “the counter-irritant of motion and toil,” to wear out disease; though “no frame of less iron hardness than his could, with any safety, have hazarded the perils of his frequent extreme exposure,” and in the last five years of his life he suffered during his journeyings, and with increasing frequency, very dangerous attacks of illness. But his constitution was such that as these attacks yielded, he was “straightway on his feet again, apparently as well as ever.” In a letter written on August 25, 1842, he mentions for the first and only time taking “the railroad cars” from Westfield to Pittsfield, Massachusetts. “What months of tedious travel,” his biographer writes, “in storm and flood; over rough roads, and rugged mountains; in piercing cold, and melting heat; by public stage, and in open wagon; with his mind stretching forward, while his body dragged behind, would have been saved him had the . . . system of railroads, which now spreads from Boston through almost the whole of what was once the Eastern Diocese, been in existence and operation, when he first began his two and thirty years of perilous and exhausting journeyings!”

But these journeys, so taxing to his physical strength, were by no means the most painful trials that beset the bishop in his course. His episcopate began as the War of 1812 was drawing

near. That war had an evil effect upon the seaport towns dependent upon foreign trade. They were almost depopulated, and felt lonely and deserted and morally and religiously depressed. These influences spread into the interior country, and factional spirit ran high. In the old parish in Great Barrington this spirit caused such dissension between the people and their rector — a brother of the bishop — as was ended only after eight weary years in Mr. Griswold's withdrawing from the active duties of the ministry to the old home in Simsbury, leaving a wrecked parish behind him.

Bishop Griswold's report to his first convention, made in 1812, was a brief record of the work done during the sixteen months since his consecration. He did not touch on those things already burdening his mind — parishes "at their last gasp" or already "perished," the great prejudice against lay readers and the great lack of clergy; candidates for Holy Orders asking permission to read their own sermons or for Ordination before reaching the age of twenty-one; the offer of a Congregational minister to hold services in a vacant parish, the discipline necessary to be enforced upon two of his scanty band of clergy.

The convention endorsed the project of a diocesan library, which never materialized, and a plan of annual collections for the feeble parishes of the diocese. The bishop appointed Easter Day as the time for these collections, and the practice endured throughout the life of the diocese, although with small results.

MISSIONARY INTERESTS

Two years previous to this convention in 1810 the Congregationalists had organized in Boston the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions, and Bishop Griswold doubtless had this in mind when, in sending out a circular letter urging the Easter collections, he wrote, "Whilst (so much to the honor of the Christian name) a liberal spirit of piety and zeal for distributing the Holy Scriptures and for diffusing the light of the Gospel to the remotest nations of the earth, pervades the Christian world; it may reasonably be expected that the state

and exigencies of the Church in this Diocese will not, by its friends. be forgotten or neglected.”

The bishop recognized also what these Christians of other names were doing within the limits of the diocese itself. He could recall the early days of his own ministry, and the movements, in 1798, of the “associated (Congregational) pastors of Connecticut” to form a missionary society, which, beginning there, should work out into neighboring states and make its farther way “to christianize the heathen in North America, and to support and promote Christian knowledge in the new settlements within the United States.” So, while he gladly visited the new parish of St. James’, Greenfield, “where Episcopalians were never known before,” and where “if he would come, very many of other denominations would flock to it as an ark of safety from the threatening deluge of Socinianism,” in travelling through the western portion of his field, he pointed out to his companion the many houses of worship belonging to the “orthodox Congregationalists, Baptists and Methodists; but not one belonging to Episcopalians,” on the way. “As we have passed along,” he said, “I have been thinking what the people of our State would do, if they could not find religion except by seeking it in our Church.”

Bishop Griswold returned from the General Convention of 1814 to the Biennial Convention of his diocese with a charge to his clergy which he afterwards sent out, together with a pastoral letter, to all his people. These papers doubtless were influenced by his recent intercourse with his brother bishops and with the Church at large. After calling for thanks for peace and prosperity in the Church, and noting duties still undone and opportunities neglected, the bishop went on to make a direct missionary plea. “In all those noble efforts which are daily making, to diffuse the light of the holy Scriptures and the knowledge of salvation to the remotest parts of the earth . . . shall our Church only take no part? . . . Far from sending the Gospel to distant regions, we neglect to promulgate it among ourselves. . . . This is an era of Gospel light sur-

passed only by that of its first propagation. . . . May it tend to unite all Christians in faith and affection, in doctrine and practice."

The bishop went on to say that no "greater stigma" was attached to the established Church of England than "her apathy in regard to propagating her faith"; that while her children abound in "all manner of charities," in "this work of evangelists, they were unaccountably deficient"; that in but few British colonies till very lately had Episcopacy been "completely organized," that "in these states, before the Revolution, while other denominations of Christians enjoyed the full establishment of their respective systems, the Episcopal Churches were not permitted to have a Bishop." But now the Church of England was "awaking from this lethargy and arising in her strength," while "'our portion' of Christ's Church" remained "delinquent" still—"even the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States." Yet in several other States efforts to spread the Gospel were being made. "Where then shall we find a Christian community, so little engaged in extending its faith as ours of the Eastern Diocese?" The Church of Rome had too justly censured Protestants who had left to them the propagation of the Gospel. The Moravians had been a solitary exception. The time had come for the Church in the Eastern Diocese to act.

"Let us do the work of evangelists," said the bishop to his clergy. "Let the work begin in our hearts, and in our families; let it extend to our friends and neighbors, and to the humblest cottages of our respective parishes; nor let it cease till it pervades our country, and all the ends of the world have seen the salvation of our God."

A man of like spirit with Bishop Griswold, whose alert and active mind was absorbed in the effort to bring Christ to the heathen world, was the Rev. Josiah Pratt, then Secretary of the Church Missionary Society of England. Peace between Great Britain and the United States was declared in December, 1814, and in the following August Mr. Pratt sent a letter in behalf of foreign missions to "several of the leading members of the

Episcopal Church in the United States." Bishop Griswold was the first to reply. In July, 1816, he sent a warm-hearted, sympathetic response, together with a copy of his charge and pastoral letter of 1814. "Most gladly would we unite with you," he wrote, "in sending missions to Africa and the East, and hope that the time is not far distant when some of our pious young men will be zealously disposed to engage in that interesting work. At present, however, we have not funds nor other means of doing much in any missionary labor; not even of supplying the wants of our own country. It would never be credited on your side of the water, what multitudes there are in these United States destitute of the Gospel ministrations."

In November of the same year Bishop Griswold wrote again, at which time he probably suggested the Rev. Joseph R. Andrus, one of his deacons of 1815 and just ordained priest, as a missionary candidate. Mr. Pratt printed the bishop's first letter with extracts from his charge and pastoral in *The Missionary Register* of 1816, and in 1817 told of the Society's plan to open four mission stations in Ceylon. For these three Church of England clergymen had been found, and if a fourth did not offer, the Society might send Mr. Andrus. The quota was made good from England, however, and Mr. Pratt wrote that it would be much more likely to awaken missionary zeal in the United States if the Church there could have a missionary society of its own, and the Church Missionary Society offered to give £200 to encourage such an undertaking.

It was November, 1820, before Bishop Griswold again wrote to Mr. Pratt, but though long delayed the letter brought the good news that in May of that year a society "for Foreign and Domestic Missions" had been formed. "In compliance with the wishes of some individuals," the bishop added, *Domestic Missions* are embraced; but the main object of its promoters is the propagation of the Gospel in Foreign Parts." No doubt he was among those who in the following year were disappointed when the revised constitution of the Society was finally adopted, with the name of the "Domestic and Foreign Missionary Society."

Mr. Andrus never went as a missionary in connection with either the English Society or our own. This was the time of the formation of the American Colonization Society, and Bishop Griswold wrote Mr. Pratt in no hopeful vein of the conditions that had led to it. The advance of Christ's Kingdom is "not a little impeded," he said, "by the prevalence of unsound doctrine in one part of these States, and of slavery in the other. The latter evil is evidently increasing." Mr. Andrus went to West Africa as one of the earliest agents of the Colonization Society, and his bishop hoped he might be able to co-operate with the English missionaries already settled there. The bishop's interest continued a potent force in behalf of Foreign Missions from that time on. He ordained the Rev. J. J. Robertson who sailed from Boston on January 1, 1829, to pioneer in Greece, and the Rev. Horatio Southgate who adventured to Turkey and Persia in 1835. It was one of his laymen, Mr. E. A. Newton of Pittsfield, Massachusetts, who, in 1834, moved in the Board of Missions that a mission should be opened in China, and one of his own Massachusetts students, the Rev. S. H. Tyng, ordained by him in 1821, who in 1835 came from his Philadelphia parish to New York to see the first China missionaries start upon their way. It was a man ordained by him, and who succeeded him in St. Peter's parish, Salem, the Rev. J. A. Vaughan, who, from 1836 to 1841, served as Secretary of the Foreign Committee of the Board of Missions, and in the great missionary year, 1835, the bishop himself wrote the hymn still retained in the Church's Hymnal, "Holy Father, Great Creator," whose closing stanza reads:

"God the Lord, through every nation
 Let Thy wondrous mercies shine!
 In the song of Thy salvation
 Every tongue and race combine'
 Great Jehovah,
 Form our hearts and make them Thine."

Along with his interest in missions ran Bishop Griswold's keen sense of the need of a consecrated and well trained clergy.

Directly upon his consecration he had described the kind of men needed — of Apostolic zeal, willing to plant before they reaped, to go into the spiritual wilderness and cultivate it, to spend and be spent for God's glory and the salvation of men, to seek first the Kingdom of God and His righteousness. "One such," he said, "is worth twenty drones in the Sacred Ministry." Therefore, when, in 1817, the General Convention established a General Theological Seminary, he was fully in accord with the plan. No doubt he seconded Bishop Brownell's efforts that it should be conducted in New Haven, and shared his disappointment when, after a two years' trial, it was returned to New York. He recognized that New York Churchmen were the largest contributors to the expenses of the school and that it was only reasonable that the institution should be in that city; but the distance was great, the cost of travel was large, his candidates were poor, and underneath all else must have been the feeling, that for work in New England the best training could be given on New England soil. So many candidates for the ministry in the Eastern Diocese read under one or another of the parish clergy, or were trained under the direct care of the bishop himself.

In 1830, in answer to a renewed call from St. Peter's, Salem, endorsed by nineteen of the clergy of Massachusetts, the Bishop at last gave up his Bristol parish and removed to Salem. He then asked his convention to establish a theological school for the Eastern Diocese, and in 1832 repeated the request. The Rev. Geo. W. Doane, at that time rector of Trinity Church, Boston, wrote the bishop that the Rev. John Henry Hopkins might take the combined duty of assistant in that parish and professor in the proposed school. This arrangement was made. Mr. Hopkins came, three students entered the school, and the work began. But the same year Mr. Doane was elected and consecrated Bishop for New Jersey and Mr. Hopkins for Vermont, and the school was dissolved. In 1834-1835 a fund of \$104,000 was raised towards its re-establishment, and the Rev. Alonzo Potter was urged to return from Schenectady, whither he

had gone in 1831, to take charge; but he declined, and the project was again abandoned. It was then that one of the clergy said, "The best theological seminary which the Eastern Diocese ever had — perhaps the best any diocese will ever have — was in Bishop Griswold's own house and parish at Bristol."

There among his students were J. P. K. Henshaw who succeeded him as bishop in Rhode Island, John Bristed, his successor in St. Michael's Parish, James W. Eastburn, brother of the Rev. Manton Eastburn consecrated his assistant bishop, Stephen H. Tyng, Rector of the Church of the Epiphany, Philadelphia, and, later, of St. George's Church, New York. Mr. Tyng has left an account of Bishop Griswold's practical method of instruction in Pastoral Theology;

"When I had been in Bristol about a week," he writes, "the Bishop observed, 'I wish you to attend a meeting with me in the country this evening, and I will call for you after tea.' He came accordingly, and we walked about a mile to a neighborhood called 'The Neck,' where the rooms of a farmhouse were entirely filled with people waiting his arrival. He sat down among them at a little table, and, after singing and prayer, expounded to them a chapter in the Epistle to the Romans. . . . I cannot describe the impression which this occasion made on me. The condescension and meekness with which he thus familiarly walked out with a youth like me; the perfectly unassuming manner in which he appeared among the rustic congregation . . . the simplicity and tenderness of his discourse; the tremulous sweetness of his voice, as he raised the tune in singing; were all such new and striking facts to me, that I was surprised as well as delighted with the whole occasion. The Bishop opened the service with a selection of prayers from the Liturgy, and closed it with an extemporaneous prayer, in which duty he excelled almost all whom I have ever heard.

"His weekly meetings were generally of this social and private character. There were sometimes two or more such meetings each week. . . . When he was at home he attended them himself; though, even then he required of his

theological students frequent addresses and exhortations to the people assembled; so that his ministry was not only a continued example and source of instruction, but also in the opportunity for practical exercise in the duties of their future ministry which he gave them, of the greatest service in perfecting their qualifications, and in forming their habits for future usefulness."

But his recruits for the ministry were not always gained without difficulty. Two cases of especial interest occurred during Bishop Griswold's episcopate, one of which drew the attention of the entire Church. A New York physician had been moved to give up his profession in order to devote himself to the work of the ministry, and had been received in his diocese as a candidate for Holy Orders. Later, because of his use of intemperate language against a fellow Churchman of prominence in New York, Bishop Hobart refused to ordain him, and notified his brother bishops of his action. After some delay, in 1823, the rejected candidate applied for admission in the Eastern Diocese. This application brought out two interesting points. It was the first time since the organization of the Church in the United States that a candidate refused in one diocese had applied in another; could the second diocese grant the request? And, while the candidate offered for the Eastern Diocese, it was the Standing Committee of a Diocese within the limits of the Eastern Diocese (Rhode Island) which acted upon the matter.

For a year a correspondence was carried on between Bishop Griswold and Bishop Hobart, the latter furnishing the former a long argument from Bishop White also, but not in such terms as Bishop Griswold understood to include this particular case. The Rector of St. Paul's Church, Boston, and St. George's Church, New York, wrote warmly in behalf of the candidate, while on the other hand there came to Bishop Griswold from "a weak member of our Zion" in Beaufort, South Carolina, this earnest remonstrance: "That you would willingly give any cause of offence to a brother *Bishop* is not for a moment to be conceived. Or that you would deliberately degrade or lessen authority is not to be believed. But in fact will you not do both

by giving Orders to Dr. —? . . . Who will be the first to break the golden chain of harmony which has existed among the American Bishops? And what would be the consequences if this should take place? . . . Suppose the individual be an injured man, is it not better that one man should suffer than that such a bold adventure should be made?"

Bishop Griswold was not the man to be influenced by this appeal. He could not yield the point that in every instance one bishop must abide by the judgment of another. "A Bishop's authority, we know," he wrote Bishop Hobart on July 9, 1823, "is confined to his own Diocese. It is decidedly my opinion that a candidate's being rejected by one Bishop does not, in itself, debar him of the right of applying to, and being received by another; for such a rule might sanction the most intolerable oppression."

From this decision he did not waver. On July 25, 1823, the candidate was received by the Standing Committee of Rhode Island. In February, 1824, the fellow Churchman who had been abused declared his belief that there was no malignity in the attack but that its heat had been aroused through the misrepresentation of others: that he should be "extremely sorry if the occurrence should either retard the advancement or affect the usefulness" of his opponent. "Indeed," he added, "I do not think it ought." And on August 15, 1824, in St. Michael's, Bristol, the ordination took place.

Meanwhile a similar case was also going on. A lawyer of high standing, a man of fine talents and splendid scholarship, of "unquestionable piety and unimpeachable morals" wrote to Bishop Hobart of his intention of giving up his profession in order to study for the ministry. The Bishop discouraged the idea, but feeling himself led by a Divine call, the lawyer removed his residence from the Diocese of New York to that of Rhode Island and began his studies under Bishop Griswold. But the Standing Committee which had just accepted one candidate, without the same cause for indecision — but possibly perplexed and uncertain as to the propriety of its course — acted unfav-

orably upon this second request, and it was only after "protracted, most tedious and most unreasonable delays," that this candidate was finally received by the Diocese of Vermont.

In Massachusetts a greater disturbance arose when, in 1832, the Standing Committee of that Diocese acted upon the canon of the General Convention of 1826, and refused to the students of its newly established theological school its consent to a dispensation from the full three years of study required by that canon, which dispensation Bishop Griswold had advised and allowed. Those conducting the school were anxious no doubt that its requirements should equal those called for in the General Theological Seminary; but feeling in the diocese was such as to result in the election of a new set of members to the Standing Committee and of new delegates to the approaching General Convention, who were in harmony with the views of Bishop Griswold. But this was a matter of personal influence only. Bishop Griswold's position in the territory over which he presided as bishop was unique. He would attend the annual conventions of the Dioceses of Massachusetts, Rhode Island, Vermont, New Hampshire and Maine, preside, and listen to their proceedings and give his counsel; but he saved all his authoritative and official addresses for the conventions of the Eastern Diocese. He urged the few matters that held the Church people of that diocese together by a slender thread—the support of the episcopate, the spread of missions, the formation of a missionary society in every parish, the distribution of Prayer Books, the development of Sunday Schools—but he had to watch with a certain aloofness the growing under current of restlessness tending to independence in each separate diocese within his own, and to guide with an unselfish and generous devotion all steps towards that division which was urged in 1822 and again in 1827, when he claimed that as soon as possible Vermont should have a bishop.

And his cautious, unaggressive methods could not always save him from reproach. When, in 1825, trouble arose between the rector and people of St. Paul's Parish, Boston, and he was

called upon to preside over a council of the Massachusetts clergy concerning the matter, the rector accused him of "an unwarrantable stretch of power, or episcopal prerogative." An attack could hardly have been less deserved. The convention of Massachusetts completely exonerated him, declaring that he was always discreet, meek, faithful and modest. The bishop himself had said, "I wish that our bishops might always be poor and have no more power than is necessary for the discharge of the proper duties of their office. . . . If it is only a place of labor and usefulness, without the reward of worldly honors and emolument, there will be little danger of any one seeking it, or accepting it, but from desire to do good."

DIFFERENCES AND GROWTH

It was now fourteen years since he had been consecrated, and they were years in which differences of conviction and practice had sprung up, deepened and spread. During their course, in 1823, Bishop Hobart had visited England and had won the heart of the young curate, Walter Farquhar Hook, later the noted Vicar of Leeds. The young man who was longing at this time to be "dabbling in High Churchery," was delighted with the Apostolic Church in America, and hoped that the American Bishop's visit would cause "episcopacy to be better understood in England." In the next twenty years Dean Hook himself, as he kept his steady middle course, watched friends and associates pass by him, as the leaders in the Oxford Movement and the Tracts for the Times created a strong tide which swept English Churchmen to and fro, and had a marked effect upon the Church in America as well, and on no part of that Church more marked than in the Eastern Diocese.

Church papers, fanning the varying tempers of the time, rapidly increased and multiplied. *The Churchman's Repository* for the Eastern Diocese, which appeared in 1820, in Newburyport, was soon removed to Boston, and renamed *The Gospel Advocate*. Bishop Griswold commended it to his conven-

tion. It was his "decided opinion" that "to do much good and obtain the patronage of the pious" the paper must have for its chief object "the glory of God in the salvation of men." "Let us also," he said, "be careful to manifest a spirit of candor, charity and Christian love. . . . We had never more occasion for the exercise of forbearance."

But the paper did not preserve this standard. In September, 1822, an attack was made on the prayer meetings, so dear to the bishop's heart and which he had been first to introduce into the diocese. Controversial articles appeared from time to time, and when at last, in 1825, the bishop himself took up the cause his articles were refused by *The Gospel Advocate*, and were later printed in *The Episcopal Register* of Vermont.

This was perhaps the first decided and most public expression of a divergence of views between the bishop and some among his clergy. and it kindled a flame in which his biographer says, his "patient love of peace . . . burnt, martyr-like, for more than twenty of the last years of his life."

The General Convention of 1826 suggested changes in the Prayer Book, which were referred back to the different dioceses for action. Bishop Griswold objected to the particular changes proposed, which had to do with the Preface to the Confirmation Office and in the rubric immediately following the Office of the Holy Communion. "My wish," the bishop wrote, "is to make none, or to make all that are needed." He was accused of having shown a want of attachment to the Liturgy and the Church, and in 1827 defended himself before his own convention. "I am well aware," he said, "of the delicacy and difficulties of this subject, and how necessary it is, if we would be accounted *Churchmen* to eulogize the Liturgy, and to deprecate as sacrilege even the least alteration. But on this point I have little anxiety. Nursed, as I have been, from earliest infancy, in the bosom of this Church, having passed my whole life among Episcopalians, as much so perhaps as any man of my age in this country living, and having been above forty years a member of its communion, I have long since imbibed a deep prepossession (not to say

prejudice) in its favor. . . . For many years I have endeavored impartially to examine the claims of our Church to Scriptural orthodoxy and primitive order, and the examination has confirmed me in the belief that her claims are well founded. . . . I humbly trust that I have also, in some small degree imbibed that truly liberal spirit of forbearance and charity, which our Church, more than any other Christian community on earth, inculcates, and which is not the least among the many proofs that she is, indeed, the *Church of Christ.*”

But forbearance and charity were not at that time the Church’s distinguishing characteristics. From July, 1828, to August, 1829, Bishop Griswold printed in *The Episcopal Register* a series of articles upon Prayer Book changes and his views of rendering the service, and these were strongly assailed by *The Gospel Messenger* of Western New York.

The five years’ rectorate of the Rev. Alonzo Potter in St. Paul’s Church, Boston did something to harmonize discordant elements. He came from the Diocese of New York in 1826, and for the first time Bishop Griswold held the Institution office and Bishop Hobart preached the sermon. In 1828 Mr. Potter voiced to Bishop Griswold the wish of some of the clergy that they might meet more often for informal conference. In his convention address of that year the bishop congratulated his diocese on “the reverence which clergy and people now generally have for the order and worship of the Church and for the General Convention,” and was thankful to have “a body of clergy so decidedly attached to the Episcopal Church and so zealous in support of its distinctive principles without any leaning to Popery or abandonment of Protestant principles or neglect of Evangelical truth.” He urged them to a greater interest in the general missionary work and referred to the rivalry existing between the Domestic and Foreign Committees which then represented to a marked degree the differing parties within the Church. “Some we may fear” said the bishop. “who pass for pious, zealous Christians, had rather that mankind should remain in their sins than that those, whom they

dislike, should be the instruments of changing their hearts and bringing them to Christ."

"Even different sects," he added, "should not view each other as rivals, still less as opponents; but as all laboring in the same good work, each according to his knowledge, faith and sense of duty."

And again, of tendencies within ourselves he said — in this showing his kinship to Dean Hook — "There are two extremes in which we naturally and too often err. . . . The one is, undue reliance upon religious rites, and . . . the other is too little reverence for the sacraments and other institutions of Christ and his Apostles. These are the Scylla and Charybdis of religious life. They are perils to which we of the Episcopal Church, with all our best intentions to steer a middle course, are much exposed."

The bishop seemed to be happy in the thought that the clergy of his diocese as a whole were keeping to this middle course, but when, in 1832, the Rev. James S. Stone came to Boston as Rector of St. Paul's, the convention of the Massachusetts Diocese revealed to him that "he had approached a mountain which from a distance had seemed quiet and beautiful," only to find it "covered with a somewhat large proportion of the lava and ashes to be thrown up by its sudden volcanic explosion."

It was in this convention that the new delegation to General Convention was chosen. Vermont had just withdrawn from the Eastern Diocese and elected Mr. Hopkins as Bishop. At the same time Bishop Chase had resigned Ohio and the Rev. Charles P. McIlvaine had been elected in his stead. The question of the right of a bishop to give up his diocese came up in General Convention, and it was the influence of Bishop Griswold upon the new Massachusetts delegation which gave the deciding vote in these mooted questions.

Indeed it was affection for their bishop and respect for his character that held his diocese together. In withdrawing, the Convention of Vermont had sent him the message that "this crisis has indeed been delayed through an extreme unwillingness

to deprive ourselves of the ministrations of a Bishop, whom we so truly revere and love." When New Hampshire withdrew in 1838 and Maine in 1839, the withdrawal was but nominal; they still remained under Bishop Griswold's care.

In 1832 the Rev. Theodore Edson of St. Ann's Church, Lowell, again brought forward the convocation plan. It had been adopted with good results in Rhode Island, and, in a lesser degree, in the eastern part of Massachusetts. In the western part the clergy had formed an association of a somewhat different kind. The bishop commended both; the *meeting*, and not the *method* of meeting, for mutual helpfulness, was the important point. New missionary interest resulted from these convocations, and in 1836 the Massachusetts Convention substituted for its Episcopal Missionary Society, a Board of Missions.

PRESIDING BISHOP

In 1835 Bishop Griswold was finally persuaded to give up parochial ties and to confine himself to the duties of the diocese. He removed to Boston and there made his home for the remainder of his life. On July 17, 1836, Bishop White of Pennsylvania died, and according to the rule adopted in 1832 by the House of Bishops, Bishop Griswold became Presiding Bishop of the Church. He had opposed the suggestion of Primus, made by some of his brother bishops, and now that this position which had been authorized by the Church became his, he shrank from it and its responsibilities. What he *must* do he would do to the best of his abilities, but if he *could* avoid office, he would do so, especially if "he had any reason for believing that he was not wanted, or was not welcome."

In response to a letter from Bishop Onderdonk of New York, he wrote, on December 22, 1836, "I doubt the wisdom of making the oldest of our body the presiding Bishop. . . . By this rule (his duties) will frequently, as in the present instance, fall upon one who resides far from the center; rendering the discharge of them less convenient to him and to the Churches

generally. I would prefer that he should be the Bishop of New York or Philadelphia. And (as in the present instance) these duties will often, if not always, fall upon one who, by reason of old age, is least capable of performing them." "But," he continued, "we must take things as they are. Whatever may be my feelings, I desire, far as I am able, to perform every duty, which may not as well, or better, be done by another person."

Bishop Griswold accepted conditionally the invitations contained in Bishop Onderdonk's letter to attend approaching meetings of the Board of Missions and the Trustees of the General Theological Seminary, but suggested that considering "his very advanced age" and his possible inability to attend, a substitute be appointed to preach the missionary sermon and to address the students. He then went on to a mention of the Pastoral Letter of the House of Bishops, which for many succeeding General Conventions had been prepared by Bishop White. "Surely," he wrote, "this will not henceforth be considered as the duty, *ex-officio*, of the senior Bishop. For several good reasons I shall decline it." And he proposed that the House of Bishops appoint a committee for the purpose, to prepare and present the letter of 1838.

This proposal was not acted upon. The new Presiding Bishop prepared that Pastoral, and the one also presented in 1841, at the last General Convention held before his death. This convention occurred at a time when party spirit was running high. The heat of controversy in the American Church surpassed what was experienced in England. The most fervent of the Evangelicals looked to Bishop Griswold for a sharply defined presentation of the views which seemed to them vitally important. But he was not the man to use his office of Presiding Bishop for the upholding of a party standard. He took for his subject, "The Doctrine of our Church on the Article of Justification by Faith, in connection with that on the necessity and place of Good Works," and won such "an expression of universal approbation" as led him to fear he had not clearly expressed his views.

Between the years 1838 and 1841 Bishop Griswold carried on correspondence with the Archbishops of Canterbury and York, the Primus of Scotland, and the Bishops of Montreal, Nova Scotia, Jamaica and the Barbadoes, with regard to establishing terms of intercommunion with the Church in the United States. In 1840 he added to the letter from the Foreign Committee one of introduction and instructions to Dr. Robertson and Mr. Southgate, going out for the second time to the East. In this letter he described the double labors before them "among a people of whom a part are already Christians, organized in regular ancient Churches, but somewhat divided into separate denominations," again among others, and they the dominant part of the people, who are "very hostile to Christianity." He hopes that among pagans and Mahomedans, the missionaries may win a greater respect for our religion and more toleration for it; and would explain to the bishops or other ecclesiastical authorities that we would "scrupulously avoid all offensive intrusion into the jurisdiction of our Episcopal brethren, nor intermeddle with their Church affairs." The bishop goes on to urge the position of the Protestant Episcopal Church as standing between the Protestants "opposed to Episcopacy, Confirmation and the use of Liturgies" on the one hand, and the Church of Rome on the other, and adds, "Under such circumstances, our thoughts and affections are particularly directed and strongly drawn to our brethren of the Eastern Churches, who, we believe, agree with us in what is most essential. . . . To their bishops and other clergy would we gladly extend the right hand of fellowship, and impart to them some portion of those good things which God, in his bounteous mercy, does on us bestow."

Twice in connection with interests in the East Bishop Griswold aroused criticism.

A clergyman who had lived in his house, studied under him, and been ordained by him both Deacon and Priest, becoming greatly exercised over conditions in that part of the world, asked the House of Bishops to consecrate him and allow him to go

at his own charges as a missionary bishop to the Turks. The appeal was refused, and the young man resolved to visit England and make a trial there. He brought to Bishop Griswold a letter of introduction to "the Bishops and Clergy and faithful in foreign lands" which he himself had written, and begged his signature. The letter was not at all to the bishop's taste; he had already advised against the plan, had told his young friend that he would probably injure himself without giving much help to the Turks, and that there was little or no probability of his obtaining Episcopal Orders for such a mission from any source. But the young man was importunate, the bishop found it hard to resist one of his own boys, he drew his pen through certain objectionable parts of the letter, signed his name, and finally under renewed pressure, at the last moment, added *Bishop* to the signature and let it go. He was bound to regret such an unwonted lack of caution. *The Churchman* accused him of assuming an aspect of Archbishopal authority and the bishop felt it necessary to reply, "I never put my name to anything with less willingness, having from my youth disliked any unnecessary appearance before the public."

Again, in 1841, he received letters from Dr. Robertson and Mr. Southgate, introducing Mar Yohanna, the Nestorian Bishop of Ooroomiah in Persia. Mar Yohanna came to Boston, met Bishop Griswold in private and public, attended service in Grace Church, and joined the bishop and others in the Holy Communion. For this last circumstance in some quarters the Bishop was severely blamed. One letter in criticism came even from Scotland, and the old bishop sent a very warm and trenchant letter in response to the Vermont clergyman who had forwarded it to him. Excusing a delay by reason of other engagements, he continued: "I freely acknowledge that I scarcely have patience to consider (the subject of this letter) at any time. That so much ado should be made about my communing with one who is said to be a Nestorian Bishop sickens me at heart . . . I believe from conversation had with him that he is a pious, good man and a sincere believer in Jesus Christ; and with such

I am ever willing to commune. Clergymen, or ministers, of various denominations have come to the Lord's Supper when I administered it, but it never entered my mind that any one would be so absurd as to suppose that it was uniting with their denomination or acknowledging the validity of their orders, or the soundness of the faith, or the orthodoxy of the Churches, to which they respectively belonged. I know not of any Bishops of any Church, whom, as such, I would reject from communion; no, not even Popish Bishops, whom I consider as, of all who claim the title, the most heretical."

CLOSING YEARS

But though his charity was thus embrasive Bishop Griswold found it hard to tolerate, much less to welcome, changes of practice within certain parishes of his diocese. The tide of feeling, which had subsided after 1832, by 1838 had risen to even greater heights, and the bishop felt that, as he had refused the sale of Church property to Congregationalists and had forbidden a Congregational minister to preach in a Church pulpit, so now, in order to "steer his middle course," he must express his disapproval of matters which showed a leaning towards the other extreme. To read what he wrote in 1841 and 1842, in view of what is the commonplace in the Church in 1921, shows how quickly history works its changes.

Writing of two parish churches lately renovated the bishop said: "I was pained and mortified at the strange derangement of the reading-desk and the communion table, and at the other exhibitions within the chancel. . . . In regard to this, their house is now in a worse state than any other Protestant church that I ever beheld. . . . There was *then* (formerly) a very convenient reading desk. . . . *Then* also there was a *communion table*, very suitable and in sight of the whole congregation. Since, I have seen instead an edifice, like a Popish *altar*, above a flight of many steps very inconvenient for ministrations at the Lord's table. . . . I saw also a

picture standing at the back of the *altar* such as the Papists avowedly and very much worship. . . . Before the Madonna, and on what *should be* the communion table, I saw flowers strewn; and there too stood candles in the day time; whether they are ever lighted in the day time I did not inquire. . . . Formerly the railing of the chancel was clear for many to kneel at communion and confirmation. but, in my last visit, it was exceedingly encumbered. The stool, or place for the minister in preaching, is far the most awkward and inconvenient that I ever beheld. That, and something like a reading desk, and a bridge or platform leading from the chancel to a place where baptism was performed, occupied so much of the chancel that . . . the convenience for administering confirmation and the other Christian ordinances is very much diminished. Your minister wore such a dress as I had never seen before . . . And never did I see a minister go without the railings of the chancel to administer Baptism."

So wrote Bishop Griswold when seventy-six years of age, who had been trained from infancy in the Episcopal Church and who had served in her ministry for forty-seven years. Thus we have from his long experience a picture of the outward aspect of the Church in New England during that nearly half century of time. The quickly coming change was, as it were, awaiting his death.

At the next convention of the Eastern Diocese after the bishop's serious illness in 1837 he called for an assistant. The question at once arose, would this assistant be an assistant for the Eastern Diocese? That is, was the Eastern Diocese to be continued? Could this be done? Opinion was divided, and in 1838 the bishop declared himself in favor of elections in the different State conventions, and the Massachusetts convention proceeded to elect Dr. Alonzo Potter, who declined. In September, 1842, this convention made another choice equally dear to Bishop Griswold's heart. This was of the Rev. Manton Eastburn, Rector of the Church of the Ascension, New York, who came to Massachusetts to fill the double office of assistant

bishop and Rector of Trinity Church, Boston. On December 29, 1842, Dr. Eastburn was consecrated in that church by Bishop Griswold. It was the last ordaining act of the bishop's life. On February 11, 1843, he went out from home to call upon his new assistant, and as he reached the house, fell at the door and died upon the threshold.

This sudden end came as the culmination of many serious illnesses. For years the bishop had lived in the daily presence of death. On this last morning at family prayers he had read, "For me to live is Christ and to die is gain. But if I live in the flesh, this is the fruit of my labour; yet what I shall choose I wot not. For I am in a strait betwixt two, having a desire to depart, and to be with Christ; which is far better." And so he arose and departed thence.

During Bishop Griswold's episcopate of 32 years, he assisted in the consecration of 6 bishops, and, as presiding bishop, was chief consecrator of 6 others. At the time of his own consecration there were 19 clergymen within the limits of the Eastern Diocese. He ordained 202 men to the ministry, of whom 12* became bishops, instituted 53 rectors into their parishes, consecrated 71 churches, and confirmed 11,299 persons. The district which he administered is now presided over by 8 bishops and served by 531 clergymen in 575 parishes and missions, numbering 113,085 communicants.

Born ten years before the outbreak of the War of the Revolution Bishop Griswold personally knew the "deep-rooted and violent opposition to Episcopacy" then cherished in New England by the Congregationalists, who "considered themselves as 'the standing order' (or 'established religion') to whom the ground of right belonged." Their "abhorrence" and "the fear of offending them" had been chief reasons why the British

* Benjamin B. Smith of Kentucky; John P. K. Henshaw of Rhode Island; Carlton Chase of New Hampshire; Horatio Southgate of Constantinople; George Burgess of Maine; Jonathan M. Wainwright of New York; Henry W. Lee of Iowa; Thomas M. Clark of Rhode Island; Thomas H. Vail of Kansas; George M. Randall of Colorado; Mark A. DeW. Howe of Central Pennsylvania; Alexander Burgess of Quincy.

Government would not allow bishops in these colonies. The extent of this "abhorrence" can hardly be believed, but Bishop Griswold relates a story told him of a "very intelligent and pious young man" in Boston, "a member of the Rev. Mr. Eliot's church." On reading an English extract in the newspaper, to the effect that the Rev. Dr. — was about to sail in his majesty's ship —, "to go out as the first bishop of New England," this youth exclaimed to his companion, "*Then, M —, I am a dead man! For, if this announcement prove true, the moment Dr. — sets his foot on Long Wharf. Boston, as Bishop of New England, I will shoot him! And the next moment I will surrender myself into the hands of justice with the certainty of being hanged!* I feel that, by such a deed, I should be doing God service."

Such a state of mind was possible in Boston in 1785. In the change effected by 1843 a powerful force was working. In 1805 Henry Ware, Professor of Divinity in Harvard College, was drawing a clear-cut line between the strict Orthodox Congregationalism of the past and "liberal" Unitarianism. In 1819 William Ellery Channing preached the sermon which became famous as the Unitarian "Declaration of Independence." In the following year nearly one hundred and fifty Congregational Churches in New England declared their adhesion to his position. In 1825 representatives of those congregations united in the American Unitarian Association. From many of these congregations enlisted under this new banner individuals clinging to their Orthodox belief drifted off, and looking elsewhere for an anchorage to their faith found it in the Church they had once feared and despised, built up in their midst under the holy and diligent shepherding of the first and only Bishop of the Eastern Diocese.

With the close of Bishop Griswold's life that diocese ceased to be, but in its anomolous structure the student of the Church's history cannot fail to trace a connection with the system of missionary districts originating in 1835 and of provinces established in 1907.

PERSONAL CHARACTERISTICS

As to Bishop Griswold himself, his life speaks for him. The wife of his early years died in 1817, and ten years later he married again. He was the father of fourteen children, three only of whom outlived him. He was tender and devoted to them, and their voices and play in his study, unless there was some sound of discord, never disturbed him. But his incessant cares and toils withdrew him from them, and he became "by degrees habitually reserved and distant in his intercourse with them." He combined with the colossal industry which was, perhaps, his most outstanding characteristic, a "deathless passion for literature and science." Upon the publication of La Place's *Mechanique Celeste*, notwithstanding the comment of an English reviewer that few men in England read the book, a Boston bookseller ventured to import a single copy. One day "a venerable, white-haired man" came into the store, picked up the volume, became absorbed in its contents, bought it and carried it away. The purchaser was Bishop Griswold, and when a friend asked him if this were true and if he read La Place, "Yes," he answered, "I have sometimes amused myself that way; but of late, finding mathematics in danger of interfering with my other duties, I have laid them aside."

He was an extraordinarily silent man. Living profoundly within himself, when brought into contact with others who differed from him in opinion or practice, the sensitive pride that lay beneath his acquired grace of Christian humility was often stirred and kept him back from frank and free intercourse and discussion.

In 1818 when Philander Chase begged him to come to Philadelphia to support him in solving difficulties as to his consecration and to take part in the service, if held, he excused himself, adding, "I see no reason for my going thither. Bishop White, with the assistance of others in his vicinity, has invariably now for many years performed our consecrations. A deviation from this usage in your case would have a novel appearance.

There are, indeed, some reasons of serious consideration, why I should not be present."

In 1823 when a committee of his diocese upon Sunday School instruction reported to the bishop the preparation of a system in connection with a Connecticut committee, there is an inference of the Bishop's satisfaction that this never became general, the system of the Church's General Sunday School Union — in many cases combined with the American Sunday School Union — taking its place.

In 1839, the bishop wrote of a book of prayers which he had issued some years before. "How extensively the prayers which I have published are used in my Diocese I do not exactly know. By many of our clergy, those by Bishop Hobart, in Sunday Schools especially, are used in preference." And in commenting on the opinion that none but Prayer Book prayers should be used in "social worship," he wrote. "If, in *all* cases we adhere to the strict literal sense (of Canon 45, of 1832) how can the Gospel, *by us* be ever preached to the heathen? They who have attended the meetings of our General Board of Missions must have seen what common sense has taught our Bishops and clergy respecting the occasional use (in the church even) of other prayers beside those in the Prayer Book."

As early as 1820 Bishop Griswold had written his English correspondent, Mr. Pratt, "The pertinacity with which so large a part of our citizens adhere to the slave-holding interest precludes the hope of this country's soon becoming what it is so often and so absurdly called, a land of freedom." Yet in 1842 at a meeting of the Anti-Slavery Society of Plymouth County he was attacked on the ground that he had lately received property from a son's estate in Cuba (presumably, in the minds of the accusers, from the sale of a plantation and slaves). The bishop contented himself with the simple explanation that the property, however acquired, was not his but administered to him by his son in trust for his brothers and sisters and their children.

At the time of making this explanation the bishop was

within a year of his own death, and in deepest grief over the death of his youngest and greatly loved son; but he did not fail to write to correct the censure bestowed. It was one more evidence of that unwavering steadiness of character which, having adopted rules in early life, caused him to follow them not as rules but, as his biographer says, "a sort of living thing," which, having adopted, "his life became but their embodied spirit."

These rules were as follows:

1. "Never to ask another to do for me what I can as well do for myself.

2. "When censured, or accused, to correct, not justify, my error.

3. "From a child, in reading anything applicable to the improvement of the mind, or to the conduct of life, to consider first and chiefly how it may be applied to myself.

4. "In all *clashing* claims, where rights are *equal*, and one *must* yield, to do it myself.

5. "To have a trust that, in all events and exigencies of life, if I strictly do my duty and walk according to the Christian rule, however I may *seem* to suffer, what is really best for me the Lord will give."

That Bishop Griswold's life was the embodiment of these rules this story may have made clear. But if one questions the partiality of an over enthusiastic biographer, the sober testimony of a daughter rings too true to admit of doubt. During the whole of his episcopate the bishop's house was a home for the clergy, and this daughter said that she had often been pained to notice in them things "not perfectly consistent with their high and holy character and office; that she had never seen but one, in whom no such inconsistency was observable, and that this was the one whom she had known longest and observed most closely, her own revered father."



