THE CHURCH · OF ENGLAND · ITS CATHOLICITY AND CONTINUITY

· HERBERT POLE ·

THE
CHURCH OF ENGLAND.

The Church of England:

ITS CATHOLICITY AND CONTINUITY.

SEVEN LECTURES.

BY THE

REV. HERBERT POLE

(M.A. OXON; ASSISTANT CURATE OF BEXLEY HEATH).

London:

SKEFFINGTON & SON, PICCADILLY, W.

PUBLISHERS TO H.M. THE QUEEN AND TO H.R.H. THE PRINCE OF WALES.

1899.

PREFACE.

THESE Lectures are printed at the request of many of those who heard them delivered, and they appear in the present form without having undergone any alteration. Their object is to bring before the public the significance of certain epochs in the history of the Church, and not to give a complete account of all the subjects with which they deal. It will be noticed that quotations are freely used where they support an opinion or strengthen an important point. So much is this the case that several of these Lectures may be looked upon merely as compilations.

The author must express indebtedness to the labours of the Rev. A. H. Hore. "The History of the Church of England" has furnished him with much of the material of the earlier Lectures, and "The Church in England from William III. to Victoria" has been closely followed in the Lecture dealing with the Oxford Movement.

The preface to this last work states that Mr. Hore offers his book to the public "as a contribution to the cause of Church Defence." I am glad to have this opportunity of expressing my gratitude for his labours, and I desire to assure him that they were not thrown away.

H. P.

Bexley Heath.

CONTENTS.

LECTURE III.

LECTURE IV.

LECTURE V.

LECTURE VI.

LECTURE VII.

The Founding of the Church.

The Church of England:

ITS CATHOLICITY AND CONTINUITY.

LECTURE I.

The Founding of the Church.

Introduction. The Early Britons. Introduction of the Faith to the Britons. Roman Soldiers. Gaul and Britain. S. Alban. Council of Arles. Result of Saxon Invasion. Influence of British Church on Ireland and Scotland. Re-conversion of Britain. Gregory and the Slaves. S. Augustine. His Mission. Augustine and British Bishops. Northumbria and Paulinus. Edwin and Heathenism. Failure of the Mission. Oswald and the British Church. Controversy between the Britons and the Roman Mission. Wilfrid. Colman. Theodore at Canterbury. His Work. Council at Hertford. Theodore's independent action.

THE object which I have in view in undertaking this Course of Lectures is twofold. First, it is to give some general facts about the history of the Church of England for those who have not had leisure to make this subject a special study; and secondly, it is to try to correct a few of the false impressions which are common respecting the origin and history of our Church.

The majority of men are either too indifferent to the

history of religion, or too much absorbed in their business occupations to care much to inquire into the history of their Church. And yet in these days, when Dissent is so active and—I am sorry to say—so bitter against the Church of England, it is necessary that every faithful Churchman should be able to defend his Church from an historical point of view. Many statements are popularly made about the history and the constitution of the English Church, which are historically most untrue.

Dissenters read the history of the Church as penned by Dissenting historians; and very often Churchmen are unable, through want of knowledge, to meet the assertions which are falsely made.

It is maintained by scores of people that Christianity was introduced into England and founded there by the Roman Catholics; that before the Reformation the Papal Church had the supreme sway in our island; that at the Reformation an absolutely new Church was made in England; that the present Church of England came into existence at the time of the Reformation. Every one of these assertions is absolutely and entirely false. And I hope that you who follow these Lectures to their close, and who will investigate the facts to be brought forward for yourselves—if you do not care to trust my statements—I hope that you will be of this opinion.

It will be my object, then, in these Lectures, to show how the Church of England has grown from the earliest days of Christianity to what it is now—an organization exerting a powerful influence for good on our national life. I shall dwell upon some of the Church's struggles, I shall speak of

some of its champions, and, above all, I shall endeavour to show that the Church of England has grown out of the first Christian movement known to have come to Britain. We shall see that the first line of Archbishops belonged to the Church of England, as distinct from the Roman Church, as much as Archbishop Temple belongs to us to-day.

It will be as well to give at the outset the subjects of the Lectures which I hope to deliver. To-night I shall speak upon the founding of the Church of England. Then, in order, I shall show how the Papal power tried to usurp the religious life of England, and that the nation was continually resisting the Roman claim. I shall speak of the Reformation, explaining what that movement really meant. The rise, progress, and work of the Puritans will come next under consideration. Then will follow a lecture in the form of a biography of Bishop Andrewes and Archbishop Laud, in which we will estimate the value of their work and character. We shall conclude the course with an account of the Oxford Movement, referring to the circumstances which gave it birth, and with a lecture dealing with the renewed life in the Church of England during the last sixty years.

To-night I am to speak upon the Founding of the Church. The time covered in this Lecture will extend from the beginning of the Christian Era to the year 690, the death of Theodore, Archbishop of Canterbury.

Very little is known about the religious history of our ancestors during the first century of the Christian Era. The early Britons were heathens, and had a form of religion called Druidism. They made the oak and the mistletoe objects of veneration and worship. They are said to have

believed in one Supreme God, but they held that He should be appeased with offerings of human sacrifices and by magical incantations. The early Britons were superstitious to an extreme. The light of the Gospel gradually dawned upon them and destroyed their barbarous forms of worship.

When Christianity was first introduced into this country no one knows. We do not even know by whom it was introduced. A tradition says that the Apostle Paul visited Britain to evangelize it; but, although we know that he was the first Christian Missionary, there is no good reason for believing that he came to our land. There is no more truth in another legend, that Joseph of Arimathea landed on the South West Coast of Britain for a similar purpose, and went as far as Glastonbury, where he preached the Gospel.

We do know that Christianity had gone from Palestine to Rome before the year 55 A.D., and that the Romans came to Britain and conquered it. At Rome the Gospel had made rapid strides in spite of the many persecutions which attended it. The Romans began to come to Britain in the time of Julius Cæsar, 55 B.C., and for about 400 years the Romans were masters of this island. They introduced their customs to our land, they persecuted the Druids, they imposed upon our ancestors their military organization. Hundreds of Romans came over to Britain to live, and built their villas here. We cannot doubt that some of these were Christians who had been converted to the Faith at Rome, or whose ancestors had been converted before them. Those who were Christians would not tolerate the heathen forms of worship, nor could they rest without teaching the Britons the Christian Faith.

It is probable that the Gospel was brought to Britain through another channel. Gaul, our modern France, may have had a great deal to do in Christianizing Britain. It was a Roman Province and it must have carried on trade with the new British Province. We know that before the end of the second century Christianity was established in Gaul. When the Emperors of Rome persecuted the Christians in Italy they did not confine their persecution to that country alone. Gaul came in for a share of it, in fact every part of the Roman Empire where Christians were known to be. In Gaul, however, the persecution was especially severe. It is conjectured that at that time, in the year 177 A.D., many Christians escaped from Gaul, when the Church of Lyons and Vienne felt the Emperor's hand, and came to Britain, where Christianity was practically unknown. They, when the persecution was over, were probably the means of spreading the knowledge of the Gospel here. Professor Bright holds this view of the question. [1] "It was almost certainly from Gaul," he says, "certainly not, as far as we can judge, directly from the East, that these outposts, so to speak, of the advancing spiritual kingdom were sent forth among the Roman provincials of Britain. Their arrival may, with much probability, be dated either shortly before, or shortly after the persecution of Lyons and Vienne."

Whatever doubt there may be about the origin and exact time of the introduction of the Gospel into England, we can speak with certainty of the early date when Christianity flourished here. Tertullian tells us that in the last quarter

[1] Early English Church History, Second Edition, p. 5.

of the second century there were places in Britain not yet reached by the Romans which were subjugated to Christ.

As far back as the early years of the fourth century history gives us traces of an organized Church in Britain. We then find the three Orders of Bishops, Priests, and Deacons. In the year 303 we read of Christians in Britain being martyred by the Romans. Alban, Aaron, and Julius are among their number.

The story of Alban's martyrdom is beautiful, though pathetic. He was a Roman and a heathen, who had come to Britain. In the persecution he gave shelter to a Christian Priest, and on observing that he spent his time in continual prayer and watching, day and night, he was led to cast off his idolatry and become himself a Christian in all sincerity. The magistrates, knowing that Alban had sheltered the priest, sent to order him to hand the culprit over to them. But Alban gave the priest his own clothes, and he himself put on the priest's clothes, and was taken to the magistrates in place of the priest. There he was again ordered to deliver the fugitive, but refused, and he told the judge that he had himself become a Christian, and "that he adored the true and living God Who created all things."

Alban was then scourged and whipped, in the hope of shaking his faith, but he bore all this, said Bede, not only patiently, but joyfully. He was put to death during the last Christian persecution of the Romans; and seeing that Christians in Britain were sought out at that time, it shows that at that early date Christianity must have had a footing here.

We have other testimony of the early date of Christianity

in Britain. Church Councils were held on the Continent. In the year 314, one was held at Arles to condemn the schism of the Donatists, with whose principles we are not at present concerned. We read in documents relating the doings of this Council, that Bishops, a priest and a deacon were present there from Britain. The names are given of several of them. Eborius of Gaul, Restitutus of London, and Adelphius, who was probably Bishop of Caerleon-on-Usk. This shows that the Gospel had reached Britain, and had a good footing here as early as 314 A.D. That Bishops were here at that time shows that there must have been clergy under them.

We read again, that in the year 359 the Bishops of Britain supported Athanasius against the teaching of the enemy Arius, and that then three of them were given their travelling expenses by the Emperor Constantine to visit the Continent. We may conclude, then, from all these statements, that before the end of the fourth century Christianity was settled in Britain. It had an organization through which it spread the Christian Faith. We know from the testimony of some of the early Fathers, that Britain took an interest in the theological disputes and struggles of early Christianity. S. Athanasius, in the year 363, reckoned the Britons amongst those who were loyal to the faith of the Doctrine of the Incarnation. S. Jerome, who complained of the results of the Arian teaching and of its ascendency, said: [1] "That Britain worships the same Church, observes the same rule of faith as other nations." At the beginning of the fifth century our forefathers brought odium on themselves by encouraging the doctrine of Pelagius, who had

[1] Quoted by Hore, p. 9, History of the Church of England (Edit. 1895).

unorthodox ideas upon original sin, and they were embroiled in controversy in consequence.

All this shows the life of Christianity in our land at those early times. We know that in these early days the British or the Celtic Church had erected many Churches, and held Councils for considering ecclesiastical affairs. Although we see that the Gospel has a good footing in Britain now, we cannot hold out the hope that it continued to spread and flourish. The Christian movement was very often hidden behind black clouds. We must now refer to a storm which arose and almost swept it away.

You must remember that up to this time Britain was under the government of the Roman Empire. This Empire was now beginning to decline in power. The German nation was rising into fame. The Goths invaded the Roman State, and it was necessary for the Roman Empire to concentrate all its forces at Rome to save itself from destruction. So the Roman legions were withdrawn from Britain and the British were thrown upon their own resources. Being deprived of the protection of the Romans, the Britains were open to attacks from other foreign powers. The Picts and Scots invaded Britain. What were the British people to do? In the year 449 they invited the German nation to help them to drive out these new invaders. This was a very unfortunate step for the progress of the Gospel in Britain. The Germans were heathens, who worshipped a different God every day in the week. They were very desirous of territory and covetous of power. From being allies of the Britons against the Picts and Scots they became the conquerors of our country. They peopled our land with their own tribes. They drove

the British people into the mountainous parts of our island, and they almost completely exterminated the Christian religion. Churches and Monasteries, which had been built with loving care, were burned and ruthlessly levelled to the ground. Many Christian priests and people were slaughtered.

To find Christianity now you must follow the surviving Britons. We must follow them into Wales and Cornwall, and other mountainous districts of Britain. We know very little of the doings of the British Christians after this Saxon invasion for many years. They kept up, as well as they were able, their old Church life. They held Synods and Church Councils. They founded new Sees in the districts where they were forced to reside. Four of these are in existence now, viz., Llandaff, S. David's, Bangor, and S. Asaph.

The Britons seemed to be strong in Cornwall and Devonshire. Devon and Cornwall were not conquered by the Saxons. [1] "Here the Christians were numerous," says Mr. Hore, "and they preserved their ancient customs and ritual into the seventh century." In this part of Britain there lived many saintly men. One of them was called Ives, after whom S. Ives, a town, was probably named.

The Britons were so completely conquered by the Saxons that they did not try to evangelize them. They did no missionary work among their enemy. Bede, the historian, said of them: "They never preached the Faith to the Saxons in England who dwelt amongst them." But we must remember that the British were terribly afraid of their formidable conquerors.

Although the British Church was thus conquered and

[1] Hore, p. 5, Ibid.

humiliated, its work was by no means done. We can trace its marked influence upon the Irish and the Scotch early Churches.

Ireland had been visited by Palladius, a British monk, in in the year 429, who had been consecrated Bishop to convert that country to the Faith. Christians were there before that time, but no Bishop. His mission failed. In fact, it is an Irish saying, that "not to Palladius, but to Patrick, did the Lord give the conversion of Ireland."

In the year 432, Patrick, with twelve monks, headed another Mission to Ireland. He fixed his See at Armagh, and lived till 493. The Gospel made good progress during his time, but it did not get a permanent footing in Ireland. It declined after his death, and some say that Christianity was entirely abolished in Ireland. At any rate, the British are now asked to give Ireland help; and Gildas and S. David with other men were sent to them. This was a second Mission to Ireland from the British Church, and this Mission was so successful that Ireland was called the Island of Saints; and from this Mission the Gospel was carried into Scotland, and Missionaries went from Ireland over to France, Jerusalem, Switzerland, Italy, and Iceland.

It is interesting to recall the fact that the Christian Mission in Ireland was quite independent of the Church of Rome. Columban, one of the Irish Saints, was charged by the Bishops of Gaul with holding customs differing from the Roman Church. He replied, "That he observed the customs of his national Church, which was," he said, "independent of the Church of Rome." He wrote a letter to Pope Gregory explaining his position.

From the Mission in Ireland, then, you can see that the British Church in England had not finished its work at the time that the Saxons came. It is also due indirectly to the Celtic Church that the Gospel was taken to Scotland. It was due to the North of Ireland that the Gospel was carried into Scotland. S. Columba—a different man, remember, from S. Columban—visited Scotland with the object of planting the Gospel there. The king of that time presented him with the island of Hy or Iona for a home, and there Columba founded a Monastery, and it became a seat of learning. It was from this island that Christian priests were sent, many years later on, to re-kindle the dying embers of the Christian faith in Northumbria.

But to return to England again.

We see that it is now, in the fifth and sixth centuries, possessed by the Saxons. The Saxons were heathens. The old Celtic Church was confined to very narrow limits—the North of Wales and Cornwall. All the rest of England was pagan. How did Christianity come back to England again?

It is now our pleasure to begin a brighter and more interesting story.

We have to go back to Rome, to a scene which took place in the slave market. It is due entirely to the goodness and pertinacity of Gregory the Great, after he became the Bishop of Rome, that Christianity was brought to our land again. He sent a Christian Mission to England, the Roman Mission it has been called. You must not think that Gregory was a Pope after the mediæval type of Popes. The Christianity of Gregory and his times was quite a different thing from the elaborate Papal system which swayed the world at the time

of Henry the Eighth. Most of the doctrines peculiar to Roman Catholicism had not as yet come into existence; doctrines such as the Infallibility of the Pope, the worship of the Virgin Mary, and the doctrine of the Immaculate Conception. The Christianity of Gregory was as different from the later Papal system as the Church of England to-day differs from the Papal religion previous to the Reformation. You ought to bear these facts in mind, for it is sometimes said that the Mission sent by Gregory was a Roman Catholic Mission. It was not Roman Catholic in the sense we understand Roman Catholicism to-day.

What suggested to Gregory the conversion of the Saxon tribes of England, was a sight which he saw in the market-place at Rome. Some youths, which came from England, were being offered there for sale as slaves. Gregory was moved by their beautiful appearance, and having asked if they were Christians, and learning that they were *Angles*, he replied, were they Christians they would be *angels*. Hearing further that they came from *Deira*, a part of Northumberland, he answered, that they should be plucked *De Ira* from the wrath of God. "Who was their king," asked Gregory. "*Ella*," was replied. "*Alleluia*," Gregory said. "They should sing Alleluia praises to the Lord." Gregory was so moved by this sight in the market-place, that he wished to go himself on a missionary journey to England, but he was so beloved at Rome that the Pope would not let him go. It was when he was Pope himself that he carried out the wish of his heart.

Gregory started a Mission to our country in the year 595, consisting of forty monks, headed by S. Augustine, who was

the Prior of a Monastery which Gregory had founded in Rome. Augustine, you must remember, was not the same person as the great S. Augustine, one of the early Fathers. These men left Rome to carry on their mission, but when they reached Aix they received so stirring an account of the barbarity of our forefathers, that they returned to Rome to beg Gregory to allow them to abandon his projects. But Gregory would not hear of it. He sent them off again in July, 596, and, after spending the winter in Gaul, they reached our shores early in the year 597.

They landed in the Isle of Thanet, in Kent. The king of Kent at that time was Ethelbert, whose wife, Bertha, was a Christian, the daughter of Charibert, of Paris. When she came to England she brought over with her a Christian Bishop, named Luidhard. This fact was favourable to the success of S. Augustine; who might reasonably have expected to gain a hearing from the king. The king went to Thanet to meet the missionaries, and to enquire what their strange appearance meant, and to hear what they had to say for themselves. After they explained the object of their landing, listening to their wishes, the king said: [1] "Fair words and promises are these, but inasmuch as they are new and doubtful, I cannot give up all that I and the English people have so long observed." But the king allowed the missionaries to preach and to teach. He also provided for their sustenance, and appointed them a lodging close by the walls of Canterbury. This, I think, you must acknowledge was a very good beginning. These men, with the royal favour, conducted services in a little Church outside Canterbury,

[1] Hore, p. 24, Ibid.

called S. Martin's, and soon, by their preaching and consistent method of living, they won over the interest of the people. The king himself very soon declared that he had become a Christian, and as early as June 1st, after the missionaries landed, he was baptized. His subjects very soon followed his example. By the end of the year Gregory reckoned there were 10,000 converts to the Gospel in England. Augustine then had received the protection of the king, and soon after the king's baptism he went to Gaul again, where he was consecrated Archbishop of England. He returned to his work in Kent, which consisted chiefly of preaching, teaching, and baptizing. The little Church of S. Martin's now became too small for the new movement, and it was decided to erect a larger building; this was done on the site of the present Cathedral of Canterbury. On this same spot the Britons had erected a Church before. As success was more certain, Augustine found it necessary to call more clergy to the work. He wrote to Gregory for his help, and as a result of this, in the year 601, Mellitus, Justus, and Paulinus were sent from Rome, and two of them became Bishops of new districts of England. These men brought over with them many valuable books and ecclesiastical vestments. Gregory sent over, said Mr. Hore,[1] "A Bible in two volumes, two copies of the Psalms, two copies of the Gospels, a book of lives of the Apostles and Martyrs, and a Commentary on the Gospels and Epistles."

The Mission having been fairly started in Kent, Augustine turned his attention to several other districts in England. In the year 604, Mellitus was ordained Bishop of London,

[1] Hore, p. 26, Ibid.

and Justus Bishop of Rochester. These places formed new centres whence the light of the Gospel might throw around its beams into the districts clouded over by the blackness of heathenism. The object of these new Bishops was, first of all, to get the hearing of the kings of these districts. These two Missions, however, were attended with only partial success.

Now let us pause a moment to ask ourselves what had become of the old British Church which was driven into the mountains of Wales and Cornwall. It was still in existence in those places, and, to an extent, was in a flourishing condition. When its Bishops heard of the work of Augustine and his allies, they were roused up to inquire into their success. They were, in fact, brought into contact with Augustine. Augustine had written to Gregory to ask how he ought to deal with the old British Bishops, and, in reply, he was told that they were under his authority. We shall see what the British Church thought of this decision. Two Conferences were held between Augustine's Mission and the representatives of the old Church, to discuss over certain ecclesiastical customs. The first took place on the banks of the River Severn in the year 603. There Augustine accused them of heresy. He said that they did many things which were contrary to the Church. This roused the spirit of the British, and they would have nothing to do with S. Augustine. The second Conference was held, but met with no greater success. Some of the British Bishops on their way to the Council asked a hermit whether they should abandon their traditions and obey Augustine. [1] "Yes," the hermit said, "if

[1] See Hore, p. 27, 28.

he be a man of God." "But how shall we know if he be a man of God?" they asked. The hermit said, "If he rise to meet you. If he do not rise, he cannot be like Christ, meek and lowly in heart, and his words should not be regarded." The Bishops went on their way. Augustine did not rise to meet them. He received them sitting, and he asked them to comply with him for the sake of unity on the two points on which they differed most, viz., on the proper time for observing the feast of Easter, and on the mode of conferring baptism. The Bishops would not comply, but stood firm to their old traditions. They continued to use their own ritual, their own liturgy, their own version of the Scriptures. Thus, then, for a while, there were two Churches in Britain —the Celtic or British Church, and that which sprung up from the Roman Mission.

Let us leave the British Church again, and follow the fortunes of S. Augustine's Mission. Was that prosperous? No! It almost failed.

In the year 604 both Gregory and Augustine died. Laurence succeeded Augustine in his work, but that work depended upon the goodwill of the king. It went on smoothly enough as long as Ethelbert lived, but in 616 he died also, and his son Eadbald succeeded him, and he renounced Christianity. A similar story is told of other kings, in whose districts Christianity had been planted. It seemed for a moment as if England would relapse into heathenism again. Mellitus left London, Justus left Rochester for France, in order to escape from heathen hatred. Laurence, the successor of Augustine, was on the point of doing the same, when a dream is said to have prevented him. His

dream was, that S. Peter visited him at night and scourged him for his cowardice in contemplating flight; when he awoke in the morning, the marks of the scourging were left. These marks the Bishop showed to the heathen king. The king, frightened at what he saw, forsook his idolatrous worship, and henceforth favoured Christianity. Kent, again, was reclaimed to the Faith. Many new Churches were rebuilt. Justus was called back once more to Rochester from the Continent. But the Mission to London and Essex had failed entirely. The people would not receive back Mellitus, and for thirty-eight years more that part of England was again steeped in heathenism.

We must now turn our attention to another part of England, to the North country, to Northumbria. This district was now about to receive the Gospel. Northumbria was one of the most important kingdoms of England at this time, and Edwin its king—one of England's most powerful kings. He sought in marriage the hand of Ethelberga, the sister of Eadbald, king of Kent. She was a Christian, and she consented to the marriage on the condition only, that she should be allowed to observe the customs of her religion. For this purpose, when she went to Edwin's court to live, she carried with her a Christian Bishop, named Paulinus, and a deacon, named James. This was in the year 625. It is due to the efforts of Paulinus that the North again was taught the doctrines of Christianity. The same success we find attended his Mission, as followed the Mission of Augustine in Kent. Paulinus sought every opportunity to spread the Gospel. He tried hard to win the heart of the king. Several events happened, propitiously for him. One was, that

Edwin was saved from the assassin's knife which had been hurled at him by the instigation of Cwichelm, his determined enemy. Paulinus told the king that his escape was due to the mercy of God. The night on which this happened Ethelberga gave birth to a daughter, for which Edwin had prayed to other heathen gods. Paulinus told him that he had prayed to the Christian God that he might have the same blessing. Edwin was persuaded to believe that the gift was due to the prayers of Paulinus, and he allowed his daughter to be baptized. He also made a further promise, that if he should be successful in gaining a victory over Cwichelm, who had sent to assassinate him, he himself would become a Christian. Edwin went to battle. He was victorious. This fact led to the conversion of Northumbria, and through Northumbria of nearly the whole of England.

On his return from battle, Edwin called together a Council of his wise men and heathen priests, at Godmundham, to consider the question of renouncing their heathenism. The High Priest Coifi was called upon to speak of the merits of heathenism. [1]"The old worship," he said, "seems to me to be worth nothing: no man has practised it more than I, and yet many fare better, and have more favours at your hand. If the gods had any power, they would rather help ME, who have served them more than others. Let us then see what this new lore is good for; if it is better than the old, let us straightway follow it." A Thane also made a speech. [2]"I will tell you, O king," he said, "what methinks man's life is like. Sometimes, when your hall is lit up for supper, on a warm winter's evening, and warmed by a fire in the midst, a

[1] Quoted by Bright, p. 121. [2] Quoted by Bright, p. 121-2.

sparrow flies in by one door, takes shelter for a moment in the warmth, and then flies out again by another door, and is lost in the stormy darkness. No one in the hall sees the bird before it enters, nor after it has gone forth: it is only seen while it hovers near the fire. So it is, I ween, with this brief span of our life in this world, what has gone before it—what will come after it—of this we know nothing. If the strange teacher can tell us, by all means let him be heard."

Paulinus was heard, and he made the best use of the opportunity. He set forth, at their request, the teaching of Christianity on this subject. The people were convinced. The chief priest said that now he understood what the truth was. Edwin then and there publicly acknowledged the Gospel, and ordered that the altars and temples of heathenism should be destroyed. Coifi, the chief priest, was the first to begin the work. It was unlawful for anyone of his profession to ride a mare or bear arms, but Coifi disregarded this law, and he rode to the venerated temple, and was the first to hurl a spear against it, to signify his contempt for the old idolatry. His companions then burnt the building to the ground.

After this event rapid strides were made in the spreading of the Gospel. Edwin was baptized, and thousands of people followed his example. Paulinus spent most of his time for many weeks to come in going through the country, to perform the duty of baptizing. For six years Paulinus and Edwin worked together in harmony. Paulinus went to the North in the year 625. Edwin was killed in the battle of Hatfield in the year 633. The great enemy of that time was Penga, and he was the champion of heathenism. He slew

King Edwin. This was a dreadful calamity for Northumbria. This blow undid the whole work of the Gospel in the North. Paulinus had to fly with the queen into Kent. James, the faithful deacon, did not accompany him; but he stayed behind to do the best he could to rally the Christian forces under King Oswald. Oswald had a great desire to see the Gospel restored again to his kingdom, but it is significant to notice that Paulinus was not asked to come back again to carry on his work. Neither did Oswald ask Kent to help him in his difficulties at all. He appealed, kindly notice, to the old Scotch, the old British Church. At that time the Gospel flourished in the island of Hy. Oswald had lived there in the early days, and knew something about the Celtic priests. He made an appeal, then, to his old friends, and in answer to this a man named Colman was sent to his kingdom. But he found the people so hard to deal with that he returned home in despair. At a meeting held to discuss the situation after he returned, someone suggested that Colman had been a failure because he had not learnt the Apostolic precept to feed babes with milk. This was the opinion of S. Aidan. He was at once recognized as a fit person to take Colman's place. He was a strong and a saintly man, and he took up the work which Paulinus first, and Colman afterwards, had failed to accomplish; and the greatest success attended it. Thus you see that the North of England was re-converted to the Faith, not by the work of the Roman Mission, not through the efforts of the Christians in Kent, but through the priests and Bishops of the old Celtic or British Church. It was through their Mission in the North that many other parts of England were in future years evangelized, and not through

the work of the Mission in Kent—the Roman Mission. Through this renewed life in Northumbria, Essex and London were re-converted under Cedd. Mercia was also converted in the year 653. Wessex also was made Christian through the North, through the marriage of King Kynegil's daughter. The mid-Angles also were made Christian chiefly through the work of four Celtic priests—Cedd, Adda, Betti, and Diuma.

On the death of Honorius, the Archbishop of Canterbury, in the year 654, Rochester was the only Bishop in England who had been connected with the Roman Mission.

We have now reached that point of time in the history of the English Church when nearly the whole of England had embraced the Christian Faith. Many stalwart men had lived and died, many saintly men indeed, to spread the Gospel teaching. Among them we should mention S. Aidan, Finan, Cedd, Colman, S. Cuthbert, and Chad. These are men who worked hard to give our ancestors the knowledge of the Gospel; and all these, you must not forget, belonged to the Celtic Church. We must not forget this fact, that it was the old Celtic priests who specially helped in reviving the Christian religion in England, when we hear it so frequently said that England was converted to the Faith by the Romanists. Rome only gradually imposed its own customs on our country, as it did on every other nation. She made it appear as if our Church in England were under obligation to her, and under her authority.

During the sixth and seventh centuries the power of the Papal Court continued to grow, and became aggressive. The Popes, even then, desired to fill up the English Sees

with men who would bring over with them Roman customs. This is why it is that, from the time that Northumbria was again established in the Faith, we hear of continual disputes between the upholders of the old Celtic Church and those of the Roman Mission.

Already I have referred to these differences. Now that each party was in a prominent position again, these differences were more marked than even before. There were two things now on which the two Churches could not agree—the time when the feast of Easter should be kept, and the particular shape of the tonsure.

At Northumbria, in the same year, Easter was celebrated at different times, in accordance with the opinion of the respective upholders of their customs. It was thought to be absolutely necessary that, on so important a matter, some settlement should have been arrived at. A Conference was called at Whitby to consider the question. This was in the year 664. This was called by the order of King Oswy, of Northumbria. Colman, the old British Bishop, was there to represent the old custom, and Wilfrid, who was a Northumbrian, to uphold the truth of the Roman custom. He had spent much of his time in Rome, and became attached to the customs prevalent there. In many respects Wilfrid was a grand man and a splendid character. His life was a very troublesome one. He had but little peace in his life. Driven from country to country, immense money was offered for his head. Because he so loved Rome, in his difficulties he appealed to her for help. The Pope always took his side, with the hope, no doubt, that he might gain a hold on England. The king of Northumbria, however, did not care

for the Pope's decisions, and, in opposition to his wish, imprisoned Wilfrid on his return to England, and set the Pope's decision, on their mutual troubles, at defiance.

However, it is not my object to speak of the troubles of Wilfrid, or to write his history. And in what I have already referred to, I have anticipated events far beyond the date of the Whitby Council. To return to that again. Speakers in that Council were heard, who represented both sides of the question as to the time of keeping Easter, and it was entirely through the influence and personality of Wilfrid that it was decided that the Roman custom was the true one. The king gave forth the decision. We are given a glimpse at his reason for doing this.

[1]"Is it true, Colman," the king asked—you know that Colman upheld the Celtic custom—"Is it true that the keys of Heaven were given to S. Peter?" Colman admitted that it was true. "Then," said the king, "I will not oppose the door-keeper of Heaven, lest, when I present myself, I find no one to open the door to me."

The Conference settled that controversy which had for so long divided the Celtic from the Roman Churches, and after this was held we hear very little of the old Celtic party. Some of them, on the point to which we have now referred, who upheld the old Celtic custom, embraced the decision of the Council. Others resigned their positions in the North and returned to their old island at Hy. Among them was Colman, who was the Bishop of Lindisfarne.

Now we must again go back to Kent, to hear what happened there. S. Augustine was long since dead. Two of

[1] Quoted by Hore, p. 46, Ibid.

his successors were also dead, without having accomplished very much for the furtherance of the Gospel. A fearful pestilence, called the "yellow fever," had passed over the land and carried off many of the Christians and some of the most famous Bishops. Deusdedit, the Archbishop, died of this plague. After his death the See was vacant for a couple of years. There was no Bishop in England to consecrate a successor. Two of the kings chose a man named Wighard for the See, and sent him to Rome for consecration. But he died of the plague on the way. Then it was that the Pope's usurpation began to show itself. He himself proceeded to appoint a Bishop for Canterbury. His choice fell upon Theodore of Tarsus, an old man sixty-six years of age, who had great wisdom and wide learning. It was a happy choice. [1] "A better or a more judicious appointment," said Mr. Hore, "could not have been made." After Theodore was duly ordained and consecrated for his office he came to England, accompanied by Benedict Biscop, in the year 669.

Let us see in what way his work was an advantage to the Church of England.

Up to this time the Church in England was only a collection of so many independent Missions, without any recognized head or any centre of unity. The Celtic Church had not the capacity of organization. It could not bind the Church together into one whole. Rome excelled in this matter of organization, and Theodore had learnt the way to do it. His object, then, on coming to England was, first of all, to unite the separate Christian Missions, and to place them under one central authority. In order to carry out this object, he spent

[1] Hore, p. 49, Ibid.

three years in a general visitation of the kingdom. He filled up the Bishoprics which had been rendered vacant through the plague. He founded new dioceses, and split up those which were already grown too large.

In the year 673 also, he summoned a Council of the clergy at Hertford, with the object of reducing further the differences between the two different Christian elements in the land. At this Council there was drawn up a set of Ecclesiastical Canons for the government of the Church. It was decided also that Bishops should have no jurisdiction outside their dioceses, and that their work should be confined to their own dioceses. It was further resolved that the clergy were not to officiate in other dioceses without the consent of the Bishops. It was agreed that Synods should be held at least once a year to discuss matters concerning the welfare of the Church. Some people have considered that it was Theodore who attempted the organization of our present parochial system, but that is doubtful. Theodore's work was certainly to make the Church of England a *national* Church. He bound all the separated parts together. He made Canterbury the chief See, and York the next in importance. He was also the means of introducing Church music and architecture into our land. He made the Church a Church of learned men, and the great pity was that his life was well-nigh closed before he came to England.

You must not think that because Theodore was nominated to Canterbury by the Pope of Rome that he considered that England was submissive to Rome. He himself acted independently of her by ignoring her decisions. This was shown most clearly in his dealings with Wilfrid, whom he

opposed in spite of Wilfrid's protection at Rome. Theodore pursued his own course. He knew what ought to be done, and he fought through opposition to accomplish it. Theodore had quarrels with Wilfrid, because he wished to divide Wilfrid's See without having consulted him on the matter. In this trouble Wilfrid appealed to the Pope. But the Archbishop went his own way. Shortly before his death, in the year 690, he and Wilfrid were reconciled again.

In his desire to preserve the unity of the Church Theodore was often urged to take strong measures. Another instance of this was seen in his treatment of Chad, the Bishop of Lindisfarne. On coming to England the Archbishop thought that he saw a flaw in Chad's consecration, and as a result of this he deposed the saintly Chad from his See. "I will willingly resign my See," Chad said,[1] "if you consider I have not received the Episcopate rightly, of which I never thought myself worthy, but which I undertook for the sake of obedience to command."

Theodore lived long enough to learn that Chad was worthy of a Bishopric, and, after seeing that he was canonically consecrated, he appointed him to the See of Lichfield.

Of course Theodore had his faults, but the Church owes to him a great debt of gratitude. If a man of his stamp had been sent to convert the English to the Faith, the history of our country must have taken a very different turn. Augustine's Mission was a failure as much through his own weakness of character as through the trying conditions of the time. He had not been in England long before he sent a letter to Gregory, asking his advice as to what should be done with

[1] Hore, p. 50, Ibid.

the offerings of the people, and how should he deal with men guilty of sacrilege; such questions he asked, you see, as a strong man would think to be quite unnecessary to ask advice upon. Theodore was not a man of this type. He was strong, and he had great power of binding people together.

At last I am drawing to the close of this Lecture. I have wished to show you to-night how the Church's Faith was founded in England. You have seen that this was not done without determined struggles. We are taken to-night to the end of the seventh century, and at this time you find that the Church is well-organized in England, governed by its Bishops, guided by Canon law, kept alive by Synods and Councils. The two Archbishoprics at this date, Canterbury and York, were well-established, and many other Bishoprics were working under them.

Next week I shall turn to another subject—The growing claims over England of the Popes of Rome.

The Papal Usurpation.

LECTURE II.

The Papal Usurpation.

Outline of the Church's fortunes between Theodore and William the Conqueror. Growth of Papal Power. Canute and Rome. Dunstan. The Conqueror asks the Pope's help. William and Peter's pence. Lanfranc. Anselm and Rufus. Henry I. and Anselm. Thomas à Becket. His quarrel with the King. King John and the Pope. Stephen Langton. The Interdict. Opposition to the Pope's claims. Secret Society. Deputation to the Pope. England's sufferings. Work of Grosseteste. Simon de Montfort. Edward I. and Parliament. John XXII. and his demands. John Wycliffe.

AST week I traced the history of the first seven centuries of Christianity in our land. We saw how the Church was planted in England, and we watched it grow to what it was through many struggles and disappointments.

It is impossible in a few short lectures even to touch upon the chief outlines of all the events which have agitated the Church of England. To-night I shall have to pass over a good many years following the events related in the last Lecture. I will dwell more especially upon our struggles to resist the autocratic and domineering conduct of the Popes from the time of William the Conqueror's rule in England,

about the year 1068, to the death of John Wycliffe, 1384, who so persistently denounced and opposed the Roman Catholic claims and doctrines.

However, before I begin the special subject of this Lecture, it may be well to say a few words about the events which happened between the death of Archbishop Theodore and the accession of William to the throne.

After the administration of Theodore, the Church of England gained power and influence in the country. It bred and nurtured many men of world-wide fame. Two of them bare names which are household words. Caedmon, the monk of Whitby, is one. He it was who thought that he could not sing the praises of God in verse, but who, when he tried, found that his fellow men were entranced with his metrical writings of Scripture history. Bede, the scholar, priest, and abbot, is another faithful son of the Church. You have heard how we are indebted to him for his histories. You have heard the story of his persistent work even to the hour of his death.

There have been scores of such men as these since the days of Theodore, who worked hard for the Church before the time of the Norman Conquest.

As the Church grew in influence, it was recognized by the princes and kings of the land in their laws. Up to the time of Theodore the Church was allowed to work and live more as private societies than as a great national institution. But as the Church gained in influence, the desire grew to recognize it by the law of the land. We see it first noticed in this way as far back as 605, in the dooms of Ethelbert. But its position and power were much more distinctly recognized

in the laws of Ina, king of Wessex, about 690 A.D., and of Wehtraed, king of Kent, in 696. The Church in time was freed from many civil burdens. Bishops were given a social position next to the kings and nobility. The people were the means of building many new Churches in the land. Kings gave money for this purpose from their private purses. So did many Bishops and nobles. At the time of the Norman Conquest there were probably more than two thousand parishes in England. The clergy were provided for by the free-will offerings of the people, and by tithes given by rich landowners, who left their property to their successors subject to the condition that they continued to pay the same tithes.

The general duty of the clergy in those days was much the same as it is at present. They had to provide for the Church services, and administer the Sacraments of the Eucharist and Holy Baptism. They heard the confessions of the people and visited the sick and needy, and performed the offices of marriage and burial. They were to see that the Church fabric, the books and vestments and ecclesiastical vessels were kept in good repair. The state of their parishes had to be reported by the clergy to the Synod held every year. They instructed the youths in the Commandments, the Lord's Prayer, and the Apostles' Creed.

As we draw nearer to the time of the middle ages, the Church of England began to decline in power and purity. The Monasteries, of which there were many in England, gradually became defiled, and the clergy were given over to licentious living. The monastic clergy, who were called the regular clergy, and the parish priests, who were called

the secular clergy—because they often were married men, and sometimes followed a secular craft to gain a livelihood—were very frequently engaged in disgraceful feuds. The secular and the regular clergy of Canterbury were notorious for their disagreements, especially when the subject of dispute was the election of an Archbishop to their See. All this, of course, helped to weaken the Church.

But another catastrophe awaited it. That was the incursion of the Danes. They began to come in the year 787. A section of them settled in East Anglia in 866, another section at York in 868. They followed the customs of the Saxons in their treatment of the Church. Scores of Churches were destroyed, and many of the clergy were butchered. The monks of Lindisfarne, which was one of the Bishoprics of the North, had to fly to save their lives, carrying with them the bones of S. Cuthbert, a former Bishop. The famous Monasteries of Wearmouth and Jarrow were destroyed. But I cannot stay to dwell upon these ravages. I will only mention further that a noble champion arose against them, the famous Alfred. He became a king in the year 871. One of his first acts was to defeat the Danes in a great battle. He could not succeed in driving them out of England. He therefore did what he could to make them his friends. By his means many of them were converted to the Faith and became members of the Church of England. Alfred's chief work of life was to elevate the Church of England to what it was in years gone by. He became a Christian legislator. In disposing of his money, only one-third of it did he keep for his private needs, another third he gave to the Church, and one-third he devoted to the wants of the poor. He

purified the morals of his time. He gave to the Church the privileges that it had enjoyed from many of his predecessors. His work was very difficult, but it was a holy work.

I must now come to the chief subject of this evening's Lecture, and that is to show that the Church of England as a Church never, during the time now under review, and certainly never since, save at the time of the reign of Queen Mary, recognized that the Pope had the primacy over us. It never recognized, as a Church, I say, that the Pope was its head, and that, as a Church, we should obey or even follow him in his doctrinal innovations. Some men there were no doubt, members of the Church of England, who acknowledged Rome's demands. Some certainly did acknowledge the Pope's authority. But they were generally those men who had been educated and brought up under Rome, and thrust into English Sees and livings through the diplomacy of the Popes. Many Englishmen had special regard for Rome, because it was the home of most of the culture and knowledge of those days, and they looked upon the Bishop of Rome as having more authority than Bishops of less important Sees, because his Church covered the bodies of S. Peter and S. Paul. But this is quite a different matter from thinking that our people considered that the Pope had a right to govern the Church in our land, or even had the right to demand our obedience.

We have to call to mind that, at the time of which we are now speaking, the papal pretentions were more fully developed than at the time when Gregory sent his missionaries to England. Several of the objectionable doctrines of Roman Catholicism were now coming into prominence. Such as

the doctrine of the celibacy of the clergy, and transubstantiation. The Pope of Rome then, unlike the Bishops of our days or even Bishops of England at that time, maintained a Court not equalled in splendour and magnificence by any other Court of Europe. The Pope was a king. Yea, more powerful than a king. For the Pope made kings tremble before him, and humble themselves for his alliance and friendship. The papal power was also an aggressive power. It was as much its object to conquer countries as the object of any regal Court who made no pretentions to religion. That power tried to conquer England. It forced upon us its paid servants, and most unscrupulously did its utmost to carry the revenue of our richest Sees into its own coffers. It demanded money of us; and what was England to do? We were often terrified into payment, or else expect the Pope to send across a conquering army.

As Englishmen of note went to Rome, it was the object of the Pope to gain their favours by representing to them that it would be to their interest to serve his Church.

It was probably in the year 1027 that Canute went on a pilgrimage to Rome. His object in going there, he said, was [1]"to pray for the forgiveness of his sins and for the welfare of his people." He wrote a letter home, saying to the Bishops of England, as Mr. Hore expresses it, [2]"That he had obtained from the Pope an abatement of the expenses incurred by the Archbishop in obtaining the pall. He adjured the Bishops and Government of England to take care that all dues belonging to God, according to the old laws, be paid"; amongst which he mentioned Peter's pence. If they

[1] Hore, p. 91, Ibid. [2] Hore, p. 92, Ibid.

were not paid, he said, "defaulters would be fined according to the law."

We are now to pass on to see how the English nation and Church would tolerate this unwarrantable interference. We shall notice that even those whose sympathies were with the doctrines of Rome very often opposed the Pope's demands.

Dunstan is a signal instance of this. He was born in the year 924, and was closely connected with the history of the Abbey of Glastonbury, and ultimately he became the Primate of all England. In heart he was a Romanist. He urged on his clergy the doctrine of celibacy. He was a thorough-going monk, and he did not scruple to pretend that he had wrought many miracles. But when the Pope wished to interfere with the internal arrangements of our Church government Dunstan boldly defied his right. A certain earl had married someone outside the lawful degrees. In the year 970 Dunstan excommunicated him—that is to say, he deprived him of the privileges and the blessings of the Church. The Pope heard of this and sent back an order that Dunstan should remove the curse which he had pronounced. Dunstan said in reply: [1] "When I see the excommunicated person penitent for his faults I shall willingly obey his Holiness' commands, but till this happens God forbid that I should do anything to cause the nobleman to continue in his sin and insult the discipline of the priesthood." The nobleman ultimately repented, and Dunstan gave him absolution. Up to the time of William, [2] "England had always observed an independence of Rome," says Mr. Hore, "for which the Pope owed it no love or gratitude."

[1] Quoted by Hore, p. 87, Ibid. [2] Hore, p. 95.

It was about the time of William the Conqueror that the Popes tried very hard to gain a footing here. Let us now follow the history of this attempt.

The Popes watched the history of the world with eager eyes. As a matter of course, then, the Pope interested himself in the attempt of William to conquer England. Normandy, you must remember, whence William came, was at that time one of the strongholds of Roman Catholicism, and the Pope perhaps thought for this reason that he had a right to interest himself in this expedition, and even to give it his protection. But William knew quite well how to get along without his help. It is not my business to trace the conquests of the Conqueror, or to speak of the good which came to England from his labours. But I want to show how he defied the Pope, when that personage demanded William's obedience, as though it had been the custom of former kings to give this, and there had been no dispute concerning it.

William was firm in having his own supremacy respected, and once he asked the Pope to aid him in demanding this. He desired, on coming to England, to get rid of many of the worthless clergy, who had no virtue in them to recommend them to their office. He was certainly a religious-minded man. The Archbishop of Canterbury was one of these men, and it was to depose him that William appealed for the help of the Pope. In reply to this supplication, a papal legate was sent to England, with the commission to hold a Council to consider the subject. A papal legate had not been seen in England since the time of Ofa, king of Mercia, three hundred years before. The Council was held

at Winchester, in the year 1070, and William was successful in his wish. This fact, of course, encouraged the Pope to impose himself on England. But at that time, remember, William was in a difficulty, and he only appealed to the Pope to help him to accomplish his own purposes. William's real mind respecting the Pope's authority is seen through other incidents. Green, the historian, says that with [1] "strictness William enforced his supremacy over the Church. Homage was exacted from Bishop as from baron. No royal vassal could be excommunicated without the king's license. No Synod could legislate without his previous assent, and subsequent confirmation of its decrees. No papal letters could be received within the realm, save by his permission. William was, indeed, the one ruler of his time who dared firmly to repudiate the claims which were now beginning to be put forward by the Court of Rome." These decisions, you notice, show that William took a strong stand against the Pope, and by this means the Pope's intentions towards England could not be realized before they would be stopped by William's absolute control. If William fought for anything, it was the insular independence of the Church of England.

When the famous Hildebrand was raised to the papal throne he renewed his Church's claim over our country. No doubt he was under the impression that England was under his control. He wrote to William demanding that his people should pay him Peter's pence, and, what was more audacious still, that William should do homage to him for his crown. This was the way the Popes had. If only they

[1] Short History (Edition 1882), p. 82.

could succeed in making kings believe that the Popes were the lawful possessors of all kingdoms, and that kings had their right of rule as a gift from them, the whole world might then be made subservient to the Church of Rome, and the Popes might then claim absolute obedience and command enormous wealth. But William was not to be frightened by even an iron-willed Hildebrand. He replied to those demands, that he would not hinder his subjects, if they wished it, from giving the Pope his pence; but it was to be understood to be a freewill offering, and not as a due. But on the matter of his submission for his crown, he boldly replied: [1] "Fealty I have never willed to do, nor do I will to do it now. I have never promised it." And he added, significantly, "Nor do I find that my predecessors promised it to yours."

Mr. Hore, in his history of the Church of England, bears out this same testimony. [2] "Papal letters might not be received into the kingdom," he says, unless William "had himself first seen them. No suit might be carried to Rome without his sanction, nor were papal legates allowed to land in England without the royal license. At the same time, he did not overlook his own supremacy over the Church of England; the Church might pass no new canons unless they had been first approved by him, nor inflict ecclesiastical penalties on any of the king's vassals without his leave, nor might any clergyman leave the kingdom at his own will."

The independence of the Church from Rome, which William so strenuously maintained, was also upheld by the Primate Lanfranc, whom William had brought over to fill the See from the Continent. The Pope ordered Lanfranc to go to

[1] Green, p. 83. [2] p. 104, Ibid.

Rome to receive the pall from his hands, but we do not read that he ever went. And yet he was in heart a Roman Catholic. He was probably the first prelate in England to teach the doctrine of transubstantiation. He also favoured the celibacy of the clergy. Still the Pope's strong threat did not render him obedient. [1] "Hitherto," said Pope Hildebrand, "you have out of pride or negligence abused our patience. . . . By virtue of our Apostolic authority we enjoin you, that setting aside all pretences and insignificant apprehensions of danger, you make your appearance at Rome within four months." In case of disobedience he was threatened to be thrown outside S. Peter's protection, and would be deprived of the power of exercising his ecclesiastical functions.

Although these facts are true about the resistance of the king to the Pope's growing claims, we must accuse the Conqueror of bringing England nearer Rome and giving the Pope some show of authority here. The fact that he appointed such men as Lanfranc, who was a foreigner and brought up under the influence of Rome, to our English Sees and livings, must have increased the Pope's authority.

The successors to the throne of the Conqueror were by no means model kings. As far as their relation to the Church went, in theory, they believed in their own royal supremacy, over both things temporal and things spiritual. They used their supremacy so badly, that many of the clergy, in the choice of two evils, chose the lesser, and preferred to look for help to the Pope of Rome. Anselm is an instance of this, who succeeded Lanfranc at Canterbury.

[1] Quoted by Hore, p. 105.

He was born in the very heart of Romanism, and was brought up, a great part of his life, in its Monasteries. It was with reluctance that he accepted the office of Archbishop of Canterbury. But as soon as he came into power there was a series of disputes and quarrels between him and William Rufus, the king. This king had greatly sinned against the Church, by using its money for his own private purposes. He kept the See of Canterbury vacant for several years, in order to appropriate its funds to his use. It is no wonder then that when Anselm came he appealed to the powerful Pope to restore the rights of the Church. Rufus tried his utmost to hinder this, as well as to prevent Anselm from going to Rome to receive the pall. Their differences were intensified by the fact that there were two Popes now claiming the supreme control. The one whom Rufus recognized was not the man whom Anselm favoured. Rufus desired that Anselm should receive the pall from him. Anselm replied that this was never done before. He fled from home, and the king would not reinstate him in his See. The Pope sent to say that if Rufus refused to reinstate the Archbishop he should be excommunicated. The only notice Rufus took of this threat was to reply that he would tear out the Pope's messengers' eyes if they should come to England. So they did not come. These events show you how Rome continued to desire a hold over the English Church. It was because such strife existed at home, and men were put into our Sees who had sympathies with, and sometimes a belief in the superiority of Rome, that in their difficulties men sought the Romanists' aid.

We now pass on to another reign. When Henry I. came to the throne he declared that he would preserve "God's

holy Church free"; and some time after this he opposed the introduction of a papal legate into England. This king, however, was compelled to recall Anselm to his old post. Then began another series of troubles, in which the Pope was an interested party. The subject of dispute now was over the right of investiture. This was a ceremony which put the Archbishop in the possession of the goods and chattels, and of the spiritual jurisdiction of the See. The king considered it was his right to give Anselm the archiepiscopal ring, and that Anselm should receive both his spiritual and temporal authority from him. In this matter he was upholding the law of his realm. He further said that it was his right to demand the Archbishop's homage for these benefits. The Archbishop considered the matter in another way. He objected to receiving his spiritual authority from the king. He, in fact, denied the king's supremacy over the Church, and preferred the authority of Rome. The other Bishops of England were astounded at him for thus opposing the law of the land, although it was known, of course, that he was a foreigner. This difficulty was settled agreeably; that Anselm should do homage to the king for his temporal power connected with the See, but that he should receive his spiritual authority from the Pope. Rome took advantage of this decision, and turned it to good account in years to come.

It was such discords as those to which we have now alluded which sowed the seeds of spiritual disease throughout the Church in Stephen's time. The Church of England was brought to a very low ebb indeed. It became a common saying "that Christ and His saints slept."

Now I must refer to another trouble which rent the Church, and led the nation to assert its abhorrence of the claims of Rome. This is concerned with Henry II. and Thomas à Becket. It may be well to give a few facts about Becket's life. He was born in London in the year 1118, and was the son of a merchant. He was educated by the Augustinian Friars at Merton, in Surrey, and afterwards in London. A portion of his life was spent in Paris, whence he returned to business in London. After this he took deacon's orders, and went to Bologna, Auxerre, and Rome to study law. He became a rector in London, and also in Kent. He was a prebend of S. Paul's and Lincoln, and Archdeacon of Canterbury. He was a great friend of the king, and became his chancellor. In his early days he upheld the king's judgment, and was sent by him in 1157 to Paris to negotiate a marriage for Prince Henry, of whom he was the tutor. In the year 1161 the Archbishop of Canterbury died, and Henry then wished Becket to fill his post; but Becket was not willing to undertake the responsibility. He said that his past secular life made him unworthy of such a position. He further objected, because, as he said, he knew [1] "the very heart of the king; that he would desire authority in Church affairs to which, as Archbishop," he said, "I should not consent. I should either have to lose the king's favour or that of God." Apart from this, Becket was only in deacon's orders. All objections, however, were over-ruled. He was one day ordained as priest, and on the next day consecrated for the primacy. From that moment a complete change took place in his character. All at once he threw up

[1] Lane, Church History Notes, p. 191, Early Period (S.P.C.K.).

his chancellorship; and Henry, to his surprise, saw in him quite a different man. He became most vigilant in all religious duties. He really threw off all his past worldly habits, and devoted himself to the matters of religion with vigour. Beneath his gorgeous episcopal robes he wore a shirt of hair, and on being prepared for his burial it was discovered that insects nestled snugly beneath it, and that they had eaten their way through his very skin and flesh. The king did not bargain for such a man. You have all heard Becket's subsequent history. The king and he were in continual feuds. Becket had to fly frequently from the land, and to stay away from his See for years together; and at last, when a reconciliation was effected, some other cause arose that led Henry to utter some hasty words about him in the presence of his retainers. They, unknown to him, escaped to England, made their way to Canterbury, and in the coldest blood slew the Archbishop at the Altar. One of the barbarous wretches, after Becket lay dead at his feet, clave the skull in two, and with the point of his sword scattered the primate's brains upon the pavement. The king did penance for this murder in the following months; and Becket was held in such estimation through this tragic end that, even up to the Reformation, pilgrimages of thousands went to his tomb for religious purposes. I cannot stay to consider Becket's character further, or to estimate its value—a most interesting and profitable study—for it would take me too far from my purpose. Let us see what his struggles were with the king in order to illustrate how the papal powers influenced England.

Becket's quarrels with the king arose over the question—who had the right to punish offending clergy? The king

said that the clergy who were guilty of crimes should be tried in the Royal Courts, but Becket held that they came under the jurisdiction of the Ecclesiastical Courts. The King's ruling was against the law, as put in force by the Conqueror. From a moral point of view, however, he was in the right, for priests tried in the Ecclesiastical Courts did not always receive the punishment commensurate with their crimes. A great Council was held at Westminster, in the year 1163, to consider the burning question. No satisfactory conclusion was arrived at. This led both parties to appeal to the Pope, and, as had often happened before, the Pope decided in the Archbishop's favour. This fact, you see, led to another forfeiture of our Church's liberty.

Such troubles as I have now related, in the year 1164 led to another important Council, held at Clarendon, where sixteen constitutions were drawn up, relative to matters affecting the Church of England. The general tenor of the articles was to restrain the authority of the Church, and to make the clergy punishable by the Civil Courts. But they also resisted and restrained the influence of the Pope of Rome in England. They reasserted the old principle that the papal interference should be opposed. Prelates were not allowed to quit England without the permission of the king. Becket seemed to play a double part in his opinion of these constitutions. He swears his consent to them, but refused to give his signature, and then he sought absolution from his oath from the Pope of Rome. As he heard the constitutions read, he declared that now [1] "Christ was to be judged anew before Pilate." Here I must leave this remarkable man.

[1] Hore, p. 133, Ibid.

It is now my duty to relate a very dark story in the history of the Church of England. I must relate events which roused strong men to attempt to cut short the evils which attended them. I am sorry to have to tell you how at last the Pope, for a short while, became the master of England. You perhaps know that we are speaking of the time of the weak and vacillating John. The reigning Pope at the time of King John was Innocent III., and no man before his reign had carried the papal pretentions so high as he carried them. [1]Innocent considered himself to be "The Vicegerent of God, that he stood between God and man, less than God, more than man." This Pope, we must remember, was quite as strong in character as John was weak.

Troubles now arose over the election of the Archbishop of Canterbury. The monks of Canterbury and the Church did not agree in their election of a man, and each party considered it had equal right to decide the question. As usual the Pope was requested to tender his help. Through him, ultimately, Stephen Langton, a Yorkshireman, was nominated. John protested against the Pope's choice, and he vowed that Langton should not be elected. The Pope made reply that if the king were faithful to his word his kingdom should be put under an interdict. [2]"If anyone dared to put his kingdom under an interdict," burst forth John, "he would send them packing to Rome and confiscate their goods. If they were the subjects of the Pope he would pluck out their eyes, slit their noses, and so return them to the Pope." But in the face of this brave reply, in the year 1208, the interdict came, and it stayed in England for five

[1] See Hore, p. 143, Ibid. [2] Hore, p. 145, Ibid.

years. The Pope had so many men in England obedient to his will that it was very fully observed, except in the dioceses of Winchester, Durham, and Norwich. What harm could this interdict do to England? It is best to relate the consequence of it in Mr. Southey's words. During the whole of the time just mentioned,[1] "No bell was heard, no taper lighted, no service performed, no Church open; only baptism was permitted, and confession and the sacrament for the dying; the dead were either interred in unhallowed ground, without the presence of a priest or any religious ceremony, . . . or they were kept unburied till the infliction, which affected every family in its tenderest and holiest feelings, should be removed. Some little mitigation was allowed, lest human nature should have rebelled against so intolerable a tyranny. The people, therefore, were called to prayers and sermon on the Sunday, in the churchyards, and marriages were performed at the Church doors."

In addition to sending the interdict, the Pope also excommunicated John, and threatened him with deposition from his throne. And he was strong enough to do this too, which John knew, and this increased John's fear. When John saw that the legate Pandulf had set foot in England to carry out the Popes threat, he was forced to submit to his will. It was simply a matter of the superior will of the strong Pope conquering the feeble will of the feeble John. The king was urged to resign his crown by placing it at the legate's feet. Then it was given back to him from the hands of Rome as a present; this act signifying that John held his kingdom as a gift from Rome, and that, therefore, all his subjects were also vassals of the Pope.

[1] Book of the Church, p. 157 (Fifth edition).

The worst part of this story has now been related. The manly sequel awaits our close attention.

The people, the barons, and the clergy, in fact the whole nation, were roused to the greatest indignation at this unwarrantable insolence of Innocent, and at the cowardice of John. They hated John for his obedience. Stephen Langton, the Pope's chosen Archbishop, played a splendid part. He headed the barons, clergy, and people ; the nation joined him, almost to a man, and several Councils were called to consider England's doleful state. Meetings were held at S. Alban's as well as at S. Paul's. The king tried to dally with this movement, but he had no strength behind him. Only seven of his knights remained faithful to him. The result of this movement was the great English Charter, which was a monument of English freedom. It laid it down that the Anglican Church is free—the words are *Anglicana Ecclesia*—and it has its own laws and liberties, and we wish them to be observed. The decisions laid down in this document were confirmed several times in subsequent struggles in England. John was compelled to sign this at Runnymede, on June 15th, 1215, but his anger was so great that he actually threw himself on the ground and gnawed bits of sticks and straw in his rage. After he gave his signature, he immediately sent a letter to the Pope to say that he was still his vassal ; and the Pope, in reply, pronounced the Magna Charta to be null and void, and he sent a bull to England denouncing it. He also ordered Stephen Langton to see that his demands be carried out, which, of course, Langton refused to do. Untold joy went throughout England when it was known that Pope Innocent was dead. He had done

more than anyone else to bring England under the authority of his mother Church, and England could not speedily recover from the harm which the Roman See had now done to it.

I must continue to relate other troubles to show how the English people continually and persistently resisted the claims of Rome.

Henry III. came to the throne of England, and he was a Romanist. During his reign the papal imposition in England took a different and a more decided turn. Rome was now embroiled in expensive wars, and it was thought that part of the money to carry them on should come from our country. There were two ways of procuring it—by imposing taxes on us and demanding Peter's pence, and by filling up our rich Sees and benefices with foreigners, through whom much wealth might be taken to Rome. We cannot fully understand the misery caused to our country by these measures. The Pope had many men in England to help him in his plans. The Dominican and Franciscan Friars were active in working according to his will.

The nation ultimately raised a great outcry against these impositions. In the year 1231 a secret society was founded in England to oppose these evils. Letters were freely circulated which emphasized the evils, and this led to a widespread insurrection. The people [1] "Seized the tithes collected for the Pope," says Mr. Hore; "They trampled his bulls under foot. The barns of the foreigners were destroyed and the corn distributed amongst the poor, and the foreigners were in danger

[1] p. 160, Ibid.

of their lives." The Pope denounced the secret society, and accused the Bishops of being members of it. The Archbishop of that time, Edmond Rich, was so disgusted at the king for allowing Rome to rob our Churches, that he at last resigned his See and spent the rest of his days in exile. What urged him especially to take this course was the order issued to the king by the legate of the Pope, that no Englishmen should be given any preferment before the king found three hundred benefices for the Romanists.

The spirit of opposition grew, and in the year 1245, a deputation, headed by Earl Bigod and several other barons, was sent to the Pope, to give him a description of their grievances, and to protest against his pretentions over England. These men complained, says Mr. Hore, [1] "That the English benefices were held by foreigners, men who could not speak English, and were otherwise incapacitated: that Italians drew above 60,000 marks annually from the Church, a sum larger than the revenues of the crown; and that this, coupled with the *non obstante* clause in the bulls, was an intolerable imposition. What galled them most was the annual payment of the 1,000 marks covenanted by John. They said that it had been protested against from the first, and that neither their ancestors nor themselves would endure such a badge of slavery."

The deputation returned from Rome without receiving any redress. The national cry of woe increased. Even the king was compelled to join in it. He wrote to the Pope, saying that if he did not listen to his people's entreaties it would be unfortunate for himself as well as for his Court. Part

[1] p. 162-3.

of the king's letter ran, [1] "Indeed, the English Churches are burdened with so many heavy provisions of this kind, that not only are the patrons of Churches, and those whose duty it is to confer ecclesiastical benefices, defrauded of their rights, but besides this many works of charity are given up. For these benefactions, which are usually charitably bestowed on religious houses for their sustentation, and almost all others, are exhausted by your provisions."

The Pope, however, seeing that he had so much strength behind him, could afford to laugh at Henry. No change was made. A proclamation was then issued, saying that not a penny should be given to Rome; but at the last moment the king's courage failed to carry this out, and England was burdened heavier than before.

Listen for a moment to the account of England's wretchedness from these extortions, as given by a writer of the time. [2] "Every day," said Matthew Paris, "illiterate persons of the lowest class, armed with bulls from Rome, burst forth into threats, and despite the privileges enjoyed by our holy predecessors, feared not to plunder the revenues which our pious forefathers had assigned for the maintenance of the religious, the support of the poor, and the sustaining of strangers; for thundering out their decrees of excommunication they made no delay in taking what they demanded by force. And if those who suffered wrong, or were plundered, took refuge in an appeal, or in their privileges, they at once suspended and excommunicated them through some other prelate, under power of a writ from the Pope."

[1] The Misrule of Henry III., p. 80. English History from Contemporary Writers.

[2] p. 25, Ibid.

The spirit of the nation, then, continued to be roused. Some men were bold enough to defy the Pope. The Bishops of London and Worcester refused to pay him his demands. A consultation was held by the prelates in London on the matter of giving the first-fruits of their Sees to Rome, and after they had carefully deliberated upon the matter, says a contemporary writer, [1] "Bishop Fulk, of London, said, with a long drawn sigh, 'Rather than willingly subject our great Church to slavery, wrong, and intolerable oppression, I will lose my head.' On seeing his determination, Bishop Walter, of Worcester, loudly exclaimed, 'And I will be hung, rather than see Holy Church so ruined.'"

In considering the national movement against the imposition of the Pope, we must mention another champion of the people's cause—Robert Grosseteste, the Bishop of Lincoln. He had occasion to go to Rome to consult the Pope on some difficulties at home. While there his eyes were opened to the grave harm Rome was doing to the Church of England. When he found that money was needed before he could receive advice, he called out in the presence of the Pope, [2] "O, money, money, what power thou hast, especially in the Court of Rome." This led him to resist with all his will the Roman claims on England when he returned home. [3] "From 1247 he waged a ceaseless war against the attempts of the Pope to tax the English clergy on behalf of the private needs of the Roman See, and to provide for foreign ecclesiastics by conferring on them English offices and benefices, of which, in many cases, the duties were beyond their powers or

[1] Simon de Montfort and his Cause, p. 59-60.
[2] Misrule of Henry III., p. 132. [3] Ibid, p. 153.

outside their intentions. . . . He traced all the evils of the Church to the corruption of the Curia and the greed and avarice of the Romans."

In the year 1253, Grosseteste most boldly and righteously opposed the Pope in another matter. The Pope ordered him to instal his nephew, a mere boy who was not even in Holy Orders, into a canonry. He absolutely refused to do so, or as he himself expressed it, he [1] "filially and obediently refused to obey." The letter in which the refusal was conveyed spoke out strongly against the Pope's wickedness.

[2] "Those are guilty," he said, "who receive the profits without performing the sacerdotal office. Those who appoint such unqualified persons are most to blame, especially in proportion to their high station. The Holy Apostolic See, which has received its authority for edification and not for destruction, can never countenance such a horrible prevarication which would amount to a forfeiture of its authority; indeed, such persons might be said to sit in the chair of pestilence with the devil and antichrist."

I think you will now acknowledge that I have said quite enough to show you how the English people opposed the claim of Rome over them, enough to show that Englishmen did not recognize that the Pope of Rome had legal authority in our land.

I could give you many other instances to bear out this testimony.

I must beg to crave your attention a little longer in order

[1] Hore, p. 167.

[2] Ibid, p. 166. See p. 30-31, Simon de Montfort and his Cause. English History from Contemporary Writers.

to refer to a couple more attempts on the part of Englishmen, before the Reformation, to cast off the power of the Popes of Rome.

The first of these attempts was headed by Simon de Montfort, and the other by the great John Wycliffe.

The country was so roused up by the papal impositions, that in the year 1258 the barons again determined to make a stand for liberty. There was a civil war. At the head on the one side was De Montfort, and the king on the other side to fight the cause of the Pope. Simon de Montfort called a Parliament together at Westminster, and he was well supported by the clergy, and this shows whether the Church was papal then. Thirteen Bishops, four deans, sixty-five abbots, and thirty-five priors, all attended this Parliament. In 1264 De Montfort, having gathered a great army around him, met the king's forces at Lewes. He defeated them, and took the king and his son prisoners. He now, in everything except the name, was king of England. But the other party had a turn in their affairs. On August 24th, 1265, De Montfort was met in battle by the young Prince Edward, and both he and his son were slain. Thus the national cause for a while was lost again. The Pope became more triumphant than ever.

Edward I., however, on coming to the throne continued Simon de Montfort's work. Following his example, he called together a Parliament, 1295, where the clergy were represented, and in which the nation could air their grievances and legislate accordingly. It was at first called to raise money for the king's wars, but it also led to a series of oppositions to the Pope's power. Petitions were presented

to Parliament complaining of Rome's impositions. The complaint was made again that the Sees and livings in England were conferred upon Italians, who never resided in the country. Complaints were made of the payment of first-fruits of vacant benefices to Rome; "A thing never heard of before," they said. Objection was raised to the payment of Peter's pence, which now was treble the original amount. A declaration was drawn up in the House, saying that these [1]"grievances, oppressions, and extortions should no longer be permitted in the king's domains." The clergy, however, were afraid of a repetition of such experience as John had brought upon them through the interdict.

The Papal Power at this time was at its height, and internal divisions were bringing about its fall.

From the years 1309-1377 there were rival Popes, one of them holding his Court at Avignon. But the papists did not, in their troubles, lose sight of England. John XXII. sent further demands for money. Parliament said, in reply, "They neither could nor would tolerate such a state of things any longer." What was the state of things which they would not tolerate? You may gather it from the following facts: Between the years 1317-34 [2]Pope John, more than once, appointed men on his own authority to the English Sees of Worcester, Lichfield, Hereford, and Durham; to Rochester, Lincoln, Winchester, Carlisle, Norwich, Exeter, and Bath and Wells. Besides this he often appointed men to vicarages and rectories.

Such facts helped to lead, in the year 1351, to another great English Act—The Statute of Provisors. This declared

[1] Hore, p. 179. [2] See Hore, p. 181.

[1] "That if the Pope collated to any ecclesiastical benefice, or dignity in England, the collation was to escheat to the crown for that term." Anyone who procured "reservations or provisions from the Pope should, on conviction, be fined and imprisoned!" What answer did the Pope give to this? His demands were only increased.

In 1365 a further command was given for the payment of 1,000 marks which had been promised by King John, and thirty-three years' arrears were ordered to be paid as well. The English people decided that neither John nor any other of their kings could bring the English under such servitude and subjection without the consent of Parliament. And this consent, they said, had never been given. That money should be paid to Rome, they added, was contrary to John's coronation oath. In consequence of the demand the king was strong enough to stop the payment of Peter's pence to Rome, and after this, says Professor Green, [2] "The claim of papal lordship over England was never heard of again." This statement, however, is rather premature.

And now, in the last place, I must make only a short reference to the work of John Wycliffe, the "Morning Star of the Reformation," as he has been called. His date extends from 1324-1384. His early days are wrapped in much obscurity. We know most about his life at Oxford as student, graduate, fellow, and professor. He received Holy Orders, and became rector of Fellingham, in Lincolnshire; of Ludgershall, in Bucks; and Lutterworth, where he ended his days. Wycliffe's work, of course, was to oppose the principle of the Romanists that the Pope had supreme

[1] Hore, p. 184. [2] See Hore, p. 185.

spiritual authority in England. But it is not for this that he is chiefly famed, but for an entirely new line of attack upon the papacy. He condemned the morals and the doctrines of the upholders of the See of Rome. He inquired into the evil lives of the friars, of whom there were many in England in his days. It was when Wycliffe was a leader in Oxford that he discussed the doctrine of transubstantiation, and preached against the celibacy of the clergy, and showed the evils attendant upon the papal practices. He appealed for his authority in his teaching to the Holy Scriptures, and he defied anyone to show him that the peculiar papal principles could be proved from their pages. Wycliffe, then, please observe, preceded Luther in his chief contention that the Bible should be the final Court of Appeal in matters referring to the religious life. He thought that no better course could be followed; no better work would be done than that of placing in the people's hands the Holy Scriptures. With this object he produced several translated versions of the Bible, and he appointed his poor friars to go through the country to make it known to even the boy who drove the plough. I expect you know something about the troubles through which they passed. You have heard of Wycliffe's persecutors. But this man had a work to do, and he did it manfully in spite of anathemas from Rome, and in spite of discouragement and opposition from home.

Now to-night I have had to pass through a long range of subjects, and I fear that it may have wearied some of you. But it was most important that an overwhelming mass of facts should have been placed before your attention, in order to convince you that the Church of England before the

Reformation was not really the Church of Rome. What have you learnt to-night? Certainly that England did not *recognize* that the Pope was their lord and master, their Spiritual Father before the Reformation.

The Church of England, as a Church, was not a papal Church in the years we have had under our review. Had it been a papal Church you would not have seen so many national movements to curb the Pope's authority. Had it been a papal Church no doubt would have been raised respecting the Pope's right of spiritual lordship. What you have learned to-night is that the Popes of Rome tried their utmost to subjugate England to their will, and to make our Church subservient to their aims. You have learnt also that Rome sowed the seeds of strife, which were not destroyed till after the age of the Reformation. England before the Reformation was not strong enough to deal effectually with the Popes and their cautious emissaries. It had to tolerate the aggressions of a despotic master, and to be content merely with feebly objecting to his conduct, and with expressions of disapproval and contempt.

Next week I hope to speak on that movement known as the Reformation.

The Reformation.

LECTURE III.

The Reformation.

Did the Church break from the past? Causes of Reformation. Papal aggression. State of Morality. Continental Protestantism. Revival of Learning. The Divorce. Religious character of Henry. Acts of Reformation. Supremacy. Destruction of Monasteries. Doctrinal reforms. Bible. Ten Articles. Liturgy. Edward VI. His reforms. Book of Homilies. The Prayer Books. Forty-two Articles. Controversy on Vestments and Altar. Re-action under Mary. Doctrinal test. Persecution. Elizabeth. The Reformers. Supremacy. Mary's work undone. Episcopal Ordination. Thirty-nine Articles. The Romanists. The benefits of the Reformation. Services in common tongue. Pope's power over the Church of England destroyed. Gift of Prayer Book and Articles of Religion. Continuity of Church of England.

O-NIGHT I am going to speak of that change which took place in the Church of England known as the Reformation. The time covered by the events about to be related extends from the twentieth year of the reign of Henry VIII., 1529, to the death of Queen Elizabeth in the year 1603. The object which I have in view to-night is to show what the Reformation really was. As I have already stated, many people assert, and some of them believe, that at the Reformation an entirely new Church was made in England, and that before

that movement the Church was Roman Catholic, and further, that the Church of England began its life in the time of Henry, who, it is asserted, gave it birth.

Such statements as these, however, are without historical foundation. History, in fact, asserts the opposite opinion. Ask yourselves for a moment what you mean by Reformation. The word merely means a reforming, not recreating. It denotes that what was already in existence was merely changed and not that something new was brought into existence. If it be true what some partisans say in their assertions about the Reformation, the only word that could be used to describe accurately the change would be the word revolution.

At the Reformation the Church did not break away from the previous Church as a distinct and separate communion. There was no schism from a previously existing body. As Mr. Hore says, [1] "It was only from the abuses and innovations of Rome that England separated, and it remained the same garden as before the Reformation, only it was cleared of its weeds."

I hope you will have sufficient testimony to-night to convince you that the Church of England did not spring up at the Reformation, but that it was only stripped of its popish errors and finally freed from papal aggressions. I hope you will be convinced that it has remained the same continuous Church since the days of British Christianity.

After I have spoken briefly of the causes which led to the Reformation, I will pass on to describe the chief events which make up this movement. Then I will state in what way

[1] Hore, p. 228.

the Church was benefitted by it. In conclusion I will gather together the evidence in order to show that the Church of England was not made by Henry VIII., but only changed and purified by the movement which he started.

What were the causes of the Reformation?

In the last Lecture we heard enough to convince us how continually the English nation rebelled against papal usurpation. The nation tried by legislation, by protest, by letters, and by rebellion, to curb the Pope's authority in England, but it was not strong enough to succeed. The national feeling had not changed, but grew stronger as time went on. When Henry came the nation was only waiting for the happy opportunity of completing what had been so often attempted before. The people longed for their national independence. These aggressions of the Pope then were the first cause of the Reformation. England was more than weary of the Pope's demands for Peter's pence, for first-fruits and tenths. Our forefathers were disgusted at the insolence of the Pope in thrusting into our Sees and benefices men of foreign birth, ignorant of their ways, their language, and their customs. They lamented that men who held our livings very frequently lived out of England and that all they cared for was our money.

In addition to these facts the state of morality and religion in England had fallen to a very low ebb indeed. Such a state of things could not long continue. The Protestants on the Continent were denouncing the evil lives of many of the Romanists. This spirit spread to England.

It is not my intention in this Lecture to say much about the reformer, Martin Luther. But his movement in Germany

was another aid in bringing about the change which took place in our country. Pamphlets expressing the opinions of his party came across the water, and they were read and many of their sentiments endorsed by our people. The movement which John Wycliffe started, to which I briefly referred last week, the activity of his followers, the Lollards, who went throughout the country preaching against the iniquities of many of the clergy and the friars, prepared the minds of the nation for the change about to come.

There was one more cause of the Reformation, and by no means the least important one. That was the movement known as the Revival of Learning. Before the Reformation the ignorance of the people was astounding. Even priests who had the cure of souls were so lazy and indolent that many of them could not translate the Latin services which they so improperly rendered. Some time before the Reformation men began to travel to inquire into the customs of distant countries. Thus the mind was aroused and the understanding quickened. Men flocked to Italy to find out all they could about the old classic writers. There was a mania for discovering old manuscripts of the Greek and Latin authors. Florence became the home of this intellectual revival. Such men as Grocyn, Linacre and Colet, came to England in large numbers. They went to the Universities and lectured to the students there. Thus they aroused the nation's intelligence. Colet became a master in the study of Greek, and made the desire to know the Greek New Testament the aim of his scholarship. He lectured at Oxford on St. Paul's Epistles with such earnestness that as

someone said of him at that time he seemed [1] "Like one inspired, raised in voice, eye, his whole countenance, and mien, out of himself."

Erasmus was another of these reformers. The greater part of his labours he devoted to the publication of various editions of the Greek New Testament. He wrote a paraphrase of the Gospels and the Acts of the Apostles. This great movement infected the growing generation with desires to interest itself in this work, and helped to make the people dissatisfied with the tone of life, moral and religious, before Henry's time, and led them ardently to desire a change.

You must not think that the Reformation was brought about by a single stroke. That is how people sometimes speak of it. A struggle to bring it on had been made for centuries, and all the events alluded to now had a share in completing it. King Henry was not the inventor of the Reformation. It was rather forced upon him. As we have already seen, during the whole of the mediæval period the kings of England had striven to effect a reformation. The struggle now brought to a head continually went on, and as Dr. Beard in his Hibbert Lecture says: [2] "On both sides claims were always renewed," that is on the side of England and the Pope. "Popes of arbitrary temper and high spirit knew how to avail themselves of the political necessities of kings. . . . The formal assumption of supremacy by Henry VIII. was but the last stage of a process which had been going on for almost 500 years."

Clearly understand, then, that the Reformation was not the work of a moment, but of a long period of strong struggles

[1] Green's History, p. 299. [2] p. 308.

between the Popes of Rome and the upholders of the common law of England.

We have seen what the primary causes of the Reformation were. Now I must speak of its more immediate cause. That cause was a private quarrel which King Henry had with the Pope over his second marriage.

It is due to this fact that you have sometimes heard the taunt which Dissenters hurl at us that the Reformation came into existence through the licentiousness of the king. This, however, as we have seen, is most certainly not true. It was the question of Henry's divorce from his first wife which led him to throw off the authority of the Pope of Rome. Henry by his first wife had no children, and as he had married her within the prohibited degrees he considered, so he said, that her childlessness was God's judgment on his sin. For the sake of having lawful children he sought a divorce from her. He appealed to the Pope to sanction it. But the Pope was not eager to grant his request, for he feared the result of his acquiescence in Henry's wish upon the other Courts of Europe. The king was enraged at the Pope's delay, and so—it is a long story and the result had better be briefly stated—Henry took the law into his own hands. He said that the Pope should no longer have authority in his kingdom. He succeeded in having a special Act of Parliament, in the year 1533, sanctioning his divorce from Catherine, and in that year he married the object of his affection, viz., Anne Boleyn. It is not my object to speak of the king's inner character respecting this event, since more important subjects await our consideration. But it was this act of divorce which finally brought all the woes of England

to a head. It was this fact which urged Henry to bring about that good object which the English nation had so long desired. The Pope himself, of course, resented Henry's bold act, and he pronounced the second marriage null and void. But Henry cared little for his threats, for he had good support behind him, especially in his chief minister, Cranmer.

This event led Parliament to set to work in good earnest to help on the Reformation.

Before considering the events which make up that great movement, I should like to say something about Henry's real position as a reformer. He certainly was not a Protestant, and in no way can you say that he made the Church of England Protestant, or changed a Roman Catholic Church into a Protestant Church. The Church of England, in fact, as a Church, never was Protestant. You nowhere find it so described in the Book of Common Prayer or in the Articles. If Henry was anything in religion he was a Roman Catholic. In fact, before the Reformation in England, he wrote a book against the teaching of the reformer Luther, and this was so much approved of by the Pope that the Pope signified his pleasure of the work by sending back to Henry a beautiful and costly sword, and bestowed upon Henry the title *Defensor Fidei*—the Defender of the Faith. After Henry broke from Rome he punished and condemned not only Roman Catholics but Protestants as well, and passed some severe laws against the latter. Seeing that the Protestant spirit of the Continent was affecting England, Henry put in force his six Articles, or, as the persecuted called it, the whip with six strings. These Articles forced on the people all the special Romanist

doctrines. They asserted the doctrine of transubstantiation, that after consecration the bread and wine were no longer bread and wine, the celibacy of the clergy, auricular confession to a priest, and private masses for the dead. We see the king's religious opinions from the wish expressed in his will as Mr. Southey reminds us. Henry requested [1] "That a convenient altar be set up, honourably furnished with all things requisite, for daily masses to be said perpetually for his soul while the world should endure."

Facts such as these show that the king was not a Protestant. No; the king was not particularly scrupulous over any shade of religious opinion. What he rigidly insisted on was his own supremacy in place of the Pope's—supremacy over both things spiritual and things temporal in his kingdom, and as long as he was obeyed on this particular point, as long as he was looked upon as the Supreme Head, he cared but little for anything else.

Now I must pass on to speak of the chief events of the Reformation. I shall have to give a hasty survey of facts extending to the death of Queen Elizabeth, for the Reformation certainly was not completed in England before that time.

It was in the year 1527 that Henry first began to look for the divorce, and although the clergy opposed this as a whole, yet they were, most of them, anxious to destroy the Pope's assumption over England. The first thing done to show the nation's determination in this object was the passing of an Act of Parliament, 1530, to abolish payment of money to Rome. Henry married Anne Boleyn 1533. In answer to the Pope's command that the king should return to his

[1] Book of the Church, p. 294.

lawful wife or else be excommuicated, Henry caused a sermon every Sunday to be preached in S. Paul's by one of the Bishops, to teach the people that the Pope should no longer be supreme in England. The same year, 1534, an Act was passed to compel the clergy to submit to Henry's decision and to hinder them from appealing to Rome in their difficulties. The same year it was decided, by Convocation of the clergy, that [1] "the Pope has no greater jurisdiction conferred upon him by God in Holy Scripture in the kingdom of England than any other foreign Bishop." This was passed before Parliament expressed the same sentiment in a law. So we see that the Church itself, and not the State, took the primary matter first in hand. Parliament next decided that no Bishop nor clergyman should be accepted to serve in our English cures who had been nominated by the Pope of Rome. Notwithstanding these important changes, the king made it known through a statute that he had no intention [2] "to vary from the Catholic faith of Christendom or in anything declared in Holy Scripture and the Word of God to be necessary to salvation." The great Act of this new movement was passed in November, 1534—The Act of Supremacy. This made the king the supreme Governor of the Church, and it embodied in its declaration the decision arrived at in Convocation, to which I have already referred. This Act declares that the king [3] "justly and rightly is and ought to be *supreme head* of the Church of England, and is so recognized by the clergy of the realm in their Convocation. . . . Be it enacted by the authority of this present Parliament that the king, his heirs and successors, kings of this realm, shall be

[1] Hore, p. 241. [2] Hore, p. 243. [3] Hore, p. 243.

taken, accepted and reputed, the only supreme head on earth of the Church of England called *Anglicana Ecclesia*." A little later in the Lecture we shall notice what this title "Supreme Head of the Church of England" meant, as understood by the clergy.

After this great Act of the Reformation, then, the Pope's authority was no longer to be recognized in our land. The king was, in a sense, to take his place. This explains why the fortunes of religion in England in the next few generations depended largely upon the religious character of the reigning Sovereign.

In continuing to relate the changes in the Church in Henry's time, we might in the next place refer to the wholesale destruction of the Monasteries. Cromwell, Henry's minister, was chiefly concerned in this.

It is perfectly true that many of the Monasteries of this time had sunk into a terrible state of vice and corruption. But they were not all given over to licentiousness. Some of them were doing excellent work in educating the poor and administering to the corporal wants of the sick and needy. But Henry grew rapacious. He saw behind the walls of the Monasteries an immense store of wealth. The Monasteries, we must remember, were staunch supporters of the Pope, and therefore they defied Henry's supremacy. Accordingly a Commission was appointed to visit them and to report upon their state and work. Two eagle-eyed men, Legh and Leyton, were appointed to the business. The result of their labours was put before Parliament in what was called the "Black Book." It was clearly to be seen that the smaller Monasteries were given over to revel and debauchery. Their

condition, no doubt, was much exaggerated. It was allowed, as Professor Green says, [1] "that one-third of the religious houses were fairly and decently conducted. The rest were charged with drunkenness and simony, and with the foulest and most revolting crimes." So the cry was raised, "Down with them," and the decision was that all those whose incomes were under £200 per year should be destroyed, and their revenues be granted to the Crown. How did the nation meet this measure? With perfect silence. But it was a silence produced by terror. As many as 376 houses were suppressed, and thus 10,000 men were thrown upon the world to swell the ranks of beggars. The destruction of these houses was followed by several formidable rebellions in various parts of England, as the nation gradually took in what it meant. In 1536 one was suppressed in Lincolnshire, and soon after that another, called the Pilgrimage of Grace, in Yorkshire. The king and his party, however, took no warning from these events.

In the year 1539 he allowed the larger Monasteries to be suppressed, although in these it was acknowledged good work, honest Christian work, was carried on. The tomb of Thomas à Becket, at Canterbury, was also spoiled and its treasures plundered. As many as twenty-six loads of valuables were taken away. Many of the ancient Abbeys were also destroyed, and in some cases the Abbots were executed. The wealth was enormous which fell to Henry from these ravages. With this he enriched himself and his courtiers, and erected some new bishoprics and endowed them. He promised that twenty-one bishoprics should be erected from the spoils, as

[1] Short History, p. 333.

Wolsey had suggested to him. But is seems that only six new Sees were provided, Oxford, Gloucester, Bristol, Peterborough, and Chester, and Westminster Abbey was joined to the See of London.

It was a shameful piece of business, the wholesale destruction of the Monasteries. It so increased the ranks of beggars that it gave birth to our poor laws under Elizabeth. It helped to create the evil of lay rectors in the Church, and this in time gave birth to the evil of pluralities. This destruction filled England with discontent, and helped to sow seeds of dissent, and prepared the troubles which came to a head under Charles I. Besides this, the loss of books to England was most lamentable. Valuable documents which gave the history of past ages, and rich editions of ancient learning, were ruthlessly thrown away. The Monasteries, please remember, were especially rich in books, and they were in the olden times the homes of learning. In the Monasteries were kept [1] "the records of our convocations, the Acts of Parliament, as well as the hereditary documents of private families." Hore says: [2] "If these things were not destroyed they were sold as waste paper. Some books were used to scour candlesticks, some to rub boots, some sold to grocers or soap boilers, and some sent over sea to bookbinders, not in small quantities, but at times in whole ships full, to the wondering of foreign nations. A single merchant purchased at forty shillings apiece two noble libraries, to be used as Grey papers." Many writers of that time also lamented the loss. Bale, in speaking to King Edward on this subject, said: [3] "I judge this to be true, and utter it with

[1] Hore, p. 250. [2] Quoted from Spelman, Ibid. [3] Quoted by Southey, p. 308.

heaviness, that neither the Britons under the Romans and Saxons, nor yet the English people under the Danes and Normans, had ever such damage of their learned monuments as we have seen in our times. Our posterity may well curse this wicked fact of our age, this unreasonable spoil of England's noble antiquities." And Bale, we should call to mind, really hated the Monasteries. Fuller also speaks upon this subject. [1] "As brokers in Long Lane," he says, "when they buy an old suit, buy the linings together with the outside, so it was conceived meet that such as purchased the buildings of Monasteries should in the same grant have the libraries (the stuffing thereof) conveyed unto them; and these ignorant owners, so long as they might keep a *Liegerbook* or *Terrier*, by direction thereof to find such straggling acres as belonged to them, they cared not to preserve any other monuments." Southey, in his history of the Church, likewise laments this wholesale destruction. The books, he said, [2] "were sold to grocers and chandlers. Whole shiploads were sent abroad to the bookbinders, that the vellum or parchment might be cut up in their trade. Covers were torn off for their brass bosses and clasps, and their contents served the ignorant and careless for waste paper. In this manner English history suffered irreparable losses, and it is more than probable that some of the works of the ancients perished in this indiscriminate and extensive destruction."

We must pass away from this phase of the Reformation with only this remark, that such violent vengeance was not needed.

To continue the history of Henry's time, we find that in

[1] Ibid. [2] Ibid, p. 309.

1534 efforts were made to reform corrupt doctrines. The spirit of the Continent had affected England, and the desire was expressed that the Bible should be placed in the people's hands. Convocation requested that the king should authorize a translation. Tyndale, before this time, had turned the Bible into English, but through the means of Tunstall as many copies of this as could be found were burnt. Ten Articles were drawn up in 1536 to unite the clergy, but their tone was Roman Catholic. Injunctions were given at the same time to the clergy to assert the king's supremacy and, by preaching, to condemn the Pope's usurpation in England. The Creed, the Lord's Prayer, and the Ten Commandments were ordered to be said in our mother tongue, instead of in the Latin as before. About this time a deputation came to England from the Protestant Princes of the Continent, to request the English Church to ally itself with the Lutheran Church. But this failed. In answer to this request for the Bible, the clergy, in 1538, were ordered to chain a copy of that precious book in their Churches, that the people might gather there to read it. This same year orders were given for the removal from the Churches of all relics and superstitious ornaments.

In the next place, attention was given to the liturgy, that the Pope's name might be expunged from the services of the Church, and that the name of Thomas à Becket might be removed from the Calendar of Saints. A new edition of the Sarum use was, therefore, issued and commanded to be used in the province of Canterbury. Books of devotion were drawn up to take the place of those books used by the Pope's men.

As a consequence of these reforms, more interest was taken in the subject of religion than ever before, and especial interest was taken in the reading of the Bible. This last fact ultimately led to many wrangles, and so bitter were they that Henry was fearful of the results. Already he had requested that the Holy Scriptures should not be made a subject of discussion. But now [1] "the king complained," says Mr. Hore, "that the Bible was made the cause of wrangles and disputes in every tavern and ale-house." To give a check to these displays of temper then, Henry passed and put into force the six Articles, the whip with six strings, to which I have already referred.

I must now turn to the state of affairs in the time of Edward VI. In his reign further changes were made, but they were of a more revolutionary character. Edward was really a Protestant, but he was a mere boy, and was guided by such men as the Protector Somerset, who practically steered the ship of State. [2] "The Reformation now," says Mr. Hore, "became deformation and spoliation." The people severely rebelled against such sudden changes as were made. Once more the hand of the spoiler was placed upon the Church's property. Chantries were destroyed. At one time it was the Protector's intention to pull down our beautiful Westminster Abbey, that the site might be used to build a palace for himself. He was only turned from his purpose by gifts of money. He did destroy the town houses of several of the Bishops to make room for his own servants. Five or six more Abbeys were appropriated, and amongst these was the magnificent Abbey of Glastonbury, now a

[1] Hore, p. 256. [2] Hore, p. 263.

perfect ruin. This place, in which God had been worshipped for ages, was given over to the French and Walloon refugees, that they might use it as a woollen manufactory.

Such robbery of the Church's wealth and places of worship urged the nation to take sides on the question of religion. From this time Protestant and Catholic became parties in the State, and the English Catholic preferred to side with the Roman Catholic rather than with the Protestant. The Protestant party in England grew up and increased from the party men who came to England from the Continent. Hooper came across the channel, bringing with him all the love he could for Calvinism. He and many others spread the precepts of Calvin and Luther in the Church, and were successful in influencing the State in their favour. Through this reforming party the Book of Homilies was published for the clergy to read in Church. These men brought to England the mania for destroying images in Churches, as being superstitious objects of worship. It was during Edward's reign that Erasmus' paraphrase upon the Gospels and Acts of the Apostles was ordered to be read in Churches. The six Articles which Henry had enforced were repealed, as well as several other persecuting Acts which disgraced the Statute Book, as *De Hæretico Comburendo*—the Act for burning heretics.

One of the chief events of Edward's reign was the compilation of our liturgy. Up to his time there was not one uniform service used in England, as there is now. There were several what were called Uses in existence. There was the Use of Sarum, York, Hereford, Bangor, and Lincoln. These were all used in different parts of England. But in 1548

there was a vigorous demand for only one Use for the whole country. So in 1549 the First Prayer Book of Edward appeared, compiled from all the other Uses, and it was enforced by Act of Parliament. This book was again revised with many alterations in 1552. This was entirely due to the growth of the Protestant feeling in England. Men came over to us within these few years with more advanced views on doctrine and ritual, and they did not rest until they imposed their principles upon the heads of the Church. This book was also enforced by Act of Parliament; but there is no evidence to show that it was ever used, for the death of Edward was drawing near, and that was the sign of another great change in ecclesiastical matters.

One more act of reform was made in Edward's reign. The Articles of religion were drawn up, forty-two in number, to which the clergy should subscribe. They were published "to root up discord and to establish the agreement of true religion."

During this reign there was plenty of controversy going on to keep the people in touch with the general upheaval of the times. The subject of great importance was "The use of Vestments." Those who came from the Continent wished to abolish vestments and overturn the country's old customs. Another controversy was on the use of the altar. This was removed by Ridley from its accustomed place, and stationed like a table in the middle of the Church. "Oyster boards" they were nicknamed by the Papists. The Church was in danger not only of becoming very Protestant, but of being ruined by so much freedom, strife, and change. The people were heartily weary of such changes. They mourned for

the loss of their old reverent customs, and many of them preferred the religion of the Pope to the barrenness and coldness of Protestant worship, brought over from the Continent. They hailed with great enthusiasm the accession of Queen Mary. The whole nation, almost to a man, looked upon her with affection. But they had yet to learn what she would do for England.

On her accession there was a great reaction against the work of the Reformers. The people, to a large extent, were with the queen. They expressed their discontent in Edward's life. Then even discontent reigned everywhere, especially in the east, west and midland counties, but all revolts were stamped out in blood. Cornwall, Devon and Norwich were foremost in opposing the Reformers. These facts enable us to understand why the people so heartily welcomed Mary.

But what was Mary's work?

Now she was a Roman Catholic. Most of her time had been spent in France, where she had received a splendid education. On account of her training she hated the Protestants. But still, if it had not been for her advisers, she might have steered England through her religious difficulties. She became allied with Spain, the very centre of Roman Catholicism, the home of the barbarous inquisition. She married Philip, a match never popular with the English, and this was the first step to lead to her unpopularity. Her work then, with the help of such a husband, was to make England Roman Catholic. We have now to relate that there was a deliberate attempt to put England under the Pope, and for the next few years he really had considerable power in England. Mary put our country in submission to Rome.

All the Acts favouring Protestants in the previous reign were repealed. A Romanist and a Cardinal, Reginald Pole, was placed in the See of Canterbury. The old Mass books were restored, and as far as possible the old liturgies. [1] "The whole system," says Professor Green, "which had been pursued during Edward's reign fell with a sudden crash . . . the married priests were driven from their Churches, the new Prayer Book was set aside, the Mass was restored with a burst of popular enthusiasm. The imprisoned Bishops found themselves again in their Sees, and Latimer and Cranmer, who were charged with a share in the usurpation, took their places in the Tower." Still the people had no sympathy with Mary's leanings towards Rome.

Now the doctrine of transubstantiation was made a test doctrine by Mary's ministers. Without scruple for age or birth they were condemned and burned who denied it. Even the Princess Elizabeth did not escape examination, and it was only due to her wisdom that her life was saved for the future glory of England. When Tonsal, Bonner and Gardiner plied her with questions on the Sacrament, she gave this answer:

[2] "Christ was the Word that spake it,
He took the bread and brake it,
And what the Word did make it
That I believe and take it."

The most shameful blot of Mary's reign was her persecutions. Hundreds of the best men in England were burnt at

[1] Short History, p. 354.

[2] Quoted by Lane in Notes on Church History, p. 75. Modern period. There is doubt as to whether Elizabeth is the author of this verse.

the stake. Many of them bear household names. Cranmer, Ridley, Latimer, Rogers, Taylor, Hooper. These persecutions were carried on all over England, and no mercy was shown by Gardiner and his allies. Mary was not responsible for all the evil of that time. She was led by other men. She died, however, a most miserable and discontented woman. The people were as glad to hear of her death as they were to see her accession. It was a fortunate thing for England that her reign lasted only five years.

Now we are to notice Elizabeth's work for the Church of England. The final settlement of the Reformation is due to her. Before she ascended the throne no one could tell what her religious position would be, and the public mind was much exercised over this important question. But Elizabeth, as a matter of fact, cared very little for religion at all. She did not take the interest which her father and sister did in theological matters, and she was not a partisan, like Edward. When she came to the throne she continued the services in her private Chapel just as Mary had left it. Elizabeth insisted on one thing, her own supremacy, and no reverence for Bishops did she show if they dared to oppose her will. However, she had a very difficult position to fill, and, on the whole, she acted wisely.

Soon after her accession scores of men came back from the Continent who had left our country during the Marian persecutions. They brought over with them increased love for the Reformers' doctrines. Elizabeth saw the prospect of great division and discord in her kingdom. But, apart from her political troubles, she had as much as she could do to settle the religious difficulties of her age. Her one desire

in this respect was to establish uniformity. As the Calvinistic clergy flocked into the Church the distinction of Protestant and Catholic was more clearly defined than ever before. The Puritans, now becoming a separate party in the State, gave her no small anxiety over the object she had in view. But she succeeded in keeping them at bay. She had to conciliate them. Both parties were included in her Council. Elizabeth's first act, then, in coming to the throne was to restore the Sovereign's supremacy. The Pope resented this, and charged her with being illegitimate, and as having no right therefore to the Crown. He desired to see Mary, Queen of Scots, upon the throne. Elizabeth, unlike her father, showed her wisdom in not assuming to herself the title of Supreme Head of the Church. She preferred the title of Supreme Governor. The need now arose of restoring much of the work of the Reformation which Mary had destroyed. The Book of Common Prayer was called for in place of the old Roman Missals. The Second Prayer Book of Edward was restored, with alterations. To this Book a rubric was added speaking of the vestments and ornaments to be used in the Church, which was discomforting to the Puritans. These should be the same as were in use in the second year of the reign of Edward VI. This Book was enforced by an Act of Uniformity, and considering that so many Puritans were then in England, it might reasonably have been expected that most of them would have left the ranks of the Church of England. But it appears that only one hundred and eighty-nine of them resigned their livings.

When Elizabeth came to the throne there were very few Bishops left to fill the Sees. Many of them had been burnt

by Mary for denying the belief in transubstantiation, and several of them died within a few years of Elizabeth's accession. When only one diocesan Bishop was left it was necessary to find men to fill the vacant posts. But now comes a difficulty. Who were to consecrate them? Well! it was discovered that there were three Bishops still living in England whom Mary had ejected, viz., Coverdale, Scorby and Barlow. There were also several other Bishops living in retirement who had been validly ordained. These Bishops were asked to consecrate Parker for the primacy. Parker was a man to suit Elizabeth's purposes. He was a good Catholic, opposed to Protestant and Romanists alike. It is respecting this man's consecration that the Pope has recently given it as his verdict that he was not canonically ordained, and therefore that our Anglican orders are null and void. He has stated that there was a flaw in Parker's consecration, and that consequently all men ordained in succession to him are no more lawfully ordained than dissenting ministers. The Romanists also asserted that Barlow, who consecrated Parker, was not himself validly consecrated. This opinion on Anglican orders, however, has not been shared by all the leaders of Roman Catholics. Many of the leading Romanists take the opposite view. Dr. Dollinger in recent years is looked up to as an important Roman Catholic authority. But he strongly asserted [1] "that he had no manner of doubt as to the validity of the episcopal succession in the English Church." And again, [1] "The fact that Parker was consecrated by *four rightly consecrated Bishops, rite et legitime*, with imposition of hands and the necessary words, is so clearly

[1] Quoted by Hore, p. 300.

established that if one chooses to doubt the fact one could with the same right doubt one hundred thousand facts. The Orders of the Roman Church could be disputed with more apparent reason."

Surely these are strong words, and there is far more truth in them than the Pope would recognize. But I must pass away from the opinion respecting Anglican Orders with only the remark that we are certain that our ministry is validly ordained. Later on I shall quote opinions to confirm it.

After Parker's consecration then, he set to work to fill up the vacant English Sees, for which he consecrated other Bishops, according to the old forms and ceremonies.

In the year 1562, an important document was drawn up to preserve the doctrine of the Church of England. The Forty-two Articles of Edward were revised. The object of this was to procure greater uniformity in the Church through the clergy subscribing to them. These Articles were finally reduced to Thirty-nine, as we have them now. In the year 1563, the clergy were asked to subscribe to them, and have subscribed to them ever since. These changes mentioned of Elizabeth's time completed the Reformation in England, and *Ecclesia Anglicana* was, through these measures, freed for ever from the Pope's authority and usurpation.

In Elizabeth's time there were many attempts on the part of the Romanists to give the Pope the upper hand in England. But they all failed. Philip of Spain tried hard by his desire to marry Elizabeth to influence the religious life of our country again. The Jesuits were sent over to England to undermine the Church's constitution, but they were jealously watched in their ardent desires, and several

of their leaders were put to death. The Armada came to the Channel crowned with the papal blessing, carrying a whole host of priests and monks on board, and having loads of instruments of torture used by the Spanish Inquisition. [1] "*Sed Deus afflavit et dissipati sunt.*" God breathed on them and they all were scattered.

Elizabeth was a strong woman, and irreligious though perhaps she was, well skilled in equivocation and lying, as she certainly was, yet she did a good work for England. She has made it what it is to-day by her splendid laws, and it was not without reason that she was lovingly styled "The Good Queen Bess."

Now I have completed the general outline of the work of the Reformation in England. Let us speak for a short time of the benefits of this movement to the Church of England.

The Reformation, for one thing, gave us the Holy Scriptures in our language. It ordered that the services of the Church should be said in our own tongue, instead of in a language which none but the learned could understand. In addition to this there were three other things which the Reformation did for us. It, once and for all, effectually excluded the Pope from claiming any authority over the Church of England. It gave us our magnificent Book of Common Prayer. It also gave us a theological document, the Thirty-nine Articles. I will speak briefly on each of these three benefits, and, for the sake of clearness, I must repeat some things which I have said before.

Instead of the Pope the Sovereign was made the Supreme Governor in England. This decision was only taking us

[1] Motto on the medals struck to commemorate the victory over the Armada.

back to the old laws of our land, which were recognized by the Conqueror and even by kings before his time. The clergy were willing to acknowledge the Sovereign as the Protector of the Church. But not in the sense that Henry at first requested. He desired to call himself "Protector and Supreme Head of the Church." But the clergy would not have a royal Pope, even though they wanted to be rid of the Pope of Rome. They therefore insisted in their convocation on inserting a clause in the document, asserting the extent of the king's power. Henry should be supreme over the Church. "*Quantum per Christi leges licet*," in so far as this be agreeable to the laws of Christ. This attitude of the subject Henry himself took in later years. He wrote to the Bishop of Durham: [1] "We be as God's law suffereth us to be, whereunto we do and must conform ourselves." The clergy did not look upon the Sovereign as having authority over the spiritual affairs of the Church. Henry also shows us that he agreed to this. In his letter to the Convocation of York, he says:—

[2] "As to spiritual things, meaning by them the Sacraments, being by God ordained as instruments of efficacy and strength, whereby grace is of His infinite goodness conferred upon His people, forasmuch as they be no worldly nor temporal things, they have no worldly nor temporal head, but only Christ that did institute them, by Whose ordinance they be ministered here by mortal men elect, chosen and ordered as God hath willed for that purpose, *who be the clergy*." And again:

[1] Hore, Vol. II., p. 510, The Church in England, from William III. to Victoria.

[2] pp. 34 and 35, J. S. Brewer's Establishment: Its Origin, History, and Effects (S.P.C.K.).

"In these their ministrations the clergy exercise functions which transcend all human authority, and if these functions are viciously or carelessly performed, but without overt scandal, they are answerable to God alone."

I have quoted at some length these sentiments because some people say that the Sovereign now has a right to alter our doctrines and has control of our spiritual heritage. Nothing is farther from the truth.

The next benefit of the Reformation was the gift of our beautiful Prayer Book. As we have remarked, before this movement many Service Books were used in England. From a comparison of these our present Book was compiled, so that most of its contents are of very ancient date, and much of it comes down from Apostolic times, as, for example, many of the Collects and the greater part of the Office for Holy Communion. We have seen that in Edward's reign two Prayer Books were published. The latter was brought about through the protestantizing influence of the Puritans. The Second Book of Edward was restored in Elizabeth's reign, with additions giving it a more Catholic tone. The Book was slightly changed in the time of James I. The last revision was made in the reign of Charles II., when a few prayers were added and some other small details omitted. This is in brief the history of our Book of Common Prayer, which is now so highly prized.

The other gift of the Reformation was the theological treatise, the Thirty-nine Articles of religion. The object for which they were drawn up was to preserve unity of doctrine in the Church. They were preceded by the Ten Articles of Cranmer. The first draft of our Articles was forty-two in

number, drawn up in Edward's reign. When Elizabeth came to the throne these were again remodelled, but still remained in number forty-two. In her reign they were changed again as we now have them. They are thirty-nine. These Articles were drawn up after the model of the Lutheran confession of faith. They have served a good purpose, and I am convinced that they serve a good purpose now if those who subscribe to them honestly understand what the act of subscription means.

The Articles originally were drawn up to include in our Church men who had opposite theological tendencies. They were so constructed by Cranmer that Calvinists as well as Arminians might subscribe them. This is the reason why one of them, at least, is so difficult to understand.

Now I must draw to a close. We have seen that the Reformation in England was an important movement. We have seen what its benefits were to the Church of our land. Now, as I very much want you to see that no new Church was made by the events brought to your consideration to-night, I wish to emphasize this thought a little more. What happened at the Reformation was that the Pope was told, once and for all, to keep out of the Church of England, and those clergy who sided with him were urged to resign or else to change their opinions on this important point. No new doctrine was introduced. There was no schism. The Bishops descended in continuous line from the days of S. Augustine. Henry wrote to Cardinal Pole that it was not his object to break the historical continuity of the Church, nor [1] "to separate himself, or his realm, from the unity of

[1] p. 506, Vol. II., Hore, History of Church of England from William III. to Victoria.

Christ's Church, but inviolably, and at all times, to keep and observe the same, and redeem the Church of England out of captivity of foreign powers heretofore usurped therein."

Hardwick the historian says: [1]"In this country, as the old episcopal organization was preserved inviolable, the succession of ministers was also uninterrupted and the spirituality continued to form a separate estate."

Even an Unitarian, whose sympathies would certainly be the other way, was willing himself to acknowledge—I mean Dr. Beard in his Hibbert Lecture on the Reformation—that [2]"There is no point at which it can be said, here the old Church ends, here the new begins. Are you inclined to take the act of supremacy as such a point? I have already shown that Henry's assumption of headship was but the last decisive act of a struggle which had been going on for almost five centuries. The retention of the Episcopate by the English reformers at once helped to preserve this continuity, and marked it in the distinctest way. . . . It is an obvious fact that Parker was the successor of Augustine, just as clearly as Lanfranc and Becket, Warham, Cranmer, Pole, Parker—there is no break in the line, though the first and third are claimed as (Roman) Catholic, the second and fourth as Protestants." Only one more quotation from another writer of authority. It runs: [3]"No historic fact is clearer than that the Church of England retained every essential element of her ancient organization, her apostolic doctrines, and her national character all through the years when the Tudors reigned. *She never lost her identity.* She

[1] p. 328, Reformation (1890 edit.) [2] Hibbert Lecture, p. 311.
[3] pp. 103-4, Lane's Notes on Church History, Vol. II.

lost her old Monasteries, it is true, and cast off many errors that the foreign clergy had introduced; but the Bishops and parochial clergy retained their respective positions, performed their duties in the same Churches, to the same congregations, and retained such endowments as the monastic system had allowed them to keep. Corruptions were cut away, sometimes at the expense and loss of much that was good; the usurped power of the Popes was successfully overthrown, but *no new Church was founded.*"

Let no one assert, then, now that the Church of England was born at the Reformation. The very phrase "Church of England" was used in Magna Charta. Let no one assert that the Church of England is only a thing boasting of three centuries' creation, and that its creation came through an immoral king. The movement which we have considered to-night only purged our Church of its mediæval corruptions, gave us a new and valued liturgy, and it told finally and effectually the Pope of Rome to consider this fact, that he was not wanted in our country.

The Puritan Usurpation.

LECTURE IV.

The Puritan Usurpation.

Puritan principles. Love for Bible. Origin of the Puritans. Continental Reformers. Puritans and Elizabeth. Vestments. Uniformity. Cartwright. Grindal and the Puritans and Elizabeth. James I. Millenary Petition. Conference at Hampton Court. Puritans and Doctrine. Church Government. James' opinion of them. Increase of Puritans. Charles I. Puritans in Parliament. Westminster Assembly. Prayer Book condemned. Penalties. Thirty-nine Articles superseded. The Puritan rule and National disgust. Puritan persecution. The intolerance of Puritans. Southey's testimony. Puritan desecration of Cathedrals. S. Paul's, Westminster, Lambeth, etc. Abuse of the Pulpit. The Restoration. The Reaction.

AST week I traced the history of the Reformation in England, and we saw in what way it benefited the English Church. This took us down to the end of the reign of Queen Elizabeth. To-night I shall continue the history of religious thought in England from Elizabeth's time to the restoration of monarchy under Charles II. The object which I have in view in this Lecture is not so much to speak about the inner working of the Church of England, as to give the history of the principles of a movement quite alien and opposed to episcopacy. I

refer to Puritanism. I want to show how the Puritans for a time gained the supreme control over ecclesiastical matters in our country. In the first place, then, I will give a general idea of the growth of the movement; then pass on to show what it did when it was raised to the height of its power. In the last place, I will dwell upon some of the consequences of its work, and leave you to gather your own conclusions respecting its value.

The Puritan principles were opposed to nearly every distinct principle of the Church of England. The Puritans denied the doctrine of Apostolic Succession, and opposed our teaching on the Sacraments. Puritans abhorred anything that savoured of prelacy. In theory they opposed a State religion, but when in power they tried all the same to impose, by Act of Parliament, Puritan principles on the State. They especially objected to the wearing of the surplice and all ecclesiastical vestments. They tried to abolish the use of the ring in the performance of our marriage vows. The sign of the Cross should not be used over our infants when brought to Church to receive Holy Baptism. The scruples of the Puritans went so far indeed that they would not allow us to deck our houses at jolly Christmas-tide with the holly and the mistletoe. They deprived us of the innocent pleasure of eating our mince-pies.

The Puritans were especially zealous to establish the supremacy of the Bible. They made our nation a nation of the Bible. Nothing was allowed in public worship which could not be proved or gathered from the sacred pages. They had so much reverence for the Book that they mixed up their ordinary conversation with Biblical phrases.

Cromwell's soldiers rushed to battle with the words of the old Hebrew prophets on their lips. The Puritans also differed from the standpoint of the Church of England in their view of Holy Scripture. They considered that all men were capable of interpreting it for themselves, and that they had sufficient learning for such a task. The result of this principle was that men drew very different conclusions from the same passages of Scripture, and these differences became so marked as time went on, that the Puritans split up into different parties, each holding dissimilar conceptions of the teaching of our Lord, and they formed separate sects. It was because the Bible was looked upon as the sole authority in religious matters, as interpreted by our individual preferences, that so many dissenting sects have come into existence. Nearly every Christian sect professes to follow the teaching of Scripture, though we know that the sects hold very different opinions.

The Church, of course, also teaches—and it taught the same at the time now under review—that the Bible is our authority for our Christian Faith, but it does not hold that we are all capable of understanding it in all its depth of meaning. There are many parts obscure to us. For the interpretation of the Bible the Church calls in the aid of the early Christian Fathers, several of whom were connected with Apostolic times, and who, therefore, knew more about the original meaning of many parts of Scripture than we know by ourselves to-day.

With these remarks I must proceed to speak about the history of the Puritans. This will lead us back for a short time to the age prior to Elizabeth. John Wycliffe and

his followers were in a true sense forerunners of the Puritans. His object was to build up a religion, as gathered from the pages of the Bible, to oppose the teaching of Rome. The Lollards and the Wycliffe preachers desired to make every boy at the plough acquainted with the sacred pages. For the true origin of the Puritans, however, we must not look to England but to the Continent. At the beginning of the fifteenth century a great change passed over the history of religion there, especially in Germany and Switzerland. In Germany, Luther, who was born at Eisleben, 1483, began to oppose the claims and teaching of Rome. Tetzel came to Würtemberg to sell indulgences. This led this great reformer to expose their iniquity. His attack on one Roman doctrine led to his denouncing many others, until at last he found himself an excommunicated heretic. But Luther cared little for this as long as he had the Bible to which he could appeal. The movement which Luther started was taken up by other men. In Switzerland, Calvin and Zwingli became heads of parties. They also acknowledged the Bible as the authority of their teaching. These three reformers, however, arrived at very different conclusions respecting the meaning of Holy Scripture. But what have these facts to do with the history of Puritans in England? The answer to this I will give you now. Men who came under the influence of these reformers arrived in England even as early as the reign of Henry VIII., and brought over their teaching with them, and later on became a strong party here. In the reign of Mary, hundreds of our ancestors fled to the Continent to escape persecution, and fell in love with the reformers' teaching; and when peace was restored, and Elizabeth ascended

the throne, they came home again. They did not forget what they had learned abroad. Some of these men were in sympathy with Lutheran views, many more imbibed the teachings of Calvin. Some of these men managed to obtain important positions in England, so that they could influence our national religious life. It was in this way and through these causes that Puritanism began in our country.

The University of Cambridge became the centre of the movement.

In Elizabeth's time the Puritans were a strong party in the State. Many efforts were made to keep them at bay. The reformers returned from the Continent with a stronger spirit of opposition to the teaching of the Church than was ever shown before. They especially called attention to the subject of vestments in public worship. As they thought these to be relics of popery they succeeded in influencing many of the clergy of the Church to side with them. Ministers, therefore, began to please themselves as to whether they should use the surplice or not. This led the Archbishop to enforce the principle of uniformity.

In the year 1566, Parker published what was called "the Book of Advertisements," to accomplish this object. Many Churchmen refused to obey his orders. They were compelled to resign their livings. Thirty-seven of the clergy in London alone were deprived for disobedience. It was subsequent to this event that the non-subscribers were called Puritans or Precisians.

Another circumstance led the Puritans to form themselves into a separate party in the State. That was the Jesuit Mission to England. The Jesuits, as you know, were

a new order founded by the Romanists to oppose the principles of the reformers. Many of these came to England for this purpose. There was danger of their undermining the Church's constitution also. It was necessary for Elizabeth to take strong measures to keep them out of the Church. Hence, as we have seen before, Thirty-nine Articles of Religion were drawn up, to which the clergy were compelled to subcribe. These articles not only excluded Romanists from the Church, but they contained many things objectionable to the Puritans as well. As a result of this many more Puritans were forced to leave the Church. The Puritans then became more marked as a separate body, and they formed meeting-houses of their own for public worship.

The chief leader of the Puritans was Thomas Cartwright, a Presbyterian,[1] a very bitter and intolerant man, according to Professor Green; but of this side of his character we shall have occasion to speak later in the evening. He was a Professor at Cambridge, and while there he [2]"took advantage of his position," says Mr. Hore, "as lecturer and a preacher at S. Mary's, to impugn the doctrines and discipline of the Church of England." He was a learned man, as seen from the controversy between him and Whitgift, but because of his teaching he was deprived of his Fellowship and debarred from holding any office in the University. Then he went to Geneva for a couple of years. When he came back to England again he was more than ever indoctrinated with reforming principles, and he became a still more bitter enemy of the Church which had bred him.

[1] Short History, p. 455. [2] Hore, p. 311.

We have to notice that the Church tried to weaken the influence of the party now formed in England. As long as Parker was alive he made strong efforts to keep the Puritans under control. But his successor, Grindal, who was consecrated in 1576, relaxed his predecessor's severity. In fact this Primate had much sympathy with Puritan conceptions. At first he refused the Primacy because he looked upon consecration as being, to use his own word, only "mummery." Much of this man's time had been spent on the Continent, under the influence of the reformers. He was a friend of Bucer, one of the leaders of the reforming movement. Because of his influence over him he did not disapprove of many of the principles of the Puritans. He allowed them to hold what they called their meetings for "prophesying," which were meetings really for Bible reading. Queen Elizabeth ordered the Archbishop to suppress these meetings, but Grindal objected to her dictating to him as to what his spiritual duties should be. Instead of obeying her he told her what her duties were. He first advised her [1] "to refer all those ecclesiastical questions which touch religion or the doctrine and discipline of the Church unto the Bishops or divines of the realm, according to the example of all godly Christian emperors and princes of all ages." He continued: "I have a second petition to make to your Majesty. When you deal in matters of faith and religion, or matters that touch the Church of Christ, which is His Spouse, bought at so dear a price, you will not use to pronounce so peremptorily or resolutely *quasi ex auctoritate*, as ye may do in civil and external matters, but always remembering that

[1] Hore, p. 313.

in God's causes the will of God and not the will of any earthly creature is to take place. . . . Remember, Madam . . . that you are a mortal creature . . . and although you are a mighty prince, that He which dwelleth in Heaven is mightier." This was stronger speaking than anyone of Elizabeth's disposition could take with patience. Grindal was, therefore, ordered before the Star Chamber, and he was ultimately suspended from his office. The Queen wished to depose him from his episcopal position, but it was due to Earl Leicester that such harsh measures were not taken. This was in the year 1576. Grindal died, totally blind, 1585.

The Puritans increased in Elizabeth's reign, but they were kept well out of ecclesiastical and civil offices by her desire for uniformity. It was when James I. came to the throne that their hopes ran high. They looked forward to the accession of the Scottish king because he was brought up as a Presbyterian, and they thought that he would have sympathies with them. But James hated Presbyterianism.

As soon as it was known that James would be the king of England, Archbishop Whitgift sent a messenger to Scotland to congratulate him on his coming accession, and in reply James said that he determined to uphold the Church of England as it was left by Elizabeth, and that he had great anxiety for its welfare. On his way to London, the Puritans met him with a petition which they called the Millenary Petition. It was not signed by a thousand men. Of the Puritan ministers there were only seven hundred and fifty-three signatures. In this petition they stated their objection

to the Church of England. They said that they were "groaning under a common burden of human rites and ceremonies." Complaint was made of our Book of Common Prayer. They objected to the word "priest," and disapproved of absolution. They complained of the length of the Church Services, of their having to sign the Thirty-nine Articles, of the use of the cross in Holy Baptism; they found fault with our beautiful rite of Confirmation. They also disliked the use of the square cap, the surplice, and the marriage ring. Church music was another thing to which they raised objection. They raised scruples against bowing at the mention of the sacred Name of Jesus. They said, too, that the Apocrypha should not be used for public reading in Church. These were some of the practices to which they objected in their petition to the king.

The king did not reject their petition without consideration. A meeting was called to discuss it on January 14th, 1604, at Hampton Court. James was glad of the opportunity of displaying his knowledge on theological matters. He was not altogether ignorant, though most pedantic on this subject. "The wisest fool in Christendom" he has been called by some wag. The leading Puritans of the period were summoned to the Conference, to meet the heads of the English Church. Among the Churchmen present were Archbishop Whitgift, Bishop Bancroft of London, Launcelot Andrewes Dean of Westminster, Barlow Dean of Christ Church, and Overall Dean of S. Paul's.

The king called upon the Puritans to state their grievances. He asked for their opinion on our Prayer Book, on Confirmation, Absolution and Baptism, on those points, in fact,

on which they most disagreed from the Church. The Puritans stated their objections first by speaking on matters of doctrine, then on their view of the Church's ministry and the desire for a revision of the Prayer Book. Finally, they spoke upon the subject of Church government, and pleaded for the right of holding the meetings, which they named prophesyings. It is only fair to say that the Puritans did not receive a patient hearing. James told Reynolds, one of their number, that they should conform to the Church or else, said he, "I will harrie them out of the land, or hang them." The Conference was a failure, as far as the Puritans were concerned. The chief reforms which they desired were not granted them. James was immovable on the point that it should not be left to the caprice of any clergyman as to whether he should wear the black gown or the surplice in the public services. It should not be left to his will to mar the beauty of the Church's worship. It should not be left to the clergyman's will as to whether the ring should be used in marriage or not, or whether the cross should be used in Baptism.

Gardiner, the historian, says: [1] "It cannot be said that James's decision was entirely unreasonable. If every minister is to be allowed to take his own course he may possibly give offence to his congregation, by omitting some ceremony to which they are accustomed as well as by adopting some ceremony to which they are unaccustomed." We must call to mind in this connection that in the days of King James no one had any idea, as some people have to-day, that separate bodies should exist with different forms of worship.

[1] The Puritan Revolution, p. 14. Epochs of Modern History.

The idea of separate sects would then have been repelled by the Puritans as much as by the Church. What the Puritans aimed at was to have public worship carried out only in their own way. They desired to overthrow the customs of all the preceding ages, without considering the reasonableness or necessity of it. James did not feel inclined to adopt their method of worship because he so disliked it, and felt it was not on the side of truth. When the Puritans forced their views, James lost control of himself, and in his outburst of anger he lets us into another reason why he rejected Presbyterianism and Puritanism. [1] "A Scottish Presbytery," he said, "agreeth as well with a monarchy as God and the devil. Then Jack and Tom, and Will and Dick shall meet, and, at their pleasures, censure me and my council, and all our proceedings. . . . Stay, I pray you, for one seven years, before you demand that from me; and if then you find me pursy and fat, and my windpipe stuffed, I will perhaps hearken to you. For let this government be once up, I am sure I shall be kept in breath; then shall we all of us have work enough. . . . Until you find that I grow lazy let that alone."

The form of government to which James here referred was set up in England after the time of Charles I., and we shall see what that did for England; how it did curb the Royal power, and at last temporarily destroyed it. James certainly understood the Puritan movement, seeing that the prophecy was so lamentably fulfilled.

To return to the Hampton Court Conference. It was not without some beneficial results. It led to further legislation

[1] Gardiner, Ibid, p. 14.

on the government of the Church of England. A set of canons was drawn up for the Church's benefit. It led to the authorized version of the Scriptures, from which we now read the Gospel in our Churches, and which is dedicated to King James. It was decided that the greater part of the Apocrypha should not be read in Churches. But the Prayer Book was not changed. A form of thanksgiving was added to the Litany, and an addition concerning the Sacraments made to the Catechism. The Puritans were greatly disappointed at the result of the Conference. They left it with more embittered feelings than they entered it, and from that time their hostility to the Church increased. When the canons before alluded to were finally published, the Puritans raised a public cry against them. The canons were drawn up to enforce conformity and to oppose their views. As a result of these canons becoming law, the Puritans say that three hundred more clergy left the Church of England to join them, but we cannot trace more than one-sixth of that number.

During the twenty years of King James' reign the Puritans very much increased in numbers. One of the reasons why they became such a power in the land was that they were foremost in undertaking the people's grievances against the arbitrary government of the king. They took a definite stand in politics, and in this many Churchmen were at one with them. But the Puritan movement to a great extent was a political movement; and, unfortunately, the Church at that time was looked upon as being identified with the cause of the king, whether it was good or bad; and the Puritans were looked upon as the exponents of righteousness and freedom,

and as inaugurators of the reign of peace. King James was much to blame for this state of things, because of his teaching that if there were no Bishop there could be no king. There was no reason why the troubles of James' time, and those of the early years of the reign of King Charles, should have been mixed up with the religious problems of the day. The early stages of these troubles had nothing to do with the different religious opinions held by Puritans and Churchmen. But so it was that political and religious differences were looked upon as being one and the same thing, and all the disorders of the latter days of Charles I. were wrongly attributed to the Church.

In passing on to speak of the reign of Charles I., I must say that it is not my business to enlarge upon the troubles which brought about the civil wars, or to discuss the king's mistakes. They are interesting and pathetic reading. You all know something about the rule of tyranny, as it was called, when ship money was imposed upon a part of the nation, when taxes were illegally demanded, when the king and his advisers governed without a Parliament. The end of these troubles were the civil wars and the murder of the king. These are not subjects which we must discuss. I will only say this: that the Puritans, during this first twenty years of Charles' reign, became more formidable than they ever were before. They built their meeting-houses and formed new congregations. Many of the Puritans left the country for Holland and America in Charles I.'s early years of rule, that they might enjoy greater freedom in their worship. Ultimately, we must remember, the troubles in England were resolved into religious troubles, and a war in

1640 was carried on to put these troubles down, called the Bishop's war.

The Puritans managed to be in the majority in the Parliament, when Parliament ruled in defiance of the king and took the law into its own hands. They were the primary movers in the civil wars, with Cromwell at their head.

I must now show what Parliament did when it became the organ of Puritan wishes and principles, and tell you how it governed the Church. The Puritans set about the consideration of the ritual and liturgy of the Church. In 1643 Parliament ordered that an assembly of divines should be held at Westminster. Its object should be, as defined by Parliament, [1] "For the settling of the government and liturgy of the Church of England, and for vindicating and clearing of the doctrines of the said Church from false aspersions and interpretations." This assembly was comprised of one hundred and thirty ministers and thirty laymen. But most of them were Presbyterians, and some few were Independents. That is to say, that men bitterly opposed to the Church of England should legislate for the Church, and order its rites and ceremonies and teaching, without Churchmen having a chance of explaining the meaning of their customs. At first, however, a few Episcopal clergymen were present at the meeting, and several of these were Bishops of the Church, but they withdrew when the king issued a proclamation forbidding the assembly. This meeting of divines were so far from considering the liturgy and the doctrines of the Church of England, that they determined to extirpate prelacy and popery, as they called

[1] Quoted by Hore, p. 355.

the Churchmanship of such men as Laud. [1] "They received orders," says Green, "to revise the Articles, to draw up a Confession of Faith, and a Directory for Public Worship; and these, with their scheme of Church government . . . were accepted by the Houses of Parliament and embodied in a series of ordinances." The Directory of Public Worship was ordered to take the place of our Book of Common Prayer, and on August 23rd, 1645, Parliament passed an ordinance enforcing its use. This said: [2] "It is hereby ordained by the said Lords and Commons that, if any person or persons whatsoever shall at any time or times hereafter cause to be used the aforesaid Book of Common Prayer in any Church, chapel, or place of public worship, or in any private place or family within the Kingdom of England or Dominion of Wales, or post or town of Berwick; then every such person so offending shall for the first offence forfeit and pay the sum of five pounds, for the second offence the sum of ten pounds, and for the third offence shall suffer one year's imprisonment without bail or mainprise, and further, every minister who does not strictly keep to the Directory for Public Worship, shall every time he offends forfeit forty shillings." Mr. Hore says that [3] "Any one writing or preaching against the Directory was liable to a fine not less than five pounds nor more than fifty pounds." What do you think of this as a coercive measure? This was one of the laws of the Puritans. This was drawn up without consultation with Churchmen, and it was imposed upon the whole realm. Mr. Lane, in his Church History, tells us what this law means for England.

[1] Short History, p. 544. [2] Quoted by Hore, p. 359. [3] Ibid.

It made it [1] "an offence to kneel at the reception of Holy Communion, or to use any kind of symbolism in sacred things, such as the ring in marriage; and when any person departed this life the dead body was to be interred without any kind of religious ceremony, nor were the friends allowed to sing or read or pray or kneel at the grave, although the civil pomp and pageantry in funeral processions of persons of rank or condition were not in any way restricted. Then the holy and beautiful petitions of our liturgy, though sanctified by the devotions of Christians in every clime and by every tongue for fifteen hundred years and more, gave place to long and tedious harangues from illiterate fanatics of two or three hours' duration; and the observance of Church festivals, together with all anniversaries, was strictly forbidden."

The Thirty-nine Articles of Religion were next brought under consideration, and a Confession of Faith was drawn up, consisting of Twenty-three Articles, to take their place. The Feast of Christmas Day was ordered to be observed as a fast day.

In the year 1643 the Puritans in Parliament signed the Solemn League and Covenant for the extirpation of popery and prelacy. Listen to the decision of Parliament on this point. It said: [2] "(1) That we shall sincerely, really, and constantly, through the grace of God . . . endeavour to bring the Churches of God in the three Kingdoms to the nearest conjunction and uniformity in religion, confession of faith, form of Church government, directory for worship, and

[1] Lane's Notes on Church History, Modern Period, pp. 140, 141.

[2] Quoted by Lane, Ibid, p. 135.

catechising; (2) that we shall in like manner endeavour the extirpation of . . . Church government by Archbishops, Bishops . . . and all other ecclesiastical officers depending on their hierarchy; (3) we shall, with the same sincerity . . . endeavour . . . to preserve the rights and privileges of the Parliaments and the liberties of the Kingdoms, and to preserve and defend the king's majesty's person and authority . . . that the world may bear witness with our consciences of our loyalty." Here they stated deliberately, you see, two things. First, that they would utterly destroy the Church of England. God did not allow them to succeed. Secondly, that they would preserve the king's person. But they murdered him.

It was from the death of Charles I., 1649, to the year 1660 that the Puritans had full swing in England, and did with it what they willed. But before that time what dissensions there were among them! They had long ago split themselves into two parties, and each one was almost as much opposed to each other as they both were to the Church of England. Their internal discord was only lessened by one of their parties proving the stronger. The Independents governed England and our Church. It was during this reign of the Puritans under Cromwell that we are given an idea of what our land would have been if they had succeeded in destroying the Church of England. There would have been no religion in our land. The nation became heartily sick of the Puritan rule. It longed for the return of the exiled king. It desired with a strong desire the old worship in the Parish Churches, and it rebelled against the desecration to which our Churches had been put by the Puritan leaders. The

religious sense was wounded, seeing that our sacred buildings were turned into stables and dancing halls. I could relate many arbitrary measures which resulted from this Puritan sway. A committee was appointed to inquire into the fitness of those who offered themselves as candidates for Holy Orders. It was named the Body of Triers. This was in the year 1654. They compelled the faithful clergy of the Church, who yet remained, to take the oath to the Republican Government. This committee was made up of thirty-eight commissioners. But notice this, that most of them were Independents, some few were Baptists, and they were to examine the qualifications of Churchmen.

Evelyn, who has left us a valuable document in his diary, said that in 1655 a sharp persecution commenced against the Church, and it was necessary to confine the Church services to private houses, and this was only done with danger. Clergy were ejected from their positions by scores. Without considering those who were unbeneficed, or those who were masters of hospitals, or schoolmasters, out of the ten thousand clergy in England before the Puritan usurpation, seven thousand were afterwards ejected.

The Archbishop of Canterbury was beheaded without any law for the deed, being on the Puritan side. The Archbishop of York, to save himself, thought it wise to join "the faction which had ruined his brethren." Eighteen of the Bishops died in poverty. Only nine Bishops survived the Commonwealth. Those clergy who were ejected were, however, allowed one-fifth of their benefices as a pension. But how could they live on so small a sum? [1] "As a great

[1] Hore, p. 362.

majority of them were married," says Mr. Hore, "it is clear that fully thirty thousand persons were turned out on the world to get their livings in the best way they could."

The religious life of England under the Commonwealth was a miserable picture of wreckage; and Cromwell lived long enough to be embittered by some of his failures. His last days were spent in remorse. After his death there were eighteen months of anarchy. The nation was degraded, and with a great longing it looked for the restoration of Charles II. to the throne. This took place in the year 1660. After his accession the Church was revived. The old Bishops who were living were restored to their old Sees, and the clergy regained their rectories and vicarages. The national Church was put in power again, and the Prayer Book with alterations brought back to use. The Puritans were ejected from the Church by successive Acts of Parliament passed in the early years of Charles; and dissent, as a consequence, became established in our land.

From what I have already said of the Puritans, you must conclude that their work was not worthy of the highest respect. They almost succeeded in destroying the religious sentiment in England. In fact, I consider that they greatly added to the woes of England, for they did not scruple to wound people in the tenderest parts of their nature. They tried to destroy all beauty in our public services. They despised every material aid to devotion. Their movement was essentially a political affair; and it is due to this that dissent to-day, to speak the truth about it, is quite as much, if not more, a political than a religious campaign.

Notice next the intolerance of the Puritans to any form of

religion differing from their own. They hated the Church of England beyond everything. Cromwell is spoken of as being a tolerant man. It is true that he could hold out the right hand of fellowship to Anabaptists, and even provide a pension in those days for an Unitarian, but for prelacy he had no moderation, no toleration. We should remind ourselves of this side of the Puritan movement, for it is the cry to-day of the followers and representatives of the Puritans that it is the Church of England which is intolerant and bitter against all those who differ from it. But as a matter of fact the Church's intolerance is not one-hundredth part as bitter as that of dissent towards us. Please do not think I am speaking rashly in pointing out this side of Puritanism. Be sure of this from other writers' testimony. Mr. Southey, in his history of the Church, says of Puritans: [1] "The tyrannical disposition of these people, who demanded to be set free from all restraint themselves, was even more intolerable than their presumption. As far as was in their power they separated themselves from the members of the Church, and refused to hold any communion with them. Instances occurred, where they were strong enough, of their thrusting the clergy out of their own Churches if they wore the surplice, and taking away the bread from the Communion Table because it was in the wafer form. Some fanatics spit in the face of their old acquaintance to testify their utter abhorrence of conformity." And again: [2] "The Puritan clergy, to whom every vestige of Catholicism was an abomination, had succeeded to the intolerance of the Catholic priesthood, to their assumed infallibility, and

[1] Book of the Church, p. 414. [2] Ibid, p. 454.

were now claiming to inherit their spiritual despotism."

In estimating the character of Cartwright, who, you remember, was the leader of the Puritans, Green, the historian, says that [1] "his bigotry was that of a mediæval inquisitor." . . . [2] "With the despotism of a Hildebrand," says Green, "Cartwright combined the cruelty of a Torquemada. Not only was Presbyterianism to be established as the one legal form of Church government, but all other forms, Episcopalian and Separatist, were to be ruthlessly put down. For heresy there was the punishment of death. Never had the doctrine of persecution been urged with such a blind and reckless ferocity. 'I deny,' wrote Cartwright, 'that upon repentance there ought to follow any pardon of death. . . . Heretics ought to be put to death now. If this be bloody and extreme, I am content to be so counted with the Holy Ghost.'" I could give numerous quotations from other writers to illustrate this side of the Puritan character. In the year 1655 the Puritans passed an edict dealing with the subject of the banishment of the clergy of the Church of England. It would be difficult to match this for severity and intolerance. It ran as follows:—[3] "That no person or persons do, from after the first day of January (1656), keep in their houses or families as Chaplains, or Schoolmasters for the education of their children, any sequestered or ejected Minister, Fellow of a College, or Schoolmaster; nor permit any of their children to be taught by such; in pain of being proceeded against in such sort as the said orders do direct in such cases. And that no person who hath been sequestered or ejected out of any benefice, college, or school, for delin-

[1] Short History, p. 455. [2] Ibid, p. 456. [3] Quoted by Lane, Ibid, p. 157.

quency or scandal, shall, from and after the said first day of January, keep any school either public or private ; nor shall any person, who after that time shall be ejected for the causes aforesaid, preach in any public place, or at any private meeting of other persons besides his own family, nor administer Baptism or the Lord's Supper, or marry any persons, or use the Book of Common Prayer or the forms therein contained, upon pain that every person so offending shall be proceeded against as by the said orders is provided."

No wonder, then, that at the restoration the methods which the Puritans now used to destroy Churchmen were used in turn to ruin them. Parliament, then, was only following the methods previously laid down by the Puritans.

I must now pass on to speak of another phase of the Puritan movement. Consider, in the next place, how they used our Churches and dealt with their ministers. Certainly they showed no reverence for the sacred buildings in which people had worshipped for generations. The very idea of beauty in worship was quite enough to enrage them. Some of the finest works of art ever possessed by England were destroyed in their fanaticism. Beautiful windows and masterpieces of sculpture were shattered to atoms by their blows. We are reminded by Mr. Southey[1] that some of the Puritans hoped to see the day when the noble building of S. Paul's should be levelled to the ground. A certain faction did demolish with axes and hammers the carved work of that noble structure, and the body of the Church was converted into a stable to shelter the troopers' horses. Old market

[1] p. 472.

crosses, notable objects in the old towns, were pulled down also in the general havoc. Cheapside cross fell in the demolition. Bishop Andrewes said, "That there had been a good riddance of images by the Puritans"; by which he meant to say that they had been busy at destroying them.

The Puritans had quite a crusade against our Churches. They were guilty of the worst form of sacrilege. Southey says, [1] "In some of them they baptized horses and swine, in profane mockery of baptism; in others they broke open the tombs and scattered about the bones of the dead, or, if the bodies were entire, they defaced and dismembered them. At Sudbury, they made a slaughter-house of the chancel, cut up the carcases upon the Communion Table, and threw the garbage in the vault of the Chandoses, insulting thus the remains of some of the most heroic men, who, in their day, defended and did honour to their country. At Westminster, the soldiers sat smoking and drinking at the Altar, and lived in the Abbey, committing every kind of indecency there, which the Parliament saw and permitted. No Cathedral escaped without some injury; painted windows were broken, statues pulled down and mutilated, carvings demolished, the organs sold piecemeal for the value of the materials, or set up in taverns. At Lambeth, Parker's monument was thrown down, that Scott, to whom the Palace had been allotted for his portion of the spoils, might convert the chapel into a hall. The Archbishop's body was taken, not out of his grave alone, but out of his coffin, and the lead in which it had been enclosed was sold, and the remains were buried in a dunghill." Scores of historians

[1] p. 473.

give a similar account of these miserable doings. Mr. Lane reminds us that at Hereford Cathedral the Puritans shattered the windows,[1] "tore up the brasses and carried off the ornaments." At Winchester the soldiers broke into the Church as service was going on, marched up the nave with drums beating and banners flying; they destroyed the tombs, and used the bones of the dead as hammers to break up the stained-glass windows. The altar was taken away to an ale-house, and was burnt there with the service books. The soldiers then put on the surplices of the clergy and the choir, and took the crosses and banners of the Church, and, with awful mockery, wended their way in this guise through the streets of the town. The men who did this were Cromwell's soldiers, godly men, as he called them in another connection. Similar scenes happened at Chichester and Norwich. [2] "At S. Asaph the Cathedral was used as a stable for the horses of one Miller, a postmaster, who occupied the Bishop's Palace as an inn, fed his calves in the Bishop's throne, and removed the font into his yard for use as a watering trough." In 1653 the Puritans ordered [3] "All the Cathedral Churches in England, where there are other Churches sufficient for the people to meet in for the worship of God," to be "surveyed, pulled down, and the materials sold." Fortunately the order was not carried out. Some of you will think that I have said quite enough to convince you of the sacrilege of the Puritans.

Dissatisfaction was everywhere expressed at their tyrannical rule, and it was not without good reason that the Church people of those days cried out: "O God, the

[1] Lane, p. 150. [2] Ibid, p. 151. [3] Quoted by Lane, p. 152.

heathen are come into Thine inheritance. Thy Holy Temple have they defiled, and made Jerusalem an heap of stones."

Notice, in the next place, how they used our pulpits. It seems that everyone was allowed to preach in them. Discipline was a thing unknown to them. Evelyn, in his diary, wrote, [1] "Going this day (December 4th, 1653) to our Church, I was surprised to see a tradesman—a mechanic—step up" to the pulpit. "I was resolved to stay and see what he would make of it. His text was from 2 Samuel xxiii. 20. 'And Benaiah went down also and slew a lion in in the midst of a pit in the time of snow.' The purport was that no danger was to be thought difficult when God called for shedding of blood, inferring that now the saints were called to destroy temporal governments."

Evelyn gives us further important information about these times. On December 25th he wrote, [2] "No Churches or public assembly. I was fain to pass the devotions of that Blessed Day (a Sunday) with my family at home." In 1655 he wrote, [3] "On Sunday afternoon he had frequently to stay at home to catechise and instruct his family," because the clergy were forbidden to catechise the children. On Christmas Day of that year he said, [4] "There was no more notice taken of Christmas Day in Churches." The proclamation had gone forth that it should be observed as a fast day. "The Lord Jesus pity our distressed Church," he wrote, "and bring back the captivity of Zion." [5] "The parish Churches," he writes, "were filled with sectaries of

[1] Quoted by Lane, p. 147. [2] Quoted by Lane, p. 159. [3] Ibid, p. 159.
[4] Ibid, p. 159. [5] Ibid, p. 160.

all sorts, blasphemous and ignorant mechanics usurping the pulpits everywhere." He tells us that on Christmas Day in 1657 he ventured to go to a Celebration of the Holy Communion, and he found the Church surrounded by soldiers,[1] "who levelled their muskets at the communicants as if they would shoot us at the altar. Afterwards they took all the congregation prisoners."

I have dwelt fully upon this side of the Puritan movement, because the descendants of the Puritans—the Independents and the Baptists of to-day—would not acquaint you with these facts. Perhaps they are ignorant of them, for they read their own history as written by their own partisans, and it is only natural that such facts as these should not be brought into prominence.

Whatever good we may think the Puritans did they certainly did immense harm, and their tyranny was greater than the tyranny which they tried to suppress when they killed the king. Their method was more autocratic than the king's was, and certainly quite as unlawful. The loss which England has sustained through these men in ancient works of art and architecture cannot now be estimated. The nation learned that the last state of the man was worse than the first. Most eagerly did it look forward to the coming back of Charles II. to the throne, and it gave him a hearty welcome when he came.

When Charles II. began his reign a complete reaction set in against Puritan strictness, and many evils grew up alongside of it. The people had been so long kept in restraint by the Puritans, and their most innocent pleasures had been so

[1] See Hore, p. 361.

rigorously denied, that they gladly welcomed back their old English games at the Restoration; and licentiousness grew up along with them, now that restraint was removed. At the restoration, says Mr. Green, [1] "All that was noblest and best in Puritanism was whirled away with its pettiness and its tyranny in the current of the nation's hate. Religion had been turned into a political and social tyranny, and it fell with their fall. Godliness became a byword of scorn, sobriety in dress, in speech, in manners, was flouted as a mark of the detested Puritanism." One of the evil results of Puritanism on England, as told us by Mr. Green, was the growth of the freethinking spirit and of indifference to religion. [2] "From the social and religious anarchy around them," he says, "from the endless controversies and discussions of the time, they drank in the spirit of scepticism, of doubt, of free inquiry. If religious enthusiasm had broken the spell of ecclesiastical tradition, its own extravagance broke the spell of religious enthusiasm."

It would be foolish and untrue to say that the Puritans had not good men in their ranks, or to say that they had not some right principles upon their side. We must give them praise and honour for this. But it is their assumption and intolerance and desecration of which we so bitterly complain. We complain that they could not enter into the spirit of the Church of England, and that by anarchy and unlawful measures they tried their very best to destroy the Church. But it was not allowed that they should succeed in this, although they tried so hard to get success. This is a reason for holding, I should say, that there is some

[1] Short History, p. 589. [2] Ibid, p. 590.

inherent power in the Church which makes it impossible for man to destroy it. Many of the Puritans were godly men, who had righteous principles, who believed first in God and His ways. But they all had strong antipathies, which, in those days, at any rate, disqualified them from being able to tolerate anyone who differed from them or who worshipped in any way other than their own.

Some of you may have wondered why in this Lecture I have not spoken of Archbishop Laud, who had so much to do with the Puritans, and who, by them, was accounted to be the cause of the civil wars. I have reserved the consideration of his position for the next Lecture, when, in conjunction with the life of Bishop Andrewes, I shall speak of his work and character.

Representative Churchmen.

LECTURE V.

Representative Churchmen.

Growth of Calvinism. Party in Church to oppose it. (1) Andrewes. Birth. Education. Youth. At Cambridge. Studies. Preferment. Andrewes and King James. Bishop. Advice to Clergy on Pastoral work and right living. Bishop's character. Andrewes and Roman Catholics. His Sermons and Meditations. Cultivated tastes. (2) Laud. His times. Opposes Puritans. Love of learning. Preferment. Decisive character. Church principles. Ritual. Laud on Calvinism. Scotland. Star Chamber. Puritans his bitter enemies. Imprisonment. Death. Laud's character. Was he a Papist? His refutation of the Jesuit Fisher. Rome's view of his death. Laud's own opinions. Cause of his persecution. Holy Table. Scotland. Laud's sincerity. Southey's testimony. His courage on the scaffold. The Puritans pervert his diary. Laud's complaint. His religious spirit. Prays for his enemies.

N our Lecture last week we gave the history of the Puritans and considered the value of their work. The events related came within the reign of James and Charles I. We saw the Church of England in a state of chaos. From all we said about the Church in that Lecture, you may have the idea that no one stood up in those times for the teaching and the doctrine of the Church in opposition to the Puritans. There were men, however, who fought hard for the Church; and these men

were headed by Lancelot Andrewes and William Laud. We saw last time that Calvinism was the phase of religious thought which the Puritans chiefly expounded, and their desire was to model the Church of England in accordance with the Calvinistic method of Church government as seen at Geneva. Now a party existed in the Church to oppose this teaching throughout both James' and Charles' reigns. Its object was, as expressed by Mr. Lane, [1] "To resist the advance of Calvinistic principles, as seen in Presbyterianism, by an appeal to history, reason, and Scripture; so as to demonstrate that episcopacy is a divinely ordered form of Church government, that the Church of England in her organization, discipline, ceremonial, doctrine, and liturgy could claim relationship to the Apostolic Church by an unbroken lineage; and that her reforms and repudiation of papal control did not put her out of harmony with other national branches of the Holy Catholic Church." This party continually dwelt upon the fact that the Church of England is an Apostolic Church; that its teaching was Catholic and not Protestant of the type of the Protestant teaching of the Continent which the Puritans in England represented; and that the Church had Sacraments committed to its charge which it was the duty of its ministers to see observed and preserved. The object of this party, in fact, was the very same as that of the Tractarian Movement at Oxford in 1833, which we shall consider in our next Lecture. Men belonging to this party strove hard to teach Churchmen of those restless days that it was their duty to be faithful to their Prayer Book in all its detail. They stood up for episcopacy

[1] Lane, Notes on Church History, p. 120.

in opposition to the Genevan rule of Church government. They opposed, and rightly opposed the teaching of Calvinism, because it was foreign to the Church of England and subversive of Apostolic teaching.

Now the Father of this movement against Calvinism was Lancelot Andrewes. William Laud, his personal friend, who had come under Andrewes' influence, continued the work he had begun and persevered in it till it cost him his head.

To-night I will briefly speak about the lives of these two men with the object of showing what they tried to do for the preservation of the Church of England. Remember that they lived at the time when the Puritans were trying to do the work of which we spoke last week: when the Puritans were trying to undermine the Church of England. I say, we will consider the work of these two men for our Church, for, believe me when I say it, that both Andrewes and Laud were faithful sons of the Church, and they had no other desire at heart than the Church's welfare, although you have often heard them described as Papists or Romanists. Sectarian historians say that Laud certainly was a Roman Catholic, and that he taught papal doctrines, that he would have handed England over to Rome. We shall see the truth of this this evening.

At the outset we should consider that these men lived in very troublesome days, and in days when men used means differing from our own to enforce their most conscientious convictions. Passions were stronger then than now. Bigotry was looked upon almost as a virtue. But to say these men were Papists is nothing short of calumny. They

understood the Puritan movement, and saw its evils. They felt so keenly about the truth and teaching of episcopacy that Laud, at least, was urged to be somewhat too earnest and aggressive in his desires to put its enemies down.

I must speak first, in the order of time, of Lancelot Andrewes. He saw Puritanism in its infancy. His time extends from 1555, throughout the whole of Queen Elizabeth's reign, to the year 1626, two years after the death of James. He was spared the pain of witnessing the evil results of the Puritan movement of Charles' troublesome years. This divine was born in Thames Street, in the parish of All Hallows, London. His parents were religious people, and in circumstances sufficiently well-to-do to give their boy a splendid education and to leave him a fair-sized estate as well. His early training was received in London. He was sent to Pembroke Hall, Cambridge, and became a Fellow in 1576, at the time when Puritanism was so popular in the University. He was of a very retiring nature, and in early days loved the quiet of the study rather than the pleasures of the field. [1] "What he did when he was a child and a schoolboy it is not now known," says his biographer; "but he hath been sometimes heard to say, that when he was a young scholar in the University, and so all his time onward, he never loved or used any games, or ordinary recreations, either within doors, as cards, dice, tables, chess, or the like; or abroad, as bats, quoits, bowls, or any such, but his ordinary exercise and recreation was walking, either

[1] Quoted from Isaacson, by Rev. A. T. Russell. Memoirs of Lancelot Andrewes, p. 4.

alone or with some companion, with whom he might confer and recount his studies." It is certain that from an early date his mind was given over to scholarship and meditation.

Andrewes must have felt much out of sympathy with the teaching at Cambridge, and this would have led him to take the strong stand he did to uphold the teaching of the Church of England. Cartwright, the leader of the Puritans, was at the height of his power when Andrewes first went to the University. The reaction set in, and Cartwright was expelled from the University.

Andrewes made good progress in the University. After he had received his degree of B.A., he soon rose to be the head of his College, and was elected a Fellow. He gave his mind over to the study of the Greek and Hebrew languages, the last of which was so much neglected in those days, and became proficient in them. He received Holy Orders in 1580, and this circumstance led him to the study of theology, in which he became a complete master. He had a particular love for moral theology. [1] "He was," says Harrington, "a man deeply seen in all cases of conscience, and he was much sought to in that respect." Andrewes held many preferments in the Church of England. Coming under the notice of Walsingham, the Queen's Minister, he was made Rector of S. Giles', Cripplegate, and brought under the notice of the Court. He was elected Canon of S. Paul's and Southwell. Then he was Chaplain in Ordinary to the Queen. In Elizabeth's reign he was several times pressed to accept a Bishopric, but he refused for conscientious reasons. He did not agree with Elizabeth in her custom of alienating

[1] Quoted by Ottley, p. 15.

a part of the revenues of Sees to the Crown. In 1604 he was Dean of Westminster. It was with the accession of King James that Andrewes came prominently into notice. There were good reasons why they should have been drawn to each other. The divine was without doubt the greatest theologian and the most profound scholar of his day. It is said that he could speak fifteen languages. The king also prided himself upon his theological knowledge. This must have formed a bond of friendship between them. Andrewes also believed in James' pet doctrine that kings held their position by divine right, and not through the election or will of the people. We now see Andrewes as one of the Bishops of the Bench. In 1605 he was Bishop of Chichester, in 1609 he was translated to Ely, and in 1618 to Winchester. Here he entertained King James at an enormous cost to himself.

In his position as Bishop, Andrewes, by his quiet life and his devotion to his work, gave a check to the efforts of the Puritans. In a small degree he was able to mould the public mind against their teaching. We read that he was present at the Wesminster Assembly of divines, called to consider the Puritan grievances, but we do not hear that he took much part in the discussion. He, above all men, desired peace, and if he saw this could not be procured, he would say nothing to irritate existing evils. He was asked at this Assembly to take part in the translation of the Scriptures. He was the head of a company to whom was assigned the translation of the Pentateuch, the Book of Joshua, and the Second Book of Kings.

Andrewes did not enter into controversy with the Puritans as Laud. He preferred above all to show them by his way

of living how much he disapproved of their principles. He had great influence over his clergy. It was his first care to emphasize the need of purity of life. He spoke strongly and fearlessly to his clergy on this subject. In one of his sermons he spoke from the text [1] "Take heed to yourselves." He said to the clergy: "You do, indeed, take heed to yourselves. Who denies it? It is the common report that you so do. You take heed, verily, to the enriching of your sons and daughters. You are so careful for your heirs that you are forgetful of your successors. . . . At the present," he says, "it is reported of us that we are more concerned with shearing than shepherding the sheep." It was by such advice as this that he exhorted Churchmen to give the Puritans no cause to complain of them.

Other things for which the Bishop especially pleaded, in his time, were the preservation of the doctrine of the Church of England, a higher standard of living among the clergy, and a warmer pastoral spirit. He says of clerical neglect: [2] "If you attend not to the flock, the flock will attend to you. . . . While you are neglectful of the people, be sure that the people has its eye on you."

One side of Andrewes' character we must not pass over. He has been extolled by everyone for his high principle and the purity of his own life. Professor Gardiner says of him: [3] "Going in and out as he did among the frivolous and grasping courtiers, who gathered round the king, he seemed to live in a peculiar atmosphere of holiness." In fact, as far as he possibly could considering his office, he avoided the life

[1] Life of Andrewes, by Rev. R. L. Ottley, p. 32. Leaders of Religion.
[2] Ibid, p. 34. [3] Quoted by Ottley, p. 49.

of the Court, and he would not be drawn into the evils which went hand in hand with familiarity with the Court. An anecdote lets us into Andrewes' character. [1] Neale, the Bishop of Durham, and Andrewes were one day with the king, when the king asked, "My lords, cannot I take my subjects' money when I want it, without all the formality of Parliament?" Neale replied, "God forbid, sir, but you should, you are the breath of our nostrils." Andrewes sat silent. The king pressed him for an answer. "Sir," he replied, "I think it is lawful for you to take my brother Neale's money, because he offers it." A very pretty story, which shows us Andrewes' integrity, and that he would not be false to his convictions even to please his king.

We must next notice Andrewes' relations to the Roman Catholics. The time of King James was the age of papal plots, and Roman controversialists arose to poison the mind of the Church of England. They found a worthy opponent in Andrewes, although controversy was not what he loved. No man, however, had as much learning as he to meet the arguments of Bellarmine, the champion of the Pope of Rome. Andrewes disposed of the claims put forward by him by appealing to history. And it was acknowledged that Andrewes' work was unanswerable.

Andrewes could express himself in vigorous language, as the following quotation from this controversy will show. He was speaking of the popish plot of the 5th of November, and said it was [2] "an abomination of desolation standing in the Holy Place." It was, he said, "undertaken with a holy oath; bound with the Holy Sacrament (that must needs be

[1] Ottley, p. 49. [2] Ottley, p. 70.

in a Holy Place); warranted for a holy act, tending to the advancement of a holy religion, and by holy persons called by a most holy name, the name of Jesus. That these holy, religious persons, even the chief of all religious persons (the Jesuits), gave not only absolution, but resolution, that all this was well done: that it was by them justified as lawful, sanctified as meritorious, and should have been glorified (but it wants glorifying because the event failed; that is, the grief, if it had not glorified) long ere this and canonized, as a very good and holy act, and we had had orations out of the conclave in commendation of it—[this is the pitch of all]—this shrining it such an abomination, setting it in the Holy Place, so ugly and odious; making such a treason as this, a religious, missal, sacramental treason, hallowing it with orison, oath and Eucharist; this passeth all the rest."

As I said before, Andrewes was in his element in the seclusion of the study. He preferred that to taking an active part in the political troubles of his days. And he has influenced for good through the study far more people than he did in his political work. He is chiefly known for his sermons on the Incarnation, delivered in successive years before King James, and for his profound works on meditation and his soul-stirring prayers. Churchmen of succeeding years have thanked him for these benefits. By such publications he has helped to build up the spiritual life of hundreds of his successors.

He took but little part, I say, in active political movements of his time. We hear that he accompanied James and Laud to Scotland when the idea was first conceived to impose the Prayer Book on that nation, but we do not hear whether he

agreed or disagreed with the movement. He was at any time ready to speak out on the side of justice when any political trouble agitated the nation. Abbot had accidentally killed a gamekeeper while out hunting. This was a serious offence in the eyes of ecclesiastical law. The question was as to whether a Bishop with blood on his hands, even though brought there by accident, was worthy of continuing in his episcopal office. Andrewes used his influence on behalf of Abbot. [1] "Brethren," he said, "be not too busy to condemn any for uncanonicals according to the strictness thereof, lest we render ourselves in the same condition."

Andrewes, unlike Laud, found the policy of rigour uncongenial. Had he lived in such troubles as Laud subsequently passed through, we cannot say what his conduct would then have been. That he would have been gentler in reform than Laud was there can be no doubt. And we cannot doubt, too, that he would not have sacrificed his principles, even though he should be called upon to be severe.

Now, in the last place, let us look at Andrewes from another point of view. He was a man of the most cultivated tastes. He was acquainted with, and could number among his personal friends, some of the foremost men of his time. He knew such men as Nicholas Fuller, and the great Bishop Cosin, of Durham. He knew Casaubon, Grotius, Bacon, Hooker, and George Herbert. He was called by Casaubon [2] "The most wise and learned Bishop of Ely." "I acknowledged," he said, "his extraordinary courtesy and kindness towards me." Again, "He is a man whom, if you knew, you would take to exceedingly. We spend whole days in

[1] Quoted by Ottley, p. 79. [2] Ottley, pp. 96, 97.

talk of literature—sacred especially—and no words can express what true piety, what uprightness of judgment I find in him." "I am attracted to the man by his profound learning, and am charmed by his graciousness of manner, not common in one so highly placed."

Here I must finish our consideration of the life of Lancelot Andrewes. It has been well to speak of him to show you that even in James' time, when the Church seemed to be going to destruction, there were men who stood up for its rights against the attacks of Puritans. There was at least one good Bishop, and that man Bishop Andrewes, who emphasized the teaching of the Church, and whose life was a model for his brethen to follow, who was as pious and gentle as he was undoubtedly learned.

WILLIAM LAUD.

William Laud, in very many respects, was a very different man from Bishop Andrewes. He held the same views as his predecessor on the teaching of the Church. We must come to the conclusion that he was a remarkable, a pious, though unfortunate man. He lived in the reign of Charles I., when England was torn asunder by many troubles. He lived to see the troubles brought to a head which began in the reign of James I. Laud was mixed up in the king's troubles to his own misfortune, because he believed in the doctrine of the king that kings were appointed by Divine right, and therefore it was the duty of the people to obey the rule and wish of the king. It was his misfortune that he held to this view of the king's office. [1] The great question, you

[1] See Hore, p. 337.

remember, in Charles' days was, "Should the king or Parliament be supreme in the land." It was found that they could not work together. Another great difficulty of that time was to solve the question as to whether the Church of England should be the Church of the country. You know the opinions of the Puritans upon this point. Laud was most bitterly opposed to them. It was on this last matter that he held very strong and decided views. His whole aim was to preserve the Church of England, but, unfortunately, he was arbitrary and unwise in his method of obtaining his object. He looked upon the Church government model of Geneva with a great loathing, and he preferred to lose his head rather than agree to it. But then William Laud lived in times more troublesome than the reign of James. We must not forget that for a moment. He lived in a time when men's strongest passions were called forth by the events of the age.

William Laud came into prominence as soon as Charles I. ascended the throne. [1] "He rose out of the mass of Court Prelates," says Mr. Green, "by his industry, his personal unselfishness, and his remarkable capacity for administration." He was born at Reading on October 7th, 1573. He was particularly fond of Oxford, his University, and he did much to elevate its standard of education. He was always the patron of learning. [2] "His plans for the promotion of sound learning," as a writer says, "were of the most munificent kind. He had employed his fortune as well as his influence in carrying them into effect. From his own private means he had endowed a Chapel in his native town of

[1] Short History, p. 494. [2] Southey, p. 451.

Reading, enlarged S. John's College at Oxford, where he had been bred, established an Arabic lecture in that University, and presented to the Bodleian Library as many Greek and Oriental manuscripts as he could procure from the East." These facts show his love for learning. Besides, he was an active teacher in the University. He was Divinity Professor at S. John's. Laud's rise was rapid in the ecclesiastical world. He became the Chaplain of the Bishop of Rochester. In 1616 he was Dean of Gloucester: 1621 he was consecrated Bishop of S. David's. Five years later he was translated to the Bishopric of Bath and Wells. In the year 1627 he was one of the King's Privy Council. He became Bishop of London in 1628, and on August 4th, 1633, he was translated to the See of Canterbury. He attained to these positions through many difficulties. The Puritans were ever his bitter opponents. At Oxford, as Divinity Professor, he imparted sound Church teaching to the undergraduates who came under his influence. This brought him into prominence, and the Puritans then saw the type of man they would have to deal with. When he was offered the Bishopric of S. David's he showed his firmness of character when the question of his consecration was under discussion. It was Abbot's duty to perform this service. But Laud would not allow this, because, as we have already related, Abbot had accidentally killed a man, and Laud, therefore, considered that Abbot was not "a fit" person to perform so solemn an office as the Consecration of a Bishop. Laud was ultimately consecrated by the Bishop of London and five other Bishops of the Bench.

The Church principles of Laud were much the same as

Bishop Andrewes'. It was his object to raise the Church of England to its old position as a branch, though a reformed branch, of the Catholic Church. He strongly protested against the Puritan innovations, and no less strongly opposed, as Green has said, the peculiar doctrines of Romanism. He based his teaching upon the doctrines of the age preceding the Council of Nicea. He was so thoroughly opposed to the teaching of Calvinism that he stopped the introduction into England of Bibles from the Continent with elaborate marginal notes imparting Calvinistic teaching.

He restored more orderly methods of conducting public worship. At the Celebration of the Holy Communion it was ordered that everyone should reverently kneel on receiving the Elements, instead of communicating in any position that pleased. He revived the power of the Bishops' Councils. There was one point on which he favoured the Romanist. He preferred a celibate to a married clergy. But this he taught not as a *doctrine* of the Church, but because it was agreeable to his ascetic nature.

He was especially severe on the due observance of ceremonial. The strong opposition of the Puritans to this led Laud to be quite as severe as they in the other direction. The Puritans' hatred of ceremonial, led Laud to be correspondingly severe in his orders that ceremonial should be observed. He said, and said rightly, that it was an aid to worship and devotion. It was almost one of Laud's first acts on reaching Lambeth to restore the smashed windows, the organ, and the choir. He ordered the glazier to set up the broken crucifix again in the east window, and so anxious was he to see the work well done, that he helped with his

own hands to piece the shattered fragments together. This reformation was not confined to his Lambeth Chapel, but he urged all his clergy to follow his example in this respect. Laud considered that copes, vestments, and genuflexions were very important aids to public worship. And it is because of these opinions that so many people have called him a Romanist. But we shall see the truth of this charge later in our Lecture.

It was when Laud became Bishop of London that he began to wield great influence over the ecclesiastical life of England. He was then the confidant of the king, and in many ways his adviser. One of his first acts as Bishop of that See, was to exert his authority against the growing Calvinism of the country. He drew up a declaration which he attached to the Thirty-nine Articles of Religion, to prevent the Calvinists from putting a Calvinistic interpretation on the Articles. By this declaration he forbad any clergyman to read any other than the literal and grammatical sense into the Articles. This declaration was put forward afterwards by Royal authority. The Puritans were greatly enraged at it. The Commons drew up a "vow" in reply, which said: [1] "We, the Commons, do claim, protest, and avow for truth, the sense of the Articles of Religion, which were established by Parliament in the thirteenth reign of Queen Elizabeth . . . and we reject the sense of the Jesuits, Arminians, and all those wheresoever they differ from us." Here you see they accused Laud and the king of being Jesuits. Laud is clearly getting out of favour with the Puritans. His troubles began, however, with the part he

[1] Hore, p. 341.

took in the issuing of the Book of Sports in 1618, which spoke on the subject of pastimes and games on Sundays. The climax of his troubles came in 1633, when Laud went to Scotland with the king with the object of introducing episcopacy into that country. The Scotch were Presbyterians, and very Calvinistic in their theology. James had been brought up in the Presbyterian religion, and hated it, and he wished to establish episcopacy in Scotland, but was not able to do so. It was Laud and Charles, with their policy of "Thorough," who attempted this. A liturgy was especially drawn up for the Scotch Church, and a day was fixed in the year 1637 when it should be read to the people. Laud was the chief instrument in this work. It was also ordered that the surplice should be worn in Churches. We must remember that it was the strong opposition of the Puritans to such things as these which urged Laud to be equally strong in enforcing conformity. The day arrived for the introduction of the reform. The minister was in S. Giles' Church to obey the Royal orders. He had no sooner begun to read, than a woman in the congregation hurled a stool at his head, and burst out in the hearing of all the people—"Dost thou say Mass in my lug." This small event roused the nation. The congregation was roused to protest against this new reform. This spread to the streets, throughout the whole town, and so passed from there to all Scotland. It is not my duty to show what followed this opposition. It was a very unfortunate stroke of business for Archbishop Laud. It lead to his downfall. He was altogether too arbitrary in his measures. "Stony Sunday," as that day was called, was not soon forgotten by

the nation. Another fact led to the fall of Laud. That was his doings in the Court of Justice, called the Star Chamber. He made this a means of enforcing his ecclesiastical policy. Men of influence were brought before this Court, and their writings examined and condemned. Dr. Alexander Leighton, a Scotch divine, was one of them. He had written a work called [1] "Zion's Plea against Prelates," in which he not only attacked the Bishops, but described the Queen as a "Canaanite and an idolatress." He was ordered to be whipped and branded and put in the pillory. He had his ears cut off and his nose slit. Prynne was another man who came in for punishment. He had written a book called "Histrio-mastix," which was against [2] "stage plays, interludes, music, dancing, and other festivities." Some of the amusements he condemned were indulged in at Court. The Star Chamber therefore condemned his book, and he "was also sentenced to stand in the pillory, to have his ears cut off, to pay a heavy fine, and to be imprisoned afterwards." For all these methods of punishment the Puritan Parliament held Archbishop Laud chiefly responsible. But they were not just in their bitterness. It was not always due to Laud that these persecutions were allowed. They accused him of causing the punishment meted out to Prynne, but as a matter of fact Laud had nothing to do with this. He purposely kept aloof from it [3] "because the business had some reflection upon himself," says Mr. Hore. However, the rage of the Puritans was aroused. Because of his connection with the Star Chamber, [4] "On July 7th, 1637, a

[1] See Green's History, p. 512, and Hore, p. 344.
[2] Smith's Small History of England, p. 168. [3] p. 346. [4] Hore, p. 346.

paper was affixed to the Cross in Cheapside declaring that the Arch Wolf of Canterbury had his hand in the persecution of the saints and shedding the blood of the martyrs."

In the year 1640, a mob attacked his palace at Lambeth, and desired to tear the Primate to pieces. In the same year he was impeached by the Commons of high treason, a charge which could not be proved. Fourteen articles were drawn up on which they hoped to condemn him. A Committee of Religion was appointed to inquire into the state of ecclesiastical affairs, keeping especially in view the work of Laud. This committee consisted of twenty lay peers and ten Bishops, but only four of them would act. Their object [1] "was to inquire into innovations in doctrine and discipline, which had been made since the Reformation, and a sub-committee, consisting mostly of doctrinal Puritans was appointed to prepare matters for the committee." [2] "Most of their proceedings," says Hore, "were directed against Laud. They complained (amongst other matters) of the practice of private confession, of the altar with a canopy over it, with candles lighted in the daytime; of the communion table being turned altar-wise and called an altar, and that people were taught to bow towards it; that the clergy said the prayers turning to the East; that there was a credence or side table on which the Elements were placed before consecration." Many other practices and customs were complained of, but these are the chief ones.

In the year 1641, Laud was committed to the Tower, and remained a prisoner for four years. A bill condemning him passed the House of Lords in 1645. But the king did not sanction it. Indeed, he wrote a free pardon. But the

[1] Ibid, p. 351. [2] Ibid, p. 351.

masters of our country at that time did not heed the word of the king. Contrary to the laws of the country they beheaded the aged Primate on January 12th, 1645.

In this Lecture it has not been my object to give a full and detailed account of the life of William Laud. I have desired especially to show you what his position was in the Church during the reign of Charles I. I will now pass on to consider his character.

In the first place, let us dwell upon the charge that Laud was a Papist. This was what the Puritans said of him, and many people hold the same opinion to-day. It was chiefly on this charge, in fact, that the Archbishop was condemned. Was Laud a Roman Catholic? You know the Puritans were his enemies, and you can seldom gather the truth about anyone from his enemies. Most decidedly Laud was not a Papist. He repudiated most of the essential papal doctrines. Laud's only object, as I have already said, was to restore the Catholic teaching of the Church of England. So far was he from being a Papist that he urged his clergy to take an oath to keep the papal power out of England. They had to subscribe this declaration: [1] "I, A.B., do swear that I do approve the doctrine and discipline, or government, established in the Church of England, as containing all things necessary to salvation, and I will not endeavour by myself, or any other, directly or indirectly, to bring in any popish doctrine contrary to that which is so established; nor will I ever give my consent to alter the government of this Church by Archbishops, Bishops, Deans and Archdeacons, *et cetera*, as it now stands established."

[1] Quoted by Hore, p. 349.

These words are surely strong enough.

[1] "It was one of the most effectual acts" of the Puritans, said Southey, "to possess the people with an opinion that the king, in his heart, favoured Popery, and that Laud was seeking to re-establish it. In both cases the imputation was nefariously false." The principle here indicated is very largely responsible for our difficulties to-day.

Laud was no Papist. It was through his influence that the great Chillingworth was urged to leave the ranks of Rome, not an action likely to have been undertaken by a Jesuit in disguise. In fact, Laud was a strong and very successful controversialist against the Romanists. He wrote a book called "Conference with Fisher," justifying the reformation movement. He said that the Papists were the cause of religious schisms in our country. He was so successful in his proofs of this that the Puritans even said that [2] "he had muzzled the Jesuit and smote the Papist under the fifth rib." Laud refuted the doctrine of the Pope's infallibility from the history of the early Fathers. He made himself an enemy of the queen because of his opposition to the Roman religion. The Romanists certainly did not love him. Several times he refused a Cardinal's hat, which was offered him in the hope that he might render England subservient to the Pope. But Laud replied that before England could acknowledge the Pope's authority many things would have to be altered in the Roman religion. Then when Laud was beheaded there was great rejoicing at Rome. This could not have been the case had he been a Papist. Evelyn was at Rome at the time of Laud's death. He wrote in his diary:

[1] Book of the Church, p. 445. [2] Quoted by Hore, p. 333.

[1] "I was in Rome when the news of Laud's death arrived. There was great rejoicing in Rome at it. They spoke of his murder as of the greatest enemy the Church of Rome had in England being cut off, and the greatest champion of the Church of England silenced." Laud, at his trial, referred to this charge of Popery, and distinctly denied it. [2] "Perhaps, my lords," he said, "I am not ignorant what party of men have raised this scandal upon me," *i.e.*, the scandal that he was charged of endeavouring "to bring in Popery," "nor for what end; nor perhaps by whom set on; but I would fain have a good reason given me if my conscience lead me that way, and that with my conscience I could subscribe to the Church of Rome, what should have kept me here, before my imprisonment, to endure the libels, and the slanders, and the base usage of all kinds which have been put upon me, and these to end in this question of my life?" "In point of my religion . . . by God's grace, I have ever hated dissimulation; and had I not hated it, perhaps it might have been better with me for worldly safety than now it is. But it can no way become a Christian Bishop to halt with God."

Again, Laud said, [3] "I was born and bred up in and under the Church of England, as it yet stands established by law; I have, by God's blessing and the favour of my prince, grown up in it to the years which are now upon me, and to the place of preferment which I yet bear; and in this Church, by the grace and goodness of God, I resolve to die. I have ever, since I understood aught of divinity, kept one constant tenour in this my profession, without variation, or

[1] Quoted by Hore, p. 357. [2] Quoted by Southey, pp. 486, 487.
[3] Quoted by Southey, p. 486.

shifting from one opinion to another for any worldly ends; and if my conscience would have suffered me to shift tenets or religion with time and occasion, I could easily have slid through all the difficulties which have pressed upon me in this kind."

No! Whatever the Puritans sought fit to affirm, Laud was not a Papist. Nor did he love Rome. He was charitable towards Romanists, even more than towards the Puritans.

A well-known Unitarian writer, whose sympathy is entirely opposed to Laud's, in the interests of truth bears out the same fact about his character. [1] "There is no proof," says Mr. Taylor, "that either Charles I., or Laud, or any of the leading Churchmen, ever seriously entertained the thought of a submission to Rome. The adoption of so much that was Catholic in doctrine and ceremony was rather intended, like the efforts of modern Puseyism, to retain those who from disgust at the opposite extreme were strongly tempted to throw themselves into the arms" of Rome. So we conclude that Laud was not as bad as his enemies wished to make him.

One of the reasons why he was charged with Romanism, was due to his removing the holy table from the body of the Church to the old and accustomed place under the east-end window. By negligence and the Puritan influence the holy table had been placed in the centre of the Church, and formed a stand for hats and cloaks during the ordinary service. This outraged the refined susceptibilities of Laud, and he set about a reformation in this matter. As soon as he

[1] Retrospect of the Religious Life of England, pp. 70, 71 (Second Edition).

became Dean of Gloucester he put his principles into practice on this point, and the Bishop of the Diocese was so enraged at this that he declared he would never enter the Church again as long as Laud was there, and it appears that he kept his word. It is not difficult, however, to account for the Bishop's heat. The Bishop, a learned man, was a Calvinist, and [1] "under him," says Hore, "the Cathedral was falling into decay, and the services resembled those of a conventicle." Laud was the last man to tolerate this state of things. He, therefore, restored order and reverence in worship. For a long time after these reforms there was a cry raised throughout the land against Laud, quite out of all due proportion to their importance.

Although Archbishop Laud was not a Papist, he did desire to see Rome reunited to the English Church. But, before that was possible, he stated that Rome would be compelled to lose most of its distinctive doctrines. Laud was what today would be described as a High Churchman and a Ritualist. He tried to enforce his views in very unfortunate times, and with a spirit which was not agreeable to the Puritans. He suffered, however, as much through the mistakes of the king as through his own acts of indiscretion. He was considered to have been the king's chief adviser, and whatever mistakes the king made were therefore visited upon himself. But the Puritans were blind, and future history has shown them to be as "blind leaders of the blind."

No! For the true character of Archbishop Laud we must not go to the opinions of his enemies. He was not what his enemies made him out to be. He was greatly misrepresented,

[1] Hore, p. 331.

and unscrupulously slandered. He was a good Churchman, and a good man for his times. He was a man more sinned against than sinning, and his bad acts of policy were not bad in intention. He was murdered by the Puritans as much out of hatred at his episcopal beliefs as through his influence against the Puritans. He had strong principles, but his fault was that he used wrong methods to enforce them. We must make allowances, however, for the time in which he lived, and we should remark that his enemies used more arbitrary measures than he used, to put down the teaching of men of Laud's school.

Southey, in his "Book of the Church," speaks very highly of Laud. He says, [1] "His love of learning, his liberal temper, his munificence, and his magnanimity would have made him an honour and a blessing to the Church in its happiest ages; his ardent, incautious, sincere, uncompromising spirit, were ill adapted to that in which his lot had fallen. But the circumstances which brought on, together with his destruction, the overthrow of the Church and State, the murder of the king and the long miseries of the nation, were many and widely various; some of remote and foreign origin, others recent and of home growth."

It was not Laud's desire to be domineering and absolute. He did not court popularity; that was given to him without his own desire for it. Mr. Lane says of him, [2] "He never wavered in his determination to do what he felt to be just and right when persons of high position were charged before him."

Laud spoke at his trial of the way he viewed his own

[1] p. 443. [2] Lane's Notes, p. 127.

work. [1] "I laboured nothing," he says, "I laboured nothing more than that the external public worship of God (too much slighted in most parts of the Kingdom) might be preserved, and that with as much decency and uniformity as might be; being still of opinion that unity cannot long continue in the Church when uniformity is shut out at the Church door." These words are almost a prophecy. They have been amply fulfilled, as you can see from the result of Puritanism in modern Dissent and Nonconformity. There must be uniformity to preserve unity, unity of doctrine, unity of religious ideals, unity in successful spiritual work.

Mr. Hore gives us a faithful account of Laud's character. [2] "The best test of his character is to be found," he says, "in the deep love which his friends and those who knew him well bore towards him. He must have been a man of ability, for although his enemies ascribe his rise in life to Court favour, no common man could possibly have risen step by step to the high honours which he held. That he was a generous patron of learning, even his enemies allow; no one ever accused him of love of money; and of his great munificence, the Church and his University are sufficient witnesses." Another writer says (Mr. Southey) that the Puritans afforded Laud [3] "an opportunity of displaying at his trial and on the scaffold, as in a public theatre, a presence of mind, a strength of intellect, a calm and composed temper, an heroic and saintly magnanimity, which he never could have been known to possess if he had not thus been put to the proof." And Heylyn says: [4] "Never did man put off

[1] Quoted by Lane, p. 127. [2] p. 358. [3] p. 501.
[4] Quoted by Southey, p. 500.

mortality with a better courage, nor look upon his bloody and malicious enemies with more Christian charity." At his execution, Laud turned to the man who had to take away his life, and, after giving him money, said, [1] "Here, honest friend, God forgive thee, and I do; and do thy office upon me with mercy."

It would be foolish, of course, to say that Laud had no faults. But what they were were such as men had in common with him, even those of his enemies. But to say that he was a bad man is very far beside the mark indeed.

It was equally false, the aspersion that he wished to subvert the law of England and to overthrow the customs of this country. The Puritans behaved in a shameless way towards him, quite apart from their act of unlawfully cutting short his life. They managed to steal his diary, which was meant for no eyes save his own, and this in his lifetime they published with interpolations and alterations, and used this amended copy as witness against him at his trial. Southey says that [2] "Prynne published Laud's diary, being garbled in some parts and interpolated in others, artfully and wickedly; and when the Archbishop came to the bar, he saw that the book had been presented to everyone of the lords who were to pronounce sentence on him." Laud bitterly complained of this in his address which followed this event. He complained to the House that he had been searched to the very core. [3] "My diary," said he, "nay, my very Prayer Book, taken from me and used against me, and that in some cases not to prove but to make a charge. Yet I am thus far glad even for this," he added, "for by my diary your lord-

[1] Southey, p. 500. [2] p. 489. [3] Southey, p. 490.

ships have seen the passages of my life, and by my Prayer Book the greatest secrets between God and my soul; so that you have me at the very bottom; yet, blessed be God, no disloyalty is found in the one, no Popery in the other."

It is from this diary that we are given deeper glimpses into Laud's religious spirit and piety. It is interspersed with prayers which were composed to settle his troubled mind in his daily occupations. Just before he was thrown into prison, he wrote, [1] "I stayed at Lambeth till the evening to avoid the gaze of the people. I went to evening prayer in my Chapel. The Psalms of the day, and chapter fifty of Isaiah, gave me great comfort. God make me worthy of it and fit to receive it. As I went to my barge hundreds of my poor neighbours stood there, and prayed for my safety and return to my house. For which I bless God and them." He did not return again to his home. For no toleration was shown to him by those who were opposed to his method of Church government. His dying address further unfolds to us his inner character. In this he prayed for his enemies. But I had better give it in his own words. This is a part of his prayer: [2] "O Eternal God and merciful Father! look down upon me in mercy, in the riches and fulness of all Thy mercies, look down upon me; but not until Thou hast nailed my sins to the Cross of Christ, not till Thou hast bathed me in the blood of Christ, not till I have hid myself in the wounds of Christ, that so the punishment due unto my sins may pass over me. And since Thou art pleased to try me to the uttermost, I humbly beseech Thee, give me now, in this great instant, full patience, proportionable comfort, and

[1] Quoted by Green, Short History, p. 521. [2] Quoted by Southey, pp. 498, 499.

a heart ready to die for Thine honour, the king's happiness and the Church's preservation. And my zeal for this (far from arrogancy be it spoken!) is all the sin (human frailty excepted, and all the incidents thereunto) which is yet known to me in this particular, for which I now come to suffer; I say, in this particular of treason. But otherwise my sins are many and great. Lord, pardon them all; and those especially (whatever they are) which have drawn down this present judgment upon me! And when Thou hast given me strength to bear it, do with me as seems best in Thine own eyes, and carry me through death, that I may look upon it in what visage so-ever it shall appear to me. Amen! And that there may be a stop of this issue of blood in this more than miserable kingdom (I shall desire that I may pray for the people too, as well as myself), O Lord, I beseech Thee, give grace of repentance to all blood-thirsty people. But if they will not repent, O Lord, confound all their devices, defeat and frustrate all their designs and endeavours, upon them which are or shall be contrary to the Glory of Thy great Name, the truth and sincerity of religion . . . the preservation of this poor Church in her truth, peace and patrimony, and the settlement of this distracted and distressed people, under their ancient laws, and in their native liberty."

This was a part of the prayer of the Primate now about to die. It rings with sincerity, and no man at the hour of death can trifle, can put on a mask of sanctity. It is rather the opposite to this. Great sanctity, true faith, come out of the man at that trying moment. The last words Laud uttered, just before the axe fell, were the words of a greater martyr

before him : "Lord Jesus, receive my spirit," and thus his soul passed away.

[1] "The Puritans tried Laud," says Southey, "in the burning fiery furnace of affliction, and so his sterling worth was assayed and proved. And the martyrdom of Cranmer is not more inexpiably disgraceful to the Papists, than that of Laud to the Puritan persecutors."

[1] p. 501.

The Oxford Movement.

LECTURE VI.

The Oxford Movement.

Short Account of the Church from the Restoration to 1833. Charles II. James II. William and Mary. Anne. The time of the Georges. Church life at this time. State of Church in 1833. Oriel College, Oxford. Leaders of Movement. Their views. Hadleigh Rectory. The Tracts. Newman. Keble's Sermon. Association formed. Its Object. Teaching of the Tracts. Movement outside Oxford. Tractarians and Dr. Hampden. Tract 90. Its Teaching. Considered by Heads of Colleges. Opposition to the Movement. Newman's influence at S. Mary's. New Centres. London. Leeds. Hook's Sermon on the Church. Pusey's Sermon. Split in the Party. Secession of Newman and others. His opinion on the English Church and Anglican Orders. Keble and Newman.

N previous Lectures I have not spoken of the history of the Church of England since the accession of Charles II. to the throne. I shall not be able to dwell upon many important events which happened to our Church during the next two centuries succeeding that event. Our subject to-night is the Oxford Movement, which began in the year 1833.

Before proceeding to speak on this, you may, however, like to have the general outline of the Church's fortunes during the time where we left our history last week and the year 1833, of which I shall speak to-night.

When Charles II. came to the throne he found the Church of England in a very poor way indeed. The first work to be done was to restore it to its old position of influence, and to attain this many Acts of Parliament were passed to exclude the Puritans from the Church. It was hard work to settle the religious troubles of the people and to win back their love for the old Church. Before this could be accomplished nearly two thousand of the Puritan Clergy were ejected from the rectories and vicarages of England. They would not conform to the Church's teaching, and they could not expect, therefore, to benefit from the Church's property. These men went to swell the ranks of dissent. Dissenters then formed their own separated congregations in larger number than ever before. A spirit grew up which asked for greater liberty in religious matters, and such men as favoured it were called Latitudinarians. In the reign of Charles II. the Papists began again to plot against the Church and Government.

James II., who came to the throne, favoured the Romanists, and he became a Papist in reality. His wish was to bring the Church of England into bondage again. But the leading Churchmen of the day resisted his efforts. Many of the Bishops so much displeased him in opposing his aims and wishes that they were imprisoned for their conduct. But the popular voice was with them. Crowds of people stood by them, and welcomed their release, with every mark of public joy. To show you how James favoured the papal movement let us recall a few facts about his work. He filled his army with Roman Catholic officers, which was an unlawful thing for him to do, and he placed a Roman Catholic at the

head of his army. He set at nought laws previously passed against the Roman Catholics. In his palace of S. James' a gorgeous Chapel was opened for him to worship in, with every Roman Catholic adornment. Monks of several Orders crowded to London, and boldly walked about the streets in the religious dress peculiar to their Order. James tried his best to put the Universities under Roman Catholic control. At Cambridge he ordered that a Benedictine monk should be given the M.A. Degree without the necessary qualifications. At Oxford the Master of University College acknowledged that he was a Papist, and James ordered that he, as the law directed, should not be for that reason deprived of his post. James did his best to appoint Farmer, a Roman Catholic, to the headship of Magdalen College, but the Fellows would not allow it. He also arbitrarily appointed seven Commissioners to govern the Church, with a similar object in view, but the nation was against him, and, as a result of this policy of his, he was forced to abdicate the throne.

Another change awaited the Church when William and Mary came to England. There was no fear then of the Church becoming Papist. William was brought up on the Continent under the teaching of the Reformers, and he had no love for episcopacy. During his reign, then, the Church lost much of the power it had gained in the time of Charles II. Bishops were appointed to govern it who had sympathies with William's tone of mind. The great cry in William's time was toleration in religious faith and profession. Bishops were allowed to hold Sees who, as far as teaching and doctrine were concerned, were not really

Churchmen. In William's reign there was a movement on foot even for founding some method of public worship which might include all religious parties, Episcopalian and Dissenters, with the exception that Roman Catholics and Unitarians should be excluded. No Popery was the cry of the day. Controversy arose on doctrine. One was on the doctrine of the Trinity. Men began to explain the Holy Trinity in such a way that they ended in explaining it away. There was also a movement on foot for abolishing subscription to the Articles of Religion. The idea of that time seemed to be to establish a form of public worship which should be very broad and inclusive.

A better state of things was restored during the reign of Queen Anne. During her life the Church rose to great influence in the land again. With the exception of the last sixty years it was never more prosperous than during her reign. She took a great interest in the Church, and was very particular that the decencies of worship should be observed. Many new Churches were erected in her time, and a fund was started by her which has proved of excellent service since for the benefit of the poorer clergy. For many years Convocation had never met. But it was called back to power again in her time.

This excellent state of things received another check when the Georges were the ruling kings. They were about as irreligious as men could be, and they hated and despised England and our ways. They had no sympathy with our Church. They did not understand its teaching. The Church was bound to suffer in consequence. The spiritual life of England followed the example of the kings. No care

was shown in the election of Bishops. Not only was the Church practically dead throughout the reign of the early Georges, but even Dissent had very little life. The ideal of morality was very low. As I am unable to spend much time in discussing this period of our history, I will give you the opinion of Professor Green on the religious state of England just before the revival of religion under the Wesleys. [1] "A Welsh Bishop avowed that he had seen his Diocese but once, and habitually resided at the Lakes of Westmoreland. The system of pluralities turned the wealthier and more learned of the priesthood into absentees, while the bulk of them were indolent, poor, and without social consideration. A shrewd, if prejudiced, observer brands the English clergy of the day as the most lifeless in Europe, 'the most remiss of their labours in private, and the least severe in their lives.' The decay of the great dissenting bodies went hand in hand with that of the Church, and during the early part of the century the Nonconformists declined in number and in energy." Green further says [2] "that not a new parish had been created. Hardly a single new Church had been built. Schools there were none, save the Grammar Schools of Edward and Elizabeth. The rural peasantry, who were fast being reduced to pauperism by the abuse of the poor laws, were left without moral or religious training of any sort. 'We saw but one Bible in the Parish of Cheddar,' said Hannah More at a far later time, 'and that was used to prop a flower pot.'" It was because of this state of things that the revival of religion took place under the Wesleys at Oxford. They themselves held private

[1] Short History, pp. 716, 717. [2] Ibid, p. 717.

meetings for their own edification, and this led to their preaching in the fields or anywhere. This movement roused up the spiritual life of the Church. It was Wesley's movement which gave birth to the Evangelical party in the Church of England. One wishes one had time to go into this part of our history with greater detail.

But I must now come to the chief point of this Lecture: which is to show how the Church received a new impetus to put forth the life which it has to-day. This impetus was given by the Oxford, or Tractarian Movement, as it has been called, and it began in the year 1833.

About that time the Evangelical movement which had sprung up in the Church had lost much of its force, and alongside of this there had sprung up a liberal movement for disposing of Creeds and Confessions of Faith. The Broad Church party at this date were about the only men who took a practical interest in religious questions. Mr. Gladstone gives a graphic description of affairs of this time.[1] "It must be admitted," he says, "that the state of things . . . was dishonouring to Christianity, disgraceful to the nation; disgraceful most of all to that much-vaunted religious sentiment of the English public, which in impenetrable somnolence endured it, and resented all interference with it . . . The actual state of things as to worship was bad beyond all parallel known to me in experience or reading . . . Our services were probably without a parallel in the world for their debasement. As they would have shocked a Brahmin or a Buddhist, so they could hardly have been

[1] Quoted by Hore, Vol. II., pp. 238, 239. Church in England from William III. to Victoria.

endured in this country, had not the faculty of taste, and the perception of the seemly or unseemly, been as dead as the spirit of devotion . . . But of the general tone of the services in the Church of England at that time I do not hesitate to say, it was such as when carefully considered would have shocked not only an earnest Christian of whatever communion, but any sincere believer in God." Mr. Hore gives us some interesting detail as to how the services were conducted just before the Oxford Movement. [1] "What was the state of the Parish Churches?" he asked. "They stood, beautiful in their pristine architecture, but rendered paragons of ugliness by modern barbarism, or, as it was termed, modern improvement; the high roof cut down; the windows robbed of their stained glass, and even their tracery; the pillars cut away to make room for some hideous monument; the frescoes buried beneath a dozen coats of whitewash; naves, aisles, and even choirs choked up with hideous pews, prominent amongst them standing that of the Squire, with its stove and easy chair and drawn curtains, the owner, perhaps himself a dissenter, sending his servants to occupy it and keep out intruders; the pulpit, with its red cushions, towering towards the ceiling, and often overhanging the altar; the reading desk, with the head of the curate scarcely visible above the books; the square box for the nasal-toned clerk; a basin, the miserable substitute for a font; the meanly-dressed altar, the common receptacle of the hats and cloaks of the congregation; a common glass bottle containing the wine for the Holy Communion, with some square pieces of bread placed on the Holy Table by the clerk before the service; the unused

[1] Ibid, pp. 235, 236.

credence table—everything, in short, bore witness to a state of carelessness and neglect, and desecration of God's House."

It is well that you should hear these details respecting the state of the Church before the Oxford Movement, that you may be the more ready to enter into the spirit of that Movement.

There were men at Oxford who, dreading the future of the Church if this state of things were allowed to go on, determined to do something to save the Church. They were alarmed at the indifference of the Broad Churchmen to the importance of doctrine to the life of the Church.

It was in the year 1833—remember that year, it is a very important one—the Oxford Movement began in the Common Room of Oriel College. Its chief leaders were Newman, Keble, Pusey, the two Wilberforces, and Hurrell Froude. They were all resident Fellows of Oriel. They saw [1] "that the Church could no longer stand still," as Mr. Hore has said; "it must either become worse or better; either become committed to a formal Latitudinarianism, and the Broad Church become the Church of the future, in which case there would be an expungement from its services, certainly of the Athanasian Creed, probably of the Nicene Creed, possibly of the Apostles' Creed also, or she must reclaim her Catholic birthright."

These men, therefore, upheld the Catholicity of the Church of England. They taught that the Church was Apostolic in origin; that the Bible should be received as interpreted by the Church and Fathers of the early centuries. They laid great stress upon the importance of doctrinal

[1] Ibid, p. 266.

teaching and the Sacraments. They considered that the Evangelicals were greatly mistaken in explaining only one of the important doctrines of the Church, to the neglect of all the others, and complained that the Broad Church party was not particular about teaching doctrine at all.

A revival was made in this respect as early as 1827, when Keble put his book of poems called "The Christian Year" before the people. How much is that book prized now! But at the time of its publication, because it dwelt upon seasonable Church teaching, and laid stress upon Saints' Days, it was called the "Fons et origo mali," the root and foundation of evil.

The Tractarians began their work by holding meetings for Bible readings, on which they had general discussions. One of the early subjects brought under consideration in this way was, "Is the Pope Antichrist?" The question was answered in the affirmative. Newman, who afterwards went over to Rome, in those days considered that the Church of Rome was bound up with Antichrist.

In the year 1833, Hurrell Froude and W. Palmer in the Common Room of Oriel resolved to form an Association for upholding the rites and principles of the Church. They communicated their idea to Keble and to the Rev. A. Percival, Rector of Hadleigh in Essex, and a Conference soon followed, held at the rectory, and it lasted a week. They came to the conclusion, considering recent events in Parliament, that Parliament had a wrong idea of the character and constitution of the Church of England. They decided, therefore, that they would revive the practical recognition of the truths so clearly set forth in the Prayer Book. This

formed a good starting-point for their work. The public were given the opinions of these men in what were called the "Tracts for the Times." These productions at first consisted only of four pages each, but they ultimately reached the size of treatises. One of them, written by Pusey in 1837, had 42 pages, and another Tract reached to 424 pages.

In his "Apologia," Newman tells us what he thought of this new movement in its infancy. [1] "I had a supreme confidence," he says, "in our cause; we were upholding that primitive Christianity which was delivered for all time by the early Teachers of the Church, and which was registered and attested in the Anglican formularies and by the Anglican Divines."

The Tractarians, in the first place, thus desired to give to the people the doctrines of the Church in opposition to the movement known as liberalism in the Church. They maintained that there was a visible Church with sacraments and rites which were, as Newman expressed it, "channels of invisible Grace."

Their efforts had not attracted much notice before Keble preached at S. Mary's, Oxford, a sermon entitled, "The National Apostasy." It was this sermon which brought the Tractarians formally before the public, and it was from this event that Newman considers their Movement to have really begun. In 1833 there was formed "An Association of friends of the Church." A draft of its objects and aims was drawn up and submitted to the public. Its object was, in the first place, [2] "To maintain pure and inviolate the doctrine, the discipline, and the services of the Church; that is, to

[1] Apologia, p. 43. Longmans, 1890. [2] Quoted by Hore, Ibid, p. 278.

withstand all change which involves the denial of, or departure from, primitive practice in religious offices, and innovations upon the Apostolic prerogative, order, and communion of Bishops, Priests, and Deacons."

Secondly, its object was "To afford Churchmen an opportunity of exchanging their sentiments, and co-operating together on a large scale."

As a result of this Association, an address was sent to the Archbishops, signed by 7,000 Clergy, acquainting them with their object, and in 1834 another was sent from the laity which was signed by 230,000 heads of families. This showed undeniably how much the people were in sympathy with the Movement.

Newman was the leading spirit of the cause, and as it came before the public it was called by wags "The Newmania." In 1835 Pusey fully associated himself with this Movement, and thus added to its influence. The knowledge of the work of the Tractarians spread to the Court, where William IV. told the Bishops that he would be devoted to the cause of the Church.

Let us look into the teaching of the "Tracts for the Times." The first Tract appeared on September 9th, 1833. Its subject was "Thoughts on the Ministerial Commission." The teaching in this pamphlet was opposed to both the views held by the Evangelical and the Broad Church party of that time. This Tract says,[1] "The Lord Jesus Christ gave His Spirit to His Apostles; they in turn laid their hands on those who should succeed them; and these again on others; and so the sacred gift has been handed down to our present

[1] Quoted by Hore, p. 282.

Bishops, who have appointed us as their assistants, and in some cases their representatives. Everyone believes this, for it is the doctrine of the Ordination Service." This cannot be denied.

The Tractarians often used very forcible language to spread the truths they had at heart. In speaking of Rome Newman said,[1] "We must deal with her as we should towards a friend who is visited by derangement; for in truth she is a *Church beside herself*, abounding in noble gifts and rightful titles, but unable to use them religiously, *crafty*, *obstinate*, *wilful*, *malicious*, *cruel*, *unnatural as madmen are*. Or rather she may be said to *resemble a demoniac . . . the system itself*, so called, as a whole, and therefore all parts of it, *tend to evil*."

Very strong language for one who afterwards joined the ranks of Rome.

In 1836 Newman published his Tract called "The prophetical office of the Church reviewed relatively to Romanism and popular Protestantism." This was called forth by the efforts of Cardinal Wiseman, who had come to London to give a course of lectures on the Roman Catholics.

By the year 1837 the Oxford Movement had spread throughout all England. It was attacked everywhere. It was discussed at Court, in the Bishops' Palaces, in Parliament and among the people. The leaders were denounced as enemies of the Church and as Papists in disguise. In Scotland and Ireland the attitude was the same. The clergy in Ireland were ready *en masse* to rise up against this cause, but the strange part, as far as could be found was that not a

[1] Ibid, p. 283.

Tract of the Times had crossed the channel. The opposition which these men received, however, was chiefly due to prejudice. People heard general reports, and jumped to the conclusion that the Tractarians were trying to bring England under Rome again. But however their work was received at first, the principles of the Movement spread rapidly, and were largely endorsed by the people and clergy. Newman had a splendid chance of spreading their views through the *British Critic*, of which he was Editor from 1838-1841. This was made the organ of the party.

The supporters of the Oxford Movement next began to try their strength by influencing the public in the appointment of men to important offices in the Church and University. The first instance of this was in reference to the nomination of Dr. Hampden to the Regius Professorship of Divinity in Oxford. Hampden had some years previous to this given the Bampton Lectures at S. Mary's, and had caused great offence by some of his statements. In 1834 he also published a pamphlet dealing with Dissenters and subscription to the Articles by University Graduates. In this he said that the Creeds were matters of opinion, and he advocated the abolition of subscription. He spoke of [1] "putting Unitarians on the same footing precisely of earnest religious zeal and love for the Lord Jesus on which," he said, "I would place any other Christian." This pamphlet was evidently directed against the teaching of the "Tracts for the Times." For these opinions the Tractarians hoped to hinder his appointment to so important a post. They had hoped that Keble would

[1] Quoted by Hore, Ibid, p. 287.

have been offered it, for he was certainly well qualified for it, and he had great influence at Oxford. But he belonged to their party, and that was enough in those days to disqualify him. What the Tractarians lamented was the influence that Hampden would have on the growing generation of clergy should he be appointed. He would be in a position to influence one half of the clergy. A protest was, therefore, made against his appointment. It was signed by seventy-three resident Fellows and nine Heads of Colleges in the University, and this was sent to the king. But their object was defeated. The next step was to approach the University itself, to curtail Hampden's influence when he came into residence. Convocation was petitioned to submit Hampden's writings to examination. But to this the Heads of Colleges would not agree. A compromise was finally agreed to, and it was decided that Dr. Hampden should not be allowed to have a voice in the appointment of the select preachers who spoke to the undergraduates every Sunday from S. Mary's pulpit. This decision was arrived at by 474 votes against 94 votes.

Hampden's pamphlet, before alluded to, was sent to Newman soon after its publication. Newman acknowledged it, and said, [1] "While I respect the tone of piety which the pamphlet displays, I dare not trust myself to put on paper my feelings about the principles contained in it; tending as they do, in my opinion, altogether to make shipwreck of Christian Faith. I also lament that, by its appearance, the first step has been taken towards interrupting that peace and mutual good understanding which has prevailed so long

[1] Apologia, pp. 57, 58.

in this place." It was by these and similar efforts that the influence of the Tractarians was felt all over England.

Now we must turn to another important event in the history of this Movement. In the year 1841 Newman published what was known as Tract 90. Its title was "Remarks on certain passages in the Thirty-nine Articles." The object of this was to show that the Thirty-nine Articles were not, as people commonly thought they were, Protestant in their tone. You nowhere find the word "Protestant" mentioned in them nor in any other part of the Prayer Book. Newman's endeavour was to show that they upheld Catholic teaching as distinct from Roman Catholicism, and that a Protestant interpretation had been imported into them. Newman says of his object afterwards,[1] "The main thesis of my essay was this: the Articles do not oppose Catholic teaching, they but partially oppose Roman dogma; they for the most part oppose the dominant errors of Rome. And the problem was to draw the line as to what they allowed, and what they condemned. Such being the object which I had in view, what were my prospects of widening and defining their meaning? The prospect was encouraging, there was no doubt at all of the elasticity of the Articles. To take a preliminary instance: the fourteenth was pronounced by one party to be Lutheran, by another Calvinistic, though the two interpretations were contradictory to each other; why then should not other Articles be drawn with a vagueness of an equally intense character." In this Tract Newman said,[2] "Our Articles neither contradict anything Catholic, nor are meant to condemn anything in early

[1] Quoted by Hore, p. 290. [2] Quoted by Hore, p. 290.

Christianity even though not Catholic, but only the later definite system in the Church of Rome."

Tract 90 made a very great stir. As a result of its publication Newman was accused of holding the theory that a man could subscribe the articles in a non-natural sense. But this he vigorously denied. Four tutors at Oxford, named Churton, Griffiths, Wilson, and Tait, a late Archbishop of Canterbury, took steps to condemn the treatise. Through their means a Council of the Heads of Colleges was held to examine into its teaching. At that time they did not know that Newman was its author. Newman wrote to them to ask them to defer deliberations until another Tract should be published which was then almost completed. But they refused to stop their proceedings. They met together and resolved that the Tract [1] "had a highly dangerous tendency: that it appears 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. This Tract," they said, "puts forth new and startling views as to the extent to which that liberty may be carried. . . . We are at a loss to see what security would remain were his (the author's) principles generally recognized, that the most plainly erroneous doctrines . . . might not be inculcated . . . from the pulpits of our Churches." This Tract made so much stir that it was the last one published of the Series. Dr. Bagot, the Bishop of Oxford, requested that the Tracts be discontinued, and Newman, out of respect for the Bishop,

[1] Quoted by Hore, p. 291.

obeyed. The Tracts had come to an end. But, as Mr. Hore says, [1] "The object for which they were undertaken was accomplished. Long forgotten truths concerning the apostolical character of the Anglican Church were brought to light: a higher tone of feeling pervaded society; a taste for theological study manifested itself amongst the clergy; an increased devotion amongst the laity; a more reverent performance of Divine Service; more frequent Communions; and an improvement in Church Music followed."

The success of the Movement was so great that a party at Oxford who opposed it raised subscriptions enough to erect a handsome piece of workmanship known as the "Martyrs' Memorial," thinking that by putting the nation in mind of the martyrs, Cranmer, Ridley, and Latimer, they might give this Movement a check. But their good motives were doomed to disappointment. These men were mistaken in considering that the Oxford Movement was Roman Catholic, although several of its chief men were ultimately driven to Rome.

We must now refer further to Newman's great influence. He was appointed Vicar of S. Mary's Oxford, and here he had wonderful advantages for spreading the principles he had at heart. Immense congregations of undergraduates flocked together to listen to his sermons. Gladstone was one of his listeners, and spoke of his influence there in these words: [2] "Newman's manner in the pulpit," he says, "was one which, if you considered it in its separate parts, would lead you to arrive at a very unsatisfactory conclusion. There was not much change in the inflexion of his voice;

[1] Ibid, p. 293. [2] Quoted by Hore, p. 294.

action there was none ; his sermons were read, and his eyes were always on his book . . . but you take the man as a whole, and there was a stamp and a seal upon him ; there was a solemn sweetness and music in his tone ; there was a completeness in the figure, taken together with the tone and the manner, which made even his delivery such as I have described it, and though exclusively with written sermons, singularly attractive."

Newman tells us himself in his "Apologia" of how his influence was felt in Oxford, and so throughout all the country. [1] "As is the custom of a University," he said, "I had lived with my private, nay, with some of my public pupils, and with the junior Fellows of my College, without form or distance, on a footing of equality. Thus it was through friends younger, for the most part, than myself, that my principles were spreading. They heard what I said in conversation, and told it to others. Undergraduates in due time took their degree, and became private tutors themselves. In their new *status* they in turn preached the opinions with which they had already become acquainted. Others went down to the country, and became curates of parishes. Then they had down from London parcels of the Tracts and other publications. They placed them in the shops of local booksellers, got them into newspapers, introduced them to clerical meetings, and converted, more or less, their Rectors and their brother curates."

The Tractarian Movement, or High Church party, as it now began to be called, thus had considerable influence outside Oxford. Centres were started away from its home,

[1] Apologia, pp. 58, 59.

from which rays of light emanated to the surrounding neighbourhood. London was made acquainted with the Movement through the work of Oakley and Leeds, through W. F. Hook, who became the Vicar of Leeds in 1837. Mr. Hook found a shocking state of things in the parish when he went to it. [1] "Of the seven Churchwardens," says Mr. Hore, "none, except the one appointed by the Vicar, were Churchmen; they resolutely refused to spend a farthing on such matters" as surplices, which they called rags, "until they were threatened with proceedings by the Archdeacon. When they assembled for Vestry Meetings, they piled their hats and coats on the altar, and even sat upon it, and soon afterwards, under the increased number of communicants, they grumbled exceedingly at the increase of wine required for the Holy Communion, and objected that the consecrated wine was, as the Rubric directed, drunk in Church after Celebration, instead of being reconsecrated; and they remained in the Vestry to guard, although there was strong reason for suspecting that they themselves drank, the wine." All these evils, however, Hook soon removed. This was the state of things, remember, only as far back as sixty years ago, and it was what could have been found in many Parish Churches. You can see then what a change the Oxford Movement wrought in England. Hook showed his love for the cause in another way. He was honoured with an invitation to preach before the Queen, in her Royal Chapel. He took for his subject, "Hear the Church." It was his object to show that the Church was not founded at the Reformation, as it was commonly believed, but that it existed in

[1] Ibid, p. 295.

continual succession from the days of the Apostles downwards. This sermon was greatly disliked by the Queen's advisers, and it took away from Hook's popularity. But 100,000 copies of this sermon were sold and read, and thus the views which he advocated were spread.

Another sermon of importance was preached in the year 1843, and this by Dr. Pusey, at Oxford. The subject was, "The Holy Communion a comfort for the penitent." This sermon brought such a hornet's nest about Pusey's ears that he was suspended for the next two years from preaching in the University pulpit. He desired to explain the meaning of his statements in this sermon, but his judges, very unfairly, would not hear him.

I now come to a very sad story in the history of the Oxford Movement. A split was made in the party. Keble, Pusey, and Isaac Williams took one side, and Newman, Oakley, and Ward the other side. In years to come the first three men were looked upon as the representatives and leaders of the High Church party in the Church of England. Newman, Oakley, and Ward seceded from the Church, and went over to the ranks of Rome.

I will not dwell upon the struggles through which they passed before they were able to acknowledge themselves obedient to the Pope. They gradually drifted away from the Church. Ward had published his work "The ideal of the Church considered." In this he stated that he did not renounce any one of the Roman doctrines. This expression of his opinions aroused Convocation, and as this was in flat contradiction to the teaching of the Articles, he was condemned. Oakley was also condemned for holding all the Papal

doctrines while exercising his office as an Anglican priest in London. His license to perform his sacred duties was revoked until he should renounce his errors. These events helped to shake Newman's faith in the Church of England. He withdrew from the living of S. Mary's, and retired to Littlemore—about two miles from Oxford—where he had built a Church in connection with S. Mary's—to think over his position and to decide upon his future course of action. At the end of the year 1841 he describes himself as being on his death-bed with regard to the Church of England—the Church of his baptism. In February, 1843, he wrote, [1] "I made a formal recantation of all the hard things which I had said against the Church of Rome. In September I resigned the living of S. Mary's, Littlemore included. . . . As I advanced, my difficulties so cleared away that I ceased to speak of the Roman Catholic and boldly called them Catholics."

On October 8th, 1845, he wrote to some friends from Littlemore: [2] "I am this night expecting Father Dominic the Passionist. I mean to ask of him admission into the one fold of Christ."

On February 23rd, 1846, Newman left Oxford. He was received into the Church of Rome, and for many years to come he did not see his University again. Oakley and Ward very soon followed in his footsteps.

The blow which this act of Newman gave to thousands of Englishmen cannot be described. His action has been spoken of as "a national calamity." It was a pity to lose him. He and his fellow-workers were good men, and in a

[1] Quoted by Hore, pp. 301, 302. [2] Ibid, p. 304.

sense we may say they were driven out of the Church of England by the action the Bishops took. [1] "The Tractarians had been condemned by the Bishops," said Mr. Hore, "almost without exception. They had been told incessantly that they were Papists in disguise; that they were dishonest men, professing one thing and teaching another; till at length they began to believe it themselves. It was very hard to bear. To be stigmatized as Papists when they were writing strongly against Rome; violators of Rubrics when they were enjoining obedience to the Rubrics; upholders of human tradition when they were thanking God that the Church rested on no human names, but was derived from the Apostles; founders of a party when they advocated the maintenance of *One* Catholic Church; their position was unique; they were accused of being inventors of novelties and bigots of antiquity."

I think it is perfectly certain that they were driven into Rome because they saw no prospect of a better state of things in the English Church. But they were over-hasty in their conclusions. It is not stated without reason that Newman went over to solve his doubts and to be freed from the responsibility of deciding his own religious convictions for himself. The "*Sturm-und-Drang*" of the last fifteen years must have told upon his endurance. Newman, without doubt, was a saintly man, a great scholar, and a great loss to Oxford and to the cause which he had at heart.

It is interesting to notice what he said of the Anglican Church long after he joined the Romanists, as stated in his "Apologia." In that book he says, [2] "I recognize in the

[1] Hore, pp. 308, 309. [2] Apologia, p. 340.

Anglican Church a time-honoured Institution of noble historical memories, a monument of ancient wisdom, a momentous arm of political strength, a great national organ, a source of vast popular advantage, and, to a certain point, a witness and teacher of religious truths. I do not think that, if what I have written about it since I have been a Catholic be equitably considered as a whole, I shall be found to have taken any other view than this."

You know that recently the Pope has decided against the validity of Anglican Orders. It is curious to read a passage of Newman's in the light of this decision. [1] "As to its possession (*i.e.*, the English Church) of an Episcopal succession from the time of the Apostles," he says, "Well! it may have it, and, if the Holy See even so decide, I will believe it, as being the decision of a higher judgment than my own; but, for myself, I must have S. Philip's gift, who saw the sacerdotal character on the forehead of a gaily attired youngster, before I can by my own will acquiesce in it, for antiquarian arguments are altogether unequal to the urgency of visible facts."

We may perhaps point to another cause why Newman went over to Rome. The early efforts of the Tractarians were devoted to reviving the doctrines of the Church of England. They wished to show that our Church possessed, and that it taught in the past, Catholic doctrines. But they gave no attention whatever to ritual. At least they did not advocate its usefulness though they saw its importance. The time was not ripe enough for that. Their aim rather was to teach doctrine first, and then, when a chance offered itself, to ad-

[1] Ibid, p. 341.

vocate the ritual which explained these doctrines. Newman, with his ascetic nature, must have overpoweringly felt the need of ritual to aid devotion and true worship. And this he would find to excess among the Romanists. I cannot help thinking that he was largely drawn to Rome for some such reason as this.

John Keble and Newman were great friends, and Keble knew Newman through nearly all his struggles just before the latter joined Rome. In fact, Newman often asked him his advice in his troubles and doubts. The correspondence between these two men is most pathetic reading. I will give you a few extracts from it. Keble wrote in 1843,[1] "Believe me, my very dear Newman, that any thought of wilful insincerity in you can find no place in my mind. You have been and are in a most difficult position, and I seem myself in some degree able to enter into your difficulties."

When Newman was talking of withdrawing from the Ministry of the Church, as his troubles first came upon him, Keble wrote,[2] "My feeling is that your withdrawing from the English Ministry, under present circumstances, will be a very perilous step . . . as I fear it would, in every respect," bring you "nearer, what I must call, the temptation of going over."

Again, Keble wrote,[3] "Another thought one has is of the utter confusion and perplexity, the astounding prostration of heart and mind into which so many would be thrown, were their guide and comforter to forsake them all at once, in

[1] For these letters see Life of Keble, in "Leaders of Religion," by Walter Lock, p. 119.

[2] Ibid, p. 119. [3] Ibid, p. 123.

the very act, as it would seem to others, of giving them directions which they most needed." Again, [1] "I really suppose that it would be to *thousands* quite an indescribable shock, a trial almost too hard to be borne, making them sceptical about everything and everybody."

Again, [2] "Do not in any case imagine, my dear Newman, that you have not hundreds, not to say thousands, sympathizing with you, and feeling indeed that they owe their very selves to you." Then, on October 11th, 1845, he wrote,[3] "I find that the thunderbolt has actually fallen upon us, and you have actually taken the step which we greatly feared. . . . It is very mysterious, very bewildering indeed; but being so, one's duty seems clearly pointed out: to abide where one is, till some new call come upon one. . . . Besides the deep grief of losing you for a guide and helper . . . you may guess what uncomfortable feelings haunt me."

Then in the same letter Keble says, [4] "My dearest Newman, I cannot well bear to part with you—most unworthy as I know myself to be, and yet I cannot go along with you. I must cling to the belief that we are not really parted. . . . May you have peace where you are gone, and help us in some way to get peace. . . . So, with somewhat of a feeling as if the spring had been taken out of my year,

"I am, always your affectionate and grateful,

"J. Keble."

These letters are rather sad reading, but a few extracts show in what estimation Newman was held. They also show that it is not true that the Tractarian Movement was

[1] Ibid, p. 123. [2] Ibid, p. 125. [3] Ibid, pp. 126, 127. [4] Ibid, p. 128.

a secret Jesuitical affair. Were that the case, when the leader left for Rome, all his allies would have followed him. As a matter of fact, considering the immense influence of Newman, it is a matter of great wonder that more men did not follow Newman than actually went over with him. The Tractarian Movement was not a secret Romanizing movement, although Mr. Walsh has recently published a book to try to prove that it was. Anyone who has read that book ought to read the criticism which has latterly been made upon it. There was nothing secret at all about the work of the Tractarians. What they did they did openly, and they brought great odium upon themselves for doing it. But they also won a blessing.

Next week I shall give the last Lecture of this course, and the subject will be—The Growth of Church Life during the last Sixty Years.

Growth of Church Life during the Last Sixty Years.

LECTURE VII.

Growth of Church Life during the Last Sixty Years.

Renewed Life of the Church. Attractive Services. Opposition to changes. Church Restoration. New Societies formed. Ritual Commission. Public Worship Regulation Act. Incumbents' Resignation Act. Dilapidations. Burial Laws. Tithe Act. Clergy Discipline. Ecclesiastical Commissioners. Their work. Cathedral Acts. Episcopal Act. Convocation. Essays and Reviews. Conferences and Synods. Pan-Anglican Councils. Colenzo's work on Pentateuch. Creation of Bishroprics in England. Abroad. Theological Colleges. Voluntary offerings of the people. The Ecclesiastical Commissioners' valuable work. Suffragan Bishops. Church progress certain. Parish Magazine. "Parties" in the Church. The Church differs from Dissent on (1) organization; (2) matters of doctrine. Is the Church Catholic? Church Endowments. The spirit of Dissent and of the Church contrasted. The attitude of the Church towards Dissent. Conclusion.

AST week I traced the history of the Oxford Movement, and to-night it will be my object to show how the Church of England has been benefited during the last sixty years through that Movement.

The Tractarians gave birth to a new spirit in the religious life of our country. I do not think that we can be otherwise

than grateful for their work. As a result of it worship has become a greater reality to the people. Our services have been conducted in a more orderly and more reverent way than they were for centuries before that Movement began. The Tractarians brought to the front the essential teaching of the Church of England and saved the Church from falling away into a form of dissent. The first care of the Tractarians was, as we have seen, to teach the people the whole of the Faith of the Church. They chiefly desired to convince England of the Catholicity of the Anglican Church, and to bring into prominence those parts of the Prayer Book which had been neglected. They emphasized the observance of Saints' Days, showing how these taught some point of the Catholic doctrine. The Tractarians, I say, imparted a new spirit to the religious life of England and yet it was not new. It was the spirit which dominated our worship centuries ago, and which supported such men as Bishop Andrewes and Archbishop Laud. Since the "Tracts for the Times" were placed in the people's hands, we have made enormous strides for good in our method of conducting public worship. It was not until some years after the appearance of the Tracts that changes were made in the orderly way of conducting worship. What is now known as Ritualism was not then brought before the people's attention. Newman and his school did not go so far as to teach the nation the use of vestments and ornaments in daily worship. It was in their mind, however, to do this when they thought the time ripe enough for it. Dr. Pusey said that [1] "They shrank from caring for externals at the outset of their work, from intro-

[1] Hore, Vol. II., p. 323.

ducing Ritual before doctrine had taken possession of the hearts of the people. It was like giving children flowers which would fade, wither, and die immediately. They had laboured rather to plant the bulbs which in good time would send forth their flowers flourishing abundantly and lastingly."

He said further: [1] "There is not the slightest difference between the Ritualists and ourselves. The sole practical difference is that we taught *through the ear*, and the Ritualists teach also *through the eye*."

For some time after the Tractarian Movement the services of the Church were very cold and unattractive. The growth of Ritual brightened them. The Rubric in our Prayer Book states that the services might be either said or sung. Choral services were therefore revived, and music was made a means of offering worship to God. The due observance of another Rubric was also brought before the people's notice. This Rubric ordered that the same vestments and ornaments should be used in Church as were in use in the second year of the reign of King Edward VI. It was, therefore, discovered that our Prayer Book orders that the clergy should wear the surplice and the hoods peculiar to their degrees in their ordinary ministrations, and that other vestments peculiar to the office should be used in the celebration of the Holy Communion. The result of this was that a movement was started to abolish the black gown from our services and to put the surplice in its place. Greater attention was paid to the order of celebrating the Eucharist. Every part of the Church building was put to

[1] Ibid.

the use for which it was originally intended. The font was no longer allowed to be the receptacle of dripping umbrellas, or to be adorned with the worshippers' hats and cloaks. The altar was respected as a Holy Table, and it was considered sacrilege for the wardens to count their offertories upon it, as was often the case before. Of course it was very hard work to restore these decencies of worship, and many were the protests raised against it. Riots and law suits arose over the legality of the doings of some of the clergy. Some of you may recall a few of these troubles. When Tait was Bishop of London he had many difficulties to meet of this character. Before this, when Dr. Blomfield was Bishop he was distressed at the events which happened at S. George's, London, where King was rector. The rector used vestments in the Celebration of the Holy Communion, and an organized conspiracy was set on foot to interrupt him in his services.[1] "The rabble," says a writer, "unchecked by the Churchwardens, gathered strength; and Sunday after Sunday S. George's became a scene of rioting and blasphemy." . . . "The mob were masters of the situation, and held it for eighteen months, and the rector was driven from the parish." But these doings only served the purpose of a good advertisement. This brought the Ritualistic Movement more directly under the eye of the people, who in the end are bound to judge justly of all persecuted movements.

Opposition similar to this was raised to the new Movement at S. Alban's. The Dean of Westminster was sent to visit this Church by his old friend Bishop Tait, and he was to report on the doings there.[2] "Well, Mr. Dean," said the

[1] Hore, p. 338. [2] Ibid, p. 340.

Bishop, "what did you see?" "Why, my Lord," replied the Dean, "I saw three men in green, and your Lordship will find it very hard to put those men down."

This proved to be very true. The Movement spread, and now it has too strong a hold upon thinking people, and on their affections, to be very easily destroyed. In our time we do not hear of riots and opposition for such trivial matters as called them forth in the infancy of the Movement.

Hand in hand with this desire for more reverent services in Church there went a desire for Church restoration. The fabric of our Churches had often been allowed to fall into a state of decay. One half of the wealth of the Churches was hidden. Beautiful frescoes had been covered over by the successive layers of the washers' brush and the plasterers' trowels. Valuable pictures were discovered on the walls. Brasses were repolished, and shone on the people's faces once more to tell them that they could read there the history of their parishes.

With this revival of interest in ecclesiastical building there came into existence in 1838 the Architectural Society, which was founded at Oxford for the improvement of Church buildings. Its object was to urge that new-built Churches should be erected with some idea stamped on them of the purpose for which they were erected. It kept the subject of Church building before the people's mind. The Church which Newman erected at Littlemore, and the new Church built by Hook at Leeds, show the spirit of the Society.

In 1846 the Ecclesiological Society was organized, which grew out of the Cambridge Campden Society. The object of this was to promote Christian art in Churches. It dealt

especially with the decoration of Churches, their architecture and arrangement.

As time went on the need was felt for more services than had been held in years gone by, and with this there was a desire that shorter services than the Prayer Book contained should be authorized. So in 1867 a Ritual Commission was appointed to consult on the need of making alterations in our Prayer Book, and amending its Rubrics. The only result of this was that an Act was passed authorizing the clergy to have services in their Churches composed of collects culled from the Prayer Book, and a new lectionary was drawn up changing the lessons hitherto appointed to be read in Churches.

The spirit which had animated these changes ultimately infected the people, and it was often very difficult work for the Bishops to soften the discontent which a section of the people expressed at the influence of the Ritual Movement.

In 1874 an Act was passed, called the Public Worship Regulation Act, chiefly through the work of Archbishop Tait. This Act, says Disraeli, was passed to put down the Ritualists. Whether this be strictly true or not it was aimed against the Ritualistic Movement, and it laid down how to deal with those who too zealously advocated its teaching. This Act would not allow of any alteration or addition being made to the fabric, ornaments, and furniture of the Church, unless lawful authority had been previously secured. Penalties were prescribed for the offenders. But the Act has not proved successful in its working, and many people consider that it has been a failure. It has been disapproved of by many of the clergy and foremost laity, and not long after it

became law a Society was started, The English Church Union, in opposition to it, to uphold the cause of the Ritualists and to oppose another Society, The Church Association.

As the Church was stirred up to acknowledge its responsibility, other important movements came into birth in the Church of England. Many new Acts were passed by Parliament for the regulation of the Church's affairs. In 1871 was passed "The Incumbents' Resignation Act," through which clergymen were enabled to resign their cures and receive a pension from them if age, illness or lunacy incapacitated them for their duties. This Act was found to be unsatisfactory in its working, so that in 1887 an amended Act was passed to remedy its weakness.

In 1871 was passed "The Ecclesiastical Dilapidation Act," which aimed at preserving the property of our Churches. This imposed duties on every incumbent in England. It makes him liable to keep his parsonage or vicarage, as the case might be, in good repair, and if he fail to do this his successor can legally claim from him or his executors the cost of the necessary repairs.

In 1880 was passed "The Burial Laws Amendment Act." This made it lawful for anyone who was not a clergyman to use what service he pleased in even consecrated ground, and it freed the clergy from any censure if they used the Burial Service in unconsecrated ground.

In 1891 "The Tithe Act" was passed, which ordered that tithes should be paid in money instead of in kind as before. But by this Act the clergy have greatly suffered though they have been benefited thereby in other ways.

In 1892 [1] "The Clergy Discipline Act" was passed, a very important measure. Its object was to remove clergymen from their cures who have been convicted of crimes and misdemeanours. This law enacted that clergy convicted of treason and felony, who have been sentenced to imprisonment for the same, clergy who are proved to have committed adultery, or against whom a judicial act of separation has been made, shall be deprived of their livings and cures. This was a great step for the benefit of the Church, and already men have been justly punished through it. All these facts show what new life had come into the Church of England. But I have not finished yet.

I must now speak of another very important Act of legislation.

In the year 1836 the Ecclesiastical Commissioners were incorporated, and the influence of the Church to-day is very largely due to their efforts. Parliament ordered that the Commission should be made. It authorized the Commission to set about a redistribution of the Church's wealth. The end of this was to benefit the Church, but we should remark that Parliament had to appropriate private property to accomplish this aim. We must remember that the Church of England, as a body, has no wealth at all. The wealth in the Church belongs to separate parishes and is the property of each parish. No parish has a right to interfere with the property of other parishes. But to proceed, the Ecclesiastical Commissioners set about their work to redistribute the the wealth in the Church. Upon inquiry it was discovered that there was great inequality in this respect. First

[1] See the Act in Blunt and Phillimore's Church Law.

consider the case of the Bishops. The Archbishop of Canterbury had £18,090 a year. The Bishop of Durham £19,480 a year, while Llandaff had only £1,170, and Gloucester only £700. It was found that the Bishops and Cathedral dignitaries altogether carried off fully one-eighth of the whole money in the Church. The evils of this were very great. Because some dignitaries were poorly paid, compared with other men, there were pluralities, that is to say, that the same man would hold two or more offices to enlarge his income. A Bishop, for example, would sometimes be a Dean as well. The same inequality was discovered in the livings of vicars and rectors. Eleven livings had only £10 a year each, while a few were as much as £7,000 a year. It was to amend this state of things that the Commissioners were incorporated. A series of Acts of Parliament were passed to help the Commissioners in their labours. There was the "Pluralities Act." This aimed at providing a clergyman for every parish in the country. Before this the same man would often be the holder of two or more livings that he might receive an adequate income. But now it was decided that each parish, as far as possible, should have a vicar of its own, and the Ecclesiastical Commissioners should provide the necessary funds.

There was also brought into existence the "Cathedral Act," in 1840. This Act empowered the Commissioners to make the redistribution of the Church's property. [1] "Under this Act some 360 Prebendal estates attached to the Cathedrals of the old foundation; and the corporate incomes of all the Canons beyond four in (with a few exceptions) all the

[1] Hore, p. 376.

other Cathedrals; and the revenues of the separate estates of Deans and Residentiary Canons as distinguished from corporate revenues; and the proceeds of sinecure rectories, were appropriated and entrusted to the management of the Ecclesiastical Commissioners." Out of these revenues the Commissioners now pay fixed stipends to the Bishops, Deans, Resident Canons, and Archdeacons. The money left after this is done they give as they think best to other objects in the Church. As a result of this they have greatly improved 5,000 benefices in the country.

In 1836 there was passed the "Episcopal Act," by which was effected a re-organization of the Dioceses in England. This led to the founding of the Bishoprics of Manchester, and Ripon; Gloucester and Bristol were united as one See. You remember that the Bishopric of Gloucester was very poor. Since then, and not long ago, Gloucester and Bristol have again been made two separate Dioceses, and suitable stipends have been provided for the Bishops. The Bishoprics of Bangor and S. Asaph were also amalgamated. There was no change made in the number of Dioceses in England by this redistribution.

Another important source of strength to the Church of England was the revival of Convocation, whose duty it is to discuss the work of the Church, and to deliberate on matters of interest and common difficulties. This was revived in 1852. It had not met before this time for 130 years. Bishop Wilberforce was the great moving spirit in this important matter, who was at Oxford during the Tractarian Movement, and who was one of its supporters. As early as 1847 an attempt was made to revive this disused branch of Church

life. The reason given for its revival, as expressed by its supporters, was "for increasing the efficiency of the Church."

In July, 1851, the House of Lords decided that Convocation should be reopened again, and Wilberforce gave a powerful speech in its support, but, unfortunately, Archbishop Tait was against the Movement. That was one of his great mistakes, and he lived long enough to acknowledge this. It was in 1852, on November 1st, that Convocation met for business, but through the Archbishop's opposition, who was president of it by virtue of his office, nothing was accomplished. There was brought under discussion a Bill before referred to, for the "Discipline of the Clergy." In 1860, royal letters were issued authorizing Convocation to to proceed to business. That Convocation was allowed to meet again has proved to be one of the great blessings of the Church in modern times. It has been a safeguard to the Church's doctrines. It kept in check the sweeping changes of the Broad Church party. It represented the opinions of the great body of English Churchmen, and its decisions on important matters are not to be lightly estimated. One of its first important acts was to give its opinion on a book, *Essays and Reviews*, which at that time agitated England. This book consisted of Essays written by several Churchmen and it contained, to say the least of it, doctrines dressed up in a new garb. If it taught the old doctrines of the Church at all they were represented so as to lose much of their old significance. Convocation considered the subject of its heterodoxy or orthodoxy. In 1864 the Upper House condemned it, and in this decision the Lower House agreed

by 39 against 19 votes. It was decided [1] "That this Synod having appointed Committees of the Upper and Lower House to examine and report upon the volume entitled *Essays and Reviews*, and the said Committees having severally reported thereon, doth hereby synodically condemn the said volume, as containing teaching contrary to the doctrine received by the United Church of England and Ireland, in common with the whole Catholic Church of Christ." It was acknowledged, we should remark, that all parts of this book did not merit censure.

As a result of the revival of Convocation there was also a revival of Conferences and Diocesan Synods, to which the clergy, and in the first case the laity as well, are invited to discuss questions of importance to the Church. The value of these meetings cannot be too highly spoken of, both as aids to settling difficult problems referring to the Church and as means of intercourse among the clergy. They enabled Churchmen to feel more than they ever felt before, that they belonged to a great organization, and the clergy were by these means acquainted with what went on in other parishes than their own. The first Church Congress was held at Cambridge in 1861, and the second one at Oxford.

Another order of clerical meeting was held in 1867, for Bishops only. The first Pan-Anglican Council was held at Lambeth. These meetings had the same objects in view, the efficiency of the Church. Archbishop Longley started them. At the first Council which he called together there were 76 Bishops present, and they discussed an important

[1] Hore, p. 382.

work which had attracted much attention. I refer to the work on the Pentateuch, written by Colenzo, Bishop of Cape Town. In this book Colenzo denied the Mosaic origin of the Pentateuch, and many statements in it showed that he could not accept the doctrines of the Church. He said that the clergy could no longer use the Baptismal Service as it stands in the Prayer Book, because he considered that it had historical inaccuracies. The teaching of this book was considered by the first meeting of the Bishops, and they entirely disapproved of it, and, as Mr. Hore says, [1] "They implicitly condemned two of its most prominent errors," viz., the denial of the inspiration of Holy Scripture and of the Godhead of Jesus Christ.

An encyclical letter was then sent out by the Bishops to the world, giving an account of their deliberations. In the year 1868 another Pan-Anglican Council was held, under the Presidency of Archbishop Tait, and more than one hundred Bishops were present, and these Councils have been held periodically ever since.

With the increase of Church life in England there was need of more Bishops to cope with it. It was felt that every Bishop should have personal knowledge of the whole of his diocese. Many of the old dioceses were far too large to allow of this possibility. New dioceses were therefore formed. In 1876, St. Albans was made a separate See again, and in the same year the diocese of Truro was founded. In 1878 an additional Bishop's Act was passed; and, as a result of this, the See of Liverpool was formed in 1880. Newcastle was cut off from Durham in 1882. The

[1] Hore, p. 392.

See of Southwell was formed in 1884. Wakefield was also made a diocese. An Act was passed, as we said before, in 1884, to separate Gloucester and Bristol. The separation has now been made.

The movement for forming new bishoprics was not confined to England alone. With the growth of the Catholic revival, a greater impetus was given to missionary work, and Bishops had to be sent abroad to govern dioceses. Within the last sixty years the missionary spirit has spread rapidly. This part of its work the Church in times past had not attended to. Archbishop Laud had a scheme in hand, in the reign of Charles I., to found dioceses in America, to counteract the work of the Pilgrim Fathers, but it did not come to anything. However, during this century the missionary movement has advanced by bounds and strides. The Colonial Episcopate has been enlarged, and in 1840 ten new Sees were formed. We must not forget in this connection the good work done by the Church Missionary Society, whose duty it is chiefly to carry the Gospel to the heathen, and the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel, whose work chiefly is to carry the Gospel to our Colonies.

In speaking of the renewed life of the Church during the last sixty years, we should remember what it has done for the cause of education. I do not intend to detail the work in this connection, but it has not been behind the Dissenters in this duty, as statistics will clearly show, although it is a favourite saying of some men that the Church desires to keep the people in heathen darkness.

I desire to refer more especially to what the Church has

done, partly as a result of the Tractarian Movement, for the cultivation of theology.

Within the period under discussion many theological colleges have been started for the education of the clergy. It was a saying fifty years ago that a gentleman made the fool of his family a clergyman, but such a state of things is not possible now, even if it were true then. It is true that before the Oxford Movement the majority of the unbeneficed clergy were chiefly distinguished for their theological ignorance. The general training they received was a University education, and the standard of education then at the Universities was nothing like as high as the standard is now. The lack of theological knowledge on the part of the clergy was for a long time deplored. It was rightly thought that no man should take Holy Orders who had not made a special study of the subjects on which he was expected to be an authority. It was to meet this deficiency that theological Colleges were started, and many of the clergy of the present generation have had a course of training at them after they had taken their degrees at the University. Some clergy have gone to them who have had no University training, and they are far better equipped for their work of life than some of the old clergy who took an old degree without any theological training. Among the Colleges, whose work is what I have now referred to, we must mention S. David's Lampeter, Wells Theological College, S. Aidan's, Lichfield, Salisbury, Gloucester, Ely, and Truro. There is a splendid clergy school at Leeds. Ridley Hall, Cambridge, and Wycliffe Hall, Oxford, were started to teach theology. Colleges have also been formed for the education of foreign

missionaries, such as S. Augustine's, Canterbury, and S. Boniface at Warminster. Church Missionary Colleges also exist at Islington, at Dorchester, and Burgh-le-Marsh in Lincolnshire. Theological knowledge is also given at King's College, London, and many men are ordained on becoming Associates of this College. Keble College, Oxford, must also be mentioned. It trains scores of our clergy. The Pusey House, Oxford, also does the same, and Selwyn College, Cambridge. Even in the case of those men who cannot go to these Colleges—and men who do pass through them also have the same test—a test of their theological requirements is made by the Bishops under whom they seek work. Every Bishop has theological examinations, which the clergy had to pass before they were ordained deacons, and again before they could be ordained priests. The standards in the examinations vary in the different dioceses.

In speaking of the renewed life of the Church in recent years we must speak on other facts. Since the beginning of this century 9,000 Churches have been built or restored.[1] Between the years 1840-1874—I do not know the figures since that time—as much money has been spent for building Churches as £24,403,261. There has also been a large increase in the number of clergy. At the beginning of the century there were about 10,600 parishes. Since then 2,700 more have been added to them. At the beginning of the century there were 10,300 clergy. In the year 1891 there were 14,603 clergy, and now the number is over 23,000. You sometimes hear it said to-day that it is a difficulty to find clergy. That does not mean that their

[1] See Lane's Notes for these details, and Hore's Vol. II.

number is less now than in days gone by, as these figures show, but it means that the Church is fully alive to its duties, and that it desires to provide additional clergy according to the increase of the population. In the year 1836 the number of curates employed by resident incumbents was 1,006, but in the year 1890 there were 6,457. This shows how the needs of the parishes of England in late years are better provided for by the residence of more than one clergyman in each parish.

From the following facts you can gather also that one of the old abuses of the Church is fast dying away. I mean the abuse of non-residence: that is the abuse of clergy drawing the stipends of their parishes without doing the work in them themselves. In 1836 there were 4,224 curates employed by non-resident rectors and vicars, but in 1890 there were only 228 men so employed. Look at these facts, and draw the inference that the clergy to-day are more conscientious than in days gone by.

Now for much of the good work done in the Church to-day we have to thank the labours of the Ecclesiastical Commissioners. We must not forget, as Mr. Hore says of this corporation, that the work done by it is invaluable.[1] "They have constituted 3,079 new districts, they have augmented and endowed with £3,000 a year all parishes in public patronage which have a population of 4,000 or upwards, and have largely contributed towards the building of parsonage houses. They have endowed about 300 new benefices created since 1871; they have raised to £300 a year many parishes with a smaller population than 4,000;

[1] Hore, pp. 418, 419.

they have largely added to benefactions from private sources to increase benefices in private patronage, and they provide annually about £24,000, to meet an almost equal sum, for providing additional curates to the mining population. They have made grants amounting to more than twenty-three millions, of which £3,872,212 were from private benefactories to about 5,000 benefices." Through the Benefices Act of 1863 "the sum of about £25,000 has been added to the capital endowment of Churches."

Another movement for the benefit of the Church has been the appointment of Suffragan Bishops to help in the work of the Bishops of the dioceses. They can assist the regular Bishops by conducting Confirmations and consecrating Churches, and in the case of the Bishop's illness they can take his whole duties if so authorized by him. Suffragan Bishops were known as far back as the time of Henry VIII. But even with their help to-day all the needs of our densely populated dioceses cannot be attended to as they ought to be.

We must not forget other agencies of good in the Church. For instance, the great work done by our Sunday Schools, by the Society for Waifs and Strays, our Orphanages, our Temperance movements. We must remember the Church Army and the Church Lads' Brigade. We must remember too the noble work of the Sisterhoods in the Church of England. Here, gentle women, of gentle birth, devote all their labours to the cause of the poor and destitute. They are ready to go at a moment's notice by their self-sacrifice to rescue any poor starving or badly treated child from the horrors and the immorality of some miserable hovel. The Church's life to-day is so varied and so complex that it is

impossible in one short lecture to show how it has been aroused within the last sixty years. But I have said enough, I think, to show you what a change has come over the Church of England in this century. It is quite correct what a modern writer has asserted,[1] "It may be truly said that never has the Church been more efficient, never more beloved by Churchmen, never more beneficial to the State, never more liberal, never less formal, than it is in the present day. Everything around us bears witness to the fact; few, except political opponents and unbelievers, are found to dispute it. The tone and influence of the clergy, the zeal of the laity; Ruridecanal Synods, Diocesan Synods, Diocesan Conferences, Church Congresses; Guilds, Confraternities, Penitentiaries, Orphanages, Missions, Retreats, Quiet Days; the increased number and improved character of daily and Saints' day services, and of the Celebration of Holy Communion; the work of Missions; the spread of education; the tone of our Universities and Public Schools; the revival of Suffragan Bishops; the building and restoration of Churches; an improved style of Church building not unworthy of the best days of our Gothic architecture; the number of free and open Churches; the substitution of the offertory for pew rents; in a word, in every department of the Church, look where we will, the improvement is universal." These words by Mr. Hore ably support what I have already said.

One more thing we ought not to forget, and that is the influence of the Parish Magazine. Most parishes now possess their magazine. It is the means of spreading the

[1] Hore, pp. 426, 427.

knowledge of the Faith and keeping Churchmen *au fait* with the doings of their own parish. It is a source of great good. Not only in providing reading in otherwise idle moments, but in carrying a stray word to the heart of some idle or irreligious man. No doubt in hundreds of cases the magazine has led men to live purer, holier, and more Christ-like lives.

And now I have brought this Course of Lectures to a close. You who have followed them to the end know how much ground we have travelled over. You have seen the Church pass through many vicissitudes. You have seen it force its way through the attacks of the Romanists on the one hand and of the Puritans and their followers on the other hand. You have learnt this lesson: that the Church of England was not a new created thing of the Reformation, that it was not born of the will of bluff King Henry and his followers. But you have heard that it descended from Apostolic times.

The Church has always held that it was Apostolic and that its doctrines are the doctrines of the Apostles and the early Christians. In covering so much ground there may have been mistakes due to oversight. If you have discovered any I should be glad to know them. To-day the Church of England is stronger than ever it was before. It is more in touch than in days gone by with all classes of society. The clergy penetrate everywhere to homes of every class. It is the object of the Church now to leave no house destitute of the knowledge of the Gospel. The clergy taken as a whole were never more devoted than they are to-day. They were never more self-sacrificing. And taking the clergy as a whole they were never as well educated as they are to-day.

Before I close I want to speak upon another subject. The different schools of thought in the Church and the attitude of the Church to Dissent and of Dissent to the Church.

In speaking of the different schools of thought in the Church of England we tread on rather delicate ground. There are considered to be at least three parties in the Church. The Ritualistic or High Church, the Evangelical and the Broad Church party. If we speak of their numbers there can be no doubt at all that the High Church section is far the most numerous and the most influential. The Evangelical party is falling away. It has done a good work, but its weakness has been that it did not preach the whole Gospel but showed great zeal in enforcing one part of it only, viz., the doctrine of the atonement, while its tendency was to neglect other doctrines. The Broad Church party is too hostile to the importance of any doctrine to have any permanent influence. Because its policy is essentially a negative one it could not be expected to have long life. This party, while so busily engaged in discussing the importance or non-importance of creeds and dogmas, has generally reduced to a minimum its teaching about the Faith. It was the personality of the leaders of this movement in the Church which won people on its side rather than the message which it had to deliver. The fault of the Broad Church party has been that it did not think enough of the message of the Gospel which was entrusted to its keeping, and as its tendency was to lessen the importance of this there could be no life for it. For my part, I consider it is a mistake to be labelled with any particular party name. We should call ourselves simple Churchmen. And we should be faithful

Churchmen if we followed the Prayer Book in its entirety and not only in part. We should be Churchmen if we obeyed the rubrics and other injunctions of that book, and modelled our lives in accordance with their directions.

When we come to speak of Dissenters in relation to the Church of England we find that they differ from us in essential and fundamental beliefs. The teaching of the Church as gathered from the Prayer Book is that the Church is Apostolic, that it is doctrinal, and that it is Catholic. But Dissenters differ from us on all these particulars. No Dissenter believes that the Church of England is of Divine origin, that it was the system of worship founded by our Lord, and handed down to us from His time with, of course, the necessary changes in organization suitable to changing customs. Dissenters think that they have a right to form a Church for themselves, and each of their bodies thinks that its own particular form of government is nearest to what Jesus founded. The fact is that the form of worship which they themselves most approve of, and which is most agreeable to their taste, is the form which they are apt to think to be most agreeable to the Word of God.

Dissenters again differ from us very much on matters of doctrine. The tendency of Dissent is to teach the non-importance of doctrine, as though it had not a most important influence on right living. Of course they have and believe in doctrines. The Independents, for instance, profess most elaborate ones. You have only to see the trust deeds of their chapels and meeting-houses to be acquainted with them. But the tendency of their body is to ignore the

doctrinal side of Christianity. Very few of the modern Independents believe in the doctrines held by their forefathers. It is the custom of some of them to preach about the non-importance of doctrines. There can be no brotherly unity, no close unity, between Dissenters and the Church until they acknowledge the doctrines of the so-called Apostles' Creed as a pledge of Holy Baptism, and of the Nicene Creed as a pledge of Christian faith and practice.

Then again, very few Dissenters will acknowledge that the Church of England is Catholic as distinct from Roman Catholic. They say it is Protestant. They say, in fact, what it has been the object of these Lectures to disprove, that it was made Protestant at the Reformation. But they can nowhere find it so described in its laws and formularies. The word Protestant is nowhere found in our Prayer Book, nowhere in the Articles. But quite the opposite. The Creeds tell us to believe in the Catholic Church. The Article of Belief is, "I believe in the Holy Catholic Church," this is in both the Apostles' and Nicene Creeds; and in the prayer for all sorts and conditions of men we are asked to pray for "the good estate of the Catholic Church." Although the English Church protests against the errors of Rome, it was never Protestant in the sense that this word is often used to-day.

I never could understand why there was such a desire to make out that the English Church should be called a Protestant Church. It cannot be because there is anything very lovable or attractive in the term. For Protestants have been as bitter in their persecutions as the Roman Catholics, though they have not been guilty as frequently

as they of this sin. We saw in what way Cartwright, the Protestant of Protestants in England, would have been a persecutor. We saw what the Puritans' persecution did for England. And surely it is a form of persecution, if not something worse, that Dissenters, the Protestants of to-day, should wish to deprive the Church of its rights and endowments.

I should like to digress a moment here to speak of the subject of endowments. Many Dissenters believe that they have a right to them, for they say—Is not the Church a national Church? It is true that it was the national Church, and we hope it will be the national Church in the future. But it must be remembered that our endowments were given to the Church, at least, the greater part of them, when the nation had only one faith, one belief, one baptism, when no Dissenters existed. And these endowments were given to uphold this belief, this faith, and not to spread the principles of Dissent. The money that was given in those days long ago has been handed down for the same purposes by the successive generations. Dissenters can still enjoy this money, if that be their wish, if they profess the faith which it was originally left to maintain. If they dissent from that faith they are quite at liberty to form congregations of their own. We can respect them for their sincerity; but if they demand that the Church's wealth should be taken away and be devoted to other purposes than those for which it was originally given, for this we could not respect them. We should look on this as nothing short of robbery, and we should consider that Dissenters have no more right to misappropriate the Church's endowments than we have to ask

for theirs. We should not think of going to a Congregational, a Baptist, or an Unitarian Chapel to demand, for the support of the Church of England, the endowments left to them for the support of their own particular opinions. We do not expect them, therefore, to come to us to claim our wealth. And we shall not allow them to take it unless they take it by stealth or violence.

But to return to the thread of our thought, Dissenters cannot be at one with us because they do not acknowledge the Catholicity of the English Church. They do not seem to grasp the idea that although the Church is a national Church, it is not a national Church alone, but it is the Church of Christ, the Church of all races and all ages. It is a Catholic Church because it teaches the same faith as was taught in Apostolic days by men who received that faith from Jesus. Among the primary teaching of the Catholic faith there is the belief in the necessity of Holy Baptism and Holy Communion and in a regularly ordained ministry. It is on the importance and meaning of these things that Dissenters differ from us.

I would like to make a further criticism on the dissenting systems. The spirit of Dissent is quite opposed to the spirit of the Church, and in every way unlike it. The spirit of most dissenting bodies is this: I must find a form of religion that suits *me*. But the spirit of the Churchman is: I am contented with that religion which has been tried for ages, which has given consolation and help to millions of people who have gone before me. It is the spirit of the Churchman to sink his own preferences and particular wishes for the sake of strengthening and increasing the

efficiency of that great organization which has been such a powerful means of good. I am far from wishing to appear unkind in these remarks upon Dissent. See the truth of them for yourselves. I can only refer you to the numerous bodies of Dissenters—as catalogued by Whitaker, about 280 different sects in all—and ask you to inquire the cause of their birth. You will find in most cases it was due to the fact that their founders sought for a religious system which would suit their particular selves. They were not satisfied with the doctrines and customs in which they were reared, and were not contented to give their adherence to the Church. They, therefore, started fresh sects to correspond to their own ideas, and according to their own conceptions and interpretations of religious truth. It was through this spirit that the early Baptist movement split up into two or three separate sects, which differ from one another on some particulars, and that the original Methodist movement gave birth to four or five other separate sects. The same remark is true of other bodies. It is the spirit of Dissent, I say, which is wrong, and it is not calculated to lead to unity and peace. It does not consider that for the sake of the public good, for the sake of making public worship possible, it is quite as necessary that we should sink our private differences in minor matters as it is in our ordinary social relationship.

But I must now draw these reflections to a close. But before doing so I should say that we ought to have the greatest respect for the work of some of the Dissenters, though we must deplore that they do not see their way to throwing in their lot with the Church, for the sake of the

common and public good. We regret that they try to weaken the forces of the Church. Still, our attitude towards them should be conciliatory. Our attitude to Dissent is well expressed in the Encyclical letter sent out from the Lambeth Conference some years ago :—

[1] "The attitude of the Anglican Communion towards the religious bodies now separated from it by unhappy divisions would appear to be this—We hold ourselves in readiness to enter into brotherly conference with any of those who may desire intercommunion with us in a more or less perfect form. We lay down conditions on which such intercommunion is, in our opinion and according to our conviction, possible. For however we may long to embrace those now alienated from us, so that the ideal of the one flock under the one Shepherd may be realized, we must not be unfaithful stewards of the great deposit intrusted to us. We cannot desert our position either as to faith or discipline. That concord would, in our judgment, be neither true nor desirable which should be produced by such surrender. But we gladly and thankfully recognize the real religious work which is carried on by Christian bodies not of our communion. We cannot close our eyes to the visible blessing which has been vouchsafed to their labours for Christ's sake. Let us not be misunderstood on this point. We are not insensible to the strong ties, the rooted convictions, which attach them to their present position. These we respect, as we wish that on our side our own principles and feelings may be respected. Competent observers, indeed, assert that not in England only, but in all parts of the Christian world,

[1] Quoted by Lane, p. 285.

there is a real yearning for unity—that men's hearts are moved more than heretofore towards Christian fellowship. The Conference has shown in its discussions as well as its resolutions that it is deeply penetrated with this feeling. May the Spirit of Love move on the troubled waters of religious differences."

Let us be ever devoted to the Church of England. She has been the strength of millions; she has carried the Gospel to thousands of the fallen, the destitute, the poor. She has done a noble work, and there yet awaits for her a far nobler work to be done.

[1] "Bulwark of a mighty nation
See the Church of England stand,
Founded on the Rock of Ages,
Hope and Glory of our land.
Nursing Mother of our Freedom
Sowing Truth from door to door,
Watching o'er the young and aged,
Church alike of rich and poor."

[1] Lane, Notes, p. 264.

THE END.

Printed by Curtis & Beamish, Ltd., Coventry.