





Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2007 with funding from
Microsoft Corporation

B.

ANNALS

OF THE

TRACTARIAN MOVEMENT,

FROM 1842 TO 1860,

BY

EDWARD GEORGE KIRWAN BROWNE,

LATE PROTESTANT CURATE OF BAUSDSEY, SUFFOLK.

—
THIRD EDITION.
—

Permissu Superiorum.

~~~~~  
1861.

86067  
3/3/08

TO BE HAD OF THE AUTHOR ONLY,  
THROUGH MISS DALY, 75, GEORGE STREET, PORTMAN SQUARE,  
LONDON.



Entered at Stationers' Hall.

[The Author reserves to himself the right of translating this work into foreign languages, and all other rights of international copyright.]



To my dearest Mother,

DEPARTED IN THE FAITH OF JESUS CHRIST,

THESE PAGES

ARE

HUMBLY DEDICATED,

AS A THANK-OFFERING, FOR HAVING PLACED

THE WRITER,

WHILE AN INFANT,

UNDER THE MATERNAL PROTECTION OF

THE MOTHER OF GOD.

EDWD. G. K. BROWNE.

WARWICK,

*East St. Winefrid,*

1860.



## CONTENTS.

|                                | Page. |
|--------------------------------|-------|
| PREFACE ... ..                 | 1     |
| INTRODUCTION ... ..            | 26    |
| ANNALS OF THE YEAR 1842 ... .. | 60    |
| "    "    1843 ... ..          | 73    |
| "    "    1844 ... ..          | 57    |
| "    "    1845 ... ..          | 100   |
| "    "    1846 ... ..          | 129   |
| "    "    1847 ... ..          | 145   |
| "    "    1848 ... ..          | 158   |
| "    "    1849 ... ..          | 164   |
| "    "    1850 ... ..          | 174   |
| "    "    1851 ... ..          | 223   |
| "    "    1852 ... ..          | 262   |
| "    "    1853 ... ..          | 305   |
| "    "    1854 ... ..          | 326   |
| "    "    1855 ... ..          | 340   |
| "    "    1856 ... ..          | 345   |
| "    "    1857 ... ..          | 408   |
| "    "    1858 ... ..          | 448   |
| "    "    1859 .. ..           | 463   |
| "    "    1860 ... ..          | 498   |
| ADDENDA W, p. 304 ... ..       | 526   |
| APPENDIX .... ..               | 529   |



## P R E F A C E .

---

THE progress of Christianity in England presents many curious features: with the sole exception of white-cliffed Albion, no nation, no kingdom, has ever had her lost hierarchy restored to her, which has ONCE, ONLY ONCE, rejected the truth; but England, though she has repeatedly rejected the truth of God, and trod under foot the Covenant of JESUS CHRIST the Lamb of God, has again, after a lapse of three centuries, had the pearl of inestimable price offered her. England (it is supposed) first received the light of faith in A.D. 63, by the teaching of S. Joseph of Arimathœa and his three companions, who took up their residence at Glastonbury—the first land of God—the first home of the saints in England—“here S. Joseph resided for some time, but the rays of the Gospel were received coldly by the inhabitants of Britain,” and after the death of the Missioners, Glastonbury became the retreat of wild animals.

Christianity was again re-introduced into England in A.D. 156, when Lucius, King of the Britons, sent a letter to that holy man, Eleutherius, who presided over the Church at Rome, beseeching, that under

his direction he might be made a Christian. "Two most saintly men, Fugatius and Damianus, were sent by S. Eleutherius to preach the Gospel in Britain, by whom the words of life were announced, and the Sacrament of Baptism conferred upon King Lucius and his people." It does not enter into our plan to speak of the martyrdom of SS. Alban and Amphibalus, or of the labors of S. German, or S. Lupus, or S. David against the heresiarch Pelagius; we do not purpose alluding to the visit of S. German to the shrine of the holy martyr S. Alban, and how he deposited certain relics with the bones of the Martyred Patron of Verulam, whose name is now, alas, all but forgotten in the very town honored in days of yore by his blood, and how he "took thence a portion of the earth reddened with the blood of him who had given His life in testimony of the faith." It is beside our purpose to speak of the battle of Maes Garmon, or Guid Cruc, or of the Alleluia victory. To others it must be left to write of the labors of S. Helena, S. Daniel, S. Illtyd, S. Sampson, S. Aidan, S. Cadoc, and S. Briec; to others it must be left to speak of the Monastery of Caer Leon and the labors of its holy monks. A pen more eloquent than ours has, in his life of S. German, described the Alleluia victory, and we hope that others may be induced to enter as fully into the detailed history of the Anglo Saxon Church.

We are now led forward to the arrival of S. Augustine.

“The cause that led S. Gregory to take an anxious and earnest interest in the salvation of our nation is one that, derived as it is by tradition from our ancestors, ought not to be buried in the silence of oblivion. It is stated that, on a certain day, some foreign merchants, recently arrived at Rome, exposed a great variety of things for sale in the Forum, and among the number of persons who had gathered there as purchasers was S. Gregory; his attention was instantly attracted to a few boys about to be sold as slaves. Three hapless young creatures were remarkable for their dazzling white skin, their bright complexion, their beauteous figures, and their fair and flowing ringlets of hair. He inquired from what country they had come, and was told from the island of Britain, whose inhabitants were as fine and beautiful in their appearance as these youths. Again he enquired, if these islanders were Christians, or still buried in the error of Paganism, and when informed that they were Pagans, he sighed heavily and deeply as he exclaimed: ‘Oh! grief of griefs, that the author of darkness should lay claim to beings of such fair forms, that there should be so much grace in their countenance, and the soul still so completely destitute of it.’ He next asked of what race were these men, and on hearing they were ‘Angles,’ ‘justly,’ indeed, are they (he observed) so named, for their face is angelic, and they themselves ought to be co-heirs of the angels in Heaven. But how, asked

he, is the province called whence they came?' It was replied, 'Deira.'

'*De ira Dei* they must, indeed, be rescued before they are called to the mercy of God. But what is the name of the king of that province?' It was said, 'Alla.' 'Then,' rejoined S. Gregory, alluding playfully to the name of Alla or Ælla, 'Alleluia in praise of God, the Creator of all, shall yet be hymned in that portion of the earth.' S. Gregory, unable, himself to go to Britain with these youths whom he had purchased and instructed as Christians, in consequence of his election to the chair of S. Peter, deputed S. Augustine to be the missioner to the island far in the north. It does not enter within our plan to speak of the labors of S. Augustine, or of the martyrdom of the various defenders of the Faith in this island. Nor do we purpose to speak of the Abbeys and Religious houses which once bestudded this and the sister island of Ireland; we intend not to delay you, reader, by bewailing the beauteous ruins of Adare or Rathkeale, Mucross or Jedburgh, Bindon or Tintern, whose walls call loudly for reparation on the sacrilegious wretches by whom they were despoiled; we wish not to compare the rule that once existed in S. Alban's monastery with the regulations of the S. Alban's New Poor Law Union; but we would hurry on to the rejection of the Gospel in the time of Henry VIII.

The season has now arrived for the full and perfect

development of the “Man of Sin,” and the nation selected for the *denouement* of the satanic plot against the peace of the Church,—was England—the island of Saints, the nursery of Missioners; England, who had sent apostles to Germany, Sweden, France; England, whose fame was bruited abroad for the sanctity and learning of her children, was selected by the fallen angels as the fittest spot for the development of the most damnable of all heresies. The long suffering of an all-patient God had been long evinced towards England, but the hour had now arrived when she saw her Religious turned from their peaceful homes and sent adrift, and lands, consecrated to the service of God and His Church, bestowed on harlots and dissolute favourites. These Religious had each “according to their ability, an almonry, great or little, for the daily relief of the poor about them; every principal monastery had a hospital in common for travellers, and an infirmary (which we now call a hospital) for the sick and diseased persons, with officers and attendants to take care of them. Gentlemen and others having children, without means of maintenance, had them brought up and provided for.”\* We do not purpose speaking of the punishment which befel, and STILL befal those, who are guilty of plundering property solemnly dedicated to God, under a curse, and who are dedicated to the torments of eternal fire, to be tormented with Kore, Dathan

\* Spelman’s History and Fate of Sacrilege, 1853.

and Abiron.\* It does not enter into our plan to show by how “stringent a system of persecution the Catholic spirit was crushed down in this country for many generations;” nor do we purpose showing how Henry, (who had so nobly opposed Martin Luther in his *Assertio VII Sacramentorum*”) aided by the perjured Cranmer, Ridley, Cromwell, and a subservient Court, had succeeded in uprooting the Church and establishing a creature of his own. It is not our purpose to show how in Henry’s reign “all episcopal jurisdiction was laid asleep, and almost struck dead by the Regale during the king’s pleasure.”†

\* The curse is as follows:—“Auctoritate Omnipotentis Dei et B. Petri Apostolorum principis, cui a DOMINO DEO collocata est potestas ligandi atque solvendi super terram, fiat manifesta, vindicta de malefactoribus, latronibus et prædonibus possessionum et rerum juriumque et libertatum Monasterii St. Wandergisilii de Fontanellà totiusque congregationis ipsius Monasterii, nisi de malignitate suâ respiscant cum effectu. Si autem prædicti malefactores hoc in quo ipsi commisserint emendari voluerint, veniat super illos benedictio Omnipotentis DEI et retributio bonorum operum. Si vero in suâ malignitate corda eorum indurata fuerint, et possessiones cæteraque reddere noluerint, seu ad statum debitum redire non promiserint et emendare pœnitentialiter malitiose distulerint, veniant super illos, omnes maledictiones quibus Omnipotens DEUS maledixit, qui dixerunt DOMINO DEO, Recede a nobis; viam scientiarum Tuarum nolumus: et qui dixerunt, hæreditate possideamus sanctuarium DEI. Fiat pars illorum et hæreditas ignis perpetui cruciatus. Cum Chora, Dathon et Abiron, qui descenderunt in infernum viventes, cum Juda et Pilato, Cayapha et Anna, Simone Mago et Nerone, cum quibus cruciatus perpetuo sine fine crucientur. Ita quod nec cum Christo, nec cum sanctis ejus, in cælesti quiete societatem habeant, sed habeant societatem cum diabolo et socios ejus in inferni tormentis deputati, et pereant in æternum. Fiat.”

† Collier’s History of England.

But Almighty God, slow to punish his rebellious people, and mindful of the prayers of an Aidan, a Bega, a Hilda and a More, again offered the Church to this besotted nation. Christianity was for the fourth time restored to England by Cardinal Pole, in the reign of the maligned Mary Tudor—but on the accession of her sister, an idol somewhat similar to that created by her father, but made yet more subservient to the royal will, was erected: for we find Archbishop Parker doing homage in these words, “I Matthew Parker D.D., acknowledge and confess to have and to hold the said Archbishopric of Canterbury, and the possessions of the same entirely, as well the spiritualities as temporalities thereof, ONLY of your Majesty and Crown Royal;” and to this document is added, as an appendix, “We also, whose names be under written, being Bishops of the several Bishoprics within your Majesty’s realm, do testify, declare, and acknowledge all and every part of the premises in like manner as the Right Rev. Father in God, the Archbishop of Canterbury has done.” In this Sovereign’s reign, more than 120 priests, besides some thousands of the Laity, suffered martyrdom for the faith; and of the church of England, we may in truth say, that her ministers, her so called ministers, unable to bear the presence of those who adhered to that pure and immaculate faith, preached and planted in these islands by S. Lucius, and S. Augustine,

and restored by Cardinal Pole, enacted penal laws making it death for a priest to say Mass, or for one of the faithful to be present at the unbloody Sacrifice of the altar. No language can depict in their true colors the sufferings of our forefathers; but it was left for a later day, not only to enact new laws, but to witness persecutions, yet more harrowing than any ever endured by the Church Militant. If our forefathers could with S. Gregory of Nazianzum, say,

“*Ἐχουσι οὗτοι τοὺς οἴκους, ἡμεῖς τὸν ἔνοικον· οὗτοι τοὺς ναοὺς, ἡμεῖς τὸν θεὸν· οὗτοι δῆμους, ἡμεῖς ἀγγέλους· οὗτοι θράσος, πίστιν ἡμεῖς· οὗτοι τὸ ἀπειλεῖν, ἡμεῖς τὸ προσεῖχέσθαι. οὗτοι τὸ βάλλειν, ἡμεῖς τὸ φέρειν· οὗτοι χρυσὸν καὶ ἄργυρον, ἡμεῖς λόγον κεκαθαρμενόν.*”

we may with the Poet say:—

“How darkly lower the clouds above,  
 How drear the wide horizon round,  
 Where shall we fly, my friend, to escape  
 This sullen swelling sound?  
 Fly! ’mid the darkest clouds that roll.  
 Faith whispers peace to troubled soul—  
 Faith sees the awful gracious Form  
 That stills the sea and sways the storm;  
 Hope on the judgment blast is borne,  
 And peace is nearest then when hearts are most forlorn.”

At length, after three centuries of desolation and bitter sterility, three centuries of weeping and lamentation, He that created and redeemed us, “called His own sheep by name and they followed Him, because they knew His voice”;—a light again beamed on England, and a movement, as extraordinary as any that had taken place, began to display itself.

“ Protestantism (says the late Frederick Lucas), nor any worship imbued with the spirit of Protestantism, will ever add a type or a symbol to what it has already, nay, it can barely retain those which it has not thrown off. The tendency of Protestantism is to reject symbolism in worship. The tendency of the Primitive Church was to assume it. There must then have been a radical difference between the spirit of the worship of the Primitive Church, and that of the Protestants, and this difference can be traced to nothing but the Sacraments. Plant in a new country the Catholic religion of the Sacraments, and of itself it will necessarily issue forth, like primitive Christianity, in a worship of Divine Symbols produced by faith, and nourishing faith in its turn. Plant in a new country the Protestant scheme, and it will gather round it a certain decent regularity of public prayers, and, it may be, eloquent preaching, but nothing more. It could never grow into any form akin to Catholicity. If the primitive worship had been imbued with the Protestant spirit, it could never have issued in Catholicity. Catholic Christianity could never have sprung from a Protestant origin. It had its birth in a nobler region. It hath been sent down from Heaven unto the children of men, by the inspiration of the Divinity.”\*

The Eternal Council of God had determined that the reactionary movement to His Church

\* Reasons for becoming a Roman Catholic, by F. Lucas, Esq.

should commence in the University of Oxford. The light was to shine forth at first dimly in Oxford, boasting of her "*Martyrs' Memorial*," a memorial devoted to the memory of three apostates, and traitors as well to their Sovereign as their God, whose names deserve to be held in as great execration as is that of Haman by the children of Israel. Laud, Montague, Hooker, Beveridge, Bramhall, Jeremy Taylor, had each done their best according to the light granted them to lead souls Romeward, not knowingly, for they desired (as well as the Tractarian party), that this Church of England should flourish like the Garden of Eden, alleging, perhaps, the same reason as Dr. Featly in the "*Sacra Nemesis*."—"We must have an eye to the nurseries of good religion and learning, the two Universities, which will never be furnished with choice plants if there be no preferments and encouragements to the students there, who for the farre greater part bend their studies to the Queen of all professions, Divinitie; which will make but slow progress, if Bishopricks, Deanries, Archdeaconries and Prebendaries, and all other Ecclesiastical dignities, which, like *silver spurs*, prick on the industrie of those who consecrate their labors and endeavours to the glorifying of God, in employing their talent in the ministering of the Gospel, be taken away. What sayls are to a ship, that are afflictions to the soul; which if they are not filled with the hope of some

rewards, and deserved preferments, as a prosperous gale of wind, our sacred studies and endeavours will soon be calmed: for *honus alit artes ; omnesque incenduntur studio gloriæ ; jacentque ea semper quæ apud quosque improbantur*. And if there are places both of great profit, honor, and power propounded to Statesmen and those that are learned in the law, like rich prizes to those that prove masteries; shall the professors of the Divine Law be held in less esteem than the students and practisers in the municipal? And shall that profession only be barred from entering into the *temple of honor* which directeth all men to the temple of virtue, and hath best right to honor by the promise of God, *honorantes me honorabo*, because they most honor God in every action of their function which immediately tended to His glory.”\* Previous to the formation of the modern ‘Oxford School,’ whose ‘*Annals*’ we are now presenting to the public, there existed another school—the Caroline or ‘Laudian’—(many of whom submitted to the Church;—indeed ever since that unfortunate period miscalled the Reformation, souls have been added to the Church of such as were predestinated by salvation)—whose object it also was—though not so unblushingly proclaimed as by the Tractarian party—to ‘*Unprotestantize the Establishment*,’ and to ‘*inculcate a love of unfeigned affection to the Apostolic See*’ in lieu of that

\* *Sacra Nemesis*, p 56.

uncharitable and unscriptural spirit fostered by Cranmer, Cecil, and the other minions of Henry and Elizabeth. Passing over the other schools we come to that formed by the '*Tracts for the Times*,' which has given more than 200 of the clergy and many thousands of the laity to the Church. They could not remain in the Anglican Communion because they perceived that "the Anglican system was worldly in its origin, naturally wanting in divine nature and real spiritual life;" that it was a "piece of human mechanism, like one of those rustic arbors formed of unplanned branches, which hold out some show of vegetation because its frame-work has been cut from the living tree, but it has no interior life, and you may take any of its parts without injury to what remains. Yet for a while, men sit and live and are merry within it. But in a short time the under timbers become decayed, and the worm eats into the substance, and men come and repair a little here and a little there, and as it goes on consuming inwardly, they cover it every year with some deceitful varnish that gives it a false appearance of youth and freshness, but at last it will hold no longer, and they sweep it away as unprofitable lumber, and gather up the fragments together, and heap them up for burning."†

There are some who laugh at trivial circumstances being caused by an overruling Providence, and con-

† Lucas' Reasons for becoming a Roman Catholic.

sequently turn those into ridicule who speak of the casual discovery of an umbrella by a Roman Priest in his confessional, as having lead to the reconciliation of the Hon. Mr. Douglas with the Church ; but such forget that a holy Confessor was once saved by means of a spider. Who can laugh at little things as not being overruled by a Providence, and yet forget the case of S. Felix of Nola, whose countenance God so changed that his persecutors knew him not, and then protected him from their hands by means of a spider.

The compiler of these "Annals" having obtained the patronage of our venerated and beloved Hierarchy, cannot do less than return his most sincere and heartfelt thanks to them for their supporting his humble efforts in collecting as many of the "fugitive pieces" as he could, respecting the doings of his quondam brethren, and most earnestly does he pray God to grant those who are yet out of the pale of the Church, grace to enter therein, lest they die *extra salutem* ; and to his own brother converts, a hope that he and they, profiting by the fall of some few, may learn to appreciate, yet more and more, the gift of Faith which they have received from on High.

---

P.S.—We beg to call our readers' attention to the following reply to a review, (*penned by a convert with whom we had been in correspondence previous to the publication of the first Edition, but whose name we suppress*) as it appeared in the 'Tablet' in

November, 1856. Our object in compiling the '*Annals*' not the '*History*' of the *Tractarian Movement*, was simply to present documents connected with this most extraordinary revival of Christianity in England; and hence our reason for dividing the work into *years*, and not into chapters, and also of omitting all reference to associations.

### THE REVIEWER REVIEWED.

A LETTER TO THE EDITOR OF THE "TABLET."

Sir—Your assurance to a Reverend friend, who was as equally surprised as myself at the insertion of so unjust a review of my work, "*History of the Tractarian Movement*," in your columns, that the writer was not in any way connected with your paper, induces me to address you, instead of the readers of the *Kilkenny Journal*, or my opponent the *Kilkenny Moderator*. Your reviewer commences with complaining of my not using Clergy lists, Oxford and Cambridge Calendars, and cheap Peerages. I can assure you that these works, with the exception, perhaps, of Mr. WALFORD's cheap Peerage and Baronetcy, (which I did not use because its accuracy had been attacked) were referred to by me. Your correspondent, I will not call him your reviewer, as he is "not in any way connected" with the *Tablet*, while attacking me for some typographical errors, says—

"We confess ourselves disappointed, whether we look to the typography or the contents of the book, to its matter or to its style. It is written on no plan or system, nor has the author been at the pains of dividing it into chapters, or connecting his paragraphs.

Whether the work is written on any "plan or system" I leave to my readers "not to your accurate and truth telling reviewer" to decide, for *they* will perceive that the work is divided into years.

These typographical errors with which the learned reviewer—the *doctor doctorum*—the self appointed *castigator librorum* is displeased, are—as follows—

"The book itself, we observe, appears, not *permissu*, but *permissi superiorum*; and the motto which adorns the title-page speaks of '*Ecclesia Die*' *sic*.

"On page 207, among the lists of converts for the present year, we have the Rev. W. A. *Wegurton*, Vicar of South Stoke; a reference to the '*Clergy List*' shows that the individual mentioned

is the Rev. Mr. Weguelin. Mr. E. J. Hutchins, M.P., for Lymington, is omitted at page 181; in the list for 1855, (?) we find Viscount Dungarvan, M.P., the present Earl of Cork, who has never been accused of any love of Catholicity, though his mother is a Catholic. Again, Lord Adare, a boy 14 years of age in 1855, can scarcely be called a convert on account of the change of religion by his father, the Earl of Dunraven. In 1854 we find the Rev. W. H. Scott given as "Curate of Bolton," whereas he was beneficed with a valuable family living in the neighbourhood of Oscott. Again, instead of the Earl of Castlestuart, we find *Viscount* Castlestuart; the late Sir R. Blennerhassett, who has been for some years past a boy at St. Gregory's College, Downside; and two strange individuals besides, for whom we have looked in vain in every book of reference, 'Sir R. Crown,' and 'the Hon. J. R. Chanter.'

"In 1853 he need not have omitted that J. F. Pollen was Fellow of Merton College, Oxford. This same gentleman occurs also in the list for 1852; so that we suppose he was twice received. The initials also of the Rev. Messrs. Belamy and Coleridge are both incorrect. In mentioning the name of Dr. Ives, in his list for 1852, Mr. Browne might have told his readers that he was a Protestant Bishop in America, and the only convert of Episcopal rank. In 1851 there are plenty of blunders: We happen to know that Mr. Walford was never Curate of Tunbridge Wells, Kent, and, in fact never held a license from any Anglican Bishop, having been simply ordained upon his college title as a scholar of Balliol College, Oxford.\*

"The Rev. Mr. Harper was never '*Dean*' of S. Ninian' at Perth, nor did he ever own the title of the Very Reverend. The Hon. and Rev. William Towers (*sic*) Law was Vicar, not of East Brent,' but of Harborne, near Birmingham. The Rev. Seton Rooke has not taken orders as a Secular Priest, but has joined the Dominicans at Woodchester. In 1850 it was not the Rev. J. A. Dagnan, but a very different person, the Rev. J. A. Dayman, who became a convert. Mr. Maskell's name is William, not 'W. G.' There was no such convert in that year as 'Mr. Anderon'; and it is well known that there is a right as well as a wrong way to spell the names of Lord and Lady Fielding. We observe similar inaccuracies in the names of Mr. Sergeant

\* Mr. Walford is himself to blame for this error.

Bellassis (*sic*) and the Right Hon. W. R. (*sic*) Monsell, M.P. In the list of 1849 we should extremely like to know Mr. Brownne's authority for inserting the name of the late Lord Melbourne,\* and we cannot but feel a doubt whether he is more correct with the name of the late Admiral the Hon. Sir John Talbot, who was baptised and brought up a Catholic; and though occasionally in the course of a long life he entered a Protestant place of worship, yet never positively abjured his religion, but on the contrary, repeated a 'Hail Mary' every day, and returned to his religion when nearly 80 years of age.

"In the first list for 1847 we find the name of the Rev. R. G. Macmullen given as Vicar of S. Saviour's, Leeds, a statement corrected two pages afterwards, where the name of the then Incumbent, Mr. Ward, is given correctly. We doubt whether, after the name of Mr. Darnell, we ought not to read 'Fellow of New College, Oxford,' instead of Trinity College, Cambridge. But of these errata our readers will probably have had enough. We may add, that whenever a Latin document is quoted the mistakes are numerous and troublesome."

Now, sir, before I refer to the learned Pundit's own errors in your columns, *for which he is as much answerable and liable to censure, though typographical errors, as I am for the typographical errors of the Printers of my book*, so ably reviewed by men of a far higher standing than one who cannot, as I shall presently show, quote two lines from the Mantuan Bard without making more mistakes than a child just commencing to translate the first *Æneid*. I shall take his corrections as they stand. I plead guilty to the typographical errors on the title page, but being absent from Dublin, I could not personally superintend the correction; but surely any one, except a gentleman of such a very hypercritical constitution, could see that I meant *permissu superiorum* and *ecclesia DEI*. Had he looked to the errata on the last page of the book he would have seen that Mr.

\* Since the above was written we have heard confidentially the name of the Priest who *actually* received Lord Melbourne; and with regard to the late Sir John Talbot, we beg most respectfully to refer the reviewer and the Editor of the '*Tablet*' to Dr. Oliver's *Collections illustrating the Catholic religion in Devonshire, Dorsetshire and Cornwall*.

Ward's Latin Protest was corrected, and Mr. Weguelin's name properly inserted. I am not gifted with a prophetic knowledge of FUTURE EVENTS, and therefore could not anticipate the conversion of Mr. E. J. Hutchins, M.P., for Lymington, which occurred *after* my book was published. With regard to Viscount Dungarvan, M.P., the present Earl of Cork, had your reviewer referred to the list of errata he would have read—"p. 223, dele Viscount Dungarvan, M. P." If I mistake not, Lord Dungarvan was announced by some paper as a convert to the Church of Rome, and *is still suspected* by the Protestant party in this country as a Papist. I do not know why "boys of fourteen years of age," as Lord Adare, should not be called converts, perhaps your correspondent will kindly inform me.

I may as well inform my reviewer that in a list lent me by an esteemed friend, I found the names of the Ladies Kerr and their brothers, who I believe, like Lord Adare, were mere children, not even "fourteen years of age," at the time of their reconciliation with Holy Church.

The Rev. W. H. Scott was Curate of Emanuel Church, Bolton Le Moors, at the time of his conversion, unless the title page of a pamphlet published by him at the time of his secession, and the *Clergy List* for 1854, bear false witness. At the time of the present Earl of Castlestuart's conversion he was Viscount Stuart—as the late Earl was alive; the convert meant was the *late* Sir R. Bleunerhasset, and not the boy at St. Gregory's College, Downside. With regard to the "two strange individuals," "Sir R. Crown," and "Honorable J. R. Chanter," I am exceedingly sorry that I gave your correspondent such a chase; but had he consulted Directories and other books of references, he would have found that there were in existence, and I hope are still in existence, two (such) strange individuals as "Sir R. Crown" and "Honourable J. R. Chanter." I presume your learned correspondent is not so "well up" in American intelligence as in Peerages, Baronetcies, and the various *on dits* of the aristocracy of England. I am sorry that I omitted stating that J. H. Pollen, whom, our learned and accurate reviewer calls J. F. Pollen, was a Fellow of Merton College, Oxford, and also that I mistook the Christian names of Messrs. Belaney and Coleridge. Had your correspondent referred to my alphabetical list of "Clerical Converts," he would have found that I DID tell my

readers that Dr. Ives had been a Protestant Bishop in America, and the only convert of Episcopal rank. What will your readers think of the accuracy of his remarks, on reading the following passage:—"NO LITTLE SENSATION WAS CAUSED IN THE RELIGIOUS WORLD BY THE CONVERSION, AND CONSEQUENT SUBMISSION, OF THE BISHOP OF NORTH CAROLINA (DR. IVES) *to the Church of God*,"—(p. 166). Good reader, and good Mr. Editor, what say you to the truthfulness of your MOST ACCURATE and LEARNED correspondent. Respecting Mr. Walford, if I have been misinformed, the fault is his own, as I had been in correspondence with him while writing the work. The Rev. Mr. Harper WAS DEAN of S. NINIAN'S, PERTH, and *therefore* HAD EVERY RIGHT TO THE TITLE OF VERY REVEREND." Should these observations meet the eye of Mr. Harper, formerly of S. Ninian's, Perth, I should be glad if he would write a line to me on the subject.

Since writing the above I have been informed by a late student of S. Ninian's, Perth, that Mr. Harper was not "Dean" but "Canon" of S. Ninian's, and even in that case, as your reviewer is well aware, he would be entitled to be called "Very Reverend." In page 226, I find Mr. Law's name mentioned as Vicar of Haberston—it should have been Harborne; and willingly do I concede this typographical error. I am well aware that there is "no such convert as Mr. Anderon," but there is a Mr. ANDERDON. My authority with regard to the conversion of Lord Melbourne, is one of far higher respectability and credibility than that of the LEARNED, SAGACIOUS, and TRUSTWORTHY reviewer, but which I respectfully decline giving him PUBLICLY. On referring to a list of converts, I find the names of the late Lord Melbourne, and Sir J. Talbot, though according to the reviewer the latter was "BROUGHT UP AND BAPTISED A CATHOLIC," and that he "NEVER POSITIVELY ABJURED HIS RELIGION. I now proceed to the errors of your learned correspondent, with whose accurate (?) review your readers must be as tired as I am. To parade his learning and knowledge of Latin, he quotes the two following lines:

"Judque ipse miserrima vidi,  
Et quorum para magna frie,

a schoolboy's quotation, which, from its presumed similarity to

Virgil, I suppose he meant to cite the following lines, which we quote, for HIS INFORMATION, with the remarks of the Editor of the *Kilkenny Moderator*.

“One thing is certain, however; the writer in the *Tablet*, before censuring the error in the Latin motto to Mr. Browne’s book, ought to have looked to the correction of his own Latin quotations. There are two lines near the conclusion of his article which our ‘typo’ copied exactly as he found them, and we are not surprised that correspondents seem anxious to have the meaning expounded to them. They ought to apply to the *Tablet* for that information, but we are willing to assist them. We believe the writer meant to quote from Virgil—

“————— *Quæque ipse miserrima vidi,*  
Et quorum pars magna FU.—————”

ÆNEID II. 5.

“As printed by the *Tablet*, it was utter nonsense.”

After reading the above will it be credited that you, Sir, the Editor of the “*Tablet*,” though ready to censure me for typographical errors desire to shield your reviewer on the ground that printers often make such blunders. Perhaps, sir, you will kindly inform my readers, and the writer of the *first review* that appeared in the *Tablet*, whether the lines above quoted and supposed to refer to Virgil Æneid, II. 5. were the production of the same sapient and learned brain, as he who had the audacity to assert that I had not informed my readers that Dr. Ives was the only Protestant Bishop who had submitted to the Church.

I must take this opportunity of requesting the readers of my contemporary to apply to this learned correspondent of the *Tablet*, for any information they may require respecting the above quotation. I have been asked by some, was the review written AFTER DINNER? Will the learned reviewer reply to this query? Another mistake I must give. In quoting the title page of my book, he states correctly that I was late Protestant Curate of Bawdsey, *Suffolk*, but judge my surprise on finding that the learned critic speaks of my country curacy in *Norfolk*. Most sincerely do I regret with him (and I am glad to be able to condole with my learned and accurate reviewer,—the clever Daniel whose judgment is to correct the opinions of the *Dublin Evening Post*, *Freeman*, *Weekly Register*, and even *THE TABLET*) at a

work similar to mine, not having been undertaken by Messrs. Wilberforce, Manning, or Newman. Is not the late Archdeacon of Chichester, Dr. Manning; and yet your accurate correspondent (with whose accuracy all your readers must be deeply enamored and convinced by this time) styles him Mr. Manning. I am, sir, really ashamed of having trespassed so long on your time, but one word more to your correspondent. He says—"That the hand of the sketcher and painter is wanting to catch the character of each transient phase of Puseyism, and to combine them into a picture which shall be at once artistic and faithful." To this deficiency I willingly and gladly plead guilty. I am no historian. My object was only to "collect materials," and this I declared openly to have been my intention and plan.

Trusting, sir, that you will, as a simple act of justice to myself, insert this letter in your next paper.

I am, Sir,

Your obedient servant,

EDWARD G. KIRWAN BROWNE.

*Journal Office, Kilkenny,*

Advent, Feast of St. Francis Xavier, 1856-57.

P.S.—On referring to the work itself, Mr. Dayman's name is inserted, and SPELT CORRECTLY, and not Dagnan, as the Reviewer says.

*Longford,*

*Nov. 23rd, 1855.*

DEAR SIR,

It would be entirely too troublesome to you to be under the necessity of coming to Longford. To avoid that inconvenience, you might read over the MSS. for Very Rev. Dr. Smyth, Ballynahown, and if he say it contains nothing *contra fidem vel mores*, you may have inserted on the frontispiece or title-page: "Published with the approbation of the Ordinary."

Wishing your undertaking that full measure of success, which, I am sure, it merits.

I am, dear Sir,

With great respect,

Your very obedient servant,

× JOHN KILDUFF.

*Edward G. K. Browne, Esq.*

## ANNALS OF THE TRACTARIAN MOVEMENT.

---

EVERY tyro in Ecclesiastical History, must have observed the remarkable manner in which Heresy and Schism, though for a while flourishing like Jona's gourd, have in the end faded and withered, inasmuch as God had prepared for them likewise a worm, as he did for the tree, under which the fugitive prophet rested to see what would "befal the city;" while the Church of God has proceeded on her road like a bride, rejoicing on the happy morn of her wedding, pursuing her calm and equitable path, deviating neither to the right hand nor to the left, but keeping her eye fixed on Him who is the Sun of Justice, her Divine Spouse, Heresy has faded and died; She is well aware that the day of her sorest trial is the moment that God invariably displays His might and rescues her from peril; if storms arise, and She be tossed hither and thither by the billows of the tempestuous ocean, nay, even if she have, for awhile, apparently deviated from her direct course, she has but to appeal to Him who rules the winds and the waves, and immediately the ocean becomes calm and tranquil and

"Onward to that silent strand,"

she

"Lifts aloft the solemn sail,"

and returns guided by her "true helmsman" to the course whence she had apparently veered, for

"Jesus holds the helm, 'tis He

Strikes masts and changes sail,

'Tis he does all in all at sea."

For, as the poet beautifully says :—

“ What though winds and waves assail thee,  
 What though foes in scorn bewail thee,  
 Heaven bound ark of liberty ;  
 'Mid the sheeted lightnings' gaze,  
 'Mid the thunders' cloudy lair,  
 Where dark waves meet lurid air,  
 Shalt thou breast the stormy sea !  
 Clouds afar thy course are bounding,  
 Yet the light thy sails surrounding,  
 Marks a path in gloom for thee,  
 Onward ! leave the weary world,  
 Every venturous reef unfurl'd,  
 High and bright the pennon curl'd,  
 Heaven bound Ark of liberty.”\*

Thus has it been with the Church from the commencement of time. Scarcely had she come forth all pure and perfect from her Creator's hand, ere Adam, by his transgression, marred God's work, and if we may say so, imperilled Her very existence, but He, the invisible, the immortal Helmsman, was at hand, and the Divine Word was pledged that the Seed of the woman should crush the serpent's head. Follow then the Church in her onward course. Cain and Abel were born to our first parents ; Abel, the type of the Church of God, was murdered by his brother, and the children of Seth have ever struggled with the children of Cain, the murderer of Abel, for Seth, as Eve said, at his birth, was given her by God, for Abel whom Cain slew, † and though there have been some that have united themselves with the children of men, yet a chosen few have ever been called out of the world into the assembly of the children of God ; as it was at the period of the Deluge, when the Church was miraculously preserved in Noe, and his family ; as it was at the conflagration of the

\* William's Thoughts in Past Years, p. 185.

† Genesis, iv.

cities of the plain, when the Church was preserved by Lot taking refuge in a *cave*, for he "feared" to dwell in Zoar ; as it was in the Captivity, in the land of bondage, when a Joseph, a Moses, a Joshua, were raised up ; as it was in the revolt of the ten tribes, when two remained faithful ; as it was in the Babylonish captivity, when the prophets were commissioned to guide the children of Israel to the promised Messiah : so has it been in the Christian era ; when Arianism overran the Church, an Athanasius was found to preserve her from Heresy ; an Augustine was rescued from the errors of Manes by the prayers of a Monica and an Ambrose, to become the champion of the Church against Manicheism ; when the British Church was on the point of yielding to a Pelagius, a David and a German were at hand to shield her from the darts of the enemy ; for even now-a-days, Tregaron and Llanbadarn-Trefeglwys, though lost to the faith so nobly defended by S. David, still cling to the heart-stirring tradition of his having defeated Pelagius, and point to the mountain where he exposed the errors of Mwrgan ; and even when our own Erin,

" Isle of Saints justly named,"

had relapsed into barbarism, and the sacred tie of marriage was all but forgotten, a Malachy and a Malchus were commissioned to rescue and restore her to her pristine faith ; so has it ever been ; champions have been always found in the day of peril, to combat and defeat error. What was the mission of the hero of Pampeluna when he laid his sword at the Altar of our Lædye ? What was the mission of S. Wilfrid of York when he visited Rome, or S. Thomas of Canterbury, when tempest-tossed and an exile from his own beloved see, he sought a temporary shelter at Pourville ? Was it mere chance that sent S. Polycarp to Rome, to encounter the heresiarch Marcion ? Was it a chance and meaningless

tempest that stranded S. Thomas on the coast of Pourville, when banished by his Sovereign? Was it a mere chance that inflicted the wound on S. Ignatius at the siege of Pampeluna? or some fortuitous circumstances that induced S. Malachy to visit S. Imarus at his cell at Armagh? No! for if He who rules the world allows not a bird to perish without His knowledge, how much rather would He preserve His Church, for

Thou to things in Heaven above,  
 Thou to things in air that move,  
 Thou to things on earth that breathe,  
 Thou to things that are beneath,  
 Dost their order'd tasks bestow,  
 And the life they know.

Therefore, though the Church may occasionally seem to slumber, nay, not only to slumber, but to be as it were lost to sight, immersed in the deep, yet JESUS will be there to hear the voice of His servants, crying out in accents of fearful despair "Lord, save us or we perish;" and arousing Himself, He will, with a single word, rebuke the fell wind of heresy, and restore peace to his wearied and worn out spouse, for to Him, and Him alone, do the words of the Mantuan bard apply—

———"dicto citius tumida æquora placat  
 Collectasque fugat nubes, solemque reducit."

Time was when Rome, the Queen of Christendom, was regarded as a bye-word; the Hun and the Goth had laid her waste, and was about to level her to the ground, when the prayer of an old man vanquished the proud infidel, and the city of S. Peter was saved; the touching respect displayed by the uncivilized Goth to the sacred vessels (for Alaric ordered them to be taken to the Basilica of S. Peter), and his dethronement and death, proved how carefully Jehovah was watching the Eternal City, where reposed the precious relics of the Prince of the Church; time was when a King of England attempted to infringe on the privileges of Rome, and lo! he met with a sudden and unexpected death, having been slain while hunting in the New Forest; time was when

William's successor ventured to follow in the steps of his predecessor, but God was nigh to protect S. Anselm, and the monarch was punished by the retributive hand of Divine Providence; time was—but our limited space will not allow us to speak of the evil deeds of England's Sovereigns, where

“Rapine and lust and perjury held sway.”

Time was when the mighty Sovereign of a mighty Empire vowed vengeance against Rome, and proceeded so far in his audacious rebellion, as to attempt, by means of a mercenary Prelate, to excommunicate and depose the Sovereign Pontiff, but the prayers of the “old man” were once more successful, and the scheme, so artfully concocted, served only to humble its originator. William, Bishop of Utrecht, Hugh Le Blanc, an excommunicated Cardinal, aided by other Prelates, equally schismatical and disobedient to the Head of the Church, proceeded to depose and excommunicate the Sovereign Pontiff, and Henry, to further his designs against Rome, endeavoured to urge the Romans to revolt, but Gregory excommunicated Henry, and on the mere recital of a few words dictated by one old man, and repeated by another (Sigefried, Archbishop of Mayence), who was always despised by the Emperor as foolish and silly, had so great an effect, that the mighty potentate was abandoned by all, abjured by his Prelates, forsaken by his princes, and unsupported even by the presence of a single menial; Henry was humbled, and after a while, through the interposition of his good consort, Bertha, sought and obtained reconciliation with Rome.\* Time was when a Bourbon, at the head of a mercenary army, marched against the Eternal City, and vowed to level her to the ground, but the God of S. Peter was there, and once more was the “old man,” though a prisoner in the Castle of Sant Angelo, victorious: while his enemies were revelling in drunkenness and debauchery, Clement was praying for them. Though De Bourbon

\* See Appendix A.

had fallen at the first onset near the Porta Del Spirito Santo, his conquerors, satiated with meat and wine, and excited by the darkness of the night, conceived the idea of a masquerade with *flambeaux*, in derision of that captive Papacy which they imagined they had for ever destroyed. Asses were brought, on which rode some lancers vested in Cardinals' robes. Wilhelm De Sandizell, with a paper tiara on his head, represented the Pope. On arriving opposite the Castle of Sant Angelo, the party stopped, the Cardinals dismounted and knelt before Sandizell and kissed his hands and feet, and received the benediction, which he gave with a glass of wine. A voice then exclaimed, "Let us elect a Pope;" "yes," cried others, "a Pope not created after the image of Clement, a Pope who will obey Cæsar, a Pope who will not desire either war or blood." "Luther," replied the crowd, "let those that wish that Luther should be Pope hold up their hands?" and all did so shouting, "long live Pope Luther!" When about to separate, one of the lancers (Grunenwald) addressed the following words to the captive Pontiff, "What pleasure would it give me to embowel thee, thou enemy of God, Cæsar, and the world." What, reader, think you was the termination of this expedition? The barbarians, decimated by the plague, left Rome on the 17th Feb., 1521, and Clement, on his arrival at Orvieto, where he had fled disguised as a gardener, thus prayed publicly for those wretches who had so maltreated him—"O my God, pardon my enemies as I pardon them, the injuries and insults they have inflicted on thy Church, its invisible Head who is in Heaven, and the visible who is on earth."\* Time was when a proud ambitious tyrant, who had levelled thrones and created sovereigns at his nod, conceived the idea of humbling Rome, but the "old man," though despised by the Conqueror flushed with success, again triumphed. The proud Emperor met his reserves almost as soon as he had been excommunicated. He had impiously asked his son-in-law, Beauharnais, if the Pope imagined that by placing

\* Audin's Histoire de Henri VIII.

him under an interdict, his soldiers' weapons would fall from their hands; but what Napoleon had so tauntingly enquired really occurred. He was excommunicated in June 1809, and in 1812, during the disastrous Russian Campaign (on the retreat from Moskowa,) an eye-witness (the Comte De Segur) says that the soldiers seemed unable to carry their arms; when they fell their weapons fell from their hand, broke, and were lost in the snow. They did not cast them aside, but, from cold and famine, were unable to retain their hold. In 1814 Buonaparte signed his abdication in that very palace of Fontainebleau where he had imprisoned Pius VII.† And so is it now-a-days. But a few years since, and Alleluias were resounding through the length and breadth of England, at the fall of Rome; Mazzini and Garibaldi, aided by Gavazi and Achilli, had utterly exterminated the Papacy! the Church of Rome had perished!! Fleming's prophecy had been fulfilled!!! Rome was no more!!! Cumming was in ecstasies, and Spooner and Newdegate, M'Neile and Stowell, danced and whooped with very delirium! But alas! the "old man" to whom had descended the Fisherman's ring, weak and powerless as he was, an exile at Gaëta, uttered a few words, and lo! a mighty heretical nation was convulsed and scared with terror, impelled by the instinctive awe which Heresy ever feels towards the truth. S. Peter had issued his mandate, and the Hierarchy was restored, in the mercy of a God, to a nation that had FIVE TIMES DELIBERATELY REJECTED the Gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ, and preferred the worship of devils, inasmuch as England had embraced heresy with its concomitant evils of drunkenness and vice.

“At length the Law, the Faith, she flung o'erboard,  
 When carnal Calvin, lecherous Luther, roar'd,  
 Down with the Church! free Passion from duress,  
 Raise high the flood-gates of Licentiousness.

† Rohrbacher Histoire de l'Eglise, Vol. XXVIII.

They stripped the Church of all the poor's estate,  
 And gave its acres to the guilty great ;\*  
 They dressed the Latin Mass in English guise—  
 Oh what a Mass —without a sacrifice !

Blood without cause was spilt, the poor were fleec'd,  
 Churches destroyed, church lands to spendthrifts leas'd ;  
 Widow's were seen their husbands to deplore,  
 And orphans begged from door to door."†

ROME CANNOT AND WILL NOT FALL. To her may be applied the following lines of a lately living poet, slightly altered, which we gladly re-echo :—

“Ruin to Rome!—  
 ————Do ye dream  
 Because fate lends you one insulting hour,  
 That ye can quench the purified flame that God  
 Has lit from Heaven's own fire ?  
 ————'Tis not a city crowned  
 With olive, and encircl'd with peerless fame,  
 Ye would dishonour, but an opening work  
 Diviner than the soul of man had erst  
 Been gifted to imagine ; truths serene  
 Made visible in beauty that shall glow  
 In everlasting freshness, unapproach'd  
 By mortal passion, pure amidst the blood  
 And dust of conquests, never waxing old,  
 But on the stream of time, from age to age,  
 Casting bright images of heavenly things  
 To make the work less mournful,  
 And ye, frail insects of a day, would cry,  
 RUIN TO ROME !”

The prayers of England's martyred children had been heard. The prayers of those who suffered the martyrdom of the rack and the gibbet, the scavenger's daughter and the iron gauntlet, a Campian and a Haydock, a Nelson and

\* Spelman on Sacrilege.

† O'Brennan's Ancient Ireland and S. Patrick.

a Paine, an Arrowsmith and a Hart, a Margaret Clitherow and the aged Mrs. Killingate, have been answered, for they had not suffered for their faith in vain. S. Alban, (England's protomartyr) S. Paternus, (whose place of martyrdom is still pointed out as the Dwl Hallog in the vicinity of Aberystwyth) S. Edmund, S. Oswyn, S. Alphege, F. Arrowsmith, Fisher, F. Johnson,\* and Mrs. Killingate, have not interceded, let us hope, in vain, united as their intercessions have been with those glorious confessors, S. Wilfrid, St. Wulstan, S. William, S. Anselm, S. Dunstan, and Cardinal Pole. God had, in His Divine mercy, permitted His Church in England to endure a cruel, aye, a most cruel persecution for the space of nearly three hundred years, but ere the third century had rolled into eternity, in confirmation as it were of the visions vouchsafed to S. Edward and the Spanish Hermit,† He, who had, to all appearance, yielded the field to the enemy of mankind, reappeared. "He came (says Dr. Newman) as a spirit upon the waters; He walked to and fro Himself over that dark and troublesome deep, and, wonderful to behold and inexplicable to man, hearts were stirred and eyes were raised in hope, and feet began to move forwards to the great Mother who had almost given up the thought and seeking of them. First one and then another sought the rest which she alone could give. A first and a second and a third and a fourth, each in his turn as grace inspired him, not altogether, as by some party understanding or political call, but drawn by Divine power and against his will, for he was happy where he was, yet with his will, for he was lovingly subdued by the sweet mysterious influence that called him on. One by one, little noticed at the moment, silently, swiftly and abundantly they drifted in,

\* F. Johnson was arrested near Kidderminster and executed at Worcester; he had been previously concealed in the Priest's hiding hole, at Harington Hall, when he received the abjuration of Lady Yate.

† See Neale's Hierologus.

till all could at length see that secretly the stone was rolled away and that Christ was risen and abroad.\*

How truly and accurately do the following lines of an anonymous poet depict the convert's sentiments on entering the Church:—

“I can sympathize with none  
 And none can feel with me,  
       \*    \*    \*    \*  
 Nor is it this, that friends may feel  
 Though *false* indeed they be,  
 For I am in my bark *alone*  
 Upon the wide, wide sea.”

But we would caution our readers against imagining that conversions to the Church only commenced with the “*Puseyite*” movement, for many were reconciled to the See of S. Peter at a period when it was death by the law of the land to belong to her Communion, or for one holding her orders to be seen in the country. The following names, as converts and martyrs to the faith, are recorded by Bishop Challoner, who suffered not a little on the night of the Anti-Popish riots under the leadership of Lord George Gordon:—†

\* Christ upon the Waters, a Sermon, by Rev. J. H. Newman, D.D.

† The Editor of “*Dolman's Magazine*” gives the following account of Dr. Challoner's narrow and providential escape during the Gordon riots:—“His name was particularly obnoxious to the mob. Many had sworn to roast him alive. Castle Street, Holborn, where his humble dwelling was situated, swarmed that night with the riotors who were vainly seeking for his house. The number had been accurately supplied them, but, either from drunkenness or the merey of God's protecting Providence, they failed to discern it. We may faintly guess the horrors endured by this aged Prelate when the frequent shouts for the Popish Bishop to come forth assailed his ears. He remained, during that long and agonizing interval, upon his knees, praying with his accustomed fervor to his Heavenly Master to give him that fortitude and resignation which might sustain him in his threatened martyrdom. If those aged eyes shed tears they were not for his own calamities, but for those of his flock who, like the early Christians, were exposed to the wild beasts of Ephesus.” (*Dolman's Magazine*, Vol. V., p. 81.)

## 1581.

1. Rev. Ralph Sherwine, Exeter College, Oxford.
2. Rev. Edward Campian, S. J.
3. Rev. Alexander Brian, Hart Hall, Oxford.

## 1582.

4. Rev. Thomas Ford, Trinity College, Oxford.
5. Rev. John Short, Brazenose College, Oxford.
6. Rev. William Fuller, Lincoln College, Oxford.
7. Rev. Laurence Richardson, Brazenose College, Oxford.
8. Rev. Thomas Cottam, Brazenose College, Oxford.

## 1583.

9. Rev. William Hart, Lincoln College, Oxford.
10. ——— Body, Esq., New College, Oxford.

## 1584.

11. Rev. George Haydock, New College, Oxford.
12. Rev. James Fenn, New College, Oxford.\*
13. Rev. Robert Fenn, New College, Oxford.
14. Rev. John Fenn, New College, Oxford.
15. Rev. Thomas Hemerford, New College, Oxford.
16. Rev. John Nutter, New College, Oxford.
17. Rev. John Mund, New College, Oxford.
18. Rev. Joseph Bell, New College, Oxford.
19. Rev. Richard White, New College, Cambridge.

## 1586.

20. Rev. Edward Strachan, S. John's College, Oxford.

## 1587.

21. Rev. Richard Sutton, New College, Oxford.
22. Rev. Rev. Stephen Rousham, S. Mary's College, Oxford.
23. Rev. Edmund Jennings.
24. Rev. Eustachius White.

\* Messrs. James, Robert, and John Fenn were brothers, and were born at Montacute. "F. James Fenn was apprehended on the public road near the house of a Catholic Gentleman, named Giles Bernard, who suffered much persecution on that account,"—*Oliver's Collections*, &c.

1593.

- 25. Rev. Edward Waterton.
- 26. Rev. John Cornelius, New College, Oxford.\*
- 27. Rev. John Bost.
- 28. Rev. John Ingram.
- 29. George Sallowel, Esq., Protestant Curate of Houghton-le-Spring, Durham.

1595.

- 30. Rev. Alexander Robins, New College, Oxford.
- 31. Rev. Henry Walpole, S. J., New College, Cambridge.

1596.

- 32. Henry Abbot, Esq.

1597.

- 33. Rev. William Andleby.

1600.

- 34. Rev. Christopher Wharton, Trinity College, Oxford.

1602.

- 35. Rev. Francis Page, S. J.

1604.

- 36. Rev. Edward Kensington, S. J.†
- 37. Rev. Thomas Kensington.

1612.

- 38. Rev. William Scott, O.S.B., Trinity College, Cambridge.

\* The Rev. John Cornelius was apprehended in his *hiding hole* at Chidlock Castle. The Priest's hiding holes at Harvington Hall, Worcestershire and Malvern Priory, are still in existence, as also one at Little Walford Priory, near Shipston-on-Stour.

† The Rev. F. Edward Kensington, whose real name was Laithwaite, on hearing of his brother's imprisonment and condemnation, hurried to Exeter to reclaim him from the errors of Popery, and the magistrates witnessing his enthusiastic zeal allowed him free access to his brother. But at the end of eight days he became satisfied that he had been combating shadows instead of substance; that he had mistaken for Catholic doctrine the base misrepresentation and calumnies of the enemies of God's Church. The discovery of such unjustifiable practices served as a beacon to direct him through the surges of error and to lift him upon the rock of truth. By the end of the Christmas holidays he was himself reconciled to the Catholic Church.—*Oliver*

1642.

39. Rev. William Rose, O.S.B., Trinity College, Cambridge.

1678.

40. Edward Colman, Esq., Trinity College, Cambridge.

41. Rev. Anthony Turner, S.J., Trinity College, Cambridge.

The following are from the "*Legenda Lignea*," and we make no doubt our readers will be astonished at finding that the sons of Dr. Potter, the Dean of Worcester, and Dr. Cosin of Peterborough, were among those on whom it pleased God to bestow the Divine gift of faith:—

- “1. Rev. Sir Toby Matthews, son of the Archbishop of York.
2. Rev. Walter Montacute, Sydney Sussex College, Cambridge.
3. Rev. — Goff, D.D., one of the King’s Chaplains.
4. Rev. — Vane, D.D., one of the King’s Chaplains.
5. Rev. Hugh Cressy, Fellow of Merton College, Oxford.\*
6. Rev. Thomas Bailey, D.D., son of the Bishop of Bangor, and Chaplain to the Marquis of Worcester.
7. Rev. Richard Crawshaw, Fellow of Peterhouse, Cambridge.
8. Rev. William Rowlands.
9. Rev. William Simons.
10. Rev. — Potter.
11. Rev. — Cosin.
12. Sir Kenelm Digby.
13. Sir Francis Doddington.
14. Sir Theophilus Gelly.
15. Lord Andover.
16. Lord Goring.
17. Hon. C. Goring.
18. Sir Richard Lee.
19. Sir William Davenant.
20. Dr. Hart.
21. Dr. Johnson.
22. N. Read, Esq.
23. Richard Millivent, Esq.

\* Rev. Hugh Cressy, O.S.B., author of the "Church History of Brittany," was received into the Church, while travelling as tutor with the Earl of Falmouth, at Rome in 1646.

24. Thomas Normington, Esq.
25. — Glue, Esq., Balliol College, Oxford.
26. Richard Nicholas, Esq., Peterhouse, Cambridge.
27. Edward Barker, Esq., Caius College, Cambridge.
28. Marchioness of Worcester.
26. Marchioness of Clanricarde.
30. Countess of Denbigh.
31. Lady Kilmanchie.”

In addition to these, we must not omit the names of the Duke of York and Rev. F. Lewgar,\* the friend of the notorious apostate Chillingworth; and in our days, previous to the movement whose annals we are compiling, Messrs. Kenelm Digby, Beste, Lisle Phillips, the late Frederick Lucas, M. P., the Rev. F. Ignatius, and many others; nor should we forget the penalty awarded by an Act of Parliament, enacted in the reign of Elizabeth, making it “High Treason to draw off any person from the communion of the Church of England to that of Rome:” and that those who “knowingly maintained or concealed the reconciling or reconciled, and refused to discover them within twenty days to some Justice of the Peace or other higher officer, should fall under the penalty of misprision of treason.” It was likewise enacted that every person convicted of saying Mass should forfeit 200 marks and suffer a year’s imprisonment, and those who willingly heard Mass be liable to the forfeiture of 100 marks and one year’s imprisonment. Further: “every person above the age of sixteen years who absents himself from church, incurred the forfeiture of £20 per month, and in case the absence was continued for twelve months, he was to be bound to his good behaviour to enter into a recognizance of £200, and find two sufficient sureties.” Well, then, has a Dignitary of the Establishment said, that “the Penal Laws were notorious through the whole of Europe as the most

\* It was through the instrumentality of Father Lewgar, S.J., that the Savoy Conference altered the words of the Ordination service of the Church of England, and thus acknowledged the invalidity of the Orders conferred from the time of Parker to their day.

cruel and atrocious system of persecution ever instituted by one religious persuasion against another ;”\* and Mr. Burke justly called it “a truly barbarous system, where all the parts are an outrage on the laws of humanity and the rights of nature ; it is a system of elaborate contrivance as well fitted for the oppression, imprisonment, and degradation of a people and the debasement of human nature, as ever proceeded from the perverted ingenuity of man.” In a word, Catholicity was nearly extinct in England. “The vivifying principle of truth, the shadow of S. Peter, the grace of the Redeemer, had left England. All seemed to be lost ; there was a struggle for a time, and then its priests were cast out and martyred.”†

Have we not then reason to marvel at the increase of the Church now-a-day ? Have we not reason to exclaim, *Digitus Dei est hic*, when we see converts daily received into the Church, and not a week pass by without announcing the opening of a new Mission ?—But fifty years since and we were a bye-word among the people ;—but half a century since, and one of our Prelates (Dr. Talbot) was tried for the crime of saying Mass, and only acquitted on the informer swearing, that he had heard the officiating Prelate say, CONFITEO DEO omnipotenti, instead of the wonted formula, CONFITEOR DEO omnipotenti—inasmuch as (said the Lord Chief Justice of the day) the Latin language has no such word as CONFITEO. “Truth was disposed of and shovelled away, and there was a calm, a silence, a sort of peace.” Thus was it but a few years since.

Methinks we hear our Protestant friends inquiring, “What has given rise to this unusual excitement in the world ? What has caused the revival of Catholicity, not only in England, but in Germany, America, Russia, and even Sweden and Turkey ; not only do we see mem-

\* Sydney Smith’s Letter to the Electors of York on the Catholic Emancipation.

† The Second Spring, a Sermon by the Rev. J. H. Newman, D.D.

bers of the Establishment, but of every other *soi-disant* religious body flocking into the Catholic Church. To-day Wesleyanism gives up with a sorrowful heart a Pritchard; to-morrow records the reception of an Ida Hahn, a Petcherine, or a Boyhimie, and the next day a Professor of one of the 'Godless Colleges,' a Crofton, or it may be a Gfröer, submits to the chair of S. Peter, and sues for reconciliation with the Rock of Ages! It is the spirit of God, the *Ruach Elohim*, once more hovering over the face of the earth, and quickening men's souls prepared in secret by Almighty God, and fitted into His Living Church like the stones in Solomon's temple, "which were made ready before they were brought to Jerusalem, so that there was neither hammer nor axe, nor any tool of iron, heard in the house when it was in building." So has it been now-a-days, for throughout the movement no visible exertion (if we except the form of prayer drawn up by his Eminence the Cardinal Archbishop of Westminster, for the conversion of England, while Principal of the English College at Rome) was made by the Church; the pear fell as it ripened, and was gathered into the garner, the chrysalis was converted into the butterfly, and the stone that "had been hewn and made ready elsewhere," was brought to Jerusalem, and fixed in its own place; each convert by God's grace working out his own salvation with a joyful fear rejoiced in having found rest, true genuine rest, for his soul; it was the new spring; the winter had past, the rain was over and gone. As in those happy days, when the Church was in her infancy, and Priests were wont to offer up the Holy Sacrifice in the Catacombs, and inquirers to visit the Apostles by night, so now might men be found studying S. Thomas Aquinas, Bellarmine and Perrone, and using the "Garden of the Soul" and the "*Paradisus Anima*" as books of private devotion, but secretly for fear of their fellow-men—some might be seen stealing to Mass at the Catholic chapel—humble and mean as it was—but disguised, and pouring out their hearts to

their God, concealed from the view of man by some pillar, beseeching Him to guide them into the truth, for none dared trust another, or confer with the friend of his bosom, or the companion of his earlier days, on so sacred, so awfully sacred a subject as the salvation of the soul; in truth, many were exclaiming with S. Augustine, "*Quamdiu, quamdiu, cras, et cras? Quare non modo? Quare non hęc horę?*" for they were consumed with very grief, so palpable was the darkness in which their souls were buried.

The avowed object of the "Oxford movement" (for its chrysalis state under Dr. Lloyd, we would refer the reader to Canon Oakeley's lecture) was to contribute something towards the practical revival of doctrines, which, although held by the great divines of our Church, at present have become obsolete with the majority of her members, and are withdrawn from public view even by the more learned and orthodox few who still adhere to them;" in a word, to "Catholicize the present Establishment; and gradually to restore to England the blessings of the Catholic Church," for the "zealous sons and servants of the English Branch of the Church of Christ, seeing with sorrow that she is defrauded of her full usefulness by particular theories of the present age, which interfere with one portion of her commission, believe that nothing but these neglected doctrines, faithfully preached, will repress that extension of Popery, for which the ever multiplying divisions of the religious world are too clearly preparing the way."\* A series of pamphlets embracing a wide range of subjects was published, entitled *Tracts for the Times*, "embracing such subjects as the following:—the Constitution of the Church—the authority of its ministers—the Ordinances, and especially the Sacraments of the Church—refutation of the errors of Romanism, and directions how to oppose it—translations of interesting passages of early Church History, and collections of passages in confirmation of their tenets

\* *Tracts for the Times*, Vol. I., Preface.

from the great standard English Divines."†

The Tractarians further taught, much to the dismay of the Bishop of Ossory, (Dr. O'Brien, whose Anti-Catholic tendencies are well known in the city of St. Canice) the doctrine of Apostolic succession as a rule of practice, i.e.

1—That the participation of the Body and Blood of Christ is essential to the maintenance of Christian life and hope in each individual.

2—That it is conveyed to individual Christians *only* by the hands of the successors of the Apostles and their delegates.

3—That the successors of the Apostles are those who are descended in a direct line from them by the imposition of hands, and that the delegates of these are the respective Presbyters whom each have commissioned, and that "without a Bishop there can not exist any Church, nor any Christian man, no not so much as in name." In vain did Dr. O'Brien disclaim this truth, so emphatically laid down by the members of the new School, who contend that "all our great Divines who maintain the reality and the advantages of a succession 'from the Apostles line' of episcopally consecrated Bishops, and episcopally ordained Ministers in the Church, and who rejoice in the possession of it by our then Church, as a signal blessing and privilege, *not only do not maintain that this is absolutely essential to the being of the Church, but ARE AT PAINS TO MAKE IT CLEAR THAT THEY DO NOT HOLD THAT IT IS.*"\*

Such was the state of matters in 1833;—the opinions entertained by the "Oxford School," were becoming somewhat popular, but it was by no means to be expected that they would become "widely popular, for truth is never, or at least never long, popular," though Mr. Sewell expressed his surprise at the rapidity with which the fundamental principles of the Oxford School had advanced—"a

† Evans' Sketch of all Religions, edited by Rev. J. H. Bransby.

\* Charge of the Bishop of Ossory.

rapidity which ten years since we should have pronounced a delusion;\* Mr. Dalgairns in his letter to the 'Univers' also says, referring to the progress of Tractarianism—  
 “The progress of Catholic opinion in England, for the last seven years, is so inconceivable that no hope should appear extravagant. Let us then remain quiet for some years till, by God's blessing, the ears of Englishmen are become accustomed to hear the name of Rome pronounced with reverence. At the end of this term you will soon see the fruits of patience.”

The Bishops were closely watching their proceedings; the Evangelical party were alive to their actions, and waiting their time to act. The Oxford school was attacked on all sides; Bishops, Archdeacons, and Deans, were charging against them; Charlotte Elizabeth, in her *Christian Ladies' Magazine*, was warning her fair readers to beware of the “sleek slim Tractarian Curate;” while others were accusing them of “disaffection to the Church, unfaithfulness to her teachers, a desire to bring in new doctrines, and to conform our Church more to the Church of Rome, to bring back either entire or modified Popery.” “Tractarianism” (says one), “is a wicked, ungodly, unscriptural conspiracy to confine and enslave the souls of free Englishmen and to crush them beneath the Juggernaut wheels of episcopal tyranny and spiritual despotism.”† Another, that “in narrowness and bigotry they might vie with any production of the Dark Ages, their chief aim being to retain the great bulk of mankind in abject intellectual prostration, and blind subjection to a domineering priesthood. Could they attain such strength as to render them rash enough to attempt to reduce their opinions to practice, the result would be most awful: for a collision would ensue, which might endanger our sacred and valuable institutions, and our *National Church in particular would be sure to fall in the struggle.*”‡

\* Sewell's Letter to Dr. Pusey on Tract No. XC.

† What is Tractarianism? By Rev. J. Gladstone.

‡ Christian Observer, Feb. 1841.

According to one Bishop (Chester), "Tractarianism is daily assuming a more serious and alarming aspect, and threatens a revival of the worst evils of the Romish system;" and another, "I charge you in the name of Christ to shun these novelties, to despise such teaching, and to abhor such perversity of learning." While the Bishop of Calcutta felt it his duty to "caution his Reverend Brethren against the whole system as proceeding upon a false and most dangerous principle, and differing from the generally received Protestant notions.

Dr. Pusey in consequence of these attacks, was compelled to defend the "*Tracts for the Times*," and their writers, by quotations such as the following, from their works, to prove that they were not Romanists, nor even their writings of a Romish tendency.

"Rome maintains positive errors, and that under the sanction of an anathema, but nothing can be pointed out in the English Church which is not there so far as it goes, and even when it opposes Rome with a truly Apostolic toleration, it utters no law or condemnation against her adherents."\*

"The Romanists are wretched Tridentines everywhere."†

"The freedom of the Anglican Church may be vindicated against the exorbitant claims of Rome, and yet no disparagement ensue of the authority inherent in the Catholic Apostolic Church."‡

———"O that thy creed were sound,  
For thou dost soothe the heart, thou Church of Rome,  
By thy unwearied watch and varied round  
Of service in thy Saviour's holy home."§

Mr. Dalgairns also says in reply to the question 'why do you not join us?' The theory of the Church is pure; but according to certain works of piety which are too widely spread, according to the statements of enlightened travellers

\* *Tracts for the Times*, No. lxxi.

† Froude's *Remains*

‡ Keble on *Tradition*.

§ *Lyra Apostolica*. Appendix B.

free from all the prejudices of vulgar Protestantism, he (Mr. Newman) fears that there is a system authorized, which practically, instead of presenting to the soul of the sinner the Holy Trinity, Heaven and Hell, substitutes for that the Holy Virgin, the Saints and Purgatory. It is true that all that does not form an essential part of the faith of the Church; but he avows that the system loudly calls for reform, and that it would be impossible for the Anglican Church *yet* to cast itself into the arms of Rome.”\*

Thus did Dr. Pusey show that the writers of the “*Tracts for the Times*,” were not Romanists, though *closely approximating* to Rome in particular doctrines, principles and views, that they were not “fighting under false colors;” or, as another writer says, that though “deeply convinced in spite of outward appearances, that the Church of England is intrinsically Catholic, that it is our duty to belong to her, and that it is a great sin to leave her, still were she ever unhappily to profess herself to be a form of Protestantism, (which may God of His infinite mercy forbid), then I would myself reject and anathematize the Church of England, and would separate myself from her immediately as from a human sect; and in conclusion (continues Mr. Palmer) I once more publicly profess myself a Catholic and a member of a Catholic Church, and say Anathema to the principle of Protestantism, (which I regard as identical with the principle of Dissent) and to all its forms, sects, and denominations, especially to those of the Lutherans and Calvinists, and British and American Dissenters. Likewise to all persons who knowingly and willingly, and understanding what they do, shall assert either for themselves or for the Church of England the principle of Protestantism, or maintain the Church of England to have one and the same common religion with any or all of the various forms and sects of Protestantism, or shall communicate themselves

\* Letter to the ‘Univers.’

in the temples of Protestants, or give communion to their members, or go about to establish any intercommunion between our Church and them, otherwise than by bringing them, in the first instance, to renounce their errors and promise a true obedience for the future to the entire faith and discipline of the Catholic and Apostolic Episcopate—to all such I say Anathema.”\* Mr. Froude also in his letters and ‘Life of St. Thomas of Canterbury,’ laments, (reminding one of Hamlet’s affections for Ophelia so beautifully portrayed by the Bard of Avon) the state of the Establishment, (his Ophelia) asserting that the “tyranny of the State and the weakness of the Church seem to have divested them of all claims, not merely on his obedience but also on his good faith. This is a very serious charge; but as it seems clearly well founded, painful as it is, it is very necessary that it should be very distinctly made; and being made of course it ought to be substantiated.”†

His Eminence the Cardinal Archbishop of Westminster, with that far-seeing discernment for which he is so justly celebrated, predicted the tendency of the Oxford School, for he says, speaking of the “Library of the Fathers,” “I augur results most favorable to the cause of truth, from the publications of the Fathers in a form acceptable to ordinary readers.”‡ The storm which had for so long a period been lowering over the head of the Oxford School, at last burst forth in all its fury on the devoted person of Isaac Williams. The description of the storm that overtook Æneas and his companions, as described by the Mantuan bard, may well apply to that now lowering over the Tractarianizing section of the Establishment—

——— “Venti velut agmine facto,  
Qua data porta ruunt et terras turbine perflant,  
Incubere mari totumque a sedibis imis,

\* Letter of the Rev. W. Palmer, to Rev. C. P. Golightly.

† Froude’s Remains.

‡ High Church Claims, by Dr. Wiseman.

Una Eurus Notusque ruunt creberque procellis,  
 Africus. \* \* \* \* \*  
 Insequitur clamorque virum stridorque rudentum,  
 \* \* \* \* \*  
 Intonuere poli et crebris micat ignibus æther.”

For from this moment the Anglican party might have said with the stranded Gonzalo—

“We split! we split! Farewell, my wife and children,  
 Farewell, brother, we split! we split! we split!”

Bishops now charged in reality against the tenet of “Reserve in teaching Religious Knowledge,” regarding it as contrary to the doctrine and practice of the Gospel. Dr. Phillpotts (the Bishop of Exeter) “lamented more and more the tendency, at least, the direct import of some of their (The Oxford School) views, on reserve, in communicating Religious Knowledge; especially their venturing to recommend us to keep back from any who are baptized, the explicit and full declaration of the Doctrine of the Atonement,” and Dr. Monk, Mr. Williams’s Bishop, accused him of “withdrawing the Scriptures from mankind, and robbing us of the greatest blessing which flows from a pure religion.” To this Mr. Williams replied by showing that he had been misrepresented by his Diocesan, as “*Reserve*,” only meant, *reverence*, and that it was far from his intention to withhold the doctrine of the Atonement, for he says in the Tract, “surely the doctrine of the Atonement may be taught in all its fulness on all occasions, and at all seasons, more effectually, more really and truly according to the proportion of the faith, or the need of circumstances, without being brought out from the context of Holy Scripture into prominent and explicit mention.”

Dr. Copleston, Bishop of Llandaff, thus referred in his Charge to the Tractarian movement—“It was with pain and sorrow that I observed the early indication of that evil, which almost invariably attends the formation of what must be called a school or party in matters of religion. It is true,

that in these ‘*Tracts*,’ the falsehoods of Popery are occasionally held up undisguised for rejection, and even for abhorrence. But this, so far from being a justification of the tone in which at other times her faults are palliated, and her pretensions respected, rather strikes me as carrying with it a self-condemning evidence. If she be guilty to the extent described, it is inexcusable to hold communion with her, or to court her favor: there is undoubtedly in these ‘*Tracts*,’ an admission of various corruptions sanctioned and enforced by the Romish Church.”†

Nor were Drs. Copleston, Monk, and Phillpotts, alone in their condemnation of the *Tracts on Reserve*, in communicating Religious Knowledge; “and notwithstanding the continued assertions of the writer, that by ‘*Reserve*,’ he meant ‘*reverence*,’ the Anglican ‘*Bishops*,’ in their various charges condemned Mr. Williams and his *Tracts*, one saying, “we” (Dr. Carr, Bishop of Bombay), deprecate any *Reserve* in putting the Gospel into the hands of any who desire to secure Christian instruction—“while another (Dr. Blomfield) rejected every thing in the nature of a *disciplina arcani*.”

No. XC. at last made its appearance; and in obedience to the express command of the Bishop of Oxford, the “*Tracts for the Times*,” were now discontinued, with an unreserved and joyful submission to the authority of the Bishop, inasmuch as “the Episcopacy is a divinely ordained chain of supernatural grace,” and that it would be “acting lightly against the Spouse of Christ, and the awful presence which dwells in Her, if they hesitated a moment in not putting their Lordship’s will before their own,” for if “a Bishop’s lightest word *ex cathedra* is heavy; his judgment on a book cannot be light.”

The following letter to the Editor of the ‘*Tracts for the Times*,’ was the cause of No. XC. being brought before the notice of the Hebdomadal Board:—

† Charge of the Bishop of Llandaff, 1841.

‘To the Editor of the *Tracts for the Times*.

SIR,—Our attention having been called to No. 90, in the series of ‘*Tracts for the Times by the Members of the University of Oxford*,’ of which you are the Editor; the impression produced in our minds by its contents, is of so painful a character that we feel it our duty to introduce ourselves briefly before your notice. This publication is entitled “*Remarks on certain passages in the Thirty-nine Articles*;” and as these Articles are appointed by the statutes of the University to be the text book for tutors in their theological teaching, we hope that the situations we hold in our respective Colleges will secure us from the charge of presumption in thus coming forward to address you. The ‘*Tract*’ has in our apprehension, a highly dangerous tendency, from its suggesting that certain very important errors of the Church of Rome are not condemned by the Articles of the Church of England: for instance, that those Articles do not contain any condemnation of the doctrines,

- 1 Of Purgatory,
- 2 Of Pardon,
- 3 Of the worshipping and adoration of Images and Relics,
- 4 Of the Invocation of Saints,
- 5 Of the Mass,

as they are taught authoritatively by the Church of Rome; but are a condemnation of certain absurd practices and opinions which intelligent Romanists repudiate as much as we do. It is intimated moreover, that the declaration prefixed to the Articles, so far as it has any weight at all, sanctions this mode of interpreting them, as it is one which takes them in their “literal and grammatical sense,” and does not “affix any new sense” to them. The *Tract* would thus appear to us to have a tendency to mitigate, beyond what charity requires, and to the prejudice of the pure truth of the Gospel, the very serious differences which separate the Church of Rome from our own, and to shake the confidence of the less learned members of the Church of England in the Spiritual character of her formularies and teaching.

“We readily admit the necessity of allowing that liberty in interpreting the formularies of our Church, which has been advocated by many of its more learned Bishops and other eminent Divines; but this *Tract* puts forward new and startling views as to the

extent to which that liberty may be carried. For as we are right in our apprehension of the Author's meaning, we are at a loss to see what security would remain were his principles generally recognized, that the most plainly erroneous doctrines and practices of the Church of Rome might not be inculcated in the Lecture Rooms of the University, and from the pulpits of our Churches.

In conclusion we venture to call your attention to the impropriety of such questions being treated in an anonymous publication, and to express an earnest hope that you may be authorized to make known the writer's name. Considering however grave and solemn the whole subject is, we cannot help thinking that both the Church and the University are entitled to ask that some person beside the Printer and Publisher of the Tract should acknowledge himself responsible for its contents.

We are, sir, your obedient and humble servants,

“T. T. CHURTON, M.A.,  
Vice-principal and Tutor of Brazenose College.”

“H. B. WILSON, B.D.,  
Fellow and Senior Tutor of St. John's College.”

“JOHN GRIFFITHS, M.A.,  
Sub-warden and Tutor of Wadham College.”

“A. C. TAIT, M.A.,  
Fellow and Senior Tutor of Balliol College.”

*Oxford, March 8th, 1841.*

The Hebdomadal Board consequently came to the following resolution—

“At a Meeting of the Vice-Chancellor, Heads of Houses and Proctors, in the Delegates' Rooms, March 18th, 1841—

Considering that it is enjoined in the Statutes of this University, (Art. III., sect. 2, tit. IX., sect. II., § 3, sect. V. § 3) that every student shall be instructed in the Thirty-nine Articles, and shall subscribe to them; considering also, that a Tract has recently appeared, dated from Oxford, and entitled, *Remarks on certain passages in the Thirty-nine Articles*, being No. 90 of *The Tracts for the Times*, a series

of anonymous publications purporting to be written by members of the University, but which are in no way sanctioned by the University itself:—

Resolved, that modes of interpretation such as are suggested in the said Tract, evading rather than explaining the sense of the Thirty-nine Articles, and reconciling subscription to them with the adoption of errors which they were designed to counteract, defeat the object, and are inconsistent with the due observance, of the above mentioned Statutes.

W. WYNTER,  
Vice-Chancellor."

Whereupon Mr. Newman addressed the following letter to the Vice-Chancellor:—

"MR. VICE-CHANCELLOR,

I write this respectfully to inform you that I am the author, and have the sole responsibility of the Tract, on which the Hebdomadal Board has just expressed an opinion, and that I have not given my name hitherto, under the belief that it was desired that I should not. I hope it will not surprise you if I say, that my opinion remains unchanged of the truth and honesty of the principle maintained in the Tract, and of the necessity of putting it forth. At the same time, I am prompted by my feelings to add my deep consciousness, that everything I attempt might be done in a better spirit and in a better way; and while I am sincerely sorry for the trouble and anxiety I have given to the members of the Board, I beg to return my thanks to them for an act which, even though founded on misapprehension, may be made as profitable to myself as it is religiously and charitably intended. I say all this with great sincerity, and am, Mr. Vice-Chancellor,

Your obedient servant,

JOHN HENRY NEWMAN.

*Oriel College, March 16th."*

In consequence of the condemnation of Mr. Newman by the Hebdomadal Board, Dr. Hook thus expressed himself." "The moment I heard that Mr. Newman was to be silenced, not by argument, but by *usurped authority*, that moment I determined to renounce my intention of pointing out in Tract XC. what I considered to be its errors: that moment I determined to take my stand with Mr. Newman; because, though I did not approve of a particular Tract, yet in general principles, *in the very principle advocated in that Tract, I did agree with him*; in a word, I was compelled by circumstances to act as a *party-man*. And in justice to one whom I am proud to call my friend, *I am bound to say that Mr. Newman's explanatory letter to Dr. Jelf is to my mind perfectly satisfactory*. The Church of England is now a divided body. The most unhappy determination of the Hebdomadal Board at Oxford to censure Mr. Newman, A CENSURE WHICH I LITTLE DOUBT THE CONVOCATION OF THE UNIVERSITY WOULD, IF SUMMONED, REVERSE—has proclaimed this from one end of the country to the other."†

The object of this far-famed *Tract* was, "to show that, while our Prayer book is acknowledged on all hands to be of Catholic origin, our Articles also, the offspring of an uncatholic age, are through God's good providence, to say the best, not uncatholic, and may be subscribed by those who aim at being Catholic in heart and doctrine."\*

Notwithstanding the condemnation of the Tract by the Bishop of Oxford, Dr. Pusey, and Messrs. Percival, Ward, and Keble, vindicated its principles; and this notwithstanding the *ex cathedra* denunciations of one Bishop, who condemned No. 90 as "a most dangerous delusion;" while another lamented that the Tracts "sometimes dealt with some of the worst corruptions of Rome, in terms not indicating so deep a sense of their pernicious tendency."

† Hook's Letter to the Bishop of Ripon, P.C.

\* Tracts for the Times, No. XC.

The work of God had commenced; the "*Tracts for the Times*" and "*Froude's Remains*" had effected their appointed task, which He, in His good providence, had set them to accomplish, though unknown to the writers and leaders of the "Oxford School," who were "earnest and copious in their enforcement of the high doctrine of the Faith, of Dogmatism, of the Sacramental principle, of the Sacraments, (as far as the Anglican Prayer Book admitted them) of Canonical observances, of practical duties, and of the counsels of perfection." They were single-minded and sincere in teaching the doctrines of "Prayers for the departed in the faith and fear of God," of the "Invocation of Saints," of the "Real Presence," of the "Church speaking with stammering lips," and of exhorting their disciples to be "content" to be "in bondage," and to "work in chains." It was this spirit which led Mr. Dalgairns to say in his letter to the *Univiers*—"If I could once be convinced that the Spirit of God had quitted the Church of Rome, I should think at the same time, that Christianity was about to be extinguished all over the world."

But it was, however, necessary, in the dispensation of Divine Providence, that the earnest and sincere "Anglo-Catholic" should see the utter absurdity of his position, accordingly the "*Lives of the English Saints*" made their appearance, and Mr. Newman, in all simplicity, having resigned his living of S. Mary the Virgin, Oxford, and Littlemore, retracted certain offensive expressions used by him towards Rome.\* Mr. Faber, also in his "*Life of S. Wilfrid*," told his readers that to "look Romeward was a Catholic instinct seemingly implanted in us for the safety of the Faith," that "the process may be shorter or longer, but that Catholics get to Rome in spite of wind and tide," and Mr. Ward boasted that he held the whole cycle of "Roman doctrine."

The Tractarian party was at this period divided into two great sections. The one, earnest and simple-minded, were content in following Mr. Newman's advice, and to "work

\* Appendix C

on in chains, submitting to their imperfections as a punishment, to go on teaching through the medium of indeterminate statements, and inconsistent precedents and principles but partially developed," to believe that God would visit and rescue them if in error; they listened reverently while he thus addressed them,—“ O, that instead of keeping on the defensive, and thinking it much not to lose one remnant of Christian light and holiness, which is getting less and less, the less we use it; instead of being timid and cowardly, and suspicious, and jealous, and panic-struck, and grudging, and unbelieving, we had the heart to rise as a Church in the attitude of the Spouse of Christ, and the dispenser of His grace, to throw ourselves into that system of truth which our fathers have handed down, even through the worst times, and to use it like a great and understanding people! O, that we had the courage and the generous faith to aim at perfection, to demand the attention, to claim the submission of the world! Thousands of hungry souls in all classes of life stand round us, we do not give them what they want, the image of a true christian people, living in that Apostolic awe and strictness, which carries with it an evidence that they are the Church of Christ. This is the way to withstand and repel the Romanists, not by cries of alarm and rumours of plots, and dispute, and denunciation, but of living up to the Creeds, the services, the ordinances, the usages of our own Church, without fear of consequences, without fear of being called Papists; to let matters take their course freely, and to trust to God's good providence for the issue:”\* The other section is described by Mr. Marshall, as “fighting about vestments, and postures and pues,” or by Mr. Faber, as “playing at Mass, putting ornament before truth, suffocating the inward by the outward, bewildering the poor instead of leading them, revelling in Catholic sentiment instead of offering the acceptable sacrifice of hardship and austerity; this is a painful, indeed a

\* Newman's Letter to Dr. Faussett.

sickening development of the peculiar iniquity of the times, a master-piece of Satan's craft;"† others of this party, not content with "playing at Mass" and losing themselves in "Ecclesiastical vagaries," adopted peculiar Roman devotions, such as that to the "Sacred Heart of Jesus" or the Rosary, and felt a pleasant emotion in reading the lives of Catholic Saints and translations of Jesuit spiritual writers; "but," continues Mr. Faber, "this is not the way to become Catholic, it is a profaner kind of Protestantism;" disgusting, indeed, was it to hear sentimental young ladies lisp about "copes," and "cottas," and "Ecclesiastical vestments," and "Knight Templars," and "altars," and "plain chants."‡

While thus contending for the Catholicity of the Church of England and Ireland as established by Law, a circumstance, clearly showing its purely Erastian character and thorough dependance on the State, occurred; we refer to the appointment of a Bishop of Jerusalem in connexion with the Lutheran Government of Prussia. This act, had not Mr. Palmer come to the rescue, would have so unsettled the junior members of the Oxford school as to have destroyed the party while yet in its "chrysalis" state, for the butterfly, the gaudy, gay, tinselled butterfly of the Oriental Church scheme had not yet been fully developed by Messrs. Neale, Palmer, and Maitland. Mr. Palmer had succeeded in not only puzzling his Anglican friends, but also certain members of the Russo-Greek Church, by asserting that the Church of England "had long had a double being, a double form, and a double language, the one, spiritual and religious, the other, worldly and political; it is only inwardly that our Church is a Catholic Church, outwardly it is the Protestant Reformed Religion established by Law; and there is now a struggle for life or death, whether the outward Protestantism shall eat inwardly into the heart of the Church and destroy her life, or the inward

† Life of S. Wilfrid.

‡ We refer the reader to Dr. Newman's "*Loss and Gain*," and Paley's "*Church Restorers*."

Catholicity shall rise up from below, to the surface, and expel or shake off the poison and dust of heresy, and change the outward form of our Church, and of our language.”\* In vain did the Catholic-minded members (as they called themselves) of the Establishment protest against this act. The fiat had gone forth, and a *Congé d' élire* was issued, nominating Dr. Alexander to the new See of Jerusalem and even Mr. Newman was compelled to acknowledge that this measure “had a most grievous effect in weakening the argument for our Church’s Catholicity,” and in shaking the belief of it in individuals.

Dr. Pusey also, in his letter to the Archbishop of Canterbury ‘confessed that he could not “see how the picture of an united Church could be presented by an English and Lutheran congregation, of which the one holds one Holy Catholic Church throughout all the world, knit together by its Bishops, as joints and hands under its one HEAD CHRIST, and joined on by unbroken succession to the Apostles; the other an indefinite number of Churches hanging together by an agreement in a scheme of doctrine formed by themselves, and magnified by the civil power.”

We append the text and translation of the letter commendatory given to Dr. Alexander by the Archbishop of Canterbury.

*Letter commendatory from the Most Rev. the Lord Archbishop of Canterbury, &c.*

To the Right Rev. and Rev. Brethren in Christ the Prelates and Bishops of the Ancient Apostolic Churches in Syria and the countries adjacent, greeting in the Lord, William

Τοῖς πανειρωτάτοις καὶ ἀγαπητοῖς ἐν Χριστῷ ἀδελφοῖς, τοῖς Ἐπισκόποις καὶ προεστώσι τῶν ἐν τῇ Συρίᾳ καὶ ἐν ταῖς ὁμόροις χώραις Ἐκκλησιῶν ἀρχαίων καὶ ἀποστολικῶν, Γυλιέλμος, τῇ θεῇ προνοίᾳ, Ἀρχιεπίσκοπος Καν-

\* Aid to Reflection on the seemingly double character of the Established Church, by William Palmer.

by Divine Providence, Archbishop of Canterbury, Primate of all England, &c., Metropolitan,

We most earnestly commend to your brotherly love the Right Rev. Michael Solomon Alexander, Doctor in Divinity, whom we, being well assured of his learning and piety, have consecrated to the office of Bishop of the United Church of England and Ireland, according to the ordinances of our Holy and Apostolic Church, and having obtained the consent of our Sovereign Lady the Queen, have sent out to Jerusalem with authority to exercise spiritual jurisdiction over the clergy and congregations of our Church, which are now, or which hereafter may be established in the countries above mentioned. And in order to prevent any misunderstanding in regard to this our purpose, we think it right to make it known to you, that we have charged the said Bishop, our brother, not to intermeddle in any way with the jurisdiction of the prelates or other ecclesiastical dignitaries, bearing rule in the churches of the East, but to show due reverence and honor, and to be ready on all occasions, and by all the means in his power, to promote a mutual interchange

τουαρίας, πάσης τῆς Ἀρχιεπίσκοπικῆς καὶ Μητροπολιτικῆς, ἐν Κυρίῳ χαίρειν.

Πάση σπουδῇ συνίσταμεν τῇ εὐνοίᾳ ὑμῶν ἀδελφοὶ σεβάσμιοι καὶ ἀγαπητοὶ, ἄνδρα εὐσεβέστατον, Μιχαὴλ Σολομῶντα Ἀλέξανδρον, ἱεράς θεολογίας ἐξηγητὴν, ὃν ἡμεῖς, ἐξετάσαντες αὐτοῦ τὴν εὐλάβειαν καὶ ἰκανότητα, καὶ ἐπιτήδειον κρίναντες, ἐχειροτονήσαμεν εἰς ἐπίσκοπον τῆς ἐν Ἀρχιεπίσκοπικῇ καὶ Ἰβερνίᾳ Ἐκκλησίας, κατὰ τοὺς κανόνας τῆς αὐτῆς ἁγίας ἡμῶν καὶ ἀποστολικῆς Ἐκκλησίας. Ἐξουσίαν δὲ λαβόντες πυρὰ τῆς σεβαστῆς ἡμῶν βασιλείσεως, ἐπέψαμεν αὐτὸν εἰς Ἱεροσόλυμα, πιστεύσαντες αὐτῷ ἐπιτροπήν πνευματικὴν ἐπὶ πᾶσι τοῖς τῆς ἡμετέρας Ἐκκλησίας κληρικοῖς καὶ λαϊκοῖς τοῖς ἐκεῖ μετοικοῦσι καὶ ἐν ταῖς ὁμόροις χώραις. Ἴνα δὲ μὴ τις ἀγνοῇ τίνος ἔνεκα τοῦτον τὸν ἀδελφὸν ἡμῶν ἐπίσκοπον οὕτως ἐπέψαμεν, γινώσκοντες ὑμῖν ὅτι προσετάξαμεν αὐτῷ μηδαμῶς ἐν μηδενὶ πράγματι ἐπιβαίνειν τῇ ἐξουσίᾳ τῆς καθηκούσης ὑμῖν τοῖς Ἐπισκόποις καὶ τοῖς ἄλλοις ἐν τῷ ἀρχιεπίσκοπικῇ τῶν Ἐκκλησιῶν Ἀνατολικῶν τάγματι καθεστῶσι, μᾶλλον δὲ παρέχειν ὑμῖν τὴν πρὸς ἡμᾶς τιμὴν καὶ θεραπείαν, καὶ πρόθυμον εἶναι πάντοτε καὶ παντὶ τρόπῳ σπουδάζειν τὰ εἰς φιλανθρωπίαν καὶ συνήθειαν καὶ ὁμόνοιαν φέροντα. Πεισθόμεθα μὲν περὶ τοῦτου τοῦ ἀδελφοῦ ἡμῶν, ὅτι ἐκ θυμοῦ καὶ διὰ συνέδησιν, ταῦτα τὰ ἐντεταλμένα ὑφ' ἡμῶν πιστῶς φυλάξει. Παρακαλοῦμεν δὲ ὑμᾶς ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι τοῦ Κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, ὡς ἀδελφὸν δέχεσθαι αὐτὸν καὶ

of respect, courtesy and kindness. We have good reason to believe that our brother is willing, and will feel himself in conscience bound, to follow these our instructions; and we beseech you, in the name of our Lord Jesus Christ, to receive him as a brother, and to assist him as opportunity may offer with your good offices.

We trust that your Holinesses will receive this communication as a testimony of our respect and affection, and of our hearty desire to renew that amicable intercourse with the ancient Churches of the East which has been suspended for ages, and which, if restored, may have the effect, with the blessing of God, of putting an end to divisions which have wrought the most grievous calamities in the Church of Christ.

In this hope, and with sentiments of the highest respect for your Holinesses, we have affixed our archiepiscopal seal to this letter, written with our own hands at our own palace of Lambeth, on the twenty-third day of November, in the year of our Lord one thousand eight hundred and forty-one.

The *Times* in an article commenting on the above letter says "We observe with some surprise, that the Greek is not an exact translation of the English. One variation is of considerable importance. It is stated in the Greek that

χρεῖαν αὐτῷ ἐπικαίρον παρέχειν.

Πεποιθίμεν, ἀδελφοί, ὅτι ἡ πανειρότης ὑμῶν τὴν ἐπιστολὴν ταύτην φιλοφρόνως δέξεται, ὡς μαρτυροῦσαν τὴν ἡμετέραν εἰς ὑμᾶς σέβασιν καὶ φιλαδελφίαν, καὶ τὴν ἐν ἡμῖν ἐπιπόθησιν τοῦ ἀνανεοῦσθαι τοὺς τῆς ἀρχαίας ἀγάπης θεσμοὺς πρὸς τὰς παλαιὰς ἐν τῇ Ἀνατολῇ Ἐκκλησίας, ἐκ πολλῶν ἤδη γενεῶν διαλιπούσης· ἧς ἀνανεομένης κατὰ βούλησιν καὶ χάριν Θεοῦ πεποιθίμεν ἰαθήσεσθαι ἂν τὰ σχίσματα, δι' ὧν δεινότατα ἔπαθεν ἡ τοῦ Χριστοῦ Ἐκκλησία.

Ταύτην ἐλπίδα ἔχοντες, καὶ τὴν ὑμετέραν ἀγιωσύνην ἐκ θυμοῦ καὶ πάσῃ θεραπείᾳ σεβόμενοι, τὴν σφραγίδα ἡμῶν ἀρχιεπισκοπικὴν ταύτη τῇ ἐπιστολῇ αὐτογράφῳ προσεθήκαμεν ἐν Λαμβήθῳ, ἔτει αῶμα, Νοεμβρίου κγ'.

Bishop Alexander is to be "over all the clergymen and laymen of our Church, who are *sojourning* in Jerusalem and the countries adjacent." In the English, the words are "over the Clergy and *Congregations* of our Church which are now, or which may hereafter be established in the countries above-mentioned."

1842.

---

The period at which the Tractarian harvest commenced to ripen had now arrived; the preceding year (1841) had witnessed the resignation of his preferments by Mr. Newman, and also his recantation of certain offensive expressions "against the Romish system," and, yet in the very paper containing this recantation, he says—"I am as fully convinced as ever, indeed I doubt not Roman Catholics themselves would confess, that the Anglican doctrine is the strongest, nay, the only possible, antagonist of their system. If Rome is to be withstood it can be done in no other way."

Previous to giving our list of Converts, we would fain with Canon Oakley, refute an idea unfortunately too prevalent, and the erroneousness of which, all connected even in the slightest degree with the *movement*, are aware that there was no *premeditated union* among those who ultimately ended in becoming Catholics. "We had, one and all, our individual peculiarities, which, like so many sharp edges, stood in the way of anything like effectual combination."\*

The following were amongst the first that submitted to Holy Church:—

Rev. Bernard Smith, Rector of Leadenham, Lincolnshire.

Rev. A. D. Wackerbarth, Curate of Peldon, Essex.

Pierre Le Page Renouf, Esq., Pembroke College, Oxford.

\* Oakley's Lecture on Personal Reminiscences of the Oxford movement.

Johnson Grant, Esq., St. John's College, Oxford.

Hon. Edward Douglas, Christ Church, Oxford.

J. Biden, Esq., University College, Oxford.

— Sankey, Esq., Trinity College, Dublin.

Capt. Millar.

Robert A. R. Maurice, Esq., R.N.

Mr. T. Morewood.

The Countess of Clare.

Mrs. Pittar.

Miss Eliot.

Miss Gladstone.

Miss Perkins.

Mrs. Levi.

Mrs. Wrey.

Miss Pittar.

Honb. Miss Crewe.

We must not omit Mr. Sibthorp, who, on his submission to the Church, published two pamphlets, detailing his reasons for having become a Catholic, in which the erratic tendency of his mind is easily perceivable, though his line of argument was too strong for any of his opponents to refute, his "submission being simply on the ground that he could not reconcile the unity of the Church as answering to its types in the Old Testament except by admitting the Supremacy of the Papal See." Mr. Sibthorp thus alludes in his first Letter to the want of unity in Protestantism:— "How fearfully different is the fate of those who are separated from the See of Rome! Do they form an united band? Is there communion, or even mutual intercourse, among them? Is there harmonious discipline or holy order? Surely they are rather like the floating remnants of some disastrous wreck, driven here and there on the restless waves of private opinion and individual interpretation of Scripture. A few, indeed, in some little bark seem waiting to hail the vessel of the Church, as she steers more in sight, and to seek on board of Her, a security they scarcely dare reckon on at present; but the most part—

some on boards, and some on broken fragments, and some in solitary effort, struggling for life—present a sad spectacle of the distress, danger, and ruin which men bring on themselves by contempt of that order and rule which God Himself has sanctioned.”\* To this accusation four of the Hull clergy replied,—“We are prepared to prove by a mass of evidence which cannot be overborne, that there is more true union among Christian Protestants than there now is, or ever has been, among Romanists.”† The Hull clergy not having favored the world with this “mass of evidence,” we are unable to refer to it. However, with Mr. Sibthorp we have nought to do; he has returned again, “like a dog to his vomit, and a sow that has been washed to her wallowing in the mire,” and there would we leave him, earnestly entreating such of our readers as have received the gift of Faith, to pray for his reconciliation with Holy Church, that he may again become a member of that Body whose privileges he has thus described;—“The Catholic Church is the friend of the human race; with one hand She points to Heaven, and with the other strews largely the charity of God on earth. None can attend on Her steps, and not perceive it to be Her daily office to remind the children of men of the vanity of this life, of judgment, of eternity, of the evil of vice and the beauty of piety to God and his works and laws, and, above all, of the inestimable price paid on the Cross, for human redemption. Her special lessons to the rich and great, is poverty of spirit as to themselves, humility as to God, beneficence to their fellow-creatures; to the poor and mean, She opens out the riches that are of faith, and the nobility of the sons of God. The patroness of the Fine Arts, they wither where She comes not. The nurse of Science, She leads it forward, while She restrains its natural tendency to go

\* Some answer to the enquiry, why have you become a Catholic? by R. W. Sibthorp.

† A Serious Remonstrance addressed to the Rev. R. W. Sibthorp, by those of the Hull clergy who knew him.

alone and forget God. The Spouse of Christ, She seems alone to understand how to keep His earthly dwelling in discipline and due order, and how to deck the chamber of His Presence with the adorning meet for His Majesty. Her Feasts and Holy Services gladden the most oppressed, while Her Vigils and Fasts subdue the proudest hearts."\*

Mr. Renouf, previous to his secession, enumerates the following:—

*Desiderata* in the Establishment:—

- 1.—The ancient form of Sacrifice, the words "Altar," and "Mass."
- 2.—Prayer for the faithful departed.
- 3.—The sign of the Cross *repeated and used in each of the Sacraments.*
- 4.—The use of Chrism in Baptism and Confirmation.
- 5.—Extreme unction.†

Shortly after his submission to the Church, Mr. Renouf, exposed the inaccuracies of Mr. Palmer's quotations in his controversy with Cardinal Wiseman, wherein he assured his correspondent that the "objections of the most conscientious opponents to Catholicity are founded on misunderstandings, the fruit either of misrepresentation or prejudices."‡

Mr. Wackerbarth also, on his secession, expressed his conviction that "there is but one way to put an end to this miserable state of corruption and secular bondage, and that way is to repent speedily, and return to the obedience of faith; to replace the Church of England under the dominion of CHRIST'S appointed Universal Vicar, that the weight of his sacred authority might counterbalance the hopeless corruption of the state—that huge idol, the Regal Supremacy, must be utterly destroyed, and

\* Sibthorp's Further Answer to the Enquiry, Why have you become a Catholic?

† Doctrines of the Catholic Church in England on the Holy Eucharist.

‡ Renouf's Letter to Rev. W. Palmer.

the Faithful once more rallied round the Holy See—God's appointed Centre of Unity."

Mrs. Pittar also published her reasons for submitting to the Church. After relating her endeavours to bring about an interview between Dr. Terrot, the titular Bishop of Edinburgh, and Dr. Gillis, the Bishop of Limyra, and Vicar Apostolic in Edinburgh, which was declined on the plea that an interview would be "useless," and by Mr. Drummond, offering to listen to Dr. Gillis' argument, behind a screen, and when he was gone to prove all that he had said was false. She became a Catholic, an undeserving but happy Catholic; and a Catholic (continues Mrs. Pittar) "who was once so zealously and sincerely opposed to every thing Catholic—now as it were living and feeding upon it to my soul's unspeakable delight. Once a respected member of a respected society—a devoted child to the best of parents—the beloved wife of an incomparable husband—a doating mother of a fair offspring;—*now* severed perhaps in every one of the above relations, and yet resigned, contented; possessing all in the possession of Catholicity.\*

Dr Pusey, about this time commenced his series of the "Catholic Devotional Library," comprising such works as Avrillon's "Guides for Advent and Lent," Horst's "Paradise of the Christian Soul," Surin's "Foundation of a Spiritual Life," Scupoli's "Spiritual Combat," &c., &c., adapted to the use of the English Church; wherein he advocated and recommended the introduction of the Confessional, and the use of corporal mortifications and austerities, though acknowledging that there were few in the English Church prepared to lead souls to God.

Froude and Knox had fulfilled their task in unsettling men's minds, and bidding them look elsewhere for rest and peace than to Canterbury or York; no Anselm or Wilfrid, no William or Dunstan, no Alphege or Becket, wielded

\* A Protestant converted to Catholicity by her Bible and Prayer Book.

the archiepiscopal crozier. Every act of the men who, by favor of the regnant Sovereign, enjoyed the title of Archbishop or Bishop, proved their instability, and led those who were ill at ease to look to Rome for rest and peace; men now began to perceive that "it was not in the Establishment to produce an Athanasius or a Basil, that marriage and martyrdom go badly together. 'Non si te ruperis, pareris,' says the little frog in the fable to the big one, when it was swelling itself to the size of the bull. One squall from the little dearies—one scream of Mamma—would spoil a dozen Athanasiuses. You may call your spirits from the vasty deep, but no Basil or Athanasius there. 'Nec erat Brutus, Bruti nec avunculus usquam.'"\*

In one Diocess, Baptismal Regeneration was regarded as a God-denying and man-exalting doctrine, and that it was absurd and unscriptural; and in another it was propounded as the belief of the Church of England, that "infants are capable of being savingly born of water and the Spirit, and of being adopted into the Sonship with what depends thereon;" here the Offertory was adopted, and Stone Altars erected; there daily services restored and Saint's-days kept, while such practices were denounced as Popish in the adjoining parish, or even in the same pulpit. † While Henry of Exeter endeavoured to preserve peace at Helston and S. Sidwell's, by defending Messrs. Blunt, Courtenay and Carlyon, Charles James of London was doing his best to foment discord by countenancing Mr. Bennett at S. Paul's, Knightsbridge, and Mr. Oakley at All Saints, Margaret-street, and denouncing Messrs. Baugh and Bertie at Illford, and sacrificing Mr. Cameron to the ire of Mr. Walter and the "*Times*"; and Charles Bird of

\* Cooper's Anglican Church—The Creature and Slave of the State.

† The writer recollects having been appealed to by a lady in a book-seller's shop in the town of Lynn, as to what she ought to believe, in consequence of the two Curates and the Lecturer preaching opposite doctrines.

Winchester, aided by his brethren of Dublin, Chester and Cashel, were upholding Messrs. Bickersteth, Close, Noel, M'Neil, and Stowel, in their crusade against Tractarianism.

It was in vain that some of the "Catholic" school endeavoured to obey the Rubric; for we were ourselves denounced to our Diocesan for issuing the following circular as directions for the guidance of those committed to our charge:—

"NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN,

That the Sacrament of Holy Baptism, except in cases of sickness, will be administered immediately after the Second Lesson in the Afternoon Service, as directed by the Rubric, which says, 'The people are to be admonished, that it is most convenient that Baptism should not be administered but upon Sundays, and other Holy-Days, when the most number of people come together: as well for that the Congregation there present may testify the receiving of them that be newly Baptized into the number of Christ's Church; as also because in the Baptism of Infants, every man present may be put in remembrance of his own profession made to God in his Baptism. And furthermore, the Rubric proceeds to say, 'When there are Children to be Baptized, the Parents shall give knowledge thereof OVER NIGHT, OR IN THE MORNING BEFORE THE BEGINNING OF MORNING PRAYER, to the Curate. *And then the Godfathers and Godmothers, and the People, with the Children, must be ready at the Font, EITHER IMMEDIATELY AFTER THE LAST LESSON AT MORNING PRAYER, OR ELSE IMMEDIATELY AFTER THE LAST LESSON AT EVENING PRAYER, as the Curate in his discretion shall appoint.*'—Bawdsey, Fest. Nat. B. V. 1844.

In vain did the "*English Churchman*," complain of the irregularity of the Ministers of the Establishment, as may be seen by the following extract from its columns:—

"One correspondent states that he has 'been assured by Anglican Priests, that in some churches, nay, in some rural districts, the custom, no long time ago, was, during the winter, to *Baptize without water!*'"

"A clerical correspondent writes—

“I know a clergyman who re-baptized his child, on being assured by one or two standing by, that not a single drop of water had touched the child’s face; and I have every reason to believe, from the report of credible witnesses, that this sometimes happens in large parishes, where, *e.g.*, sixty or seventy children are baptized on the Sunday afternoon, and where, consequently, there is often great haste and carelessness. The drop or two of water, intended to sprinkle the child, merely touches his cap or dress, and thus he remained unbaptized.”

“Another clergyman say—

“‘Three cases fell under my own notice, when in London, quite unconnected with each other, yet all corroborative of the fact, that no water had been used. One was, from the circumstances, a peculiarly distressing case. These three cases occurred in the same parish (S. Pancras) about the same time.’”

“‘I have seen a clergyman merely touch the forehead of the child *with a wet finger*, holding it there until he drew the sign of the †, and I have occasionally myself, been called upon to baptize in the Churches, even of High Churchmen, where, *from the smallness of the vessel inserted within the font, and the paucity of the water supplied*, very great care was necessary to administer the Sacrament validly to the number of children to be baptized.’”

“‘There is a great ignorance, too, among the laity, as to what constitutes Baptism. I was once requested by a respectable tradesman NOT TO USE ANY WATER IN BAPTISING, as *his child was too ill to bear it*. People commonly bring their children so be-capped and muffled up, that it requires some care to apply the water to the face, and I have known them complain that the water was not sprinkled as lightly as it might have been.’”

“A third clergyman assures us that, very recently, the officiating minister of a very large and populous metropolitan parish constantly baptized with *a wet finger merely*.”

The High Church or Oxford School in Scotland, were highly indignant at finding an excommunicated Presbyterian of the Diocese of Aberdeen (Sir W. Dunbar) received and abetted by the Church Missionary Society.

The Scotch Episcopalian Body is placed in an anomalous position—dissenters from the Established Church of the country, they possess “Bishops” and episcopally ordained clergy. One of these, Sir William Dunbar, S.C.L., and formerly minister of the Floating Chapel on the Thames, accepted from the managers, constituent members, and congregation, of S. Paul’s Chapel, Aberdeen, an invitation and call to become their minister. Sir William Dunbar, after his election, discovered that there was a deed in existence reserving the independence of S. Paul’s, Aberdeen, from the government of Dr. Skinner, the Bishop of Aberdeen and Primus of Scotland. Sir William Dunbar contended, in conjunction with Mr. Drummond, that he could still “act as a Presbyterian of the Church of England,” in opposition to Dr. Skinner, though he had promised “to pay all spiritual obedience to the Right Reverend William Skinner and his successors,” and, as a consequence, Dr. Skinner promulgated the following excommunication:—

“In the name of God, Amen.

“Whereas the REVEREND SIR WILLIAM DUNBAR, late Minister of S. Paul’s Chapel, Aberdeen, and a Presbyterian of this Diocese, received by letters dismissory from the Bishop of London, forgetting his duty as a Priest of the Catholic Church, did, on the 12th of May last, in a letter addressed to William Skinner, Doctor of Divinity, Bishop of Aberdeen, wilfully renounce his canonical obedience to us his proper ordinary, and withdraw himself, as he pretended, from the jurisdiction of the Episcopal Church, and, notwithstanding our earnest and affectionate remonstrances repeatedly addressed to him, did obstinately persist in that his most wicked act, contrary to his ordination vows and his solemn promise of canonical obedience; whereby the said Sir William Dunbar hath violated every principle of duty which the laws of the Catholic Church have recognized as bearing on her Priests, and hath placed himself in a state of open schism, and whereas the said Sir William

Dunbar hath moreover continued to officiate in defiance of our authority; therefore we, William Skinner, Doctor in Divinity, Bishop of Aberdeen aforesaid, sitting with our clergy in Synod this 10th day of August, 1843, and acting under the provisions of Canon XLI., do declare that the said Sir William Dunbar hath ceased to be a Presbyter of this church, and all his ministerial acts are without authority as being performed apart from Christ's mystical Body wherein the one spirit is; and we do most earnestly and solemnly warn all faithful people to avoid all communion with the said Sir William Dunbar in prayers and Sacraments, or in any way giving countenance to him in his present irregular and sinful course, lest they be partakers with him in his sin, and thereby expose themselves to the threatening denounced against those who cause divisions in the Church, from which danger we most heartily pray that God of His great mercy would keep all his faithful people committed to our charge, through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen."

Though Sir William Dunbar was "*formally*" and Mr. Drummond "*virtually*" excommunicated, yet the "Church Missionary Society" communicated with Mr. Drummond and Sir W. Dunbar in common with the other local officers of the association, and co-operated with them in the business of the Society—nay, Mr. Bickersteth, of Watton, preached twice in Sir W. Dunbar's conventicle to overflowing congregations of "Free Kirk" people and others, declaring "that it was impossible for him to estimate the honour and privilege which he felt in supporting Sir W. Dunbar under the present circumstances." As the reader may expect, schism is sure to lead into Heresy, and that, according to one of the Fathers, "*adversus hæreticos victoria est sententiæ eorum manifestatio*," so the "*Christian Remembrancer*," to whom we are indebted for the above details, laments that the "Archbishop of Canterbury and Bishop of London" are in full communion with an excommunicated Priest, and that its results will "*unsettle*" men's minds.

We would wish to call our readers attention to the "Deed of Union," a most curious, highly instructive, and truly amusing document, as showing the existence of a harmonious discord hitherto presumed to be perfectly unattainable.

---

*"Deed of Union between the Scottish Episcopal Church and S. Paul's Chapel, Aberdeen."*

---

1841.

---

"We, considering that the Ministers of S. Paul's Chapel should be placed under Episcopal authority, and, as the only means of obtaining the same within our power, should join the Scottish Episcopal Church, do hereby promise in the name of, and acting for, the said Constituent members of S. Paul's Chapel, to pay all spiritual obedience to the Right Rev. William Skinner and his successors to the office of Bishop in the Diocese of Aberdeen, under the following articles and conditions, under which we join the Scottish Episcopal Church, viz.:—That all the present rights and privileges of the members of S. Paul's Chapel (particularly as set forth in the Constitution or Decree Arbitral pronounced by the late George Moir of Scots-town, Esq., and extension thereof, copies of which are herewith produced and signed as relatives hereto) shall remain entire and be secure in the Union, more particularly the choice of the Clergyman, the sole management of the Funds, and the continued use and preservation to the Chapel of the Liturgy, including the Catechism of the Church of England, none of which rights and privileges shall be infringed upon without incurring the dissolution of the said Voluntary Union. And we further promise to call upon and require our Clergymen for the time being to subscribe the Canons of the said Scottish Episcopal Church in the form prescribed, (but always in accordance

with the continued use of the Book of Common Prayer of the Church of England), so that the congregation may be henceforth constituted and recognized as a regular congregation of the said Church before mentioned."

To this we would add the following Protest of Sir W. Dunbar, against a petition presented to the House of Lords, regarding the schism among Scotch Episcopalians :—

*"A Protest of the Rev. Sir William Dunbar, Bart."*

"Having accidentally learned, late in the evening of Saturday, the 3rd inst. that a document had been for three days lying in this city for signature, by the English Episcopalians resident here, purporting to be a petition to Parliament, praying, as I am informed by one who saw it partially, that Parliament would empower and require the Archbishop of Canterbury for the time being, to induct all English Episcopal ministers who should officiate henceforth in Scotland, or would appoint an English Bishop to exercise jurisdiction over the English Episcopalian congregations in Scotland :

"Having also learned that this document, on the one hand, professes to express the mind of all English Episcopalians in Scotland, while, on the other, there are English Episcopalians in this city to whom no notice was given that such petition was in existence.

"Having also ascertained that the intimation sent to some of the members of S. Paul's congregation, requesting them to sign the petition, was made in a printed circular, dated 'S. Paul's Chapel, Thursday, March 1, 1842 :'

"Having also met with persons who had signed it, but who confessed they had not read the document, nor heard it read :

"Having also had no opportunity of seeing it myself, as before the time when I heard of it, it was to be sent to

Edinburgh, where, it would appear, it is also receiving signatures :

“I, who have been for seven years the minister of the said S. Paul’s Chapel, do feel aggrieved by this conduct on the part of those who have put this petition into circulation, and also fully justified in concluding, from the clandestine character of the transaction, that something is in contemplation affecting the privileges of English Episcopalians in Scotland, and of which those who have signed it, as well as those who have not seen it, may not be aware.

“Under these circumstances I felt myself called upon to put forth the following

“PROTEST.

“I protest, in my own name, and in the name of such as may agree with me, against the steps thus taken with a view to effect an alteration of the law affecting English Episcopalians in Scotland.

“If it would appear desirable to others that an alteration should be made, I hereby, as above, protest against its being attempted without admitting to consultation on the subject all who are interested; and especially against procuring the signatures of the congregation of St. Paul’s Chapel without apprising me, the senior minister thereof—and until within the last few months, the sole minister—as has been done on the present occasion, so that I might have an opportunity of examining the matter, and of deliberating with them in reference to it.

“(Signed)      WILLIAM DUNBAR, BART.

“Presbyter of the Church of England, and Senior  
Minister of S. Paul’s Chapel, Aberdeen.

“Aberdeen, March 5, 1842.”

1843.

The principal converts this year were—

Hon. and Rev. George Talbot, Rector of Evercreech  
Somerset.  
Rev. Daniel Parsons, Curate of Marden, Wilts.  
Rev. Charles Seager, Assistant Professor of Hebrew, Oxford.  
William Simpson, Esq., Trinity College, Cambridge.  
William Lockhart, Esq., Exeter College, Oxford.  
William D. Turnbull, Esq., Advocate, Edinburgh.  
Charles De Bary, Esq., (R.I.P.)  
Henry Bosanquet, Esq., Barrister.  
Charles Hemans, Esq.  
Sir Charles D'Albiac.  
Henry Richardson, Esq., Manchester.  
Miss Bowles.  
Mrs. De Bary.  
Miss Warner.  
Miss Townsend.  
R. Richardson, Esq.  
Mrs. Parsons.

Tractarianism met with a most curious check this year. Dr. Pusey, in his turn as Canon of Christ Church, Oxford, preached a Sermon before the University, entitled "The Holy Eucharist a comfort to the Penitent." Scarcely had time been given him to breathe, ere the Vice Chancellor, to the surprise of the University, sent for the sermon to be tried in his court—the assessors being, with himself, *pro hac vice*, Dr. Jenkyns, Master of Baliol; Dr. Hawkins, Provost of Oriel; Dr. Symons, Warden of Wadham; Dr. Jelf, Canon of Christchurch; and Dr. Ogilvie, Regius Professor of Pastoral Theology; with the complainant, Dr. Faussett, Margaret Professor of Divinity, as *ex officio* assistant, in consequence of Dr. Hampden, Regius Professor of Divinity, being excluded by the special Statute of censure passed soon after his election to the Chair.

The ground taken by the Chancellor against the Sermon was the following Statute:—

“Statutum est, quod si quis pro Concione aliqua, intra Universitatem ejusve præinctum habita, quicquam doctrinæ vel disciplinæ Ecclesiæ Anglicanæ publicè receptæ dissonum aut contrarium, aut publica auctoritate, ad tempus vel aliter, prohibitum, protulerit, sive protulisse, ab ipso Vice-Cancellario suspectus, vel ab alio aliquo, rationabilem suspicionis causam afferente, delatus fuerit; quod postulanti Vice-Cancellario, sive ejus deputato, Concionis suæ verum exemplar, eisdem terminis conscriptum, virtute juramenti tradet; vel, si prætendat se exemplar non habere, de iis, de quibus suspectus vel delatus fuit, directè virtute juramenti respondebit.

“Deindè vero Vice-Cancellarius, sive ejus deputatus, verbis sensuve eorum, quæ in quæstionem vocantur, in medium prolatis, et rite perpensis, adhibito consilio sex aliorum S. Theologiæ Doctorum (quorum unus sit S. Theologiæ Professor Regius, si Concioni interfuerit), si quem criminis objecti reum invenerit, eum pro arbitrio vel a munere prædicandi intra præinctum Universitatis suspendet; vel ad ea quæ protulit recantandum adiget.”—Tit. xvi., s. 11.

The Court was a secret one, “a mysterious tribunal fished up from the deep of ages,” and Dr. Pusey, seeing how it was constituted inasmuch as he was refused a hearing, began to feel uneasy as to the aspect of affairs; so strictly did they manage their business, that Dr. Pusey was himself the first to announce to the world that he had been convicted of Heresy and suspended by the “six Doctors.”\*

“In judicial affairs there can be no place for uncertain rumors. There may be ‘wars and rumors of wars,’ but we never yet heard of verdicts and judgments rumored to have been delivered; the rumors going on for days and days after the rumored date of judgment, and all uncontradicted, and with nothing but rumors on the other side to

\* Appendix E.

contradict them, and all in the immediate vicinity, if indeed a trial, which had no place, could be said to have a vicinity. It was like the comet of the season, a tail without a nucleus. People were looking about impatiently for the fact itself. They went to the doors of the College Halls, to the Commons rooms, to the doors of the Schools, and all the public places where University notices of all kinds are posted; they could find nothing new. There was a notice that some livery-stable keeper had been suspended from University communications, but no Dr. Pusey. The Divinity Beadle was seen going about, but it was only the announcement of the next Sunday's preachers."\* The sermon was universally talked over. Squires prosed about it over their port, and young ladies were heard to lisp its condemnation in the brief interval between the figures of the quadrille. The Board of Oxford Inquisitors had condemned the Regius Professor of Hebrew; they had inferred that a Puseyite was an animal to be hunted down and allowed no law, and nothing could protect Dr. Pusey, for if there was no other Puseyite in the world, he was one; and accordingly the columns of the *'Record'* were filled with paragraphs headed in flaring capitals, "OXFORD BOARD OF HERESY," "SUSPENSION OF DR. PUSEY FOR HERESY," and the *'Standard'* actually "DARED" him to publish and defend his sermon. Dr. Pusey did so and with pain, "for it is impossible for any one not to foresee one portion of its effects, namely, what floods of blasphemy against Holy Truth will be poured forth by the infidel or heretical, or secular and anti-religious papers with which the church and country is at this time afflicted. It is like casting with one's own hands, that which is most sacred, to be outraged and profaned."† While Dr. Pusey and his friends were calling "for a specification of the particular passage condemned," the Rev. Dr. O'Connell addressed a

\* *British Critic*, July, 1843.

† Pusey's *The Holy Eucharist a comfort to the Penitent*—the Preface.

Letter to Dr. Pusey, in which he most earnestly pleaded with the condemned Professor, but in vain. "What public duty (writes Dr. O'Connell) of greater magnitude can present itself than the restoration of peace and union by the reconciliation of the Anglican Church with the Mother Churches? What undertaking of more importance and deeper interest can employ the zeal and the learning of the Ministers of Religion, than the endeavour to accomplish this truly Christian work? If Leibnitz, Grotius, Bacon, and Bossuet, were awakened from their tombs, how would not such men—the greatest geniuses that adorned the annals of philosophy—employ their vast resources, in hastening the day of England's regeneration, by laboring to unite her distracted children once more in the bands of religious union. A fresh ardor would animate their exertions now more than ever, because the grounds of dissension are being daily narrowed, and doctrines which, in their days, entitled us to the foul appellations of 'idolators and superstitious,' are now numbered among the cherished dogmas of Oxford, and placed beneath the reach of scoff and cavil by the eloquent and untiring pens of its most distinguished Professors. Truly, then, hath God raised up glorious testimonies unto His Beloved Spouse, and elicited from Her most gifted adversaries a confession of the purity of that faith which had been so long detained in bondage."\*

Professor Lee stigmatized this sermon as one of the "most insidious sweeping and ruinous endeavours" of Dr. Pusey and his party, its manifest tendeney is to unsettle every thing under a plea the most authoritative, plausible, and alluring; a plea admirably calculated to ensnare the junior branches of the Clergy, and all who have not either leisure or learning sufficient to examine the question for themselves.

Another member of the University of Oxford, the Rev. E. Morris, M.A., Student of Christ's Church, Oxford,

\* Letter to Rev. E. B. Pusey, by Rev. J. O'Connell.

was charged with preaching a heterodox sermon on Ascension Day, 1843. Mr. Morris, carried away by his zeal, canonized Laud, an "Archbishop" of Canterbury in the reign of Charles I., and whom the Tractarians delight in calling "S. WILLIAM OF CANTERBURY," and thus referred to him:—"Laud, the martyred Archbishop, who, let us trust, still intercedes for this Church, whose enemies he resisted unto death, and for this ancient seat of prayer and holy contemplation for which he did so much."\* Mr. Morris, in self vindication, published his sermon, and, following the example of Dr. Pusey, inserted an appendix, in order that he might "remove any misapprehensions that might exist." But it was not for us, to know whether, in spite of the XXII Article, the Establishment holds the doctrine of the Invocation of Saints, or (begging Mr. Morris's pardon) whether the Saints departed pray for us, "for the belief that we ought to make request to them is not involved therein, 'for (says Bramhall) a *comprecation* both the Grecians and we do allow, an *ultimate invocation* both the Grecians and we detest."

Mr. Morris having been called on to sign his assent *ex animo et corde* to the 22nd Article, did so without reserve or hesitation.

Messrs. Palmer and Percival published this year a Narrative of events connected with the '*Tracts for the Times*,' each wishing to vindicate himself from the odium attached to the members of the "Oxford School"; they had no desire to be sacrificed to the fury of a mob, like Messrs. Blunt, (at Helstone) Baugh, (at Ilford) Courtenay and Carlyon, (at Exeter) or to be made the butt of the "*Times*," like Mr. Cameron of Hurst, or to be mulcted like Mr. Escott of Gedney, or to be held up to scorn with their fellows; breakers were ahead, and Messrs. Palmer and Percival deemed it more politic to wipe their hands of the "foul conspiracy" against the peace of the Establishment.

\* A Sermon preached on Ascension Day, 1843, by T. E. Morris.

From these gentlemen we learn that the original conspirators against the peace of the Establishment were Messrs. Newman, Keble, Froude, Rose, Perceval, and Palmer; "these individuals were in the habit of meeting in secret conclave for the express purpose, with articles drawn up, and a scheme of operations digested and settled, of introducing Romanism into England, and of getting the whole Anglican Church to subscribe to the Tridentine decrees."

The following suggestions for the formation of a Church Association were at this time put forth by Messrs. Newman, Keble, Rose, Perceval, and Palmer—

"It will readily be allowed by all reflecting persons, that events have occurred within the last few years calculated to inspire the true members and friends of the Church with the deepest uneasiness. The privilege possessed by parties hostile to Her doctrine, ritual, and polity, of legislating for her,—their avowed and increasing efforts against her,—their close alliance with such as openly reject the Christian faith,—and the lax and unsound principles of many who profess and even think themselves her friends,—these things have been displayed before our eyes and sounded in our ears, until from their very repetition, we almost forget to regard them with alarm.

"The most obvious dangers are those which impend over the Church as an Establishment; but to these it is not here proposed to direct attention. However necessary it may be, on the proper occasion, to resist all measures which threaten the security of ecclesiastical property and privileges, still it is felt that there are perils of a character more serious than those which beset the political rights and the temporalities of the clergy; and such, moreover, as admit and justify a more active opposition to them on the part of individual members of the Church. Every one who has become acquainted with the literature of the day, must have observed the sedulous attempts made in various quarters to reconcile members of the Church to alterations

in its Doctrines and Discipline. Projects of change, which include the annihilation of our creeds and the removal of doctrinal statements incidentally contained in our worship, have been boldly and assiduously put forth. Our services have been subjected to licentious criticisms, with a view of superseding some of them, and of entirely remodelling others. The very elementary principles of our ritual and discipline have been rudely questioned. Our apostolical polity has been ridiculed and denied.

“In ordinary times, such attempts might safely have been left to the counter operation of the good sense and practical wisdom hitherto so distinguishing a feature in the English character : but the case is altered when account is taken of the spirit of the present age; which is confessedly disposed to regard points of religious belief with indifference, to sacrifice the interests of truth to notions of temporary convenience, and to indulge in a restless and intemperatè desire of novelty and change.

“Under these circumstances, it has appeared expedient to members of the Church, in various parts of the kingdom, to form themselves into an association on a few broad principles of union which are calculated from their simplicity to recommend themselves to the approbation and support of Churchmen at large, and which may serve as the grounds of a defence of the Church’s best interests against the immediate difficulties of the present day. They feel strongly that no fear of the appearance of forwardness on their part should dissuade them from a design which seems to be demanded of them by their affection towards that spiritual Community to which they owe their hopes of the world to come, and by a sense of duty to that God and Saviour who is its Founder and Defender. And they adopt this method of respectfully inviting their brethren, both elergy and laity, to take part in their undertaking.”

*“ Objects of the Association.*

“ 1. To maintain pure and inviolate the doctrines, the services, and the discipline of the Church ; that is, to withstand all change, which involves the denial and suppression of doctrine, a departure from primitive practice in religious offices, or innovation upon the apostolical prerogatives, order, and commission of Bishops, Priests, and Deacons.

“ 2. To afford Churchmen an opportunity of exchanging their sentiments, and co-operating together on a large scale. It is right to state (which is done on Mr. Newman’s authority) that Mr. Froude disapproved of these suggestions, because he was strongly against any Society or association other than the Church itself ; which objection striking many others with like force, occasioned the idea of any such association to be speedily relinquished : only the necessity for increased exertions, in their several legitimate stations and limits, was felt and responded to by the bulk of those to whom the appeal was made.”

“ As eight years have elapsed since the address above referred to was signed by the clergy, it may be interesting to many of them to know the terms in which it was expressed. The following is a copy of it, it was circulated among the clergy for their subscription :—

*“ To the Most Reverend Father in God, William, by  
Divine Providence Lord Archbishop of Canterbury,  
Primate of all England.*

“ We, the undersigned clergy of England and Wales, are desirous of approaching your Grace with the expression of our veneration for the sacred office to which by Divine Providence you have been called, of our respect and affection for your personal character and virtues, and of our gratitude for the firmness and discretion which you have evinced in a season of peculiar difficulty and danger.

“ At a time when events are daily passing before us which mark the growth of latitudinarian sentiments, and

the ignorance which prevails concerning the spiritual claims of the Church, we are especially anxious to lay before your Grace the assurance of our devoted adherence to the apostolical doctrine and polity of the Church over which you preside, and of which we are ministers; and our deep-rooted attachment to that venerable Liturgy, in which she has embodied, in the language of ancient piety, the orthodox and primitive faith.

“And whilst we most earnestly deprecate that restless desire of change which would rashly innovate in spiritual matters, we are not less solicitous to declare our firm conviction, that should anything, from the lapse of years or altered circumstances, require renewal or correction, your Grace, and our other spiritual rulers, may rely upon the cheerful co-operation and dutiful support of the clergy, in carrying into effect any measures that may tend to revive the discipline of ancient times, to strengthen the connexion between the bishops, clergy, and people, and to promote the purity, the efficiency, and the unity of the Church.”

One of the charges brought against Mr. Newman was that of disrespect and disobedience to the commands of the Bishop of Oxford, which led to the publishing the following letters, by Drs. Pusey and Bagot:—

To the Editor of the *‘Irish Ecclesiastical Journal.’*

Sir,—In defending an article of the *‘British Magazine’* in the last number of your *‘Journal’* you have brought a charge of inconsistency against Mr. Newman, as though after having in 1838 declared his readiness to withdraw any Tract to which his Bishop had an objection, he continued the publication of Tract xc. after his Bishop had declared it objectionable.

Had you known more of Mr. Newman’s saintly and simple character, you would have felt sure that he would not profess what he did not fulfil. It had savored more of that charity which ‘thinketh no evil,’ to suppose that since Mr. Newman did not withdraw the ‘Tract,’ there were some reasons why the Bishop, although he thought it ‘objectionable,’ still acquiesced

prospectively in its being continued. It is obvious what mis-statements there would have been, had it been withdrawn, when there are so many now; that it might have been represented as going farther than it does, and this unavoidably without the aid of all the angry and uncharitable feelings which are thus to rend our church. How inaccurately do we all remember any thing, each giving to what we hear or have read, the colour of his own mind. It was natural to suppose that the Bishop, kind as he is known to be, would not require of any one so hard a sacrifice as this. Nor did he, for whatever reason, although the Bishop wished it had never been published, he acquiesced prospectively in the continuance of its publication. Nothing but evil could have resulted from its suppression. The mode of interpreting the articles justified in it, (and to which I myself cordially assent), had gone forth, and must find its way; the only remaining question was, whether it should find its way in its genuine form, and as it had already been guarded in the second edition, or in some exaggerated, perhaps distorted form, misleading some of those disposed to embrace it, and giving occasion to unfounded surmises. Again, nothing could have prevented its being re-printed,—*e. g.* in America, and re-imported into this country. Again, the withdrawal of this 'Tract' involved a principle which was not the case with the preceding. Other 'Tracts' might have been withdrawn—*e. g.* on account of the wording of any statement, without giving up any doctrine they contained; the withdrawal of Tract xc., involving the mode of subscribing the Articles maintained in it, would have been an apparent recantation of the mode of signing under which he held a cure under the Bishop; however, it is not for me to state grounds upon which the Bishop may have thought it right to acquiesce beforehand in the publication of Tract xc., this would be to make him in his Episcopal office amenable to public opinion. It is sufficient that he thought it just and right to do so. I enclose a letter from himself, stating 'that from well-considered reasons at the time' he so did.

And now allow me to express my strong conviction, that this habit of judging individuals without knowledge of the circumstances, as it is directly contrary to the command of our Blessed Lord, so it is one of the greatest evils with which our Church is

well nigh rent asunder. It is of God's mercy, not through any love or bowels of compassion in men that she is kept together. They are not so much things without, which shake men's minds or loosen their allegiance to our Church, but rather the unceasing strife within, those endless suspicions, hatred, variance, emulations, wrath, which certainly are not the fruits of the Spirit which "maketh men to be of one mind in an house." There is, I doubt not, a deeper unity whereby both the several branches of the Church Catholic and our own Church within it are thereby held together, notwithstanding these miserable appearances on the surface. But certainly this is not the way to obtain the blessing upon those 'who dwell together in unity.' Evil reports or conjectures against good men and faithful servants of our Lord should not even be heard, much less entertained. Shall we ever go on as though our Lord had said—'judge'—not, 'judge not;' or as if he meant to reverse all which Holy Scripture says of Charity—'rejoicing in iniquity,' and 'rejoicing not in the truth,'—'bearing' nothing—'believing' nothing—'enduring' nothing.

Your humble servant,

E. B. PUSEY.

Christ Church, Oct. 14, 1843.

---

Cuddesden,

Oct. 11, 1843.

My dear Sir,—I was not aware till I received your letter this morning of the serious and unfounded charge brought against Mr. Newman of his having broken his faith with me by suffering a republication of the Tract No. xc. I lose no time in stating that when I requested the '*Tracts for the Times*' might cease, however I might have regretted the original publication of 'Tract' xc., it formed no part of my injunction or request (from well considered reasons at the time) that there should be no republication of that 'Tract.'

People may feel themselves at liberty to express their opinions as to the propriety or policy of having published more editions of

that 'Tract,' but the accusation of Mr. Newman's having done so contrary to promise, is unfounded and unjust.

No one, however, who has the slightest knowledge of Mr. Newman will give a moment's credit to such a charge of unfaithfulness in him; and I feel sure it is unnecessary for me to state to Mr. N. or yourself, that nothing which I have ever said or written, can have given the remotest grounds for the accusation. I know not, of course, from what quarter so serious a charge may come, and should myself deem it undeserving of the notice; at the same time, if you think differently, you are at liberty to make use of this letter.

Believe me, my dear Sir,

Faithfully yours,

R. OXFORD.

The Rev. Dr. Pusey.

We have, a word to say to the writer of an article in the "*Christian Remembrancer*" of November, 1843, who says:—"We think the conduct of the recent converts to Romanism very un-English, we had almost said shabby. The very way in which these 'goings over' are conducted shows much latent suspicion in the good of a cause; *transfuga* is the Latin word, and we cannot disconnect it from the notion of a deserter. Never to consult friends or even families, to be lost for a week, to announce a step upon which the soul may be perilled by a penny-post letter from Oscott, to lodge no appeal with a Bishop whom they have served, to dive down at Littlemore, and to be lost to sight till they pop up at S. Chad's as 'acolytes'; if this were not too serious a matter to laugh at, it would be scarcely more than simply farcical. If really and truly their souls were undergoing a perilous sifting, if they had not resolved upon this step without the most earnest prayer, if they had well and long weighed the conflicting claims of the two Communions, and if at last they resolved in favor of Rome, only because England was deficient in the signs of an Apostle—was too cold—too narrow—too hard—too grudging—then, surely, and we put it upon the lowest ground,

if ever their minds were possessed with the slightest or a single suspicion at any time, that in spite of appearances, England might not be wrong, surely the Church of their Baptism and Ordination was worth struggling for; it was worth making a public and solemn appeal for; it was worth a trial to make it better, more holy, more religious; it was worth some agitation to recall it at least to its proper character. If they were defeated, and if their claim, boldly and dutifully argued, were rejected—well, that is another question, but, since they have not done this, their conduct to us appears, we ADVISEDLY use a very strong and offensive phrase, to be sneaking and unmanly; we may pity them—pray for them—weep for them—but we dare not respect them.\* We know not whether the writer of this article be yet a Catholic, but if so, his punishment will be severe when he recollects how he maligned his elder brethren in the Faith; if still a Protestant—if still clinging to the stranded bark of Anglicanism in spite of the howling wind, pelting rain, and angry thunder, when

————— “All but a few  
Plunge into the flowing brine and quit the vessel,”

we would most respectfully say to him—for we too “pity” him—“pray” for him—“weep” for him—“Sir, you know nothing of the sighs and tears we have shed while yet in doubt—you cannot feel or sympathize, nor can you have the most distant idea, of all that we have suffered while God’s good Spirit was leading us onward—you cannot tell how bitter, how intense, how agonising, were our sufferings when the dread truth flashed on our mind for the first time, that our Orders were naught, and that the Church of England was merely a creature and slave of the State—and that faith, saving faith, was impossible to be obtained save in the Church of Rome; therefore, good sir, we do most respectfully beg of you not to stigmatize our conduct as ‘sneaking’ and ‘unmanly’;—was it ‘sneaking’ and ‘un-

\* Christian Remembrancer, November, 1843.

manly' in Mr. Bernard Smith resigning a preferment of £700 per annum, or in others, cheerfully resigning their Archdeaconries, Deaneries, and snug Rectories, for beggary, and in some instances, actual starvation?\* We speak advisedly, for we are acquainted with several converts who have voluntarily resigned preferments of great value, to eke out a living with their family, on salaries which our servants would have contemptuously rejected; nay, some have even been beggared in consequence of their embracing the FAITH once delivered to the Saints.† Is it a slight trial, a mere 'diving down' and a 'popping up,' to leave friends and relatives, and all that one holds dear, for a strange worship, but yet one that we felt to be true—one in which we have met and conversed with our God—our Incarnate JESUS—for we know that the Church 'has JESUS Himself with Her, the Living God in the Blessed Sacrament. It is no commemoration of Him; it is Himself. It is no part of the mystery of the Incarnation; it is the whole mystery, and the Incarnate One Himself. It is not simply a means of grace; it is the Divine Fountain of Grace Himself. It is not merely a help to glory; it is the Glorified Redeemer Himself, the owner and the source of all glory. The Blessed Sacrament is God in His mysterious, miraculous veils. It is this real presence of God which makes Catholicism, a religion quite distinct from any of the so-called forms of Christianity. It is this possession of Her God, which is, of necessity, the life-long triumph of the Church. Nothing short of this could

\* Two of the clerical converts would have starved at T——n had it not been for the broken meat given him by some charitable Catholics. Another walked from Limerick to Dublin with his wife, and on arriving at the latter city footsore and weary, found that they possessed *sixpence* between them.—Appendix F.

† Two of the clerical converts became Railway Porters, another kept a Cigar shop, at M——; will our Anglican friends behave in like manner for their faith? What but *faith* and the grace of God have strengthened us in our trials?

be a real or sufficient triumph to the Bride of Christ.' You speak also of our leaving the 'Church of our Baptism'—the writer of these 'Annals' and every other Anglican he has yet met with, boasts of their having been made by Baptism, children of God, MEMBERS OF CHRIST, and inheritors of the Kingdom of Heaven, and consequently not of any national Church. For, with Mr. Northcote, I may say to you, 'surely you do not yourself look on your Baptism as something purely local and national; you do not consider that one baptized by a Presbyterian or a Wesleyan would forsake 'the Church of his Baptism' by becoming an Anglican.' The true Church, wherever that be, and no other, must needs be to the Christian the Church of his Baptism. She is his *real* Mother, to whom all his affections are due, though it may be that a stranger stole him from her even in his cradle, and has brought him up in ignorance of his royal descent and rightful heritage. Labor then to discover the true Church, and in Her you will have discovered the Church of your Baptism."

Mr. Seager, the Assistant Professor of Hebrew at Oxford, previous to his secession, published a volume of the Sarum Breviary, in order that Anglicans might be prevented from reciting the Roman Office, which they were wont to alter to suit their own preconceived notions of Catholicity, as, e.g., instead of praying to the Saint, begging that the Saint might pray for them. Mr. Seager also published, Courayer's "Defence of Anglican Orders;" thus proving, by his secession from the Establishment, what his opinion was of the validity of the arguments used by the apostate Courayer, who has been so ably refuted by Le Quien.

---

1844.

Some of the converts this year were—

Rev. James Burton, Curate of Trinity Church, Brompton.

Rev. William G. Penny, P.C. of Ashdon, Bucks.

Thomas A. King, Esq., Exeter College, Oxford.

Charles R. Scott Murray, Esq., M.P., Christchurch, Oxford.

William Leigh, Esq.  
 George Tickell, Esq., M.A., University College, Oxford.  
 J. A. Stothert, Esq., Advocate, Edinburgh.  
 B. Butland, Esq., Trinity College, Cambridge.  
 J. Mills, Esq.  
 Thomas Fenn, Esq.,  
 Mrs. Seager.  
 Miss D'Albiac.  
 Miss Nangle.  
 Miss Hext.

---

Mr. Penny says, "In quitting the Anglican Communion for the Catholic, we are not renouncing one authority to follow another, but putting ourselves under an authority, having previously been under none at all. I say 'having been previously under none at all,' because it is evident that though a person in the Anglican communion were to hold all Roman doctrine, if such a thing were possible, which it is not, inasmuch as *one* Roman doctrine teaches the necessity of communion with the See of Rome, he would not hold what he holds upon the authority of Rome, but only by way of opinion. Because, of course, to submit to the authority of a body, is to submit to the guidance of those, whom it has authorized to guide us. Now what Anglican submits to those whom the Roman Communion authorizes as guides? None, in that among other things they do not make confession to them as is required."\*

Certain members of the "Oxford School," dissatisfied with Mr. Newman's advice to "work in chains," to be "content to be in bondage," determined to exert themselves in obtaining the abrogation of that which they deemed "a mockery, a snare, and a delusion"—viz., *The compulsory burial of Schismatics*. They had "freely and voluntarily subscribed to the thirty-nine Articles, and to the

\* The impossibility of Faith out of the Church of Rome, by W. G. Penny.

three articles contained in the thirty-sixth Canon ;” accordingly a Committee, consisting of the following clergymen, was formed—viz. :

Rev. Thomas W. Allies, Rector of Launton, Oxon.

Rev. I. U. Cooke, Vicar of East Lulworth, Dorsetshire.

Rev. W. H. Mountain, Vicar of Hemel Hempstead, Herts.

Rev. W. H. Henslow, P.C. of Tottenhill, Norfolk.

Rev. Edward G. K. Browne, Curate of Bawdsey, Suffolk :

whose duty it was to invite their clerical brethren to unite and sign a Petition to the High Court of Parliament, against the compulsory burial of Schismatics, as they fully believed with the 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, and 12 Canons of the Established Church, that Schismatics were “*ipso facto* excommunicated, and not to be restored, but only by the Archbishop, after his repentance and public revocation of such his “wicked errors.” “We cannot but conclude (says one of the supporters of this Petition) that those only, who have received the Sacrament of Baptism from one who has been episcopally ordained, are, according to the view of the Church of England, truly and Scripturally baptized.”

The following Petition was drawn up by the aforesaid Committee for presentation to the House of Commons, but we believe never presented :—

*“To the Right Hon. the Lords Spiritual and Temporal of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland, in Parliament assembled.*

The Petition of the undersigned Clergymen of the Church of England, humbly sheweth—

1. That your Petitioners view with unfeigned sorrow and alarm the late decision in the Ecclesiastical Courts in the several prosecutions of their Reverend brethren, the Messrs. Escott, Chapman, and Henslowe, respecting Dissenting or Schismatic Baptism, and Church Burial ; which latter rite is thereby made

compulsory upon all Parochial Clergymen, in violation of their public pledge to obey the Church's rule and the statute law.

2. That your Petitioners esteem it most inconsistent and unreasonable to confer the peculiar privileges of the Church upon such as are not, nor ever has been, members of the same; and the height of injustice and oppression to compel its officers thereto, with respect to any who have never been received therein or have separated therefrom.

3. That the Church of England is such a voluntary association, inasmuch as each man's religious profession is, or should be, of his own free will and choice, none having right to compel another to adopt either this or that mode of faith, but each being free to follow that which he does believe to be the law of God.

4. That the said Church has peculiar ceremonies, rites, and privileges, reserved for those, and those only, who are members of the same.

5. That the mode of becoming a member thereof is plainly and clearly defined in the Book of Common Prayer; which Book, with the rites, ceremonies, and directions therein contained, has received the sanction of Parliament, by Act 13 and 14 Car. II., cap., 4., expressly establishing and confirming it, and no other, as the ritual code and ceremonial of the said Church; and that such mode of admission into membership is, by Baptism at the hands of a "lawful" minister, lawfully and episcopally ordained 'according to the order' of the said Church.

6. That by the Act 52 Geo. III., cap 146, it is enjoined that the names of all persons so baptized, and admitted members as aforesaid, shall be enrolled as such in the Parochial Registers, which are officially kept by the Minister of every parish in England—no other Baptisms, or alleged Baptisms, being recognizable therein as conferring admission to membership in the said Church.

7. That the Rubric prefixed to the office of the Burial of the Dead, in the Book of Common Prayer, so sanctioned and established by Parliament as aforesaid, directs that such 'office is not to be used for any that die unbaptized,' 'or excommunicate, or have laid,' &c., or, in other words, that have not been admitted

by the Holy Sacrament of Baptism, as prescribed by the Book of Common Prayer, and duly registered according to Law as members of the said Church, or have been cut off by authority, or their own act, from its communion.

8. That notwithstanding such prohibition, and the Act of Parliament which expressly sanctions and establishes it, your Petitioners, as officiating Ministers of a voluntary association, the United Church of England and Ireland as aforesaid, are, by reason of the precedent of those late decisions in the Ecclesiastical Courts, now daily liable to be called on and compelled—by, as they believe, a mistaken and unconstitutional decision,\* to use that office, and the privilege of burial as members, with respect to those who have never been admitted or registered, nor could be registered, as such; and that, consequently, the number of such prosecutions, as those above referred to, must indefinitely increase, or your Petitioners and their brethren, the officiating Ministers of the united Church of England and Ireland, be compelled to violate their sense of the demands of reason and consistency, of the due discipline of their Church, and the principle embodied in the construction of that Church and the laws of the Realm.

9. Your Petitioners, therefore, humbly pray that your Lordships would be pleased to take these facts into your gracious consideration, and to make such order thereupon as to your wisdom shall seem meet, to relieve your Petitioners and their Reverend brethren from the grievance and anomaly of being exposed to prosecution in the Ecclesiastical Courts, for fulfilling those directions which their reason, their solemn engagements, the rules of their Church, and the Acts of Parliament, alike enjoin.

And your Petitioners shall ever pray, &c.,'

\* A periodical, to whom we are already much indebted, thus speaks of this decision of Sir H. J. Fust—"Here is the office of the Metropolitan, or, in other words, the Metropolitan, fining and ruining the clergy because they will not betray the Church, and Separatists are permitted to form an unholy league with the Archbishop of Canterbury himself, for the strange purpose of showing that their ministerial commission is as good as his own. The tyranny of a State is bad enough, but for a Church to encourage schism and to oppress the clergy alone, is still more intolerable." Appendix 2.

Another party following the advice of Lord John Manners, determined to found a monastery consisting of MARRIED and unmarried monks, and selected as their site a small village in Suffolk; the *unmarried* Fathers and Brethren were to take "Bachelors" vows, regarding "Celibacy, as it really is, as a higher state," and that "there are surely duties enough in the Church where Celibacy may have its proper place, and where there is much room for the exhibition of the sterner grace of self-denial, foregoing all the highest earthly joys which cheer us in our pilgrimage, passing *alone* and *isolated* through the world, and *visibly* living only for his Master's work, and to gather in his Master's scattered sheep." They forgot that "Monks and Nuns were not commodities to be found everywhere, and to be moulded for the nonce whenever they are wanted. Funds may be found, and buildings raised, and vestments manufactured, but it requires a special vocation from God to make a man or woman renounce the world;"\* and so it was. In vain did the learned Regius Professor of Hebrew enquire, "Why should the daughters of our land be in a manner forced into marriage, as in the former days of Romanism they were into Celibacy, and the days of the Old Testament be brought back upon us, and our maidens marry in order to 'take away their reproach from among men. Now that He who was looked for is come, and they can serve Him, not by becoming mothers of the Holy line whereof He was born, but by ministering to His members in a sanctified virgin estate, why should we not also, instead of our desultory Visiting Societies, have our *Sœurs de la Charité*, whose spotless and religious purity might be their support amid the scenes of misery and loathsomeness, carrying that awe about them, which even sin feels towards undefiledness, and impressing a healthful sense of shame upon guilt by their very presence? Why should marriage alone have its duties among the daughters of our great, the single estate be condemned to an unwilling listlessness,

\* Life of S. Gilbert of Sempringham.

or left to seek undirected, and unauthorised, and unsanctified, ways of usefulness of its own?"\* The attempt was made at ———, and turned out a failure.

The following paper, taken from the "*Church Intelligencer*," and widely circulated among the "Oxford party," is so curious, that we are sure our readers will excuse our giving it an insertion in our pages, referring as it does to a

"*Revival of Monastic and Conventual Institutions on a plan adapted to the exigencies of the Reformed Catholic Church in England.*

"Quid aliud fuere Monasteria quam officinæ virtutum; jejunii patientiæ laborum.'—*D. Ambros, lib. X. Ep. 82.*

"'A Monastery is a school of Christian penitence. It is a little community, having its own officers, in which each has his own post marked out, and in which all are engaged in labors of love; whilst, from its silence and peace, the soul has leisure for contemplation.'—*British Critic, No. LX., Article, Port Royal.*

"'To speak seriously and without passion, what can the ill be—to have places set apart whither men, either by nature, turn, or otherwise unfit for the world, may retire themselves in religious company, may think on Heaven and good learning.'—*Sir Roger Twysden's Beginners of Monastic Life.*

"'Something like Monasteries for women would be a glorious design, and may be set on foot to be the honor of a QUEEN ON THE THRONE.'—*Bishop Burnet.*

---

"It is a question which must long have presented itself as a subject of anxious thought to reflecting Christians, 'In what way the general interests of the Church and the Christian education of her people may be best promoted; and by what means a remedy may be best provided for many of the evils—social, domestic, and personal—arising out of the present disordered state of our civil and ecclesiastical relations?'

"The solution of this question, which has occupied so many minds, and which seems to be increasingly gaining ground, is,

\* Pusey's Letter to the Bishop of Oxford, p. 215.

that the wants alluded to would be most effectually met and supplied by the REVIVAL OF MONASTIC AND CONVENTUAL INSTITUTIONS, in a form suited to the genius, character, and exigencies of the Church of England, whereby her devotional, practical, and educational system might be carried out, and an asylum might be opened for persons of both sexes, who, from deliberate choice or under the pressure of various trials, might be desirous of permanent or occasional retirement from the world, and opportunity of quietude and devotion.

“Perhaps the best model for such establishments (*mutatis mutandis*) would be the monastery of Port Royal des Champs as described by Mrs. Schimmelpeninck, in her edifying ‘Memoirs of Port Royal.’

---

“The OBJECTS of such Institutions would be—

“1. To widen and deepen the legitimate influence of the Church, by exhibiting a model of Her system, as fully carried out and reduced to actual practice.

“2. To promote and conduct Christian education upon Church principles.

“3. To afford a retreat for the contemplative, the bereaved, the destitute, and the embarrassed.

“4. To cherish a spirit of devotion, charity, humility, and obedience.

“5. To give better opportunities of acquiring self-knowledge, and exercising penitence.

“6. To promote simplicity and godly sincerity in the intercourse of life.

“7. To revive plainness and self-denial in diet, dress, furniture, personal attendance, &c.

“8. To form habits of retirement, silence, and recollection.

“THE MEANS.

“1. A system of community where the superabundance of the wealthier might be made available to the support of the poorer members.

"2. Daily public devotion and frequent Communion agreeably to the order of the Church.

"3. Strict observance of the Festivals, Fasts, &c., prescribed in the Book of Common Prayer.

"4. A RULE for dress, diet, furniture, recreation, &c.

"5. Appointed time for silence and subjects for meditation.

"6. Corporal and spiritual works of mercy.

"7. Exercising penitence and obedience.

"8. Bodily and mental labor—particularly in educating the young, composing works to meet the necessities of the Church, working for the poor, and assisting in the various duties of the establishment.

#### " THE CONSTITUTION.

"No vows, but a solemn declaration and engagement of obedience to the Superior, and of compliance with the RULE of the Institution during residence.

"VISITATION.—Monthly by the Parochial Minister, quarterly by the Rural Dean, half-yearly by the Archdeacon, yearly by the Bishop.

"SUPERIOR—To be appointed by the Bishop and removeable at his pleasure ; to appoint his or her subordinate, subject to the Bishop's approval.

"Other details may be easily supplied.

"It is hoped and earnestly requested that the friends of primitive piety, order, and simplicity, into whose hands this paper may fall, will direct their thoughts and endeavors towards expanding these hints, and devising some method of bringing them to a practical issue. To such, it will be obvious that the design must not be desecrated by the interference of schemes of worldly gain, in the shape of Joint-Stock Companies, Proprietary Shares, &c. It must be the offspring of love to God and love to man—the free-will offering of penitent gratitude or open-handed charity to God and to HIS CHURCH.

We shall again refer to this point, as there "were in the shade several pious associations of individuals who live in com-

munity and follow a strict conventional rule"—or, as a correspondent of the "*English Churchman*" said, "that many were pining for a life of solitude," while they forgot that by giving up earth they did not gain Heaven in exchange—for a "Protestant nun conveys to us a mournful idea. For the brethren she leaves, where is the happy familiar intercourse with the Saints in glory?—For the mother to whom perhaps she bids adieu, where is the fond child-like intimacy with God's Blessed Mother, and our Mother too?—And for the earthly love which she perchance renounces, where is the spouse of her soul, where is her beloved?—Where are the hours spent before the Blessed Sacrament? Oh, the life of the nun is treasured up there! It is this which makes the convent a home to her; her God abides ever with her. When she tore away her heart from its fleshly shrine, she placed it in the Tabernacle, in the clefts of the rock, in the wound in her Saviour's side, in the Heart of Jesus, and there it is at rest." Would to God that Miss Sellon, Miss Nightingale, and their companions fully realised the force of these words, and felt that neither Dr. Pusey, nor Mr. Liddell, had any authority over them, while they despised the authority of their Ordinary.

The "*Times*" thus referred to Mr. Tickell's conversion:—  
 "Rightly or wrongly they (the Tractarians) assert that the English Church, and that large body of Christians in communion with the Church of kindred form and origin, viz., in Ireland, and in Scotland, and in the United States of America, and in Brunswick, and in the East Indies, and in the West, and in Australia, and in New Zealand, and in short wherever the English tongue is known, are, whatever may be the true test or theory of Christian membership, genuine and indispensable members—one great third in short of the Christian Church. Rightly or wrongly they assert, and that without prejudice to Christian Charity, that this great body of the Church is Apostolic in foundation, Apostolic in usages, Apostolic in doctrine. Rightly or wrongly they assert that this great and import-

ant portion of Christendom stands not on any *exclusive* or *self-limited* basis of its own, the assumed truth of which should cut down every one else, but on an equal footing—the great footing of Catholic and Apostolic ordination—with the other Churches of the Universal Faith. So far as we are aware, no other school in our Church at all regards, or wishes to regard her in the same light. So far as we are aware, these same principles, and none other, are the very ones which, be they right or wrong, our Church has all along rested her claim to a fellowship with and position in Christendom. They vindicate to her at once her high rank and destiny among the Churches of Christendom. Mr. Tickell, a gentleman of some promise and distinction, we believe not, however, a clergyman, but one who has given out, or supposed to have given out, that he zealously supported or even exaggerated those peculiar views, which consist in exalting the importance of that Apostolic ordination, which no one has ever disproved or denied to the English Church—this gentleman has now gone over to Rome. The truth is that if Mr. Tickell, and other gentlemen of his school, kept in mind the importance of the Apostolic institution, which they *profess* so much to value, they would then see that comparisons of points of external practice and the like, however they might deride them, as no doubt they would, though most unreasonably, against their own Church, were not anything to the purpose so long as their own Church was confessedly a true and Apostolic one. But this done, estimate these facts by the value which by their own principles they should set upon it. They deny their own doctrines. Hence their lapse. Hence, and hence alone, their blindness, their positive blindness, to the superinduced errors and monstrous corruptions of Romanism.”

Having already referred to the circumstance which led to the conversion of the Hon. Mr. Douglas and Mr. Scott Murray, we beg to call our reader's attention to the following extract from Battersby's Catholic Directory:—

“About two years ago Mr. Scott Murray, and his friend Mr. Douglas, were at Rome, and went frequently to see the Catholic Service in S. Peter’s, the Cathedral of the Christian world, ‘Christ’s mighty shrine above his martyr’s tomb.’ On one of these occasions Mr. Scott Murray, to get rid of the incumbrance of his umbrella, placed it on one of the vacant confessionals, and when the service was over, found it was locked, and his umbrella of course not forthcoming. On enquiring of one of the sacristans, he learned that the good old clergyman, to whom the confessional belonged, had as usual taken the key to his convent with him, and would not return till the following morning, when, if Mr. Murray sent his servant or left his address, the umbrella should be forwarded to him. It so happened that Mr. Murray was obliged to leave Rome for England, that evening or the next morning, to attend his duties in Parliament, and requested his friend, Mr. Douglas, to look after the umbrella. Accordingly, following the instructions of the sacristan, he directed his steps toward the convent, and having reached it, enquired for the *Padre Confessore* in whose confessional the umbrella lay a prisoner. The Padre received him most kindly, handed him the key of the confessional, and sent two of the younger Religious to accompany him to S. Peter’s, to release the prisoner, and thus the umbrella found its way home. Mr. Douglas was so charmed with the urbanity, piety, and superior information of the venerable Religious, that he begged to be allowed to repeat his visit; his enlightened conversation soon cleared away all his doubts and prejudices, and showed him the truth of the Catholic religion, which, after due preparation, he cordially embraced, and after some time returned to England. Mr. Scott Murray was surprised, to find his friend, from conviction, a sincere Catholic; this led him to examine more fully into Catholic doctrines, and the result on his enlightened and impartial mind was a full conviction of their truth; and, as he, in company with his mother and sister, proposed to spend the winter in the south of Europe, and to visit Rome, he requested a letter of introduction from his friend Mr. Douglas to the good Religious above mentioned, and also to one of the Canons of S. Peter’s, and then proceeded on his tour through Italy, Sicily, and Malta. He remained but a short time at Malta, and returned through Sicily to the Eternal City. Arriving there he lost no time in becoming acquainted

with the worthy clergyman, the instrument of his friend's conversion, followed up his researches, and having fully satisfied his mind on every ground, was received a few weeks after into the Catholic Church, by his Eminence the Cardinal Fransoni. It may be satisfactory to know that this distinguished ornament of our senate, who was returned on high Tory interest, as one of our county members, is now in his twenty-fifth year, with a noble fortune of about £20,000 a year, and this gives an additional proof of the remarkable observation in the Protestant '*British Critic*,' that, 'the Catholic system in this country (England) is just now beginning, after a long interval of torpor, to lay hold of the most gifted minds and the most energetic spirits of the time.' "

We have been favored by the Editor of the *Tipperary Vindicator*, with Mr. Mills' reasons for renouncing Anglicanism, and beg to call our reader's attention to his third reason.

THREE REASONS FOR RENOUNCING THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND,  
AND RETURNING TO THE ORIGINAL CATHOLIC, APOSTOLICAL,  
FAITH.

I. Because I conscientiously and firmly believe that the religion of the primitive Christian Church, as transmitted to us by tradition and revelation, is the only pure source of belief.

II. Because the Church of England has, without Divine authority, entirely removed from her rites and ceremonies, as well as from the eyes of the faithful, that emblem of our Blessed Saviour's suffering and death—the Cross, which was borne by Himself in person, and which all true Christians should humbly venerate as the symbol of redemption and eternal salvation.

III. Because the effects of the propagation of the Church of England's doctrines, forced upon Ireland, my country, have been to denationalise the people of Ireland, and, by disuniting them, to dissolve the religious and social compact ordained by the commandments of God.

NOTE.—Although the Cross is banished from the Churches in England, it is a curious fact that the English flag retains it to this day upon the Cross of S. George, as borne in the time of the crusaders.

J. MILLS.

*Rome, March 17, 1844.*

---

1845.

---

Some of the converts of this year were—

- Rev. J. Campbell Smita.  
 Rev. J. Moore Capes, Incumbent of S. John's, Eastover, Bridgewater.  
 Rev. George Montgomery, Curate of Castle Knock, Dublin.  
 Rev. W. G. Ward.  
 Rev. Brook C. Brydges.  
 Rev. Ambrose St. John, Curate of Walmer, Kent.  
 Rev. F. S. Bowles.  
 Rev. Richard H. Stanton, Curate of Guilborough, Northamptonshire.  
 Rev. John Walker, Curate of Benefield, Northamptonshire.  
 Rev. F. R. Neve, Rector of Poole-Keynes, Wilts.  
 Rev. F. Oakeley, Canon of Lichfield, and Incumbent of All Saints, Margaret Street.  
 Rev. W. F. Wingfield.  
 Rev. J. H. Newman, Vicar of S. Mary's, Oxford.  
 Rev. Frederick W. Faber, Rector of Elton, Northamptonshire.  
 Rev. T. W. Marshall, Rector of Swallowcliffe, Wilts.  
 Rev. J. Melville Glenie, P.C. of Mark, Somerset.  
 Rev. J. Coope, Curate of S. Oswald, Salisbury.  
 Rev. B. H. Birks, Curate of Arley, Cheshire.  
 Rev. Michael Watts Russell, Rector of Benefield, Northamptonshire.  
 Rev. Robert A. Coffin, Vicar of S. Mary Magdalen, Oxford.  
 Rev. H. J. Marshall, Curate of Burton-Agnes, Yorkshire.  
 Rev. Edgar E. Estcourt, Curate of Cirencester, Gloucestershire.  
 Rev. Edward G. K. Browne, Curate of Bawdsey, Suffolk.

- Thomas Meyrick, Esq., Corpus Christi College, Oxford.  
 J. D. Dalgairns, Esq., Exeter College, Oxford.  
 Albany Christie, Esq., Oriel College, Oxford.  
 J. C. Calman, Esq., Worcester College, Oxford.  
 Robert Simpson, Esq., S. John's College, Oxford.  
 J. B. Rowe, Esq., S. John's College, Cambridge.  
 E. F. Wells, Esq., Trinity College, Cambridge.  
 J. A. Knox, Esq., Trinity College, Cambridge.  
 Scott N. Stokes, Esq., Trinity College, Cambridge.  
 William Hutchinson, Esq., Trinity College, Cambridge.  
 Jño. Grant, Esq., St. John's College, Oxford.  
 — Toogood, Esq.  
 — Tucker, Esq.  
 T. Ruscombe Poole, Esq.  
 M. Woodmason, Esq.  
 F. W. Tarleton, Esq.  
 G. T. Brydges, Esq.  
 E. T. Hood, Esq.  
 Leicester Buckingham, Esq.  
 M. J. Capes, Esq.  
 R. Judge, Esq.  
 C. Nasmyth Stokes, Esq.  
 Captain Ensor, R. N. (R.I.P.)  
 Major Zielder.  
 Lady C. Towneley.  
 Lady A. Acheson. (R.I.P.)  
 Lady O. Acheson. (R.I.P.)  
 Mrs. Austin.  
 Mrs. Northcote. (R.I.P.)  
 Hon. Mrs. Heneage.  
 Miss Gibberne.  
 Mrs. Watts Russell. (R.I.P.)  
 Miss Watts Russell.  
 Mrs. Lambe.  
 Miss Lambe.  
 Mrs. O'Gorman.  
 Mrs. Tucker.  
 Mrs. Ticehurst.  
 Mrs. T. W. Marshall.  
 Mrs. Wood.

Miss E. F. Sewell.  
 Miss Wood.  
 Mrs. W. G. Ward.  
 Miss Wingfield.  
 Mrs. Wingfield.

The reader will, we trust, pardon our referring to a circumstance practised (we believe) for the first time this year. Dr. O'Connell had referred to Catholics "visiting by stealth the mouldering images of England's Saints, her mutilated sepulchres, and the drooping aisles of her ivy-mantled towers, relics of her ancient glory;" and accordingly pilgrimages were made to the shrines of S. Richard, at Chichester, S. Thomas, at Canterbury, S. Cuthbert, at Durham, S. Wilfrid, at York and Selsea, S. Gilbert, at Sempringham, S. Winefride, at Holywell, and S. Alban, at S. Alban's; nor was our Ladye of Walsingham, Bindon, or Redclyffe, forgotten; but Deans and Chapters, Rectors and Curates, solicitous for the Protestantism of their Cathedrals and Parishes, ordered their vergers and sextons to allow none to kneel at the shrines of the saints, as they detested the "mummery of kneeling at the tombs of dead men and women,"\* and we are creditably informed, that certain shrines were, and *are*, painted to spoil the satin and silk dresses of weak devotees.

\* The following amusing circumstance, which doubtless many of our readers, if they have ever visited S. Alban's shrine as pilgrims buoyant with hope for the success of the "conspiracy" discovered by Dr. Faussett and Mr. C. P. Golightly, and believing that the day of redemption was at hand for the "*Anglo Catholic Church*," will recall to mind, we gladly take from the "*Christian Remembrancer*" of August, 1843—

"On entering the choir, we were much pleased with a large board attached to the Altar-rails desiring strangers not to enter within the sacred enclosure. 'Well, this is quite right,' we exclaimed to one another, 'this shews a proper and decent reverence for the Chancel; it is very sad and humiliating that such a notice should be required, but anything is better than to permit careless, thoughtless people to go up to the Altar, and perhaps sit down upon it to get a better view of the church.'

'Don't be too sure of the motive (said one of the party, a cautious and caustic observer). Pray, sexton, what does that board mean!'

We also remember being informed in Chichester in 1842, that no such 'mummery' as kneeling at the shrine of S. Richard would be allowed.\*

There was now every appearance of Mr. Palmer's words being verified—"I shall be greatly surprised, so long as the present system continues, if the number, not of undue favorers of Rome, but of apostate defaulters to her communion, should not increase rapidly every year."

Mr. Capes had "never joined in the religious movement which has brought so many to the Church; nay, he wrote against it, he wrote not in bitterness and contempt as many have done, and do, but as a gentleman and a man of serious principles. But, though he started from so different a point, he too came near the Church, he too entered it. He did so at a great sacrifice; he had devoted a great part of his fortune to the building of a Protestant Church. It

'Why, sir, you see that these steps (pointing to the raised floor of the Chancel) were worn out; we have not money enough to put down stone steps, so we got these; very neat ain't they? *but they are only deal sanded over to look like stone, and if the visitors were to walk up and down they would be scratched to pieces presently, so we put up the board to keep the new steps from being worn out.*'

Never was so pretty a theory so remorselessly shattered."

The *Guardian*, shows how the zealous Dean of Westminster excludes Catholics from praying at the shrine of S. Edward the Confessor:—

"It is customary to turn all persons out of Westminster Abbey immediately after each service, and to keep the Abbey strictly closed every year on the 13th of October—S. Edward the Confessor's Day. A worthy lady, who is said to be as well known at the Abbey as the Dean himself—if not better—explained this circumstance to a clergyman as follows:—Mrs. M·E——, —'Ah! the Abbey will be closed to-morrow; always is on the 13th of October.' Clergyman—'Indeed! how is that?' Mrs. M·E——, —'Oh! it's the Dean's orders; you see it is Edward the Confessor's Day, and the Catholics *will* come and say their prayers here on that day, so we are obliged to shut up the Abbey to keep them out; *very unpleasant ain't it?*'"

\* We were permitted to kneel, not only at S. Richard's shrine at Chichester, but also at St. Thomas of Canterbury, in that Cathedral during our late visit to those Cities.

was all but finished when the call came; he arose and obeyed it, and had to leave his means of subsistence behind him, turned into stone. He came into the Catholic church, and remains a layman in it." Mr. Capes, according to M. Gondon, endowed the new church of S. John's, Eastover, with the sum of £4,000.

Mr. Capes, on his secession from the Establishment, published the following address to his parishioners:—

*"To the Congregation of S. John the Baptist's Church,  
Eastover, Bridgewater.*

"MY DEAR FRIENDS AND BRETHERN,—The time has at length arrived when I can no longer delay communicating with you on a subject, which I cannot but fear, will cause you very great surprise, perplexity and distress. I am aware that many reports, as to my religious opinions, have been for a long time circulated in the town and neighbourhood, and that you had consequently, been in much doubt in which of the many divisions which distract the Christian world you ought to class me. But I am afraid you are little prepared for the announcement which I have now to make to you, that after some years' consideration of the subject, I can now no longer conscientiously continue a member of the Established Church of England, and, consequently, can no longer act as minister of S. John's Church. I am sure you will believe that in making this announcement, I most deeply feel the painful shock that it will be to many or all of you, and that it is only because I see that it is the will of God that I should take the step which I propose, that I can bring myself to do that which must cause you so much sorrow. When I see the numbers among you who are destitute of all religious knowledge and of the hopes and joys of the Gospel; the crowds of the neglected children waiting for some one to teach and guide them; when I think of the universal good-will and kindness which has been at all times shown to me, and of the thankfulness with which so many have availed themselves of the Service of S. John's Church; when I remember all this, and recollect, that by mine own act, I shall be throwing all into confusion, trouble of mind, and astonishment,

I shrink back at the thought of making known my determination to you, until I remember also that the will of God is to be obeyed at every risk and every cost, even though to the eye of man it may seem to be the immediate cause of mischief and evil.

“For the last two or three years, I have been unable to resist the conviction that the Established Church of England is not the true Church of Christ in England. She has few, barely any, of the marks by which we are taught to distinguish that Church, into which all men are called to fly for refuge from the world. I have tried her and found her wanting. She has many good qualities, and many of her members most truly deserve our sincerest respect and affection. But, if the Holy Scriptures are to be believed, the Lord of the Church, Who is our only rest and refuge, is not present with Her as He is elsewhere. He must be sought in that Church which has held the same truth from the beginning, which fulfils her Lord’s command and brings souls to Him, Which is not divided and distracted by a variety of doctrines and teachers, all claiming to be heard as teachers sent by God.

“You will ask me, if I have so long believed the Church of England not to be a Branch of the True Church, why I have so long continued within Her? Because I have continued to hope for better things. I have waited to see whether the arm of God would interfere and save Her, and I have not felt uneasy under the line of conduct I was pursuing. I had no warnings from God (as far as I can judge) to tell me plainly to leave the Church in which I was born. But I now feel thus no longer. Latterly the question has pressed powerfully and constantly on my conscience. I can give no reason, except worldly ones, for not seeking the mercy of God at once when He offers it, and dare not refuse to obey when he offers it. I dare not refuse to obey, now that I hear (as I believe) the voice of Christ saying to me, ‘Arise and follow.’

“I have therefore resigned my License into the hands of the Bishop, and I beg to give up all claims to the benefits of the endowment of S. John’s Church, and return it into the hands of those who have contributed to it, at the same time that I feel most deeply, how much they will be disappointed and distressed

at that which I am conscientiously obliged to do. All that I can do in return for their past good-will and friendship, will be to render every help in my power to assist in any arrangements which it may be thought desirable to make. To myself the loss of all that I give up is great indeed, in every way, but the call of duty requires us to make every sacrifice that may be demanded of us, and, therefore, I could not hesitate for a moment to sacrifice everything rather than not hearken to the command of God.

“I cannot either be insensible to the evil opinion which you will probably entertain respecting myself and my conduct in the step I am now taking. It is impossible, indeed, that some should not think ill of me. All I ask is, that you would judge as charitably as possible, and believe that, if it were in my power, I would still labor to the utmost for your spiritual and temporal welfare.

“I must also ask you to bear in mind that I am not now in any way changing my belief in religious doctrines; that what I have, to the best of my power, preached to you, I still believe to be the true and pure Gospel of the Grace of God, and it is because I am more and more convinced, that this Gospel is not that which is taught by the Church of England, that I now depart from Her, and seek for it, and for Him Who gave it, in the bosom of the Catholic Church. There I know it is to be found; there, with the assistance of Holy Scripture, I learned it for myself; there I know, and see, and feel by a thousand proofs that our Saviour Christ is present, and there, through His Infinite Mercy, He calls his unworthy servant. I am about to go to Him.

“Believe me to be ever, my dear friends, most sincerely and affectionately yours,

*June 20th.*

J. M. CAPES.”

Mr. W. G. Ward, Fellow of Balliol College, Oxford, indignant, and justly so, at the cowardly and unmanly conduct of Messrs. Palmer and Perceval, published a work, in which he boldly stated that he held the “whole cycle of Roman doctrine,” and that he could not agree with those who

prefer the English Reformation to the foreign; so far from it,—“I know no single movement in the Church, except Arianism in the Fourth century, which seems to me so wholly destitute of all claims on our sympathy and regard, as the English Reformation,” for when we “consider how signally and conspicuously the English Reformation transgressed those great principles (*the absolute supremacy of conscience in moral and religious questions, and the high sacredness of hereditary religion*), one part of the reason will be seen for the deep and burning hatred with which some members of our Church regard that miserable event.”\* The work was laid before the Hebdomadal Board, and Mr. Ward was to be degraded for holding opinions not proved to be contrary to the teaching of the Establishment, if indeed she teaches any dogma.

The question to be brought before the Convocation turned wholly and solely on the good faith of Mr. Ward in signing the formularies. “The resolution proposed to you is, that the passages read are not false, pernicious, anti-evangelical, or the like; I have no doubt that the great majority of you think them all this—but ‘are inconsistent with the Articles of Religion of the Church of England made and subscribed by William George Ward, and with the good faith of me, the said William George Ward, in respect of such declaration and subscription.’ This, and this only, is the question which you have to try; and the more intense your feeling of dislike to my theology, the more anxious a duty does it become for you to watch narrowly your own mind, lest any prejudice should distort your clear judgment:”† as a natural consequence, resulting from the agitated mind of the University, Mr. Ward was condemned by a majority of 717 to 368, on the first proposition laid by the Hebdomadal Board before the Con-

\* *The Ideal of a Christian Church*, by Rev. W. G. Ward.

† *Address to the Members of Convocation*, by W. G. Ward. Appendix H.

vocation,\* and by a majority of 569 to 511 on the second,† notwithstanding the exertions made by Messrs. Oakeley and Keble, the latter gentleman holding that it is “especially uncharitable and unwise at present to narrow the ground of Anglicanism, and that on the side of Rome exclusively; both as increasing the relative power of the Latitudinarian and Rationalistic schools which exist among us, and as adding force to any doubts which may be reasonably or unreasonably felt concerning our Catholicity;”‡ and Mr. Oakeley contended that “the sense in which the Articles were propounded was not a Catholic nor a Protestant, but a vague, indecisive, and therefore, a comprehensive sense, that the Reformers themselves were without any precise doctrinal views of their own upon the points in controversy, that they were consequently the victims alternately of extreme Catholic and extreme Protestant influences, that so far as they had any doctrinal sympathies of their own, they were Protestant rather than Catholic, but that the necessities of their position, as having to provide for the religious pacification of a country partly Catholic, partly Protestant, obliged them to a course (so far as doctrines at issue between the contending parties were concerned) of the strictest neutrality, and that the mode by which they sought to carry out this principle of neutrality was that of couching their formulary in language at once sufficiently Protestant *in tone* to satisfy the Reformers abroad, and sufficiently vague *in expression* to include the Catholics at home.”§

Shortly after Mr. Ward’s degradation, Mr. Oakeley addressed a Letter to the Bishop of London claiming for himself “the right of holding, as distinct from teaching, all Roman Doctrine,” but so far as Mr. Oakeley from contemplating secession from the Establishment at this period,

\* Appendix I.

† Appendix J and K.

‡ Heads of Consideration on the case of Mr. Ward, by Rev. John Keble.

§ Oakeley on Tract No. XC.

that he bade his Bishop "pause" ere he "snapped one binding tie, broken up one compact system, dislodged one needful element in the existing Church of England. It subsists by a balance; it is kept in its orbit through the operation of rival and conflicting influences. If we tamper with a body of such delicate structure and such heterogeneous materials, or enforce or enfeeble either of the powers, in whose gentle and well-poised sway, it depends for the equality of its movements, my own deep and deliberate apprehension is, that it will break up, and its dissociated parts fly away in obedience to some more powerful attraction, or wheel their restless and self-chosen course round and round the dreary regions of space. This, its brittleness and want of inward balance, *might* indeed be a proof that it had never been a Divine work at all, at least as to its essential frame work; but they might also tend to show that though a Divine work, it had not been treated as God would have it treated."\*

Mr. Oakeley addressed the following letter to the Vice-Chancellor immediately after Mr. Ward's degradation:—

*"Balliol College, Oxford, Feb. 14th.*

"Mr. Vice Chancellor,

"The vote of Convocation upon the two propositions submitted to it at the meeting of yesterday, seems to make it imperative, that I should address a few words to you, with the view of clearing my position in the University. I am anxious, then, to direct your attention to the following passage, in the preface to a pamphlet, which I forwarded to you about six weeks ago, and which you acknowledged by return of post with that courtesy and kindness which I have ever experienced at your hands;—  
'I have no wish to remain a member of the University or a Minister of the Church of England under false colors. I claim the right, which has already been asserted in another quarter, of holding (as distinct from teaching) *all Roman doctrine*, and that notwithstanding my subscription to the Thirty-nine Articles.'  
In a Tract which I have put out during the last fortnight, I have stated these words were published 'with the fullest delibe-

\* Oakeley on Tract No. XC.

ration.' I appropriated and repeated them in that Tract, and here, with the same deliberation and distinction, I again appropriate and repeat them. A statement on the subject of subscription, tantamount in substance to the above, is made, as I need hardly say, in the course of the extracts from '*The Ideal of a Christian Church*,' upon which Convocation yesterday expressed an opinion, and, as it must also be necessary for me to observe, it is to this statement that I refer in the above passage, when I speak of the right which I claim, having been already asserted in another quarter.' This right having been *apparently* called in question by the vote of yesterday, it seems to me quite necessary, with a view to the defence of my own position, that I should publicly state in what light I regard that vote. I consider it, then, as expressing a certain opinion upon a series of extracts, from a particular work comprehending a variety of statements, my agreement with which I am in no way called upon either to affirm or deny, except in the single instance relating to the question of subscription to the Articles, in which I have already declared that I take precisely the same view of the case with Mr. Ward. Had the censure of Mr. Ward been limited to the single point of his statement upon the subject of subscription to the Articles, the case, as far as this part of my argument is concerned, might have been otherwise. But, as this statement is only involved in a common condemnation with a variety of others, it is impossible, as I conceive, to determine whether, in the minds of the proposers and ratifiers of the measure, *all* the extracts are considered to be at variance with the good faith of the author's subscription, or only *some* of them, and if some only, then *which* in particular of the whole number? I consider, therefore, that Convocation, in expressing an opinion upon these passages, has by no means necessarily made any declaration with respect to the question of subscription in particular so as to affect those, who, like myself, while appropriating Mr. Ward's view of subscription, do not appropriate (nor yet disclaim) other sentiments expressed in the selected passages. But if, in the judgment of the Board over which you preside and of the House of Convocation, I have rendered myself liable to penalty by the declarations above cited, I am anxious 'not to shelter myself (as I say in my pamphlet) under the cover of supposed differences as to this matter of subscription from others

who have been directly assailed.' If, on the other hand, I am allowed, after this plain and public declaration of my sentiments, to retain my place in the University, *I shall regard such acquiescence as equivalent to an admission on the part of the academical authorities, that my own subscription to the Thirty-nine Articles is not at variance with good faith.* But I am here arguing upon the assumption that the House of Convocation has a power to determine in what sense members of the University shall, or shall not, subscribe to the Articles. I wish it, therefore, to be distinctly understood that my argument so far has been purely one *ad hominem*; I reserve to myself the power of disputing, if necessary, and at the proper time, any such claims on the part of Convocation. I consider myself to receive the Articles at the hands of the University, *solely as an organ and representative of the Church of England*, and inasmuch as the Church of England has no where declared against the sense in which I claim to subscribe to them, I accept them under no other limitations than those which are imposed by my conscientious belief of their grammatical meaning, and the intention with which they were at first put out, and are now proposed to me, by the Church of which I am a member. It is necessarily difficult, as I am sure you will perceive, to word a document of this nature, so explicitly as its very purpose requires, without the appearance of presumption as well as disrespect. I assure you that I would gladly have embraced a different alternative, had one presented itself which seemed to be equally consistent with my duty both to the University and to myself. But I am deeply and deliberately satisfied that the course of frankness, whatever present inconveniences or misconstructions it may entail, is at once the kindest and the fairest towards all parties, as it is undoubtedly also that which is most agreeable to my own feelings; and I hope that this course will at least have the effect of clearing, from the very suspicion of insincerity, those assurances of personal respect towards yourself, with which I am most conscientiously able to accompany it.

"I have the honor to be,

"Mr. Vice Chancellor,

"Your faithful, humble servant,

"FREDERICK OAKELEY,

"Senior Fellow of Balliol College.

Proceedings were also taken against Mr. Oakeley by Dr. Blomfield in the Arches' Court, when, contrary to "the judgment of his legal adviser, he declined to defend himself, and resigned his license as minister of Margaret-street Chapel." Our space will not allow us to do more than quote the sentence of Sir H. J. Fust,—“The Court would not go beyond the justice of the case by revoking the license of Mr. Oakeley to perform the office of minister in Margaret-street Chapel, or any ministerial office in the Diocese of London, and by prohibiting him from performing such office elsewhere within the Province of Canterbury, till he should have determined to retract, and did retract, his errors.”

Mr. Newman was received into Holy Church on the 9th of October. Long had this event been anticipated, as well from the sermon which he delivered on the occasion of his resigning S. Mary's, Oxford, as from other reasons. He had in one of his sermons said “Alas! I cannot deny that the outward notes of the Church are partly gone from us and partly going, and a most painful judgment is at hand;” and in the sermon delivered on the occasion of the resignation of his parochial duties, he thus apostrophized the Establishment—“O my Mother, whence is this unto thee that thou hast good things poured upon thee, and canst not keep them, and bearest children, yet darest not own them? Why hast thou not the skill to use their services, nor the heart to rejoice in their love? how is it that whatever is generous in purpose, and tender or deep in devotion, thy flower and thy promise, falls from thy bosom, and finds no home within thy arms? Who hath put this note upon thee to have ‘a miscarrying womb and dry breasts,’ to be strange to thine own flesh, and thine eye cruel towards thy little one? Thine own offspring, the fruit of thy womb, who love thee and would toil for thee, thou dost gaze upon them with fear as though a portent, or thou dost loathe as an offence,—at best thou dost but endure, as if they had no claim but on thy patience, self-possession and vigilance,

to be rid of them as easily as thou mayest. Thou makest them 'stand all the day idle' as the very condition of thy bearing with them, or thou biddest them to be gone where they will be more welcome, or thou sellest them for nought to the stranger that passes by. And what wilt thou do in the end thereof?"\* Mr. Newman was received into the Church, by Father Dominic of the Mother of God, at Littlemore, and had the happiness of making his First Communion on the following morning, with Messrs. Bowles, St. John, and Stanton.

Mr. Wingfield,† previous to his abjuration, published a translation of the Office of the Dead from the Roman Breviary, in the hope that it might be the means of "restoring among the members of our Church the Christian practise of prayer for the Faithful Departed, to the comfort of those holy souls, and the comfort and edification of us who remain in this 'vain and transitory world.'" Mr. Wingfield, in publishing this work, merely carried out the principle laid down in Tract 85, that though "Scripture be considered to be altogether *silent* as to the intermediate state, and to pass from the mention of death to that of the Judgment, there is nothing in this circumstance to disprove the Church's doctrine (if there be *other* grounds for it) that there *is* an intermediate state, and that it is important that in it, the souls of the faithful are purified and grow in grace, that they pray for us, and that our prayers benefit them;" and by Dr. Pusey, who, in his letter to the Bishop of Oxford, contends that these "prayers are not opposed to the doctrine of the Church. The Church of England has expressed no formal opinion in favor of prayers for the dead either in her Canon or Articles, but neither has she said anything against them. At the time of the Reformation they were universal, and nothing being said against a custom thus prevalent, and which could not have escaped

\* Sermons on the Subjects of the Day, by J. H. Newman.

† Appendix L.

notice, is tantamount to at least to a silent approval." Mr. Palmer, proceeding yet further than the Regius Professor of Hebrew, says, that "when the doctrine of Purgatory had been extirpated, the English Clergy restored the commemoration of Saints in the Liturgy, (viz., at the end of the prayer for the Church Militant) which had been omitted for many years from the said cautious and pious regard to the souls of her children.\*" But Dr. Sparrow makes no reference to this custom, though he quotes a beautiful passage from S. Jerome on the death of S. Fabiola—" *Quid sibi volunt istæ lampades tam splendide? nonne sunt athletas mortuos comitamur? quid etiam hymni? nonne ut Deum glorificamus quod jam coronavit discedentem, quod a laboribus liberavit, quod liberatum a timore apud se habet.*" But how "bright burning torches" could in any manner apply to a Church, which was only permitted by some of her Bishops to have unlit candles and candlesticks on the communion table, we know not, and leave it to the Editor of "*Sparrow's Rationale of Common Prayer*" to enlighten us. We shall find Mr. Bennett contending for "*Prayers for the Dead*," and defending its orthodoxy against the Bishop of London; and on the other hand, we will find some, who are now, thank God, members of His One Church, yielding to the Bishop of Ripon, inasmuch as obedience is especially necessary at the present crisis, for "obedience to the Church is obedience to God in the highest sense as to His appointment," and they have been rewarded with the light of Faith, for the Establishment was to them, at that period, the Church of God, and it was their duty to "*obey*" her, believing as they did, that when they left Her guidance they lost that security, for it is in this manner that our Church became to us the seat of "quietness and confidence."

\* Mr Isaac Williams complained, that this apparent exclusion of prayers for the Faithful departed, disunited us in some degree from the former communion of those departed saints, who are now with Christ as if deemed worthy to profess ourselves one with them.

“ I will be still,  
I will not stir, lest I forsake thy arm  
And break the charm.”

They were mindful of the words of S. Ignatius to the Magnesians—“ οὐτως μηδὲ ὑμεῖς ἀνευ τοῦ ἐπισκόπου μηδὲν πράσσετε—”, of that martyred Prelate, who bid the Ephesians “ συντρέχειν τῇ τοῦ ἐπισκόπου γνώμῃ ”

Mr. Faber published his reasons for becoming a Catholic—“ I left the Anglican Establishment for no reasons short of these—that I became convinced, with sufficient clearness to make acting upon it imperative, of what I now see clearly and undubitably by the light of Faith and the teaching of the Church, the Protestant Establishment is no Church at all, but a schismatical body in Heresy and without the grace of the Sacraments, whatever graces may be conferred with the celebration of the ordinances, according to the Faith of those who assist at them in invincible ignorance. If I believed your premiss, viz., that the Establishment is a branch of the Church, then I would grant your conclusion, that to try to convert you was wrong, or, to use simpler language, very absurd, *there being nothing to convert you to*, except a stricter life. If I am in error be it so, only that you must grant that, believing as I do, I cannot act otherwise than I do; I believe you to be in great danger of loosing your soul, can I do less than strain every nerve to call you out of that peril? I look back with trembling to my former position, can I do less than try to move you from it? I feel such a spiritual peace and happiness as I never knew before, can I do less than to try to make those I love participate therein? I feel deeply grateful to God for His mercy in rescuing me from the meshes of a false position, can I do less for Him than strive to co-operate with His grace in the conversion of others.”\*

The compiler of these Annals published the following letter, to *The Editor of the Church and State Gazette*, as

\* Faber's Grounds for remaining in the Anglican Communion.

embodying his reasons for seceding from the Establishment.

SIR,

Having so lately addressed several letters to you on the various apostacies to Protestant dissent, and also having been one of the Committee for the purpose of obtaining signatures to be appended to a Petition, about to be presented to Parliament in the ensuing session against the Clergy, (I use the term Clergy out of courtesy to those Laymen in England who are laboring under a delusion in imagining themselves to be in Holy Orders,) being compelled by certain late notorious decisions in the Ecclesiastical Court to bury persons (so called,) schismatically baptised, I feel it my duty to inform you of my having obtained admission into the Catholic Church. In the creeds I had been wont from a child to confess my belief in the One Holy Catholic and Apostolic Church—in vain did I while a member and (so called) minister of the Protestant Establishment look about me for unity—in vain did I look for those marks of life, of which the Venerable Dr. Pusey speaks in such high and exalted language—in vain did I look for the communion of saints!—but all things, both present and the prospect of futurity, combined to turn my thoughts towards Rome. Now did I begin to experience the truth of what the author of the "*Life of S. Wilfrid*" says—"To look Romeward is a Catholic instinct seemingly implanted in us for the safety of the Faith." But I was unwilling to trust to feeling, I examined and re-examined the subject. The more deeply I investigated the claims of the Establishment—the further I searched into Patristic evidence—the more I became convinced of the falsity of her claims to be a Branch of the Catholic Church, in fact that the "English Church" was nothing more or less than a gigantic impostor, became daily evident to me. At this critical juncture, while my mind was being tossed about with the various ideas—while I was being driven here and there searching for the "Fair Havens," my soul was providentially directed to Milner's "*End of Religious Controversy*." I believed, before this precious volume fell into my hands, that however

seemingly the "English Church" might have lost the outward marks of Catholicity, she retained her Orders. To this point I naturally turned my attention, and soon saw from the incontestable evidence brought forward by Milner, in his twenty-ninth letter, that, even allowing the validity and succession of Parker, still the form used was such that the words applied to the Bishops, might be used to a child; "Take the Holy Ghost, and remember that thou stir up the Grace of God which is in thee by the imposition of hands!" This form was pointed out as so objectionable by the Catholic Divines, Dr. Champney, Lewgar and others, that in 1662, Convocation altered the formula of ordaining Priests and consecrating Bishops. But (as Milner asserts) admitting that these alterations are sufficient to obviate all the objections of our Divines in the ordinal, *which they are not*, they came above one hundred years too late for their intended purpose, so that if the Priests and Bishops of Edward's and Elizabeth's reigns are invalidly ordained and consecrated, so must those of Charles II. and their successors also. Admitting that Parker, and his consecrators, Barlow and Scory, were validly consecrated, yet being out of the pale of S. Peter, the Church of England as established by law is out of the Catholic Church, "*Qui Ecclesiæ renititur et resistit, (says S. Cyprian) qui cathedram Petri, super quem fundata est ecclesia, deserit, in Ecclesia se esse confidit? Quisquam ab ecclesia segregatus, adulteræ jungitur, a promissis Ecclesiæ separatur. Alienus est, profanus est, hostis est.*" Apologising for the length of this communication, and sincerely praying, Sir, in the language of the pious writer of the life of S. Richard of Chichester, that the prayers of that saint (and I would fain add those of the Blessed Virgin) may avail for all those, who, in these times of perplexity, know not where to find rest for their souls, and bring them to the only haven, the Church Catholic, where peace is to be found in this wretched world.

I am, Sir, Your obedient Servant,

EDWARD G. K. BROWNE.

Curate of Bawdsey, Suffolk.

P.S.—Will you please to insert this letter as the production of Mr. (*not the Reverend*) Edward G. K. Browne.

In the ensuing number of the "*Church and State Gazette*," the following letter appeared from the Rev. W. H. Henslowe, P. C. of Tottenhill.

*To the Editor of the Church and State Gazette.*

SIR,

With concern and surprise I noticed in your columns the secession of the Rev. E. G. Browne, late Curate of Bawdsey, Suffolk, from the communion of the English Church to that of Rome—concern and surprise, not so much at the abstract fact, as from the active interest manifested by that gentleman in that Petition to the Legislature which he refers to in his letter to you, and which has been mooted as it has been founded on the atrocious prosecutions in the Arches Court of Canterbury of the Messrs. Escott, Chapman and myself. With Mr. Browne I have no personal acquaintance, and I can only wish him well, by no means wondering that any Clergyman should feel himself unsettled, and unsatisfied in a Communion professing so much purity, and perpetrating such abominations as appears in ours. If Rome illustrates the "false prophet," England adores the "beast,"—pleads for her own enthrallment to state Prelacy and Prelate law, and offers up in daily sacrifice her God to Mammon.

These things are "written with an iron pen." They are indelible, and yet they cannot last the lifetime of the present generation in their present state. In vain we bolster up our own "ideal" of our church with hopes and self-delusions. The Church establishment of England must reform itself or else go into perdition. My individual allegiance to the powers and laws which have revolted me, is forfeited by their blood guiltiness upon me; and as a moral duty, and as an English Clergyman and no seceder, I disclaim it, I disdain it. A Church without a synod—a clergy without brotherhood—playing the game of chance for crusts, committing simony before Christ, coveting preferment under

human favor, truckling (through fear of losing) to the *dicta* of their disputes, certainly, as Mr. Browne objects, these offer little of that unity, that Catholicity, that transcendental piety and charity, which was originally meant by Christendom, and though I grieve that Mr. Browne should leave our body, still I cannot condemn him for the part he has taken. If it were possible for me to worship any outward system, or to look to any man as "master," I should be more disposed to clan with Knox than side with Newman; but in the chaos of these times, minds which depend on others, does as he says, "instinctively" revert to Rome; and wheresoever they may turn, they cannot turn to any form of Antichrist more vividly asserted than that which tolerates and triumphs in such persecutions as the Messrs. Escott's, Chapman's, Seeley's, Harvey's, and your correspondent's—causes, good causes, which can never be impaired by any errors of the suffering parties consequent on the sufferings imposed; since, however faulty these might be, blame would attach commensurately to the originators and abettors of these wrongs, concerning whom it is divinely decreed, that "it were better for a millstone to be hanged about their necks and then plunged headlong into the sea."

Yours very faithfully,

W. H. HENSLOWE.

*Tottenhill, Downham, Norfolk,*  
27th Nov. 1845.

Dr. Pusey, alarmed lest others should "straggle over to Rome," published four letters in the "*English Churchman*." We shall merely state that in the first letter he refers to the discussion on the Stone Altar case, and in the second and third to the sentence passed on Mr. Oakeley.

We must not omit the fourth and most remarkable letter written by Dr. Pusey, respecting the secession of Mr. Newman, and while calling our readers' attention to it, exclaim with the lamented Daniel French—

“Thou wast not wont, so Sixtus Lawrence cried,  
 Apart from me Heaven’s food to give,  
 And will not thou, by long loved Newman’s side,  
 Participate that food and live.

Say wilt thou still, with sons of jarring strife  
 The shadows and the types receive,  
 Or taste the fount that gives eternal life  
 To those that with him firm faith believe.”

“MY DEAR FRIEND,

Truly ‘His way is in the sea, and His paths in the great waters, and is footsteps are not known.’ At such moments it seems almost best to ‘keep silence, yea, even from good words.’ It is an exceeding mystery that such confidence as he had once in our church, should have gone. Even amid our present sorrows, it goes to the heart to look at that former self, and think how devotedly he did work for our church; how he strove to build her up. It looks as if some good purposes for our church had failed; and that an instrument raised for her had not been employed as God willed, and so is withdrawn. There is a jar somewhere. One cannot trust oneself to think, whether his keen sensitiveness to ill was not fitted for these troubled times. What, to such dulled minds as my own, seemed as a matter of course, as something of necessity to be gone through and endured, was to his, as you know, ‘like the piercings of a sword.’ You know how it seemed to shoot through his whole self. But this is with God; our business is with ourselves. The first pang came to me years ago, when I had no other fear, but heard that he was prayed for by name in so many churches and Religious Houses on the Continent. The fear was suggested to me, ‘If they pray so earnestly for this object, that he may be won to be an instrument of God’s glory among them, while, among us, there is so much indifference and in part dislike; may it not be that their prayers may be heard, that God will give them whom they pray for—we forfeit whom we desire not to retain. And now, must they not think that their prayers, which they have offered so long—at times I think night and day, or at the Holy Eucharist—have been heard? and may we not have forfeited him, because there was comparatively so little love and prayer? And so

now then, in this critical state of our church, the most perilous crisis through which it has ever passed, must not our first lesson be increase of prayer? I may now say that one set of those 'prayers for unity and guidance into the truth,' circulated some years past, came from him. Had they, or such prayers, been used more constantly, should we be as we are now? Would all this confusion and distress have come upon us?

Yet since God is with us still, He can bring us even through this loss. We ought not indeed, to disguise the greatness of it. It is the intensest loss we could have had. They who have won him, know his value. It may be a comfort to us that they do. In my deepest sorrow, at the distant anticipation of our loss, I was told of the saying of one of our most eminent historians, who owned that they were entirely unequal to meet the evils with which they were beset, that nothing could meet them but some movement which should infuse new life into their church, and that for this he looked to one man, and that one was N. I cannot say what a ray of comfort this speech darted into my mind. It made me at once realize more, both that what I had dreaded might be, and its end. With us he was laid aside. Engaged in great works, especially with that bulwark against Heresy and misbelief, S. Athanasius, he was yet scarcely doing more for us than he could, if he were not with us. Our church has not known how to employ him. And since this was so, it seemed as if a sharp sword were lying in its scabbard, or hung up in the sanctuary, because there was no one to wield it. Here was one, marked out as a great instrument of God, fitted through his whole training, of which through a friendship of twenty-two years, I have seen at least some glimpses, to carry out some great design for the restoration of the Church, and now after he had begun that work among ourselves in retirement—his work taken out of his hands, and not directly acting upon our church. I do not mean of course that he felt this or that it influenced him. I speak of it only as a fact. He is gone, unconscious (as all great instruments of God are) what he himself is. He has gone as a simple act of duty, with no view for himself, placing himself entirely in God's hands. And such are they whom God employs. He seems then to me not so much gone from us as transplanted into another part of the Vineyard, where the full energies of his powerful mind can be employed, which here they

were not. And who knows what, in the mysterious purpose of God's good Providence, may be the effect of such a person among them : you too have felt that it is what is unholy on both sides which keeps us apart. It is not what is true in the Roman system, against which the strong feeling of ordinary religious persons among us is directed, but against what is unholy in her practice. It is not anything in our church which keeps Rome from acknowledging us, but Heresy existing more or less within us. As each, by God's grace, grows in holiness, the Churches will recognise more and more the presence of God's Holy Spirit in the other ; and what now hinders the union of the Western Church will fall off. As the contest with unbelief increases, the Churches, which have received and transmitted the substance of the faith as deposited in our common creeds, must be on the same side. If one member suffers, the other members suffer with it ; and so, in the increasing health of one, others too will benefit. It is not as we would have had it, but God's will be done. He brings about his own ends, as, in His sovereign wisdom, He sees to be the best. One can see great ends to be brought about by this present sorrow, and the more so, because he, the chosen instrument of them, sees them not for himself. It is perhaps the greatest event which has happened, since the communion of the churches has been interrupted, that such an one, so formed in our Church, and the work of God's Spirit as dwelling within her, should be transplanted to theirs. If anything could open their eyes to what is good in us, or soften in us any wrong prejudices against them, one should think it would be the presence of such an one nurtured and grown to such ripeness in our church, and now removed to theirs. If we have, by our misdeeds (personal or other), 'sold our brother,' God, we may trust, willeth thereby to 'preserve life.'

It is, of course, a heavy thing for us who remain, heavy to us individually, in proportion as any of us may have reason to fear, lest by what has been amiss in oneself, one has contributed to bring down this heavy chastisement upon our church. But while we go on humbled, and the humbler, surely neither need we be dejected. God's chastisements are in mercy too. You, too, will have seen within these last few years, God's work with the souls in our Church. For myself, I am even now far more hopeful as to our Church, than at any former period—far more

than when outwardly, things seemed most prosperous. It would seem as if God, in His mercy, let us now see more of His inward workings, in order that in the tokens of His presence with us we may take courage. He has not forsaken us, who in fruits of holiness, in supernatural workings of His grace, in the deepening of devotion, in the awakening of consciences, in His own manifest acknowledgement of the 'Power of the keys,' as vested in our Church, shows Himself more than ever present with us. These are not simply individual workings. They are wide-spread, too manifold. It is not to immediate results that we ought to look; 'the times are in His hands;' but this one cannot doubt, that that good hand of our God, which has been over us in the manifold trials of the last three centuries, checking, withholding, guiding, chastening, leading, and now so wonderfully extending us, is with us still. It is not thus that He ever purposed to leave a Church. Gifts of grace are His own blessed Presence. He does not vouchsafe his Presence in order to withdraw it. In nature some strong rallying of life sometimes precedes its extinction; it is not so in Grace. Gifts of grace are His love and 'whom He loveth, He loveth unto the end.' The growth of life in our Church has not been in the mere stirring of individuals. If any one thing has impressed itself upon me during these last ten years, or looking back to the orderings of His Providence for a yet longer period, it has been, that the work which he has been carrying on, is not with individuals, but with the Church as a whole. The life has sprang up in our Church, and through it. Thoughtful persons in churches abroad have been amazed and impressed with this. It was not through their agency nor through their writings, but through God's Holy Spirit dwelling in our Church, vouchsafed through His Ordinances, teaching us to value them more deeply, to seek them more habitually, to draw fresh life from them, that this life has sprung up, enlarged, deepened. And now, as you too know, that life shows itself in deeper forms, in more marked drawings of souls, in more diligent care to conform itself to its Divine Pattern, and to purify itself by God's grace, from all which is displeasing to Him, than ever heretofore. Never was it so with anybody whom He purposed to leave. And so amid whatever mysterious dispensations of His Providence, we may surely commit ourselves and our work in good hope to Him who bath

loved us hitherto. He who loved us amid negligence, so as to give us the earnest desire to please Him, will surely not forsake us now. He has given us that desire, and we, amid whatever infirmities individually or remaining defects as a body, do still more earnestly desire His glory.

May He ever comfort and strengthen you.

Ever your very affectionate friend,

E. B. PUSEY."

As a balm to the troubled mind of the members of the Oxford School, as a compensation for the irreparable loss sustained by them in the secession of Messrs. Newman, Faber, Ward, and Oakley, in addition to Dr. Pusey's letters to the "*English Churchman*," in which he bid his friends take courage notwithstanding their great loss, the church of S. Saviour's, Leeds, was opened this year; "its express purpose (as its unknown founder (a penitent) had embraced that system of Catholic truth, or, as he believed it, the full system of the Church of England, commonly called Tractarianism,) was to give a practical solution to questions of inexpressible interest;" but even in a matter of this nature, where unity and harmony would be supposed to exist, (though division is the essence of Church of Englandism,) an objection was raised *in limine* by the Bishop of Ripon. Over the West door internally, runs the Legend,

"*We who enter this holy place pray for the sinner who built it.*"

This gave great offence (most unfortunately) to the Bishop. On the evening preceding the consecration, he objected to proceeding to consecration, till it was removed. He was told that the church had been built upon the one condition of its being there. The reason of the objection was, that the founder must die, and so prayer might be said for him by some person after his death, and the Bishop could not think it right to pray for the dead. He was told that the founder was living, and he assented to consecrate the church, because it would have been a breach of faith not to do so, when he had assented to this inscription. Subsequently, on reverting

to the subject, he was informed that if the founder should die, while his Lordship was still Bishop of Ripon, he should be informed of it. Another difficulty, at the same period, was the Sacramental plate. The vessels in question consist of two large chalices, with two patens and two cruets of silver gilt enriched with jewels. The two chalices were encrusted on the stem, top, and foot, with hearts, in diamonds, rubies, emeralds and enamels. They were the gift of a young lady, Miss Lucy Bouverie Pusey, (who deceased when not yet fifteen) her brother and sister. The jewels were given by her relations and friends. The vessels were finished accordingly, and on them a legend, inscribed

“Propitius esta, Domine, Lucia Maria, &c.

(the giver,) including also her brother, sister, and those who had adorned them with their jewels. The design had been brought to her as she lay dying, and the sight of the Cross had comforted her. The last earthly subject which had given her pleasure was “the Cross which she had ever loved; to point to it when she could scarcely speak, was the last use of her emaciated finger. On this account the Bishop’s wish was the harder to obey; the trial, however, was accomplished, and the legend altered.”

While on the subject of S. Saviour’s, Leeds, we must not omit to lay before our readers the inscription on the Foundation Stone.

THE FIRST STONE  
OF HOLY CROSS CHURCH  
IN THE PARISH OF LEEDS, AND COUNTY OF YORK,  
WAS LAID  
UNDER THE ALTAR,  
IN THE NAME OF A PENITENT,  
TO THE PRAISE OF THE REDEEMER,  
ON HOLY CROSS DAY,  
A.D. 1812.

“ God forbid that I should glory save in the Cross of our Lord Jesus Christ, whereby the world is crucified unto me, and I unto the world.”

“ O Saviour of the world, who by Thy Cross and Precious Blood hast redeemed us, save us and help us ;

“ We humbly beseech thee, O Lord.

|                                    |                            |
|------------------------------------|----------------------------|
| “ By Thine agony and bloody sweat, | } “ Good Lord, deliver us. |
| “ By Thy cross and passion,        |                            |
| “ In the hour of death,            |                            |
| “ In the day of judgment,          |                            |

Lord, remember me when thou comest in thy kingdom.”

WALTER FARQUHAR HOOK, D.D., Vicar of Leeds.

JOHN MAC DUFF DERRICK, of Oxford, Architect.

JOHN NEWLAND MILLS, of Headingley, Builder.

We must not here omit recording the formation of a Society called into action by the proceedings of the School whose annals we are chronicling. It was called a SOCIETY FOR THE MAINTENANCE OF SCRIPTURAL PRINCIPLES, ESPECIALLY IN OPPOSITION TO “ ANGLO-CATHOLIC ” ERRORS, but denominated by the Puseyites “ *the Church of man established to supply the deficiencies of the Church of God.* ” The principles and rules were as follows :—

“ 1. Every Christian is bound to examine and ascertain the meaning of the Word of God for himself in the use of all the aids within his reach, and receive no doctrine as the doctrine of Scripture unless he sees it to be declared therein, otherwise he may receive errors as truth upon a fallible authority, against the plain testimony of the Word of God.

“ 2. Believers are justified by the righteousness of Christ imputed to them, not by any inherent righteousness imparted to them, by the Spirit ; and they are, from first to last, justified by faith alone without works, but as ‘ good works do spring out necessarily of a true and lively faith ’ (Arts xii.), the faith which justifies is a faith which ‘ worketh by love.’

“ 3. Ungodly persons have neither been born again of the Spirit nor justified, although they were baptized in infancy, but

remain in an unpardoned state, exposed to the wrath of God, and, unless they be born again of the Spirit and obtain saving faith in Christ, they must perish.

“4. There is no Scriptural authority for affirming that our Lord is present with His people at the Lord’s Supper in any other manner than that in which He is present with them whenever they meet together in His Name (Matthew xviii. 20); and His Body and Blood are verily and indeed taken and received by them at that ordinance by faith, just as they are verily and indeed taken and received by them whenever they exercise Faith in His atoning Sacrifice; so that the imagination of any bodily presence, or of any other presence, effected by the consecration of the elements, is unscriptural and erroneous.

“5. The Ministers of Christ are termed in Scripture Presbyters, Bishops, Shepherds, Stewards, &c., but are never distinctly termed Priests (*ἱερεῖς*) and the notion of any sacrifice, offered in the Lord’s Supper, by the minister as a Priest, distinct from the sacrifice of praise and devotedness offered by every true worshipper, is unscriptural and erroneous.

“6. There is no Scriptural authority for asserting that these only are rightly ordained, or are to be esteemed true members of Christ, who have received episcopal ordination.

“7. The true apostolical succession is the succession of faithful ministers in the Churches of Christ, who have preached the doctrine of the Apostles and have ministered in their spirit.

#### “ RULES OF THE SOCIETY.

“1. This Society shall be designated ‘The Society for the maintenance of Scriptural Principles, especially in opposition to Anglo-Catholic errors.

“2. The object of the Society shall be to promote the reading, and the examination of the Word of God, and especially to maintain the truths contained in its declaration, by the delivery of lectures, by the publication and distribution of tracts, by the formation of associations for the reading of the Scriptures and for prayer, and by any other suitable means.

“3. All persons who express their assent to the declaration, shall be considered members of the Society if they so desire.

“4. Every member of the Society who shall subscribe 10s. annually, shall be entitled to vote at the general meeting of the Society.

“5. A donation of £5 shall give the same privilege for life.

“6. The affairs of the Society shall be directed by a Committee, Treasurer, Secretary, and, if requisite, by a President and other officers, all being members of the Established Church.

“7. The Committee shall be chosen annually at a general meeting of the Society.

“8. All the meetings of the Society and of the Committee shall be opened with prayer.

“Subscriptions and donations in aid of the Society’s plans and operations will be thankfully received by the Treasurer at the Banking House of Messrs. Barclay, Evans and Co., 54, Lombard Street, by the Honorary Secretaries, 53, Woburn Place, Russell Square, by any members of the Committee, or at the Office of the Record.”

If not to this Society, at least to some of its members, we are indebted for the following circular—which, though not absolutely connected with the Tractarian Movement, may yet be regarded as a sign of the times:—

*“London, February 15th, 1844.*

“SIR,

It is an undeniable fact that a considerable body of the Clergy are becoming more and more dissatisfied with the Baptismal Service, especially when they see how it has been perverted by the Tractarians.

Some parts of this Service, as well as of the Catechism, have given a sort of legitimacy to one of the most dangerous errors which have ever agitated the Church of Christ. The doctrine of Baptismal Regeneration is believed and taught by a vast majority of the Clergy at the present time, without the least check or restraint from the Bishops. Nay, it is to be feared that nearly all our Prelates are infected with the same heresy. For some years past, an attempt has been made to revive the delusions and superstitions of the Papacy, while the active agents in this work are still permitted to retain their emoluments and preferments undisturbed.

The worldly character of the National Establishment (the necessary effect of its connexion with the State), has long been a

cause of grief to her most pious and conscientious Members, who have mourned in secret over the withered and desolate condition of the Lord's Vineyard. It need scarcely be added, that the strifes, divisions, and heresies, which prevail, and which are spreading more widely than ever, have made our Established Church a by-word to the whole of Christendom. What then is to be done, in order to remedy these enormous evils? The conviction is daily gaining ground, that nothing but a revised Liturgy, and the formation of a distinct Protestant Episcopal Church, can meet the exigency of the case, or secure for us the blessing of that God who is the 'Author of peace, and the lover of concord.' It is proposed, therefore, as a preliminary measure, that a Committee be formed, consisting of Clergymen and Laymen, with a view to promote friendly discussion on the subject, and to consider what may be the best means for carrying the scheme into effect. If you approve of the object, I shall have much pleasure in adding your name to the list of Gentlemen who have already given in their adhesion. As to the revision of the Liturgy, I beg to state that it is intended to remodel it *somewhat* on the plan proposed by the Rev. John Riland, in a work entitled, 'An Attempt towards an Analysis, &c. of the Book of Common Prayer, published by Hamilton & Co.

I remain, &c., &c."

---

1846.

---

The converts for this year were—

- Rev. H. M. Walker.
- Rev. J. Spencer Northcote, Curate of Teignmouth.
- Rev. J. Brande Morris, Fellow of Exeter College, Oxford.
- Rev. H. Formby, Rector of Ruardean.
- Rev. G. Burder, Curate of Ruardean.
- Rev. W. Wells, Curate of S. Martin's, Liverpool.
- Rev. W. J. Lloyd, Curate of Kevidiog.
- Rev. E. Healy Thompson, Curate of S. James, Westminster.
- Rev. J. Julius Plumer.
- Rev. E. Burton, D.D., Chaplain at Kilmainham Hospital, Dublin.
- Rev. G. D. Ryder, Rector of Easton, Hants.
- Rev. David Lewis, Fellow of Jesus College, Oxford.

- Rev. H. J. Milner, Rector of Penrith, Cumberland.  
 Rev. J. Wenham, Galle, Ceylon.  
 Rev. J. P. Simpson, Curate of Langton, Yorkshire.  
 Rev. J. Rodwell, Rector of S. Ethelburga, London.  
 Rev. H. Laing, Curate of Tewkesbury.  
 Rev. N. A. Hewitt. }  
 Rev. S. A. Mayor. } America.  
 Rev. L. Calvinzel. }  
 Rev. E. Rushton. }  
 Rev. H. Lauriston. }  
 J. M. Chanter, Esq.  
 H. Mill, Esq., Trinity College, Cambridge.  
 J. B. Walford, Esq., Barrister.  
 H. Bacchus, Esq., Corpus Christi College, Cambridge.  
 H. Foley, Esq., Barrister.  
 J. Chisholm Anstey, Esq., M.P.  
 W. Duke, Esq., M.D., Hastings.  
 R. Monteith, Esq.  
 J. R. Judge, Esq.  
 F. A. Paley, Esq., S. John's College, Cambridge.  
 J. Morris, Esq., S. John's College, Cambridge.  
 Captain Gooch, R.N  
 Edward Fullarton, Esq.  
 Lady Georgiana Fullarton.  
 Mrs. Glenie, (R.I.P.)  
 Mrs. Monteith.  
 Mrs. Major Browne. (R.I.P.)  
 Mrs. Bonsall.  
 Mrs. Ryder. (R.I.P.)  
 Mrs. Lockhart.  
 Miss D'Eyncourt.  
 Miss Sewell.  
 Miss O'Brien.  
 Miss Agnew.  
 Miss Gooch.  
 Miss Bridges.  
 Miss Duke.  
 Miss Harris. (R.I.P.)\*

\* Miss Harris (the writer of "*From Oxford to Rome*," "*Rest in the Church*" and "*Via Dolorosa*,") died in the bosom of the Church, and we hope our readers will pray for the repose of her soul.

Hon. Mrs. Heneage.

Miss Heneage.

Mrs. Hatton.

Miss Munro.

Miss Ruscombe Poole.

H. Pownall, Esq.

J. Ruscombe Poole, Esq.

J. B. Rowe, Esq., S. John's College, Cambridge.

Captain Granville Wood, R. N. (R.I.P.)

Mrs. Duke.

Mr. John Morris' secession from the ranks of Anglicanism, caused some slight sensation, and ultimately led to the submission of his tutor, Mr. Paley.

To the pen of Mr. J. Brande Morris, we are indebted for a work on the Incarnation of our Lord and the *cultus* of the Blessed Virgin. Mr. Morris thus explains the position, that "the ascription of the power of Mary as Mistress and Servant of the Creator, Her Son, follows from an honest belief that she is Mother of God"—"You may think it is as absurd as you please for Him to become a woman's Son at all, but you cannot deny that if He did, the Church draws a natural conclusion from an absurd hypothesis.

"All we contend for is, that the foolishness of God is wiser than man in other instances, so in this. If God was not in an unconscious half-brute state as we are, through the fall, He knew Mary's wishes, and was bound to obey them. It is enough for God to have died on the cross, and we need not beset Him in the womb with a loathsome and unnecessary ignorance."\*

"If, then, he is asked (writes Mr. Edward Healy Thompson,) to state in a few words upon what grounds he leaves the Anglican Establishment to enter the Catholic Church, he answers, that he does so under the very deepest conviction, both moral and intellectual, that no where but in that communion can he profess the terms of the Creed in their original and orthodox sense. So long as he is an

\* Jesus the Son of Mary. By J. B. Morris.

Anglican, he believes not only that his creed is defective, but that he is positively unsound in the faith that he professes. He says he believes in the 'One Holy, Catholic and Apostolic Church,' but is obliged by his position so to define it as to make it indeed not *one*, but many—he says it is *holy*, but defines it to be in parts corrupt in doctrine, if not heretical in faith—he says it is *Catholic*, but defines it to be not diffused everywhere and everywhere one, but local, particular, sectional and national—he says it is *Apostolic*, but maintains it to be removable from the sure foundation Christ, laid in S. Peter, the chief of the Apostles—he calls it *the Church*, but denies its individuality and identity. He goes, therefore, where he can believe with his heart and confess with his mouth One, Holy, Catholic, and Apostolic Church. He goes where there is a faith to hold, and an authority to reverence, where it is possible to hear Christ in His Church, and to receive Him in His Ministers, and obey Him in His Prelates. He goes to unite himself to the one body, the Church of his baptism, in which alone salvation is certain—where are the Cleansing Waters, and the True Anointing, and the Living Bread, and the Adorable Sacrifice—where is not only Public Prayer, miscalled Common, with a congregation for an audience, but Divine worship, whose object is the Sacred and Eternal Trinity, and in which the Blessed in Heaven and the Holy Angels communicate with and intercede for the Church still militant on earth, and the souls of the just departed—where, therefore, the Communion of Saints is not only confessed in terms, but realized in acts—where the intercession of Christ is no vague abstract doctrine, but a blessed reality, as actual a work as that which He finished on the Cross—where the humble and the penitent may undoubtedly obtain the forgiveness of their sins, and Resurrection from the dead to life everlasting.”\*

What a miserable picture does Mr. Wrey, in his Address,

\* Remarks on Anglican Unity, by E. H. Thompson.

on his curate's (Mr. Wells) secession, draw from the Establishment! He says that the deviations from the doctrine, discipline, and ceremonial of the Church have at length arrived at such a height, that "*men of a reverential tone of mind* are actually driven from us by the keen disgust they feel at our miserable inconsistencies"—that "*the fundamental doctrines of the Gospel are denied*"—that "*it is to be feared that THERE IS VERY LITTLE REAL WORSHIP IN OUR CHURCHES*"—that "*it is to the doctrines of the Church, the fundamental and clearly defined doctrine of the Church, that numbers who minister at her Altars, are violently and schismatically opposed.* This is the festering cancer which is gnawing at the Church's vitals—this is the damning plague-spot which scares away from her thoughtful men, who would cheerfully shed their blood in her cause, *if she were only true to herself.* BUT SHE IS NOT TRUE TO HERSELF. HERESY OF THE MOST FEARFUL KIND IS OPENLY TAUGHT IN OUR PULPITS, AND THIS UNREBUKED BY AUTHORITY. Holy doctrines of the Gospel, such as the Apostolic descent of the clergy, Baptismal Regeneration, and the Real participation of Christ in the Eucharist, are not only denied but blasphemously denounced as 'soul deluding,' and thus the entire scheme of the Church's teaching is contravened. This is unhappily too notorious to need proof."

Such is the picture drawn by Mr. Cecil Wrey in his address to the congregation of S. Martin's, Liverpool, on the secession of Mr. Wells, whom he calls "an earnest minded deserter," and of whom he thus expresses himself—"He often expressed to me in grief and much perplexity, his difficulty in retaining his confidence in a Church, which was unable to maintain *any authority as a consistent dogmatic teacher, which proved herself equally powerless to suppress Heresy, and to determine truth: which durst not fix the sense of her own forms of faith; which permitted her clergy to fraternize with Dissenters, and every principle of discipline to be trampled upon; her Bishops to be insulted; her excommunications to be laughed to scorn; and*

her *theory* of Catholic sympathy with other branches *to be proved an empty conceit.*"\*

Nor can we omit in our annals of Tractarianism a correspondence between a lady, a relative of ours and a convert of this year, and the Rev. S. Symons, Rector of Philleigh, and late Anglican Chaplain at S. Servan. Mr. Symons having been informed that our relative and her mother purposed following our footsteps, penned (having in vain endeavoured to preach against them) the following letter:—

"My Dear Madam,—Herewith I send you some books I have just received from England, and beg that you will do me the favor to read them carefully, as I am sure that they will prove to you that *Protestantism is the old Religion*, the religion of the Bible, of Christ, of the first Christian ages. *Poperly is the new Religion*. I defy the Romanists to contradict the following dates:—

|                                                                                             | A.D. |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------|
| Invocation of Saints .. .. .                                                                | 800  |
| Image worship .. .. .                                                                       | 887  |
| Infallibility .. .. .                                                                       | 1076 |
| Transubstantiation .. .. .                                                                  | 1215 |
| Supremacy .. .. .                                                                           | 1215 |
| Holy Communion (under one kind) .. .. .                                                     | 1415 |
| Purgatory .. .. .                                                                           | 1438 |
| The Seven Sacraments .. .. .                                                                | 1547 |
| Priestly Intention .. .. .                                                                  | 1547 |
| Apocryphal Books .. .. .                                                                    | 1547 |
| Venial Sins .. .. .                                                                         | 1563 |
| Sacrifice of the Mass .. .. .                                                               | 1563 |
| Indulgences introduced in the Fifteenth Century, but not sanctioned by a Council till 1563. |      |

"With many earnest prayers to Almighty God that He will keep you and yours from error and guide you to all truth,

" I remain,

" My Dear Madam,

" Yours faithfully,

S. Servan,  
Feb. 15th, 1846.

SAML. SYMONS.

\* Wrey's *Scandal of Permitted Heresy and a Violated Discipline.*

“ Dear Sir—I received the books you sent, and beg to return you my sincere thanks for the kind interest you take in my welfare. I trust you will not think that I am taking too great a liberty, or be angry with me for sending you the accompanying book, which you will oblige me by reading *with care*. I must say I have too high an opinion of you to think that you have read the ‘ *Gospel Lever*,’ or that you agree with the dreadful doctrine contained in it. You well know that *at one time* shortly after my brother’s secession, none could have been more bitter against the Catholics than I, but I now find that I was mistaken in my opinion concerning them. If you speak to twenty or more Catholics, you will find that they ALL AGREE AND BELIEVE THE SAME DOCTRINE; but among Protestants NOT THREE WILL DO SO, neither can they answer Catholic arguments, but by some evasion elude the force of them, and whenever they are at a loss, their whole business is to get out of the question as well as they can, and to leap directly into some other point of controversy, and it is next to impossible to keep them to the same point. The followers of the new religion interpret Holy Scripture as the freak takes them, and even those of the same stamp clash against one another in articles of belief; they cannot then be the *one* church. I shall have much pleasure in returning you the books you lent me in a few days. It is my earnest wish and sincere prayer to the Lord that you will be able to see things in their *proper light*, and not judge them, as I am sure you *now* do, by *prejudice*. Trusting you are, with Mrs. Symons, quite well,

“ I am,

“ Dear Sir,

“ Ever Yours truly,

“ ELLEN L. BONSALE.

*S. Servan,*  
Feb. 16th, 1846.”

“ Dear Madam—I have to apologize for keeping Mrs. Ryan’s ‘ *Golden Treatise*’ so long; I have read it carefully, and consider it one of the best works I have ever met with, to prove that the *Roman Catholic* is not the church of Christ. It does not say one word of the errors of which I sent you a list, and which

were clearly unknown in the year 434. This takes from the antiquity of the Romish Creed. In page 169, Queen Elizabeth is called a *SHE POPE!* the church of England is merely so far on a par with the church of Rome, for she had her '*SHE POPE,*' which was not discovered till *Her Holiness* was seized with the pains of labor, whilst walking in one of (I may say) your *pagan* processions. It is a well known and undisputed fact, that since that time a peculiar sort of chair has been used at the consecration of the Popes, in order that similar imposition might be avoided. About the year 1300 there were several Popes at one time; one was at Rome, another at Avignon, and they all issued their Bulls, and opposed each other in various matters; will you oblige me by asking some of your Roman Catholic friends which of these was the infallible Pope. In reply to your note I beg to assure you, that I have read the '*Gospel Lever*' more than once, and hope to read it again; if I did not agree with what you and your unfortunate brother are pleased to call the '*dreadful doctrine*' contained in it, I should not have requested you to peruse it. I have just read in this day's '*Times,*' that fifty Roman Catholics were admitted into our Protestant Apostolic Church the first Sunday in March, at the very place where Mr. Nangle is stationed (Achill). Although several persons, from *worldly motives,* have left the Church of Christ in England, I rejoice to see that in France, and that *hot-bed of Popery* (Ireland), Protestantism is rapidly gaining ground. Whatever your motives may be, I hope that you will yet draw back from the certain perdition awaiting all those who place their trust in man for the pardon of their sins, and are not satisfied with the advocacy of the *ONE* Mediator between God and man, the *MAN CHRIST JESUS,* but must pray to all the saints in the kalendar to intercede for them, thereby making beings canonized by a single man, equal, if not superior, to our great Advocate with the Father. You must allow that the Saints are omniscient and omnipresent, attributes which belong to God alone; and if you suppose that that they can hear your prayers, read Revelations xxiii. 89. If the Romanists were allowed to read the Bible they would soon discover that the Priests (I hope from ignorance) are their greatest enemies and deceivers. The poor unenlightened Romanist is bound to believe his Priest, though he were to tell him that the stars in the firmament are holes made

on purpose for the Saints to peep through, to discover what is going on upon earth. Do let me entreat to consider the souls of your children, even if you are determined to join an idolatrous Church.

“ I remain,

“ Dear Madam,

“ Yours faithfully,

“ S. SYMONS.”

*S. Servan,*

11th April, 1846.

Mr. Henslowe, (whose letter to the ‘*Church and State Gazette*’ referring to our secession, may be seen in p. 118) published the following solemn Protest, to which we beg to call our reader’s attention:—

“A SOLEMN PROTEST  
AGAINST THE  
PRELATE CLERGY,  
OF THE  
CHURCH OF ENGLAND.

---

“ O Lord our God, *other* Lords besides Thee have had dominion over us :” —ISAIAH XXVI, 13.

---

(COPY.)

To Her most Gracious Majesty the Queen, this solemn protest and denunciation in the sight of God and of our common Country, sheweth—

I. That Jesus Christ on no occasion instituted such an order as the prelate clergy or the bench of bishops, now endured within this realm of England—made none of his apostles “lords” or despots of the rest—but utterly forbade such absolute authority and power to destroy one another as is usurped at this time by the prelate clergy over other clergymen in England.

II. That as chief magistrate of England, and a member of the church, your Majesty is vested with peculiar powers and duties for that church's welfare, and for the welfare of its clergy, the parochial pastors, no less than for the common welfare of the realm; and that, accordingly, it lies within your Majesty's responsibility to summon all the church in convocation, when and as you summon all the state in Parliament for council.

III. That, notwithstanding such provision for good government in church as well as state, the "Sacred Synod" of the Church of England is at no time summoned to debate on church necessities, abuses, and reforms: but that the prelates only meet in parliament and legislate in church affairs without the "Commons'-Clergy" or the "nether house of convocation."

IV. That these said prelates do not represent the clergy in the parliament, and are not chosen by them even as their presidents or prelates; but are selected by some minister of state to rule, to recompense, or ruin other clergymen, without responsibility, or check, or any earthly guide, but that of their own arbitrary will.

V. That clergymen accordingly have no security against the overwhelming weight of wealth, and privilege, and power bestowed on prelates; and as a consequence, become too commonly, too palpably, degraded into moral serfs, "men-pleasers," and time-servers in the stead of being elevated to that high and holy standard proper to the ministers of God.

VI. That clergymen are thus inequitably and irrationally dealt with both by church and state: some having no assured provision whatsoever during their whole lifetime; some having such inadequate provision only as lay impropriation or episcopal appropriation may have left; and all permitted, tempted, or else obligated either to solicit or make merchandise of church endowments.

VII. That the subscribed, or underwritten, clergyman has been so dealt with by certain lord bishops, and has had such experience of injustice and oppression in the church (so called,) and has been so beleaguered with intrigues and injuries, so public and notorious on the part of those whose duty called upon

them rather to protect him, as to feel equally deprived of needful ardour in his holy calling, and of all sense of duty and affection to "lord bishops," who betray alike the cause of God and of the church, and both the duties and the rights of English clergymen.

VIII. That the subscribed, or underwritten, clergyman (whose grievances, *by no means singular*, are registered before the public and the Primate, and in the so-called Arches Court of Canterbury) accordingly and solemnly, and to your Majesty, and in the presence of the nation and Almighty God, protests against the prelate clergy, the "lord bishops" of this realm, as he has been required also to protest against the Pope of Rome, who neither hath, nor "ought to have, such jurisdiction, power, superiority, pre-eminence, or authority, ecclesiastical or spiritual, within the same."

IX. That the subscribed, or underwritten, clergyman has many grounds and reasons to be true and faithful to your Majesty, and to your royal house; and cannot better prove his loyalty than by denouncing solemnly this public wrong; and that the grace and goodness of Almighty God may govern all your councils to promote His glory, and His people's and your own, he will not cease to pray.

(Signed)

WILLIAM-HENRY HENSLOWE,

P. Curate, Wormegay and Tottenhill, Norfolk.

June 18, 1846.

---

[*The foregoing document was forwarded in manuscript, together with the ensuing letter, to the Lord High Chancellor of England. It was also first published in "the Railway Bell and Family Newspaper, of Saturday 27th June, 1846: 335, Strand, London:" and subsequently, in "the Church of England Journal, of Wednesday, 5th August, 1846: Duke Street, Douglas, Isle of Man."*]

---

"Tottenhill, Downham, Norfolk, July 24, 1846.

"My Lord Chancellor,—You have already earned the gratitude of all the commons' clergy, by throwing out, or putting

on? THE BILL for the CORRECTION OF CLERKS—projected (it appears) by the Lord Bishop of London, and unanimously approved of by the whole bench of bishops, (*Ecclesiastical Gazette*, 14 July, 1846, page 9.)

The commons' clergy of the Church of England, are (*like the common soldiery of England's army*,)\* in a very "evil case" (Exodus, v. 19;) and, *from the moral treatment they receive*, can never reach *the moral standard they profess*.

As one of those experienced in this treatment, I adjure your Lordship to protect the commons' clergy from the legislation of the prelates; and to present, on my part as a clergyman of christian England, to her most gracious Majesty, my individual PROTEST herewith sent, in this behalf.

I have the honour to remain, my Lord Chancellor, your Lordship's very faithful and humble servant,

W. H. HENSLOWE,

P. Curate, Wormegay and Tottenhill, Norfolk.

To the Right Hon. the Lord Cottenham,  
Copse Hill, Wimbledon, Surrey.

BY THE SAME AUTHOR.

---

I. FACTS AND TRACTS, in evidence of the Apathy, Dereliction, and Degredation of the National Clergy—W. E. Painter, 342, Strand, London. 1844—1845.

---

"It is a miserable consideration, but so is the *fact*, Mr. Henslowe was prosecuted by his Bishop, for doing an act of positive duty!" ENGLISH CHURCHMAN, June 12, 1845, p. 380; *also* July 24, 1845, p. 473; *also* CHURCH AND STATE GAZETTE, May 30, 1845, p. 340, &c.

---

"Sittest thou to judge me after the law, and commandest me to be smitten contrary to the law."—PAUL, *Acts* xxiii. 3.

\* This refers to a recent case of a soldier's death, after "flogging," at Hounslow Barracks.

Mr. M'Mullen, whose degree of B.D. had been refused him by Dr. Hampden, owing to his extreme Romanizing views, to the danger of losing his fellowship, was as Vicar of S. Saviour's, Leeds, inhibited by the Bishop of Ripon from all further Priestly duty in the Parish, owing to his having preached a sermon on "Intercessory Prayer by the Saints below and above," towards the close of which occurred words of this sort—"What comfort to us, who are struggling, to know that the prayers of those who have reached the eternal shores, are offered on our behalf—for those who covet purity of heart to remember that the Blessed Virgin is interceding for them—for the penitent to think of S. Peter asking pardon for those who have erst denied their lord—for the Christian Priest, toiling for souls, to know that the Apostle of the Gentiles, once in labors abundant on earth, now pleads in Heaven the cause of those who strive to follow in his steps."

To those who remember the late trial of the Incumbent of Fulham, Rev. Dr. Ferguson, for marrying two of his parishioners without the presence of the Registrar, and the indignation of the worthy magistrate, will be amused at hearing of the exertions of two of our *quondam* friends, Mr. Irvine of Bedford Leigh, and Mr. Cooke of Lulworth,—the first in refusing to marry parties without their producing a certificate of Confirmation, and the latter, drawing up tickets of Confirmation and Baptism for emigrants. Were it not that the souls of men were imperilled, it would be amusing to contemplate the writhings and contortions, as also the mimicry of Catholic custom peculiar to this party: but to adopt F. Faber's words, when speaking of the school whose annals we are penning;—"It would be hard indeed to keep our patience with such objectors, if we did not know how much they were above their own criticisms, how much that is high, and noble, and generous, and lofty, lives and loves under all this crust of pedantry and narrowness of mannerism! They were born for better things than to worship the gentlemanly and canonize the respectable, and by the grace of God, in His due time, those better things

will they do, and better far than we. They are fighting with shadows; they are beating the air; they know not what they want; all they know is, that they are not in possession of it yet, and they are teased by the possibility that it may after all be with us, whom it has been a first principle with them to dislike as deteriorated and fallen from noble things. Men toss most in a dream when they are on the eve of waking. They seem petulant, but they are in reality affectionate; they appear wanting in generosity and fairness to opponents, but it is their school and party which cannot afford to let them be otherwise." Hence it is that we would speak of our *quondam* fellow-combatants gently and mildly in love and affection, feeling assured that they would far exceed us in the race of perfection had the like grace been vouchsafed to them. Who can peruse a volume from the pen of either Pusey, Keble, or Williams, without perceiving deep striking devotion, and inducing one, that has been rescued from the entanglement of the "Oxford School," to pray for their release. At present they are, as Dr. Faber truly says, "fighting" for "shadows" and "beating the air;" what though Mr. Irvine gained his point in the single parish of Bedford Leigh—still the question occurs, would his successor, at his death, keep on the custom? and we are of opinion that were this school (as a body) to take this matter seriously into consideration, they would immediately secede from the Establishment as a sectarian and human Institution—they would then see, what we, thanks be to God, know, that the Establishment is in reality a slave, acting at the nod and will of its imperial master; the love of Jesus Crucified is a stranger to it; "preferment," as Dr. Featly acknowledges, is all the inducement it holds out to its ministers. Unlike the Church, it (we speak not of individuals but of the body) believes not that its mission is to save souls.

Our annals of the Tractarian movement would indeed be incomplete, were we to omit mentioning the formation of a "Society of Mutual Intercession" by Messrs. Pusey, Keble,

and Marriott, which was condemned in no unmeasured terms by the Bishop of London. "I feel myself called upon to caution my younger brethren, against a spurious proposal, which has been recently made to form a sort of association or fraternity for mutual intercession. . . . But when it is proposed (continues his Lordship) to establish something of a Sodality or brotherhood for mutual intercession, the members of which are to *have their names registered, in order that they may be informed of particular objects to be prayed for, either of general interest or connected with themselves or their own friends*, the plan seems to me to be . . . likely to form or bind together a secret party in the Church, and to teach them the necessity of doing something more than the Church instructs them to do, or of doing it in a different manner." We well remember when this subject was first mooted, the "*English Churchman*," and, if we mistake not, the "*Church and State Gazette*," rapidly seized on it as a sure means of procuring the return of Mr. Newman and his fellow converts. The prayers and proposals we give in the Appendix.\*

Our readers will permit us to remind them, that in this year England bethought herself of poor Popish Ireland, and taking advantage of the famine, endeavoured to corrupt her children, but in vain; for notwithstanding the boasting of Mr. Marrable, that, "for every pervert in England there are one hundred converts in Ireland," and that "it is calculated that thousands upon thousands of persons have been converted in Ireland within the last few years, besides thousands who have emigrated to America to escape the persecution at home"—that "there are hundreds of thousands now enquiring, no longer led blindfold by the priests"†—of Mr. Bickersteth, who told the Society in 1853, that the work of the Missions was not "only an emancipation from the outward trammels

\* Appendix N.

† Marrable's Sketch of the Origin and Operation of the Society of Irish Church Missions to Roman Catholics.

of Romanism, and an introduction into the visible fold of Protestantism, but a real work of spiritual emancipation from the power of Satan to the power of God, and from the errors that make them slaves, to the truths that make them free;”\* we are assured by Protestant writers of great credibility, that the whole system depends on their feeding the famished, and clothing the naked; and to an American Presbyterian writer we are indebted for the following confession of the system—“It requires the Irish language to provide suitable words for a suitable description of the spirit which is manifested in some parts to proselytize, by bribery, the obstinate Romanists to the Church which has been an instrument of oppression for centuries. The English language is too meagre to delineate it in the true light. Rice, India meal, and black bread, would, if they had tongues, tell sad and ludicrous tales. The artless children, too, who had not become adepts in deceit, would, and did sometimes, by chance, tell the story in short and pithy style. It was a practice of some of the zealots of this class to open a school or schools, and invite those children who were in deep want to attend, and instruction, clothes, and food, would be given on the simple terms of reading the scriptures and attending church. The Church Catechism must be rehearsed as a substitute for the Romish.

“The children flocked by scores and even hundreds; they were dying with hunger, and by going to these places they could ‘keep the life in them’—they could go on the principle, ‘*if thou hast faith, have it to thyself before God;*’ and when their hunger was appeased they could go back again to their own religion. When such children were interrogated, the answer would be, ‘we are going back again to our own chapel or our own religion, when the stirabout times are over;’ ‘or when the potatoes come again.’ †

\*Report of the Irish Church Missions Society to Roman Catholics, A.D., 1853.

† While at Corophin, County Galway, we ourselves heard of a poor woman who, while on her way to Tuam to receive her mite, knelt down while passing the chapel door, and *solemnly took leave of Almighty God till the potatoes came back ! ! !*

‘ But you are saying these prayers and learning this catechism?’ ‘ We shan’t say these prayers when we go back—we’ll say our own then.’ ”\* The further development of this Satanic development was left to the ensuing year when the famine was at its height.

---

1847.

---

The following are the principal converts of this year:—

Rev. R. G. M‘Mullen.

Rev. W. Walker.

Rev. C. Cox, Exeter College, Oxford.

Rev. F. J. New, Curate of Christ Church, S. Pancras, London.

Rev. E. Caswall, Curate of Stratford, under the Castle, Wilts.

Rev. J. Gordon, Curate of Christ Church, S. Pancras, London.

(R.I.P.)

Rev. Edward Horne, Rector of S. Lawrence, Southampton.

Rev. R. Ornsby, Curate of S. Olave, Chichester.

Rev. Alexander Chirol, Curate of S. Barnabas, Pimlico.

Rev. T. Turner.

Rev. J. Wilson, } Independents.

Rev. J. Brown, }

---

Rev. G. Allin, Prof. of Greek in the University  
of Pennsylvania. } America.

Rev. E. Wilkes

Rev. F. Wilkes.

C. Wilkinson, Esq.

Daniel Haigh, Esq.

W. J. Buckle, Esq.

H. Kingdon, Esq., Trinity College, Cambridge.

W. Gordon, Esq., Trinity College, Cambridge.

J. G. Rhubenson, Esq.

Captain Tylee.

J. Fogg, Esq. (R.I.P.)

\* Nicholson’s Annals of the Famine in Ireland, p. 300.

T. Tarleton, Esq.  
 N. Darnell, Esq., Trinity College, Oxford.  
 James Burns, Esq.  
 Captain Baines, (R.I.P.)  
 F. Charles New, Esq.  
 Captain Burnett.  
 R. Suffield, Esq., S. Peter's College, Cambridge.  
 J. Cruikshanks, Esq., Rugby.  
 Lady Duff Gordon.  
 Mrs. M'Cabe.  
 Mrs. Chirol, sen.  
 Mrs. Chirol, jun.  
 Mrs. Caswell  
 Mrs. James, (R.I.P.)  
 Mme. De La Barca.  
 Miss Du Ponchallon, and her two sisters.  
 Miss Munro.  
 Miss Wrighte.  
 Miss Gordon.  
 Miss Banks.  
 Miss Bicknell.  
 Miss E. Agnew.  
 Mrs. G. Allen.  
 Mrs. Buckle.  
 Miss Buckle.  
 Walter Buckle, Esq.  
 Mrs. Burns.  
 Mrs. Barker.  
 Hon. T. J. Bernard.  
 Mrs. Cornish.  
 Hon. Edward Chitty, Judge in Jamaica.  
 Miss Dudley.  
 Mrs. Harstey.  
 Captain Ballard, (R.I.P.)  
 Miss Lechmere.  
 Mrs. New.  
 Miss S. New.  
 Miss Plumer.  
 Mrs. Phillipp (of Longworth.)  
 G. Weatherlaw.

Mr. Gordon, in his "Reasons of his conversion to the Catholic Church," says,—“Our best hope and our best ground of confidence is the strong ground we have of believing that we are in the Church of God—in the deep conviction that we have left the unreal for the real, the human for the divine—that God is with His Church; and that whatever obstacles may oppose, or whatever length of time may intervene, success is surely Hers in the end, because HER CAUSE IS THE CAUSE OF GOD.”

As a consequence of Mr. M‘Mullen’s secession, the then Vicar and Curate of S. Saviour’s, Mr. R. Ward and Mr. Case, were obliged to leave, and “the hopes of the founder and the College of Priests fell to the ground.” A length of time elapsed before a new Vicar was found, and as the reasons for this apathy in clergymen, believing themselves to be Priests, sent by One who, Himself “*worked as a carpenter*” while on earth, are so *naïvely* brought forward by Mr. Pollen in his “Narrative,” our readers will excuse our giving them in full; we merely do so, as a sample of the reasons adduced even by the Tractarian and Transitionist party. “First: the Vicarage was poor; the tithe is about £30, a sum which would be more than swallowed by the expences of collecting, were it collected. There is a sum of £150 offered yearly by an individual for the support of Curates. Secondly, it is a laborious position, and placed amidst much that is dismal and distressing to look at. And lastly, it was generally condemned by the authorities and sent into Coventry, or, as an important dignitary afterwards expressed it, a *cordon sanitaire* was drawn round the place by the neighbouring clergy;” after some slight delay the living was given to Mr. A. P. Forbes, who “could get no Curate because the place was in such odor.” Within a short time of Mr. Forbes’ “institution” he was elected to the See of Brechin, and “a new Vicar had again to be provided.” At the recommendation of Lord Campden to Dr. Pusey, Mr. Minster was appointed.

No little sensation was created, not so much by the

secession of Mr. Alexander Chirol, Curate of S. Paul's, Knightsbridge, as by a sermon preached by the deserted Incumbent on the occasion; for not only was Mr. Chirol excommunicated, but his secession thus referred to from the pulpit:—"It was only in the month of April last that he, of whom we unfortunately speak, solicited of me, with more than usual earnestness of entreaty, the office of a Curate in this Parish, and I, confiding in that implied truthfulness which one has a right to expect between man and man, in the commonest things of life—much more in the solemn profession of the works of the Priesthood—appointed him to serve in this Curacy, with more especial reference to those duties which were to be performed in the school-house and district of S. Barnabas. Consequently, since it is the custom at the entrance of any Curacy to renew the subscription to the Articles, and, before the Licence is given by the Bishop, *the oath of supremacy is required to be again sworn.* It was only in the month of April last, that these oaths, to which I have alluded, were deliberately and solemnly renewed. But observe the issue. The oath had hardly gone forth—the words had hardly left their sounds still vibrating on the ear—the Holy book had hardly yet become dry from the sacred kiss of solemn abjuration, wherein he denied the authority, both ecclesiastical and spiritual, of the Bishop of Rome within these realms:—I say, that Holy book had hardly become dry from the kiss of that abjuration, when lo! he is found in open adherence to that very Roman Bishop whom he had so solemnly denied; hugging to his bosom the very errors which he had so determinedly professed to hate, and ready to propagate with violent schismatics and sectarians, his new found brethren, the very opposite and contrary of those pure and apostolic doctrines, which he had vowed himself before God and the Church for life, as his Priest, to teach. For what can we say? If the Church had, in the interval, changed in her character, or openly mutilated her doctrines; if great temptations had come upon the Church, and we had

suffered many things and had gone back from the faith ; if twenty years had passed—ten years—five years—two years—something might be said. But when *two months* had barely passed ; when no word is said of doubt or misgiving ; when no guidance is sought as of friends within the Church, but counsel taken only of those without : when, beneath the unruffled exterior of one serving in the fold of Christ, there lay the whole time the secret lust after the accursed thing, and the spirit within was giving the lie to the words and deeds without ; when we are left, in our simple confidence, to hear by an accident, that plots and stratagems are being carried on to undermine the faith of the flock, and that he who was appointed the Pastor was himself the traitor. What, then, are we to infer—what, then, are we to say—how, then, are we to characterize (keeping within the language of charity) an act of apostacy so glaring, so indecent, and so fearfully treacherous in the eyes of both God and man ?”\* Well may a reviewer of this sermon enquire, “ Is this sermon the kind of food with which the flock is to be fed ? Was it to provide such meagre fare that the Saviour died and the Scriptures were written ? Where is the passage, throughout the entire address, that would tend to heal the broken-hearted, or to ‘ set at liberty them that are bruised ?’ Is it merely to give an opportunity for the outpouring of a tirade of abuse and misrepresentation, that money is sought to erect new churches and schools ? Grant, for a moment, that all the conduct ascribed to Mr. Chisol is true ; that he acted hastily, disingenuously, and unlawfully, yet how striking is the contrast in the language of the Preacher to that presented by the Apostle Paul. He writes :—‘ We were gentle among you, even as a nurse cherisheth her children, so, being affectionately desirous of you, we were willing to have imparted unto you not the Gospel of God only but also our own souls.’ Successor of the Apostles forsooth ! As well

\* Apostacy. A Sermon by the Rev. W. J. E. Bennett.

might Robert Owen claim to be a successor of the ‘Judicious Hooker.’\*—

The sentence of excommunication was thus worded:—

#### NOTICE.

“WHEREAS MR. ALEXANDER CHIROL, late assistant Curate of this Parish, has joined certain Schismatics and Sectarrians generally called Romanists, and is thereby, *ipso facto*, DEPRIVED for the present of all the spiritual functions of HOLY ORDERS, and EXCOMMUNICATED from the Church of England; and whereas the said MR. ALEXANDER CHIROL has been circulating letters, and otherwise tampering with the faith of certain of the Parishioners, endeavouring to induce them to join him in his sinful act of Schism and Apostacy, it is my duty, as the Parish Priest, to warn the Parishioners, and all other faithful members of the Church, and they are hereby warned against holding any intercourse by letter, speech, or otherwise with the said MR. ALEXANDER CHIROL until such time as he may be restored to communion of the Church. The rule of Holy Scripture and the Church is, that the Faithful should not hold communion with Schismatics and Apostates, according to the precept of our Lord, ‘If he shall neglect to hear the Church let him be unto thee as an heathen and a publican. (S. Matthew xviii. 1.)’

“The Parishioners are also requested to notice that the school-room of S. Barnabas (in addition to the present services of Sunday) will be opened on Friday Evenings at 7 o’clock for an Evening Service.

“A plain Lecture will be delivered by the REV. WM. BENNETT for the benefit of the poor and those who seek religious instruction.

“The subject of the Lecture will turn upon the peculiar features of the Church of England as opposed to Dissent and the Schismatic Communion of Rome, called forth by the conduct of the late Curate.

“To commence next Friday, the 12th of November.

“WM. J. E. BENNETT, M.A.

“Perp. Curate of S. Paul’s.

“S. PAUL’S, 23rd Sunday after Trinity, 1847.”

\* Strictures on Apostacy, by Caustic.

Mr. Ornsby, now Professor of Classical Literature in the Catholic University, is thus referred to in the "*Catholic University Gazette*,"—"Mr. Ornsby is a Master of Arts of the University of Oxford, where he early distinguished himself by gaining one of Lord Crewe's Exhibitions. On his examination for his Bachelor's degree, he gained the highest honors in Classics, and was afterwards elected Fellow of Trinity College. Subsequently he served the College Office of Lecturer in Rhetoric, and the University office of Master of Schools, and was for four or five years actively engaged in private tuition. He has been, both before, and since, his conversion, a contributor to several periodical publications, a translator and editor of various historical and religious publications, and a constant writer of critical reviews."

Mr. Haigh (one of the Leeds converts, and now P.P. of Erdington, where he has built a magnificent church) devoted previous to his conversion, some £10,000 or £12,000 of his private fortune to the building of a church and school in the York Road district, Leeds, which, like Mr. Capes, he was obliged to leave behind him in the service of a heretical Establishment.

This year an appointment was made which called forth the ire of the Puseyite party, and protests against the nomination of Dr. Hampden to the See of Hereford, were as thick as mulberries; nay, there was some rumour of the Dean of Hereford suffering from the statute of *Premunire*, as he had resolved to oppose her Majesty's *Congé d'élire*; but alas! Dr. Merewether was no "Athanasius" or "Basil," and the *fiat* having gone forth, the whole matter quietly ended in Dr. Hampden succeeding Dr. Musgrave as Her Majesty's Clerical Inspector at Hereford; for the only satisfaction Dr. Merewether obtained on signifying his opposition—as Dean of the Cathedral of Hereford—was the following cool and significant note from Her Majesty's chief Inspector in England, Dr. Sumner:—

‘ Rev. Sir,

“It is not within the bounds of any authority possessed by me to give you an opportunity of proving your objections. Finding, therefore, nothing in which I could act in compliance with your remonstrance, I proceeded, in the execution of my office, to obey Her Majesty’s mandate for Dr. Hampden’s consecration in the usual form.

“ I am,

“ Rev. Sir,

“ Your obedient servant,

“ J. B. CANTUAR.”

We have inserted in the Appendix the Protest of certain Bishops,\* addressed to Lord John Russell, and his reply, the Memorial of Dean Merewether to Her Majesty,† his letter to the Premier, and the reply of Lord John Russell,‡ with the copy of the *Congé d’élire*,§ the Letter Recommendatory,|| the Citatory Letter from the Dean and Chapter,¶ and an Extract from the Statutes of Provisors,\*\* (enacted in 25 Edward III.) and premunire,†† (16 Richard II.) The Protest, however, of Dean Merewether, against the appointment of Dr. Hampden, being too important to be inserted in the Appendix, we beg to present it to our readers:—

PROTEST OF THE DEAN OF HEREFORD.

“ *In the Name of God. Amen.*

To all to whom these presents shall come, especially to the Canons of the Cathedral Church of Hereford, John Merewether, Doctor in Divinity, Dean of the Cathedral Church of Hereford, lawfully constituted, and as styled in the form of his installation therein, Rector thereof—greeting.

Whereas, in the year 1836, the Rev. Renn Dickson Hampden, Doctor in Divinity, was appointed Regius Professor of Divinity in the University of Oxford.

\* Appendix O.

† Appendix Q.

|| Appendix S.

\*\* Appendix U.

‡ Appendix P.

§ Appendix R.

¶ Appendix T.

†† Appendix V.

And whereas, in the same year, it was in convocation of the University of Oxford decreed as follows:—

‘Seeing that it has been committed by the University of Oxford to the Regius Professorship of Divinity that he should be one of the number of those by whom the select preachers are appointed, according to Tit. xvi. s. 8,—(Addenda, p. 150). And also that his counsel should be given if any preacher should be called in question before the Vice-Chancellor, according to Tit. xvi. s. 11,—(Addenda, p. 154)—and since he, who is now professor, has treated theological subjects in such a manner in his published works that the University in this respect hath no confidence in him. It is therefore decreed that the Regius Professor of Divinity be deprived of the afore-mentioned offices until it shall otherwise please the University; but, lest the University in the meantime should suffer any detriment, let others discharge the functions of the said professor—namely, in appointing the select preachers, the senior among the deputies of the Vice-Chancellor, or, he being absent, or filling the place of Vice-Chancellor, the next in order, provided always that he shall have taken Holy Orders; and, in holding any consultation concerning sermons, the Lecturer of Lady Margaret, Countess of Richmond.’

And whereas, in the year 1842, the following proposition was in convocation made:—‘Seeing the Statute, Tit. xvi. s. 8, promulgated and confirmed in the House of Convocation on the 5th day of May 1836, it was determined that the Regius Professor of Divinity should be deprived of certain offices mentioned in the same statute, until it should otherwise please the University. It hath pleased the University to abrogate the statute.’ And the said Convocation thereupon decreed *not* so to abrogate it, and it has never been abrogated to this day.

And whereas the said Dr. Renn Dickson Hampden, in the correspondence which thereupon ensued with his Grace the late Archbishop of Canterbury, thus wrote:—‘I disclaim the calumnious imputations with which I have been assailed; I disclaim them for myself, I disclaim them for my writings: I retract nothing that I have written, I disown nothing.’ And again, in the preface to the second edition of his ‘Bampton Lectures,’ (p. 19 of the introduction,) which professed to be an explanation, he

writes—‘I see no reason from what they (the objectors) have alleged for changing or retracting a single statement.’

And whereas when, upon the translation of the late Bishop of Hereford, Dr. Thomas Musgrave, to the Archiepiscopal See of York, it was understood that the said Dr. Renn Dickson Hampden was to be appointed to the See of Hereford, although the same was not yet vacant, the late Archbishop of Canterbury, Dr. William Howley, did write a letter of objection and remonstrance, and also that thirteen other Bishops did join in a combined remonstrance, and another Bishop also wrote a separate letter of similar objection and remonstrance, to the Right Honourable Lord John Russell, the First Lord of the Treasury, against the said appointment.

And whereas addresses to the number of from ninety to one hundred, as well as numerous letters from individuals of all shades of opinion tolerated in the Church of England, were presented to the Dean and Chapter of Hereford, entreating them not to elect the said Dr. Renn Dickson Hampden, should the *Congé d'élire* be issued in his favor notwithstanding the various objections stated.

And whereas, I, the Dean of the said Cathedral Church, did fully and fairly represent the same to the Right Honourable Lord John Russell, the First Lord of the Treasury, both by personal communication and repeated letters.

And whereas, when the *Congé d'élire* and letter mandatory were received, and the Dean and Chapter assembled on the 28th day of December, 1847, to consider the same, the said Dr. Renn Dickson Hampden was not duly elected according to the statutes of the said Cathedral Church, to observe which each member of the same is by oath obliged.

And whereas, upon certain members thereof proposing to affix the capitular seal to certificates of election unstatutably made, I the Dean, did specially object thereto, and in due form in writing protest against the said course and the said election, and which Protest duly signed, sealed, and attested, was attached to the document so in spite of my objection sealed.

And whereas, on the 11th of January, at Bow Church, in the city of London, a confirmation of the said unstatutable and in-

valid election was forcibly made, notwithstanding that, when opposers were called, three beneficed clergymen of the province of Canterbury, two of them of the diocese of Hereford, did appear by their duly authorised proctors and advocates, but were not permitted to proceed.

And whereas, on the 14th day of January, 1848, the said opposers, feeling aggrieved by such proceedings, did thereupon move the Court of Queen's Bench for a rule to show cause why a Mandamus should not issue to permit and admit, in due form of law, the said opposers to oppose the said confirmation, and require the Lord Archbishop of Canterbury and his Vicar-General, to hear and determine upon such opposition, and upon the articles, matters, and proofs thereupon; and the said rule was granted.

And whereas, on the 24th day of January, 1848, and three following days, the arguments upon the said rule were heard at great length; and on the 1st February the matter was in effect left undetermined, as it appeared that, of the four judges on the bench, two were in favor of making the rule absolute, and two against it.

And whereas, upon the lamented death of the late venerated Archbishop Howley, to whom an appeal had been made by the said opposers, and the appointment of his present Grace the Lord Archbishop of Canterbury, the same appeal was presented to his Grace Dr. Sumner, and also an address and appeal, signed by 1650 Priests of the Church of England, praying his Grace to surcease from the consecration of Dr. Renn Dickson Hampden, besides another address signed by a very large number of Clergy and Laity, all having the common object of claiming a satisfactory investigation and decision, by a competent ecclesiastical inquiry, into the objections and the whole of the works so objected to, and which has not been granted.

And whereas, I myself presented an appeal to his Grace, which was duly acknowledged, praying visitorial decision upon important matters touching the stringency of oaths, and the obligation and effect of our Cathedral statutes, and the postponement of the said consecration until such questions have been resolved which has never yet been replied to.

And whereas, on Sunday, the 26th day of March, the said Dr. Renn Dickson Hampden was consecrated at Lambeth Palace, and a Mandate to install him in the Cathedral Church of Hereford, has, as is alleged, been issued, but which I, the Dean of the said Cathedral Church, have never seen, it having been sent to the Bishop's secretary, Deputy Registrar of the diocese of Hereford, and by him to the Canon in residence, and not, as it ought to have been, to the Chapter Clerk, the registrar of the Dean and Chapter, in the first instance.

And whereas the said Canon in residence has called together the Prebendaries of the said Cathedral Church, and irregularly issued, as I am informed, a citation to the general Chapter, I having, under the circumstances and in the absence of any authority to me delivered or conveyed (the mandate never having passed into my hands, nor having ever been seen by me), been precluded from interfering in the matter.

Therefore, I do declare and proclaim my dissent to the said proceedings, as irregular and unstatutable, and protest against the said proposed installation in the Cathedral Church of which I am Dean Archipresbyter, and Rector, and inasmuch as the whole course of events touching the appointment, election, confirmation, and consecration, of the said Dr. Renn Dickson Hampden, I do believe to be uncanonical, inconsistent with those decrees and usages of the Church of Christ upon which the practice and discipline of the Church of England have ever been considered to be based, and injurious in the most essential manner to the vital interests of that Church.

And I do further solemnly declare that I make this protest, not from any considerations which can be regarded in the slightest degree as having any personal reference to the said Dr. Renn Dickson Hampden as an individual, inasmuch as I have never spoken or written to him, nor he to me, but I do so protest because I could not conscientiously, nor consistently with my previous conduct, take any part in the said installation, and because I believe that it is my bounden duty to God and His Church to do so, notwithstanding the painful position in which I may be placed thereby, and in spite of the consequences which may result, and be productive, not only of perplexities and diffi-

culties, but of obloquy and misrepresentations of my motives and of positive injury to my own interests.

And, finally, I do claim and require that this my Protest be entered in the act book of the Dean and Chapter of the Cathedral Church of Hereford.

Given under my hand and decanal seal, this 26th day of April, in the year of our Lord, 1848.

JOHN (L. S.) MEREWETHER.

Dean of the Cathedral Church of Hereford."

The transition from the defeat of Dean Merewether, and his Protest against the appointment of Dr. Hampden to the See of Hereford, to the doings of the Proselytizing party in Ireland during the height of the famine, where people were dying by hundreds, is so natural that our readers will pardon the digression. A Protestant, to whom we have already referred, thus writes of a much vaunted case of persecution in Kerry, and as he really gives the true version, we cannot do better than place both accounts in juxta position.

*The Protestant Officer's Account.*

"Some five or six years ago a half dozen or more of the Romanists had concluded to unite with the Protestant Mission established at Dingle, and the Sabbath that the union was to take place in the church, the soldiers were called out to march under arms, to protect this little band from the fearful persecutions that awaited them in their way thither. The coast guard officer was summoned to be in readiness *cap-a-pie* for battle, if battle should be necessary; he remonstrated—he was a Methodist by profession, and though his occupation was somewhat warlike, yet he did not see any need of carnal weapons in building up a spiritual church—but he was under Government pay, and must do Government work. He accordingly obeyed, and, to use his own words substantially, 'we marched in battle array, with gun and bayonet, over a handful of peasants—a spectacle to imply our trust in a Crucified Christ—and the ridicule and gratification of the Priests and their flocks, who had discernment

sufficient to see that with all the boasted pretensions of a purer faith and better object of worship, both were not enough to shield our heads against a handful of turf, which might have been thrown by some ragged urchin with the shout of 'turn-coat' or 'souper,' as this was the bribe which the Romanists said was used to turn the poor to the Church!"

*Society's Account.*

"So great are the persecutions in Dingle that the believing converts cannot go to the house of God to profess their faith in Him without calling out the soldiery to protect them."

---

1848.

---

The chief converts this year were—

Rev. R. C. Thomas, Vicar of Brandeston, Suffolk.  
 Rev. F. P. Wood. (R.I.P.)  
 Rev. R. K. Sconce, Curate of S. Andrew's, Sydney. (R.I.P.)  
 Rev. H. R. Makinson, Curate of S. Andrew's, Sydney.  
 Rev. W. Allan, Curate of Dumbarton, (R.I.P.)  
 Rev. J. C. Robertson, Chaplain to the Duke of Buccleuch.  
 J. Strongitharm, Esq., King's College, London.  
 J. Mivart, Esq.  
 J. Baxter, Esq., S. John's College, Cambridge.  
 J. C. Algar, Esq., Trinity College, Cambridge.  
 F. Palgrave, Esq.  
 Aubrey De Vere, Esq. R.N.  
 Sir De Vere De Vere.  
 Stephen De Vere, Esq., M.P.  
 Chevalier Di Zulueta  
 J. B. Aspinal, Esq.  
 George Moore, Esq.  
 Captain Tucker.  
 Major Faber.  
 Major Ballard.  
 Major Phillipps.  
 Captain Carden.  
 Colonel Le Couteur, Jersey.  
 H. J. R. Greata, Esq.

Colonel Jarrett.  
 Mrs. Paglar.  
 Mrs. Di Zulueta.  
 Mrs. Baxter.  
 Miss Emily Simpson.  
 Miss Carden  
 Hon. Miss Methuen.  
 Miss Le Couteur.  
 J. E. Bowden, Esq.  
 Miss Bonsall  
 Miss H. Bonsall.  
 W. A. Archer, Esq.  
 J. Bowden, Esq., Trinity College, Oxford.  
 Andrew Blake, Esq., J.P., Galway.  
 Charles Bowring, Esq., (R.I.P.)  
 Miss Bowring.  
 Pierce Butler, Esq., Cahirciveen.  
 Mrs. Dakins.  
 Mrs. Jarrett.  
 J. V. Moore, Esq., Galway.  
 Mr. B. Marcus.\*  
 F. Quain, Esq.  
 J. Simpson, Esq., Trinity College, Cambridge.  
 Lady De Vere.

\* Mr. Marcus is a native of Russian Poland, author of the new work entitled "*Mykam Hayem*," printed at the University Press, Trinity College, Dublin. He is also author of many other works, and well versed in Hebrew, Chaldee, and Rabbinical erudition. He has for some years past been lecturing against Christianity, and in a particular manner against the Protestant version of the Bible. A few days ago he received an introduction to the Rev. J. B. Morris, late under professor of Hebrew at Oxford, and a convert to the Catholic Church, a gentleman intimately acquainted with Jewish modes of thought and reasoning. Discussions took place between these two gentlemen upon the great questions at issue between them, which eventually terminated in the expression, on the part of Mr. Marcus, of a thorough conviction of what he termed the truths of Christianity, and a desire to be admitted into the Romish Church. Before, however, this ceremony took place, Mr. Marcus expressed a desire to state his reasons for his change; and accordingly the household was assembled, young and old, to hear his statement of reasons. The Rev. Mr. Heneage then performed the ceremony of Baptism, after which the convert made a public profession of faith.—*Morning Herald*, 1848.

Scarce had the storm, excited by the election and consecration of Dr. Hampden to the See of Hereford, and the expected confiscation of Dr. Merewether's property for *premunire*, subsided, ere another rumor of an approaching hurricane, faint indeed at first, was heard ; a storm was brooding in the distance, of which it might be said :

" Depuis deux ans, le démon des ténèbres  
M'a déchainé,  
Et le pays sous mes accents funèbres  
A frissonné :"

and that storm was about to burst with greater fury than ever on the heads of the "Tractarian" School. Long had they vaunted, that if the Church of England spoke with stammering lips on every point, in that of Baptismal Regeneration she was safe. Her Offices, her Divines, all spoke on this subject at least *unanimò corde* and *unanimò voce* ; for the GORHAM CASE, the terrific Gorham case, was looming in the distance, both the Bishop and Presbyter were buckling on their armor and preparing for the mortal combat. But while men were thus employed, amid the revolutionary exploits of Ledru Rollin, Louis Blanc, Cabet, Garibaldi, Mazzini, Gavazzi, and Kossuth ; while impious and blasphemous wretches urged on at home by the pious "Lydia" Shaftsbury, Lord Campbell, Lord John Russell, and Lord Palmerston, with Messrs. Cumming, Stowell, and the "Angel's" butler,—were drinking downfall to Popery, and belching forth in their Exeter Hall orgies, blasphemies and impieties yet more awful than those uttered by the lawless band led by De Bourbon against Rome, Jehovah was raising up for His Church a protector in the prisoner of Ham—the Emperor Napoleon III.

Amid this excitement, and while her visible head was an exile at Gaëta, having fled from Rome in the company of the Comtesse de Spaur, the Church was not inactive in these countries. She has a mission to fulfil—it is to SAVE SOULS, and with this idea Her children are naturally impressed. F. Faber says, in a work from which we have already quoted, "There is no part of the Church where this instinct for souls is not to be found at work. Multitudes, who are leading but ordinary and lukewarm lives themselves, would hardly be easy if they did not belong to some Confraternity which did not impose upon them intercessory

prayer for others. To make or to get Novenas or Triduos, to write to convents and schools for prayers, to have Masses said and to recite Rosaries, or to beg extra communions of their confessors simply to get the conversion of some Anglican minister, of whom they know nothing more than that he is a good man and near to the Faith; these things are no marks of any extraordinary seriousness, or even of men aiming at perfection. They come natural to a Catholic; he hardly goes through any process of self-persuasion in doing them, they come to him of themselves as the workings of an instinct, on which probably he never reflected for five minutes in his life."

It was this spirit which led F. Gentili to sacrifice his life to missionary efforts in Ireland; it was this spirit which induced F. Segneri to travel forty or more miles over frost and snow; it was not unfrequently the case, moreover, that (continues his biographer) "in treading upon the earth his feet were sorely pricked by the sharp thorns; and one who followed him for years assures us that he has frequently seen him thus wounded, and suffering to such a degree as to cause fever;" it is this spirit which induces the missionary to proceed onward, for even if life be shortened, there must be no rest, no truce—there must be continuous work, continuous sacrifice. The Anglican party commenced this work of Missions at Banbury, but Dr. Wilberforce soon perceived it was a failure, because the Establishment is *not of God nor from God*.

"Again, (says Dr. Faber) how frequently is the confessor of little children besieged by such petitions as, 'Father, may I pray that papa or mamma may become a Catholic. May I say such or such a prayer for them;' yet no one has put the child up to it—it has a growing sense of discomfort in the matter simply because it is a Catholic." F. Faber refers to Catholic children; we knew a dear child, now, we trust, interceding for us in Heaven, who was so anxious to be received into the Church, as to beg every Catholic he met to pray for his Mamma to become a Catholic, that he might become one. The little angel went to "*his own Mamma*," as he was wont to call the Blessed Virgin, during the course of 1848.

Mr. R. K. Seonce, curate of St. Andrew's, Sydney, published his "Few Plain Reasons" for submitting to the Church in which

he thus refutes the 'Tractarian Movement,' (which he truly describes—as we have already seen Mr. Sewell and Dalgairns do—as almost miraculous in its rapid spread and awakening power.”)

“Step by step the teachers and the learners had advanced in Catholic truth—unconsciously approaching that one visible fold to which the Holy Spirit was guiding them. At length the leading men, the best and the wisest—and with them, sooner or later, as grace was given them, many an humble follower—entered the gate of the Holy City. Such was the state of things two years before I became a Catholic; and it was this that led me to devote these two years to prayer and study, in order that I might not be influenced, on the one hand, solely by respect for men who might have erred in judgment; nor, on the other hand, be deterred from doing my duty, if those men really were appointed to be my guides, by mere reverence for a religion in which I happened to be born, or by the force of old associations, or by present interests and affections. In acting thus, I did what I was obviously bound to do. . . . And as the Church of England bade me go to antiquity; I did so. I acted not in a spirit of self-conceit, or because I had much trust in my own powers of discernment, but in simple obedience to the authority under which I was placed. It was no fault of mine that my studies convinced me of the unsoundness of Anglican divinity, and of the fact that the theology of antiquity was essentially the same as that of the Church of Rome. I found that the living Catholic Church was, from the time of the Apostles downwards, the guide which all implicitly followed, and that the doctrines, branded as corruptions by the heretics of the present century, were taught as apostolical traditions. I saw no ground whatever for the belief, recently invented by Protestants, that the Bible is the sole rule of faith; I saw *every* ground for believing that the Church in communion with the See of S. Peter, on whom it was founded, was to be unhesitatingly followed. Here, then, was an intelligible and practical answer to the question, What is the Church? It was that Society which was founded by our Lord Jesus Christ Himself, upon S. Peter, against which the gates of hell should never prevail—the Church which was committed to the government of S. Peter and his successors—the

Church which, as an undeniable historical fact, has ever been so governed, has ever been one, has ever taught one and the same doctrine—the Holy Catholic and Apostolic Church. This was the result of my reading; and of course I became a Catholic.”

Mr. Sconce further adds—a hope in which every convert must join, for with him they all cordially and unanimously say,—“Truly they who spread reports about the disappointment of converts, little know *how far beyond all power of words to describe, is their satisfaction and their happiness. It is as though they had passed from death to life—from shadows to reality—from longing to fruition.*”\*

“My sincere hope is, that the unreasonableness and inconsistency of “High Church” principles will soon be generally apparent, and then those who are Catholics at heart, those who feel the need of a living guide, those who read in Scripture that there *is* such a guide, will hasten to the one fold of the only true Christian Church. Prophecy describes that one fold in plain terms, and the New Testament declares, in terms as plain, that the Christian Church fulfils the prophecy. We accordingly believe in *one* Holy Catholic Church. *Are* the Churches of Rome and England one? Most clearly not. Is there any Church that can pretend to be that one Church, but the Church in communion with the Bishop of Rome? If there is reality, in that article of the Apostles’ Creed, two Churches strongly opposed to each other cannot be meant by it. We must choose between the Church of S. Peter and that of the Reformers. The Oxford theology, which has attempted to solve the difficulty, has been tried, and is found wanting. The *via media* is losing its supporters one by one. Men *must* be either Catholics or Protestants. They cannot continue any longer half one and half the other. Their theology is ingenious, and looks well on paper, but it is utterly unreal and unpractical; and clergymen who, in the zealous discharge of their duties, find it necessary to reduce it to practice, must, sooner or later, be undeceived.†

\* Sconce’s supremacy of the Holy See.

† Sconce’s few reasons for submitting to the Catholic Church.

The principal converts this year were—

Rev. J. A. Stewart, Rector of Vange, Essex.

Rev. W. H. Bittlestone, Curate of All Saints, Margaret Street.

Rev. A. J. Hammer, Curate of Tidcombe, Tiverton.

Rev. W. C. Thomas

Rev. R. Simpson, V. Mitcham, Surrey.

---

AMERICA.

Rev. E. Preston, Curate of S. Luke, New York

Rev. J. M. Forbes, D.D., Rector of S. Luke, New York.

Rev. E. Pitman.

---

G. H. Plomer, Esq.

T. S. Knowles, Esq.

Captain Hibbert.

Dr. Yonge.

J. Longman, Esq.

W. R. Gawthorn, Esq.

Captain Moore.

Lieutenant Randolph.

W. Neville, Esq.

Dr. Hassell.

Lord Melbourne. (R.I.P.)\*

J. Oswald Wood, Esq., Liverpool.

Sir J. Talbot. (R.I.P.)

Mrs. Pierce Butler.

Lady Curtis.

Mrs. Rhetigan.

Mrs. Bowden.

Madame Veron.

Miss Bradstreet.

Miss Bathurst.

Miss Eyre.

Miss Sarah Bowden.

\* Since the accusation was brought against us by Mr. Walford, we have heard the name of the clergyman who actually received Lord Melbourne's abjuration.

Mr. Bittlestone had been compelled the preceding year to leave the Diocess of Worcester, in consequence of Dr. Pepys objecting to Auricular Confession, and had taken shelter for a while under the wing of the Rev. Upton Richards, of All Saints, Margaret-street, but finding no rest for his soul out of the Church, he submitted to the See of S. Peter.

Mr. Hammer says—"Simply and in one word, strange and harsh though it may seem, I must confess that I could not have remained where I was without incurring the loss of every atom of faith. In adhering to the principles of the Established religion (could I have done so) I must have become an Infidel;—a downright total Infidel;—and in the long run, no doubt, an avowed and open Infidel;—a Deist, or Pantheist, or Atheist, as might have happened."\* Though this did not occur to Mr. Hammer, yet two or three of the Tractarian party avowed themselves Pantheists, and one of them justly ridicules the Establishment as "having nothing really established; its doctrinal teachings being still the subject of endless controversy within the pale of her Communion; † another laughs and sneers at miracles; ‡ while a third openly glories in his unbelief. §

Mr. Allies, accompanied by Messrs. Pollen, Wynn, and Marriott, proceeded to the Continent on an ecclesiastical expedition—the journal, a joint-stock production (we believe) of these gentlemen, was published, and immediately condemned by the Bishop of Oxford, whereon it was withdrawn by the Rector of Launton.

Mr. Gorham having been presented by the Chancellor to the Living of Brampford Speke, was obliged to undergo an examination as to his Orthodoxy by the Bishop of Exeter, notwithstanding his having held the living of St. Just, in Penwith, for several years previous to his nomina-

\* Submission to the Catholic Church, by A. J. Hammer.

† Popular Christianity, by F. J. Foxtan.

‡ The Soul, by F. J. Newman.

§ The Nemesis of Faith, by W. Froude.

tion to Brampford Speke. The examination which extended to 149 questions, was on the single subject of Baptismal efficacy, which terminated in the Bishop of Exeter refusing to institute Mr. Gorham because he "held doctrines contrary to the true Christian faith, and the doctrines contained in the Articles and Formularies of the United Church of England and Ireland, and especially the Book of Common Prayer and Administration of the Sacraments, and other Rites and Ceremonies of the Church according to the use of the United Church of England and Ireland.\*

Mr. Gorham consequently carried the case into the Court of Arches; "turning from the *servant* to the sovereign, I appeal from a private interpretation to a constitutionally constituted court—from a personal opinion to a legal deliverance;" and issued a monition on the 15th January, 1848, requiring the Bishop to show cause why he refused Institution: upon which Sir H. J. Fust, after mature deliberation, gave the following judgment:—The points which were decided:—

"1. Does the Church of England hold the doctrine of Baptismal Regeneration in the case of infants?"

"2. Does Mr. Gorham hold this doctrine?"

"It is quite clear from the formularies of the Church that children do receive spiritual regeneration in Baptism. It is also evident, from the whole tenor of his examination, and from his counsel's argument, that Mr. Gorham does *not* hold this doctrine.

"The Bishop of Exeter has consequently shown sufficient cause for refusing to institute Mr. Gorham to the Living of Brampford Speke, and therefore his Lordship must be dismissed and with his costs."

The Tractarians were in ecstasies of delight—an Ecclesiastical Court, the same that had decided against them with regard to Stone Altars, and Mr. Oakeley, had now de-

cided that Baptismal Regeneration was a doctrine of the Church of England; the Apostolicity and Catholicity of the Establishment was proved; after such a decision, Newman and Faber, Oakeley, Ward, and all the seceders, would return; England and Rome would embrace one another, and mutual concessions would be made on both sides; nay, Mr. Gorham, Mr. Goode, Mr. Golightly, Dr. Symonds, and others would “walk their chalk,” and Anglicanism would triumph. God was good, the day of triumph was at hand—the night of bitter woe and sorrow had past; but, alas! Mr. Gorham appealed to the QUEEN IN COUNCIL!! (poor Church of England!) and the Judicial Committee, consisting of the following judges, sat for the first time on 11th December to try a purely doctrinal question, viz:—

The Master of the Rolls, (Lord Langdale).  
 The Lord Chief Justice, (Lord Campbell).  
 Mr. Baron Parke.  
 Vice-Chancellor, Sir J. Knight Bruce.  
 The Right Honorable Dr. Lushington.  
 The Right Honorable Pemberton Leigh.

---

The Archbishop of Canterbury.  
 The Archbishop of York.  
 The Bishop of London.\*

WITH THE FOLLOWING COUNSEL FOR MR. GORHAM.

---

Mr. Turner, Q.C.  
 Dr. Bayford.

---

THE BISHOP OF EXETER.

Dr. Adams.  
 Mr. Badeley.

\* The two Archbishops and the Bishop of London were not members of the Committee, were not present as judges, and had no right to vote or to sign the report that the Committee would submit to the Queen.”—*Great Gorham Case*.

Here at present we leave the "Gorham case," as in the annals of the following year 1850, the decision of the Queen in Council will be noticed.

Mr. Sheridan Knowles, indignant at the submission of his son to the See of S. Peter, abandoning the buskin for the black gown of Geneva, commenced a crusade against Rome, as if *he* could hurt the Church of God, and hurl Her Head from that high position in which He had been placed by Him who said to His first Vicar on earth—" *Thou art PETER*, and on *THIS* Rock I will build my Church." Mr. Knowles says—" You misrepresent Christ, you dishonour Him, you deny Him when you quote Him as the authority for your fundamental dogma—your arch and blasphemous Heresy;" if it be not too late, we should advise Mr. Knowles to study the question of the *Rock of Rome* again, and we feel positive that he would find no difficulty in admitting the Divine right of the Papacy.

About this time an enquiry was made into the management of a *soi-disant* religious house under the care of Miss Sellon, as the Mother Superior (better known as Mother Lydia), and the following rules were published:—

#### RULES OF THE ORPHANS' HOME.

1. Study to offer up every duty and every action to Christ.
2. Devote ordinarily six hours each day to works of mercy.
3. In all intercourse with the poor, follow as much as possible the direction of the parish Priest to whose care their souls are committed.
4. Shew tender sympathy towards the sick; for the most part begin by relieving his bodily wants, and contribute in any way you can to his cleanliness, ease, and comfort—for we are most inclined to listen to those who shew love towards us. When ye have to visit those who in health have forgotten God, dwell on the tender love of Christ to all true penitents: yet warn them affectionately, that unless they seek His mercy and pardon in the way He hath appointed, they must be miserable through all eternity.

5. Impress yourselves, and speak to them as being impressed with the Truths ye speak of, and as feeling the value of the soul; for if our own hearts be not moved, in vain shall we hope to move the hearts of others.

6. Pray earnestly with and for them, and especially that God would look down on them with pity, and bring them to repentance.

7. When there is no hope of the patient's recovery, if it is necessary to make this known to him, do so with great caution, and, if time permit, gradually; telling the sick man that to submit himself wholly to the will of God, trusting in His mercy for His dear Son Jesus Christ's sake, will turn to his profit, and help him forward in the right way that leadeth unto everlasting life.

8. Speak in a gentle, soothing, impressive way, and be careful not to fatigue the sufferer by trying to gain too much in one visit.

9. If mention be made to you of the disposal of property, endeavour to put the subject from you, and refer the patient to some proper person, in whom he may have confidence.

10. In visiting the schools, besides the ordinary instructions, ye shall be diligent in teaching the children to direct all their thoughts, words, and actions, to the glory of God, and to realize His presence everywhere;—to implore His grace that they may know and love Him, and keep His commandments; and to respect their parents and superiors.

11. Especially ye shall be diligent in catechizing, and preparing the children to go before the parish Priest for examination previous to Confirmation and for Holy Communion. The orphans shall be the especial charge of the Sisters, in proportion to their numbers: great watchfulness shall be used that they do not teach each other harm: they shall be carefully trained in all the duties of their calling; the Sisters who have the care of them allowing nothing to interfere with this work of love.

12. Aim to do all things in the spirit of deep, sincere, unfeigned humility, 'in honor preferring one another.'

13. Receive any suggestion or reproof with an expression of thankfulness, or otherwise in perfect silence. Whatever ye think it necessary to say defer till another time.

14. Dwell in unity, with one heart and one soul in God.
15. Let there be no contention, or at least let it be soon ended.
16. If there be a difference of opinion and ye must speak your thoughts, give your reasons with modesty and charity, with a view to truth and edification, and not to get the better of the argument.
17. Should any offend another, let her make amends as soon as possible, and the offence must be pardoned directly; if both have offended, both must mutually pardon.
18. Carefully avoid all harsh expressions.
19. Shun all party spirit and partizanship as a source of discord and division.
20. Be content with such food and raiment as ye have; let the furniture in the dwelling rooms of the Sisterhood be simple and plain.
21. Let all things needful be given to all alike, according to their needs.
22. The Sisters being constantly employed in works of mercy, care shall be taken that the health do not suffer by indiscreet abstinence; yet the Sisters shall refrain from eating out of meals, unless health require. But whatever is needed they shall ask for.
23. There shall be no unnecessary conversation in rising and going to bed, amid daily duties, and in going to and from Church.
24. Let each attend to herself and her own duties, and not curiously enquire of others, or needlessly talk of them.
25. Take whatever befalls yourself or others as from the hand of God.
26. The dress of the Sisters shall be as simple as possible, both as to material and as to form.
27. Consider personal neatness and general order as religious duties.
28. If sick, obey not the Superior only but the Physician also, in all things relating to the body. The Sisters, especially the Superior as Mother, shall frequently visit the sick, and treat them with tender love.
29. If death be apprehended, the Superior shall take care that the Holy Communion be administered in due time.

30. Fathers, mothers, or such as have stood in the place of parents, brothers, and sisters, aunts, uncles, nephews, nieces, shall be admitted to see any of the Sisters, but except on any urgent occasion, only at stated hours.

31. It shall be a strict rule that the duties of the Sisterhood shall not interfere with the Sisters shewing filial piety and affection towards relatives. It shall be also allowable to any Sister to visit her parents yearly for a limited period.

32. The Superior shall not value herself upon the authority she holds, but rather esteem it an opportunity of rendering loving service to others.

33. She shall be loved and honored as a mother, in matters of great or less moment, in things agreeable or disagreeable, not considering whom they obey, but rather Him for whose sake they obey, that is, Jesus Christ our Lord.

34. She shall have the direction of the employments of the household, and exercise a mother's care of the health of the whole family.

35. She shall make herself a pattern to all, receive and support the weak, be patient with all, be exact with herself, and cautious in what she requires of others.

36. The Sisters who serve shall by no means be treated differently from the others, but all shall live together in equal love. Any orders given them shall be seasoned with charity.

37. All the Sisters shall call them Sister, mindful that although these be servants in outward circumstances, they are still the daughters of God, and with them in hope co-heirs of Jesus Christ.

38. Whereas the Institution is still in its infancy, and it may be expedient that other regulations should be adopted for the well-being of the Sisterhood, and of the Orphans' Home, the Superior, with the advice and consent of the Sisters, shall have power to frame such further rules in harmony with the foregoing, as she may conceive calculated to promote those ends. And such rule shall be laid before the Bishop, whenever he shall think that they have been sufficiently approved by experience.

#### RULES FOR THE SISTERHOOD OF MERCY.

In order to secure, as far as may be, that the Sisterhood of

Mercy in Devonport, recently established by the permission of Almighty God, should, under His Divine Blessing, be continued upon the same principles on which it was begun, the following Regulations, as to its funds and operations, have been adopted, with the sanction of the Lord Bishop of Exeter.

1. A legal instrument has been prepared, by which certain of the Sisters have agreed to live together (conforming to certain regulations, sanctioned by the Bishop, for the better conduct of the interior of the Institution;) but with free liberty to any Sister to withdraw if it shall so seem good to her.

2. Any Sister so withdrawing, or in any way ceasing to be a member of the Society, shall be entitled to her own personal property; but neither she nor her heirs shall be entitled to any share of the common property of the Society.

3. The Sisterhood shall belong to the Church of England; and if any Sister should unhappily cease to be a member of the Church of England, she shall, *ipso facto*, cease to be a member of the Society.

4. The object of the Sisterhood shall be the education of the female children of Sailors and Soldiers, who shall have lost either parent; the visiting the sick and needy; superintendence of schools, infant or adult, industrial or educational; oral instruction of adults in smaller classes; the visiting of female emigrants on board of vessels sailing from or touching at the port of Plymouth: and any other purpose of love (such as the care of hospitals or infirmaries, the temporary shelter and training of distressed women of good character); which God, in His good Providence, shall open to them.

5. The Bishop of Exeter, for the time being, shall be *ex officio* Visitor of the Sisterhood; and all the internal regulations of the Sisterhood shall be open to him.

6. The Sisters, in visiting the poor and sick, shall be under the direction of the Clergy in whose districts they visit.

7. The schools formed by the Sisters shall be open at all times for the inspection and religious instruction of the Parochial Clergy of the district, and of the Diocesan Inspector of the schools appointed or approved by the Bishop.

8. Any property given to the Sisterhood, either by the Sisters themselves, or by donations for permanent purposes, or by

bequest, shall be vested in the Sisterhood: but the accounts shall be at all times open to a person appointed by the Bishop to inspect them.

9. Any one who shall hereafter be admitted to join the Sisterhood shall have the concurrence of two-thirds of the Sisters above the age of 25, with the sanction of the Bishop.

10. Should it hereafter unhappily ever become necessary (which God avert!) to remove any Sister, it shall be requisite that such removal shall be deemed necessary by at least two-thirds of the Sisters above the age of 30, and be confirmed by the Bishop.

Bequests being made to the Sisterhood under the title of 'Church of England Sisterhood of Mercy in Devonport.'

#### RULES FOR THE ORPHAN'S HOME.

1. The Institution shall be called '*The Orphans' Home, for the Orphan Daughters of British Sailors and Soldiers.*'

2. The object of this Institution shall be to feed and clothe such children from the earliest age, and to train them in the fear and love of God, in the Church of England. And for the right discharge of their duties in the state of life to which God shall call them, they shall be trained either as trustworthy servants, or for other important and reasonable offices, as village school-mistresses, attendants on the sick, &c., as their capacities and dispositions shall indicate.

3. All due economy shall be used, consistent with the health and comfort of the children, in order that a new Orphan shall be admitted for every £10 10s. subscribed. Any subscriber of £10 10s., or a Donor of £100 to the permanent Fund, shall have the power of recommending one child at a time, to whom such subscriber shall be especially interested, as the Orphan of a soldier in any regiment, although at a distance, or of a sailor belonging to any of Her Majesty's ships. Members of a family, or any number of individuals contributing the above sums, shall have the joint right of a subscriber.

4. When there is no other paramount claim, preference shall be given to the Orphan of any soldier or sailor who has died in actual service, or been lost at sea.

5. Evidence must be produced that the children who are

candidates for admission, are really the daughters of sailors or soldiers in Her Majesty's service.

6. No child shall be expelled while there is any hope of amendment.

7. Sickliness, or even consumptive tendency, shall be no ground of exclusion; nor shall any child be removed on account of any infectious disorder, but shall be transferred to some place separate from the other children.

8. Great care shall be taken of the individual training of the children, according to their capacities. They shall in all cases, besides religious instruction, be taught reading, writing, arithmetic, plain needle-work, and knitting. Such as show tenderness and other qualifications, shall be trained as Nurses of the younger children; and such as, in addition, evince talent and high religious principles, shall have a superior education to fit them for village schoolmistresses.

9. The children shall be allowed to remain in the Institution until they be fully qualified to undertake a respectable situation in the line of duty for which they shall be fitted.

10. Near relations and friends shall be admitted to see the Orphans from time to time, especial regard being had to the surviving parent when they shall be sick.

---

1850.

---

The principal converts this year were—

Rev. A. J. Dayman, Curate of Wasperton, Warwickshire.

Rev. J. H. Stuart, Curate of Bramford, Suffolk.

Rev. T. F. Balston, Rector of Benson, Oxford.

Rev. T. Scratton, Curate of Benson, Oxon.

Rev. J. H. Wynne, Fellow of All Souls, Oxford.

Rev. J. L. Pattison.

Rev. F. G. Case, Curate of All Saints, Margaret st., London.

Rev. W. G. Maskell, Vicar of S. Mary's Church, Devon.

Rev. C. B. Garside, Curate of All Saints, Margaret st., London.

Rev. T. Bodley, Curate of Archbishop Tenison's Chapel, London.

Rev. C. Cavendish, Curate of All Saints, Margaret st., London.

Rev. E. S. Bathurst, Rector of Kibworth Beauchamp, Leicester.

Rev. T. W. Allies, Rector of Launton, Oxfordshire.

- Rev. E. Ballard, Curate of Pucklechurch, Gloucestershire.  
 Rev. W. F. Trenow, Curate of Northfield, Staffordshire.  
 Very Rev. W. A. M'Lauren, Dean of Ross and Moray.  
 Rev. W. H. Anderdon, Vicar of S. Margaret's, Leicester.  
 Rev. H. W. Wilberforce, Rector of East Farleigh, Kent.  
 Rev. W. H. Todd, }  
 Rev. W. Henn, } Curates of S. James's, Bristol.  
 Rev. R. S. Butler, Warden of the House of Charity, Soho, London.  
 Rev. E. Scott.  
 Rev. C. H. Laprimaudaye, Curate of Lavenham, Sussex, (R.I.P.)  
 Rev. T. Mostyn.  
 Rev. W. Dodsworth, Incumbent of Christchurch, S. Pancras,  
 London.  
 Rev. T. G. Rogers, Chaplain to the Convicts, Botany Bay.  
 Rev. D. Goltz, Christchurch, Southwark.  
 Rev. N. W. Dubois, Free Church of England, Southwark.

---

 AMERICA.
 

---

- Rev. E. Johnstone, }  
 Rev. J. W. Huntington, } New York.  
 Rev. A. Stewart, }

---

 FRANCE.
 

---

- Rev. X. Ferré.  
 Rev. T. A. Boyhimie.

- 
- The Earl of Roscommon, (R.I.P.)  
 Viscount Feilding.  
 Hon. C. Pakenham, (R.I.P.)  
 Baron Strutzeeh.  
 Lady Foley.  
 Lady Ida Lennox.  
 Ctsse. Ida Hahn-Hahn.  
 Mrs. Taplin, (R.I.P.)  
 Mrs. Foljambe

Mrs. W. Wilberforce.  
 Mrs. H. Wilberforce.  
 Edward Windeyer, Esq., King's College, London.  
 N. A. Goldsmid, Esq., Trinity College, Oxford.  
 E. Bethell, Esq.  
 R. J. Tillotson, Esq.  
 G. Ballard, Esq.  
 G. Bowyer, Esq., M.P.  
 H. Alban Arden, Esq., Dorchester.  
 Edward P. Bastard, Esq., (R.I.P.)  
 The Right Hon. W. J. Monsell, M.P.  
 Lord Nigel Kennedy.  
 Countess of Arundel and Surrey.  
 Lady Cavendish.  
 Lady Fielding, (R.I.P.)  
 Ctsse. De Pepe.  
 Sergeant Bellasis  
 Miss Peel.  
 Miss Lechmere.  
 Miss Lockhart.  
 Miss Scott.  
 Miss Yates.  
 Miss Brande.

---

If paucity of matter compelled us to be but brief while tracing the events of the past year—if events were but few—such will not now be the case. The “Gorham case” was still pending—the Tractarian party was in suspense, anxiously waiting for the moment when the six laymen, forming the Judicial Committee of Her Majesty’s Privy Council, should decide whether Mr. Gorham was orthodox or heterodox: in addition to this all-important case, came the restoration of the Hierarchy to England—for from the See of S. Peter was issued a decree, annihilating, as it had created, the Dioceses of Canterbury and York, Lincoln and Chichester—the cities of S. Augustin and S. Wilfrid, S. Hugh and S. Richard, were no more—they were blotted off the ecclesiastical map, and in their place were created Westminster, reminding one of S. Edward and his pro-

phetic vision—Beverly, sweetly bringing to our memory S. John of Beverly—Northampton, recalling to our mind a certain weary and way-worn Prelate, sitting on a harsh December morn at a nook in the vicinity of De la Prè Abbey, and even then mindful of future generations, blessing the weary and way-worn pilgrim with a fountain still bearing his name, though he himself be all but forgotten—and Shrewsbury, to excite in our mind a longing for the restoration of those happy days when the Church was one.

The subjects, consequently, which will attract our attention are—

1. The Gorham Case.
2. The Maskell, Dodsworth, and Pusey Correspondence.
3. The anti-Puseyite Crusade.
4. The Greek Church.

#### I.—THE GORHAM CASE.

The decision of the Judicial Committee of the Privy-Council, so long and so earnestly expected by all parties, was delivered on the 8th of March, when it was “held that the sentence pronounced by the learned Judge in the Arches’ Court of Canterbury, ought to be reversed, and that it ought to be declared, that the Lord Bishop of Exeter had not shown sufficient cause why he did not institute Mr. Gorham in the said Vicarage,” on the plea that the “doctrine, held by Mr. Gorham, is not contrary or repugnant to the declared doctrine of the Church of England, as by law established, and that Mr. Gorham ought not, by reason of the doctrine held by him, to have been refused admission to the Vicarage of Bramford Speke.” Mr. Denison, of East Brent, thus spoke of the anticipated decision of the Judicial Committee—“I may be allowed in this great assembly, holding in my hand the Book of Common Prayer and Administration of the Sacraments, with my finger upon the Catechism and the Office of Baptism, to say that all Church education depends upon and flows from the Catholic doctrine of Regeneration in

Baptism. We have lived to see what our fathers never saw. We have lived to see it called in question before a Supreme Court of Appeal, a Court, not composed necessarily, even of professing members of the Church of England—a Court with no spiritual character necessarily attaching to it—we have lived to see it called in question before such a Court as this, whether the Church of England holds, as *necessarily and exclusively true*, the doctrine of the One Catholic and Apostolic Church in respect of the Holy Sacrament of Baptism. In other words, we have lived to see it called in question before a Supreme Court of Appeal, whether the Church of England is, or is not, a branch of the Church Catholic. We have lived to see a Supreme Court of Appeal asked to declare, *not that Regeneration in Baptism*, as held always by the Church Catholic, is not the doctrine of the Church of England—for this nobody has yet dared to ask—I say YET, for we know not what may be coming upon us—but *that there is room in the Church of England for this*, and also *for the denial of it*. In other words, we have lived to see it asked, of a Supreme Court of Appeal, that it should set the seal of its authority upon this—that the Church of England has no doctrine of Holy Baptism. *Has any thing so revolting, ever been at any other time attempted to be palmed upon the religious sense of the English people?* Room for the *two* doctrines of the *one* Baptism in the *one* Catholic and Apostolic Church! Why not say at once, room for ten thousand doctrines? There would be some honesty in that.

Mr. Gresley also asks “whether it is not one of the most astonishing facts in religious controversy, that Ministers of the Church of England, should baptize infants brought to them, and then call on the congregation to join with them in thanking God for that it hath pleased him to *regenerate* each, and yet hold the opinion either that the *child has not been regenerated* at all, or that his regeneration is hypothetical.”\*

\* Gresley's “Real Danger of the Church.”

Mr. Turner thus stated his client's case—"He conceived Mr. Gorham to entertain this doctrine—that spiritual regeneration meant a change of nature, not religion; and that it was a gift of the Almighty—that it might be given before or after Baptism as the Almighty saw fit—that if infants received Baptism aright, by which he understood *well*, he considered that they must have received the grace of God before Baptism, or that they must receive it in Baptism—that in such cases Baptism was a sign of regeneration—that in such cases infants were grafted into the Church, and that the promises of God to infants were signed and sealed, confirmed and increased in accordance with the terms of the Gospel; but that, on the other hand, if infants did not receive Baptism rightly, that Baptism in such case had no immediate spiritual effect," and then, after laboring to establish his client's cause, he quotes the judgment of Sir H. J. Fust—"It may be said that there is no evidence to show that Mr. Gorham comes within the description of those who entertain Calvinistic opinions. Mr. Gorham undoubtedly says, that our Church has determined, that those children who are baptized and die before they commit actual sin, are undoubtedly saved. But then Mr. Gorham will not allow that benefit to be by regeneration in Baptism. He says it is by 'prevenient grace,' without which they could not be 'worthy recipients,' and that if not 'worthy recipients,' they could not receive the sacrament with advantage. That I take to be the doctrine Mr. Gorham holds." But in order to justify that position his learned Counsel maintained, that the Reformers were Calvinists, and that therefore we must construe the Services and Articles in a Calvinistic sense. Mr. Gorham had defended this doctrine of "prevenient grace" in his examination before the Bishop of Exeter.\* Moreover, as Mr. Turner stated that the "Articles were, by the Statute

\* This Article (Article xxviii.) teaches 'that there must have been a prevenient act of grace to render such infants worthy.'—*Gorham's Examination*, p. 125.

Law of England, the code of the doctrines of the Church of England, and not the Prayer Book, which was a mere code of its devotion," most truly then did the six Lay judges decide, that if it be, "as undoubtedly it is, that in the Church of England many points of theological doctrine have not been decided, Baptismal Regeneration is among the number, for it has been ruled that the code of laws of the Church give no decided judgment on the matter." The Bishop of Exeter accordingly carried the case into the three Law Courts. The Queen's Bench, speaking through the Lord Chief Justice, decided—"We all think that no reason has been alleged to invalidate the sentence in this case on the ground that the Queen in Council and the Judicial Committee had no jurisdiction over the appeal; and, therefore, we feel bound to say, that a rule to show cause why a prohibition to stay the execution of the sentence ought not to be granted." It was then carried into the Court of Common Pleas, where Chief Justice Wilde delivered the following sentence:—"In determining upon the present application we have attentively considered the circumstances under which it comes before us. The litigant parties have concurred in prosecuting the appeal to the Judicial Committee; and, after a decision has been come to, an objection is for the first time made upon the ground of a want of jurisdiction in the tribunal."

"The case was elaborately moved before the Court of Queen's Bench; that Court has pronounced a deliberate judgment upon the construction of the Statutes, and the applicant has since exercised his undoubted right of making a similar application to this Court; and when so doing the learned Counsel who made this motion brought before us all the authorities that there is any reason to suppose have any bearing upon the subject; and the Court of Queen's Bench, having stated that there were several instances of appeals to the delegates, founded upon the construction adopted by that Court, nothing was presented to us during the arguments in support of the application tending to

create any doubt of the accuracy of that statement, although we cannot suppose that due investigation was made as to the fact of such instances having occurred and of their applicability to the case; and we have informed ourselves of the particulars of those cases as before detailed, and further, no appeal has been discovered to have been made to Convocation. Under these circumstances, we have every reason to conclude, that further discussion will not furnish additional information or light upon the subject; and passing by another question to which the application might be subject, and founding our decision simply on the construction of these particular ancient statutes, as supported by the usage in the only instances of appeals in matters touching the Crown known to have occurred since they passed, we think that it would not be consistent with the due discharge of our duty, but would only tend to prolong an useless litigation, to grant any rule." The case was then taken into the Court of Exchequer, where the Chief Baron thus decided:—"Entertaining as we do no doubt upon the question before us, and concurring with the other Courts of Westminster Hall, and as far as we know with every judge of all the Courts, we do not think that we should be justified in creating the delay and expense of further proceedings with a view to take the opinion of the House of Lords, and our judgment is that the rule be discharged with costs."\* A motion was accordingly issued which the Bishop obeyed, merely lodging the following Protest against the institution of Mr. Gorham to the Living of Bramford Speke, which was rejected by the Court of Arches.

*Protest of Henry, Lord Bishop of Exeter.*

"In the name of the Holy Trinity, Amen.—We, Henry, by divine permission, Bishop of Exeter, having been monished by this venerable Court of Arches, to bring into the registry of the same, the presentation made to us by her Majesty Queen Victoria as patron of the vicarage of Bramford Speke, in our said diocese, commanding us to institute the Rev. G. C. Gorham, clerk,

\* The Gorham Case.

Bachelor of Divinity, to the church of the said parish, and to the cure and government of the souls of the parishioners of the same—presentation aforesaid notwithstanding,—we have found it to be our duty to refuse to admit and institute the said Rev. George Cornelius Gorham to the said church and cure of souls, inasmuch as it hath manifestly appeared to and hath been adjudged by us, after due examination had, that the said clerk was, and is not, fit to be entrusted with such cure of souls, by reason of his having held and continuing to hold certain false and unsound doctrines, contrary to the pure Catholic faith, and to the doctrines set forth and taught in the Thirty-nine Articles of the Church of England and in the Book of Common Prayer and administration of the Sacraments, according to the use of the said Church—against which our refusal to institute him, as aforesaid, the said clerk did prosecute his suit called *duplex querela* in this said venerable Court, and such suit was by the same, after due hearing, solemnly refused and rejected, whereupon the said clerk did appeal to the judgment of her Majesty in Council, and her Majesty in Council hath remitted the cause to this venerable Court, declaring that we, the said Bishop, have not shown sufficient cause why we did not institute the said George Cornelius Gorham to the said vicarage of Bramford Speke, and commanding that right and justice be in this Court done in this matter, pursuant to the said declaration—do hereby, in obedience to the monition of this Court, bring into the registry of the same the said presentation :—

“Under protest, that whereas her said Majesty, before she remitted the said cause to this Court with the declaration aforesaid, did refer the same to the Judicial Committee of her Majesty’s said Council to hear the same, and to make their report and recommendation thereupon ; and the said Judicial Committee did accordingly hear the said cause, and make their report and recommendation after hearing the same, that her Majesty should remit the said cause with the declaration aforesaid ; but such their report and recommendation was notoriously and expressly founded on a certain statement of the doctrines held by the said George Cornelius Gorham as it appeared to them, the said Judicial Committee, which statement was in the terms following :—

“That Baptism is a Sacrament generally necessary to salvation, but that the grace of regeneration does not so necessarily

accompany the act of Baptism, that regeneration invariably takes place in Baptism; that the grace may be granted before, in, or after, Baptism; that Baptism is an effectual sign of grace, by which God works invisibly in us, but only in such as worthily receive it—in them alone it has a wholesome effect; and that without reference to the qualification of the recipient, it is not itself an effectual sign of grace; that infants baptised, and dying before actual sin, are certainly saved; but that in no case is regeneration in Baptism unconditional.’

“And whereas, the above-recited statement, on which the said Judicial Committee did so expressly found their said report and recommendation to her Majesty, was set forth by them as a just and true and sufficient statement of the doctrines held by the said George Cornelius Gorham, notwithstanding he had declared (Article XV.), that ‘as infants are by nature unworthy recipients, being born in sin, and the children of wrath, they cannot receive any benefit from baptism, except there shall have been a preventient act of grace to make them worthy;’ and solemnly re-affirmed the same, (Article LXX.) when his attention was by us especially called thereto, in order that he might correct it if he thought fit; and notwithstanding that he, the said George Cornelius Gorham, had further declared (Article XIX.) of ‘baptised infants, who, dying before they commit actual sin, are undoubtedly saved,’ that, ‘therefore they must have been regenerated by an act of grace preventient to their baptism, in order to make them worthy recipients of that sacrament.’ Again (Article XXVII.) ‘the new nature must have been possessed by those who receive baptism rightly; and therefore possessed before the seal was affixed’—meaning thereby before baptism was given. Again (Article LX.) ‘that filial state’ (meaning thereby ‘adoption to the sons of God’), ‘thought clearly to be ascribed to God, was given to the worthy recipient before baptism, and not in baptism,’ manifestly contradicting thereby the said Articles of Religion, and the doctrine of the said Book of Common Prayer, as set forth in its offices of public and private baptism of infants, and of Confirmation, and especially in the ‘Catechism, or instruction to be learned of every person, before he be brought to be confirmed by the Bishop.’

“Notwithstanding, too, that the Lord Bishop of London, who was summoned by command of her Majesty to attend the hearing

of the said appeal, and who did attend the same accordingly, having been requested by the said Judicial Committee to read and consider the said report and recommendation before it was laid before her Majesty, did thereupon read and consider the same; and, after such reading and consideration thereof, did say and advise the said Judicial Committee to this effect, that he could not consent to the said report and recommendation, because the said George Cornelius Gorham holds not that remission of sins, adoption into the family of God, and regeneration, must all take place in the case of infants, not in baptism, nor by means of baptism, but before baptism;—an opinion which the said Lord Bishop declared to the said Judicial Committee appeared to him to be in direct opposition to the plain teaching of the Church, and utterly to destroy the sacramental character of baptism; inasmuch as it separates the grace of that sacrament from the sacrament itself: which said heretical opinions so held by the said George Cornelius Gorham, and thus by the said Lord Bishop of London expressly brought to the notice of the said Judicial Committee, and the manifest contradiction of the said opinions to the teaching of the Church plainly pointed out, were nevertheless wholly omitted by the said Judicial Committee, in the statement of the doctrine which appeared to them to be held by the said George Cornelius Gorham, on which they professed to found their report and recommendation to her Majesty as aforesaid.

“Now we, the said Henry, Bishop of Exeter, taking the premises into our serious and anxious consideration, and furthermore considering, that the judgment of her most gracious Majesty in Council on the said appeal was pronounced solely in reliance on the statement made in the report and recommendation of the said Judicial Committee, as being a just, true, and sufficient statement, do, by virtue of the authority given to us by God, as a Bishop in the Church of Christ, and in the apostolic branch of it, planted by God’s providence, within this land, and established therein by the laws and constitution of this realm, hereby solemnly repudiate the said judgment, and declare it to be null and utterly without effect *in foro conscientæ*, and do appeal therefrom in all that concerns the Catholic faith to ‘the Sacred Synod of this nation when it shall be, in the name of Christ, assembled as the true Church of England by representation.’

“ And further, we do solemnly protest and declare, that whereas the said George Cornelius Gorham did manifestly and notoriously hold the aforesaid heretical doctrines, and hath not since retracted and disclaimed the same, any Archbishop or Bishop, or any official of any Archbishop or Bishop, who shall institute the said George Cornelius Gorham to the cure and government of the souls of the parishioners of the said parish of Brampford Speke, within our diocese aforesaid, will thereby incur the sin of supporting and favoring the said heretical doctrines; and we do hereby renounce and repudiate all communion with any one, be he whom he may, who shall so institute the said George Cornelius Gorham as aforesaid.

“ Given under our hand and episcopal seal this 20th day of July, in the year of our Lord 1850.

“ H. EXETER.”

By thus protesting, the Bishop of Exeter followed as well the example of his progenitors in the formation of the Establishment, the common course pursued by the “Tractarian” party; when Dr. Pusey was condemned—when Tract XC. fell under the censure of the Bishop of Oxford—when Mr. Escott of Gedney was mulcted for refusing to bury a schismatic—when Mr. Ward was degraded and Mr. Oakeley deprived of Orders—when the Stone Altar Case was decided—when Dr. Hampden was raised to the See of Hereford—Protests without end were signed and presented, and so now Protests became quite fashionable; among the most celebrated was the following, bearing the signature of Messrs. Mill, Wilberforce, and Manning:—

“ Whereas it is required of every person admitted to the order of Deacon or Priest, and likewise of persons admitted to ecclesiastical offices or academical degrees, to make oath that they abjure all foreign jurisdiction, and to subscribe the three Articles of Canon XXXVI., one whereof touches the Royal Supremacy;

“ And whereas it is now made evident by the late appeal and sentence in the case of Gorham v. Bishop of Exeter, and by the judgment of all the Courts of Common Law,

that the Royal Supremacy, as defined and established by Statute Law, invests the Crown with a power of hearing and deciding in appeal all matters, howsoever purely spiritual, both of discipline and doctrine ;

“ And whereas to give such power to the Crown is at variance with the Divine Office of the Universal Church, as prescribed by the law of Christ ;

“ And whereas we, the undersigned clergy and laity of the Church of England, at the time of making the said oath and subscription, did not understand the Royal Supremacy in the sense now ascribed to it by the Courts of Law, nor have until this present time so understood it, neither have believed that such authority was claimed on behalf of our sovereigns :

“ Now we do hereby declare ;—

“ 1. That we have hitherto acknowledged, and do now acknowledge, the supremacy of the Crown in ecclesiastical matters to be a supreme civil power over all persons and causes in temporal things, and over the *temporal accidents of spiritual things* :

“ 2. That we do not, and in conscience, cannot, acknowledge in the Crown the power recently exercised, to hear and judge in appeal the internal state or merits of spiritual questions, touching doctrine or discipline, the custody of which is committed to the Church alone by the law of Christ.

“ We, therefore, for the relief of our own consciences, hereby publicly declare that we acknowledge the royal supremacy in the sense above stated, and in no other.

“ HENRY EDWARD MANNING, M.A.,  
Archdeacon of Chichester.

“ ROBERT ISAAC WILBERFORCE, M.A.,  
Archdeacon of the East Riding.

“ WILLIAM HODGE MILL, D.D.,  
Regius Professor of Hebrew, Cambridge.”

The reader must not suppose that the Bishop of Exeter, in his Quixotic gallantry against the Erastianism of the Establishment, quietly succumbed; nay, so far from this, he wrote a letter to his Metropolitan, in which, after accusing the judges of having been guilty of a grievous violation of their plain duty, and of introducing confusion into the Church, thus concludes—"Meanwhile I have one most painful duty to perform. I have to protest not only against the judgment pronounced in the present cause, but also against the regular consequences of that judgment. I have to protest against your Grace's doing what you will speedily be called to do, either in person or by some other exercising your authority. I have to protest, and do hereby solemnly protest before the Church of England, before the Holy Catholic Church, before Him who is its Divine Head, against your giving mission to exercise cure of souls within my Diocese to a clergyman who proclaims himself to hold the heresies which Mr. Gorham holds. I protest that any one who gives mission to him till he retract, is a favorer and supporter of those heresies. I protest, in conclusion, that I cannot without sin—and by God's grace I will not—hold communion with him, be he who he may, who shall so abuse the high commission which he bears."\*

In vain did Archdeacon Wilberforce contend that "the Church may be rich without worldly wealth, and its members revered without worldly titles, but if it abandon that Creed which was committed to its trust, or those Sacraments which it was embodied to administer, it will neither secure man's respect nor God's favor."†

"The Privy Council," (says Dr. Pusey), "cannot continue to be the judge of heresy in the English Church. Points of faith will not be accounted of less moment than points of honour. Civil courts are not thought the best tribunals to decide on military discipline, cowardice, and obedience. Are the Eternal Sonship of God the Son, or

\* Bishop of Exeter's Letter to the Archbishop of Canterbury.

† Wilberforce on Erastianism.

the Being of the All Holy Trinity, or the extent of Christ's redemption, and of His love for all our infants, subjects less deep, less essential to our being or to our peace? Common sense, natural feeling, instinctive reverence coincide with the rules of the Church, and the practice of Christendom in all ages, which requires that matters of faith should be referred to those who are by God's appointment 'Overseers' of the Church of God, whom the Church requires to vow before God, that 'they will banish and drive away all cironeous or strange doctrine contrary to God's word'—the special guardians of the faith ;" notwithstanding Dr. Pusey's assertion, that the Privy Council cannot continue to be the judge of heresy in the English Church, and that twelve pious, unlettered communicants of our peasantry would have been more likely to have given a sounder judgment than the members of the Privy Council, the six laymen, acting as the judges of the Judicial Committee of Her Majesty's Privy Council, still continue to be the judges of heresy in the Establishment, and will ever be so. Were one not busied in the din of controversial warfare, to simply peep at the quarrel now raised by a certain school in the Establishment, he would be convinced of the truth of Hobbe's position, that 'though king's take not on them the ministerial priesthood, yet are they not so merely laick as not to have 'sacerdotal jurisdiction.' Hence we must conclude taht not only have they (we speak of Protestant sovereigns only), 'sacerdotal jurisdiction,' but even jurisdiction in doctrinal matters. Dr. Pusey, referring in anticipation to this decision of the Queen in Council, says, "our eyes are now opened, we dare not close them, nor act as if they had not been opened. We see now on the brink of what peril the Church is placed, and even if by God's mercy we escape at this time, we dare not leave the flood-gates open which might again admit it: we have seen a doctrine to us as plain as the sun itself, called in question in a Court from which there is no ordinary appeal; we have heard part of the faith defended

and cross-examined. A Court, we have been told, must 'take time to consider,' whether a truth held by the whole Church, from the first, 'always, by all, and every where,' confessed in the Baptismal services of the Universal Church in every tongue from Britain to India, is a part of the doctrine of the Church of England. It hangs, as far as ordinary means are concerned, on six laymen chosen with no reference to, or thought of, such an office,—no, it hangs upon the will and goodness of God, whether as far as discipline is concerned, the Church of England shall be pronounced in a Court, without appeal, to be indifferent to the truth. But (continues Dr. Pusey), judicial sentiments are not authorities *for* the Church; but if right *from* the Church. They are *not* the ground of Canons; but if true they flow *out of* them; if false, they are to the Church *ipso facto* null and void. *They do not doctrinally hear the Church,* but deserve anathemas. Although judicial sentences cannot affect the *real doctrine* of the Church, they may very seriously attack her as to her discipline. As judicial sentences they are authoritative until they are rescinded. *Bishops ought to act against it if wrong.* They cannot bend even in discipline, the authority which Bishops have from God. Our eyes are now opened, we dare not close them, nor act as if they had not been opened; we see now on the brink of what peril the Church is placed, and even if, by God's mercy, we escape at this time, we dare not leave the flood-gates open which might again admit it.\*

Poor Dr. Pusey! one really grieves at recollecting that he is still out of the pale of the Church, still beating the air and fighting for airy nothing, contending for a phantom, a vain shadow: can Dr. Pusey seriously imagine that God would allow His Church to depend in matters of doctrine or "*discipline,*" on the judgment of six laymen, "chosen with no reference to, or thought of, such an office?" It is

\* Pusey on the Royal Supremacy.

with such men as Dr. Pusey that it is difficult to keep our patience; men who would labor for "His one Church," are indeed in danger, as long as they remain members of a Body that has arisen on the ruins of everything that is holy,—on the destruction of the altar—on the defacing of the sweet pictures of the Saints—on the denial of angels—on the denial of Holy Celibacy—on the persecution of a life of solitude—on the denial of the efficacy of intercessory prayer, whether among ourselves, or among a higher order of Beings—on the denial of the mysterious powers of the Christian Priesthood—on the denial of the necessity of continued and multitudinous prayers—on the denial of the need of a life of abstinence, as far as can possibly be attained, from all things that inflame the flesh and blood—it is not surprising then, that with a German writer, we should say, "*delenda est ista infernalis, seclerata, sanguinea, et execranda religionis Christianæ deformatio, quæ falsissime vocatur, Reformatio.*"

To one depending on the Book of Common Prayer as his guide, to one looking up to Dr. Pusey and Mr. Bennett as their spiritual leaders, regarding *their opinions* as the voice of the Church, it may not be amiss that the following language from some of the Reformers, so forcibly adduced by Mr. Gorham's counsel, should again be quoted to show the really inanimate condition of the Establishment. Becon, the favourite chaplain of Cranmer, says, "The Sacraments of the New Law, i.e., Baptism and the Lord's Supper, DO NOT CONFER AND GIVE GRACE, righteousness, and remission of sins: but *only shew and set forth* to us those things which God, of His infinite goodness, gives to the faithful, and seal, confirm, and *testify* God's *good-will* towards us."

Hooper. "Although Baptism be a Sacrament to be received and honorably *used* by all men, YET IT SANCTIFIETH NO MAN. And such as attribute the remission of sins unto the external sign DOTH OFFEND." And we are told by Coverdale, that the "*water in Baptism is an outward thing which CANNOT CLEANSE THE SOUL FROM SIN.*"

The following Resolutions were also drawn up and circulated :—

1. "That whatever be at the present time the form of the sentence delivered on appeal in the case of "*Gorham v. the Bishop of Exeter*," the Church of England will eventually be bound by the said sentence, unless it shall openly and expressly reject the erroneous doctrine sanctioned thereby.

2 "That the remission of original sin to all infants in and by the grace of Baptism is an essential part of the Article—One baptism for the remission of sins.

3. "That to omit other questions raised by the said sentence—such sentence, while it does not deny the liberty of having that article in the sense heretofore received, does equally sanction the assertion that original sin is a bar to the right reception of Baptism, and is not remitted except when God bestows regeneration beforehand by an act of prevenient grace (whereof Holy Scriptures and the Church are wholly silent) thereby rendering the benefits of Holy Baptism altogether uncertain and precarious.

4. "That to admit the lawfulness of holding an exposition of an article of the creed contradictory of the essential meaning of that article, is in truth and fact to abandon that article.

5. "That inasmuch as the faith is one, and rests upon one principle of authority, the conscious, wilful, and deliberate abandonment of an essential meaning of an article of the creed, destroys the Divine foundation upon which alone the entire faith is propounded by the Church.

6. "That any portion of the Church which so abandons the essential meaning of an article of the Creed, forfeits not only the Catholic doctrine in that article, but also the office and authority to witness and teach as a member of the Universal Church.

7. "That by such conscious, wilful, and deliberate act, such portion of the Church becomes formally separated

from the Catholic body, and can no more assure to its members the grace of the Sacraments and the remission of sins.

8. "That all measures consistent with the present legal position of the Church ought to be taken without delay to obtain an authoritative declaration of the Church of the doctrine of Holy Baptism impugned by the recent sentence; as for instance, by praying license for the Church in Convocation to declare that doctrine, or by obtaining an Act of Parliament to give legal effect to the decision of the collective Episcopate on this and all other matters purely spiritual.

9. "That failing such measures, all efforts must be made to obtain from the said Episcopate, acting only in a spiritual character, a re-affirmation of the doctrine of Holy Baptism, impugned by the said sentence."

H. E. MANNING, M.A., Archdeacon of Chichester.

ROBERT I. WILBERFORCE, M.A., Archdeacon of the East Riding.

THOMAS THORP, B.D., Archdeacon of Bristol.

W. H. MILL, B.D., Regius Professor of Hebrew, Cambridge.

E. B. PUSEY, D.D., Regius Professor of Hebrew, Oxford.

JOHN KEBLE, M.A., Vicar of Hursley.

W. DODSWORTH, M.A., Perpetual Curate of Christ Church, St. Pancras.

WILLIAM J. E. BENNETT, M.A., Perpetual Curate of S. Paul's, Knightsbridge.

HENRY WILLIAM WILBERFORCE, M.A., Vicar of East Farleigh.

JOHN C. TALBOT, M.A., Barrister at Law.

RICHARD CAVENDISH, M.A.

EDWARD BADELEY, M.A., Barrister at Law.

JAMES R. HOPE, D.C.L., Barrister at Law.

GEORGE ANTHONY DENISON, M.A., Vicar of East Brent.

In vain did Mr. Robertson appeal to "a Convocation as the only existing authority for the solution of our difficul-

ties," and Mr. St. Leger express a hope that the 'self-denying holy Bishop of Exeter would cut off Mr. Gorham by excommunication, that act being the last, the sternest, the most awful that a Bishop of Christ's Church can execute. And in the performance of this act, continues Mr. St. Leger, (an act though the sternest and the most awful that a Bishop of Christ's Church can execute—but which Dr. Phillpotts not having the power, being no Bishop, could not execute); let all the faithful, as well those who are awaiting a favor till judgment in the rest of paradise, as they who are journeying on in the strait and narrow way that leadeth unto life, strengthened in their toilsome travel by the "means of grace," lodged in and dispensed by the Church, the Spouse of Christ, and lightened in their path by that word of Truth which she holds forth to reflect upon the baptismal boon of salvation—let all unite in earnest prayer to God for the blessing of strength and fortitude upon His faithful consecrated servant, that he may exercise boldly his Apostolic power in defence of the Faith, and also that he may use the power of THE KEYS, and pronounce the sentence of excommunication against the heretic who would force himself into his Diocess, to defile the holy Altar, and to BLASPHEME the blessed font of spiritual regeneration."

## II.—THE MASKELL, PUSEY, AND DODSWORTH CORRESPONDENCE.

It pleased God of His love and mercy to bestow the grace of faith, and a corresponding disposition on Messrs Maskell, Allies, and Dodsworth. Mr. Maskell, perplexed as to the doctrinal teaching of the Establishment, addressed a letter to Dr. Sumner, and was informed by his "Grace," that he was as good a judge as the Archbishop of the interpretation by the Church of England of Holy Writ. As Mr. Maskell, Mr. Allies, and Mr. Dodsworth had, in conjunction with Dr. Pusey, and at his suggestion, after no little difficulty, succeeded in "restoring," or *partially* "restoring," the sacramental rite of Penance among their people, they

accordingly addressed him the following letter, on the subject of confession :--

ASCENSION DAY, 1850.

Dear Dr. Pusey,—We wish to put you a question on a point clearly concerning our own peace of mind and that of others. It is this. What authority is there for supposing that the acts of a Priest are *valid* who hears confessions and gives absolution, by mere virtue of his orders, without ordinary or delegated jurisdiction from his Bishop ?

We believe it to be the undisputed law of the Church that as it flows from order, acts done wrongly and illicitly are yet though when done, *valid*; the reason of which is that the power of order being given by consecration and indelible, cannot be taken away: but that acts flowing from Jurisdiction, if done upon those over whom the doer has no jurisdiction are absolutely *invalid* and *null*; the reason of which is, that jurisdiction being a relation of command between a superior and a subject, one who has no subject can bear no jurisdiction, and accordingly cannot exercise a power which he has not received.

But the act of remitting sin upon confession is an act not only of order but of jurisdiction. That it is an act of order, nobody doubts, and therefore proof is needless ; that it is likewise an act of jurisdiction, a power, is by two considerations ; first, it is a guiding power, and all judgment, to be valid, requires jurisdiction ; and secondly, it is not only a power of remitting, but also of binding, and none can bind one who is not his subject.

Now Priests, by virtue of their ordination only, and their sacerdotal character, have not subjects in the Church, nor have christian people been committed to their care and government. To Bishops alone the flock of the Lord is intrusted, to feed it, and they have to render account to God for the Priests likewise, who act under their commission. Every particular Church is founded upon its own Bishop, inasmuch as he is its head, and as such is the principle, fountain, root, and centre of its unity. Therefore every ecclesiastical act and function ought to be regulated by the Bishop, either doing it immediately or by means of others who received from him their jurisdiction and authority to do it. And an act so principal in the government of souls as the absol-

ving them from sins, cannot be regulated, but by the Bishop, nor done, but by authority emanating from him.

Such authority emanates from him when he commits to any Priest the care of souls, thereby intrusting such an one with a part of his own ordinary jurisdiction, *as regards such particular souls*, for all purposes of the Christian Ministry, and among them, for absolution from sin in order to the due reception of the Lord's Body and Blood.

Such authority, again, he can commit to any person qualified by sacerdotal orders, over the whole or any portion of his flock, as to a Vicar-general, or a Penitentiary; who would accordingly have a delegated jurisdiction.

But what we wish to know is, whether there be any authority for considering *valid* the absolution of a Priest, who has neither such ordinary jurisdiction; or again, who, having the care of souls, absolves not only his own Parishioners, but others also, without license from their own Parish Priest or Bishop.

We can find in the first fifteen centuries of the Church's history, no trace of such power being allowed to reside in Priests by virtue merely of their ordination; on the contrary, the further we go back, the stricter appears to be the dependance of the Priest on his Bishop in all such acts, until in the first ages we find the Bishop alone in person receiving penitents and admitting them to absolution. S. Cyprian is an instance of this in the case of the lapsed: and the discipline then allowed was a relaxation of a severer law. In progress of time as the faithful multiplied, and offences too increased, Penitentiaries were appointed in the various Cathedrals by express commission from the Bishops; and when the *public* discipline of penance fell into disuse, and *private* confession was gradually substituted, and the Bishop no longer dwelt with all his clergy in one city, and he was obliged to send Presbyters for the government of rural Parishes, the number of confessors was increased in proportion, but the office was never exercised, save by direct commission from the Bishop, even the persons specially entrusted to the Priest who absolved them; one proof among many of this is, that certain cases were reserved by the Bishop for himself.

Such appears to have been the state of things existing at the Council of Lateran in 1215, which in its 21st Canon ordered,

“ Let all the faithful of both sexes, as soon as they come to years of discretion, faithfully confess all their sins in private, at least once a year, *to their own Priest* :—but if any one for a just reason desire to confess his sins to a Priest not his own, let him first ask and obtain leave from his own Priest, *inasmuch as otherwise the other cannot absolve or bind him.*”—Mansi Tom. xxii. p. 1010. “ The minister by this Sacrament,” (says the Council of Florence in the year 1439), “ is a Priest, *having authority to absolve either ordinarily or by the commission of his superior.*”—Mansi. Tom. xiii. p. 1058. What was the received doctrine in England between these two periods of 1215 and 1439 is proved by Lindwood’s “ *Provinciale Anglicanum,*” containing the constitutions of fourteen Archbishops of Canterbury, from Stephen Langton in 1112 to Henry Chicheley, in 1415. The following quotations are to the point—Constitution of Walter Reynolds, Archbishop, from 1313 to 1327, “ Let no Priest admit to penitence the parishioners of another, except with the permission of his own Presbyter or Bishop.” Again : “ As it often happens that the Rectors of Churches, and even certain Priests and persons in sacred orders, because they are subject to none, as they suppose, in respect to the penitential forum, either confess not at all, or *appoint such as have no power to bind or absolve* ; we appoint that in every Archdeaconry one or two fitting Presbyters of competent knowledge, and approved character, have this charge given them in each Deanery, to hear the confessions of such, and enjoin on them penances, *to whom we will that authority should be imparted by the Diocesan of the place, or his Vicegerent, strictly prohibiting religious persons, or Monks, or Canons, or Hermits, daring to admit to penitence any one’s subject.*” Mansi. Vol. xxxi. p. 451 ; and Constitutions of John Peckham, Archbishop, from 1278 to 1293, “ Absolution likewise from voluntary homicide, as well public as secret, we reserve to the Bishops alone, except in the article of necessity.” Ibid. p. 452.

It would seem, then, that the Council of Trent only affirmed what had been the doctrine of the Church from the earliest times, when it declared—“ Since, therefore, the nature and principle of a judgment demands this, that a sentence be passed on all those subject to it, it hath always been the belief of the Church of God, and this Synod confirms it as most certain verity, *that the absolution must be held to be of no force which a Priest*

pronounces on one over whom he has not ordinary or delegated jurisdiction." Session xiv. cap. 7.

We have not overlooked the sentence in the exhortation appointed in the Common Prayer Book before communion :—" Let him come to me, or to some other discreet and learned minister of God's word, and open his grief," &c., &c. But, after the best consideration in our power, we have come to the conclusion that, so far from weakening the difficulties which we have suggested, it strengthens their force.

The words " some other," &c., would of course be intended to be understood only in the sense of the common practice and discipline of that time, (1548) in the matter; and we believe there is not any doubt whatever what that practice and discipline were; so that the " some other," &c., would of necessity be a Priest who had been appointed by the Bishop for that diocese and district.

It would certainly follow from all this, as it seems to us, that the authority which for some time past has been exercised by some among us, and especially by ourselves, not only in our own dioceses, but in other dioceses,—often without the knowledge, and probably (were it known) against the consent of both the Parish Priest and Bishop,—has not been based upon true and sufficient foundation; nay more, has been (however ignorantly) in opposition to the Catholic rules from the first ages to the present time. And further, a point to which we allude with reluctance and sorrow—it would follow likewise that the vast majority of those persons, to whom you and others have given absolution in this manner, are still, so far as the effect of any such absolution is concerned, under the chain of their sins, because they have not made confession to Priests who had duly received power to absolve them.

Hence, we cannot suppose that you will be surprised that we should earnestly desire from you an elucidation of this matter, and that we purpose to make public both our questions and your answer; in order that this very solemn matter should be properly considered, and that persons who are in much doubt and

anxiety should know whether they have, or have not, been misled concerning the true conditions of any ordinance of the Gospel.

We are, Dear Dr. Pusey,

Ever yours faithfully,

THOS. W. ALLIES,

W. DODSWORTH,

W. MASKELL.

London,

May 16th, 1850.

Dear Dr. Pusey,—We are very anxious to disclaim every intention or thought of calling yourself, personally, to account in the letter which we sent to you. Our only object was to arrive at the truth upon a very obscure question, and to lay before you, in a plain way, a doubt at this time pressing very heavily upon ourselves and many others. We cannot alter the wording of our letter to you; and we are confident few will think the open way in which we have alluded to our own practice, and that of many others, is beyond what the nature of the case itself requires. We cannot press you to give us an answer; but propose as soon as possible to print that letter and the present one, with some remarks. We shall not do so, however, for a few days, until we have learnt your final decision as to receiving any answer. You will see that we regard the two letters which you have already written to one of us as *private*; but we are quite ready to print both of them, if you wish it.

Mr. Dodsworth is from home for a few days, and has instructed us how to act for him in this matter during his absence.

We are, dear Dr. Pusey,

Faithfully yours,

THOS. W. ALLIES,

W. MASKELL.

London,

May 22nd, 1850.

Dear Dr. Pusey,—We are surprised and deeply regret that you continue to suppose that our letter referred to, or tended

to implicate yourself, personally, in any degree more than many others, who, during the last few years, have been in the habit of receiving confessions and giving absolution. We can most sincerely say that we selected you as the person to be publicly addressed on this very solemn matter, on account of your position in the Church, your acknowledged learning and long practice of administering in various Dioceses the Sacrament of Penance.

We must therefore leave our first letter as it was originally written, and unless we receive your answer, we propose to publish these three letters without further delay.

We are, dear Dr. Pusey,

Very faithfully yours,

THOS. W. ALLIES,

W. MASKELL.

“Dr. Pusey, (writes Mr. Dodsworth) I mention it to his honor, was one of the foremost to recommend the restoration of this salutary practice, (confession) both by precept and example. He was the first Anglican clergyman who spoke to me of its revival in the Established Church, and I know of many persons whom he has lead into the practice.”\* Mr. Dodsworth had accused Dr. Pusey of encouraging, not enjoining, auricular confession, and giving special priestly absolution, and also other acts of a Romanizing tendency, such as introducing the Rosary, and the use of crucifixes, which induced Mr. Palmer to observe, “that Dr. Pusey, holding the position of a recognized leader of a section of the Church of England, has at length openly, avowedly and argumentatively maintained the propriety of introducing Romish devotion, of using images and crucifixes, and offering to them the signs of worship customary in the Church of Rome, of employing Rosaries, devotions to the ‘Five Wounds,’ multiplied repetitions of the *Pater Noster*, besides inculcating such hints as ‘counsels of

\* Dr. Pusey hears confessions *kneeling*—he, at one side of the table, and his penitent at the other, and occasionally *forgets to give a penance*.

perfection,' and other doctrines in his letter carried to the extreme verge of orthodoxy or beyond it; and Dr. Pusey has publicly denied that the Church of England has any 'distinctive' doctrine, and asserted that 'it is idle' for any of her members to make declaration against Romish error and idolatry; when in accordance with these views, it is the practice of many persons of influence to discourage all argument against Romanism, to speak only of what is good in the Church of Rome, and to dwell upon the defects existing among ourselves, and when, in fine, we have seen the results of this mode of teaching in a restless and dissatisfied tone of mind, which either precipitates men into Romanism, or leaves them imbued with party-spirit, unsettled in principle, and disobedient to the heads of their own Church, 'ever learning and never coming to the knowledge of the truth,' and yet positive and dogmatic to the last degree."\*

Dr. Pusey, in reply to Mr. Dodsworth's accusation, of introducing 'Auricular Confession,' says, "Since I have not, except in some few very special cases, *recommended* individuals to use confessions, I need not hardly say that I have not recommended persons to place themselves under what is commonly understood by the technical word '*direction*.'

### III.—THE ANTI-PUSEYITE CRUSADE.

In consequence of Lord John Russell's celebrated Epistle to the Bishop of Durham, and the violent conduct and language of some of the leaders of the Exeter Hall section of the Church, aided by the signor Gavazzi, a regular crusade was commenced against "Puseyism," and as Messrs. Blunt, Baugh, Cameron, and Courtenay, had been the victims of the Evangelical party, in the previous years; so now Mr. Bennett of S. Barnabas, was chosen, and as the ringleader of the attacking party, a butler in the service of an "Angel," was elected.

\* Letter of Rev. W. Palmer to Bishop of London.

In vain did Mr. Bennett appeal to the Bishop of London, in vain did Mr. Harper tell his Diocesan that he had "driven from the service of the Church some of her best men."

Mr. Bennett himself refers to those attacks by a lawless mob on his private residence and chapel, attacks which made it necessary that he should call in the aid of the police.\* "Our Bishop was silent—he left the Priest to fight it out as best he might. The mob were his people—he was their Bishop. He had episcopal jurisdiction over them, if not, who had? for the people are never without a Bishop in the Church of Christ. He might then have come down among us and preached to his unruly mob, but alas! he did not, he left them to their own ungodly and merciless devices; he neither sent word of comfort to me, nor word of reproof to them; we were left to fight our way by ourselves, and in ourselves, and how to act we hardly knew." To one acquainted with the real nature of the Establishment, and how it is governed by an "unruly mob," Mr. Bennett's remarks affords no little amusement. Poor Dr. Blomfield! it certainly would have been a sight far more worthy of chronicling than the exploits of the hero of La Mancha, or Mr. Wildgoose, whose acts of spiritual heroism are recorded by Mr. Greaves, had his Lordship "gone down to S. Barnabas and preached to this unruly mob;" for it would certainly have been a more Quixotic act than the celebrated tilt at the mill, or the Spanish knight's successor, Mr. Wildgoose, preaching to the colliers of Derbyshire. Did Mr. Bennett really imagine that Charles James London, of unlit candle celebrity, would have ventured among the lamps under the leadership of the angelic butler.

No, no, good reader, the Anglican Bishops are not of the same stuff as the martyred Affre of Paris, who sacrificed his life for his flock. London might have been in flames; Belgravia sacked, and Mr. Bennett tied to the stake by the "unruly mob," ere Charles James would "have gone to preach to his people."

\* Appendix Y.

## IV.—THE GREEK CHURCH.

Messrs. Neale, Palmer, and Manning, held out a hope of reconciliation with the Oriental Church. They forgot that though Moskowa and Constantinople rejected the authority of Rome, and denied the Procession of the Holy Ghost from the Father and the Son, yet she held and taught the invocation of the Saints, and our Blessed Lady,\* and even Purgatory, and ignored, with the Church of Rome, the validity of Anglican Orders. While on the subject of the Greek Church, we must not forget to mention, that repeated attempts have been made to patch up a reconciliation between the Protestant bodies of nearly every shade and denomination with the Oriental Churches. The Establishment has made several attempts.

1. In the time of Charles I., when a friendly correspondence arose between Cyril Lucar, and Dr. Abbot.

2. In the reign of Charles II., when Sir Paul Ricard was English Consul at Smyrna, and Dr. Smith, Chaplain to the British Embassy at Constantinople.

3. In 1722, by a Dr. Coret.

4. In our own time by certain of the Tractarian School.

Cyrl Lucar contrived some means to open a correspondence with Dr. Abbott, Archbishop of Canterbury, who promised that if Lucar would send a properly qualified young man to England, he should be cared for, and educated; and accordingly, a young priest, of good extraction and studious habits, was sent to this country, and at the command of the king was sent to Oxford, where he received a regular collegiate education. Cyrl Lucar was however condemned by the Council of Constantinople in 1639, as a Calvinistic heretic, and deposed from his Patriarchate.

Though not exactly in harmony with our plan, to refer to

\* We remember the Chaplain of the Russian Embassy in Paris, assuring us that no Russ would, even in the presence of royalty, think of saluting the Czar, or Czarina, without having first invoked Her who is their Queen and Patroness. The late war has furnished us with many instances of the devotion of the Russian soldier to our Blessed Ladye, and the Saints.

the correspondence carried on between the eccentric scholar Martin Kraus, and the Patriarch of Constantinople; still, as Mr. Mason Neale is anxious to unite the Jansenists heretics in Holland with the Greek and Anglican bodies, it may not be amiss to inform our readers that the Patriarch of Constantinople refused to enter into correspondence with the Lutherans on the following grounds—

1. That the Sacraments and rites in the Catholic Church of orthodox Christians are seven,\* viz:—Baptism, Chrism by Divine Unction, Divine Communion, Orders, Marriage, and Holy Oil; for seven are the gifts of the Divine Spirit, as Isaiah says; and *seven also are the Sacraments* of the Church which operate by the Spirit.”

2. The Catholic Church thinks after consecration, the Bread is changed into the very Body of Christ, and the wine into the very Blood of Christ by the Holy Spirit.

3. The Spiritual Physician ought to be accurately acquainted with all things, and the person making confession should speak specifically (Κατ' εἶδος) and confess on all the points which he can remember with a contrite and humble heart.

The ‘*British Magazine*’ gives the following rules as a guidance for the Anglican ‘Clergy’ in paving the way for the restoration of complete intercommunion between ourselves and them, and our ultimate purification;—*e. g.*

“Every clergyman should have the English congregation abroad in communication with the Bishop, in whose ter-

\* βάπτισμα, χρίσμα θείου μύρου, χειροτονία, γάμος, μετάνοια, καὶ ἅγιον ἔλαιον. τὸ ἅγιον βάπτισμα, τὸ ἅγιον μύρον, ἡ ἀγία λειτουργία, ἡ τάξις τῆς ἱερωσύνης, ἡ μετάνοια, ὁ νόμιμος γάμος, καὶ τὸ εὐχέλαιον. τὸ βάπτισμα, τὸ μύρον τοῦ χρίσματος, ἡ εὐχαριστία, ἡ μετάνοια, ἡ ἱερωσύνη, τίμιος γάμος, καὶ τὸ εὐχέλαιον. and refers for an account of their benefit to the book, “which the Patriarch Jeremias wrote to the Lutherans, in order to convert them,” ὅπου ἔγραψεν πρὸς τοὺς Λουτεράνους διὰ τὰ ἐπιστρέψουσιν.

ritories they are locally situated, still on the understanding, that they shall use the English Liturgy, and be under Bishops of the English Church.

“That any clergyman who ministers to the English residents, should, with the consent of the Bishops, open his communion to the clergy, desire their assistance in baptisms and the like in his own absence, and in everything endeavour to make it appear that they are members and ministers of our Catholic Church.

“That if he should be sent with a view to a permanent residence, in order to assist them, and promote their welfare, he should likewise, with the consent and advise of his own original superiors, place himself frankly and entirely under the Metropolitan and Bishop of the place in which he has fixed his abode, and to adopt, if permitted, their habits and customs as far as he lawfully can, and wait for, and discreetly avail himself of those opportunities of enlightening and preparing their minds, which Divine Providence will sooner or later open to him.”

The last attempt to reconcile, or rather to patch up a reconciliation, between the Russo-Greek Church and the Anglican sect, was made this year by some members of the Scoto-Episcopal Body; and the following “*Memorial*” was addressed (but not forwarded) to the Patriarch of S. Petersburg:—

#### MEMORIAL,

TO THE MOST HOLY PATRIARCHAL SYNOD OF THE RUSSIAN  
CHURCH.

WE, the undersigned, Clergy and Laity, find ourselves oppressed within our present British Communion by a majority of heterodox, careless, or weak members, who have either willingly acquiesced in, or ineffectually objected to, the assumption by the Civil Government of the rights to decide all questions of doctrine and of discipline, and who, more particularly, have submitted to a recent decision of that Government, to the effect that the doctrine of the Regeneration of Infants in Holy Baptism is an open question in the Anglican Church, on which any man may hold and teach either the affirmative or the negative without being rejected from her Communion.

We thus feel that Truth and Heresy are mixed together in our Communion; that our Ecclesiastical position has become untenable; and that for the future we must either hold such Catholic truths as we now hold, merely on private judgment, or unite ourselves to some other external Communion, which may enable us to hold them on the principle of Authority.

In offering to join the Communion of Rome, we should be required to do violence to our consciences by professing to believe as articles of Faith, Doctrines which we do not believe, and which rest not on Scripture nor on unbroken Tradition, but on a dubious theory of Development.

On the other hand, it appears that the more orthodox Doctrine in our present Anglican Communion (to which Doctrine we now adhere with a full conviction), is virtually identical with that of the Eastern Catholic Church; so that union therewith involves no profession of any Doctrine which we at present disbelieve, nor renunciation of, or separation from, any Doctrines or persons but those which we already renounce in our hearts, and from whose oppression we already desire to be set free.

Under these circumstances, we have resolved to apply to the Most Holy Russian Synod, through the Chaplain to the Russian Embassy in London, who is one of the nearest Clergy representing the Orthodox Catholic Church of the East, requesting information on the following points:—

Supposing us to believe the Creed of the Catholic Church according to the definitions of the Seven Œcumenical Councils, and to be willing to accept that explanation of the same which is embodied in the Longer Russian Catechism, and to be ready to renounce all those Lutheran and Calvinistic errors of which the British Churches are either suspected or accused by the Eastern Catholics, and to separate for the future from all who refuse to do the same, would the Russian Synod be able and willing to receive us into Communion —

(1.) Without requiring us to make any permanent submission of ourselves or our Congregations to the Russian Hierarchy?

(2.) Without requiring us, being Westerns, either to expatriate ourselves, so as to live in the East, or to take to ourselves or our Congregations, in our own country, any incongruous local title, such as “Eastern,” or “Greek,” or “Græco-Russia,” as a distinctive epithet of our Christianity?

(3.) Without using for public or private worship a language which we do not understand ?

(4.) Without requiring us to turn to the use of the Old Style in our Ecclesiastical reckoning ?

(5.) Would the Russian Synod be able and willing to receive us, in such a manner as to place the fewest possible difficulties in the way of others of our countrymen joining with us in what we do, either at once or hereafter, and so as to offer the greatest possible facilities and inducements for their so joining with us ; that is to say, would the Russian Synod be able and willing to allow us to continue to use those Prayers and Forms of Religious Worship in our own language to which we and other members of the British Churches have hitherto been accustomed, excepting only so far as they may be judged by the Most Holy Synod, on examination, to require correction, either by omission of any thing contrary to the Ecumenical Faith or Discipline, or by the addition of anything of essential importance, now improperly omitted ?”

The reasons given for drawing up this Memorial, are so curious that we are constrained to lay it before our readers. The writer of the tract (now a convert) acknowledges that the object of the Memorial was ;—“ To offer openly to the distressed members of the British Communion, a proposition to join the Church of the East, while we are not certain of the precise terms on which that Church would receive us, and have no authority to treat in her name, would obviously be foolish in the extreme. While, on the other hand, to apply to the Patriarchs of the Eastern Church, without being able to place before them the desire of more members of the British Communion than have as yet concurred in the application, to hail with gladness the advent of aid in their extremity, in order to maintain among them a pure Catholicity, might perhaps endanger the cause we have at heart.”

To shew those discontented Tractarians, who were not prepared to become Catholics, the harmony of the Establishment with Catholicity, a Scoto-Episcopal minister published a pamphlet in which he endeavoured to harmonize

the "Anglican doctrine with the doctrine of the Catholic and Apostolic Church of the East;"—the Catholic reader, unacquainted with the vagaries of Tractarianism, will be surprised to learn that the Protestant sect, established by law, holds the doctrine of "*Guardian Angels*,"—that the "Most Holy Mary, ever Virgin, is in rank and creation above every other created being"—"*The Seven Sacraments*," and "*the Unction of the sick with oil*." The writer places at the head of each section extracts from the "Longer Russian Catechism," followed by quotations from Anglican divines.

A friend, intimately acquainted with the Russo-Greek movement, has kindly favored us with the following remarks:—

"All who have taken an interest in the great movement towards Catholicity in the Anglican Church, have heard of the attempts of Mr. William Palmer, formerly of Magdalen College, Oxford, and now happily a Catholic, to establish some better understanding between the Eastern Schismatic Church and Anglicanism, and failing in that to unite himself to the former of these bodies. It is hardly necessary to add that neither of these attempts succeeded. But it was during the time that passed after this good and learned man had failed in the first of his objects, and was now about to devote himself with an energy all his own to the second, that a Scotch gentleman, living in Edinburgh, who had been greatly impressed with the arguments for the Greek schism, having come to the conclusion, that since the Gorham case, Anglicanism was nearly or quite indefensible, and not being as yet prepared to submit to the Catholic Church, endeavored to gather together a certain number of persons, both clerical and lay, to join him in making an application to the Russian Synod to be admitted into the Russian (Schismatic) Church. A form of appeal to the Synod was drawn up and printed, and circulated among those likely to join in it; it proposed to join the Eastern Church on certain terms which it was supposed would probably be conceded. Only a very few persons joined it, and of these one or two of the more important shortly afterwards deserted it, upon which it broke down never to revive.

Meanwhile, however, it had found its way from Scotland into the hands of an Englishman, whose good intentions outran his wisdom and judgment; and he, feeling that Anglicanism was almost, if not quite, hopeless, and yet being imbued with the idea that the Greek, rather than the Catholic Church, was the true place of refuge, determined to make an effort to carry out the application to the Russian Synod. Perceiving, however, the manifest impropriety of a young layman, as he was, taking the lead in such a movement, he endeavored to interest an Anglican clergyman in the scheme, who was well known for his learning upon subjects connected with the Greek Church. But as he still clung to Anglicanism, he would not join the movement till the application was so far modified as to put the question to the Russian Synod in a hypothetical form, such as 'would they receive us if the Anglican Church failed us,' instead of broadly stating that it had failed. This, with two or three other alterations or additions having been made, it was attempted to get signatures to the 'Appeal'; a very few indeed gave their names, so few that it was never sent, though it was privately shown to the Russian Chaplain in London. The clergyman already alluded to, never having lost his attachment to Anglicanism, took comparatively little interest in the movement; and, upon the promoter of it, becoming (by prayer and study, and particularly by corresponding with the greatest of modern converts) gradually enlightened as to the claims of the Catholic Church, it finally died a natural death; the progress of his mind was simple enough, from the Greek Schism to the true Church; he had found himself obliged to maintain, in order to make out a clear case to himself, that the 'Eastern Church' was of herself the one only Church Catholic, and not (as Anglicans commonly say) a branch of it; but this notion was of course overthrown as he was led to observe how completely this Eastern community showed herself, and indeed plainly felt herself, to be nothing more than a local church, and how little, notwithstanding high-sounding phrases, she really acted or showed any consciousness of being able to act in the spirit and with the authority of the Catholic Church; so that at last, by the grace of God, he found his true home in that Church which ever has acted so, and which always taught with authority and claimed universal obedience.

The movement towards the Greek schism was of course a

wrong and mistaken one, and to Catholics it must seem the *ne plus ultra* of absurdity; but looking at it from an Anglican point of view, or with the dim light that a person hardly emerged from Anglicanism would enjoy, it is not so. When those who cared about Religious Truth and dogmatic teaching saw (and who could help seeing it?) that the Anglican Church could have no possible claim on their allegiance, supposing them to be still encumbered with prejudices against Catholicity, it was not unnatural that they should turn towards a Religious Body which at least taught, as of necessary faith, the Catholic doctrine about the grace of the Sacraments, and which did not leave Baptismal Regeneration and the Real Presence open questions. Besides there was a plausible historical case to be made out for the Greeks, sufficient to enlist the sympathies of those who fancied that the Holy See had exceeded its legitimate rights and powers, or who had got the notion that all the items of Catholic Dogma had been immemorially handed down from generation to generation in exact and *explicit* words.

To an Anglican, the argument might be put, 'On what ground do you recite the '*Filioque*' in the Creed? On the authority of the Infallible teaching of *the Holy See*? or that of the Council of Lyons? or that of the Council of Florence? or on your own private judgment? Not on the first certainly, he would reply; nor, he must add, on the second, for that was a Western Council never received by the Eastern Branch; nor on the third, for that defined the Pope's Supremacy no less than the Procession of the Holy Spirit from the Eternal Father and Son; then upon private judgment (whether of a national church or an individual, of course that does not make any difference in principle) must he base his belief in that article of Faith who refused to hold the Supremacy of Rome. The insertion of the clause in the Nicene Creed was a clear case of that process signified by the word, so often attacked and so little understood, *Development*, or to use the mode of expression which the author of the work on '*Development*' himself prefers, now that he knows so much more of Catholic Theology than when he wrote that wonderful treatise, it was an instance of the process by which doctrine held implicitly becomes part of the Church's explicit Faith. The Greek Church seemed to avoid the difficulty, for though

committed abundantly (as what Religious Body is not?) in other points, to this very principle of gradually involving explicit dogma from implicit faith, she did not do so in this particular very marked instance, and, practically at least, she denied the Pope's authority. So that, looking upwards at the Greek Church from Anglicanism, it appeared an object worthy of respect, veneration, and imitation;—and it is not to be wondered at that some of those who were earnest in the desire to detach themselves from the Protestant heresies which the Established Church of England allowed to be taught, should have turned to the supposed 'Eastern Orthodox Church.' Of course it was absurd to think that to do this, it was right and necessary to collect a number of names, and propose terms of communion; if the Greek Church really were what she was supposed to be, it was the duty of the applicants to submit individually to her, and upon her own terms; Mr. Palmer (some time before his conversion) had the courage to offer to do the first of these things, and the wisdom to refuse to do the second. But allowance should be made for those who did not yet see their way clearly.

Looking downwards at the Greek Schism from the Catholic Church, the vision that meets the eye is repulsive enough. To say nothing of the odious worldly pride, and abominable schismatical spirit, which led to the separation from the Holy See, no Greek or Russian, whatever he may argue on other points, can answer the question, '*What is the Catholic Church?*' Either he makes a divided Church out of the two branches, East and West, (for they all utterly rejected the Anglicans, who, they say, rebelled against their own Patriarch) and thus sacrifices the doctrine, which Greeks no less than Catholics hold, of the visible unity of the Church; or else, which is by far the most frequent idea with them, he says his own is the one Orthodox and Catholic Church to the exclusion of all others, and thus, by exalting what is manifestly a lawful sect, sacrifices the doctrine of the Universality of the Church, the *orbis terrarum*, whose prerogatives S. Augustin so gloriously maintains."

This year also recorded the reconciliation to Holy Church of Lord and Lady Fielding. Lord Fielding bequeathed a Church which he had commenced building, but had not finished at the time of his secession, to the *Franciscans*.\* His

\* Appendix A 2.

conversion (which took place in Scotland, in the Chapel of S. Margaret's Convent, Edinburgh, on 28th August,) led to a controversy between the Lord Bishop of Newport and Mr. Baylee, Principal of S. Aidan's College, Birkenhead, and Chaplain to the Earl of Denbigh. This controversy displays the usual cunning and tact of Protestant controversialists in general, though we are bound in justice to Mr. Baylee to acknowledge, that he displayed greater talent than many of his predecessors, when they have presumed to take the field against a champion of Catholicity. The Bishop of Newport soon discovered, as any one having a slight knowledge of controversy with Protestants of Mr. Baylee's school must know, that "instead of close logical reasoning, he had to contend against conventicle declamations—mere begging the question, incessant misrepresentations, and irreverent scurrility." The controversy ended, and we are assured by the Bishop that some converts were made.

"I leave the Anglican Communion" says Mr. Allies "not simply because it is involved in Heresy by the decision of Her Majesty in Council, but because that Royal Supremacy, in virtue of which Her Majesty decides at all in matters of doctrine, is a power utterly incompatible with the existence of the Church of God, and because Anglicanism, as a whole, has not only tampered with and corrupted the entire body of doctrine which concerns the Church and the Sacraments, but as a living system, is based upon the denial of that Primacy of S. Peter's See, to which I find Holy Scripture and the Church of the East and West bearing witness, and which I believe on their authority to have been established by Christ Himself as the rock and immovable foundation of His Church, Her safeguard from heresy and dissolution.\*"

Mr. Wilberforce says, "I have mentioned thirteen different marks which prove that the Catholic Church is the true Church to which we all ought to submit. They are these—

\* Allies' Rock of S. Peter.

“1. It is the Church set up by Christ and the Apostles, and the Protestant Churches are new.

“2. The Church is infallible. That is, it cannot teach error; and this is the only Church which always taught the same thing she now teaches.

“3. This Church is founded upon S. Peter, the first Pope, on whom Christ built His Church.

“4. It is spread all over the world, not in any one country.

“5. It teaches the same things in all places and at all times.

“6. It is a Kingdom by itself, separate from all the kingdoms of the World—the Kingdom of Heaven, as our Lord called His Church.

“7. It forgives sins by the hands of its Priests, and by the authority of Jesus Christ.

“8. It keeps up the custom of the Apostles by anointing the sick with oil.

“9. It offers the Daily Sacrifice to God.

“10. It keeps to, and shows, the meaning of all parts of Scripture, not only some parts.

“11. It honors and practises the ‘Counsels of Perfection,’ virginity, purity, and obedience.

“12. Miracles continue to be worked in it, and not among Protestants.

“13. It is hated by the world.

“Scripture shows that these are all signs of the true Church, and these things, and many others of like sort, have convinced me, my dear friends, that the Catholic Church is the one only Church of Jesus Christ upon earth; the one Ark of Salvation from the flood—the flood of fire which is coming upon the world. ‘The name of the Lord is a strong tower—the righteous runneth into it, and are safe.’ And knowing this I did not dare to remain out of this true Church any more than I dared have waited outside the Ark

of Noe, when Noe and his family went into it, and the door was shut, and the waters came down upon the earth.\*

Mr. Anderdon, on his secession from the Anglican body, addressed a most powerful letter to his late parishioners, and after stating his reasons, apologized for having allowed himself while "in ignorance and presumption to speak disparagingly, or worse, of the definitions of the Faith," he thus addresses his late friends, and would to God that his words had been listened to by an attentive and obedient people, but they closed their ears to the Truth of God:—"You cannot (says Mr. Anderdon) at once accept definite church principles and retain faith in the Anglican communion; you will be forced to swell the Protestant cry which now proclaims through England, day by day, the real character of her Establishment; or you will be led on nearer to the truth, and the heart will be given you boldly, because humble and believing on His promises, to cast yourselves within the circle of that mighty family of His redeemed, whose examples have stirred and whose triumphs have cheered you, whom you have already felt to be very near to you though you believed you might not speak to them, but whose love and prayers have prevailed to bring you thus far on your way. These two paths are henceforth inevitably before you. O! the solemnity of that decisive choice! Alas for those who will hang back, though they seem to hear the Voice that simply says 'Follow Me,' and are almost persuaded to embrace what their inmost hearts in their holiest hours feel drawn to; and who dare not follow out their conclusions as far as to a sacrifice, and prefer doubting His Body to bearing His Cross! There will be many such; it is fearful to foresee that there will not be a few among yourselves. Yes, some to whom I have taught all I then knew, whom I may have led up to the very threshold, and who never again can be in such ignorance as to be held guiltless of their own blood, will, after all, go back and fall away for ever. O darkest of all

\* Wilberforce's Letter to his Parishioners.

imaginable states—to have known much and attempted somewhat, only to be finally condemned for leaving undone the crowning, determining act of faith! Almost to have laid one's hand upon the door, and then be found outside at the coming of the Son of Man."\*

Mr. Maskell says—"I have resigned my cure of souls because I have no doctrines and no faith to teach as *certainly* the faith and doctrines of the English Church; but for a time at least, I have not her communion. Brief time it may be; One alone can tell. But if there really be truth and life in our Church, if she indeed be that which she claims to be—a part of the Church Catholic—she will not shrink from speaking plainly in such a day as is the present, on all essential doctrines of the Faith; and we shall know in what we are to trust."

The following defence of an Anglican Minister residing in a well-known Tractarian diocese, has been forwarded to us by a lay convert, with a remark that his Reverence observed that his *arguments* (?) would be as strong if used by a Dissenter from the Establishment.

"Newman says, 'Christianity has been long enough in the world to be dealt with as a fact.'

"Here, then, is a fact in the history of Christianity. *The visible Church*, which all, Romans, Greeks and Anglicans, maintain to have been constituted by our Lord to be the only channel of grace to mankind, and the only ark of salvation in the world. And yet *external* to that Church, (take whatever definition you please of it, whether Roman, Greek, or Anglican,) there are and have been whole generations of men and women, whom no one can doubt to have been, and to be, *true and living members of Christ*; and no one can be *more* than this.

"This, then, is the difficulty so far as concerns those, who are considered, by either Romans, Greeks, or Anglicans, to be *without* the pale of the visible Church; and for which difficulty all therefore have to account. But there is another difficulty for which

\* A Letter to the Parishioners of S. Margaret's, Leicester, by W. H. Anderdon.

Greeks, and Anglicans have to account; according to their view of it *the Church itself* is divided. The Greeks (I believe) admit, that Saint Peter and his successors in the See of Rome were by our Lord appointed to be the Chief Pastors of His Church, to rule and govern it upon earth in His name, (though not certainly as infallible,) and yet that there are whole Episcopal communities now rejecting the Pope's authority without being *ipso facto* guilty of schism.

“This is the difficulty, so far as concerns the government, and consequently, the Unity of the Church, which arises from the view which the Greeks take of it, and for which, as they consider it to be a fact, they must account.

“Again, Anglicans maintain that our Blessed Lord constituted His Church as *One*, visibly united Body; and yet they admit, that that Body is now *divided*. This, then, is the difficulty so far as concerns the *Unity* of the Church, which arises from the view which *Anglicans* take of it; and for which as they consider it to be a part, they must account.

“Now, Newman says again, ‘We want a theory,’ and certainly we *all* do need one to explain the above-named phenomena, whether we be Romans, Greeks, or Anglicans.

“Such a theory then, is the following, which I think explains them under the Greek and Anglican (and even I think under the Gallican) views of the Church; though not of course under the Ultramontane.

“I will take the Greek view of the original constitution of the Church, as comprehending the Anglican, and as being in my own belief the truest.

“It *had* been God's apparent purpose that His Church, under the Christian dispensation, should be the sole channel of grace to mankind, and that it should be *one, visibly united community*, governed, and ministered to, by Bishops and Priests of an Apostolic succession, under the supreme government of the successor of S. Peter.

“*But God's apparent purposes towards mankind, have from the first been THWARTED* by the wickedness of man; and we have no *promise* that they should not, in part at least, be so under the Christian, as under the older, dispensation.

“It had been God's ‘apparent’ purpose that His Church under

the Christian dispensation should be the sole channel of grace to mankind ; but the many and great graces among separated Christians would seem to *prove* that it is no longer so. It is no longer so, because God's first gracious purpose to mankind in the Christian dispensation has been thwarted by man's wickedness. He is merciful to men in another way ; as the sin of our first parents lost Paradise, and as the sins of the people of Israel withdrew them from the blessings of a Theocracy ; and as again the sins of the King sent ten tribes from Jerusalem, and the House of David, so have the sins of both people and rulers in the Christian Church been enough, and more than enough, to justify the supposition (there being no express promise to the contrary), that possibly God's gracious purposes, (or rather we should say offers,) have been again thwarted, or forfeited for the time ; and that the Church has forfeited her high and *exclusive* privilege of being the *sole* channel of grace ; while, as I have just said, the many and great graces among separated Christians would seem to *prove* that it had, and that God's first gracious purpose or offer to mankind in the Christian dispensation having been thwarted or forfeited by the wickedness of those to whose care He had entrusted the ministration of His Word and Sacraments, and whom He had appointed as the Pastors of His flock ; He is merciful to men in another way—calling them as he will, one by one oftentimes, and those His sons who answer to this individual and personal call, and who, without any outward sacramental means of union, maintain by faith in Christ, “*tanquam per instrumentum*” as Luther says, a spiritual union with Him, and so are verily and indeed members of Him ; and no man can be *more* than this.

“Thus, then, I meet the first difficulty, which arose from the case of those, whom no one can doubt to have been and to be *true and living members of Christ* ; and who, nevertheless, are not in any sense, either Roman, Greek, and Anglican, within the pale of the visible Church ; and thus we may believe they may in safety remain, and even grow in grace, so long as they remain in invincible ignorance of the Divine Institution of the Church, but hardly beyond that time.

“I now come to the *second* difficulty which arises from the view which both Greeks and Anglicans take of the original constitution of the Church, and of its present condition—viz : that it

was to be *one* visibly united community, ministered to, and governed by Bishops and Priests of an Apostolic succession; (the Greeks adding, under the supreme government of the successor of S. Peter), and yet, as a matter of fact it is *divided*. As I said before, I will adopt the Greek view as the truest in my belief, and as including the Anglican.

“It *had* been God’s *apparent* purpose that His Church under the Christian dispensation should be one visibly united community, governed and ministered to by Bishops and Priests of an Apostolic succession, under the supreme government of the successor of S. Peter; and that it should thus *remain* one, our Lord prayeth.—But, here again I say, that *God’s apparent purposes towards mankind have, from the first, been thwarted by the wickedness of man*; and we have no *promise* that they should not, in part at least, be so under the Christian as under the older dispensations. While this very prayer of our Blessed Lord’s itself suggests a doubt, that they *might* be so thwarted, and that too upon this very point of visible unity.

“As a matter of fact, the outward Unity of all Episcopal communities is long since broken—outward unity, by which the mystical unity with the Head *had* been maintained, is gone. Is that mystical Unity, therefore, lost to all those who no longer hold Unity with the Head of the Church on earth, the successor of S. Peter? The spiritual life and power of those bodies or Churches, separated from him, would seem to *prove* that it was *not*.

“It is not, because God’s first gracious purpose or offer to His Church having been thwarted by the wickedness of the rulers and people of the Church. He is merciful to it in another way—The ambition and tyranny of the Popes on the one hand, and the rebellious spirit of the Eastern Churches on the other, brought about the first great schism between East and West; while the tremendous sins of the Hierarchy and Priesthood in the middle ages, brought about the Reformation, and the separation of the Anglican Church from Rome, as through the sins of Rehoboam, the ten tribes were rent from the house of David. But still, though it is quite true that Elijah and other Prophets were sent to the separated tribes, yet the *temple* was at Jerusalem, and the Law and the Testimony were there; by which I mean, that though God did not reject those ten tribes from the

Covenant of Israel, yet in *Judah* was the larger measure of grace. I do not *argue* from this, I only bring it forward to illustrate the "theory" I am suggesting, as a possible one, and which I would farther draw out thus:—Though it be true, that outward unity is broken up, and grace nevertheless given to those Churches separated from what we may call the *formal* Church; (I call the Roman communion the *formal* Church, because I am supposing according to the Greek view of it, that it was under that form the Church was originally constituted), so shewing that orthodox Churches of the Apostolic succession, though outwardly separated for the time being, from that formal Church, may still have union with the Head through the Sacraments, and be real integral living parts of the Catholic Church; and though it be true that Grace is also given to individuals who are *without* the pale of the *visible* Church altogether; so shewing that they are real living members of Christ, and have essential union with Him; yet there may be different *degrees* of union with the Head, whether for Churches or individuals, or different forms or modes, with more or less of grace attached to each, by which different forms or modes it may please the Head to unite to Himself those Churches or Christians who have been guilty of no *wilful* act of schism. Thus, those who have remained in communion with the successor of S. Peter, may be in the *most* intimate communion; next in order may be those Churches or communities of Christians, who under the Greek and Anglican view, are still members of the visible Catholic Church, by being in communion with orthodox Bishops of the Apostolic succession. And, lastly, those, who, without any outward divinely appointed sacramental means of *union*, maintain by *faith* in Christ, "*tanquam per instrumentum*," a spiritual union with Him. This theory, if it be a possible one, would seem to me to account for a great deal, for which otherwise, it is difficult to account. The far higher (as it appears to me) standard of the saintly life among Roman Catholics than among any other Christians; their unvarying and undoubting assumption of an universal spiritual dominion, and their *power* in asserting it; their greater Apostolic zeal in Missions; their greater fidelity to Catholic traditions, and to the Catholic *religion*, properly so called; and their consequently richer ritual; their unvarying and undoubting assumption of the continuance of miracles among them, as well as the indisputable

*fact*, as it seems to me, of that continuance, as well as many other marks of superior excellence; and yet with all those tremendous corruptions, which to a large extent pervade their whole communion, mixing up truth and falsehood in a manner which the world has never seen before, and which one feels to be so mysterious, that one approaches them with awe and fear, such as is never excited by heretics, or any other partially or wholly corrupted religious community; for the higher the position of a Church or of an individual in the Divine Economy, so much the more awful is this fall, if they do fall; whether that fall be partial or entire, temporary or final. All this, I mean, would seem to say that while Rome is indeed the Jerusalem, and therefore mighty works are seen in her; yet she has sinned; and for her sin (and their's also), the ten tribes have been rent from her; and she, with those of her communion, is not what her Lord at the first designed her to be, and what for many ages she was—the one, only Spouse, “without spot or blemish.”

“Then, again, this theory would account for the state of the *Oriental Churches*; orthodox, faithful to the Catholic traditions, and sometimes shewing signs of great life and vigor, as in the conversion of Russia, (though this fact is disputed), but for the most part apathetic, “neither hot nor cold,” without missionary zeal, and powerless against their worldly oppressors.

“Again, it would account for the lowly but faithful state of England; humble in her pretensions; not setting up any heroic standard for her sons, but faithful, *very* faithful to essential truth; and maintaining a pure and simple code of morals; upon a neglect of many Catholic traditions, and therefore a poor Liturgy, but still a Liturgy—a miserably isolated position, but still a looking back with affectionate yearnings to the days of primitive simplicity, when those corruptions had not yet begun, which have since separated her from her sister Churches; and as I should add, from her *mother*; from her, who was by Divine appointment, “*Mater et Domina totius Ecclesiæ*;” but whose universal claims, *facts* tell us, are *suspended* for the time at least; because those facts shew us, that Churches have communion with the Divine Head of all, who are nevertheless separated from her and anathematized by her. It will also account for the small effects produced by Christian Missionaries among the

heathen in these latter ages ; not one entire Church permanently founded—Russia excepted.

“ And lastly, this theory will account for the many and great Christian graces so often to be seen in individual Protestants, as also for their utter faithlessness as *Bodies*—they are oftentimes eminent *personally* as Christians, but no aggregate of them can form a Church, or any part of a Church ; and when so aggregated, they have even fallen into heresy as a Body, though many will, we may well believe, be hereafter found enrolled among the members of the Church Triumphant ; while many Catholics, who have here boasted of their superior privileges, will be cast out.

“ If all this be so, then a further question would arise ; is a man *bound* to change, or is he justified in changing his position, when he becomes satisfied that the Roman Catholic belongs to a Church in a higher Christian condition than his own, in consequence of his being in communion with the successor of S. Peter ? If he be *not* justified in changing, then that condition, *is* a higher one, would not be so to *him*, but the reverse—but if on the other hand he is satisfied that he would be *justified* in changing, he is surely *bound* to do so.

“ Under the Ultramontane view of the infallibility of the Pope there can be no doubt ; but that all who are convinced that such is the true view, must join Rome forthwith ; but then they must account for the phenomena I began by describing—that however is their affair, not mine. Meanwhile, till they do put forward a satisfactory theory on that point, I look on those phenomena as an argument against *their* view of the Papal supremacy. For though I admit that their doctrine of grace overflowing its appointed channels, in favor of the invincibly ignorant, as sufficient to account for the Christian excellence of individual Protestants ; I do not think it sufficient to account for the life (!!!!) and orthodoxy (!!!!!!!) of the Greek and Anglican Churches, as *Churches*.

“ Again, the Protestant, when he is once convinced of the existence of the visible Church, should put himself, if possible, immediately into communion with some part of it ; for being as a Christian, a mere *individual*, he, as a Christian, owes no duty or

obedience to any sect or community, and is therefore justified in providing for his own personal advantage.

But under the Anglican view of the Church, and under the Greek view of the Papal supremacy, and even under, I should say, the Gallican view of that supremacy, (though they would not of course admit it,) it would seem clear, that the member of an Orthodox Episcopal Communion of the Apostolic succession is *not* justified in changing that position within the Church in which it has pleased God to place him, even though he might think the Roman Catholic Church in a higher position than his own—for, by so doing, he would be making a schism in the *Body*, through which he had been made a member of Christ, and through whose Sacraments he had received Christian graces, and whose ministrations he saw visibly blessed to others, and which he also saw bearing visible marks of God's favor and presence—"Lo! I am with you always, even unto the end of the world;" and if we see Christ present in that part of the Church, in which we were born, evidently working and energizing not only in individuals within Her, but with Her as a *Body*, as a *Church*, surely it is sufficient evidence that we are members of a community which forms a part of that great Family, to which that promise was given; and where He is, there may we abide in peace. Still, we may labor each in our vocation, Lay or Clerical, to bring about the restoration of Unity to the whole Catholic Church, and as one share in that great work, and as the first step to it, we may endeavour to bring our own Church, as speedily as the maintenance of truth and Christian liberty will permit, into the obedience to the Successor of Saint Peter.

The Rev. Alfred Dayman, Curate of Wasperton, near Warwick, published the following letter to the Editor of "*The Morning Post*," as containing his reason for seceding from the Establishment:—

To the Editor of "*The Morning Post*."

Dear Sir,—As I understand that you have been kind enough to publish in your columns the correspondence which has lately passed between the Bishop of Worcester and myself,

perhaps you will not think me taking an unreasonable liberty in begging you to give publicity to this letter, and the intelligence contained in it. I think it may with fairness be required, that they who have been appointed to teach others, should inform their hearers of a change having matured itself, has taken place, and is important. I have the happiness, then, to inform yourself and your many readers that, after much agony of mind and prayerful consideration, I have found the One, true Catholic Church of Christ—the Church of Rome, (believing that the ruin or salvation of my soul depended on my doing so,) and have been received into its Holy Communion by the Very Rev. F. Newman, at the Oratory, in Birmingham. Perhaps it would not be interesting to you to know, nor safe for me under my present feelings, feebly to express the deep drawn peace, and the heavenly—I had almost said the ecstatic—joy, which has illumined and bathed my soul, since by God’s grace and love I have been helped to take this ever-to-be blessed and happy step. But still, you will, I am sure, suffer me to breathe the evident hope that burns in my bosom, that you and all my brethren may soon, or at all rate, one day before the last, be inspired to do the same, and thus attain more of rest, peace, and joy; more of unity, of love, and Heaven than ever you or they have seen or can see in a kingdom so awfully divided against itself—so sorely torn asunder and distracted as is the pitiable body of the Church of England. I will, with your permission ask you one question; Do you not think, Sir, that when we see and hear such things in the Protestant Establishment; when an Archbishop would have us believe it is not necessary for little children to be born again of the Water and Spirit in Holy Baptism for them ever to enter into the Kingdom of Heaven; when another Archbishop refuses to give his blessing to a distressed curate, (as the Archbishop of Canterbury did to myself,) though he humbly begs it on his knees; and tells him that he *cannot do this*, for it would only be encouraging him in wrong notions of the Priestly powers, which Ministers of the Protestant Church have not; when Bishop is set against Bishop and teacher arranged against teacher; when in the nineteenth age of the Church it has to be decided whether Baptismal Regeneration is the doctrine of Christ’s Church or not; and when so vital, so momentous, so fundamental a dogma is left to be

settled by the private judgment of a few lay arbiters, who lay no claim to that special inspiration from above, to those gifts ever most necessary for arriving at, and still more for decreeing upon the truths of God's Word; when all the essential notes of a Church seem to be lost (if ever they were to be discerned) where there is no unity of love, of Faith, of discipline; no note of sanctity; no note of Catholicity; do you not think, Sir, that there is more than cause enough for piercing anguish of mind, for terrible and alarming doubts to those who are anxiously seeking for the truth which never can change, nor err, nor be altered,—which has been, which is, and which ever shall be *one*? for that truth, which is deposited, and is to be found alone in the One Church, which is the pillar and ground of the truth? And now, Sir, let me bid you farewell, and thank you for what you have done with the highest intention to advance the cause of Christ's religion. Let me bid adieu for ever, with a sigh, though it be for the past, yet with more hopeful joy for the glorious prospects of the future, to that one who, instead of embracing, of soothing, and consoling as a true and tender *Mother would do*, those that have wished and striven to love her well, has suspected them as aliens, rather than faithful children; or has treated them with cold scorn and utter contempt, or at last has thrust them altogether away from her bosom with the unnatural bowels of a cruel step-dame!

I am, Sir,

Your humble servant,

ALFRED J. DAYMAN.

Late Curate of S. John's Wasperton, Warwick.

---

1851.

---

The converts of this year were—

Rev. E. P. Walford.

Rev. T. N. Harper, Incumbent of S. Peter's, Pimlico, London.

Rev. H. Bedford, Curate of Christ Church, Hoxton.

Rev. E. A. Coffin, Curate of East Farleigh, Kent.

Rev. J. H. Minster, Vicar of S. Saviour's, Leeds. (R.I.P.)

Rev. W. Coombes, Curate of S. Saviour's, Leeds.

Rev. S. Rooke, Curate of S. Saviour's, Leeds.

- Rev. G. E. L. Crawley, Curate of S. Saviour's, Leeds.  
 Rev. R. Ward, late Vicar of S. Saviour's, Leeds.  
 Rev. W. Lewthwaite, Vicar of Clifford, Yorkshire.  
 Venerable H. E. Manning, Archdeacon of Chichester.  
 Rev. J. H. Jerrard, D.D., King's College, London, (R.I.P.)  
 Rev. T. L. Coghlan, Curate of Torquay, Devon.  
 Rev. J. H. Woodward, Incumbent of S. James, Bristol.  
 Rev. T. Orr, Curate of S. James, Bristol.  
 Rev. C. H. Dixon, Curate of Fewston, Oxfordshire.  
 Rev. J. Rodmell.  
 Rev. J. D. Parkinson, Curate of Wakefield.  
 Rev. W. J. Bakewell.  
 Rev. J. Collins.  
 Rev. S. B. Harper, S. Ninian, Perth.  
 Rev. T. Dykes }  
 Rev. F. Barff } Curates of Holy Trinity, Hull.  
 Rev. J. R. Shortland, Curate of Launceston.  
 Rev. W. Hutchinson, Curate of S. Eudellion, Cornwall.  
 Rev. H. D. Clerk, Rector of Iping.  
 Rev. J. C. Earle, Incumbent of Brandford, Wilts.  
 Hon. and Rev. W. T. Law, Vicar of Harbeston.  
 Rev. J. Rodwell, Trinity College, Cambridge.  
 Rev. H. James, Curate of S. Andrews, Well-st., London.  
 Rev. G. Harper, Curate of Dorchester.  
 Rev. E. R. Vale, Incumbent of S. Peter's, Pinllico  
 Rev. F. Hathaway, Curate of Teignmouth.  
 Rev. J. Scratton, Curate of Sittingbourne.  
 Rev. J. Kenrick.  
 Rev. A. R. Johnstone.

---

 AMERICA.
 

---

- Rev. F. E. White.  
 Rev. W. E. Everett.  
 W. P. Heathcote, Esq.  
 Lord Campden.  
 Baron Weld, (R.I.P.)  
 Sir John Simeon, M.P.  
 Lieutenant Nightingale, R.P.  
 Hon. Gilbert Talbot.

E. G. G. Howard, Esq., M.P.  
 F. R. Ward, Esq., Bristol.  
 J. B. Biddulph, Esq.  
 E. Neville, Esq.  
 J. H. Scott, Esq., Abbotsford.  
 F. Chambers, Esq., M.D.  
 J. N. Coghlan, Esq.  
 Captain Frisbie.  
 Professor G. Froerer.  
 Dr. Wolff  
 R. Cholmondely, Esq.  
 Comte De Lippe.  
 Col. Smithsize, (R.I.P.)  
 Baron De Turckheim.  
 Comte De Platten.  
 Baron Stritzich.  
 V. Browne, Esq., Galway.  
 Lady Campden.  
 Lady C. Peat.  
 Lady Simeon.  
 Lady Douglas.  
 C. Manning, Esq.  
 Duchess of Hamilton.  
 Duchess of Montebello.  
 Comtss. De Lippe.  
 Lady De Vere.  
 Lady C. Kerr.  
 Lady K. Howard.  
 Mrs. Coghlan.  
 Miss Coghlan.  
 Miss Cowridge.  
 C. Murray, Esq.  
 Miss Thewles.  
 Madle. De Montebello.  
 Miss Laprimaudaye.  
 Miss Peel.  
 Miss Dashwood.  
 M. De Florincourt.  
 Captain F. Case.  
 Lady Gage.

Miss Fraser.  
 Miss Thislethwaite.  
 Hon. Miss Law.  
 Hon. Mrs. Law.  
 Miss Neville.  
 Mrs. Manning.  
 Miss Manning.  
 Miss M. Manning.  
 Miss A. Manning.

We shall begin the annals of 1851 with the resignation of Mr. W. J. E. Bennett. Mr. Bennett, previous to leaving S. Barnabas, delivered three "Farewell Sermons," and addressed a Farewell Letter to his Parishioners, in which, like Dr. Pusey, he clearly stated that the Establishment taught no "distinctive doctrine;" for says Mr. Bennett, "it is no longer a question of *parties* in the Church, it is the question of the Faith, of Salvation of human souls. It is not on the point of having this or that to believe, but having ANYTHING to believe. We are on a wreck, a stranded wreck. There lies, helpless and waterlogged, the beautiful bark in which we were wont to make our voyage—our beautiful Church;—we were cast out of her by the force of the waves, and the stormy winds do rend her deep and wide. What shall we do? First let us urge our rulers, and strive all we can by entreaties that they will, as far as they have the power, (speaking humanly), allay this perilous storm, that of their heedless haste they have conjured up around us.

\* \* \* \* \*

And then if they *will* not help, if they *will* stand yet heedless by, if the vessel *must* needs be lost, why then we must seize the first plank that comes to hand—watch the long weary night of misery with prayer and fasting, and wish for the day."\*

Well does Mr. T. Harper observe, "What have we lived to see, my Lord? The English nation through its length

\* Farewell Letter to his Parishioners, by W. J. E. Bennett.

and breadth, has been convulsed and agitated with a no-Popery cry. The Supreme Pontiff has arranged the Episcopate of *that* part of the Church in this country, which is under his obedience, and immediately there is such an outburst of fanaticism, as we have not seen for a long while. In particular the English Establishment has led the movement. Her Bishops denounced in charges, the Dignitaries of Cathedrals and Diocesses summoned clerical convocations, the clergy in their turn summoned parochial meetings; quiet country squires\* suddenly emerged into public sight, mounted platforms, and helped on the old Orange cry. All the extraordinary force, moral and numerical, which our church could bring into the field, she has brought. And is this cry worthy of her? *Is it consistent with her expressed belief in One Catholic Church and the Communion of Saints!* What a communion of love is here in good sooth! A branch of the Church of Christ urging on with maddest excitement every one of the legions of Satan against a Church, which contains within her above 200,000,000 souls, one with us, *in our own theory*, in all the gifts of sacramental grace, and in union with our common Head; exciting against Her the world, the flesh, and the Devil, appealing to the public, leading the public; which is, of course, simply the world. Am I wrong in saying that the Devil was excited? Who, but

\* The following appropriate and ludicrous anecdote is given by Rev. N. Rigby, M R of Ugthorpe, to which we beg to call the reader's attention: "I once heard that a noble Lord, attending a great County meeting in the York Castle Yard, had achieved for himself a lasting notoriety by declaring that, in his opinion, the Bible ought to be read by all, men, women, and children, and even *ideots*. And fancy how the merriment, excited by this memorable burst of sound sense had scarcely subsided, before his Lordship was heard thus resuming his exhilarating influence.—'Yes, even by ideots. I myself have derived great advantage from that book.' The effect upon the meeting was electric. The noble advocate of the unfortunate class had so completely identified himself with his clients, that laughter became irresistible, and to what class of intelligent beings his Lordship belonged, became most evident. I believe this is the only instance on record of a noble Earl establishing his religious opinions at the expense of his understanding."—Two Addresses, by Rev. N. Rigby, p. 38.

that enemy of all truth could have induced any to write on our walls 'NO WAFER GOD,' 'NO JEW GOD,' 'NO DOVE GOD?' Who but he could have put it into the hearts of baptized Christians to burn Bishops in effigy; to profane their vestments, their pastoral staffs with jeers and execrations. Who but he could have stirred up Christians to mock and then burn the sacred symbol of our faith, the Holy Cross, with impious exultation, as was done more than once? Who but he, that wicked one, could have so blinded the eyes of believers in Christ, as to allow of their joining with Jews, Infidels, and Heretics, in an indiscriminate onslaught on the Roman Church—a Church, as we confess, of Christ, purchased by His Blood? Oh! burning shame! only to be excused on the plea of ignorance; outburst of superstitious rage, hateful in the sight of God, and stinking in the nostrils of Christendom. Who could suppose that such a movement, so characterized, was from God? Where was the mark of the Cross? Whence ascended the prayers and fastings? Nay, rather had it not plainly enough the mark of Antichrist: to wit, lying, pride, malice, evil-speaking, cruelty, blasphemies? Surely, my Lord, even those who first unwillingly joined in the popular fury begin to see this now; they begin to see that it had nothing of Christ about it, that it was the maniacal cry of an impure spirit struggling with an angel of the Church!" †

A curious question, curious as regards the *soi-disant* Anglo-Catholic Church, was raised this year by means of a lay convert, Mr. W. Rees Gawthorn—we mean whether Episcopal ordination, was essential to the Establishment. The "*Tracts for the Times*" had, from its earliest numbers, advocated Apostolical succession, and consequently Episcopal ordination, as a *sine quâ non* for the Establishment. In the first Tract the clergy are thus exhorted—"Keep it (the Spirit of the Apostles which is in you, for 'surely this is a great gift') before your minds

† Harper's Letter to the Bishop of London.

far higher than the secular respectability, or cultivation, polish, or learning, or rank, which gives you a hearing with a many. Tell *them* of your gift." "Why should we talk so much of an *Establishment*, and so little of an APOSTOLICAL SUCCESSION?"—"Look on your pastor as acting by man's commission, and you may respect the authority by which he acts, you may venerate and love his personal character, but it can hardly be called a *religious* veneration, there is nothing properly *sacred* about him. But once learn to regard him as 'the deputy of Christ for reducing man to the obedience of God,' and everything about him becomes changed, everything stands in a new light." "It may be asked, who are at this time the successors and spiritual descendants of the Apostles? I shall surprise some by the answer I shall give, though it is very clear, and there is no doubt about it—THE BISHOPS. They stand in the place of the Apostles as far as the office of ruling is concerned,\* and whatever we ought to do had we lived when the Apostles were alive, the same ought we to do for the Bishops. He that despiseth them despiseth the Apostles. It is our duty to reverence them for their office sake; they are the shepherds of Christ's flock. If we knew them well, we should love them for the many excellent graces they possess, for their piety, loving-kindness, and other virtues. But we do not know them; yet still for all this we may honor them as the Ministers of CHRIST, without going so far as to consider their *private* worth, and we may keep to their 'fellowship,' as we should that of the Apostles. I say we may all thus honor them even, without knowing them in private, because of their high office, for they have the mark of CHRIST's presence

\* As far as the office of *ruling*, not so far as the office of *teaching*, is concerned. The Apostles were both *inspired teachers* (Acts ii., 3, 4.) and *Bishops* (S. John xx. 21—23.) Their successors are Bishops only, not inspired teachers, and rule *according* to the Apostles—not absolutely, as the Apostles may be said to have done.

upon them, in that they *witness* for Christ, and *suffer* for Him, as the Apostles did."†

Such was the course of teaching adopted by the earlier numbers of the "*Tracts for the Times*," and none more eagerly claimed the title of Priests, or vaunted more of their Apostolical succession, than the Tractarian Clergy; it was in vain to point out to them instances of Bishops speaking of dissenting Ministers, as "their brethren in minor Orders," or of their being "hail-fellow-well-met" with Dr. Binney, or Dr. Cumming, or Dr. Newton. It was in vain to ask for "the marks of Christ's presence upon them," they were nowhere to be seen—the marks of Christ's presence were visible in another place, and men were instinctively led to acknowledge the spiritual sway of Nicholas of Westminster, John of Beverley, or Thomas of Southwark. It is not then to be wondered at that Mr. Upton Richards, still smarting under the wound inflicted by the secession of Messrs. Manning, Allies, Dodsworth, and Maskell, should seize the first opportunity of attacking the Evangelical section of the Church of England, and consequently, having observed a notice affixed to Woburn Chapel, S. Pancras, announcing that Dr. Mèrle D'Aubigné would preach the following Sunday, addressed the following letter to the Bishop of London:—

*"Albany-st., Regent Park, June 10th.*

"My Lord Bishop,

"Your Lordship will, I trust, not consider that I am transgressing my position as an incumbent in your Diocese, when I venture to submit to your Lordship how much distress of mind many members of my congregation feel at the conduct of the ministers of various proprietary chapels in London, who have recently allowed the pastors of various foreign Reformed Congregations to preach in their pulpits, thereby apparently reducing our Apostolic Church to an equality with those modern sects in the eyes of

† *Tracts for the Times*, vol. 1.

Europe. The immediate cause of my writing to your Lordship is, that one of the members of my congregation has, as he has informed me, addressed you on this matter. I feel it therefore my duty to testify to the grief which this caused him, and also to explain to your Lordship that his case, being that of a person who has from conviction conformed from Dissent to the Church, is one deserving, in such a matter, of special care on my part, and I am sure I may add that of your Lordship. Indeed, I should venture to submit that the ministers of those chapels, and those clergymen who have taken part in such services, have been accomplices before, after, and during the facts, to an overt violation of the 26th Canon, which prescribes that no one is to be ‘*suffered to preach, to catechise, or to be a lecturer or reader of Divinity, in either University, or in any cathedral or collegiate church, city, market-town, or parish church, or in any other place within this realm,*’ except he be licensed, and shall first subscribe to the three articles contained in that Canon. It was remarked to me, in reference to this proceeding of the Ministers of Portman and Woburn chapels, what would have been said or done had Mr. Harper, trafficking in the supposed immunity of proprietary chapels, invited Père de Ravignan to preach in Charlotte-street Chapel? But yet, my Lord, that parallel can hardly hold good. The Church of England regards Père de Ravignan as a Priest of the Universal Church. He has only to subscribe that 26th Canon to be competent to perform in our Church all the functions of the Priesthood; while, on the other hand, our Church regards M. Roger and Dr. Mèrle D’Aubigné as laymen and nothing more, and no mere subscription, on their part, can ever give them any other character in her eyes. Let me, then, on behalf of my flock, who are sorely distressed at it, implore your Lordship not to be silent under this outrage upon our Church and upon yourself, as Bishop of the diocess, at a time when the maintenance of our character as a Church is so essentially needful. I shall

feel particularly obliged by your Lordship favoring me with an early answer, as the minds of many are so sadly perplexed.

“ I remain, my Lord Bishop,

“ Your Lordship’s faithful servant,

“ W. UPTON RICHARDS.”

The Bishop replied to Mr. Richards as follows:—

*Fulham, June 11th.*

Dear Sir,—My attention had been called to the notice affixed to Portman Chapel before I had received your letter, and I have written to Mr. Reeves, pointing out to him the illegality of his proceedings, and expressing my surprise at his having made such an arrangement without any previous reference to me. Woburn Chapel had not been brought to my notice till I received your letter. I shall communicate to Mr. Dale this morning.

I am, dear Sir,

your faithful servant,

C. J. LONDON.

*London House, June 9th, 1851.*

My Dear Sir,—My attention has been directed to a placard affixed to your chapel, giving notice that M. Le Pasteur Roger will preach there every Sunday at three o’clock, and in a dissenting place of Worship every Wednesday. This notice, as far as regards your chapel, is in direct violation of the Act of Uniformity, (13 and 14 Car. II., c. 6 and 19,) which enacts that no person shall preach or read a sermon in any chapel for public worship unless licensed by the Bishop, who can only license those who sign and declare their assent to the 39 Articles of Religion. Any person offending against this law is liable to three months imprisonment. I must request you to explain this to M. Le Pasteur Roger, and inform him that our laws do not permit you to grant him the use of your pulpit. I cannot but express my surprise that you should have made

such an arrangement without any previous reference to me.

I am, my dear sir,  
Your faithful servant,  
C. J. LONDON."

Rev. T. Reeves.

In consequence of this correspondence between Messrs. Richards, Reeves and their Diocesan, Mr. Gawthorn conceived the idea of addressing a letter, under a fictitious signature, to Dr. Sumner.

47, *Holywell-street, Westminster,*  
*June 18th, 1851.*

My Lord,—I am very sorry to find by the public prints that Bishop Blomfield joins with the notorious Mr. Richards of Margaret (now Titchfield) street chapel, in casting a slur upon the orders of foreign Protestant pastors, so many of whom met your Grace in friendly conference at Willis' Rooms, on Tuesday last, and that he even concurs with that gentleman (at least so it would appear, I hope I am mistaken) in regarding them as 'mere laymen' (to use Mr. Richards' own words, from which the Bishop expressed no dissent), just as the Romanists do all Protestant clergymen, Mr. Richards included, though I believe that gentleman repudiates the name of Protestant.

\* \* \* \* \*

I venture to trouble your Grace with this communication in order to inquire whether it is your Grace's opinion and that of the majority of your brethren—in short, whether it is really the sentiment of the Church of England that these excellent foreign clergymen (whom we have most certainly led to believe that we recognize their orders) are not as truly Pastors of the Church of Christ as even the Bishops of the Established Church; or whether, on the other hand, we should regard them, with the Bishop and his *protégé*, as 'mere laymen.' I am myself a convert, from Dissent to the Established Church (and I trust,

therefore, your Grace will excuse my troubling you on this point), but I confess to your Grace that if the latter view is involved in adherence to the Church of England, or is the opinion of the majority of your Lordships, I, for one, shall certainly feel that the national Church has not a particle of claim to my allegiance, and that such a view really sanctions, to a very great extent at least, the efforts of the Tractarians to ‘*unprotestantize*’ the Church of this country, and that they are not so very far wrong after all in speaking of the Romish as a ‘sister Church.’ (*vide* ‘Christian Year,’ &c.) But I cannot believe that your Grace regards the celebrated champion of Protestantism, Dr. Cumming, who also I believe met you on Tuesday, and indeed the whole Established Church of Scotland (which the Supreme Head of the English Church, under Christ, has only just assured of her ‘sanction and support,’ accompanying the assurance with a very large contribution) as, as the Tractarians assert, ‘without the pale of the Church of Christ,’ which, however, they make to include the Romanists. I am most anxious to be informed of your Grace’s sentiments on this subject as the chief ecclesiastical authority (under Her Majesty,) and I am confident, therefore, that you will forgive the liberty that I have taken in venturing to trouble your Grace upon the subject.

I am, My Lord,

Your Grace’s Obedient Servant,  
W. FRANCIS.

By this means Mr. Gawthorn succeeded in eliciting the following reply from Dr. Sumner.

(*Private.*)

“Sir,—You are far too severe in your censure of the Bishop of London in his letter to Mr. Richards, though I wish that his Lordship had explained himself more fully. But in his original letter to Lord Cholmondeley on the subject of the foreign Pastors, he expressly stated that they could not, by *law*, minister in our churches, but that every endeavor would be made to provide places where they

might celebrate Divine Worship according to their own forms. I hardly imagine that there are two Bishops on the Bench, or one Clergyman in fifty throughout our Church, who would deny the validity of the orders of these pastors, solely on account of their wanting the imposition of Episcopal hands. And I am sure that you have misunderstood the import of the letter which occasioned your addressing me. I never supposed that it implied any such sentiment in the writer's mind.

I remain, Sir,  
Your obedient and humble servant,  
"J. B. CANTUAR."

Mr. Gawthorn, delighted as indeed he might well be at having such a document in his possession, immediately addressed the following letter to Mr. Cyril W. Page:—

47 *Holywell-street, Westminster,*  
*S. Basil, 1851.*

Dear Sir,—I will make no apology for troubling you with this communication as the information it contains is so important. I have a letter in my possession from Dr. J. B. Sumner (marked 'private,' which I must ask you to bear in mind), in which he says that only two of the Protestant Bishops, and not more than one clergyman in fifty, *consider the imposition of episcopal hands (his own words) necessary for the conveyance of orders, and that the foreign Protestant ministers may therefore be regarded by Anglicans as true Pastors of the Church of Christ.* He adds, moreover, that even Dr. Blomfield only objects to their ministering in Anglican churches on the ground of certain *legal* difficulties—not that he considers them 'mere laymen' with my old friend, Mr. Richards. I cannot believe that those who wish to be Catholic in heart and doctrine will much longer put faith or confidence in such an Episcopate and such a system. I can show the above Letter to any one who wishes to see it, and you are at liberty to make any private use of the information I have given you,

short of communicating it to Protestant 'Bishops.' I know it to be a fact that Dr. Maltby (of Durham) has contributed largely towards the support of several Dissenting congregations, and it is said that some of his brethren have acted in a similar manner. Pray excuse this hasty letter, and believe me to be your's faithfully,

W. R. GAWTHORN.

This letter elicited from Mr. Page a reply, at once showing how truly wanting the Tractarian Clergy are in meekness and gentleness.

"7, James-street, Buckingham Gate,  
July 7th, 1851.

Sir,—I have received a letter signed 'W. R. Gawthorn,' offering to show me, or any who wish to see it, a letter from 'Dr. J. B. Sumner,' marked '*private*,' and also giving me leave to make any private use of the information it contains, short of communicating it to Protestant 'Bishops.' I presume you are the same Mr. Gawthorn who resided for a short time in Dartmouth-street, and deserted the Church of England for that of Rome. I presume also that you are the same Mr. Gawthorn who a short time afterwards, under the name of 'Rees,' sent a letter to the Bishop of London accusing the clergy of S. Margaret's Westminster, of altering the Kalendar, and observing the Feast of the Annunciation on a wrong day, and who, when detected, declared it was done with the object of driving some of the accused parties to Rome. Such being the case I have no hesitation about the answer which I ought to give to such a letter coming from such a person. I refuse your offer, and I reject your confidence. I repudiate your claim to tie me down to a '*private*' use of the information which you have unwarrantably forced upon me. I know not upon what principle a man who insults the Church of England and her Bishops, and who upon his own showing is willing to betray the confidence reposed in him, can claim to force his confidence and impose his secrecy upon a Priest of the Church which he is endeavouring to subvert,

and whose chief Pastors he calumniates. I, therefore, so far from acknowledging any such obligation in this matter, have thought it my duty to send a copy of your letter to the Archbishop of Canterbury, and I shall feel myself at liberty, not only to make the matter known to any one whom it may concern, but also to publish the correspondence if I think fit. As to the matter of your communication, I must simply say that I give very little credence to it. And as to the inference you would draw from it, though I am unwilling to enter into controversy with you, I will say this much, that even supposing the Archbishop of Canterbury and the Bishops alluded to did, openly or secretly, entertain principles inconsistent with the formularies of the Church of which they are the chief guardians, I should not lose all faith or confidence in the Church of England, or even if I should be driven to such an extremity, the absence of straightforwardness, the lamentable deterioration of religious character, which I have too often witnessed in recent converts to Rome, would lead me to look out for some other system which should offer the attractions of honesty and love of truth. Whether what you say of the Bishop of Durham and 'some of his brethren' be true or not I shall not stop now to inquire, nor have I any intention of discussing with you the propriety of their conduct, even if the statement should be vouched upon better testimony than mere hearsay, or your professed knowledge; but I will suggest to you that, instead of seeking to vilify the Bishops of England, your time might be more profitably occupied in studying the history of the Church of Rome. Do this, Sir, and when you have made yourself acquainted with the flagrant delinquencies of the Popes and Prelates of your own communion, which you will find it difficult to deny or palliate, remember what is said in Holy Scripture about the mote in thy brother's eye. But one word more—I cannot 'excuse your hasty letter.' If ever hastiness should be avoided, it should be in writing such a letter upon such subjects. It is not the

first time that the zeal of recent conversion has led you into writing a most indiscreet and hasty letter, little creditable to your judgment, and somewhat damaging to the cause which you espouse; it is for you to consider whether it had not better be the last.

I remain, yours faithfully,  
CYRIL W. PAGE.

One is amused at this contest, and the confusion produced by Mr. Gawthorn's imprudent act in the ranks of the Anglicans of "high and low degree." In vain did Dr. Pusey again express his certain conviction of the validity of Anglican Orders, the Bishops were quiet on the subject of Dr. Sumner's letter, and not even "one in fifty" of the Clergy of the Establishment appeared in defence of their Orders.

In deference to the wishes of a Catholic journal, we are induced to add a few particulars on this subject, as it is important to notice the circumstances under which Archbishop Sumner's letter was obtained and published; and our information is chiefly derived from a pamphlet published by the Messrs. Richardson, entitled "Archbishop Sumner and Mr. Gawthorn," and containing the whole of the correspondence. It appears, then, that with a view to the conversion of a Protestant relative (who was shortly after received into the Church,) Mr Gawthorn addressed a letter to the Protestant Archbishop of Canterbury, couched in such terms as to conceal the fact of his being a Catholic, and to which he affixed his *Christian* name only, enquiring as to whether the majority of the Anglican Bishops and clergy considered Episcopal ordination indispensable. Dr. Sumner replied that he did not believe there were "more than two Bishops on the bench, or one clergyman in fifty throughout our Church, who so regarded it; and the result shewed that he was not far wrong in his estimate." *Not one* Bishop had the boldness to assert the impugned doctrine, though continually urged to do so by the Tractarians; and

many thousands of the inferior clergy subscribed an address to the Archbishop *thanking him* for his bold avowal, and his consequent recognition of dissenting bodies. "Either the Archbishop is in heresy, or I am in heresy," wrote Archdeacon Denison to the "*Guardian*,"—"I desire much to know which, by the decision of a legitimate tribunal of the Church of England, and then I shall be able to estimate my position correctly, which at present I am not." Mr. Beresford Hope, the founder of St. Augustin's college at Canterbury, addressed the "*Morning Chronicle*" (under his well-known fictitious signature) in even stronger terms; and refused to believe that the Anglican episcopate would not disclaim the sentiments attributed to them by their Metropolitan. "I cannot, I will not believe this," wrote 'D.C.L.;" "I cannot, I will not believe that the English Bishops will thus proclaim their great unfitness for the position which they hold. . . . I cannot, I will not believe that they will thus condescend to lower themselves in the eyes of entire Christendom, Catholic and Protestant alike." But Mr. Hope was mistaken, as the event has shown. Not even a Wilberforce or a Phillpotts had the courage to make the disavowal which appeared to be so necessary, though the whole Church of England was agitated to its very centre; and the subject continued to occupy the attention of both Catholic and Anglican periodicals for many weeks. Dr. Sumner's letter seems to have cut the last remaining link which held many persons to the Church of England; and henceforth Episcopal Ordination, like the doctrines of Baptism and the Eucharist, must be acknowledged an "open question" within its pale.

Many persons were, however, much scandalized by Mr. Gawthorn's apparent assumption of a false character in this matter, though prompted by his desire for the conversion of his relative, and by his publication of a private letter. But the latter was *really* the act of the Anglican clergyman who was the first to assail him in the matter;

and he did not himself defend his conduct in the first instance, though we believe he stated nothing in his letter which was untrue. He is now lay secretary to Cardinal Wiseman.

While on this question, raised by Mr. Gawthorn's letter to Dr. Sumner, it will not be amiss to notice the all-important fact of the want of evidence that Secker and Butler were ever baptized, and that Dean Whittingham, of Durham, was (as Anthony à Wood says,) "made a minister according to the Genevan fashion."

When we consider the manner in which men are raised by Her Majesty's Premier to the dignity of a Bishop, and call to mind the words of Mr. Wilberforce:—"The great safeguard is the control possessed by the two Metropolitans over the appointment of their suffragans.—It happened that two persons were nominated at the same moment for consecration by the Crown, one of whom (Hampden of Hereford) was publicly charged with denying the faith, the other (Lee of Manchester) with a breach of morals.—The two Primates were called upon to pronounce respecting the charges which were made, and either to acquit the parties or reject them. But what happened? The Primates instituted no inquiry, but proceeded to the consecration, on the ground, which was maintained by the Law officers of the Crown, that they had no power to test the fitness of the parties, but were bound to bestow spiritual mission upon any person who was presented to them by the Crown. Here, then, there must either have been a gross dereliction of duty in the Church's rules, or the rules by which her purity is defended must be grievously impaired;"—we can but laugh at the high standing taken by the Tractarian party. We see no sign of a Bishop in the gentlemen selected by her Majesty to enjoy these titles, and when we call to mind their position, we are amazed that any should regard the Sabellian Whately, the latitudinarian Hampden, the fickle, restless Blomfield, as BISHOPS.

The above correspondence elicited the following letter from the Rev. W. Palmer, who has lately (1858) distinguished himself as a partizan of ' *Souperism* ' at Belmullet;—what a fall for the author of ' *Origines Liturgicæ?* ' It does come within our scope to refer to Mr. Palmer's controversy with the Rev. R. G. Macmullen, M. R. of Chelsea, and his defence of rabid Evangelicism.

*Whitchurch Canonicorum,*  
Sept. 17, 1851.

My Lord (Archbishop),—Having seen in the public journals a letter addressed by your Grace to Mr. Gawthorn, and being under the impression that the purpose and meaning of that communication have been in some degree misunderstood, I venture most respectfully to inquire of your Grace, first, whether the letter in question is to be considered as an official authoritative document, or as informal opinion of public expression; and, secondly, whether it was your Grace's intention in that letter to state that the Bishops and Clergy of the Church of England generally, are of opinion that episcopal ordination is simply non-essential to the validity of Orders, in which case it might be dispensed with among ourselves; or whether your Grace meant to include in the majority, of which you spoke, those who would be reluctant to pronounce positively on the validity of all ordinations to the Ministry performed in foreign parts where episcopal ordination could not be obtained, though they would not consent that such ordinations should be introduced into the Church of England, or recognized as conveying power to officiate in that Church?

I have the honor to be,

My Lord Archbishop,

Your very humble servant in Christ,

W. PALMER.

*Addington, Sept. 19th, 1851.*

Rev. Sir,—A letter addressed to me in a spirit of Christian candor would be entitled to attention, independently

of the advantage which it derives when contrasted with other notices which have been taken of the communication fraudulently obtained from me by Mr. Gawthorn. In regard to that communication I take the opportunity of mentioning that it is not unusual for me to receive inquiries from persons unknown to me respecting matters connected with the Church, to which I consider myself bound to reply when there appears no ground for suspecting the motives of the writer. Mr. Gawthorn's letter came to me as one of these, and whether concocted by himself, or with the assistance of others, I cannot think that it was otherwise than cleverly composed, or contained anything to excite suspicion. My answer was expressed in a manner which I certainly should not have adopted "in the authoritative or official document," or if I should believe I was writing any other than a private letter. Still, inferences have been drawn from it, for which it furnishes no ground whatever. Otherwise, you could not ask me whether "it was my intention to state that I myself, or the majority of our Clergy look upon episcopal ordination as non-essential to the validity of Orders, so that it might be dispensed with among ourselves," or so that others, than those episcopally ordained, could have power to officiate in our Church.' This was no party of Mr. Gawthorn's inquiry. His inquiry was whether "in my opinion, or that of the majority of my brethren, these foreign Clergymen were to be considered as laymen! This I thought equivalent to the question, we held that no person in any country, or in any circumstances, could be entitled to minister in the Church of Christ, except through the imposition of episcopal hands. I replied, that I imagined this to be as far as possible from the general opinion, either among our Bishops or Clergy. I know that neither our articles nor our formations justified such an opinion. I know that many of our eminent Divines had disclaimed such an opinion; and I know that such an opinion would amount to declaring that no valid

sacrament, or other ministering act, had ever been performed, except under an episcopal form of government: and therefore I could not believe, and still do not believe that many of our Clergy would venture seriously to maintain such an opinion.

To be convinced that episcopal government, and therefore that episcopal ordination is most agreeable to Scripture, most in accordance with primitive practice, and is in itself the more excellent way, is perfectly consistent with the judgment of Hooker, that the lineal descent of power by Apostolical succession is not in certain cases to be urged absolutely, and without any possible exception.

Unable as I am to account for the misrepresentation to which I have been subjected, I am glad to find so proper an opportunity of correcting them, as your letter affords.

I remain, Rev. Sir,

Your faithful servant,

J. B. CANTUAR.

In this year Messrs. Patterson and Wynne, who had gone to the Holy Land fortified with letters commendatory in Latin, addressed to "all orthodox and Catholic Bishops," from the Scottish Bishop of Brechin (?) which they had a vague idea of presenting to some of the *Oriental* Bishops (knowing that those in communion with Rome would return but one answer); however, they did not do so, finding that the "Oriental Bishops" were in reality schismatics and heretics, and that as members of the Western Church they could not hold communion with them. Shortly after falling into a Tractarian dilemma, Messrs. Patterson and Wynne had the happiness to be received into holy church at Jerusalem.

Mr. Patterson gives the following explanation of his reasons:—

*Saturday, April 13th.*

Now that we are free from its bondage, I begin to wonder and inquire how it was possible that the Anglican Establishment

can have held one so long. I think the main reasons were—first, a profound traditionary dread of the Catholic Church, quite unreasoning and unreasonable—a sort of tacitly assumed first principle, supposed to be self-evident, which rules most Englishmen; secondly, our assumption that the goodness and worth of individuals (our Oxford friends and others) was a proof of the Anglican Church's Catholicity—an argument with which misgivings about the principles to which we were pledged, and the facts which were our antecedents, were stifled and postponed; and, thirdly, a theoretic view that somewhen or somewhere, there had been a Catholicity different from that of Rome at the present day. This it was which interpreted Scripture, and Councils, and Fathers, favorably to the Anglican position; and this prompted our tour to the East, if perchance we might escape Rome and its claim there, and secure ourselves in a remote corner of the Church, not Protestant, and yet not Roman. I do not mean to say that the utter futility of these pretexts dawned upon me till I had accepted the call of Providence, and made a distinct act of submission and faith, both of which are, of course, the inevitable conditions of conversion. But still the last few months had shaken and impaired their hold upon me. Contact with Catholics (especially my good friends in Silesia and France) had shaken the traditionary horror of 'Popery,' which still clung about me. The inapplicability of internal notes to prove external facts, or to disprove them, and the knowledge of individual goodness in every religion, which years of retirement at Oxford had made me forget, shook the hold that good men there had upon me, and with it the 'moral proof,' as we used to call it, of the Church's Catholicity. I did not, I think, at all appreciate before I became a Catholic, that which I now see as clearly as all do, save 'Puseyites' themselves—viz. the ultra-Protestantism of my position. Partly from being surrounded by one clique of persons of my own opinions, I never realized fully how completely unauthorized by the Anglican authorities, are Tractarian principles. It pained me, indeed, to come in contact with Bishops and other authorities, to meet them with shifts and evasions about the Articles and formularies, and to be a sort of ecclesiastical radical; but these were rare occasions; whereas the circle I lived in was perpetually about me, encouraging, suggesting, and protecting the shifts we

had recourse to. Some of these were almost laughably transparent; and I do not wonder now, that they irritate men of plain sense and straightforwardness. One of my 'High Church' friends used to defend his taking the oath of Supremacy, in which the authority of any '*foreign*' prince, prelate, or power, within the realm of England, is so solemnly renounced, by saying that the Pope was not a '*foreign*' but a *domestic power!* Another, in order to include the dead in his suffrages at the Communion rite, which the High Church use so often, used to omit the words inserted by the 'Reformers' in order expressly to exclude them, by feigning a slight cough at the proper moment! As to the last point, contact with the Eastern sects, and examination of their doctrines, showed that the notion of the Episcopate being a bond of Catholic unity in faith and discipline, was the merest figment of distorted minds, and moreover, that I had no right (on Anglican High-Church principles, which I conscientiously held) to look to them for help; but still, letters from England recalled our hopes, from this disappointment, to the West. The appeal of Mr. Gorham was to be the signal for an independent movement of the Establishment: the judgment of the High-Court invoked was immaterial; all that the Tractarians felt, that, to admit its rights to decide a question of doctrine in ultimate appeal was flat Erastianism, and so a great movement of resistance was predicted. Thus we held on to one straw after another till the fulness of our time came, and we were free."

As the Bishop of Exeter found, on account of his advanced years, that he could not visit his clergy as usual, he addressed them a pastoral letter convoking a Synod to be held at Exeter, in which he thus refers to Dr. Sumner's conduct with regard to Mr. Gorham:—

"The Archbishop, instead of doing this, (considering for himself the merits of the case, and forming and pronouncing his own judgment,) thought fit to desert the duty of his office, and at once to institute the Crown's presentee without further examination, did thereby no more commit the Church to a complicity in his act, than if, on presentation to him by the Crown of a Clerk, against whom he was formerly warned that he was

unfit for the cure of souls by reason of the unsoundness of tenets holden by him, the Archbishop had wilfully, and in despite of such warning, proceeded to institute him."

The Bishop of Exeter's summons to a Synod was met by several protests, but notwithstanding this opposition, the Synod met, passed certain resolutions, and the affair was regarded as an event betokening undoubted signs of life, and Mr. Mayow expressed it as a source of the most heartfelt thankfulness, that the present Bishop of Exeter *is what he is*.

The following important protest is from the pen of the Bishop's old antagonist Mr. Gorham:—

*The Vicarage, Bramford Speke, June 18th, 1851.*

My Lord Bishop,—Although I have *already* stated several reasons for objecting to the Synod which you propose to hold on the 25th inst., in a letter to which my signature is annexed in association with those of many other clergymen of this diocese, yet I cannot refrain from requesting your Lordship's serious attention to some *other* considerations, which could not be embodied in that letter without my brethren being pledged to certain documentary facts, which few (if any), of them had personally investigated, and for the accuracy of which I am alone responsible. This must be my apology for troubling your Lordship with a *separate* communication, supplementary to that letter, which (heartily as I adopt it as far as it goes), only *partially* sets forth my objections to the Synod to which you have invited your clergy to send elected representatives. In truth, the two reasons (hereinafter stated), which have the greatest weight in compelling me to protest against that Assembly, could not have been conveniently adduced in so concise a letter as that to which our united signatures are appended. I will now, however, endeavour to state them as briefly as may be consistent with perspicuity: and I humbly solicit your Lordship to give them deliberate consideration.

I feel bound to protest against this projected measure—

I. Because I have a very strong impression of *the illegality of a diocesan Synod assembled without permission of the Crown.*

It may appear presumptuous for an individual clergyman to avow such a scruple, after your Lordship's assurance in your pastoral letter, on the 9th of April, that you have "sought to obtain the very highest legal authority on this point;"—and more especially after the declaration of the Prime Minister in the House of Commons, on the 1st of May, based on the opinion of the law officers of the Crown, that diocesan synods are "not unlawful," provided it be not attempted by them to enact canons to bind the clergy. Nevertheless, I venture to think that such an opinion (formed apparently in haste for the immediate use of the minister), was adopted from a too implicit reliance on the authorities of Bishop Gibson's "Codex," and probably without the knowledge of at least one material fact, which I shall presently state. Who your lordship's "highest legal authorities" are, or how the case was put to them, we are not informed.

1. It cannot, I believe, be doubted, that in ancient periods, up to the year 1553, *both* provincial and diocesan synods were summoned by the same or by similar authority, and proceeded to discharge their functions "*pari passu*:" namely, by the King's writ, when the affairs to be discussed concerned the state; and by the independent authority\* of the Archbishop, when the business related to the Church at large, and of the Bishop, when the matters touched the interests and discipline of a particular diocese. Examples of diocesan synods, summoned for state purposes *by the King's writ* (though inadvertently ignored by Lord John Russell, on the authority, I presume, of the law officers of the Crown), are not rare. We have instances, in 1279, in the diocese of Worcester; in 1340, in the dioceses of Winchester and Worcester; and in 1464, in the diocese of York; in fact there can scarcely be a doubt that a Royal Brief was transmitted in each of these cases (as it is expressly said to have been in 1340 to *all* the Bishops) of both provinces, commanding

\* I am aware that the form of submission of the clergy contained an acknowledgment to the King, that "*convocation always hath been, and must be, assembled by your high commandment or writ*" But this form is said to have been dictated by the King, and was rather in conformity to the royal *claim*, than to the invariable *practice* in ancient times. If held to be literally declarative of the *fact*, it would, of course put an end to all pretence for synods, provincial or diocesan, except under a writ from the Crown.

them to summon diocesan synods. Those which I have cited may be seen in "Wilkin's Concilia," vol. ii. pp. 40, 624, 659; vol. iii., p. 59.

2. From this long-established parallelism of the authorities by which *both* the general and the limited Convocations of the clergy were summoned, it appears to be a fairly analogical inference, that the Act of Submission (25 Hen. VIII., cap. 19), which in terms forbids the *provincial* synod hereafter to congregate, even for purely ecclesiastical business, without the sanction of the Crown, does, in its spirit, and virtually, prohibit the revival of *diocesan* synods for concluding any questions of faith, or adopting any orders of discipline. The major prohibition seems to me naturally to include the minor; for it is surely a highly imaginative supposition that the two Archbishops were absolutely restrained from exercising a privilege which their suffragans might nevertheless continue to assert without hindrance. It is still more romantic to entertain the notion that, while the general Synod of the clergy can no longer meet, by the summons of the Archbishop without licence from the Crown, to conclude the smallest matters of interest to the Church, a diocesan synod may yet lawfully assemble by the mere *fiat* (or rather the *convenient*) of the Bishop, to utter, by the assumption of a corporate voice, a declaration interpretative of doctrine, and calculated (if not intended), to cast disrepute on the authority of a judgment, framed by the most learned expounders of the law, approved by the Archbishops of both provinces, and adopted by the Sovereign in her privy council. The Church of England might, indeed, with reason tremble for her Catholicity, while she watches anxiously these proceedings, were the clergy of this single western diocese calmly to acquiesce in this anomalous (if not illegal), act of its Bishop; and were they silently to permit a Synod to be convened, chiefly for "ONE GREAT QUESTION" (as your Lordship terms it in your circular to your Archdeacons), or mainly for the purpose" of making "A DECLARATION" (as you denominate it in your pastoral letter) of adherence to an article of the Nicene Creed, which you extravagantly "consider to have been virtually denied when her Majesty decided, as she did" by affixing her sign manual to the late judgment. It is, however, a hopeful fact, that more than 100 voices of the clergy have been lifted up in

solemn disavowal of participation in this proceeding; and I do not doubt that (should it be necessary) their protest will be echoed by multitudes of both clergymen and laymen, in token of their loyalty to their Queen, of respectful confidence in the Archbishops, and of their earnest desire to conserve the peace and unity of the Church of England.

While I thus state my views, I do not forget that your Lordship disclaims the idea of committing your convention to any authoritative act—(Pastoral Letter p. 112); and, indeed, it is manifest that no assembly of the clergy, possessed of common prudence, would “presume to attempt, enact, promulge, or execute any canons,” since, by such proceedings, it would clearly be liable to the severe penalties of the statute of submission. But, even the agitation of the “one great question,” which has been already decided by supreme ecclesiastical authority, and on which, therefore, no subordinately-authoritative conclusion *could* be attained, would from that very circumstance, be replete with the mischievous influence of a theological controversy, without the possibility of an effective issue. If your Lordship’s anticipated pseudo-synodal proceeding be not positively illegal, it is discriminated from illegality by a very thin covering:

Periculosæ plenum opus alexæ  
Tractas: et incedis per ignes  
Suppositos cineri doloso.

The treacherous crust may break in suddenly under your feet, and the flames may burst out before your Lordship or your assembled delegates dream of danger. I hesitate to follow, even my Bishop, in such a perilous track; and I must be content still to pursue the ordinary path which the laws of my country, and the usages of my Church, have distinctly marked out for me, though it be a beaten, and, therefore, in the apprehension of some minds, an inglorious way.

I forbear to occupy many moments on the single, and very obscure, post-reformation precedent quoted by your lordship; namely, that of the synod of the diocese of Kilmore, convened by Bishop Bedell in 1638. It may suffice to say, that it affords no evidence of *the legality* of that synod; but rather the contrary, for it does not appear that he ventured to summon it again agreeably to his original intention. It occasioned much discussions; but it was connived at by the state, for reasons

which may be assigned with great probability, chiefly on account of the universal veneration with which this simple-minded and pious Prelate was regarded. The primate, Ussher, whose influence was not small, threw his shield over the amiable Bishop. Archbishop Laud would be slow to check a proceeding in which the Church had asserted an ancient privilege independently of temporal authority. Moreover, these synodal decrees were of an innocent, and most of them of a very trivial character; for instance, the forbidding clergymen to wear long hair (*"comam ne nutriant"*) the prohibition of intramural burials, the exclusion of women from seats in the chancel, injunctions to wardens to prevent children from running about the Church, and to vergers to turn dogs out of the house of God. In fact, there was no "ONE GREAT QUESTION," which might have thrown the Church into dangerous agitation. Conivance, therefore, might be a wise, because a safe course. As a legal precedent, however, the Synod of Kilmore is utterly without value. But there is one lesson to be derived from it, not inapplicable, perhaps, to present times, and not the less gravely important, though it be connected with a homely and somewhat ludicrous incident. It is recorded in the still existing autograph MS. notes of a friend of Bishop Bedell, who was present at the diocesan convocation (though the occurrence is not noticed in Burnet's printed account of the Synod), that one clergyman, "D. Faythful Teate," subscribed the Kilmore decrees with the reservation of his dissent from that relating to the exclusion of women from sittings in the chancel: "and the reasons was this, because he had erected a new seat for his wyfe in the chancell but a little before, and was loathe to remove it!" Alas! my lord, it is humiliating to find that *personal motives, and considerations, far removed from a simple desire to promote the good of the Church*, can easily creep even into diocesan synods—yes, even when the matters to be discussed are of the most simple character. What, then, may not take place, when "One Great Question," connected with a lamentably fierce controversy—a question long prejudged by the Bishop who is to preside, and, therefore, to be brought before his representative assembly with an undue influence—a question which admits of no possible synodal solution except with *his* concurrence—is to be carried "at every hazard?"

I further protest against this proposed assembly of the clergy:

II. Because, even if it were admitted that a diocesan synod may be lawfully convened, without the sanction of the Crown—yet *there does not exist*, as far as I can discover, *any precedent for constituting it by election, representation, or ex-officio membership.*

It appears, from unquestionable records, that, while the provincial synods, invariably assembled by delegation, diocesan synods always comprehended *the whole of the Clergy* cited for personal attendance. Upon the obvious reasonableness of this distinction it is not my purpose to dwell; the *fact* alone is to my point. The only instance which presents the color of an exception is, in truth, a confirmation of the general rule; for when, at the close of the 11th century, Wistan, Bishop of Worcester, summoned a synod (or rather a commission under that name), for so limited a purpose as to decide a disputed privilege of a certain parish church in his cathedral city, “ALL the wisest incumbents of the three counties of Worcester, Gloucester, and Warwick” (which then constituted that diocese,) were “assembled by invitation,” for the discussion of even a matter of merely local interest. (“Wilkins’ Conc.” vol. 1., p. 369.) But, when matters concerning the whole diocese were to be debated, the assembly was universal. Thus, in 1312, among the constitutions of Richard de Kellow, Bishop of Durham, for annual diocesan Synods, to be held at Easter and Michaelmas, it was declared that “*all* abbots, priors, archdeacons, provosts, rectors, vicars, parochial chaplains, *and others,*” were “bound to appear, *by custom or by right,*” in those assemblies. (Wilkins’ Conc., vol. 2., p. 417.) On the verge of the Reformation, the Bishop of Hereford, when convoking a diocesan synod, in 1519, disclaimed the idea of framing its constitution by a scheme of his own, for the limitation of members, and addressed his Archdeacons by a circular, in which occur these remarkable words:—“We, not acting by ourselves alone, in a headstrong way, nor relying on our prudence, have determined to proceed by the counsel of prudent men, and by the assistance of our *whole clergy*; we, therefore, have cited *all clergymen of every degree, state, and dignity*, to our synod, in our cathedral church, namely, “*all and singular archdeacons, rectors, portionaries, vicars, chantry priests, stipendiaries [curates], and ministers of every sort.*” (Wilkins’ Conc., vol. iii., p. 181.)

How different is this language, my Lord, from that of your pastoral letter, and of your circular to *your* archdeacons; in which you assume “the necessity of the synod being composed mainly of *representatives*—(the objectionable word is emphasised by yourself)—“elected by the clergy of the different deaneries.” You add, “that if there is to be a meeting of so numerous a body of clergy—comprising nearly 800 persons—it must be effected by representation, is manifest:”—but the inference is contradicted by facts extending through six, possibly many more, centuries. You proceed to confer, by a few strokes of your pen, *ex-officio* Synodal seats on certain specified clergymen; and you name the number and mode of election of delegates from the rest of our body,—indulging the delusion that all the presbyters and deacons of this diocese will be thus represented with our “full confidence!” . . . .

I confess my bewilderment at the boldness of conception which has sketched out the plan of *such* a synod, with the faintest expectation that it could meet with the concurrence of the clergy, at a period, and in a diocese, in which opinions on ecclesiastical matters are so greatly and so unhappily divided. I cannot wonder that the First Minister of the Crown, when expressing his opinion on this matter in Parliament, declared (at least he is so reported in the *Times* of the 2nd of May) that “The assembly of representative clergy, formed in the particular manner as proposed by the Bishop of Exeter, seems to be entirely unknown to the laws of the church, and completely a device of his own.” For my own part, I cannot hesitate to declare decidedly, but respectfully, that I consider the calling into existence such an Ecclesiastical Convention, affecting to represent this diocese, to be an arbitrary act, eversive of the supremacy of the Crown, contrary to the usages of the Church, and destructive of the privileges of the clergy.—I remain,—“in all things lawful and honest,”—your Lordship’s obedient servant,

GEORGE CORNELIUS GORHAM.

To the Right Reverend the Lord Bishop of Exeter.

This year witnessed the submission of the Vicar of S. Saviour’s, Leeds, and three of his Curates, owing as much to the impracticability of the Bishop of Ripon, as the

deadly hostility of Dr. Hook. Mr. Minster, with his curates, was favoured with the following circular, evidencing the animosity of the Vicar of Leeds:—

*“Leeds, December 2nd, 1850.*

“My Dear Sir,

“I am desired by the Rural Dean to inform you, that in compliance with the request of the Chapter Meeting, this day, a Special Meeting of the Clergy will be held on Monday next, at twelve o’clock, with reference to the following notice:—‘To consider and adopt such measures as appear to be necessary in reference to the doctrines and practices now prevalent at S. Saviour’s Church.’

“I am, &c.,

“EDWARD JACKSON, Secy.”

In a few days after, Messrs. Beckett and Rooke were inhibited. The Bishop of Ripon was completely opposed to the conduct of Mr. Minster and his curates, and they, on their side, acknowledged that they “FULLY BELIEVED HIM TO BE IN THE WRONG.” The Bishop also condemned Mr. Pollen for a sermon in which he taught that there were seven sacraments, and furthermore inhibited him for preaching, and censured him and the Leeds clergy for promulgating such doctrines as the following:—

“1. That it is a duty of each member of the Congregation to go to a Priest for Confession and Absolution before he receives the Holy Communion.

2. That the Communion Table is the Throne of God, and the Lord’s Supper the Sacrifice of the Altar.

3. That no one can be considered a faithful Minister or member of the Church, who does not preach or practise praying for the souls of individuals departed, that Jesus might have mercy on them.

4. That the great misery of the sinner is losing the Intercession of the Saints, and the aid of the Sacrifice of the Altar.

5. That penance is the means of forgiveness of actual deadly sin.

6. That deadly sin after Baptism must end in spiritual

death, unless Penance be resorted to, and unless persons confess their sins to one of Christ's Physicians, by which is meant a Priest.

7. That after the consecration of the elements, the bread is no longer bread; the wine no longer wine, but the Body and Blood of Christ."\*

Mr. Dodsworth, in his pamphlet, says, "Who, that is at all competent to judge, can say, that the Church of England can be compared to the Catholic Church in its practical method of dealing with souls under the disease of sin—of leading them to compunction and administering the healing balm of the Gospel? *Individuals* may exist in the English Church, who are endowed with skill for these great ends. But in the Catholic Church it is part of *the system*. It exists everywhere. Again, can we say that the saintly life has been developed in the one in any due measure, or proportion, with the other? And, which is much to the point, wherever that saintly life has been most prominently developed in the English Church, it has been in such men as Andrewes, and Ken, and Wilson—men who in their life and writings have most symbolized with Rome, even while they said harsh things against her. In a word, compare the two systems, the prominent features in the Church of England seem to mark it as formed for this present world: decent, respectable, corrective of abuses which offend society, with enough of devotion to relieve the conscience; but withal cold, unenthusiastic, and dreading fanaticism far more than wordly mediocrity; it sustained its self-appropriated title of the *Via media*. The Catholic religion, on the other hand, seems to be formed for Heaven; braving the enmity of the world; bearing her unceasing witness to things supernatural; more intent on training souls for Heaven than on ministering to their comfort on earth: bringing us evermore into union with our Divine Lord by Her Daily Sacrifice, giving us thereby an entrance into Heaven; by

\* Pollen's Five years at S. Saviour's, Leeds.

the prominence of Her Sacramental system surrounding us with invisible realities; and while tenderly nourishing the weakest of her children, encouraging in those who aim to reach it, the saintly life, the highest, the holiest, the most enthusiastic and unearthly devotion.”\*

It having been asserted (and probably it is to this assertion of Mr. Fortescue, that Mr Walford the reviewer of the ‘*Tractarian Movement*,’ in the ‘*Tablet*,’ to which we have already referred, founds his charge against us as unworthy of credit,) by Mr. Fortescue, that Mr. S. B. Harper was not connected with S. Ninian, Perth, that that gentleman addressed the following letter to the Editor of the ‘*Glasgow Free Press*’ shortly after his submission to the Church:—

*To the Editor of the “Glasgow Free Press.”*

*Blairgowrie, July 12, 1851.*

Sir,—In your last week’s paper is a letter signed “G. B. Knottesford Fortescue, Dean of S. Ninian’s Cathedral,” in which occurs the following passage. ‘I think it only just to state.—First, Mr. Harper was never in any way connected officially with the Cathedral, &c.’” Now, I do believe, that every member of the ‘*Congregation*,’ as well as the Clergy themselves, would be as astounded as I was on reading this marvellous assertion. It concerns me, however, but little to notice this paragraph, as I am now of God’s undeserved mercies, safe in the bosom of the Catholic Church, and am consequently, far from being solicitous to substantiate claims of having been connected with any of the various forms of Protestantism; but really I cannot for the mere sake of common truth, suffer so very curious a statement to pass uncontradicted.

The relation of a few facts will serve to put matters on their true bearing. Before the three Clergymen who, together with your correspondent, constituted the Clerical Staff of S. Ninian’s—were at all acquainted with the Rev. G. B. Knottesford Fortescue, I was earnestly pressed by one of them to accompany him to Perth, for the purpose of joining in their proposed work, and before that gentleman was chosen for his present office, I

\* Anglican considered in its results, by W. Dodsworth.

was solicited by the whole body to come down and connect myself with the Cathedral. I did so, and for nearly two months, to the best of my recollection, before the so called Dean of S. Ninian, made his appearance, I had been assisting the laborious Clergyman, who originated the mission, and had shared with him the services about equally, and regularly every day of the week, as well as Sundays.

Some of your readers may perhaps have met with a little Tract, entitled '*A Few Words to the Free Congregation of Perth,*' which was published during that period. It was written by me, and signed for the Clergymen, above referred to, and myself, "The Clergy in residence at S. Ninian, Perth."

From the day that Mr. Fortescue arrived, until my voluntary retirement from any official connection with the Cathedral, I regularly occupied a fixed place in the choir, and performed a stated part of the services, at every one of which I chose to be present. Not only so, but a certain stipend was secured to me for my services, one of the contributors to which, was one of the chief benefactors of the institution. I have, moreover, in my possession, a letter from a 'layman, to whom the Cathedral is largely indebted, thanking me for such services as I was able to render, in terms of kindness, surpassing what they merited. Your correspondent could scarce have been ignorant of all this. For at a meeting, or chapter, held soon after his arrival, he applied for information on the subject; and his reply, when he had received it, was, 'then, of course, Mr. Harper must be considered as one of the body,' or words to that effect. Moreover, the Bishop of S. Andrew's was officially applied to, to license me to open a mission at Newburgh, in direct connexion with the institution.

At a subsequent period, a Clergyman in the same Diocess, was anxious that I should establish a mission in a town in his district, and when I represented that I could not very well do so, in consequence of my engagement with the S. Ninian's people, the latter offered to guarantee all my expenses, if the Clergyman alluded to would consent to my undertaking it as a S. Ninian's mission. And, lastly, to bring a most uninteresting subject to a close, I occupied as I have said, my stated place in the choir daily, at all the services at which it suited me to be present, and regularly performed the portion of the service allotted to me. It would be idle at present to enter into more

details, or to rehearse the motives which have induced me at much sacrifice, to withdraw from the Protestant, and to embrace, with God's blessing, the Catholic, religion; but I submit that these few unvarnished facts must serve to show how curious has been the statement of the Rev. G. B. Knottesford Fortescue.

I have the honor to remain,  
 Your most obedient servant,  
 S. B. HARPER,  
 Late of S. Ninian's Cathedral.

The *Tablet*, August 9, 1851, says of Sir John Talbot, "He had been educated in the Church of England, but he *returned* to the Faith of his ancestors on the Feast of the Assumption, 1849."

Sir J. Simeon on his submission to the Church issued an address to his constituents, he being at the time M.P. for the Isle of Wight, in which he gave the following reasons for resigning his trust as their representative:—

Gentlemen,—The events of the past year which have in a variety of ways, in which it is unnecessary for me to enter, so strangely complicated the position of the Established Church, forced upon my unwilling consideration an inquiry into the grounds upon which that Church claims the allegiance of her members. The result of that inquiry, honestly, and I trust, dispassionately conducted, has been the conviction that it is my duty to seek admission into the body of the One Catholic Church, from which England was severed at the Reformation. A change of views so entire and decided entails upon me as an honorable necessity, the duty of returning into your hands a trust which I am conscious I should never have received had I been a Catholic at the time of soliciting your suffrages.

We have been favored by the Editor of the *Hull Advertiser* with the following letter from Mr. T. Dykes, (now a Father of the Society of Jesus,) being his reasons for submitting to the Catholic Church.

*To the Editor of the Hull Advertiser.*

Sir,—It seems incumbent on every one holding a public office, on resigning that office to be able to assign some reason for

doing so. That I shall succeed in making any considerable portion of your readers appreciate my motives, is far beyond my expectations. Those who cannot enter into my views must necessarily be at a loss to account for my conduct.

Before I undertook the Curacy of Holy Trinity, I had, after five years careful study of the subject, adopted what are called High Church principles. A main point on which these differ from those of the Low Church school, is as follows:—The consistent Low Churchman believes that in all intercourse between God and man, man is dealt with as an isolated individual; that grace is communicated from God to man, independently of all external media; that God, by the preaching of His word, makes the offer of an outward gift of righteousness to man, and that each individual who accepts that offer puts forth a certain power, inherent in his own mind—lays hold on and apprehends this gift—becomes possessed of it—applies it to himself—adorns his soul with it—and, thereby, without at all being so *inwardly*, is *outwardly* accounted righteous before God. His part is thenceforth among the just, and dying in that state, is undoubtedly saved. The consistent High Churchman, on the other hand, believes that it is as the members of an outward and visible, though at the same time, spiritual and mystical Community, that man approaches God; that life and grace flow down from Christ to every member of this community, as sensation from the head, or blood from the heart in the human body; that this vital principle is conveyed by certain external media, called Sacraments, but that grace may produce the result which God requires, viz.,—personal holiness,—the co-operation of the human will is required, that without the result man will never be admitted to the presence of God. He further believes that this body which is called the Church, constitutes a visible kingdom in this world, having its own laws, governors, and subjects: that with these, so far as they are purely spiritual, no earthly prince or temporal power can meddle, for it was to His Apostles and not to Cæsar or Herod, that Christ entrusted the keys of this kingdom and committed the care of His sheep. This body is the keeper of the Faith, and by its exposition of the same, all its members are bound. Of these two theories it is sufficient to say that the first is most agreeable to human nature and man's reason, the latter to the express teaching of the New Testament, and the testimony and history of the Church itself.

Now from this brief summary it will be evident that it is a matter of little or no consequence to the Low Churchman to what body of Christians he belongs. In any community in which the Bible is freely circulated, he can hear of the offers of salvation—he can put forth his spiritual hand, and seize that outward garment which will conceal all his inward imperfections—the imputed righteousness of Christ; and clothing himself with this, he can wait in quiet assurance for his summons out of this world.

It is otherwise with the High Churchman; with him it is of the most vital importance that the spiritual community to which he belongs be at least a part of that visible body, out of which, as far as he knows, there is no salvation. He watches anxiously therefore, all the actions of this body, he investigates the principles upon which it professes to be founded, and if these should be incompatible with such a supposition, his mind became at once a prey to the most distressing inquietude, and fears. At any rate the question must not rest there. Before he can have any peace of mind, his doubts must be resolved; he must look again how far the body, to which he belongs, will bear the test of those notes, by which, Holy Scripture and the Fathers assure us, the true Church may be known. He must see how far the evils with which it contends are accidental, how far essential, how far they are the result of circumstances, how far the accessory development of principles.

Now it is because I hold these views, because I cannot look upon the matter as a Low Churchman does, that I have been much troubled at events and disclosures which have recently taken place in the English Church. These have raised in my mind, as they have in the minds of many others, serious doubts, as to whether she is a true branch of Christ's Holy Catholic Church. Recent events have shown that our *civil* rulers, not our *spiritual* ones are the "Lords over God's heritage," and exercise their power by "removing the old landmark," abolishing ancient bishoprics, founding new ones, and re-adjusting those already existing. That it is our Sovereign who holds *in solidism* that episcopate, of which each Bishop receives a part to be exercised only during her pleasure; for the power that gave can also take away, as has been done before now in the cases of Grindal, Abbot, Sancroft, Ken, &c. We have seen a man

convicted of notorious heresy, put in trust of Christ's sheep, the highest ruler in the Church, confessing that he had no power to prevent it. We have seen the English Church committed, by the same civil power, to acts of most gross schism, thrusting an heretical intruder into the very see of S. James'.—And lastly, we have seen the doctrinal decision of the highest spiritual court in the Church, overruled by the Queen in Council and a committee of Lay Lords, exercising a power over the faith, to which neither Pope nor General Council ever laid claim, viz :—to reduce an Article in the Creed of the Church to mere arbitrary opinion. Nor is this all. Every Clergyman in the Church of England is pledged by a vow to teach the doctrine, not which he deduces from Holy Scripture, nor which he believes may fairly be gathered from the words of the Prayer Book, but which the Church and State together agree to receive. “Will you minister the doctrine of Christ as this Church *and Realm* hath received the same?” “I will.” That the heretical judgment in the Gorham case, has been so received, there can be little doubt. It was delivered by the Supreme Head of both Church and Realm—it was adopted by the highest courts of the Church, and acted upon. It was accepted by the Bishops as a body, for, having met to consider it, they resolved not to put forth any united protest against it. It is thenceforth a doctrine of the Church of England, and it must be taught by her ministers that no man is bound to believe in “one baptism for the remission of sins.” From what doctrines the Church of England may yet release us, God only knows. Rationalism now fearfully spreading, will make short work with the remains of a mutilated creed, that I should have doubts about the Catholicity of a body in which I thought I saw spiritual jurisdiction centered in the crown of an earthly sovereign, and her faith at the mercy of a committee of privy councillors, is not much to be wondered at; and that these doubts have been many and painful, God and my own conscience can bear me witness. With the hope of removing the ground for them, I resolved to look into the subject more carefully. Meanwhile, so long as they were but *doubts*, and did not amount to *convictions*, I felt that I could conscientiously continue to minister in the Church of England. I might have my suspicions that all was not right, that might be well or ill founded; at all events I

was not bound to publish them to the world; I was not bound to cut myself off from retreat, and throw myself out of a sphere of usefulness for what, after all might turn out to be a mistake. I therefore kept those doubts to myself, or only mentioned them before those who were joined with me in office; the only objection was in the case of persons who were perplexed with the same doubts; and asked my opinion on the subject. Of this two cases, I believe, only have occurred. Words, however, spoken in the openness of confidential intercourse, have been taken advantage of, they have been added to and spread abroad. False reports were presently in circulation, and readily believed. I found myself charged with dishonestly using my position as a Minister to unsettle the minds and shake the faith of those who had no doubts about the Church of England of their own. I have already stated what ground there was for such a charge. I do declare it to be utterly false. But though I might be able to clear myself of dishonesty, I saw it would not be in my power to regain confidence; unless I could deny that I had any serious doubts about the Church of England; I could not make people believe that I was thoroughly to be trusted. These doubts might influence my teaching, even in spite of myself. One course only appeared left to me, and that was to resign a position in which I could be no longer useful, and in which I should be regarded as dangerous, if not dishonest. It is not without pain that I have resolved to adopt it. I have therefore tendered to the Vicar my resignation of the Curacy of Holy Trinity, until—if God so pleased it—my doubts are removed. Should I find, after giving the whole subject serious re-consideration, that there is no cause for alarm, I shall only be too glad to resume the office of ministering in that Church to which every earthly tie has bound me.

Before I conclude, I take this opportunity, once for all, to give the most public and positive denial to a charge which was fabricated very shortly after I came into the town, and which has been calculated with an eagerness—I wish I could not say with a malice—which is really astonishing; a charge for which—I say it with the utmost certainty—I have never given a shadow of foundation, and that is, in speaking of my beloved and venerable grandfather, I had been heard to say that he had taught error all his life, the effect of which I had come to undo.

That such a monstrous and unnatural charge should be believed for many months I believed impossible; it is only after repeated assurances that it is believed, and believed widely, that I am compelled to submit to the disgrace of denying it. Never have I spoken of my grandfather but in terms of the highest veneration and affection—expressing, at the same time, my desire that I might even be as bold and uncompromising in support of what my conscience tells me is right, as he was. I have ever said, and I confidently say so still, that had I lived in the days of my grandfather, I should, by God's grace, have taken the same course as he did. Zeal, holiness, and truth in the Church of England were at that time only to be found in their measure in that school to which he attached himself. Am I saying too much in stating my belief that, had he lived in the days in which I live, he might, perhaps, have been found taking somewhat the same course that I have taken?

One word only remains to be said, and that a painful one. It is to bid farewell to those who ever have been, and ever will be, in my heart and in my prayers—my late charge, and to request them, whatever may be my future course, to beg of God for me that I may have the grace to know His will, and the power to perform it.

I remain, Sir,  
Your obedient servant,  
THOMAS DYKES.

---

1852.

---

The principal converts for this year were:—

- Rev. T. Moyston, Vicar of Annaghdown (R.I.P.)
- Rev. T. A. Watson, Vicar of Long Whatton.
- Rev. J. H. Coleridge.
- Rev. H. G. Brasnell, Curate of Brasted, Kent.
- Rev. F. Elwell, Sydney.
- Rev. G. Norman, Curate of Wooton, Glo'ster.
- Rev. Lord H. Kerr, Vicar of Dittisham.
- Rev. J. H. Pollen.
- Rev. Lord C. Thynne, Vicar of Kingston Deverell.
- Rev. E. P. Wells.
- Rev. G. R. Belaney, Vicar of Arlingford.

---

 AMERICA.
 

---

Rev. P. J. Burchan.  
 Right Rev. J. S. Ives, Bishop of North Carolina.  
 Rev. H. Cook.  
 Rev. T. Thompson.  
 Rev. S. Cooper.  
 Rev. ——— Hendel.  
 Rev. G. Hoyt.  
 Rev. E. Hassert.  
 Rev. J. Keenan.

J. G. Law, Esq.  
 Lieut. Innis.  
 John Stratford Kirwan, Esq., Trinity College, Dublin.  
 Judge Jones.  
 Thomas Richardson, Esq.  
 Edward Baddeley, Esq., Q.C.  
 Major Frazer.  
 A. J. de Castro, Esq.  
 Prince Bou Maza.  
 Pierce Blake, Esq.  
 D. Potter, Esq., Tuam, (R.I.P.)  
 Hon. F. Cavendish, (R.I.P.)  
 Prince de Ingenheim.  
 Cte. de Kilmansegge.  
 F. R. Wegg Prosser, Esq. M.P.  
 Comte de Pffiel.  
 Lord Huntingtower.  
 Mr. S. W. Knutter, Scripture-reader to the Jews.\*  
 J. R. Hodges, Esq.  
 N. Hodges, Esq.  
 Lady Harris.  
 Countess of Kenmare.  
 Countess of Claunicarde, (R.I.P.)  
 Duchesse de Dalmatie.

\* A doubt having been raised by the Rev. Mr. Darby of Manchester, respecting Mr. Knutter's Ordination, we have placed his name among the *lay* converts.

Lady C. Thynne.  
 Lady H. Kerr.  
 Princess of Mecklenberg.  
 Mrs. Harper.  
 Mme. de Florimond.  
 Lady A. Kerr.  
 Lady C. Kerr.  
 Lord John Kerr, (R.I.P.)  
 Capt. Johnson and his Crew.  
 Miss Thynne.

Dr. Ives, on his submission to the Church, issued the following address to the Convention of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the Diocese of North Carolina:—

*Rome, Wednesday, Dec. 22nd, 1852.*

Dear Brethren,—Some of you, at least, are aware that for years doubts of the validity of my office as Bishop have at times harassed my mind, and greatly enfeebled my action. At other times, it is true, circumstances have arisen to overrule these doubts, and to bring to my mind temporary relief. But it has been only temporary; for, in spite of resolutions, to abandon the reading and the use of Catholic books; in spite of earnest prayers and entreaties that God would protect my mind against the distressing influence of Catholic truth; and in spite of public and private professions and declarations, which in times of suspended doubt I sincerely made to shield myself from suspicion and win back the confidence of my Diocese, which had been well nigh lost—in spite of all this, and of many other considerations which would rise up before me, as the necessary consequence of suffering my mind to be carried forward in the direction in which my doubts pointed, these doubts would again return with increased and almost overwhelming vigor, goading me at times to the very borders of derangement.

Under these doubts, I desired temporary relief from duties that had become so disquieting to me, and determined to accompany Mrs. Ives, whose health demanded a change of climate, in a short absence abroad. But absence has brought no relief to my mind. Indeed, the doubts that disturbed it have grown

into clear and settled convictions, so clear and settled that without a violation of conscience and honor, and every obligation of duty to God and His Church, I can no longer remain in my position.

I am called upon, therefore, to do an act of self-sacrifice, in view of which all other self-sacrificing acts of my life are less than nothing; called upon to sever the ties which have been strengthened by long years of love and forbearance, which have bound my heart to many of you, as was David's to that of Jonathan, and makes my heart bleed as my hand traces the sentence which separates all Pastoral relation between us, and conveys to you the knowledge that I hereby resign into your hands my office as Bishop of North Carolina; and further, that I am determined to make my submission to the Catholic Church.

In addition, my feelings will allow me only to say, as this act is earlier than any anticipation of my own, and antedates, by some months, the expiration of the time for which I asked leave of absence, and for which I so promptly received from members of your body an advance of salary, I hereby renounce all claim upon the same, and acknowledge myself bound, on an intimation of your wish, to return whatever you may have advanced to me beyond this 22nd day of December.

With continued affection and esteem, I pray you to allow me still to subscribe myself, your faithful friend, &c., &c.,

L. SILLIMAN IVES.

Since the days of the eloquent eagle of Meaux—the immortal Bossuet—a Protestant Prelate had not submitted to the Church,—then a Gordon had yielded to his conviction, and now an Ives bowed humbly his head, and, as a child, sought for admission within the pale of Holy Church. Thus does Dr. Ives describe his feelings; and oh! what convert on perusing them will not see pictured his own state of mind, previous to his taking the last step which brought him into the full light of the Gospel, and made him say with the aged Simeon, “Mine eyes have seen thy Salvation;”—and what convert will not testify his own experience in saying, that the result has been a matter of “deep and joyful thankfulness.”—Oh, better, yes, far

better is it to enjoy rest in the Church of God for one moment, than to be battling without for half-kept rubrics and antiquated observances without life;—what mean the Piscina, the ambyre, the rood-loft, the Credence Table, the Sedilia, the offices, without THE TRUTH, without God's saving Truth, without the perfect conviction that you are within the Church—the Ark,—and that—

Jesus does all in all

for Her. If we have not this innate interior hope, our confidence is vain, our peace is false, and we are in the hands of the enemy. But to return to Dr. Ives:—‘When I seriously approached this question (what was the foundation of my hope of eternal salvation) it was terrible to me. No man can well conceive the horror with which I first contemplated the possibility against my own claims, as the result! My claims as a Bishop, a minister, a Christian, in any safe sense, and hence of my being compelled, as an honest man, to give up my position. A horror enhanced by the self-humiliation, with which I saw such a step must cover me, the absolute deprivation of all mere temporal support which it must occasion not only to myself, but to one whom I was bound ‘to love and cherish until death.’ The heart-rending distress and mortification in which it must involve, without their consent, a large circle of the dearest relatives and friends, the utter annihilation of all that confidence and hope which, under common struggles and common suffering for what we deemed the truth, had been reposed in me, as a sincere and trustworthy Bishop. But I forbear; enough that the prospect, heightened, in its repulsiveness by the sad forebodings around me, at the renewed symptoms of my wavering, was so confounded as actually to make me debate whether it were not better, and my duty, to stay and risk the salvation of my soul—as to make me supplicate in agony to be spared so bitter a chalice—to make me seize with the eagerness of a drowning man upon every possible pretext for relinquishing the enquiry. Could I not be sincere where I was? to work

with a quiet conscience where Providence had placed me? Were not the Fathers of the Reformation, in case of my being in error, to be held responsible? Would it not be presumption in me, a single Bishop, to consider other points long considered settled by a National Church? These, and more like questions would force themselves daily upon my mind, to deter my advance, and under their influence I actually went so far as to commit myself publicly to Protestantism, to make such advance the more difficult. But God was merciful, and all this did not satisfy me; I thought I saw in it clearly the temptation of Satan, an effort of my overburdened heart, to escape *self-sacrifice*. I felt that if for such reasons, I might be excused, so might Saul of Tarsus have been."\* Dr. Ives is now a Professor in an American College.

"Politically speaking (says Mr. Belaney) † the Establishment was never stronger than at the present hour. Its revenues are now as cheerfully paid by the farmer, and its fees by the poor, as any common rent,—the natural consequence of the settlement of the tithe question, the minds of the majority of the nation, and these by far the wealthiest and most influential, are, though not all its warm supporters, still all so far attached to it that they would rather bear *it* than any other of the national sects in its place, *rather it* a thousand times than see the Catholic Church left free to regain her ancient position. If its friends are not, except in a few instances, ardent, they are at least sincere, believing, as many of them do, that its services in the cause of morality, of Protestant ascendancy and general civilization, have entitled it to their gratitude. Again, what is next best to having good friends, it has certainly *no enemies* in the political or literary world. In its presence infidelity is silent, if it is not extinct, her champions have had no occasion to unsheathe their swords against any infidel assailant for these twenty or thirty

\* The Trials of a Mind, by J. S. Ives.

† Martyrdom at the Carmes, in 1783, by G. R. Belaney.

years past. She has had time to restore what puritan frenzy had destroyed in a former generation, to increase the number of her churches and clergy by almost one-half since the last century began, to augment her livings, to raise the literary, if not the theological, character of her clergy, and to do many other things calculated to improve her condition. Meanwhile, notwithstanding all this, sects, whose aggregate number more than equalled her own in the reign of Elizabeth, have been creeping out of her at every part of her body for a succession of centuries, many of them, as the Wesleyans, Unitarians, and Irvingites, gaining in numerical strength and respectability every year. She has shown, what all heretical bodies show, that when her members are once lost to her, when once they have formed themselves into independent societies, they are lost to her for ever. They may dwindle out of one shallow creed into another yet more shallow, and she may see them gravitating downwards from one bad state of faith and morals into a worse, yet she feels she has no power to arrest their decaying career. *To retrieve* the lost, long experience has shown, is a power or capacity not possessed by her. In this respect she is only, however, what every other religious community out of the Catholic Church is. None of them can keep their members what they are at the outset. What between evaporation above and leakage below, the spirituous part of their tenets is continually making its escape. If lapsed members are ever *recalled*, they are recalled with a diminution of their orthodoxy, they are never *reclaimed*.

“The followers of Luther in a very few years broke off from the Confession of Augsburg; he tried in vain to *retrieve* them. He followed them up with the zeal of a London *detective* in pursuit of a Bank of England clerk who has made off with a bag of gold. The culprit is overtaken, caught, and brought back to the place from which he started to be identified, He is the same man, all but the pen behind his ear, he was before, but he is *minus* the

treasure which made him worth the pursuit. So, by running and panting, the great founder of the Lutheran schism, and his other heretical associates, labored early and late in the pulpit and with the pen to keep their disciples within the enclosure they had drawn round them. But it was all to no purpose! Away from them (ungrateful children!) they would go. Luther ran, Calvin ran, Melancthon ran, Zuinglius ran, they all ran, and when by some evil accident any of them fell, helped to their feet by some kind friend who stood by, they ran again. A deserter here and there was the prize. . . . The Catholic Church *possesses the power*, which these instances show no other body, pretending to exercise spiritual functions in the name of Christ, possesses. Evil agencies and evil passions succeed continually (such does God permit!) in drawing away her members. They may fly from her for a time—a year, a number of years, even up to the last hour of an abandoned life. But she does not give them up for lost. She keeps her maternal eye upon them. She fasts, and weeps, and prays, and warns with a mother's heart and a mother's voice. Her pity wins them back. They die or live *retrieved* from, as the case may be, a death of despair or a life of sin. She sees them brought back with the 'joy which is felt by the angels of Heaven over one sinner that repenteth.' "

We must not omit this year mentioning a circumstance which occasioned some little commotion at Chichester, where, as we are informed by a correspondent of the *Church and State Gazette*, the Rev. P. Freeman, the Principal of the Chichester Theological College, omitted on January 2, 1853, to give the cup to the lay communicants of the Chichester Infirmary. Mr. Freeman, on enquiry, pleaded that *he forgot the wine*.

Miss Sellon (or, as she sigus herself, "P. Lydia Sellon, y<sup>e</sup> M. Superior') was at this time called into painful notoriety, as she herself states in the following address:

"My Friends—The recent publications which have disturbed not only the tranquility of my private life, but also the repose

of your own minds, have made it desirable that I should communicate with you. I have now been for four years resident amongst you, and have during that time been joined by those who are now labouring amongst you, and who are, as you are aware, kind, wise, and able assistants in enabling me to carry out the plans I have projected for your benefit. These plans, as you know, consist in employing as many as we could, who were in need of employment, in educating children, in securing respectable homes to those who wished to live under our protection, together with help to the sick and suffering. The Lord Jesus Christ has desired that as we are all brethren and sisters in Him, so we should love one another, and help one another, and try to lead each other to Him. For this cause I came to you, as I heard from your Bishop that you required help—for this cause others have joined me.

I wish to assure you that no public annoyances will, I hope, shake the purpose for which I came among you, or make me less anxious for your prosperity, less desirous of assisting you. The false report of the world soon perishes, whether it is for good, or whether it is evil. The great and only true subject of anxiety in my mind is whether we ourselves, and you and your children, are being brought nearer to God—whether you are more earnestly seeking the salvation of your souls—whether you are growing in the knowledge of our Lord Jesus, and loving Him more, and obeying him better—whether the waves of this troublesome world are indeed bearing us onward to the haven of eternal rest.

I wish also to assure you that there is but one circumstance which would materially interfere with the endeavors both of the Sisters and myself to benefit you. That circumstance would be your own reception of the stories which are printed and circulated. I would not wish to vindicate myself at the expense of those whom I have received under my roof; I am satisfied with the affection of those who remain with me, and with the confidence manifested by yourselves. You will be comforted to know from myself that the accusations contained in all those publications are false, and that I wish you to judge by what you see and know yourselves, not by anything which is published or rumored abroad. Continue to do so, and then all which is false will presently be made manifest, our mutual confidence in

each other will remain unshaken, and our peace and tranquility will never be effectually disturbed. I say *effectually*, because it is probable that you and ourselves may have to suffer further disquiet, until by God's providence, and in His own good time, it is made manifest that we are under His protection, Who is the God of truth, and Who has taught us all false ways utterly to abhor.

May God bless you, my friends, and may he knit our hearts together in His holy love and fear. From you I desire your continued prayers for this society and myself, while on my part I hope ever to remain your faithful and affectionate friend.

PRISCILLA LYDIA SELLON.

*Plymouth, May 1, 1852.*"

One of the charges brought against Miss Sellon, Mother Superior at Devenport, was, that she "did not forget the principle of holy obedience so far as to omit taking care of herself, for she has contrived to secure the disposal of all the fortunes or the incomes of the whole sisterhood; and

2. She was charged with compelling the Sisters to confess to her. She acknowledges simply to hear their confessions, which looks rather like a desire to obtain power over the consciences and persons of the sisterhood."

So says Mr. Seymour's in his Lecture on Nunneries, —which he wished to deliver, in consequence of the treatment experienced by Miss D. Campbell, Lady Olivia Stratford, Miss Wall, and others, while subject to Miss Sellon's rule.

According to Mr. Seymour some of the sisters gave him the following description of Miss Sellon's practical mimicry of Conventual life:—

"It was no uncommon thing to be carrying at half-past five in the morning, a large dust barrel to the top of the court, a feat requiring almost their utmost strength. Later in the day, some sisters were engaged in sweeping out the house, cleaning the grates, making the fires, pumping the water, and other of the occupations of domestic servants. One would have occasion to

carry the dinner to the bakehouse, and to fetch beer from the public house. Nor was this all. Often had they to take a letter to the Post Office at half-past nine, or a parcel to the Railway Station. Once a sister was sent on the latter errand at mid-night. Another of the sisters reveals a further portion of the *ménage*. She states, she (Miss Sellon) caused me to lie on the floor of an inner oratory for twenty minutes daily, flat on my face, with my arms stretched out in the form of a cross, and this for several months together. On one occasion she came into the Oratory while I was thus prostrate, and bade me remain there till she came out of Compline, and think a while of some further discipline to humble me, as I had been occasionally not quite so humble of late. The Mother returned, and seated herself in the oak chair, enquired what I had thought of. I rose, and replied that I had not been able to think of anything that would do. She then said that I had not thought enough or properly, and, at the same time, opening my mouth with her hands, she inquired whether that did not humble me. I replied, that it was very uncomfortable, but not humbling. She looked displeased, fixed her eyes upon me, and sat gazing at me for some time in the most unaccountable manner, every now and then bending my arms, opening my mouth and lips, and putting her fingers in my mouth. Not comprehending her conduct, and unable to go away, I began to feel quite alarmed and anxious. She kept me thus, gazing at me and speaking at times incomprehensible words, as I thought, of the revelations to come."\*

In consequence of Mr. Spurrell, Mr. Colliss' and Miss Campbell's pamphlets, and the monster meeting at Plymouth, where a mortal sin, of a grievous nature, was styled a "babyish trick" by Mr. Hatchard, Commander Sellon wrote a letter to the Rev. J. Spurrell, demanding—

1. By what authority "he printed the detail of his daughter's private life.
2. From whom had he her private letters, and how dared he to publish them, or worse, to publish garbled extracts from them.

Mr. Spurrell's rejoinder elicited a defence from Capt.

\* Seymour's Lectures on Nunneries.

Sellon, an answer from Miss Sellon, as also a letter of sympathy from Henry of Exeter, who cautioned her against the extravagance of her claim on the obedience of the sisterhood, being so "rigorous, a demand of the submission of the understanding, as well as the will of one human being to another, cannot, in my judgment, be enforced without serious danger to the spiritual conviction, both of her who governs and those who are governed."

The following address in consequence of these charges was presented by the "Nuns" to the Mother Superior:—

"Our beloved and revered Superior and Mother.

We, the Sisters of the Society of Devonport and Plymouth, which by your self-devotion and undaunted energy you have founded and preserved amidst difficulty and persecution, and in spite of what we daily witness, your own great bodily suffering: deeply sensible of what we owe to you, and justly indignant at the unprincipled attacks with which our Society has been assailed, and especially at the slanderous aspersions cast upon you as its head, entreat you to allow us to address a few words to you.

We earnestly desire to be permitted publicly and entirely to deny, *as we now do*, the untrue and calumnious charges made against you of cruelty and unkindness shown to ourselves. It is with pain and shame, though with sorrow and compassion, that we can think of the unworthy conduct of the two who have cast themselves off from us, and who have been the originators of these charges: long have we borne them in silence while our hearts burned within us, but we consider it an act of justice to the Society and to you, that such slanderous accusations should not be permitted by us to remain abroad and to be believed in the world as truths. Once more, *we positively and wholly deny them*. We would express to you our deep gratitude and unshaken confidence and affection towards yourself,—gratitude for the laws and government which you have formed for the Society:—unshaken confidence,—because you have preserved those laws unchanged, whilst the government by which you maintain them, is gentle and loving—in every dealing with regard to ourselves; both in what concerns our domestic and

interior life, as well as in the outward direction of our daily work. We speak from an experience, in many of us, of nearly four years, during which we have ever found your principles and your government unchanged and unchangeable, and both have become more and more endeared to us.

We would respectfully remind you that our laws and our government (as they thus originally stood and have remained, voluntarily accepted by us) are our heritage and right; as Sisters of this Society we prize both them and our Superior as God's especial gifts to us, and as means by which He leads us nearer to Himself: and we earnestly intreat you, in justice to ourselves, that whatever alteration might take place in our work which must always be, as it always has been, dependent upon circumstances, yet that you would never allow any alteration in our rule and government, which we have found so necessary for carrying on our work for God, and for our soul's progress in the way to eternal life, for we would unanimously assure you that there is not one point which we desire changed in the slightest degree. We are grieved to the heart at the odium and abuse which has been heaped upon you as our Superior, for these things, but would remind you and those who have had a share in promoting this odium against you, that *you* are also a part, and that the most precious and dear to us of our heritage and right, and that in abusing you they have most deeply touched and wounded us.

We, the Sisters of Devonport, have been and ever trust to remain faithful to the Society and to you, and we have the fullest and most undoubting confidence that *you* will continue that which we have ever found you—the wise and inflexible guardian of our laws,—our tender and loving Superior and Mother,—our guide and our leader,—our counsel and our help in difficulties,—our comfort in trouble,—our refreshment in toil,—the sharer of joys and sorrows,—our defence when attacked,—(yourself receiving or warding off the blows in our stead which have wounded your own heart so bitterly)—ever self-sacrificing—ever self-forgetful. We speak as individuals, though we speak unanimously.

Thanks be to God for his good gifts to us, especially in the daily blessings of our life and in your affection: our happiness in it has been doubted; we can only say, that it is our constant

prayer that others, (and if it were His Will those we loved the best), might be brought to share with us in both, and be permitted to join in the blessed privilege of ministering to our LORD in the persons of the poor, and of attempting, however unworthily, to draw the souls to Him which are perishing for lack of knowledge.

With the highest respect and affection,  
Believe us,  
Your grateful and deeply attached children.  
(Signed by all the Sisters.)

24th June, 1852.

#### THE REPLY OF Y<sup>R</sup> MOTHER SUPERIOR.

“ My Dearest Children in Christ,

I could not without deep feeling receive the affectionate and dutiful address you have sent to me.

I hope to continue to do what you desire, viz., to preserve your rule and customs in their original simplicity. I am convinced with you, that it is by a steadfast adherence to those things which we have found useful and good, that we may hope by the blessing of GOD to persevere, to grow in grace, and to be free from the fatal evils which a spirit of change and relaxation will inevitably bring upon us.

I am rejoiced to find you all of one mind, as you have ever been. I am rejoiced that the violent outward shocks which our Society has sustained, have not created any spirit of unrest amongst yourselves. May He, in Whom is strength and wisdom, preserve you unto the end. As a community, you have always shunned any interior change. Continue to do so: continue to assist every future Superior in shunning such.

I am now employed to this end in writing down for you all the oral rules which you have practised, and through practice have valued as conducive to harmony, tranquility, order, and discipline, through these four years past.

I deeply sorrow with you over the scandals which have alienated for a time the love of our Christian friends, by making them half suspicious of us, and which had caused the great enemy of souls to triumph by hindering our work.

I am willing and glad that you should make this one unanimous

attempt to prove that they are not true ; but if you do not succeed, rest in peace and trust in GOD ; trusting that He, Who sends this trial, will teach us how to bear it, and to profit by it.

And for myself, my beloved children, you know that, living or dying, in sorrow and in joy, through good report and evil report,

I am, yours in CHRIST JESUS,  
P. LYDIA,  
Superior.\*

*Bristol, July 1, 1852.*

Having omitted during the Annals of last year (1851), to refer to a curious correspondence between Miss Sellon and Lord Campbell, we beg to present it to our readers, as also one between that lady and the Rev. J. H. Johnson, Vicar of Tilshead, near Devizes.

*The Orphan Home, Plymouth, March 19.*

My Lord,—It is with a pain, the intensity of which, amidst such apparent gratitude, that in writing to express my deep sense of your kindness in consenting to aid the work at Davenport, I have now to request the withdrawal of a name, which, noble and honored as it is, is connected most painfully with a decision which, for the present, brands the Church of England with uncatholic teaching.

As a most unworthy yet faithful daughter of the Church, I have, as your Lordship may perceive, no choice left me in working for her, but to withdraw from one who has assisted in a judgment which I am bound to believe is so contrary to her fundamental principles as to be fatal to her, unless absolutely refuted.

It is useless to multiply words of sorrow. Your Lord-

\* One of Miss Sellon's novices at Plymouth, till very lately, was a child of three years old, who was ONCE WHIPPED for not giving an orthodox reply on the subject of Original Sin!!! This poor infant was clothed in the Nun's habit, and compelled to keep the rule of silence!!! Oh! Tractarianism, how truly art thou the *Simia Dei!*

ship will know and feel that such a letter as the present ought not and could not be written without much grief and embarrassment. Entreating your forgiveness, and praying that all blessing may attend you and yours,

I am,

Your Lordship's humble and grateful servant,

PRISCILLA LYDIA SELLON,

Y<sup>e</sup> Mother Superior.

*Midland Circuit, Warwick,*

*March, 31, 1850.*

Madam,—Having a most sincere respect for your feeling and benevolence, I would beg you to re-consider your request that my name may be withdrawn from the list of those who are desirous of assisting you in the truly Christian objects to which your life is devoted. . . . I assure you that we have given no opinion contrary to yours upon the doctrine of Baptismal Regeneration. We had no jurisdiction to decide any doctrinal question, and we shew ours by abstaining from doing so. We were only called upon to construe the articles and formularies of the Church, and to say whether they be so framed as to condemn certain opinions expressed by Mr. Gorham. . . . Recollect that the Archbishop of Canterbury and the Archbishop of York entirely approved of what we did, and that they are as much answerable for it as if they had been members of the Court instead of being only our advisers. Reflect then, whether it be for the good of the Church, to which you are so affectionately attached, to pronounce excommunication against all who approve of the decision which you censure. Perhaps you may find that a large majority of the pious sons and daughters of the Church of England think that the decision is sound, and that it may heal the wounds from which she has lately suffered. At any rate, I do hope that, upon re-consideration, you will allow me to have the gratification of being upon your Committee. If you remain inflexible, I must submit to your determination,

but I shall continue to pray that Heaven may enlighten your understanding, and further your labors with its utmost blessings, and I have the honour to be, Madam,

Your most obedient faithful servant,

CAMPBELL.

*The Orphan's Home, April 8.*

My Lord,—I found your letter on my return from a short absence from home. Now I say that the kindness of its contents only made me the more bitterly murmur over the unhappy cause which separates me from such a benevolent and noble heart,—separates me, as I still hope, only for a term, for how can I believe but that your Lordship will, in time, perceive what is involved in your decision, and will lament as deeply as any one of us, that it should have endangered the Church by the apparent admission of heretical teaching.

You tell me, on the contrary, that it will help to heal her wounds? Alas! my Lord, that you should say so! How can it heal her wounds to tell us that her Articles admit of a heresy which her Creed rejects? I may not believe it, although such words are admitted by the two Archbishops. My Lord, I do not believe it. It would be to question the truth of the Church of England, to believe that it were a matter of allowed indifference whether an Article of the Creed were contradicted or not. It is not being faithful to her to doubt until her own voice condemn her, which may God forbid! But many hearts, since the decision, do fail. They believe that your decision is just; they do not believe that the Church of England is a witness to, and a holder of the truth of God,—they turn from her as not being “a light set on a hill, which cannot be hid!” Their faith is utterly shaken. I speak from a little knowledge of facts. I see her forsaken by those who have loved her. And you, my Lord, do you also believe that the Church of England has been untrue to herself—that her formularies are so constituted that she contradicts her own Belief—

that she will not maintain the Faith of her Creeds—that she will admit Priests to teach her children that which has been condemned as a heresy? Pray forgive me, my Lord, for writing thus to you. . . . I thank you very earnestly for your promise of remembering me in your prayers. I am not worthy to pray for you, and yet, if a God of all goodness will hear the supplication of a loving and deeply sorrowing heart, He will bring you to grieve for the injury done to the Church, and will help you to repair it, and give you all blessing in time and in eternity.

Your's very humbly and affectionately,

P. LYDIA SELLON.

*Strathden House, April 10.*

Madam,—I deeply grieve that (although in very courteous language) you adhere to the stern resolution of excluding me from the gratification of being upon the list of your Committee, and of contributing my mite to the excellent charities which you so laudably superintend. . . . I cannot think that I am called on to answer your observations respecting the merits of the decision, or I could easily show you that you try the question entirely by assuming that the doctrine to which you object has been condemned by her Articles and formularies as a heresy; and I might demonstrate that, whether the decision be wrong or right, it can afford no plausible pretext for leaving the Church, as it must be a very slight reproach to her if she has omitted to denounce one false doctrine as heretical, considering that no Christian Church has professed to settle dogmatically all points of doctrine, and that the Church in which those who complain most bitterly seem disposed to take refuge, has studiously left open various questions, considered by the members of that Church to be of high importance.

I have now only to submit to your sentence. Though expelled from your Committee, and forbidden to have any communication with you in your charitable deeds, I may

perhaps be allowed in parting, to remind you of the peril you incur by complicity giving way to a religious impulse. "Some of the darkest and most dangerous prejudices of men, (said Lord Erskine,) arise from the most honorable principles. When prejudices are caught up from bad passions, the worst men feel intervals of remorse to soften and disperse them; but when they arise from a generous though mistaken source, they are hugged closer to the bosom, and the kindest and most compassionate natures feel a pleasure in fostering a blind and unjust resentment."

If at any time hereafter you should be induced to relent, I shall joyfully avail myself of the opportunity of again trying to further your benevolent schemes, and in the meantime, I have the honor to remain, with the highest respect, Madam, your most obedient servant,

CAMPBELL.

Miss Sellon.

*The Orphan's Home, St. Peter's, Plymouth.*

My Lord,—I am very much surprised and pained to hear that my letters to you have been published. If your Lordship had thought it advisable that any public statement should have been made regarding the subject on which they were written, this could easily have been done in another form, but these letters were addressed simply to your heart, and, coming from the fulness of mine, were such as I should not have shown to others. They were a sacred matter, between your conscience and my own, and our God, and are, I need scarcely observe, singularly unfitted for the columns of a newspaper. It is not the first time that I have had cause to remonstrate at the way in which my private words have been made public by others; I would, my Lord, that you, and all to whom I write, would recollect that my letters are only written for those to whom they are addressed, and that I claim the courtesy most especially due to a woman in requiring that they

should not be published without my knowledge and consent. I own, my Lord, that I am rather indignant with you, but I am still your's humbly and affectionately,

P. LYDIA.

The Mother Supr. of the Sisters of Mercy.

MISS SELLON TO REV. J. H. JOHNSON.

Rev. Sir,—The Lady Superior desires me to reply to your letter of last month. Her continued ill health obliges her to use the hand of another in corresponding with our kind friends. She regrets that you should have been so misinformed concerning this Society, the fact which you mention being a simple untruth. Our work is open as the day. Our object being to do good, as best we can to the poor. Would that you could see their misery here! You would not wonder that every heart and hand should be strained to the utmost to alleviate their sufferings, and bring their souls back to their God and Saviour. We earnestly recommend them and ourselves to your prayers. The Lady Superior pays her regards, and believe me,

Rev. Sir, yours very faithfully,

CATHERINE S. M.

*St. Peter's, Devonport.*

*Vicarage, Tilshead, Devizes, Dec. 24, 1850.*

Madam,—Your reply to my letter, I am sorry to inform you, does not at all meet my objection to your Society. "I gave two reasons" for refusing to render you pecuniary assistance,—viz., that you were accused of spreading the doctrine of Popery, under the mask of the Church of England, and that you required a pledge (or oath) of secrecy from the inmates of your establishment. You are completely silent on the first charge, so that I am left to form my own opinion from public rumor. You do not seem to deny the second. Your 'work' outside your walls may be "as open as the day," for any thing that I know to the contrary, but this is not the question, what I said had reference to the interior of your house. To form

a religious community for the instruction of the ignorant or for the relief of the poor and needy, it is surely not necessary to bind the 'Sisters' by vows of any kind; still less that the ladies should be pledged to conceal from their friends the discipline of our house, and the nature of the treatment they receive therein. The greatest abuses of the Conventional system, of which yours appears to be a copy, arose from the secrecy enforced by the Superiors; and you need not be surprised that suspicion should attach to your proceeding so long as the public believe that vows of secrecy are required by you. Had you denied that such was the case, I should have felt it my duty, however disagreeable to myself, to have furnished you with the name of the 'Sister' living under your roof, by whom a written statement to that effect was made to her friend.

If you think that your object, which I admit to be excellent in itself, can be best accomplished, by approaching as nearly as possible to the principles and practices of the Papal Church in its convents, and the title you have assumed as 'Lady Superior,' appears to imply it, neither I nor any other person have a right to complain. But I do think it is your duty, when you apply to the benevolent to contribute to your funds, to inform the public without reserve, what are the rules and regulations of your Society, and what doctrines you believe and teach; and then and then only, can you expect to be supported in your design in proportion to the degree which your opinions, and those of the party to whom application is made, coincide.

Believe me that I ardently pray both for you and myself that we may each be led into all truth, and be enabled in our several vocations to act with simplicity and godly sincerity in our endeavors to promote the salvation of souls, and the glory of the Lord.

I remain, Madam,

Yours faithfully,

J. H. JOHNSON.

## The Lady Superior of the Sisters of Mercy.

Rev. Sir,—I had requested one of the Sisters to answer your first letter for me. I can now only say in reply to your second, that the whole statement is wholly false. I think it very probable that, as you have misunderstood her letter and thought it a subterfuge, you will disbelieve my words, being as I am, an entire stranger to you. I do not write to you to ask you to subscribe. I could have wished you to believe that what I say is true, and that I should consider it wicked to act in the way that your note says that I do act. I should consider it wicked to pretend to belong to the Church of England when I was not in heart and practice, belonging to her. I should consider it wicked and foolish to require a premium, a vow, an oath of secrecy from one concerning the exterior or the interior of this Society, or any thing belonging to it. No sister has ever left this Society; four persons have left me; they came and went away before they were admitted as sisters. As I have an affectionate interest for each one of them, though knowing two of them but little personally, I should be sorry to be made acquainted with the name of the individual to whom you allude. I should be sorry to think that the confidence with which they were received as entire strangers had been returned by falsehood and calumny. I therefore do not wish to know the person's name, but you are at liberty to show her this letter.

You will pardon me for saying that I could wish our correspondence to drop here. It is naturally painful to be disbelieved; and where there is no confidence words are of no avail—they are only misunderstood and thought to be a subterfuge or equivocation. I have the honor to be,

Your obedient servant,

P. LYDIA SELLON, Y<sup>E</sup> SUPERIOR.

*St. Peter's, Devonport.*

I hope you will forgive the abruptness of my liberty of

writing. May all the blessings of this happy season be richly given!

The Bishop of Exeter, after instituting an inquiry into the charges brought against Miss Sellon by Lady O. Stratford, Miss Campbell, and Rev. Mr. Hatchard, wrote the following letter to her:—

*“Bishopstowe, March 29, 1852.*

My dear Miss Sellon—Not only your own letter of Saturday last, but intelligence which has reached me from another quarter, makes me apprehend that the intention with which I wrote my published letter to you has been greatly misunderstood. In announcing to you my withdrawing from the office of visitor of your community I stated my reasons to be, first, that the course of your operation had carried you beyond the limits within which I deemed it prudent to confine my own official connexion with you, and, secondly, that I could hardly continue that connexion without incurring the responsibility of seeming to sanction practices which, without having a right to condemn, I nevertheless might not approve. At any rate the inquiries and explanations, which were likely to become necessary, must interfere with the discharge of my own special duties of this extensive Diocese. But although I cease to be your visitor I should be more grieved than I need express, if on this account you should cease to carry on your blessed work at Plymouth. No! let me again thank you as your Bishop for having proved by that work that the Church of England is not so cramped and stinted in its Christian action as not to admit Sisterhoods of Mercy within its borders. Let me, moreover, say that if, in the exercise of that liberty, which our Church allows alike to you, and to those who may differ most widely from you, some things may have been done to which I decline to give my sanction, yet I am fully confident in your entire faithfulness to that Church. Would that all they, who are among the loudest in condemning you, were as really animated by its spirit as you have proved yourself to be—as earnestly practised its precepts, aye, and as truly understood its doctrines!

Go on, then, I beseech you, in your labor of love amongst us. And may He, who hath given to you and to those who labor

with you, the desire and will thus to devote your time, your substance, your faculties of body and mind—your whole selves—to His service, accept and bless the offering! May he continue to cheer you with the sight of His work prospering in your hands! And, in his own good time, crown you with everlasting glory in that kingdom where all is peace, and joy, and love!—Farewell! and believe me always affectionately yours,

H. EXETER.”

In consequence of Mr. Prynne, who was Miss Sellon’s ‘*guide*’ in spiritual matters, (we will not say ‘*director*’ as Dr. Pusey objects, and most naturally, to the more Catholic phrase,) being charged with hearing confessions, and “making a lady, young and beautiful, and full of religion and enthusiasm, degrade herself at his feet, and with her tongue to make the sign of the cross upon the floor;”—an inquiry was held. Mr. Prynne having first assured his Lordship that, “confession is not a part of the regular discipline of the house—but that those who *desired* confession were free to use it.” At the termination of the inquiry, which ended in Mr. Prynne’s acquittal, the following correspondence ensued between Dr. Philpott’s and Mr. Prynne, wherein the Bishop asserts that “the Church seemed to discourage the practice of habitual confession.”

*Bishopstowe, 4th Oct, 1852.*

Dear Sir,—When I acknowledged the receipt from you of the ‘*West of England Conservative*,’ of last week, containing a copy of your “case” appended to a report of the recent inquiry, I told you that I had been unable to give it more than a cursory reading—on which reading I added that I was pleased with it. I have now read it again, and with more attention.

On the second reading, while I do not withdraw my approbation of it in general, I find one passage, on which I think it necessary to remark. It occurs in the second paragraph of the second column in the last page, where you deal with Mr. Nantes’ objection to your assertion, *that the Church of England does not discourage the general habit of confession.*

You say, "It is surely for him to show that the Church of England does discourage this practice by some authoritative statement, in some of her authorized documents." This would, doubtless, avail you in answer to the charge, if it were made a part of a criminal proceeding against you. But in discussing it on the broad grounds of propriety, the answer seems to me by no means satisfactory. Our Church, as far as I recollect, nowhere says anything expressly, which requires such a practice, whether to encourage or to discourage it. But on the other hand, in the exhortation to be used in giving warning of Communion, it assumes that persons in general may be expected to satisfy themselves of the sincerity and fulness of their repentance, by 'examining their lives and conversations by the rule of God's commandments,' and, it is only 'if there be any who cannot, *by this means*, quiet his own conscience herein, but require further counsel and advise "that the Church recommends special confession to a Priest. In short, the Church earnestly impresses on the party *the duty of doing all that he can himself* in the way of self-examination, self-judgment, self-conviction, in order to attain unto "repentance not to be repented of, and it is only when he has himself done all he can towards quieting his own conscience *in vain*, that he is instructed to have recourse to private confession and private absolution. In my opinion, that is, virtually *to discourage the general habit*, for such general habit would seem to show, either that the party adopting it did never honestly and earnestly strive to do all that he can for himself—or that having once received private absolution, he is so unstable, so light-minded, so utterly incapable of all self-control, that, after such absolution, he is continually relapsing into sin, and sin of such malignity that he cannot of himself attain (by the ordinary grace of God) to due repentance. Surely we must believe that such cases, if there be any such, are very rare.

I say, therefore, now, as I have more than once publicly said before, as well as privately told my candidates for Holy Orders, that the Church of England appears to me to 'discourage confession as a general habit.'

You state (at the end of your next paragraph but one)—'I have invited our people to have recourse to this ministration of our Lord's most merciful authority, whenever the spiritual necessities of any of them shall need it, *in accordance with the*

*advice contained in your Lordship's Pastoral Letter of last year,"* when you thus referred very correctly to my advice, as your authority in one particular, I must express my regret that you did not, at the same time, give equal weight to the authority of that same pastoral letter, in the very passage from which you were quoting, where it "condemned the habit of going to confession as a part of the ordinary discipline of a Christian life." I even stated in the same place, "that I had warned a clergyman, who had himself incited a party to have recourse to confession before him, not being either of the two cases, where it is prescribed in the Book of Common Prayer." I had, I say, "warned this Clergyman to abstain from a course which seems ill-accordant with the mind and teaching of our Church." In conclusion, I there said, "Let me add, that I presume not to interfere with the conscience of any who (to use the words of our first Reformed Liturgy) think needful, or convenient, for the quieting of their consciences, particularly to open their sins to the Priest *at any time*. What I *deprecate* is, that this should be made a *regular observance*—still more, that *any Priest should advise it as such*."

If you have kept within the plain meaning of this my counsel you have a right to claim the authority of your Bishop for what you have done—if you have extended it, you have not only exceeded but run counter to it.

I shall send a copy of this letter to Mr. Nantes, giving to him as I give to you, full permission to use it in any way which he may think fit.

I am, Rev. Sir,  
Yours sincerely,  
H. EXETER.

*S. Peter's, Plymouth, Oct. 6, 1852.*

My Lord,—I beg to acknowledge your Lordship's letter of 4th inst. I believe I may safely say that there has been nothing in my practice respecting private confession, which is opposed to the opinion expressed in your Lordship's letter. I conceive my answer to Mr. Nantes was a sufficient one to give to a person bringing a charge against me. If Mr. Nantes objected to any statement made by me he was bound to show grounds of that objection beyond his own private opinion, and it seemed to

me that no grounds short of an authoritative statement in the authorized documents of the Church herself, would have been sufficient for this purpose. I went on to say—"I can find no such declaration of her mind—all I can find serves to show me that she leave her children entirely at liberty to use these means of grace whenever their spiritual necessities require it. There is no prohibition, or shadow of a prohibition, that I know of to prevent their doing so, and again at the end of the paragraph, in short, my Lord, I have only meant to assert for the members of the Church of England, general and absolute freedom of being allowed to unburden their minds to their Minister whenever they desire it for their soul's good. Such a freedom I do believe to be most in accordance with her spirit." In this passage, my Lord, I intended to say that the Church of England does not *prohibit* or *authoritatively exclude* the general habit of confession. I expressly guarded myself by saying that I did not mean to assert that the Church of England recommends confession ordinarily, but was silent about it, and left it to the consciences of individuals." And such has been my practice, I have not taught it as a duty, I have not brought or trained persons to look at it as a regular observance, or a part of the ordinary discipline of a Christian's life;" but on the other hand I am not aware of any statement of the Church of England which would justify me, as one of her ministers, *in refusing to receive* persons, who desire of their own accord, or I may add, by the advice of their parents or guardians to come to me regularly for this purpose. I repeat, my Lord, I have not enforced or taught this practice as a part of my ordinary teaching, but I have also not felt myself at liberty to reject those who did not think they found it useful as an habitual practice and denied it on that account to use it as such.

I venture respectfully to put this case to your Lordship, (which I may add is not an imaginary one)—supposing a person to come to me, at his own particular request, several times in the course of the year, for confession—have I any authority from the Church of England to refuse to receive that person? I will further suppose that I fully press upon the person the necessity of private self-examination and repentance, but that he still urges that he finds confession a great help and means of grace, and presses on me my obligation to receive him. Is it

your Lordship's opinion that I should be authorized by the Church of England (whatever my own private opinion might be) to reject such a person?

In submitting this case for your Lordship's consideration, I would humbly venture to remind your Lordship, that there are many persons in the Church of England who deeply value private confessions as a means of grace, and who use it regularly as such, and that it would be a great shock to their minds to be deprived of it. For my own part, I would not dare to do so unless I had some most indisputable authority to bear me out in so doing. I would also venture to suggest that the consciences of those who use private confession, and are in the habit of that self-examination which it involves, become more alive to the fact of sin, and that, even if they do not relapse at times into their old sins, they get worse on other minor sins as of a serious nature. There are, my Lord, persons, who from a constant habit of self-examination and self-accusation find that very frequently their conscience is hardened with weighty matters, which bring them under the class specified in the exhortation to Communion. Does the Church of England require of her ministers to refuse to this class of persons (and it contains many of her most earnest and spiritual children) what they esteem as so great a means of grace to their souls?

With reference to your Lordship's remarks on my quotations from your Lordship's Pastoral Letter of last year, I would humbly beg to observe, that had I in quoting your Lordship's sentiments as bearing on the subject of private confessions, generally, I should certainly have thought it my duty fully to have expressed those sentiments, but I was only quoting in support of my argument of the entire liberty which the Church of England gives her children to use the means of grace whenever their spiritual necessities required it. On this point, I trust, I was not unfairly claiming your Lordship's support.

I have the honor to be,

Your Lordship's faithful and obedient servant,

G. R. PRYNNE.

*Bishopstowe, 9th Oct. 1852.*

Rev Sir,—As I do not think that the Church of England *prohibits* your receiving to confession those who seek it as an habitual practice, I do not presume to prohibit your doing so.

The Church seems to me to discourage such a practice; therefore I should endeavour to *dissuade* one who come to me in pursuance of the practice from persisting to desire it. If I had sufficient reason to believe that he had *not* endeavoured honestly or earnestly to *quiet his own conscience* by self-examination and other acts of repentance, I should not myself admit him. More than this I must decline saying.

Yours sincerely,  
H. EXETER.

Mr. Bennett of S. Paul's, Knightsbridge, having been nominated by the Marchioness of Bath to the Vicarage of Frome, published a Pastoral letter to his parishioners in reply to a certain Protest from some of his brother clergy against his appointment. In this Pastoral, Mr. Bennett speaks of his great tenacity in clinging to the rigging of the stranded Church of England. "The greater danger there is, the more I see the ship rock to and fro, and almost helpless,—the more I see evil spirits all around the ship, some weakening her by putting bad pilots on board to guide her wrongly, and rejoicing to think that she must soon go to pieces: the more, I say, that all this happens, and just in consequence of its happening, and as long as two planks hold together, the more it is the duty of brave men to stand by her and to counteract the evil; to pray the longer and the stronger to Almighty God to save her." Mr. Bennett thus reprimanded those who had left the stranded wreck of Anglicanism, who, perceiving that she was completely water-logged and unable to right herself, had gained the shore and rejoiced in their escape from inevitable destruction; for

"Apparent rari nantes in gurgite vasto."

"Some (says Mr. Bennett) have said we have a right to think for ourselves, the Church of England is heretical, and *we*, think so; it is time to leave her, and *we* think so; *we*, as private Priests and individuals think so; and so they have become members of the Roman Communion, whereas, by simply saying, as I think they should, we are not judges of that, let us leave it to higher powers, let us

leave it to the Church herself and her Bishops, we have no right to form an opinion about it.”\* Well, some have done so, and yet they have embraced the Church of God; they have left the Establishment, simply because her Bishops are not united, and the *soi-disant* Bishops, nominated by Queen Victoria, are pastors of discord and disunion.

We would again refer to the controversy raised by Mr. Gawthorn. The Bishop of Exeter, and one of his clergy, who still cling to the riggings of the stranded Establishment, and imagine her to be “A CHURCH,” published letters on the necessity of Episcopal ordination, in reply to Mr. Goode and Dr. Sumner. Dr. Phillpotts, after accusing the Church of Rome of having “audaciously mutilated one of the Sacraments of the Church of Christ,” acknowledges that Anglicans accept Episcopal orders from a most corrupt church: but Dr. Phillpotts, in his zeal to define the orders of the Anglican body, confesses that its “*Mission*” “is not so plainly expressed in the English Articles,” and herein “the necessity of defending it publicly in the face of the Church”—but, alas! for the Bishop and his friends. We would wish to know who gave “Christ’s commission to Parker,” for most true is it that “*they WHO CAN CONFER Christ’s Commission must FIRST HAVE SPECIAL POWER GIVEN TO THEMSELVES BY CHRIST FOR THAT PURPOSE!*” But no where does this *Prelate* attempt to prove that Parker was ACTUALLY consecrated. Dr. Phillpotts allows that a great laxity prevailed in the Establishment, and cites the cases of Whittingham,† Morrison,‡ and Travers,§ but

\* Bennett’s Pastoral letter to the Parishioners of Frome.

† Whittingham was Dean of Durham for MANY YEARS before Sandy’s attempt to oust him for not having orders.

‡ Morrison, though knowingly licensed by Grindal to a lecturer’s place in the Diocese of Canterbury, had only received Presbyterian ordination in Scotland.

§ Travers had been educated at Antwerp, but was removed by Whitgift, more on account of his opposition to Hooker than for want of orders.

simply regards it as a "lax usage of the Church," and exhorts his foreign brethren who had assembled like the happy family,\* to return to those Primitive and Apostolic Orders, which their forefathers were, it may be, compelled to relinquish, but which we would tender to them in all earnestness.

Mr. Flower defends his Diocesan with much zeal, but if he has occasion to exclaim while commenting on Mr. Goode's skill as a logomacheter—

ὦ πόποι ἦ μέγα πένθος,

how much rather should we repeat these words when we find Morini and the Greek Liturgy quoted in defence of Dr. Phillpotts. To one acquainted with the actual want of orders in the Establishment, it is astonishing to find Mr. Flower contending that the "Anglican orders are from God," and that the Church of England professes to "CONFER A COMMISSION FROM GOD IN HIS NAME." In vain will Mr. Flower contend for the Apostolicity of Anglican Orders, in vain will he quote the Roman and Greek ordinals, for so long as the Church of God bears her testimony to the truth, so long will he and his brethren be regarded as laymen, endeavouring to subvert the Kingdom of God.

The Countess Ida Hahn-Hahn, a well-known German author, whose writings are distinguished by a peculiar grace and beauty, submitted to the Church. She says— "As my soul awakened, she found herself a Catholic, for that which Protestantism teaches she had never been able to comprehend, nor receive nor derive her sustenance from.

\* The following account of the "happy family" is taken from the Report of the *Société Centrale Protestante d'Évangélisation*, where we learn from M. K. Pasteur Grandpiere, D.D., that in Paris, after all the different Protestant Societies had held their annual meetings, the members of the different sects all agreed to take the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper together as a poetical exemplification to the world of their unity of heart and attachment. THE CONSEQUENCE WAS, THAT A CALVINIST MINISTER WAS SEEN SERVING ONE TABLE, A LUTHERAN SERVING ANOTHER, A WESLEYAN MINISTER ANOTHER, AN INDEPENDANT ANOTHER, AND SO WITH ALL THE OTHER DENOMINATIONS.

No echo reverberated to the voice of Protestantism, no note responded, not a chord was touched; not a single connecting link could I discover in it, to which I could attach any inherent sense either in my youth or after years. How many are there even among our readers who will acknowledge this truth. Our souls were either dead or wandering 'through dark labyrinthine paths,' seeking for truth and unable to find it—seeking for peace, and not knowing to whom to go—knowing that God is the author of peace and not of confusion, and yet unable to see Him in His own Church." We are and were bid to look to Dr. Blomfield, or Dr. Alexander, or Dr. Whately, or Dr. Stanley, or Dr. Philpotts as our guides, but we were sure to find them either administering to the wants of their wives and families, or giving uncertain advice. With Ida Hahn-Hahn, the soul, in an inquiring state, thinks not of such men, but of S. Augustin, S. Charles Borromeo, S. Pius V., Bossuet, Fenelon, the martyred Affre, or our own Plunkett of Armagh. A Bishop should be our ideal: "but what have the Anglican Bishops to do with the ideal? They may be very conscientious and honorable men, and lead a most respectable life, but they have not raised themselves above the sphere of common life—they have not conquered the world and themselves like S. Augustin. The same may be applied to the Protestant missionaries, those gentlemen in black coats with wife and children. How can they preach to the Heathen to forsake all and follow the Cross? What have they forsaken? what have they sacrificed? And how can one be inspired with love for a thing for which he has made no sacrifice? That cannot surely be denominated sacrifice which is no more than the undertaking of a few laborious exercises, such toils as every journey must bring with it, or the dedication of a few hours in the day to the holy cause, after which the earthly comforts are diligently sought. No, the poor Franciscan Monks in their cowls and with their beggars' rags, who inhabit the poor convents that are strewed

throughout Syria from Ramala to Damascus, are another race of men! They have made their sacrifice, the greatest that man can make, *themselves!* and he who can do that—who can sacrifice the mighty I—can venture to exact it of others. They can ask it with a good conscience, and he who asks it without this can expect no result. Well and truly does the Countess Ida Hahn-Hahn say, “I am disgusted with the Evangelical church, which is the fashion just now. No! a church—if there must be a church—can only be the Catholic Church.” How clearly did this truth flash on our mind while yet wandering in the labyrinthine maze of Protestantism.

“Where then is your faith (asks Mr. Crawley in his Letter to his late Parishioners, at S. Saviour, Leeds)? You have none. For faith is the receiving all that God has revealed upon the authority of His Church. But you do not know what to believe and what not, because you are in doubt about the teacher. Therefore, though you may have a strong opinion that *this* is true, or *that* is true, you have no faith, for faith and doubt cannot go together. You cannot have a doubt about a truth, and have faith in it too. But without faith you cannot be saved. If then there be any pillar and ground of the truth at all it cannot be the Church of England, and it must be the Roman Catholic Church. For the choice lies between these two.”

The Rev. Dr. Hasert, Pastor of Bunzlau, addressed the following letter to the ‘*Bunzlau Journal*,’ on announcing his submission to the Church:—

Sir,—I shall soon be a member of the Catholic Church. Two years have sufficed to cause this resolution to rise and ripen within me. I have just declared it openly to all my honorable brethren, assembled in General Synod, at Breslau, in expressing to them very cordially, my farewell. In presence of all that passes;—people say:—“He will end in becoming a Catholic!” Yes, O my God! mayest Thou accord this grace to many others. It is what I wish for everybody, though leaving to each individual the right of being what it is given to him to be, for every

thing depends on grace. All that I ask of my honorable fellow-citizens, of my brethren in Jesus Christ, is not to refuse to follow the *attrait*, not in a half-and-half way, but altogether. Let them not attribute my return to folly or to superstition; let them not judge before the coming of the Lord, who will one day manifest hearts, whilst men only see what come before their eyes. As for me, I am ready to give at every time an amicable explanation to all those who have the same sentiments.

HASERT.

Up to the present time a Protestant Minister.

*Bunzlau, Feast S. Hedwigis, 1852.*

We submit the following reasons of Lord Charles Thynne, as being too valuable to be lost, *in extenso* :—

My dear Friends,—When you were first committed to my charge some years ago, I little thought that anything short of death itself could ever separate me from you; there were many ties, associations, and interests prevailing to make our connexion secure; and, as in after years we began to know and understand each other, as I learnt the nature of your wants, and the difficulties of your condition, a far deeper interest took possession of me, and separation seemed to be still more impossible. I had learnt to share your sorrows and your joys, and I was thankful to you for the confidence placed in me, and for the way in which you allowed me to become acquainted with circumstances which were your trial, and with thoughts which occupied your minds. I hoped that as it was my duty to do all in my power to lead you to God I might be permitted to spend my life in your service—that my life might wear itself out among you in offices of love. But I will not speak of what my hopes once were. After an intimate acquaintance of fifteen years it cannot be necessary for me to say that nothing but the strongest sense of duty could have induced me to sever the connexion which has existed between us. You will at least believe me when I say that the strong affection I have, and must ever have, for you, has made the duty of leaving you one of no ordinary trial. It was not my intention to have alluded to this subject, I intended to have remained perfectly silent; and had others acted generously by me this intention would not have

been departed from; but I understand that at the opening of your church the Bishop of Salisbury thought it his duty to speak publicly against me in his sermon, and I find that some of you have been distressed to hear one, whom you have regarded with affection for so many years, thus publicly censured. I am not surprised that the Bishop of Salisbury thinks me wrong; were it otherwise he would, of course, have acted as I have done, the fact of his not taking the same step is proof that he does not approve that step, or at least he does not see the necessity for taking it. But I am surprised that when there were so many subjects upon which he might have addressed you at such a time, he should have brought me before your notice, and should have encouraged you to pass a censure upon me. I was prepared for such blame, but was hardly prepared to find myself thus held up to the scorn of those among whom I have labored for so many years by one who has himself said that I could pursue no other course than that which I have pursued and to whom I was ever ready to submit at every cost, so long as I believed him to have a lawful jurisdiction over me. My surprise is increased when I consider the time and place which the Bishop selected for censure. Under these circumstances I feel that I have a duty to perform, which compels me to break the silence which I had imposed upon myself. What the words of censure may have been I know not, but this I know that the censure has been made, and that it has pained those who have a regard for me; and for their sake, for my own sake, and, above all, for the sake of the cause which I have conscientiously made my own, I must say a few words to you.

I conclude that I am blamed,—

1st—For leaving you at all.

2nd.—For entertaining opinions which have made it necessary that I should leave you and the Established church.

The *first* point may be dismissed in a very few words. I did not leave you for the sake of any worldly advantages, but I left you because I could not honestly hold the position in which I had been placed. By this I mean that I did not consider it to be the act of an honest mind to believe one thing and to teach another. I will give you some instances of this.

I believe that in order to obtain the remission of our sins by Absolution, it was necessary to confess them to some one pos-

sessed of authority to receive confessions, and to give absolution. I believe this to be necessary for all who have fallen into sin after Baptism. But when I had recourse to the only means within my reach, when I was a member of the Church of England, I was pained by the very secret stealthy way in which alone my necessities could be met, showing that so far as the Church of England was concerned there was something unreal and unauthorised in the act; and after a fuller inquiry into the matter, it appeared to me, both from the practice of the Church of England, as well as from the testimony of the Bishops, that it did not sanction confessions, except in extreme cases, and as a kind of religious luxury for the dying. I mentioned this to the Bishop of Salisbury, and asked his opinion upon the subject. He very candidly told me that, as a minister of the Established Church of England, I could not enforce the necessity of penance, which is a Sacrament in the Catholic Church of Christ, and of which confession forms one important part. Conceive, then, my distress of mind. The very peace which I felt to be so necessary, I could neither obtain for myself, nor lawfully apply to others equally in need; nay more, I could not even encourage them to seek it, so long as they continued to be members of the Church of England. That blessed fountain for the remission of sins has been closed against the people of England for three hundred years. Ever since the Reformation successive generations have passed away unabsolved; and it seems to be the intention of the Church of England (so long as it shall remain) that future generations shall pass away in the same uncomforted, unhopeful state.

Again, I had always maintained that all who dissented from the Established Church were, by the very fact of their separation, excluded from the graces and the certainty of salvation, which are inseparable from the true Church of Christ. I, at that time, held that absurd notion, that it was possible that separate national churches, distinct from each other, and anathematising each other, could make up the *one* Church of Christ, and on this ground I pressed upon Dissenters the necessity of union with the Established Church. But here a difficulty soon presented itself to my mind. The Church of Rome, as the centre of all unity, claims jurisdiction over all baptized Christians. The Church of England denies this claim, and yet at the same time

asserts a similar claim over all Christians in England, affirming that she represents to them the Catholic Church, though she is herself divided from the rest of Christendom. In endeavoring to maintain this, I was led to admit the claim of the Church of Rome, for I found that in admitting the argument by which the Church of England justifies her separation from the Church of Rome, I, in fact, admitted at the same time the argument by which Dissenters defend their separation from the Church of England; for the Dissenter justifies his separation from the Church of England upon grounds very similar to those upon which the Established Church justifies her separation from the Catholic Church of Christ, whose circumference is the world and whose centre is Rome. Step by step, I became convinced that union with Rome is as necessary to the vitality of a Church, as the union of a branch with the trunk is necessary to the vitality of the branch. How, then, could I honestly maintain my position, holding as I did the necessity of unity, while division is the principle of the Church of England.

Again, I had believed that the Established Church maintained, as its exclusive teaching, the doctrines of Baptismal Regeneration, and of the Real Presence of our Lord in the Holy Eucharist. But I soon found that these doctrines were, at least, as frequently denied as they were taught by the ministers of the Established Church; and that even the Bishops of that Church are so little agreed upon the true doctrine of Holy Baptism that when it was denied, they could not agree to vindicate it. How, then, could I remain where I had no authority for my teaching, or where at least the same authority for my teaching, was equally claimed for the denial, as for the assertion, of the true doctrines of Christ's Catholic Church? How could I remain amongst you, and remain true to God, to my own conscience, and to you? This, then, is the reason why I left you, because I believed more than I dared to teach, and because for my teaching I had no other, no higher authority to fall back upon than the authority either of individual men, or of my own mind; and, professing to be a messenger from Christ, I could not rest upon less than a Divine authority, and this the Established Church does not possess, and therefore cannot give.

The other point, on account of which I may have been blamed,

is, that I have allowed these opinions to have any place in my mind. Now I think that you will admit that if these opinions are of God it would be very sinful to attempt to resist them; if they are of God they cannot be overthrown—if they are of Satan they will soon show that they are his, and will fade away. The advice of Gamaliel is applicable here, and should be followed lest men be found fighting against God. Yet seeing how much of the happiness of others would be involved in my act, I consulted the most learned, and even endeavored by an act of the will to crush the thoughts which were continually rising up in my mind. For this I must ever humble myself in deep penitence before God, that in my blindness I once strove against Him, when He would in mercy call me to Himself. But the stirrings of God's grace are mightier than any human efforts, and, thanks be to His holy name, He did not leave me till He had blessed me; He did not forsake me, but has guided me to His holy hill, where I hope and pray to dwell in safety for ever. But perhaps you will say to me, "Why did you not go on struggling against these doubts, you might have succeeded in overcoming them at last?"

My dear friends, I will tell you why I did not do so. 1st. Because I did not dare. I believed that God's grace was at work, and I dared no longer resist it. 2dly. I remember that the principle of the Church of England, of which I was then a minister, was that each man should satisfy his own mind by examining every doctrine for himself, and should not be required to accept anything as true until he had satisfied his own mind upon it. I, therefore, searched the Scriptures, and by the exercise of the right of private judgment, which the Church of England affirms to be the right of all her members, I was convinced that my plain and obvious duty was to submit myself to the one true Church of Christ—the *one Holy Catholic and Apostolic Church*—which is governed by Bishops united under one visible head—the Bishop of Rome. It would weary you if I were to go through the several points which presented themselves to my mind, and have led me to take the step which I have taken. Therefore I will speak as briefly as I can of those points which I have already mentioned.

1. The unity of the Church. 2. The Sacraments of the Church.

1st.—I read in the Bible that unity is the mark which God has set upon all His works. When the world was sunk in guilt, and Almighty God overthrew it, He saved *one* family, the family of Noah. Afterwards He called and blessed *one* family, the family of Abraham. Then he chose out *one* nation, and then established *one* Church. Afterwards He sent His son into the world, the visible manifestation of God in the flesh, to save the world; and when Jesus Christ came fulfilling the law, He was not the author of confusion, for He still maintained the same principle of *unity*. He founded the *one* Church, He laid her foundations upon *one* rock; He called her the *one* fold of the *one* Shepherd—the *one* vine—the *one* kingdom; He instituted *one* baptism and *one* Eucharist. As the Jewish Church was the shadow of that more perfect Church which was to come, and *was one*, so the substance which cast forth the shadow, the great reality which had been prefigured, *is one also*. So we find the Apostles afterwards speaking only of *one* Church—of *one* Society of Christ—of *one* body, *one* house, and of Christian *unity* as the abiding in the Apostles' doctrine and fellowship. The Church is the *one* dove, the *one* ark of safety, the *one* faith; she is the visible presence of our divine Lord's mystical body upon earth, and like the eternal Godhead, *one*. Her object is to preserve Christianity, or the revelation of God, by which salvation has been, and is continually announced to man; and as Christianity or revelation is *one*, so the Church, the keeper of that revelation, is *one* also.

It is therefore, impossible to admit the theory of independent national Churches—of Churches bounded by territory and separated from all others. The principle of particular churches is a dissolution of unity, and destroys Catholicity. “As the sun is *one* and the *same* throughout the universe so the preaching of the truth shines everywhere and enlightens all men who wish to come to a knowledge of the truth.”

Holy Scripture has taught me the value of this unity.—Holy Scripture has taught me to believe unity to be a mark of Christ's Church. Does the Established Church possess this mark? Is it *one* with the rest of Christendom? Nay, is it *one* with itself? Is it not the house divided against itself? Three hundred years ago it lost this mark of a true Church, and cannot recover it but by returning as a penitent to the

centre of unity, from which at that sad period it broke loose.

2nd—And now let me speak of the Sacraments. First, the Established Church has mutilated them as to their number. Throughout Catholic Christendom there are seven Sacraments—Baptism, Confirmation, Eucharist, Penance, Extreme Unction, Holy Orders, and Matrimony. The Church of England acknowledges but two—Baptism and the Supper of the Lord; and in her rejection of the other five she is condemned by Holy Scripture, by antiquity, and by the great majority of Christians. Even the Greek Church, though it has broken away from the unity of the Catholic Church, yet retains seven Sacraments. This fact in itself condemns the Established Church of England for her rejection of *five* out of the seven. No one can deny that the agreement between the Catholic Church and the Greek Church affords a very strong testimony in favor of those points on which they agree; testifying, as it does that such must have been the doctrine or practice (as the case may be) of the Catholic Church previous to the Eastern schism—that she teaches now what she has always taught.

What, then, can the Established Church of England say in her defence for having thus tampered with the great verities of the Catholic Church? How can she justify her isolated position having, in her pride, broken up and (so far as she is concerned) destroyed that sacramental system which our Blessed Lord established for the consolation of His children. How great a loss she has sustained by this rejection of the Sacraments which are, and ever were, the strength, support, and consolation of saints and penitents in the Catholic Church, it is impossible to form a just estimate. Yet the continual contention and fret against everything like Church authority, and the jealousy existing between the laity and the clergy, prove how great a blow has been inflicted by the denial of the Sacrament of Holy Orders, while the carelessness and immorality with which matrimony is generally approached by the English people, and the little acquaintance of the clergy with the spiritual condition of individual souls committed to their charge, prove how ruinous has been the effect of the Church of England's rejection of the Sacrament of Penance, and of her degradation of the Sacrament of Matrimony.

Secondly—The Church of England has mutilated the force

and meaning of the only two Sacraments which she has kept. Upon Holy Baptism she allows two contrary doctrines. In this article of her faith she at least connives at heresy.

In the service for the holy communion she denies the Real Presence of our Lord. To prove this I need but refer you to the Rubric at the end of the communion service, though there are parts in the service itself which sufficiently prove it. I might also bring forward the general practice of the clergy with regard to the consecrated elements, which is a forcible commentary upon the service itself, and confirms the Church of England's denial of the Catholic doctrine of our Lord's Presence in the Sacrament of the Holy Eucharist. And here I would remark but one of two doctrines can be held upon this article of faith, either a *Real Presence* or a *Real Absence*, and of these but one is the truth; I know of nothing between the two. The Catholic Church of Christ, under the guidance of the Holy Spirit, has ever maintained the *Real Presence*. The Church of England seems to prefer the *Real Absence*. But it is painful to have to write upon these subjects, for I cannot forget that I was very lately a minister of that Church which I, in my conscience, believe to be in schism and in error. There are some, I know, who lament the position of the Church of England, and who profess to desire to bring about the restoration of unity, and hope to do so by remaining to fight on. But *for* what do they fight, and *against* what do they fight?

They fight *for* a Church (if it be one) which for three hundred years has been in a state of wilful schism—has at least doubtful orders—has mutilated the Sacraments—has no living voice, no definite teaching, has surrendered its highest trust to the Crown, which is now its head, and the judge of its doctrine. In a word, they fight for a *shadow*.

They fight *against* a Church of unbroken succession—of undoubted unity—herself the centre of all unity—possessing all the Sacraments—the Mother and Guide of souls—distinct and clear in her teaching—whose voice can be heard above the tumult of the world—whose visible Head upon earth is the successor of St. Peter, the Prince of the Apostles—which has lasted for more than 1800 years, in spite of all the trials and adversities which would have overthrown any human kingdom, but which cannot hurt or prevail against her, for she is founded

on the rock. The Almighty dwelleth in her; she is the kingdom of God and of his Christ; THE ONE HOLY CATHOLIC AND APOSTOLIC CHURCH.

My dear friends, this is my defence. I have acted honestly by you and myself. My only repentance (and it is one which I must carry with me to my grave) is, that I did not obey the call at once when I first heard it; but I knew not that it was the Lord who called me. I have sought for the pearl of great price, and, God be praised, have found it; and you, my dear friends, must not quarrel with me, if in stretching forward to seize upon that pearl, and to make it my own, I have severed the tie which bound us. Do you yet ask to what Church I belong? I will tell you. I belong to that Church which Jesus Christ Himself and His Apostles guided—in which the great saints and learned men of old were nurtured—which built those beautiful cathedrals and ancient parish churches which are scattered up and down through the length and breadth of this land, and which are even now the boast and glory of our country—which founded our Universities, and all the noblest institutions we have. Day by day do I now hear the same services which were heard in your old Church when it was first built, and consecrated, as your village tradition says, by S. Thomas of Canterbury, otherwise called Thomas á Beckett, and I have no doubt that, if he were to come amongst us again, he would weep over the deserted altar of your Church, and would with sorrow, tell you that you are wrong—that you have lost Catholic truth in rejecting Catholic unity and Catholic practice—that the way in which I now worship God is the same as the way in which he, and the whole company of saints and martyrs before him, worshipped the God of our fathers. Farewell, my dear friends. May God ever bless you, and watch over you, and may it please him to restore to our country her lost inheritance.

Always your affectionate friend,

CHARLES THYNNE.

Clifton, Feast of the Purification  
of the B. V. Mary—1853.

A complaint having been laid against the proceedings of the Rev. A. D. Wagner, of St. Paul's, Brighton, before the Bishop of Chichester, Dr. Gilbert considered it his

duty to protest most vehemently against Mr. Wagner giving to his parishioners ‘pictorial crucifixes, in height four and one-eighth inches, by two and five-eighth, and weighing two ounces,’ and “well adapted either to be suspended in the closet or worn upon the person, or to be kept before the eyes on the table, in short, to be in either constant or occasional use,’ and therefore in a way to lead to a superstitious use of them.” Mr. Wagner, however, has persevered in his ‘Tractarianism,’ by simply concealing his ultra views from the gaze of Mr. Paul Foskett, and the Brighton Protestant Defence Association, who have repeatedly memorialized Dr. Gilbert.

The ‘*Times*,’ having with its wonted love of truth circulated a report that Mr. Manning had returned to the Church of England,—the late Archdeacon of Chichester addressed the following pithy letter to the ‘*Times*.’

*To the Editor of the ‘Times.’*

Sir,—On my arrival from Rome on Saturday last, my attention was called to a paragraph in “*The Times*” of the day before, stating that my return to the Church of England was expected.

To those with whom I have been in communication, either personally or by letter during my absence from this country, the report must appear simply absurd. But to others who can have no such means of knowing the truth, the currency given to any rumour by the authority of “*The Times*” might appear to render it probable.

I therefore request you to oblige me by publishing this prompt and *direct contradiction* of every portion and *particular* of the paragraph in question.

*I have found in the Catholic Church all that I sought, and more than, while without its pale, I had ever been able to conceive.*

I am, Sir,

Your obedient servant,

HENRY E. MANNING.

*Charles Street, Berkeley Square,*

*12th June, 1852.*

---

 1853.
 

---

The principal converts this year are :—

Rev. S. H. Neligan' Curate of Cashel.  
 Rev. W. Pope, Curate of Lever Bridge.  
 Rev. S. R. Bailey.  
 Rev. N. Houghton.  
 Rev. — Luttrell.  
 Rev. L. Kynaston.

---

 AMERICA.
 

---

Rev. N. C. Stoughton.  
 Rev. D. Lynam.  
 Rev. J. L. Barrett.  
 Rev. W. Pollard.  
 Rev. C. E. Foote.

---

 DISSENT.
 

---

Rev. P. Pritchard, D.D.

Stuart Monteith, Esq.  
 Lieut. Bastard.  
 Lord R. Kerr.  
 S. Church, Esq. (R.I.P.)  
 Prince L'Arendt.  
 Duke of Mecklenberg.  
 Lieut. A. Bathurst, R.N.  
 Lieut. Browne, U.S.N.  
 Lieut. Bayard, U.S.N.  
 Professor Blum.  
 Princess Vasa.  
 Marchioness of Lothian.  
 Mrs. George M'Donald, Killeagh, Westmeath.  
 John Pope, Esq.  
 Miss Pope.

Miss Louisa Pope.  
 Miss E. Pope.  
 Mdlle. Boulanger.  
 Mdlle. De Pau.  
 Miss E. De Pau.  
 Miss F. Bowden.  
 Mrs. B. Wilson.  
 Mrs. S. Monteith.

Mr. William Pope says, "Unless we have some rule to enable us to determine what the faith of the early Church really was, even though we were able to study the writers of that Church, we should only arise from their perusal perplexed. For how could we determine what works of the Fathers apply to all times; which are occasional, which are historical, and which doctrinal: what opinions are private, what are authoritative, what they only seem to hold, what they ought to hold, what are fundamental, what ornamental. English High Churchmen have felt this difficulty strongly, and a well-known writer of that School has advised the study of the Great Anglican Divines before plunging into the sea of Patristic Theology—in other words, that we should learn of the Anglican Divines what the belief of the Primitive Church really was. But why of them? Why should *they* be better able to inform us about the Early Church than their contemporaries of the Roman Communion? Why should they be right any more than modern Divines? If we may not take our Faith from Dr. Pusey—if we may not trust those who in the present day tell us that the Ante-Nicene Fathers did not believe in the Doctrine of the Holy Trinity, or of Original Sin, why should we trust Hooker, for instance, who held that the Greek Fathers were involved by implication in the heresy of Pelagius, or Andrewes, who did not believe in the necessity of Episcopacy, or Jeremy Taylor, who was heterodox on the subject of Original Sin, and who much lamented the Nicene Council itself, and calls the question at issue between Arius and the Catholics,

‘the product of idle brains, a matter so nice, so obscure, so intricate, that it was neither to be explicated by the clergy nor understood by the people, a dispute of words which concerned not the worship of God, nor any chief commandment of Scripture, but was vain and a toy in respect of the excellent blessings of charity;’ or lastly, Bramhall, who vindicates as orthodox, the Nestorian and Eutychian Heresies of the present day. It is idle therefore (may Mr. Pope well and truly conclude) to talk of appealing to the Church of the Fathers, unless we have the means of ascertaining what the belief of that Church really was.”\*

The secession of Mr. Pope and the other members of his family led to the following letter from the Provost of Beverley, (Very Rev. Joseph Render), to the Protestant Incumbent of Holy Trinity Church, York, (Mr. W. Beckwith) who, we are led to believe from Mr. Render’s letter, was one of the chief instigators of certain harsh proceedings on the part of Mrs. Pope to her children:—

TO THE REV. W. BECKWITH, INCUMBENT OF HOLY TRINITY,  
MICKLEGATE.

REV. SIR,—Professing yourself to be a minister of Christ, you cannot but rejoice in the opportunity which I am about to offer you of performing, within the precincts of your own parish, one of those charitable works to which Christ attached a special blessing when he said, ‘*Blessed are the peace makers for they shall be called the children of God.*’ I, therefore, respectfully invite you to join with me in a combined effort to establish peace, and to accomplish, if possible, a cordial and lasting reconciliation between one of your parishioners, a Protestant parent and five of her own children, two sons and three daughters, who have lately seceded from the Protestant church and embraced the creed of their Catholic forefathers.

If you can induce the Protestant parent to grant liberty of conscience to her Catholic children, they, I can assure you, will give to her their prompt and cheerful obedience in all other

\* England, Greece, or Rome, by a Convert.

respects. They will love her also, and within their own breasts they will cherish for her all that ardent and devoted affection which good and dutiful children have ever felt for a beloved parent.

Under these given circumstances, on what plea can you, Rev. Sir, withhold your charitable interposition in behalf of the Catholic children? or, on what grounds, let me ask, can the Protestant mother refuse to be reconciled with them?

The resolution which they have formed to adhere to the Catholic Church, and to worship God according to the dictates of their own conscience, is the only crime, I contend, which can be laid to their charge. But, in the first place, and while their minds were yet in quest of truth, was it a crime, or was it not their right and their sacred duty also, to search, to examine, and to select for themselves, and in accordance with the conscientious convictions of their own minds? At the present day, and in the midst of our present enlightenment, will any Protestant parent venture to deny to children of mature age and well-informed minds, this right of free and independent examination in matters of religion? How then could the Protestant parent be justified, in the present instance, in her attempts to compel her then Protestant children to live and to die in total ignorance of the principles and system of that church which pervades the universe, and which professes to be divinely commissioned to teach all truth to all the nations of the earth? From their infancy their own Protestantism had taught them to rejoice in their possession of liberty of conscience, and to boast of those rights of private judgment which it had conferred upon them and proffered to all men.

But afterwards, and when they have advanced in age and ripened in judgment, can this same Protestantism be allowed to turn round upon them, and tell them that it is a crime to exercise the rights which it had given them, and forbid them to examine the principles of the universal church, and command them to believe in blind obedience to its own word,—that Popery, that the religion of the vast majority of the Christian people, really is neither more nor less than that horrible thing which its avowed accusers have represented it to be? By your own adhesion to Protestantism, and by the value which you attach to the principles, I solemnly call upon you to inform their

Protestant parent that free inquiry is the very basis of her own religious system, and that it would be cruelly unjust on her part to punish her children for having acted on the principles which her own Protestantism has infused into their minds.

Her sons and daughters had a right, you must admit, to investigate the system and to examine the principles of the universal church, but they had no right, you will contend, to sacrifice the independence of their own private judgment to the influence or authority of the priest. This is a reproach which you are no doubt prepared to urge against them—but you are laboring under a very serious mistake. They did not sacrifice their right of judgment to the authority of the priest—they did not make the sacrifice, neither was it required at their hands. It was neither the opinion, nor the authority, nor the influence of the priest—but it was the deliberate, free, and independent exercise of their own private judgment that led them into the bosom of the one Holy Catholic and Apostolical Church. Their solemn adhesion to the Catholic Church was a free and most deliberate act of their own minds, and to fit their private judgment for that solemn act, and to free themselves from that undue influence which a desire of worldly advantages on the one side, or an excessive fear of reproaches and humiliations on the other hand, might produce upon them, they lifted up their minds from earth to Heaven, and often prayed to God in the words of the Psalmist—“*Give me understanding and I will search thy law, and I will keep it with my whole heart.*” While they were thus devoutly asking for light to know, and grace to embrace, all the truths of divine revelation, the whole system of the Catholic Church was developed before them, and in it they recognised all the essential features of Christ’s Church, and they both inwardly believed and outwardly confessed it to be that Church which He had commanded them to hear.

In all these proceedings they made a real and lawful use of all the rights of their own private judgment. Neither did their admission into the Catholic Church deprive them of any of those lawful rights of reason or private judgment which God has conferred upon them. They soon found that the Church of their own free choice does not condemn the rightful use, but the unlawful abuse, of the rights and powers of their own minds. They now feel and believe that they are using those powers most

freely, and that they are acting most wisely in submitting their own minds to the teaching of that Church which God Himself has established, and commissioned and commanded to teach them all things requisite for their salvation. Protestantism may contend that they erred in matters of faith, but it must admit that they used their own reasoning powers, and that they employed good and worthy means to fit and enable their own private judgment to form a right decision, and that they held themselves accountable before God for the judgment which they had to form. But finally and for a moment, let it be supposed that they fell into error—on that supposition will Protestantism openly avow in the presence of astonished Europe that their error was criminal, and that external punishments ought to be inflicted on persons who are found guilty of such crimes?

But in another respect, you may imagine that you can impeach their conduct on safer ground and with more satisfaction to yourself. They turned away from the Bible, and on entering into the Catholic Church, the sacred volume became to them a sealed and forbidden book!! Even on that supposition would your Protestantism think itself justified in visiting them with pains and external penalties? or will it affirm that such a crime on the part of children would be sufficiently ample to free their parents from their duties, and from all the sacred obligations which God and nature have imposed upon them? But their minds were not turned away from the sacred Scriptures; neither has the Bible been closed against them. Reference was constantly made to its inspired pages during the whole course of their investigations. In the present instance, religious controversy is out of place, and being uncalled for, I am not so rude as to obtrude it upon your attention. My present object is to state facts in support of my claims to your charitable interposition for peace and reconciliation between a Protestant parent and her Catholic children. I must not therefore attempt to convince you of the fact that they had recourse to the Bible, by placing before you all the passages that were drawn from it in support of Catholic doctrine. But they and I can affirm in the most solemn manner, and you will be glad to learn, that the Bible then was, and still remains, open to their inspection. From the church to which they belong, they know that their Bible is the inspired word of God, and they find that the word,

caught up by the eye from the inspired page, is the very same word that has been preached to their ears by the living and ever teaching voice of God's Church. By this means they now rejoice to think that they can read their Bible, and freely investigate its meaning, without exposing themselves to the danger of wresting it to their own destruction. Having freed their conduct from reproach in this, as well as in all other respects, I have sustained, I imagine, my claims to your interposition in their behalf.

When you speak to the parent, reason calmly and gently with her, for her sons and her daughters know that her maternal heart shrinks from the humiliation to which they have been exposed, but reproach and rebuke her bigoted and intolerant advisers. They, it has been reported to me, are the real authors of all the sufferings which the Catholic children have been compelled to endure, and if you find that report well founded, you cannot lash their intolerance with too much severity. By encouraging persecution for conscience sake, they have given the lie to all their own liberal and hypocritical professions; they have converted their boasted liberty of conscience into a mockery and a snare. They robbed these children, while yet Protestants, of the rights of private judgment, and they have robbed them, since their conversion to the Catholic Church, of their mother's affection. If report can speak the truth, they have done more than this—by their teasing misrepresentations they have impelled their beloved parent to treat them as aliens to her own family, to expel them from her bosom, and to banish them from their home.

By moderating the severity of the parent, and by reprobating the conduct of her intolerant advisers, vindicate your religion, I beseech you from this scandal, and your Protestantism from this reproach.

I remain, Rev. Sir, yours truly,  
JOSEPH RENDER.

Another controversy burst forth this year, threatening a renewal of the Gorham affair, on the only remaining Sacrament supposed to be held by the Establishment—the Holy Eucharist: our readers will remember that in 1843, Dr. Pusey had been condemned by the "Six Doctors,"

whose fame is now world-wide, for a sermon on this Sacrament; since then it had been held and taught *sub silentio* by the Tractarian party. Mr. Denison, the Archdeacon of Taunton, in the discharge of his duty as Examining Chaplain to the Bishop of Bath and Wells, had refused to present Mr. Fisher in consequence of his not assenting to a doctrine not openly preached in our Church since the days of the Marian persecution. Mr. Fisher complained to Dr. Spencer, the representative of the Bishop of Bath and Wells, who in reply to his letter says, "I am aware that the last five martyrs who sealed, with their blood, their testimony to the pure faith as it is in Christ Jesus—died the horrible, but ever glorious, death at the stake at Canterbury, for believing "*that a wicked man doth not receive Christ in the Sacrament.*" Dr. Spencer furthermore assured Mr. Fisher that the "teaching of our Church, most unquestionably, is that Christ is REALLY, though only SPIRITUALLY, present, to all faithful people in the Holy Communion;" and to Archdeacon Denison he wrote, "As I am convinced such is not the teaching of the Church of England, (*i.e.*, the doctrine laid down by Mr. Denison,) I could not continue to hold my present commission, in a Diocese where such a doctrine is imposed upon the candidates for orders." To this Mr. Denison replied in the following letter:—

*East Brent, April 25, 1853.*

My dear Lord,—On reading your letter again I am afraid that there must have been an *apparent*—for you will no more than myself suppose that it could be—a *real* want of consideration and respect for yourself and your office in my *manner* of making a statement of doctrine, and of my resolve in respect of it on the occasion to which you refer. If this was so, I can only express my deep and sincere and heartfelt regret. I should be much concerned and vexed with myself to have been so forgetful of propriety and duty in *any* case, but there are reasons which in *your* case would add largely to my regret. I will now pass on to the *SUBSTANCE* of the question between us. I am unwilling to enter at any length in a private letter upon a

matter which, unless it rest where it is, must become public, and in all likelihood largely affect the Church. From the view conveyed in your letter of your own responsibilities of ordaining at Wells—a view which I am bound to state to you is not my own—it seems clear that unless you become satisfied, which now you are not, that I hold the doctrine of the Church of England in respect of the ‘Real Presence,’ either you will not ordain or I shall not present. The causes leading to either issue cannot be kept private. The whole matter must be laid first, before the Bishop of the diocese, secondly, before the Church, with a view to a formal and authoritative decision. I have held my office of examining chaplain nearly eight years. I have been Archdeacon a year and a half, and have been in both capacities *singly* and *solely* responsible for the presentation of candidates for Holy Orders, according, as I must ever think, to the letter and the spirit of the Ordination office. My understanding of the doctrine of the Sacraments, as held by the Church of England, has been long publicly before the Church, and has been applied by me throughout in my examination of candidates for Holy Orders. The papers of questions are always printed, and may receive any circulation that any one may choose to give them. You now call in question my understanding of the doctrine of the Sacraments, as held by the Church of England. I do not feel that in strict justice to, and consideration for, myself and my position and office, I am called upon to tender any explanation. I have nothing to *retract or to explain*, but to you, as to a kind friend and a Bishop of the Church, I am ready to state that I hold the doctrine of the ‘Real Presence,’ as declared and taught by the Church of England to be this:—1. *Negatively*—That there *is not* a corporal presence of the Body and Blood of Christ in the Sacramental Bread and Wine; that the Sacramental Bread and Wine remain still in their very natural substances, and therefore may not be adored. 2ndly. *Affirmatively*—That there is a Real Presence of the Body and Blood of CHRIST in the Sacramental Bread and Wine in a manner which, as Holy Scripture has not explained, the Church has not defined. That the Body and Blood of CHRIST, being really present in the Sacramental Bread and Wine, are *given* in, and by, the outward sign to *all*, and are *received* by all. That whether the Body and

Blood of CHRIST be *given* and *received* 'unto life' or 'unto death,' *this* depends upon the state of heart and mind of the receiver; in other words, that the Body and Blood of CHRIST are present to *all objectively*;—*subjectively* that they are present to the *faithful only*. I might quote many passages from the Articles and Liturgy and Catechism, to prove that what I have here stated is the doctrine of the Church of England; I cannot admit that there is *one* passage in the Articles, Liturgy, or Catechism, which, when taken in its just and necessary dependence and connexion, teaches any other doctrine, or makes the Church appear to speak 'with an uncertain sound.' I willingly quote one passage—'Dearly beloved in the Lord, ye that mind to come to the Holy Communion of the Body and Blood of our Saviour Christ, must consider how S. Paul exhorted all persons diligently to try and examine themselves before they PRESUME to EAT of THAT BREAD and DRINK of THAT CUP, for as the benefit is great if, with a true penitent heart and lively faith, we RECEIVE THAT HOLY SACRAMENT—(for then we spiritually eat the Flesh of Christ and drink His Blood, then we dwell in Christ and Christ in us, we are one with Christ and Christ with us)—so is the danger great, if we RECEIVE the SAME unworthily, for then we are guilty of the Body and Blood of Christ (ἐνοχος τοῦ σώματος καὶ αἵματος τοῦ Κυρίου), we eat and drink our own damnation, not considering the Lord's body (μὴ διακρίνωμεν τὸ σῶμα τοῦ Κυρίου), not discerning between the Lord's Body and ordinary bread, i. e., it *is* the Lord's Body, but he who receives it unworthily deals with it as though it were ordinary bread. I have no recollection of having used the words in which you convey what appears to you to be my understanding of my doctrine, and I think it is hardly likely that I should have stated it *in this manner*. The contrast between 'faithful' and 'faithless' is quite new to me as a way of expression, which convinces me that I could not have used the words. Neither could I, I think, have applied '*verily and indeed*' as you appear to think I applied them, because I consider those words to apply solely to the SUBJECTIVE presence, and to mark the difference between it and the OBJECTIVE presence. And now, so far as any private correspondence is concerned, I must request permission to take leave of this matter. Indeed I must reserve to myself the right, if need be, of publishing our

correspondence, though I sincerely trust the need will not arise. I go to Wells to-day to proceed with the examination to-morrow. I will hope that what I have stated will be sufficient to show that you have SADLY MISCONCEIVED ME, but if not, let us clearly understand one another—I must either admit or reject all candidates for Holy Orders on MY OWN EXCLUSIVE RESPONSIBILITY, or I must cease to hold my office as Examining Chaplain even with reference to *this* ordination, for I can present *no* candidate who is subjected to any examination except and other than my own. And I should decline to present *any* of the candidates if my office, in respect of *any one of them*, be interfered with in any essential particular. I trust earnestly that in endeavouring to write plainly and definitely, I have not written improperly or unkindly.—Believe me, my dear Lord,

Yours always most faithfully and affectionately,

GEORGE A. DENISON.”

Mr. Denison also preached two Sermons at Wells Cathedral, on the Real Presence, thereby exciting the ire of Mr. Ditcher, who laid a presentment before the Bishop of Bath and Wells, praying for a *primâ facie* inquiry which was granted, and a rumor was further circulated that it was also intended to prosecute the Venerable Archdeacon Wilberforce for his work on the Eucharist, but as these matters refer to 1854, we would beg to call the attention of our readers to the following ‘*Protest*’ forwarded by Messrs. Neale and friends to the Patriarch of Jerusalem, against the conduct of Dr. Gobat, who had succeeded Dr. Alexander in the See of Jerusalem, having been appointed thereto by the Court of Prussia.

To the Most Holy Lord *Anthimus*, Archbishop of Constantinople, New Rome, and Ecumenical Patriarch: —  
and

To the Most Holy Lord *Hierotheus*, Pope and Patriarch

Τῷ μακαριωτάτῳ Κυρίῳ Κυρίῳ  
Ἀνθίμῳ Ἀρχιεπισκόπῳ Κων-  
σταντινουπόλεως, νέως Ῥώμης,  
καὶ Οἰκουμενικῷ Πατριάρχῃ,  
καὶ

Τῷ μακαριωτάτῳ Κυρίῳ Κυρίῳ  
Ἱεροθέῳ Πάπῃ καὶ Πατρι-

of Alexandria, and Œcumenical Judge:—and

To the Most Holy Lord . . . .  
Patriarch of Antioch, and of  
All the East:—and

To the Most Holy Lord *Cyri],*  
Patriarch of the Holy City  
of Jerusalem, and of All  
Palestine:—and

To the Most Holy Governing  
Synod of all the Russias:—  
and

To the Holy Synod of the  
Kingdom of Greece:

The Undersigned Bishops,  
Priests, and Deacons of the  
Catholic Church in England,  
Scotland, and Ireland, and  
others in their Communion,  
greeting in the LORD:

The Unity of the Faith, Most Holy Fathers in CHRIST, which binds together in one the different Branches of the Holy Catholic Church, renders it also necessary that, as the Apostle says, “If one member suffer, all the members suffer with it.” But the suffering, when brother gives occasion of scandal to brother, becomes much more grievous. And such is our case at the present time. For although you ignore the Church which is in England, yet this does not prevent us from sympathising

ἀρχῆ τῆς μεγαλοπόδews Ἁλ-  
εξανδρείας καὶ Οἰκουμεικῆ  
Κριτῆ, καὶ

Τῷ μακαριωτάτῳ Κυρίῳ Κυρίῳ  
. . . . . Πατριάρχῃ τῆς θεοπό-  
δews Ἀντιοχείας καὶ πάσης  
Ἀνατολῆς, καὶ

Τῷ μακαριωτάτῳ Κυρίῳ Κυρίῳ  
Κυρίλλῳ Πατριάρχῃ τῆς  
ἀγίας πόδews Ἱερουσαλήμ καὶ  
πάσης Παλαιστίνης, καὶ

Τῇ ἀγιωτάτῃ τῷ Διοικουήσῃ Συ-  
νόδῳ ἀπάσης τῆς Ῥωσσίας,  
καὶ

Τῇ ἀγία Συνόδῳ τοῦ Βασιλείου  
τῆς Ἑλλάδος

Οἱ ὑπογραφόμενοι Ἐπίσκοποι,  
Πρεσβύτεροι, καὶ Διάκονοι τῆς  
ἐν Ἀγγλίᾳ καὶ Σκωτίᾳ καὶ  
Ἰβερνίᾳ Καθολικῆς Ἐκκλη-  
σίας, καὶ εἴτινες ἄλλοι ἐν τῇ  
αὐτῶν κοινωνίᾳ νομιζονται, ἐν  
Κυρίῳ χαίρειν.

Ἡ ἐνότης τῆς πίστεως, πανιε-  
ρώτατοι ἐν Χριστῷ Πατέρες, ἡ  
τὰ διάφορα τῆς ἀγίας καὶ Καθο-  
λικῆς Ἐκκλησίας κῶλα εἰς ἕν  
συνδήσασα, ποιεῖ καὶ τοῦτο ἀναγ-  
καῖον ὅτι, κατὰ τὸν Ἀπόστολον,  
εἰ ἐν μέλος πάσχει, συμπάσχει  
πάντα τὰ μέλη. Τοῦτο δὲ πάθη-  
μα, ὅταν ἀδελφὸς ἀδελφὸν σκαν-  
δαλίῃ, πολλῶ βρυύτερον γίγνε-  
ται. Ὅπερ καὶ ἡμῖν ἐν τῷ πα-  
ρόντι τετύχηκεν. Εἰ γὰρ καὶ  
ἡμεῖς τὴν ἐν Ἀγγλίᾳ Ἐκκλησίαν  
ἀθετεῖτε, τοῦτο μένοι ἡμᾶς οὐ  
κωλύει τὸ μὴ ἐπὶ τοῖς ὑφ’ ἡμῶν  
βαλλομένοις ἐν τῇ Ἀνατολῇ σκαν-  
δαλοῖς φιλαδέλφως ἡμῖν συνα-

in a brotherly manner with you, for the scandals that have been excited by us in the East. For we are by no means disposed, when injured, to retaliate by injury, but rather as Christians and Catholics to return good for evil.

It is necessary, therefore, to give a brief summary of what has occurred, that frankly confessing the offence, we may more clearly show our own blamelessness, and render our defence more easy to be understood. For he verily is guilty of grievous sin who rends the seamless coat of CHRIST.

In the year, then, of our LORD 1841, it seemed good to the Most Reverend Father in GOD, William, at that time by Divine Permission Metropolitan of the Holy Church of Canterbury, and Primate of all England, when he sent out a certain Bishop to Jerusalem, for the purpose of taking the oversight of the English Residents in Palestine and Syria, to circumscribe the authority committed to that Bishop within certain limits which could not be mistaken, and which he himself, in the commendatory letters addressed to your Holinesses, clearly defines.

“Lest any,” such are his words, “should be ignorant

PP

γελν. Ἀδικούμενοι γὰρ μὴδὲ μὴ  
ἀνταδικεῖν θέλομεν, μᾶλλον δὲ  
ὡς Χριστιανοί τε καὶ Καθολικοὶ  
ἀντενεργῆτείν.

Δεῖ οὖν τὰ συμβεβηκότα ἐν  
βραχεῖ ἀνακεφαλαιοῦν, ἵνα τὸ  
σκάνδαλον ἀπλότερον ὁμολογ-  
οῦντες, καὶ τὴν ἡμετέραν ἀναιτίαν  
ἀποφαίνωμεν, καὶ τὴν ἀπολογίαν  
ἡμῶν εὐκαταμαθητοτέραν ποιῶ-  
μεν. Πάνυ γὰρ βαρέως ἁμαρτάνει  
ὁ τὸν χιτῶνα τοῦ Χριστοῦ τὸν  
ἄρραφον σχίζων.

Ἐν τῷ ἔτει οὖν αἰωμά ἔδοξε  
τῷ μακαριωτάτῳ Κυρίῳ Γυλιελμῷ  
τῆς ἀγίας Ἐκκλησίας τῆς Καν-  
τουαρίας τότε Μητροπολίτη καὶ  
πίσης τῆς Ἀγγλίας Ἐξάρχῳ, Ἐπί-  
σκοπόν τινα εἰς Ἱερουσαλὴμ πρὸς  
τὴν τῶν ἐν Παλαιστίνῃ καὶ Συρίῃ  
ἐπιδημούντων Ἀγγλῶν ἐποψίαν  
ἀποπέμποντι, ὅροις τισιν ἀναμ-  
φισβητήτοις τὴν ἐξουσίαν παρα-  
δοθείσαν περιγράφειν, οὓς καὶ  
αὐτὸς ἐν ταῖς πρὸς τὰς ἡμετέρας  
Πανιεροτήτας Εἰρηνικαῖς ἐκδήλως  
ἀναπτύσσει.

“Ἴνα δὲ,” ἔφη, “μὴ τις ἀγνοῇ  
τίνος ἔνεκα τοῦτον τὸν ἀδελφόν

wherefore we have thus sent this our Brother, we make known to you by these presents, that we have enjoined him by no means to interfere, in any thing, with the authority that belongs to you, the Bishops, and the others who hold the office of rulers of the Eastern Churches, but, on the contrary, to yield you due honor and service, and to show a readiness always and in every way anxiously to promote what may conduce to brotherly love and friendly intercourse and concord. We are persuaded that this our dear brother will, *ex animo* and conscientiously, obey these our Injunctions with faithfulness. And we beseech you, in the name of our LORD JESUS CHRIST, to receive him as a Brother, and to assist him, as opportunity may offer, with your good offices. We trust that your Holiness will accept this communication as a testimony of our respect and affection, and of our hearty desire to renew that amicable intercourse with the ancient Churches of the East, which has been suspended for ages, and which, if restored, may have the effect, with the blessing of God, of putting an end to divisions which have brought the most grievous calamities on the Church of CHRIST."

Ἐπίσκοπον οὕτως ἐπέμψαμεν, γνωρίζομεν ὑμῖν ὅτι προσετάξαμεν αὐτῷ μηδὲ μῶς ἐν μηδενὶ πράγματι ἐπιβαίνειν τῇ ἐξουσίᾳ τῆ καθηκούση ὑμῖν τοῖς Ἐπισκόποις καὶ τοῖς ἄλλοις ἐν τῷ ἀρχικῷ τῶν Ἐκκλησιῶν Ἀνατολικῶν τάγματι καθεστῶσι, μᾶλλον δὲ παρέχειν ὑμῖν τὴν προσήκουσαν τιμὴν καὶ θεραπείαν, καὶ πρόθυμον εἶναι πάντοτε καὶ παντὶ τρόπῳ σπονδάζειν τὰ εἰς φιλαδελφίαν καὶ συνηθείαν καὶ ὁμόνοιαν φέροντα. Πεπεῖσμεθα μὲν περὶ τούτου τοῦ ἀδελφοῦ ἡμῶν ὅτι ἐκ θυμοῦ καὶ διὰ συνείδησις ταῦτα τὰ ἐντεταλμένα ὑφ' ἡμῶν πιστῶς φυλάξει. Παρακαλοῦμεν δὲ ὑμᾶς, ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι τοῦ Κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, ὡς ἀδελφὸν δέχεσθαι αὐτὸν, καὶ χρεῖαν αὐτῷ ἐπίκουρον παρέχειν. Πεποιθαμεν, ἀδελφοὶ, ὅτι ἡ πανιερότης ὑμῶν τὴν ἐπιστολὴν ταύτην φιλοφρόνως δέξεται, ὡς μαρτυροῦσαν τὴν ἡμετέραν εἰς ὑμᾶς σέβυσιν καὶ φιλαδελφίαν, καὶ τὴν ἐν ἡμῖν ἐπιπόθησιν τοῦ ἀνανεοῦσθαι τοὺς τῆς ἀρχαίας ἀγάπης θεσμοὺς πρὸς τὰς παλαιὰς ἐν τῇ Ἀνατολῇ Ἐκκλησίας, ἐκ πολλῶν ἤδη γενεῶν διαλιπούσης· ἧς ἀνανεουμένης κατὰ βούλησιν καὶ χάριν Θεοῦ, πεποιθαμεν ἰαθῆσθαι ἂν τὰ σχίσματα, εἰ ὧν δεινότατα ἔπαθεν ἡ τοῦ Χριστοῦ Ἐκκλησία."

The Bishop who is at the present time entrusted with that authority, entirely neglecting the commands of our late Metropolitan, and transgressing the injunctions which limit his authority, is harassing to such an extent the orthodox Eastern Church, as to receive Proselytes from her and congregate them into certain schismatical congregations.

Whence it has come to pass that the Anglican Church is reasonably brought into suspicion with your Holinesses, as if she were waging war against the ancient Faith, and daring to bring in secretly other new dogmas.

We therefore, whose names are undersigned, Bishops, Priests, and Deacons of the Catholic Church, make this declaration as follows:—

We altogether protest against all such acts done or now doing by that Bishop, as proceeding from himself alone, and receiving no sanction from our Church; we would especially repudiate his proselytizing practices, as being repugnant to the Compact (ratified A.D. 1841,) and as being direct infractions of the Canons of the Church. We therefore pray your Holinesses not to impute these scandals to us and our Church. And we trust that

Ὁ μὲν οὖν ἐν τῇ παρόντι τὴν ἐξουσίαν ταύτην παριδεξάμενος ἐπίσκοπος, τῶν ὑπὸ τοῦ Μητροπολίτου τοῦ μακαρίτου ἐντεταλμένων πάννυ καταφρονήσας, καὶ παραβὰς τὴν τὰς διακονίας αὐτοῦ περιγράφουσαν διαταγὴν, τὴν ὀρθόδοξον τῆς Ἀνατολῆς Ἐκκλησίαν εἰς τοσοῦτον διαταράττει, ὥστε καὶ προσηλύτους ἐξ αὐτῆς ὑποδέχεσθαι καὶ εἰς σχισματικὰς τινὰς συναγωγὰς ἀθροίζειν.

Ἐξ ὧν συμβέβηκεν τὸς ἡμετέρας Πανιεροτήτους τὴν ἐν Ἀγγλίᾳ Ἐκκλησίαν εὐλόγως ὑποπτον ἔχειν ὡς τῆς ἀρχαίας πίστεως καταπολεμήσασαν καὶ ἄλλα νέα δόγματα τολμῶσαν ὑπεισενεγκεῖν.

Ἡμεῖς οὖν ὧν τὰ ὀνόματα ὑπογράφεται Ἐπίσκοποι ὄντες καὶ Πρεσβύτεροι καὶ Διάκονοι τῆς Καθολικῆς Ἐκκλησίας οὔτως ἐπισχυριζόμεθα.

Τοῖς μὲν οὕτως ὑπὸ τούτου τοῦ Ἐπισκόπου πραχθεῖσι τε καὶ πρασσομένοις πάννυ ἀποτασσόμεθα, ὡς ἐξ ἑαυτοῦ, καὶ μὴ ὑπὸ τῆς ἐνθῆδε Ἐκκλησίας πρυχθεῖσι. μάλιστα δὲ τὸν προσηλυτισμὸν ἀφοσιούμεθι, ὡς ἀντικρὶς τὴν συνθήκην (τὴν ἐν ἔτει αἰωμά) ὑθετοῦντα, καὶ τοῖς κανόσι τῆς Ἐκκλησίας ἐκδήλως ἀντιτείνοντα. Προσκαλοῦμεν οὖν τὰς ἡμετέρας Πανιεροτήτας τοῦτο τὸ σκάνδαλον μῆτε ἡμῖν μῆτε τῇ παρ' ἡμῖν Ἐκκλησίᾳ ἀντιθέσθαι. Πιστεύομεν δὲ ἡμῖν ὡς ταύτην τὴν ἀπολογίαμ

this explanation may be received in a friendly spirit; and that your prayers may ever ascend for the well-being of the Holy Churches of God and the Union of all.

We have set our hands to this in the month of August,  
A.D., 1853.

φιλοφρόνως δεξομένοις, ἀδιαλείπτως ἱκετεύουσιν ὑπὲρ τῆς εὐσταθείας τῶν ἀγίων τοῦ Θεοῦ Ἐκκλησιῶν καὶ τῆς πασῶν ἐνώσεως.

Ἐγράφομεν ἐν Ἀυγούστῳ ἐν ἔτει ρωνγ'.

This Protest was condemned in the following terms by the Archbishops of England and Ireland:—

“Whereas certain Clergymen have addressed a memorial to the Oriental Patriarchs and Synods in which the Anglican Bishop in Jerusalem is accused of having exceeded the proper objects of his mission, and of introducing schism into the Eastern Churches:

“And whereas some of the names affixed to the said document are the names of persons who hold official stations in the United Church of England and Ireland, and it might be supposed, at least in foreign parts, that a censure of the Bishop, as having acted without due authority from his Church, would not be made by persons who were themselves acting without such authority:

“Therefore we, the Metropolitans of the United Church of England and Ireland, deem it expedient to make this public declaration that the said Memorial does not in any manner emanate from the said Church, or from persons authorized by that Church to pronounce decisions.

“We are induced to take this step, first, in order to guard against the danger which might arise to our own Church from the example of the irregular and unauthorized proceedings of the memorialists; and further, because we sympathize with our brother, the Anglican Bishop in Jerusalem, in his arduous position, and feel assured that his conduct, under the circumstances in which he is placed, will be guided by sound judgment and discretion.

“J. B. CANTUAR.

“T. EBOR.

“JOHN G. ARMAGH.

“RICHARD DUBLIN.

“Nov. 1. 1853.”

Upon which the Committee framed the following reply:—

We, the Committee engaged in procuring subscription to an address to the Oriental Patriarchs on recent proselytizing proceedings in the East, having before us the declaration issued by the most Reverend the Archbishops of Canterbury, York, Armagh, and Dublin, concerning that address, do now, on behalf of the subscribers, most solemnly and earnestly protest before the Church, that we do not presume in the said address to speak authoritatively in the name of the Church of which we are members, but simply to clear our own consciences, and, as far as our individual subscriptions extend, to help towards the clearing of our own Church, also of what we feel to be a most grievous scandal pressing upon all. Should we be considered over anxious in hastening forward an object so urgent, we desire to submit ourselves, in this and all other matters, to the authoritative and formal judgment of the Church. And we would very respectfully represent that to receive proselytes from a Church to which friendly professions, never cancelled, were made by the late Primate, and this with no other justification than that some of the persons so received had already left that Church, and professed before Mahometan magistrates their renunciation of their former confession of faith, and their preference of a nondescript Christianity, without any speciality of doctrine or discipline, is a proceeding at variance with Holy Scripture and with the canons of the Church, and, if persisted in and avowed and sanctioned, destructive of the character of our Church itself, as being, what we maintain it to be, a true portion of the One Holy Catholic Church of the Redeemer. We cannot but hope also from the concluding sentence of the Archbishops' Declaration, that the degree in which such proceedings have been pursued and avowed before the world, had scarcely been brought under their Graces' knowledge and animadversion. And should it be judged that we have done wrong in not having presented the scandal to the legitimate authorities of our own Church before entering into communication with others on the subject, we trust that such presumed error will not be attributed to any disrespect for those authorities; nor can we persuade ourselves that, on account of what may be

deemed irregularity on our part, the Archbishops, in conjunction with their brethren, will abstain from doing what in them lies to remove our cause of complaint. If our proceeding be irregular, we trust that it may be considered but as one of many irregularities inseparable from the present position of the Church of England, in which the clergy, deprived of the legitimate mode of expressing their complaint afforded by the Convocations of the two Provinces, are compelled to clear their consciences in such way as is open to them, not being contrary to the Canons.

Signed on behalf of the Committee,  
W. H. MILL, Chairman.

Mr. Mason Neale had been inhibited in 1847, by the Bishop of Chichester, for certain supposed Popish tendencies, viz. : a wooden cross on the rood screen, an Altar with Cross and candlesticks, a Roman Breviary, and a Vulgate edition of the Scriptures; the matter was carried into the Court of Arches, and Sir H. J. Fust decided that "Mr. Neale was liable to Ecclesiastical censure, but the Court would be satisfied with admonishing him to abstain from officiating in future without due authority, that authority being the Licence of the Bishop."\* In consequence of the Bishop's continued refusal to license Mr. Neale, the following petitions were presented by the inmates of Sackville College to the Bishop of Chichester and the Patron of the Institution, the Earl De Le Warr.

*The Memorial of the Pensioners and Inmates of Sackville College, to the Lord Bishop of Chichester.*

"May it please your Lordship,—We, the undersigned, inmates of Sackville College, humbly implore your Lordship's pardon for presuming to address you, but we cannot forbear representing to your Lordship the great hardship which we suffer, in consequence of your having seen fit to forbid our Minister to officiate in the Chapel. We do not doubt that your Lordship knows best what is right—better than we do:

\* Appendix CC.

but if your Lordship will condescend to make inquiries, we are quite sure you would find Mr. Neale an excellent Minister, as well as most kind to his people, and very much beloved by them. And if your Lordship would give him leave to read the Service in Chapel as he should do, we should be very much comforted, and very grateful to your Lordship, and pray that your Lordship may long live in health and happiness here below; and finally, after this life, attain everlasting joy, shall be the prayer of your Lordship's humble servants.

|                    |                      |                   |                       |
|--------------------|----------------------|-------------------|-----------------------|
| Sarah Andrews      | } Sister Pensioners. | William Everest   | } Brother Pensioners. |
| Elizabeth Hooker   |                      | George Taylor     |                       |
| Elizabeth Alcock   |                      | Richard Jenner    |                       |
| Jane Beard         |                      | William Wren      |                       |
| Mary Wren          |                      | Edward Martin     |                       |
| Sarah Leith        |                      | Elizabeth Histed  |                       |
| Mary Anne Leith    |                      | Mary Jenks        |                       |
| Sarah West         |                      | Lucy Grayland     |                       |
| Anne Hoare         |                      | Charlotte Skeates |                       |
| Sarah Ougley       |                      | Abigail Martin    |                       |
| Elizabeth Ougley   |                      | Emily Wells       |                       |
| Arabella Swaysland |                      | Benjamin Chapman  |                       |
| Elizabeth Bish     |                      | John Trice."      |                       |

*The Pensioners and Inmates of Sackville College to the Earl De La Warr.*

"To the Right Honorable Earl De La Warr.

"My Lord,—We, the undersigned Pensioners of Sackville College, feeling ourselves disappointed, and our condition in no ways bettered, by the answer of the Bishop to our Petition that he would let Mr. Neale read in the Chapel as he ought to do,—we now pray your Lordship, as our patron, to settle to us that we may not any longer suffer this wrong, but, according to the ordering of the Statutes, we may have the Warden to read prayers in Chapel, which are now only read by one of ourselves, and all because (as we suppose) of the Bishop's dislike to Mr. Neale.

"We all heard the Bishop's letter read in the Hall, and it did in no ways satisfy us, as we are all willing to swear that Mr. Neale has taught us no new doctrines, or perplexed our minds with any vain shows, as the Bishop says. That he should say

this puzzled us, and made us determine to ask your Lordship to get Mr. Neale righted, for it was a good day that brought him to the College, and we do all look upon him as our Clergyman, and want that he should have the cure of our souls, which he is so fit and so willing to have, and which nobody else has, as we see.

“If your Lordship choose to show this Letter to the Bishop, we don’t mind his seeing of it; only we know he has no calling in the College, and it does seem so vindictive-like to punish Mr. Neale all this four years, and so keep us out of our rights, which was our reason for writing to him instead of your Lordship, whereas some say, Parliament would be the best friend, as we stand by an Act of Parliament. We, pensioners on your Lordship’s bounty, are most of us old and infirm, and don’t like the end of our days to be troubled as we have been; and so we pray GOD would bless your Lordship and my Lady, and every branch of that ancient and honorable family, with long life and great prosperity.

(Signed by the Pensioners as before)

“We, the undersigned Inmates of Sackville College, are wholly of the same mind with the Pensioners, and pray your Lordship to receive this our Petition.”

(Signed by the Inmates as before.)

*The Lord Bishop of Chichester to the Pensioners and Inmates of Sackville College.*

“To the Inmates of Sackville College, East Grinstead, who signed an Address to me, dated 22nd inst.

“Dear Christian Friends,—I have read your address several times since I received it,—each time with a renewal of pain and sorrow. I know not what I can do to help you. I am sure those who designated Mr. Neale to the office of Warden in your College, with the intention that he should minister to you in holy things, believed they were acting for your good. I cannot, however, approve of the way in which he conducted those ministrations, departing, as he did, from the simplicity of our ordinary Church services, and perplexing your minds, for such cannot be the result, with new and strange shows and observances, different to all you have been accustomed to from your youth. The knowledge of these proceedings grieved me,

and obliged me to consider what it was in my power to do, to relieve you from the ill effects on your religious views which I apprehended from them.

“The institution of which you are members has no Chaplain properly belonging to it. The Warden is appointed to be taken from among yourselves, and to read prayers and lessons, the Collegians being assembled in the Chapel. It is right that the inmates of such a house as yours should daily offer prayer to GOD in social worship, and provision was thus made for their fulfilling that duty; but they were in no degree withdrawn from the full spiritual superintendence of the Incumbent of the parish, or of the Bishop of the diocese.

“Disapproving then, as I said, of what I heard and saw of Mr. Neale’s proceedings among you, I had to choose between appearing to countenance them, by abstaining from interfering, or manifesting for your benefit, and that of all who observed what was going on, my disapprobation, by the adoption of some step, which would be considered, I hoped, as a warning and a caution against the views and practices he was introducing among you.

“I need not extend my letter further. It remains only that I should say that I have no reason for supposing that, if I were to remove the restriction I felt it my duty to lay upon Mr. Neale, his views are so altered as that I might hope you would be safe from injurious influences from them. I must deplore your situation; but I cannot bring myself to be a party in placing you under the guidance of Mr. Neale.

“You have your Bibles and the Prayer Book of your Church in your hands. Read diligently in that precious Book of GOD’S Word, with humble prayer to Him, that He will be pleased to incline your hearts and to open your understandings, that you may profit thereby. Attend the public worship of your Church as often as age and infirmities will permit you. And may GOD of His mercy, give you support, patience, and consolation in the trial He is pleased to lay upon you, in your being made the subjects of an unhappy difference, whereas we ought to be all of one heart and of one mind before Him.

“I remain your faithful Pastor,

“A. T. CICESTR.

“*Palace, Chichester, 27th December, 1851.*”

*“The Earl De La Warr to the Pensioners and Inmates of Sackville College.*

“To the Pensioners of, and other Inmates, in Sackville College, East Grinstead.

“I have read with lively interest, but with great pain, the memorial which you have addressed to me, as one of the patrons and visitors of Sackville College. I can well understand how deeply you must be affected by the Episcopal interdict, which has now for a lengthened period deprived you of those ministerial services in the Chapel of the College which your excellent Warden might and—to use your own forcible expression—ought to perform. Into the causes which have led to the present state of things—hitherto unheard of in any collegiate establishment—and to the severe ecclesiastical penalty continued in force against the Rev. Mr. Neale, it is not necessary for me now to enter, even if it were possible to find any causes existing in a tangible shape.

“All, therefore, that I can now say in reply to the prayer of the petition is, that I will spare no effort in my power to obtain for you a restoration of those spiritual advantages to which you are entitled, as members of an institution founded to the honor and glory of God: with fervent prayers to Whom for your welfare, temporal and eternal, in which I am most cordially joined by Lady De La Warr and my family, I remain,

“Your affectionate friend, and one of your patrons and visitors,

“DE LA WARR.

*“Buckhurst, January 27, 1852.”*

---

1854.

---

The principal Converts this year were:—

Rev. G. J. Hill, Bath.

Rev. A. T. Morton, Curate of Devizes

Rev. W. H. Scott, Curate of Emanuel Church, Bolton.

Rev. W. Hamilton.

Rev. G. J. McLeod, Curate of St. Matthew's Stoke Newington.

Rev. J. A. Pope, Incumbent of St. Matthew's, Stoke Newington.

Rev. H. N. Felgate, (R.I.P.) Fellow of Trinity Coll., Cambridge.  
 Ven. R. I. Wilberforce, Rector of Burton Agnes, York, (R.I.P.)  
 Rev. G. de la Feld, Rector of Tortington, Sussex.  
 Rev. B. Wilson, Vicar of Fordham, Cambridgeshire.

---

GERMANY.

---

Rev. — Meinholdt.  
 Rev. — Mosheim.  
 Rev. P. Oertel.  
 Rev. — de Soharet.

---

AMERICA.

---

Rev. H. Parsons.  
 Rev. O. A. Shane.  
 Rev. D. M'Leod.

Lord Monteith.  
 Baron Ward, (Milan.)  
 Sir R. Crown.  
 Dowager Lady Castlestuart.  
 Digby Boycott, Esq.  
 Hon. J. R. Chanter.  
 Prince Galitzkin.  
 Viscount Castlestuart, (R.I.P.)  
 Lieut. Bastard.  
 Charles Voegel.  
 G. Wincklemann  
 Hon. F. Cavendish, (R.I.P.)  
 Prince of Hesse Darmstadt.  
 Dr. Eisenbach.  
 Lady Floyd.  
 Lady Monteith.  
 Lady de Trafford, (R.I.P.)  
 Princess Navroki.  
 Baronne D'Ordred.  
 Ctss. Zule.  
 Mrs. Hill.  
 Mrs. Scott.

Miss Monteith.  
 Princess C. Vasa.  
 Miss Floyd.  
 Miss Stanley.  
 Mrs. Sandys.

England was startled with rumors of hostility against Messrs. Denison, Phipps, Morton, and Robert Wilberforce, which ended in the resignation of the Curate of Devizes, and his ultimate submission to the Church; thus terminating a quarrel, as far as he was concerned, which would have dragged the most evident proof of our Lord's love before the public, before an infidel and unbelieving race of men who sneer at God's truth, and thereby increase their own damnation; for though the Establishment does not, and cannot possess HIM WHO dwells in our tabernacles, the God of Love and Peace, yet the very fact of certain of its (so called) ministers holding the doctrine of the Real Presence, might tend to blaspheme Him Whose Holy Name should be treated with reverence and veneration.

And yet, dear reader, is it possible to believe that those who are still left behind in the meshes of Anglicanism "*enjoy peace in the way of duty, and rest in obedience?*" They believe in the Real Presence, and yet persist in upholding a Church, which refuses to adore, and they have *peace* (we are told) *in the way of duty*. They believe in the efficacy of the Mass, as the one Sacrifice for the living and the departed, and yet persist in upholding a Church, whose language denounces that office as a blasphemous and dangerous deceit, and yet they say they have *peace in the way of duty*. They believe that they who reject Christ's lawful ministers reject Him, and on Dr. Pusey's assurance, that they need not examine who those Ministers are, they reject those whom the See of S. Peter and the Catholic world send and acknowledge as the only lawful ministers of Christ, and *yet* (we are assured) *they have peace in the way of duty*. And from whom, but from

themselves, has Dr. Pusey derived this most singular authority over them? Trusting, however, to his assurance, they reject the warnings, disobey the commands, and disregard the excommunications of the acknowledged successors of S. Peter, and they have *rest in obedience*—TO WHOM?"

Mr. Robert Wilberforce, previous to his secession, having first resigned his preferment in the Establishment,\* published a work on the Principles of Church Authority, in which he proves that "private judgment has (since the Reformation, been the real system that prevailed in England." Well and truly does Mr. Wilberforce sum up the argument of his work in the following words, "It has been shown by the testimony of those who lived before us, that our Lord not only taught doctrines, but founded a Church. To this Church He was pleased to commit the especial function of interpreting that system which He delivered to mankind. He qualified it for such an office, by rendering It the habitation of that Divine Spirit, which had dwelt without measure in the temple of his own Humanity, and was pleased to take up His perpetual abode in His Body Mystical, the Church. Such is the statement of those who have delivered to us an account of our Lord's nature and actions, and unless this capacity of judgment had been possessed by the Church, we could have no evidence of the inspiration of that Sacred Volume, which contains the records of our faith. For it was the Church's judgment, which stamped it with authority, and in its turn it confirms that which Antiquity had previously witnessed, respecting the authority of the Church. The Church's authority then depends on that presence of the Spirit which gives it life. This authority had resided first in its completeness in the Person of our Lord, when He was manifest in the flesh. He was pleased to bestow it in a plenary manner on the College of His Apostles; from them it has descended to their successors, the Bishops

\* Appendix DD.

throughout the world. But to preserve the unity of this wide-spread commission, our Lord was pleased to give an especial promise to one of His Apostles, and to bestow upon him, a name and office derived from Himself. And as the Episcopal College at large succeeded to the Apostles, so was there one Bishop, whom the Universal Church believed from the first to be the successor of S. Peter. Hence was he spoken of in ancient time, as discharging that function among the rulers of the Church Catholic, which was discharged among his brethren by the chief Apostlé. The successor of S. Peter is declared by those General Councils which are admitted by all Catholics to be the representative of Him Who was the bond of unity and Rock of the Church. And hence, as the circle of Christendom grew wider, and its unity could not be maintained without a stronger principle of confraternation, it was through this principle that the Oneness of the Catholic Body was perpetuated, and the Primacy of S. Peter ripened into the Supremacy of the Pope. But now comes a change. There arises a powerful Monarch in a remote land, who resolves to separate the Church of his nation from the unity of Christendom. He effects his purpose by force or fraud, and bids it recognise a new principle of unity in himself. He passes to his account, and his children rule after him. But this new principle of unity is found in time to be insufficient. No sooner is the grasp of the civil ruler relaxed, than a host of parties divide the land; the very thought of unity and hope of concord is gradually lost. The National Church is surrounded by sects, and torn by dissensions. *Intra muros peccatur et extra.* And can it be doubted what advice would be given to its children by that great Saint, who looked forth upon a somewhat similar spectacle in his native land, and whose life was expended in winning back his brethren one by one to the unity of Christendom? He did not think that the national energy of Africa was any pledge of safety to the Donatists, or that the number and succession of their

Bishops entitled them to respect.—‘Come, brethren, if you wish to be inserted in the Vine; for we grieve when we see you lie thus cut off from it. Number the Bishops from the very seat of Peter, and in that list of Fathers, see what has been the succession; this is the rock against which the proud gates of Hell do not prevail.’”\*

The conversion of Hon. F. Cavendish is thus referred to by the very Rev. F. Rinolfi:—“The Missioners had also the great satisfaction of receiving into the Church before leaving Castlebar, the Hon. F. Cavendish. This gentleman had always been a most upright and liberal man, advocating Catholic interests for years merely on the score of truth and of justice, not anticipating that he should ever be a Catholic himself. It was during this Mission, which he attended as often as his old age and infirmity allowed him, that his natural honesty and justice done to his abused and insulted Catholic neighbours were repaid by Almighty God, by granting deep conviction to his mind and firm resolve to his heart to embrace the Catholic faith. It was a spectacle moving to tears to see that grey-haired and infirm nobleman, with his eyes bathed in tears, submit, with the simplicity of a child, his venerable head to the regenerating waters of Baptism, and then declare his utter unworthiness of such a grace, and his incapacity to express his feelings of gratitude to Almighty God and His Missioners.”

The Protestant churchwarden of S. Paul’s, Knightsbridge, elated by the success of his canvass and the resignation of Mr. Bennett of excommunication notoriety, addressed a letter to the Right Rev. the Lord Bishop of London, in which he complains of the Romish practices of Mr. Bennett’s successor, the Hon. and Rev. R. Liddell, who was governed by Mr. Nugee, one of his curates. Mr. Westerton thus describes the 11 o’clock service at S. Paul’s, and proceeds to mention other discrepancies between the conduct of Messrs. Liddell, Nugee, Parry, and

\* Willerforce’s Principles of Church Authority.

Lowder—"While the *Clergy bell*\* is ringing, the choristers, boys and men, issue from the clerk's vestry in procession, followed by one of the curates, cap in hand; when they have taken their places, Mr. Liddell and two other curates, with occasionally volunteer clergymen, walk in procession from the vestry, each bearing one or more of the vessels to be used at the Communion. As they approach the '*Altar*,'† on which stands a large cross, Mr. Liddell bows to it reverently, and deposits on the credence-table by its side the vessel he has brought. Mr. Nugee, also bowing, reverently approaches it, and giving up what he has brought to be put there, takes his post on the south side of it, followed by the others, who having imitated his example, take their places behind them." Mr. Westerton further compares with

*The Rubric, from the Book of  
Common Prayer.*

*The manner in which the direc-  
tions of the Rubric are fol-  
lowed at S. Paul's.*

1. 'At the beginning of Morning Prayer, the Minister shall *read* with a loud voice some one or more of these sentences of the Scriptures that follow, and then he shall say that which is written after the said sentence.

1. The Minister does not *read* or say, but *intones* ‡ them, and that so quickly that the effect intended to be produced by them, is altogether lost on the congregation.

\* Mr. Westerton has not explained this mystical phrase, and we have in vain searched Hook and Riddell for the meaning of this Anglican, and, to us, certainly novel term.

† An Altar is defined to be "a sort of table which the old heathens made use of to offer sacrifice to their gods. Among the Jews there was a great variety of Altars, and also in the Primitive Christian Church; and even to this day in the Roman Catholic Church; but the Church of England and all the Reformed Churches discontinue the NAME and have abolished the DOCTRINE that supported the use." Dyche's Eng. Dictionary.

‡ To *intone* is to "make a slow protracted noise," as Pope—

"So swells each windpipe; ass *intones* to ass,  
Harmonick twang."

2. A general confession to be *said* of the whole congregation, after the Minister.

3. The absolution is to be pronounced by the Priests.

4. The people shall answer, here, and at the end of all other prayers, Amen.

5. Then the Minister shall kneel, and say the Lord's Prayer, with an audible voice, the people repeating it.

6. Then likewise he shall say;—

7. Here all standing up shall say, Glory, &c.

8. Then shall be said or sung the Psalm following.

9. Then shall follow the Psalms in order.

10. Then shall be sung or said the Apostles' Creed by the Minister and people standing, except only such days as the Creed of S. Athanasius is appointed to be read.

\* \* \* \* \*

20. The table at the communion time having a fair white linen cloth upon it, shall stand in the body of the Church, or in the Chancel, where morning and evening prayers are appointed to be said, &c.

2. Chanted.

3. It is *intoned*.

4. It is chanted by the choir.

5. The Minister does not say, but intones it, the choristers the same for the people.

6. He chants it, and the answers are chanted by the choir.

7. He chants it as often as it occurs with this addition—Mr. Liddell, folding his hands across his breast, bows his head toward the Altar, continuing bent till it is ended. Mr. Nugee does the same.

8 Chanted.

9. Chanted.

10. The Apostles' Creed is sung accompanied by the Organ, but while doing so the choristers and Clergy turn their faces to the 'Altar' and their backs to the Congregation.

\* \* \* \* \*

20. No table is provided, but instead of it an elaborately carved oaken Altar precisely like those used in Roman Catholic Cathedrals and Chapels, and like them covered with rich velvet 'Antependia' or

'Altar' cloths of colors varying with the season, embroidered with monograms, fleurs de lis, and other devices in silver and gold.

\* \* \* \* \*

25. Then shall follow the Sermon, or one of the Homilies already set forth or hereafter to be set forth by authority.

25. Mr. Liddell then leaves the Altar to put on his gown and preach the Sermon, the Curates remaining hidden from the congregation in the *sedilia* by the side of the Altar, like Monks and Roman Catholic Priests.

26. Then shall the Priest return to the Lord's table, &c.

26. The Sermon ended, all the congregation depart except those who stay to the communion. Another procession of the Curates from the 'Altar' to the Vestry, and with Mr. Liddell from the Vestry to the 'Altar' having taken place, the choristers resume their places, and the two Churchwardens approach the railing in front of the 'Altar,' one on the north, and the other on the south side; here each finds two golden dishes, placed for him with a piece of red cloth with embroidered border, and the monogram I.H.S. inside them, they turn round and come down to the foot of the steps leading to the chancel, where the Clerk is waiting on the north, and the Verger on the south side, for their plate or bason, and during the *intoning* of the sentences previously al-

luded to, the Offertory money is collected, and each takes up his plate to one of the Curates, who, with the large alms dish before him, is waiting to receive and place them therein; when this is done it is handed to Mr. Liddell, who reverently places it on the '*Altar*' before the Cross.

\* \* \* \* \*

42. After the Divine Service is ended, the money given at the Offertory shall be disposed of to such pious and charitable uses as the Minister and Churchwardens shall think fit. Wherein, if they disagree, it shall be disposed of as the Ordinary shall appoint."

42. Until very recently, Mr Liddell took possession of the whole of the Offertory money, amounting annually to an unusually large sum, which he disposed of at his own will and pleasure—the Churchwardens not having a voice in the distribution of a single shilling to the poor, nor have they so now."

This letter having produced no reply from the "Bishop" of London, though Mr. Liddell discontinued the "procession" and the bowing to the Altar, yet as some Popish practices were still continued, a remonstrance was addressed to Mr. Liddell by his Protestant churchwarden, wherein he thus refers to the credence-table:—"I have to complain of the introduction and use of the '*Credentia*' or '*Diminutive Preparatory Altar*,' or, as it is sometimes called, the '*side board*' or '*Credence Table*,' which has been set up in the said Church of S. Paul, as I affirm, without any lawful authority. I protest against the use of the said credence-table as furniture or ornament utterly unknown to ecclesiastical uses in the Protestant Reformed Church of England at any time since the Reformation, and I insist that the same is a mere

Popish utensil; and I do accordingly protest against the use of the same as a thing so utterly foreign and unknown in the Protestant Church, that it has no English word or equivalent phrase to express its Roman name; an utensil, moreover, only mentioned in the Missals or Romish ceremonials, declared unlawful by the Statute 3 and 4 Edward VI. c. 10."

After a lengthened series of protests and remonstrances, the period of the election for churchwardens approached, and after no little manœuvring, unusual even in any contest for a Parliamentary seat, Mr. Westerton was returned on 16th of June, by a majority of 327. The state of the Poll was—

Westerton, 651.

Davidson, 328

During the first election a circumstance occurred which deserves a place in our "Annals," as showing the partiality of Protestants, whether Soupers or Tractarians, to figure in the Police Court; we refer to the enquiry into the complaint of John Ledwich against the Rev. Charles F. Lowder, for inciting certain lads in Cherry-street, to attack him with eggs and stones. Mr. Lowder apologized, and as a salve to the egg-pelted bill carrier, gave him £2. We insert the trial in the Appendix, as also a most amusing letter from a Parishioner of S. Paul's describing the zeal of "certain ladies" (reminding us, by the way, of our Souper ladies in Ireland), who rushing into the shops would take the place of the little tradesman, and dispense "lolly-pops" and red herrings, while the proprietor was hurried into a cab to vote against "that Westerton."\* Well may we smile when we hear of S. Barnabas pelting S. Paul with rotten eggs!! Of a truth Mr. Lowder deserves our best thanks for this farcical and ludicrous interlude in a Tractarian hand-to-hand contest. When will Mr. Lowder again interfere and think it a "capital joke," as no doubt it was, to pelt a poor "board man" with rotten eggs and

\* Appendix EE.

stones? would that we knew, for that we should like to see the fun, from a window at least, and purchase a pen'orth of lolly-pops from one of the titled dames of Belgravia, and be present at one of the "High Teas" of S. Barnabas.

Mr. Westerton, finding himself supported by so large a majority of the Protestant parishioners of Belgravia, published a Reply to the Adjudication of the Bishop of London, proving by the Injunction of Edward VI. (1547) that processions were never recognized or used by the Protestant Church—that "bowing to the altar" was only peculiar to Popery, that intonation was forbidden by Edward and Elizabeth, and by the 13 and 14 Charles II., cap. 4, sect. 2; that "Altars," high or diminutive, are wholly and solely Popish, and we are informed by Mr. Westerton, on the authority of Cave, that "*Primitive Christian had no other Altar in their churches THAN DECENT TABLES OF WOOD.*" The churchwarden reminds Dr. Blomfield that an altar is an altar though it be "not fixed" but "moveable," as fixedness was never an essential element or characteristic of the structure called an Altar, and as a proof of this cites Lucan—

"Erexit subitas congestu cespitis aras  
Vota qui thuri cremos non irrita fudit in ignes ;"

and Virgil—

"Campum ad certamen, magnæ sub mœnibus urbis,  
Dimensi Rutulique viri Teucrique parabant :  
In medioque focus, et Diis communibus aras  
Gramineas ;"

and further quotes Facciolati to show the difference between the "Alta ara" (i. e., altare) and the "ara quæ humilior est," or the Altare prothesis—"Altare, (says Facciolati) locus ad sacrificandum aptus, in quo adoletur victima ; quare differt ab ara, quæ humilior est, et tum Inferis, tum Superis, diis convenit. Præterea in ara aut supplicatur, aut libatur tantum in Altari victima adoletur"

—that ALTARS by the injunction of Edward VI. addressed to Ridley, “WERE TO BE TAKEN DOWN IN EVERY CHURCH AND CHAPEL”—that “Sir John Gates went down with letters to see the Bishop of London’s injunctions performed, which touched plucking down of superaltars, Altars, and such like ceremonies and abuses”—that in 1564 an order was issued for “the Parishes to provide a decent table,” and that “Altar stones were to be defaced and bestowed to some common use”—that candlesticks are “purely and essentially Romish”—that the decking the “Altar with flowers is a corruption of the Roman Church first imitated from the Pagans, as—

“Ridet argento domus: ara castis  
 Vincita *Verbenis* avet immolati  
 Spargier agno;”

and Virgil—

“Effër aquam, et molli cinge hæc altaria vitta  
 Verbenasque adole pingues et mascula thura.”

To this memorial the Bishop’s secretary thus replied:—

*Dean’s Yard, Westminster,  
 17th August, 1854.*

“Sir,—The Bishop of London desires me to say, that he has received your letter of the 9th instant, and that he sees no reason to alter the decision which he made known to you in his letter of March last.

“I am, Sir, your most obedient servant,  
 CHRISTOPHER HODGSON, Sec.”

And here we purpose for a while bidding adieu to Messrs. Westerton, Liddell, Lowder, and Co.

The Archdeacon of Taunton, on being apprised by the Archbishop of Canterbury that the Rev. Mr. Ditcher had brought the two following charges against him, viz:—

1. “That the Act of Consecration causes the Bread and Wine, though remaining in their natural substances, to have the Body and Blood of Christ really, though spi-

ritually, joined to them, so that to receive the one is to receive the other.”

2. “That the wicked and unbelieving eat and drink the Body and Blood of Christ in the Lord’s Supper just as much as ever;”—and that it was His Grace’s “intention after the expiration of fourteen days, to nominate five Clergy of the Diocese to inquire into the justice of this charge in accordance with the provision of the Act of the 3<sup>r</sup>, and 4<sup>th</sup>, of Victoria, cap. 86, and to ascertain whether there be *primâ facie* ground for further proceedings,” determined to fight out the battle on *technical* grounds, leaving it to his adversary to prove the publication of the Sermons, &c.; the Archdeacon accordingly presented a formal protest against the proposed court as null and illegal, but, however, the Commissioners, viz. :— the Right Rev. Bishop Carr, Bath, the Rev. C. Langdon, Vicar of Queen’s Camel, the Rev. C. Pole, Rector of Yeovelton, the Rev. R. C. Phelps, Rector of Cucklington, and the Rev. C. O. Mayne, Vicar of Midsomer Norton, who proceeded, regardless of the Archdeacon’s protest, to ascertain whether there were *primâ facie* grounds for further proceedings pursuant to an ‘Act for better enforcing Church discipline,’ “and held their sitting at Clevedon: and after several days declared their unanimous opinion to be;

1. “That as respects the preaching and publishing (or making known or public) the above Sermons, by the Venerable the Archdeacon of Taunton, within the Diocese of Bath and Wells, there is sufficient *primâ facie* ground for instituting further proceeding.”

2. “The Commissioners having carefully examined the aforesaid Sermons and charges specified in the Commission, declare their unanimous opinion that ‘the proposition’ of the Venerable the Archdeacon of Taunton, ‘That to all who come to the Lord’s table, to those who eat and drink worthily, and to those who eat and drink unworthily the Body and Blood of Christ are given, and that by all who

come to the Lord's table, by those who eat and drink unworthily the Body and Blood of Christ are received,' is directly contrary or repugnant to the doctrine of the Church of England, and especially to the Articles of Religion, and that the doctrine as set forth in the aforesaid Sermons with reference to the Real Presence in the Holy Eucharist are unsupported by the Articles taken in their literal and grammatical sense, are contrary to the doctrines and teaching of the Church of England, and have a very dangerous tendency. The Commissioners are therefore of opinion, secondly, that there is sufficient *prima facie* ground for instituting further proceedings. The Commissioners at the same time think it due to the Venerable the Archdeacon to state that in the Sermons under consideration, he has expressed his full assent and consent to the Articles of Religion, and that he has *ex animo* condemned the doctrines of the Church of Rome, and particularly the Roman doctrine of Transubstantiation."

In consequence of this decision certain criminal articles—twenty-five in all, were filed by John Bird, Lord Archbishop of Canterbury, at the voluntary promotion of the Rev. Joseph Ditcher, against the Venerable George Anthony Denison, Archdeacon of Taunton.

The *cause célèbre* of Ditcher v. Denison, will be again brought before our reader, during the following year.

---

1855.

---

The principal converts were—

Rev. C. E. Parry, Curate of S. Paul's Knight's-bridge, London.

Rev. E. S. Ffoulkes, Tutor of Jesus College, Oxford.

Rev. W. Palmer, Fellow of Magdalen College, Oxford.

Rev. E. B. Deane, Rector of Lewknor, Oxford.

Rev. T. P. Wright, Fellow of King's College, London.

Rev. F. Lascelles, Vicar of Merevale, Warwickshire.

Rev. T. S. Cocks, Rector of Sheviok.

Rev. W. Wheeler, Vicar of Shoreham.\*  
 Rev. G. Rose, P. C., Earl's Heaton, Yorkshire.  
 Rev. L. Kynaston.  
 Rev. H. I. Nash.  
 Rev. — Chestnutt.  
 Rev. — Moody.

---

RUSSIA.

Rev. — Djunvowsky.

---

AMERICA.

Rev. H. Wheaton.  
 Rev. W. B. Whitcher.  
 Rev. W. Markoe.  
 Rev. E. H. Doane.  
 Rev. W. Forest.

Mrs. G. Talbot.  
 Colonel Wood.  
 Gemschid Rasched Bey  
 Hon. J. Vandyke. (America.)  
 M. David Richard.  
 M. J. Marguet.  
 Earl of Dunraven.  
 Mr. Reid.  
 F. Gosberry, Esq.  
 C. R. Bailey, Esq.  
 Miss Lawfield.†

\* "Since the retirement of Archdeacon Manning from the Establishment," (says the Brighton Examiner,) "there has been nothing in this part of the country which has created half the sensation as the secession of Mr. Wheeler, and every one must see that it affects all those large establishments which have been formed at Shoreham, Hurst, and Lancing, and which now involves to a considerable extent Magdalen College Oxford."

† The *Guardian's* Constantinople correspondent says:—"The case of Miss Lawfield, one of the English Church nurses who has joined the Roman Catholic Church, will, doubtless excite a considerable degree of attention in England. Her change of mind cannot be justly attributed to the influence of the Catholic Priests here. I believe that one cause of her turning her back on her old faith is this: there is a religious indifference amounting to a practical infidelity amongst most of our military men. The large majority

Miss Featherstone.

Mrs. Spurgeon.

Miss Spurgeon.

Lady Bourke. Marble Hall, Co. Galway.

Duchess of Buccleuch

Capt. Boteler.

Mr. Parry says, "Certainly there is one hindrance to our submitting to the Catholic Church, independent of argument, false notions, and prejudices. It is *dread*. The dread of leaving for ever one idea of Christianity for another, so strangely different, so hateful to the natural man, so unbending, as that of the Church of Rome. High Anglican theories excited our imaginations, and separated us in thought from the rest of our Protestant brethren, but Rome divides us for ever from all such theories, as well as from Protestantism in general. She will be believed entirely or not at all; she is the whole truth or none; she is alone Christ's Church or Antichrist; a gigantic delusion, or the true messenger from Heaven. These Anglican Theories may lead you gallantly to her threshold, but once there, you must retrace your steps, or leave those theories as you pass within her pale. Many when they see this sicken at the sight, and shrink from the sacrifice. Let us count then the cost, for the sacrifice of the past must be full and entire. The English Establishment is utterly wrong, notwithstanding its ancient creeds and respect for past times, or Rome is a lie. Better remain where you are than take your Protestant fancies into the Roman Communion. She must be exclusive, for the Gospel is so. The Gospel is indeed open to all, both bad and good, and so also are the Church's doors, and all nations and people are pressed to come in, but as every Christian creed necessarily excludes more than 500,000,000

of the Protestant officers and medical men do not make any recognition of religion. The common soldiers are generally sunk in apathy. The spectacle of a dead faith among her fellow-Christians being daily presented to her seems to have shaken her attachment to the Church of her birth and of her country.

of human beings from the present grace of the Gospel, so the creed of Rome excludes from the unity of the True Church, all Protestants and Greek schismatics too. If *nothing* would persuade you that the latter creed can be right in its exclusion, nothing ought to convince you that the Gospel can be true at the expense of so many other religious systems in the world."\*

As regards Mr. Ffoulkes, we feel it incumbent on us to refer to a work published by him in 1853, entitled, *The Problem 'What is the Church?' solved*, σκέψις περὶ τοῦ τί ἦν εἶναι τῆς Εκκλησίας. or *the Counter Theory*." Mr. Ffoulkes informs his readers, that he published this little work after spending "seven years" in analyzing what seemed to be principles, and accounts for his title by quoting and adopting the following passage from the late Professor Butler, whom he designates as Dr. Newman's ablest opponent—"Probably nothing would wholly destroy the effect of such a work (Newman's Essay on Development) but some equally clever *rival theory*. An intellectual romance of this kind is in this respect like a religious or political novel; you cannot meet it effectually by mere argument; to put it down at all you must win the public ear and fancy by a counter novel."† To Mr. Ffoulkes we are indebted for this "rival theory," this "counter novel," by which he endeavoured to "win the public ear and fancy,"—however, in about two years after its publication, Mr. Ffoulkes was led by the grace of God to answer his own question, "What is the Church?" by humbly suing for reconciliation with the Sec of S. Peter.

To Mr. Ffoulkes we are further indebted for the following list of converts from Protestantism to the Roman communion;—"Dryden, the first of poets, and Sunderland, the Prime Minister, stand at the head of a catalogue in which the Earls of Peterboro' and Salisbury, Sir Edward Hales, Haines, and Tindal, are names still familiar to English

\* Parry's Appeal to Common Sense.

† Butler's Lectures on the Development of Christian Doctrine.

ears. . . . Among foreigners, while Christiana, Queen of Sweden; Wolfgang William, Count Palatine of the Rhine; Christian William, Marquis of Brandenburg; Ernest, Prince of Hesse; John Frederick, Duke of Brunswick; and Frederick Augustus, king of Poland, were crowned heads; John Christian, Baron of Boineburg; Rongovius, a Knight of Holstein; Caspar Scioppius, Peter Bertius, Christian Besold, Ulric Hunnius, Nicholas Stenonius, John Philip Pfeiffer, Lucius Holstenius, Peter Lambecius, Henry Julius Blum, Andrew Fromm Bartholt Nihusius, Christian Hellwig, Matthew Prætorius, and others, were all men of various genius and acquirements.”\*

Mr. Palmer, whose name has often been mentioned in the course of our narrative, was received into the Church at Rome; but while Oxford and Cambridge were thus giving to the Church the elect of her sons, America is also yielding fruit. Brownson, Ives, Huntingdon, Forbes, are among the more celebrated of her converts; 1855, also, witnessed the reconciliation of the son and brother of two Bishops, in Mr. Doane and Mr. Bailey. The father of the former gentleman, who is regarded as the Bishop of New Jersey, issued a document purporting to be a sentence of deposition against his son, the Rev. G. H. Doane, and as it is so *unique*, we cannot refrain from presenting it to the reader, trusting that he will, while smiling at Dr. Doane's zeal, pray for his conversion to the Faith promulgated by Christ on Mount Calvary and taught by the Church of Rome alone.

“ TO ALL EVERY WHERE WHO ARE IN COMMUNION WITH THE  
HOLY CATHOLIC AND APOSTOLIC CHURCH :

Be it known that GEORGE HOBART DOANE, M.D., Deacon of this Diocess, having declared to me in writing his renunciation of the Ministry, which he received at my hands, of the Lord Jesus Christ, and his design not to officiate in future in any of the offices thereof, intending to submit

\* Ffoulkes' Counter Theory.

himself to the Schismatical Roman intrusion, is deposed from the Ministry, and I hereby pronounce and declare him to be deposed. In the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost. Amen.

Given at Riverside this fifteenth day of September, in the year of our Lord 1855, and in the twentieth year of my consecration.

G. W. DOANE, LL.D.,  
Bishop of New Jersey.

In the presence of

MILO MAHAN, D.D., Presbyter.

MARCUS F. HYDE, A.M., Presbyter.

This sentence was not put into execution until the Canon 'where the party has acted unadvisedly and hastily,' which is preeminently the present case, had been offered, urged, and refused. It only remains for me humbly to ask the prayers of the Faithful in Christ Jesus, that my erring child may be brought back to the way of truth and peace, and for myself, that I may have grace to hear and do the holy will of God.

G. W. DOANE."

---

1856.

---

The Converts for this year are :—

Rev. T. H. Kirke, Chaplain to Mr. Ram.

Rev. W. A. Weguelin, Vicar of South Stoke.

Rev. J. R. Oldfield, Curate of Dorking.

Rev. H. R. Rawes, Warden of Sobro, London.

Rev. G. Arnold.

Rev. W. G. Freeman, Plymouth.

Rev. W. Littleboy, Curate of Shearston, Leicestershire.

J. Ram, Esq., Gorey, Wexford.

J. O. Cuffe, Esq., Missenden, Bucks.

— Culverwell, Esq., Shepton Mallett.

— Heenan, Esq.

Mrs. Ram.  
 Mrs. Henau  
 Mrs. Rogers.  
 Miss Rogers.  
 E. J. Hutchins, Esq., M.P.  
 Mrs. Burton.  
 Miss Hoffman.  
 Miss C. Maxwell.  
 Miss G. Maxwell.  
 Mrs. Wadsworth.  
 Sutton Swaby, Esq.  
 Miss Coleridge.  
 Miss Hinkey.

Dr. Pusey, ever eccentric, ever erratic in his conduct, astounded, nay, perplexed his followers and adversaries, and, we may add, his quondam disciples, by the following characteristic letter to Mr. Perry, curate of S. Paul's, Brighton :—

“My dear Friend,—I never said or wrote a word in disparagement of the English Reformation. You know that I always disliked the influence of the foreign reformers upon ours, but that was passing. I could not use such an expression as ‘the principles, if any, of the English Reformation,’ nor should I ever have admitted it into any work for which I was responsible; for I have always believed that the English Reformation had very definite principles, and what I have wished to do (as far as in me lay) was to bring people back to the principles of the English Reformation, as expressed in the Prayer Book and Homilies. I am not conscious of having done one thing beyond the principles of the English Reformation. The Reformers acknowledged the Holy Scriptures as the sole rule of faith; they acknowledged the early ages of the Gospel its best interpreter; ecumenical councils as authoritative; they believed in the Sacrament of Baptism; the real presence of the body and blood of Christ in the Holy Eucharist; they provided a form of absolution for penitents who specially confessed their sins; they believed in the value of good works done through the grace of

Christ and by his Spirit; they believed that He would come again at the end of the world to judge both the quick and the dead, according to their works; they gave directions as to days and seasons of fasting; they taught the value of almsgiving, of daily public prayer, of frequent communions, and so on. I believe that those whom people call Tractarians have, in the main, been true to the principles of the English Reformation; and I must believe that those who taunt us with not being true to those principles, themselves only take as much of them as they like. God is the Judge. I wish those who judge us would only exercise as much charity, and take as much pains to know what we really believe, and look to anything which they would think good in our teaching if they knew it, as they would in case of Dissenters. There would soon be more peace and a better understanding.

Yours affectionately,

E. B. PUSEY.

*Christ Church, Oxford, Feb. 12."*

The Venerable the Archdeacon of Taunton objected to the proceedings filed against him by the Rev. J. Ditcher, on the following grounds:—

1. That the whole of the proceedings were and are null and void, by reason of counsel on behalf of Archdeacon Denison tendering a plea of *recusatio judicis*.
2. Because the Commissioners refused to hear Mr. Denison or his counsel.

The Archbishop's Court, was, however, held at Bath, on July 22nd, when the following important judgment was pronounced by Dr. Lushington:—

“His Grace the Archbishop desires me to read the following declaration:—That his Grace has taken into his consideration the articles filed in this proceeding on behalf of the Rev. Joseph Ditcher, Vicar of the parish of South Brent, in the county of Somerset and Diocese of Bath and Wells, against the Ven. George Anthony Denison, Vicar of East Brent, and Archdeacon of Taunton, in the county and diocese aforesaid; the evidence adduced in proof of the said articles, the arguments of counsel and the authorities cited, and with the

assistance of his assessors, he has come to the following conclusions. Before stating these conclusions, I am desired by the Archbishop to explain how this proceeding came to originate with his Grace. This arose in consequence of the preferment held by the Ven. Archdeacon being vested in the Bishop of the diocese. By virtue of the statute which I now hold in my hand—viz., the 3rd and 4th Victoria, chap. 86—when the Bishop of the diocese has conferred the preferment held by the accused, the duty of the Diocesan devolves on the Archbishop. In the fulfilment of that duty, his Grace caused the original commission to be issued—an obligation which, as his Grace had been advised, it was imperative on him to discharge, there being no legal discretion vested in him with respect to it. The 3rd section of the statute of Victoria enacts, that when any clerk in Holy Orders of the United Church of England and Ireland is charged with any offence against the laws ecclesiastical, or when there exists touching such clerk any scandal or evil reports to the effect that he has offended against the said laws, it shall be lawful for the Bishop of the diocese, within which the offence is alleged to have been committed, on the application of any party complaining, or, if he think fit, on his own mere motion, to institute proceedings. It is perfectly clear, therefore, that, if a Bishop under this statute thinks fit to do so, he is entitled, in the exercise of his discretion, to direct proceedings to be commenced of his own mere motion. But it is not so with regard to an application made to the Bishop. If it were so, the ancient law of the Church would have been subverted by this statute. Lord Stowell, in the case of the “Queen’s Proctor General *v. Stone*” (1, Haggart’s Consistory Reports), uses these words:—“It is not in the power of the Bishop, by any intervention on his part, to refuse the process of the Court to any one who is desirous of availing himself of it in a proper case.” That proposition does not stand on the authority of Lord Stowell only, but is confirmed by Sir John Nichol. What would happen if the Archbishop or the Bishop had a purely discretionary power to order proceedings to be begun or not, according to his own judgment, or according, I may say, to his own fancy? Why that in every case it would rest entirely upon the authority of a single Bishop, either to permit a prosecution to be instituted, on account of unsound doctrine or on

account of immoral conduct ; or, if he chose, wholly to prevent any inquiry from taking place, and any charge, however grave, from being considered ; the consequence of which would be that the uniformity, which now, happily, prevails among the clergy of this country, might be destroyed and put an end to. Having made these remarks, before I come to the declaration of the conclusions to which his Grace has arrived, I have now only to state that this investigation, although based, as far as relates to procedure, upon the Clergy Discipline Act, is yet instituted under the provisions of the 13th of Elizabeth, chap. 12. The mode of proceeding, and the Court which now sits, are both founded upon the Act of Victoria ; but the issue to be tried must be determined under the statute of Queen Elizabeth. This is not a question such as was involved in the Gorham case—namely, as to what might be deemed admissible doctrine. It is a question wholly turning upon the second section of the statute, which I will now read:—The question which his Grace had to try was, whether the doctrine set forth and preached by the Ven. Archdeacon, in the sermons annexed to the articles filed in this proceeding, were, or were not, directly contrary and repugnant to the Articles of the Church. The authority of Parliament has established that the Thirty-nine Articles must be taken to be the true expression of Scripture on every subject to which they advert. I state this in order that it may be made known to all, why and wherefore the Ven. Archdeacon was not permitted to go into an examination of the Scriptures with a view to justify his doctrines. The reason was this :—There could not be a more inconvenient proceeding, or one more opposed to the law than that, when the Legislature of the country has authoritatively pronounced in the given form of the Thirty-nine Articles what are the doctrines of the Church of England, an individual sermon should be compared—not with that standard which is the only standard of the Church—but with a number of disputed texts of Scripture. What might be the possible consequence of the adoption of such a course ? One or more judges might be found who would conceive that certain doctrines were conformable with Scripture ; but should they hold that those doctrines (conformable in their opinion with Scripture), were not equally conformable with the Thirty-nine Articles, in what position would they

then be placed? That anomaly is excluded by the law applicable to this case. It is excluded from all our courts of judicature. The only question which his Grace has tried or could try, having regard to the law, is whether these sermons do or do not contain doctrines which are directly opposed and repugnant to the Articles of the Church of England? I shall now state the conclusions at which his Grace has arrived. They are these:—That the 9th, 10th, 11th, 13th, and 14th of the Articles, filed in this proceeding on behalf of the said Rev. Joseph Ditcher, are proved, and that the charges therein made are established, so far as is hereinafter mentioned. Whereas, it is pleaded in the said 9th article, filed in this proceeding, that the said Archdeacon, in a sermon preached by him in the cathedral church of Wells, on or about Sunday, the 7th of August, 1854, did advisedly maintain and affirm doctrines contrary and repugnant to the 25th, 28th, 29th, and 35th of the Articles of Religion referred to in the statute of the 13th of Elizabeth. chap. 12, or some or one of them; and among other things did therein advisedly maintain and affirm, “that the Body and Blood of Christ, being really present after an immaterial and spiritual manner, in the consecrated bread and wine, are therein and thereby given to all, and are received by all who come to the Lord’s Supper;” and “that to all who come to the Lord’s table, to those who eat and drink worthily, and to those who eat and drink unworthily, the Body and Blood of Christ are given; and that by all who come to the Lord’s table, by those who eat and drink worthily, and to those who eat and drink unworthily, the Body and Blood of Christ are received.” His Grace, with the assistance and unanimous concurrence of his assessors, has determined that the doctrines in the said passages are directly contrary and repugnant to the 28th and 29th of the said Articles of Religion, mentioned in the aforesaid statute of Queen Elizabeth, and that the construction put upon the said Articles of Religion by the Ven. the Archdeacon of Taunton—viz., that the Body and Blood of Christ become so joined to, and present in the consecrated elements by the act of consecration, that the unworthy receivers receive in the elements the Body and Blood of Christ, is not the true, or an admissible, construction of the said Articles of Religion. That such doctrine is directly con-

trary and repugnant to the 28th and 29th Articles, and that the true and legal exposition of the said Articles is, that the Body and Blood of Christ are taken and received by the worthy receivers only, who, in taking and receiving the same by faith, do spiritually eat the flesh of Christ and drink His blood: while the wicked and unworthy, by eating the bread and drinking the wine without faith, do not in anywise eat, take, or receive the Body and Blood of Christ, being devoid of faith, whereby only the Body and Blood of Christ can be eaten, taken, and received. Whereas it is pleaded in the said 11th of the articles filed in this proceeding, that divers printed copies of the said sermon or discourse in the 10th article mentioned as written and printed, or caused to be printed, by the said Archdeacon Denison, were, by his order and direction, sold and distributed in the year 1854, within the said Diocese of Bath and Wells; and whereas the said sermon or discourse contains the following, among other passages;—“That the Body and Blood of Christ being really present, after an immaterial and spiritual manner, in the consecrated bread and wine, are, therein and thereby given to all, and are received by all who come to the Lord’s table; and, “that to all who come to the Lord Table—to those who eat and drink worthily, and to those who eat and drink unworthily—the Body and Blood of Christ are given; and that by all who come to the Lord’s table—by those who eat and drink worthily, and by those who eat and drink unworthily, the Body and Blood of Christ are received.” His Grace, with the assistance of his assessors, has determined that the passages aforesaid contain a repetition of the erroneous doctrine charged in the 9th article filed in this proceeding; and that such doctrine is directly contrary and repugnant to the 28th and 29th of the Articles of Religion mentioned in the aforesaid statute of Queen Elizabeth. Whereas it is pleaded in the said 14th of the articles filed in this proceeding that divers printed copies of a sermon or discourse in the 12th article mentioned as written and printed, or caused to be printed, by the said Archdeacon, were by his order and direction sold and distributed in the years 1853 and 1854, within the aforesaid Diocese of Bath and Wells; and whereas, the said sermon or discourse contains the following among other passages:—“That to all who come to the Lord’s table—to those who eat and drink worthily, and to

those who eat and drink unworthily—the Body and Blood of Christ are given; and that by all who come to the Lord's table, by those who eat and drink worthily, and by those who eat and drink unworthily, the Body and Blood of Christ are received;” and “it is not true that the consecrated bread and wine are changed in their natural substances, for they remain in their very natural substances, and therefore may not be adored. It is true that worship is due to the real, though invisible and supernatural, presence of the Body and Blood of Christ in the Holy Eucharist under the form of bread and wine,” his Grace, with the assistance of his assessors, has determined that the doctrines in the said passages are directly contrary and repugnant to the 28th and 29th of the said Articles of Religion mentioned in the aforesaid statute of Queen Elizabeth. His Grace desires me further to state that he will allow time to the Ven. Archdeacon to revoke his error until Wednesday, the 1st of October next; when, if no such revocation as is required by the statute of Elizabeth aforesaid shall be made and delivered by that time into the Registry of Bath and Wells, he will, in obedience to the said statute, pronounce sentence in this Court, which will be adjourned to Tuesday, the 21st day of October next, and be held in this place at half-past one o'clock.

Dr. Phillimore—The Archdeacon appeals from the sentence of his Grace and the assessors. Perhaps, therefore, the Court will assign some time for the appeal to be prosecuted.

Dr. Lushington—Certainly not. You cannot appeal against any interlocutory decree.

Dr. Phillimore—I understand the sentence to be given in this case.

Dr. Lushington—No sentence is given, and no decree made.

Dr. Phillimore—Do I understand the 1st of October to be fixed for that purpose?

Dr. Lushington—No: that is the day fixed for revocation.

Dr. Phillimore—Then I understand the Court to say no appeal can be made now?

Dr. Lushington—Certainly not. It is no sentence or decree. The course will be, if the Archbishop thinks right, there may be at the end of judgment and afterwards a decree according to the statute. There is no decree. It is only an intimation of the Archbishop's opinion.

The Court then adjourned.

Mr. Denison so far from revoking his plea as required by the statute of Elizabeth, read the following Protest.

“George Anthony Denison, Clerk, M.A., Vicar of the Vicarage of East Brent, and Archdeacon of the Archdeaconry of Taunton, in the Diocese of Bath and Wells and Province of Canterbury, the defendant in this suit, having been required by the declaration of the court to revoke certain doctrines in certain passages of his sermons set forth in that declaration, and declared therein to be directly contrary and repugnant to the Twenty-eighth and Twenty-ninth Articles of Religion, and to subject the defendant to the penalty imposed by 13th Eliz., c. 12, under which statute, criminal proceedings have been taken against him, doth hereby—without prejudice to the validity of any pleas in arrest of judgment—of which pleas he hereby claims to avail himself—respectfully states to the Court—

I. That he had never advisedly maintained or affirmed any doctrine contrary or repugnant to either one or both of the said Articles, and that he doth not desire or intend to maintain or affirm any doctrine at variance with either one or both of the said Articles; to which Articles he has subscribed, and to which he assents, “*ex animo*,” as declaring the same of Holy Scripture, committed unto him in the teaching, and by the authority, of the Church.

II. The defendant further respectfully submits to the Court—referring herein to an injunction contained in the royal declaration prefixed to the said Articles in the Prayer Book—viz.: that “a man shall not put his own sense or comment to be the meaning of the Article, but shall take it in the literal and grammatical sense.”

That he had been mindful of this injunction, and hath, in obedience to the precept of the Church of England, put to be the meaning of the said Articles no “sense or comment” other than that which, in the language of the preface to the Prayer Book, is “agreeable to the mind and purpose of the old Fathers,” and which he believes to be

the "literal and grammatical sense" of the said Articles.

The defendant begs respectfully to specify to the Court, among the said Fathers, St. Augustin, upon whose authority Article Twenty-nine is expressly founded; and who, both in the passage cited in the Article, and in various other passages of his works, hath declared himself precisely to the same effect as the defendant hath done.

The defendant further respectfully submits to the Court that the same "sense or comment" hath been put to be the meaning of the said Articles by many of the most learned and esteemed Divines of the Church of England, at the time of, and at various periods since, the Reformation, including certain of those Divines to whom was intrusted the last revision of the Prayer Book, A.D. 1662; and this in the most public manner, and without question by any process of law.

III. The defendant further respectfully submits to the Court that finding himself, under the circumstances above stated, called upon by the declaration of the Court to "revoke his error," it becomes, in the first place, his duty to ascertain what, in the sense of that declaration, his error is. The defendant finds—

That the charge, or complaint, of the prosecutor being one which extends to, and covers, each and every particular of the doctrine of the Holy Eucharist, as maintained and taught by the defendant, viz.:—

1. "The real presence of the Body and Blood of Christ in the sacrament, by virtue of the consecration of the elements."
2. "The receiving unworthily."
3. "The worship due."

The Court, by extracting passages in whole, or in part, from the indictment or criminal articles, which passages, as so extracted, comprise, and set out in terms, each and every one of the said three particulars; by transferring such passages to the declaration, without discrimination,

exception, or reservation of any one of the said three particulars; and, lastly, by making the whole contents of each and every one of such passages matter of censure and revocation; has adopted in all its extent and entirety, the charge of complaint of the prosecutor, and has, among other things, affirmed thereby that the doctrine of the real presence of the Body and Blood of Christ in the sacrament, by virtue of the consecration of the elements, is “directly contrary, or repugnant, to the twenty-eighth and twenty-ninth Articles of Religion.”

That, with respect to the second of the three particulars above enumerated—viz., “the receiving unworthily,” there is, in the said declaration, a grave omission of a portion of the doctrine of the defendant, which is not material only but integral; and this, notwithstanding that such portion had not been omitted, but had been included in the said indictment or criminal articles, is stated in terms in at least twenty-eight passages of his sermons, and is interwoven with the entire substance of his argument.

The portion of the doctrine of the defendant here referred to is included under the said indictment or criminal articles in two forms, viz:—

1. That the receiving of the body and blood of Christ in the Lord’s Supper by those receiving unworthily is “unto condemnation.”

2. That “it is not true that the holy sacraments save ‘*ex opere operato*,’” in the ordinary acceptation of that phrase—*i.e.*, by the mere act of receiving.

Neither of these two forms has been noticed in the declaration of the Court.

The defendant respectfully submits to the Court that the passages cited in the declaration do not, by reason of the aforesaid omission of an integral part of the defendant’s teaching, contain the doctrines which the defendant has maintained.

The defendant further respectfully observes to the Court that he finds, to his extreme surprise, that among “the

doctrines" which are said in the declaration of the Court to be "directly contrary and repugnant to the twenty-eighth and twenty-ninth Articles of Religion," and of which, *as such*, he has been required to make revocation, is the following:—It is *not* true that the consecrated bread and wine are changed in their very natural substances, and therefore may not be adored.

The defendant desires, further, respectfully to state that he is unable to recognise as, and admits to be, his own, a construction of certain of the Articles of Religion which is imputed to him in the declaration of the Court; and, further, that he apprehends he is not called upon in any manner to adopt that, which is put forth in the declaration as "the true and legal exposition" of the said Articles. The defendant finds further—

That in each instance of error imputed to him, it is not any particular statement contained in the passages cited in the declaration, but the "doctrine" (or the "doctrines") set forth in those passages, which is pronounced to be in error.

That the passages so cited, without discrimination or exception of any of the several parts therein contained, do, therefore, if the declaration is to be taken in its plain meaning, constitute the error which the defendant is required to revoke; and that no less revocation than that of "the doctrine" (or the "doctrines") therein set forth would satisfy the terms of the declaration, or arrest the sentence with which the defendant is menaced.

IV. With respect to the particular language which has been employed by the defendant in teaching the doctrine of the Lord's Supper:—

The defendant desires to be permitted to state to the Court that he has spared no pains to guard his language, and to remove from it all occasion for offence, or for misapprehension of the terms employed; and that having felt it to be his duty at the present time carefully to reconsider that language, he humbly conceives that it is not open to

any just exception ; and he is confirmed in this view of it by finding that, in point of substance, it does not exceed in any particular, and in point of expression falls short of the language which has been employed with respect to the same subject matter by many of the greatest Divines of the Church of England at the time of, and at various periods since, the Reformation, and this in the most public manner, and without question by any process of law.

But as it is, nevertheless, possible that the language employed by the defendant may have caused a misapprehension of the doctrine which he has intended to teach ; and as it is both the desire and the duty of the defendant to seek to remove every ground of offence connected with his teaching, so far as he may do so consistently with a firm adherence to the entire substance of that teaching itself, the defendant further respectfully states to the Court :—

That, having never intended to teach, or to convey any doctrine of the Lord's Supper other than that which is set forth in the Liturgy, Articles, and other Formularies of the Church of England, as "read in," or "proved by" Holy Scripture, he craves permission to cite here, as identical in substance with the language which he has himself employed in teaching the said doctrine, and as conveying all the meaning of that language, the language employed by certain great Divines of the Church of England, who have, as the defendant humbly conceives, maintained (in common with other such Divines) under various forms of expression, the doctrine of the Lord's Supper as it is maintained by the defendant : and he begs to add that, if his language appear to the Court to teach or to convey any doctrine other and beyond that of the Liturgy, Articles, and other formularies of the Church of England, as interpreted and explained by the said Divines, it has not been his intention to teach or to convey any other doctrine, and he doth hereby respectfully disclaim any such intention.

V. The defendant has now, cited, as identical in sub-

stance with his own language, and as conveying all its meaning, the language of the Liturgy, and of Article XXV. ; and humbly prays the Court that it will not construe two of the Articles “of the Sacraments,” or, in other words, a portion of one only of the exponents of the doctrine of the Church of England, so as to be out of harmony with the language of other portions of the said Articles, and also with the language of the other exponents of that doctrine, that is to say—the Homilies, the Catechism, and the Liturgy.

The defendant has also now, cited as identical in substance with his own language and as conveying all its meaning, the language in which many of the most learned and esteemed Divines of the Church of England—including certain of those to whom was entrusted the last revision of the Prayer Book, A.D., 1662—have expressed themselves concerning the doctrine of the great and holy Mystery of the Sacrament of the Lord’s Supper, set forth in the Liturgy, Articles, and other Formularies of the Church of England as “read in” or “proved by” Holy Scripture ; and has disclaimed all intention of teaching or conveying any doctrine, other than that so set forth, and so expressed.

The defendant humbly prays that the Court will not now, for the first time in our history since the period of the Reformation, pronounce the severest penalty of the law upon a Priest of the Church of England, who holds the doctrine of the Church of England in respect of the Sacrament of the Lord’s Supper, in common with the said Divines, and expresses it in language, between which and the language of the said Divines he is unable to detect any substantial difference.

The defendant begs, however, respectfully to say, that—as it is not his duty to contend for language only, apart from its substance—if it can be shown to him that the language, which he has employed in teaching the doctrine of the Lord’s Supper, is, in one or more particulars, open to just exception, as conveying that doctrine under any

aspect new or strange to the Reformed Church of England, the defendant will be ready to alter his language to such extent.

VI. All which the defendant, submitting respectfully to the consideration of the Court, has now only further to say—

That it is not in his power to make the revocation required of him by the Court.

(Signed) GEORGE ANTHONY DENISON,

Clerk, M.A., Vicar of the Vicarage of East Brent, and Archdeacon of the Archdeaconry of Taunton, in the diocese of Bath and Wells, and province of Canterbury, *East Brent, September 30, 1856.*

Notwithstanding this lengthened protest on the part of the Archdeacon of Taunton,\* the Archbishop of Canterbury delivered the following sentence of deprivation:—

SENTENCE OF DEPRIVATION.

“In the name of God, Amen.

Whereas, there is now depending in judgment before us, John Bird, by Divine Providence, Lord Archbishop of Canterbury, Primate of all England, and Metropolitan, acting under the provisions of a certain Act of Parliament made and passed in the 3rd and 4th years of the reign of her present Majesty, entitled, ‘An Act for better enforcing Church Discipline,’ a certain cause or proceeding promoted by the Rev. Joseph Ditcher, Clerk, Vicar of the parish of South Brent, in the county of Somerset, against the Venerable George Anthony Denison, a Clerk in Holy Orders of the United Church of England and Ireland, Archdeacon of Taunton and Vicar of the parish of East Brent, in the said county of Somerset, and in the diocese of Bath and Wells, and province of Canterbury, which said cause or proceeding is promoted and brought before us by reason that the patronage or right of presentation, as well of, in, and to the said Archdeaconry of Taunton, as of, in, and to the said Vicarage of East Brent, belongs to the Lord Bishop of the diocese of Bath and Wells aforesaid: and, whereas

\* See Appendix (NN) for the further Protest of the Archdeacon of Taunton, filed Sept. 30th.

we, rightly and duly proceeding in the said cause or proceeding, issued our commission under our hand and seal authorising and requiring the Commissioners therein named to inquire into the grounds of the charges made against the said George Anthony Denison; and whereas the said commissioners having met and examined witnesses, transmitted to us under their hands and seals the depositions of the witnesses taken before them, and also a report of the unanimous opinion of the Commissioners present at the inquiry, that there was sufficient *prima facie* ground for instituting proceedings against the said George Anthony Denison; and whereas Articles were thereupon drawn up and filed, as required by the said Act of Parliament, wherein the said George Anthony Denison was charged and articulated touching and concerning his soul's health, and the lawful correction and reformation of his manners and excesses, and more especially for having offended against the laws and statutes, and against the constitutions and canons Ecclesiastical of this realm, by having preached three several sermons or discourses in the Cathedral Church of Wells, as therein mentioned, and by having written, printed, published, dispersed, and set forth, or caused to be printed, published, dispersed, and set forth, the said sermons respectively, with prefaces, advertisements, appendices, and sundry notes thereto, and by having advisedly maintained or affirmed in such sermons, prefaces, advertisements, appendices, and notes, certain positions or doctrines, directly contrary and repugnant to the doctrine of the United Church of England and Ireland as by law established, and especially to the Articles of Religion agreed upon by the Archbishops and Bishops of both provinces and the whole Clergy, in the Convocation holden at London in the year of Our Lord God 1562, according to the computation of the Church of England, for the avoiding of diversities of opinions, and for the establishing of consent touching true religion, or some one of them, and against the Act or Statute made in the Parliament holden at Westminster in the 13th year of the reign of her late Majesty Elizabeth, Queen of England, entitled 'An Act for the Ministers of the Church to be of sound Religion;' and whereas the said George Anthony Denison was duly served with a copy of the said Articles, and was duly required by writing under our hand to appear and to make answer to the said Articles; and whereas we, rightly and duly proceeding in the said cause or

proceeding, with the assistance of three Assessors nominated by us—to wit, the Right Hon. Stephen Lushington, Doctor of Laws, Judge of her Majesty's High Court of Admiralty of England, and who has practised as an advocate for five years and upwards in the Court of the Archbishop of the said province of Canterbury; the Very Rev. George Henry Sacheverell Johnson, Master of Arts, Dean of the Cathedral Church of Wells; and the Rev. Charles Abel Heurtley, Doctor in Divinity, the Lady Margaret's Professor of Theology in the University of Oxford—having heard, seen, and understood, and fully and maturely discussed the merits and circumstances, and diligently searched into and considered of the whole proceedings had and done therein, and observed all and singular the matters and things that by law ought to be observed, and having heard witnesses examined in proof of the said Articles, and heard advocates and proctors on both sides thereon, did, on Tuesday, the 12th day of August, 1856, pronounce, decree, and declare, that the eight first Articles filed against the said Archdeacon were proved, so far as is by law necessary; that the 9th, 10th, 11th, 13th, and 14th of the Articles filed in the said cause or proceeding on behalf of the said Rev. Joseph Ditcher were proved, and that the charges therein made were established, so far as in hereinafter mentioned; and that whereas it is pleaded in the said 9th Article filed in the said proceedings, that the said Archdeacon, in a sermon preached by him in the Cathedral Church of Wells, on or about Sunday, the 7th of August, 1853, did advisedly maintain and affirm doctrines directly contrary and repugnant to the 25th, 28th, 29th, and 35th of the Articles of Religion referred to in the statute of the 13th of Elizabeth, chapter 12, or some or one of them, and amongst other things did therein advisedly maintain and affirm 'that the Body and Blood of Christ, being really present after an immaterial and spiritual manner in the consecrated Bread and Wine are therein and thereby given to all, and are received by all who come to the Lord's Table;' and 'that to all who come to the Lord's Table, to those who eat and drink worthily, and to those who eat and drink unworthily, the Body and Blood of Christ are given; and that by all who come to the Lord's Table, by those who eat and drink worthily, and by those who eat and drink unworthily, the Body and Blood of Christ

are received'—we, the said Archbishop, with the assistance and unanimous concurrence of our said Assessors, did determine that the doctrine in the said passages was directly contrary and repugnant to the 28th and 29th of the said Articles of Religion mentioned in the aforesaid statute of Queen Elizabeth, and that the construction put upon the said Articles of Religion by the Ven. the Archdeacon of Taunton, viz., that the Body and Blood of Christ become so joined to and become so present in, the consecrated elements by the act of consecration, that the unworthy receivers receive in the elements the Body and Blood of Christ, is not the true or an admissible construction of the said Articles of Religion; that such doctrine is directly contrary and repugnant to the 28th and 29th Articles, and that the true and legal exposition of the said Articles is—that the Body and Blood of Christ are taken and received by the worthy receivers only, who, in taking and receiving the same by faith, do spiritually eat the flesh of Christ and drink His Blood, while the wicked and unworthy, by eating the Bread and drinking the Wine without faith, do not in anywise eat, take, or receive the Body and Blood of Christ, being void of faith, whereby only the Body and Blood of Christ can be eaten, taken, and received; and whereas it is pleaded in the said 11th of the Articles filed in the said proceeding that divers printed copies of the said sermon or discourse in the 10th Article mentioned as written and printed, or caused to be printed, by the said Archdeacon Denison, were by his order and direction sold and distributed, some time in the years 1853 and 1854, within the said diocese of Bath and Wells; and whereas the said sermon or discourse contains the following, among other passages:

“That the Body and Blood of Christ being really present after an immaterial and spiritual manner in the consecrated Bread and Wine, are therein and thereby given to all, and are received by all who come to the Lord's Table;” and ‘That all who come to the Lord's Table, to those who eat and drink worthily, and to those who eat and drink unworthily, the Body and Blood of Christ are given; and that by all who come to the Lord's Table, by those who eat and drink worthily, and those who eat and drink unworthily, the Body the Blood of Christ are received;” We, the said Archbishop, with the assistance of our said Assessors, did determine that the passages aforesaid contain

a repetition of the erroneous doctrine charged in the 9th Article filed in this proceeding, and that such doctrine is directly contrary and repugnant to the 28th and 29th of the Articles of Religion, mentioned in the aforesaid statute of Queen Elizabeth; and whereas it is pleaded in the 14th of the said Articles, filed in the said proceeding, that divers printed copies of a Sermon or Discourse in the 12th Article mentioned as written and printed, or cause to be printed, by the said Archdeacon, were by his order and direction sold and distributed in the years 1853 and 1854 within the said Diocese of Bath and Wells; and whereas the said sermon or discourse contains the following, among other passages:—

“‘That to all who come to the Lord’s Table, to those who eat and drink worthily, and to those who eat and drink unworthily, the Body and Blood of Christ are given; and that by all who come to the Lord’s Table, by those who eat and drink worthily, and by those who eat and drink unworthily, the Body and Blood of Christ are received;’ and ‘It is not true that the consecrated Bread and Wine are changed in their natural substances, for they remain in their very natural substances, and therefore may not be adored. It is true that worship is due to the real though invisible and supernatural presence of the Body and Blood of Christ in the Holy Eucharist, under the form of bread and wine;’—we, the said Archbishop, with the assistance of our said Assessors, did determine that the doctrines of the said passages are directly contrary and repugnant to the 28th and 29th of the said Articles of Religion, mentioned in the aforesaid statute of Queen Elizabeth; and whereas we, the said Archbishop, thereupon allowed time to the said Archdeacon to revoke his error, until Wednesday, the 1st day of October then ensuing, and now last past, with intimation that if no such revocation as is required by the statute of Elizabeth aforesaid should be made and delivered into the Registry of Bath and Wells by that time, we should, in obedience to the said statute, pronounce sentence in the said cause or proceeding, which was thereupon adjourned to Tuesday, the 21st day of October instant, and has from thence been further adjourned to this day; and whereas the said Venerable George Anthony Denison, notwithstanding the premises, hath not made or delivered any such revocation as aforesaid, but doth still persist in, and hath not revoked his said error, and the said promoter, by his proctor, earnestly

praying sentence to be given, and the proctor of the said George Anthony Denison praying justice, without waiving his protests; therefore we, the said John Bird, the Archbishop aforesaid, having first called upon the name of Christ, and setting God alone before our eyes, have, with the assistance of the said Right Hon. Stephen Lushington, the Very Rev. George Henry Sacheverell Johnston, Dean of Wells, and of the Right Rev. Thomas Carr, a Bishop of the Church of England, and Rector of S. Peter and S. Paul's, in the city of Bath, in the County of Somerset, and diocese of Bath and Wells, and the Rev. Charles Otway Maine, Clerk, Prebendary of the Cathedral Church of Wells, aforesaid, and the Rev. John Thomas, Doctor of Civil Laws, sitting with us in the said cause, with whom we have fully communicated on this behalf, and having maturely deliberated upon the proceedings had therein, and the offence proved, exacting by law deprivation of ecclesiastical promotion, have thought fit to pronounce, and do accordingly pronounce, decree, and declare, that the said Ven. George Anthony Denison, by reason of the premises, ought by law to be deprived of his ecclesiastical promotions, and especially of the said Archdeaconry of Taunton, and of the said Vicarage and parish church of East Brent, in the county of Somerset, diocese of Bath and Wells, and province of Canterbury; and all profits and benefit of the said Archdeaconry, and of the said Vicarage and parish church, and of and from all and singular the fruits, tithes, rents, salaries, and other Ecclesiastical dues, rights, and emoluments whatsoever belonging and appertaining to the said Archdeaconry and to the said vicarage and parish church; and we do deprive him thereof accordingly, by this our definitive sentence or final decree, which we read and promulge by these presents."

In consequence of this sentence the Archdeacon Denison published the following important document in the 'Union' newspaper, the Ultra Tractarian successor of the Latitudinarian '*Church and State Gazette*.'

*Position of the Church of the England as construed by Courts of Law—at the Close of the Year of our Lord 1856.*

I. That a Benefice with cure of souls *may* legally be held by a Priest who *denies* the Doctrine of Holy Baptism.

(Sentence of Court of *final* Appeal, *March*, 1850.)

II. That Benefice with a cure of souls *may not* legally be held by a Priest who *affirms* the Doctrine of Holy Communion.

- (a.) Finding of Clevedon Commission; the Commissioners *refusing* to *hear* the Defendant in person, or by Counsel, upon *the* question before the Court. *January*, 1855.
- (b.) Sentence of Diocesan Court at Bath—presided over by the Archbishop of Canterbury, acting "*pro hoc vice*," as Bishop of Bath and Wells—The Court *refusing* to allow the Defendant to show from HOLY SCRIPTURE, and from Antiquity, that his interpretation of the Articles "of the Sacraments" is the true interpretation. *October*, 1856.
- (c.) Appeal from Sentence of Diocesan Court at Bath, *refused* by Court of Appeal of the Province.

*December*, 1856.

III. That the Cross *may not* legally be set up in the Churches; and that, where so set up, it ought to be removed.

- (a.) Sentence of Consistory Court of Diocese of London.  
*December* 1855.
- (b.) Sentence of Court of Appeal of the Province.  
*December* 1856.

GEORGE ANTHONY DENISON,  
Clerk, M.A., Vicar of East Brent,  
and Archdeacon of Taunton.

*East Brent, Christmas Day*, 1856.

The Rev. W. J. E. Bennett, formerly of S. Paul's, Knightsbridge, published a work on the Eucharist, in which appears the following letter to the Bishop of Bath and Wells:—

My Lord Bishop,—The essential ground-work of the office of a Parish Priest is truthfulness. And this in two respects: towards the Bishop under whom he serves in the Church, and towards the Parishioners for whom he labors. Any retention within himself of a doctrine which he dares not, for fear of men, enunciate; of which, with any view to his own personal position, he keeps back or hides, is fatal to his character and the vitality of his office.

Reserve, indeed, in the sacred mysteries of our holy Religion is justifiable, sometimes necessary, even as our Lord has said: "I have many things to say unto you, but ye cannot bear them *now*." We are not to "cast our pearls before swine, lest they turn again and rend us." We are to feed the grown up men with "strong meat," but the babes "with milk." But these directions of our Blessed Lord and His Apostle affect only the *time* and *manner* of our communicating religious truth—they do not authorize concealment, or evasion of the truth itself. Entrusting us with discretionary power in the different circumstances of our teaching as to its application, we are still forbidden to "handle the Word of God deceitfully, but by **MANIFESTATION** of the Truth, to commend ourselves to every man's conscience in the sight of God."

It is obvious that the Church could never hold together as a Body were it possible that an individual Priest or Bishop could bear office within her, and yet, either from vagueness of mind, have no opinion at all; or, from want of sincerity, retain a power of withholding what his opinion might be. Hence the necessity of a test imposed in the form of Articles of Faith, which are to be subscribed by every one who serves the Church in a ministerial capacity. These Articles of Faith pre-suppose that it is necessary in him who teaches, whether he be Bishop or Priest, to have a decided opinion of some sort. They assume by their very existence, that it is necessary to *profess* that decided opinion. Moreover, they demand by the fact of their subscription, before institution to any office in the Church, that for the sake of unity, and mutual trust between the Clergy and the people, such decided opinion should be known,—that it should be known beyond the possibility of concealment, evasion, duplicity, or compromise. And if this be true in general—and, my Lord, there can surely be little doubt of it, when in consequence of it this land swarms with non-conformists, dissenters, and schismatics of every kind—such dissent and schism being mainly caused in conscientious minds by the stringency of the Church's test in her Thirty-nine Articles—if this be true in general, much more must it be true when controversies unhappily arise on questions of special doctrine involved in those articles of faith.

There are indeed mysteries—solemn and deep-seated myste-

ries—in our faith, specially those involved in the Blessed Sacraments, concerning which in ordinary times Humility would veil all attempt to dogmatize or define, and Faith would say, “Let us not reason, but believe;” but, when, in the infirmity of our nature, those mysteries of our religion are called in question by circumstances over which we have no control; and when, without our fault, they are thrust not only upon the Church but upon the world—when the congregations of the faithful in every Diocese are disturbed and distracted—when men in every position of life are canvassing the secret things of God, in the common writings and assemblies of the people—then, although with grief and with reluctance be it said, yet it is necessary, for the truthfulness of the Pastoral character, that we should mutually know what we all think, what we all intend, what we have in our mind to believe, to profess, and to teach.

Up to the late judgment of the Archbishop of Canterbury in your Lordship’s diocese, the mysteries of the Holy Eucharist might indeed have been kept back in decent reserve as matters of popular teaching; but *now*, since men have forced the awfulness of God’s truths before the profane—and our very Primate has not scrupled to declare in a Court open to the people that which is in his opinion the interpretation of an Article of Faith regarding the Holy Eucharist—it becomes our imperative duty, if we differ from that interpretation, to assert that difference. We are placed in a position which requires of us *de novo* to declare to the world what we really are, in respect of the new interpretation of the Church now promulgated *ex cathedrâ* by one Bishop, *and not denied by any other*.

It has been said by some that the enunciation of the Archbishop of Canterbury, and the decree of the Court of Bath, have no power in point of Ecclesiastical Law to fix a meaning on the Articles, and that we may still continue to hold the very same opinions that we have ever held. To which there is an evident reply on the ground of that truthfulness which I advocate as necessary for the purity of the pastoral office. As long as the Archbishop’s opinion was not known by any public act, such might have been the case, but not under the present circumstances; and certainly not for your Lordship and myself, when the Archbishop, contrary to the Canons of the Church, has invaded this Diocese, and sentenced to deprivation a Priest and

an Archdeacon of our own, promulgating in the act of deprivation, publicly and notoriously, and before the whole world, an heretical opinion. Such heretical opinion in such a peculiar case, and specially to us of the Diocese of Bath and Wells, becomes, *if undenied and unresisted*, a judgment of the Church *ex cathedrâ*.

It is true many Bishops have held heretical and unorthodox opinions, which have in nowise bound the Church. This I have shewn in the following pages, in order to maintain that the integrity of the Church is not destroyed by the present state of the controversy; but, on the contrary, to comfort weak minds in the proof that abundant grounds of hope, even ecclesiastically, remain to us. In our own country, Bishop Hoadly held, most notoriously, heretical opinions; and, in particular, on this very question of the Presence of our Blessed LORD in the Eucharist. The opinion of Archbishop Cranmer, was unquestionably heterodox in many of the publications which he issued, as in his "Treatise on the Sacrament," and his "Answer to Gardiner." His belief in the Real Presence was unsettled by Alasco and Peter Martyr; and he seems to have been altogether perplexed and confused in what he held. But then these were *private opinions*. Feeling that they were private opinions, Cranmer appealed to a General Council, and protested that he did not wish to maintain any point of faith which was adverse to the Catholic Church.\*

But not so our present Archbishop. He has made no appeal to a General Council. He has resorted to no test of the Catholic Faith. He has made no allusion to "the Church throughout the world;" but he has set before us—the "LEGAL" interpretation of a doctrine of the highest import, which he supposes is to be forced upon the Priests of the Church by the penalties of Acts of Parliament, and the judgment of a Deprivation of our temporal benefices. He has not written, or held the opinions upon which he bases this sentence in private; but he has made them the basis of a Judicial Act—such a Judicial Act, as when carried as a matter of appeal to the highest Court of the Church—the Court of Arches—was made by the opinion of that Court final and decisive. The opinion of the Archbishop cannot therefore be viewed any longer as a mere *private opinion*,

\* Cranmer's Works, vol. iv., p. 121.

nor is it possible to consider it as otherwise than a judicial sentence *ex cathedrâ*. It might possibly have been held as a private opinion so long as obeying an Act of Parliament, the Archbishop, as the officer of that Act of Parliament, and compelled by the Court of Queen's Bench, proceeded to give sentence *under the Statute Law*; but no longer so now—when the Court of Arches has stamped with its decision the validity of the sentence of Deprivation. I repeat that the Church cannot but view it *now, as long as it remains undenied and unresisted*—as a Judgment *ex cathedrâ*—a Judgment which calls upon us, if we value truth and honesty, if we hold by our integrity and our faith, either to say before the Church, and before our people for whose souls we are called of God to minister, that we accept it, or that we deny it. To blink the question, or to evade it, to make circuits round it by ambiguous words, or smother it by dexterous generalities, would be the act of a dishonorable man in the eyes even of the world, and certainly of a coward in faith in the eyes of ALMIGHTY GOD. You, my Lord, as Bishop of the Diocese, have a right to know what the Priests of your Diocese intend to hold and teach; the Priests have a right to know what you, our Bishop, intend to hold and teach; and the people have a right to know how, in such a time of perplexity and confusion, their several ministers both Priests and Bishops, intend for the time to come to direct their Services, minister the Sacraments, and interpret God's Holy Word.

Hence, as it appears to me, is the peculiar danger of the present crisis in the Church. It is the danger, not of division, but of an attempt to escape such division at the cost of our sincerity. It is better, most assuredly, that we should be cast out of our temporalities, and lose our present position in the service of the Church, than that we should attempt to hold it by time-serving or by dissimulation. It is better that we should speak plainly what we think, even at the cost of worldly things, than that we should continue in the ministration of the Church with the stigma of untruthfulness.

In the controversy at Bath, Archdeacon Denison tendered his renewed subscription of the Thirty-nine Articles, "*ex animo*." But this subscription was rejected, because, in the eyes of the judges, the *animus* was sufficiently manifest, by the propositions

of faith which those judges denounced. We learn from this that the *animus* of subscribing the Thirty-nine Articles must for the time to come, according to this precedent, be that of other men; and not our own—a common theory in the imposition of the chains of religious persecution; one to which we have been used in the history of the Inquisition and the Star Chamber; but one from which, up to the present judgment, we had thought the Church of England to have been happily delivered.

But in proportion as such a chain as this is placed upon the freedom of our minds in saying what we mean, so it follows the rather that the principle of truthfulness which I advocate demands a confession of faith, that the Church may know what our *animus* is. If we are silent, or keep back after such an interpretation of the doctrines of the Church, we are liable most justly to the imputation that our "*animus*" in regard to the Thirty-nine Articles, and specially those regarding the Holy Eucharist, is that of the Court of Bath. Silence involves an acquiescence in the dicta of the Archbishop of Canterbury and Dr. Lushington. Truthfulness demands that we should be explicit in openly denying that such is our opinion, if in fact we do in our hearts deny it.

These, my Lord, are the grounds upon which I have felt it my imperative duty to set before yourself and my parishioners the statements involved in the ensuing pages. Considering the judgment which has been pronounced, and the opinions which I hold in relation to it—knowing that the *animus* with which I have signed, and am ready to sign again, the Thirty-nine Articles, would not be that *animus* which the Archbishop of Canterbury, your Lordship's Metropohtan, would receive, because it is precisely that which has been formally condemned by him; I could not with a safe conscience continue to do the work appointed me as a Parish Priest, without openly declaring such to be the case. I should be wanting to your Lordship in canonical obedience; I should be wanting to my parishioners in common honesty; I should be wanting to myself in a pure conscience, if, in reality, holding the very same opinions as those which have been condemned by the Primate of All England in your Lordship's Diocese, I remained silent, or continued under a reserve, which under ordinary circumstances it would have

been my duty, for the peace of the Church, to maintain. With a mind, as I hope, deeply impregnated with what I believe is Catholic teaching, and never having read, or been taught any other doctrine than that which is set forth in the Catechism of the Church of England, and embodied in her Liturgy; it would be impossible to pursue the daily labours of a Parish, to teach the young and poor, to pray in the House of God, to minister to the sick and dying, to preach God's Word, and, above all, to celebrate that Blessed Sacrament of the Eucharist which is now the matter of discussion, under the possibility of a doubt that I was holding any other opinion than such as was consonant with the Church of which I was a member and a Priest. The whole office of the Pastor would in such a case be little more than a solemn mockery before ALMIGHTY GOD; utterly valueless, if not a sin.

And now, my Lord, in concluding this painful subject, I have one or two considerations upon which I would plead your indulgence.

The first is, that, in receiving what I have here written, you will not impute to me any desire even in the slightest degree of seeming to dictate to your Lordship what should be done in regard to the Episcopal office. My simple intention is to confess my faith, and abide by it. When I see a brother Priest, and a Dignitary of the Church in our own diocese suffering, or likely to suffer, the penalty of deprivation, because he has taught a certain doctrine of the Catholic Faith, and in my conscience I find that I myself am teaching the very same doctrine without any perceptible shade or difference, it is quite impossible that while the penalty of the law is carried into effect in his case, I should stand by in silence, and be held harmless. If the Archdeacon of Taunton has suffered by the strange anomaly of the law, owing to the accident of his benefice being in your Lordship's patronage, so that his full appeal to the highest Court of the Church has been shut out, it is very satisfactory to think that there is no such impediment to the full investigation of the truth in the case of the benefice of Froome Selwood, should your Lordship think it necessary to pursue it. Another is, that in the observations I have made in regard to the preservation of the integrity of the pastoral office, and therein the necessity of confessing our faith in the matter of a

controverted doctrine, I by no means desire to rest any imputation on those of my brethren who have hitherto maintained a reserve on this question. Many may be impelled to keep silence from motives of conscience quite as powerful as those which prompt me, on my part, to speak. To *such* nothing that I have said will apply.

A third point is, to divest your Lordship's mind, and also the minds of my Parishioners, of any idea that there is lurking under this statement any unfaithfulness to the English Church, or any hidden desire to advance to other points of doctrine not recognized by us, and specially to those of the Church of Rome. To be certain of this, it is only necessary to refer to that abundant and full *consensus* of English Divines who have unquestionably held the doctrines which are here advanced. The passages which confirm this view will be found, in *extenso*, in one of the publications of Archdeacon Denison; and your Lordship is, no doubt, fully acquainted with them. It is refreshing to look back upon the names of these great men, and to remember the position which they once held in the English Church. It is comforting to reflect that if we suffer in anywise under the present decision of the Archbishop of Canterbury, we suffer as far as the imputation of wrong teaching is concerned in company with such men as—

|                                                                                       |       |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------|
| POYNET, Bishop of Rochester, .. .. .                                                  | 1546. |
| RIDLEY, Bishop of London, .. .. .                                                     | 1550. |
| HOOKE, Master of the Temple, .. .. .                                                  | 1584. |
| TAYLOR, Bishop of Down, .. .. .                                                       | 1600. |
| SARAVILA, Prebendary of Westminster, and one of the Translators of the Bible, .. .. . | 1607. |
| FIELD, Dean of Gloucester, .. .. .                                                    | 1609. |
| LAKE, Bishop of Bath and Wells, .. .. .                                               | 1616. |
| BAYLY, Bishop of Bangor, .. .. .                                                      | 1616. |
| ANDREWS, Bishop of Winchester, .. .. .                                                | 1618. |
| OVERALL, Bishop of Norwich, .. .. .                                                   | 1618. |
| JACKSON, Dean of Peterboro' .. .. .                                                   | 1620. |
| FIELD, Bishop of Hereford, .. .. .                                                    | 1623. |
| DONNE, Dean of S. Paul's, .. .. .                                                     | 1624. |
| MORTON, Bishop of Durham, .. .. .                                                     | 1632. |
| FORBES, Bishop of Edinburgh, .. .. .                                                  | 1633. |
| MEADE, Fellow of Christ's College, Cambridge, .. .. .                                 | 1638. |

|                                              |       |
|----------------------------------------------|-------|
| POCKLINGTON, Canon of Windsor, .. ..         | 1640. |
| KEN, Bishop of Bath and Wells, .. ..         | 1657. |
| L'ESTRANGE, Master of the Temple, .. ..      | 1659. |
| HAMMOND, Bishop of Worcester, .. ..          | 1660. |
| NICHOLSON, Bishop of Gloucester, .. ..       | 1660. |
| BRAMHALL, Archbishop of Armagh, .. ..        | 1661. |
| COSIN, Bishop of Durham, .. ..               | 1661. |
| THORNDIKE, Prebendary of Westminster, ..     | 1666. |
| SPARROW, Bishop of Norwich, .. ..            | 1678. |
| SHIRLOCK, Rector of Winwick, .. ..           | 1680. |
| BREVINT, Dean of Lincoln, .. ..              | 1681. |
| PELLING, Canon of Westminster, .. ..         | 1683. |
| WILSON, Bishop of Sodor and Man, .. ..       | 1698. |
| NELSON, Author of Fasts and Festivals, ..    | 1703. |
| BEVERIDGE, Bishop of S. Asaph, .. ..         | 1704. |
| GRABE, D.D., of the University of Oxford, .. | 1706. |
| JOHNSON, Vicar of Cranbrook, .. ..           | 1710. |
| WHEATLEY, Vicar of Brent, .. ..              | 1728. |

These are the men who have set forth such a body of Divinity, as no other national Church can boast, for the nourishment of Her Spiritual children; and, with these abiding stedfast, there can be little danger of any eventual failure in the Catholicity which it is our glory, as well as our love, to maintain. Clouds there may be lowering over us just now, and for a time we may be depressed. In temporal things some of us will very probably have to suffer; but, as in the days of Cromwell and the Puritan persecutions of the Commonwealth, there may come a Restoration of that which may for a time be forfeited. Our mission, too, as Priests for the cure of souls, may for a time be withdrawn. This we must expect as long as our Bishops and Church Courts are under the influence of the State. But while the Church never changes—being the Rock which is shielded by the Divine Promise, “that the gates of Hell shall never prevail against her,”—while the Church bears for her motto “*Semper et ubique et ab omnibus*,”—the Legislature is but local and ephemeral; Governments are fallible; an Act of Parliament is a perishing thing; Prime Ministers are mutable, and do not continue in one stay; and Time, by God’s directing hand, is a merciful moderator of things human. With such testimonies of absorbing truth as we read of in “the Church throughout

the world," we must take good heart, and though suffering, it may be, for a while, shall emerge through this present cloud when God shall think fit. Confident that we hold the truth, albeit in earthen vessels, we must manifest it by our steadfastness, and patience, and long-suffering, that the Church of England is not the Church of a day, nor the creation of an Erastian Establishment, but the Church of a Royal Priesthood throughout all generations.

In this hope, I am, my Lord Bishop,  
Your Lordship's faithful son and servant in Christ,  
W. J. E. BENNETT,  
Vicar of Froome Selwood.

The following Protest is the one referred by Mr. Bennett, It is signed by sixteen Ministers of the Anglican Body, and is worthy of a perusal.

"We the undersigned, Priests of the one Catholic and Apostolic Church, called, by God's Providence, to minister in the province of Canterbury according to the Book of Common Prayer, do hereby, in the presence of Almighty God, and in humble conformity with the tenor of our ordination vows, as we understand them, make known and declare as follows:—

"1. We believe (in the words used in the Book of Homilies) that we 'receive the Body and Blood of our Lord Jesus Christ under the form of Bread and Wine;' and with Bishop Cosin, 'that upon the words of consecration, the Body and Blood of Christ is really and substantially present, and so exhibited and given to all that receive it; and all this, not after a physical and sensual, but after a heavenly and incomprehensible manner;' of which statement, Bishop Cosin says, 'it is confessed by all Divines.'

"2. We believe, in the words of Bishop Ridley, 'that the partakinge of Christ's Bodie and of his Bloude unto the faithfull and godlie, is the partakinge and fellowship of life and of immortalitie. And again, of the bad and ungodlie receivers, S. Paul plainlie saie, thus:—'He that eateth of this bread and drinketh of this cuppe unworthilie, he is guilty of the Bodie and Bloude of the Lord. He that eateth and drinketh unworthilie, eateth and drinketh his own damnation, because he esteemeth

not the Lord's Bodie ; that is, he receiveth not the Lord's Bodie with the honour which is due unto Hym.' Or with Bishop Poynt, 'that the Eucharist, so far as appertains to the nature of the Sacrament is truly the Body and Blood of Christ, is a truly Divine and Holy Thing, even when it is taken by the unworthy ; while, however, they are not partakers of this grace and holiness, but eat and drink their own death and condemnation.'

"3. We hold with Bishop Andrewes, that 'Christ Himself, the inward part of the Sacrament, in and with the Sacrament ; apart from and without the Sacrament, wheresoer He is, is to be worshipped.' With whom agrees Archbishop Bramhall ; 'The Sacrament is to be adored, ' says the Council of Trent, that is (formally), 'the Body and Blood of Christ,' says some of your authors ; we say the same ; 'the Sacrament,' that is, 'The species of bread and wine, say others—that we deny.'

We therefore being convinced,

"1. That the doctrine of the Real Presence of 'the Body and Blood of our Saviour Christ under the form of bread and wine' has been uniformly held as a point of faith in the Church from the Apostolic times ; and was accepted by General Councils, as it is also embodied in our own Formularies ;

"2. That the interpretation of Scripture most commonly held in the Church has been, that the wicked, although they can, in no wise be partakers of Christ, nor 'spiritually eat His Flesh and drink his Blood,' yet do in the Sacrament not only take, but eat and drink unworthily, to their own condemnation, the Body and Blood of Christ, which they do not discern ;

"3. That the practice of worshipping Christ then and there especially present, after Consecration and before communicating, has been common throughout the Church ;

"And moreover, that the Thirty-nine Articles were intended to be, and are, in harmony with the faith and teaching of the Ancient undivided Church ;

"Do hereby protest earnestly against so much of the opinion of his Grace the Archbishop of Canterbury, in the case of *Ditcher v. Denison*, as implies directly or indirectly, that such statements as we have cited above are repugnant to the doctrine of the Thirty-nine Articles ;

"And we appeal from the said opinion, decision, or sentence of his Grace, in the first instance, to a free and lawful Synod of

the Bishops of the Province of Canterbury ; and then, if need be, to a free and lawful Synod of all the Churches of our Communion, when such by God's mercy may be had :—

“ Bartholomew, U. C., M.A., Perpetual Curate of S. David's, Exeter.

“ Bennett, W. J. E., M.A., Vicar of Froome Selwood.

“ Carter, Thomas J., M.A., Rector of Clewer, Oxon.

“ Grueber, C. E., Incumbent of S. James's, Hambridge.

“ Heathcote, W. Beadon, B. C. L., Precentor of Salisbury Cathedral.

“ Henderson, T. M. A., Prebendary of S. Paul's, Vicar of Messing.

“ Keble, John, M. A., Vicar of Hursley, Winchester.

“ Neale, J. M., M.A., Sackville College.

“ Plumer, C. T., M.A., Rector of Elstree, Rochester.

“ Popham, T. L., M.A., Prebendary of Salisbury, Rector of Chilton Folliatt.

“ Pusey, E. B., D.D., Regius Professor of Hebrew, Canon of Christ Church, Oxford.

“ Scott, William, B.D., Perpetual Curate of Christ Church, Hoxton, London.

“ Stuart, E., M.A., Incumbent of S. Mary Magdalene, Munster-street, London.

“ Williams, Isaac, B.D., Stinchcombe, Gloucestershire.

“ Woodford, J. R., M.A., Vicar of Kempsford, Gloucestershire.

“ Yard, G. B., M.A., Rector of East Torrington with Wragby, Lincolnshire.”

Dr. Pusey mindful of the period when he was condemned by the far famed Six Doctors and sentenced to three years silence, published a work on the Holy Eucharist in defence of Archdeacon Denison, in which he says—

“ Now that a war of extermination is carried on against those who believe, as I have learnt, from the Church of England to believe . . . I think it a duty to the Church of which God has made me a Minister to clear away the imputations made against my belief.”

Mr. Westerton having obtained no redress from the Bishop of London against the Romanizing practices of Mr. Liddell, proceeded against him in the Court of Arches for "using worked and embroidered linen instead of fine but plain damask linen—for having the Credence table and the Cross. The following sentence was delivered in this important case by the Judge of the Court of Arches.

Sir J. DOBSON said that the cases came before him by appeal from the decrees therein made by the Consistory Court of London. The two cases, and the questions arising upon them, were as closely connected and so much resembled each other, that it was deemed convenient they should be argued together, and should be decided by one and the same judgment. That was the course pursued by the learned counsel retained in the cause; and it was now the duty of the Court, after expressing its deep obligation to them for the very learned and elaborate arguments which they had addressed to it, to pronounce its judgment. The case of S. Paul's, Knightsbridge, was a suit brought by Mr. Westerton, one of the churchwardens, praying a faculty for the removal of the high altar, with the Cross elevated thereon or attached thereto, of the gilded candlesticks and candles, the credence table, and of the several divers coloured altar coverings. The case of S. Barnabas was somewhat different in form, but substantially to the same effect. It was an application for a monition to the churchwardens to remove the articles objected to,—namely, the altar and other articles, as in the case of S. Paul's. And it was further complained that there were jewels in the Cross on the altar; that there was a wooden screen, with a large Cross carved thereon, between the nave of the church and the chancel; that there were brazen gates with locks thereon separating the chancel from the church; and that the linen cloth at the time of the communion was ornamented with lace and embroidery. There was also a prayer made that the churchwardens be directed to put up the Ten Commandments in the East end of the Church. Acts on petition were brought in and answers thereto, and affidavits on each side were produced in their support. There was also an allegation brought in this court, which was afterwards admitted, and

upon which only one witness, the Rev. Mr. Bennett, had been examined. The learned judge of the court below ordered the removal of the credence table in S. Paul's, the cross on or near the communion table, all the cloths used in the church for covering the communion table, and their substitution by one only covering of silk or other decent stuff. As to S. Barnabas, the Court decreed a monition to remove the stone altar, and directed the substitution of a moveable table of wood; to remove the credence table, the Cross on the altar, and also that on the screen; to take away the coverings of the structure used as a communion table, and to use in their place one only covering of silk or other decent stuff; to remove any cover ornamented with lace or embroidery used when the sacrament was administered; to substitute a fair white linen cloth in lieu thereof; and, lastly, to cause the Ten Commandments to be set up at the East end of the Chancel. Upon these several matters it was necessary that this Court should now pronounce its decision. As the subject of Crosses placed on the altar or communion table and upon the screen between the chancel and the church had formed a principal object of discussion at the bar, he would proceed in the first instance to consider that part of the case. It seemed to be admitted on all sides that Crosses were to be deemed ornaments, and the question was whether such ornaments so used were now legally admissable in the Church of England. It was also admitted that the rubric in the present Book of Common Prayer was to be deemed the primary law upon this point. The Rubric was in the following terms:—"And here it is to be noted that such ornaments of the Church and of the ministers thereof at all times of their ministration shall be retained, and be in use as were in this Church of England, by the authority of Parliament, in the second year of King Edward VI." The question, then, was whether Crosses were within the true intent and meaning of the Rubric, and what was the parliamentary authority applicable to ornaments of the Church and of the ministers thereof in the second year of Edward VI? Were crosses to be included among such ornaments as were in the Church of England in the second year of King Edward VI. by the authority of Parliament? The statute which had been mainly relied on in support of the affirmative of that proposition was the 25th Henry VIII., cap. 19, entitled, "An Act for the

submission of the Clergy to the King's Majesty." After reciting the acknowledgment and petition of the Clergy with respect to ecclesiastical constitutions, it enacted in the first clause that the Clergy should not make any constitution, except in Convocation, with the King's assent, under a penalty of fine and imprisonment. The second section enacted that the King might assign 32 persons to view and examine the canons, constitutions and ordinances, provincial and synodal, and such of them as were thought worthy were to be kept and obeyed, and the others to be void. The seventh section was in these terms:—"Provided also that such canons, constitutions, and synodals provincial being already made, which being not contrariant or repugnant to the laws, statutes and customs of this Realm, nor to the damage or hurt of the King's prerogative Royal, shall now still be used and executed as they were afore the making of this act, till such time as they may be viewed, searched, ordered, or determined by the said 32 persons, or the more part of them." The power conferred upon the King by that statute seemed to have been considered limited as to the time within which it was to be executed, or if not so limited, it was judged proper afterwards to limit it, for by a later act,—namely, the 27th of Henry VIII., c. 15, the power was continued, but was expressly limited to the space of three years. A still later act,—namely, the 35th of Henry VIII., cap. 16, renewed that power, and conferred it upon the King for life. He must here observe that the two last-mentioned acts were not to be found in the ordinary editions of the statutes, but in the edition which he had,—namely, Raithby's edition of *Statutes Defective*,—a note was appended to the first-mentioned statute, the 25th Henry VIII., cap. 19, stating the fact that such later acts were passed, and further stating that the 7th section of the first act was thereby made more explicit. Considering that it might be useful for the purpose of this investigation to ascertain in what that greater explicitness consisted, he had searched for and succeeded in finding the statute which was set forth at length among the statutes printed by the Record Commissioners by command of George III., in pursuance of an address of the House of Commons. By the 2nd section of that act,—namely, the 35th Henry VIII., cap. 16,—it was enacted, "That till such time as the King's Majesty and the said 32 persons have accomplished and executed

the effects and contents afore rehearsed and mentioned, that such canons, constitutions, ordinances, synodal or provincial, or other ecclesiastical laws or jurisdiction spiritual as be yet accustomed and used here in the Church of England, which necessarily and conveniently are requisite to be put in use and execution for the time, not being repugnant, contrariant, or derogatory to the laws or statutes of the realm, nor to the prerogative of the Regal Crown of the same, or any of them, shall be occupied, exercised, and put in use for the time within this or any other the King's Majesty's dominions, and that the ministers and due executors of them shall not incur any damage or danger for the due exercising of the aforesaid laws, so that by no colour or pretence of them or any of them the minister put in use anything prejudicial or in contrary of the regal power or law of the realm, any whatever to the contrary of this act notwithstanding." Such were the words of that 2nd section, which appeared to enlarge the proviso of the 7th section of the 25th Henry VIII., cap. 19, inasmuch as that section related only to canons, constitutions, and ordinances synodal or provincial, such as were not repugnant, &c., whereas the 2nd section of the later act was made to include other ecclesiastical laws or jurisdiction spiritual as might be yet accustomed and used here in the church, which necessarily and conveniently might be put in use and execution for the time, not being repugnant to the regal authority, &c.—in short, to include the ecclesiastical common law as well as the canons synodal and provincial. It is well known that Henry VIII. never exercised the powers conferred upon him by the acts above mentioned, and, as those powers were expressly limited to him for life, it had been strongly contended that upon the event of his death they became wholly and altogether inoperative. As regarded the power to appoint commissioners and so forth, there could be no doubt that the statutes ceased to have effect; but it was by no means equally clear that the same temporary character was to be ascribed to the several clauses respecting canons, constitutions, ordinances, and other ecclesiastical laws, &c., and especially to the second clause of the 35th of Henry VIII., which it was to be observed was an enacting clause, and not a mere proviso, as in the former act. The language of the sections to which he had adverted, scarcely, he thought, warranted him in

saying that at the death of Henry VIII., and the accession of his son to the throne, there was no Parliamentary authority for the use of any ornaments whatever in the church, although there might be very great difficulty in ascertaining what particular ornaments had the sanction of that authority. He might here observe, that no particular canon, constitution, or other ecclesiastical law had been pointed out as directly authorizing the use of crosses in churches, or the manner in which, being there, they were to be made use of. It could not, however, be seriously denied that, for the most part at least, they were admitted and used in the churches before the Reformation. Omitting for the present any further discussion on that point, he would proceed to enquire whether any, and what law had been enacted by Parliament, or made under its authority, revocatory of or inconsistent with the law as it stood, or as it was supposed to have stood, at the death of Henry VIII. Now, the authority first mentioned, although not the first in point of date, was the Rubric of the present Prayer Book, which was universally admitted to be Parliamentary authority. He thought it necessary to call attention to the 1st Edward VI., cap. 12, which he believed had not been noticed by the Court below, or in the arguments in this Court. It was nearly one of the last acts that were passed in the first year of his reign. It was entitled, an act for the repeal of certain statutes concerning treason, felonies, &c.; therefore it would not be expected that much would be found about ecclesiastical laws in that statute; but it was very comprehensive, and went into many subjects, and among others the revoking of the power of the King to issue proclamations. It repealed a number of acts which it set forth, and then it went on to repeal all and every act concerning doctrine in matters of religion. The question was whether it did not operate as a revocation of the very statutes upon which he had commented, and which gave authority to the ecclesiastical law. He thought it must operate as a revocation of the former act, and consequently there would now be no statutory authority whatever for the use of those ornaments in the church. Supposing he was right in that view, it would put an end to the question; but he was by no means so positive of it as not to feel that it was his duty to enter into other parts of the case and consider how the law stood upon them. He should have been

more decided if the statute 1st Edward VI. had been referred to in the court below, or in the arguments of counsel in this court, and which statute repealed all acts relating to matters of doctrine and religion. This act, passed after the injunctions of Edward VI., but before the statute of the second and third of that Monarch's reign for establishing the Prayer Book. It had been contended that the rubric had no application to the first Prayer Book, because the statute establishing that book did not come into operation until some time in the third year of King Edward's reign. In point of dates the matter stood thus:—King Edward succeeded to the Throne on the 28th of January, 1547, and was proclaimed King on the 31st of the same month. The second year of his reign would therefore terminate on the 28th of January, 1549. The Parliament met in his second year on the 4th of November, 1548, and the statute for establishing the Book of Common Prayer was read for the third time in one house on the 15th of January, 1549, and in the other on 21st of the same month, and consequently in the second year of the King's reign. On what day it received the Royal assent he (the learned Judge) had not been able to ascertain; but it was probable that no time was lost in this respect, because the book was known to have been in a state of preparation before hand, and both Crammer and the Protector Somerset must have been anxious that it should become law as speedily as possible. It was true the book was not in actual use in the churches until after the expiration of the second year, but the law itself had passed in that year, and the book was to be in use throughout the kingdom at the ensuing Pentecost, and at an earlier period where practicable. The best commentators on our present Book of Common Prayer concurred in thinking that the rubric therein referred to the first book of Edward VI., and the second and third statute of that Monarch's reign; and he (the learned Judge) had no hesitation in stating that it was the conviction of the Court that the rubric did recognize the first book as being of Parliamentary authority in the second year of Edward's reign. Moreover, the journal of the transactions occurring in his short reign, kept by the young King in his own handwriting, put an end to all doubt upon the subject. Under the head of the second year the king wrote:—"A Parliament was called, where an uniform order of prayers was institute,

before made by a number of Bishops and learned men gathered together in Windsor." But there remained another and a very grave question arising upon the terms of the rubric. Supposing the rubric to refer to the first book of Edward as being of Parliamentary authority (and the Court was of opinion that it did), could it be construed to mean that it was exclusively so—that it could have the effect of revoking any act of Parliament of a previous date authorizing the use of certain ornaments in the church? The learned judge of the Consistory Court appeared to have doubted whether it would exclude all other ornaments not then in use—*i. e.* that nothing was to be retained but what was in the church by the authority of an act of Parliament passed in that year. He professed his inability to arrive satisfactorily at the same conclusion. The words of the rubric were certainly not free from ambiguity, but no affirmative direction could be found therein for any ornament to be placed in the church, and no negative terms prohibiting the use of ornaments which might have been in the church, by Parliamentary authority. Another point for consideration was, whether the statute 2d and 3d Edward VI., cap. 1, being an act for the uniformity of service and administration of Sacraments throughout the realm, and for establishing one uniform system of rites and ceremonies, did not as a necessary consequence repeal all previous laws and ordinances on these subjects. The Judge of the Consistory Court held, in reference to the 7th section of the 25th Henry VIII., cap. 19, that it was necessarily inconsistent and could not co-exist with the Act of Uniformity, inasmuch as the 7th section of the statute of Henry went to the establishment of a diversity of local ordinances and practices, many of which were well known to be at variance with each other. He agreed with the Court below that in so far as the act of the 25th of Henry VIII. and the two subsequent acts of his reign established local ordinances and practices at variance with each other, or confined to some particular ecclesiastical district or districts, they were inconsistent with the Act of Uniformity, and were by it so far repealed. But if it could be shown that under one or more of these ecclesiastical laws or ordinances the use of the cross was authorized as an ornament throughout all the ecclesiastical divisions of the kingdom, then the inconsistency with the Act of Uniformity would not present itself.

He would now proceed to consider what other statutes or authorities in or previous to the second year of the reign of Edward VI. had any and what bearing on this subject. By the 26th Henry VIII., cap. 1, entitled "An Act concerning the King's Highness to be Supreme Head of the Church of England, and to have Authority to reform and redress all Errors, Heresies, and Abuses in the same," the King was appointed supreme head of the church, and it was further enacted "that the King, his heirs and successors, should have full power and authority from time to time to visit, repress, redress, reform, order, restrain, and amend all errors, heresies, abuses, contempts, and enormities and offences, whatsoever they be, theretofore used in the realm of England, which by any manner of spiritual authority or jurisdiction ought to or may lawfully be reformed, any usage, custom, foreign law, foreign authority, prescription, or any other thing or things to the contrary notwithstanding." By the statute 31st Henry VIII., cap. 8, entitled "An Act that Proclamations made by the King's Highness, with the Advice of his Honourable Council, shall be obeyed and kept as though they were made by Act of Parliament," it is enacted, in section 1, that "always the King for the time being, with the advice of his hon. Council, whose names hereinafter follow, or with the advice of the more part of them, may set forth at all times by the authority of this act his proclamations under such pains and penalties and of such sort as His Highness and his said hon. Council, or the more part of them, shall deem requisite and necessary; and that these same shall be observed and kept as though they were made by act of Parliament, for the times in them limited, unless the King's Highness dispense with them, or any of them, under his great seal." The 4th section of this same statute, setting forth before whom offenders were to be convicted, contained the list of officers referred to in the 1st section. These officers, at the head of whom stood the Archbishop of Canterbury, consisted of 25 persons, holding 26 offices among them; and offenders were to be convicted before these, or at least before one-half their number. Another section directed that such proclamations should be posted up in market-places. A further section directed that these proclamations should not infringe any existing law. This was a very curious provision, respecting which Dr. Burnet and other writers ob-

served that it contained very wide words and ended in giving very large power to make interpretations of the law. Section 8 directed that, in the event of the King's successor being a minor, then "all and singular proclamations which shall be in anywise made and set forth in any part of the realm, or other the King's dominions, by virtue of the act within the foresaid years of the minority of the next heir or successors, shall be set forth in the successor's name, then being King, and shall import or bear underwritten the full name of such of the King's hon. Council then being as shall be devisors or setters forth of the same, which shall be in this case the whole number afore rehearsed, or at least the more part of them, or else the proclamation to be void and of no effect." By the 34th and 35th Henry VIII., cap. 23, it was enacted that offenders against proclamations made under the foregoing act might be convicted before nine of the King's Council. These acts continued in force until towards the end of 1547, when they were repealed by the Parliament which met in the November of that year. It did not appear that Henry VIII. issued any proclamations under the above mentioned acts. The injunctions issued by him in 1536 and in 1538, as well as *The Institutions of a Christian Man*, having been published before, apparently under the authority given to the King by the Act of Supremacy, *The Erudition of a Christian Man*, published in 1542, subsequently to the first of these, did not assist in throwing any light upon the question. Henry VIII., by his will, appointed 16 guardians of his son, and 12 councillors, who held among them most, if not all, the offices enumerated in the 4th section of the 31st Henry VIII., cap. 8. The learned Judge of the Consistory Court, relying, it would seem, in part, at least, on a passage to be found in *Collier's Ecclesiastical History*, was of opinion that the injunction of Edward VI. had no Parliamentary authority. Reference was made in the report of his judgment to the marginal note in the fifth volume of Collier's work, page 228; but on examination of the text it would appear that Collier was not stating his own view of the question, but merely setting forth the reasons assigned by Bishop Gardiner in his letter, and elsewhere, for opposing the injunctions issued by the King. Gardiner seemed to have been almost the only person who disputed the validity of these injunctions at the time and he was thrown into prison

in consequence. He afterwards, indeed, thought proper to relent, and wrote a letter to the Protector, in order to get released from his confinement. The Protector, however, for reasons best known to himself (as suggested by one of these lawyers), thought it better to keep him there until the session of Parliament was over, as otherwise the Bishop might have given him some trouble. Nevertheless, Gardiner had expressed his wish to retract his objection to the injunctions, and it was remarkable that Bishop Bonner also never refused to acknowledge their validity.

In his letter to the Protector, Bishop Gardiner alleged that the religion professed in the late reign (that of Queen Mary) was established by law, and that, although the King's proclamation was to have the same force as an act of Parliament, yet that it was not to revoke any act then in being; and that, moreover, the injunctions of King Edward had not been proclaimed and published at the market-places with the requisite formalities. The learned Judge of the Consistory Court having mentioned the acts 31, Henry VIII., cap. 8, and 35 Henry VIII., cap. 23, and stated that the prescribed particular formalities, according to which the powers given to them were to be exercised, then observed that "certain injunctions were indeed issued by Edward VI. in 1547, but they were not found to have been issued in pursuance of those statutes, or in virtue of them, nor with the requisite formalities. Whosoever should affirm that these injunctions ought to be received as law must prove the affirmative. This has not been done, and the Court, therefore, has not the advantage of any explanation from that source." Since the decision of this case in the Consistory Court of London he had been furnished with a copy of a pamphlet published by a learned barrister, Mr. Chambers, in which he dwelt a good deal on this subject. Mr. Chambers, speaking of the injunctions issued in May, 1547, in the first year of King Edward's reign, stated that the original of them existed in Corpus Christi College, Cambridge. As to the preparation and issue of the injunctions of Edward VI., he found from *Burnet* that, by a patent dated the 13th of March, 1547, the King appointed Somerset Protector, and all the former executors, with the exception of Southampton, to form his council. From the patent it could be made out who and what they were. It must

be remembered that the constitution was at that time in a very unsettled state. The King had power under the acts of supremacy to reform abuses, but how far that power extended was not clearly ascertained. The act giving to proclamations the force of law seemed to have been passed with the determining what he could do, but the act itself, Gardiner said, caused large words at the passing of it, and was open to great doubts of construction. Burnet said that the act gave great power to the judges, but there were restrictions in some branches of it which seemed to lessen the great extent of the other parts of it, so that the exposition of the law was much referred to them. Upon that act the great changes of religion in the nonage of Edward VI. were grounded. Gardiner objected to the injunctions that they were invalid, as contradictory to the acts of Henry VIII. He also objected to them that they had not been posted up in market places as required. His objections, however, were overruled and the injunctions enforced. The object of those injunctions clearly was to take away those images and other ornaments not essentially necessary to Divine worship, which had been abused. The question was whether the cross was included among them, whether it was included under the head of the pictures, paintings, and all other monuments of feigned miracles, pilgrimages, and idolatry and superstition which all deans, archdeacons, masters of collegiate bodies, &c., were enjoined to take away, so that there remained no memory of the same in walls, glass windows, or elsewhere within their churches or houses. Was the cross spoken of as an image? The word "cross" was sometimes loosely used for cross or crucifix, the last of which could not be excepted from images. The expression *imago crucis* generally meant a crucifix, but was not altogether free from ambiguity. In *Lydwood's Provinciale* the *effigies crucis* was spoken of in contradistinction to the real or original cross. Collier, in his *Ecclesiastical History*, vol. 2, p. 5, spoke of the images of Christ, of the cross of our Lady, or any other saint. There was no need in the English language to speak of the crucifix by such a circumlocution as the image of the cross, even if it were correct. The cross, as a single detached ornament placed on shrines and altars, just as a crucifix or figure of a saint, and dealt with like them, would naturally, in general expressions, where a distinction was not intended to be drawn,

be included under the head of images. That the cross was so used was apparent from *Jansens' Missale Romanum*. The crucifixes with figures only painted or engraved thereon seemed to form, as it were, a connecting link between cross and image proper. The Second Book of Homilies, composed or sanctioned by Convocation in 1562, had the following passage:—“Helen found the cross and the title on it. She worshipped the King, and not the wood, for that is a heathenish error, and the vanity of the wicked; but she worshipped Him that hanged on the cross, and whose name was written on the title.” The Homily went on to say:—“See both the godly Empress' faith and S. Ambrose's judgment at once! They thought it had been an heathenish error and vanity of the wicked to have worshipped the cross itself, which was imbued with the Saviour Christ's own Precious Blood, but we fall down before every cross piece of timber which is but an image of the cross.” Whether or not that were enough to show that the cross might be very infrequently included under the general term “image,” it was, at all events, evidence to show that adoration was paid to it in England, and would therefore bring it under the head of monuments of idolatry and superstition forbidden by the injunctions. It would appear, he thought, from the injunctions, that the cross, if not an image, was at least a monument of idolatry and superstition. The learned counsel for the appellants cited from *Collier's Ecclesiastical History*, vol. 2, page 203, part of a letter from Henry VIII. to Archbishop Cranmer, written in 1545. The passage was as follows:—“We be contented and pleased also that the images in the churches shall not be covered as hath been accustomed in times past, nor no veil upon the cross, nor no kneeling thereto upon Palm Sunday, nor any other time; and forasmuch as you make no mention of creeping to the cross, which is a greater abuse than any other, therefore our pleasure is that the said creeping to the cross shall likewise cease from henceforth, and be abolished with other the abuses before rehearsed.” That passage was cited by the learned advocate as applying to the cross, and not to the crucifix, but he thought it was calculated to throw great light on the meaning of the injunctions, as showing that crosses had been greatly abused. He found in the *Missale Romanum* two services, the one in commemoration of the invention of the cross, in which the cross

itself, and not the figure or person affixed thereto, was addressed and referred to in a manner which could not but be admitted to partake of idolatry and superstition. In *Lynwood's Provinciale*, under the rubric *De Ecclesiis Ædificandis*, in a note upon an order of Archbishop Winchelsea, page 252, it would be found that an adoration of the cross, as distinct from any image, was prescribed. The isolated ornament of the cross was not one by its nature excepted from the danger of being abused, according to the distinction in "the Homily against the peril of idolatry" (1562). This Homily made an exception in favour of historical paintings, observing that men do not so readily worship a picture on a wall or window as an embossed and gilt image set with pearls or stones. It added that "a story painted with the gestures and actions of many persons, and commonly the story written without, hath another use in it than one dumb idol or image standing by itself." How strong was the determination of the framers of these injunctions to get rid of all images that had been or might be abused, appeared from a letter issued by the Council to Cranmer in February, 1548, in which, after stating that the injunctions had in some parts given rise to strifes or contention as to whether this or that image had been offered unto, kissed, censed, or otherwise abused, and was therefore to be taken down and destroyed, it went on to direct that, to put an end to such contention, all the images remaining in any church or chapel should be at once removed and taken away. The letter in question would be found in *Heylin's Reformation*, vol. 1, page 114. The learned counsel for the appellant had relied on a passage in this letter to show that images in the strict and exclusive acceptation of the word, only were intended to be removed. That passage was as follows:—"Considering, therefore, that almost in no place in this realm is any sure quietness but where all images be clear taken away and pulled down already, to the intent that all contention in every part of this realm for this matter may be clearly taken away, and the lively images of Christ should not contend for the dead images which be things not necessary, and without which the churches of Christ continued godly many years." But this passage, according to the interpretation put upon it by Burnet, and adopted by the learned counsel, would not apply to the images which most unquestionably have been introduced among

those that had been abused, but was confined to the dead images of Christ—thus reducing it to a mere rhetorical antithesis. The conclusion to which he came was that by the injunctions of Edward VI. it was intended to take away all ornaments that had been abused, or might thereafter be abused, as therein mentioned. He had shown that, reasoning *a priore* the cross was an ornament that had been abused; and there was, to say the least of it, no sufficient evidence of its legal use afterwards to outweigh that reasoning. On the contrary, looking only to facts, the presumption was against such a use. The injunctions of Queen Elizabeth, which were almost a repetition of those of King Edward, appeared to show almost beyond a doubt that crosses were taken away, and the construction put upon the injunctions in 1559 was a very good illustration of what was intended in 1547. The circumstances of the cross having been on the communion-table of the church of S. Paul at the time of its consecration, and of the cross with the jewels thereon having been placed in S. Barnabas with the consent previously given by the Bishop of the diocese, had been relied upon as affording strong reasons for suffering them to remain in the positions in which they had been put. As regarded S. Paul's, it appeared from a letter under the Bishop's own hand that he never saw the cross at the time of consecration, a large offertory dish having been placed before it. Being thus concealed, the consent of the Bishop to consecrate the Church with the cross so placed in it really amounted to nothing. No man could consent to that of which he had not a knowledge. The case of S. Barnabas was somewhat different. After the causes had been appealed to that Court, it was asserted on the part of the appellants, that a most important fact had come to their knowledge since the judgment of the Court below was delivered,—viz., that the Bishop of London had been fully informed of the intention to place the cross in question upon the communion table of S. Barnabas; that he had given his assent thereto, and consecrated the church accordingly. The Court having been strongly urged to permit an allegation to be brought in, in order that the Rev. Mr. Bennett, the former incumbent of S. Paul and of S. Barnabas, might be examined to prove these facts, gave that permission, and Mr. Bennett had been so examined. In his evidence he stated that he was

minister of the church at the time of its consecration in 1850, and communicated with the Bishop on the subject both by letter and personal interview; that he apprised the Bishop that the cross would be placed on the altar or table, and asked his consent. Whether he described it as a metal cross, or spoke of it simply as a cross, the Rev. gentleman could not recollect. He said that the Bishop objected to the cross if it was to be moveable and considered it illegal, if moveable, but stated that he had no objection to it if it was fixed. Thereupon Mr. Bennett ordered it to be placed as it was at the time of the consecration, and as it still remained, as far as he (the Rev. gentleman) knew. Mr. Bennett further said that he had an interview by appointment with the Bishop on the subject of the cross on the rood or chancel-screen; that that cross had not been fixed at the time when the Bishop came on the 1st of the month to inspect the church; that, fearing there might be some mistake, he explained to the Bishop that the cross would be placed on the rood screen, and also apprised him of it in their interview of the 17th of May; that the Bishop at first objected on the ground that there was already a very handsome cross on the altar, which he thought might be sufficient; that the Bishop reverted to the subject of the said proposed cross, saying that he did not think "we ought to be ashamed of the cross;" and that it ended by the Bishop granting him permission to affix it, which he did before the consecration.

Such was the account given by Mr. Bennett of what passed between himself and his diocesan in relation to these crosses; and far be it from him to say that it was not a fair and impartial statement. At all events, he was sure that there was no intentional misrepresentation of what passed between Mr. Bennett and the Bishop. Thus much, however, might be remarked, that his Lordship did not give any very willing or cordial assent to the propositions of the reverend gentleman. He hesitated as to the cross on the communion-table, and stipulated that it should not be moveable, for he thought that would be illegal; and, as to the cross upon the screen, he objected in the first instance, but afterwards gave way to the solicitations of Mr. Bennett. That the Bishop said, "We should not be ashamed of the cross" there was no doubt; for what Christian could avow that he was ashamed of the cross of

Christ? There was no counter allegation and no evidence taken on the other side; indeed, considering the illness of the Bishop, his Lordship could not well have been troubled with any application on the subject; yet it so happened that they had other means of ascertaining the Bishop of London's sentiments with regard to these crosses in the churches of S. Paul and S. Barnabas. The Court had before it (annexed to the other judgment) a letter of his Lordship's addressed to Mr. Westerton, on the 28th of March, 1854, and to which, of course, the most implicit credit was due. In this letter the Bishop stated, "The wooden cross which is affixed on the communion-table I consider to be objectionable" (this did not look like a very full assent),—"but when, some time after Mr. Liddell's appointment to S. Paul's, I expressed a strong wish for its removal, I was assured by Mr. Southern, then one of the churchwardens, that such removal would wound the feelings of a great number of the congregation, and I therefore allowed the matter to remain in suspense." It could not be said, then, that the Bishop suffered the cross to remain there altogether,—he only consented to allow the matter to "remain in suspense." "As this cross," continued the Bishop, "which is not large and massive as you describe, but small and slight, was on the table when the church was consecrated, although not seen by me, a large offertory dish being then in front of it, I am not satisfied that I have authority to direct its removal without the consent of the churchwardens and the parishioners." Thus, it having been in the church when he consecrated it, his Lordship was not satisfied that he had authority to direct its removal; but then came the important qualifying words, "except by a formal decree of the Consistorial Court. I certainly wish it to be removed, and should be glad if the parishioners would agree to its removal without such authoritative sanction." Of course, the Bishop's opinions in regard to the case of the one church would equally apply to the other. But, in truth, supposing the Bishop gave his assent, as stated by Mr. Bennett, what difference could that make, provided the cross was illegally there? If it was contrary to law no consent of the diocesan could make it legal. Where, indeed, the matters were indifferent—where certain rites or ceremonies were enjoined, and it was doubtful in what manner they should be performed—the Church left

and wisely left it, to the Bishop to decide between parties entertaining divergent opinions. But if the use of the cross in the church was illegal, no consent of a Bishop, nor even of an Archbishop, could permit it to be there. The law must be obeyed, and the question was whether it was legal or illegal. Now, it was notorious that for very many years crosses had not been in general use in the Church of England. If any evidence were necessary to support this position, that of Mr. Hope, whose affidavit had been introduced by the appellants themselves, would alone be almost sufficient for that purpose. That gentleman mentioned 13 churches only in which crosses were to be found—whether of recent introduction or not he did not say; and out of this number two were described by him as situated in Scotland. So that, with the extensive knowledge that Mr. Hope was supposed to possess in matters of this kind, and with the deep interest which he was believed to take in them, he was unable to specify more than 11 churches in all England; and out of those 11, four only were described as having crosses attached to or placed upon the communion table. It must be confessed that this number was very inconsiderable, especially when compared with the number of churches and chapels belonging to the Established Church, which, according to the last census, was upwards of 14,000. It was true that the affidavits of Mr. Hope were followed by those of four other gentlemen, architects by profession; but it was to be observed that only one of them—viz., Mr. Butterfield—deposed that “crosses placed upon the Lord’s table, or either painted or carved on the wall of the chancel above the said table, exist in very many parish churches throughout England and Wales other than those mentioned in the said schedule.” The depositions of the other three were really so vague as to amount to nothing at all. They were altogether silent on the subject of crosses “placed upon the Lord’s table,” and it must therefore be presumed that they knew of no instance of crosses being so placed in the Established Church. The learned counsel for the appellants had quoted a letter from the Council to Cranmer, dated the 11th of February, 1548. This letter, which would be found in Strype’s *Cranmer*, book 2, chapter 8, directed that a more considerable change should be made in the way of removing all images that had been

abused for superstitious purposes. The learned counsel relied upon that letter to prove that crosses were to be retained in contradistinction to images; but the crosses mentioned were crosses of precious materials only, and were associated with chalices, bells, and jewels. The reason assigned for writing that letter was the information received that the churchwardens and parochians "Do alienate and sell these ornaments which were not given for that purpose to be alienated at their pleasure, but either to be used for the intent for which they were first given, or to some other necessary and convenient service of the church." The object of the letter clearly was that they should in nowise sell, give, or otherwise alienate such valuable ornaments. They were not directed to continue the use of them as theretofore in the churches, but, on the contrary, the expressions "either to be used to the intent for which they were at first given, or to some other necessary and convenient service of the Church," seemed to imply that it was contemplated to apply some of them at least, and probably the silver crosses, for other uses than those for which they had been given before the Reformation. The uses to which many valuables of that kind were not infrequently converted by some of the grasping officials of those days was well known. The object of the letter clearly was to prohibit the sale of those valuables by the persons referred to in the letter. That view of the matter derived some confirmation from an act passed in the following year—the 3rd and 4th Edward VI., cap. 10. The act showed the *animus* of the authorities of the time to get rid of all images rather than any that had been abused should remain, and carried out the true meaning and spirit of the letter addressed by the Council to Cranmer in February, 1548. Some reliance was placed upon the circumstance of crosses being actually found in several, perhaps not a few, of the churches as testified by the returns of several commissions in the 6th year of the King Edward's reign. But if the mere *de facto* existence of crosses was to be taken as proof that they were legally in use, the same argument would tend to prove the legality of other ornaments, images, &c., which had unquestionably been abused and prohibited by law. The mere circumstance of such articles being found at some place or other within the walls of a church was hardly sufficient to show that they continued down to that time

to be in the church for the purposes of Divine service, much less that they were lawfully used for such purposes. The incompleteness of the manner in which the law had been carried out was sufficiently attested by the letter to Cranmer to which he had referred. It did not occur to him that it was requisite that he should further observe upon the events which occurred in the reign of Edward VI., and, as it was certain that no act of the Legislature which passed after the second year of that King's reign, and before the Act of Uniformity in 1662, could have any binding effect in respect to the ornaments to be used in the Church of England, it would at first sight seem useless to comment on what took place in the interval. Some things, however, did occur which might properly be inquired into, as tending to throw light on what the real state of things in the second year of King Edward. In regard to the reign of Queen Mary it was scarcely requisite to mention that a period was put to the Reformation, and that the Church of Rome, under her auspices, resumed its full powers. On the accession of Elizabeth another change took place. Her Act of Uniformity, 1 Elizabeth, c. 2, passed on the 12th of April, 1559. That act legalized the second Prayer Book of King Edward, and by the 25th section it was enacted that such ornaments of the Church, and of the ministers thereof, should be retained and be in use, as were in the Church of England by the authority of Parliament in the second year of Edward VI. In the same year she issued 53 injunctions, several of which closely resembled those of Edward, more especially the second, forbidding the extolling of images, relics, or miracles; and the 23d ordering the destruction of all monuments of superstition and idolatry. The last was, in fact, identical with the 28th of King Edward's. He would now proceed to see how those injunctions of Elizabeth, so closely resembling those of Edward, were construed and applied. It appeared that divers commissions were appointed for carrying out the visitations under the newly issued injunctions. They were all appointed in July and August, 1559, with the exception of that of London, which commenced somewhat earlier. In the accounts of what was done during those visitations he found nothing to show that the cross was excepted from those monuments of idolatry and superstition which were to be destroyed, still less any proof that the cross was in use in the churches

subsequently to those visitations. On the 18th of July, 1559, the visitors sat at the palace of the Bishop of London. In that visitation they took care to have all the utensils and instruments of superstition and idolatry demolished and destroyed out of the churches where God's pure service was to be set up—such as the roods—namely, the images of Christ upon the cross, and of John and M<sup>ary</sup> standing by, and also the images of other saints, tutelaries of the churches to whom they were dedicated, Popish books, altars, and the like. Bishop Sandys, in a letter to Peter Martyr, dated the 1st of April, 1560, said that he was sent into the northern parts of England, and at their last visitation all images of every kind were not only taken down, but also burnt, and that too by public authority. Jewel, in a letter to Peter Martyr, dated the 5th of November, 1559, after his visitations complained that the “theatrical habits,” as he called them, still remained. On the 16th of the same month he thus wrote, “Religion among us is in the same state which I have often described to you before. The doctrine is everywhere most pure, but as to the ceremonies and maskings there is a little too much foolery. That little silver cross of ill-omened origin still maintains its place in the Queen's Chapel—wretched me!—this thing will soon be drawn into a precedent.” On the 4th of February, 1560, speaking of the controversy respecting the Queen's cross, or crucifix, which was to be argued before the Queen, and referring to what had been done at the visitation, he mentioned the crosses of silver and tin which they had everywhere broken in pieces. Sampson, in a letter to Peter Martyr, dated the 6th of January, 1560, wrote to the same effect. That the crucifix and cross, and lights, were confined to the Queen's chapel would appear from the fact that at about that time, or a little later, Cox, being appointed to minister the Sacrament before the Queen in her own chapel, made it a matter of conscience to do it in a place which he thought so dishonoured by images, and could scarcely be induced to officiate therein, refusing it for a great while, and when he at length consented declared that it was with a trembling conscience; and in order to plead for himself, he wrote a most humble letter to the Queen acquainting her with his conscientious scruples. The letter itself was to be found in the appendix to Strype's *Annals*.

The account given by Grindal of the general state of religious

matters in England at that time might be collected from the contents of a letter sent to him in answer by Peter Martyr about the end of 1559. Grindal, it seemed, had been nominated to the See of London, but having some scruples about the habits and ornaments to be used on the occasion, consulted Martyr on the subject. Martyr, in reply, said that though he was always against the use of such ornaments, yet he saw the present danger lest they should be put from the office of preaching, and that perhaps, as altars and images were already taken away, so also those appearances of the Mass might in time be taken away too. Reliance was placed on a passage contained in an address from the Bishop to the Queen in reference to the use of images, which was to be found in *Cardwell's Documentary Annals*, vol. 1, p. 268, and in which the Bishops there expressed their trust that they might persuade Her Majesty by her Regal authority to remove them. If they looked to other parts of the same address, and especially to the latter part of it, they would find far stronger expressions. At page 272 they said, "The establishing of images by your Royal authority shall not only utterly discredit our ministries, and builders of the thing which we have destroyed, but also blemish the fame of your most godly brother and such notable fathers as have given their lives for the testimony of God's truth, who by public law removed all images. To these grave and weighty reasons says Strype, (*Annals*, 222), the Queen at length condescended. Moreover, Sampson, in a letter to Peter Martyr in January, 1560, speaking of the crucifix placed on the table with lighted candles, put this question:—"Suppose the Queen should enjoin all the Bishops and clergy either to admit this image, together with the candles, into their churches, or to retire from the ministry of the Word, what should be our conduct in this case?" The learned advocate had also cited a letter dated the 14th of April, 1559, from Jewel to Peter Martyr, in which, speaking of the Queen, and of his wish that she would abolish the practices in her own chapel, he said, "But this woman, excellent as she is, and earnest in the cause of true religion, notwithstanding she desires a thorough change as early as possible, cannot, however, be prevailed upon to effect such change without the sanction of law, lest the matter should seem to have been accomplished not so much by the judgment of discreet men as in compliance with

the impulse of a furious multitude." The purpose for which this letter was cited was to show the respect of Queen Elizabeth for the law, and that she never would have suffered the cross or crucifix to have remained in her chapel if they had not been sanctioned by the law passed in the second year of King Edward's reign. But the letter containing the reasons assigned by the Queen having confessedly been written before the passing of the 1st Elizabeth, cap. 2, did not go far in support of such an argument. The fondness of Elizabeth for pomp and show was well known; and it only proved that she temporized and remonstrated against their abolition, so long as the law of her predecessor, Queen Mary, was unrepealed. After the statute of the 1st Elizabeth, cap. 2, we did not find that she made use of this argument. He would next refer to a letter of Grindal's written at the end of 1571 or the beginning of 1572, which gave a summary of the state of things in the early part of Queen Elizabeth's reign, and seemed to confirm the view that he had just taken. This letter was addressed to Zanchius, a professor at Heidelberg, and in it Grindal said, "that when the Queen first began to reign, the Popish religion being cast off, she reduced religion to that condition wherein it was while King Edward VI. was alive, and to this all the states of the kingdom with full consent gave their voices in the great council of the nation called the Parliament; that the authority of this council was so great that the laws made therein could not by any means be dissolved, unless by the same authority that made them; that in that form of religion set up by King Edward there were some commands concerning the habits of ministers and some other things which some good men desired might be abolished or mended; but the authority of the law hindered them from doing anything that way; yet the law allowed the Queen, with the consent of some of the bishops, to alter some things. But, indeed, nothing was either altered or diminished; that there was not a Bishop that he knew of but obeyed the rules prescribed, and gave example to others to do the same; and as the Bishops did, so did the other ministers of the Church, learned and unlearned." Grindal here stated that the things to which good men objected—foremost among which he placed the habits of the clergy—were all in accordance with law. If the cross had been in use, surely

such a precisian as Grindal would have been loud in his complaints of it—it would have formed a prominent grievance with him. If the cross had been removed otherwise than by law he could not have used the words—“the law hindered the removal.” The period with which he had just been dealing was that in which the reformed religion was being restored, after its abolition in the reign of Queen Mary. It was attended with some of that confusion and irregularity which characterized the commencement of King Edward’s reign. It was therefore not very surprising to find contrary opinions held by writers of the day, and statements of facts somewhat difficult of being reconciled with each other. The only course which could safely be pursued—and that was not entirely satisfactory—was to give due consideration to all, and to strike the balance as well as circumstances would admit. The great desire of the Reformers was to get rid of what they regarded as monuments of superstition and idolatry.

An exposition by a competent authority of what the general practice of the Church had settled into at a time closely following the re-establishment of the reformed religion was to be found in *Whitgift*. That Divine had been selected by Parker to answer the *Admonition of the Puritans*, supposed to be the work of Cartwright. Writing in defence of that answer, Whitgift said,—“As for Papists, we are far enough off from them, for they pictured the sign of the cross, and did worship it; so do not we. They used it to drive away spirits and devils; so do not we. They had it in their churches; so have not we. They used it daily and nightly for religion’s sake; we only in Baptism and for a sign and token, as I have said before; so that their abusing of it is sufficiently corrected. Neither is there any man that knoweth not to what end and purpose we use it.” Again, he said,—“As there is great difference betwixt the painting of an image to set forth an history, and placing of it in the church to be worshipped, so is there also a great difference betwixt crossing a child in the forehead at the time of baptism, with expressing the cause and use of it, and the placing of crosses in churches or highways and streets. The crossing of the child in baptism is but for a moment; the cross of wood and stone remaineth and continueth—the cross on the child’s forehead is not made to be adored and worshipped:

neither was ever any man so mad as to imagine any such thing of it. But the crosses in churches, streets, and highways, of metal or wood, were erected to be worshipped, and were so accordingly: and therefore there was no like peril in the one as there was in the other." The reference in these passages was plainly to the cross, and not to the crucifix, the contrast being between the sign of the cross in baptism and the material cross. It was unhesitatingly stated, as a fact notorious to all, that the cross was not in the Church of England, and the reason for it given—viz., that material crosses in churches were made to be worshipped, and were so accordingly. Was it credible that the cross was at this time in the church by the authority of Parliament, and that it had been withdrawn solely on account of the prejudices of the ultra-reformers in the Church? As to the fact of the cross or crucifix being in Bishop Butler's study, Seeker, a great admirer of the author of *The Analogy*, and a very mild man, disapproved Butler's practice in this respect, according to the report of Bishop Halifax. Bishop Butler, however, only used the cross for himself, and for no idolatrous purpose, and there was no authority whatever for saying that either he or Hooper used it in any church or chapel in their dioceses. That the disuse of the material cross continued to be the general and recognized practice of the Church in the reign of Elizabeth's successor was equally clear. In the conference held before James I. at Hampton Court, in 1603, we found it objected, *inter alia* by the Puritans that the sign of the cross was used in baptism. In answer to an argument used by Dr. Reynolds, that the cross ought to be abolished as the brazen serpent was destroyed, the King, in one of the replies made by him, said—"What resemblance is there between the brazen serpent—a material and visible thing, and the sign of the cross made in the air?" Again, he said—"I am given to understand by the Bishops, and I find it true, that the Papists themselves did never ascribe any power or spiritual grace to the sign of the cross in baptism." And further—"You see that the material crosses which in times of Popery were made for men to fall down before them as they passed by them, to worship them as the idolatrous Jews did the brazen serpent, are demolished as you desire." Here again was a distinction taken between the sign of the cross and the material cross, and a statement, on

unimpeachable authority, that crosses were not in the Church of England at that period." He did not intend to lay it down as an universal proposition that a cross or crucifix may not have been to be found here or there in some few churches where it might have escaped notice, or where from particular circumstances it was not wished to notice it. He spoke only of the general and almost universal, if not quite universal, practice of the Church. Crosses, crucifixes, and numerous other ornaments, were afterwards, and more especially in the reign of Charles I., introduced into the churches, and there remained until 1641, when they were removed by order of the House of Commons. They were unquestionably regarded as innovations upon the practice which previously prevailed. The difference of the doctrine held by the Caroline Bishops, as a school of theologians, from their predecessors, was well known. Which were the sounder divines it was not within his province to decide, but as interpreters of the injunctions of Edward VI. and his rubric, as well as of those of Queen Elizabeth, he was bound to give the preference to those who lived at the time, or shortly after, the publication of those regulations. It was unnecessary to dwell upon what occurred during the Great Rebellion. In 1662, shortly after the restoration of Royalty, the Act of Uniformity now in force was passed; but previously to this becoming law conferences were held at the Savoy, at which discussions took place respecting alterations to be made in the Book of Common Prayer, with the view of conciliating the Nonconformists. In these discussions Baxter took a very prominent part. He objected, *inter alia*, to the rubric respecting ornaments in the Prayer Book under Queen Elizabeth's Act of Uniformity, and was desirous of introducing the regulations as to ornaments prescribed by the statute of the 5th and 6th Edward VI., instead of those of his second year. The rubric, or proposed rubric, as set forth in the *Life of Baxter*, (page 321), was in these words:—"And here it is to be noted that the minister, at the time of the Communion, and at other times in his ministration, shall use such ornaments in the church as were in use by the authority of Parliament in the second year of the reign of Edward VI., according to the act of Parliament." Then followed Baxter's exception in these words:—"Forasmuch as this rubric seemeth to bring back the

cope, alb, &c., and other vestments forbidden by the Common Prayer Book of the 5th and 6th Edward VI., and so our reasons alleged against ceremonies under our 18th general exception, we desire it may be wholly left out." Nothing was said against the ornaments in the church, which, if prescribed in that book at all, were so by this rubric. If the cross had been deemed to be so prescribed, Baxter would undoubtedly have added that to his objections. Exceptions were also taken, as they had been before at the Hampton Court Conferences, to the use of the sign of the cross in Baptism, but none to the material cross, as most undoubtedly they would have been, had there existed a suspicion that such cross was authorized by the Prayer Book or rubric. Much stress had been laid by the appellant's counsel on the opinion of Bishop Cosins, one of the principal revisers of the Book of Common Prayer, when in preparation just previous to the passing of the Act of Uniformity. Bishop Cosins at different times wrote no less than three several comments on the Book of Common Prayer. In his second series, written about 1638, he commented on the rubric at the time of the Communion in these words:—"And at the celebration of the Holy Communion it was ordained by the rules and orders of the first liturgy set forth by the Church of England, and confirmed by the authority of Parliament in the second year of Edward VI., that among other ornaments in the church then in use the setting of two lights on the communion-table or altar was appointed by the King's injunctions, set forth about that time, and mentioned or ratified by act of Parliament, whereby all other wax lights, images, &c., were abolished by the authority of Parliament, which confirmed the first liturgy, and the injunctions of Edward VI." (*Anglo-Catholic Theology*, vol. v., p. 230-3.) There was a passage on the same subject in the 3d series of *Annotations*, p. 438-541, supposed to be written in 1640, upon which he might observe that Cosins was a high churchman, a zealous opponent of Baxter at the Conferences, a disciple of Andrewes and the Caroline Bishops. He was one of those who were subjected to trial; he was therefore one of those who would naturally be inclined to give the fullest construction to the rubric in respect of ornaments. They had his several different enumerations of the ornaments he conceived legalized under it. Was it credible that Cosins would have

omitted all mention of the cross if he had considered it to be a legalized ornament? He was of opinion that there was no authority for the use of the cross in the church at the present moment, and therefore he must pronounce against it. Having dwelt so long on that subject, he must now come to other parts of the case, but on which it would not be necessary to dwell at any length. The next part related to altars or communion tables and also to the credence tables. As the law relating to such matters had been very elaborately, and, as he believed, very well ascertained and determined by his learned predecessor in that chair, in the case of "Falkener v. Lichfield," it was not necessary that he should discuss the matter at any length. In respect to altars or communion tables, Sir H. J. Fust held, that "the tables were not to be of stone and fixed, but of wood and moveable." How, then, did the law so laid down apply to the present cases? It was stated by Dr. Lushington that he considered that judgment as imperatively binding upon him, and it was also to some extent binding on this Court. He was bound to follow the rule, unless he was of opinion that it was decidedly wrong; if he was satisfied that it was, then, notwithstanding the case was decided by that great Judge, he should take the liberty of coming to a different decision. It appeared to him, however, that his reasonings were conclusive, and he fully agreed in all that fell from him.

As to S. Barnabas, it appeared that the altar or table was made entirely of stone, and not of wood. It was therefore clearly not in accordance with the rule laid down by Sir H. J. Fust. With respect to the altar or table of S. Paul's, that was composed of wood, and was capable of being moved, although perhaps with no great facility; that, therefore, might be viewed in a more favourable light. It had been said that the case of "Faulkner v. Lichfield" was distinguishable from the present, inasmuch as the Court in that case, although it pronounced the stone altar to be illegal, did not order its removal. But that apparent difference was attributable altogether to the mode in which the case came before it. In that case a faculty had been granted by the decree of an inferior Court confirming the erection of the stone altar. From that decree an appeal was brought to the Arches' Court, and the learned judge reversed the decree

appealed from. It was not competent under the circumstances of the appeal to go further; but there could be no doubt that if the suit before him had been for the removal of the altar he must have decreed it. The whole tenor of the judgment put that out of all possibility of doubt. With respect to credence tables, he saw no sufficient reason for departing from the decision in "Falkener v. Lichfield." He did not consider it a matter of great importance, but, as it was laid down by Sir H. J. Fust that there was no authority for placing them in the church, he would follow the precedent and pronounce against them. That brought him to the consideration of the coverings of the communion table in the time of Divine service, and at the celebration of the Holy Communion. He would consider the latter point first. The law upon the point, he apprehended, was to be found in the rubric prefixed to the communion service in the Book of Common Prayer. It was in these words:—"The table at the communion service, having a fair white linen cloth upon it, shall stand in the body of the church, or in the chancel, where morning and evening service are appointed to be said." The directions of the 82d canon were to the very same effect:—"The table is to be covered with a fair linen cloth at the time of ministration." Those directions seemed to be sufficiently plain and explicit. It was to be a fair linen cloth, and nothing whatever was ordered, or even suggested, as to the additions of lace, embroidery, or any other ornament; nor had he been able to discover any authority for such addition, or that any such usage had prevailed in the Church of England since the Reformation. He did not mean to assert positively that no such instance had ever occurred, but merely that it never came within his cognizance. He did not wish it to be understood that he considered this to be of very grave importance in this case, but, supposing the law as cited to have left the matter unsettled, and that it was diversely taken by the parties, resort must be had to the Ordinary as directed by the instructions prefixed to the Prayer Book, and that was the course which had been pursued—for the decision of the learned Judge sitting in the Consistorial Court of the Ordinary had been obtained, and he saw no reason for departing from it. A similar observation applied to the use of the various coloured cloths on the communion table at the time of Divine service, and the results must be

similar. It was not necessary, therefore, to make any further observations upon them. As to the brazen gates they had not been seriously objected to, and he would make no order with reference to them. There had been no appeal with respect to them. Neither was there any appeal as to the candlesticks and candles. Then the only remaining point was the affixing of the Commandments at the east end of the Church. This was required by the law to be done; the Court below had ordered it to be done; and he apprehended that there was no appeal as to that. The conclusion of the Court, therefore, was that the judgment of the Court below must be affirmed in all respects. There was still left the question as to costs. He was of opinion that the Court below did perfectly right, under all the circumstances, in not allowing costs. But when there had been an appeal, and when he felt himself constrained to affirm the first judgment, he deemed it his duty to condemn the appellants in the costs of that appeal. He therefore affirmed the judgment of the Court below in both these cases.

Mr. CURREY (the proctor for Mr. Liddell) then said,—In accordance with my instructions I beg with all respect to assert appeals in both these cases to the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council.

During the course of the above trial to which we shall again refer, giving the judgment of the Privy Council, Dr. Philpotts gave his idea of the use of a Credence table, which is so thoroughly unique that we present it to our reader with his note, appending thereto the real meaning of the word "*credenza*," and also the import of the ceremony of *prægustatio*, which we believe was not "*ad vitandum veneni periculum*." Dr. Philpotts says, "whether indeed the name 'Credence,' or the thing, be of Roman origin, is by no means certain. Those who so consider it, ascribe it to a frightful state of manners in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, when more than one person of eminence were believed to have been cut off by poison, introduced into the Host. I do not pretend to a full acquaintance with the facts which made the precaution of a 'Credence,' necessary—nor with the exact manner in

which this precaution was effected; but I am assured by a friend of much authority in any archæological question, that, in order to prevent the Host being made the means of administering poison, or, to use the words of Martene, ‘ad vitandum veneni periculum quod sic in sacristæ caput recidisset,’ there was a certain ceremony termed *præ gustatio*, in which three Hosts were prepared, ‘unam pro sacramento, et duos pro proba.’ This ceremony seems to have made necessary in certain cases some small adjunct in the form rather of a chest or safe than of a table, either attached to the altar, or in the immediate neighbourhood of it, in order that the bread so tasted before consecration, and after consecration the portion reserved, should be *trustworthy*, whence the origin of the name—*credenza*, a safe.”—The following note is appended to this passage—“The whole ceremony was called *præ gustatio*, and is thus described in the *Museum Italicum*—*Diaconus Evangelii latinus accipit hostiam unam de tribus, quæ sunt super patenam, et cum eâ duas alias hostias tangit, et dat sacristæ comedendam; deinde accipit aliam hostiam de duabus quæ remanserant, et cum eâ tangit patenam et calicem per totum, intus et extra, et similiter dat eam sacristæ comedendam, &c.* The ‘*Vocabulario degli Accademici della Crusca*,’ gives, among others, the following definitions of the word ‘*credenza*,’ which term is by no means peculiar to the service of the Altar, from which we may see that the term is used to signify both the assay itself and the place of trust (*safe*), to which the assayed viands were committed,—‘*Credenza*’—L’ Assaggiare che fanno gli scalchi e i coppieri delle vivande e bevende, prima di servirne i lor Signori. ‘*Credenza*’—diciamo anche quel armario dove si ripongon le cose da mangiare, e vi si distendon sopra i piatelli per lo servizio della tavola.”

In the revision of Clement VIII. the word *credentia*, is carefully avoided, and the term *abacus*, side table, substituted, possibly from a desire to obliterate the memory of the reason for which the credence table properly so

called had been introduced. Whenever the word is mentioned at all in his revision, it is used as if it were the *trivial*, but not the correct, name—*mensa seu abacus quod credentiam vocant*.

We shall first of all ease Dr. Philpotts' apprehension, respecting the ceremony of *præ gustatio*, by reminding him that many instances are given by Du Cange, in which the *credentia* or *abacus* is used as a sideboard in profane sacrifice, and hence its being introduced into the Eucharistic sacrifice. We next beg to call his attention to the following letter from the Rev. T. A. Crowther, O.S.A., respecting the definition of the word *credenza*.

“ *To the Editor of the ‘ Times.’* ”

Sir,—In this morning's paper I noticed some account of a letter written by the ‘ Bishop ’ of Exeter on Dr. Lushington's recent judgment about the fittings of Protestant churches. His Lordship, it appears, is at a loss to know what ‘ credence table ’ exactly means—he cannot tell whence it is derived, and evidently labors under some mystery about it. Might I state, for the information of such of your readers as have not lived in Italy and mixed with the people, that the word is of Italian derivation, and is used in ordinary conversation? *La credenza* means nothing more than a small cupboard or shelf in any handy situation, serving to stow away any odd matters that may be wanted at a moment's notice. *La credenza* is not necessarily a piece of religious furniture, nor has it any connexion with religious rites *per se*. There is *la credenza dell' altare*, *la credenza del battisterio*, *la credenza dell' olio santo*, and there is a *credenza* in every body's chamber. So the *word* is not so very Popish as the ‘ Bishop ’ seemed to fear.

Yours respectfully,

T. A. T. CROWTHER,

Priest of the Eremitic Order of S. Augustine.

*Chatham, January 9.”*

As regards the altar cloths we might present our readers with fuller catalogues of church ornaments than those

adduced by the Bishop of Exeter : but in the name of common sense, why do certain Ministers of Establishment require these “sumptuous carpets of silk or velvet, or other such stuff,” credence tables, ambyres, piscinæ, crosses, &c. &c., when they ignore the presence of Him, who is God as well as man, on their altars, when they tell us that Dr. Pusey has demolished the Tridentine Doctrine of the Real Presence, and that the Sacrifice of the Mass is impious and blasphemous—when their own Martyrologist, the truth-telling and candor-loving Foxe, has recorded instances of blasphemy that make our blood curdle within our veins ; and when the walls of our cities, towns, and villages, are placarded with falsehoods so glaring, that it is marvellous how any can credit them, and the press daily teems with the most palpable absurdities.

These “*tapetes ex serico*,” credence tables, ambyres, &c., are necessary in the Church of God—rich and gorgeous antependia are of utility in that House of Prayer, where the dim light of the sanctuary tells you that the God of Heaven and Earth, the Crucified Redeemer, is *actually* present, but in buildings consecrated to heresy they are worse than useless, and therefore do we commend Dr. Lushington in inhibiting the use of more than one altar cloth.

---

1857.

---

The Converts for this year are:—

- Rev. H. R. Howell, Vicar of S. Veep.
- Rev. T. Collins, Curate of S. Veep.
- Rev. T. Woodward, Curate of S. Martin, Cripplegate.
- Rev. M. O'Connor, Rector of Caleleft.
- Rev. B. Bailey, Trinity College, Cambridge.
- Rev. H. N. Oxenham, Curate of S. Bartholomew's.
- Rev. H. Collins, Curate of Knaresboro'.
- Rev. T. Marshall, Exeter College, Oxford.
- Rev. E. Randolph, Curate of Little Hadham, Herts.

Sir Bouchier Wrey.

Mrs. Randolph.

Lord Boyle.

H. Butterfield, Esq.

W. J. Hill, Esq., Trinity College, Cambridge.

W. Brandred, Esq., Christ College, Cambridge.

V. J. Fenwick, Esq., Caius College, Cambridge.

T. Tordiffe, Esq.

Miss Newton.

W. J. B. Ribaud, Esq., S. Mary's Hall, Oxford.

“We ask you (says Mr. Oxenham) to lay aside the burden of an unreal responsibility, the fretting wearisome anxiety of a perplexed conscience, the doubts that will torture you even in the Confessional, and the cold distraction when you kneel before the Altar, and to come as little children to learn at your Mother's knee. We call you from a spirit of doubt, distraction, and error to a spirit of knowledge and power, and truth; from an heretical state tradition of yesterday to the One True Church of the Eternal. Only be faithful to your convictions and follow the inspirations of Grace.”\*

“The Church (says Mr. Henry Collins) alone can be the home of every Catholic heart; away from it, one, who is in doctrine a Catholic, speaks what is a barbarian language, and every one to him also speaks a barbarian language, but in the Church he is at home. He leaves a murky gloomy atmosphere of darkness, and is translated into a land of light and genial warmth. He makes his way out of Egypt into the land of Goshen, where there is light and health in their dwellings. He is no longer in a strange land not understood and looked upon as a curious phenomenon;—but he quietly subsides in his proper position and vocation in the Church of God.”†

The Judicial Committee of the Privy Council gave

\* Oxenham's “*Tractarian Party and the Catholic Church.*”

† Collins's *Difficulties of a Convert.*

the following important Judgment in the case of Westerton v. Liddell :—

PRELIMINARY REVIEW.

These cases come before the Court by appeal from two orders in distinct suits, directing the removal of various articles of church furniture, in the one case, from the district church or chapel of S. Paul, Knightsbridge, and in the other from the chapel of ease of S. Barnabas, Pimlico. Although there is some distinction between the circumstances of the two cases, they involve the same principles—they were included in one argument at this bar—and will be conveniently disposed of in one judgment.

It appears that the district church of S. Paul was erected by private subscription ; that the income by which it is supported is derived from the rent of pews ; that Mr. Liddell is the incumbent, and Mr. Horne and Mr. Westerton the two churchwardens. The two churchwardens differed as to the propriety of certain ornaments of the church ; and in Hilary Term, 1855, the suit out of which the present appeal arises was instituted in the Consistory Court of London, by Mr. Westerton, against Mr. Horne and Mr. Liddell, who are now the appellants. The citation called upon the appellants to show cause why a faculty should not be granted for removing the altar, or high altar, and the cloths used for covering the same, together with the wooden cross elevated thereon and affixed thereto, as well as the candlesticks thereon, together with the credentia, preparatory altar or credence table, used in the said church or chapel, and for substituting in lieu and stead thereof a decent and proper table for the administration of the Lord's Supper and Holy Communion, and a decent cloth for the covering thereof.

The answer of the defendants alleges that the article of church furniture called in the citation an altar, or high altar, is in fact, and according to the true and legal interpretation of the 32nd of the Constitutions and Canons of England and Ireland as by law established *mensa congrua et decens*, or a convenient and decent table such as is required by law for the celebration of the Holy Communion, and denies that the wooden cross is inconsistent with the laws, canons, customs, and constitutions of the said Church. In subsequent passages of the

answer this table is always spoken of as the altar or communion table; and it is alleged that the said altar or communion table, and the platform on which the same is raised, the wooden cross attached thereto, the gilded candlesticks, and the said side table or credence table, were placed in the same church as the same now exist, and formed part of the furniture thereof, at the time of the consecration of the said church and of the furniture thereof by the Lord Bishop of London on the 30th of May, 1843. Their lordships understand that this table, described as an altar or communion table, is made of wood, and is not attached to the platform, but merely stands upon it; that it is placed at the east end of the church, or the chancel, according to the ordinary usage as to the communion table; that at the end nearest the wall there is a narrow ledge raised above the rest of the table; that upon this ledge, which is termed the "super-altare," stand the two gilded candlesticks, which are moveable, and between them the wooden cross, which is let into and fixed in the super-altare, so as to form part of what is thus described as the altar or communion table.

The judgment complained of has not ordered the removal of the table or of the candlesticks, but only of the cross, the credence table, and the cloths. There is no appeal against this order, as far as it permits the table and candlesticks to remain; and it is therefore not open to their lordships to consider the judgment with reference to the articles not ordered to be removed. The evidence as to the wishes of the parishioners upon this subject appears to their lordships to show what, in such a case, might perhaps be expected, that with respect to these ornaments there are many persons of great respectability who from conscientious motives are strongly attached to them; many of equal respectability who, from motives equally conscientious, feel an invincible repugnance to them; and some, it may be hoped not a few, who, whatever opinion they may form of their intrinsic value, consider them as of no importance whatever in comparison with Christian charity and concord, and who, whether they approve or whether they disapprove them, would infinitely rather sacrifice their individual feeling and opinions than secure their triumph at the expense of disturbing and distracting the Church of which they are members.

With respect to the case of *Liddell v. Beal*, S. Barnabas is a

chapel of ease within the district chapelry of S. Paul, of which the curates are appointed by Mr. Liddell. In this case both the chapelwardens agree with Mr. Liddell as to the ornaments in question. On the 17th of January, 1855, a monition was issued against them at the instance of Mr. Beal, an inhabitant of the district chapelry of S. Barnabas, by which they were monished to remove from the said chapel the rood-screen and brazen gates, together with the cross elevated and fixed on the said screen; and also the stone altar and cloths now used for covering the same, and the cross ornamented with jewels elevated thereon and fixed thereto, with the candlesticks and candles placed thereon; and also the marble credentia, preparatory altar or credence table, and to substitute in lieu and stead thereof a decent table for the administration of the Lord's Supper and Holy Communion, and a decent covering thereto, and to set up on the east end of the chancel of the said chapel the Ten Commandments, as by the laws, canons, institutions, and customs of the United Church of England and Ireland is prescribed (App., case 7).

The answer admits that between the chancel and the nave of the church there is a screen of carved wood, on the summit whereof a wooden cross is affixed. It admits, in substance, the existence of the stone table, or altar, with the metal cross attached thereto; and it insists that the article of furniture so described is a *mensa congrua et decens* within the meaning of the canons, and such a communion table as is required by law for the celebration of the Holy Communion. It admits the use of various cloths differing in colour from each other as coverings of the communion table at different seasons; and that the covering used on the said altar or communion table at the time of the administration of the Holy Communion is of worked and embroidered white linen, ornamented and enriched with and bordered at the ends with elaborately worked lace, and that the other articles of linen used in the said office are also decorated and enriched with white lace. It denies that the credence table is attached to the chancel, and alleges that the same is a moveable table, necessary and convenient for the decent celebration of the Holy Communion according to the rubrics of the Book of Common Prayer. The answer then alleges that these ornaments existed in the church when it was consecrated in

1850, and that the services are attended by large and devout congregations, whose religious feelings would be violated by their removal.

The judgment complained of has ordered the church or chapelwardens of S. Barnabas to remove the present structure of stone used as a communion table in the said church, and to provide instead thereof a moveable table of wood; to remove the credence table; to remove the cross on the screen, as also the cross on or near the present structure used as a communion table; to take away all the cloths at present used in the said church or chapel for covering the structure now used as a communion table during the time of divine service, and to provide and substitute in place of the said cloths one only covering for the communion table of silk or other decent stuff; and, further, to remove any cover used at the time of the ministration of the Sacrament, worked or embroidered with lace or otherwise ornamented, and to substitute a fair white linen cloth, without lace or embroidery or other ornament; to cover the communion table at the time of the ministration of the Sacrament, and to cause the Ten Commandments to be set up on the east end of the church in compliance with the terms of the canon. As to the order directing the Ten Commandments to be set up there is no appeal. When this case came by appeal before the Dean of the Arches some additional evidence was given with respect to the assent of the Bishop of London to the use of these ornaments before the chapel was consecrated. But it does not appear to their lordships to be necessary to go into this part of the case.

#### THE CROSS.

Their lordships will deal with each of the articles which are the subject of appeal separately; and, first, with respect to the crosses, the point to which by far the greater part of the argument at this bar was addressed.

No distinction was taken by the Courts below between the different crosses which are the subject of appeal—between the crosses on what are termed the altars or communion tables both at S. Paul's and S. Barnabas, and the cross on the chancel screen in S. Barnabas. The learned judges have treated them as being all subject to the same considerations, and have ordered

them all to be removed as illegal ornaments. But, though both judges arrived at the same conclusion, there is some difference between the reasons assigned for their decisions. Dr. Lushington seems to have held that the question was, what ornaments could be shown to have been in churches in the second year of the reign of Edward VI., by authority of Parliament, according to the Rubric of the present Prayer Book, whatever the true construction according to those words might import? Sir J. Dodson, on the other hand, considered the question to depend on the effect of certain royal injunctions and an Act of Parliament against the use of images, among which he considered crosses to be included.

It will be necessary to examine both these grounds of decision with the attention and respect which are due to the eminent persons who have adopted them; and first, as to the effect of the rubric. In dealing with this question it is necessary to remember that there were many crosses, some with, some without, the image of the Saviour, which were in use in the Roman Catholic ritual; altar crosses, processional crosses, funeral crosses, and others, as well as painted or carved representations of the cross not used in the services, but set up as architectural decorations of churches; and the question is whether the rubric applies to the latter class. The rubric is in these words:—"And here it is to be noted that such ornaments of the church and of the ministers thereof at all times of their ministry shall be retained, and be in use as were in this Church of England, by authority of Parliament in the second year of King Edward VI."

Dr. Lushington was of opinion that, by the true construction of these words, reference must be had to the Act of the 2nd and 3rd Edward VI., and the Prayer Book which is established, for the purpose of determining what ornaments were thereby sanctioned; but he was perplexed by the difficulty that, although there were words in that Prayer Book describing the ornaments of the ministers, there were none which applied to ornaments of the church in his understanding of this expression.

Their lordships, after much consideration, are satisfied that the construction of this rubric which they suggested at the hearing of the case is its true meaning, and that the word "ornaments" applies, and in this rubric is confined, to those

articles the use of which in the services and ministrations of the Church is prescribed by the Prayer Book of Edward VI. The term "ornaments" in ecclesiastical law is not confined, as by modern usage, to articles of decoration or embellishment; but it is used in the larger sense of the word "ornamentum," which, according to the interpretation of Forcellini's dictionary, is used "quocumque apparatu, seu instrumento." All the several articles used in the performance of the services and rites of the Church are "ornaments." Vestments, books, cloths, chalices, and patens, are among Church ornaments; a long list of them will be found extracted from Lyndwood, in Dr. Phillimore's edition of "Burns's Ecclesiastical Law." In modern times organs and bells are held to fall under this denomination. When reference is had to the first Prayer Book of Edward VI., with this explanation of the term "ornaments," no difficulty will be found in discovering among the articles of which the use is there enjoined, ornaments of the church, as well as ornaments of the ministers. Besides the vestments differing in the different services, the rubric provides for the use of an English Bible, the new Prayer Book, a poor man's box, a chalice, a corporas, a paten, a bell, and some other things. That these articles were included in the term "ornaments of the church" at the period in question is clear, from two documents nearly contemporaneous, one before and the other after the establishment of the first Prayer Book.

In a letter of the Council to Cranmer, dated the 30th of April, 1548 (to be found in Strype's "Memorials of Cranmer," vol. ii. p. 90), they complain of the conduct of certain churchwardens who sent away their chalices, crosses of silver, bells, and other ornaments of the church; and in a commission in 1552 (Cardw., Doc. Ann., p. 112) the commissioners are enjoined to leave in every church or chapel of common resort one, two, or more chalices or cups, according to the multitude of people in every such church or chapel, and also such other ornaments as by their discretion shall seem requisite for the Divine service in every such place for the time."

If reference be now made to the alterations in these matters introduced by the second Prayer Book of Edward VI., and the subsequent rubric to the Prayer Book of Elizabeth, the meaning will be sufficiently clear. The second Prayer Book forbids the

use of different vestments by the priest in the performance of the different services, and enjoins the use of a surplice only, and does not expressly mention the paten, chalice, and corporas. After the overthrow of Protestantism by Queen Mary, and its restoration on the accession of Queen Elizabeth, a great controversy arose between the more violent and the more moderate Reformers as to the church service which should be re-established, whether it should be according to the first, or according to the second, Prayer Book of Edward VI. The Queen was in favor of the first, but she was obliged to give way, and a compromise was made, by which the services were to be in conformity with the second Prayer Book, with certain alterations; but the ornaments of the church, whether those worn or those otherwise used by the minister, were to be according to the first Prayer Book. In conformity with this arrangement the Act 1 Elizabeth, chap. 2, was passed, by which the use of the second Prayer Book was established; but it was provided "that such ornaments of the Church and of the ministers thereof shall be retained and be in use as was in this Church of England by authority of Parliament in the second year of the reign of King Edward VI., until other order taken therein by the authority of the Queen's Majesty," with such advice as therein mentioned. The rubric to the new Prayer Book, framed to express the meaning of this proviso, is in these words:—

"And here is to be noted that the minister at the time of the Communion, and at all other times of his ministration, shall use such ornaments in the church as are in use by authority of Parliament in the second year of the reign of King Edward VI., according to the Act of Parliament set forth in the beginning of this book."

Here the term "ornaments" is used as covering both the vestments of the ministers and the several articles used in the services: it is confined to such things as in the performance of the services the minister was to use. It will be observed that this rubric does not adopt precisely the language of the statute, but expresses the same thing in other words. The statute says such ornaments *of* the church and of the ministers "thereof shall be retained and be in use:" the rubric, "that the minister shall use such ornaments *in* the church." The rubric to the Prayer Book of January 1, 1604, adopts the language of the rubric of

Elizabeth. The rubric to the present Prayer Book adopts the language of the statute of Elizabeth; but they all obviously mean the same thing, that the same dresses and the same utensils or articles which were used under the first Prayer Book of Edward VI. may still be used. None of them, therefore, can have any reference to articles not used in the services, but set up in churches as ornaments, in the sense of decorations.

It was urged at the bar that the present rubric, which refers to the second year of Edward VI., cannot mean ornaments mentioned in the first Prayer Book, because, as it is said, that Act was probably not passed, and the Prayer Book was certainly not in use, till after the expiration of the second year of Edward VI.; and that, therefore the words "by authority of Parliament" must mean by virtue of canons or Royal injunctions having the authority of Parliament made at an earlier period. There seems no reason to doubt that the Act in question received the Royal assent in the second year of Edward VI. It concerned a matter of great urgency which had been long under consideration, and it was the first Act of the session, it passed through one House of Parliament on January 15, 1549, N.S., and the other on the 21st of the same month; and the second year of the reign of Edward VI. did not expire till January 28th. A missive of the Council to the Bishops, dated March 13, 1549, N.S., speaks of it as an Act passed at the Parliament lately holden at Westminster; and in the Act of the 5th and 6th Edward VI., chap. 1, sec. 5, it is expressly referred to as the Act "made in the second year of the King's Majesty's reign." Upon this point therefore, no difficulty can arise. It is very true the new Prayer Book could not come into use until after the expiration of that year, because time must be allowed for printing and distributing the books; but its use, and the injunctions contained in it, were established by authority of Parliament in the second year of Edward VI., and this is the plain meaning of the rubric.

It was contended by Mr. Stephens, in a very able argument, that the canons passed in the reign of Henry VIII. had no parliamentary authority in the reign of Edward VI., for that the true meaning of the statutes relating to that subject, passed in the reign of Henry VIII., is, that they provide for the review of the existing canons by commissioners appointed by the King,

and give authority to those canons only in the meantime, *i.e.*, during the continuance of the commission; that the commissioners never made any report; that the commissions determined by the death of King Henry VIII.; and that the parliamentary sanction given to the canons ended at the same time. If it were necessary to determine this point, their lordships think this argument might deserve serious consideration, although it is contrary to the general impression which has prevailed upon the subject.

As, however, their lordships entertain no doubt whatever as to the meaning of the words "authority of Parliament" used in the rubric, it is useless to enter further into the question. Their lordships, therefore, are of opinion that, although the rubric excluded all use of crosses in the services, the general question of crosses not used in the services, but employed only as decorations of churches, is entirely unaffected by the rubric. If crosses of the latter description were in use in the second year of Edward VI., they derive no protection from the rubric; if they were lawfully in use they are not excluded by the rubric, though they might not have the sanction of the authority of Parliament.

The next question is, are crosses forbidden under the term "images" in the Injunctions and Act of Parliament relied on by Sir John Dodson? It is laid down in the judgment, and was strongly pressed at the bar, that the term "images" may apply to crosses; that "imagines crucis" are often mentioned, as well as "imagines crucifixi, et sanctorum;" that the cross, at the accession of Henry VIII., was itself an object of superstitious worship in the Roman Catholic Church; that two services in its honor are found in the Roman Catholic missal; that it was abused like other images, and was abolished like other images. It is impossible to deny that crosses are frequently spoken of amongst images. The Articles concerning laudable ceremonies, published by Henry VIII. in 1536, under the head "Of Images," declare that the worship is only to be done "to God, although it be done before the images, whether it be of Christ, of the Cross, of our Ladye, or of any other Saint beside." (1 Lloyd's Formularies, xxviii). And passages to the same effect are to be found in other contemporary documents.

But the result of the best examination which their lordships

have been able to make is, that the term "image," though it may be extended by the context, is generally to be understood in a more limited sense. Although it is true that crosses have been abused as well as crucifixes and images of saints, it must be remembered that there is a wide difference between the cross and the images of saints, and even, though in a less degree, between a cross and a crucifix. A cross was used as a symbol of Christianity for two or three centuries before either crucifixes or images were introduced: it was used for ages before the Reformation, and has continued ever since to be used as an ensign of honor, as an ornament both of buildings and persons, ecclesiastical and civil, public and private, without any relation to superstitious or even to religious usages. That this was the view taken by some of the early reformers will sufficiently appear by a letter of Cassander, to be presently mentioned.

The distinction between the cross and images is still more marked. Though in process of time the cross was transformed into a crucifix, or itself became the object of adoration, it was the memorial of a real event, the most momentous that ever happened in the history of the world, and was worshipped, however erroneously, only in connexion with that Being to whom all worship is due. The images of the saints, on the other hand, were often connected (to use the language of some of the writings to which we must refer) "with lying legends and feigned miracles;" and it might well be that the worship and invocation of saints should be abolished, and the images connected with that practice be swept away, while the cross was retained with the faith of which it was an emblem.

The important question, however, is not what it was reasonable to do, but what in fact was done by the regulations for the removal of images. The first set of injunctions of Edward VI. were issued in the first year of his reign, some time, as it was said, between the months of May and August 1547, (Cardw., Doc. Ann. p. 4). By these injunctions the clergy were bound to teach the people that all the usurped authority of the Bishop of Rome has been justly abolished. They are not to extol any images, relics, or miracles for any superstition or lucre, nor allure the people by any enticements to the pilgrimage of any saint or image; they are to teach that "works devised by men's fantasies, besides Scripture was, wandering to pilgrimages, offering of

money, candles, or tapers to relics or images, or kissing and licking of the same, praying upon beads or such like superstition, have not only no promise of reward in Scripture for doing of them; but contrariwise, great threats and maledictions of God, for that they are things tending to idolatry and superstition." The third item is in these words:—

"That such images as they know in any of their cures to be or have been so abused with pilgrimage or offerings of anything made thereunto, or shall be hereafter censured unto, they (and none other private persons) shall, for the avoiding of that most detestable offence of idolatry, forthwith take down, or cause to be taken down, and destroy the same; and shall suffer from henceforth no torches nor candles, tapers, or images of wax to be set afore any image or picture; but only two lights upon the high altar, before the Sacrament, which, for the signification that Christ is the very true light of the world, they shall suffer to remain still: admonishing their parishioners that images serve for no other purpose but to be a remembrance, whereby men may be admonished of the holy lives and conversation of them that the said images do represent; which images if they do abuse for any other intent, they commit idolatry in the same, to the great danger of their souls."

It is clear that in this passage, images are spoken of as images of persons, and that only such images of any kind as had been or should be the object of superstitious worship, were to be removed; and it shows that the high altar was to remain as it had been before, with lights upon it, before the Sacrament. The nineteenth item, provides "that no person shall change the order or manner of any fasting day that is commanded, nor of common prayer, or Divine service, otherwise than is specified in these injunctions, until such time as the same shall be otherwise ordered by the King's authority." The 21st provides for reading certain portions of Scripture in English in the time of High Mass. The 28th is in these terms:—

"Also, that they shall take away, utterly extinct and destroy all shrines, covering of shrines, all tables, candlesticks, trindles or rolls of wax, pictures, paintings and all other monuments of feigned miracles, pilgrimages, idolatry, and superstition: so that there remain no memory of the same in walls, glass windows, or elsewhere within their churches or houses. And they

shall exhort all their parishioners to do the like within their several houses. And that the churchwardens, at the common charge of the parishioners in every church, shall provide a comely and honest pulpit to be set in a convenient place within the same, for the preaching of God's Word."

If this section be read in connexion with those which precede it, it is obvious that it applies only to articles which had been the object of feigned miracles, pilgrimages, idolatry, and superstition, and at all events, could not include either crosses or images which had not been so abused, and which, by the previous injunctions, were to be retained; and, as regards the cross itself, its use was not only permitted, but enjoined, as the old services which required it were retained. The section could not mean that all candlesticks should be removed from churches, for two were to be retained on the High Altar. Still less could it mean that all Tables, candlesticks, and pictures should be removed from private houses. That this is the true meaning of the injunctions is further shown by the Articles of Visitation, in which inquiry was to be made, whether they had been obeyed. The article applicable to this subject is as follows—

"Whether there do remain not taken down in your churches, chapels, or elsewhere, any misused images, with pilgrimages, cloths, stones, shoes, offerings, kissings, candlesticks, trindles of wax, and such other like; and whether there do remain not delaid and destroyed any shrines, covering of shrines, or any other monument of idolatry, superstition and hypocrisy."—(Cardw., Doc. Ann., p. 25.)

Another inquiry is—

"Whether they which have spoken and declared anything for the setting forth of pilgrimages, feigned relics, images, or any such superstition, have not openly recanted the same."—(Cardw., Doc. Ann., p. 27.)

The object of these injunctions appears to have been to abolish the worship or superstitious veneration of images and relics, but they left entirely untouched the service of High Mass, and made no declaration as to the nature of the sacrament then administered. Indeed a subsequent proclamation of the King, dated the 27th of December, 1547, forbids any discussion of the doctrine of the Real Presence until the King should define the doctrine. On the 6th of February, 1547, N.S.,

the King issued a proclamation by which punishment was denounced against such persons as should of their private mind "omit, leave done, change, alter, or innovate any order, rite, or ceremony commonly used and frequented in the Church of England, and not commanded to be left done" in the reign of the late King, other than such as Edward VI., in manner therein mentioned, had ordered or should order to be altered; provided always that no man should be punished for omitting certain particular observances therein mentioned, and, among others, for "not creeping to the cross."

The ceremony of creeping to the cross seems to be explained by a constitution of Giles de Bridport, Bishop of Sarum, A.D. 1246 (Wilkins' "Concilia," vol. i., p. 713), which provides that on the day of our Saviour's Passion all the parishioners "shall come to worship the cross and to offer according to their inclination." In Strype's "Memorials of Cranmer" the practice is alluded to in these terms:—"And because creeping to the cross was a greater abuse than any of the other (for there the people said, 'Crucem tuam adoramus Domine,' and the Ordinal saith, 'Procedant clerici ad crucem adorandum nudis pedibus,' and it followeth in the said Ordinal, 'Ponatur crux ante aliquod altare, ubi a populo adoretur,' (which by the Bishop's book, entituled 'A Necessary Instruction,' is against the Second Commandment); therefore he, (the Archbishop,) desired of the King that the creeping to the cross might also cease hereafter" (Strype's "Mem.," vol. i., p. 299). It is plain, therefore, that up to this time the use of the cross was permitted, though misused images were, in the strongest and most general terms forbidden. On the 21st of February, 1548, N.S., however, another proclamation was issued, upon the authority of which it is contended that all images, including crosses, were to be taken down. It is in these terms:—

"After our right hartye recommendations to your good lordship; where now of late in the King's Majesties visitation, amonge other godlye injunctions commanded to be generally observed throughe all partes of this his Highnes realme, one wes set forthe, for the taking downe of all suche images, as had at any tyme ben abused with pilgrimages, offeringes, or censinges; albeit that this said injunction hath in many partes of the realme been wel and quyetye obeyed and executed, yet in many other places much stryfe and contentyon hath rysen and dayly ryseth, and

more and more increaseth, about the execution of the same, some men beyng so superstytyous or rayther wylfull, as they wold by theyre good wylles retayne all suche images styлле, although they have been mooste manyfestlye abused, and in some places also the images whiche by the said injunctions were taken downe, be now restored and set up againe, and almost in every place ys contentyon for images, whether they have been abused or not; and whiles these men go about on both sides contentyouslye to obtaine theyr mindes, contending whether this or that imaege hath been offiered unto, kyssed, censed, or otherwysе abused, partyes have in some places ben taken in suche sorte, as further inconvenyence is very like to ensue, yf remedie be not provided in tyme: considering therefore that allmost in no places of this realme ys any sure quyetness, but where all images be hooly taken awaye and pulled downe already, to the intent that all contentyon in everye parte of this realme for this matter may be clerely taken away, and that the lyvely images of Chryste shulde not contende for the deade images, whiche be things not necessary, and without whiche the churches of Christ contynued most godlye many yeres. We have thought good to signify unto you, that his highnes pleasure, with th' advyse and consent of us the lord protectour and the reste of the counsell ys, that immediately upon the sight herof, with as convenyent dilligence as you maye, you shall not onely gyve ordre, that all the images remayninge in any churche or chappell within your diocese be removed and taken away, but also by your letters signifye unto the reste of the Busshopes within your provynce his highnesse pleasure for the lyke order to be gyven by them and every of them, within their severall dioceses; and in th' execution therof we requyre bothe you and the reste of the Busshopes foresayd, to use suche foresight as the same may be quyetlye donne with as good satisfaction of the people as may be."

It appears to their lordships that this proclamation applies only to such images as are the subject of the former proclamation, and that the intention was not to introduce within the prohibition, articles of a description not before forbidden, but to do away with the distinction between images which had been, and images which had not been, abused. This proclamation, any more than the former, could not apply to crosses, for the old

services were still in use. The Act establishing the new Book of Common Prayer did not pass till near a twelvemonth afterwards, and that Act itself provides that for a certain time after its date the old ceremonies should continue.

This is confirmed by the proclamation issued on the 13th of May, 1548, by which clergymen were enjoined to teach the people on the one hand "to flee all old erroneous superstitions, as the confidence in pardons, pilgrimages, beads, religious images, and other such of the Bishop of Rome's traditions and superstitions, with his usurped power, the which things be here in this realm most justly abolished;" and then, on the other hand, straitly to rebuke those "who will take upon them to run before they be sent, to go before the rulers, to alter and change things in religion without authority." It is declared that it "is not a private man's duty to alter ceremonies, to innovate orders in the church, nor yet is it not a preacher's part to bring that into contempt and hatred which the prince doth either allow or is content to suffer."—(Cardwell, *Doc. Ann. 1.*, p. 65).

The next authority relied on is the 3rd and 4th Edward VI., chap. 10, entituled "An Act for the Abolishing and Putting Away Divers Books and Images." The object of this Act was to enforce the observance of the new Prayer Book, and of former orders with respect to images. After enacting that all Antiphonals and other books of the services of the Church, other than the authorised Prayer Book shall be utterly abolished, it proceeds to enact, that if any person shall have such books in his possession, or any images of stone, timber, alabaster, or earth, graven, carved, or painted, which heretofore have been taken out of any church or chapel, or shall stand in any church or chapel, and do not before the last day of June then next ensuing, deface and destroy the images, and deliver up the books for the purpose of being destroyed, such persons failing to deliver up the books shall be subject to certain penalties, but it inflicts no penalty on persons failing to deface or destroy the images, nor does it in terms order their destruction or defacement.

No doubt, however, it implies that to retain them is illegal, but it relates in their lordships' opinion, to the destruction of images already ordered to be removed, but which either had not been removed, or, having been so, were still retained for private

eneration and worship ; and the images so described, for the reasons already assigned, cannot include crosses. The letter of King Edward VI. to Craumer, directing him to give effect to this Act, refers only to books, saying nothing as to images. Thus, matters remained as regarded the law upon the subject now in question, until the end of the reign of Edward VI., for although most important alterations were made in the order of Divine service by the 5th and 6th of Edward VI., chap. 1, and the new Prayer Book thereby introduced, they apply only, like the former Prayer Book, to that which was to be used in the services and rites of the Church.

But although their lordships are of opinion that the law did not require the removal from churches of crosses, merely as such, both Books of Common Prayer had excluded them from use in the services. They were no longer to be employed ; and nothing is more probable, therefore, than that if they could be turned to any profit, they would be made the subject either of sale or robbery, and that in the popular disturbances which accompanied the great change in the religion of the nation, and in many cases anticipated and outran the acts of the Government, crosses would share the fate of images ; so that between the fanaticism of the populace, and the cupidity of the courtiers, the ornaments of the churches, in every sense of that term, would be subject to spoliation and destruction.

We find, indeed, by the injunction of the Council of the 30th of April, 1548, already referred to, that even at this early period such proceedings were going on, for that letter expressly forbids the sale or alienation of the chalices, silver crosses, bells, or other ornaments, which it declares were not given for that purpose to be alienated by parishes at their pleasure, but rather to be used to the intent they were first given, or to some other necessary and convenient service of the church. Under these circumstances it cannot be matter of surprise if comparatively few crosses remained either standing in the churches or preserved in the repositories of its ornaments. On the accession of Queen Mary all the old superstitions were restored and the Acts of Parliament to which we have referred were repealed. The images which had not been taken down remained, and many which had been taken down were restored. On the accession of Elizabeth, in the year 1558, the statutes of Queen



the churches, whether of Christ Himself or of the Saints, had come into use; that on the destruction of all monuments of idolatry, by which everything was defiled, the figure of the cross, which was, as it were, a sacred symbol of Christianity, succeeded under better auspices into their places. And like as the word Cross, in the writings of the Evangelists and Apostles, mystically signifies the passion, death, and triumph of Christ, and the afflictions of the Saints; so also by the figure of the cross, everywhere set up, and meeting the eye, they intended all these things to be set forth, as it were, by a mystic symbol, and infixed in men's minds: wherefore they made a great distinction between the figure or representation of the cross, and all other images."

Of the Cross thus used Cassander signifies his approval. That many of the English Bishops objected both to crosses and crucifixes, and either ordered or sanctioned their removal from churches within their dioceses, and that in many others they were defaced or destroyed by the violence of the people, can admit of no doubt; and that this violence extended also to monuments in churches, appears by a proclamation issued by Queen Elizabeth against defacers of monuments in the year 1560; for it speaks of these proceedings as "to the slander of such as either gave or had charge in times past had only to deface monuments of idolatry and false feigned images in churches and abbeys;" expressions which tend strongly to confirm the meaning their lordships have already attributed to the Injunctions and Acts of Parliament of Edward VI.

Upon the whole, their lordships, after the most anxious consideration, have come to the conclusion that crosses, as distinguished from crucifixes, have been in use as ornaments of churches, from the earliest periods of Christianity; that when used as mere emblems of the Christian faith, and not as objects of superstitious reverence, they may still lawfully be erected as architectural decorations of churches; that the wooden cross erected on the chancel screen of S. Barnabas is to be considered as a mere architectural ornament; and that as to this article they must advise Her Majesty to reverse the judgment complained of. Their lordships hope and believe that the laws in force respecting the consecration of any building for a church, and which forbid any subsequent alteration without a faculty from

the ordinary, will be sufficient to prevent any abuse in this respect.

THE ALTAR AND ALTAR CROSS AT S. BARNABAS.

This decision, however, by no means disposes of the question as to crosses attached to communion tables, which it will be convenient to deal with in connexion with the altar at S. Barnabas, which is ordered to be removed. This article of church furniture consists of a marble slab, with a super-altare on the side nearest to the wall of the chapel. It stands apart from the wall supported upon stone carved arches, the arches resting upon a stone plinth, which is let into and embedded in the pavement on which it stands. The cross is attached to the super-altare, and stands between two large candlesticks which are moveable. The question is whether this structure is a communion table within the meaning of the law.

The appellants in their pleadings, term these tables, "altars or communion tables;" and in the argument they have referred to two recent statutes, in which the word "altar" is used to signify the "communion" table. When the same thing is signified, it may not be of much importance by what name it is called; but the distinction between an "altar" and a "communion table" is in itself essential and deeply founded, in the most important difference in matters of faith between Protestants and Romanists,—viz., in the different notions of the nature of the Lord's Supper which prevailed in the Roman Catholic Church at the time of the Reformation and those who were introduced by the Reformers. By the former it was considered as a sacrifice of the Body and Blood of the Saviour. The Altar was the place on which the sacrifice was to be made: the elements were to be consecrated, and, being so consecrated, were treated as the actual Body and Blood of the Victim. The Reformers, on the other hand, considered the Holy Communion not as a sacrifice but as a feast, to be celebrated at the Lord's table; though as to the consecration of the elements, and the effect of this consecration, and several other points, they differed greatly among themselves.

This distinction is well pointed out in Cudworth's "Discourse Concerning the True Nature of the Lord's Supper," c. 5, p. 27:—

“We see then how that theological controversy which hath cost so many disputes, whēther the Lord’s Supper be a sacrifice, is already decided ; for it is not ‘sacrificium,’ but ‘epulum ;’ not a sacrifice, but a feast upon sacrifice ; or else, in other words, not ‘oblatio sacrificii,’ but, as Tertullian excellently speaks, ‘participatio sacrificii ;’ not the offering of something up to God upon an altar, but the eating of something which comes from God’s altar, and is set upon our tables. Neither was it ever known among the Jews or Heathens that those tables upon which they did eat their sacrifices should be called by the name of Altars. Therefore he (S. Paul) must needs call the Communion Table by the name of the Lord’s Table, *i. e.*, the Table upon which God’s meat is eaten, not His altar upon which it is offered.”

That the Roman Catholic altars are constructed with a view to this doctrine of sacrifice, admits of no doubt. Cardinal Bona speaks of them in these terms: “De Altaribus Novi Testamenti agendum est in quibus Corporis et Sanguinis Christi sacrificium incruentum immolatur.”—(Lib. i. chap. 20.) With respect to the question what is required to constitute a Roman Catholic altar, we have been furnished with valuable information by a treatise entitled “Institutiones Liturgicæ ad usum Seminarii Romani,” by Fornici; the present text-book of the Pope’s Seminary. In the first part, “De Sacrificio Missæ,” chap. 3, page 18, “De Altari ejusque ornatu,” it is laid down, in the first place, “Nunquam extra altare hostiam immolari.” It is then stated that altars originally were made indifferently of wood or stone, but that many centuries ago the Church ordered that they should be made only of stone. The term “Altar” is thus explained: “Nomine autem altaris intelligitur superficies plana ad sacrificium Missæ immediate deputata.” The Altar is to be in the church ; it is to be fixed and immovable, “immobile œdificatum seu fixum super suis pedibus, seu base quod habet totam integram planitiem seu mensam superiorem ;” and it is required to be “lapideum, et ab Episcopo consecratum.” The treatise then proceeds to state that by most ancient usage, as early as the Council of Tours, in the year 567, the standard of the cross, “Vexillum Crucis,” was to be placed in the middle of the Altar ; it states that by the term “cross” is meant “the crucifix ;” and it refers to two compara-

tively modern declarations on the subject by the Holy See, one in 1746, and another in 1822, by which orders are given with respect to the size and position of the crucifix on the Altar. It then refers to the lights upon the Altar; "Ad utrumque crucis latus cereum in Missæ sacrificio accendi jubet ecclesia," p. 21; and it refers to the rubric, by which it is ordered: "Collocetur crux et candelabra saltem duo." Such, then, as regards its form, is the Roman Catholic Altar. A stone structure fixed in the church, and immoveable, with a plane surface, or mensa, on which the unbloody sacrifice ("sacrificium incruentum") may be offered; on which the Host and the Cup—"Hostia et Calix"—may be placed with a crucifix, and two candlesticks, as essential adjuncts to it.

At the date of the first Prayer Book of Edward VI. the doctrine of the English Church as to the Real Presence and the nature of the Holy Communion was undecided; the book, therefore, enjoined no change in the form of the altar, but spoke of the rite itself as the Lord's Supper, commonly called the High Mass, and of the structure indifferently by the names of the "Altar" and the "Lord's table." It contains a prayer for the consecration of the sacred elements, in which the sign of the cross is to be used. The bread is to be unleavened, and round as it was aforetime. The corporal, the paten, the chalice, the vestments, are all articles directed to be used in the Roman Catholic Ritual, and spoken of by those names in the Missal.

But, by the time when the second Prayer Book was introduced, a great change had taken place in the opinion of the English Church, and the consequence was, that on the revision of the service, these several matters were completely altered; the use of a surplice was substituted for the several vestments previously enjoined; the prayer for consecration of the elements was omitted, though in the present Prayer Book it is restored.\* The bread and wine delivered to the communicants were no longer described as the Body and Blood of Christ, as was the case in the first Prayer Book; the Table was no longer spoken of as the Altar, but as the Lord's table, or as God's board; and the

\* The sentence was thus erroneously delivered in the Judgment; but was afterwards corrected in the authorized report, edited by Mr. E. F. Moore, to the following, "material alterations were introduced in the prayer of consecration."

Table is to have, at the time of the Communion, a fair white linen cloth upon it, and is to stand in the body of the church, or in the chancel, where Morning Prayer and Evening Prayer are appointed to be said. And it is declared by the rubric, that "to take away the superstition which any person hath, or might have, in the bread and wine, it shall suffice that the bread be such as is usual to be eaten at the table with other meals, but the best and purest wheaten bread that conveniently may be gotten. And if any of the bread and wine remain, the curate shall have it to his own use."

The distinction between the Supper of the Lord and the Sacrifice of the Mass, is set forth with great precision in the Articles agreed upon in Convocation in the year 1562, soon after the accession of Queen Elizabeth, and which still form the Articles of the Church of England. The 28th Article, "Of the Lord's Supper," contains this clause.

"The Supper of the Lord is not only a sign of the love that Christians ought to have among themselves one to another; but rather is a Sacrament of our redemption by Christ's death; in-somuch that to such as rightly, worthily, and with faith, receive the same, the Bread which we break is a partaking of the Body of Christ, and likewise the Cup of Blessing is a partaking of the Blood of Christ." The article then contains a declaration against transubstantiation; and Article 31, entitled, "Of the one oblation of Christ finished upon the cross," declares that "the sacrifice of Masses, in the which it was commonly said that the Priest did offer Christ for the quick and the dead, to have remission of pain or guilt, were blasphemous fables, and dangerous deceits."

This change in the view taken of the nature of the Sacrament, naturally called for a corresponding change in the ancient altar. It was no longer to be an altar of sacrifice, but merely a table, at which the communicants were to partake of the Lord's Supper. Accordingly, it appears that, with or without sufficient authority, such change had been carried into effect in the majority of churches before the Act of 5 and 6 of Edward VI. was passed.

At his visitation in 1550, Bishop Ridley issued injunctions, in which, after forbidding the use of superaltaries, he introduces, among other directions, the following item:—

“Whereas in divers places some use the Lord’s board after the form of a Table, and some as an Altar, whereby dissension is perceived to arise among the unlearned; therefore wishing a godly unity to be observed in all our diocese; and for that the form of a table may more move and turn the simple from the old superstitious opinions of the Popish Mass, and to the right use of the Lord’s Supper, we exhort the curates, churchwardens, and questmen here present to erect and set up the Lord’s board after the form of an honest table decently covered, in such place of the quire or chancel as shall be thought most meet by their discretion and agreement, so that the ministers, with the communicants may have their place separated from the rest of the people; and to take down or abolish all other by-altars or tables.” (Cardw., Doc. Ann., p. 94.)

This injunction extended only to Ridley’s own diocese, and probably had no binding force even there; but an order was afterwards, in the month of November in the same year, issued by the King’s Council to Ridley and the other Bishops, reciting that in most of the churches the altars were already taken down, and ordering that those which still remained should be taken down, and tables substituted. (Cardw. Doc., Ann., p. 100.) Bishop Burnet remarks upon those changes, that the reasons for them were to remove the people from the superstitious opinions of the Popish Mass, and that a table was a more proper name than an altar for that on which the Sacrament was laid. He says:—

“It was observed that altars were erected for the sacrifices under the law, which ceasing they also were to cease, and that Christ had instituted the Sacrament, not at an altar, but a table, and it had been ordered by the preface to the Book of Common Prayer, that if any doubt arose about any part of it, the determining of it should be referred to the Bishop of the diocese. Upon these reasons, therefore, was this change ordered to be made in all England, which was universally executed this year. (Burnet, “Hist. of Ref.,” vol. ii. page 95; “Faulkner v. Lichfield,” 3 Notes of Cas. 555).

By the injunctions of Queen Elizabeth, issued in the first year of her reign—(Cardw., Doc. Ann., p. 210) it is ordered—“that the holy table in every church be decently made, and set in the place, where the altar stood, and there commonly

covered, as thereto belongeth, and as shall be appointed by the visitors, and so to stand, saving when the communion of the sacrament is to be distributed; at which time the same shall be so placed in good sort within the chancel, as whereby the minister may be more conveniently heard of the communicants in his prayer and ministration, and the communicants also more conveniently, and in more number, communicate with the said minister. And after the communion done, from time to time the same holy table to be placed where it stood before."

These injunctions plainly show that the communion of the Lord's Supper was to be held at a table, as distinguished from an altar, a table in the ordinary meaning of that term; that as by the rubric the bread used was to be "the ordinary bread eaten at table with other meats," so the table was to be of the character of those employed on such occasions; that it was not only to be moveable, but was from time to time to be moved. The 82nd canon of 1604, that which is now in force, introduces no material alterations; it assumes the existence in all churches of convenient and decent tables for the celebration of the Holy Communion, and provides that they shall be kept in repair. It orders that the table be covered in time of Divine Service with a carpet of silk or other decent stuff thought meet by the ordinary, and at the time of the ministration with a fair linen cloth as becometh that table. Since this period no alteration has been made in the law with respect to the nature of the table to be used. The rubric of the present Prayer Book provides only that at the communion time, the table, having a fair white linen cloth upon it, shall stand in the body of the church or chancel, where Morning and Evening Prayer are appointed to be said; and the priest is to commence the service standing at the north side of the table. The term "altar" is never used to describe it, and there is an express declaration at the close of the service against the doctrine of transubstantiation, with which the ideas of an altar and sacrifice are closely connected."

Under these circumstances, the first question is, whether the stone structure at S. Barnabas is a communion table within the meaning of the canons and the rubric; and their Lordships are clearly of opinion that it is not. The case is within the principle of Sir H. Jenner Fust's decision, in "*Faulkner v. Lich-*

field, (3 Notes of Cases, 555); from which indeed the present proceeding is in effect an appeal. In the elaborate judgment in that case, the whole subject is discussed with a learning and ability which make it useless on the present occasion to go further than their Lordships have already done into the authorities. The decree complained of in the appeal of "Liddell v. Beal," has ordered the church or chapelwardens of S. Barnabas to remove the present structure of stone used as a communion table, and to provide instead thereof a moveable table of wood. Their Lordships had at first some doubt whether the law had prescribed of what material the table should be made; but on further consideration, they are satisfied that the opinion expressed by Sir H. Jenner Fust, and adopted in the decree in this case, is well founded.

The term "table," and the corresponding Latin word "mensa," especially when it is considered for what purpose it was to be used, naturally import a table of the material of which tables are ordinarily made. The communion table was to be provided by the parish, was to be moveable, not by machinery, but by hand, and was actually to be very frequently moved. Wood is a lighter and cheaper material than stone, and the circumstance that the old altar was necessarily of stone would be an additional reason with the Reformers for requiring that the table should be of wood. The canons of 1571, expressly provide that it shall be of that material—"mensa ex asseribus compositè juncta;" and although those canons, not having received the royal assent, were not of themselves of binding force, it is probable that they were generally acted upon, and they sufficiently show what was at that time understood to be the proper material of the table which, under the Act of Elizabeth and the regulations of Edward VI., was to be substituted for the altar. The canons of 1604, which are now in force, do not contain any provision upon this point. They speak of the communion tables as things which already exist in parish churches, and provide for their repair, and give minute directions as to the covering to be used. If any doubt had existed at that time as to the material of the table itself, it is not probable that the canons would have omitted all notice of this question. Their Lordships, therefore, are satisfied that the decision upon this point in "Faulkner v. Lichfield," is well

founded, and they must advise Her Majesty that the decree as to the removal of the stone structure at S. Barnabas, and the cross upon it, and the substitution of a communion table of wood, ought to be affirmed.

#### THE ALTAR CROSS AT S. PAUL'S.

Next, with respect to the wooden cross attached to the communion table at S. Paul's. Their Lordships have already declared their opinion that the communion table intended by the Canon was a table in the ordinary sense of the word, flat and moveable, capable of being covered with a cloth, at which, or around which, the communicants might be placed in order to partake of the Lord's Supper, and the question is, whether the existence of a cross attached to the table is consistent either with the spirit or with the letter of those regulations. Their Lordships are clearly of opinion that it is not; and they must recommend that upon this point also the decree complained of should be affirmed. It may be urged, and indeed was urged with great force by counsel at the bar, that in modern usage the communion table never, in fact, is moved; that the general adoption of rails to fence off the table from the rest of the church shows that its removal is never contemplated; and that if it is not to be moved, it is useless to require it to be moveable; that if it be in such a form that a sufficient portion of it may be covered with a fair linen cloth to receive the sacred elements, it is idle to insist on the whole being capable of being covered. To these observations the answer is, that the distinction between an altar and a table is in itself essential; that the circumstances, therefore, which constitute the distinction, however trifling in themselves are for that reason important; and that when positive rules are established by law, courts of justice, when called into action by parties entitled to maintain the suit, are bound to enforce the law as they find it, leaving it to the Legislature, if it see fit, in any manner to alter it.

#### THE CREDESCENCE TABLE.

The next question is, as to the Credence Tables. Here the rubrics of the Prayer Book become important. Their Lordships entirely agree with the opinions expressed by the learned judges

in these cases, and in "Faulkner v. Litchfield," that in the performance of the services, rites, and ceremonies ordered by the Prayer Book, the directions contained in it must be strictly observed; that no omission and no addition can be permitted; but they are not prepared to hold that the use of all articles not expressly mentioned in the rubric, although quite consistent with, and even subsidiary to the service, is forbidden. Organs are not mentioned, yet because they are auxiliary to the singing, they are allowed. Pews, cushions to kneel upon, pulpit cloths, hassocks, seats by the communion table, are in constant use, yet they are not mentioned in the rubric. Now, what is a Credence Table? It is simply a small side-table, on which the bread and wine are placed before the consecration, having no connexion with any superstitious usage of the Church of Rome. Their removal has been ordered on the ground that they are adjuncts to an altar; their Lordships cannot but think that they are more properly to be regarded as adjuncts to a communion table. The rubric directs that, at a certain point in the course of the communion service (for this is, no doubt, the true meaning of the rubric) the minister shall place the bread and wine on the communion table, but where they are to be placed previously is nowhere stated. In practice they are usually placed on the communion table before the commencement of the service, but this certainly is not according to the order prescribed. Nothing seems to be less objectionable than a small side table, from which they may be conveniently reached by the officiating minister, and at the proper time transferred to the communion table. As to the credence tables their Lordships, therefore, must advise a reversal of the sentence complained of.

#### THE ALTAR CLOTHS.

Next, as to the embroidered cloths, it is said that the canon orders a covering of silk, or of some other proper material, but that it does not mention, and therefore, by implication excludes more than one covering. Their Lordships are unable to adopt this construction. An order that a table shall always be covered with a cloth surely does not imply that it shall always be covered with the same cloth or with a cloth of the same color or texture. The object of this canon seems to be to secure a cloth

of a sufficiently handsome description, not to guard against too much splendor. In practice, as was justly observed at the bar, black cloths are in many churches used during Lent, and on the death of the Sovereign, and some other occasions, and there seems nothing objectionable in the practice. Whether the cloths so used are suitable, or not, is a matter to be left to the discretion of the Ordinary. In this case their Lordships do not see any sufficient reason for interference, and they must, therefore, advise the reversal of the sentence as to the cloths used for the covering of the Lord's Table during the time of Divine service, both with respect to S. Paul's and to S. Barnabas.

The last question is, with respect to the embroidered linen and lace used on the communion table at the time of the ministration of the Holy Communion. The Rubric and the Canon prescribe the use of a fair white linen cloth, and both the learned judges in the Court below have been of opinion that embroidery and lace are not consistent with the meaning of that expression, having regard to the nature of the table upon which the cloth is to be used. Although their Lordships are not disposed in any case to restrict within narrower limits than the law has imposed, the discretion which, within those limits, is justly allowed to congregations by the rules both of the Ecclesiastical and the Common Law Courts, the directions of the Rubric must be complied with; and upon the whole their Lordships do not dissent from the construction of the Rubric adopted by the present decree upon this point; and they must, therefore, advise Her Majesty to affirm it. As the judgments in these cases have been materially altered, and such alterations ought to have been made at the hearing in the Arches Court, so much of the sentence of that Court in each case as awards costs against the appellants must of course be reversed; and in those proceedings, as well as in the present appeals, each party must bear their own costs.

In the case of "Gorham v. the Bishop of Exeter," when a difference of opinion as to the judgment existed amongst the the Prelates who attended at the hearing, it was thought proper publicly to announce such difference. In the present case it is satisfactory to their Lordships to be able to state, that *both the Archbishop of Canterbury and the Bishop of London concur in the judgment which has just been delivered.*"

At the commencement of this year, the 'Union' made its appearance, startling not a little the unconscious Puseyite, who was horrified at the ultra-tone adopted by the new organ of the advanced guard of the Transitionist party, affecting, as it did, a 'union' of the three branches of the Church Catholic, *i. e.* the 'union' of Christ with Belial,—the conjunction of light and darkness. In this extraordinary, untenable, and dangerous notion they were encouraged by Mr. A. Lisle Phillipps, who, not being a convert *from* the Tractarian movement, was unable to see the mischief he was causing by delaying the reconciliation of souls, and still keeping them in that system of falsehood and deception in which they had, alas! too long cradled themselves. Mr. Phillipps proposed a convocation at Paris, of the most learned Greek and Latin Theologians with the most learned Divines of the Anglican Church, to lay down certain preliminaries as a basis for further operations. "For 'union' to be lasting, says Mr. Phillipps, every least point must be maturely weighed, and a perfect concert owned, not only by the Ecclesiastical Superiors on all sides, but also let me add, by the secular powers of Christendom also. Nothing good can be brought about without the approval and consent of the three greatest Sovereigns of the world,—the Emperor of Russia, the Emperor of France, and the Queen of Great Britain; and on the other hand nothing must be done without the knowledge and approval of Him, whom all 'Christendom practically acknowledges as the Great Head of the Christian Church, our Holy Father, Pope Pius the Ninth.' With Mr. Phillipps others fully agreed, but how any Catholic recollecting the *real*, not *visionary*, position of the Establishment, its division into sects and parties too numerous to detail, its *total* want of Orders, its denial of the Sacraments, its contempt of every thing Catholic, could ever dream of uniting such a heterogeneous mass of contradiction we never could discover. But in consequence of Mr. Phillipps's pamphlet, an Association for the '*promotion of the Unity of Christendom*

*was founded,\** as if Protestantism, in any of its multifarious and multiplex forms had any part, share, or lot, with Christendom, or with 'the Great Head of the Christian Church, our Holy Father Pope Pius the Ninth.'

During the course of the year 1856, a Commission was issued by the Bishop of Exeter, to enquire into a charge against the Rev. C. G. Gorham, Vicar of Bramford Speke, (against whom Mr. St. Leger prayed that that 'Holy Prelate, the "namesake of that chief of the holy army of Martyrs (?) whom Popery tortured but Heaven received,' might have strength to exercise his Apostolic power, that of the keys, and pronounce the sentence of excommunication), accused of brawling in the church on the complaint of one of his Churchwardens. The Commissioners, after hearing the evidence, decided that though there "was very clear proof of indiscreet conduct on the part of Mr. Gorham, it was very uncertain that the legal offence could be established." Mr. Gorham accordingly published a pamphlet in which the 'namesake of the chief of that holy army of Martyrs whom Rome tortured but Heaven received,' is attacked for vexatious and tyrannical conduct.

Mr. Oldknow, Perpetual Curate of Holy Trinity, Bordesley, imagining that it was no difficult matter to prove the validity of Holy Orders in the Church of England,' published a pamphlet on the subject in which he made two statements that caused no slight commotion among the Transitionists. Two Catholic Bishops had acknowledged that the 'Parsons' of the Establishment were genuine Priests, and that the apostate Courayer was correct in asserting that Parker had been validly consecrated.

Mr. Oldknow asserted

1. That Carrol, the first Archbishop of Baltimore had ordered before his death that the clergy of the American Church, should, at his funeral, be received within the

\* Appendix GG.

sanctuary of his Cathedral, *in order to testify his conviction of the validity* of their orders.

2. That Purcell, Archbishop of Cincinnati, and Blanc, Archbishop of New Orleans, having met Dr. Brownell, the (so called) Bishop of Connecticut, had, by assisting in the Anglican service, *i. e.*, by the Archbishop of Cincinnati preaching, and the Archbishop of New Orleans reading the Epistle and Gospel as prescribed by the Anglican Book of Common Prayer, while Dr. Brownell read the service, acknowledged the validity of Protestant Episcopal Orders.

To these allegations of Mr. Oldknow, the Rev. Mr. Wyse replied by the following statements:—

1. The Rev. Father Vespere, S.J., wrote to the Archbishop of Baltimore as follows, from Philadelphia, “I attended the funeral of the Archbishop of Baltimore with the Seminarists, and saw no Protestant Ministers with any badge or exterior appearance of their religious character. I remember that only two or three Episcopalian Ministers, in their secular dress, were with a few gentlemen, in the Sacristy of the Seminary, to see the procession come in, and the placing of the coffin in the vault behind the Altar.”

2. The Archbishop of Cincinnati wrote as follows to Mr. Wyse on the second truthful statement of Mr. Oldknow:—“The facts are, that in the Spring of 1857, the good Arch-bishop of New Orleans and myself, travelled together from that city to attend the Council of Baltimore. On our arrival at Louisville or Cincinnati, having changed boats, we found ourselves in the same steamer with Bishop Brownell and his son. The Bishop of Connecticut did, as is stated in the pamphlet, politely compliment me on the cleverness with which I had lately conducted a public discussion with a dissenting Divine—and let me add that the stereotyped Report of that discussion shows very plainly what I think of the Anglican Schism and Heresy, as well as of every other form of Heresy and unbelief. And if

that Report speak not my mind with sufficient distinctness on the subject of Anglican Orders, I shall further add that, neither I, nor any other Prelate of the Catholic Church—the only true Church of God—in America, believes in the validity of the Orders of the Church of England;” but “it is of course utterly untrue that either the excellent Archbishop of New Orleans, or myself, made the responses to the reading of the Church of England service for Sunday, by the Anglican Bishop of Connecticut. I do not think that the Archbishop heard the service read at all, but rather believe he was on the deck, or in the state room, as I was, while Bishop Brownell was engaged in some kind of Sunday service in the cabin.”\*

Well then may we, with a convert, question the ‘morality of Tractarianism,’ and reflecting on the ‘detestable evasions,’ defiling compromise, the ‘hesitating expressions,’ the ‘vague generalities,’ ask what are we to do? Are we to continue to ‘live in an imitation of Catholicity, playing with things which are not genuine,’ or, are we ‘to think of Rome as our home?’ in vain do those who are not engaged in the strife of Tractarianism with the Church, protest against such conduct;—in vain do those who are not in the van of the battle, and who have no occasion to have recourse to ‘stammering lips,’ stuttering accents, and vague generalities, ask ‘for no more compromise, no more interpretation,’ no ‘more disgraceful and dishonorable subterfuges,’ but ‘for the arrows of truth as the weapons of controversy,’ and to ‘be freed from enforced deceptions.’”

Our readers will probably recollect that at the conclusion of the year 1857, a most disgraceful riot took place at the funeral of Miss Scobell, a Tractarian nun, at S. Margaret’s Home, East Grinstead. Miss Scobell, if we are to believe her father’s statement, was lured, betrayed, and lost to the faith and practice, and name of her Baptism.

\* The Archbishop of New Orleans was on deck at the time while the Anglican Service was being read, saying his office.

In consequence of the revelations made by Mr. Scobell's school mistress (Miss Parker)\* and other circumstances, the Bishop of Chichester addressed the following letter to Miss Greame, the Lady Superioress of S. Margaret's, East Grinstead.

*“Palace, Chichester, Nov. 21, 1857.*

“Madam,—Your Society was first formed as an association of Ladies, who should engage themselves and train others to minister to the bodily wants of their fellow Christians, by nursing them in sickness. Such an Institution I regarded as praiseworthy and Christian in its object, and I authorised the use of my name in connexion with it. It has for some time past submitted itself to the unlimited influence of Mr. Neale, a clergyman, in whose views and practices it is well known I have no confidence. Especially it is well known that I deny that the Church of England sanctions the habitual practice of confession. She acknowledges it only in rare and exceptional cases, and Mr. Neale is unwarranted in using it in the frequent and regular way in which he applies it. Those who admit of such application of it to themselves, manifest thereby the inadequacy of their direct faith in Christ's promises.

Their resort to this unauthorized remedy, by a righteous retribution, issues in a continuous increase of weakness, and an accumulation of obstructions in the way of the true influences of Grace upon their hearts. They trust more and more in man, and are less and less able, without man, to hope in Christ, *i. e.*, truly to hope in Him.

I desire, therefore, that henceforth neither you nor any of your Sisterhood will state that I approve of, or have any connexion with, your Institution and Sisterhood of S. Margaret's. I desire that any circulars or printed copies of your rules in which my name is introduced, may be cancelled and not used with my name in future. Whatever

\* Appendix FF.

expense is brought upon the Institution by the consequent loss of the copies you may have by you, I will fully repay.

I remain, Madam,

Your faithful Pastor,

A. T. CICESTER.”

Mr. Neale, in consequence of the Bishop's letter to Miss Greame, stating that it is well known that he denied that the Church of England sanctioned the habitual practice of confession, referred the case to Mr. Chambers, who gave it as his legal opinion that confession was valid,\* ignoring the question, unanswered by Dr. Pusey, respecting the unwillingness of the '*proprius sacerdos* or *Parochus* giving his consent. In vain did Miss Greame, on the receipt of the above letter, unlike Miss Sellou, who refused Lord Campbell's donation in consequence of the judgment given by the Judicial Committee *in re* Gorham, call on the Bishop for the purpose of giving an explanation, but Dr. Gilbert, not only refused to see her, but, in fact, shut his door in her face.†

We omitted while recording the Tractarian Annals of 1856, referring to the following anomalous circumstances, proving yet further the human origin of the Establishment, in the correspondence between Dr. Skinner, 'Bishop' of Aberdeen, and Dr. Sumner, 'Archbishop' of Canterbury, respecting the conduct of Dr. Gobat, Anglican 'Bishop' of Jerusalem:—

#### BISHOP SKINNER TO THE BISHOP OF JERUSALEM.

*Aberdeen, July 2, 1856.*

My Lord Bishop,—Lest his Grace the Archbishop of Canterbury may not have complied with the request which, under a high sense of duty, I presumed a few

\* Appendix II.

† Appendix KK.

days ago to make to him, it seems right that your Lordship should now be made aware of it; and I beg leave accordingly to send you the enclosed copy of my letter, while I herein renew the solemn protest it contained.

I have the honor to be my Lord,  
Your humble servant,

W. SKINNER,  
Bishop of Aberdeen, and Primus of Episcopal  
Church in Scotland.

---

BISHOP SKINNER TO THE ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY.

*Aberdeen, July 28, 1856.*

My Lord Archbishop,—I would earnestly hope that you are entirely ignorant of, and have not in any way concurred in countenancing, so glaring an infringement on the discipline of our Scottish branch of the Church, and breach of unity, as has this week been announced in our local newspapers and placards to take place here on Wednesday and Thursday next, by the Right Rev. the Lord Bishop of Jerusalem preaching and addressing meetings in the *soi-disant* Church of England chapels, in complete separation from the Church, for the purpose of obtaining contributions to the Jerusalem Diocesan Missionary Fund. My duty to the Church constrains me to enter my official protest against such an act, and I trust that your Grace will do me the favor to make known the same to Bishop Gobat, who will pay more respect to a communication coming from under your hand than he might probably feel inclined to pay to any remonstrance from a person whose authority as Ordinary of this Diocese he seems wholly to set at nought. Your Grace will, I hope, pardon my troubling you on a subject which may to some appear perhaps a very trivial matter, but which may prove of

serious consequence to the interest of the Church in this quarter. With the utmost respect and esteem,

I have the honor to remain,

My Lord Archbishop,

Your Grace's humble servant and faithful brother,

W. SKINNER.

Bishop of Aberdeen, and Primus of the Episcopal  
Church in Scotland.

THE BISHOP OF JERUSALEM TO BISHOP SKINNER.

*Aberdeen, July 3, 1856.*

Right Rev. Sir,—I beg to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of yesterday's date, including a copy of yours to his Grace the Archbishop of Canterbury, dated the 28th of June. As you have lodged your uncalled-for protest in so good hands, it only remains for me to subscribe myself,

Right Rev. Sir,

Your faithful servant,

S. ANGL. HIEROSOL.

REV. JOSHUA KIRKMAN TO THE ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY.

*Aberdeen, July 4, 1856.*

My Lord Archbishop,—I trust your Grace will excuse the inquiry I now venture to make. You received a letter, a few days back, from Bishop Skinner of Aberdeen, relative to the visit here of the Lord Bishop in Jerusalem. Bishop Gobat has just left me; and during his visit Dr. Skinner repeated his protest in writing to him with a copy of his letter to your Grace. Bishop Gobat's visit here has been in every way most successful, and we have rejoiced thankfully before God for such a signal support to us in our isolated position. Any notice from those in authority

in England is most valuable; and it is because I am well known to many leading Evangelical clergymen in England, and blest here with a steady prosperity in my own sphere, and because of various communications from your Grace in times past relative to our Church, both in Sir William Dunbar's case and others, as is generally known, that I presume to ask if you will kindly inform me, so far as your Grace thinks fit, only for our own comfort, what notice your Grace has taken, or intends to take, of Bishop Skinner's letter. If only our identity with the Church of England, and the wide separation from her of the Episcopal Church in Scotland, in almost every part of her offices and constitution, were generally known in England, we should not be so isolated as we are. Your Grace's character is one of those supports we always remember as in reserve and ready in times of need; and therefore I trust you will favor me with such notice as you think may conduce to the help of Evangelical truth and feeling in Scotland, and against a gratuitously hostile Church with whom we are forced into a certain amount of collision.

I have the honor to subscribe myself,

Your Grace's most humble and obedient servant,

JOSHUA KIRKMAN,

Minister of S. Paul's Episcopal Chapel,  
Aberdeen.

THE ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY TO THE REV. JOSHUA  
KIRKMAN.

*Addington, Croydon, July 23.*

Rev. Sir,—Accidental circumstances have delayed my answer to your letter concerning the visit of Bishop Gobat to Scotland. Bishop Skinner sent me an "official protest" against his preaching in the "*soi-disant* Church of England chapels in complete separation from the Church." My answer was simply that "Bishop Skinner was right in

supposing that I had had no communication with the Bishop of Jerusalem on the subject; and that I was not aware of any jurisdiction possessed by me which could warrant my interposition in regard to the course which he was pursuing, and which I greatly regretted to find, was seen in an unfavorable light by the Scottish Bishops." I was much gratified by hearing the account which Bishop Gobat, since his return, has given me of the state in which he found your church and congregation, and of his success both at Aberdeen and Glasgow.

And I remain, Rev. Sir,

Your faithful servant,

J. B. CANTUAR.

Well then may Dr. Trower, referring to this circumstance, viz., the intrusion of Dr. Gobat into the Diocese of Aberdeen, say in a charge to his Clergy, "One lesson, my brethren, we may certainly gather from what has recently occurred: it is this--that any departure from principle is sure to bring in its train a multitude of evil consequences. When this so-called See was erected at Jerusalem--(not, remember, by any act of the Anglican Church herself)--there were not wanting many well-meaning persons who regarded the line taken by the King of Prussia as a triumph to Anglican principles, and as likely to lead, even in his own dominions, to the introduction of diocesan episcopacy. Others, more keen sighted, saw in that measure, the seeds, at least, that were likely to germinate into a formal sanction for non-episcopal ordination, and an avowed invasion of the rights of independent Bishops. Let this recent act of Bishop Gobat's, and the principles which, if rightly reported, he publicly enounced, show plainly to all thoughtful persons which view of the erection of the so-called See of Jerusalem was the true, and which was the erroneous, opinion. No measure has ever caused more painful perplexity to many attached members of the Anglican Church; no measure, I believe, was more clearly

perceived by enemies to the Church of England to be a most dangerous act—an act by which, if the Church had been herself committed to it, she would have cut the ground from under her own feet. And now this measure has issued in the virtual denial (on the part of the second Bishop of this questionable See) of the first principles of diocesan episcopacy.’

---

1858.

---

Some of the Couverts for this year were—

Rev. C. F. Lichfield, Curate of Poplar.  
 Rev. H. De Burgh, Curate of Lawshall.  
 Rev. R. Wilson, Curate of Stapleton.  
 Rev. E. J. Baillie, Vicar of Lawshall.  
 Rev. R. Campbell, Curate of Peterhead.  
 Rev. S. Maturin, Curate of S. Paul's, Halifax, Nova Scotia.  
 Rev. C. E. Rowlatt, Curate of Thurrock.  
 Lord Norreys.  
 W. A. Maude, Esq., Cuddesden College.  
 Captain Taylor.  
 Miss Pullen.  
 Lord Portarlington.  
 Lady Portarlington.  
 T. Tordiffé, Esq.  
 Mrs. Baillie.  
 G. A. Browne, Esq.  
 Mrs. Pole.  
 A. Beale, Esq.  
 H. W. Spranger, Esq., Exeter College, Oxford.  
 J. Brown, Esq.  
 Mrs. Neve.  
 R. Williams, Esq., Oriel College, Oxford.  
 F. C. Ellis, Esq., Queen's College, Oxford.  
 J. F. Whetherall, Esq., Brasenose College, Oxford.  
 Edward Purbrick, Esq., Christ Church, Oxford.  
 W. Wortman, Esq., Queen's College, Oxford.

J. J. Saint, Esq., Christ Church, Oxford.

J. Ellis, Esq., S. John's College, Oxford.

Mr. Maturin, in a Letter to his former Parishioners, after giving a brief sketch of his search for the truth, says, "A Church which is continually changing her doctrine cannot be the true Church of Christ, while the Catholic Church has proved Her divine origin by the uninterrupted *unity* of doctrine, and the perfect *consistency* of all its parts with each other, which she has constantly maintained at every period of Her existence. She can *never more alter* or *re-consider* any one point of Christian doctrine that She has authoritatively defined for the last 1800 years. Like Her Divine Author, She is "the same yesterday, and to-day, and for ever." Well and truly does Mr. Maturin conclude his 'Letter,' 'There is no safety but in submitting entirely to the teaching of God's Holy Spirit in His Church: and in the complete surrender of human reason to the Divine rule of Faith which He has appointed for the perpetual preservation of His truth on earth. For my own part, my own choice is finally made, it is fixed and sealed for eternity. I am done for ever with all the doubt and uncertainty of Protestant principles. I have embraced the whole principle of God's revealed truth with all my heart and soul, and I am firmly resolved by the Grace of God to live and die in the bosom of His Holy Catholic Church.'"\*

The circumstances occurring this year, and to which we shall especially refer, are:—

The proceedings in the suspension of Mr. Cheyne, and the Knightsbridge and Boyn Hill confessionals.

Ere we do this we would refer to the following protest on the part of the assistant Wardens of Sackville College, of which Mr. Neale is the Warden, against the "late painful occurrences at Lewes."

\* The claims of the Catholic Church by Edmond Maturin, formerly Curate of S. Paul's Halifax, Nova Scotia.

“ We, the undersigned, the assistant Wardens of Sackville College, having noticed with much regret that the name of the College has been mentioned in some of the public reports of the painful occurrences at Lewes, as though the establishment at East Grinstead, called S. Margaret’s Home or Institute, was connected with the college, do hereby officially notify, in the discharge of our duties as assistant Wardens :—

That the inmates of the College and those of the above named house are entirely separated and distinct, and that the ancient foundation of the College is in no way allied to this newly created and self-constituted establishment. That when the Rev. J. M. Neale, then, and now acting as Warden of Sackville college, associated himself a short time since with some persons calling themselves “ Nursing Sisters,” and more recently “ Sisters of Mercy,” and endeavored to introduce some of them into rooms in the college, we protested against such an infringement of the statutes and abuse of the intentions of the foundation. That the Rev. J. M. Neale did afterwards, in order to secure the direct superintendance of the establishment, hire a house in the immediate vicinity of the college, but entirely separate from it ; and in this house the late Miss Scobell, who was not a member of the college, died.

We feel it our duty further to add in justification of the authorities of the college, in consequence of the distressing notoriety Mr. Neale has brought upon it and them, that it has been from first to last in opposition to their wishes and intentions that Mr. Neale has had any connexion with the above mentioned establishment, and it is with surprise and regret we learn that it has also received some countenance from the Bishop of the diocess and the Archdeacon of Lewes.

REGINALD W. SACKVILLE WEST,

J. HENRY ROGERS,

Assistant Wardens of Sackville College.”

“ *Sackville College, East Grinstead.*

*November 25, 1857.”*

One of the converts of this year published anonymously a work partially containing his reasons for seceding from the establishment. He says, that he distinctly repels the imputation of having deserted the Church of his Baptism, he did not abandon the Anglican Church till the Anglican Church had first abandoned herself. The final decision in the Gorham case—a decision brought about by means and influences which it might be highly dangerous to describe accurately, changed entirely the character of the Anglican establishment as a religion and as an institution. She had *believed herself a church*, but that decision entirely *un-churched* her and degraded her into a ‘fortuitous concourse’ of schools, *some of theology and others of a more religious sentiment or feeling apart from all theology—mutually antagonistic*. The church of the writer’s baptism, from the moment of that decision, had ceased to exist.

Mr. Baillie, too, says, “Every thing led me to the belief and forced on me the conviction that the claim of the Church of England’ to represent the Holy Catholic Church of Christ is an unsound one; that she is nothing more than a human institution three hundred years old, not the Church and Kingdom of Christ upon earth, which He himself instituted, and to which alone His promises are given, and that concern for my own soul demanded that I should seek for salvation where alone Christ has covenanted to bestow it, that is to say, in “His Holy Catholic and Apostolic Church,” built by Christ Himself upon S. Peter as the “Rock,” united in one Body and cemented with one faith under the chief Pastorship of His successor, against which Christ promised that “the gates of Hell should never prevail.” This letter was replied to by Mr. Dennis, who alleges as a reason of Mr. Baillie’s secession (somewhat more charitable than the ‘English Churchman,’ the ‘Times,’ and other journals respecting the earlier converts,) “infatuation not amounting in any case to positive mental imbecility, a superinduced morbid state of the system, a congestive condition of the

liver, or something of that sort, as the proximate cause of the sensitive condition of Mr. Baillie's mind, and who can say but that the blue pill and active exercise might have restored equilibrium to the brain, by bringing into play the action of the natural functions. !!!

I. The case of the Rev. P. Cheyne and the Synod of Aberdeen.

In August, 1857, Dr. Forbes delivered his primary charge, in which he referred to the case of the Archdeacon Denison and the doctrine of the Real Presence—"the ever living Presence of Jesus Christ in the Mysteries of the New Law," without "maintaining what is termed *Transubstantiation*." Dr. Forbes, in his charge, to the horror of his brother Bishops (the judges were again the ominous number of *six*) taught the 'Real Objective Presence,' and that Supreme adoration "*(Λατρεία)*" was due to "Christ as mysteriously present in the gifts," and also that the Eucharist was a 'Christian sacrifice,' and that it was (as S. Justin declares it to be) 'the accomplishment of the Prophecy of Malachi.' The perpetual or continual sacrifice, the *θυσία ἐς τὸ ἑτηρκὲς* which is now exercising as potential an influence on the salvation of the human race as when it was lifted up a spectacle to men and angels on the Altar of the Holy Cross." In consequence of the delivery of this charge, the six Bishops of the Scotch Episcopal body published the following declaration:—

*"To all Faithful Members of the Church in Scotland, the Bishops in Synod assembled, send greeting."*

BRETHREN BELOVED IN THE LORD,—It must be only too well known to you all that a Charge, delivered to his Clergy in the month of August, last year, by our Right Reverend brother, the Bishop of Brechin, and afterwards published by him, has called forth much opposition, and given rise in an unusual degree to anxiety and alarm. Our notice was drawn to the publication by two of our Body, at our ordinary Synod in Sep-

tember last: and again, when we met for special purposes in December, the same subject was brought before us more formally. Unfortunately we were not then all present, and, such being the case, and there being a difference of opinion among us as to the course which it would be most expedient to pursue in so grave a matter, it was ultimately resolved to defer the determination of it till our next Ordinary Synod. At the same time, it is right you should be informed that there was but one feeling and one opinion expressed by those who were present, as there is now but one opinion entertained by us all (except the Bishop of Brechin) in regard to the publication itself. We unanimously regret that such a Charge should have been delivered and put forth by one of our Body. We regret it on other accounts, and because it forces upon us the painful duty of making known that we do not concur with our Right Reverend Brother in the views he has expressed on so material a point as the doctrine of the Holy Eucharist. We think those views, in the extent in which he has defined and urged them, unsound, erroneous, and calculated to lead, if not resolutely opposed, to still greater error. The case may not amount to a direct call for a formal presentment of the Bishop as liable to judicial penalties; and no such formal presentment has been lodged before us. But the publication of such views in a document for the guidance of Clergy, and still more, the re-publication of the Charge 'in its integrity,' notwithstanding the grave remonstrances with which it has been met, and the scandal which it had raised, — this, attended by the avowed confidence of the author in the eventual 'triumph of his teaching,' leaves us, we feel, no alternative but to declare our own dissent, and to caution you against being led astray, either by the teaching itself, or by the undue confidence with which it is maintained.

At the same time, however, let it be clearly understood that we cordially concur with our Brother in his desire to protect the most Holy Ordinance of our religion from all irreverence, and to impress upon the hearts of all men a deep, faithful, thankful conviction of its unspeakable blessedness. It is not on account of any variance between us as to the importance of those duties which he has made to rest upon a false foundation that we feel we have cause to differ from him. We cannot

forget that the aversion to the doctrine of Sacramental Grace, and even its entire rejection unhappily prevalent in many quarters since the time of the Reformation, is to be regarded as the natural reaction from excesses with which the Primitive teaching had been overlaid; and we have learnt abundantly both from History and experience, that the violence of such reaction instead of gradually diminishing, is liable to be renewed and aggravated whenever it is attempted to restore those excesses. This we believe is the fundamental error, into which our Brother has fallen.

Anxious to assert and uphold the grace, the dignity, and efficacy of the Blessed Sacrament of the Lord's Supper, he has adopted a line of argument which, as it exceeds the truth of God's Holy Word, so it is calculated, we are sure, by no slow or uncertain process to defeat that very end. He has pleaded for what has recently been called "the Real Objective Presence," in such a manner that the inferences, which he draws from it, however doctrinally unsound, become, as he represents it, logically inevitable; *i. e.*, Supreme Adoration becomes due to Christ as mysteriously present in the gifts, or, as it is expressed elsewhere, 'to Christ in the Gift,' and the Sacrifice of the Cross and the Sacrifice of the Altar 'become substantially one,' and, in some transcendental sense, identical.'

Convinced as we are, that neither of these conclusions is to be found in Holy Scripture, or has been deduced therefrom by the Church, and persuaded that the teaching of them has given rise to corruptions and superstitions, from which we have been set free through the blessing of God, vouchsafed to the wisdom and courage of our forefathers; we feel it our duty to resist the attempt which has been made to prefer these conclusions upon your acceptance, and we earnestly entreat you not to suffer yourselves to be disturbed and misguided by it. After due consideration we do not hesitate to say that the reasoning, by which they are maintained, is, in our opinion fallacious; and that the testimony of authorities, produced in their support, when fully and carefully examined, will generally be found not to justify the use to which it has been applied.

More particularly we feel called in this season of trial to exhort you, our dear brethren of the Clergy, that you be not moved under the excitement that prevails around us, so as either

to exceed or fall short in your teaching of the truth with respect to the doctrine of the Blessed Sacrament which has thus unhappily been brought into controversy.

1. Instructed by Scripture and the formularies of the Church you will continue to teach that the consecrated elements of Bread and Wine become in a mystery the Body and Blood of Christ; for purposes of grace to all who receive them worthily, and for condemnation to those who receive them unworthily. But you will not, I trust, attempt to define more nearly the mode of this mysterious Presence. You will remember, that as our Church has repudiated the doctrine of Transubstantiation, so she has given us no authority whereby we can require it to be believed that the substance of Christ's Body and Blood, still less His entire Person as God and Man, now glorified in the Heavens, is made to exist *in, with, or under* the material substances of Bread and Wine.

2. You will continue to teach that this sacrifice of the Altar is to be regarded no otherwise than as the means whereby we represent, commemorate, and plead with praise and thanksgiving before God, the unspeakable merits of the Precious Death of Christ, and whereby He communicates and applies to our souls all the benefits of that One full and all sufficient Sacrifice once made upon the Cross.

3. You will continue to teach that the Consecrated elements being the Communion of the Body and Blood of Christ, are to be received with lordly veneration and devout thankfulness. And inasmuch as doubts have been raised with regard to the true interpretation of the Rubric affixed to the Communion Office, in the Book of Common Prayer, we desire to remind you of a Canon which was passed by the Convocations of both Provinces of the Church of England in 1640, and which we are satisfied to accept meanwhile, for our own guidance in determining the sense of the aforesaid Rubric, the matter not having been ruled by a general Synod of our own Church.

According to that Canon, it was resolved that gestures of adoration in the celebration of the Holy Eucharist, are to be performed, 'not upon any opinion of a Corporal Presence of the Body of Jesus Christ on the Holy Table, or in mystical elements, but only for the advancement of God's Majesty, and to give Him alone that honor and glory that is due to Him, and no otherwise.

These words of fatherly guidance and admonition in a time of trouble and offence, we claim to offer to you all, by a right, essentially inherent in a Provincial Episcopate; a right which was constantly exercised by the Bishops of the Primitive Church. Whenever in the exercise of this right, or rather, in the performance of this duty, they had occasion to animadvert upon the teaching of one of their own Body, doubtless they would feel their position of responsibility doubly difficult and painful. And the same most assuredly has been felt by us. We would gladly—most gladly—have avoided the course now taken if we could have done so consistently with the solemn obligations under which we lie towards you all, and not least, towards our Brother himself.

The reluctance we have shown to adopt any Synodal action in this case, and the calls we have made upon our Brother, both privately and in Synod, and the opportunities we have given him to reconsider what he has written, are a proof of this. But tracing as we plainly do, in the teaching of this charge, a tendency to undermine the great foundations upon which our formularies rest, and to weaken our sense of gratitude and respect towards the holy men from whom we have derived them in their present state; and seeing also on his part an apparent determination not to surrender the position he has taken up, we have felt ourselves constrained to deal with the matter as we have now done. For this purpose we have assembled in Special Synod, which a due regard to the peace and security of the Church appeared to us to require. We earnestly entreat you to join with us in prayer that the issue of our anxious and solemn deliberations may be blessed to the restoration of mutual confidence and harmony, and to the avoiding of all causes of dissension and offence for the time to come.

Grace be with you, brethren, and peace from God the Father, and from our Lord Jesus Christ. Amen.

C. H. TERROT, Bishop of Edinburgh and Prinus.

ALEXANDER EWING, Bishop of Argyll and the Isles.

W. J. TROWER, Bishop of Glasgow and Galloway.

ROBERT EDEN, Bishop of Moray and Ross.

CHARLES WORDSWORTH, Bishop of S. Andrew's, Dunkeld, and Dumblane.

THOMAS GEORGE SUTHER, Bishop of Aberdeen.

*Edinburgh, May 27, 1858.*

To these Bishops, his acknowledged adversaries, the Rev. P. Cheyne, Incumbent of S. John's, Aberdeen, was presented by the Rev. G. Rolison, Incumbent of Peterhead, for holding and teaching the doctrine of the Real Presence, *i. e.*, that "after consecration, whole Christ, God, and Man, is really, truly, and substantially present in the Eucharist, under the form of Bread and Wine,\* and both parties, the prosecutor as well as defendant were summoned to appear before Dr. Suther, on the 15th of June. In consequence of this decision an address was presented to "the College of Bishops of the Church of Scotland," praying them in reference to the declaration given above to discourage an unauthoritative definition of doctrine or confessions of faith,† against which Mr. Ramsay of Edinburgh protested. But the Archdeacon of Taunton came to the rescue of Mr. Cheyne, who was suspended by the Synod of Aberdeen,‡ against this sentence Mr. Cheyne protested in vain, and Dr. Pusey, fearful of the effect of the decision on his party, wrote the following letter to the '*Guardian*,'

"My dear Sir,—I have been asked (if you so permit) to make public, through your paper, a few thoughts on the recent decision of the majority of the Scotch Bishops, which I had recently expressed to an eminent individual. It is impossible to conceal from one's self the extent to which the Truth is condemned by that decision. It were no light thing that belief, such as that of good Bishop Andrewes, is no longer to be tolerated in the Scotch Church. The doctrine, as expressed by the great Bishop is "Christ Himself, the Substance of the Sacrament, in, and with the Sacrament, out of, and without the Sacrament, wherever He is to be adored," has been condemned by the majority of the Scotch Bishops. Bishop Andrewes, one certainly of the most eminent Divines in our Church since the Reformation would no longer be tolerated in the Scotch Church.

\* Appendix, FF.

‡ Appendix, HH.

† Appendix, GG.

§ Appendix, II.

But further, although in *terms*, the word ‘substantially,’ alone is condemned, yet in the whole argument upon which the Bishop of S. Andrew’s founded that condemnation, the Real Presence is rejected, and a real absence of our Blessed Lord’s Body and Blood is maintained. As reported by the ‘*Edinburgh Advertiser*,’ the Bishop of S. Andrew’s maintains as the only doctrine allowed by the Church of Scotland “a presence of virtue and grace.” “A presence of Virtue and Grace” does not, of course, in itself, exclude the Presence of Him who is the Author of Virtue and Grace. But a Virtual Presence *as contrasted with* a real, true, and *substantial Presence* is a real absence. The doctrine, then, of the Real Presence has, for the first time since the Reformation, been condemned by the majority of Bishops in communion with our own church. I need not speak of the strange illogicalness of the Bishop of S. Andrew’s argument, that because the Church of Scotland nowhere uses the word “substantial,” therefore she condemns it, and not only condemns it, but condemns the words “really and truly,” (which she does herself use,) if employed in that same sense. The sentence is not altered because the grounds are illogical. No one could, in Mr. Cheyne’s position, have honestly withdrawn the word “substantial,” if he intended to retain the words “really and truly,” in what is, I believe, their only real meaning, the self-same. What then is the effect of this sentence on the Scotch Church? The majority of the Bishops were acting judicially not legislatively. They have not thought it right, as yet, to frame any new Articles of Faith, or to alter any old one. Their act is their own act only. It in no way alters the teaching of the Church of which they are Bishops. In regard to the Eucharistic Sacrifice, the Bishop of S. Andrew’s has strangely misrepresented the belief which he condemns. In regard to this doctrine, then, he has condemned not this doctrine, but a doctrine which he has himself imagined. But in regard to the doctrine of the Real Presence which he and the other Bishops have condemned, happily not those Bishops, (either individually or as a Court of Appeal,) but the formularies of the Church are the teachers of the people. We must all have felt this since the Gorham judgment. The Prayer Book being our own words to Almighty God, and *our own language*, is the teacher of the people. We still give thanks to

God (as before) that "it has pleased Him to regenerate" this infant. And plain words will, to plain minds, convey their own plain meaning. So it will be in this case. Individuals pass away, but the formularies of the Church abide. We, of our generation, were taught through our Catechism and our Prayers; and so, please God, will the next, and the next, and the next generation who succeed us. However we may lament this decision, however heavily it may fall, as it has fallen on individuals, (as I know it has fallen on an individual, who, with singular meekness and faithfulness was doing his duty towards God and the Church,) the Church, will, through her Catechism and her Prayers, teach to those who will hear the truth, which some of her Bishops have unhappily condemned." Faint not, and fret not, "may be our word, still grievous as is this sentence, the Scotch Church, as well as our own, still retains unimpaired, "the good deposit" which she has received from her Lord.

Your faithful servant,  
E. B. PUSEY.

*Christ Church, Dec. 7, 1858.\**

In direct opposition to the decision and opinion of Dr. Pusey, Archdeacon Denison contended in a letter to the 'Union,' that the Church of Scotland *was formally committed to the* "DENIAL OF THE REAL PRESENCE," and that he could see no *distinction* between the "pernicious novelties" of Zwinglius and Calvin, and the teaching of the majority of the Scotch Bishops.

THE CONFESSIONAL AT S. PAUL'S, KNIGHTSBRIDGE, AND  
BOYN HILL.

Mr. Poole, one of the Curates of S. Barnabas, Pimlico, was accused by the Honorable and Rev. F. Baring, of hearing confessions and putting certain immoral questions to his female penitents. On an enquiry being made, Dr. Tait revoked Mr. Poole's license,† who thereupon appealed to Dr. Sumner against the decision of his Diocesan, because—

\* Guardian Dec. 8, 1858.

† Appendix, J.J.

1. The revocation of the License was unfounded and unjust.

2. Because Mr. Baring's statements were entirely and deliberately untrue.

3. Because Mr. Poole never had an opportunity granted him of explaining certain supposed admissions.

4. Because Mr. Poole has had no opportunity given him of revoking his supposed admissions and confessions.

5. Because Mr. Poole has always and *ex animo* accepted what he believes to be the law and doctrine of the Church of England, and does not desire to go beyond it.

6. Because the notice to Mr. Poole to appear and show cause was not served in accordance with the 112 section of the Statute of the 1st and 2nd Victoria.

7. Because Mr. Poole has had no opportunity of defending himself and clearing his character openly.

8. Because Mr. Poole ought to be assisted by Council in a matter of (such) vital importance.

9. Because Mr. Poole is desirous of legal assistance in the conduct of a case so difficult and complicated.

Dr. Sumner, in his reply, confirmed the sentence passed by Dr. Tait,\* and accordingly Mr. Poole applied for a Mandamus, which was granted.

Mr. West of Boyn Hill, who had been formerly suspended for having refused, while Curate of Hemel Hempstead, to use certain forms of prayer forwarded him by her Majesty's Printer, was charged by Mr. Shaw, with a crime somewhat similar to that laid against Mr. Poole, viz., hearing confessions and asking questions of married women contrary to morality, and 'charging her not to tell her husband.'

Dr. Wilberforce in accordance with a requisition forwarded to him,† issued a commission empowering Dr. Phillimore, the Archdeacon Randall, the Revds. J. E. A. Leigh, Sawyer, and Hibbert, to inquire into a certain offence against the laws ecclesiastical laid to the charge of

\* Appendix, KK.

† Appendix, LL.

the Rev. R. T. West. The Commissioners decided that the charge had not been substantiated against Mr. West. to which Report Dr. Wilberforce returned the following reply:—

*Lavington House, Petworth, Sept. 30.*

Gentlemen,—I have received the report of your Commission of Inquiry into the charges brought against Mr. West, and heartily accept as my own the decision at which, after a full examination of the matter, you have arrived. In thus formally adopting your decision, I wish, for the sake of my Diocese at large, to add a few words, on the general subject of confession. As I have already stated in writing to Mr. Shaw, I hold it to be a part of the wisdom and tenderness of the Church of England, that she provides for any parishioner who in sickness shall feel his conscience troubled with any weighty matter, ‘being moved to make special confession of his sins,’ and that she also provides for those who before Holy Communion, ‘cannot quiet their own consciences,’ being invited to ‘open their grief to the minister of God’s Word.’ In making this special and limited provision for troubled souls, I hold that the Church of England discountenances any attempt on the part of her Clergy to introduce a system of habitual confession, or, in order to carry out such a system, to require men and women to submit themselves to the questioning and examination of the Priest. Such a system of inquiring into the secrets of hearts must, in my judgment, lead to innumerable evils. God forbid that our Clergy should administer or that our wives and daughters should be subjected to it. I am sure that any attempt to introduce it would throw grievous difficulties in the way of that free ministerial intercourse with our people which, for their sakes and for the efficiency of our Ministry it is all important to maintain open and unsuspected.

I am, &c.,  
S. OXON.

The Commissioners of the Boyne Hill Enquiry.

Mr. Lowder (who had been summoned for hiring boys to pelt a bill carrier belonging to Mr. Westerton, the ob-

noxious churchwarden of S. Barnabas) during the contested election in 1556, published his second Annual Report of the S. George's Missions, in which he speaks of the good effected in reclaiming the victims of the social evil from their guilty traffic in language so touching, that our readers will pardon our giving it a place in our '*Annals of the Tractarian Movement*,' in the prayerful hope that some good Catholic may be led to pray for Mr. Lowder's submission to Holy Church.

"The advantages of the change are already very apparent in the better order, the happier tone of mind, the more cheerful obedience, and the improved health of the young women. It is indeed a cheering sight, after leaving the sad scenes of Ratchiffe Highway, where these poor girls were once seen carrying on their guilty traffic, with their uncovered heads, streaming ribbons, and gaudy dresses, to behold them now, 'sitting and clothed, and in their right mind,' as they listen to religious instruction, or sew in the class-room; to find them industriously employed in the laundry, the kitchen, or other household work; or to see them, in their hours of recreation, walking happily together in the garden, and enjoying the sight of the flowers and trees, and the calm soothing air of the country, which some have never known, and but few since the days of their innocence and childhood; or, better still, to join with them in their prayers and hymns in their little oratory, where their hearts seem indeed to unite with their voices in the praises of that God Whom once they blasphemed, but whom now they are learning to love; or to look at the attentive faces, and very often streaming eyes, with which they listen to words of warning and exhortation, to assurances of a Saviour's mercy, and calls to repentance, and faith in a Saviour's blood.'"\*

---

\* Report of S. George's Missions, 1858.

---

 1859.
 

---

Some of the Converts this year are—

Rev. A. Marshall, Curate of S. Matthias, Liverpool.

Rev. J. C. Barrow, Curate of S. George's, Kensington.

Rev. J. W. Jervis, Chaplain to the East India Company,  
Bombay.

Rev. R. V. Pope, Chaplain to the East India Company,  
Bengal.

Rev. W. H. Woodward, Vicar of S. Margaret's, Canterbury.

Rev. W. H. Wormal, Curate of S. Barnabas, Pimlico.

Rev. A. C. F. Fothergill, Curate of S. Paul's, Knightsbridge.

— Fowler, Esq. M.D.

W. Winstanley, Esq.

Mrs. R. V. Pope.

Mrs. Beckwith, Silksworth Hall.

Miss L. Stanley.

Lieut. Twynam.

J. Dick, Esq., Dalkeith.

Mrs. Dick.

Mr. Woodall announced his submission to the Church in the following circular, addressed to the 'Parishioner's of S. Margaret's, Canterbury,' which the '*Union*' did not deem worth the space necessary for insertion in its columns:—

My dear Friends,—It is my painful duty to inform you that the close relationship, which for so many years has subsisted between us in unbroken harmony and peace, has at length come to a close—and that I am no longer your pastor; though, be assured, the most sincerely attached and warmest of friends for life. Need I say what it costs me thus to write?

Your own honest, upright, honorable minds, however, will at once enable you to perceive that such a course was the only straightforward one to follow when I found my deep convictions of heart, on some points, less and less in unison with the Oaths, Articles, and Homilies of the Church of which I was the

pastor, and when I could no longer, with a good conscience, subscribe to the conditions on which alone I was entrusted with authority as pastor of the parish.

This being the case, it became a necessity that the sacred trust should be placed in the hands of others better qualified—but not more sincerely anxious for your eternal welfare than myself.

The same spirit of candor and charity towards others, so often inculcated in Holy Scripture, will enable you to understand how, under such circumstances, it became my duty to place myself in communion, as soon as possible, with that Church, which, I believe, has paramount claims on my obedience; and also to remember that to our Divine Master alone we are responsible in every matter of conscientious difficulty and perplexity—and that “no man judge his brother in anything.”

This was done—and by that act of submission to the Church of Rome, (very recently made,) my authority and office in the Church of England necessarily ceased.

Beloved,—My heart will never cease to beat warmly toward you all. Forgive my manifold imperfections, shortcomings, and every thing wherein I have offended you. My aim has been to preach “Christ crucified” among you, and to declare unto you “the whole counsel of God, and keep back nothing that was profitable unto you.” Accept the intention, my fervent prayers and intercessions for your temporal and eternal welfare—and believe me, under every circumstance of life,

Your most sincere and attached friend,

E. H. WOODALL.

*Canterbury, August 19, 1859.*

Mr. Poole having succeeded in obtaining a Mandamus compelling the Archbishop to hear his appeal against Dr. Tait's decision, accordingly on Feb. 18th, the Court was held, and the Appeal of Mr. Poole from the decision of Dr. Tait heard. Judgment was however deferred till March 23rd, when Dr. Sumner decided that Dr. Tait had “exercised a sound discretion in revoking Mr. Poole's license, as his course was not in accordance with the Rubric or

doctrine of the Church of England, but most dangerous and likely to produce the most serious mischief to the cause of morality and religion.”

Dr. Suther also having been informed that Mr. Cheyne had not obeyed the sentence of suspension, but had acted as ‘Deacon’ in the Church of S. John’s, Aberdeen, issued the following citation, all communication between him and Dr. Suther passing through Mr. Hutchins.

We, the Right Reverend Thomas George Suther, D.C.L., Bishop of the Episcopal Church in Scotland for the Diocese of Aberdeen—Whereas we have reason to believe that the Rev. Patrick Cheyne, A.M., residing in Aberdeen, in the said Diocese of Aberdeen, has been guilty of the Ecclesiastical offences of disobedience to the lawful sentence of his Ecclesiastical Superiors; of disobedience of the Canons of the Church; and of breach of his Ordination Vows, or of one or more of the said offences. In so far as the said Rev. Patrick Cheyne being a Presbyter of the said Episcopal Church in Scotland, duly ordained according to the form and manner used in the United Church of England and Ireland, as adopted by the Episcopal Church in Scotland.—And having as such been instituted and appointed to be Pastor or Minister of the Congregation assembling for the public worship of God, at the Church or Chapel of S. John the Evangelist in Aberdeen, in the said Diocese of Aberdeen. And having been, upon the fifth day of August, eighteen hundred and fifty-eight, or about that time, suspended by us from the office of a Presbyter of the said Episcopal Church in Scotland, and prohibited and discharged from exercising any of the functions belonging to that office, both in the said Church of S. John the Evangelist, of which he was the Incumbent, and also in every other place within the Diocese over which we exercise spiritual jurisdiction as a Bishop of the Episcopal Church in Scotland, until such time, as he should renounce and purge himself before us of the erroneous teaching founded on in the third Branch of a Presentiment brought against him before us, as in the said sentence is particularly specified—which sentence was on his appeal against the same, on the second day of December, eighteen hundred and

fifty-eight, affirmed by the College of Bishops, and is still in force and unrecalled—

Did (First), During the period between the said second day of December, and the twenty-sixth day of March last, officiate as Pastor or Minister of the said Church of S. John the Evangelist, by teaching and catechising the children, baptising, reading the morning and evening prayers, the burial service, and other offices of the Church, and on one or more occasions preaching or publicly lecturing in the said Church to the Congregation there assembled. (Second), Upon the twenty-fifth day of March last, or about that time, write and subscribe a certificate of the fitness of a Candidate for confirmation, and cause the same to be transmitted to us as his Ordinary, and require us to confirm the Candidate thereon—which certificate, having been rejected by us, he did, on the twenty-sixth day of the said month of March, write and address to the Rev. W. H. Hutchins, Curate of the said Church of S. John the Evangelist, a letter, in which he stated that he was Incumbent of S. John the Evangelist's, that he intended to exercise his Ministerial functions as such, especially to instruct the youth in the Catechism, and required Mr. Hutchins to admit to the Communion such as he, the said Rev. Patrick Cheyne, should certify were ready for confirmation, whether confirmed or not; and which letter was under his authority transmitted to us by Mr. Hutchins. (Third), At or about the Feast of the Epiphany in this present year, write and cause to be printed and published, or authorise to be written, printed, and published under his name, a Pamphlet, entitled "A Letter to the Congregation of S. John the Evangelist's, Aberdeen, in Answer to their Address, together with the Protest of the Incumbent and Lay Communicants—by the Rev. Patrick Cheyne, Incumbent of S. John the Evangelist's," in which publication he, the said Rev. Patrick Cheyne, has made various statements in breach of the solemn promise and vow which he made at his Ordination—"reverently to obey his Ordinary and other chief Ministers, unto whom is committed the charge and government over him, following with a glad mind and will their godly admonitions, and submitting himself to their godly judgments;" and in particular he has made therein the following statements, viz. (page 13)—"The majority of our Bishops have condemned the doc-

trines which I have taught, and you received, and in so doing they have virtually denied the Catholic faith concerning the most sacred mystery of the Eucharist;" and (pages 17 and 18)—  
 "As long as there stands unrevoked a sentence of suspension against a Priest for teaching the true doctrine of the Eucharist, as the Church has believed it, so long will there remain a standing witness that the Scotch Church is committed to the heterodoxies, which received their final sanction on the second of December last."

Therefore, in terms of the thirty-sixth Canon of our Church, We hereby summon the said Rev. Patrick Cheyne to appear before us, sitting in Diocesan Synod, within the Church of S. Andrew, in the City of Aberdeen, upon the third day of May, Eighteen Hundred and Fifty-nine, at the hour of twelve noon, with continuation of days, there to answer to a charge of the tenor above written, to be then stated against him by the Dean or any other Presbyter as may be appointed by us; and on confession or probation of the foresaid charge, or part thereof, to hear and see judgment and sentence pronounced against him, conform to the Canons or Laws of the Church, or else to allege a reasonable cause to the contrary, With certification, that, if he appear not, he will be held as confessed. Given at Aberdeen, this fourteenth day of April, Eighteen Hundred and Fifty-nine years.

THOMAS GEORGE SUTHER, D.C.L.,  
 Bishop of Aberdeen.

On the 3rd of May, Mr. Cheyne appeared in the Synod, summoned by Dr. Suther, puzzled that Anglo-Scotch Bishop by objecting to his summons, and by Mr. Hutchins refusing to answer certain questions put to him by Dr. Suther, who, at an adjourned Synod excommunicated and deposed Mr. Cheyne, and an appeal was accordingly made to the civil authorities against the decision of his Bishop.

In consequence of this sentence the following declaration on the Holy Eucharist was promulgated by the Chapter of the Cathedral of S. Ninian, Perth.

"Whereas certain recent events and statements have af-

forded ground for apprehension that a disposition exists to confine within limits, never hitherto prescribed in our Communion, what may lawfully be held by the Laity, and taught by their Pastors, on the doctrine of the Holy Eucharist, we, the undersigned members of the Chapter of the Cathedral of S. Ninian, in Perth, trustees of the same communicants within the parochial cure appertaining thereto, declare that we have received to hold that

1. "The Body and Blood of Christ are \* verily and indeed taken and received by the faithful" (*Catechism*) "under the form of Bread and Wine:" (*Adv. I. BK. Homilies*): "for in the Supper of the Lord there is . . . no untrue figure of a † Thing absent, but the Holy Table is called by the Church The King of Kings' Table;" (*Homily xxvii.*); and of the same, Our Lord Jesus Christ, who was given, 'not only to die for us, but also to be our Spiritual Food and Substance in that Holy Sacrament.' (*Exhort. I. Comm. Office*). She hath further taught that, being God, "of the Substance of the Father . . . and Man, of the Substance of His Mother," (*Athanasian Creed*), "two whole and perfect Natures were joined together in one Person, never to be divided—whereof is One Christ. Very God and Very Man." (*Article II*). Wherefore, in the receiving of the Holy Gifts which have "become the Body and Blood of the Son" of God, (*Scotch Comm. Office*), whereby we are made "one with Christ, and Christ with us," (*Exhort. III. Comm. Office*), "we are made partakers of a heavenly refection, and not earthly—a Ghostly substance, and not carnal." (*Homily xxvii.*). In accordance with which teaching we believe that in the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper there is a Real and Essential—*i. e.*, ‡ substantial—Presence of the Body and Blood of Christ, both God and Man—"given, taken, and eaten only after an heavenly and spiritual manner. (*Art. xxviii.*)

\* *Vere et Re-ipsa* (Latin Version of Church Catechism).

† The *Res Sacramenti*—the Substance of the Sacrament. (Andrewes Resp. ad Bellarm.)

‡ *Oὐσία*—Essence—Substance—"Substantial." (Bp. Geste Framer of Article 28). A word employed by Bishop Forbes of Edinburgh, by Bishop Lyndsay of Brechin, and other Divines of the 17th century. "*A substantive communication from the Adorable Person of our Redeemer.*" (Alexander Knox).

2. The Sacrifice once made upon the Cross by our Lord Jesus Christ—than which there is none other satisfaction for sin—is not, nor can be repeated in Heaven or on earth. Nevertheless, by His presence in Heaven, He “a Priest for ever, after the order of Melchisedec;” (*Heb.* v. 6), “the Lamb as it had been slain,” (*Rev.* v. 6), “appearing in the presence of God for us,” (*Hebrews* ix. 24), “abideth a Priest continually,” (*Heb.* vii. 3),\* and is the “Lamb of God, that taketh away the sins of the world.” (*Comm. Office*). And to this “Heavenly ministration,” (*Heb.* viii. 2), “within the veil,” (*Heb.* vi. 19),† the Sacrifice of the Altar is ‡ intimately united”—seeing that Christ, who, Himself offers, is Himself the oblation;” (*S. Aug. de Civ. Dei.* x. 20); while, after his measure, at each celebration, the “Church offereth Christ, God’s Son, to God the Father, not by the suffering of death again, but after an unbloody manner,” (*Field—Of the Church,* p. 215), containing ‘a perpetual memorial of His Precious Death and Sacrifice, until his coming again.’” (*Scotch Comm. Office*).

3. In partaking of “So Divine a Thing,” (*Exhort. I.*), “even of that Deifical Communion,” (*Homily xxvii*), and looking up with Faith upon the Holy Body and Blood of (our) God,” (*ibid.*) we deem it meet and right to say, before Him, “who standeth in the midst of the Throne,” (*Rev.* v. 9), and yet “is here invisibly present with us, (*Bp. Andrewes, Dev.*), as the Substance of the Sacrament.” (*Bp. Andrewes, Resp. ad Bellarm.*) “Worthy is the Lamb that was slain to receive power, and riches, and wisdom, and strength, and honor, and glory, and blessing,” (*Rev.* v. 12); and so believing, “we do not eat the Flesh before we have adored, with Augustine, not it, (the outward part or sign), but Him who is worshipped upon the Altar, as Nazianzen says.” (*Bp. Andrewes, Resp. ad Bellarm.*)

E. K. FORTESCUE, Provost of S. Ninian,

H. HUMBLE, Canon and Precentor,

A. LENDRUM, Prebendary,

and one hundred other communicants.

\* *There* Thou hast never *ceased* to be our Friend, our Great High Priest Pleading on our behalf Thy Blood. That Holy reconciling “Flood.” (Hymn 82. Collection recommended by the College of Bishops.)

† *Vine of Heaven*, Thy Blood supplies this Blessed Cup of Sacrifice. (Hymn 102. Collection recommended by the College of Bishops.)

‡ Bishop of Exeter’s Pastoral Letter.

The Scottish Court of Appeal confirmed Dr. Suther's sentence, and pronounced Mr. Cheyne as 'guilty of disobedience,' and therefore "publicly declared him to be no longer a Clergyman of the Episcopal Church of Scotland.'

Mr. Golightly, ever restless, published a pamphlet which caused no little sensation in the Diocese of Oxford, as he accused Dr. Wilberforce of Papalizing the See committed to his charge, and stated that the following Romanizing practises were introduced to the Diocese of Oxford, viz. :—

1. Auricular Confession.
2. Altar Crosses and Crucifixes.
3. Processions and Processional Crosses and Banners.
4. Stone Altars.
5. The Romish wafer.
6. Mixing water with wine at the Eucharist.
7. Elevation of the Elements.
8. Bowing to the Elements.
9. The Priest crossing himself.
10. Anointing of the sick.
11. Prayers for the Dead.
12. Masses for the Dead.
13. Romish Vestments.
14. Romish Ornaments.
15. Sisterhoods.

In the course of his pamphlet Mr. Golightly refers to a most curious work, edited by Mr. Purchas, entitled "*Directorium Anglicanum*," in which the most minute details are given for "the Decent and orderly performance of Divine Service in the English Church." A reference being made to the *Instrumenta* on ornaments used in the reign of Edward VI.

Mr. Purchas apologises for his '*Directorium Anglicanum*,' on the ground that the 'recently ordained Deacon and Priest have had *generally* no *official* training or example' for the college chapel and the Cathedral of the Diocese have been rather bearing to warn them off the rocks of irreverent slovenliness and ritual irregularity,

than 'a star to guide them how to offer, or to assist in offering acceptable sacrifices in the Church of God.'

We must acknowledge that we are not surprised at Mr. Golightly's alarm, but rather wonder at the temerity displayed by Mr. Purchas and the Unionists.'

To calm the naturally irritated feeling of Dr. Wilberforce, in consequence Mr. Golightly's assertion certain *clergymen* (?) in the *Diocess* (?) of Oxford, addressed the following letter to their Diocesan :—

"My Lord,—We the undersigned, being Archdeacons and Rural Deans in the Diocese, address your Lordship under the most unusual circumstances.

It has come to our knowledge that a pamphlet entitled "*Facts and Documents showing the Alarming State of the Diocess of Oxford*," has been sent round to the Churchwardens and other Laymen of the Diocess. We have felt bound carefully to examine the statements made in it; and, having done so, and thinking it possible that, professing to come from "A senior Clergyman of the Diocess," they may be believed by some who have not an opportunity of ascertaining the facts of the case, and so produce inquietness and disaffection. We feel further bound to declare, from our own knowledge of the Diocess, they are unjustifiable misrepresentations. The writer states that the Diocess of Oxford is the centre of a Romanizing movement; and he grounds this charge on the publication, by a Mr. Purchas, of the University of Cambridge, of a book called "*Directorium Anglicanum*," revised by an Incumbent of this Diocess, and of an anonymous work called the "*Churchman's Diary*," and on no better foundation than the publication of these two books, the writer proceeds to his charge of the introduction of fifteen peculiarities of the Romish system; and, further, he insinuates that this attempt has received your sanction.

Now, we, who are well acquainted with the actual state of this diocese, hereby solemnly declare to your lordship that, to the best of our knowledge and belief, this charge is absolutely false and calumnious—that there is nothing whatever introduced or attempted to be introduced among us to justify the assertion that the diocese is in an alarming state, or that your lordship has ever sanctioned any peculiarities of the Romish system. We

should, as earnestly as any could, contend against the introduction of such peculiarities. We conceive, from the extracts we have seen from it, that Mr. Purchas's book is a very unwise and mischievous publication. We are strongly opposed to all attempts to alter in any respects the Ritual of our Reformed Church, of which we are, as our fathers were before us, loyal and affectionate sons. We are confident, from our experience of your episcopal rule of fourteen years among us, that these are also your convictions and principles of action; and many of us know instances in which, where young and inexperienced men have been led in this direction, you have kindly but firmly restrained them and corrected their errors. We therefore feel bound solemnly to declare that the statements of the "Senior Clergyman" are, in our judgment, presumptuous and unfounded calumnies against your lordship in this diocese.

CHAS. C. CLERKE, Archdeacon of Oxford.

E. BICKERSTETH, Archdeacon of Bucks.

J. RANDALL, Archdeacon of Berks.

CHAS. BARTER, Rural Dean of Chipping Norton.

F. K. LEIGHTON, Rural Dean of Oxford.

C. LLOYD, Rural Dean of Wycombe.

J. C. BLOMFIELD, Rural Dean of Bicester.

C. WHATELEY, Rural Dean of Burnham.

H. W. MAJENDIE, Rural Dean of Newbury.

W. J. BUTLER, Rural Dean of Wantage.

T. EVETTS, Rural Dean of Amersham.

F. W. CARTWRIGHT, Rural Dean of Waddesdon.

A. P. CUST, Rural Dean of Mursley, 2nd portion.

S. T. ADAMS, Rural Dean of Mursley, 1st portion.

R. N. RUSSELL, Rural Dean of Buckingham, 2nd portion.

G. W. PEARCE, Rural Dean of Newport, 2nd portion.

DACREES ADAMS, Rural Dean of Witney.

G. MARSHALL, Rural Dean of Aston.

H. ROUNDSELL, Rural Dean of Buckingham, 1st portion.

A. POTT, Rural Dean of Cuddesdon.

N. DODSON, Rural Dean of Abingdon.

J. E. AUSTEN-LEIGH, Rural Dean of Maidenhead.

J. WILDER, Rural Dean of Reading.

E. PAYNE, Rural Dean of Deddington.

J. L. HOSKYNs, Rural Dean of Wallingford.

H. BULL, Rural Dean of Newport, 1st portion.  
Feb. 25.

To this address Dr. Wilberforce returned the following characteristic reply :—

*To the Archdeacons and Rural Deans of the Diocese whose  
Names are subscribed to an Address dated Feb. 25.*

Rev. and dear Brethren,—I sincerely thank you for your address. Under the “unusual circumstances” of which you speak, it may, beyond the gratification it has afforded me, tend in no small degree to remove many injurious misconceptions; for the statements of the anonymous writer calling himself “A Senior Clergyman of the Diocese,” could not but alarm any one who believed them to be true; and those who are unacquainted with me personally, and with the real state of this diocese, might, but for your contradiction, have so esteemed them. You are the best possible witnesses as to their truth or falsehood for you have seen in detail my real discharge of the duties of my office for many years past; and living, as you do, in every part of the three counties of Oxfordshire, Berkshire, and Buckinghamshire, which constitute the diocese of Oxford, the facts of the case must be known to you, while your high character makes your testimony concerning them unimpeachable. It is my duty to add my own solemn assertion to your declaration. Our diocese is not (God forbid that ever it should be!) the “centre of a Romanizing movement.” The assertion that it is so is, as you have declared, “a presumptuous and unfounded calumny.”

“You have well exposed the frivolous grounds on which this scandal has been founded. Our diocese has no peculiar share in that said list of apostates to the Papacy which has been culled from all the dioceses of England for many years past. Neither has it any connection with the book of Mr. Purchas; and the attempt to connect us with it, because one clergyman who holds preferment, and another who was once a student within our borders, are said to have revised its sheets, is transparently futile. So far as I know, there is not one clergyman in the diocese who has been so weak as to attempt practically to introduce into his parish the ritualistic system of the writer. For

myself, I rejoice in the opportunity which your address gives of declaring thus publicly that, with you, I utterly disapprove all attempts to introduce any such unusual ritualistic developments. I deem it unpardonable that we, who are charged with the all-important work of seeking to save souls for which Christ died, should waste our own energies, and estrange the hearts of our people by giving ourselves up to such childish frivolities.

I know well that unwearied and reiterated misrepresentations have led many who view me from afar to suppose that I am favourable to these innovations. But you know me better : you know that I could point to all the high diocesan offices, and to every important parish I have had to fill, and could show that I have placed in them hearty English Churchmen, free from all extremes either of doctrine or ritual. You know that I hold it to be my duty to maintain firmly and without compromise (though with the utmost charity in judgment, word, and conduct to those who differ from us) the distinctive doctrines of our own Reformed Church, and the solemn and expressive ritual which is so closely connected with them. You know that to the utmost of my power I discourage all diminution and all excess of her sober rule. You well know that I have a jealous dread of every Romanizing tendency, and I have not the slightest sympathy with those who wish to restore among us such a ritual as Mr. Purchas describes—for that, in my opinion, such attempts both breed, on the one side in some weak minds a longing, first for the gorgeous ritual and then for the corrupt doctrines of Rome ; and on the other, tend far more widely to alienate our people from sound Church of England principles, and give occasion to such calumnies as those which you have condemned.

With the wide margin left in our Church to the individual action of her clergy it must often happen that a Bishop may see in the ministrations of really good men, who are neither secret Romanisers nor secret Puritans, variations (sometimes in excess and sometimes in defect) from what he in his own judgment considers to be the proper line of ritual observance among us. In the generality of such cases it would be injudicious as well as unkind in the Bishop, until he had tried all other means, publicly to stigmatize the clergyman with his disapprobation ; and consequently, though the Bishop may be employing his

best efforts to repress such variations quietly and without violence to the feelings of the clergy concerned, he is exposed to being misrepresented by those who seek occasion against him, as approving and encouraging that which he altogether disapproves, and is in the wisest way removing from his diocese. Such was actually my own conduct in what is called "the Ad-dington case;" though, unless public attention had been called to it, none but the individual clergyman whose eccentricities caused that scandal might ever have known the fact.

This pamphlet contains one such misrepresentation of matters not under your immediate observation, and on which, therefore, it is due to you that I should say a few words. I refer to what is there called "the Lavington case." The only direct charge against your Bishop in that statement has been publicly declared by the person immediately concerned to be a falsehood (*vide* letter to the '*Guardian*' of February 23, by the Rev. J. W. Burgon, Fellow of Oriel College). But, besides this direct assertion, it is insinuated that I have favored certain unusual modes of teaching and observance adopted by the rector of that parish, because, as a private patron, I some years ago nominated him to the benefice. This inference is utterly at variance with fact. I need not tell you that the incumbent, belonging to another diocese, was in no degree under my control. Had he been so, I should, as the Bishop of Chichester has done, have called on him to abandon those peculiarities of which I had long since, in this case, expressed my strong disapproval, and which, at his Bishop's wish, he has since dutifully abandoned.

To such misrepresentations the family misfortunes to which the pamphlet that has called forth your address so heartlessly alludes—misfortunes among the bitterest which could wound the soul of one heartily attached, as I am, to our Reformed Church—have, alas! peculiarly exposed me at the hands of cruel and unscrupulous enemies; but such misrepresentations, with the blessing of the God of Truth, time and your support, my reverend brethren, will ultimately dispel. Most certainly the state of our diocese affords us no reason for despondency. The diocese is, I rejoice to believe, indeed the "centre" of a great "movement." But that movement is not Romeward. It is really a movement towards that which Romanists have always found to be the strongest guard against the introduction

of their manifold corruptions—a movement towards a healthier, more self-denying, more laborious, and more devout maintenance of the true Church of England faith, and carrying out of true Church of England practice both among our clergy and our laity.

Meanwhile the support and confidence of the great body of our intelligent and religious laity are being manifested by the munificence of their contributions, and yet more by the personal service of many of them at our boards, and by their presence and interest at our newly-established “consultations.”

It is no slight support to me, amid many misrepresentations, to be able to note these cheering signs, and to feel assured that the great cause of Christ’s truth is, in spite of all our infirmities, thus advancing among us, and to know that in working for it to the best of my abilities I have the affectionate confidence of such men as you, and the hearty support of a large portion of our laity.

May God of His great mercy for Christ’s sake accept our sacrifices and bless our labours for His truth, and in His good time “turn” to peace and love the unquietness and trouble of those who are “persecutors and slanderers.”

I am, my reverend and dear brethren,  
Your faithful and affectionate,

Oxford, March 7.

S. OXON.

A most curious controversy occurred this year at Tiverton, which, though *local*, may here be briefly referred to. Mr. Baillie, having on his secession from the Anglican Body, taken up his residence at Tiverton, dated his letter, to which we have already referred, from his new residence, little imagining that Messrs. Gilbert and Brown, the Vicar and Curate of Tiverton, would regard it as an act of Papal aggression, and that Dr. Cumming would be sent for, with his assistant Mr. Drury, to oppose the fearful aggression on the Protestantism of Tiverton, by a convert residing among them. The controversy between these sensitive gentlemen and Mr. Baillie, has terminated in proving that the former are adopting the plan of the Tractarians, and equivocating, to use no harsher phrase, when they can.

Two or three remarkable signs of the vitality of Anglo-Catholicism occurred this year, and we should indeed be unfaithful chroniclers were we to omit them, viz.: the consecration by Dr. Tait, (whose text caused a smile to play on the countenance of those who heard it,) of All Saints Church, Margaret St., London, and an attempt by Mr. Golightly of Oxford, to compel Dr. Gilbert to institute proceedings against Mr. Randall, of Lavington, for certain Papistical proceedings, which was unsuccessful, as it would be "productive of the greatest mischief and inconvenience were this Court (the Queen's Bench) to lend its aid to any stranger to compel a Bishop to issue a Commission in any particular case." And, lastly, the disgraceful riots at S. George's-in-the-East, which called forth the following curious and significant letter from Dr. Tait, to which we beg to call our reader's especial attention.

"Sir,—I beg to acknowledge your official letter of the 2nd inst., respecting the late disgraceful proceedings in the parish of S. George's-in-the-East, which reached me yesterday, (Sunday,) and I also beg to acknowledge the copy of a report made to the vestry of S. George's by a committee appointed by that body.

"In answering your letter I think it necessary to draw your attention to a distinction as to episcopal authority very commonly lost sight of in such disputes. A bishop's authority is of two kinds. Within a certain range, defined by law, he has power to give orders and enforce obedience to them by penalty of law. Over a much wider range he has authority from the good feeling of all well-disposed members of the Church, who voluntarily accept his paternal advice and guidance. It is not too much to say, that by far the greater part of a Bishop's government of his diocese is carried on through the willing deference which good Christian feeling suggests to the members of the Church, both lay and clerical, that he is entitled to claim on account of the very nature of his office.

"Now a difficulty arises in answering your letter from your not distinctly intimating in which of these two capacities it is that the aid of my authority is now invoked.

“ I. I shall first consider the matters brought before me in reference to that authority which I can enforce by legal penalties.

“ You are aware that two parties in this dispute have invoked my aid.

“ 1. I am informed, on the part of the rector, that the parish church is desecrated by disorderly persons, the public worship of God interrupted, and the rector or other officiating minister, with the choristers, habitually insulted during or after Divine Service. No language can be too strong to express the abhorrence with which all persons of any true Christian feeling must regard such outrages, if they really take place, as is not denied. It is the grossest self-deceit to suppose that they can be justified by any provocation which the rector’s choral service or unusual habiliments may have given. But what is the legal remedy for these disturbances? It is that to which I have had recourse. I have required the churchwardens to be present at the service in which the riotous proceedings complained of are alleged to take place, and to exercise the powers inherent in their office for the suppression of disorder. These powers are well defined by statute 1, William and Mary, chap. 18, sect. 18.

“ ‘If any person maliciously or contemptuously come into any church and disquiet or disturb the congregation, or misuse any preacher or teacher, such person, upon proof thereof before any justice of the peace, by two or more sufficient witnesses, shall find two sureties bound by recognisances in the penal sum of 50*l.*, and in default of such sureties shall be committed to prison, there to remain till the next general or quarter sessions, and upon conviction shall forfeit 20*l.* to the use of the Crown.’

“ At common law, a person disturbing Divine service may be removed by any other person there present, but the duty of maintaining order lies especially on the churchwardens. If they are absent, or being present, do not repress disorder, they neglect their duty. I grant that the performance of their duty in the present instance is difficult, but the law seems to point out with sufficient distinctness how they ought to act. The rector, as I learn from the report of the committee of vestry, has formally intimated to the churchwardens that he will hold them responsible to an ecclesiastical court for the performance of their duty above described, and they are certainly so responsible. The committee of vestry is of opinion that they are most assidu-

ous in the performance of their duty, and I shall be truly glad to find that this is so.

“This is the strict legal aspect of the case as regards the complaint on the rector’s part respecting the alleged disturbance of public worship, and as regards the remedy which ought to be applied.

“The complaint of the vestry which you forward to me has reference to the alleged exciting cause of such disturbance. You state, as I understand you, that these disturbances arise from the exasperation of feeling caused by the objectional mode in which you allege that the Rev. Bryan King, the rector, and those appointed by him, celebrate Divine Service in the parish church, and also by the inconvenience of the hour appointed by the rector for the afternoon lecture.

“You, therefore, request me to restore the Afternoon (Lecture) Service to the hour of three or half-past three, and to prohibit the use of unaccustomed vestments by the officiating clergy. I gather from your letter and the report enclosed that there are other matters in the ceremonial of the parish church which you consider to be causes of dissension, and in particular you bring under my notice the mode in which the Morning Service was conducted on Sunday, the 27th of August, by a strange clergyman, designated the Rev. Frederick George Lee.

“1. As to the hour of the afternoon (Lecture) Service—You are aware that the arrangements respecting this Lecture were very lately made the subject of proceedings before a court of law, and my understanding of the decision of the learned judge in the case is, that it was left to the Rector to fix such hour as he deemed fit and proper for the lecture. I write at a distance from the means of verifying this impression, but subject to correction and better information, I am of opinion that I have no legal authority to order the hour to be changed. Your request on this subject must, I apprehend, be addressed to the rector, and not to me.

“2. With regard to the mode of celebrating Divine Worship in the parish church, I understand you to complain that at four o’clock on Sundays the Litany is used as a separate choral service.

“If your objection be to the celebration in the parish church of any additional Divine Service beyond the ordinary Morning

Service, the Afternoon (Lecture) Service, and the Evening Service, I have no power to prevent such additional use of the church, and certainly I should not employ such power if I had it. In a parish so vast as that of S. George's-in-the-East the more services there are the better, and the incumbent has a legal right to use his church as often in the day as possible; and I highly approve of his multiplying the opportunities of public worship.

“Again, if your objection is to this additional service being choral, the law allows an incumbent to have a choral rather than a read service if he pleases; and though I may highly disapprove, as I do, of forcing a choral service on an unwilling parish, I can only remonstrate; I have by law no power of forbidding, or, if I forbid, of enforcing obedience to my mandate.

“Again, if your objection be to this additional service being the Litany, and not a third regular Evening Service, I must point out to you that there is a very commonly expressed desire, to which utterance has been given in Parliament and elsewhere, to have the ordinary Morning Service of the Church of England shortened; and I have myself in my place in Parliament stated that an obvious way of legally attaining this object is by separating, as the law allows, the Litany from the ordinary Morning Service. It is an open question whether a clergyman has not the power of effecting such a separation, in strict accordance with the rubric, even without any sanction from his bishop. If, from my common authority as ordinary, I have legal power to forbid this practice, I should be very unwilling to do so, unless I were satisfied in this instance that it is the fact of this service being the Litany rather than an additional repetition of the common Evening Service that is the cause of the exasperation which you allege.

“But the chief real objection to this four o'clock service I presume arises from its being supposed to interfere with the (Lecture) Afternoon Service. I have already stated to you how I apprehend the case stands regarding any legal power on my part to regulate the hour of that Lecture Service. I will only point out to you further that I fear the parish would scarcely be satisfied if the rector so far gave way as to incorporate Mr. Allen's lecture into an afternoon choral service of his own, conducted according to the model of his own usual services; and if

he so far gave way as to admit the lecturer to his pulpit at his usual Afternoon Service, he would, I apprehend, have a legal right to make that service choral. I confess I think it is, on the whole, better that these two gentlemen (the Lecturer and the Rector of the parish) should have their hours of ministration in the parish church separate.

“I now come to the only other point you mention—the use of unaccustomed vestments by the officiating clergy. It is well known that I have announced my determination of putting a stop to such follies when I can do so by my summary jurisdiction over those who are placed more immediately under my personal control; and such jurisdiction I have already exercised in S. George’s; and I hereby require the churchwardens to give me immediate information if any clergyman so officiates in the church as to give reasonable offence by this childish mimicry of antiquated garments, or by so dressing himself up that he may resemble as much as possible a Roman Catholic priest. Even if it be proved that such foolish practices are not a distinct violation of the letter of the law, they may indicate such a wrongheaded and self-willed determination, for the sake of a foolish theory, to endanger the success of his ministrations among the souls committed to him, as to justify the bishop in summarily withdrawing a curate’s licence for the good of the parish. I need not, however, point out to you that the law does not give a bishop any such power of dealing summarily with an incumbent; and in the case of the rector of your parish, with whom I had some lengthened communication last winter on the subject of these very garments, you are probably aware that, on mature consideration, I determined to trust rather to my conviction that common sense will in the end prevail, and not to go into a court of justice on a matter which appears to me so foolish in itself, and the issue of the legal prosecution of which through all the several courts must, after all, be uncertain, from the very nature of a controversy turning on the shape and pattern of the clothes worn at the time of the Reformation, and their points of resemblance to, and divergence from, the garments made for us in the present day.

“But though I entertain this opinion myself, that prosecutions, on what may be called the vestment question, in a court of law are inexpedient, and indeed derogatory to the character of

our Church, I by no means wish to bind others by my opinion in this matter against their will; and if it is the deliberate desire of those whom you represent to prosecute the rector for wearing garments which, I grant not unnaturally, offend his parishioners, I shall be ready when called upon to afford you all due facilities for the commencement of your law suit, so far as my authority extends.

“I need scarcely say further, that if you have any charge to bring forward of unsoundness of doctrine or other distinct violation of the law of the Church, which you think you can substantiate, I shall be ready at once to hear and investigate it.

“With respect to the Rev. F. G. Lee, of whom you complain, that gentleman has no leave to minister in my diocese, and I have required intimation to be sent to him to desist from so officiating till he obtains my formal authority. I have written to Mr. Maconochie, who is a licensed curate in the parish, desiring him to take the service in the parish church till the rector’s return.

“I have thus stated to you what is the legal power I possess of interfering by my authority personally to enforce obedience on both sides of this miserable controversy; and I shall now sum up my decision as respects this legal power. On the one hand, I call on the churchwardens at their peril to do their duty in preserving order in the church, and bringing offenders to justice according to the statute. On the other hand, I prohibit all unusual vestments, such as you complain of, in the celebration of Divine Service. I am ready, where I can summarily, to enforce their disuse, and if you desire it, I am ready to further your prosecution in a court of law of those whom I cannot myself reach summarily. Any other complaint of violation of the Church’s law I am ready at once to investigate on its being distinctly pointed out. I do not consider myself entitled in law to order the alteration of the hour of service which you desire.

“You may feel at first surprised that my power as bishop should go no further than I have notified; but on the whole, for my own part, I do not consider it an evil in the Church of England that incumbents of parishes are invested with so independent a responsibility, which I am bound to say, in most cases, they exercise wisely for the good of their parishioners, and which it would not be consistent with our manly English

spirit to see superseded by an arbitrary extension of episcopal dominion. As I have said, it is not by compulsory force of law, but by authority of a gentler kind, that a bishop most effectively works; and I would now shortly consider, in the second place, how such authority may avail us in the present miserable disputes.

“II. If the Rector, on the one hand, and those who oppose him on the other, have any right Christian spirit, they must be thoroughly ashamed of the state into which the parish is now brought. If the allegations which have reached me are to be depended on, bad men have availed themselves of the irritation which has been excited to bring dishonor on the worship of God and the name of our holy religion. Under such circumstances sincere members of our Church cannot, I should think, hesitate as to the duty of submitting their causes of quarrel for arbitration to him whom God has placed over them in the Church for the very purpose of healing differences. Up to this time, however, I have received no distinct intimation from either party of their willingness thus to be guided by me as their bishop; on the contrary, some indications have not been wanting, at least on one side, that my advice will not be listened to unless it can be penally enforced. If the case were thus voluntarily placed in my hands by both parties for friendly adjustment—if the clergy of the parish, on the one hand, consented to follow my directions as to the ordering of the services, and the vestry with the churchwardens, on the other hand, were equally willing to be guided by my advice as to the best way of allaying the unseemly tumults which have arisen, I am very hopeful that all might yet go well. There has, I doubt not, been no lack of conscientiousness on both sides, but so far as I can at present judge, there has, I am bound to say, been a sad lack of kindly Christian consideration for each other’s feelings. I earnestly beseech all concerned, for the sake of the many ignorant and thoughtless souls in this parish of S. George’s, not to allow another day to pass without taking such steps towards Christian reconciliation as may, by God’s blessing, end the present miserable disturbance. Depend upon it none can feel any satisfaction in these church riots but those who are the enemies of the Lord Jesus Christ and of all true religion.

“My advice to the vestry is formally to request the rector to

join with them in submitting the whole case to my episcopal arbitration—both parties binding themselves to act as I direct. If this offer is not made, or if, being made, it is not acceded to, I do not see how I can aid the parish in any other than by such strictly legal interference as I have indicated.

“ I have the honor to be, Sir,

“ Your obedient faithful servant.

“ A. C. LONDON.

*Llandudno, Sep. 5.”*

Against this decision of Dr. Tait's, Mr. G. F. Lee pleaded, but in vain. The cause of the riots was Mr. King's opposition to the appointment of a Lecturer by the Vestry, and thence the resolve of the *real* rulers of the Establishment to interrupt Mr. King and his representatives. One of the accusations against Mr. G. F. Lee was, that he wore Popish Vestments. Against which he protested in a letter to the '*Times*,' as also did Mr. King in a communication to the '*Guardian*.'

*To the Editor of the Times.*

Sir,—I thank you most cordially for having refused to insert any report of the riots which again took place in this church yesterday; and I respectfully ask your permission to place before your readers a few facts which I conceive it desirable for the public to be made acquainted with. My former communication, which I am obliged to you for having inserted, was written to correct certain misrepresentations personal to myself, without the Rector's knowledge. I now write with his full sanction—as we have been so grossly misrepresented by the cheap daily papers—to state frankly and accurately, for the sake of the law and order, what took place here yesterday.

“ First, I would observe that the morning service has never been ‘said before the altar.’ but always in the accustomed place in the choir stalls, the lessons being read from the reading-desk, and the dress worn being the surplice, the ordinary academic hood, and the stole. During the Holy Communion, but not during the sermon, those legal ‘ornaments of the minister’—the Eucharistic vestments—which have been used here for some time, have been assumed.

“This was the case yesterday, and in the morning no unseemly interruptions took place, though the congregation was large and many strangers were present. In the afternoon, however, it was far otherwise. An assembly of nearly two thousand persons accompanied Mr. Hugh Allen, the afternoon lecturer, and filled every nook and corner of the church. His service proceeded with all proper decorum—the canticles and hymns being sung—in which the people generally joined. At the conclusion of the lecturer’s sermon three-fourths of the congregation remained in church, and a scene occurred which almost baffles description. The people took possession of the chancel stalls, and of the pulpit and reading-desk stairs, climbed on to the edges of the pews, clung to the gas standards, and commenced hissing, groaning, and cat-calling in the most unseemly manner. The approach to the chancel being utterly blocked up by an excited mob, it was soon perceived that any attempt to perform the Rector’s service, as it is called, was quite out of the question. So, after some consideration, it was for a third time abandoned, and the churchwarden announced this fact to the crowd, which, unhappily, tended rather to increase than allay the extraordinary excitement and tumult. It was, in truth, with the greatest difficulty that I afterwards performed the baptismal service, for the crowd refused to leave the north-west door, hustled me considerably, and severely maltreated several persons connected with the choir.

“In the evening the most serious riot took place. An organized gathering of people took possession of the chancel stalls and the approaches thereto. When called upon to remove them, the churchwarden respectfully declined to do so. The person who occupied the clergyman’s accustomed place, when asked by me to move, readily gave way, and I was thus enabled to commence the service; but at so great a disadvantage, on account of the excessive pressure and pain I endured, that I was compelled, during the second lesson, to go in search of the churchwarden and appeal to him for assistance in performing my duty. Two persons near me persisted in reading the clergyman’s as well as the people’s part of the ordinary evening prayer, and interrupted and incommoded me in every possible way. I pointed them out to the churchwarden as

‘brawlers;’ but he neither removed them from the building, nor, as far as I am aware, asked for their addresses.

“When the hymns were given out a loud and vigorous hissing, such as would have appeared excessive at a hustings, took place. The hymns began as follows:—

‘Blest are the pure in heart,  
‘For they shall see their God,’ &c.

And,

‘Jesu, the very thought of Thee  
‘With sweetness fills my breast.’

My sermon was continually interrupted. In fact, the groaning, hissing, cat-calls, exaggerated coughing, scraping of feet, and slamming of doors, which took place at intervals, would have been regarded as rioting and disgraceful in a concert-room. ‘Hear, hear!’ ‘Humbug!’ ‘No soft sawder!’ and other similar expressions were used continuously throughout, and the scene generally was one which few can have witnessed at all, and which I most heartily trust I may never see again.

“One person, when the alms were being collected, seized the bag and attempted to retain it, and at the conclusion of the service the disturbance was beyond description disgraceful. The parish clerk, who has occupied his present position for half a century, consolingly informed me that the tumultuous people were mainly strangers to the parish, and this testimony was confirmed by the expressed opinion of two other officials of the church of long standing.

“I venture then, Sir, in conclusion, to ask most earnestly, in the name of decency and decorum, whether such scenes are to be permitted to be again enacted? I am ignorant of the exact bearings of the law in such difficulties; still, as the local inspector of police as well as Sir Richard Mayne have been both appealed to in vain—for they refused to render any help, or even to sanction the presence of the police in the church—I venture to ask you to print this letter, containing a simple statement of facts. The Rector and Curate, harassed and worn out with three months’ trials of this nature, are away ill, and we are in a sore straight. Mob law, created by the exaggerations and misrepresentations of certain of the penny papers, reigns here su-

preme. In plain words, we stand in jeopardy of personal assaults while we conduct the religious duties of the Church.

“If there be anything illegal in the service, either in general or detail, it is in the power of the diocesan at once to put a stop to it. ‘The law is open and there are deputies; let them implead one another.’ But I am confident if the Statutes and Canon Law were against him, the Rector would only be too ready most cheerfully to obey. In my own opinion, every thing done is not only within the letter, but within the spirit of the law. Last evening’s service was identical with those special gatherings at S. Paul’s and Westminster Abbey: therefore it seems hard, one-sided, and unjust that such scandalous disturbances should be permitted to continue unchecked.

I remain, Sir,

Your obliged and most obedient servant,

F. G. LEE.

*Rectory S. George’s-in-the-East, Sep. 5.”*

---

*To the Editor of the Guardian.*

“Sir,—I should regret that any of your readers should be misled by the account of the service of my church on Sunday morning last, which was copied from the ‘*Times*’ in your last number; and, as the same account has appeared in several other papers, perhaps you will kindly permit me to correct it.

“In the first place, then, it is said that ‘Mr. Lee appeared in the vestments of a Roman Catholic priest, the ordinary ecclesiastical habit of a clergyman of the Church of England being entirely dispensed with.’ This is incorrect, as Mr. Lee said the prayers in a surplice, hood, and stole. It is then stated that ‘he knelt in front of the altar, and intoned the prayers.’ This is incorrect, as he intoned them at the west end of one of the choir stalls, where they have been said for a considerable period. It is next stated that Mr. Lee preached in a chasuble ‘with a cross woven into the back.’ This is incorrect; the chasuble was perfectly plain, and the foundation of this statement probably was that on the stole, at the back of the neck, there was a small cross of about one inch or one and a half inch in diameter.

“I need not allude to the description given of the sermon, as

this is now in course of publication. But, now, permit me to add a few remarks upon the subject of those disgraceful outrages by which the Litany service at four p.m., has for the last three months been interrupted. It is possible that your readers may imagine that those outrages have been occasioned by some extravagant celebration of that service. I may, then, state that the Litany is merely sung by the clergyman and choir, as is customary in cathedrals, and as it has been sung in my church now for about fourteen years without a whisper of disturbance until the 22nd of May last, when Mr. H. Allen, the recently elected lecturer, intruded himself into the pulpit. I resisted this intrusion, and was borne out in my resistance by the Court of Queen's Bench. On that occasion the Court suggested that Mr. Allen should be allowed to hold a distinct service of his own after my (parochial) service was concluded. This arrangement I offered to Mr. Allen through his solicitor; but, upon his representing to me the inconvenience of this arrangement, I allowed him the use of the church for his service *before* mine. This, however, did not satisfy his adherents, and I received many anonymous letters threatening that, unless I allowed Mr. Allen to preach at my service, I should never be allowed to hold that service without disturbance. The result has been the late attempt to override Queen's Bench law by mob law; and thus, for the last three months, this service of the Litany has been interrupted by a number of Mr. Allen's congregation remaining in and about the church for that purpose, (the accounts of the newspapers give one thousand as the number who remained on Sunday last), whilst my brother curate and myself have been hissed, hooted, and spat upon, in going to and returning from the church for the service in question.

"I hear that a number of laymen have associated themselves for the purpose of prosecuting these brawlers, and that an advertisement from them will appear in your next number. I am sure that I may appeal to my brother Churchmen for help in the endeavour to put down a system of such profane ruffianism as is, I trust, utterly unprecedented in any church.

BRYAN KING.

"*Yarmouth, September 3, 1859.*"

At the commencement of this fresh ebullition of Pro-

testant feeling on the part of John Bull, Dr. Tait was appealed to by Mr. Bryan King and replied as follows :—

*Fulham Palace, S.W., Dec. 3.*

“My dear Sir,—I think I ought to commit to paper the result of our interview yesterday, for, indeed, in such interviews, it is difficult to keep the main point in view; and I am sure it is due to your standing in this diocese, as well as to many personal qualities which have secured you the respect of all who know you, that I should state my opinion and wishes for your calm consideration, apart from any of those unpleasant feelings which an interview to investigate complaints may call up.

“1. With respect to what has been laid before me by the churchwardens, I am glad to be assured by you that the candles are not lighted at the celebration of the Holy Communion, except for purposes of light.

“As to the green vestments, stoles or whatever they may have been, which it appears you yourself and Mr. Burn wore on the occasion of the anniversary, I very deeply regret that you should think it right to assume the unusual garments you described to me. I am convinced there is no sufficient warrant for it, and if you continue it, it is against my express order. Surely if in any matters a Bishop is entitled to require the canonical obedience of his clergy, it is in such a case as this. You cannot believe that there is any legal obligation on you to depart in this respect from the usage of our Church, as explained and enforced by all her living authorities. The very utmost point to which you can go must be to consider that the law of the land does not positively forbid you to use such vestments (as, indeed, there are many other strange things which it has never contemplated, and therefore does not forbid); and that, by giving an order for their disuse, I am abridging your liberty. Surely your regard for the office I hold, and the rubric enjoining upon you to refer to the Ordinary, must suggest that, in such matters, your own private opinion ought to be waived in deference to those set over you; especially when I urge upon you to give up your own wishes out of regard for the 30, 000 souls committed to you, to your usefulness among whom I feel convinced these excessive ritual observances are a great hindrance,

as is found, it pains me to think, in the emptiness of your great church.

“As to Mr. Burn’s wearing such garments, I am glad to have been assured yesterday, both by you and him, that he will discontinue them, and I shall be truly glad if you will resolve to do the same yourself. I have only allowed him to officiate on his probation under very peculiar circumstances, and require obedience as one of the conditions of his probation.

“The same objections that apply to these garments apply also, though, perhaps, in a lesser degree, to other matters which I pointed out to you in the written description which the churchwardens have given of your service on the occasion of the anniversary, and which I am certain have raised and keep alive a grievous prejudice against your ministry in the minds of your parishioners. I know that you are anxious for the good of their souls. I pray you to consider whether you cannot sacrifice your own peculiar taste in such matters to promote your spiritual usefulness.

“As to matters brought before me by others, and not by the churchwardens, it was satisfactory to me to be assured by you that the Catechism complained of as teaching Romish doctrine had never been distributed in the parish, or used in the school, with your knowledge or sanction. I understand your curate, Mr. Lowder, to have given me before the some assurance as to his district of your parish. I take leave to advise that you should let your people understand that you disapprove of this Catechism, if it is still circulating among them, through any dishonest influence of those two of your curates who lately joined the Church of Rome.

“I was glad also to be assured by Mr. Burn that he was not in the habit of distributing the ‘Manual of Confession’ which was complained of. I understand him to say that he had only given it in one instance, and that only because he was requested to give some such book to a person who was troubled in mind, and that he very incautiously gave the book without having read it, and that he has not read it even now.

“I would strongly urge upon him, through you, the impropriety of his giving to any of your people a book on such a subject without having satisfied himself that its contents are accordant with the Word of God. I understand him distinctly to

assert that he does not teach the doctrine complained of as inculcated in that book.

“And now allow me, my dear Sir, to conclude by repeating, what I endeavored to express to you at the close of our interview, how gladly I would endeavor to strengthen your hands if you could bring yourself to alter your course. I do beg you to give up the matters complained of, which are, I believe, a grievous impediment to your usefulness. In carrying out the simple scriptural system of our own Church you will receive, I assure you, all sympathy and assistance from me; and I cannot but think that the high opinion of your high and gentlemanlike bearing under trying circumstances which I have heard expressed, even by those of your people who are strongly opposed to you, if you showed willingness to act differently in the matters complained of, would not be without its proper weight in enabling you to do our common Master’s work in the fearfully responsible position in which you are placed.

“One word more. You seem to have felt aggrieved yesterday that I should lay my commands upon Mr. Burn not to follow your example as to these (you must excuse me for calling them) foolish vestments. But I think, on reflection, you will see that a Bishop, in such a case, must exercise his power to guide and control a curate, where he conscientiously believes an incumbent is leading him astray; and Mr. Burn is not even your curate, he is simply a gentleman on his probation assisting you by special favor.

“I have thought the simplest way of answering the presentment, if I may so consider it, of the churchwardens, is to send them a copy of this letter.

“I wish to draw your attention to their statement that the congregation of the parish is less than 150 at the most, while the number of regular attendants in the pews and free sittings together is only about 40, and that in the mission chapels the united congregation altogether consists of only about 35 adults.

Believe me to be, my dear Sir,

Yours faithfully,

A. C. LONDON.

Rev. B. KING.

*P.S.*—Since writing the above I have received Mr. Burn’s

letter this day. I beg to assure him that it gives me great satisfaction to hear that the endeavors of your Clergy to rescue the destitute and abandoned have been blessed, and that they are laboring to teach the very poor. Such work would in no wise be interfered with, but rather furthered by your conciliating the good will of your parishioners in the matters I have referred to.

Nor must we forget the two following letters from the Provost of Westminster and the Rector of the Catholic University, Dublin, in a reply to an enquiry as to whether they were about to return to Anglicanism.

*St. Mary's, Bayswater, April 16, 1859.*

“My Dear ——, I am much obliged by your telling me of my expected return to Protestantism. It is not the first time I have heard of it; and I always hear it with a kind of consolation, for nobody would take so much trouble about so unimportant a person, if, in some way, I were not bearing a witness to the truth! and also it gives me the joy of saying that, from the hour I submitted to the Divine Voice, which speaks through the one Holy Catholic and Roman Church, I have never known so much as a momentary shadow of doubt pass over my reason or my conscience. I could as soon believe two and two to make five, as that the Catholic and Roman Faith is false, or Anglicanism true.

“I enclose a little paper, which may explain what I have not time to write.

“If the Clergyman who made this statement will be so kind as to communicate to me the ground on which he made it, I shall be happy to see him. I cannot suppose that he said so grave a thing lightly, as it would be a serious act.

“Believe me, with sincere hope, and prayer that all dear to you may be brought into the only way of Life.

“Always yours faithfully,

“H. E. MANNING.

## THE REV. DR. NEWMAN'S LETTER.

*"The Oratory, Birmingham, April 18, 1859.*

"My Dear —— —I suppose Dr. Manning's account of the matter is the right one. It irritates the judgment, feelings, and imagination of Protestants to know that religious men have deliberately and at a great sacrifice acted on the conviction that Protestantism is not a safe religion to live in or to die in. It is a great difficulty in their way. And the fact of this deliberate sacrifice on the part of men now alive, is urged against them by others—and unsettles those whom they wish to keep contented in Protestantism. The consequence is, that they are always hoping that Dr. Manning and I may come back—and from wishing and hoping, they proceed to mention that it is likely—and those who hear them say that it is likely, misinterpret them, on account of their own similar hopes and wishes, and say that it is to be expected. And then the next hearer says that it is a fact which is soon to be, for he has heard of the expectation on the best authority. And then the next hearer says that he has the first authority for saying that Dr. Manning or Dr. Newman is coming back in the course of the next few months. And then, lastly, some one perhaps, puts into the newspapers, that he knows a person who was told by Dr. Newman himself, that he had discovered the unreality and hollowness of Romanism, and meant to return in the course of April, May, or June, to the bosom of the Establishment.

"Thus only can I account for the most absurd, and utterly unfounded reports which, ever since I have been a Catholic, have been spread abroad, about the prospect of my return from the Mother of Saints to the City of Confusion.

"Very faithfully yours,

JOHN H. NEWMAN.

We are unable to give even a brief sketch of a curious movement in the West, known as the Aitkin movement, and having as its two principal leaders Messrs. Aitkin and Haslam. Their object is a revival of Evangelical or Low-Church doctrines, combined with Tractarian or High-Church asceticism, and has terminated, as these movements

invariably do, in the reconciliation of many to the Church of God.

Mr. Bryan King (having appealed to Dr. Tait and Mr. Selfe, the magistrate, in vain, and Mr. Lowder, of the rotten egg notoriety, having endeavoured to *martyrize* a boy of the name of John Bradford,) commenced in the Arches Court proceedings against some of those who had shown their Protestant zeal by brawling at S. George's-in-the-East.

Mr. C. F. Lowder, of egg pelting notoriety, also further proved his militant zeal in favor of Tractarianism, by being fined 2s. for assaulting a Mr. Jones,\* whom he held prisoner by the skirt of his coat.

The parishioners of S. George's, moreover, presented the following petition, to the Houses of Parliament:—

“To the Honorable the Commons of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland in Parliament assembled.

“The humble petition of the vestry of the parish of S. George-in-the-East, in the County of Middlesex,

“Showeth,—

“That the Rev. Bryan King became Rector of this parish in the year 1843, at which time the services at the parish church were attended by a large portion of the parishioners, all the seats being usually full, and in Mr. King's own words, the people of the parish were distinguished for their ‘loyalty and devotion.’

“That shortly after Mr. King's appointment he introduced uncustomary observances in the form of public worship, and on being remonstrated with by the parishioners refused to abandon them, although the late Bishop had left the matter to his own discretion and sense of duty; that the remonstrance of the parish was conceived and made in the most courteous manner, and that, notwithstanding Mr. King's obstinate perseverance, the conduct of the parish towards him continued to be marked with courtesy and kindness.

“That during seventeen years the parishioners have been, in consequence, alienated from their parish church, and the public

\* Appendix, MM.

charities of the parish have not been advocated within it, to the great injury of the poor and needy.

“That in the year 1856, Mr. King introduced a body of clergymen and others, under the title of S. George’s Mission, from which a marked development of Romish usages in the public services may be dated, forms and ceremonies hitherto unknown, except in the Romish ritual, having been practised, and practises and doctrines contrary, as your petitioners believe, to the Reformed Church of England having been taught.

“That by the Act (2nd Geo. II., c. 30) your petitioners are empowered to elect and nominate a lecturer, to whom the rector is bound to grant admission to the pulpit; that on the 31st March, 1859, your petitioners having exercised their right, were opposed by the Rector, and forced to apply to the Court of Queen’s Bench, which decided in their favor; that the Rector has since, by a series of petty annoyances, disturbed the peaceable enjoyment of this legal right, and has given occasion to disturbance in the parish church; that on appeal to the diocesan, it appears that he has no power to compose the existing differences.

“Your petitioners pray your Honorable House that some means may be devised, whereby the existing defects in the discipline of the Church of England may be removed, and power given to the laity to interfere, by some cheap and summary process, for the redress of grievances to which they are at present liable, from the want of any sufficient means to restrain or remove an erring or wrong-minded incumbent of a parish.

“And your petitioners will ever pray, &c.”

---

1860.

---

The principal converts for this year are—

Rev. J. V. Yarwood, Vicar of Westbury, Bristol.

Rev. C. J. P. Forster, Curate of Stoke Abbot, Dorset.

Miss Wedd, Warwick.

Miss Dick, Dalkeith.

Miss Turton.

— Forman, Esq., M.D., (Newcastle-on-Tyne.)

While the last pages were passing through the Press, the Synod of Scotch Bishops passed the following sentence on the Bishop of Brechin—a sentence completely stultifying that passed on Mr. Cheyne of Aberdeen, and proving if proof were necessary, the ultra Protestantism of Dr. Forbes.

The Bishop of Glasgow then read the finding of the Court, which was to the following effect:—At Edinburgh, the 15th day of March, 1860, the College of Bishops having resumed consideration of the presentment at the instance of the Rev. W. Henderson, incumbent of S. Mary's, Arbroath, and Patrick Wilson and David Smith, vestrymen thereof, being members of the Scottish Episcopal Church, against the Right Rev. Alex. Penrose Forbes, D.C.L., Bishop of Brechin, complaining of the teaching and doctrines contained in the charge delivered by the said Bishop to the clergy of his diocese, and thereafter published and republished by his authority, and having heard parties fully thereon, find that the said presentment is relevant, and proven to the extent and effect after mentioned; and, more particularly, find, with reference to the charges contained under the first and second heads of the presentment, that the teaching of the respondent there complained of is unsanctioned by the articles and formularies of the Church, and is to a certain extent inconsistent therewith: find that the third charge of the presentment is not proven: find, with reference to the concluding charge of said presentment, that the passage in the respondent's charge marked *b*, has been withdrawn by the respondent, and that the charges under letters *a* and *c* have been in substance disposed of by the foregoing finding applicable to the second head of the presentment; but, in consideration of the explanations and modifications offered by the respondent in his Answers in reference to the first charge, and in consideration also that the respondent now only asks toleration for his opinions, and does not claim for them the authority of the Church, or any right to enforce them on those subject to his jurisdiction, we, the said College of Bishops, feel that we shall best discharge our duty in this painful case by limiting our sentence to a declaration of censure and admonition: and we do now solemnly admonish, and in all brotherly love entreat, the Bishop of Brechin to be

more careful for the future, so that no fresh occasion may be given for trouble and offence, such as have arisen from the delivery and publication of the Primary Charge to his clergy complained of in the presentment; and we declare the proceedings in this case to be now concluded.

Previous to the finding of the Court being read by the Bishop of Glasgow, the Primus delivered the following address :—

“The important and painful trial on which the attention of the Church has for many months been fixed, is now drawing to a close. The Rev. W. Henderson, as representing those who, in conjunction with himself, presented the Right Rev. Alexander Penrose Forbes, Bishop of Brechin, to the Episcopal Synod, as guilty of contradicting and depraving the articles and other formularies of the Church, has been heard in support of the presentment, and in reply to the answers to that presentment lodged and read in the Court by the Bishop of Brechin: and finally, the Bishop, as respondent, has laid before us all that he has thought necessary in his own defence, and in reply to the arguments by which the presenters have endeavoured to support the charges which in the presentment they have laid against him. Nothing, then, remains but that the Bishops now in Synod assembled, after careful consideration of the charge presented, and of all the pleadings in the case, should, in pursuance of the obligation imposed upon them by the 36th canon of the Scottish Episcopal Church, close the painful task with which they have long been engaged, by pronouncing such a judgment as the merits of the case, the character and position of the respondent, and the general interests of the Church require at their hands. But before doing this, it seems right that they should explain to the members of the Church over which God’s Providence has made them overseers, the two, and, as it has been thought by some, the incompatible, courses of duty which were imposed upon them by the delivery, and the repeated publication of the Charge now presented. Being persuaded that certain propositions respecting the holy Eucharist contained in that charge were, to say the least, very different in form of expression from the terms employed by our formula-

ries, and as such calculated to disturb the minds of the laity, and to raise suspicions that the existing clergy of the Scottish Episcopal Church or some of them were disposed to strain and misinterpret the language of the Church on the subject of the most sacred mystery of the Lord's Supper, the Bishops considered themselves bound, by the obligations into which each of them had entered at his consecration, to issue a pastoral letter, in the hope of thereby removing suspicion, allaying agitation, and establishing the souls committed to their charge in a clear and faithful apprehension of the Catholic Doctrine of the Eucharist, as adopted and enforced in the Articles and Communion Offices of the English and Scottish branches of the Reformed Catholic Church. The Bishops had reason to hope that, by this publication, they were relieved from the necessity of any farther action in the matter.

But, at the same time, they were aware they had not thereby relieved themselves from the obligations under which they are placed by the 36th canon—namely, that of citing and judging any bishop who may be accused by “three or more respectable persons, members of the Scottish Episcopal Church.” Of the expediency of the law which affords so much facility to the presentment of accusation, they are not now called upon to express an opinion. They saw that the law was imperative, and that it left them no discretionary power of accepting or rejecting a presentment, such as that on which they are now called upon to adjudicate; and they have felt that the performance of one of their official obligations could not be pleaded by them as a reason for declining the performance of another, equally important and equally obligatory. The Bishops, then, have only to examine and pronounce upon the charges, which are generally that the Bishop of Brechin has in his Charge depraved certain articles, and other formularies of the Church. By this word depraved in a criminal charge I understand denied or contradicted, either by interpretation or inference, for mere difference in either respect is not necessarily contradiction, and does not necessarily involve heresy or any criminality. I think the Bishop of Brechin, having chosen the doctrine of the Eucharist for his subject, ought to have taken for the groundwork of his argument the explanation and defence of that doctrine as laid down in the articles and formularies of the Scottish Episcopal Church.

He has preferred to take for his groundwork the doctrine as held "*semper ubique et ab omnibus.*" The doctrine thus collected from various authors of various periods must, even if we suppose a perfect uniformity of meaning, contain much diversity of expression among the witnesses produced, and between them and our formularies. The Court has not to pronounce whether the authorities produced by the Bishop of Brechin are a full and accurate exposition of the catholic doctrine of the Eucharist; not whether they assert neither more nor less than, nor anything different from, our articles and formularies, but simply whether the Bishop of Brechin, regard being had both to the language of his charge, and to the explanations and modifications thereof contained in his answer and reply, has or has not contradicted the articles or formularies specified in the presentment.

By the first count of the presentment, then, the Bishop of Brechin is charged with contradicting and depraving the 31st article of religion, by asserting "the tremendous and absolute identity" of the sacrifice of Christ upon the cross, and of the Eucharistic sacrifice. I am of opinion that the language quoted in the presentment from pages 41 and 42 of the second edition of the Bishop of Brechin's Charge is fully censurable,\* as being *prima facie* inconsistent with the teaching of the 31st article, and that the explanations and modifications thereof given in his defences are not satisfactory nor sufficient to remove the charge of repugnancy, while at the same time I admit that the defences do effectually repudiate any heresy respecting the sufficiency of the sacrifice once offered on the cross as an atonement for the sins of the whole world. With this proviso, then, I find the first count proved. By the second count, the Bishop of Brechin is charged with depraving and contradicting the 28th article of religion, and the rubric or declaration at the end of the English Communion Office. I am of opinion that the depravation of the declaration is; and I am of opinion that no explanations offered by the Bishop do sufficiently or effectually prove the compati-

\* These passages as taken from the Presentments are—

1. That "the Eucharistic Sacrifice is the same substantially with the Cross: (Primary charge, p. 41.)
2. That "no words of man can strengthen the tremendous and absolute identity of the two Sacrifices." (Primary charge, p. 42.)

bility between his language at page 33 of the charge and the plain, grammatical meaning of the declaration. By the third count the Bishop of Brechin is charged with depravation of the 28th and 29th of the articles of religion. This I do not hold to be proved, inasmuch as I am of opinion that the expression "in no ways are they partakers of Christ," may allowably be interpreted as meaning "in no wise do they participate in the benefits of Christ's death and passion." By the fourth count, on page 5 of the presentment, the Bishop of Brechin is charged with depraving the articles and formularies, and that under three heads, marked *a, b, c.*\* Of these I have sufficiently stated my opinion under the first and second counts; and whereas the

\* A. "Look at the Declaration at the end of the Communion Service, how cautiously it avoids committing itself against the adoration of Christ in the Gifts; "it goes on to affirm that no adoration is intended or ought to be done, to what? to CHRIST, verily and indeed, taken and received? No, but first, to the Sacramental Bread and Wine, and secondly, to any Corporal (*i. e.*, material) Presence of CHRIST'S Flesh and Blood," (p. 33,) which words draw aside the plain meaning of the said declaration, and pervert the literal and grammatical sense thereof."

B. "If the Church had wished to condemn the practice," of "the adoration of CHRIST in the Sacrament," it was putting a very great stumbling block in the way of believers," to remove the 'Gloria in Excelsis,' to the position it occupies;" "Knowing what was the deep faith of the people in the gift of the Sacrament at the time of this arrangement, it was cruel to put a prayer into a place which must at once tempt them to an act which it assumed the Church thought wrong," (p. 34,) which words, in as much as they affirm that the Church cruelly put a stumbling block in the way, by placing the Gloria in Excelsis, where it stands in the service, unless it was intended to sanction the practice of worshipping of CHRIST in the gifts, which practice the Church has elsewhere disallowed and condemned in Article 28th, and by declaring that kneeling at the Communion is "meant for a signification of our humble and grateful acknowledgment of the benefits of CHRIST therein given to all worthy receivers," do in reality deprave the integrity of the Church, and tend to undo the confidence of the faithful in her formularies and declarations.

C. "Indeed, never has the Church to which we belong committed herself to any expression which forbids the worship of our LORD in the Holy Sacrament," (p. 35,) which affirmation being made, notwithstanding the declarations in Article 28th, and in the Rubric or Declaration at the end of the Communion Service in the Book of Common Prayer ignores the Church's testimony upon this point, and tends to invalidate and subvert the authority of the said Article and Rubric or Declaration in their literal or grammatical sense."

passage lettered *b* has been withdrawn by the respondent, I do not consider it necessary to give any further opinion on this charge.

Mr. Bryan King also, to revert to English 'Tractarian' matters, prosecuted one of the offenders against common decency in the Ecclesiastical Court; but previous to this act on the part of Mr. King, he and his Curate were mulcted by a Police Magistrate for an assault on some (supposed) intruders.\* Mr. Rosier, to whose prosecution for brawling in S. George's church we have just referred, was sentenced on April 17th, by the Consistory Court. We refer the reader to the Appendix for the sentence; † on the motion of the Hon. F. Lygon, M.P. for Tewksbury, the correspondence between Mr. King, and the Chief Commissioner of the Police and the Home Secretary were ordered to be printed, and in one of these letters we are informed that some person made use of a pew (No. 16) in the South aisle, as a water closet. ‡ It is indeed most humiliating to read the correspondence between a PRIEST (?) as he styles himself, and a Commissioner of the Police, but while humiliating it is most instructive, inasmuch as it shows the REAL character of the Establishment. Reference is also made in this correspondence to the conviction of Mr. Lowder, (the hero of the egg-pelting assault on the poor bill-sticker of Belgravia,) for an assault on "a person of the name of Jones," when Mr. Lowder was fined two shillings, the opinion of counsel was taken on the subject, who gave it as their opinion that the decision of the Magistrate was incorrect in point of law."§ Apropos to S. George's-in-the-East, Mr. Bryan King, having in his letter to Dr. Tait expressed his opinion that some of the clergy coincided with him, several of that body addressing a letter to their Diocesan assured his Lordship that they felt no sympathy with Mr. King, this letter the '*Union*'

\* Appendix, OO, for the Presentment.

† Appendix, PP.

‡ Appendix, QQ.

§ Appendix, RR.

omitted to insert in its columns, and hence our inability to present it to our readers in the Appendix, which we truly regret, inasmuch as it affords a curious illustration of the unity existing in Anglicanism. Dr. Tait further showed his opposition to Tractarian innovation, by forwarding a 'monition' to Mr. Thompson, the churchwarden, to send the 'singing men and boys' to the gallery, and inhibiting Mr. Dove from officiating at S. George's.

Mr. Westerton's first act on assuming office as churchwarden at Belgravia, was to institute proceedings against Mr. Liddell in the Court of Appeal, Doctors' Commons,' for having violated in many essential respects the judgment given by the judicial Committee, on 21st March, 1857, "as to the 'restoration of the Cross,' and the 'use of embroidered altar cloths.'\*" The Court on giving judgment in this matter, stated that 'it refused the motion,' whereon Mr. Stephens resolved to refer the matter to Her Majesty in Council.

The case of *Poole v. the Bishop of London*, was brought before the Privy Council, in which the ex-stipendiary Curate of S. Paul's, Knightsbridge, requested leave to appeal against the decision of the Archbishop of Canterbury confirming the revocation of his license by the Bishop of London; the Court decided in favor of the appeal, Lord Chelmsford stating that, "the question of right of appeal in this case is one of such great and general importance, and their Lordships not having had the advantage of hearing Counsel against the right, and being very unwilling to exclude the further consideration of the case, they think it right to admit the appeal, reserving all question as to the competency of the appeal, and all right to protest against the same."

A Society essentially Tractarian in its origin was inaugurated on July 5th, 1859, and received the appellation of '*The Church of England Protection Society*,' its end being to 'defend and preserve unimpaired the doctrine

\* Appendix, SS.

and discipline of our beloved Church,' and it must really be humiliating to the 'Tractarian' party to publish the facts they were compelled to issue in this their 'first Report, and it is only wonderful how men like Mr. Gresley and others can deceive themselves as they do; the *real object* of 'this new Society is to maintain the Truth as the English Church (*i. e.*, the Establishment) has received it, but we must refer our readers to the Report\* for a further account of this hybrid Society, merely giving in the Appendix a slight sketch of the object.

Mr. Cheyne, (the *soi-disant* Martyr of Tractarianism in Scotland, where Dr. Suther would not permit him to carry on his antics any longer, to the edification of the Aberdeen Presbyterians,) published a reply to the Address of sympathy, presented to him by more than 4,300 persons, in which he most feelingly refers to the difference between him and Dr. Forbes;† but his friends, with greater truth than is usual, condemned the titular Bishop of Brechin, and Mr. Keble and the 'Union' prophesied that the Scotch Church was rapidly sinking into Protestantism, and loudly called for a little plain sailing and vigorous action.‡

It has been reserved for the 'Union' to arrive at the culminating point of Tractarianism absurdity. That journal since its birth has been noted for its absurdities, and has gained for itself the soubriquet of the clerical *Charivari* or *Punch* of the day, (distancing its less witty brother in Fleet Street,) and while we are pening these lines, an article entitled 'The Church in the Catacombs,' has appeared, where the writer, (comparing the heresiarchs of S. George's-in-the-East, and the other apish imitators of the Truth, with the Christians in the earlier ages of the history of the *Church* of God, not the Establishment or any other heretical body,) advises his followers to build way-side oratories where they may continue their vagaries without any fear of '*monitions*, from Dr. Tait, or any other "heretical Palmerston—Shaftesbury Bishop."

\* Appendix, TT.

† Appendix, UU.

‡ Appendix, VV.

We have finished our Annals of the "*Tractarian*," "*Oxford*," or "*Puseyite*" movement, and perhaps we may be asked *cui bono*? What interest is it to those who have always been Catholics, to hear of the erratic performances of a Mr. Blunt, or a Mr. Liddell, or a Mr. Bennett? or what possible pleasure can it give the convert who has fully and entirely submitted to the Church of Rome, to hear of his past doings, or to have the scenes of his Anglican days brought before his mind; to think of the time when a respectful salutation to the departed at the lych gate, was taken as a salutation to the representatives of a Poor House, and when his casting the dust on the coffin of the deceased was regarded as an act of superstition—or what possible gratification could it afford to one who is satisfied (if indeed there be any such) that the Church of England is all that he stands in need of, to read of the secession of such men as Newman, Ward, Faber, Oakeley, Maskell, Allies, Dodsworth, Manning, Wilberforce, Ffoulkes, or Palmer? It is from no wish to parade the names of these or any other of our fellow converts that we have penned our Annals: but simply to present them as a guide to some future historian of the Church of England—as an index to the commencement of the fulfilment of the vision granted to S. Edward and the Spanish Hermit in the reign of Elizabeth. Three centuries had scarce elapsed, when the top-mast of the sunken vessel, perceived by the Hermit, was seen rising above the waters, and the English Church, prefigured by that vessel, once more manfully and openly breasted the waves of heresy and schism. The Hierarchy was restored to England, and though Protestantism was rampant with fury, still the Church proceeded onward, reconciling one and then another wandering son to her bosom, regardless of the threats of Lord Campbell, the proclamations of Mr. Spencer Walpole, or the letters of Lord John Russell. But not so with the Establishment; while the Church rejected and cut off from her communion such rotten branches as Ronge and

Czerski, the Establishment, inasmuch as she is not the Church of God, was compelled to see one Heretic promoted to the Bench of her so-called Bishops, and another appointed to a Living, while others defended these practices. In the case of Mr. Gorham, the Bishop of Exeter had the honesty to act upon his conviction and refuse to institute and here the matter ended.—Nay, it did not end here—we have forgotten; the Bishop of Exeter “protested” (as Protestants, no matter whether imbued with high Anglican Church theories, or Latitudinarian principles, invariably do) against the institution of Mr. Gorham, on the ground that “the said George Cornelius Gorham did manifestly and notoriously hold the aforesaid heretical doctrines, and hath not since retracted and disclaimed the same, any Archbishop or Bishop, or any official of any Archbishop or Bishop, who shall institute the said George Cornelius Gorham to the cure and Government of the souls of the parishioners of Bramford-Speke within our Diocese aforesaid, will thereby incur the sin of supporting and favoring the said heretical doctrines, and we do hereby renounce and repudiate all communion with any one, be he who he may, who shall so institute the said George Cornelius Gorham as aforesaid.”\*

But why did not Dr. Philpotts, “warn those parishioners of Bramford-Speke whom Christ has placed under his charge, to avoid all communion with the said Mr. Gorham, to flee from his ministrations and seek orthodox teaching elsewhere?” He could not do so, for, as he tells the churchwardens of Bramford-Speke, that “it would be a presumptuous invasion of his rights so to do, it would be schismatical to follow it;” so that Bishop Philpotts, who “felt himself bound to submit to every penalty rather than *himself* give Mr. Gorham institution, in the Diocese which he says is committed to his charge by Christ, yet tells the poor people it will be schismatical if they do not place themselves under the pastoral care of an open and

\* The Gorham Case.

intolerable heretic.”\*—Mr. Gorham was instituted, and the case ended; for “when it was first decided that the validity of Baptism was to be left an open question in the Church of England, many persons expressed their conviction that to allow an Article of Faith to be denied, was to abandon the principle of Authority, and therefore to lose that which was essential to the vitality of the Church. But a few years have accustomed men to this as to other evils.”† And thus will it invariably be with the Establishment, for it has not, as Dr. Pusey has truly said, “any distinctive doctrine,” and that therefore it is worse than idle for any of her members to make declaration against Romish error.

The Tractarian controversy has developed another circumstance; a certain party in the establishment had contended for the Apostolical succession of the Anglican Ministers, and much was said and written on this subject, when the Primate put an end to the matter, by expressing his belief that not one of the Bishops believed in the absolute necessity of Episcopal Ordination. We know not whether Dr. Sumner intended to contend for lay ministration, (though in reality he, as well as the other *soi-disant* Bishops, are only laymen) with Dr. Gilbert Burnett, and to found his argument upon two *supposed* ecclesiastical facts, which it would be well for us to examine. Dr. Burnett’s “ecclesiastical facts” are—

I. The preaching of S. Frumentius.

II. The conversion of the Iberians.

The passage from Burnett is as follows,—“Our Reformers had also in view two famous instances in Church History, of laymen that had preached and converted nations to the Faith. It is true they came as they ought to have done to be regularly ordained, and were sent to such as had authority so to do; so Frumentius preached to the Indians, and was made a Priest and a

\* Ward’s letters on the Establishment.

† Wilberforce on the Principles of Church Authority.

Bishop by Athanasius; the king of the Iberians, before he was baptized himself, did convert his subjects (says the historian,) and became the Apostle of his country before he was himself initiated. It is indeed added, that he sent an embassy to Constantine the Emperor, desiring him that he would send Priests for the further establishment of the Faith there.”\*

Let us enquire into the case of

I. S. Frumentius preaching to the Ethiopians before his ordination by S. Athanasius.

A Christian philosopher, (Meropius) on his return from India, brought with him his two nephews, Ædesius and Frumentius; who, on the vessel anchoring at some port in Africa, landed for the purpose of learning their lessons. They were surprised by a body of Barbarians, who were at war with Rome; returning from the vessel which they had pillaged, they were so touched by the beauty and innocence of the children that they brought them to their King, who made Ædesius his cup-bearer, and Frumentius the keeper of the Royal Records. The King died, and on his death left his kingdom to his son, still a child, with his wife as regent, and granted Frumentius and Ædesius liberty to do as they pleased. But the Queen besought them to assist her in the government of the kingdom until her son should be of age. God inspired Frumentius with the idea of inquiring if there were any Christians among those who trafficked with the country, and as he found there were, he permitted them to hold prayer meetings after the manner of the Romans, and even allowed them to build Churches, thus aiding them in planting and propagating Christianity. On the young king coming of age, Ædesius and Frumentius rendered him a faithful account of their administration, and left. Ædesius returned to Tyre to see his relations; but Frumentius proceeded to Alexandria, saying that it was not right to conceal the work of the Lord. He informed S. Athanasius, as Bishop

\* Burnett on the XXXIX Articles.

of the Diocese, of all that had occurred, and exhorted him to send some one as Bishop, to preside over the number of Christians that were there. S. Athanasius, after reflecting on the words of S. Frumentius, said, "whom else can I send, save you;" and having consecrated him Bishop, he commanded him to return to Auxuma in Ethiopia, where he performed several miracles, and converted a large number of the Barbarians.\* S. Frumentius cannot then be cited as an example of a *lay-preacher*, as he did no more than any Christian would have done in similar circumstances.

## II. The conversion of the Iberians.

"A certain woman (says Socrates,)<sup>†</sup> distinguished by her devout and chaste life, was, in the providential ordering of God, taken captive by the Iberians, who dwell near the Euxine Sea, and are a colony of the Iberians of Spain. She accordingly in her captivity exercised herself among the Barbarians in the practice of virtue: for she not only maintained the most rigid continence, but spent much time in fastings and prayers; at which extraordinary conduct the Barbarians were very greatly astonished. The King's son, then a mere babe, happening to be attacked with disease, the Queen, according to the custom of the country, sent the child to other women to be cured, in the hope that their experience would supply a remedy. After the infant had been carried around by its nurse without obtaining relief from any of the women, he was at length brought to this captive. She, having no knowledge of the medical art, applied no material remedy; but taking the child and laying it on her bed, which was made of horse-cloth, in the presence of other females, she simply said, 'Christ, who healed many, will heal this child also;' then having prayed, in addition to this expression of faith, and called upon God, the boy was immediately restored, and continued well from that period. The report of this miracle spread itself far and wide among the Barbarian women, and soon reached the

\* Baronius.

† Socrates' Ecclesiastical History.

Queen, so that the captive became very celebrated. Not long afterwards the Queen herself, having fallen sick, sent for this woman, who being a person of modest and retiring manners, excused herself from going, on which the Queen was conveyed to her, and received relief in like manner as her son had, for the disease was at once removed. But when the Queen thanked the stranger, she replied, 'This work is not mine, but Christ's, who is the Son of God that made the world.' She therefore exhorted her to call upon Him, and acknowledge the true God. Amazed at his wife's sudden restoration to health, the King of the Iberians wished to requite her with gifts, whom he had understood to be the means of effecting these cures; she however declined their acceptance, telling him that she needed not riches, inasmuch as she possessed abundance in the consolations of religion; but that she would regard as the greatest present he could offer her, his recognition of the God whom she worshipped and declared. This answer the King treasured up in his mind, and going forth to the chase the next day, the following circumstance occurred;—a mist and thick darkness covered the mountain-tops and forests where he was hunting, so that their sport was embarrassed, and their path became inextricable. In this perplexity the Prince earnestly invoked the gods whom he worshipped, but finding that it profited him nothing, he at last determined to implore the assistance of the captive's God; when scarcely had he begun to pray, ere the darkness arising from the mist was completely dissipated. Wondering at that which was done, he returned to his palace rejoicing; and relating to his wife what had happened, he immediately sent for the captive stranger, and begged her to inform him who that God was whom she adored. The woman, on her arrival, caused the King of the Iberians to become a Preacher of the Gospel; for having believed in Christ through the faithfulness of this devoted woman, he convinced all the Iberians who were under his authority; and when he had declared to

them what had taken place in reference to the cure of his wife and child, as well as the circumstance connected with the chase, he exhorted them to worship the God of the captive. Thus, therefore, both the King and Queen were made preachers of Christ, the one addressing their male, and the other their female subjects. Moreover, the King, having ascertained from his prisoner the plan upon which Churches were constructed among the Romans, ordered an Oratory to be built, providing all things necessary for its immediate erection; and the edifice was accordingly commenced. But when they came to set up the pillars, Divine Providence interposed for the confirmation of the inhabitants in the faith, for one of the columns remained immovable; and the workmen, disheartened by the fracture of their ropes and machinery, at length gave up all further effort. Then was proved the reality of the captive's faith in the following manner:—going to the place at night without the knowledge of any one, she spent the whole time in prayer; and the power of God was manifested by the pillar being raised, and caused to stand erect in the air above its base, yet so as not to touch it. At day-break, the King, who was an intelligent person, came himself to inspect the work, and seeing the pillar suspended in this position without support, both he and his attendants were amazed; but shortly after, while they stood gazing on this wonder, the pillar descended on its own pedestal and there remained fixed. Upon this the people shouted, attesting the truth of the King's faith, and hymning the praise of the God of the captive. Their belief being thus established, the rest of the columns were easily reared, and the whole building was soon completed. An embassy was afterwards sent to the Emperor Constantine, requesting that henceforth they might be in alliance with the Romans, and receive from them a Bishop and consecrated clergy, since they sincerely believed in Christ. Ruffinus says, that he learned these facts from Bacurius, formerly one of the petty Princes of the Iberians, who

subsequently went over to the Romans, and was made a captain of the military force in Palestine: being at length intrusted with the supreme command in the war against the tyrant Maximus, he greatly assisted the Emperor Theodosius."

Such were "the two famous instances in Church History" referred to by Burnett, and relied on by Dr. Sumner and those who think with him regarding the non-necessity of Episcopal Ordination—but perhaps these gentlemen have a latent suspicion that they are in reality only laymen. Acknowledging the validity and canonicity of Anglican orders, acknowledging that Dr. Sumner is an Archbishop and Dr. Pusey a Presbyter—still the question is, "who gave Dr. Parker (the first Protestant Archbishop of Canterbury), not his orders, not his episcopal character, but *mission* to execute the powers which belong to that character in the determinate see of Canterbury, and *authority* to execute the powers of a Primate in the Province of Canterbury. To this no answer can be given but one—Queen Elizabeth gave, or at least attempted to give, that mission and authority;" and, continues Mr. Allies, "more need not be said on this head, as all the Courts of the Kingdom have just affirmed this power to exist in the Crown, and as Her Majesty, in exercise of her authority as Supreme Ecclesiastical Judge, has just reversed the sentence of the Archbishop's Court, and decreed that the clergy of the Church have it wholly at their option, to teach and preach that infants are regenerated by God in Holy Baptism, or that such a doctrine is 'a soul-destroying heresy'—nay, as the perfection of liberty, the same clergyman can now at the font, in the words of the Baptismal Service, declare his belief in the former doctrine, and in the pulpit proceed to enforce the latter."\* The Queen has also power to institute Bishops, *i. e.*, to originate missionary jurisdiction.

In addition to this the Anglican ministers are not or-

\* Allies' the See of S. Peter.

dained, for the words conveying the orders "might be used to a child when confirmed or baptized," but this objection was so powerfully brought home by Lewgar (a convert, and friend of the notorious apostate Chillingworth) that the celebrated Savoy Conference altered the form of ordaining Priests and consecrating Bishops in order to meet these objections. "But (says Dr. Milner) admitting that they are sufficient to obviate all the objections of our divines to the Ordinal, which they are not, they come above a hundred years too late for their intended purpose; so that if the Priests and Bishops of Edward and Elizabeth's reigns were invalidly ordained and consecrated, so must those of Charles II.'s reign and their successors have been also."\* Another peculiarity was the respect with which Bishops were to be treated; their lightest word was esteemed a censure, and at first it was so, but soon the Episcopal Bench was arrayed against the Tractarian party, and then matters were different. The Bishop of Hereford is still styled Bishop Hampden by the *English Churchman*, and one of the "Oxford School" says—"The Bishops of the present day are manifestly NOT THE CHOSEN OF THE CHURCH, but CREATURES OF THE SECULAR CLERGY; and to the Secular Government, and to their own ambition, and aggrandizement and power, do they now compromise, betray, and sell the liberties, the duties, nay, the very bread and (moral) being of the so-called Lower Clergy, who notwithstanding are the only hopeful pastors of the people and faithful witnesses of Jesus Christ." What watchful observer of the course of events in the Establishment, and the gradual return of England to the faith of her forefathers, has forgotten the curious correspondence between Messrs, Henslowe and Harvey and their respective Diocesans.

The Puseyites at first did not use the Rosary or have crucifixes, for Mr. Newman tells us that "the crucifix is

\* Milner's End of Religious Controversy.

in this place (Oxford) no badge of persons ;”\* but as the controversy developed itself, we find Dr. Pusey and Miss Sellon defending the crucifix, for says the former, “Neither the use of the crucifix nor of the pictures of the Crucifixion, which are more common among ourselves, can be in any way regarded as contrary to the second commandment, when used to set before our eyes the Divine Lord, and the sufferings of our Crucified Lord. For what is forbidden in that commandment is to make for ourselves any likeness of God ; but to represent Christ Crucified is but to exhibit the human form which for us and our salvation He Himself took.”† “Nor do I know anything to forbid an English clergyman either to wear such a memorial of his crucified Lord himself, or to give it to others to wear, not ostentatiously, but unseen by man, to recall the thought of Himself to them ; but further, neither can I think it wrong to pray either with a picture of our Lord crucified, or a crucifix before him, so that it be used only to fix and deepen our thoughts of His dying love, and make it present to us, and so I have said when asked.”‡ Mr. Dodsworth thus remarks on this passage, (and need we say that we fully concur with him, for there always has appeared a—delicacy shall we call it?—no, rather an apologetic spirit, long before Dr. Pusey even sanctioned the use of the crucifix and the Rosary, among the Tractarian party—a reserve which plainly showed that though they, “with Dr. Arnold, envied the little girl kissing the crucifix in the crypt,” yet were afraid to act)§—“I very reluctantly

\* Newman’s Letter to the Rev. G. Faussett (1838.)

† Pusey’s Preface to Scupoli’s Spiritual Combat, p. 191, Note, (2nd Edition).

‡ Pusey’s Letter to the Bishop of London.

§ We give the extract in full from Mr. Bennett’s “Letter to Lord John Russell, M.P.”—“The second commandment is, in the letter, utterly done away with by the fact of the Incarnation. To refuse then the benefit which we might derive *from the frequent use of the Crucifix*, under the pretence of the second commandment, is folly, because God has sanctioned one conceivable similitude of Himself when he declared Himself in the person of Christ”—

notice the following painful passage in Dr. Pusey's remarks on this branch of the subject. The italics are mine. *I could not when asked but say that the crucifix itself was not forbidden by the second commandment.* Dr. Pusey argues at great length, and with much force and beauty, upon the edifying use of the crucifix, as reminding us of him who died for us, as reminding us of Him by its very touch, and he says much more in this good strain; he knows too how falsely Catholics are accused of breaking the second commandment by its use. And yet he speaks as if reluctantly, '*I could not refuse*'—'when asked'—and as being able to shelter himself behind the opinion of a most estimable man indeed, but an avowed latitudinarian. Thus fortified, he could not refuse to say that Christians, who use the crucifix, are not actually IDOLATERS. What must we then think of a position which forces such a man as Dr. Pusey to write in this strain? Afterwards, at p. 149, he says 'It cannot but be natural to every Christian heart to love to behold representations of his Crucified Lord. *It cannot, dare not, need apology.*' Would that he had thought of this before he wrote the previous painfully apologetic passage."\* The Oxford party now adopt the Rosary as well as wear crucifixes, nay, they even go so far as to wear relics and the Agnus Dei. Poor men! they imagine themselves to be *in* the Church, members of Christ's One Holy Catholic and Apostolic Church, whereas they are *still* out of Her pale, and "aliens to the commonwealth of Israel," thus forcibly reminding one of those words of the

and in another place, "In the crypt is a Calvary, and figures as large as life, representing the burying of our Lord. The woman who showed us the crypt had her little girl with her, and she lifted up the child, about three years old, to kiss the feet of our Lord. Is this idolatry? Nay verily, it may be so, but it need not, and assuredly is, in itself, right and natural. I rather envied the child. It is idolatry to talk about Holy Church and Holy Fathers—bowing down to fallible and sinful men, not to bend knee, lip, and heart to every thought and every image of Him, our manifested God.—(Life of Dr. Arnold.)"

\* Dodsworth's Letter to Dr. Pusey.

Prophet Isaiah, "Behold all ye that kindle a fire, that compass yourselves about with sparks, *walk in the light of your fire, and in the sparks ye have kindled.* THIS SHALL YE HAVE OF MINE HAND, YE SHALL LIE DOWN IN SORROW!"\*

The Tractarian party are great sticklers for the revival of the obsolete rituals and ceremonies of the Establishment, but with what success our readers may judge, when one Bishop recommended unlit candles to be placed on the Communion table, and others acknowledged that they had "no *dispensing* power over either Rubric or Canon, but only an explanatory one in difficult cases."†

Fifteen years have now elapsed since the writer of these pages was led by the loving kindness of a good and gracious God to resign all that he had in this world to embrace the Faith as taught by Jesus Christ, and now held and maintained by the Church of Rome, and though these years have been a period of bitter suffering, still, thank God, he has been enabled to remain firm in his faith, and to be still, by the Grace of God, A CATHOLIC. The Church of Rome ALONE possesses that faith which S. Peter preached, and for which S. Paul suffered, that glorious faith which enabled a child of twelve years to court martyrdom, and to tell the impious Dacian that she was the implacable enemy of his idols, that Isis, Apollo, and Venus were nothing, and carried away by her zeal, the youthful Eulalie spat in Dacian's face, and trampled under foot the idol which she saw before her, and thus she perished; that faith which enabled S. Agnes, S. Lucy, and S. Euphemia, to suffer unheard-of tortures; that faith for which S. Alban shed his blood; but this was at a time when, with the poet, it might be said—

"The Kingdom all did rush to sanctify,  
There was fear each day and love of God in them,  
As long as lived the warmth of faith without decay."

"Oh then," do we say with Mr. Allies, "Church of Rome, too late have we found thee who shouldst have

\* Isaiah, l. 11.

† The Church her own Revivalist, by J. F. Knolles.

fostered our childhood, and set thy gentle and awful seal on your youth; who shouldst have brought us up in the serene regions of truth, apart from doubt and the long agony of uncertain years. . . . O too long sought and too late found, yet be it given us to pass under thy protection the short remains of this troubled life, to wander no more from the fold, but to find the Chair of the Chief Shepherd to be indeed the ‘shadow of a great Rock in a weary land!’”

We have no reason to be surprised at the cool appropriation by heresy of that which belongs to the Church of God, for, *simia Dei diabolus*, is a true proverb—the Devil is ever aping God in his works; “yet,” to use the words of Mr. Ffoulkes, “he is made instrumental to the very purpose which he would defeat,” for a lie would not be a lie did it not counterfeit some truth.

Does the Church establish the Sisters of Mercy and call their services into requisition? the Devil is ready, as the “*Simia Dei*,” with a Nightingale or a Sellon \* to ape the works of the genuine Sister of Mercy. Does the Church in her wisdom establish missions? a Wilberforce is at hand to attempt the same. Does the Church send out missionaries to the distant East, or the cold frigid North? a Martyn and a Heber are nigh to go likewise. Does the Church recommend her clergy to practice celibacy? immediately does Anglicanism seize the idea, and “*Bachelors’ vows*” are taken, and *soi-disant* monasteries and convents established—nay, even our very ecclesiastical dress is imitated, and it is not without great difficulty that one can at first glance discern a Priest of the most High from a teacher of heresy.

Did not the Devil act as the “*simia Dei*,” when he urged men to establish Societies for the perversion of Ireland, and established a “*Priest Protection Society*” to

\* We by no means desire to depreciate the exertions of these ladies in the cause of mercy and charity, as we sincerely trust to see them and their companions rejoicing one day in the faith that cometh from above.

give shelter to apostate Priests—to men who, failing to raise a schism among their people, or actuated by evil passions, left their God, and sold their souls for a mess of pottage?—for we are aware that, from the moment that Browne, the Apostate Archbishop of Dublin, broke the sacred *Baculum Christi* to this hour, bribery is used to purchase souls dedicated to God. We are further aware that when the hour of death draws nigh, when the “apery” of Satan is seen through, and the soul is approaching the valley of the shadow of death, that she sends, like Myler Magrath, the apostate Archbishop of Cashel, and the penitent Dunboyne, for the Priest of the Most High to console and reconcile her to an offended Deity. The Devil, at the hour of death, fails to be the “*simia Dei*,” as the death beds of apostates fully confirm; others, like Quinn, the Scripture-reader at Cushendall, and Magrath, Bishop of Down and Connor, submit to the Church before that awful hour. Satan is foiled, thoroughly foiled, in his attempt to act the “*simia Dei*”—his instruments are pliant enough, but God is generally at hand to overthrow their plans and to turn them into ridicule. Well may the Psalmist’s words apply to the instigators of this movement in Ireland—“Why have the Gentiles raged, and the people devised vain things? The Kings of the earth stood up, and the Princes met together against the Lord and against his Christ. Let us break their bonds asunder, and let us cast their yoke from us. He that dwelleth in Heaven shall laugh at them, and the Lord shall deride them. Then shall He speak to them in his anger, and trouble them in his rage.”

And now, in conclusion, let us briefly review the transactions of the last few years—but ere doing this, our readers will forgive our quoting a passage from Dr. Lushington’s far-famed judgment *in re* Westerton v. Liddell—“Have we not even in our own day witnessed a sad example of the danger of endeavoring anew to reform that which our Reformers left us, and assimilate our system to

the Church of Rome? Have we not seen, what never has before, from the days of Cranmer, been seen in this land—not less, in a very few years, than 100 clergymen of our Church secede to Rome, and who were many of them men of undoubted piety, of great learning, blameless lives? See the monuments erected to the memory of the martyrs of our own Church at Oxford; and read the names of those who took a leading part in that work. How many have seceded from that Church which they sought to preserve by honoring the memory of its first restorers and martyrs? Ought we not then to pause—to doubt our own strength and our own judgment—when we seek to mend that which they bequeathed to us, consecrated by their own blood? Ought we not to hesitate before we admit any one practice, any one thing, not sanctioned by them, and more especially any one thing which has the remotest leaning to the Church of Rome and her usages, which our Reformed Faith holds in just abhorrence? Is it not wiser to keep on the safe side—to omit rather that which may be innocent in itself, even decorous or ornamental,—than run the remotest risk of consequences so much to be deplored.”

It must be evident to the most listless observer of passing events, that no sooner had one rendered himself remarkable for his zeal in defence of the Establishment, than we were sure to hear of his return from bondage to the land of promise. At the commencement of the movement, the names of Newman, Oakeley, Faber, Ward, were continually pointed out as torch-bearers to guide the erring Anglican, but as time rolled on, and the Tractarian movement developed itself, they submitted to the Church, then were Anglicans led to mourn for their secession, and to pray for their return, and also exhorted to look up to Caswall, Dodsworth, Manning, Allies, Wilberforce, and as each of them were in their turn reconciled to a fond and affectionate parent;—Ffoulkes and Palmer started each their own “counter-theory,” like so many “will-o’-the-wisps,” to deceive the unwary traveller, seeking the salva-

tion of his soul; at last they also—Palmer, after much toil and enquiry, as to the Catholicity of the Greek Church—Ffoulkes, after no little mental labor, yielded themselves as willing subjects of the See of S. Peter. Nor were the Laity excluded; Campden, Feilding, Dunraven, Pakenham, Biddulph, Simeon, Murray, Prosser are names too well known to dispute that each and every Anglo-catholic, if sincere minded, is sure to enter the bosom of the Church; and, reader, what would we deduce from this, what would we bid you do?—Simply to pray for those who are “seeking the Lord in the simplicity of heart,” and be assured that He who has bestowed the mighty gift of faith on such souls as Newman and his brother converts, will hear our prayer, and bestow the like precious gift on the remaining champions of Anglicanism. Can we as Catholics enjoying the full favor of God’s love, see such men as Bennett, Denison, Liddell, Neale, and Keble, toiling for that which has not life, and yet refrain from holding up our hand for them. No! perish the thought, accursed be the very idea of such an anomalous position,—we do pray earnestly for the reconciliation of our brethren. They are praying for us; it is a holy war of prayer, and let us proceed on in our crusade, and perhaps ere S. Silvester again revisit us, we may have the pleasure of seeing chronicled among the converts, the names of those who are in the front of the battle leading on hostile troops against the city of God.

And now one word for ourselves—if, reader, we have done aught either to amuse or instruct, may we ask of you an *Ave Maria* for our spiritual welfare, an *Ave Maria* that we may have grace to struggle on to the end, bearing before our eyes the heart-cheering motto, *Ἐν τούτῳ νικᾷς* and ever remembering the word of Holy Writ—“He showeth Himself to them that have FAITH in Him, for *perverse thoughts* separate from God.”

Many have been led to the Church—the Ark of Christ—where alone peace *can* be found in these troublous times,

by a hatred of that spirit of equivocation, deceit and shuffleing practised by the Puseyite party without, we grieve to say, a single exception.

Well does Miss Braine say, in her invaluable brochure, '*The Morality of Tractarianism*,' "We give up some things lest we should be found out. Is this right? How used we once to teach our children? Was it not thus? Speak the truth: never be ashamed of the truth: have no secrets; avoid mysteries; tell your parents everything; be open, be simple, be true. And, how are we acting? Are we not living a life of concealment? feeling the very hairs of our heads telling secrets about us. Does a week pass without a contrivance, or an escape? Is there not a weight and a burden on us so great that we feel as if we could no more dare, as once we dared look up into the clear face of heaven and let its quiet and its peace be reflected in the mirror of our own hearts. . . . We prevaricate and evade, and get out of difficulties in a manner worthy of those whose rule of faith is the Catholic interpretation with which Tractarian piety interprets the Reformed Book of Prayer, and Articles of our Reformed Church."

#### POSTSCRIPT.

The riots at S. George's-in-the-East have terminated as every Catholic foresaw they would terminate, in the most complete triumph of Protestantism, and the total defeat of bastard Catholicity—the total defeat of that "apery" of Popery which has been so long allowed to pursue its course under the auspices of Messrs. Bryan King, Lowder, Dove, and others. Mr. King has virtually surrendered his cause, (though he professed himself prepared to meet the fate of the martyred Archbishop of Canterbury, (S. Thomas à Becket,) inasmuch as he has resigned his charge to Mr. Hansard, nominally for a year, but virtually, if we are to believe the '*Union*,' for ever. Before we quote the '*Union*,' or rather one of its correspondents, we sincerely trust that ere long we shall have to enrol the names of Mr. King, his

Curates, and his distressed flock among those who have (by the grace of God, and the loving kindness of our Blessed Ladye, the Immaculate Mary,) been led to submit to THE CHURCH, and have relinquished that most fatal shade of Protestantism—THE BRANCH THEORY.

The 'Union,' or rather one of its correspondents, thus writes respecting Mr. Hansard's conduct :—

*The Editor of the Union.*

Sir,—Permit me as a pretty constant member of the late S. George's congregation, to draw, for a moment, the attention of your readers to the present state of that unhappy church.

I say of "the late congregation," for the course pursued by Mr. Hansard, on Sunday last, has driven out in sorrow and dismay the faithful, though scanty, relics of the flock which, with an almost unparralleled devotedness, has clung to its church and its Pastor through fourteen months of outrage and persecution, such as no other Christian congregation has, for many and many a year, been called on to suffer. I am not speaking of these like myself, some from sympathy with the Rector's opinion, some from a sense of a duty to God and man, superseding all minor consideration of sympathy or distaste—who have come to his assistance in his long struggle. We, of course, knew why we came, and could no more desert the cause we had once joined, than a soldier could desert his post in battle. I speak of those who came as to their regular place of worship, who had no relief in quiet day-services elsewhere, whose daily life had grown, through their devotedness, an unvarying round of pain and insult, and worldly loss; but who yet held on unwaveringly and uncomplainingly to their church and pastor, fit followers of one, who, in life and character, no less than in bitter suffering and unmerited obloquy, followed His Heavenly Master with no distant step. We have known many such. We have mingled with them through these long months of contest, and in the close communion of a common struggle and a common faith. We have learned lessons from them which some of us at least may well carry to our graves.

Shall we not sympathize with them now in the sudden overthrow of all which they have suffered so much to maintain?

sad, indeed, was that parting service, when, perhaps for the last time, they received from the hand of their beloved Pastor, that Holy Sacrament which had so long sustained them both in their heaviest trials, with a strength above the wildest fury of their foes. But even then it was not all dark. They could still look forward to the time when he, who was now driven from them, would return with renovated health and strength; and, meanwhile, they had their Rector's assurance that the privileges they had so dearly valued would be faithfully maintained.

A very few days sufficed to show how both he and they had been deceived. Scarcely had their own Pastor left the shore, when at one blow the fruits of all their hard won victory were torn from them, without a struggle, without a word, every mob demand was eagerly conceded, and the helpless congregation learned that henceforth their worship was to be shaped and the faith dictated by every blasphemous clamor from the den of vice in which they are compelled to live.

Thus, then, mob law prevails at last, the relics of the congregation are driven forth, they know not where: and the church of S. George's-in-the-East is handed over to undivided blasphemy and sacrilege. Let them who were present at the celebration of Tuesday, compare it with that of Sunday morning last, and ask themselves which was the sadder sight, the sorrowful throng of worshippers on the one day, or the triumphant mob and the desecrated, deserted altar of the other. Let those who still possess and value the privilege of Christian worship, try for a moment to picture to themselves the condition of those whose prayers are now to be disturbed by the publicans and harlots of their parish, and ask themselves if nought can be done even at this twelfth hour to help them.

I am, Sir, yours, &c.

A COMMUNICANT.

We sincerely trust (as the Catholic annalist of this movement, whose annals we are attempting to record for the use of the future historian of England's return and submission to the yoke of Christ and his Vicar,) that all who "possess and value the privilege of Christian worship," who "possess and value the privilege" of being able

to assist at the Holy and Adorable Sacrifice of the Christian Church, will pray most sincerely for the submission of Mr. King and his misguided followers, who are 'driven forth,' wandering they know not whither—such wanderers, we trust, will direct their feet to the Ark of God, and there find rest for their souls.

Another curious controversy has risen in the Establishment, where we trust will tend yet further to compel our quondam brethren to submit to the Church. We refer to the conduct of Dr. Forbes in administering the rite of Confirmation at Mr. Gurney's '*temple*' in Paris. With Mr. Pinckney, the law established Vicar of Collumpton, we agree in believing that Dr. Forbes seems to us to have acted contrary to the teaching of the Fathers and the Council of Nice, for S. Jerome says, with truth, "Non in unâ urbe certe *plures* episcopi esse potuissent," and the Council of Nice decreed. "Ἴνα μὴ ἐν τῇ πόλει δύο ἐπίσκοποι ᾤσι

Nor can Mr. Gurney's plea respecting the conduct of the Church in England be received, until he can irrefutably prove that Messrs. Tait, Sumner, Bickersteth, and their confrères are "*ἐπίσκοποι*" in the real sense of the word. As Catholics, we regard them as laymen, and even among those of the *soi-disant* 'Bishops' who pretend to be Catholics, there is no fixity of Doctrines. Look at Dr. Forbes' recent conduct, who, previous to the decision of his judges, boasted that he "repudiated all private interpretations and peculiar theories," yet, on the decision being made known, withdrew his "belief," in "*that which was DEARER TO HIM THAN LIFE ITSELF,*" and for which he was "prepared to endure every thing."

Dr. Forbes has published an apology in his late charge to the Clergy of the Diocess of Brechin, but how worthy of one, who *pretends* to be a CATHOLIC Bishop!!! and *knows* that he is only a *layman*.

---



## A D D E N D A .

---

PAGE 304.

---

We have much pleasure in supplying an omission in our 'Annals' of 1852, by giving an extract from Mr. Belaney's letter to the Bishop of Chichester.

"The change, my Lord, which religion underwent in this country about three hundred years ago, necessarily demanded of one who had been taught to regard it as a Divine work, 'a blessed Reformation,' the most attentive investigation, before he could be justified in condemning it. A convulsion so widely spread, so permanent in its effects; desolating, like an earthquake, not one kingdom, but many; and operating, like a solvent, throughout every class of society, and in all the relations of life; dismembering empires, and in many instances, inundating the land with blood; a convulsion such as this, was not to be ignored, where truth alone, and that the highest truth of all, was the object of pursuit. In my quiet residence in the country, removed from the bustle of the world, with little to distract my attention, I consequently devoted a considerable portion of my time latterly to a careful inquiry into the grounds of that extraordinary event; nor in this had I any view of making out a theory, but of establishing such facts as were connected with the question demanding my most deliberate and solemn determination. My mind having been biassed from childhood in favor of the Reformation and its promoters, I could not suspect myself of any natural partiality for the system of religion which, before that period, had prevailed throughout Western Europe, and which the entire history and traditions of our country, for the last three hundred years, have taught us all to look upon, not so much as a religion, but as one of the greatest abominations

upon earth. In spite, however, of all this adverse influence, I found that the equitable principle of hearing both sides of the question before a conclusion is arrived at, interfered very much with the Protestant predilections with which my mind had been imbued at every stage of its growth. The private character of Luther, of his patron, the Elector of Hesse, and many others, great and small, who took the lead in that revolution, which effected such changes abroad, fairly seemed to me to be matter for careful consideration. When the reigning religion of the Son of God was to be reformed, who and what were the men abroad who proposed to reform it? I could not but discover that, to use an Apostle's words, they were not 'spiritually minded,' but 'carnal:' not like the Apostles or their Master, but rather like the Jews who slew the Christ. I next asked myself if such men (and the same will apply in this country to Henry VIII.) could by any possibility be commissioned of God to remodel and renew His Church? Bad men are, we know, employed by Him continually to execute His will, as Caiaphas and Pilate were, as John was, and as our own Cromwell might be said to be, and many others. Bad men again, like Balaam, may be prophets. They may also be the agents He employs to inflict His wrath upon evil doers, without, as well as within, the pale of His Church. But when did God, I asked myself, employ wicked men—men who held sacrilege to be no crime, men who indulged in the lusts and pleasures of the flesh, as were the leaders of the German movement, as was Henry VIII., and his coadjutors generally, when did God employ men like these as **CONSTRUCTORS OF HIS CHURCH, THE ADMINISTRATORS OF HIS WORD AND THE EXPOSITION OF HIS MYSTERIES.**"\*

\* Belaney's Letter to the Bishop of Chichester, second edition, p. 14.

APPENDIX.



## APPENDIX.

---

A—PAGE 30.

*The Deposition of King Henry, the son of the Emperor Henry, and the absolution from their oaths of all who have sworn allegiance to him.*

---

“Oh! Blessed Peter! Prince of the Apostles, incline thy pious ears to us and hear me, thy servant, whom from my infancy thou didst nourish, and that thou hast even until this day, saved from the hands of the wicked who have hated, and who still detest me, because of my fidelity to thee. Be then my witness, and with thee our Sovereign Lady, the Mother of God, and the Blessed Paul, thy brother amongst all the other Saints, that thy Holy Roman Church dragged me in my own despite to its Government; and that I would have far preferred to end my days in exile, rather than by human means to usurp thy place. And as I believe that it is through thy gracious favor, and not by my own works, that it has been pleasing and is still pleasing to Thee, that the Christian people specially committed to Thee should obey me, and that through Thy grace, power is given to me on this behalf from God, of binding and of loosing both in Heaven and on Earth.

“It is in this confidence and for the honor and defence of thy Church, and in the name of the Omnipotent Trinity, and through thy power and authority, that I forbid Henry, the King and son of the Emperor Henry, who by an unheard-of pride, has rebelled against thy Church, to exercise longer any power as a Sovereign over the Empire of

the Germans or in Italy, and that I absolve from their oaths of allegiance which all Christians have made or still render unto him: at the same time, I interdict any one from serving him as King. And this I do, because it is fitting that he who endeavors and studies to diminish the honor that is due to Thy Church should lose those honors and that dignity which he himself appears to possess. And because as a Christian he has contemned obedience, and will not return to the Lord whom he has abandoned, by holding communion with those that are excommunicated, and that he persists in perpetrating many iniquities, and despising those warnings which (Thou art my witness) were alone given by me to him for the sake of his own salvation, and as he has separated himself from Thy Church, and seeks still to produce a schism in It, I do, in Thy Name, now bind him with the fetters of excommunication, so that all nations may know and experience, that Thou art Peter, and Thou the Rock upon which the Son of God has built His Church, and that the Gates of Hell shall not prevail against It."

Sigefrid, upon reading this document, handed it to his attendant Chaplain and said:—

"This document must be enrolled in the archives of the Church of Mayence. Let it be there endorsed by you as a witness, that it was read by me in the presence of the King and of the assembled Princes and Prelates of the Empire. And here receive also my Crozier and Mitre. Retain possession of them, until I am authorized by the Pontiff to resume them. I now set forth upon my pilgrimage to Rome, and I invite all the other German Bishops who are like me summoned there as sinners—as unworthy shepherds of the flocks confided to our care—to accompany me on my way thither. As to this place it is accursed, as long as one stricken by anathema remains in it, and no Christian can, without involving himself in the penalties of an excommunication, continue to abide here. Away, then, one and all, avoid it as if pestilence clung to

its walls, and death stood in its door-way. Remember the doom of the Bishop of Utrecht, and let us be careful we do not tread in the footsteps of one who now howls a demon in hell.”

---

B—PAGE 45.

Some of the other passages quoted by Dr. Pusey were as follows :—

I. “ Be assured of this,—no party will be more opposed to our doctrine, if it ever prospers and makes noise, than the Roman party. This has been proved before now. In the seventeenth century the theology of the divines of the English Church were substantially the same as ours is; and it experienced the full hostility of the Papacy. It was the true *Via Media*; Rome sought to block up that way, as fiercely as the Puritans. History tells us this. In a few words, then before we separate, I will state some of my irreconcilable differences with Rome as she is; and in stating her errors, I will closely follow the order observed by Bishop Hall in his treatise on *The Old Religion*, whose Protestantism is unquestionable.

I consider that it is unscriptural to say with the Church of Rome, that ‘ we are justified by inherent righteousness.’

That it is unscriptural that ‘ the good works of a man justified do *truly* merit eternal life.’

That the doctrine of transubstantiation, as not being revealed, but a theory of man’s devising, is profane and impious.

That the denial of the cup to the laity, is a bold and unwarranted encroachment on their privileges as CHRIST’S people.

That the sacrifice of Masses, as it has been practised in the Roman Church, is without foundation in Scripture or antiquity, and therefore blasphemous and dangerous.

That the honors paid to images is very full of peril, in the case of the uneducated, that is, of the great part of Christians.

That indulgences, as in use, are a gross and monstrous invention of latter times.

That the received doctrine of purgatory is at variance with Scripture, cruel to the better sort of Christians, and administering deceitful comfort to the irreligious.

That the practice of celebrating divine service in an unknown tongue is a great corruption.

That forced confession is an unauthorized and dangerous practice.

That the direct invocation of Saints is a dangerous practice, as tending to give, often actually giving, to creatures the honor and reliance due to the Creator alone.

That there are not seven Sacraments.

That the Roman doctrine of Tradition is unscriptural.

That the claim of the Pope to be universal Bishop is against Scripture and antiquity.

I might add other points in which also I protest against the Church of Rome, but I think it enough to make my confession in Hall's order, and so leave it.—*Tracts for the Times*, No. 38. p. 11.

II. "Truly when one surveys the grandeur of their system, a sigh arises in the thoughtful mind, to think that we should be separate from them; Cum talis sis utinam noster esse!—But, alas! AN UNION IS IMPOSSIBLE. Their communion is infected with heterodoxy; we are bound to flee it as a pestilence. They have established a lie in the place of God's truth; and by their claim of immutability in doctrine, cannot undo the sin they have committed. They cannot repent. Popery must be destroyed; it cannot be reformed."—*Ibid*, No. 20. p. 3.

III. "As to the *manner* of the presence of the Body and Blood of our LORD in the Blessed Sacrament, we that are Protestant and Reformed, according to the ancient Catholic Church do not search into the manner of it with perplexing inquiries. . . . Had the Romish maintainers of Transubstantiation done the same, they would not have determined and decreed, and then imposed as an article of faith absolutely necessary to salvation, a manner of presence, newly by them invented, under pain of the most direful curse; and there would have been in the Church less wrangling, and more peace and unity than now is."—*Ibid*, No. 27, p. 2.—*Bishop Cosin on Transubstantiation*.

IV. "How miserably contrasted are we with the One Holy Apostolic Church of old, which 'serving with one consent,' spoke 'a pure language!' And now that Rome has added, and we have omitted in the catalogue of sacred doctrines, what is left to us but to turn our eyes sorrowfully and reverently to

those ancient times, and, with Bishop Ken, make it our profession to live and 'die in the faith of the Catholic Church before the division of the East and West!'"—*Records of the Church*, No. XXV. p. 11.

V. "O Mother Church of Rome! why has thy heart  
 Beat so untruly towards thy Northern child?  
 Why give a gift, nor give it undefiled,  
 Drugging thy blessing with a stepdame's art? &c.

And now thou sendest foes  
 Bred from thy womb, lost Church! to mock the throes  
 Of the free child, thou cruel-natured Rome!"

*Lyra Apostolica*, 171.

VI. "The ground taken by the Church of Rome is that all *her present* traditions are to be received, as of equal validity with the written word, because she holds them; our ground, that they are not to be so received, because they cannot be proved to be apostolic, and some are corrupt and vainly invented. Our controversy then with Rome is not an *à priori* question on the value of tradition in itself . . . . but is one purely historical, that the Romanist traditions not being such, but on the contrary repugnant to Scripture, are not to be received. . . . Nor does our accepting the tradition of the *Universal Church in their day*, involve our accepting those of the particular Church of Rome after so many centuries of corruption *in the present*."—*Pusey's Earnest Remonstrance to the Author of the Pope's Letter* (*vide Vol. iii. of the Tracts*), p. 13.

VII. "We never have, nor do we wish for any alteration in the liturgy of our Church; we bless GOD, that our lot has fallen in her bosom,—that He has preserved in her the essentials of primitive doctrine and a liturgy so holy; and, although I cannot but think its first form preferable, alteration is out of the question, THERE CANNOT BE REAL ALTERATION WITHOUT A SCHISM; and as we claim to have our own consciences respected, so, even if we had the power of change, would we respect the consciences of others . . . . The whole course of the Tracts has, as you know, and yourself reproach us with, been against innovation."—*Ibid*, p. 28.

VII. "From the time that the Church of Rome began to forsake the principles of the Church Catholic, and grasp after human means, she began also to take evil means for good ends,

and incurring the apostolic curse on those, who 'do evil that good may come,' took at last evil means for evil ends. She, the Apostolic Church of the West, consecrated by Apostolic blood, showed herself rather the descendant of them who slew the Apostles, and 'thought that they did GOD service,' stained herself with the blood of the Saints, that on her might come all the righteous blood which was shed within her; even of the very Apostles, who had shed blood for her. There is not an enormity which has been practised against people or kings by miscreants in the name of GOD, but the divines of that unhappy Church have abetted or justified." *Pusey's Sermon on the Fifth of November*, p. 29.

IX. "How hopeless then is it to contend with Romanists, as if they practically agreed with us as to the foundation of faith, however much they pretend it! Ours is antiquity, theirs the existing Church. Its infallibility is their first principle; belief in it is a deep prejudice, quite beyond the reach of any thing external. It is quite clear that the combined testimonies of all the Fathers, supposing such a case, would not have a feather's weight against the decision of a Pope in council."—*Newman on Romanism*, p. 86.

X. "Time went on, and he [Satan] devised a second idol of the true CHRIST, and it remained in the Temple of God for many a year. The age was rude and fierce. Satan took the darker side of the Gospel. . . . The religion of the world was then a fearful religion. Superstitions abounded, and cruelties. The noble firmness, the graceful austerity of the true Christian, were superseded by forbidding spectres, harsh of eye and haughty of brow; and these were the patterns or the tyrants of a beguiled people."—*Newman's Sermons*, vol. i. p. 350.

XI. "There have been ages of the world, in which men have thought too much of angels, and paid them excessive honor; honored them so perversely as to forget the supreme worship due to Almighty GOD. This is the sin of a dark age."—*Newman's Sermons*, vol. ii., p. 400.

XII. "I never could be a Romanist; I never could think all those things in Pope Pius' Creed necessary to salvation."—*Froude's Remains*, vol. i., p. 434.

XIII. "The Freedom of the Anglican church may be vindicated against the exorbitant claims of Rome, and yet no dis-

paragement ensue of the authority inherent in the Catholic Apostolical Church.”—*Keble on Primitive Tradition*, p. 6.

---

C—PAGE 54.

MR. NEWMAN'S RETRACTION.

“It is true that I have at various times, in writing against the Roman system, used, not merely arguments, about which I am not here speaking, but what reads like declamation.

I. “For instance, in 1833, in the *Lyra Apostolica*, I called it a ‘lost Church.’

II. “Also, in 1833, I spoke of ‘the Papal Apostasy’ in a work upon the Arians.

III. In the same year, in No. 15 of the series called the ‘Tracts for the Times,’ in which Tract the words are often mine, though I cannot claim it as a whole, I say—

“True, Rome is heretical now—nay, grant she has thereby forfeited her orders; yet, at least, she was not heretical in the primitive ages. If she has apostatized, it was at the time of the Council of Trent. Then, indeed, it is to be feared the whole Roman Communion bound itself, by a perpetual bond and covenant, to the cause of Antichrist.’

“Of this and other Tracts a friend, with whom I was on very familiar terms, observed in a letter some time afterwards, though not of this particular part of it—‘It is very encouraging about the Tracts—but I wish I could prevail on you, when the second edition comes out, to cancel or materially alter several. The other day accidentally put in my way the Tract on the Apostolical Succession in the English Church; and it really does seem so very unfair, that I wonder you could, even in the extremity of *οικονομία* and *φειλακισμός* have consented to be a party to it.’

“On the passage above quoted, I observe myself, in a pamphlet published in 1838—

‘I confess I wish this passage were not cast in so declamatory a form; but the substance of it expresses just what I mean.

IV. “Also, in 1833, I said—

‘Their communion is infected with heresy; we are bound to

flee it as a pestilence. They have established a lie in the place of God's truth, and, by their claim of immutability in doctrine, cannot undo the sin they have committed.; Tract 20.

V. "In 1834, I said, in a magazine—

'The spirit of old Rome has risen again in its former place, and has evidenced its identity by its works. It has possessed the Church there planted, as an evil spirit might seize the demoniaics of primitive times, and makes her speak words which are not her own. In the corrupt Papal system we have the very cruelty—the craft, and the ambition of the Republic; its cruelty in its unsparing sacrifice of the happiness and virtue of individuals to a phantom of public expediency, in its forced celibacy within and its persecutions without; its craft in its falsehoods, its deceitful deeds and lying wonders; and its grasping ambition in the very structure of its policy, in its assumption of universal dominion; old Rome is still alive; no where have its eagles lighted, but it still claims the sovereignty under another pretence. The Roman Church I will not blame, but pity—she is, as I have said, spell-bound, as if by an evil spirit; she is in thralldom.'

"I say, in the same paper—

'In the Book of Revelations, the sorceress upon the seven hills is not the Church of Rome, as is often taken for granted, but Rome itself, that bad spirit which, in its former shape, was the animating principle of the fourth monarchy. In S. Paul's prophecy, it is not the Temple or Church of God, but the man of Sin in the Temple, the old man or evil principle of the flesh which exalteth itself against God. Certainly it is a mystery of iniquity, and one which may well excite our dismay and horror, that in the very heart of the Church, in her highest dignity, in the seat of S. Peter, the evil principle has throned itself, and rules. It seems as if that spirit had gained subtlety by years; Popish Rome has succeeded to Rome Pagan: and would that we had no reason to expect still more crafty developments of Antichrist amid the wreck of institutions and establishments which will attend the fall of the Papacy! . . . I deny that the distinction is unmeaning. Is it nothing to be able to look on our mother, to whom we owe the blessing of Christianity, with affection instead of hatred, with pity indeed, nay and fear, but not with horror? It is nothing to rescue her from the hard

names which interpreters of prophecy have put on her, as an idolatress and an enemy of God, when she is deceived rather than a deceiver?’

“I also say—

“She virtually substitutes an external rite for moral obedience; penance for penitence, confession for sorrow, profession for faith, the lips for the heart: such at least is her system as understood by the many.’

“Also I say, in the same paper—

“Rome has robbed us of high principles which she has retained herself, though in a corrupt state. When we left her, she suffered us not to go in the beauty of holiness; we left our garments and fled.’

“Against these and other passages of this paper the same friend, before it was published, made the following protest:—‘I only except from this general approbation your second and most superfluous hit at the poor Romanists. You have first set them down as demoniacally possessed by the evil genius of Pagan Rome, but notwithstanding are able to find something to admire in their spirit, particularly because they apply ornament to its proper purposes: and then you talk of their churches: and all that is very well, and one hopes one has heard the end of name-calling, when all at once you relapse into your Protestantism, and deal in what I take leave to call slang.’

“Then, after a remark which is not to the purpose of these extracts, he adds—‘I do not believe that any Roman Catholic of education would tell you that he identified penitence and penance. In fact I know that they often preach against this very error as well as you could do.’

VI. “In 1834 I also used, of certain doctrines of the Church of Rome, the epithets ‘unscriptural,’ ‘profane,’ ‘impious,’ ‘bold’ ‘unwarranted,’ ‘blasphemous,’ ‘gross,’ ‘monstrous,’ ‘cruel,’ ‘administering deceitful comfort,’ and ‘unauthorised,’ in Tract 38. I do not mean to say that I had not a definite meaning in every one of these epithets, or that I did not weigh them before I used them.

“With reference to this passage the same monitor had said—‘I must enter another protest against your cursing and swearing at the end of the first *Via Media* as you do. (Tract 38.) What good can it do? I call it uncharitable to an excess. How

mistaken we may ourselves be on many points that are only gradually opening to us!’

“I withdrew the whole passage several years ago.

VII. “I said, in 1837, of the Church of Rome—

‘In truth she is a Church beside herself,’ &c. [as above].

VIII. “In 1837, I also said in a review—

‘The Second and Third Gregories appealed to the people against the Emperor for a most unjustifiable object, and in, apparently, a most unjustifiable way. They became rebels to establish image-worship. However, even in this transaction, we trace the original principle of Church power, though miserably defaced and perverted, whose form

‘Had yet not lost

All her original brightness, nor appeared

Less than Archangel ruined and the excess

Of glory obscured.’

Upon the same basis, as is notorious, was built the Ecclesiastical Monarchy. It was not the breath of princes, or the smiles of a court, which fostered the stern and lofty spirit of Hildebrand and Innocent. It was the neglect of self, the renunciation of worldly pomp and ease, the appeal to the people.’

“I must observe, however, upon this passage, that no reference is made in it (the idea is shocking) to the subject of Milton’s lines, who ill answers to the idea of purity and virtue defaced, of which they speak. An application is made of them to a subject which I considered, when I so wrote, to befit them better, viz., the Roman Church as viewed in a certain exercise of her power in the person of the two Popes.

“Perhaps I have made other statements in a similar tone, and that, again, when the statements themselves were unexceptionable and true. If you ask me how an individual could venture, not simply to hold, but to publish such views of a communion so ancient, so wide-spreading, so fruitful in Saints, I answer that I said to myself, ‘I am not speaking my own words, I am but following almost a *consensus* of the divines of my Church. They have ever used the strongest language against Rome, even the most able and learned of them. I wish to throw myself into their system. While I say what they say, I am safe. Such views too, are necessary for our position.’

Yet I have reason to fear still, that such language is to be ascribed, in no small measure, to an impetuous temper, a hope of approving myself to persons I respect, and a wish to repel the charge of Romanism.

“An admission of this kind involves no retraction of what I have written in defence of Anglican doctrine. And as I make it for personal reasons, I make it without consulting others. I am as fully convinced as ever, indeed I doubt not Roman Catholics themselves would confess, that the Anglican doctrine is the strongest, nay, the only possible antagonist of their system. If Rome is to be withstood, it can be done in no other way.”

---

D—PAGE 60.

*An Alphabetical list of the Clerical Converts with the dates of their submission to the Church, and their preferments in the Establishment.*

| <i>Names.</i>   | <i>Year.</i> | <i>Preferment.</i>               | <i>Diocess.</i>         |
|-----------------|--------------|----------------------------------|-------------------------|
|                 |              | A.                               |                         |
| Allan, G.       | 1847         |                                  | Pensylvania.            |
| Allan, W.       | 1848         | C., Dumbarton,                   | Glasgow.                |
| Allen, W.       | 1848         |                                  |                         |
| Allies, T. W.   | 1850         | R., Launton,                     | Oxford.                 |
| Anderson, W. H. | 1850         | V., S. Margaret's,<br>Leicester, | Peterboro'.             |
|                 |              | B.                               |                         |
| Bailey, B.      | 1857         |                                  | London.                 |
| Bailey, S. R.   | 1853         |                                  | America.                |
| Baillie, E. J.  | 1858         | V., Lawshall,                    | London.                 |
| Bakewell, W. J. | 1851         |                                  | America.                |
| Ballard E.      | 1850         | C., Bucklechurch,                | Gloster and<br>Bristol. |
| Balston, F. R.  | 1850         | R., Benson,                      | Oxford.                 |

| <i>Names.</i>           | <i>Year.</i> | <i>Preferment.</i>                 | <i>Diocess.</i>                    |
|-------------------------|--------------|------------------------------------|------------------------------------|
| Barff, F. S.            | 1851         | C., Holy Trinity,<br>Hull,         | York.                              |
| Barrow, J. C.           | 1859         | C., S. Philip's,<br>Kensington,    | London.<br>America.                |
| Barrett, J. L.          | 1857         |                                    |                                    |
| Bathurst, E. S.         | 1850         | R., Kibworth Beau-<br>champ,       | Peterboro'.                        |
| Bedford, H.             | 1851         | C., Christ Church,<br>Hoxton,      | London.<br>Chichester.             |
| Belaney, G. R.          | 1852         | V., Arlington.                     | Chester.                           |
| Birks, B. H.            | 1845         | C., Arley,                         |                                    |
| Bittleston, E. W.<br>H. | 1849         | C., All Saints, Mar-<br>garet St., | London.                            |
| Bodley, T.              | 1849         | C., Tennison<br>chapel,            | London.<br>Oxford.<br>France.      |
| Bowles, F.              | 1845         |                                    |                                    |
| Boyhimie, T.            | 1850         |                                    |                                    |
| Brasnell, H. G.         | 1852         | C., Brasted,                       | Canterbury.                        |
| Browne, E. G. K.        | 1845         | C., Bawdsey,                       | Norwich.                           |
| Brown, J.               | 1847         |                                    |                                    |
| Brydges, B. C.          | 1845         |                                    | Oxford.<br>America.                |
| Burchan, G. P.          | 1852         |                                    |                                    |
| Burder, G.              | 1846         | C., Ruardean,                      | Gloster and<br>Bristol.<br>Dublin. |
| Burton, E.              | 1846         | Chp., Kilmainham,                  |                                    |
| Burton, T.              | 1844         | C., Trinity Church,<br>Brompton,   | London.<br>London.                 |
| Butler, R. S.           | 1850         | Warden of Soho,<br>C.              |                                    |
| Calvinzel, L.           | 1846         |                                    | America.                           |
| Campbell, H.            | 1858         | C., Peterhead,                     | Aberdeen.                          |
| Candia, N. de           | 1848         |                                    | Greece.                            |
| Capes, J. M.            | 1845         | V. Eastover,                       | Bath & Wells.                      |
| Case, G. F.             | 1850         | C., All Saints, Mar-<br>garet St., | London.                            |
| Caswall, E.             | 1847         | C. Stratford under<br>the Castle,  | Salisbury.                         |
| Cavendish, W.           | 1850         | C., All Saints, Mar-<br>garet St., | London.<br>Norwich.                |
| Chesnutt, H. C.         | 1855         |                                    |                                    |
| Chirol, A.              | 1847         | S. Barnabas, Pim-<br>lico,         | London.                            |

| <i>Names.</i>     | <i>Year.</i> | <i>Preferment.</i>             | <i>Diocess.</i>        |
|-------------------|--------------|--------------------------------|------------------------|
| Clarke, H. D.     | 1851         | V., Iping,                     | Chichester.            |
| Cocks, J. S.      | 1855         | R., Shevioock,                 | Exeter.                |
| Coffin, R. A.     | 1845         | V., S. Mary Mag-<br>delene,    | Oxford.                |
| Coffin, J. A.     | 1851         | R., Alwington,                 | Exeter.                |
| Coghlan, T. L.    | 1851         | C., Torquay,                   | Exeter.                |
| Coleridge, J. H.  | 1852         |                                | Oxford.                |
| Collins, —        | 1851         |                                | Chester.               |
| Collins, T.       | 1857         | C., S. Veep,                   | Exeter.                |
| Collyns, C.       | 1855         | Exeter College,                | Oxford.                |
| Collins, J.       | 1851         |                                | Chester.               |
| Collyer, J.       | 1848         |                                |                        |
| Cooke, C.         | 1852         |                                |                        |
| Coombes, H.       | 1851         | C., S. Saviour's,<br>Leeds,    | Ripon.<br>America.     |
| Cooke, H.         | 1858         |                                |                        |
| Coope, T. G.      | 1845         | C., S. Oswald's,<br>Salisbury, | Salisbury.<br>America. |
| Cooper, S.        | 1852         |                                | Oxford.                |
| Cox, C. E.        | 1847         | Exeter College,                |                        |
| Crawley, G. J. L. | 1851         | C., S. Saviour's<br>Leeds,     | Ripon.                 |
| D.                |              |                                |                        |
| Dale, J. H.       | 1846         |                                | New Zealand.           |
| Dayman, A.        | 1850         | C., Wasperton,                 | Worcester.             |
| Deane, E. B.      | 1855         | R., Lewknor,                   | Oxford.                |
| De Burgh H.       | 1858         | C., Lawshall,                  | London.                |
| Dewhurst, W. H.   | 1852         |                                | America.               |
| Dixon, C. H.      | 1850         | C., Fewston,                   | Oxford.                |
| Djumvoveski.      | 1855         |                                | Russia.                |
| Doane, G. H.      | 1855         | Christ Church,                 | America.               |
| Dodsworth, W.     | 1850         | V., S. Paneras,                | London.                |
| Dykes, T.         | 1851         | C., Holy Trinity,<br>Hull,     | York.                  |
| Dubois, N. W.     | 1850         | Christ Church,<br>Southwark,   | London.                |
| E.                |              |                                |                        |
| Earle, T. C.      | 1851         | C., Bradford,                  | Salisbury.             |
| Elwell, F.        | 1852         | Sydney,                        | Australia.             |
| Endyer, T.        | 1848         |                                | France.                |

| <i>Names.</i>              | <i>Year.</i> | <i>Preferment.</i>               | <i>Diocess.</i>         |
|----------------------------|--------------|----------------------------------|-------------------------|
| Estcourt, E. E.            | 1845         | C., Cirencester,                 | Gloster and<br>Bristol. |
| Everett, W.                | 1851         |                                  | America.                |
|                            |              | F.                               |                         |
| Faber, F. W.               | 1845         | R., Elton,                       | Peterboro.              |
| Feld de la Comte.          | 1854         | V., Tortington,                  | Chichester.             |
| Felgate, J. N.             | 1854         | Cambridge,                       | Ely.                    |
| Ferrè X.                   | 1850         |                                  | France.                 |
| Foulkes, E. S.             | 1855         | Jesus College,                   | Oxford.                 |
| Foote, C. E.               | 1854         |                                  | America.                |
| Forbes, J. M.              | 1849         | R., S. Luke, New<br>York,        | America.                |
| Forest, W.                 | 1855         |                                  | America.                |
| Formby, H.                 | 1846         | R. Ruardean,                     | Gloster and<br>Bristol. |
| Forster, C. J. P.          | 1860         | C., Stoke Abbot,                 | Salisbury.              |
| Fothergill, W. A.<br>C. F. | 1859         | C., S. Paul's,<br>Knightsbridge, | London.                 |
| Freeman, W. G.             | 1856         | Plymouth,                        | Exeter.                 |
|                            |              | G.                               |                         |
| Garside, C. B.             | 1850         | C., All Saints,                  | London.                 |
| Glenie, J. M.              | 1845         | P. C. Mark,                      | Bath & Wells.           |
| Goltz, W.                  | 1850         | Christ Church<br>Southwark,      | London.                 |
| Gordon, J.                 | 1847         | C., S. Pancras,                  | London.                 |
|                            |              | H.                               |                         |
| Hamilton, C.               | 1854         |                                  |                         |
| Hammer, T. J.              | 1847         | Tiverton,                        | Exeter.                 |
| Harper, S. B.              | 1851         | S. Ninian,                       | Perth.                  |
| Harper, G.                 | 1851         | C., Dorchester,                  | Oxford.                 |
| Harper, T. N.              | 1851         | P. C., Charlotte St.,            | London.                 |
| Hassert —                  | 1853         | Bunzlaw.                         |                         |
| Hathaway, F.               | 1851         | C., Teignmouth,                  | Exeter.                 |
| Henn, W.                   | 1850         | C., S. James, Bris-<br>tol,      | Gloster and<br>Bristol. |
| Hender, C.                 | 1853         |                                  | America.                |
| Hewett, N.                 | 1846         |                                  | America.                |
| Hill, G. I.                | 1845         | C., Morebath,                    | Exeter.                 |
| Horne, E.                  | 1847         | V., S. Martin's<br>Southampton,  | Winchester.             |

| <i>Names.</i>          | <i>Year.</i> | <i>Preferment.</i>                   | <i>Diocess.</i>         |
|------------------------|--------------|--------------------------------------|-------------------------|
| Houghton, N.           | 1853         |                                      | Peterboro'.             |
| Howell, R.             | 1857         | V., S. Veep,                         | Exeter.                 |
| Hoyt, E.               | 1853         |                                      | America.                |
| Huntington, J. H.      | 1850         |                                      | America.                |
| Hutchinson, H.         | 1851         | C., S. Eudellion,                    | Exeter.                 |
|                        |              | I.                                   |                         |
| Ives, J. S.            | 1854         | Bishop of North<br>Carolina,         | America.                |
|                        |              | J.                                   |                         |
| James, E. H.           | 1851         | C., S. Andrew's,<br>Well's St.,      | London.                 |
| Jerrard, J. H.         | 1851         | King's College,                      | London.                 |
| Jervis, J. W.          | 1859         | Chaplain to H. E.<br>I. C.,          | Bombay.                 |
| Johnston, A. R.        | 1850         |                                      | America.                |
|                        |              | K.                                   |                         |
| Keenan, J.             | 1853         |                                      | America.                |
| Kenrick, H.            | 1851         |                                      |                         |
| Kerr, Lord H.          | 1851         | V., Dittisham,                       | Exeter.                 |
| Kirk, J. H.            | 1851         | Gorey,                               | Ferns.                  |
| Kynaston, L.           | 1853         |                                      | Exeter.                 |
|                        |              | L.                                   |                         |
| Laing, H.              | 1846         | C., Tewkesbury,                      | Gloster and<br>Bristol. |
| Laprimaudaye, C.<br>H. | 1850         | C. Lavenham,                         | Chichester.             |
| Lascelles, F.          | 1855         | P. C., Merevale,                     | Worcester.              |
| Lauriston, H.          | 1846         |                                      | America.                |
| Law, Hon. C. T.        | 1851         | R., Harborne,                        | Worcester.              |
| Lichfield, C. F.       | 1855         | C. All Souls, Poplar,                | London.                 |
| Littleboy, W. H.       | 1856         | C., Shearston,                       | Peterboro'.             |
| Lloyd, W. J.           | 1846         | C., Kyvidiog,                        | S. Asaph.               |
| Lutterell, H.          | 1853         |                                      | America.                |
| Lynam, W.              | 1852         |                                      | America.                |
|                        |              | M.                                   |                         |
| M'Laurin, A.           | 1850         | Dean of Ross and<br>Moray,           | Ross & Moray.           |
| M'Leod, D.             | 1854         | C., S. Matthias,<br>Stoke Newington, | London.                 |

| <i>Names.</i>    | <i>Year.</i> | <i>Preferment.</i>                | <i>Diocess.</i>         |
|------------------|--------------|-----------------------------------|-------------------------|
| M'Leod, M.       | 1854         |                                   | America.                |
| M'Mullen, R. G.  | 1847         | V., S. Saviour's<br>Leeds,        | Ripon.                  |
| Maffé, X.        | 1846         |                                   | France.                 |
| Major, W. A.     | 1846         |                                   | America.                |
| Meakinson, H. R. | 1848         | C., S. Andrew's,<br>Sydney,       | Australia.              |
| Manning, H. E.   | 1851         | Archdeacon of Chi-<br>chester,    | Chichester.             |
| Markoe, W.       | 1855         |                                   | America.                |
| Marshall, —      | 1859         | C., S. Matthias,<br>Liverpool,    | Manchester.             |
| Marshall, H. J.  | 1845         | C., Brands Burton,                | York.                   |
| Marshall, J.     | 1858         |                                   | Oxford.                 |
| Marshall, T. W.  | 1845         | V., Swallowcliffe,                | Salisbury.              |
| Maskell, H. W.   | 1850         | V., S. Mary's<br>Church,          | Exeter.                 |
| Maturin, —       | 1858         |                                   | Nova Scotia.            |
| Meinhold,        | 1854         |                                   |                         |
| Milner, H.       | 1846         | C. Barnoldswick,                  | Ripon.                  |
| Minster, J.      | 1851         | V., S. Saviour's,<br>Leeds,       | Ripon.                  |
| Moberly, W. T.   | 1851         | C. Easton,                        | Winchester.             |
| Montgomery, G.   | 1845         | C., Castleknock,                  | Dublin.                 |
| Moody, R. S.     | 1855         | C., Aston,                        | Chester.                |
| Morris, J. B.    | 1846         |                                   | Oxford.                 |
| Morton, H.       | 1854         | C., Devizes,                      | Salisbury.              |
| Mosheim, E.      | 1854         |                                   |                         |
| Mostyn, W.       | 1854         |                                   | Oxford.                 |
| Moyston, D.      | 1852         | V., Anaghdown.<br>N.              | Tuam.                   |
| Naish, H. F.     | 1857         |                                   |                         |
| Neligan, H.      | 1853         | C., New Court,                    | Armagh.                 |
| Neve, F.         | 1845         | V., Poole Keynes,                 | Gloster and<br>Bristol. |
| New, T. F.       | 1847         | C., Christ Church,<br>S. Pancras, | London.                 |
| Newman, J. H.    | 1845         | V., S. Mary the<br>Virgin,        | Oxford.                 |
| Norman, G.       | 1845         | C., Wooton,                       | Gloster and<br>Bristol. |
| Northcote, J. S. | 1846         | C., Teignmouth,                   | Exeter.                 |

| <i>Names.</i>    | <i>Year.</i> | <i>Preferment.</i>                | <i>Diocess.</i>      |
|------------------|--------------|-----------------------------------|----------------------|
|                  |              | O.                                |                      |
| Oakeley, F.      | 1845         | V., All Saints, Margaret-street,  | London.              |
| O'Connor, M.     | 1857         | R., Culdaff,                      | Armagh.              |
| Oertel, P.       | 1854         |                                   |                      |
| Oldham, G. R.    | 1856         | C., Dorking,                      | London.              |
| Orr, J.          | 1851         | C., S. James, Bristol.            | Gloster and Bristol. |
| Ormsby, F.       | 1847         | C., S. Olave,                     | Chichester.          |
| Oxenham, H. N.   | 1857         | C., S. Bartholomew the Less.      | London.              |
|                  |              | P.                                |                      |
| Palmer, W.       | 1855         | Magdalene College,                | Oxford.              |
| Parkinson, J. D. | 1851         | C., S. Mary's, Wakefield,         | Ripon.               |
| Parsons, D.      | 1843         | C., Hardon,                       | Salisbury.           |
| Parsons, H.      | 1854         |                                   | America.             |
| Parry, G.        | 1855         | C., All Saints, Margaret-street,  | London.              |
| Pattison, J. L.  | 1850         |                                   | Oxford.              |
| Penny, W. G.     | 1844         | P. C., Ashendon,                  | Lincoln.             |
| Pitman, E.       | 1849         | C., S. Luke's, New York,          | America.             |
| Plumer, J. J.    | 1846         |                                   | Oxford.              |
| Pollard, W.      | 1859         |                                   | America.             |
| Pollen, J. H.    | 1853         | Merton College,                   | Oxford.              |
| Pope, J. A.      | 1854         | V., S. Matthias, Stoke Newington, | London.              |
| Pope, R. V.      | 1859         | Chaplain to Hon. E. I. C.         | Calcutta.            |
| Pope, W.         | 1853         | C., Leversbridge,                 | Manchester.          |
| Preston, E.      | 1849         |                                   | America.             |
| Pritchard, J. P. | 1853         |                                   | America.             |
|                  |              | R.                                |                      |
| Randolph, E.     | 1857         | C., Little Hadham,                | London.              |
| Rawes, T. H.     | 1856         | Warden of Soho,                   | London.              |
| Rhodes, J. M.    | 1854         | Leeds,                            | Ripon.               |
| Robertson, J. C. | 1858         | C., Dalkeith,                     | Edinburgh.           |
| Rodmell, J.      | 1851         |                                   | Ely.                 |
| Rodwell, J.      | 1846         | R., S. Ethelburga,                | London.              |
| Rogers, T. G.    | 1850         |                                   | Australia.           |

| <i>Names.</i>     | <i>Year.</i> | <i>Preferment.</i>                | <i>Diocess.</i>         |
|-------------------|--------------|-----------------------------------|-------------------------|
| Rooke, S.         | 1851         | C., S. Saviour's,<br>Leeds,       | Ripon.                  |
| Rose, G.          | 1855         | P. C., Earl's Hea-<br>ton,        | Ripon.<br>London.       |
| Rowlatt, C. G.    | 1858         | C., Thurrock,                     | Peterboro'              |
| Russell, M. W. W. | 1845         | R. Benefield.                     | America.                |
| Rushton, J.       | 1846         |                                   | Winchester.             |
| Ryder, G. D.      | 1846         | V., Easton.                       |                         |
|                   |              | S.                                |                         |
| S. John, A.       | 1845         | C., East Farleigh,                | Canterbury.             |
| Sconce, R.        | 1848         |                                   | Australia.              |
| Scott, W.         | 1850         |                                   |                         |
| Scott, E.         | 1853         | C., Hoxton,                       | London.                 |
| Scrattton, R.     | 1851         | C., Sittingbourne,                | Rochester.              |
| Scrattton, T.     | 1850         | C., Benson,                       | Oxford.                 |
| Seager, C. E.     | 1843         |                                   | Oxford.                 |
| Shortland, J. H.  | 1851         | C., Kibworth<br>Beauchamp,        | Peterboro'.             |
| Simpson, T. R.    | 1846         | C., Langton,                      | York.                   |
| Simpson, R. B.    | 1841         | C., Mitcham,                      | London.                 |
| Smith, B.         | 1842         | V., Leadenham,                    | Peterboro'.             |
| Smith, J. C.      | 1845         |                                   |                         |
| Sneyder, T. T.    | 1845         |                                   | America.                |
| Stanton, J.       | 1845         |                                   | Oxford.                 |
| Stewart, A.       | 1851         |                                   | America.                |
| Stewart, J. A.    | 1850         | R., Vange,                        | London.                 |
| Stewart, T. H.    | 1850         | C., Bramford,                     | Norwich.                |
| Stoughton, N.     | 1853         |                                   | America.                |
|                   |              | T.                                |                         |
| Talbot, Hon. G.   | 1843         | V., Evercreech,                   | Bath & Wells.           |
| Thomas, R. C.     | 1848         | V., Brandeston,                   | Norwich.                |
| Thomas, W.        | 1847         |                                   |                         |
| Thompson, E. H.   | 1846         | C., S. James's, West-<br>minster, | London.                 |
| Thompson, H.      | 1852         | C., Ashford,                      | Canterbury.             |
| Thynne, Lord C.   | 1852         | V., Kingston De-<br>veril,        | Salisbury.              |
| Todd, G. H.       | 1851         | C., S. James, Bris-<br>tol,       | Gloster and<br>Bristol. |
| Trenow, W. T.     | 1852         | C., Northfield                    | Worcester.              |
| Turner, J.        |              |                                   | America.                |

| <i>Names.</i>      | <i>Year.</i> | <i>Preferment.</i>                        | <i>Diocess.</i>         |
|--------------------|--------------|-------------------------------------------|-------------------------|
| Vale, E.           | 1843         | V.<br>C. S. Andrew's,<br>Wells St.,<br>W. | London.                 |
| Wackerbarth, A. D. | 1842         | C., Peldon,                               | London.                 |
| Wadham, E. P.      | 1846         |                                           | America.                |
| Walford, E.        | 1851         |                                           | Oxford.                 |
| Walker, H.         | 1846         | C., Hardenhuish.                          | Salisbury.              |
| Walker, J.         | 1845         | C., Benefield.                            | Peterboro'.             |
| Walker, W.         | 1847         |                                           | Oxford.                 |
| Ward, R.           | 1851         | S. Saviour's, Leeds,                      | Ripon.                  |
| Ward, W. G.        | 1845         | Balliol College,                          | Oxford.                 |
| Weguelin, H.       | 1855         | V., South Stoke,                          | Chichester.             |
| Wells, G. P.       | 1846         |                                           | America.                |
| Wells, W.          | 1846         | C., S. Martin's,<br>Liverpool,            | Manchester.             |
| Wenham, G.         | 1846         |                                           | Ceylon.                 |
| Whitcher, G.       | 1855         |                                           | America.                |
| White, F. E.       | 1851         |                                           | America.                |
| Wilberforce, H. W. | 1853         | V., East Farleigh,                        | Canterbury              |
| Wilberforce, R. I. | 1855         | Archdeacon of West<br>Riding of York,     | York.                   |
| Wilkes, E.         | 1847         |                                           | America.                |
| Wilkes, F.         | 1847         |                                           | America.                |
| Wilson, B.         | 1852         | V. Fordham,                               | Ely.                    |
| Wilson, J.         | 1847         |                                           | America.                |
| Wilson, J. A.      | 1853         | V., Long Whitton,                         | Peterboro'.             |
| Wingfield, W. F.   | 1845         |                                           | Oxford.                 |
| Winchester, —      | 1860         | Chaplain at Dacca.                        | Calcutta.               |
| Wood, F. P.        | 1848         |                                           |                         |
| Woodhall, E. H.    | 1859         | R., S. Margaret's,<br>Canterbury,         | Canterbury.             |
| Woodward, H.       | 1856         | C., S. Martin's,                          | London.                 |
| Woodward, T. H.    | 1851         | V., S. James, Bris-<br>tol,               | Gloster and<br>Bristol. |
| Wormall, S. P.     | 1859         | C., S. Barnabas,<br>Pimlico,              | London.                 |
| Wright, J. P.      | 1855         |                                           | London.                 |
| Wynne, J. H.       | 1850         |                                           | Oxford.                 |
| Yarworth, J. V.    | 1860         | Y.<br>C., Weston,                         | Gloster and<br>Bristol. |

The following are the number of clerical converts from each of the Diocesses :—

|                          |                |                    |
|--------------------------|----------------|--------------------|
| Canterbury, 7.           | Exeter, 14.    | S. Asaph, 1.       |
| York, 4.                 | Ripon, 10.     | Manchester, 3.     |
| London, 42.              | Peterboro, 11. | Hereford, 0.       |
| Durham, 0.               | Worcester, 4.  | Chester, 4.        |
| Winchester, 8.           | S. Davids', 0. | Norwich, 4.        |
| Bangor, 0.               | Chichester, 7. | Llandaff, 0.       |
| Carlisle, 0.             | Lichfield, 0.  | Lincoln, 1.        |
| Rochester, 1.            | Ely, 3.        | Salisbury, 8.      |
| Gloster and Bristol, 12. | Oxford, 26.    | Bath and Wells, 3. |

## IRELAND.

|            |          |         |
|------------|----------|---------|
| Armagh, 2. | Ferns 1. | Tuam 1. |
| Dublin 2.  |          |         |

## SCOTLAND.

|              |                   |          |
|--------------|-------------------|----------|
| Edinburgh 1. | Aberdeen 1.       | Perth 1. |
| Glasgow 1.   | Ross and Moray 1. |          |

|                |                |             |
|----------------|----------------|-------------|
| Calcutta 2.    | Nova Scotia 1. | America 29. |
| Bombay 2.      | Australia 4.   | France 5.   |
| New Zealand 1. |                |             |

## AMERICA.

## MINISTERS.

|                 |               |                   |             |
|-----------------|---------------|-------------------|-------------|
| J. R. Bailey,   | New York.     | N. Stoughton,     | New York.   |
| E. P. Wadham,   | Albany.       | — Shaw,           | Alhabama.   |
| — Hoyt,         | S. Alban's.   | E. Baker,         | Baltimore.  |
| H. Major,       | Philadelphia. | H. Wheaton,       | New York.   |
| — Hewitt,       | Connecticut.  | W. B. Whitcher,   | New York.   |
| J. S. Preston,  | New York.     | W. Markoe,        | New York.   |
| J.H.Huntington, | New York.     | E. H. Doane,      | New Jersey. |
| D. M'Leod,      | New York.     | O. A. Brownson,   | Boston.     |
| F. E. White,    | New York.     | G. Leach,         | Boston.     |
| — Lutrell,      | New York.     | D. Lynam,         | Baltimore.  |
| — Burèhard,     | New York.     | Professor Carter, | New York.   |
| W. Everett,     | New York.     | Thos. Porter,     | New York.   |
| — Pollard,      | New York.     | F. C. Foote,      | Mary Land   |
| I. S. Ives,     | Nth Carolina. |                   |             |

---

 CONTINENT.
 

---

 PROTESTANT PASTORS.
 

---

|                   |                     |
|-------------------|---------------------|
| L. Mosheim.       | Woltz.              |
| B. de Cashelbery. | Bunger.             |
| V. de Cashelbery. | Dr. Maurue Möglich. |
| — Arndt.          | Dr. Signer.         |
| — Freudenfeld.    | Dr. Chrestfreund.   |
| Dr. Hass.         | Dr. Hasert.         |
| Dr. Herbst.       | Dr. Lutekemuller.   |
| Huguee.           | Dr. Meinhold.       |

---

 PERSONS OF RANK.
 

---

|                                                  |                                      |
|--------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|
| Prince d'Ingenheim.                              | Baron de Morgenthal.                 |
| Duke of Mecklenberg-schweren                     | Baron de Rovera.                     |
| Princess of Hesse Darmstadt.                     | Baron de Berne.                      |
| Duke of Saxe Gotha.                              | Major Bernouilly.                    |
| Princess Charlotte of Mecklen-<br>berg-schweren. | Messrs. Hubert de Basle.             |
| Prince Dimitri Gallitzkin.                       | — Du Pont.                           |
| Princess Dimitri Gallitzkin.                     | M. Vulliametz.                       |
| Prince Paul of Wurtemberg.                       | — Betholet de Ferreire.              |
| Prince of Walderg-Zeil.                          | Comtesse de Salis.                   |
| Comte de Gærtz.                                  | Mme. de Bernardy.                    |
| Baron de Rumouren.                               | Comtesse de Zuling.                  |
| Charle de Schnorr.                               | Comtesse Julie Schoal.               |
| Edouard de Schnorr.                              | Comtesse de Kielmansegge.            |
| Baron de Berlepsch.                              | Comtesse Octavia de Wetter-<br>koop. |
| Stædel, (Banker at Mayence).                     | Baronne d'Ordre.                     |
| Conte de Vojelsang.                              | Mme. de Bresson.                     |
| Baron de Kittenbourg.                            | Comtesse de Salm Hoogstrae-<br>ten.  |
| Baron de Bulow.                                  | Princess de Wasa.                    |
| Baron de Rochow.                                 | Princess Caroline de Wasa.           |
| Baron Dierdsdorf.                                | Ctsse. d'Hute.                       |
| Baron Olezewsky de Potritten.                    |                                      |

---

 LITERARY MEN.
 

---

|               |                            |
|---------------|----------------------------|
| Winckelman.   | Comte Leopold de Stolberg. |
| Leibnitz.     | Frederic Schlegel.         |
| George Zorga. | Adam Müller.               |
| G. J. Hamann. | Werner.                    |

Dr. Eisenbach.  
 N. Møeller.  
 Durst.  
 Dr. Philips.  
 Dr. Jarcke.  
 L. D'Or.  
 Dr. Bartholome.  
 Charles Vogel.  
 Charles Fleischer.  
 Dr. Kœneen  
 Dr. Propost.  
 Dr. V. Schmidt.  
 M. Maasen.

M. de Florincourt.  
 Countess Ida Hahn-Hahn.  
 Storck.  
 Claude Brentand.  
 Christopher Schlosser.  
 François Schlosser.  
 Baron d'Ecksteiin.  
 Charles L. de Haller.  
 Frederick Hurter.  
 Auguste Theiner.  
 — Ranke.  
 Professor G. Fröer.

---

 STATESMEN.
 

---

Comte de Saft Pilasch.  
 Comte de Brekendorf.  
 Comte de Rintel.  
 Comte de Haltenberg.  
 Comte de Reudel.

Comte de Schardt.  
 Comte de Hardenberg.  
 Comte de Desenfeld Schomberg

---

 ARTISTS.
 

---

Overbeck.  
 Viet.  
 Schadow.

Sorg.  
 Frederic Müller.  
 Zand.

---

 E—PAGE 74.
 

---

“Junii 2, 1843. Cum Edvardus Bouverie Pusey, S. T. P. Ædis Christi Canonicus, necnon Linguae Hebraicæ Professor Regius, in concione intra Universitatem Maii 14to proxime elapso habita, quædam Doctrinæ Ecclesiæ Anglicanæ dissona et contraria protulisse delatus fuerit; Idemque Edvardus Bouverie Pusey, S. T. P. postulante Vice-Cancellario concionis suæ verum exemplar eisdem terminis conscriptum virtute juramenti tradiderit: Mihi igitur Vice-Cancellario verbis quæ in quæstionem vocabantur in medium prolatis et rite perpensis, adhibito consilio sex aliorum Sanctæ Theologiæ Doctorum, scilicet D. Doc-

toris Jenkyns, D. Doctoris Hawkins, D. Doctoris Symons, D. Doctoris Jelf, D. Doctoris Ogilvie, nec non et Prælectoris Dominae Margarietæ Comitissæ de Richmond, criminis objecti dictum Edvardum Bouverie Pusey, S. T. P. reum inventum, a munere prædicandi intra præcinctum Universitatis per duos amos suspendere placuit.

“ P. Wynter, Vice-Cancellarius,

“ Philippus Bliss, Registrarius, Univ. Oxon.”

Against this sentence Dr. Pusey protested as follows :—

“ MR. VICE-CHANCELLOR,—You will be assured that the following Protest, which I feel it my duty to the Church to deliver, is written with entire respect for your office, and without any imputation on yourself individually.

“ I have stated to you on different occasions, as opportunity offered, that I was at a loss to conceive what in my sermon could be construed into discordance with the formularies of our Church; I have requested you to adopt that alternative in the Statutes which allows the accused a hearing; I have again and again requested that the definite propositions which were thought to be at variance with our formularies should, according to the alternative of the Statute, be proposed to me. I have declared repeatedly my entire assent, *ex animo*, to all the doctrinal statements of our Church on this subject, and have, as far as I had opportunity, declared my sincere and entire consent to them individually; I have ground to think, that as no propositions out of my sermon have been exhibited to me as at variance with the doctrine of our Church, so neither can they; but that I have been condemned either on a mistaken construction of my words, founded upon the doctrinal opinions of my judges or on grounds distinct from the formularies of our Church.

“ Under these circumstances, since the Statute manifestly contemplates certain grave and definite instances of contrariety and discordance from the formularies of our Church, I feel it my duty to protest against the late sentence against me, as unstatutable, as well as unjust.

“ I remain, Mr. Vice-Chancellor,

“ Your humble servant,

“ E. B. PUSEY.

“ *Christ Church, June 2, 1843.*”

A few days after the above Protest against the sentence of the immortal six, was forwarded to the Vice-Chancellor, Dr. Pusey addressed the following letter to that officer:—

“MR. VICE-CHANCELLOR,—When I drew out my protest, I felt myself bound not to allude to the fact; that, after it was announced to me that my sermon had been condemned, I received confidential communications from yourself. I had been informed, when I received them, that the fact of my having received them as well as their contents, was strictly confidential, and this injunction to entire silence had not been removed. I felt it, therefore, even my duty to ascertain that there was nothing in my protest which could trench upon that confidence.’

“I expressed to yourself privately at the time, my sense of the kindness of *your* intentions personally, in making to me the first of these communications; and of this I was thinking when, in my protest, I spoke of ‘not casting any imputation on yourself individually.’

“To the nature of these communications I can make no allusion, since you saw right to impose silence upon me. It is sufficient to say, that after they were concluded, I received a message from yourself,—‘*Dr. Pusey has my full authority for saying that he has had no hearing.*’ It ever was and is my full conviction, that had I had the hearing which (for the sake of the University and the Church) I earnestly asked for, I must have been acquitted.

“These communications, then, in no way affect my protest. I add this explanation, because while I retain my strong conviction that my sentence was both ‘unstatutable and unjust,’ it is right, since I am now at liberty to do so, to acknowledge the kindness of your own intentions to me individually.

“I remain, Mr. Vice-Chancellor,

“Your humble servant,

“E. B. PUSEY.

“*Christ Church, June 6, 1843.*”

Certain members of Convocation desirous to evince their sympathy with Dr. Pusey, addressed the following letter to the Vice-Chancellor:—

“MR. VICE-CHANCELLOR,—We, the undersigned members of

Convocation, and Bachelors of Civil Law, beg permission respectfully to address you on the subject of the sentence lately pronounced by you on Dr. Pusey: with the request that you will make known to the University the grounds upon which that sentence was passed, that we may know what statements of doctrine it is intended to mark as dissonant from or contrary to the doctrine and discipline of the Church of England as publicly received.”

—————

The reply of Dr. Wynter.

“GENTLEMEN,—Respecting as I do the motives of those who have signed the paper conveyed to me by you, and ready as I am at all times to satisfy the reasonable demand of members of Convocation, I regret that I cannot in the present instance comply with their request. It is my plain duty as Vice-Chancellor to abide by the statutes of the University, and as these do not prescribe, so I have scarcely a doubt they do not permit, the course which is now suggested to me. For the silence of the Statutes on this point, satisfactory reasons may be presumed—reasons which are not applicable to me alone, but to yourselves individually, and to the University at large.

I beg to subscribe myself, &c.,

P. WYNTER, V. C.

“The Rev. H. Wall, E. P. Eden, E. Hill, &c.

A correspondence followed between Dr. Wynter and E. Badeley, Esq., Barrister-at-law and Master of Arts of Brazen-nose College, who wrote to inform him, that he was entrusted with an address “from more than 250 non-resident members of Convocation, respecting the proceedings lately adopted against the Rev. Dr. Pusey, and begged to know when it would be convenient to him to receive it.”

The Vice-Chancellor replied, that he would receive Mr. Badeley, “or any other gentleman,” but could not promise to receive the address, not knowing its contents. Mr. Badeley then sent a copy of the address, and asked whether he would receive it? and if so, whether it should be sent by post?

Dr. Wynter replied:—

“*S. John's College, Oxford, August 1, 1843.*”

“SIR,—I have to acknowledge your letter of yesterday's date with a copy of the address, which you inform me has been intrusted to your care in order to its being presented to me.

“After the address shall have reached my hands, I shall be enabled to tell you whether I will receive it or not.

“I should not wish to put you to the trouble of coming down to Oxford, if transmitting the address by the post would answer your purpose.

I remain, Sir,

“Your faithful servant,

“P. WYNTER, V. C.

“E. Badeley, Esq.”

The address was as follows :—

“*To the Rev. the Vice-Chancellor of the University of Oxford.*

“We, the undersigned non-resident members of Convocation, beg leave respectfully to express our serious regret at the course which you have adopted with reference to Dr. Pusey’s sermon.

“We deprecate that construction of the statute under which Dr. Pusey has been condemned; which, contrary to the general principles of justice, subjects a person to penalties without affording him the means of explanation or defence; and we think that the interests of the Church and of the University require, that when a sermon is adjudged unsound, the points in which its unsoundness consists should be distinctly stated, if the condemnation of it is intended to operate either as a caution to other preachers, or as a check to the reception of doctrines supposed to be erroneous.

(Signed)

“DUNGANNON, M.A., Christ Church.

“COURTENAY, B.C.L., All Souls, M.P.

“W. E. GLADSTONE, Christ Church.

“JOHN TAYLOR COLERIDGE, M.A., Exeter.

&c., &c.

Dr. Wynter’s reply, together with the address itself, reached Mr. Badeley, at the Temple, not by the post, but by the hands of the University Bedel, who was sent to London for this purpose; it was thus worded :—

*S. John’s College, Oxford, August 4, 1843.*

“SIR,—The address which, as you inform me, you were commissioned to present to me, reached me by yesterday’s post; I return it to you by the hands of my Bedel.

When a document of a similar nature, upon the same subject, was some time since presented to me, I was induced from respect for the presumed motives of those who signed it, not only to receive it, but to state the ground on which I felt myself precluded from complying with the request which it contained. But the paper which you have transmitted to me, presents itself to me under very different circumstances, and demands from me a different course of procedure.

“In whatever point of view I feel myself at liberty to regard it, whether as addressed to me in my individual or my official capacity, it is deserving of the strongest censure.

“In the former case, it imputes to me, by implication, that in a matter wherein every thoughtful man occupying my position would most deeply feel its painful responsibilities, I have acted without due deliberation, and am capable of being influenced by many to concede that which I have already denied to a few. Assuming it to be addressed to me in my public capacity, a graver character attaches to it. If it be not altogether nugatory, then it is an unbecoming and unstatutable attempt to overawe the Resident Governor of the University in the execution of his office.

“In either case, I refuse to receive it; and I hold it to be my duty to admonish those who may have hastily signed it, while I warn others who may have been active in promoting it, to have a more careful regard to the oaths by which they bound themselves upon admission to their several degrees; this act of theirs having a direct tendency to foment, if not create, divisions in the University, to disturb its peace, and interfere with its orderly government.

“I am, Sir,

“Your faithful, humble servant,

“P. WYNTER, V. C.

“E. Badeley, Esq., M.A.”

Brother of S. Vincent de Paul, to call on a lady, the daughter of one of the Prebendaries of A—— Cathedral, and the wife of an officer in Her Majesty's service. He complied with the request, and on the following morning wended his way to the Rue de la P——, where, on finding the house where the object of his enquiry resided, he was ushered into a room in the attic—there was no fire though in the depth of a severe winter—and here he was introduced to Mrs. M.; her story was harrowing; she had become a Catholic from conviction after a serious and prayerful study of that most precious volume—THE BIBLE. She had submitted her judgment to the teaching of the Catholic Church, regarding HER as the ONE PROPHET sent from God to direct all in the way of life, and as a consequence, her husband had left her, taking with him their only child, an infant scarce two years old, her mother had cast her off, and she was thrown upon the world. She had subsisted, or had rather tried to subsist, by taking in some sewing, and teaching English at half a franc a lesson, but her resources had failed, and she was reduced to utter destitution and even starvation, for she had had no food for two days when we called on her, having been recommended by some charitable individual to the S. A.—Conference of S. Vincent de Paul. We spoke to her of her friends, and enquired if they were acquainted with her present state. She answered in the affirmative, and stated that her mother had offered to receive her if she would abjure Popery—but she preferred starvation to the renouncing her God and perilling her soul's salvation by apostacy. We administered what relief we could, and soon after she obtained a situation as a *lady's maid* in a family living on the confines of Belgium.

We might speak of Miss N. ——— (whose brother lately fell in the Crimea) being sent to a Lunatic asylum, and there dying, calling for the assistance of a "Priest of God's Church." This step having been ADVISED by a clergyman of the Church of England and a Fellow of one

of our Universities, AND SANCTIONED BY HER OWN MOTHER!!

While these pages were going through the Press, we were grieved at hearing that one of the clerical converts is now, or rather was, an inmate of the Liverpool Work-House.

The following letter appeared in the '*Weekly Register*':—

"Sir,—It is well that the world should know what English Protestant toleration is. With this view let me mention some late events here. Mr. Johnston, the son of a respectable tradesman, who died leaving a widow and children wholly unprovided for, was apprenticed, in 1847, to Mr. Isaacs, a saddler, in High Street. I have taken some pains to enquire what has been his moral conduct, and all I can hear is most highly in his favor. As the young man is still living, I feel some delicacy in going into particulars. There is no Catholic priest or church in Maidstone, but Mr. Johnston some years ago was led to study Catholic works, by hearing the most violent abuse of 'Popery,' as immoral, irrational, absurd, soul-destroying, &c., while he saw that men of high education, irreproachable character, good connections, and flattering expectations, were month by month giving up their income, position, hope, friends, and families to embrace it. What can they see in it to attract them, thought he, if it be really what I hear it described? He accordingly sent for 'Milner's end of Controversy' and some other works, studied them seriously with much prayer, and came to the conviction that the Roman Church was the sole depository of truth upon earth, at a time when, I believe, he had never attended a Catholic service or spoken to a Catholic Priest. If private judgment be defensible at all, I cannot conceive any instance of exercise more irreprehensible. Having thus obtained conviction, Mr. Johnston sought out a Priest, who came from London to attend the poor Irish Hoppers in a neighboring village, then visited with

cholera, and was received by him into the Church in October, 1849. The very next morning he informed Mr. Isaacs (who is an extreme Protestant) of the step he had taken. Mr. Isaacs insisted on his continuing to attend the Protestant Church every Sunday till the expiration of his apprenticeship in May, 1851; but found him so valuable as to retain him ever since as his confidential manager. There being no Catholic Church within reach, Mr. Johnston was only able to get to Mass and Holy Communion on rare occasions, when he could walk over to Chatham or travel (54 miles on the railroad) to London. On Wednesday in last week Mr. Isaacs gave Mr. Johnston notice to quit his service on the Saturday following. The only reason alleged was, that he would lose his custom and the patronage of the Clergy if he did not immediately discharge him: that the Rev. Mr. Stewart, the Incumbent of Maidstone, had remonstrated with him on the inconsistency with his professed principles, of his keeping a Papist in his service; and that another influential person (Mr. Johnston believes that Mr. Isaacs said it was the Mayor of Maidstone), had specially sent for him to remonstrate with him for the inconsistency of professing Church of England principles, and at the same time harboring a Romanist in his employment!

When Mr. Isaacs was compelled by this pressure to discharge within three days' warning a man who had faithfully served him for more than nine years, and had been an inmate of his family until he left it at his own desire, some time after the expiration of his apprenticeship, neither Mr. Isaacs nor the Protestant Clergy were aware that he had any means of obtaining any other situation or getting his livelihood in any way whatever, his widowed mother being quite without means of maintaining him. He informed Mr. Isaacs, after he had received notice to quit, that he had another situation in prospect. The conduct, therefore, of the Protestants concerned was the same as it would have been had he been actually thrown upon the

world, with no means of obtaining his bread. No thanks to them that such was not the case.

The circumstance which led to Mr. Johnston's expulsion from Maidstone at this moment, is that Miss Lewis, the mistress of the Trinity Church Girls' Model School, a young person who came to Maidstone some months ago, having obtained a first-class Government testimonial in the Home and Colonial Training Institution where she was educated, resolved a few days before to seek admission into the Church. I believe that this resolution was formed in consequence of some conversation with Mr. Johnston, at whose advice she wrote to the Incumbent of Trinity Church informing him of her intention, and her consequent wish to resign the post as soon as the committee could obtain a substitute, adding that while she retained it, she would be careful to teach nothing contrary to the doctrines she had undertaken to teach there.

I am also informed that before this others of the teachers have, on more than one occasion, been warned that they must have no communication with 'a person holding principles inconsistent with those of the Church of England'—meaning Mr. Johnston. That the Mayor having seen another mistress (I believe as staunch a Protestant as himself) walking with Mr. Johnston in the High-street several years ago, privately asked her whether she knew what his religion was, and warned her that she must make up her mind whether she preferred her friend or her situation. That Mr. Glover, the Incumbent of Trinity Church, has since informed another schoolmistress that he should convene a special meeting of the committee to consider her case, on the charge that she had introduced him to the young lady in question, or at least, being aware of her acquaintance with him, had not informed the Clergy of it, and especially that she had been seen walking with Miss Lewis after she had resigned her office, and knowing the grounds on which she had done so.

I understand that one of the mistresses, a person of

unsuspected Protestantism, told the clergyman that having known Mr. Johnston for years, she could witness that so far from obtruding his conversation she had never heard him speak on the subject, except in answer to questions addressed to him, and remonstrated on the social tyranny imposed on the teachers, pointing out that they must have some acquaintances, and that the clergy and their families only speak to them occasionally on terms of such distant condescension as made it a matter of absolute necessity that they should find acquaintances elsewhere. I have no doubt that this difficulty is really felt. The different ranks of English society are, we all know, divided by impassible barriers, and none is more complete than that which separates the Protestant Clergy, their wives and families, from the class of schoolmasters and mistresses. These, however, are now educated to a degree wholly unknown a few years ago; they are separated by a real superiority of mind and manners from those who twenty years ago would have been their natural associates, and they are in some risk of social exile, not being aristocratical enough for those educated like themselves, and too much educated for others.

The fact I have related will show what is the Protestant notion of the liberty of public judgment in the latter half of the nineteenth century.

I am, Sir,  
Your obedient servant,

X.

*Maidstone, Kent.*

---

G—PAGE 91.

*“Address of the Clergy of the Deanery of ——— in the Diocess of ———, to his Grace the Archbishop of Canterbury and the Right Reverend the Lord Bishop of the Diocess of ———.*

*“We, the undersigned Clergy of the Deanery of ———, in your Diocess, beg leave with the greatest respect to call your*

— attention to a recent decision pronounced by the Judge of the Court of Arches *in re* Escott.

“Such a decision does not merely recognize (what was never recognized by any general council) the validity of Lay Baptism, and indeed of Baptism administered by Separatists, but also requires a clergyman, under pain of suspension for three months, to read the Burial Service of the Church over those who deliberately and wilfully continue in a state of separation from Her communion.

“Such a state of the law is at variance as well with Scripture and reason, as with the real principles of the Constitution.

“We hope, therefore, for your speedy co-operation in bringing about such measures as may release us from this hardship and tyranny over our consciences. And that, as the authority of the Court of Arches emanated from the Primate of all England, there can be no real difficulty in procuring for us immediate redress.”

---

H—PAGE 107.

“That the passages now read from the book entitled ‘The Ideal of a Christian Church considered,’ are utterly inconsistent with the Articles of Religion of the Church of England, and with the declaration in respect of those Articles made and subscribed by William George Ward, previously and in order to his being admitted to the Degrees of B.A. and M.A. respectively, and with the good faith of him, the said William George Ward, in respect of such Declaration.\*

\* P. 45 (note). I know no single movement in the Church, except Arrianism in the fourth century, which seems to me so wholly destitute of all claims on our sympathy and regard, as the English Reformation.

P. 473. For my own part I think it would not be right to conceal, indeed I am anxious openly to express, my own most firm and undoubting conviction,—that were we as a Church to pursue such a line of conduct as has been here sketched, in proportion as we did so, we should be taught from above to discern and appreciate the plain marks of Divine wisdom and

## I—PAGE 108.

If this proposition is affirmed, the following Proposition will be submitted to the House:—

“That the said William George Ward has disentitled himself to the rights and privileges conveyed by the said Degrees, and is hereby degraded from the said Degrees of B.A. and M.A. respectively.”

authority in the Roman Church, to repent in sorrow and bitterness of heart our great sin in deserting her communion, and to sue humbly at her feet for pardon and restoration.

- P. 68. That the phrase, ‘teaching of the Prayer-Book,’ conveys a definite and important meaning, I do not deny; considering that it is mainly a selection from the Breviary, it is not surprising that the Prayer-Book should, on the whole, breathe an uniform, most edifying, deeply orthodox, spirit; a spirit which corresponds to one particular body of doctrine, and not to its contradictory. Again, that the phrase, ‘teaching of the Articles,’ conveys a definite meaning, I cannot deny; for (excepting the five first, which belong to the old theology) they also breathe an uniform intelligible spirit. But then these respective spirits are not different merely, but absolutely contradictory; as well could a student in the heathen schools have imbibed at once the Stoic and the Epicurean philosophies, as could an humble member of our Church at the present time learn his creed both from Prayer-Book and Articles. This I set out at length in two pamphlets, with an Appendix, which I published three years ago; and it cannot therefore be necessary to go again over the same ground, though something must be added, occasionally in notes, and more methodically in a future chapter. The manner in which the dry wording of the Articles can be divorced from their innatural spirit and accepted by an orthodox believer; how their *prima facie* meaning is evaded, and the artifice of their inventors thrown back in recoil on themselves; this, and the arguments which prove the honesty of this, have now been for some time before the public.
- P. 100 (note). In my Pamphlets three years since, I distinctly charged the Reformers with fully tolerating the absence from the Articles of any *real* anti-Roman determination, so only they were allowed to preserve an *apparent* one: a charge, which I here beg as distinctly to repeat.
- P. 479. Our twelfth Article is as plain as words can make it, on the ‘evangelical’ side: (observe in particular the word ‘necessarily’); of course I think its natural meaning may be explained away, for I subscribe it myself in a non-natural sense.
- P. 565. We find, oh most joyful, most wonderful, most unexpected sight! we find the whole cycle of Roman doctrine gradually possessing numbers of English Churchmen.
- P. 567. Three years have passed since I said plainly, that in subscribing the Articles, I renounce no one Roman doctrine.

1. After the words,—

“ — Et ut Hæreticos, Schismaticos, et quoscunque alios minus recte de fide Catholica, et Doctrina vel Disciplina Ecclesiæ Anglicanæ, sentientes, procul a finibus Universitatis amandandos curet.

Quem in finem, quo quisque modo erga Doctrinam vel Disciplinam Ecclesiæ Anglicanæ effectus sit, Subscriptionis criterio explorandi ipsi jus ac potestas esto”—

it will be proposed to insert the following:

“ Quoniam vero Articulos illos Fidei et Religionis, in quibus male-sanæ opiniones, et præsertim Romanensium errores reprehenduntur, ita nonnulli perperam interpretati sunt, ut erroribus istis vix aut ne vix quidem adversari videantur, nemini posthac, qui coram Vice-Cancellario, utpote minus recte de Doctrina vel disciplina Ecclesiæ Anglicanæ sentiens conveniatur, Articulis subscribere fas sit, nisi prius Declarationi subscriberit sub hac forma :

Ego *A.B.* Articulis Fidei et Religionis, necnon tribus Articulis in Canone xxxvi°, comprehensis subscripturus profiteor, fide mea data huic Universitati, me Articulis istis omnibus et singulis eo sensu subscripturum, in quo eos ex animo credo et primitus editos esse, et nunc mihi ab universitate propositos tanquam opinionum mearum certum ac indubitatum signum.

Also in the next sentence of the existing Statute, beginning “ Quod si quos S. Ordinibus initiatus,” before the words “ subscribere a Vice-Cancellario requisitus,” to insert the following words,—

“ una cum Declaratione supra-recitata.”

2. It will also be proposed in the said sentence to omit the words “ S. Ordinibus initiatus.”

Should these alterations be approved, that part of the Statute Tit. XVII. Sect. III. § 2. *De Auctoritate et Officio Vice-Cancellarii*, which will be effected by them, will stand as follows :

“ — Et ut Hæreticos, Schismaticos, et quoscuque alios minus recte de fide Catholica et Doctrina vel Disciplina Ecclesiæ Anglicanæ, sentientes, procul a finibus Universitatis amandandos curet.

Quem in finem, quo quisque modo erga Doctrinam vel Disciplinam Ecclesiæ Anglicanæ effectus sit, subscriptionis criterio explorandi ipsi jus ac potestas esto. Quoniam vero Articulis illos Fidei et Religionis, in quibus male-sanæ opiniones, et præsertim Romanensium errores, reprehenduntur, ita nonnulli perperam interpretati sunt, et erroribus istis vix aut ne vix quidem adversari videantur, nemini posthac, qui coram Vice-Cancellario, utpote minus recte de Doctrina vel Disciplina Ecclesiæ Anglicanæ sentiens conveniatur, Articulis subscribere fas sit, nisi prius Declarationi subscripserit sub hac forma:—

Ego. *A.B.* Articulis Fidei et Religionis necnon tribus Articulis in Canone xxxvi.º comprehensis subscripturus, profiteor, fide mea data huic Universitati, me Articulis istis omnibus et singulis eo sensu subscripturum, in quo eos ex animo credo et primitus editos esse, et nunc mihi ab Universitate propositos tanquam opinionum mearum certum ac indubitatum signum.

Quod si quis (sive Præfectus Domus cujusvis, sive alius quis) Articulis Fidei et Religionis, a Synodo Londini A.D. 1562, editis et confirmatis; necnon tribus Articulis comprehensis Canone xxvi. Libri Constitutionum ac Canonum Ecclesiasticorum, editi in Synodo Londini cœpta A.D. 1603, una cum Declaratione supra-recitata, subscribere a Vice-Cancellario requisitus ter abnuerit seu recusaverit, ipso facto ab Universitate exterminetur et banniatur.”

B. P. SYMONS, Vice-Chancellor.

*Delegate's Room, Dec. 13, 1844.*

---

K—PAGE 108.

## THE LATIN PROTEST OF RĒV. W. G. WARD.

PROTESTATIO GULIELMI GEORGII WARD, MAGISTRI ARTIUM ET PRESBYTERI IN ECCLESIA ANGLICANA, CONTRA SENTENTIAM QUONDAM DEGRADATIONIS IN VENERABILI DOMO CONVOCATIONIS UNIVERSITATIS OXONIENSIS, DIE TREDECIMO FEBRUARIJ, A.D. MDCCCXLIV, PROPOSITUM VEL PROPONENDUM.

Ego, Gulielmus Georgius Ward, Magister Artium, publice et solemniter, per hoc instrumentum protestor nullam esse omnino in venerabili hâc Domo Convocationis vim, auctoritatem aut protestatem judicandi vel decernendi, degradationis causâ, utrum nunc ego dictus Gulielmus Georgius Ward libro entitulus "*The Ideal of a Christian Church considered in comparison with existing practice,*" quidquam Articulus Fidei et Religionis in synodo Londini habita A.D. MDLXII, editis et conformatis dissonum aut contrarium protulerim vel admitterem favio nullam esse omnino in venerabili hâc Domo vim, auctoritatem, aut potestatem me propter ullam hujusmodi causam vel protextum mei Magistri Artium vel gradu meo Baccularii Artium prevalendi. Tunc (si quod absit) cogeret nuper Vice-Cancellarius Procuratoris et majorem partem Magistrorum Regentium et non Regentium in degradationem legem vel sententiam contra me suscipiendam sive decretum pronunciandum hodie consentiretur protestor, et par instrumentum hoc publicum in Domo Convocationis à me relatum; omnes, qui hodie adsunt, certiores facio me legem istam vel sententiam sive decretum et degradationem pro ingestâ irritâ et plane nulla semper habiturum et quocunque possem modo pie et legitime everterim.

Datum et relatum per me in Domo Convocationis die tredecimo mensis Februarii, A.D. MDXLIV.

GULIELMUS GEORGIUS WARD.

---

Dr. Pusey ever ready to come to the aid of the *soi-*

*disant* Anglo-Catholic Section of the Establishment, addressed the following letter to the '*English Churchman*.'

MY DEAR —, You ask me what I should do in case this new Test, to be proposed to Convocation, should pass. I would say at once, that others, not so immediately affected or intended by this Test as I am, need not, I should think, make up their minds yet. I plainly have no choice; it is not meant that I should take it, nor can I.

You will not mistake me; I sign the Articles as I ever have since I have known what Catholic Antiquity is (to which our Church guides us), in their "literal grammatical sense," determined, where it is ambiguous, by "the faith of the whole Church" (as good Bishop Ken says) "before East and West were divided." It is to me quite plain that in so doing I am following the guidance of our Church.

The proposed Test restrains that liberty which Archbishop Laud won for us.

Hitherto High and Low Church have been comprised under the same Articles.

And I have felt that in these sad confusions of our Church, things must so remain, until, by the mercy of Almighty God, we be brought more nearly into one mind.

But as long as this is so, the Articles cannot be, (which the new Test requires) "certum atque indubitatum opinionum signum."

How can they be any, "certain and indubitable token of opinion" when they can be signed by myself and—? This new Test requires that they should be: one then of the two parties who have hitherto signed them must be excluded. We know that those who framed the Test are opposed to such as myself. It is clear then who are henceforth excluded. The Test is indeed at once miserably vague and stringent, vague enough to tempt people to take it, too stringent in its conclusion to enable me to take it with a good conscience.

Beginning and end do harmonize, if it be regarded as a revival of the puritan "Anti-Declaration" that the Articles should be interpreted according to "the consent of divines;" they do not in any other case. This shifting of ground would indeed (were not so much at stake) be somewhat curious; how those who speak so much of "fallible men" would require us now to be bound in the interpretation of the Articles by the private judgment of the Reformers (it being assumed, for convenience sake, that Cranmer, Ridley, and Hooper, agreed among themselves), instead of Archbishop Laud's broader and truer rule, "according to the analogy of the faith." It would indeed be well, if all who have urged on this test, could sign the 1st and 8th Articles, in the same sense as Cranmer and Jewell. Well, indeed, would it be for our Church, if all could sign the 27th in the same sense as all the Reformers, except perhaps Hooper. One could have wished that before this Test had been proposed to us, the Board who accepted it and proposed it to us, had thought of ascertaining among themselves whether they themselves took all and singular of the Articles in one and the same sense.

And yet while they enjoy this latitude, how can the signature of the Articles be any certain and indubitable token of people's opinions.

However, this is matter for others; my concern is with myself.

I have too much reason to know that my own signature of the Articles would not satisfy some of those from whom this Test emanates, since, when a year and a half ago, I declared repeatedly (as I then stated) that I accepted and would subscribe, *ex amino*, every statement of our formularies on the solemn subject upon which I preached, that offer was rejected; and this on the very ground (I subsequently learnt) that they did not trust my interpretation.

When, then, they require that the signature should be "certum atque indubitatum opinionum mearum signum,"

it is plain that they mean something more than what I offered, and they refused to accept.

The Articles I now sign in the way in which from Archbishop Laud's time they have been proposed by the Church: this Test I should have to receive not from the Church, but from the *University*, in the sense in which it is proposed to me by them. Could I then ever so much satisfy myself that I could take the Test according to any general meaning of the words, I must know from past experience that I should not take it in the sense in which it was proposed to me.

I could not then take it without a feeling of dishonesty.

You will imagine that I feel the responsibility of making such a declaration, knowing, as I must, that in case, in the present state of excitement, the statute should pass, younger men, whom it might involve in various difficulties, might be influenced by example. I know, too, of course, that some will be the more anxious to press the Test, in hopes that my refusal to take it may end in my removal from this place. Whether it would or no I know not. But whatever be the result, it seems to me the straightforward course. It is best in cases of great moment, that people should know the effect of what they are doing.

I am ashamed to write so much about myself, but I cannot explain myself in few words. What is my case, would probably be that of others. It has often been painful to witness the apparent want of seriousness in people when things far more serious than office, or home, or even one's allotted duties in God's vineyard have been at stake. But people can feel more readily what it is to lose office and home, and the associations of the greater part of life. It will be a great gain, if what is done is done with deep earnestness. For myself, I cheerfully commit all things into His hands, who ordereth all things well, and from whom I deserve nothing.

Ever yours, affectionately,

E. B. PUSEY.

*Christ Church, Advent, Ember Week, 1844—Tuesday.*

## L—PAGE 113.

The Tractarians, in their zeal for the dogma of Prayers for the Dead, were fully aware that on this point the Establishment differed from all the various bodies of Christians and even the Jews, and therefore their object in defending this dogma of Catholicity was to harmonize their views with the Church of the East and the West, previous to the schism of the Council of Florence. Consequently, a member of the School referred to the case of Breeks v. Woolfrey, where Sir H. Jenner decided, on 12th Dec. 1838. "that the offence imputed by the Articles had not been sustained; that no authority or canon had been pointed out by which the practice had been expressly prohibited; and he was accordingly of opinion, that, if the Articles were proved, the facts would not subject the party to ecclesiastical censure, as far as regarded the illegality of the inscription on the tombstone. That part of the articles must, therefore, be rejected"—founding his decision on the inscription placed on the tombstone of Barrow, Bishop of S. Asaph—"O vos, transeuntes in domum Domini, in domum orationis, orate pro conservo vestro, ut inveniatis misericordiam in die Domini."

## M—PAGE 141.

Mr. M'Mullen, (Fellow of Corpus Christi College, Oxford) was obliged in due course to proceed to the degree of Bachelor of Divinity. All that has ever been required for the attainment of this degree is, that the candidate should have taken his degree in Arts, B.A. and M.A. (which of late years implies a general examination), that he should have received Holy Orders, have resided certain years at the University for the study of theology, and have performed certain exercises—in practice the degree has been granted to all clerical M.A's who possess the requisite standing, paid

the fees, and performed the exercises. Dr. Hampden, Regius Professor of Divinity, having succeeded Dr. Burton, sent Mr. M'Mullen the following note:—

“*Ch. Ch., June 11, 1842.*”

The Regius Professor of Divinity encloses these subjects to Mr. M'Mullen for the divinity exercises, agreeable to his request. The Professor will thank Mr. M'Mullen to give him a week's notice of the day when he wishes to read his exercise. *He should also mention that he expects to have copies of the exercises delivered to him after the reading of them—(a thing wholly unpreceded.)*

“1. The Church of England does not teach, nor can it be proved from Scripture, that any change takes place in the elements at consecration in the Lord's Supper.

2. “It is a mode of expression calculated to give erroneous views of Divine Revelation, to speak of Scripture and Catholic Tradition as joint authorities in the matter of Christian doctrine.”

Mr. M'Mullen, perceiving from the wording of the Theses that the Professor desired to entrap him, requested to be allowed to write on the 8th and 28th Articles. “It seemed impossible (says a writer in the “*Christian Remembrancer*,”) that a proposal so reasonable should be rejected by a Professor who had allowed other candidates to select their own subjects, but Dr. Hampden drew a subtle distinction between this and Mr. M'Mullen's case, because as the latter had requested subjects from the Professor, he was bound to write on them—though why so bound he did not think fit to explain.” Mr. M'Mullen having examined the statutes, and finding there no admission of Dr. Hampden's claim to select the subject, entered into a correspondence in which he was so far successful as to get the Professor to intimate that he by no means prescribed to Mr. M'Mullen the view which he was to take of the Theses, or restricted the tone of his argument. He merely stated on each case the proposition on which the disputation is to turn. Mr. M'Mullen then appealed

to the Vice-Chancellor who declined to decide, and reminded Mr. M'Mullen that his notices should be in Latin. Dr. Hampden also refused to preside, and after having appealed again to the Vice-Chancellor and the Heads of the Houses, Mr. M'Mullen had recourse to law—the assessor decided in his favor, but on Dr. Hampden's appeal against this judgment, Mr. M'Mullen was cast, and the sentence reversed with costs. Mr. M'Mullen, in consequence of the new statute, accepted, under protest, the original theses which the Regius Professor had composed, and wrote and read his exercises on 18th and 19th April, 1844. After the reading of the first exercise the Professor pronounced the words, "*Nou sufficit pro forma,*" "words which no one had ever heard before, and which certainly do not carry their own meaning with them, but which were understood to mean that he did not admit the exercise as qualifying Mr. M'Mullen for his degree." We shall not proceed further in this matter, as being uninteresting to the generality of our readers, though we might show that in reality Dr. Wynter, and not Dr. Hampden, was Mr. M'Mullen's persecutor.

---

N—PAGE 143.

We are indebted for the following paper to the pages of the "*British Magazine.*"

"*These Prayers may be had, and names registered if desired, on application by letter to the REV. DR. PUSEY, Ch. Ch., Oxford, or the REV. C. MARRIOTT, Oriel College, Oxford. Copies may be also had of MR. PARKER, Oxford, or MR. BURNS, Portman street, Portman square, London, at 2d. each, or 1s. 6d. per dozen.*"

Then follows the tract, which, in the copies we have seen, has no title page :—

"I exhort therefore, that, first of all, supplications, prayers, intercessions, and giving of thanks, be made for all men. . . .

For this is good and acceptable in the sight of God our Saviour who will have all men to be saved, and to come to the knowledge of the truth.—1 Tim. ii. 1, 3, 4.

#### MUTUAL INTERCESSION.

The promise of our Lord, S. Matt. xviii. 19, 'I say unto you, that if two of you shall agree on earth as touching any thing that they shall ask, it shall be done for them of my Father which is in heaven,' invites us to unite our prayers when we desire a special blessing. The present time is one which demands not only our best endeavors, but our most earnest prayers for what can only come as a gift from above.

The divisions of Christendom are more felt as the intercourse of nations increases, and even amongst ourselves divisions are rife. *Unity and peace in the Church* must therefore be asked of Him who 'maketh men to be of one mind in a house.'

We are surrounded by numbers who live without God in the world, either from habits of vice, or from ignorance and carelessness. We may remonstrate with them to little purpose unless it please God to open their hearts. *The conversion of sinners and awakening of the listless*, is therefore a proper object for our united prayers.

We are placed in the midst of a world more than ever unbelieving and seducing, and are in continual danger of giving way to it, so as at least to slacken our efforts in advancing towards holiness.

Hence *the advancement and perseverance of the faithful* is a thing for which we have need to seek help from above.

It is proposed, accordingly, to unite in prayer for—

1. The unity and peace of the Church.
2. The conversion of sinners, and awakening of the listless.
3. The advancement and perseverance of the faithful.

Those who agree thus to combine their intercessions, will be understood to seek not only the benefit of the whole Church, at home and abroad, but also especially that of each other, and of those who may from time to time be commended to their prayers.

*Those who wish may have their names registered in order that they may be informed of particular objects, either of general interest, or connected with themselves or their own friends.*

The several objects of intercession *should be remembered at the Holy Communion, with the prayer that the Memorial then made before God of the sacrifice on the Cross may be accepted on behalf of them.* But no one will be understood to bind himself to do this explicitly every time he communicates, or to exclude himself from continuing any practice that he has begun of devoting such prayers to any other pious aim.

Almost the whole of the Common Prayer of our Church is capable of application to each of these objects, and will be used with the more thought and earnestness if so applied.

Care must of course be taken not to distract the mind and overburden the memory; but with such precaution there can be no doubt that general prayers will be used the more seriously, and with less chance of inattention, when particular cases are kept in view.

It is obvious how many of the Psalms, as the Penitential Psalms, for instance, and the 119th, may be applied to these objects of intercession. Almost all that relates to the City of God has its bearing upon unity. All prayers that evil may be brought to an end are applicable to the conversion of sinners. All prayers for victory over enemies, and for nearer approach to God are applicable to spiritual advancement, and all prayers for protection and preservation to the end, to perseverance.

Special forms of Prayer for Unity which are meant to be used on particular days have been for some time in circulation.

It may also be useful to distribute the seasons of the year for the several remembrance of each object, for example:—

*Unity and Peace.* Christmas time, Thursdays, especially in Lent and Holy Week, S. John the Evangelist, S. Peter, the Transfiguration, S. Mark, S. Bartholomew, S. Simon, and S. Jude.

*Conversion.* Advent, Wednesdays in Lent, especially Ash-Wednesday, Fridays, other days in Holy week, the Circumcision, S. Stephen, Conversion of S. Paul, Annunciation, S. John the Baptist, S. Matthew, S. James, S. Andrew.

*Advancement and Perseverance.* The Innocents, Septuagesima to Lent, Easter Week, Witsuntide, Saturdays, especially in Lent, S. Thomas, the Purification, S. Matthias, S. Barnabas, S. Philip and S. James, S. Luke, S. Michael, All Saints.

The three objects may be also remembered on the three Rogation days, and again, as connected with the work of

the Ministry, on the several Ember days at the four seasons.

*Feast of S. Luke, 1845.*

J. K. K(EBLE).

E. B. P(USEY).

C. M. M(ARRIOTT).

In addition to the application of the services of the Church, or other devotions already in use, the following methods are recommended:—

#### I.

A simple form of intercession, which can hardly be impracticable, or even difficult, to any one, is—

*Thrice every day, in honor of the Most Holy Trinity, to repeat the Lord's Prayer three times, applying it each time to one of the several objects.*

#### II.

Another form, which might be adopted by those who use the 'Day Hours,' is to add at

##### THE THIRD HOUR,

*The hour of the Descent of the Holy Ghost.*

V. Jerusalem is built as a city,

For the peace  
and unity of  
the Church.

R. That is at unity in itself,

*Ant.* O pray for the peace of Jerusalem.

*Collect.* Vouchsafe, we beseech Thee, Almighty God, to grant unto the whole Christian people, and especially to Thy servants in [N], and all for whom our prayers are desired, unity, peace and true concord, *both visible and invisible*, through Jesus Christ our Lord.

##### AT THE SIXTH HOUR.

*The hour of the Crucifixion.*

V. Turn us, O God our Saviour,

R. And let Thine anger cease from us.

For the conver-  
sion of sinners,  
and awakening  
of the listless.

*Ant.* O let the wickedness of the ungodly come to an end.

*Collect.* Almighty God, we beseech Thee to hear our prayers for such as sin against Thee, or neglect to serve Thee, especially those in [N] and others for whom our prayers are desired, that Thou wouldest vouchsafe to bestow upon them true

repentance, and an earnest desire to serve Thee, through Jesus Christ our Lord.

AT THE NINTH HOUR.

*The hour of the Death of our Lord.*

V. Thy God had sent forth strength for thee.

For the advancement and perseverance of the faithful.

R. Stablish the thing, O God, that thou hast wrought in us.

*Ant.* They will go from strength to strength, and unto the God of gods appeareth every one of them in Sion.

*Collect.* Vouchsafe, we beseech Thee, O Lord, to strengthen and confirm all Thy faithful, especially those in [N] and all others for whom we are desired to pray, and to lift them up more and more continually to heavenly desires, through Jesus Christ our Lord.

III.

Or the following Collects may be used for the several objects in addition to the Morning and Evening and Mid-day prayers.

*For Unity.* S. Simon and S. Jude, that in the Accession service 'for Unity.'

*For Conversion, &c.* Third Sunday after Easter, Third Sunday in Advent.

*For advancement.* Seventh and Fourteenth Sundays after Trinity.

*For Perseverance.* Fourth Sunday after Easter, Thirteenth Sunday after Trinity.

OR THESE.

*For Unity and Concord.*

O God, who biddest us dwell with one mind in Thine house, of Thy mercy put away from us all that causeth us to differ, that through Thy bountiful goodness we may keep the unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace.

We beseech Thee, Almighty God, that they for whom there is one Lord, one Faith, one Baptism, and one only Sacrifice, may be all of the same mind, and in charity with one another, that all may have one communion in Thee and with Thee evermore.

O God, who art love, grant to them that are born of Thee, and eat of Thy Bread, out of sincere love to bear one another's burdens; that Thy peace, which passeth all understanding, may keep our hearts and minds in Christ Jesus Thy Son our Lord, who with thee, &c.

**For the Conversion of a Sinner.**

O Lord, call back to Thee Thy prodigal son [N], now wandering in the paths of sin and death; that turning again to Thee in the spirit of humiliation, he may obtain of Thee to be mercifully received.

O God, who wouldest not the death of a sinner, but rather that he may be converted and live; grant unto [N] the grace of saving repentance, through the offering of Thy Son, that turning to Thee with his whole heart he may attain everlasting salvation.

O Lord Jesu Christ, the Good Shepherd, Who feedest with Thine own Body those whom Thou hast redeemed with Thine own Blood, bring back the sheep that is astray to thy Fold, and make it worthy of Thine eternal pastures.

**For Perseverance unto Death.**

O God, who has willed that we, who are appointed to death, should yet know neither the day nor the hour thereof, grant to us Thy servants, that we may walk before Thee in holiness and righteousness all our days, and finally depart in peace, and die in the Lord, through Jesus Christ our Lord.

We beseech Thy Great mercy, O Almighty God, that by the virtue of this Sacrament, Thou wilt vouchsafe to confirm us Thy servants in Thy grace, that in the hour of our death, the adversary may not prevail against us, but that we may obtain an entrance into life with Thy Holy Angels.

**For the Tempted and Troubled.**

O God, who art faithful, and sufferest us not to be tempted above that we are able, but with the temptation also makest a way of escape, that we may be able to bear it, we humbly entreat Thy Majesty, that Thou wouldest graciously strengthen with heavenly aid Thy servants who rely on Thy mercy, and keep them with continual protection, that they may evermore

wait on Thee, and never by any temptation be drawn away from Thee.

Almighty everlasting God, comfort of the sorrowful, and strength of the weary, may the prayers of all that call upon Thee in any trouble, come into Thy presence, that all may rejoice that in their necessity Thy mercy hath been with them.

---

The following brief prayer, comprising these three several objects, is now in hourly use within our Church :

O blessed Jesu, give us the gift of Thy holy love, pardon of all our sins, and grace to preserve unto the end.

---

The additions to the Hours are subjoined in Latin, for those who may use them in that language.

AD TERTIAM.

V. Jerusalem ædificatur ut civitas.

R. Cujus participatio ejus in idipsum.

*Ant.* Rogate quæ ad pacem sunt Jerusalem.

*Oratio.* Dignare quæsumus, Omnipotens Deus, universo populo Christiano, ac præsertim famulis tuis in [N] habitantibus. cæterisque pro quibus orare tenemur, pacem, unitatem, et veram concordiam largiri, per, &c.

AD SEXTAM.

V. Convertete nos Deus salutaris noster :

R. Et averte iram tuam a nobis.

*Ant.* Consumetur nequitia peccatorum.

*Oratio.* Exaudi quæsumus preces nostras, Omnipotens Deus pro iis qui in Te peccant, vel Tibi servire negligunt, præcipue in [N], cæterisque pro quibus orare tenemur, ut veram iis pœnitentiam largiri digneris, et Sancti Tui servitii fervens desiderium ; per, &c.

AD NONAM.

V. Manda Deus virtuti Tuæ ;

R. Confirma hoc Deus, quod operatus es nobis.

*Ant.* Ibunt de virtute in virtutem : videbitur Deus Deorum in Sion.

*Oratio.* Dignare quesumus, Domine, omnes fideles Tuos, et præcipue eos qui sunt in [N], et cæteros omnes pro quibus orare tenemur, in tuo sancto servitio confortare et conservare, mentesque eorum ad cœlestia desideria erigere; Per D. N. J. C. qui Tecum vivit et regnat in unitate Spiritus Sancti Deus, per omnia sæcula sæculorum. AMEN.

---

O—PAGE 152.

A PROTEST OF THE BISHOPS ADDRESSED TO LORD JOHN RUSSELL,  
M.P., PREMIER.

“ My Lord,—We, the undersigned Bishops of the Church of England, feel it our duty to represent to your Lordship, as Head of Her Majesty’s Government, the apprehension and alarm which have been excited in the minds of the clergy by the rumored nomination to the See of Hereford of Dr. Hampden, in the soundness of whose doctrine the University of Oxford has affirmed, by a solemn decree, its want of confidence.

‘ We are persuaded that your Lordship does not know how deep and general a feeling prevails on this subject, and we consider ourselves to be acting only in the discharge of our bounden duty both to the Crown and to the Church, when we respectfully but earnestly express to your Lordship our conviction that if this appointment be completed, there is the greatest danger both of the interruption of the peace of the church, and of the disturbance of the confidence which it is most desirable that the clergy and laity of the church should feel in every exercise of the Royal Supremacy, especially as regards that very delicate and important particular, the nomination to vacant Sees.

“ We have the honor to be, my lord,

“ Your lordship’s obedient faithful servants,

C. J. LONDON

J. H. GLOUCESTER AND BRISTOL.

C. WINTON.

H. EXETER.

J. LINCOLN.

E. SARUM.

CHR. BANGOR.

A. T. CHICHESTER.

HUGH CARLISLE.

J. ELY.

G. ROCHESTER.

SAML. OXON.

RICH. BATH AND WELLS.

“ To the Right Hon. the Lord John Russell, &c.”

## THE ANSWER OF LORD JOHN RUSSELL, M.P.,

*“ Chesham-place, Dec. 8, 1847.*

“ My Lords,—I have had the honor to receive a representation signed by your Lordships on the subject of the nomination of Dr. Hampden to the See of Hereford.

“ I observe that your Lordships do not state any want of confidence on your part in the soundness of Dr. Hampden’s doctrine. Your lordships refer me to a decree of the University of Oxford, passed eleven years ago, and founded upon lectures delivered fifteen years ago.

“ Since the date of that decree, Dr. Hampden has acted as Regius Professor of Divinity. The University of Oxford, and many Bishops, as I am told, have required certificates of attendance on his lectures before they proceeded to ordain candidates who had received their education at Oxford. He has likewise preached sermons, for which he has been honored with the approbation of several prelates of our church.

“ Several months before I named Dr. Hampden to the Queen for the see of Hereford, I signified my intention to the Archbishop of Canterbury, and did not receive from him any discouragement.

“ In these circumstances, it appears to me that should I withdraw my recommendation of Dr. Hampden, which has been sanctioned by the Queen, I should virtually assent to the doctrine that a decree of the University of Oxford is a perpetual ban of exclusion against a clergyman of eminent learning and irreproachable life, and that, in fact, the supremacy which is now by law vested in the Crown is to be transferred to a majority of the members of one of our Universities.

“ Nor should it be forgotten, that many of the most prominent among that majority have since joined the communion of the church of Rome.

“ I deeply regret the feeling that is said to be common among the clergy on this subject. But I cannot sacrifice the reputation of Dr. Hampden, the rights of the crown, and what I believe to be the true interests of the church, to a feeling which I believe to be founded on misapprehension and fomented by prejudice.

“At the same time I thank your lordships for an interposition which I believe to be intended for the public benefit.

“I have, &c.,

“J. RUSSELL.

“To the Right Rev. the Bishops of London,  
Winchester, Lincoln, &c.”

---

P—PAGE 153.

THE MEMORIAL OF DR. MEREWETHER.

“May it please your Majesty,—We your Majesty’s most dutiful and loyal subject, John Merewether, Doctor in Divinity, Dean of the cathedral church of Hereford, most humbly lay before your Majesty the assurances of our deepest and most heartfelt attachment to your Majesty’s sacred person and government.

“We thank your Majesty for having graciously granted to us your royal licence to elect a bishop of our church, in the place of the Right Rev. Father in God, Thomas, late Bishop thereof and for *‘requiring and commanding us, by the faith and allegiance by which we stand bound to your Majesty, that we elect SUCH A PERSON AS MAY BE DEVOTED TO GOD, and useful and faithful to your Majesty, and your kingdom.’*

“We also dutifully recognise the goodness of your Majesty in accompanying this your Royal Licence with letters missive, graciously announcing to us that out of *‘your princely disposition and zeal you are desirous,’* as we cannot doubt *‘to prefer unto the same See a person MEET THEREUNTO.’*

“And we further acknowledge your Majesty’s gracious intention towards us in *‘NAMING and RECOMMENDING unto us’* by the same letters missive Dr. Renn Dickson Hampden, your Majesty’s Reader in Theology in your University of Oxford, to be by us *‘ELECTED and CHOSEN into the said Bishopric.’*

“But we must humbly beseech your Majesty to permit us, as in duty bound, and in obedience to your Majesty’s Gracious command touching the qualities of the person to be chosen by us, to represent (and, if it be deemed necessary, by sufficient

documents to prove), that somewhat more than eleven years ago the said Dr. Renn Dickson Hampden, then being the late King William's Reader of Theology, the said University did, as by its laws, rights, and privileges, and by the law of the land it is empowered, and on fit occasion bound to do, judge of the published writings of the said Dr. Hampden, and did solemnly decree, and by a statute in its House of Convocation duly made did enact, that the said Dr. Hampden should be deprived of certain weighty functions, importing the right of judging of sound teaching and preaching of God's Word, which had been specially annexed by former statutes of the said University to his office therein; to wit, 'that he be in the number of those by whom are appointed the select preachers 'before the University,—and further, that his counsel be taken in case of any preacher being called (as by the statutes of the said University every preacher who may have delivered any unsound or suspected doctrine in any of his preachings is liable to be called) into question before the Vice-Chancellor.' And such deprivation of Dr. Hampden was expressly declared in the said statute to have been decreed, '*because in his said published writings he has so treated matters theological, that in this respect the University hath no confidence in him.*'

"Furthermore, six years afterwards, the Convocation of the said University having been called together to consider the question of the fitness of repealing the said statute, so that the said Dr. Hampden might be restored to the functions of which he had been, as aforesaid, deprived, the said Convocation did thereupon solemnly decree that the statute should not be repealed, but should still be (and, accordingly, it still continues to be) in full force and vigor; whereby the said Dr. Hampden stands to this day denounced by the judgment of the said University as *devoid altogether of its confidence in matters theological, by the reason of the manner in which those matters have been treated by him in his published writings.*'

"And here we deem it our duty to your Majesty humbly to submit, that not only by the people and Church of England, but by all your Majesty's royal predecessors, the solemn decisions of either of your Majesty's Universities of Oxford and Cambridge on questions and matters of theology have always been deemed to carry with them very high authority, and that

such is the renown of these your Majesty's famous Universities throughout the reformed portion of Christendom, that everywhere their judgment is heard with reverence and honor.

“Neither may we omit dutifully to lay before your Majesty, that to the office of a Bishop, to which we are commanded by your Majesty to choose ‘*a person meet to be elected,*’ essentially adheres the duty of judging of the doctrine of the clergy committed to his charge, especially of those who are to be instituted or licensed by him to the cure of souls—which high duty the University of Oxford has decreed, as aforesaid, that Dr. Hampden is, in its judgment, unfit to have confided to him; the distressing and disastrous consequences which must be expected to result from placing the Diocese of Hereford, by the strong hand of power, under a person so characterized by so high authority, we are as unwilling, as it would be painful, to recount.

“For all these reasons, and not least because, in common as we believe with almost every considerate churchman, we are desirous and anxious that the prerogative of the Crown in nominating to Bishoprics should be for ever established on its only firm foundation,—the confidence of the church in the wisdom, the justice, the purity, the considerate and conscientious moderation with which it is exercised;—we most humbly pray your Majesty to name and recommend some other person whom your Majesty shall think meet to be elected by us for our Bishop, or that your Majesty will graciously relieve us from the necessity of proceeding to the election till you shall have been pleased to submit Dr. Renn Dickson Hampden's published writings (so judged as aforesaid by the Convocation of the University of Oxford) to the judgment either of the two Houses of Convocation of clergy of the province of Canterbury which is now sitting, or of the provincial Council of Bishops of the same province, assisted by such divines as your Majesty or the said Provincial Council shall be pleased to call, or of some other competent tribunal which your Majesty shall be graciously pleased to appoint. In order whereunto we have appointed for the day of election the 28th day of December instant, being the eleventh day from the receipt of your Majesty's *congé d'élire*, and the last which we can lawfully appoint.

“And we are the more emboldened to lay this our humble supplication at the feet of your Majesty by your known cordial

attachment to our Holy and Apostolic church, and by your faithful and uniform observance of the oath made by your Majesty at your coronation,—‘That you will maintain and preserve to the utmost of your power the doctrine, discipline and government thereof.’

“And even if it could be imagined that these last-mentioned considerations apply not to our case, we should nevertheless confidently rely on your Majesty’s experienced regard for that dearest and most sacred right of every class and description of your subjects, the right of liberty of conscience, and on your having at the head of your Majesty’s councils a noble lord, the proudest boast of whose illustrious house, as well of his own public life, it hitherto has been to assert that right for all men against all opponents—a right which would in our persons be trampled to the very dust if, in spite of all our just and reasonable reclamations, we be coerced under the threatened penalties of *præmunire* to elect for our Bishop a person whom we cannot conscientiously believe, so long as the aforesaid judgment stands against him, to be ‘meet to be elected’ to that most holy office.’

“In conclusion, we would add our fervent prayers, as well as our most earnest hope, that your Majesty may long be permitted by the King of Kings to reign in the hearts of all your subjects the approved ‘Defender of the Faith,’ ‘ruling all estates and degrees of men amongst us, whether ecclesiastical or temporal,’ as is your sacred and undoubted right,—giving alike to all experience of the blessings of your just and beneficent government, and receiving from all the willing homage of grateful and confiding love. In witness whereunto we have affixed our decanal seal this 17th day of December, in the year of our Lord 1847.

“(L.S.)”

---

“The following answer was returned by Sir George Grey to the foregoing Memorial from the Dean of Hereford to the Queen :—

*Whitehall, Dec. 20, 1847.*

“Sir,—Lord John Russell having placed in my hands the

petition addressed by you to her Majesty, and transmitted in your letter to him of the 17th instant, - -

“I have had the honor to lay the same before the Queen, and I am to inform you that her Majesty has not been pleased to issue any commands thereupon.”

I have, &c,

“G. GREY.

“The Very Rev. the Dean of Hereford.”

## THE PETITION TO THE QUEEN FROM THE UNIVERSITY OF OXFORD.

TO THE QUEEN'S MOST EXCELLENT MAJESTY.

May it please your Majesty, the humble petition of the undersigned Members of Convocation and Bachelors of Civil Law in the University of Oxford

Showeth,—

That we, your Majesty's dutiful and loyal subjects, do acknowledge with ready mind that prerogative, which, as our article (*a*) declares. “We see to have been given always to all godly princes in Holy Scripture by God Himself, that is, that they should rule all states and degrees committed to their charge by God, whether they be ecclesiastical or temporal, and restrain with the civil sword the stubborn and evil-doers.

That we own that your Majesty, as supreme governor over all persons, spiritual or temporal, in the realm committed to your Majesty by God, is entitled to give redress to all your Majesty's subjects who feel themselves aggrieved, and we gladly attribute to your Majesty all that “authority (*b*) in causes ecclesiastical” which was given to “Christian Emperors of the primitive Church.”

That we entrust your Majesty's gracious attention to the following statement (*c*):—

1. That the only authority claimed by Christian Emperors and acknowledged by the Church in ecclesiastical causes has been to give, upon appeal, new “especial judges.” (*d*)
2. That the Church of which your Majesty is a member has

declared that “the (*e*) Church hath authority in controversies of faith.”

3. That Magna Charta (*f*) begins by declaring, “We have granted to God, and by this our charter have confirmed for us and our heirs for ever, that the Church of England be free, and shall have all her whole rights inviolable;” and among these liberties it was secured by one of the most ancient laws of this realm, that she should “have (*g*) her judgments free.”

4. That the largest claim ever made of old by any King of England was in the Constitution of Clarendon, in the reign of your Majesty’s predecessor, King Henry II., wherein it was provided that (*h*) “if the Archbishop failed to show justice, recourse was at last to be had to the King, that by this precept the controversy might be terminated in the Archbishop’s Court.”

5. That in the Statute (*i*) called “Articuli Cleri,” the clergy, and your Majesty’s predecessor, King Edward II., by advice of the spirituality and temporality allowed, “that spiritual persons, whom our Lord the King doth present unto benefices of the Church, if the Bishop will not admit them for lack of learning or other cause reasonable, may not be under examination of lay persons in the cases aforesaid, as it is now attempted contrary to the decrees canonical, but that they must sue unto a spiritual judge for remedy, as right shall require.” To which the answer in the statute is:—“Of the ability of a person presented unto a benefice of the Church, the examination belongeth to a spiritual judge, and so it hath been used heretofore and shall be hereafter.”

6. That in the twenty-fourth year of the reign of your Majesty’s predecessor, (*k*) King Henry VIII., it was declared by statute, with the full consent both of the spiritual and temporal estates of the realm, that this realm of England is an Empire governed by one supreme head and King, unto whom all sorts and degrees of people, whether spiritual or temporal, are bounden to bear natural and humble obedience, he having also power to render justice to them without restraint or appeal to any foreign prince or potentate.

7. That it was at the same time, and by the same statute, declared, that the spirituality, now being usually called the English Church, has power, when any cause of the law, divine or spiritual learning, may happen to come in question, to declare, interpret,

and show the same; that it always hath been reputed, and also found of that sort, that both for knowledge, and integrity, and sufficiency of numbers, it hath always been thought, and is also at this hour sufficient and meet itself, without the intermeddling of any exterior person or persons, to declare and determine all such doubts, and to administer all such offices and duties as to their rooms spiritual doth appertain.

8. That in the same year in which the statute (*l*) was passed, which made it "lawful to the parties grieved, for lack of justice in any of the courts of the Archbishop, to appeal to the King's Court of Chancery," it was admitted by another statute that heresies should be finally judged in the Bishop's Court (*m*); and in 1530, King Henry VIII. himself stated in a proclamation that "cognizance (*n*) heresies, errors, and Lollardies, appertaineth to the judge of the holy Church, and not to the judge secular."

9. That by the ancient law of the land, it is admitted that it (*o*) doth not appertain to the King's Court to determine schisms or heresies, "and that where the original cause of the matter whereof the King's Court hath cognizance, the King's Court is to consult the divines to know whether it be schism or not."

10. That the statute restoring the supremacy to the Crown under your Majesty's predecessor, Queen Elizabeth, was for "the (*p*) restoring and uniting to the Imperial Crown of the realm the ancient jurisdictions, authorities, superiorities, and pre-eminences, to the same of right belonging or appertaining;" and that that statute has been declared by the authority of Sir Edward Coke to be, "not (*q*) a statute introductory of a new law, but declaratory of the old."

11. That although the "reformation of ecclesiastical laws," prepared under your Majesty's predecessor, King Edward, by reason of his death (*r*) never received the sanction of the law, yet, that being prepared by Archbishop Cranmer with others, they are some indication of what was then intended; and these provide that "when (*s*) any cause should devolve to the Crown, it should, if a grave cause, be settled by a provincial council."

12. That during the whole reigns of King Henry VIII., Edward VI., and Queen Elizabeth, "there (*t*) is no trace of any of the nobility or common law judges in any commission," nor,

afterwards, "in one commission out of the forty," until the overthrow of the royal authority in the great rebellion.

13. That your Majesty's predecessor, Queen Anne, declares, "We are (*u*) pleased to find that, according to the opinion of eight of our twelve judges, and of our Attorney and Solicitor General as the law now stands, a jurisdiction in orders of heresy and condemnation of heretics is proposed to be exercised in convocation."

14. That the Court of Delegates having gradually declined and become generally unsatisfactory, the ultimate Court of Appeal has, by recent acts, (*v*) been transferred wholly to laymen, and a very grave cause, affecting a fundamental doctrine of the Church, has recently been decided by them.

15. That from the time of the Apostles such a question was never decided by any other than the Bishops of the Church.

16. That such a power supersedes the functions of the Church itself as declared in our article, (*w*) more especially since the synods of the Church are not actually in practice admitted to declare the doctrine of the Church, if it shall be called in question.

17. That the existence of such a state of things is a grievance of conscience, and that this grievance is aggravated by the fact, that the members of the Judicial Committee, except two, are not necessarily members of the English Church, and that these two need not necessarily sit in any cause.

18. That the court has lately declared that the Church of England does not teach distinctly and definitely in a matter of faith.

19. That the laxity of interpretation of the formularies of the Church, sanctioned by this judgment, would very seriously affect the good faith of subscription, the religious observances, and ultimately the soundness of faith in the Church and the University.

20. That this grievance presses very heavily upon the consciences of very many of your Majesty's subjects.

21. That your Majesty's predecessor, King Charles I., in a declaration still prefixed to the Articles, and printed in the Book of Common Prayer, promised, "That out of our princely care that the Churchmen may do the work which is proper unto them, the Bishops and Clergy, from time to time in convocation,

upon their humble desire, shall have licence under our broad seal to deliberate of, and to do, all such things as, being made plain by them, and assented unto by us, shall concern the settled continuance of the doctrine and discipline of the Church of England now established.”

Your petitioners, therefore, having this statement before us, and feeling convinced that both the doctrine and discipline of the Church of England are endangered, by the reference of causes involving that doctrine to the above court, and also that doubt and uncertainty have been cast upon her doctrine as to the Sacrament of Baptism by the recent decision—

Humbly pray—That your Majesty will be pleased to give your royal assent, that all questions touching the doctrine of the Church of England, arising in appeal or in your Majesty’s temporal courts, shall hereafter (as suggested to your Majesty’s predecessor, King Edward VI.) be referred to a synod.

That your Majesty will be pleased to give your royal sanction to a bill for enacting that the judgment of such synod shall be binding upon the temporal courts of these realms.

And further, that your Majesty will be pleased to refer the matter of doctrine recently questioned to the Church itself, in such a way as your Majesty may be advised by the collective episcopate.

That so the members of the Church of England may know certainly what is the doctrine of the Church on the Sacrament of Baptism, and that the Church itself may enjoy full freedom to exercise its inherent and inalienable office of declaring and judging in all matters purely spiritual to the welfare of your Majesty and of these realms, the salvation of souls, and the glory of its Divine Head.

And your petitioners, as in duty bound, will ever pray.

(a) Art. 37.—(b) Taken from Canon 2. The words “that the godly kings had amongst the Jews” are omitted, as not bearing formally on the subject of the petition.—(c) The petition has been thrown into this form in order that members of Convocation who have not time to verify the facts stated may not be responsible for them, but only for the prayer of the petition.—(d) Codex Eccl. Afr., can. 104.—(e) Art. 20.—(f) 9 Henry III. c. 1. “Confirmation of liberties.”—(g) Law of King Withfred, A.D. 697, Spelman, t. i. p. 194.—(h) c. 8. Wilkins’ Concilia, ii. 435.—(i) 9 Edward II, t. i. c. 13.—(k) 24 Henry VIII, c. 12. s. 1.—(l) 25 Henry VIII. c. 19.—(m) 25 Henry VIII., c. 12, s. 1.—(n) Wilkins, iii. 739.—(o) Speccot’s case, Coke’s Reports,

The following petition was also forwarded from Oxford to Dr. Sumner.

TO HIS GRACE THE ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY.

May it please your Grace—We, the undersigned, members of convocation in the University of Oxford, beg to express to your grace the deep anxiety we feel in consequence of the late decision of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council.

Our grounds for this anxiety are—

That, apart from the doctrine involved in that decision, it appears from the decision itself, that the “authority in controversies of faith” which we have all declared to be lodged in the Church, is transferred to a court appointed by the civil power and consisting of civil judges.

That for the future accordingly there is no doctrine of the faith however sacred, which may not, as to its meaning or even existence, incidentally be submitted for final decision to a tribunal composed of civil judges, so as entirely to supersede the functions of the Church.

That at this present time, the Supreme Court appears to us to have ruled that the Church of England has no certain doctrine at all on the Sacrament of Baptism, and that words, solemnly enunciating doctrine, may be construed in two contradictory senses.

That if the assertions of the Church on baptism may be taken as ambiguous, great uncertainty would be thrown upon very many other declarations of her faith.

That the continuance of such a state of things would endanger the faith among us, and would tend to produce an universal scepticism.

p. 5.—(p) 1 Eliz., c. 1. s. 1. The title is “An Act to restore to the Crown the ancient jurisdiction over the estate ecclesiastical and spiritual, and abolishing all foreign powers repugnant to the same.”—(q) Cawdrey’s case, Coke’s Reports, p. 5.—(r) Reformat. Leg. Eccles. Præf. (s) Ibid. De Appellat., c. xi., p. 283. In other causes it was provided that three or four Bishops should be appointed by the Crown for that end.—(t) Gibson’s Codex, Introd., p. xiii., on the Authority of the Reg. Cur. Delegat.—(u) Letter to the Archbishop of Canterbury, given in Whiston’s account of the Convocation’s proceedings.—(v) 2 and 3 Gul. IV. c. 92, and 3 and 4 Gul. IV., c. 41.—(w) Art. 20.

We therefore humbly beg your grace to be pleased to take such measures, with advice of the Bishops of both provinces, whereby all questions touching the doctrine of the Church of England, arising in appeal from the spiritual courts, or incidentally in the civil courts, shall be referred to a synod.

And whereby the doctrine of the Church of England, called in question in the late judgment, may be authoritatively re-affirmed.

(Signed)

---

Q— PAGE 152.

LETTER OF DEAN MEREWETHER TO LORD JOHN RUSSELL.

“My Lord,—I have had the honor to receive your Lordship’s letter, announcing that you had received my memorial to the Queen, and that you had transmitted it to Sir G. Grey for presentation to her Majesty; and by the same post I also receive the information that Sir G. Grey had laid the same before the Queen, and that ‘he was to inform me that her Majesty has not been pleased to issue any commands thereupon.’ Under these circumstances I feel compelled once more to trouble your Lordship with a few remarks.

“Throughout the correspondence in which I have had the honor to be engaged with your Lordship, as well as in the interview which you were pleased to afford me on the subject of the appointment of the See of Hereford, it has been my object frankly and faithfully to declare to you the facts which have come to my knowledge, and the honest conviction of my mind. I desire still to act upon the same principle, and to submit to your lordship finally, and as briefly as possible, the following considerations, upon which I feel constrained to adopt a course which, however I may apprehend it, will not be entirely congenial to your Lordship’s wishes, will, under the circumstances in which I am placed, obtain from your Lordship’s candor the admission, that it is the only course which I could pursue.

“I crave your Lordship’s indulgence whilst I enumerate the special obligations to which I am bound, and I state them in the order of their occurrence.

“When matriculated to the University of Oxford, of which I am still a member, the following oath was administered to me, as well as on taking each of my degrees:—‘*Tu dabis fidem ad observandum omnia statuta, privilegia, et consuetudines hujus Universitatis; ita Deus te adjuvet, tactis sacrosanctis Christi Evangeliiis.*’

“Again—when I was admitted to the sacred orders of priest in the Church of God, a part of my ordination vow was expressed in these words—that I would ‘banish and drive away all erroneous and strange doctrine contrary to God’s word.’

“Again—when I was inducted, on occasion of the installation to the office which I hold in the Cathedral Church of Hereford, as I stepped over the threshold of the fabric, the restoration of which, for the due honor of Almighty God, it has been my pride and anxious endeavor to promote, I was required to charge my soul with this responsibility:—‘*Ego Joannes Merewether, Decanus Herefordensis, ab hæc horâ in antea, fidelis ero huic sacro sanctæ Herefordensi ecclesiæ, nec non jura, libertates, privilegia, et consuetudines ejusdem, pro viribus observabo et ea manu tenebo et defendam pro posse meo; sic me Deus adjuvet et hæc sancta Evangelia.*

“My Lord, I cannot divest my mind of the awful sense of the stringency of those engagements at the present exigency. Let me entreat your Lordship’s patience whilst I endeavor to explain my apprehension of them.

“In my letter of the 1st of December, in reply to the second which your Lordship was pleased to address to me—and to which correspondence I trust your Lordship will permit me publicly to refer in vindication of my conduct, should need require it—I observed, ‘In regard to Dr. Hampden’s tenets, I would abstain from any opinion upon them till I had again fairly and attentively read his writings.’ That act of justice I have carefully performed, and I will add with an earnest desire to discover grounds upon which, in case of Dr. Hampden’s ever occupying the high station for which he has been selected by your Lordship, my mind might be relieved from all distrust, and I might be enabled as cordially as possible to render that service which the relative duties of Diocesan and Dean and chapter involve.

“It is painful in the extreme to feel obliged to declare that I

discover in those writings many *assertions*—not merely references to theories or impressions of others—but *assertions*, which to my calm and deliberate appreciation appear to be heterodoxical, I believe I may say heretical, and very, very much which is most dangerous, most objectionable, calculated to weaken the hold which the religion we possess as yet obtains, and ought to obtain always, upon the minds of its professors. I feel certain that the perusal of several of these works by any of that class who, ‘by reason of use’ (in cautious examination of such productions) ‘have not their senses exercised to discern both good and evil,’ would produce a doubt and distrust in the teaching of our church, in her creeds,—her formularies,—her liturgy; would rob them of the inestimable joy and peace in believing, and be highly detrimental to the spread of true religion.

“Such being my conviction, I would ask your Lordship how it must effect my conscience in reference to those solemn obligations which I have already detailed? I have sworn that I will observe all the statutes of the University of which I am still a member. The statute of that University touching this matter stands in the following words, at this moment uncanceled, unrepealed:—‘*Quin ab universitate commissum fuerit, S. Theologiæ Professori Regio, ut unus sit ex eorum numero a quibus designantur selecti concionatores, secundum Tit. XVI., 58 (addend. p. 150), necnon ut ejus concilium adhibeatur si quis concionator coram Vice-Cancellario in questionem vocatur, secundum Tit. XVI., s. 11 (Addend. p. 151), quum vero qui nunc Professor est scriptis suis publici juris factis, ita res theologicas tractaverit, ut in hâc parte nullum ejus fiduciam habeat Universitas; statutum est, quod munerum prædictorum expers sit S. Theologiæ Professor Regius, donec aliter Universitati Professoris ejusdem vicibus fungantur alii, scilicet, in concionatores selectos designando senior inter Vice-Cancellarii deputatos, vel eo absente, aut ipsius Vice-Cancellarii locum tenente, proximus ex ordine deputatus (proviso semper quod sacros ordines susceperit) et in consilio de concionibus habendo, Prælector Dominæ Margarittæ Comitissæ Richmondæ.*’ Should I not be guilty of deliberate perjury, if in direct defiance of such a decree I did any act which should place the object of it in such a position as to be not only the judge of the soundness of the theological opinions and preaching of a whole diocese, but of those whom, from time

to time, he must admit to cure of souls, and even to the sacred orders of the ministry ?

“ I have sworn, at the most awful moment of my life, that I will ‘ banish and drive away all erroneous and strange doctrines contrary to God’s Word.’ It may be replied, that this engagement applies to the ministrations in the cure of souls, inherent only in parochial functions ; but the statutes of our cathedral church constitute me one of the guardians of the soundness of the doctrine which may be preached in that sacred edifice :-- ‘ Si quid a quopiam pro concione properatur, quod cum verbo Dei, articulis Religionis, aut Liturgiæ Anglicanæ consentire non videtur, eâ de re, Decanus atque Residentiarii, quotquot audierunt, Dominum Episcopum sine morâ per literas suas monebunt.’ With what confidence, or what hope of the desired end, should I communicate such a case to a Bishop whose own soundness of theological teaching was more than suspected. Should I not be guilty of a breach of my ordination vows if I did not protest against the admission of such a person to such a responsible post, and endeavor to ‘ banish and drive away,’ by all lawful means, that person of the 18,000 clergy of this land, on whom the censure and deprivation of one of the most learned and renowned seminaries of religious teaching in the world, is yet in its full operation and effect, one who is already designated thereby as a setter forth of erroneous and strange doctrines ? Again, I have sworn to be FAITHFUL to the cathedral church of Hereford. Faithful I could not be, either as to the maintenance of the doctrine, or the discipline of the Church in those respects already alluded to, or the welfare and unity of that Church, either in the cathedral body itself or in the diocese at large, under existing circumstances, if by any act of mine I promoted Dr. Hampden’s elevation to the episcopal throne of that Church and diocese. Faithful I have labored to be in the restoration and the saving of its material and venerable fabric. Faithful by God’s help, I will strive to be, in obtaining for it that oblation of sound and holy doctrine which should ascend, together with the incense of prayer and praise, ‘ in the beauty of holiness,’ untainted and unalloyed by any tincture of ‘ philosophy and vain deceit, after the tradition of men, after the rudiments of the world, and not after Christ.’

“ But your Lordship may reply, there is another oath by

which I have bound myself, which I have as yet overlooked; not so, my Lord. Of my sentiments on the Royal Prerogative I have already put your Lordship in possession. When I warned you of the consequences of your appointment, of the tendency which it would produce to weaken the existing relations between Church and State, I fully recognised the just prerogative of the Crown; and when I thought I had not sufficiently dwelt upon it, I wrote a second time to make myself distinctly understood.

“Nor is it only the sense of legal obligation which would constrain me to a dutiful regard to such observance. Few men have a greater cause to feel their duty in this respect, warned by the sense of kindness and condescension from those of royal station, than myself. The memory of one who anxiously contemplated the future happiness and *true* glory of his successor, fixed indelibly those sentiments upon my heart. And, if for his sake only, who could, to a long course of almost parental kindness, add, in an affecting injunction, the expression of his wishes for my good on his death-bed, I should never be found forgetful even although I may never have taken in the present reign the oath of allegiance—of that loyalty and devotion to my Sovereign which is not less a duty of religion than the grateful and constitutional homage of an English heart. Forgive me, my Lord, for the reflection on that death bed injunction, if I say, that had it been observed,—as but for political and party influence it would have been—your Lordship, the Church, and the nation, would have been spared this most unhappy trial, the results of which, as I have already again and again foreboded to your Lordship, it is impossible to foresee. Nor, under any circumstances, is it likely that the obligation of the oath of allegiance in my person will be infringed upon; its terms are, that ‘I will be faithful and bear true allegiance;’ and, accordingly, the *congé d’élire* has these expressions, ‘requiring and commanding you by the faith and allegiance by which you stand bound to us, to elect such a person for your Bishop and pastor as may be devoted to God and USEFUL and faithful to us and our KINGDOM. Would it be any proof of fidelity or *true* allegiance, my Lord, to elect a person as, “MEET TO BE ELECTED’ who was the contrary to those requirements? And can it be possible that in the course of *Divine Service in the Chief Sanctuary of Almighty God in*

the diocese, however *named* and *recommended*, a person should be 'UNANIMOUSLY CHOSEN *and* ELECTED' in the awful falsification of these words, IN THE PRESENCE OF GOD, *against the consciences of the unhappy* electors, simply because the adviser of the Crown (for "the Crown can do no wrong") has in his short-sightedness and ignorance of facts (to say the least) thought fit to name an objectionable person, the one of all the clergy of the land so disqualified; and, when warned of the consequences by the voices of the Primate, of thirteen Bishops, and hosts of priests and deacons, clergy and laity by hundreds, of all shades of opinions in the Church, persisted in the reckless determination?

"In the words of an eminent writer of our Church, 'All power is given unto edification, none to the overthrow and destruction of the church,' (*Hooker's Ecclesiastical Polity*, book viii., chap. 7;) and the matter is perhaps placed in the true light and position by the learned author of *Vindiciæ Ecclesiæ Anglicanæ*—(Francis Mason;) the whole of which is well worthy of your Lordship's notice. I venture to supply a brief extract, (book iv., chap. 13, 1625:)--

"Philodoxus.—You pretended to treat of Kings electing Bishops and conferring of Bishoprics, and now you ascribe not the election to Kings, but to the clergy, and claim only nomination for Kings?

"Orthodoxus.—The king's nomination is, with us, a fair beginning to the election. Therefore, when he nominates any person he elects him, and gives, as I may say, the first vote for him.

"Philodoxus.—What kind of elections are those of your deans and chapters? 'Tis certain they can't be called free elections since nothing is to be done without the King's previous authority.

"Orthodoxus.—The freedom of election doth not exclude the King's sacred authority, but *force and tyranny* only. If any unworthy person should be forced upon them against their will, or the clergy should be constrained to give their voices by force and threatening, such an election cannot be said to be free. But if the King do nominate a worthy person, according to the laws, as our Kings have used to do, and give them authority to choose him, there is no reason why this may

not be called a free election; for here is no force or violence used.

“ ‘Philodoxus.—But if the King, deceived by *undeserved recommendations*, should happen to propose to the clergy a person unlearned, or of ill morals, or otherwise manifestly unworthy of that function, what’s to be done then ?

“ ‘Orthodoxus.—Our kings are wont to proceed in these cases maturely and cautiously, I mean with the utmost care and prudence; and hence it comes to pass that the Church of England is at this time in such a flourishing condition.

“ ‘Philodoxus.—Since they are but men they are liable to human weakness; and therefore what’s to be done, if such a case should happen ?

“ ‘Orthodoxus.—If the electors could make sufficient proof of such crimes or incapacities, I think it were becoming them *to represent the same to the King, with all due humility, modesty, and duty, humbly* beseeching his Majesty, out of his known clemency, to take care of the interest of the widowed church; and our Princes are so famous for their piety and condescension, that I doubt not that his Majesty would graciously answer their pious petition—and nominate another unexceptionable person, agreeable to all their wishes. Thus a mutual affection would be kept up between the Bishop and his church.’ ”

“ Nor is this a mere supposition, but there are instances in the history of this kingdom of such judicious reconsideration of an undesirable appointment. I will cite but one from *Burnett’s History of his own Times*, A.D. 1693, vol. iv., p. 209. London, 1793:—

“ ‘The state of Ireland leads me to insert here a very particular instance of the Queen’s pious care in disposing of Bishoprics. Lord Sidney was so far engaged in the interest of a great family in Ireland, that he was too easily wrought on to recommend a branch of it to a vacant See. The representation was made with an undue character of the person; so the Queen granted it. But when she understood that he lay under a very bad character, she wrote a letter in her own hand to Lord Sidney, letting him know what she had heard, and ordered him to call for six Irish Bishops, whom she named to him, and to require them to certify to her their opinion of that person. They all agreed that he labored under an ill fame, and till that was

examined into they did not think it proper to promote him; so that matter was let fall. I do not name the person, for I intend not to leave a blemish on him, but set this down as an example fit to be imitated by Christian Princes."

"But alas! remonstrance seems unheeded, and if our venerable Primate and thirteen Bishops have raised their united voice of warning and intreaty to no purpose, it is no marvel that my humble supplication should have pleaded in vain, for time—for investigation—for some regard to our consciences—some consideration for our painful and delicate position.

"The time draws near—on Tuesday next the *semblance* of an election is to be exhibited. I venture to assure your Lordship that I could not undertake to say that it would be an unanimous election; I was bold enough to affirm that it would not be unanimous; and I, in my turn, received the intimation and the caution—I will not say *the threat*—that the law must be vindicated. Already have I assured your Lordship that the principle on which this painful affair is regarded, is that of the most solemn religious responsibility; thousands regard it in this light. I have already told you, my Lord, that the watchword of such is this—'Whether it be right in the sight of God to hearken unto you more than unto God, judge ye.' I have anxiously implored your Lordship to pause—to avert the blow. I have long since told you the truth. I have endeavored to prevent, by every means in my power, the commotion which has arisen, and the necessity of the performance of a painful duty. I hope that the *Congé d'élire* would not be issued *until a fair inquiry and investigation had been instituted*. A suit has been commenced in the ecclesiastical courts—why not have awaited its issue? When the *Congé d'élire* did appear, I at once presumed, humbly but faithfully, though I stood alone, to petition the Crown; and now, when I am officially informed, that 'Her Majesty has not been pleased to issue any commands thereupon,' I feel it to be my bounden duty, after a full and calm deliberation on the whole subject, having counted the cost, but remembering the words of Him whose most unworthy servant I am—'He that loveth house or lands more than Me is not worthy of Me'—loving my children, dearly and ardently desiring to complete the noble work which I have for seven years labored to promote, yet not forgetting that there is an 'hour of death and

a day of judgment,' when I trust, through the merits of my Redeemer, to be allowed to look up with hope, that I may be considered by the intercession of mercy and pity to have been faithful in the hour of trial, to have 'fought the good fight, to have kept the faith, to have finished *my* course,'—believing that I risk much, and shall incur your Lordship's heavy displeasure, who may, if you will, direct the sword of power against me and mine—being certain that I preclude myself from that which might otherwise have been my lot, and expecting that I shall bring down upon myself the abuse and blame of some—I say, my Lord, having fully counted the cost, having weighed *the sense of bounden duty* in the one scale against the consequences in the other, I have come to the deliberate resolve, that on Tuesday next no earthly consideration shall induce me to give my vote in the chapter of Hereford cathedral for Dr. Hampden's elevation to the see of Hereford.

"I have the honor to be, my lord,

"Your lordship's faithful humble servant,

"JOHN MEREWETHER, Dean of Hereford.

"*Hereford Dec. 22.*"

The following letter was addressed to the Dean of Hereford in reply:—

"*Woburn Abbey, Dec. 25.*

Sir,—I have had the honor to receive your letter of the 22nd inst., in which you intimate to me your intention of violating the law.

I have the honor to be your obedient servant,

J. RUSSELL."

The Very Rev. the Dean of Hereford.

R—PAGE 152.

THE CONGÉ D'ÉLIRE.

"Victoria, by the Grace of God, of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland, Queen, Defender of the Faith, to our

trusty and well-beloved the Dean and Chapter of our Cathedral Church of Hereford, greeting.

“Supplication having been humbly made to us on your part that, whereas the aforesaid Church is now void and destitute of the solace of a Pastor, by the translation of the Right Reverend Father in God, Doctor Thomas Musgrave, late Bishop thereof, to the Archiepiscopal See of York, we would be graciously pleased to grant you our fundatorial leave and licence to elect you another Bishop and Pastor; We, being favorably inclined to your prayers in this behalf, have thought fit, by virtue of these presents, to grant you such leave and licence, requiring and commanding you, by the faith and allegiance by which you stand bound to us, that you elect such a person for your Bishop and Pastor, as may be devoted to God, and useful and faithful to us and our Kingdom.

“In witness whereof we have caused these our letters to be made patent. Witness ourselves at Westminster, on the 16th day of December, in the eleventh year of our reign.

“By Writ of Privy Seal.

“LANGDALE. BETHELL.”

---

S—PAGE 152.

THE LETTER RECOMMENDATORY.

“Victoria R.

“Trusty and well-beloved, we greet you well. Whereas the Bishoprick of Hereford is at this present void by the translation of the Most Reverend Father in God, Doctor Thomas Musgrave, late Bishop thereof, to the Archiepiscopal See of York, we let you weet, that for certain considerations us at this present moving, we of our princely disposition and zeal being desirous to prefer unto the same see a person meet thereunto, and considering the virtue, learning, wisdom, gravity, and other good gifts wherewith our trusty and well-beloved Renn Dickson Hampden, Doctor in Divinity, is endued, we have been pleased to name and recommend him unto you, by these presents, to be elected and chosen into the said Bishoprick of Hereford.

“Wherefore we require you, upon receipt hereof, to proceed to your election, according to the laws and statutes of this our realm, and our *Congé d'élire* herewith sent unto you, and the same election so made to certify unto us, under your common seal.

“Given under our signet, at our Palace of Westminster, the 16th day of December, in the eleventh year of our reign.”

---

T—PAGE 152.

THE CITATORY LETTER FROM THE CHAPTER.

“John Merewether, Doctor of Divinity, Dean of the Cathedral Church of Hereford, and the Chapter of the said Church, to our beloved in Christ, John Davis, Richard Downie, and Edward Staunton Jones, literate persons, jointly and severally, greeting. Whereas the Episcopal See of Hereford is now void and destitute of a pastor, by the translation of the Right Rev. Thomas Musgrave, the late Lord Bishop thereof, to the Archbishoprick of York; We, therefore, the Dean and Chapter aforesaid, having received the Queen's Majesty's license for electing another Bishop, have fixed and appointed Tuesday, 28th of December instant, for such election, to be made in the chapter-house in our said cathedral church, between the hours of ten and twelve in the forenoon of the same day, with continuation and proration of the said hours, day, and place from thence following, if it shall be necessary, and have decreed that all and singular the Canons or Prebendaries of the said Church that have a right to vote on the said election, should be cited to appear at the said day, time, and place, to proceed, and see proceedings made, in the business of the said election, and in all and singular the acts and things which, according to the usage and custom of the said Cathedral Church, and the laws and statutes of England, may be necessary, and as the present state and condition of the said Church may either allow or require. Wherefore, we empower and command you, jointly and severally, to cite or cause to be cited peremptorily all and singular the Canons or Prebendaries of the said Cathedral Church, by showing to them severally these presents (if it may conveniently be done,) and by publicly

affixing the same on the door of the west end of the choir, and also on the door that openeth into the chapter-house of the said Church, and afterwards by affixing and leaving on each of the said doors respectively a true copy of these presents, and also by all lawful ways, means, and methods whatsoever, whereby you can or may better or more effectually, so that this citation may most likely come to the knowledge of them so to be cited (whom by the tenor of these presents we do also cite,) that they and every of them appear before us in the chapter house aforesaid, on Tuesday the 28th day of December instant, between the hours of ten and twelve of the forenoon, with continuation and prorogation of the days and hours from thence next following, and of places, if it shall be necessary, to proceed and see proceedings in the said business of election, and in all necessary acts even to the finishing and perfecting thereof inclusively, to be done; and to do and perform all other things which the nature and condition of the said election may require. Moreover that you intimate, or cause to be intimated, peremptorily, to all and singular the persons aforesaid (to whom we do hereby also intimate,) that if they do not appear at the day, time, and place aforesaid, we nevertheless will then proceed, according to law and custom, in the said business of election, and to finish the same, their absence in anywise notwithstanding; and what you shall do in thy premises you or either of you, that shall execute this our mandate, shall duly certify to us, at the day, time, and place aforesaid. In witness whereof we have caused our common seal to be set to these presents.

“Dated this 18th day of December, in the year of our Lord 1847.

“RICHD. UNDERWOOD, Chapter Clerk (L. s.)”

---

U—PAGE 152.

A.D. 1350.

*The Statute of Provisors of Benefices, made in the 25th year of Edward III.*

And in case that the Presentees of the King, or the Presentees of other Patrons or Advowees, or they to whom the King, or such Patrons or Advowees aforesaid, have given Benefices pertaining to their Presentments or Collations, be

disturbed by such Provisor, so that they may not have possession of such Benefices by virtue of the Presentments or Collations made to them, or that they which be in possession of such Benefices be impeached of their said possessions by such Provisors: then the said Provisors, their Procurators, Executors, and Notaries, shall be attached by their body and brought to answer: And if they be convicted they shall abide in prison, without being let to mainprise, or bail, or otherwise delivered till they have made fine and ransom to the King, at his will, and gree to the party that shall feel himself aggrieved.

And nevertheless before that they be delivered they shall make full renunciation, and find sufficient surety, that they shall not attempt such things in time to come.

---

V—PAGE 152.

A.D. 1392.

*The Statute of Præmunire, made in the 16th year of Richard II.*

Whereupon our said Lord the King, by the assent aforesaid, and at the request of his said Commons, hath ordained and established, that if any purchase or pursue, or caused to be purchased or pursued, in the court of Rome or elsewhere, by any such Translations, Processes, and Excommunications, Bulls, Instruments, or any other things whatsoever, which touch the King, against him, his crown, his royalty, or his realm, or them receive or make thereof notification, or any other execution whatsoever, within this same realm or without, that they, their Notaries, Procurators, Maintainers, Abettors, Fautors and Counsellors, shall be put out of the King's protection, and their lands and tenements, goods and chattels, forfeit to our Lord the King: and that they be attached by their bodies, if they may be found, and brought before the King and his Council, there to answer to the cases foresaid: or that process be made against them by "Præmunire facias" in manner as is ordained in other Statutes of Provisors.

---

W—PAGE 166.

*“Launton Bicester, May 15th, 1849.*

“My Lord,—I regret that anything in the book that I have published should appear to my diocesan to be contrary to the Articles of the Church of England, or calculated to depreciate that church in comparison with the Church of Rome; and I undertake not to publish a second edition of the work.

“I declare my adherence to the Articles, in their plain literal and grammatical sense, and will not preach or teach anything contrary to such Articles in their plain literal and grammatical sense.

“I have the honor to be, my Lord,

“Your Lordship’s dutiful servant in Christ,

“THOS. W. ALLIES.

*“The Lord Bishop of Oxford.”*

Y—PAGE 201.

### LORD JOHN RUSSELL AND THE PAPAL AGGRESSION.

TO THE RIGHT REV. THE BISHOP OF DURHAM.

My dear Lord,—I agree with you in considering “the late aggression of the Pope upon our Protestantism” as “insolent and insidious,” and I therefore feel as indignant as you can do upon the subject.

I not only promoted to the utmost of my power the claims of the Roman Catholics to all civil rights, but I thought it right, and even desirable, that the Ecclesiastical system of the Roman Catholics should be the means of giving instruction to the numerous Irish immigrants in London and elsewhere, who without such help would have been left in heathen ignorance.

This might have been done, however, without any such innovation as that which we have now seen.

It is impossible to confound the recent measures of the Pope

with the division of Scotland into dioceses by the Episcopal Church, or the arrangements of districts in England by the Wesleyan Conference.

There is an assumption of power in all the documents which have come from Rome—a pretension to supremacy over the realm of England, and a claim to sole and undivided sway, which is inconsistent with the Queen's supremacy, with the rights of our Bishops and Clergy, and with the spiritual independence of the nation, as asserted even in Roman Catholic times.

I confess, however, that my alarm is not equal to my indignation.

Even if it shall appear that the ministers and servants of the Pope in this country have not transgressed the law, I feel persuaded that we are strong enough to repel any outward attacks. The liberty of Protestantism has been enjoyed too long in England to allow of any successful attempt to impose a foreign yoke upon our minds and consciences. No foreign prince or potentate will be permitted to fasten his fetters upon a nation which has so long and so nobly vindicated its right to freedom of opinion, civil, political, and religious.

Upon this subject, then, I will only say that the present state of the law shall be carefully examined, and the propriety of adopting any proceedings with reference to the recent assumption of power deliberately considered.

There is a danger, however, which alarms me much more than any aggression of a foreign sovereign.

Clergymen of our own Church, who have subscribed the Thirty-nine Articles, and acknowledged in explicit terms the Queen's supremacy, have been the most forward in leading their flocks, "step by step, to the very verge of the precipice." The honor paid to Saints, the claim of infallibility for the Church, the superstitious use of the sign of the Cross, the muttering of the Liturgy so as to disguise the language in which it is written, the recommendation of auricular confession, and the administration of penance and absolution—all these things are pointed out by Clergymen of the Church of England as worthy of adoption, and are now openly reprehended by the Bishop of London in his charge to the Clergy of his Diocese.

What, then, is the danger to be apprehended from a foreign

prince of no great power, compared to the danger within the gates from the unworthy sons of the Church of England herself?

I have little hope that the propounders and framers of these innovations will desist from their insidious course. But I rely with confidence on the people of England, and I will not bate a jot of heart or hope so long as the glorious principles and the immortal martyrs of the Reformation shall be held in reverence by the great mass of a nation which looks with contempt on the mummeries of superstition, and with scorn at the laborious endeavors which are now making to confine the intellect and enslave the soul.

I remain, with great respect, &c.,

J. RUSSELL.

*Downing-street, Nov. 4.*

This letter was printed in letters of gold and sold for 5s. on Nov. 9th, 1850; and on Nov. 9th, 1855, *Lord J. Russell was himself hooted down at the Lord Mayor's Banquet.*

AA—PAGE 210.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE TIMES.

“Sir,—As there are many persons anxious to know the reasons which have induced me to withhold my new church from the Anglican communion, for whose service it had originally been destined, I venture to express a hope that you will allow the following letter written to the Bishop of S. Asaph, to appear in the columns of your next edition. It will best explain my conduct in this matter.

“I am, Sir,

“Your obedient servant,

“FEILDING.

“*Downing, Holywell, Nov. 13.*”

We are very happy to afford Lord Feilding an opportunity of explaining his conduct in this extraordinary affair; but, in order

AAAA

that the public may have the whole case before them, we prefix to his Lordship's letter the correspondence that led to it, which has been forwarded to us embodied in a statement entitled—

AN APPEAL TO THE MEMBERS OF THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND.

(Copy)

“ *St. Asaph, Oct. 21, 1850.*

“ My dear Lord,—As it is now some time since I had the honor of writing to you with regard to the Church of Pantasaph, and since I have as yet received no answer, I will venture to place before you the following considerations, hoping that they may not come too late, and that you have not in this matter made up your mind without looking at the view which they, who think differently from you, must take of the subject. For I cannot help regarding it as a promise made to me and my clergy, as well as to our Divine Master.

“ You publicly declared that you purposed to bestow a large sum of money in founding a church and all things belonging to it. You invited me and my clergy to join in laying the foundation. You seemed to understand it so. We certainly understood it so, and we received the Lord's Supper together with this understanding.

“ Now I must say, that I regard this as a promise made to me and my clergy as solemnly as it could be made on earth.

“ You subsequently came to my house, and we consulted in private, as friends, as to how you could best carry out what I considered as fully settled between us. And I would ask—How you could have made a more solemn promise, as far as I and my clergy are concerned? If any one had asked me to advance money on such a promise I should have readily done it, according to my means. If I had done so you no doubt would now repay me the money. I am not doubting you, but your view of the subject. If any cautious adviser had at that time suggested that I should do well to induce you to bind yourself legally to your promise, I should have resented the suggestion as an insult to my friend, and your own feelings must have gone with mine.

“ There is another view of the question which I must take. I have received the following letter from Dr. Briscoe :—

*Whitford, Holywell, Oct. 16.*

“My Lord—I am anxious to know whether your Lordship has received any communication from Lord Feilding respecting Pantasaph.

“In the month of May, 1845, I went to Brighton, to stay a few days on a visit to the late Lady Emma Pennant, who was then confined by illness to her room. On that occasion her Ladyship communicated to me her desire and intention of building and endowing a church at Pantasaph, in the event of her life being spared; and at the same time she turned to her daughter (now Lady Feilding) and said emphatically to her, ‘Louisa, now you will remember that!’ Her daughter accordingly acquiesced. In fact, Lady Emma dwelt on the hope of establishing a church there as a matter on which she had fully set her heart.

“For several years previously she had also felt a warm interest in the spiritual welfare of the district of Pantasaph, knowing, as she did, its remoteness from the church, and the poverty of its inhabitants.

“I have several of her letters, and they prove that her heart and soul’s wish was to live to the glory of God her Saviour, and to do what good she could in her generation.

“Believe me to be, my lord,

“Your faithful servant,

“RICHARD BRISCOE.’

“Now, I presume that the money which would have been expended on this church was derived from Lady Emma Pennant, and that in the foundation thus undertaken you intended to carry out her views; so that you will easily understand what I mean by saying that I conceive that I have a moral claim that the daughter shall carry out the wish thus solemnly expressed by a dying mother; for there can be no doubt that Lady Emma Pennant intended the foundation to be connected with the Church of England.

“There are stories prevalent in this country as to a fixed sum devoted by Lady Emma Pennant to this purpose: but as I understand that you have denied any knowledge of the 6,000*l.* or 7,000*l.* being so appropriated, I take it for granted that the appropriation of a definite sum is a mistake. But I do not see

how this alters the nature of the promise made by Lady Emma Pennant.

“I must leave you to draw your own conclusions from these premises, lest I should seem to make any unreasonable claim; and I do not venture to express what I myself think, for you must be aware how very painful it is to me to write on such a subject to your lordship. But I have no alternative.

“Depend upon it that whatever gives you pain will give me pain, but it would add to the grief which I now feel for what you have done, if I were forced to conclude that in this worldly matter you had acted in a manner which I, as your friend, must deplore.

“Believe me, my dear lord,

“Yours truly,

“THOMAS VOWLER ST. ASAPH.

“*To Viscount Feilding.*”

*Downing, Oct. 30, 1850.*

“My dear Lord,—I have hitherto refrained from giving a final answer to your lordship’s inquiries respecting the destination of S. Dewi’s Church, now in course of building at Pantasaph, in order that I might be able seriously, carefully, and dispassionately to weigh all the circumstances of the case, both as they presented themselves to my own mind and as they had been laid before me by your lordship and others.

“Fearing also to act upon my own unassisted judgment, I have taken time to obtain the opinions of many whom I considered capable of giving sound and just advice.

“The result has been that my own previous opinion has been unanimously confirmed, viz., that were I to carry out, under present circumstances, the intention which I undeniably had of giving up S. Dewi’s to the ‘Church of England,’ I should be sinning in the face of God, and acting inconsistently before men.

“I will now endeavor, as briefly as possible, to explain why I should consider this to be the case.

“Lady Feilding and I designed this church for a thank-offering to Almighty God on our marriage; and, naturally enough, believing the Established Church of England to be Catholic, and consequently the authorised teacher and exemplar

of God's whole truth as delivered by Himself to His Apostles, intended fully to give it to her through you, her appointed ministers, and the imparters of those truths supposed to be maintained by her, as soon as the building was fit for consecration.

"Subsequently, however, the awful truth forced itself upon us, that we had been mistaken all our lives as to what really was God's truth, and we became convinced, not only that the Anglican communion was not Catholic, but that it protested against and denied many of God's most holy truths. We therefore felt ourselves bound to separate from her, and to submit to the true Catholic and Apostolic Church.

"Being essentially 'Protestant,' the Anglican communion, while it holds some Catholic verities, is bound to vindicate its power of antagonism by 'protesting' against others, and those most vital ones. Consequently every faithful Anglican clergyman is bound to preach against them. Such being the case, were I to fulfil my intention to the letter as it was expressed, and deliver up this church to a communion essentially antagonistic and therefore anti-Catholic, I should be denying that holy Catholic faith by my deeds which I professed with my heart and my mouth. In fact, I should be guilty of the grossest inconsistency, and be acting a lie in the face of God and man.

"Your lordship speaks of my expressed intention as of a pledged promise, by which I am morally, and might have been legally, bound. As to the latter, I think I am right in saying, that no church built at the free cost and sole expense of a single individual is ever irrevocably made over to the Church of England during the lifetime of the donor, until the deed of gift is signed at the time of consecration.

"As to the former opinion expressed in your lordship's letter, —that I am morally irrevocably bound to 'you and your clergy' —according to your reasoning I was bound to you personally, irrespective of your capacities as teachers of God's truth, and should therefore have been equally bound to give it to you, had you all become Arians or Socinians in the mean time. Yet no one, I think, would insist upon that, nor, indeed, could such have been the case. But, however it may have borne the nature of a promise, I need not refer your lordship to holy

Scripture to prove that there may be promises which to fulfil under certain circumstances is sin.

“S. Paul did not, after his conversion, consider himself bound by the promise which he had made to the Jewish synagogue, that he would do his utmost to crush the rising Christian Church at Damascus. And why? Because he made it in ignorance.

“Surely if all promises and pledges are to be kept sacred under all conceivable circumstances, you will not easily justify the act of King Henry VIII., in alienating the noble Cathedrals and Churches in this land from the intentions and services to which they had so solemnly been dedicated.

“By parity of reasoning, if it were incumbent on me to deliver up S. Dewi's Church for Protestant worship, it would be equally the bounden duty of the country to deliver up Westminster Abbey and other noble structures to that Catholic Church, for whose service they had originally been erected. It is needless to adduce other examples. My duty appears clear to me, viz., to devote that church which is being built at my own cost, and which yet remains mine, to the furtherance of God's truth, as I find He himself delivered it to His Holy Catholic Church. I ought to state further, that the money left by Lady Emma Pennant in her will (3,000*l.*, not 7000*l.*), to be as she expressed it, applied ‘for such spiritual and Church purposes in the parishes of Whitford and Holywell . . . or either of them, as they, my said executors, together with my said daughter . . . shall in their . . . discretion think proper,’ not only yet remains untouched and unappropriated (with the exception of 200*l.* which I advanced some time ago to Whitford Church), but has actually not as yet become available, it being dependant upon the falling in of certain annuities. None of the 10,000*l.*, devoted by me to S. Dewi's has been drawn from her funds.

“I am well aware that Lady Emma earnestly desired that a church should be built at the end of Whitford parish; and when we proposed to erect one, she suggested Pantasaph as the locality most desirable for the site. She, however, made no arrangements, nor left any directions, either verbal or testamentary, for devoting any money specifically for that purpose.

“And now, my dear lord, I have replied fully, I think, to all

your propositions. If, in so doing, I may appear to have spoken at all offensively or rudely, I crave your pardon, and desire to assure you that such was far from my intention. The importance of the case requires that I should express myself plainly; and that is all I have endeavored to do, being wishful to conceal nothing.

“I feel that many expressions which I have been compelled to use must give you pain, but believe me, it gives me even more pain to write them than it will you to read them. God is my witness, that my only desire is to do His holy will as far as I see it; and, save where my conscience precludes me, I desire to meet your lordship’s least wishes in everything.

“I dare not be wanting in the fulfilment of my duty towards God, even at the risk of forfeiting the good opinion of men: and I trust you will do me the justice to believe that, in acting as I do, I am following solely the dictates of my own conscience, desiring and praying only to be directed by Him who is the way, the truth, and the life.

“That He may lead us both to see and to do His holy will in all things, as long as He vouchsafes to spare us in this world is my continual and most fervent prayer.

“Believe me, my dear lord,

“To be ever, with the deepest veneration and respect,

“Your lordship’s faithful friend and servant,

“FIELDING.

“*The Lord Bishop of S. Asaph.*”

---

BB—PAGE 226.

### CONVERSIONS.

CONVERSIONS AT ADEN (INDIA.)—The following letter appears in the ‘*Bombay Catholic Examiner*,’ addressed to the Very Rev. F. Ignatius:—

“Very Rev. Sir—By the present opportunity I have the pleasure to inform you, that on the 14th instant, I received into the bosom of the Catholic Church a gentleman named Henry Johnson, a captain of a ship. He had performed three voyages

to Aden from the Mauritius, each time bringing Catholic Missionaries free of charge. Through the instrumentality of these Priests seventeen of Captain Johnson's sailors were converted to the faith and baptised. He conveyed to the island of Leichelly a Capuchin, named F. Leone, who, during the time that he resided there, that is, seventeen days, baptised 3,000 persons, who, though they had been Catholics by birth, were totally destitute of any Catholic Priest whatsoever for the space of about 60 years. Captain Johnson was an eye-witness to the persecution to which F. Leone was subjected, and of his charity and resignation to God's will. The Captain having again returned to Aden, expressed himself to me in the following terms: 'I can no longer offer resistance, I must become a Catholic.' He was so rejoiced on becoming a Catholic, that, listening to a Protestant at my residence boasting of the religion he professed, he said to him, 'I also was yesterday a Protestant, but to-day I am a Catholic, and I rejoice at it;' and, turning to me, requested that I would not forget to write to Bombay, and to have his conversion recorded in the journals of that place.

I remain, Very Rev. Sir,

Yours obediently,

LEWIS STUARLA, R. C. Chaplain.

*Aden, Oct. 18, 1851.*

---

CC—PAGE 332.

Dr. Gilbert, in consequence of a complaint being made against Mr. Neale, wrote the following letter:—

*“Frant Vicarage, 8th May, 1847.*

“Reverend Sir,—I feel it to be my duty to inhibit you, and I do hereby inhibit you, from celebrating Divine Worship, and from the exercise of clerical functions in my diocese.

“I am, Reverend Sir,

“Your well-wisher in CHRIST,

“A. T. CICESTER.”

The inhibition was accompanied with the following letter:—

*“ Prant Vicarage, 8th May, 1847.*

“ Reverend and Dear Sir,—I cannot transmit to you the following inhibition, without adding a fervent prayer that God may be pleased to open your eyes to the dishonor done to Him, by supposing that His spiritual service can be promoted by presenting to the eyes and thoughts of worshippers the frippery, with which you have transformed the simplicity of the Chapel at Sackville College into an imitation of the degrading superstitions of an erroneous Church.

I remain, Reverend and Dear Sir,

“ Your faithful brother,

“ A. T. CICESTER.”

Lord De La Warr, on being informed of the inhibition, thus replied:—

*“ Upper Grosvenor Street, May 11, 1847.*

“ Dear Sir,—I beg to acknowledge the receipt of your two letters, and to thank you for saving, as far as in you lies, the rights of the College. Into the general question between the Bishop and yourself, it would be obviously improper for me to enter at present.

“ Pray, believe me, yours most truly,

(Signed) “ DE LA WARR.”

The question now was, what course was to be pursued? And after much consideration, it was determined that the Warden should carry on the Services in the Chapel of Sackville College as usual, scrupulously abstaining from officiating either in the parish of East Grinstead, or in any other part of what was, confessedly, the Bishop’s diocese.

2. The Warden, when placed in his present position, was placed there with the full understanding that he was to defend its rights and privileges, in as full and complete a state as he had received them. It mattered not whether exemption were or were not undesirable,—were or were not an anomaly;—a right of the College it was supposed to be, and the warden, believing that right to have been invaded, thought it his duty to defend it.

3. If it be said that, the case being so, the Warden could neither yield without betraying a trust, nor persevere without seeming to oppose the Bishop of Chichester, it was his duty to resign his office, the following facts should be taken into consideration. The Warden had been entrusted with the spiritual care of a number of persons, for whom he was responsible ; persons, not in the ordinary condition of parishioners, but (for the most part) with one foot in the grave ;—persons to whom the ordinary means of grace in the parish church were, from infirmity and deafness, inaccessible ; persons who, if deserted by him, were left to their own resources in preparing for their own great change. It is not argued that these, or that any, considerations could make right a step in itself wrong : but simply that where the whole question seemed to be one of expediency, such arguments may, and ought, to have great weight in its decision.

4. It is to be assumed that the Bishop of Chichester wished for his simple right, and for nothing beyond it. But had the Warden observed the inhibition so far as regarded the College Chapel, what that right was could never have been known. The carrying on the services in that building was therefore no more to be regarded as wilful disrespect towards the Bishop, than the institution of a friendly suit in a Civil Court supposes hostility between the parties concerned in it.

In a few days, the Bishop wrote the following letter to the Churchwardens of East Grinstead :—

“ *Hastings, 12th May, 1847.*

“ GENTLEMEN,—IN CONSEQUENCE OF WHAT I SAW IN THE CHAPEL OF SACKVILLE COLLEGE, I have felt it my duty to inhibit the Rev. J. M. Neale from celebrating Divine Worship, and from exercising clerical functions in my diocese.

“ You have no jurisdiction or authority within the walls of that establishment. Nevertheless, you must have means *by inquiry*, if not by reports, *which, without inquiry*, may reach you, of learning whether Mr. Neale obeys the inhibition, or continues to officiate there ; and you are the fittest persons to whom I can apply for such information.

“ I will be obliged to you then to inform me, by letter directed to me at Chichester, *if you hear of his doing so* : and to

state the days and hours of the day when the offence was committed, if you are able to learn them.

“It is important also to me to know whether, in past times, and especially since Mr. Neale officiated there, the Chapel has been open at the hour of Divine service to others besides the inmates of the hospital;—whether any person who chose could walk in and be present.

“I am, Gentlemen,

“Your faithful Pastor and Servant,

“A. T. CICESTER.”

The matter was brought before Sir J. F. Fust, who returned the following judgment.—

“The learned judge said, that the question was one not confined to Sackville College, but of general importance. He should like to have had some authority stated to him upon which the Court could rely, for saying that any Clergyman had a right to perform Divine office, save to his own private family, without the licence of the Bishop. There was nothing to satisfy him that the inmates of this college formed one family establishment. There was, however, something in this case behind what appeared on the face of the papers. He collected it from an interrogatory addressed to one of the witnesses, who stated in reply that the parishioners of East Grinstead were composed of two parties, the high and the low Church; that by the former Mr. Neale was highly esteemed, and by the latter equally disliked. The Seventy-first Canon was conclusive on the point before him. There was no proof whatever that there was in this College any chapel dedicated and allowed by the Ecclesiastical law of the realm. Mr. Neale, according to the evidence, was the Warden of the College; but why the Court was not to have laid before it in the usual course of pleading the foundation of the College, and why Mr. Neale claimed to himself a right to officiate in spite of the Bishop, he (the learned judge) could not conjecture. In one sense the inmates of the College might be said to be under the same roof; they might have private apartments and a common dining table, but that would not constitute them a private family. Occasionally other persons, certainly not very numerous, had been permitted to attend the chapel. Under what pretence had they been introduced?

That of taking tea with Mr. Neale. It also appeared that the rev. gentleman administered the Sacrament three Sundays in every month; that he read the Litany on other occasions, and that he read prayers every Sunday afternoon. If they were not a private family, these ministrations must be regarded as public. Those persons who were stopping, as it was termed, with the rev. gentleman, might be considered as part of his household, but the performance of these Divine offices, not only without a licence from the Bishop, but against his positive injunctions, was in his (the learned judge's) opinion an ecclesiastical offence. What might be the motives of the Bishop he knew not, but doubtless his Lordship was justified in instituting the proceedings. Something might have turned on the production of the charter if it had been exhibited. It was said that the Warden was compelled to perform the duties; it appeared, however, that the predecessor of Mr. Neale was a layman, and that he read prayers twice a week in conformity probably with the statutes. Mr. Neale was liable to ecclesiastical censure, but the Court would be satisfied with admonishing him to abstain from officiating in future without due authority, that authority being the licence of the Bishop. Mr. Neale must also be condemned in the costs of the proceedings."

---

THE RESIGNATION OF VERY REVD. THE ARCHDEACON  
WILBERFORCE.

DD—PAGE 329.

(I)

*Burton Agnes, August 30, 1854.*

My Lord Archbishop,—The step which I now take, would have been taken somewhat sooner, but for the rumors that my work on the Holy Eucharist would be made the subject of legal investigation. I find it difficult to believe that the intention is seriously entertained, for the warmest opponents of that work deny Baptismal Regeneration, the Priestly Commission, and the validity of Absolution. Now these doctrines are so positively affirmed in the Formularies of our Church, that for one passage in them which presents difficulties in my system, there are a hundred by which that of my opponents is plainly contradicted.

I can hardly imagine that they desire a rigor in the interpretation of our Formularies, which must be fatal to themselves. But I should have felt it due, both to my opinions and to those who shared them, to defend myself to the utmost against such an assault. My book has now been nearly a year and four months before the public, and no legal proceedings, so far as I know, have been commenced. And in the meantime my attention has been drawn to another part of our Church's system, with which I have become painfully conscious that I can no longer concur, I refer to the Royal Supremacy. I am as ready, as any one, to allow her Majesty to be supreme over all persons and in all temporal causes within Her dominions, and I shall always render Her, I trust, a loyal obedience. But that She, or any other temporal ruler, is supreme 'in all spiritual things or causes' I can no longer admit. If the act of 1832 were all, on which my difficulties were founded, I might justify myself, as I have heretofore done, by the consideration that it was probably passed through inadvertence, and had received no formal sanction from the Church. But my present objection extends to the act of 1533, by which this power was bestowed upon the King in Chancery, and to the first article in the 36th canon which is founded upon it. With the grounds of my objection I need not trouble your Grace, though I shall shortly state them to the public through the Press. To your Grace, however, I desire to state that I recall my subscription to the first article in the 36th canon, as believing it to be contrary to the law of God. It remains of course, that I should offer to divest myself of the trusts and preferments of which this subscription was a condition, and put myself, so far as it is possible, into the condition of a mere lay member of the Church. I therefore tender my resignation to your Grace.

I remain, my Lord Archbishop,  
Your Grace's obedient servant,  
R. I. WILBERFORCE."

(II.)

*"Bishophthorpe, York, 31 August, 1854.*

My Dear Sir,—I cannot affect to be at all surprised at the contents of your letter just received. It is not necessary for

me to enter into a discussion of the questions alluded to in your letter. But as far as by law I may, I accept of your resignation of the preferments you hold in the Diocess of York. You are aware, however, that in order to give full legal effect to your intentions, a formal resignation should be made before myself in person, or before a notary public. With every feeling of personal feeling and esteem,

I remain, my dear sir,

Your faithful servant,

T. EBOR."

(III.)

*Burton Agnes, 5th Sept., 1854.*

My Lord Archbishop,—I have this morning been informed that it was stated in the '*Yorkshire Gazette*' last Saturday, that your Grace had at length determined to commence legal proceedings against me, for my work on the Holy Eucharist. Your Grace will perceive that my letter of August 30th was based upon the supposition that no such proceeding was determined upon. May I ask, therefore, if the paragraph in the '*Yorkshire Gazette*' is correct, since, if your Grace desires to try the question, I am willing to delay the legal execution of my resignation for that purpose.

I remain, your Grace's obedient servant,

R. I. WILBERFORCE."

(IV.)

*"Bishopthorpe, York, Sept. 6th, 1854.*

My Dear Sir,—I saw in the '*Yorkshire Gazette*' the paragraph to which your letter of this morning alludes. By whom or at whose suggestion, that paragraph was inserted, I have no knowledge whatever any more than you have. On the receipt of your resignation, dated August 30th, I gave orders to discontinue all further inquiry on the subject of the 'complaint' which had been laid before me. To that I adhere, as well as to my acceptance of your resignation,

I am, my dear sir,

Your faithful servant,

T. EBOR."

## PUSEYISM BEFORE THE BENCH OF MAGISTRATES.

PUSEYISM.—The *Rev. Charles F. Lowder*, one of the curates of S. Barnabas Church, Pimlico, described as of S. Barnabas College, appeared to a summons charging him with assaulting John Ledwich.

The complaint arose out of the fierce struggle which has been going on between the Puseyite and anti-Puseyite party of S. Barnabas and S. Paul's ever since the ejection of the Rev. Mr. Bennett.

Mr. Peckham, from the establishment of Mr. Henry, solicitor, appeared on behalf of the complainant. In opening the case, he said he might perhaps be allowed to state the circumstances which had given rise to this extraordinary charge. There was in the district of S. Paul and S. Barnabas, an election, on Easter Tuesday, for the office of church warden. It was not necessary to mention—as important to the charge with which the magistrate had to deal—the particular character of that contest; but there were two candidates for the office, while the complainant was a man employed to carry a board by a committee seeking to procure the return of the other candidate. The complainant was carrying his board in Ebury-street on the day in question, when he was astounded to find himself suddenly attacked by a number of lads throwing eggs and stones at him.

Mr. Broderip jocosely remarked that it was not only unlawful to carry a board, but an attendant evil upon the illegality seemed to be, that it had the effect of attracting eggs and stones, certainly not very pleasant things.

Mr. Peckham would say nothing about the legality or illegality of carrying a board, as there was no charge upon that subject at present before the magistrate. It was unpleasant to the bearer that it had, in this instance, the attractive qualities described. The circumstance became the subject of inquiry by the committee, when, to their surprise, it was ascertained that the eggs were furnished to the persons throwing them by the defendant, and that they were incited by him to commit the assault, which was the subject of the present charge.

Mr. Broderip expressed his opinion that there was some difficulty in sustaining a charge like the present; the very first

step in the case showed an illegal act on the part of the complainant in carrying the board.

Mr. Peckham remarked that it was not the sort of board prohibited by statute, it had no pole. The man and his board were what Mr. Charles Dickens had facetiously termed an "animated sandwich."

Mr. Broderip smiled, and thought that if a man was guarded like a tortoise by his shell, and had no pole, it was a very ingenious way of avoiding an Act of Parliament, which it seemed must have a pole to make it of effect. However, to leave the pole, if Mr. Peckham could prove that defendant directed, or by words encouraged A. B. to throw anything, it would be an assault. As there was evidently much else behind this, would it not have been better to have taken another course? If the case were competent of the proof described, defendant might have been made answerable for a riot, instead of a common assault. It was quite obvious that there was something behind the case; and was this the form to try anything of the sort? He had no doubt the gentleman who had charge of the case knew well what he was about; and if he thought it the best course to pursue for the common assault, he should be most happy to give the case his best attention.

Mr. Peckham admitted, that if he had been consulted before the summons had been issued, he should not have recommended proceedings to have been taken in the present form; but as it had been done, he was in a condition to support the charge in the present shape.

Mr. Broderip having invited him to go on,

Mr. Peckham observed that, after the information received by the committee, the churchwarden waited upon the defendant, as they could not positively believe that he had so far forgotten himself, when he had made a direct admission of the act imputed to him, stating that it had been done in a moment of indiscretion and want of reflection. This admission was followed up by a letter from defendant, repeating it, and acknowledging that he had incited the boys (the choristers of S. Barnabas) to bedaub the board, and offering to make any reparation to the person who had carried it. As it was a public offence, and required public notice, the matter had been brought to this court; but if the defendant was now willing to express his regret publicly, as

he had done privately, his, (Mr. Peckham's) instructions warranted, nay desired, him to retire from this prosecution.

The reverend defendant said he would now most distinctly repeat his regret. He admitted it was a most foolish thing for him to have done.

Mr. Peckham said he was quite content. He would not intimate one word about the reparation; he would leave that entirely to the defendant's free will.

Mr. Broderip was happy to see this gentlemanly feeling exhibited in the matter, and having heard that Mr. Peckham did not wish to offer any evidence against the defendant, said there was an end of the case; but, in conclusion, he could only express his most earnest hope that no more such unseemly things would take place.

The remark was followed by suppressed applause from a large auditory, who appeared to take great interest in the proceedings.

We understood defendant gave the complainant 2*l.*, as a recompense for the pelting he had received.

---

FF—PAGE 359.

FURTHER PROTEST ON BEHALF OF ARCHDEACON DENISON *in*  
*re* REV. J. DITCHER, CLERK, AGAINST THE VENERABLE  
GEORGE ANTHONY DENISON, CLERK.

Bathurst, in the name and as the duly appointed Proctor and agent of the Venerable George Anthony Denison, Clerk, Archdeacon of Taunton, and Vicar of East Brent, in the county of Somerset, and Diocese of Bath and Wells, the party accused or proceeded against, but by way of further Protest, and in arrest of judgment or sentence in this suit or proceeding, and against any further proceedings therein, alleged that this suit or proceeding is, as pretended brought or instituted under the provisions of the Act or Statute passed in the 13th year of the reign of Her late Majesty Queen Elizabeth, and entitled "An Act for the Ministers of the Church to be of sound religion." And

referring to the 5th of the Articles filed in this suit or proceeding, wherein it is pleaded and alleged in words, or in effect, that the Article of Religion entitled, "Of the wicked which eat not the Body of Christ in the use of the Lord's Supper," and in which Article of Religion it is declared and contained as follows:—"The wicked and such as be void of a living faith, although they do earnestly and visibly press with their teeth, (as S. Augustin saith), the Sacrament of the Body and Blood of Christ, yet, in no wise are they partakers of Christ, but rather to their condemnation do eat and drink the sign or Sacrament of so great a thing," was, and is one, to wit, the 27th of the Articles of Religion referred to in the said Act or Statute of the 13th of Elizabeth. And, also referring to the 9th and other of the Articles filed in this suit or proceeding, wherein it is pleaded and alleged that the said George Anthony Denison (his party), in certain sermons therein mentioned, did advisedly maintain and affirm doctrines directly contrary and repugnant to the 29th of the Articles of Religion above recited. And also referring to a certain Declaration of His Grace the Lord Archbishop of Canterbury, made and declared at Bath, on the 12th day of August, in the present year 1856, in this suit or proceeding, wherein it is, among other things, declared that the doctrine in certain passages therein set forth of the sermons mentioned in the 9th and 10th of the said Articles filed in this suit or proceeding, is, and are erroneous, and is and are directly contrary and repugnant to the 29th of the Articles of Religion mentioned in the aforesaid Statute of Queen Elizabeth, meaning thereby the Article of Religion above recited: and wherein it is also declared that if the said George Anthony Denison shall make no such revocation of the said doctrines so declared to be erroneous as is required of the Statute of Elizabeth aforesaid, the said Lord Archbishop will, in obedience to the said Statute, pronounce sentence on the said George Anthony Denison.

Now, Bathurst, on behalf of his said party, alleges, by

way of further Protest that the said Act or statute of Elizabeth having passed through Parliament in the Session of Parliament holden in the year 1571, received the Royal assent on or before the 27th day of May 1571, That the Articles of Religion referred to in the said Statute are certain Articles of Religion comprised in a book imprinted, entituled, "Articles whereupon it was agreed by the Archbishops and Bishops of both Provinces and the whole Clergy, in the Convocation holden at London, in the year of our Lord God, 1562, according to the computation of the Church of England for the avoiding the Diversities of opinions, and for the establishing of Consent touching true Religion put forth by the Queen's authority," as mentioned in the said statute. That the Articles of Religion so referred to and mentioned in the said Statute were certain Articles which had been agreed to by the Archbishops and Bishops of both provinces, in the said year 1562, and had been put forth by the Queen's authority, and had been imprinted in a book; but such Articles did not comprise or contain the said Article of Religion before recited, and called the 29th Article of Religion. That no other book, comprising Article of Religion instituted as beforesaid, and put forth by the said Queen's authority, and which had been imprinted prior to the time when the said Statute was enacted, did contain the said Article of Religion before recited, and called the 29th Article of Religion. That the said Article of Religion before recited and called as wherefore he prayed that his said party may be dismissed from all further observance of justice herein.

BATHURST.

R. PHILLIMORE.

---

GG—PAGE 439.

ASSOCIATION FOR THE PROMOTION OF THE UNITY OF  
CHRISTENDOM.

An Association has been formed under the above title to

unite in a bond of intercessory prayer, members both of the clergy and laity of the Roman Catholic, Greek, and Anglican Communions. It is hoped and believed that many, however widely separated at present in their religious convictions, who deplore the grievous scandal to unbelievers and the hindrance to the promotion of truth and holiness among Christians, caused by the unhappy divisions existing among those who profess to have "One Lord, One Faith, One Baptism," will recognise the consequent duty of joining their intercessions to the Redeemer's dying prayer "that they all may be One, as Thou Father art in Me, and I in Thee, that they also may be One in Us, that the world may believe that Thou has sent Me."

To all, then, who, while they lament the division among Christians, look forward for their healing, mainly to a Corporate Re-Union of those three great bodies, which claim for themselves the inheritance of the Priesthood and the name of Catholic, an appeal is made. They are not asked to compromise any principles which they rightly or wrongly hold dear. They are simply asked to unite for the promotion of a high and holy end, in reliance of the promise of our Divine Lord, that "whatsoever we shall ask in prayer, believing we shall receive;" and that "if two or three agree on earth as touching anything that they shall ask, it shall be done for them of My Father, who is in Heaven." The daily use of a short form of prayer together with one, "Our Father,"—for the intention of the Association—is the only obligation incurred by those who join it; to which is added in the case of Priests, the offering at least once in three months of the Holy Sacrifice for the same intention.

---

#### FORM OF PRAYER.

O Lord Jesus Christ, who said unto Thine Apostles,  
My Peace I leave with you, My Peace I give unto you ;

regard not my sins, but the faith of Thy Church, and grant Her that Peace and Unity which is agreable to Thy Will, Who livest and reignest for ever and ever. Amen.

OUR FATHER, &c.

---

NOTE—In joining the Association no one is understood as thereby expressing an opinion in any matter which may be deemed a point of controversy, or on any religious question except the object of the Association is desirable.

---

Those who are desirous of joining the Association are requested to write out the following, append to it their name and place of residence in full, and return it to the Secretary of the Association for the Promotion of the Unity of Christendom, 342, Strand, London.

---

*I willingly join the Association for the Promotion of the Unity of Christendom, and undertake (to offer the Holy Eucharist once in three months, at least, and)\* to recite daily the above prayer for the intention of the same.*

Signed, \_\_\_\_\_

---

N.B.—The names of members will be kept strictly private.

\* Lay persons will omit the words in brackets.

---

HH—PAGE 441.

*In re* MISS SCOBELL.

(I.)

LETTER FROM MISS PARKER TO REV. J. SCOBELL.

*“ Infant School, Feb. 10th, 1857.*

“ Rev. Sir,—I grieve to be obliged to trouble you in this way.

“ My reason for so doing is, that I have done wrong, and I want you to know of it.

“ I have for a long time been laboring under the weight of an evil conscience, inasmuch as I promised to be faithful to the trust placed in me by yourself with reference to one of your family. Out of kindness to Miss Scobell, I have been induced to allow her the use of my sitting room, to meet a person whom I never before saw in my life; \* and what is worse, I have deceived you in this thing, in that I ought to have told you, but I did not see the harm in it then, but I have since, and do now, to my sorrow. I see no remedy to this evil condition of things, but to ask you to give your forgiveness: and I promise you never to do the like again, if only you will trust me. I am really and truly sorry for having done this thing. I only beg that nothing may be said or done that will injure Miss Scobell’s feelings; she has trusted in me and still does so. It is only sense of duty to my Maker that obliges me to break this confidence.

“ Hoping for your forgiveness,

“ I am, Rev. Sir,

“ Yours faithfully,

“ M. B. PARKER.”

(II.)

LETTER TO THE REV. J. M. NEALE.

*February, 1857.*

Reverend Sir,—I have not been precipitate. I have surmised a long time, with a strong degree of certainty, your

\* The Rev. J. M. Neale.

practices, personal and injurious to myself, and I have used forbearance towards you. There have been lately disclosed and proved to me confirmatory facts on which I can depend, and more than a parent and clergyman ought in silence to put up with; and I ask you what is your explanation of the following circumstances; and, as I and you may fairly call them, accusations?

1. That you have been carrying on by letters, under cover to the Mistress of my Infants' School, a clandestine correspondence with my eldest daughter, while in my house.

2. That you hold clandestine and secret meetings with her, of some hours' duration, in the private apartments of my Infants' School House, situate in my parish of All Saints', Lewes.

3. That you there usurp, dishonorably and unlawfully, the office of Parish Priest of All Saints', Lewes; wearing a surplice; exercising liturgical offices; receiving confession and pronouncing absolution.

4. That you assume to yourself and allow yourself to be viewed by my daughter and parishioner in the character of her spiritual guide and adviser, to my detriment as her natural parent and lawful Parish Priest, that you receive in that character, at her hands, the letters, of me, her father, for your perusal: that you animadvert, and dictate how they shall be replied to,—how far complied with—how far resisted.

5. That you seek to hold and keep up a lasting spiritual influence over my daughter, living in my house. That you seek to guide her future course of life. That your advice is to her, that she persevere in demanding my consent to so doing, and that she join and give herself, and whatever income and property she may have, to an establishment at or near East Grinstead, or some other similar, and, under your guidance and tutelage, there to resign her will, her person, her services, her property to yours or others will and pleasure.

6. That in the exercise of these designs you have never made one word of communication to me, her natural parent, the guide of her youth, and constituted spiritual pastor; that the whole is clandestinely and surreptitiously carried on and continued now by letter during her absence from home, to the injury of my family peace, and to the infringement of my public rights.

I make these charges distinctly and deliberately, and I ask for your distinct and deliberate answer.

I remain,

Your obedient servant,

JOHN SCOBELL.

To the REV. J. M. NEALE, East Grinstead.

(III.)

LETTER FROM THE BISHOP OF CHICHESTER TO MR. SCOBELL.

*Palace, Chichester, Nov. 22, 1857.*

My Dear Mr. Scobell,—You may be well assured of the deep felt sympathy of every upright candidly religious man. I beg to offer you and your family the sincere expression of mine and Mrs. Gilbert's. I have felt it my duty to write to Lady Superioress and the Society of S. Margaret's at East Grinstead, the letter with a copy of which I thus briefly intrude upon your sorrows.\* He must be heartless who could have permitted himself to add to them as that infatuated man from East Grinstead has done. But you well know how and Whom to look to both for support in your own sufferings and for the power of a Christian feeling towards Him. May these things be abundantly vouchsafed to you sincerely prays

Your faithful brother,

A. T. CICESTER.

REV. J. SCOBELL.

---

II—PAGE 443.

OPINION OF J. D. CHAMBERS, ESQ., ON THE LAW OF CONFESSION.

*Lincoln's Inn, Dec. 10, 1857.*

My Dear Sir,—You have requested me to give you an impartial statement of the law of the Church of England as to Confession and Absolution, so far at least as concerns the late controversy. This I proceed to do in as brief a manner as practicable, premising that there have been, as far as I can

\* This letter will be found in page 442.

discover, no judicial decisions on the subject, which would seem to evince that great latitude has been permitted in the matter. Consequently I shall be obliged to derive my opinion entirely from text books.

I. *As to capacity of the Priests of the Church of England to receive Confessions.*

The 'capacity to receive confessions' is founded—

1. On that part of the exhortation in the Communion Office, which directs any person "who cannot quiet his own conscience, but requireth further comfort or council, to come to me," (*i. e.* the Parish Priest), "or to *some other* discreet and learned Minister, and to open his grief, that by the ministering of God's Word he may receive the benefit of absolution. This form, it may be observed, is only hortatory and dependent in a measure on the will of the person who is to "open his grief."

2. On the requirements in the Office for the Visitation of the sick:—"When any person is sick," (there is no need, it seems, that the sickness should be dangerous), "notice thereof shall be given to the minister of the Parish, who coming into the person's house, shall say, &c. "Then shall the minister *examine* whether he repent him truly of his sins, and be in charity with all the world," &c. "How shall the sick person *be moved* to make a *special confession* of his sins, if he find his conscience grieved with any weighty matter, after which confession the Priest shall absolve him (if he humbly and heartily desire it) after this sort," &c. And the absolution following is "of all thy sins." This form differs from the former in being directory, and in a "measure compulsory; but both imply in the strongest manner the duty of the person "*grieved*," (*i. e.* who feels the burthen of his sins), to confess them to the 'Minister.'

3. On the directions of Holy Scripture (meant, I apprehend, by the "ministry of God's Holy Word," in the address before Holy Communion) to 'confess your sins one to another, and pray for one another, that ye may be healed; and in the fact that all such particular confessions in the New Testament (as in the case of the believers, Acts xix. 18, who came and confessed, and showed their deeds') were apparently made to the Apostles, or to those commissioned by them; and those of

ἤρχοντο ἔξομολογούμενοι καὶ ἀναγγέλλοντες τὰς πράξεις αὐτῶν

the Old Testament (as that of David to Nathan) to a prophet) or person exercising the Priestly office.

4. On the "Canons, Constitutions, Ordinaries, and Synods Provincial which be not contrariant or repugnant to the laws and statutes of the realm, nor to the harm and hurt of the King's prerogative, which by force of the Statute, 25 Henry VIII. c. 19, and a subsequent one," shall now be used and executed as they were before the making of this Act, until further order be made, which never was made.

These Canons are now binding, and are, in fact, the basis of Doctors Commons law; but of course are modified by the Act of Uniformity and the Church Discipline Act, when they differ from the same.

The following are extracts:—

"Because he that confesseth ought in that action to express signs of humility and contrition; we charge that all who hear confession prevail with their penitents to confess their sins with reverence and humility." "Let no one deprive him that asks it of the grace of confession."\*

"Let laymen be admonished to confess at the very beginning of Lent, and always presently after a fall, lest one sin by its natural tendency draw the man to another."

Let every one confess to his proper Priest (*i. e.* Parish Priest or the Friar well authorized—Lyndwood) once in the year at least." A.D. 1378.†

And see the Canons presently quoted.

"Let the Priest choose such a place in the church as is open to the view of all, and never take the confession of any, especially of a woman, in secret, *unless in case of necessity*, or on account of the sickness of the penitent. Let not one Priest admit the parishioner of another to confession without the license of his proper Priest or Bishop."—A.D. 1322.‡

With respect to these last Canons, I may remark that they are modified and altered by the words of the exhortation, permitting the penitent to "go to any other discreet and learned minister,"—thus allowing the penitent to make his own choice of whom he will. Secondly, that if the church be not open for

\* Constitutions of Othohon, A.D. 1268.

† Sudbury's Constitutions.

‡ Reynold's Constitutions.

confession, then of course some other fit place must "of necessity" be chosen. Thirdly, that if the Parish Priest refuse, or be notoriously hostile to receiving a confession, and the Bishop has not licensed another, then independently of the exhortation "*of necessity*" the penitent must select another. Fourthly, that if the penitent cannot conveniently come to such other selected minister, he may clearly go to the penitent or the devotions of the Prayer Book would be frustrated.

"Let the Priest in enjoining penance diligently attend to the circumstance of the crime, the quality of the person, the nature, time, place, and cause of the sin, and the devotion of the penitent, and having diligently and distinctly considered all these particulars, let him enjoin penance.\*

II. *As to the power of the Priests of the Church of England to give Absolution.*

This is derived from the words of the office of the "Ordering of Priests." "Receive the Holy Ghost for the office and work of a Priest in the Church of God, now committed to thee by the imposition of our hands. Whose sins thou dost forgive, they are forgiven, and whose sins thou dost retain, they are retained."

Also from the words of the Absolution in the Common Prayer—God hath given power and commandment to His ministers to declare and pronounce to his people, being penitent, the absolution and remission of their sins."

Also from the unequivocal expression in the office for (the) Visitation of the Sick,—“By His (JESUS CHRIST’S) authority, committed to me, I absolve thee from all thy sins.

These statements are founded on the words of our Lord to the Apostles, (S. John. xx. 27.) "He breathed on them, and saith to them, Receive ye the Holy Ghost; whosoever sins ye remit they are remitted unto them, and whosoever sin ye retain they are retained." And on the equivalent words (S. Matt. xvi. 19; and xviii. 18.) And on the declaration of our Lord: "even as my Father hath sent Me, so send I you." And on the example of Nathan, in the Old Testament, who, after David's confession, said to him, "The Lord hath put away thy sin; thou shalt not die."

In addition to what I have before cited from the ancient

\* Reynold's Constitutions.

Canons and Constitutions which have statutory force, I find the following:—

Let all who hear confessions expressly absolve their penitents by pronouncing the under written words:—“By the authority of which I am possessed I absolve thee from thy sins.” A.D. 1268.\*

And the same is implied in numerous other places which give directions as to the mode and strictness, limits and secrecy, of confessions, matter which are not here in controversy. But I would remark that this authority is in the Prayer Book and in the Canons above mentioned given to the Priest to be exercised without any restriction or limitation, whatever excess the condition of real repentance in the penitent without which he was not to be absolved.

### III. *As to the particular periods for Confession and Absolution.*

By the exhortation in the Communion Office before cited, it appears that “opening their grief” (*i. e.* sins which burthen them) is recommended before Communion to all persons who cannot by the means before mentioned “quiet their own consciences,”—*i. e.*, who think recourse to a minister “necessary and desirable. But every person is to communicate “three times in the year at least,” of which Easter is to be one. It is therefore lawful for every person to go three times a year, at least, to his “minister,” to open these his griefs or sins, especially before Easter, and consequently the ‘minister’ is not only at liberty but bound to receive such his confession, and to absolve him if required at those particular periods at least.

By the office for the Visitation of the Sick above quoted, the confession is directory to the laity: and hearing it and giving absolution obligatory on the Priest so often as a person is sick and requires it.

By the ancient Canons at Eanham,† (A.D. 1009), “Let every Christian man often resort to his shrift, and confess his sins without shamefacedness.”

In addition to what I have before cited from the Constitutions and Canons which have stateable authority as to the *frequency* of confession, I find this:—“Let confessions be heard *thrice* in the year, and let men be admonished to communicate as often, *viz.*, at Easter, Pentecost, and Christmas.” . . . .

\* Constitutions of Othohon.

† Johnson i. 487.

“Whoever does not confess to his proper Priest *once in the year at least*, and receive the sacrament of the Eucharist at Easter, (unless he think he ought to abstain from it by the advice of the Priest,) let him be forbidden entrance into the church while he is alive, and be deprived of Christian burial when dead.”

All pains and penalties contained in these Canons for neglecting confession are done away with by the clauses in the Prayer Book, which refer it to the voluntary desire of the penitent only; yet I apprehend they still remain, indicative and directory of the proper course to be pursued both by Clergy and Laity.

IV. You have requested me to advise whether this statement of the Bishop, that “the Church of England does not sanction habitual confession, but acknowledges it only in rare and exceptional cases,” is correct in point of law and facts.

It would have been well had the Bishop stated what these “rare and exceptional cases” are,—I do not understand to what he alludes. Does he mean before the reception of the Sacrament? But that must be three times in the year at least, and many persons receive it much oftener. Does he refer to sickness? But that happens to most men often in their lives; and surely the spiritual exercises lawful and profitable then are as much so in health. Does he allude to the case of a disquieted conscience? But in persons with strong religious feelings the conscience is very often disquieted, and ought to be so in others who have them not.

The assertion of the Bishops, I think, shown to be without foundation by the authorities I have previously adduced. But there are other reasons which concur to prove this.

1. It will be observed that the directions in the Prayer Book, and in so much of the preceding Canons as remain in form, are without any restriction or limitation whatever in point of time, and are entirely affirmative. But it is a well known rule in logic that you cannot draw a negative, restricted, or limited conclusion from an affirmative and unrestricted premiss. So here the proposition being that, whenever a person before communion is disquieted in conscience, whenever he is sick, he may confess; you cannot from this deduce any conclusion whatever, as to any time when he is *not* to confess. The test is easy. Suppose a person to be a weekly communicant, to continue that habit for years, to have a very tender conscience, and con-

sequently before each communion to be disquieted in conscience, and to seek to have his mind quieted, by opening his grief and confessing his sin to another, according to the precept of S. James,—could it be contended with success that this habit was not sanctioned by the Church of England. I think not.

But further a *minimum* being recommended or directed is no exclusion to a *maximum*, but rather pre-supposes it. Thus in the Westerton case the direction to cover the Communion Table with “a carpet of silk or other decent stuff,” was held to authorize several ‘carpets’ of “various colours to be put upon it at various and set times.” It is consonant to law (says Lynwood) “to affirm that this mode of speech in the singular number, contains in itself the plural also.” If I am recommended to attend church on Sundays, does that therefore discountenance my attendance during week days? If the law compels me to go a mile, there is no reason why I should not go twain. When I am asked to give alms at the offertory that cannot imply that I am not to give alms at other times. So neither does a recommendation to “open griefs” to a minister before communion, and to make a “special confession,” in sickness exclude my doing so at other times. The inference is the other way. If it be *specialy* right in these cases, it will be *ordinarily* right in others of the like nature.

The custom of Foreign Protestant churches, except the Calvinists, who are few in number, accords with this view. The Augsburg Confession (chap. xi.) teaches, of Confession, that “private absolution is to be retained in the churches, although confession of all sins be impossible.” The Apology of the Confession well known to have Melancthon’s authority, declares “We retain confession, especially because of absolution, which is the Word of God pronounced by Divine Authority, through the power of the Keys. Wherefore it would be impure to take private confession out of the Church.” The same Apology directs that “Confession be made yearly.” In another place it is said to be used “often in the year.” In the Articles of Smalkalde, Absolution and the Power of the Keys with Confession is said to be instituted by Christ Himself, and and to be “penititis.” This is the law throughout the whole of Sweden, Norway, Denmark, Prussia, and almost all the rest of Germany. In Sweeden especially the Parish Priest is known

to visit every family every year, and each person is bound to confess or be under a pecuniary penalty, and, if neglecting to do so is excluded from Communion, and exclusion from the Communion for a certain period is followed by civil incapacity, and banishment in Prussia and elsewhere. In Germany the custom of confession is universal among religious persons, though neglected by others, and among the stricter Lutherans it is always a pre-requisite to Communion. At Hatherstadt in Prussia, about a month since, the Pastors refused to marry a couple who had not previously confessed. At a general Assembly of the Evangelical Lutheran Churches of nearly all Germany, except Prussia, held at Dresden, in May, 1856, resolutions (*inter alia*) were passed:—

1. "No one to be admitted to Communion without Confession."

2. "That a return to the old custom of private absolution and confession is absolutely necessary."

3. Absolution is not to be given to more than one person at a time, nor except in words which signify precisely and clearly the action of absolution."

If it be objected farther that the Church of England, except in the case of sickness, gives no form for private confession or absolution, and therefore does not sanction it. But this argument proves far too much. It is notorious that there are no forms peculiar to private confession either in the Roman Catholic or Lutheran Evangelical Communities, yet both require and practice it.

Lastly, you ask me if your suspension by the Bishop from officiating in the Diocess of Chichester affects your power to receive confessions and absolve according to the law of the Church of England. This suspension could not, I conceive, affect any but your public ministrations: but since the Bishop has never, though often requested, assigned to you any "good and sufficient cause," nor indeed any cause at all for suspension where the Church Discipline Act requires him to do it, it seems to me that this suspension is a gratuitous and simply arbitrary act and *null* in law.

Yours faithfully,

J. D. CHAMBERS.

The Rev. J. M. NEALE.

JJ—PAGE 442.

LETTER OF THE BISHOP OF CHICHESTER TO MISS GRÈME.

*Palace, Chichester, Dec. 3, 1851.*

Dear Madam,—When your name was announced to me I felt that you had taken a license which was by no means open to you, in coming to this house without having previously ascertained whether I approved of your doing so or not. Whatever publication with regard to Mr. Scobell, Mr. Neale may resolve upon making, he must do so, as far at least as I am concerned, upon his own responsibility, and at his own risk as to consequences. If the documents you say you have brought with you were at this moment open before me, I would refuse to look into them. I will be no party to any such intrusion of strangers into private and family matters.

I remain, Dear Madam,

Your faithful pastor,

A. T. CICESTER.

MISS GRÈME.

KK—PAGE 475.

*Accusation and Presentment by the Rev. Gilbert Rorison, Incumbent of S. Peter's Church, Peterhead, and others, against the Rev. Patrick Cheyne, Incumbent of S. John the Evangelist's Church, Aberdeen, 23rd April, 1858, with appointment therein by the Bishop.*

To the Right Reverend Father in God, Thomas George, Bishop of Aberdeen, the Presentment of the undersigned Presbyter and Lay Communicants of the Diocess aforesaid, respectfully sheweth;—

1. Whereas the Church of Rome teaches — A. In the Sacred Sacrament of the Holy Eucharist, after the consecration of the Bread and Wine our Lord Jesus Christ, true God and Man, is *truly, really, and substantially* contained *under the form* of these sensible things; adding,—if any one shall deny that in

the Sacrament of the Most Holy Eucharist are *truly, really, and substantially* contained the Body and Blood, together with the Soul and Divinity of our Lord Jesus Christ, and consequently the whole Christ, but shall say that He is only therein as in a sign, or in figure, or by virtue, let him be anathema. (*Decrees and Canons of the Council of Trent*, Session xiii.) And,

B. Consistently develops this teaching into such ramifications as these:—

*a.* In the Divine Sacrifice performed in the Mass, that same Christ is contained and immolated in a Bloodless manner, who once offered Himself in a Bloody manner on the Altar of the Cross; wherefore the sacrifice is truly propitiatory, and the Lord appeased by the offering thereof forgives sins. *For the Victim is one and the same*, the same now offering by the Ministry of the Priests, who once offered Himself on the Cross, the manner of offering alone being different; adding,—If any one shall say that the Sacrifice of the Mass is a bare commemorative Sacrifice offered on the Cross, but not a propitiating Sacrifice, and that it ought not to be offered *for the living and the dead for sins*, punishments, satisfactions, and other necessities, let him be anathema. (*Decrees and Canons of Trent*, Session xxii.)

*b.* It may not be doubted that all the faithful exhibit in veneration the worship of Latria, which is due to the true God, to this Most Holy Sacrament. For it is not the less to be worshipped because it was instituted by Christ the Lord to be received;” adding,—“If any one shall say that in the Holy Sacrament of the Eucharist Christ is not to be adored, even with the external worship of Latria, and that it is not to be carried about in processions or proposed publicly to the people to be worshipped, let him be anathema.” (*Decrees and Canons of Trent*, Session xiii.)

*c.* “It is to be desired that, at each Mass, the faithful who are present should communicate by participation; but, notwithstanding these Masses are not to be condemned, but approved, in which, this not being done, the Priest alone communicates Sacramentally;” adding,—“If any one shall say that Masses in which the Priest alone communicates Sacramentally are unlawful, and therefore to be abrogated, let him be anathema. (*Decrees and Canons of Trent*, Session xxii.)

II. And whereas the reformed Auglican Church in general,

and this Church in particular in opposition to the first of the foregoing tenets affirms:—

A. Transubstantiation (or the change of the substance of the Bread and Wine) in the Supper of the Lord cannot be proved by Holy Writ, but is repugnant to the plain words of Scripture, overthroweth the nature of a Sacrament, and hath given occasion to many superstitions. The mean whereof the Body of Christ is received and eaten in the Supper is Faith. (Article xxviii.) And,

B. Consistently with this rejection of the parent dogma pronouncing the affiliated dogmas and practices:—

a. “The offering of Christ once made is, that perfect redemption, propitiation, and satisfaction for all the sins of the whole world; and there is *none other satisfaction* for sin but that alone. Wherefore the Sacrifice of Masses, in the which it was commonly said that the Priest *did offer Christ for the quick and the dead*, to have remission of pain or guilt, were blasphemous fables and dangerous deceits; adding, Christ in His Gospel hath commanded to continue a perpetual *Memorial of that His Precious Death and Sacrifice* until His coming again. (Article xxxi. Scottish Communion Office.)

b. The Sacrament of the Lord’s Supper was not by Christ’s ordinance carried about or worshipped. By kneeling no adoration is intended or ought to be done either unto the Sacramental Bread or Wine there bodily received, or unto any Corporal presence of Christ’s natural Flesh and Blood. For the Sacramental Bread and Wine remain still in their very natural substances, and therefore may not be adored, (for that were idolatry to be abhorred of all faithful Christians,) and the Natural Body and Blood of our Saviour Christ are in Heaven and not here; it being against the truth of Christ’s Natural Body to be at one time in more places than one. (Article xxviii. *Rubric*, English Communion Office.)

c. “The Sacraments were not ordained of Christ to be gazed upon, but that we should daily use them.” There shall be no communion except four (or three at the least) communicate with the Priest. (Article xxv. *Rubric*, *English Communion Office*.)

III. And, whereas the Rev. Patrick Cheyne, Presbyter of this Diocess, and Incumbent of the Church of S. John the Evangelist, Aberdeen, in a book entitled ‘Six Sermons on the Doc-

trine of the Most Holy Eucharist,' (Brown and C. Aberdeen, 1858,) sets forth, "When I speak of the Real Presence, I mean, as the Church means; that after Consecration, the whole Christ, God, and Man, is really, truly, and substantially present in the Eucharist, under form of Bread and Wine. . . . The three terms 'truly, really, and substantially,' are used not in explanation but as meeting and opposing all the errors which have prevailed concerning it. Hence they are used as in a negative sense against error. We say first,—that Christ is present in the Eucharist, *truly*,—*i. e.* not *in figure*,—secondly, we say He is present *really*,—*i. e.* not simply to faith,—thirdly, we say, He is present *substantially*,—*i. e.*, not virtually only, by some operative virtue, grace, or power diffused from His Sacred Body. Christ is present not in figure, nor to faith, nor in virtue and grace, but in Himself, in His whole person in that very Body which He took of the Blessed Virgin and united to His Godhead, and which suffered on the Cross and rose again.

(P. 22.) And,

B. Congruously with this:—

*a.* The Sacrifice in the Eucharist is substantially the same as the Sacrifice of the Cross, because the Priest is the same in both, and the Victim the same in both. . . . On the Cross He offered a Bloody Sacrifice through death, but He is now offering Himself an everlasting Victim without shedding of Blood: and so in the Eucharist, by the ministry of the Priest. He is offering Himself an unbloody Sacrifice under the form of Bread and Wine. But in both cases the Offering is the same, differing in the manner of offering. . . . We pray that "all the whole Church" may receive through this Sacrifice the benefits of the Lord's Passion, each of course, according to his needs and his capacity of receiving. . . . When the Eucharist is called a Sacrifice for the Living and the Dead. (Pages 33, 35, 36.)

*b.* We do not kneel to the outward visible signs in the Sacrament; we kneel to the Lord Himself invisibly present 'under the form of Bread and wine,' though even to the outward things, after consecration, we give religious honor. (Page 46.)

*c.* It is not necessary, in order to obtain participation in the benefits of the Sacrifice, that all who join in offering it should

at the same time receive the communion. . . . The only thing necessary to the completion of the Sacrifice is the communion of the Priest, which is required to complete the idea of Sacrifice as an Act of communion between God and man. (Page 34.)

IV. And, whereas the teaching is not only in its separate details, but in its systematic structure and terminology, and in the mutual interdependence of its cognate parts, plainly asseverative of the distinct doctrine of the Church of Rome, on the subject of the Eucharist, and plainly subversive of the doctrine of the Reformed Anglican Church in general, and of the Episcopal Church in Scotland, in particular.

Therefore, we the undersigned, under the provisions of the 36th Canon of the Episcopal Church in Scotland, do hereby present to your Reverence the aforesaid 'Six Sermons,' and the Reverend Patrick Cheyne, as the author of the same to be judged according to the Ecclesiastical Law.

GILBERT RORISON, Presbyter and Incumbent,  
of S. Peter's Church, Peterhead,  
D. R. MORICE, one of the Trustees of S. Andrew's Church, Aberdeen,  
THOS. J. BRENMER, a Member of the Vestry  
of S. Peter's Church, Peterhead.

---

LL—PAGE 460.

*Petition of the Clergy of Scotland to the Right Reverend the College of Bishops of the Church of Scotland.*

"We the undersigned Presbyters in the Scottish Church, beg to approach your Lordship with every sentiment of respect and dutiful reverence, in the hope that the observations we have to offer, with a view to allay the present excitement of men's minds on one of the most sacred doctrines of our religion may receive favorable consideration at your Lordship's hands. To address the Episcopate on matters which affected the Church's welfare, is an admitted privilege of our Order, of which the rules of the Church have ever been prompt to recognise the benefit as being one of their main supports in the exercise of

their authority, and in the maintenance of their hold on the affections of their children in Christ. If there be any irregularity in the manner of our present address, we would rely on your Lordship's indulgence, observing that under present circumstances we have taken the only course left open to us.

We would then represent to your Lordship our sense of the great inconveniences which arise from the setting forth of Declarations on points of doctrines which wear the aspect of definitions, and which from the authority of those who make them, or hath to be mistaken for such, or at any rate are for controversial purposes assumed to be such. Men's minds are hereby unsettled, the liberty which the Church has allowed is practically narrowed; new terms of communion are introduced; and above all, the appeal thus verbally made to the private judgment of persons unaccustomed to weigh theological statements must tend to produce confusion throughout the Church; disastrous alike to Christian peace and to legitimate authority.

We would also admit that the Church Herself has presented the mode of procedure for the introduction of new Canons of discipline, and we therefore feel constrained to remonstrate in our own names and in that of the Church at large against extra-judicial opinions being promulgated, as though the expression gained anything of legal weight by being published among the transactions of the Episcopal Synod.

Permit us then to state the principle on which our objections rest, and the corollaries to it in very brief terms.

“A belief in the Holy Catholic Church implies on the part of all her members, from the highest to the lowest, a faithful adherence to her doctrines, and an entire submission to her discipline ‘as Christ has ordained, and as this Church hath received the same.’

“And therefore,

1. “That quasi-definitions of faith, by individual Prelates, are to be deprecated as tending to perplex the minds of Churchmen, and to interfere, however unintentionally, with the paramount authority of the Church in all questions of this nature.

2. “That the seeming to claiming synodical weight, former opinions must ultimately tend to lower the respect due to the Canons which the Church has deliberately passed for the purpose of maintaining discipline, and to throw doubts on the

ability and impartiality of the Court of Ordinary Appeal in our Church.

“We therefore, most respectfully, yet most earnestly implore your Lordships to discourage all unauthoritative definitions of doctrine or confessions of faith, and to refrain in future from putting forth extra judicial opinions or rules of discipline tending to curtail universal misunderstanding, in which the mutual relations of Bishops, Presbyters, and Laity may receive serious detriment and the real work of the Church in the profiting of souls be proportionally obstructed.”

JOHN MOOR, M.A., Dean of Brechin,

JAMES SMITH, M.A., Dean of Moray and Ross,

DAVID WILSON, M.A., Dean of Aberdeen,

EDWARD B. K. FORTESCUE, M.A., Provost of S. Ninian's, Perth,

ALEXANDER LENDRUM, M.A., Principal of S. Margaret's College, Crief,

PATRICK CUSHNIE, S. Mary's, Montrose, and several other names.

---

MM—PAGE 491.

*Judgment in the Presentment by the Rev. Gilbert Rorison, Incumbent of S. Peter's Church, Peterhead, and others, against the Rev. Patrick Cheyne, Incumbent of S. John's the Evangelist's Church, Aberdeen.*

*Aberdeen, 5th August, 1858.*

Having considered the Presentment by the Rev. Gilbert Rorison, Incumbent of S. Peter's Church, Peterhead, and others, *against* the Rev. Patrick Cheyne, Incumbent of S. John the Evangelist's Church, Aberdeen, along with the Sermons complained of and other documents produced, and whose procedure had in this case, and have now and formerly allowed the respondent the fullest opportunity of stating his defence, I hereby in the presence of the assembled Synod of this Diocess—Find, *First*, that the quotation from the said Sermons contained in the third branch of the said Presentment under the

head marked A., however erroneous in other respects, do not amount to a positive assertion of the doctrine of Transubstantiation, the special error controverted in the authority quoted in the first part of the corresponding head of the Second Branch, and that this has no reference to the authority quoted in the last part thereof; and I therefore dismiss the complaint under the aforesaid head of the Second Branch. And, *Second*, That the reading contained in each of the passages quoted in Branch *Third*, under the head marked B., and section *a, b, c*, is in direct contradictions to the doctrines founded on and under each of the corresponding sections in Branch Second, as restricted by my Deliverance of date, 15th June last, and I therefore call on the Respondent to state his Reasons, if he has any, why sentence should not be pronounced against him.

THOS. G. SUTHER, Bishop.

Done at Aberdeen, this 23rd day of April, in the year of our Lord 1858.

---

*Aberdeen, 26th April, 1858.*

I hereby find that *prima facie* grounds exist for the foregoing Accusation and Presentment; and for the judicial disposal thereof I summon the Rev. Gilbert Rorison and others the prosecutors, and the Rev. Patrick Cheyne the defendant, to appear before me at a Special Diocesan Synod, to be held within S. Andrew's Church, Aberdeen, the 15th day of June next, at 11 o'clock, A.M., with continuation of days if necessary:—And further, I allow the prosecutors being so advised within three weeks from the date to lodge, with the Synod Clerk, reasons in support of the said Accusation; and the Defendant if so advised to lodge Answers within three weeks thereafter.

THOMAS GEORGE SUTHER, D.C.L.,  
Bishop of Aberdeen.

NOTE.—In a case like the present, where precision of language on either side is so necessary, it appears desirable to have the pleadings prepared as above, before the meeting of Synod. With regard to the line of argument I strongly recommend the parties to confine to the Formularies of the Scottish and English Reformed Churches, (assuming them to be, as they cer-

tainly are, in accordance with Holy Scripture and the teaching of the Primitive Church,) and to the authority of the Old Great Writers of these Churches and others in communion with them. Any argument beyond these limits will be held irrelevant to the case now to be tried.

THOS. GEO. EPIS., ABERDEEN.

SENTENCE OF THE REV. P. CHEYNE.

*Aberdeen, 5th August, 1858.*

Having resumed consideration of this case, I hereby in presence of the Synod assembled as aforesaid, suspend the respondent, the Rev. Patrick Cheyne from his office of a Presbyter, in the Episcopal Church in Scotland; and I prohibit and discharge him from exercising any of the functions belonging to that office, both in the church of S. John the Evangelist, Aberdeen, of which he is Incumbent, and also in every other place within the Diocese over which I exercise spiritual jurisdiction as a Bishop of the Episcopal Church in Scotland, until such time as he shall renounce and purge himself before me of the erroneous teaching contained in each and all the quotations from his sermons quoted in the third branch of the Presentment, under the head marked B, and 'sections *a, b, c.*'

THOS. G. SUTHER, Bishop.

To the judgment I have to append this note:—

Though I have thought it my duty to decide that the quotations in do, not necessarily teach Transubstantiation, I feel bound to mark the recklessness of the defendant's teaching, which inculcates his view of the Real Presence in the precise words in which the highest Roman authority in the Council of Trent inculcates and defines the Dogma of Transubstantiation. To say the least of such teaching, it casts a stumbling block in the way of the ignorant and unwary; and any clergyman who does not more carefully guard his words deserves severe censure. Further, the doctrines of the Presence which the respondent teaches, though it may not be clearly said to be Transubstantiation, is equally erroneous, and as much opposed to the whole stream of the teaching of our best Divines. Therefore in respect to the erroneous doctrine contained in the above quotations, though I cannot pronounce upon it judicially according to the Presentment before me, I think it right thus to declare my opinion concerning it."

T. G. SUTHER, Bishop.

## MM—PAGE 494.

## APPEAL OF THE REV. P. CHEYNE.

*Aberdeen, Aug., 1858.*

My Lord,—With reference to the sentence pronounced by you in Synod against me, yesterday, I have to intimate that, in the event of my being advised to desist from any of the functions, pending my appeal to the Episcopal Synod, I do not admit that I am not fully entitled to exercise the said functions pending the appeal.

And I further beg leave to intimate that in the event of my being advised not to exercise any of the functions of the order of Deacons, either pending the appeal or afterwards, I do not admit that I am not fully entitled to exercise all the functions of that order, either pending the appeal or afterwards, notwithstanding the said sentence.

I am, my Lord,

Your humble servant,

P. CHEYNE.

## NN—PAGE 500.

## REVOCATION OF THE LICENSE OF THE REV. ALFRED POOLE.

Archibald Campbell, by divine permission, Bishop of London,  
To the Rev. Alfred Poole, Clerk, B.A.

“Whereas our predecessor, Charles James, Bishop of London, did, on or about the 26th day of September, in the year of our Lord 1851, by a License under his hand and Episcopal seal, grant unto you his License to perform the office of Assistant Stipendiary Curate, in the Church of S. Barnabas, in the District Chapel of S. Paul, Wilton Place, in the County of Middlesex, within our Diocess and jurisdiction, and did assign unto you the yearly stipend in the said License mentioned, for serving the said Cure. Now we, by virtue of the power and authority given to us in this behalf, by an Act of Parliament made and passed in the 1st and 2nd years of the reign of Her present Majesty Queen Victoria, entitled “An Act to abridge the holding of benefices in plurality, and to make better provision for

the residence of the Clergy," and of all other power and authority vested in us, ordinary and episcopal, revoke, annul, and make avoid the said License. And we do hereby dismiss and remove you, the said Alfred Poole, from the office of Assistant Stipendiary Curate as aforesaid, from the day of the date of these presents given at London House, the 25th day of May, in the year of our Lord 1848, and in the second year of our consecration.

Witness our hand and episcopal seal,

A. C. LONDON."

---

OO—PAGE 501.

CONFIRMATION OF THE REVOCATION OF MR. POOLE'S LICENSE.

We, John Bird, by Divine Providence, Lord Archbishop of Canterbury, Primate of all England, and Metropolitan, having carefully read and considered the merits and circumstance of an appeal made to us by the Rev. Alfred Poole, Clerk, as the Assistant Stipendiary Curate in the Church of S. Barnabas, in the district Chapel of S. Paul, Wilton Place, from the order, decree, or judgment of the Right Rev. Father in God, Archibald Campbell, Lord Bishop of London, whereby he did revoke the License which had been granted to the said Alfred Poole, to perform the office of the Assistant Stipendiary Curate, in the said Church of S. Barnabas, and being of opinion that the said Lord Bishop of London had exercised a sound discretion in revoking the License of the said Alfred Poole, do, by virtue of the powers and authority vested in us as Archbishop aforesaid, by a certain Act of Parliament, made and passed in the Session of Parliament, held in the first and second years of the reign of Her present Majesty, entitled "An Act to abridge the holding of benefices in plurality, and to make better provision for the residence of the Clergy," and by virtue of all other powers in us vested as Archbishop aforesaid, and by these presents pronounce against the aforesaid appeal of the said Alfred Poole, and do ratify and confirm the revocation of the aforesaid License granted to him to perform the office of Assistant Stipendiary Curate in the Church of S. Barnabas aforesaid. Given at

Lambeth Palace, under our hand this 9th day of July, in the year of our Lord 1858, and of our translation the 11th.

J. B. CANTUAR.

Witness, FELIX KNYVETT, Secretary  
to the Archbishop.

---

PP—PAGE 501.

REQUISITION TO THE BISHOP OF OXFORD.

To the Right Rev. the Lord Bishop of Oxford,—“ We the undersigned inhabitants of the Parish of Stoke, in your Lordship’s Diocess, and communicants of the Church of England, have read in the ‘ *Windsor Express*,’ of June 19, a statement detailing the manner of inducing Confession as practised by the Curate of Boyn Hill, and desire to bring his conduct officially before your Lordship’s notice. The statement sets forth that the Clergyman went to a poor woman who was in hourly expectation of her confinement, and proceeded to question her in a most improper manner, with a view of leading her to Confession, that in going through the commandments he dwelt more particularly on the seventh, and asked her “ whether she had ever committed adultery ? ” Upon her replying “ No,” he said, “ yes, but recollect, did you not before or after you were married look on a man to lust after him or for him ? ” According to the statement the poor woman was “ upset ” by this language, especially as the Clergyman continued “ Now you are lying there, and hope to be delivered and live, therefore you should confess your sins to me.” He pursued the conversation and enquired, “ Have you ever been confirmed ? ” “ No, Sir,” she replied. “ Then remember, (said he,) if you die, you can never enter the Kingdom of Heaven. If you live, you must receive the Holy Sacrament.” “ Upon his objecting to this through want of preparation, the Curate added, “ Then you cannot enter the Kingdom of Heaven.” The statement further sets forth that the Clergyman urged upon her that “ she should not tell her husband,” and that she was afterwards visited by a lady, called Sister Ellen, and upbraided by her for repeating the conversation, and again advised not to tell her husband. It is

needless for us to specify to your Lordship the many gross improprieties by which the Curate was guilty, allowing this account to be true; and that he stands self condemned of holding a conversation with any woman which he desired not to be repeated to her husband; and as Mr. Joseph H. Clark, of Altwood House, Maidenhead, has avowed himself to be the writer of this account, and ready to substantiate it; we therefore respectfully request of your Lordship to institute a full inquiry into these charges, and if true, censure and punish the accused according to the authority your Lordship has by virtue of your office.

Your requisitionists view with alarm the progress of certain Romish doctrines and practices in the bosom of the Anglican Church; one of which they would specify, scarcely ever heard of since the days of the Reformation, viz., an unscriptural, and unanglican mode of confession; and unless these practices are checked by the firm hand of authority they fear that the general character of the Clergy will be lowered in the eyes of their parishioners, that happy and free intercourse which now exists between both parties be checked, and that the Clergy and Laity will be separated into two distinct bodies, they fear that the affections of the people of England will be gradually withdrawn from the Church, and that by substituting the doctrine of an unscriptural confession in the place of hearty repentance and faith in the meritorious sacrifice of Christ on the Cross, an empty formalism will by degrees take the place of holiness of life, and a real conversion of the heart to God.

J. H. HOWARD VYSE, Lieut. Colonel,

ABRAHAM DAILY,

CHARLES LYALL,

W. CUTHROLD,

JOHN ALEX. GOWER, M.A.,

GEORGE W. DYSON,

ANDREW BATRICK,

JOHN G. SCOTTON,

ROBT. A. WILLIAMS,

JOHN SHAW, VICAR,

HENRY CANTRELL,

WILLIAM COOPER,

} Churchwardens.

*Stoke Vicarage, July 14.*

## QQ—PAGE 501.

ADDRESS FROM THE GUILD OF S. ALBAN'S, LIVERPOOL, TO  
REV. ALFRED POOLE.

“ Rev. Sir,—We, the undersigned, the members of the Guild of S. Alban, residing in the Liverpool sub-district, beg to offer you the expression of our respectful sympathy under the recent persecution with which God has suffered you to be visited.

“ We, as laymen, feel ourselves specially called upon to do this, inasmuch as the question of ‘Confession’ is a layman’s question, and you yourself have been made by this persecution the representative of our rights in this matter.

“ Taught by the Church of England, our immediate mother in the Faith, that the commission conferred upon the Apostles has in its fullness, descended to their successors (Ordination Service), so that ‘our Lord Jesus Christ hath left power to His Church on earth to absolve all sinners who truly repent and believe in Him’ (Service for the Visitation of the Sick) we solemnly believe and protest that any attempt to interfere with the discharge of that commission to the individual soul which has been moved to ‘humbly and heartily desire’ its exercise on its behalf, is a highly profane and sacriligious in vision of the rights and privileges of Christ’s people.

“ For if at your ordination to the ‘office and work of a priest in the Church of God,’—that Church having given you solemn warning to seek for ‘Christ’s people scattered abroad,’—to serve in that congregation ‘which is His spouse and His body,’ and to “feed the flock of God,”—did, in order to enable you to perform the functions and ministrations herein implied, make over to you this great commission,—‘Whosoever sins you forgive, they are forgiven, and whosoever sins you retain, they are retained;’ and if in the ordinary course of your public ministrations she puts words in your mouth, specially inviting any who feel their need of the individual application of this ministry, to come to you for the purpose; and if on other occasions she commands you to ‘move’ men to ‘make a special confession of their sins: and if she makes a canon fencing the exercises of this ministry with certain safeguards and prohibitions—as, for instance, forbidding you to reveal the ‘secret and

hidden sins' so confessed—then, we think, it follows that the liberty of coming to Christ's minister in the ordinance of confession is a liberty which the Church of England has secured for us laymen; which she not only authorises us to use, but invites us and encourages us to appreciate; which she not only allows you to afford, but charges you not to withhold; and not merely not to withhold, but not to neglect, not to pass by, not to forbear pressing upon the necessities of the devotion of her people.

“Had you done this, had you, we do not say, *refused* to exercise this commission which the Church has laid upon you; but had you forborne to invite to its ministry those for whose benefit it *was* so laid upon you, and who might be ignorant of the opportunity or diffident in availing themselves of it, we must believe that you would have been there by failing to discharge your trust as an officer of the Church of England—as a minister of Christ.

“What to say of those outbreaks of persecution which have met you in the discharge of imperatative duties, so far as they refer to you, we may easily discover:—‘Blessed are ye when men shall revile you and persecute you, and shall say all manner of evil against ye falsely for My sake. Rejoice and be exceeding glad; for great is your reward in Heaven; for so persecuted they the prophets which were before you.’ What to say of those acts of authority which punish you for doing what that authority itself empowered you to do, commanded you to do; is bound to admonish you to do it if you failed to do it; pledged to you Christ's commission for the purpose of doing, and by that act made the power and the duty inalienable and unavoidable, we know not, and dare not trust ourselves to inquire.

“For ourselves, as lay-members of the Church of England, we may humbly but firmly declare, that having been blest with ability to understand what rights and privileges belong to us, as such, we are determined, by God's help, to maintain them: and thereby proclaim our belief that the Church of England means what she says, and that no one is a dutiful, or a truthful, or an honest man who denies it.

“Accept, Reverend Sir, this expression, not only of our sympathy, but of our gratitude. You are suffering in our cause. May God give you strength to bear whatever cross He

may lay upon you ; and may you derive comfort from the sure conviction that, through the sufferings of His servants, the truth and the kingdom of Christ progress and prevail.'

"Given at Liverpool this 13th day of September, in the year of our Lord God, 1858."

---

RR—PAGE 501.

On Thursday Morning, 8th December, the Rev. C. F. Lowder, minister of the Mission Chapel, in Wellclose-Square, who has been officiating for the Rev. Bryan King at the parish church during his illness, attended before Mr. Yardley, on a summons, charging him with assaulting a parishioner named Jones. It appears that on the morning of Sunday last, there was a wedding at S. George's Church, the persons interested in which were admitted into the church at a quarter-past ten o'clock, by a side door. Mr. Jones knowing that the choristers and others had gone in, determined upon following them, when Mr. Lowder, who had possession of the door, refused him admission, raised his arm, and struck him on the shoulder, and then, banging to the door, made Mr. Jones a prisoner by the skirt of his coat, which was caught by the doors. Mr. Jones, according to his statement at the police court, was obliged to hammer away until he could obtain his release. Four parishioners were called in support of the charge, and Mr. Digby Seymour, M.P., who appeared for Mr. Lowder, argued, in defence, that the door was the private entrance of the rector, and that Mr. Jones had no business there. Mr. Churchwarden Thompson was also called, and proved that this was not a door for the rector, but for the public, upon which the magistrate decided that the assault had been fully proved, and expressed his opinion that Mr. Lowder had behaved very injudiciously as a minister of peace in acting as a policeman or door keeper. He added that he did not believe that religious principle

actuated any of the parties. As the complainant had paid 2s. for the summons, he should fine Mr. Lowder 2s. for the assault, so that one party might not exult over the other.

---

SS—PAGE 502.

*Unto the Right Rev. the Primus and the other Members of the College of Bishops of the Episcopal Church in Scotland.*

“Whereas it appertains to the office of a Bishop admitted to Government in the Church of CHRIST, by the Order of the consecration of Bishops, used in the United Church of England and Ireland, which Order of Consecration has, by Canon VIII., been adopted, and is used by the Episcopal Church in Scotland, “to instruct the people committed to his charge out of the Holy Scriptures, and to teach or maintain nothing as required of necessity to eternal salvation, but that which he shall be persuaded may be concluded and proved by the same,” and “with all faithful diligence to banish and drive away all erroneous and strange doctrine contrary to God’s word; and both privately and openly to call upon and encourage others to the same;” and whereas the Thirty Nine Articles of Religion “agreed upon for the avoiding of diversities of opinions, and for the establishing of consent touching true Religion,” and “allowed and authorized” as containing “the true doctrine of the Church of England, agreeable to God’s word,” have, by Canon IX., been adopted by the Episcopal Church in Scotland, and are subscribed by the Bishop and Pastors of the same, and acknowledged to be “agreeable to the Word of God;” and whereas the Book of Common Prayer and administration of the Sacraments, and other rites and ceremonies of the Church, according to the use of the United Church of England and Scotland, is referred to, quoted and admitted as being of authority and in use in the Episcopal Church in Scotland and the various offices of Devotion, Rubrical Devotions, and Declarations of the said Book of Common Prayer, are prescribed and sanctioned, either expressly or by implication, as formularies of administration, devotion, and instruction, and as binding along with “a form

for the celebration of the Holy Communion, known by the name of the Scotch Communion Office," of the said Episcopal Church in Scotland, by the 18th, 20th, 21st, 22nd, 23rd, and 28th of its Code of Canons, and as appears also by the decision of the Episcopal Synod of the said Episcopal Church in Scotland, in the case of the accusation and presentment of the Rev. Gilbert Rorison and others, against the Rev. Patrick Cheyne:—

WE, the undersigned, William Henderson, Incumbent of S. Mary's Church, Arbroath, Patrick Wilson, a Vestryman of S. Mary's Church, Arbroath, and David Smith, a Vestryman also, of S. Mary's Church, Arbroath, being members of the Episcopal Church in Scotland;—

Do hereby, in virtue of the 36th Canon of the said Church, humbly and dutifully present unto the Episcopal College of the said Church in Synod assembled, for trial and judgment, the Right Rev. Father in God, Alexander Penrose Forbes, D.C.L., a Bishop in the said Church, and Ordinary of the District commonly known and recognised in the Episcopal Church in Scotland, as the Diocese of Brechin; whom we do charge and accuse of holding and maintaining, and teaching in a Charge delivered to the Clergy of his Diocese, in Synod assembled, on the 5th day of August, 1857, and since published by his authority, and republished in an enlarged form, with notes and appendix also, by his authority, doctrines contrary and repugnant to, unsanctioned by, and subversive of certain parts of the said Formularies for Public Worship in use in the said Episcopal Church in Scotland, contained as aforesaid, in the said Book of Common Prayer, and also contrary and repugnant to, unsanctioned by, and subversive of the said Scotch Communion Office.

In particular, we do charge against the said Alexander Penrose Forbes, Bishop of Brechin,

I. That whereas the 31st of the said XXXIX Articles, entitled, "Of the One Oblation of CHRIST finished upon the Cross," declares that "the offering of CHRIST once made is that perfect Redemption, Propitiation, and Satisfaction for all the sins of the whole world, both original and actual; and there is none other satisfaction for sin, but that alone; and whereas in the said Office for the celebration of the Holy Communion, known by the name of the Scotch Communion Office, we are taught that God "did give His Only SON JESUS CHRIST to

suffer death upon the Cross for our redemption, (by His own oblation of Himself once offered) made a full, perfect, and sufficient sacrifice, oblation, and satisfaction for the sins of the whole world, and did institute, and in His Holy Gospel command us to continue, a perpetual memorial of that His Precious Death and Sacrifice until His coming again," and that the Holy Communion is "the Commemoration of the most Precious Death and Sacrifice of JESUS CHRIST, the said Alexander Penrose Forbes, Bishop of Brechin, asserts, maintains, and teaches what he denominates the teaching of the ancient Doctors, that "the Eucharistic Sacrifice is the same substantially with that of the Cross," (p. 41), and pronounces (p. 42,) that "no words of man can strengthen the tremendous and absolute identity of the two sacrifices," or, "of the one sacrifice in its two aspects;" and also argues that as CHRIST *is* the propitiation for our sins," "if the Body of our LORD be in any sense in the Eucharist, it must plead," and "be precious in the eyes of the FATHER," and "act according to its own law," and "effect its end," (p. 58,) *i. e.*, be the propitiation for our sins; whereby the doctrines of the oneness of the oblation of CHRIST *finished* on the Cross, of the perfect propitiation which He there once made, and of the Holy Eucharist being a *Memorial* or *Commemoration* of His Death and Sacrifice on the Cross, as asserted in the said 31st Article, and taught in the said Communion Office, are contradicted and depraved.

II. That whereas the 28th of the said XXXIX Articles declares that "the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper was not of CHRIST's ordinance reserved, carried about, lifted up, or worshipped, and the Rubric or Declaration at the end of the Communion Service of the Book of Common Prayer, in reference to Communicants being ordained to receive the LORD's Supper kneeling, declares that "thereby no adoration is intended, or ought to be done either unto the Sacramental Bread and Wine there bodily received, or unto any corporal presence of CHRIST's natural flesh and blood. For the Sacramental Bread and Wine remain still in their very natural substances, and therefore may not be adored, (for that were idolatry to be abhorred of all faithful Christians), and the natural Body and Blood of CHRIST our SAVIOUR are in Heaven and not here, it being against the truth of CHRIST's natural Body to be at one time in more places

than one." And, whereas the Catechism of the said Book of Common Prayer teaches that a Sacrament consists of two parts, an outward "sign," and an inward "grace," and particularly that in the LORD'S Supper the Body and Blood of CHRIST is "the inward part or thing signified;" the said Alexander Penrose Forbes, Bishop of Brechin, maintains in (the) said Charge that "Supreme Adoration is due to the Body and Blood of CHRIST, mysteriously present in the gifts," and that "the worship is due not to the gifts, but to CHRIST in the gifts," (pp. 27, 28;) whereby he contradicts and depraves the said 28th Article, and the said Rubric or Declaration of the Book of Common Prayer, and also the said Catechism, maintaining, in opposition to the said Catechism, that the Body and Blood of CHRIST are not only so signified by the outward part of the Sacrament as to be verily and indeed present or contained within the sign, or as he expresses it, "present in the gifts," and that being so "present in the gifts," or contained within the outward signs, that they are there to be adored.

III. That whereas the 29th of the XXXIX Articles entitled "Of the Wicked which eat not the Body of CHRIST in the use of the Lord's Supper," declares that "the wicked, and such as be void of a lively faith, although they do earnestly and visibly press with their teeth (as S. Augustin saith) the Sacrament of the Body and Blood of CHRIST, yet in no wise are they partakers of CHRIST, but rather to their condemnation do eat and drink the sign or sacrament of so great a thing;" and whereas the 28th Article declares that "the means whereby the Body of CHRIST is received and eaten in the Supper is Faith;" the said Alexander Penrose Forbes, Bishop of Brechin, teaches in the said Charge that "it is enough to believe "that in regard to the use of the LORD'S Supper," in some sense the wicked do receive CHRIST indeed, to their condemnation and loss," (p. 26.) which sense is rendered more apparent by what he says as to the 29th Article that the *Res Sacramenti* is received by the wicked, (pp. 25, 26,) by which *Res Sacramenti* he refers to the Body and Blood of CHRIST as defined by himself, (p. 13.) affirming thereby that CHRIST is verily and indeed taken and received by such as are void of a lively faith, and so contradicting the doctrine of the 28th Article, which is, that "the means whereby the Body and Blood of CHRIST is received and eaten

is *faith*, “and also the doctrine of the 29th Article, that ‘the wicked in no wise are partakers of CHRIST.’”

AND we do charge and accuse the said Alexander Penrose Forbes, Bishop of Brechin, as being guilty of contradicting and depraving the several Articles named, and the said Formularies of Devotion in use in the Church in the particulars aforesaid; and also of depraving generally in his charge, the doctrine of the XXXIX Articles, and the said Formularies of Devotion in use in the Church by drawing aside the plain and full meaning thereof: forasmuch as he, the said Alexander Penrose Forbes Bishop of Brechin, in the said Charge along with other things says:—

(a.) “Look at the Declaration at the end of the Communion Service, how cautiously it avoids committing itself against the adoration of CHRIST in the gifts;” “it goes on to affirm that no adoration is intended or ought to be done, to what? to CHRIST, verily and indeed taken and received? No, but first to the Sacramental Bread and Wine, and secondly, to any corporal, (that is, material) presence of CHRIST’s flesh and blood, (p. 33,) which words draw aside the plain meaning of the said Declaration, and pervert the literal and grammatical sense thereof.

(b.) “If the Church had wished to condemn the practice” of “the adoration of CHRIST in the Sacrament,” “it was putting a very great stumbling block in the way of believers,” to remove “the ‘*Gloria in Excelsis*’ to the position it occupies;” “knowing what was the deep faith of the people in the gift of the Sacrament at the time of this arrangement, it was cruel to put a prayer into a place which must at once tempt them to an act which it assumed the Church thought wrong,” (p. 34,) which would inasmuch as they affirm that the Church cruelly put a stumbling block in the way of believers by placing the *Gloria in Excelsis* where it stands in the service, unless it was intended to sanction the practice of worshipping CHRIST in the gifts, which practice the Church has elsewhere disallowed and condemned in Article 28th, and by disallowing that kneeling at the ‘Communion is “meant for a signification of our humble and grateful acknowledgment of the benefits of CHRIST therein given to all worthy receivers,” do in reality deprave the integrity of the Church, and tend to undo the confidence of the faithful in her formularies and declarations.

(c.) "Indeed, never has the Church to which we belong, committed herself to any expression which forbids the worship of our LORD in the Holy Sacrament, (p. 35,) which affirmation being made, notwithstanding the Declarations in Article 28th, and in the Rubric or Declaration at the end of the Communion Service in the Book of Common Prayer, ignores the Church's testimony upon this point, and tends to invalidate and subvert the authority of the said Article and Rubric, or Declaration in their literal and grammatical sense.

And, whereas the passages recited in the premises, with the reasonings and conclusions following thereupon in the said Charge, are directly contrary and repugnant to the several Articles of Religion quoted, and the said parts of the said Church's Formularies of Public Worship, devotion and instruction ;

And, whereas the teaching or maintaining of the doctrines and positions libelled in the premises, is inconsistent with the duty incumbent on every Minister of the Scottish Episcopal Church, and especially on every Bishop and Chief Pastor of the same as having subscribed the Thirty-nine Articles, and promised to banish and drive away all erroneous and strange doctrines ;

And, whereas the said Alexander Penrose Forbes, Bishop of Brechin, has offended against the laws of the Scottish Episcopal Church, and has transgressed his duty as a Minister and Chief Pastor thereof, by writing, delivering, printing, publishing, dispersing, and setting forth the said Charge, and by having advisedly maintained and affirmed in said Charge certain positions or doctrines as recited in the premises, contrary and repugnant to the Articles of Religion and Formularies of Public Worship as aforesaid,

We do humbly and dutifully present the said Alexander Penrose Forbes, Bishop of Brechin, to the Episcopal Synod, in virtue of the 36th Canon, for judgment, in the matters herein charged against him, and do crave sentence accordingly.

WILLIAM HENDERSON, Presbyter, and  
Incumbent of S. Mary's, Arbroath,  
PATRICK WILSON,  
DAVID SMITH.

*Lodged, October 3, 1859.*

## THE RIOTS IN S. GEORGE'S-IN-THE-EAST.

The summonses taken out by Mr. Thomas Herbert, Mr. Newsom, Mr. Selby, Mr. Raby, and Mr. Littlejohn, parishioners of S. George-in-the-East, against the Rev. Bryan King, the rector, the Rev. Thomas Dove Dove, the assistant curate, Mr. Barton Stutfield, a chorister, and son of a county magistrate, Mr. Edward Adams, a young gentleman, the son of the late Mr. Serjeant Adams, residing in Montagu-square; and Mr. Albert Edward Coleman, clerk to an auctioneer in the Mile-end-road, were made returnable on Thursday, at the Thames Police Court, before Mr. Selfe, the presiding Magistrate. The defendants were charged with assaulting and beating the complainants in the parish church, on Sunday evening last.

At two o'clock in the afternoon, there was a tremendous rush of people into the court, which in less than two minutes was inconveniently crowded. There were some hundreds outside unable to obtain admission. The Rector's party mustered pretty strongly, but the parishioners opposed to his innovations in the services of the church far outnumbered them, and in the course of the proceedings manifested considerable feeling by hissing, derisive laughter, and cheers. There were frequent calls of order and silence from the magistrate and ushers, and threats to clear the court, but the exhortations of those in authority had very little effect in allaying the excitement which prevailed. The "Puseyite party," as they were termed by their opponents, were very quiet.

Mr. Joseph Smith, solicitor, of Arbour-street, East, Stepney, prosecuted for all the complainants; Mr. Sergeant Ballantine, instructed by Mr. King and Mr. Hind, solicitors, appeared for the defendants.

The case against the Rev. Mr. Dove was then entered into. Herbert said that finding he could not obtain an

entrance into the church at the door where Stutfield and Adams were placed, he went to another side door which led to the children's gallery and vestry, where the clergy dressed. The outer door was not locked. He had to go up the steps, and then enter the small vestry-room. He went across the vestry-room to the door which opens on to the church. That door was locked. He returned back again, and Dove there laid hold of him to shove him out of the vestry room, and others came forward, and shoved him behind. The door was opened, and as he was leaving, it was hastily closed again by the defendant, and his leg was jammed in, and detained there about a minute and a half. He was in great pain, and called out, "Oh, my leg; look at my leg," and also called upon Mr. Williams, a ratepayer, to extricate him. Dove pressed against the door, and the friends of the Rector in the vestry laughed at him and clapped their hands and seemed to enjoy the pain he was in. He had been very lame ever since. He had two leeches applied to his leg, and it was bandaged. When he attended the evening service, on the same night, he had to rest his leg in the churchwarden's pew.'

In cross-examination by Mr. Serjeant Ballantine, the witness said he did not force his way in at the front entrance. That was closed entirely. "Murder" and "Police" were called out in the church while the rector and his friends were ill-using the parishioners. He did not hear the people call out, but others did. Mr. Dove shoved him and slammed the door upon him. Mr. Dove did not say he was liable to an action for trespass. He was not returning to the church door when he was shoved, but leaving the vestry.

Mr. Hood, boot and shoe maker, and a parishioner of S. George's confirmed the statement of Herbert.

Mr. Selfe directed the witness to go to the magistrate's door, which opens into the court, and place himself in the position Mr. Hebert was in.

This direction caused great amusement, which was increased when the witness expressed his objection to be a

living illustration of Mr. Herbert's sufferings. At length he was prevailed upon to do so, and, after opening the door of the court went out, closed it upon himself, and left part of his left leg and foot in the court, amidst roars of laughter.

Mr. Selfe.—Silence! you are not in S. George's Church to-day.

Mr. Serjeant Ballantine.—That is the best piece of evidence I ever saw.

Mr. Selfe.—Then Mr. Herbert's foot and a portion of his leg were in the vestry?

Mr. Hood.—Exactly so, sir; he was pushed out backwards.

Mr. George Williams, Mr. Edward Hofford, and Mr. William Morgan, all ratepayers of S. George's all confirmed the statement of Mr. Herbert, and spoke to the evidence of the Rev. Mr. Dove and the rector's friends in vestry when Mr. Herbert's leg was jammed, and he was calling for help, "For God's sake open the door, and try to let me out." Mr. Dove was pressing against the door, and the party were laughing at the complainant. Mr. Morgan also said he was dragged out of the church into the vestry, and detained there as a prisouer for a quarter of an hour by the rector's friends.

Mr. Serjeant Ballantine asked the magistrate if he thought there was any case at all?

Mr. Selfe.—As it stands at present, the complainant was going out of the vestry, and there was no occasion whatever to push him or lay hands upon him at all.

Mr. Serjeant Ballantine urged that the presence of the complainant and others in the church after the service was clearly illegal. The people who remained in the church in defiance of the Rector, were properly ejected. They were there to retain possession of the choristers' seats, and to act riotously at the evening service, and to do things which the law would not recognise, and never could be recognised in a civilised country. He commented on the

evidence and said there were considerable discrepancies. The story told by one of the witnesses, a lad, was a parcel of falsehoods (hisses).

Mr. Selfe ordered the police in attendance to remove any one who disturbed the proceedings.

Mr. Serjeant Ballantine.—Never mind. I do not care for hissing if the people do not make a noise. The complainant was endeavoring to force his way in a second time, and all that the Rev. gentleman did was to close the door.

Mr. Selfe said that Mr. Herbert had certainly received injury, but he believed not intentionally. He thought Mr. Herbert had in one respect said that which was not entirely correct, but on the whole he thought the matter might be settled very amicably.

Mr. Serjeant Ballantine said if the matter was put into his hands, he would soon arrange the whole affair.

Mr. Selfe.—So the Bishop of London thought, but he could not do so.

After some discussion between the professional gentlemen engaged in the case, it was agreed that the magistrate should award compensation to Mr. Herbert for the injury he sustained. Mr. Selfe said he did not believe the complainant was endeavoring to force his way into the church a second time and that he met with the injury while going out. In strict law Mr. Dove was in error. Mr. Herbert had been put to some expense for leeches and bandages, and he should award him 40s., which Mr. Dove must pay.

Mr. Smith.—And the lawyers' expenses?

Mr. Selfe.—I have taken into account all the leeches, (laughter). Mr. Dove, pay Mr. Herbert 40s., and there will be an end to this case.

The Rev. Bryan King was next charged with assaulting Mr. William Raby.

The Complainant and several witnesses gave evidence at great length.

Mr Raby remained in the church after the afternoon

service had terminated, with the intention of remaining until the evening service, and was unceremoniously ejected by the Rector, who, it was sworn, seized him by the neck and pressed his hands against his throat. Mr. Raby said, "Don't strike me." He was thrust through the small vestry-room and ejected from the church.

Police-serjeant Kettering, No. 7 K, who was called for the prosecution, stated that he saw the choristers and other friends of Mr. King in the church handling the people roughly. Mr. King seized the complainant, who wanted to go out at the principal doorway; but Mr. King, who used considerable force, got hold of Mr. Raby by the collar and pushed him into the vestry. Others were assisting the Rector in pushing Mr. Raby into the vestry. He should have used less force with the worst, most disorderly, and violent character in Batcliff-highway than was used towards Mr. Raby, (hear, hear). No disorderly character was ever used so roughly by the police as Mr. Raby was by the Rector and his friends (applause).

Other Policemen gave evidence in confirmation of the complainant.

Mr. Serjeant Ballantine said the right of the Rector to eject intruders in his church was admitted on both sides. The Rector had a perfect right to eject Mr. Raby from the church if he refused to leave when he was desired to do so, and the only question was, had the Rector been guilty of any excess. He called several witnesses, including Mr. Thomas Wilson, gentleman, of Halford-terrace, South Kensington; Mr. Atkinson, Hyde-vale, Blackheath; Mr. Stephen Lamert, of the Forest, Walthamstow, personal friends of the Rector, and Mr. Barton Stutfield, a chorister, who all swore no violence was used by the Rector, and that he merely put his hand on Mr. Raby's arm, and "in the most polite manner" requested him to leave the church, and on his declining to do so through the vestry, gently led him to it, and once, and once only, put his hand on the complainant's shoulder, but not roughly or

violently. The rector never seized complainant by the collar at all, and had his collegiate cap in his hand all the time.

Mr. Selfe said he must apply the same rule to this case as to the common every-day cases. When he could not reconcile conflicting evidence he gave the benefit of the doubt to the person charged. He believed that Raby, his witnesses, and the police, intended to tell the truth. Mr. Smith admitted all the people in the church without the Rector's consent were trespassers, and Mr. King had a right to remove them. Mr. King had no right to use any more force than was absolutely necessary to remove a trespasser after he was requested to leave the church. He believed Mr. King did not intend to commit an assault. The case was not made out to his (Mr. Selfe's) satisfaction and he dismissed the summons.

Mr. Smith said he would withdraw the other summonses, on which his clients insisted on their being proceeded with, and there were cries from all parts of the court of "Go on, go on, Mr. Smith."

After considerable discussion and a great display of hostile feeling on the part of the auditory towards the clergy and choristers, Mr. Sergeant Ballantine said he was compelled to leave in consequence of holding a retainer for a distant place, and Mr. Soyer, the solicitor, conducted the defence of the accused parties.

The Rev. Bryan King was then charged with assaulting Thomas Newson, a clerk, of 89, Canon-street-road.

The summons was withdrawn.

Albert Edward Coleman, a chorister, was charged with assaulting Richard James Seeley, a youth, and was fined 3*l*.

The last charge was preferred by Alexander Littlejohn, jun. ; the defendant was the Rev. Bryan King.

After hearing the evidence,

Mr. Selfe said, the unhappy differences in the parish were not caused by the particular services and modes of worship adopted by the Rector. It did not emanate from

him, but from an indiscreet subordinate who set himself up in opposition to the rights of the parishioners. Up to that time there were no disturbances. The outward manifestations of hostility to the Rector were not caused by his choral services and ceremonials originally. It was an error to suppose so. The church was nearly empty at every service. The particular services had been carried on for 14 years and upwards with no interruption. There was no opposition to the Rector by outward acts in the exercise of his spiritual duties while the rights of the parishioners were not interfered with, but directly they were these unhappy differences commenced, and deplorable scenes followed. He hoped all persons who disapproved of the Rector's service would stay away. For the excess which had been proved he should inflict a nominal fine on the Rector of 5s. only.

---

UU—PAGE 503.

CONSISTORY COURT—TUESDAY, APRIL 17.

(*Before* DR. TRAVER'S TWISS, *Judge.*)

THE REV. BRYAN KING AGAINST ROSIER.

This morning having been appointed by the learned judge to deliver his judgment in this painfully notorious case,

Mr. Rosier, accompanied by several friends, appeared in court to receive such judgment.

It will be recollected that the case was heard before Dr. Twiss, on Tuesday, the 3rd inst., when a large number of witnesses, including Captain Savage Hall, were examined, Mr. Rowley, the Schoolmaster, and Mr. Blatchford positively swore to the fact that, on the 14th of August, during the celebration of the afternoon service, the Rev. W. P. Burn, the officiating curate, fell down in a fit, when Mr.

Rosier exclaimed, "It is a judgment of God upon him; God has struck him down; down with Bryan King." On the part of Rosier, he himself, as also a large number of parishioners, were examined, who denied that it was Mr. Rosier who uttered the words. The second charge preferred against Mr. Rosier by the Rev. Bryan King was that, when the church was re-opened on the 6th of November, he approached Captain Savage Hall, a member of the congregation, but not a parishioner, and exclaimed "This thing calls himself a captain; he is a disgrace to the army." It was also alleged that he approached Mr. Blatchford, another member of the congregation, saying, "This man means to swear I spat upon him in Welleclose-square." Out of these transactions proceedings took place at the Thames Police-court, which were fully reported at the time.

Dr. Travers Twiss, in delivering his judgment, commenced by saying that the suit was instituted by the Rev. Bryan King, the Rector of S. George's-in-the-East, against Mr. Rosier, a parishioner. The decree, which was served on the 28th of January, cited Mr. Rosier to appear in that court to answer certain articles, charging him with brawling, chiding, and quarrelling during and after the performance of Divine service on Sunday, August the 14th, and Sunday, Nov. 6. The proceedings were instituted under the general ecclesiastical law, but the charges were laid in the terms of the 5th Edward VI., cap. 4, which enacted that "in the case of any person who by words or otherwise chided, brawled, or quarrelled, it should be lawful for the ordinary of the place to suspend him from entering the church, and if a clerk, to suspend him from the ministrations of his office." The same statute went on to enact severe penalties upon those who smote or laid their hand upon one another in any church or church yard. The immediate object of the act was to repress the disturbances which, in the early period after the Reformation, were apt to break out amongst the most ardent supporters of the

Reformation, and the equally zealous supporters of the Latin ritual. Since that time it had been made of wider application. At the same time, he must say that the jurisdiction exercised by the Ecclesiastical Courts in this country did not depend upon that statute, nor did the statute create the crime of brawling charged in this particular case, inasmuch as the statute was passed to aid in the punishment of, and by no means to create, the offence. Any disturbance (vide Hawkins, in his "Pleas of the Crown") in a church were visited with severity, rationally, which in other cases would probably pass altogether unnoticed; the object clearly was to protect the worship of the sanctuary from desecration, and to preserve the repose of the dead. The evidence which had been adduced before the Court imputed to Mr. Rosier that he brawled by words, and he was moreover charged of being guilty of that offence on two occasions. When application was made to the Court by the Rev. Bryan King, the promoter of the suit, to permit the office of the judge to be promoted, he (Dr. Twiss) required an affidavit to be put in by an eye-witness of the transactions. This was done, and a *prima facie* case having been made, he allowed the office of the judge to be promoted. He would now proceed to consider what were the specific charges against Mr. Rosier. They were of a twofold character, and Mr. Rosier had given in a negative issue to both. In the first place it was charged against him that on the 14th of August, at the four o'clock service, when the Rev. Mr. Burn, the officiating curate, fell down in a fit, he exclaimed, "It is a judgment of God upon him, down with Bryan King," or words to that effect, and that he thus caused great disturbance in the church, whereby the service was interrupted. Upon those points three witnesses had been called, one a parishioner and two nonparishioners. This evidence, if it stood alone, would go to show that two of the witnesses had not seen Mr. Rosier until that date, and that neither of them had heard him say, "Down with Bryan King," although they heard him use the other

words. In his defence Mr. Rosier called 13 witnesses, the accuracy of one or two of whom could not be relied upon, but the general accuracy of the witnesses called by Mr. Rosier he was fully prepared to admit. Into the details of that evidence he would not go, but he would state his general impressions, founded upon an examination of the general testimony, the result of which was, that the Court did not think the charges against Mr. Rosier had been established. With regard to the second charge, that of the 6th of November, in which it was alleged Mr. Rosier approached Captain Savage Hall, saying, "This thing calls himself a captain. He is a disgrace to the army; he is a greasy swell," and other words. Two witnesses had been called by the prosecution, while Mr. Rosier had only called one, (Mr. Toone,) who evidently did not speak to the same transaction as that charged. Those words were words of great aggravation, and calculated to produce immediate disturbance. The prayer of the prosecutor was, that the Court should admonish Mr. Rosier. The Court had no difficulty in complying with that portion of the prayer. The Court was further prayed to condemn Mr. Rosier in the costs of the proceedings. On this part of the prayer it would be necessary for him to say a few words before pronouncing his decision. It had always been laid down in the ecclesiastical courts that the cost of causes were in the discretion of the Court. By that it was not meant that costs could be granted or withheld at discretion, as they were always within the discussion of the counsel. At the same time costs might be mitigated, and it had been the practice of the Consistory and the Arches Court, when the promoter had not proved all his case, to direct that the person be condemned to a certain sum, which he should fix at 10*l*.

Dr. Phillimore asked the judge to tell Mr. Rosier he was admonished and condemned, and would be guilty of contempt if he did not obey the orders of the Court.

Mr. Rosier said—I appeal from this court to the nation

as an innocent man, and declare it is a malicious prosecution, and as a British subject I demand justice.

Mr. Rosier and all the parties left in a state of great excitement.

---

VV—PAGE 503.

(I.)

*Rectory, S. George's-in-the-East, March 2, 1860.*

Right Honorable Sir,—On Sunday last no police were present at my church at the Lecturer's Service, commencing at 3.30, P.M., (indeed neither the churchwarden nor myself anticipated any necessity for their attendance,) but, as a drunken woman (who was fined 10s. at the Thames Police Court for the offence on Monday last) had to be removed from the church for making a disturbance, the attendance of some policemen would seem to be necessary.

Again, a number of the congregation persisted in remaining in the church from the conclusion of that service at 4.30 P.M., until the evening service at 7. P.M., some of whom pelted the altar with stair-carpet rods, orang-e-peel, &c., and thus injured some of the altar furniture; when the curate in charge appealed to the Superintendent of Police to remove the people from the church, he declined to do so, as being unauthorised by his instructions.

Sir Richard Mayne has since been appealed to, but he replies that, "if the Rector is of opinion that different instructions ought to be given to the Police for their guidance, he proposes that the Rector should make an application to the Secretary of State on the subject."

On these grounds then I beg, very respectfully, to request that you will be kind enough to authorize the Police to prevent people from remaining in the church after the conclusion of any public service.

I am, &c.,

(Signed) BRYAN KING.

To Sir Geo. C. Lewis, Bart., &c., &c., &c.

(II.)

*Whitehall, March 3, 1860.*

Sir,—I am directed by Secretary Sir George Lewis to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of yesterday's date, asking him to authorise the police to prevent people from remaining in the parish church of S. George's-in-the-East, after the conclusion of any public service, and I am to inform you that it is not competent to a police-constable to use force for expelling from a church persons who remain there after public service, provided that they conduct themselves in a quiet and peaceable manner. If a person under such circumstances should commit a breach of the peace, or should do any injury to property, the police would take him into custody.

I am, &amp;c.,

(Signed) GEO. CLIVE.

The Rev. Bryan King,  
Rectory, S. George's-in-the-East.

---

*Rectory, S. George's-in-the-East, 6th March, 1860.*

Right Honorable Sir,—I beg very respectfully to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of the 3rd ult., in which you state "that it is not competent to a police constable to use force for expelling from a church persons who remain there after public service, provided that they conduct themselves in a quiet and peaceable manner." In reference to this remark, I would beg to bring under your notice the conduct of the police on Sunday last, (March 4th). The afternoon service was completed at a quarter before 5 P.M.; at 20 minutes before 6 P.M., I entered the church with several friends, and found about fifty persons in possession of the choir-stalls and their precincts. I requested several of them to leave the church, which they did; two or three others refused to do so, when I requested some of my friends to remove them, which they did; but as considerable disturbance took place, and a serious breach of the peace seemed imminent in their carrying out my directions as to the forcible removal of others, I sent for the police, who were stationed at the church gates. Upon their entrance, I requested the Serjeant (K 7) to remove the people from the church, as they were com-

mitting a trespass ; he refused to do so, stating that my friends were creating the disturbance by removing people, and that he should take any of them in charge who committed an assault. The police then left the church. After this, it was, of course, hopeless to attempt to clear the church ; when I requested some to leave, they replied “if we have no right to be here, why did the police refuse to remove us ?”

Now, during the afternoon, some of the people thus remaining in the church crammed one of the altar carpets into one of the stoves, and did some other mischief. Some had provisions and took their meal in the church, and some person (I shrink from the necessity of stating this disgusting circumstance) made use of a pew (No. 16, in the south aisle) as a water-closet.

May I then beg the favor of your kindly informing me, for my future guidance, whether those people who were committing a palpable trespass by insisting on remaining in the church against my consent, and who forcibly resisted those who were lawfully trying to remove them, were to be considered as “conducting themselves in a quiet and peaceable manner;” and therefore whether the police sergeant was justified in refusing to remove them ?

And if so, may I further beg the favor of your kindly informing me what steps I am to take in the event of these trespassers or others insisting upon taking up their permanent residence within my church ? It is open twice or three times every day (for about an hour at each time) for Divine Service, and it may not unreasonably be expected to offer greater attractions than the work-house as a residence to many who at present are obliged to occupy that building as a home.

I am, &c.,

(Signed) BRYAN KING.

To the Right Hon. Sir Geo. C. Lewis, Bart., &c., &c., &c.

VV—PAGE 503.

*Rectory, S. George's-in-the-East, 19th Jan. 1860.*

Right Honorable Sir,—I very respectfully beg leave to appeal to you under the following circumstances ;—

On the 8th Dec., ult., Mr. Yardley inflicted a fine of 2s. upon the Rev. C. F. Lowder, one of the assistant curates of this parish, at the Thames Police Court, on these grounds :—

A number of disorderly persons had been in the habit of entering my church some time before the commencement of Divine Service, for the purpose of taking possession of the choir stalls, and of thus excluding the choir from their customary seats; to obviate this, I adopted the plan of admitting several personal friends into the church before the doors were open to the public, through a door leading into the vestry, of which door I alone possessed the key, and of which door no one except the Rector has ever possessed a key.

On my leaving home, I left the key in the hands of Mr. Lowder.

On the morning of Sunday, December 4th, Mr. Lowder was admitting friends through the door in question, when a person named Jones attempted to force an entrance for himself. Mr. Lowder resisted him, and succeeded in excluding him from the entrance, at the same time directing him to the public entrance of the church.

Mr. Yardley, though characterizing the prosecution as "spiteful," seemed to be of opinion that, inasmuch as other persons were allowed to enter the church through my private door, the complainant Jones had a right to do so, (for no plea of unnecessary violence was, I believe, sustained,) and so inflicted on Mr. Lowder the nominal fine of 2*s.* for the assault.

Now, in a parish so unhappily circumstanced as my own at the present time, this conviction has operated to injure the character, and so to impair the usefulness of Mr. Lowder; and a number of parishioners and others have obtained the opinion of Dr. Phillimore and Mr. Coleridge, upon the conviction (a copy of which I beg to enclose,) in the hope that you may deem it right to request Mr. Yardley to revise his decision upon the above case, and to remit the fine exacted from Mr. Lowder.

I need scarcely say, that in thus giving expression to their wishes upon the subject, I earnestly unite with them in the hope that the vindication of Mr. Lowder's character, may be deemed to be compatible with the strictest justice.

I am, &c.,  
(Signed) BRYAN KING.

The Right Hon. Sir G. C. Lewis, Bart., &c., &c., &c.

---

*Whitehall, 25th January, 1860.*

Sir,—I am directed by Secretary Sir George Lewis to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of the 19th inst., requesting a revision of the decision of Mr. Yardley, in a charge of assault preferred by Mr. Jones against the Rev. Mr. Lowder.

I am, &c.,

(Signed) GEO. CLIVE.

---

*Ex parte* REV. C. F. LOWDER,

*Opinion.*

We have considered this case, and are of opinion as follows :—

1. We think that the freehold of the church is vested absolutely in the incumbent, subject only to the right of the parishioners (and other persons after the parishioners have been accommodated) to be present within it at all times when the public worship of God, or religious ceremonies, which are by law public ceremonies, are going forward. We think the times for the performance of such acts of worship or ceremonies are in the discretion of the incumbent, subject to the control of the ordinary, and that the means of access to the church are also in the discretion of the incumbent, to be reasonably exercised, and subject to the ordinary's general control. We think, therefore, that every parishioner has, and, subject to the rights of the parishioners as above explained, the public generally have, a right to be present during the celebration in a consecrated church, of a public ceremony; and we think it clear, from long custom, and from many expressions in the service, and the rubrics for the service of solemnization of matrimony in the Prayer Book that the ceremony of marriage is a public ceremony. If, therefore, there had been any attempt, at S. George's-in-the-East, to perform the ceremony of marriage in private in the church, or to exclude the parishioners or the public from the church during the performance of such ceremony, we should have thought Mr. Lowder not justified in excluding Mr. Jones, in the manner described in the case

before us. But we understand that Mr. Jones attempted to enter through a door leading into a vestry used by the rector, as is the common and immemorial practice in very many churches throughout England, for his own access, or for the access of persons by his permission to the church, that he did so before the large doors of the church were opened, and that these large doors were, in fact, opened a considerable time before the marriage service was begun, so that no parishioner, nor any one of the public, was excluded in any manner from being present, if he thought fit, at the performance of such service. It appears also, that Mr. Lowder told Mr. Jones that the particular way he wished to enter was not the way for him, not that there was any attempt made to exclude him from entering the church by the doors open to the public generally. We are of opinion that it follows, from the freehold of the church being in the rector, that he has the right to the use of a private door, of which he alone may keep the key, through which door he has a right to prevent any one he pleases from entering the church, so long as he allows to the parishioners and the public means of access reasonably sufficient at times when, as we have said, they have a right to be in the church. It follows, therefore, (and we are of opinion), that Mr. Jones had no right to enter the church at the time, and by the door at which he attempted to enter; and therefore Mr. Lowder was justified in excluding him from entering the church by that door at that time.

II. The question before the magistrate being one of assault, we do not see how he could avoid hearing it, and we do not think he exceeded his jurisdiction; we think his decision incorrect, in point of law, for the reasons above given, and if the conviction discloses the same state of facts as that on which we have advised, we think it would be quashed.

(Signed)      ROBERT PHILLIMORE,  
J. D. COLERIDGE.

Doctor's Commons, 16th January, 1860.

---

## THE S. BARNABAS CHURCH CASE.

APPEAL COURT, DOCTORS' COMMONS.—WEDNESDAY.  
(Before DR. ROBERTSON.)

*The Honorable and Rev. Robert Liddell, Incumbent, Parkes and Evans, Churchwardens of S. Barnabas, Pimlico, v. Beal.*

This morning this case came before the Court. The case formerly embraced the cause of Mr. Westerton against Mr. Liddell, in reference to S. Paul's Church, Knightsbridge, but the arguments to-day had reference simply to S. Barnabas.

Mr. Stevens, Q.C., who appeared for Mr. Beal, said that this was a cause of appeal and complaint of nullity from the Arches Court of Canterbury, to her Majesty in Council, promoted and brought by the Hon. and Rev. Robert Liddell, clerk, the incumbent, and William Parke and George Evans, the church or chapel wardens of the church or chapel of ease of S. Barnabas, Pimlico, in the district chapelry of S. Paul's, Knightsbridge, in the county of Middlesex, diocese of London and province of Canterbury, the appellants and complainants of the one part, against James Beal, an inhabitant of that part of the said district chapelry more immediately connected with the said chapel of ease, the party appellate, and complained of on the other part. It appeared that some time before 1855 the Protestant form of worship was abandoned in the Church of S. Barnabas, and that mediæval customs were introduced of so strange a character that the incumbent and churchwardens were brought before the Consistory Court. In the Consistory Court the monition against Mr. Liddell and his wardens was, that he should remove, or cause to be removed, the rood-screen separating the chancel from the nave of the said chapel, and the brazen gates

thereto, and the cross on the summit of the said screen, as well as the stone altar, or high altar, which had been set up in the chancel of the chapel, and the altar cloths with which the same was covered, together with the cross ornamented with precious and costly jewels, elevated and fixed and attached to the centre of the said altar, or high altar, and the candlesticks, with candles, placed upon the altar, and the preparatory altar, or credence table of marble, attached to the side of the chancel, and to substitute, or cause to be substituted, in lieu or instead thereof, a decent communion table for the administration of the Lord's Supper, with a decent covering thereto, and to set up on the east end of the said chapel the Ten Commandments; and was promoted and brought by the said James Beal against the Hon. and Rev. Robert Liddell. The case went from the Consistory to the Arches' Court, the judgment in each case being adverse to Mr. Liddell, who took it to the Judicial Committee of Privy Council. The case was heard, and her Majesty's Privy Council agreed to report to her Majesty their opinion that a monition ought to be issued, requiring Mr. Liddell and his wardens to remove the structure of stone used as a communion table, together with the cross, and to provide instead thereof a flat moveable table of wood, to remove any cover used at the time of the ministration of the Lord's Supper, worked or embroidered with lace, or otherwise ornamented, and to provide and substitute a fair white linen cloth, without lace or embroidery, or other ornament, to cover the communion table at the time of the ministration of the Lord's Supper, and to cause the Ten Commandments to be set up on or against the east end of the said church or chapel, in compliance with the terms of the canon in that case made and provided. The monition was duly served upon the churchwardens of S. Barnabas, but up to the present time it had not been obeyed, and the appeal now made was to enforce obedience thereof. Messrs. Parke and Evans were not now churchwardens, and the

Court might either pronounce them in contempt, or might issue a monition to the present churchwardens to compel them to obey the directions of the Privy Council. In order to show that the directions of the Privy Council had not been carried out the learned gentleman submitted an affidavit made by the Rev. Dr. Wilson, late Fellow of S. John's College, Cambridge, and now of Gough House, Chelsea. The Rev. Gentleman deposed that on the 1st of April last, at evening prayer, he attended Divine Service at S. Barnabas, and that he observed what appeared to him a metal cross, ornamented with precious stones or jewels, placed immediately above the table used as a communion table, standing upon the sill of the great eastern window of the chapel; that the table, instead of being a flat table, had an elevation of structure of about six or eight inches in height placed thereon so as to resemble what is generally known as a super-altar, in Roman Catholic churches or chapels. He further observed that the Ten Commandments were set up on or against the wall on each side of the chancel screen, but outside the chancel at the end of the nave and in the body of the chapel, and not written on or painted on or against the wall, but on two long pieces of card-board, attached to or hung on the said walls or pillars. Dr. Robertson said that for a time after the Reformation it was considered necessary that the Ten Commandments, the Creed and the Lord's Prayer, should be set up in churches, as people had not many books, and no doubt any one who pleased could enforce it, but it was not now a matter of general practice in our churches.

Mr. Stevens said he believed that was the case. He proceeded to say that Dr. Wilson again visited the church on the 13th of April, and observed that it was decorated in various parts with collections of flowers; that the communion table, approached immediately by several steps, had two large collections of flowers placed on the super-altar; that two large candlesticks, with large candles in them, were likewise placed on the super-altar. He observed that

the table was withdrawn from the wall about 14 inches, and, that a wooden cross, ornamented with flowers, was fastened against the wall directly over against the middle of the super-altar, the table and the cross on the wall being so arranged that when viewed from the gates of the chancel screen the cross on the wall seemed to be part of the super-altar. This cross seemed to be between two and three feet in length, with the cross bar in proportion, in front of which cross there was a box, apparently forming part of the super-altar. He also observed that the font for baptism was much decorated with flowers, the font being likewise surmounted with a cross, ornamented with flowers. Similar affidavits from Dr. Hunter and Mr. Hall, churchwarden of S. Paul's, Knightsbridge, were referred to by the learned counsel. Mr. Westerton, also, by affidavit confirmed the statements of the other deponents, and gave a lengthened account of conversations he had had with the Bishop of London. After a lengthened argument, in which a vast number of cases were cited, Mr. Stevens contended that the names of Messrs. Evans and Parke were surplusage, and that the monition was addressed to the office of churchwarden, and not to the individuals. He therefore prayed the Court to amend the monition, so as to compel the present churchwardens to carry out in their integrity the orders of the Judicial Committee of Privy council. If the Court decided that the monition was directed individually to Messrs. Parke and Evans, he should ask the Court to pronounce them in contempt. He could not refrain from saying that, throughout the whole of these transactions, Mr. Westerton, who had frequently served the office of churchwarden, and who had just been re-elected to that office, had behaved with the greatest forbearance; while Mr. Liddell and his curates, who ate the bread of the Protestant Church, did everything they could to undermine her faith and to Romanise her practices.

Dr. Robertson said he would deliver judgment on the next court day.

EXTRACT FROM THE REPORT OF THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND  
PROTECTION SOCIETY.

Objects of the C.E.P.S. But your Committee venture to claim a distinct and prominent place for the objects of your own Society; for they are sure that, when these are lost to view, the spirit of love and zeal, which can alone inspire your efforts with life and bring them to success, will die out, and then all will utterly fail.

The objects of your Society may be summed up in one—to maintain the Truth, as the English Church has received it. To maintain “State privileges and rights” is a high object; but to maintain the Truth of God is the highest of all. And for this there is more need than for that; for this is more assailed, and it has fewer to stand up for it. In all ages God has permitted Error to oppose Truth. But so also in almost all ages Truth has been vindicated by fearless and true-hearted witnesses. We have among us errors and attacks on the Truth in abundance. Our fearless and true-hearted witnesses are few.

Against the Pelagians stood up S. Augustine; against the Arians, S. Athanasius; against the Nestorians, S. Cyril; against the Macedonian heretics, S. Gregory Nazianzen; against the Eutychians, S. Leo; and so on. But who stands up now against those who, in this our day of perfect freedom in thought and speech, assail the Truth which God has given us?

And yet there is the same power and energy about error as when S. Paul called it *Ἐνέργειαν πλάνης*. Indeed, in this it resembles Truth. And it can only be opposed by the activity, and efficacy, and energy, and power of Truth. So that without energy and activity in those who have the Truth and believe in it, error will not be opposed at all.

Your Committee desire to insist upon this as the thing to be done—to call out the gifts and talents of Churchmen—their knowledge, their time, their wealth, their influence, their prayers, their enduring labours for the

defence of the Church of England, by which they are called, and of the Truth which that Church maintains.

Hitherto it would seem as if Churchmen had thought, with Issachar, that "rest was good," though it be with "burdens." But the days of rest have passed away with the days of security. Now is the day of danger, and with it the day of hard work and earnest persevering toil. He Who has ordained the end of all labor, has ordained labor. "Καὶ τέλος, καὶ τὰ πρὸς το τέλος."

---

LETTER FROM REV. P. CHEYNE.

AAA—PAGE 523.

Venerable Sirs, Rev. Brethren, my Lords and gentlemen—I regret that a tedious and painful illness has delayed the acknowledgment due from me for the Address with which you have lately honored me. Any words I can use would but feebly express the emotions which that Address has awakened in my heart. I shall not attempt to give utterance to what I feel. You may be assured that no time will efface the recollection of the Christian sympathy and Christian boldness with which you have taken part with one who has suffered in an unpopular cause, it may be, but a cause most holy, for which it is a duty to live, and would be a glory to die. The roll in which your signatures are inscribed will remain in the church where I have so long ministered as a witness to encourage those who shall come after me faithfully to keep and fearlessly to teach the truth of God, however they may, for a time, be deserted by the lukewarm and the timid, or oppressed by the powerful; since they may find in this instance an assurance that they are not alone in their witness; that, besides the faithful of past ages, there will not be wanting some in the present—more or fewer—to unite with them, to rejoice in their success, or sympathise in their disappointments and their trials.

My mind has been deeply impressed with this since I received your Address. Personally unknown, as I am, to almost every one who has signed it, there could be no motives of a private nature to call forth this remarkable, if not unprecedented, demonstration. It could have arisen only from a deed conviction that vital truths,

affecting our whole communion, were involved, to which the interests of an individual were entirely secondary and subordinate. And I rejoice that it is so. I rejoice that no inferior considerations can have mingled with your testimony to compromise its freedom and its purity, or to detract from its value.

I understand and receive your Address as a solemn declaration, before God and the Church, that you hold as Catholic verities those doctrines which have been recently condemned in Scotland, and recognize in me a consistent teacher and defender of them. I do not suppose that those who have signed the Address are pledged to everything I have said, or approved every step I may have taken in the new and complicated circumstances in which I have been placed; but I think I cannot be mistaken in regarding it as a profession of the personal belief of the subscribers in those great truths for which I have been called in question, and an acknowledgment that I have not said or done anything unbecoming a faithful witness and teacher of the truth.

If anything had been needed to strengthen my convictions, or inspire confidence in the general rectitude of the course I have pursued in this matter, it would have been amply sufficient to appeal to the deliberate opinion of so many persons, who, by their position and character, their learning and habits, are qualified to form an intelligent and unbiassed judgment on the case, both in its theological and legal aspect.

There can be no doubt, I presume, that such persons, having formed their judgment, had a right to express it as they have done. This seems to be the necessary result of the Inter-communion of the two Churches. If such inter-communion exist, then nothing affecting the interests of truth can occur in the one which does not very nearly touch the other; and we show far more the reality of this communion by acts of mutual charity than by empty protestations which end in nothing. We in Scotland felt this very strongly a few years ago, when the doctrine of Holy Baptism seemed to be endangered in England; though, in that case, the issue was made to turn—and was actually decided—not on the truth or falsehood of the doctrine, but upon the conditions of Institution. But, in the present case, the issue is far more momentous. The doctrines themselves, and nothing but the doctrines, are in question; and the result has been such as to affect the relation of the Churches.

Doctrines have been condemned in Scotland which the Church of England has never condemned ; and it has been attempted to enforce by authority an explanation of the Anglican Formularies hitherto unknown to either Church, while clergymen are liable to deprivation who refuse to accept that explanation ; so that the terms of communion are no longer what they were. They have been altered by the introduction of a new test ; and, though it may not be applied in that way, it comes to the same thing so long as a clergyman may be brought up and punished for teaching contrary to that novel explanation of the formularies. How this may stand as regards inter-communion with the English Church, which knows no such explanation, is a serious question for those whom it may concern. Be that as it may, there can be no doubt whatever that doctrines have been condemned in Scotland which have been, and are received for truth, throughout Christendom. They are not in the number of those points of difference which divide us externally from other parts of the Church : may the Lord, in His good time, heal that miserable breach ! They are of those Christian verities which have descended to us through all ages, and which the changes in the sixteenth century did not affect. The Church of England then professed to throw off only that which was extraneous, leaving the essential and external truth untouched, and she expressly named in her Articles those doctrines which she intended to mark out for condemnation and rejection. It matters not that all within her pale have not been agreed on these points. It cannot be denied that there have been different schools of opinion on Sacramental doctrines, and this may be an argument for mutual charity and toleration, (I wish it had been a little thought of amongst us) ; but I believe there can be no doubt what her real doctrine is on the other. If there is a doubt, there can be no faith.

It seems to have been felt that something was necessary to mitigate the odium of the sentence passed upon me ; and hence, I suppose, it has been industriously circulated everywhere that I was condemned, not for false doctrine, but for claiming the authority of the Church for my teaching. Nothing can be more groundless. The *Finding* of the Court of appeal—a Finding which it went out of its way to bring about—condemns my doctrines as “erroneous, and more or less in contradiction to, and subversive of, the Church as explained in the Opinions of the majority of the Court now delivered ;” and I was called upon, not to withdraw an unfounded

claim of authority, but "absolutely and unconditionally to retract the teaching" thus condemned. I do, of course, claim the authority of the Church; and I suppose any one who puts forth any doctrine, as of faith, does the same; for I cannot conceive a priest teaching a doctrine or subject which he does not believe to be the true one, and this necessarily implies the authority of the Church. But this point did not enter into the Finding of the Court, which passed without the slightest reference to anything of the sort. The doctrines were condemned as *in themselves* "as erroneous and subversive," &c.; and the only alternative proposed to me was simple retraction. I am rather surprised, indeed, that pains should have been taken to make it appear as if the case had been otherwise; for nothing but the most wicked heresy could justify in the sight of God or man the treatment I have received. But I thank God I can take it, not only patiently but joyfully, as part of my appointed cross. I never thought much about myself one way or other, and therefore I have now but little of personal feeling. I have done everything in my feeble way for the truth, and I have no doubt that my suffering—much as it is—will turn to its furtherance, as I know to some extent it has done already. So that God be glorified and the true Faith be advanced, I am well content to be a victim. My native Church may yet be saved, if men, through their own supineness, do not allow the truth to be overborne; or, if she sink into a mere Protestant denomination, we must confess that we have deserved that degradation by our sins. But I still hope and pray for better things. Though she has cast me out, I cannot divest myself of love to the Church for which I have laboured forty years; nor can I see her drifting away from Catholicity without the greatest pain. My own connection with her—at present only provisional—will soon be at an end. Denied even *toleration*, I am driven in my old age to seek a new abode. But, wherever I am, I shall carry with me the grateful remembrance that there were more than four thousand members of the Church of England who were not afraid openly to express their sympathy with the persecuted; and my prayer will ever be for their welfare in time and in eternity.

With the deepest emotions of gratitude and thankfulness,

I am, dear Brethren,

Your faithful servant in Christ,

P. CHEYNE.

*Aberdeen, May 20, 1860.*





## E R R A T A .

| Page. | Line. |                                                  |
|-------|-------|--------------------------------------------------|
| viii. | ult.  | for "has" read "had."                            |
| 34    | 33    | for "Harrington" read "Harvington."              |
| 35    | 27    | for "rioters" read "rioters."                    |
| 36    | 58    | dele "Rev."                                      |
| 37    | 24    | for "Chudlock" read "Chideock."                  |
| 49    | 14    | for "asservation" read "asseveration."           |
| 57    | 17    | for "hands" read "bands."                        |
| 68    | 6     | dele "and."                                      |
| 76    | 5 & 6 | for "Mother churches" read "Mother of churches." |
| 77    | 13    | for "was" read "is."                             |
| 86    | 30    | for "hem" read "them."                           |
| 87    | 33    | for "Ashdom" read "Ashenden."                    |
| 90    | 5     | for "has" read "have."                           |
| 109   | 2     | for "broken" read "broke."                       |
| 123   | 1     | dele " , "                                       |
| 125   | 13    | for "esta" read "esto."                          |
| 129   | 8     | for "convictions" read "conviction."             |
| 130   | 7     | for "Mayor" read "Major."                        |
| 130   | 91    | dele "J. R. Judge."                              |
| 131   | 1     | dele "Hon. Mrs. Heneage."                        |
| 131   | 8     | dele "J. R. Rowe."                               |
| 137   | 2     | insert "you" after "entreat."                    |
| 173   | 29    | for "to" read "in."                              |



## INDEX.

|                                                                                   | Page. |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------|
| Allies, Mr., Quotation from . . . . .                                             | 211   |
| Anderdon's, Mr., Letter to the Parishioners of S. Margaret's, Leicester . . . . . | 213   |

### B

|                                                                              |     |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----|
| Baillie's, Mr., Controversy at Tiverton . . . . .                            | 476 |
| Belany's, Mr., Letters to the Bishop of Chichester, quotation from . . . . . | 526 |
| Bennett's, Mr., Letter <i>in re</i> Denison . . . . .                        | 365 |
| Browne's, Mr., Letter to 'Church and State Gazette'                          | 116 |
| „ „ Notice to his Parishioners . . . . .                                     | 60  |
| Brechin, Bishop of, Presentment against . . . . .                            | 452 |
| „ „ Judgment against . . . . .                                               | 496 |

### C

|                                                                             |     |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----|
| Campbell's, Lord, correspondence with Miss Sellon .                         | 276 |
| Cape's, Mr., Letter to his Parishioners . . . . .                           | 104 |
| Cheyne, Mr., Suspension of . . . . .                                        | 465 |
| Chirol, Mr., Excommunication of by Mr. Bennet . .                           | 150 |
| Church Greek, Letter to the Patriarch of the . . . .                        | 57  |
| Church Greek, Memorial to the . . . . .                                     | 204 |
| Church Greek, Protest to the, against the conduct of Bishop Gobat . . . . . | 315 |
| Converts, Clerical, List of, alphabetically arranged .                      | 539 |
| Crawley's Letter, quotation from . . . . .                                  | 294 |

### D

|                                                            |     |
|------------------------------------------------------------|-----|
| Dayman's, Mr., Letter to the <i>Morning Post</i> . . . . . | 221 |
| Dead, Prayers for the . . . . .                            | 113 |
| Denison, Archdeacon, Proceedings against . . . . .         | 312 |

|                                                             | Page. |
|-------------------------------------------------------------|-------|
| Denison, Judgment of Dr. Lushington, <i>in re</i> . . . . . | 347   |
| Doane, Mr., Excommunication of . . . . .                    | 344   |
| Dobson's, Sir J., Judgment <i>in re</i> Westerton . . . . . | 377   |
| Douglas, Hon. Mr., Conversion of . . . . .                  | 98    |
| Dunbar, Sir W., Excommunication of . . . . .                | 68    |
| Dykes', Mr., Letter to the <i>Hull Advertiser</i> . . . . . | 257   |

## F

|                                                              |     |
|--------------------------------------------------------------|-----|
| Exeter, Bishop of, v. Gorham . . . . .                       | 177 |
| Exeter, Bishop of, Letter to Miss Sellon . . . . .           | 287 |
| Exeter, Bishop of, Protest of, <i>in re</i> Gorham . . . . . | 151 |
| Faber's, Dr., Reasons, quotation from . . . . .              | 115 |
| Foulkes, Mr., quotation from . . . . .                       | 347 |

## G

|                                                            |     |
|------------------------------------------------------------|-----|
| Gobat, Dr., Correspondence respecting . . . . .            | 443 |
| Gordon's, Mr., Reasons, quotation from . . . . .           | 147 |
| Gorham's, Mr., Letter to Dr. Philpotts . . . . .           | 246 |
| Gawthorne's, Mr., Correspondence with Dr. Sumner . . . . . | 228 |

## H

|                                                                          |     |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----|
| Hahn-Hahn, Countess, quotation from . . . . .                            | 292 |
| Hampden Dr., appointment of to the See of Hereford . . . . .             | 152 |
| Hanner, Mr., Reasons, quotation from . . . . .                           | 161 |
| Harper, Mr. S. B., Letter of to the <i>Glasgow Free Press</i> . . . . .  | 255 |
| Harper, Mr. T., quotation from . . . . .                                 | 226 |
| Henslow, Mr., Letter of to the <i>Church and State Gazette</i> . . . . . | 118 |
| Henslow, Mr., Protest of . . . . .                                       | 157 |
| Humble, Mr., Declaration of <i>in re</i> Cheyne . . . . .                | 467 |
| Hook, Dr., Defence of Tract XC. by . . . . .                             | 53  |
| „ opposition to Mr. Minster . . . . .                                    | 252 |

## I

|                                               |     |
|-----------------------------------------------|-----|
| Ives, Dr., Submission of . . . . .            | 264 |
| Intercession Society and Prayers of . . . . . | 142 |
| Institution Monastic . . . . .                | 93  |

## L

|                                                         | Page. |
|---------------------------------------------------------|-------|
| Lowder, Mr., Conviction of for Assault . . . . .        | 336   |
| Lowder, Mr., Second Conviction of for Assault . . . . . | 501   |
| Lowder, Mr., Report of S. George's Mission by . . . . . | 461   |

## M

|                                                          |     |
|----------------------------------------------------------|-----|
| Manning, Dr., Letter of to the <i>Times</i> . . . . .    | 304 |
| Manning, Dr., Letter from . . . . .                      | 492 |
| Maskell, Mr., Correspondence of with Dr. Pusey . . . . . | 194 |
| Maturin, Mr., quotation from . . . . .                   | 449 |
| Merewether, Dean, Protest of . . . . .                   | 152 |
| Mill, Mr., Reasons of . . . . .                          | 99  |
| Morris, Mr., Condemnation of . . . . .                   | 93  |

## N

|                                          |     |
|------------------------------------------|-----|
| Neale, Mr., and East Grinstead . . . . . | 322 |
| Newman, Dr., Submission of . . . . .     | 112 |
| Newman, Dr., Letter of . . . . .         | 493 |

## O

|                                                           |     |
|-----------------------------------------------------------|-----|
| Oakely, Mr., Letter from to the Vice-Chancellor . . . . . | 109 |
| Oxenham, Mr., Letter of, quotation from . . . . .         | 258 |

## P

|                                                       |     |
|-------------------------------------------------------|-----|
| Prynne, Mr., Letter of to Dr. Phillpots . . . . .     | 243 |
| Poole, Mr., Case of . . . . .                         | 459 |
| Pope, Mr., quotation from . . . . .                   | 306 |
| Pusey, Dr., Condemnation of . . . . .                 | 27  |
| „    Letter on the Conversion of Dr. Newman . . . . . | 120 |
| „    Letter to Mr. . . . .                            | 346 |
| Perry, Mr., quotation from . . . . .                  | 342 |
| Pittar, Mrs., quotation from . . . . .                | 64  |

## R

|                                                                |     |
|----------------------------------------------------------------|-----|
| Render, (Provost of Beverly,) Letter to Mr. Beckwith . . . . . | 307 |
| Richards', Mr., Correspondence with Dr. Blomfield . . . . .    | 230 |

## S

|                                               | Page. |
|-----------------------------------------------|-------|
| Scobell, Miss, Case of . . . . .              | 443   |
| Sellon's, Miss, orphanage . . . . .           | 168   |
| Sellon Miss, Controversy respecting . . . . . | 268   |
| Simeon's, Sir J., M.P., Address . . . . .     | 257   |

## T

|                                                                    |     |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------|-----|
| Thompson, Mr. E. H., quotation from . . . . .                      | 131 |
| Tickell, Mr., quotation from the <i>Times</i> respecting . . . . . | 96  |
| Tract XC., condemnation of . . . . .                               | 258 |
| Thynne, Lord C., Letter of . . . . .                               | 255 |

## U

|                           |     |
|---------------------------|-----|
| Union Newspaper . . . . . | 503 |
|---------------------------|-----|

## W

|                                                                                                |     |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----|
| Wickerbarth, Mr., quotation from . . . . .                                                     | 63  |
| Ward's, Mr., Controversy . . . . .                                                             | 107 |
| West, Mr., Case of . . . . .                                                                   | 459 |
| Wilberforce, Mr. H. W., quotation from . . . . .                                               | 211 |
| Wilberforce, Mr. R. S., Submission of . . . . .                                                | 329 |
| Wilberforce's, Dr., Correspondence with his "Clergy"<br>respecting Mr. Purdlo's book . . . . . | 573 |
| Wrey, Mr., quotation from respecting Mr. Well's<br>conversion . . . . .                        | 123 |














Author Browne, Edward George Kirwan.....**86067**. HEGGLE.  
B.

Title Annals of the Tractarian Movement.

UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO  
LIBRARY

Do not  
remove  
the card.  
from this  
Pocket.

Acme Library Card Pocket  
Under Pat. "Ref. Index File."  
Made by LIBRARY BUREAU

