





LIBRARY
OF THE
UNIVERSITY
OF ILLINOIS

✓



A C H A R G E

DELIVERED AT

THE ORDINARY VISITATION

OF THE

ARCHDEACONRY OF CHICHESTER

IN JULY, 1846.

BY

HENRY EDWARD MANNING, M.A.,

ARCHDEACON OF CHICHESTER.

L O N D O N :

JOHN MURRAY, ALBEMARLE STREET,

AND W. H. MASON, CHICHESTER.

1846.

TO

THE CLERGY

OF

THE ARCHDEACONRY OF CHICHESTER,

This Charge

IS INSCRIBED

BY THEIR AFFECTIONATE BROTHER AND SERVANT,

H. E. M.

A C H A R G E,

§c. §c.

MY REVEREND BRETHREN,

AT the visitation in last year I called your attention to the state of the Friendly Societies in this Archdeaconry, and endeavoured to throw out a few suggestions for their improvement. It seems natural, therefore, on this occasion of meeting, to state what has since passed on the subject. Believing that, an undertaking so extensive ought to be in the hands of the highest ecclesiastical and civil authorities in the Archdeaconry, I laid before the Bishop a statement of what had passed. His Lordship was pleased to approve it, and to take upon himself the further conduct of the project. In pursuance of this intention, a meeting of clergy and laity was convened at the Palace in the autumn of last year. The issue of that day was to appoint a Committee of Inquiry, which continued its meetings from time to time. The objects of its attention were, first, what measures could be taken to im-

prove the moral and financial state of the Friendly Societies already in existence ; and next, failing in this, what rules and calculations could be recommended for the purpose of forming better and safer associations. A large number of documents, showing the actual state and working of such societies, was collected together and examined with much care. The result was, to satisfy the committee that very few of the clubs now existing are based upon calculations and rules which it would be safe to recommend for general adoption. The further they were examined, the more complex and difficult the questions became. It would not at all surprise the members of the committee if any one not present at these inquiries should be incredulous as to the difficulty of the points which arose for decision. At this stage of our proceedings, communications were received from an eminent authority on these matters, recommending a postponement of any decision until measures to be proposed in the legislature on the subject should have been matured. For the present, therefore, the committee has suspended its meetings, to be resumed, I trust, when the autumn shall release those whose presence is chiefly important, from duties which keep them elsewhere. Let it be enough, therefore, at present, to say that the undertaking has received the full sanction of the Lord-Lieutenant of the county and of the Lord Bishop of the diocese.

To-day, for the first time, we publicly receive into the unity of the diocesan jurisdiction a body of clergy, with the churchwardens of their several parishes. I allude, of course, to the abolition of the peculiar jurisdictions of His Grace the Primate, and of the Dean of the Cathedral Church. By this act we are now united; and I trust what has been thus effected and recognised by forms of law may be ratified in heart and spirit. Although the clergy and others hitherto under the peculiar jurisdictions must retain a lively sense of grateful attachment to their late Ordinaries, yet I trust that a compensation will be found for any regret in the obvious importance of diocesan unity.

I will only add on this point, that I shall hope hereafter to hold visitations of the parishes now brought within the Archdeaconry of Chichester.

It is with great pleasure that I see, year by year, the attendance of so many of my brethren, the churchwardens, at Divine Service on the day of the Visitation. It has been my desire and endeavour to impress upon you the religious character of the duties you are charged to perform.

To you is committed a share in keeping the most precious inheritance of the English people—the churches and burial-grounds of our fathers, and all things pertaining to the worship of Almighty God. Brethren, if your pastors must needs be examples to the flock, next to them you are bound so to be.

To us it is said: "Be ye holy, ye that bear the vessels of the Lord." But if they who bear the vessels of the Lord must needs be holy, they who guard them must not be unworthy of their charge. Your work should be to set forward unity, brotherly love, peace, and Christian obedience in your several parishes. You are bound, before all, to be an example in your attendance at Divine worship, and in devout receiving of the Holy Communion. If people see the servants and guardians of the church careless, they will not be diligent; if you serve God little, many will be emboldened to serve Him not at all. Your year of office is a year of warnings and invitations to God's service. If you use it well, you will find that it will leave a blessing behind it, and the remembrance of it will endure even to your dying day.

It is, I think, a matter of congratulation that few measures affecting the Church and its ecclesiastical order have been in the last year proposed to Parliament. The tide of events, which is unsettling all old foundations, runs fast enough without any fresh contribution to swell its force. It is, therefore, a subject of thankfulness that the Ecclesiastical Courts Bill, to which we turned our thoughts last year, was, after our meeting in this place, finally laid aside. And we may hope that long and mature deliberation will be had before a subject fraught with consequences so deep and extended, both in

the discipline of the Church and in the morals of the nation, shall be again taken in hand.

The only measure of great moment now in progress, bearing directly upon the internal administration of the Church, is a Bill entitled "An Act for Amending the Laws for the Correction of Clerks."

When I recall how often a desire has been expressed among us to petition the legislature for some effectual measure on this subject, and with what unanimity an address to our Bishop, referring, among other topics, to this point, was agreed to about three years ago, I am persuaded that we shall all hail with joy the introduction of any Bill giving to our spiritual rulers in real legal effect what they possess in name, and by original right—the power of removing from the Church the scandal of an evil life, whensoever it may befall, among the priesthood. That facts which make us to burn with shame occasionally occur is manifest. In a body of fourteen or fifteen thousand men, is it a wonder that Sin should have its servants? Is the parable of the Wheat and the Tares blotted from the Gospel? Or will our lay brethren apply its sad prophecy only to themselves? If Judas was among the Apostles, shall there not be false apostles among us?

Doubtless, one purpose of the Great Head of the Church, in suffering any of our brethren to fall,

is to humble us before Him, and, in humbling us, to break down our self-confidence, lest we also be tempted. If we use it aright, their fall is our safety.

It must be that offences come. They have at all times appeared in the Visible Church, and the popular voice has held the Church to be guilty in her offending servants. Even this is, perhaps, not without its good. The just and unsparing severity of public opinion, and of an outraged moral sense, which scourges our very name in expiation over the offences of an unhappy brother, has in it somewhat of a healthful and purifying correction.

But it would be an inverted and evil state if the discipline of the Church were made to rest upon a public opinion external to its courts, instead of upon the internal force of its own spiritual rule. It is well, therefore, before we turn to the detail of the particular measure which gives rise to these thoughts, to trace to their true source the difficulties which have rendered the correction of misconduct in a clergyman so difficult and uncertain. I believe those difficulties to have arisen chiefly from without, not from within the Church, and to have a civil rather than an ecclesiastical source.

One hindrance is the imperfect, because lapsed, condition of the Consistory Courts, in which, for the most part, there exist no competent judges, no experienced practitioners, no ascertained precedents, no

fixed rules of procedure. Another is the difficulty of bringing to judgment misconduct palpable enough to excite scandal, but not gross enough to fall under the narrow definition of clerical offences. These may be matters for which the Church is responsible. But another and still more serious hindrance is the obstruction offered to the enforcement of discipline by the civil courts. Two thirds at least of the clergy of the Established Church are incumbents, and are thereby possessed of a vested interest in endowments. To suspend them from their office and benefice touches upon a pecuniary right, in which the common law courts are contending, and as a principle most justly, to uphold the plaintiff. By this it comes to pass that conduct deserving removal, at least for a time, from a spiritual cure, can effectively be corrected in an unbeneficed, but not in a beneficed, clerk: the distinction being not moral, but legal.

Another great disadvantage arising from the inefficiency of the Diocesan Courts is the necessity of carrying almost all causes to the Court of Arches in London. In effect there hardly exists more than one court; whereas the genius of the Church, and of its spiritual government, requires that every Bishop should possess his domestic *forum*, and that the clergy should be heard within the precincts of their Church and diocese, and among their fellow pastors. The moral force of Diocesan government

depends almost altogether on its domestic character.

Let us now turn to the Bill proposed; and in doing so I would wish to confine what I say to the points specifically touched upon. As to the machinery of the Bill, and the provisions for the conduct of trials and appeals, there is no doubt somewhat to be reconsidered. It is to be hoped that these provisions will be recast.

I wish to speak only of the *animus* and intention of the measure, and of two particular points, which shall be taken in their order. The outline of the measure is as follows:—

By clause 3, it is proposed that the cognizance of offences committed by a clergyman shall belong, in all cases of *beneficed* clergy, to the Bishop of the diocese; if unbeneficed clergy, to the Bishop of the diocese where he *resides*; if neither beneficed nor fixed in any residence, to the Archbishop of the province; and in case of offences committed out of England and Ireland, to the Archbishop of Canterbury.

By the 4th section, previous to any more formal proceedings, the Bishop is empowered, with the consent of the party, to conduct a private inquiry by commission.

The 10th clause designs the erection of a tribunal for the formal adjudication of causes, in the shape of a diocesan council, consisting of the several arch-

deacons, and so many beneficed clergy of the diocese, appointed by the Bishop, as shall complete the number of twelve; the members of the council to be appointed, as other judges, for life, on good behaviour.

The following section declares that all causes shall be heard by the Bishop in person, or by his Vicar-General or Commissary, with the assistance of four members of the Diocesan Council, to be nominated by the Bishop.

By section 13 it is to be enacted, that all questions of *fact* shall be decided by the opinion of the greater number of those constituting the court; and all questions of *law* (and, in case of *conviction*, the nature and amount of the punishment) shall be decided by the Bishop, or his Vicar-General or Commissary presiding in the court.

The 14th clause empowers the Bishop, or his Vicar-General or Commissary, to pronounce sentence, which shall be effectual in law.

And by the 16th clause it is provided, "that it shall be lawful for the Bishop personally, or by his Vicar-General or Commissary, to punish, by admonition, by deprivation of, or suspension from any benefice holden by him, or depriving him of any benefice then held by him, and by adjudging him to be permanently disabled to hold any benefice or exercise any spiritual function, or by deposition from the ministry, any clerk in Holy Orders who

shall be found guilty of “blasphemy, heresy, or schism, or of lewdness or any fleshly incontinency, or of drunkenness or other indecency of life or conversation, or of simony, or who shall have been convicted of treason or felony before any Temporal Court, or for any other cause for which by any law now in force he may be deprived, or is declared to be disabled to hold any office or benefice, and every clerk so deposed or adjudged to be disabled shall be for ever disabled to hold any spiritual office or benefice, or to exercise any spiritual function.” The Bishop is empowered by the 18th clause to inhibit the party under accusation from performing services of the Church.

The summary of these sections will be enough to exhibit the aim and outline of the bill.

Now the two points in this scheme on which we may do well to remark, are the *tribunal*, and the *rule* by which that tribunal is to proceed.

The tribunal is described as a diocesan council : in effect it is the Bishop with certain of his clergy as assessors. It is remarkable that, in this proposal, we are reverting from the most complex form of Ecclesiastical law to its simplest and most primitive element. The present plan gives to the Bishop sitting in his council certain assessors, without whom he cannot pronounce judgment of the *fact* : the Bishop may then apply the law. In the Consistory Court the Bishop by his representative is

judge of both *fact* and *law*. The proposed measure limits, not extends, as some have been led to think, the power of the Bishop. The assessors are an effective limitation. The foundation of the Bishop's jurisdiction over the clergy of his diocese is partly, of course, in the simple and original authority of the chief pastor over every several member of his flock, and partly in the act of ordination.* The clergy are subject to their Bishop by a double duty. They are committed, with all others, to his guidance, admonition, and censure. Like any other member of the Church, they may be cited, and, if guilty, admonished and excommunicated. But over and above this universal discipline, which embraces all as members of Christ's Church, there is another of a higher and peculiar sort to which they as clergy are subject.

In the beginning the Bishop, as he by virtue of office possessed the power of ordaining, so he had also the power of distributing his clergy, and of assigning to each his portion or field of labour.† Over the whole of his clergy so disposed, he retained the supreme jurisdiction. They were answerable to him in all matters of life and doctrine, of morals and ministerial functions. And yet the jurisdiction of the Bishop was "*non imperium sed iudicium*," and was exercised through certain definite

* Thomass. Vet. et Nov. Discipl., p. 2, lib. i. c. i.

† Ibid. c. xxxiii.

forms, after the manner of a Court. The injunction of St. Paul formed the basis of their canons in this respect. "Against an elder receive not an accusation but before two or three witnesses."* By these provisions the office of the Bishop assumed the character of a judge; and the judicature of the Bishop the formalities of a Court. This in fact is, as it was afterwards called, the Consistory. In the Court of the Consistory the Bishop sat, with certain of his clergy in the character of witnesses or assessors. We find this from the usage of the African church, especially in the church of Carthage under St. Cyprian.

Such was the nature of the Bishop's Court in the first ages of the Church: its spiritual character was evident to all. It was a religious tribunal held in the name of Christ; and its sentences were pronounced under the canons of the Church, and enforced by penalties purely spiritual in their effect.

It may be difficult at first sight in such a Court to discern the original of the Consistory of later times. In the earlier sat the Bishop in person, with certain of his pastors round him: in the later sits a Chancellor surrounded by advocates and pleaders. In the latter the Bishop is never present; in the former almost never absent: his presence was a Court in itself.

It is not necessary to trace out at this time the

* 1 Tim. v. 19.

gradual change in the external face and procedure of the Consistory; it will be enough to remind you how the Bishops of the Church became, by consent and by delegation, judges in Christian equity. To them litigants were referred by the Christian emperors; and to them the poor, weak, and oppressed fled for refuge. The vast extent of the judicial labours of the Bishop in early days is well known to us all by the histories of St. Augustine and St. Ambrose and the like. In later times this employment increased to so great an amount, that the office passed by delegation to others chosen from the body of the clergy. And this principle of delegation was still later embodied in the office of the Chancellor, who, by long usage of western Christendom, became, even to the exclusion of his principal, the judge of the Bishop's Court.*

It is obvious at first sight that, as the spiritual tribunal passed into an almost secular Court, the paternal character which had attracted to it the hearts of all men was gradually effaced. It became the arena of harsh and wrangling litigation; and its later history is such as we may well desire to pass over in silence. Since the latter end of the last century the Ecclesiastical Courts have held their peace; but with a disastrous result to the Church itself. The lapse of the Consistory has brought on an abandonment of discipline. The effects of this

* Bishop Bedell's Life, pp. 112, 113.

abdication of rule are to be traced everywhere ; in all regions of the Church—in its order, government, doctrine, and morals.

For some years past we have had to endure the shame of unchastened scandals ; of transgressions without penance ; even in our own body, of sins—at which our lay brethren kindle with indignant shame—long unchecked, hardly reached, and lightly punished at last. This suspension of discipline has been our great humiliation, and an alarming source of estrangement from the Church. The greatest offenders have braved the laws of the Church, censure of their Bishops, and the sentence of public condemnation.

The blame of this, my reverend brethren, is not with us. We have had no power to remove it. We neither make nor amend the laws. Our prayers and protests have been loud and frequent. Our Bishops have, again and again, for years past striven ineffectually with the worn out machinery of our old Ecclesiastical Law : they have attempted, again and again, to obtain sufficient powers from the legislature : but some flaw, or doubt, or alleged desuetude or absolute prohibition, has been ever ready to defeat the endeavour, or to reduce the punishment to a sentence so disproportioned to the proved misconduct as to create a new offence to the moral sentiment of the Church. We have laboured under all the imputations of laxity, because our discipline has

—through no fault of ours—been impotent. Year by year attempts have been made in Parliament to obtain Acts for the restoration of effective discipline; and as often, by parties in some way affected by them, they have been thwarted, delayed, and defeated. Sometimes, as last year, we have been threatened with measures extinguishing the whole spiritual element of the Ecclesiastical Law; when, for our very existence as a spiritual body, it became our duty to endeavour to arrest its progress.

We may trust, then, that the restoration of an effective diocesan council or tribunal, as proposed in the measure now pending, will recover for the Church the free and just exercise of its inalienable office. And with one further remark I will leave this first point of the plan.

The power of nominating the members of this council is given to the Bishop. Thus far it is in accordance with primitive use. But why should a *second* Diocesan Council be erected? There is one existing already, of which every member will hereafter be appointed by the Bishop; I mean the greater Chapter of the Cathedral Church, in which the election of the Bishop, and, *sede vacante*, the custody of the spiritual jurisdiction, is vested. It is provided by the late Act relating to cathedral churches, that any Bishop, where non-residentiary canonries do not exist already, may appoint canons to the number of twenty-four.

It is to be presumed, that those who shall be selected for these appointments will be on the whole the fittest among the clergy—at least that the whole number taken together will be a fair representation of the diocese. In the greater chapter of the Cathedral Churches the Archdeacons officially hold a place. Why not appoint as non-residentiary canons the very same clergy who should be appointed as councillors? The two bodies can hardly be kept apart; if selected with equal care they will run into one. If there be any difficulties of detail arising from such a change of the present Bill, they may be easily met by special provisions. It is obviously desirable not to erect a second council in the presence of the first, thereby assuming to divest the true aboriginal council of the Bishop of prerogatives which from the earliest time have belonged to it.

We must never forget that it was when the diocesan council passed into the cathedral chapters, that a serious division in the unity of the diocesan government was made. The Bishop in times of unity was *caput dioceseos*, the head of the diocese; the canons were joined to him as his council. The very name *capitulum* is an epoch, and sounds of separation.* The cathedral became, through causes remote from our present purpose, a second or lesser head within the diocese; under, but independent of,

* Leslie's Case of the Regale and of the Pontificate. Appendix 2. Works, vol. iii. p. 477. Ed. Oxf.

the Bishop. So it has continued, with what benefit is not doubtful, to this day. The great principle of extinguishing peculiars, manifestly prescribes also the wisdom of identifying the chapter more closely with the Bishop. What could more certainly obstruct their reunion than to interpose another body between the Bishop and the Cathedral Church? And what could more closely draw them together than to re-invest the clergy of the cathedral with a share in the judicial functions of the diocese? So much for the proposed tribunal.

The other point I purpose to speak of is the rule by which that tribunal is to proceed. By the Ecclesiastical Law, as it now stands, the clergy of the Church are liable to be proceeded against for offences of two kinds: offences against morals, and offences against their spiritual character and functions. Under the latter class will fall, of course, all questions of heresy, schism, irregularity, and the like. There are, however, many acts not capable of being brought under these literal definitions, which we all feel to be unbecoming in those who bear Holy Orders, and most injurious to souls for whom Christ died. Our life cannot be measured by the definitions of technical offences. All is not lawful in a clergyman which is not punishable by law. Impunity is not our highest standard. Now it is precisely in this particular that our Ecclesiastical Law has been hitherto defective. By the 75th Canon of 1603, the Church, after sundry pro-

hibitions, orders that the clergy shall “ at all times convenient hear or read somewhat of the Holy Scriptures, or shall occupy themselves with some other honest study or exercise, always doing the things which shall appertain to honesty, and endeavouring to profit the Church of God ; having always in mind that they ought to excel all others in purity of life, should be examples to the people to live well and Christianly under pain of Ecclesiastical censures, to be inflicted with severity according to the qualities of their offences.”

It is obvious that these are precepts addressed to the conscience ; most difficult to bring into exact definition ; often incapable of being brought within the cognizance of law. And yet it was intended that we, failing of these duties, should be corrected with censures of our Spiritual Ruler. Now it is well known how ineffective this canon has been ; it will therefore be a matter of thankfulness to us all that by the 3rd clause of the Bill proposed, cognizance may be taken of any who shall “ demean himself in any manner unbecoming a clergyman,” a form of speech well known in respect to other responsible offices. Such is at present the intention of the 75th canon ; and it is a rule of judgment which can hardly be wrongfully applied. This public sentiment of the Church, and the certainty of instant appeal, are abundant securities ; if indeed such a word can be used respecting a grave judicial duty to be exercised in open Court by our Bishops with assessors of our own

brethren. I believe we shall all gladly and forwardly recognise such a standard and tribunal.*

Let us consider, for a moment, what is the rule here laid down; it is a reflection very seasonable on such a day as this. We are here met in Visitation as pastors of Christ's flock. We have received from one of our brethren exhortations and admonitions to the devoted discharge of our sacred office; shall we not do well then to bestow our thoughts awhile on a subject so nearly affecting us, especially as it is brought thus openly, by public events, to our mind?

What then is behaviour unbecoming in a clergyman? How is it to be measured? Can it be ascertained but by a due and just perception of what our office is? How has it been dealt with in all ages of the Church? How is it defined in Holy Scripture? I need not recount the titles of our office as Pastors, Ministers, Messengers, Ambassadors of Christ; every one a name of office, a title of power truly conveyed from heaven: one saying alone of our Lord will suffice to show the surpassing and perilous greatness of the pastoral commission. "Ye are Witnesses of these things,"† that is, of the Person and Kingdom of Christ, of his Incarnation, Atonement, Resurrec-

* I cannot but express regret at the tone taken against the Bill, especially this part of it, by anonymous writers, who have endeavoured, I trust without a shadow of success, to excite the alarms and jealousies of the Clergy against the measure. I believe we are not to be moved by such a tone of writing; or to be excited by fears which a good conscience need never entertain.

† St. Luke, xxiv. 48.

tion, Ascension, and unseen Presence in the Church. If there be evil in us, surely of all false witnesses we shall be the worst; for what can be guiltier than by our unholiness to belie the sanctity of our Lord and of His kingdom?

But it is not a merely negative fitness that is required of us. "What do ye more than others?" A blameless life is not necessarily a life becoming a Witness for Christ. We may be beyond the reach of penalties, and yet reflect nothing of the kingdom of God. Our office demands the purification of our inmost thoughts; the perfecting of our whole spirit. Whether we look upon it in its aspect towards God or in its aspect towards men, in both it demands a life of positive holiness. The hands must needs be clean which dispense the mysteries of God. And the life must needs be pure which shall persuade men that devotion is a reality. Well might St. Gregory the Great say of the true pastor: "*Sit ergo necesse est cogitatione mundus, actione præcipuus, discretus in silentio, utilis in verbo, singulis compassione proximus, præ cunctis contemplatione suspensus, bene agentibus per humilitatem socius, contra delinquentium vitia per zelum justitiæ erectus, internorum curam in exteriorum occupatione non minuens, exteriorum providentiam in internorum solitudine non relinquens.*"* It is hard to express in fewer words a more perfect image of the purity, wisdom, love, lowliness, and recollected

* S. Greg. Regul. Pastor., pars ii. c. i.

devotion of a true pastor's life. On a field so fair there may be many a blot upon which the censures of an ecclesiastical code cannot fasten ; and yet they may be visible and black. In the light of such an office who can but feel his life to be reprovèd ? So to live that there shall be nothing in us unbecoming a Witness for the Holy One of God, is a fearful standard. Nevertheless it is the rule ordained for us by Him who has called us to His service. Of course it is impossible that any cognizance or censure of a formal court can extend to enforce such high precepts of holy living as these. Nothing under God but fatherly persuasion given in private, and the practice of a devout life, can form the pastors of the flock to this exalted mould. But there are numberless habits both of word and act lying between the greater transgressions and the more perfect spirit of devotion, to which it is most important that some cognizance should extend. I believe we all feel that, the higher is the standard set before us, the safer we shall be. It will be an incitement and a support. We shall be reminded that to be a Pastor of souls is to be under a vow which binds us to the highest devotion we can attain ; that relaxed habits—blameless in our lay brethren—are not innocent in us. “*Qui enim loci sui necessitate exigitur summa dicere, hæc eâdem necessitate compellitur summa monstrare.*”*

All men are not invited to the highest perfection, but the clergy are assuredly called to nothing

* S. Greg. Reg. Past., pars ii. c. iii.

less. If it be our office to do the Good Shepherd's work, of whom our Lord says, "He putteth forth his own sheep," and "he *goeth before* them,"* then certainly there is nothing in which we may be content to walk abreast with others. What does "he goeth before them" mean, but that a pastor ought in all the spiritual life to be ahead of those he leads? How can he lead who in purity, lowliness, zeal, love, devotion, deadness to life and to himself, is outstripped by the flock he ought to guide? It is he that follows them, if indeed he do follow, and not they him. A pastor that has fallen behind his flock is the first in wandering, the ringleader of a great confusion.

I could not refrain from these few remarks, spoken to none so much as to myself, in referring to the testimony borne, in the proposed scheme, to a higher law of pastoral duty than mere correctness of life: I might say a mere technical impunity at law.

It is, I believe, the one fervent desire, the constant and instant prayer of us all, my reverend brethren, that we may press on, above the measure of legal regularity, towards the high and perfect life of witnesses for Christ. And I feel persuaded that we shall all rejoice in this and in every measure rendering the correction of scandals more facile and effective: and raising the standard of devotedness

* St. John, x. 4.

among us by higher admonitions to a life worthy of our holy and happy calling.*

And this leads me to a topic which must be intimately familiar to all our thoughts, I mean the necessity of providing a searching and effective system of training for young men designed for Holy Orders. "To whom much is given, of him shall much be required." And certainly a higher demand for pastoral devotion implies the necessity of a fuller preparation for the pastoral office. Education is the correlative of discipline: or rather discipline begins in education, and moulds the character to the form which discipline prescribes. It will not be out of place to say a few words on a point which, as it must come home to the heart of every one of us from experience of the past, so it is certainly the most urgent work now pressing upon the Church in England.

When we look at the signs of the times, the forerunner of things that shall be hereafter, no one can doubt that measures for the discipline of the clergy to-day are not more demanded than a distinct and adequate training of the priesthood of the next generation.

Everything warns us of a change approaching. Our own trials are not what they were ten years ago. New forms of difficulty have come upon us ;

* Since the date of the Visitation the Bill referred to has been withdrawn.

new controversies, new questions, new and bold assertions; theories unheard of in other days are loudly demanding answers at our hands. It is evident now to almost every one, that the two great forces of faith and unbelief are marshalling themselves under their respective and proper standards. They are concentrating themselves each upon its own ultimate and kindred principle, so that we may expect every day a broader exhibition, and a more direct conflict between what is affirmative and what is negative in the Christianity of the world. Our increased intercourse with foreign nations, the general knowledge of modern languages, and the instantaneous translation of French and German writings into English have so laid the thoughts of the three nations together, that whatever passes among them is a matter of intimate concern to us. The developments of Rationalism, extending to the rejection not only of specific doctrines, but even of the original facts of the Christian faith, show us what is preparing for the future. This, and not imperfect forms of Christianity, will be our peril. Strauss' Life of Jesus (a work I will not here describe) has been within a few weeks published in English. England, as it is the mart of the world, so it bids fair to become what Old Rome was in its day, the sink of nations and the pool of all evils upon earth. It is the lot of empire to be the centre of power and the receiver of manifold corruptions.

The popular works in philosophy, criticism, politics, and lighter literature, every year translated into English, will soon possess the mind of this people with the moral and spiritual dangers of other nations in addition to our own. That the effect of this will be to unsettle the foundations of positive belief, historical fact, and even moral precept, must be evident to any one who will examine the social conditions of the countries from which such literature is imported, and the character of some of the writers to whom we are giving a popular welcome.*

* "The theology of the Protestant churches of Germany presented a very singular spectacle during the last half of the preceding century and the commencement of the present. A very large majority of the divines of these churches rejected, in a word, all belief in the divine origin of Christianity, and anxiously endeavoured to instil into others the opinions which they had embraced themselves. They had possession of far the greater number of divinity professorships in the many universities of Germany; and they had almost exclusively the direction of the literary and religious journals—a class of publications of more influence and importance in Germany than among ourselves. By the unsparing use of the means thus afforded them, and by an infinite quantity of writings, addressed to men of all classes and all ages, they succeeded in spreading their views over the surface of society. How deep the disease went among the lower orders it is not easy to ascertain; but it appears that, after a time, a spirit of almost entire indifference to religion manifested itself among all classes. The churches were thinly attended, the Sabbath little honoured, the Bible much neglected. These melancholy phenomena appear to me to deserve and demand the attention of every Christian community, and I am convinced that in this country it is very little known how far the evil extended."
—*H. J. Rose's Protestantism in Germany.*

Let it not be thought that, in saying this, I am charging the creation of our English unbelief upon the agency of foreign nations. It is a notorious and frightful fact, that the unbelief of the chief infidel writers of the last century in France was little more than the working out, or even the bare reproduction, of the deism of Chubb, Toland, Tindal, and other freethinkers of our own. We are but reaping what we have sown. This matter is all the more alarming because there is in the English mind an affinity to the evils which, in time past, issued from itself. They have a tie of kindred, and find a predisposition and a sympathy in their native soil.

And this leads to another sign portending dangers and trials to the Church of the generation now rising to manhood. I mean the intellectual condition of this country. Although by God's blessing the positive and controversial infidelity of the last century was overthrown by the force of faith and truth, yet the morbid consequences, like the sequels of a disease, are still deep in our popular system. The insensibility, not of our masses only but of educated minds, to the force even of divine revelation, and the indifference with which the boundaries of truth and error are regarded by refined and intellectual men—what are these but the moral remainders of a speculative system which has been silenced rather than rooted out? The serious importance of this subject it is easy to perceive. What a fulcrum is in mechanics, positive belief is in the

mind of a people. Where this has been broken down, or weakened, or undermined, it gives way under the weight and force of positive truth. This, it is much to be feared, is the condition of great numbers in our country.

And yet, with all our past evils of infidel literature and the like (and they are many), there has hitherto been one strong remaining point of vantage in the intellectual state of England as compared with other nations at this day. The men of literature and science and the learned professions have, with us, been believers in Revelation. This, no doubt, has resulted from many causes, among which the chief is in the fact that, the active and cultivated intellect of this country has received its character in or through our two universities. Hitherto this has been true, and may continue still to be true if we have the charity and wisdom of our forefathers. But this high vantage is at the present hour in no little jeopardy. If we be not wakefully foresighted, the key of the whole intellectual belief of this country may be seized, and our position fearfully reversed. It is a remarkable fact that, of the twenty-four colleges and halls in Oxford, only four have been founded since the sixteenth century; of the seventeen in Cambridge only one. Now at the end of the sixteenth century the population of this country was 4,000,000. It is now 20,000,000. The number of young men

residing within the precincts of the two universities at one time may be taken to be about 5000. Can it be maintained that this is an adequate number upon a population of 20,000,000? Can we believe that 5000 represents even a calculable proportion of the active and powerful intellects by whom this country shall be hereafter, or is at this moment, swayed? What is 5000 upon the youth of England? upon the nobles, gentlemen, statesmen, legislators, jurists, clergy of the next generation? What is such a number measured upon the multitude of keen and practised intellects labouring with power upon the public mind and character in every branch of literature and science?

In the four centuries preceding the sixteenth an increase was systematically made in the sphere of the Universities. Let us first take Oxford: passing by the changes and transfers by which the result was partly accomplished. In the twelfth century one college was founded; in the thirteenth, three; in the fourteenth, six; in the fifteenth, three; in the sixteenth, seven. Look next at Cambridge. In the thirteenth century was founded one college: in the fourteenth, five; in the fifteenth, four; in the sixteenth, six. The fifteenth century saw the foundation, therefore, of seven colleges; and the sixteenth, of thirteen. The population was then four millions, it is now twenty; that is, fivefold. We see, then, that as the demands of the nation,

both from increase of number, and, much more, from increase of intellectual activity, became greater, provision was thus made whereby that active intellect was satisfied, and retained in a willing allegiance to our great schools of Faith and Learning. But is it so at the present time? There are one or two facts of a kind so striking that I cannot but add them to what has been said. It is remarkable that in the three last centuries, during which the population has multiplied fourfold, the scientific character of England—I may say even science itself—has spread itself abroad, and multiplied its branches, even in a still greater proportion. All forms of pure and of applied science, ranges of intellectual labour unknown to our forefathers, have become the habitual employment of a countless multitude of minds. These later centuries are characteristically centuries of science. We date the exact method of scientific investigation within the last three hundred years; and it is specially observable, that while the popular intellect has taken so strong a course in the direction of professional and abstract science, our Universities, and especially one of them, have become comparatively unscientific. Of course, certain eminent names are excepted; I am speaking not of individuals, but of the system. The circle of faculties has almost disappeared in the one faculty of arts; or, at most, in the two faculties of arts and ma-

thematics. Medicine, music, physics, law, common and civil, and the like, linger yet as theories, but as a professional discipline have been superseded: the practitioners in such faculties, if graduated in our Universities, are formed and qualified elsewhere. As professional men, their relation to the Universities is slight: it is rather social and national than professional. The very defence set up for the Universities by some—namely, that they educate what is universal in man, that is, man as man, and not professions as professions—(good as it is in their behalf as great lay schools of popular education) is a direct inversion of the true order and even name of an University, which is a system professing to teach in all faculties as such. The defence proves the indictment.

Now when we remember how great a mass of able and powerful minds are engaged in all branches of professional labour throughout our dense population, and that without so much as the honorary relationship of an University degree, we cannot but entertain great and reasonable fear that the day may come when our Universities may lose the intellectual supremacy of the people. There are revolutions in literature and science as well as in empire. What were once fruitful and tributary provinces may become independent and hostile states. How far this may have accomplished itself already I do not now undertake even to conjecture ;

but it may be well to consider what has been said by an acute writer, not unobservant of the facts around us, and representing opinions and feelings adverse to our own. Speaking of the attempts made to throw open our Universities to all, without distinction of religion, he says:—

“ The truth is, that the claims of the Church to control the higher seminaries of education would not have been so long tolerated in this country had not means been discovered of evading that control. The practitioners in the courts of common law were early formed into corporations, which instituted a system of education for their members independently of the Universities. The medical corporations, in the same way, have taken upon them to educate their own members, who, by resting satisfied to practise under less ambitious titles than that of ‘ physician,’ have been enabled to evade the control of the Universities. From the aspirants to a diplomatic career no testimony of their having received a learned education has been demanded. The hardship imposed upon individuals by exactions of religious tests in the Universities has thus been evaded; but the State has suffered. The exclusively practical education of two of the learned professions has impaired their intellectual character; and the want of any regular system of education for the civil servants of the State has affected every branch of government. The Uni-

versities themselves have suffered from this state of affairs. Instead of being complete Universities, with all the faculties, they have become *de facto* mere clerical seminaries, with faculties of literature and theology. They still retain the exclusive privilege of conferring the title of ‘M.D. ;’ but who would trust his life in the hands of a physician whose medical education has been confined to Oxford and Cambridge? They have still the exclusive privilege of training the aspirants to Doctors Commons; but how small a field of our English law is that! And how stands the character of the English school of civil law when contrasted with that of France, Belgium, and Germany? The exclusive character of the Universities of Oxford and Cambridge has deprived them of all influence over the medical, legal, and diplomatic professions.”*

If this be true even in a very much less degree than this writer imagines—and that it is so in some measure, I fear we cannot deny—then the necessity of some extensive remedy is established.

The love and veneration we have to our Universities for their antiquity, the associations of a thousand years, the lineage of great names they claim among their offspring, the treasures of science of which they are the keepers, their past and present eminence in literature and national cultivation, and above all, the grateful and filial allegiance we owe

* Spectator, Dec. 9, 1843.

them for unnumbered blessings conferred upon ourselves, must make us deprecate any departure from the principles on which they are founded, and very earnestly desire that some persevering effort may be made, for the sake not more of the Church than of our popular Christianity, to restore their intellectual sway, and to enlarge their extent until they again overtake the vigorous and energetic people which for a time has outstripped their care. We have heard and endeavoured much of late for the education of the poor in the principles of the Church. Is it not rather, and above all, for the middle classes that such a discipline is needed ?

We may assume it as a social law, that next after the food necessary for life, there is no demand of man which will provide for itself so certain a supply as the demand of his intellectual powers. The human mind will organize itself and found its own systems. As, among other causes, the narrow area of our unenlarged parish churches has led to religious systems and establishments which should never have been forced into existence, so if the Universities and great schools of instruction within the communion of the Church fail to find room and provision for the intellectual life of the people, imperfect and dangerous systems formed by individuals, or, still worse, founded without religion by the State, will rise up and render the reunion of the people upon

our old basis of Christian education impossible. We see this already. Numberless institutes and associations are already springing up on every side. The last year was not without its warnings from the legislature. Our Universities are not the schools of the poor, nor of the middle classes, but of what I may call the titular and natural aristocracy of the country. But, through the abundant blessing of God upon us, our people is multiplied, and the number of those who are by nature born or gifted with powers to affect the course of events and the character of the nation is likewise multiplied. In one word, there is the great middle class, for whom in the Universities a new and distinct provision is required. I need not say what the Church is able to do for them; and what, if the English nation is again to be folded by the English Church, it must do. I need not say what that middle class might do for the Church, if it were drawn into its ministry and service. Let us not forget what the middle class of England really is. Perhaps there exists nowhere anything to which we may compare it. There is in politics, as in nature, a temperate zone, in which the powers of man seem to be developed and braced to their highest energies; in which the intellect becomes clear and critical, the conscience vigorous and inflexible, self-respect calm and cold, the passions checked by reason (it may be,

tinged by selfishness), the affections kept down by a round of duty, and the imagination subdued by a life of restless action. The character formed in such a school is eminently solid, and often as eminently secular. The pressure of poverty and the refinement of wealth have both their moral discipline; the middle class have less refinement and little want.

This habit of mind is characteristically strong, active, practical—endowed with all that can command the course of this world. It is made for enterprise, hazard, and empire. But it is as characteristically remote from faith. Its very excellences are a hindrance to the spirit of humiliation and self-mistrust: and its whole process is opposed to the belief of mysteries which seem to contradict the inferences of intellect and sense.

With such a people the Church is daily drawing into close contact; and if they are to be retained or won, it must be through the power and persuasion of truth.

Here, then, we may foresee the danger and the work of our successors, the clergy of the next generation. And surely it must convince us, if facts can, of the necessity, before all things, of training an order of pastors able to endure the trial. How stands the matter now? The number of the clergy may be put at about 12,000 or 14,000. Year by year more than 500 are or-

dained.* But these are not all graduates; nor, without an enlargement of our universities, can so great a number be provided. At this moment they do not yield the required supply, and many are

* *From the Ecclesiastical Gazette.*

| | Number Ordained in 1844. | | Number Ordained in 1845. | |
|------------------------|-----------------------------|----------|-----------------------------|----------|
| | Priests. | Deacons. | Priests. | Deacons. |
| Canterbury | 16 | 6 | 11 | 14 |
| York | | | 16 | 19 |
| London | 29 | 23 | 29 | 51 |
| Durham | 18 | 12 | 6 | 9 |
| Winchester | 20 | 33 | 10 | 19 |
| Lincoln | 31 | 45 | 48 | 34 |
| Carlisle | 2 | 2 | 2 | 3 |
| Rochester | 5 | 5 | 7 | 4 |
| Landaff | 11 | 6 | 10 | 6 |
| Chester | 40 | 59 | 31 | 21 |
| Bath and Wells . . | 6 | 8 | 8 | 14 |
| St. Asaph | | | 0 | 0 |
| Bangor | 2 | 3 | 6 | 0 |
| Gloucester and Bristol | 34 | 35 | 18 | 26 |
| Exeter | 20 | 21 | 25 | 22 |
| Ripon | 19 | 37 | 25 | 31 |
| Salisbury | 21 | 22 | 38 | 25 |
| Norwich | 45 | 33 | 41 | 46 |
| Hereford | 16 | 14 | 14 | 19 |
| Peterboro' | 25 | 40 | 22 | 17 |
| St. David's | | | 6 | 7 |
| Worcester | 32 | 20 | 23 | 23 |
| Chichester | 13 | 12 | 18 | 14 |
| Lichfield | 18 | 5 | 17 | 15 |
| Ely | 20 | 25 | 6 | 21 |
| Oxford | 36 | 35 | 27 | 41 |
| Sodor and Man . . . | 3 | 2 | 0 | 0 |
| | 482 | 503 | 464 | 501 |

The number of Deacons may be taken as the average.

ordained who come from other seats of instruction. The writer to whom I have referred supposes the universities to have become mere clerical seminaries. It were better if he were nearer to the truth. It would appear that the number of men graduated year by year is about 600 or 700. We have seen that the number ordained is more than 500. But it is notorious that a large proportion of graduates do not take orders. And yet so many are absorbed by the priesthood as to leave a fearfully small proportion for other classes and professions. But if this be so now, how shall it be when the clergy of the Church are so increased in number as to meet the necessities of the population? Certainly not less than 4000—probably 6000—additional clergy are needed to provide pastoral care for our people. And how shall a priesthood of 16,000 or 18,000 be drawn from sources which even now do not yield the proportion necessary to sustain a priesthood of 12,000 or 14,000?

Great and necessary efforts have been made for many years to provide education for the poor. And lately the attempt has been directed, in some slight degree, to the middle classes. Colleges for the instruction of schoolmasters have been happily founded; a collegiate system for medical students is in course of maturing; another is now rising for a missionary clergy; all things are drawing the convictions of men, in an inverted order, to the

ultimate and vital work—a wise and sufficient training for the pastors of the Church.

It seems, at last, to be agreed that an academical career alone is not enough to qualify a man to “watch for souls as they that must give account.” An academical education is a great advantage, both as laying the only firm basis of learning, and as uniting the clergy and laity in the bonds of early sympathy and in an intellectual commonwealth. But there remains to be added that without which no man risks, I will not say the life or health of a fellow creature, but the character or the money of a client—a distinct and well conducted professional education. Shall we argue by such comparisons? I had almost said, “They do it to obtain a corruptible crown;” and what do we, of whom the blood of souls shall be required? Is it not manifest that what is needed for Holy Orders is not only the learning of a scholar, but a mature and exact knowledge of sacred truth? And yet the intellectual training is the least momentous part in preparing for Holy Orders. What is required is not only a professional course of lectures, but a collegiate life of spiritual discipline—an order of devotion wherein to subjugate ourselves and to unite our whole will with the great laws and realities of our Master’s Cross and Kingdom. Exact theology is most necessary; but a life moulded upon a discipline higher than the academic rule is still more

absolutely needed. The true school of pastors is, by divine institution, under the eye of the Episcopate. The Bishop's See is the seed-plot of the Church. In an institution for training clergy all the sanctions and associations must be ecclesiastical; every object should be emblematic not of the academy but of the altar; not of scholars but of apostles. This, however, would lead us into questions as to the proper form, site, and administration of such colleges, into which we have not time now to enter. Yet if we raise no discussion, we can feel little doubt as to the place most fit and most helpful for such institutions. All I would add is, that it was the Church which created universities, not universities the Church. There is a time in the cycle of events when the old fountains must be again sought out.

For the raising of a body of faithful and devoted pastors, thoroughly furnished for Christ's work in perilous and darkening days, I believe I speak your common desire in expressing a fervent hope, that institutions wisely formed upon the highest model may be founded for the intellectual and spiritual discipline of those who shall be hereafter called to the priesthood of the Church. It is because I believe that I am but giving utterance to your thoughts, and because the united expression of a mature conviction at such public and grave meetings as the present is not without effect in pro-

moting the same conviction in others, and thereby of accomplishing it, in fact, that I have so far ventured upon this subject.

But from these topics of the future let me for a moment turn back again to the urgent duties of our present work.

If there be these adverse agents, social, civil and intellectual, loosening the bonds of our religious order, and if the only true power of restoration must needs issue from within—from the inmost spiritual life of the Church—by what means, next after the persuasion of a devout and holy life in love and self-denial for Christ's poor, shall we best knit again the broken bands of unity, and make our flocks to be conscious of the spiritual and heavenly nature of the Church, and through the Church, of their vital participation in Him who is the life of all?

Let me offer only two suggestions in answer to this momentous practical question.

The one is, that we shall best serve the Church at home by labouring to extend the missions of the Church abroad. At no time has this duty pressed so heavily upon the Church of England. We are debtors, indeed, under the bonds of the Gospel to all mankind; but by a peculiar necessity to millions who have gone out from us, and whom God has given to our charge. The whole history of our empire bears fearful witness against us. The first

foundations of our power throughout the world have been laid in deeds of which statesmen and traders will indulge their own theories; but the Church must hold far other judgment. Conquest and craft, slavery and shedding of blood, greedy commerce and moral contamination, delusion and apostacy from Christ, are fearful ministers in the train of empire. And yet these and more are in the retinue of our imperial greatness. Among our merchandise, too, there have been found the notes of Babylon, "slaves, and souls of men." *

There is one part of the subject so intensely awful that I hardly know how either to touch it or to pass it by: I mean our penal settlements. I speak in weighed and measured words when I say that our convict population is a phenomenon of carnal and spiritual wickedness, such as, I believe, the earth has never seen. How could it be equalled before the coming of the Gospel; for all earlier wickedness was innocent of apostacy from Christ? It has never been exceeded since; for fallen Christians have never, so far as I know, been herded together by thousands in the chain-gang and the crime-class (things and names created for new mysteries of iniquity) without pastors, without the means of salvation, making repentance, so far as man can, impossible, and an intense communion of mutual corruption absolutely certain. About 150,000 con-

* Rev. xviii. 13.

victs, rent from all the restraints of civil and Christian life, and, worse than all, from the bonds of nature and of home, have been cast into this pit of Tophet. It is supposed that about 40,000 are still living in those settlements. Where are the thousands who from the chain-gang have gone up to meet their Judge and ours? It is not enough to say, "This system will henceforward be abandoned." The blood of souls cries to heaven against us. The past is indelible, save by the great Atonement for the sin of the world. And if we would plead this, works meet for repentance must be done.

But in labouring for the extension of Christianity abroad, we are not only fulfilling a first duty of Christian mercy, and making a penitential restitution for grievous wounds and wrongs, but we are taking one of the surest means to reunite and to perpetuate the Church at home. Nothing preaches the Gospel more powerfully to our own flocks than to set before them the state of those who have it not, and to move them to alms and prayer for the conversion of the heathen.

And as the work of the Church extends itself abroad, and therefore the demand for devoted men increases at home, an outlet is given to the energy and zeal of thousands now pent up within restrictions which have lingered too long upon our practice.

All classes are being drawn into the pale of the

Church abroad, and so are bound more intimately to the Church in England. It is in our missions, probably, that the priesthood of the English Church will first receive a full infusion of moral and spiritual power from all grades of our social state, and thereby adjust itself to the necessities of our teeming population.

The priesthood of the Church is not the inheritance of a tribe, or the heir-loom of a family. Still less is it the privilege of a class, or the adjunct of any worldly condition. It is open to the whole body of Christians. It is like the sacraments of Christ, free to all who are meet to receive it. No qualifications but those of personal fitness and the call of God are of divine appointment. The Church demands a vast increase in her ministry, an extension of the Episcopate, a restoration of the third order, and the service of those who, for the love of God and the peace of a devout life, desire to give themselves to works of charity and mercy. And there are forces of intellect and will, and gifts of spiritual power and sanctity, under lowly roofs and in homely paths of life, which are the true endowments of the Church. Her highest riches are the living gifts of her children. If she fail to unfold them and use them for the glory of her Master, how shall she be held guiltless of burying her trust in the earth?

In addition to this, nothing perhaps has exhibited in bolder outline the true spiritual nature of the

Church, stripped of the disguise of secular array, than the Episcopate of our colonial Churches. This has, probably, been to many the first clear expositor of an article of their baptismal faith. It has taught them that the Church of England has no founder but our Divine Lord; and that its powers, like its Head, are not of this world.

Surrounded as we are by the elements of change, every day advancing, and already conscious that the British empire, having forfeited its religious unity, holds its onward way to still further estrangement from the ecclesiastical order bequeathed to us by our fathers, no one, I think, can fail to entertain a sort of foreboding that, in the Church of our colonies, we see in foresight the Church of England as it may be hereafter. Much as we must lament this, let us lose no time in lamentation. We already see it abroad separate from the world, and supported upon its own inward energy and life. We thus can measure of what it is capable, what it can endure, and what achieve. In helping it we are preparing ourselves for our future work, it may be for greater trials than we have yet been called to front. The Church in our colonial empire is the anticipation of a Church wider, poorer, mightier, less endowed, but lacking nothing, having the signs of an Apostle and the work of an Evangelist. If we would preserve and perpetuate what remains of our ecclesiastical state, it must be by restoring to full power

and action the internal and spiritual life of the Church; and by learning to depend on this alone.

It is then a duty not more of Christian love than of Christian wisdom to make our offerings for the extension of a work which returns in so great a measure of blessing upon ourselves. Let me say that we of this particular County are bound, and in this part of it most of all, to give our help to the Church in our colonies. Few districts have sent forth a larger number of emigrants. It is not only for strangers that we plead: our own brethren hold us bound still to communicate with them in the benedictions of our common mother. Children we have baptized, households we have tended, brethren with whom we have knelt and broken the bread of life, ask our alms;* it is therefore a matter of great thankfulness to know that the offerings made from this Archdeaconry, year by year, have been increased beyond what we had ventured to hope. A great majority of the parishes send their annual contributions. If in every part of the Church the same proportion were observed, the threatened deficiency in the funds of the Society for Propagat-

* The claim of our brethren abroad upon us is greatly strengthened by such events as the fires at Quebec, and now again at St. John's, Newfoundland. Out of 3700 houses 2000 are said to be destroyed: from 12,000 to 20,000 people are reported to be homeless: and property to the value of one million of money destroyed. The rebuilding of the parish church is put at 8000*l*. How shall a hearthless and destitute population find this sum? It is to be hoped that the Church in England will rebuild it.

ing the Gospel in Foreign Parts would be more than averted. I trust that the time is not far distant when the duty of giving alms for the conversion of the heathen, and for the consolation of our own brethren scattered abroad, will form a part of the pastoral instruction of every parish priest; and that offerings both of the rich and of the poor, howsoever small, will be made to this work for Christ's sake, in every several flock throughout the Church. At least if our people be unable to give, let us not deprive them of the knowledge of these awakening and edifying truths. If they are already poor, let us not take away that which is their own. If any cannot offer, we can at least instruct them in the great laws of charity and almsgiving.

Amidst the many adverse tokens which are gathering around, we may here and there see eminent and conspicuous signs of a noble faith. It is no slight manifestation of vitality and of fruitful vigour that the Church is about to consecrate another company of five bishops for the oversight of her flock abroad. Neither is it to be forgotten that, of these five sees, two will be wholly founded and endowed by one hand alone. These are works which edify the body of Christ; they quicken the living power of the Church, and fashion it for greater works at home. In striving together for the extension of our spiritual brotherhood in other lands, we are sinking deeper our own foundations, and building upon a rock which is higher than the world.

The other mode of effectually serving the Church is by multiplying the number of devout communicants.

The visible Church is truly defined to be "*cætus fidelium*"—the Company of the Baptized; and the Holy Sacrament of Baptism is both the means of our regeneration and the outward bond of unity. Baptism is the bond of the visible body of Christ. But the bond of the inner life which penetrates the Church is the great spiritual reality of which the Holy Communion is the pledge and means. I do not say that all communicants are men of holy lives: but if there be life and holiness in the Church, it will be found among its habitual communicants. They, if any, make up that mystical company which is described in Holy Writ as "a garden inclosed—a fountain sealed." The perpetuity of the visible Church is sustained by the lineal succession of those who hold devout communion with the presence of Him who abideth in His Church unto the end. And where are they to be found but around the Sacrament of Christ's Death and Passion? It is true even to a proverb that the communicants of a parish are the life of the flock; and so, collectively, the communicants of the Church are the life of the Church. If there be power, order, perseverance, imperishableness, in the Church, it is by virtue of Christ's presence in those who devoutly hold communion with Him. If the Church in England is to endure the trials which are searching it on every

side, to beat back the assaults of popular unbelief, and to gather again a disunited people to itself, it will be through the direct and diffused energy of those in it who are living the highest life of devotion : and who are they, as a body, but the great fellowship of its habitual communicants ?

Wise and important as the schemes may be by which its external system may be improved, and its functions of instruction and economical administration extended, this appears to be the quick and life of all. It is the passion of the day to aim at great works, to be done by great movements upon great masses of the people. Nothing is thought great which does not embrace multitude in its aim. We are the slaves of great reckonings, of high-toned schemes, and visible effects.

But this is not the divine procedure. The presence of Christ is not in the wind, the earthquake, or the fire, but in the still small voice which speaks apart to His servants, one by one, in the depths of their spiritual being. Our ministry, to be effectual, must concentrate itself upon the needs, trials, distresses, dangers of individual minds, as catechumens, as repenting sinners, and, above all, as communicants. As these are matured in the spiritual life, they will become our truest fellow-workers, in labours and in prayers, unto the kingdom of God.

With a view to this, it is obvious that an increased frequency of administering the Holy Sacrament is necessary. Only let us suffer it visibly to

bear its own witness to the Incarnation and Atonement of our Lord, and, through the furtherance of God, our work will move onwards under His restoring hand. I need not refer to the express rule of the Church, enjoining all its members to communicate three times at least in every year; nor to the order that sponsors shall be partakers of the Holy Communion, both which injunctions presuppose a frequent celebration of the Holy Sacrament, and are practically impossible when it is celebrated only three or four times in the year. Neither will I now stay to point out that the Holy Sacrament is the centre of discipline, and that where there is rare communion there can be little discipline. I will do no more now than commend these thoughts to your reflection, with this one word: If there be any source of love among Christians, any fountain of holiness, any bond of unity, where shall we find it if not in the Sacrament of the Love and Atonement of our Lord Jesus Christ?

Let us remember Who has said, "A kingdom divided against itself is brought to desolation, and a house divided against a house falleth." It is an axiom of the Spirit. The law of mortality is not more certain and universal. A divided will is the desolation of Churches. It rends them from their headstone to their base. Whether soon or late, they are doomed to fall. The principle of death is working in every part of a divided body, dissolving all coherence, and preparing for the last change into corruption.

The most vigorous rallies, the highest pretension to health, the most powerful excitement, will only hasten the disguised disease, and precipitate its fatal mastery.

There is but one sure pledge of life—a will united in the will of Christ. Let us strive to attain this great gift of grace. “Judgment must begin at the house of God.” It is among ourselves, then, that unity must take its rise. An united flock with a divided priesthood is impossible.

God be thanked, my reverend brethren, we have been in a singular manner drawn into the bonds of brotherly love. The memory of one who bade us meet together in our Rural Chapters has still power to constrain us to a nearer unity. The example of his loving and gentle spirit still abides with us. Let us cherish the brotherly affections which he taught us to desire. Let us foster them with a grateful and devout sense that we have been the heirs of a paternal benediction. Let us not mar the unity which he bequeathed to us. “If we love one another, God dwelleth in us,” and for all that remains, whether trial, or sorrow, or weariness, or the Cross, they have been and must be our portion. This is not our Rest. But for what is to come, let us trust in Him. “The Lord will provide;” and for us that is enough.

