

A LETTER

TO

ARCHDEACON HARE,

ON

THE JUDGMENT IN THE GORHAM CASE.

FROM THE

HON^{BLE} RICHARD CAVENDISH.

Third Edition,

WITH

REMARKS ON THE ARCHDEACON'S POSTSCRIPT.

LONDON:

JOHN OLLIVIER, 59, PALL MALL.

1850.

3X
5155
G67C67
V. 2

A LETTER.

MY DEAR ARCHDEACON,

AMONG the many trials incident to a time of controversy like the present, one not the least distressing is that we are often compelled to differ from those whom we love and honor. Still more painful is it to be forced not only to differ, but publicly to declare that difference. Such, however, is the position in which I most reluctantly find myself placed by the letter which you have lately addressed to me. I need scarcely say that I have been much consoled and gratified by the kind and affectionate tone in which you have spoken of myself in that letter. Indeed, the motives which impelled you to write it are evidently such that I cannot but feel that you have established a fresh claim on the gratitude, the respect, and the affection with which I have for so many years regarded you. If I could think that by openly avowing the great and serious differences which exist between us, I should run any risk of forfeiting your friendship, my reluctance to discharge what seems

to me a plain duty would be much increased. But as I know you too well to entertain any fears of the kind, I shall not scruple to set forth the full extent of our disagreement on a subject which threatens to bring upon the Church of England consequences so disastrous that I would most gladly abstain even from contemplating them as possibilities.

It is far from being my purpose to defend either the substance or the wording of the resolutions which called forth your letter from the strictures which you have passed upon them. I have no wish to make any presumptuous attempt to do that feebly which I have no doubt will be vigourously performed by some one of those among the signers who, as you truly say, stand in the foremost rank of our contemporary divines, if he shall deem it necessary to reply to your observations. Still farther is it from my intention to go through the judgment and give my reasons for dissenting from it in toto. Any such proceeding has been rendered wholly superfluous by the unanswerable letter of the Bishop of Exeter, and the equally unanswerable preface to Mr. Badeley's corrected impression of his speech. The object at which I shall aim is of a much humbler character. It will be simply to state the grounds on which I felt it to be my duty not to neglect the opportunity which presented itself of signing those resolutions, and on which I should be prepared to sign them at this moment, had I not already done so.

In the first place then, I must express to you the great satisfaction which it has afforded me to be told by you that on the general points at issue you did not differ from us. You say that when you put together the various passages in our symbolical books bearing on the question, you cannot come to any other conclusion than that our Church does plainly assert the regeneration of every infant. Nor, in your opinion, is this truth a mere abstract proposition. You believe it to be of great practical moment for our christian teaching and education. When, therefore, notwithstanding this your belief, you proceed to say that you are most thankful to the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council for their wise decision, I really expected that you were about to maintain that the whole effect of that decision would be (as some by a strange effort of the imagination have endeavoured to persuade themselves) to put Mr. Gorham into the possession of certain civil rights. But no, you go on to admit that by this sentence the Church of England (not of course in her spiritual capacity, but so long as she shall remain in connexion with the State) will eventually be bound, and this, too, precisely in the manner and to the extent which I contemplated when signing the resolutions, namely, "In the same way as the law on other matters is held to be defined by the judgment of the courts, at least until some opposite or different judgment be obtained in a similar case, or unless steps be taken

to procure an alteration or amendment of the law by proper authority*." It is only when you state the grounds on which, notwithstanding the important points of agreement between us, you see a cause of thankfulness and rejoicing in the same event which to us is a cause of the deepest sorrow and anxiety, that the very serious differences, which exist between yourself and those who signed the resolutions, start forward in a prominent and unmistakeable manner.

You are thankful to the Judicial Committee for their wise decision, "because they have done what in them lay to preserve the peace and unity of the Church, and to keep that large body of our so-called Evangelical Clergy within it, who might otherwise have deemed themselves compelled to retire, at least from its ministry." In assigning such reasons for your thankfulness, you are but acting in accordance with the instincts of a warm and generous heart, but you avowedly rest your satisfaction, simply and solely, on a ground of expediency. No one, I think, could be found so imbued with party spirit, as not to find matter of rejoicing in the preservation of the peace and unity of the Church, and in the fact, that sincere and devoted servants of their Lord and Master, should not feel themselves compelled to withdraw from

* I cordially concur, too, with you in wishing that some measure could be adopted which would remove the misconception respecting the meaning of the word, regeneration, which deters some from accepting the Church's doctrine touching Holy Baptism.

the sphere of their labours, provided only that so desirable an object were not to be attained by the sacrifice of that which they must value above peace, and without which, all peace and unity would be but empty names, I mean, by the sacrifice of any portion of revealed truth. On what grounds we believe that an acquiescence in the late judgment would involve so fatal a compromise, on a subject which admits of no compromise whatever, is a point which I shall touch upon shortly. At present I only insist upon the fact, that for persons who appreciate the gravity and importance of this judgment, to be deterred from the course which they feel it to be their duty to pursue by any such considerations as induce you to rejoice in it, would be, in very truth, the grossest breach of charity which they could commit. For what, if in their tenderness towards clergymen who have sought Holy Orders in the English Church, and continue to hold their preferments, although they cannot use the baptismal services except in a non-natural sense, they should altogether overlook the effect of the necessary teaching of such pastors on their flocks? If it be true that there is such a thing as one Faith once delivered to the Saints, as we believe, and that the Church of England would be giving up part of that Faith if she should submit to the recent judgment, how can we be indifferent whether or not that Faith be taught "whole and undefiled" to the poor of Christ's Church?

Surely if there be any one plain christian duty more binding than another on the rulers of the Church, it is to take jealous care that persons, the character of whose faith must so materially depend on the oral teaching of the Church, should not be robbed of any portion of their christian privileges. To overlook *their* eternal interests out of regard to the comfort and happiness of any number of clergymen, however excellent and devoted to their duties, would be morbid sentimentality.

Now it is under this feeling that I am wholly unable to regard the question, as though its object were merely whether certain opinions of Mr. Gorham's ought to be visited with civil penalties. You speak of the possible case of a Bishop who should desire to check the spread of Mr. Gorham's opinions, supposing they should spread: and again you say, that, so long as Mr. Gorham declares that he believes the Article "one Baptism for the remission of sins," he cannot legally be condemned, because he does not accept our interpretation of it. Ours may be the legitimate interpretation, his an erroneous one; but this, you say, is a matter for theological discussion, not for the interference of the law. You speak, too, of the maxim of our jurisprudence, that the accused is to have the benefit of every doubt, of the patience and forbearance manifested by our judges at the trial of even notorious criminals; of the principle, that it is better that ten guilty persons should be acquitted, than a single

innocent one condemned. You remind us that even Rush had every possible indulgence granted to him by the exemplary judge, who yet shewed, when passing sentence, that he had the fullest conviction and a righteous horror of his crimes. Now, not to revert to the important consideration which I have already advanced, that such a way of arguing leaves out of view the most sacred interests of the congregations entrusted to the care of Mr. Gorham and those who agree with him, I assure you that I know of no persons who would not deprecate the infliction of civil penalties, in the cause of religion, as earnestly as yourself.

But the question is not as to the moral guilt or innocence of Mr. Gorham, nor whether he *intentionally* denies the doctrine of our Church and an article of the Creed. If it were, God forbid that we should any of us forget that in such matters as these, it is not the province of any human being to set himself up as a judge over his brother. Had the parallel between Mr. Gorham and Mr. Rush been more complete, and had the judges been called upon to decide a case of moral delinquency, I for one, should have had no desire that Mr. Gorham should have met with less indulgence than was granted even to that great criminal.

Not only am I unconscious of any wish to injure Mr. Gorham, but I sincerely wish him every possible good. Although every one who is acquainted with the circumstances of the case, must admit that the

examination was forced on the Bishop of Exeter, who could not have failed to institute it without failing at the same time in his bounden duty as the chief pastor over Christ's flock in his diocese : yet if it be true that Mr. Gorham be, as you describe him, a man of high-minded integrity as well as of remarkable ability, who for nine and thirty years has been serving faithfully and laboriously in the ministry ; let him receive any compensation which the government or his partisans may think fit to bestow, let those secular honours and emoluments be conferred upon him, which Her Majesty has authority to dispense. But let not the character of the Church of England as a teaching body be entirely changed because Mr. Gorham is worthy of commiseration. Supposing a penniless scholar were possessed of the highest attainments in literature and science, but laboured under the very unfortunate delusion that to break one of the commandments was not only not blameworthy, but highly conducive to virtue, should we not think it rather too bad if in compassion to his penury, the Lord Chancellor were to impose him as tutor on some defenceless ward of Chancery ? And this may suggest to you why I cannot sympathize in the satisfaction which you express, because the Court of Appeal plainly admitted that Baptismal Regeneration was the doctrine which was favoured by the formularies of the Church. I have heard men say, is it not enough that the Court of Appeal itself im-

plied that belief in baptismal grace was the Church's rule and unbelief its exception? This might do well enough, if it was proposed to impose penalties on those who thought amiss: it would be a natural argument for toleration. But how can this principle be applied, when the question is whether the Church of England shall be compelled to give spiritual mission to one who teaches error? In the case which I just supposed, would it be any alleviation of the evil, that while assigning a vicious tutor, the Lord Chancellor professed himself fully alive to the importance of appointing one who was virtuous?

The question then, which really arises, is whether if there be such a thing as the Catholic Faith and the Church of England really hold it as she professes, Mr. Gorham and those who agree with him are henceforth to be at liberty to teach opinions of their own contrary to that Faith, and that too on a point which you yourself admit to be of great practical moment. The passages which I have quoted from your letter would be overwhelmingly convincing if we could bring ourselves to admit one assumption, which I am sure you would be the first to disclaim, viz., that the Faith is a matter of opinion,—my opinion,—your opinion,—Mr. Gorham's opinion,—and that to decide which it is, is merely matter of intellectual discussion, just like any question of politics or science.

It would be in perfect consistency with such an

assumption that we ought to beware of using those "ominous terrible words," heresy and heretic; words, by the way, not to be found in the resolutions which you censure. Why, if there be no such thing as the Catholic Faith, should we venture to call any opinion heresy? for, in that case, it would be only that the opinion of another does not agree with our own. And why should not others have as much right to their opinions as we have to ours? If there be no such thing as the Catholic Faith, why is any opinion on any subject to be called heresy?

And on such an assumption, the late judgment must be admitted to be a most fair and wise one. To declare a particular statement to be heresy would be wrong, if there be, and can be indeed, no such thing as heresy. No one would require evidence to induce him to believe that a jury had done right in acquitting an old woman of witchcraft, if he believed the crime itself to be impossible.

And this leads me back to your statement, that the purpose of this suit has been merely to visit Mr. Gorham with a civil penalty. No one would consider it a civil penalty to refuse the office of cook to an estimable and skilful person, whom, from some inexplicable idiosyncrasy, he knew to hold and act upon the opinion, that arsenic is a most agreeable and wholesome condiment. And how can the present case be regarded merely as the imposition of civil disability, unless

the Church's office, as a witness to the truth, be forgotten, and an heretic have as good a right as any one else to claim mission in her name?

One effect of this way of looking at the Faith as a matter of opinion is, that it ascribes to the clergy so exaggerated an authority, as I am sure that you yourself would be the last to claim. But you must have observed that some who rail at the priestly office in general are the first to claim its privileges for themselves. For what is more common than to hear from the pulpit solemn warnings and admonitions to which we are adjured to take heed as we value our immortal souls? Now, on what principle are we laymen called on to listen to such addresses to our consciences? We cannot, however highly we may esteem the preachers of-
 fice, bring ourselves to look upon every one who fills it as specially inspired with a wisdom and a learning, which no layman can claim. You are possessed of great learning and ability, as well as piety, and therefore to whatever falls from you as an expression of your personal opinion we can listen with the deference justly due to it. But however gladly we would recognize the same qualifications in all other clergymen, we cannot shut our eyes to the fact that they are not of every-day occurrence. I have indeed heard persons gravely argue on the supposition that those who value the apostolical succession, intended to maintain that every priest was instantly transformed into an infal-
 lible oracle of truth. Such a notion has probably

not found its way into so many minds as to make it important to dispel it. But really, if we discard it, unless there be some definite standard of doctrine, in accordance with which we must suppose that the clergy are bound to teach their congregations, I know not on what principle we are called upon to submit ourselves under such terrible penalties to the instructions which we receive in our churches. The authority to which you of the clergy yourselves submit, must be the basis on which you claim deference from your congregations. Now what right has the Church to impose such a standard of doctrine? You yourself tell us that it is the right of authority. But how does the Church possess this authority? If she be nothing more than a mere human institution, it would be impossible to perceive how she can lay claim to any authority whatsoever as binding on the consciences of her members. If she have nothing to refer to but human logic, she must maintain herself as she can against other disputants. But if, as we believe, she be in very truth the Body mystical of our Lord and Saviour, then we can understand how it is that, by reason of the indwelling of God's Spirit, she has, as our Articles express it, *authority* in controversies of faith. It is on this principle of authority, possessed in its proper measure by the Church of England as a particular Church, that her ministers possess the right of teaching and warning us of the laity. We conclude that they only tell us that

which is in accordance with the doctrines of the Church to which they belong. The same principle of authority existing in the universal Church, has led to the formation of those catholic creeds to which our Church requires all her members to assent. On what other principle can she demand, not only from every one of her ministers, but from every one of her members on his admission into the Church by baptism, and during his whole future existence in this mortal life, a profession of faith in those creeds? Now, if we believe that there is such a thing as the Catholic Faith as expressed in the catholic creeds, we must also believe that there is such a thing as heresy. We believe that heresy is the denial of the faith; and that the faith is not the mere letter of the Holy Scriptures or of the creeds, but the meaning of those creeds held in the consciousness of the Catholic Church, more or less explicitly, from the beginning of her existence, implied in the Holy Scriptures themselves, and shaped and moulded into an explicit form as the Church has gone on her way, by the action of the minds of holy men directed and enlightened by the indwelling Spirit—the Pentecostal gift. To deny any part of this faith implies that the Catholic Church—the habitation of the Holy Spirit—has erred in bearing witness respecting some vital point concerning the faith. But if she has erred in her testimony on one such point, she may have erred in her testimony on any and every such point. Thus

the Faith is one, because it is a consistent body of belief, drawn out into form indeed by human intellect and expressed in human words, but exhibiting the meaning and intention, not of man, but of Holy Scripture, the work of God the Holy Ghost.

This is "the principle of authority on which the Faith rests;" and as to deny or abandon one article of the creed would deny either the authority of the Divine Spirit, or the fact of His indwelling, such denial does destroy that "divine foundation." To him who denies one article, that foundation no longer exists, however firm it is in itself. Such denial is heresy. We should indeed beware of using such a word *falsely* in proportion as the charge is grave. Not to use it *at all* would be most reasonable if we thought it *imaginary*; for why should we condemn a man who, after all, only interprets Scripture differently from ourselves? We ought indeed to be *slow* to say that a man is a *murderer*, but that is no proof that the *word*, *murder*, is the real evil, and that we must above all things avoid charging a man with that crime whether *truly* or *falsely*.

To ascribe such authority to the Church is by no means derogatory to Holy Scripture. On the contrary, it is part of faith in our Divine Saviour himself, grounded on his own repeated word and promise, to believe that there is a body or society with which His truth is unfailing and perpetual to the world's end. All the prophetic Scriptures are

full of the representation of such a society. This truth is recognised by our greatest divines. Bishop Beveridge says, “The Eternal Son of God having with his own blood purchased to himself an Universal Church, we cannot doubt but that He takes sure care of it, that, according to His promise, ‘the gates of hell shall never prevail ‘against it.’ For which end, He, the head of this mystical body, doth not only defend and protect it by His Almighty power, but He so acts, guides, directs, and governs it by His Holy Spirit, that though errors and heresies may sometimes disease and trouble some parts of it, yet they can never infect the whole ; but that is still kept sound and entire, notwithstanding all the malice and power of men and devils against it. So that, if we consider the Universal Church, or congregation of faithful people, as in all ages dispersed over the whole world, we may easily conclude that the greatest part, from which the whole must be denominated, was always in the right ; which the ancient Fathers were so fully persuaded of, that although the word *καθολικός* properly signifies universal, yet they commonly used it in the same sense as we do the word orthodox, as opposed to an heretic ; calling an orthodox man a Catholic, that is, a son of the Catholic Church : as taking it for granted that they, and only they, which constantly adhere to the doctrine of the Catholic or Universal Church, are truly orthodox ; which they could not

do, unless they had believed the Catholic Church to be so. And besides that, it is part of our very creed that the Catholic Church is holy, which she could not be, except free from heresy, as directly opposed to true holiness." (*Sermons on the Church. No. 6.*) So, too, Bishop Pearson says, "To believe, therefore, as the word stands in the front of the Creed, and not only so, but is diffused through every article and proposition of it, is to assent to the whole and every part of it, as to a certain and infallible truth revealed by God." (*Exp. of the Creed. Art. 1—12.*)

Such, then, being the reasons why the creeds are binding on the Church and all her members, we cannot choose but think that for any Church to abandon the principle of authority on which she demands belief in them, must be an act of unfaithfulness to her Divine Head. You say that you are astounded at the conduct of those who have taken on themselves to assert, upon the strength of their own private judgments, that a certain proposition concerning original sin is an "essential part" of the article in the creed. You say, too, that it is plain that there is no manifest essential repugnance in Mr. Gorham's doctrine to this article in our creed, because, so far as you recollect, it was not even pleaded by the counsel against him. You must of course have read a very inaccurate report of that admirable speech of Mr. Badeley, of which

any one may now happily procure a corrected impression. For, as you will see if you will refer to page 205 of that book, he not only did plead the point, but he actually reserved it as the very strongest of all till the conclusion of his argument. He said, “ If Mr. Gorham holds, as I contend he does, doctrine which derogates from the effect of Baptism,—if he does not allow that Baptism of itself, and as Baptism, confers all these benefits which the Church has uniformly and universally attributed to it,—he is contradicting, not merely the Articles of our Church, not merely our services and the Catechism, but something more sacred even than they ; he is contradicting the Nicene Creed, and annulling one of its articles.” The judges of the Court of Appeal, indeed, took no notice of this argument, but neither did they take notice of any other argument of the Bishop’s counsel. As Mr. Badeley most justly says, “ For any thing that appears in this judgment, it might have been written just as well before the case was argued, or by some person who was unconscious of any thing that had been urged.”

In addition to the passages from Bishop Bull and Bishop Pearson, adduced by Mr. Badeley on this point of the Nicene Creed, I will refer you to Hooker, (Eccl. Pol. v. 64,) who calls Baptism “ the well-spring of New Birth, wherein original sin is purged.” I may also call your attention to the quotations from ancient writers and councils to be

found in Bishop Beveridge's Discourse on the Articles, art xxvii. After citing Origen, who says, "Young children are baptized with the remission of sins," and St. Augustine*, who, he says, spends a whole chapter in proving, "That by the price of the blood of Christ in baptism, children are washed, freed, and saved from original sin propagated from the first parents," he proceeds to refer to the second council of Milevi. It is well known that baptismal grace was never denied in primitive times except by the Pelagians. The second council of Milevi was held in order to condemn the new opinions concerning original sin, then recently broached by Pelagius, and among the Bishops present at it, was that great father of the Church, St. Augustine, to whom are generally attributed the important declarations contained in its decrees. I will give the whole of that from which Bishop Beveridge has drawn the extract which he cites: "Whosoever denies that infants newly come from their mother's wombs are to be

* A recent german writer has remarked that St. Augustine does not so much deduce the necessity of infant baptism from the truth of the doctrine of original sin, as the truth of this doctrine from the universally acknowledged necessity and practice of infant baptism. He quotes a number of passages to this effect; for instance, "The very sacraments of Holy Church shew sufficiently that even new-born infants are freed by the grace of Christ from the service of the devil." (de pecc. orig. 45.) Nothing can more clearly shew that if "the remission of sins" had not been held to apply to the remission of original sin in the case of infants, the practice of infant baptism would never have been adopted. See *Hoffling, Das Sacrament der Taufe*, v. i. p. 121.

baptized, or says, that although they are baptized for the remission of sins, still they derive from Adam nothing of original sin which is to be expiated by the laver of regeneration ; whence it must follow that in their case the form of baptism for the remission of sins must be understood, not truly but falsely, let him be accursed. For the Apostle's words ' By one man sin entered into the world, and death by sin ; and so death passed upon all men, for that all have sinned,' are not to be understood otherwise than as the Catholic Church everywhere diffused has always understood them. For on account of this rule of Faith, even infants, who cannot themselves have as yet committed any sin, are therefore truly baptized for the remission of their sins, in order that what they have derived by generation, may be cleansed by regeneration*."

Indeed so clearly does Mr. Gorham deny the article in the Nicene Creed, even in the opinion of his defenders, that one, certainly not the least able among them, has recently written a letter in a

* Item placuit, ut quicumque parvulos recentes ab utoris matrum baptizandos negat, aut dicit, in remissionem quidem peccatorum eos baptizari sed nihil ex Adam trahere originalis peccati, quod regenerationis lavacro expiatur : unde sit consequens, ut in eis forma baptismatis, in remissionem peccatorum, non vere sed false intelligatur, anathema sit. Quoniam non aliter intelligendum est, quod ait apostolus : " Per unum hominem peccatum intravit in mundum, et per peccatum mors, et ita in omnes homines pertransiit, in quo omnes peccaverunt," nisi quemadmodum ecclesia catholica ubique diffusa semper intellexit. Propter hanc enim regulam fidei, etiam parvuli, qui nihil peccatorum in semetipsis adhuc committere potuerunt ; ideo in peccatorum remissionem veraciter baptizantur ut in eis regeneratione mundetur, quod generatione traxerunt.--*Mansi Concil.* Florent. 1760. T. iv., p. 327.

newspaper*, in which he says "I am free to confess that as this article of the Creed is usually read, I do not see how the Bishop of Exeter's argument is to be answered." He therefore gravely proposes that the words of the original should be newly translated, so as to give them a sense contrary to that in which they have always been held throughout Christendom.

Independently, however, of such evidence, there is one consideration sufficient to assure me, that, as a member of the English Church, I have not been guilty of any very outrageous or extravagant abuse of the rights of private judgment, in maintaining that the remission of original sin to all baptized infants, is an essential part of the Article in question. It is this. In our Baptismal Service, remission of original sin to infants is unmistakably spoken of as one of the special benefits conferred in and by that Sacrament. In the first prayer, the congregation prays, "wash and sanctify this child with the Holy Ghost, that he, *being delivered from thy wrath*, may be received into the ark of Christ's Church, &c." In the next prayer occur these words, "We call upon thee for this infant, that he, coming to thy Holy Baptism, may receive *remission of his sins* by spiritual regeneration." Now the concluding part of the service plainly affirms that the blessings prayed for are granted by Almighty God. Again in the catechism, in answer to the

* See Letter in Record of April 22, signed M. HOBART SEYMOUR.

question, "What is the inward and spiritual grace of Baptism?" it is said, "A *death unto sin*, and a new birth unto righteousness: for *being by nature born in sin, and the children of wrath*, we are *hereby* made the children of grace." Thus we were perfectly warranted in asserting, not on the strength of our own private judgment, but on the strength of the judgment of the Church of England, that the remission of original sin to all baptized infants is a benefit conferred in and by baptism; and to that, therefore, according to the Church of England, the Article in the Creed must have had reference. In truth, the weight of your censure ought to fall on such persons as, on the strength of their own private judgments, have taken on themselves to dispute the meaning of the Article which our Church evidently recognises as true, catholic, and essential. You say, indeed, that, "if Mr. Gorham actually denied the 'one Baptism for the remission of sins,' the case would be decided *ipso facto*." But so long as he declares that he does believe in that Article, he cannot be condemned legally, because he does not accept our interpretation of it." Now, on this principle, how can you object to call Socinians orthodox Christians? Many of them do not, I believe, object to use the Apostles Creed. None of them object to the use of the words "Son of God" in reference to our Lord, but they do not accept our interpretation of these words. They only attribute to them a meaning

which is at variance with that which has ever been held by the Catholic Church to be their essential meaning.

But, you tell us, the proposition which is selected as the heresy sanctioned by the sentence of the Judicial Committee, is not even mentioned in it. Now, in the first place, I have heard lawyers assert that the effect of the judgment is, that every opinion contained in Mr. Gorham's book may be henceforth maintained with impunity by every clergyman of the Church of England. The statement of his opinions in the judgment would, in that case, be merely part of the argument by which it was sustained. Mr. Gorham was pronounced by his bishop unfit for the cure of souls, because he claimed to hold and teach the opinions contained in it; and he was pronounced by the judges fit for the cure of souls, though he did make such a claim. But even if this be not so, it would seem impossible to deny that this very proposition is virtually included in the statement of the judgment. For if "in no case is regeneration in baptism unconditional," how can there be any certain benefit at all in the case of infants? Now you admit that "our Church does plainly assert the regeneration of every baptized infant," and we have seen that in our Church Services and Catechism, the "remission of sins" to infants is inseparably connected with "spiritual regeneration;" but, according to Mr. Gorham, the reception of any benefit in the case of

infants depends on certain qualifications already existing in them, respecting which we are utterly at a loss to know whether they exist or not. Therefore, if we admit his premises, we can have no reason whatever for thinking, with respect to any baptized infant, that he is delivered from the wrath of God, and that he has received remission of his sins.

We have been frequently accused of want of charity, of bigotry, and I know not what other qualities of the like nature, because we are not content that clergymen holding such opinions as Mr. Gorham holds should be allowed to teach in the name and with the authority of the Church of England, although they have been tolerated in the same Church for the last three hundred years. Now, in the first place, the fact on which these accusations are built, is mis-stated. Whatever may have been the case before the Savoy conference, (and certainly the misquoted citations from our divines, which were adduced in the judgment, will not have convinced many persons that it was such as the judges represented it to be,) there can be no question that on that occasion the doctrine of the Church of England on the subject of Baptism was fully declared. Persons holding opinions of the same class as Mr. Gorham's sought at that time for an alteration in the baptismal services, expressly on the ground that they could not minister in the Church of England if compelled to use them.

Their petition was refused, and they eventually retired from the Church. The judges found it convenient to pass over this argument, but, nevertheless, the fact remains as it was before their judgment was given. Therefore, as a fact, these peculiar opinions have not been tolerated in the Church of England for the last three hundred years. In the middle of last century, the Church, (owing mainly to the shameless system of prostituting ecclesiastical patronage for political purposes, which was adopted after the accession of the House of Hanover,) was sunk in sloth and apathy. A revival of religious zeal took place, which, because it was not directed, as it should have been, by the responsible rulers of the Church, was all but compelled to assume a schismatical character. Then again started forth the wild and mischievous theories which must always spring from a denial of the regenerating grace of Baptism, when that denial is held in conjunction with zeal and earnestness. These notions were insisted upon with a fervour and a perseverance which, however mistaken, must always command respect. Some ministers of the Church, while they caught the fervour, became imbued with the error. So lax and imperfect has been the discipline of the Church of England, as administered by her bishops for the last fifty years, that they have for the most part been content to look on, without an attempt at discouraging the error as they might have dis-

couraged it, while, at the same time, they need not have interfered with the zeal manifested by its propagators further than to have directed it into safer channels. The dangerous condition of the Church at this moment forms the best commentary as to the consequences which must ever arise from such episcopal quietism.

Even if the fact were as it is attempted to represent it, the inference sought to be drawn from it would not bear examination. Imagine the case of a Bishop refusing institution on the ground of drunkenness and immorality, and the highest Court of Appeal deciding, "It has been proved that Mr. A. is an habitual drunkard and an open profligate. We are far from defending such habits, but we are not here to decide what is right and what is wrong, but what the Church of England has declared to be ground for objection. Now most passages which denounce these practices are devotional or exhortations, not laws. On the other hand, we can produce a catena to shew that there have been always drunken and profligate incumbents, and the rubric requires the Burial service to be read over all such, if not formally excommunicated. On the whole, without inquiring what learned men may deduce from Holy Scripture and the practice of the Primitive Church, we think that no principle of the established Church justifies Mr. A.'s rejection." How after such a judgment could the discipline of the English Church as regards drunkenness and

immorality be administered in the same way as formerly? So, too, it is in vain that we attempt to disguise from ourselves that the Church of England, so long as she remains in connexion with the State, must be affected by this judgment, unless it can be counteracted by a new decision. “The effect of the decision in Mr. Gorham’s case,” says Mr. Badeley, “is that every Bishop is now liable to have forced upon his diocese as many clergymen, holding the same opinions, as may happen to be presented to benefices; whatever his conscientious scruples may be, and however firmly he may believe that such opinions ‘are erroneous and contrary to God’s word.’” Henceforth, then, the discipline of the Church of England, as by law established, must, unless the mischief caused by the judgment can be undone, be administered on the understanding that a denial of an article of the Nicene Creed, an use of the most solemn services and addresses to Almighty God in a non-natural sense, and a system of teaching in accordance with such proceedings, that all these things on the part of her clergy are lawful, and may therefore be committed with impunity. How then, if she shall submit to this judgment, can the Church fulfil her office as a teacher and witness of the Catholic Faith?

I cannot but deeply regret that you should have, I will not say insinuated, because insinuation is a thing altogether foreign from your nature, but used expressions which may have suggested to your

readers that you thought the resolutions would be taken as a call to quit the Church of England and take refuge in the Church of Rome. I will only remind you that during the time that the resolutions were under discussion, one of the most eminent among their authors, one who has deservedly acquired a reputation as a worthy successor of the Hookers and Pearsons of former ages, took occasion in a noble sermon*, preached before the University of Cambridge, on the subject of the Judgment, to address a forcible and touching appeal to his hearers not "to abandon at this crisis the mother who had borne them and nourished them with the sacraments of Jesus Christ." Those who signed the resolutions were not called on to take into consideration the Church of Rome, but the state of the Church of England, such as it would become if she should not resist the late judgment. If, as we believe, the Church of England, by acquiescing in it, would be abandoning an article of the Creed, they who warn her of the danger of submission are not certainly to be accounted untrue to their duty as members of her body. For if there is any thing which is likely to deter men from joining the Church of Rome, it must be that they perceive the danger of heresy to be appreciated among ourselves.

That such an abandonment of the article, "One Baptism for the remission of sins," would be at-

* Human Policy and Divine Truth, a Sermon by W. H. MILL, D.D.

tended by such consequences as are pointed out in the resolutions, must result from the very nature of the case; and that the authors of them acted with no extravagant exercise of their own private judgments in drawing this conclusion, will appear from a statement which I am about to cite from a learned writer, whose competence to speak on the subject will not be disputed. I have specially selected his testimony, because it is well known that he wrote not only not with a roman bias, but with a very strong anti-roman bias. “If it be now inquired,” says Bingham, (*Antiquities*. b. xvi. ch. i.) “what articles of faith, and what points of practice were reckoned thus fundamental or essential to the very being of a Christian, and the union of many Christians into one body or Church, the ancients are very plain in resolving this. For as to fundamental articles of faith, the Church had them always collected or summed up out of Scripture, in her creeds, the profession of which was ever esteemed both necessary on the one hand, and sufficient on the other, in order to the admission of members into the Church by baptism; and, consequently, both necessary and sufficient to keep men in the unity of the Church, so far as concerns the unity of faith generally required of all Christians, to make them one body and one Church of believers. Upon this account, the creed was commonly called by the ancients, the *κανων* and *Regula Fidei*, because it was the known ‘standard or rule

of faith,' by which orthodoxy and heresy were judged and examined. If a man adhered to this rule, he was deemed an orthodox Christian, and in the union of the catholic faith; but if he deviated from it in any point, he was esteemed as one that had cut himself off, and separated from the communion of the Church, by entertaining heretical opinions, and deserting the common faith." The same principle that applies to particular persons must, of course, apply equally to particular Churches; and if any one were to maintain that the Church of England might deviate from the Catholic faith in any one point, and yet not cut herself off from the Catholic Church, he would certainly be guilty of the most extravagant exercise of private judgment of which the world has yet heard.

Such, then, being our convictions, no one has a right to brand us as seditious or peace-breakers, because we desire to ward off the fearful danger which is threatening us. You remind us that our Church declares that particular Churches may err in matters of faith. You agree, therefore, with us in thinking, that it is possible that the Church of England may err in a matter of faith. Would to God that it were possible to feel that there could be no danger, that the sins of our nation and of our Church, had not been so great as to render such a judgment undeserved! But never, till sad experience shall have convinced us, will we believe that, in this perilous crisis, the

Church of our fathers will be untrue to herself. We all remember that some twenty years ago, the Church was threatened with a confiscation of her property by the democratic party in the state. Our bishops, on that occasion, were not slow to stand up in manful defence of the Church's rights to the possession of property bequeathed to her by the piety of former ages. They did no more than their duty. Can it be possible that they will now present to astonished Christendom, the incredible spectacle of a hierarchy contending for the secular rights of the body over which they are rulers, but sunk in apathy, and keeping an ominous silence, when its faith is endangered? We will not believe it; we will not believe that the rulers over God's heritage, who have deliberately vowed, at the most awful moment of their lives, "with all faithful diligence to banish and drive away all erroneous and strange doctrine contrary to God's word," shall now, unmindful of the strict and solemn account they must one day give of their stewardship, not count all other considerations as dross in comparison with the one great duty which they are so plainly called to fulfil. If the State shall threaten them with the loss of their revenues and endowments, as consequent on the performance of that duty, we are confident that they will not be slow to fling back the implied insult, and say to the Church's oppressor, "Thy money perish with thee." Our hearts have already bounded

with joy and thankfulness as week after week, and day after day, has brought us tidings of the courage of our priesthood in protesting against the usurpations of the State, and repelling the slander which has been cast upon their beloved Church. We feel sure that they, remembering the saying, "He that loveth houses and lands more than me is not worthy of me," are prepared to give up all earthly possessions and comforts in defence of God's truth, are prepared, as one of them has nobly said, "to give up every thing but principle, to sell every thing but truth."

Still, we may well be awed and saddened at the prospect before us. A time of conflict such as that before us, must needs be a time of painful and severe trial. Many ties will have to be broken; many hearts torn asunder; works of piety and charity must suffer, nay they are suffering, a grievous interruption and hindrance until the victory shall be won. One benefit, however, we may all derive from such a state of things, if we will. When we are called to battle for God's truth, we shall be more than ever constrained to feel that we are but mere outposts, few in number it may be, and despicable in the eyes of the world, but bold beyond our numbers, because supported by chariots of fire and horses of fire round about the mountain of the Lord of Hosts, under which we stand. We shall call to mind more than ever that the visible Church depends on the invisible; not on civil

power, not on princes, or any child of man, not on endowments, not on its numbers, not on any thing that is seen. What we see is but the "outward shell of an eternal kingdom;" and on that kingdom we shall now be impelled more intently than ever to fix the eyes of our faith. The time of darkness, of disputing, and of anxiety, must soon cease to be to all of us now on earth. Meanwhile we may every one of us take comfort if only, amidst the clouds and the gloom which are daily thickening around us, we can learn to say from our hearts, "Thou art my lamp, O Lord, and the Lord will lighten my darkness."

Believe me, my dear Archdeacon,

Ever your grateful and affectionate friend,

RICHARD CAVENDISH.

Belgrave Square,

April 30, 1850.

P.S.—Since writing the above, I have received the first part of Dr. Pusey's work on the Royal Supremacy, in an appendix to which are some observations on your letter. You will, I am sure, do justice to the true spirit of christian charity and meekness which breathes through them, and join with me in the earnest hope that the efforts of the learned and pious author to dispel misunderstandings, and to promote peace in our Church, may be crowned with success.

ANOTHER edition of this pamphlet being called for, I take the opportunity of adding a few remarks on your postscript.

The real difference between you and those who signed the resolutions which called forth your letter, seems to be this; you do not regard the doctrine of Baptismal Regeneration, which you admit to be both held by the Church of England, and to be of great practical importance, as one of those truths which are of faith (p. 81); they do so regard it. Now, how are we to know what truths are, and what are not, of faith? You yourself tell us that these great fundamental truths are summed up in the Creeds—the rule of faith always recognized by the Church. You admit in pp. 49, 50, the right of the Church to bear witness to their true meaning, and that the English Church in particular does interpret the article “one baptism for the remission of sins,” in the same sense which the Catholic Church has ever affixed to it; for you say in p. 65 that you are convinced that our Church does assert the regeneration of every

baptized infant. How, then, are we to escape from the conclusion that the truth thus maintained by our Church is among those which are of faith?

Indeed, it may well be asked why, if the English Church does not esteem this doctrine as indispensably necessary to be taught to all her members, she has so clearly laid it down in her Catechism? and why has she thus enforced its inculcation on every one of her ministers? You believe with us that this doctrine is clearly laid down in the Prayer Book; and there can be no question that, by compelling all her priests to use it, the Church does make the acceptance and inculcation of that doctrine necessary conditions of their holding office in her communion. This latter you admit to be the case, and, indeed, so plain is it, that those clergymen who do not hold that doctrine, and yet consent to use the Prayer Book which contains it, are driven to deal with words in a manner which would not be tolerated for an instant in the common affairs of life. Men who put a distinct and definite sense on the language which they use in reference to the things of this world, are content to have recourse to evasions, and to what in any other matter would be accounted duplicity, when speaking of the kingdom of heaven. How long, if such a non-natural system of interpretation is to be permitted in sacred ministrations, will the laity continue to place any confidence in the words and acts of their pastors?

The Judicial Committee may have disclaimed all intention of pronouncing any opinion as to what is, and what is not, the doctrine of the English Church. Such a disclaimer is not without its value; but surely to persons of plain and simple understandings it will always seem clear, that by undertaking to decide what is, and what is not to be enforced as necessary to be taught by her ministers, they did in fact decide what is, and what is not, the Church's doctrine. You quote (p. 62) with approbation the following words in Lord Campbell's letter to Miss Sellon, "I assure you that we have given no opinion contrary to your's on the doctrine of Baptismal Regeneration." Lord Campbell undoubtedly disclaims here the function of deciding what was in his own opinion *true*; but how does it follow from this that he did not decide what was the doctrine of the Church of England?

But, in point of fact, we have reason to complain of the judgment, not so much because it mis-states, as because it refuses to enforce the Church's doctrine, because, by it, men who have solemnly professed their adherence to the doctrines of the Church of England and still more solemnly vowed to drive away all erroneous and strange doctrines contrary to God's word, (in which phrase is, eminently and expressly included [see article viii.] the doctrine of the three creeds) are set at liberty to teach without let or hindrance what in our view directly contradicts

a main article of those creeds. And this is surely enough. But, as you express your astonishment at the prominence which has been recently given to the argument from the Nicene Creed, I must take the liberty of pointing out a distinction which seems to have escaped you. The question to be decided by the Court of Arches and the Judicial Committee was, whether Mr. Gorham's doctrine was contrary to that of the Church of England. This question was to be decided by reference to the formularies of the English Church, of which the Nicene Creed is not the most explicit part. The article of the Creed, therefore, did not form the strength of the argument, and was not so relied upon. But, at present, the question is not the *fact* of Mr. Gorham's error, but its *gravity*. It is the *gravity* of the error, and this alone, which justifies the agitation which you deplore. And to shew this latter point—to shew that the error, error if it be, is one of paramount importance, we point to the Creed, and to the interpretation which it has always received; we point out that the Remission of Sins in Baptism, in the true meaning of these words, is a doctrine of such importance, that the Church thought it necessary to embody it in her Creed; and we shew what that true meaning is by pointing to a criterion to which you yourself appeal (p. 49)—the words of the Church—the words which she has elsewhere used in speaking on the same subject. And we think

it results undeniably from the whole mass of testimony which exists in the councils and canons of the Church Catholic, the writings of the Fathers, and the formularies of the English Church in particular, all which have been fully quoted in this controversy — that all infants are cleansed from original sin by the Sacrament of Baptism. It is needless to add that Mr. Gorham's doctrine, even as stated in the judgment, renders this remission of sins, and all other benefits of the Sacrament, wholly uncertain and precarious, if not impossible, in the case of infants.

You blame me for stigmatizing Mr. Gorham's opinions by the *illustrations* which I used of a law-breaking tutor and a poison-loving cook. It certainly was not my intention to use any expressions which could be deemed offensive to Mr. Gorham, and I should have hoped that no one could have supposed that I wished to institute any *comparison* between him and those imaginary personages. At all events I gladly seize this opportunity of disclaiming any such intention. But you say that both these comparisons, as you term them, blink that which is the main point in the argument, for neither the law-breaking tutor, nor the poison-loving cook, has any legal claim to the proposed office. Now, let us suppose a common case in the affairs of this world. Let us suppose that a man, nominated by the proper electors to be treasurer of a cor-

poration, is disqualified by statute from holding that office, unless he possesses property of a certain value. According to your view of the matter this statute would be penal, and, consequently, every part of it should be strained in favour of the treasurer elect. Be it so. But still no judge would argue that he was at liberty to apply the same favourable construction to the instruments under which his claimant held his alleged qualification. He would feel himself bound to give those instruments a *fair and honest* construction; he must not be over subtle in finding excuses for making them out to be good, when they were in fact bad, on the ground that their invalidity would have a penal effect on the would-be official. Granted that according to the principles of the English laws he may take any advantage for discovering a loop-hole in the (supposed) penal statute, he must still construe fairly the documents on which the applicability of that statute depends. So, too, a statute *punishing* contrariety to the doctrine of the English Church, ought to be construed strictly, but in any case the investigation as to what that doctrine is should be conducted, neither strictly nor loosely, but *fairly*, like any other investigation. This is what we contend for in Mr. Gorham's case. If his doctrine be not in accordance with the plain grammatical sense of the Prayer Book, he has no more legal claim to be instituted to a living, and so entrusted with the pastoral care of a portion of

Christ's flock, than, in the supposed case, a pauper would have, to be elected treasurer of the corporation, and to take possession of the municipal chest. This leads me to observe, that, when you quote my words, to the effect that your way of arguing the question left out of view the most sacred interests of the congregations entrusted to the care of Mr. Gorham and those who agree with him, you find fault with them because they do not prove what they were never meant to prove. You had said that the judges were bound to judge with a *bias*, to look out for some possible escape from the necessity of enforcing a strict definition of heresy; first, because penal laws should be construed strictly; secondly, because heresy involves no moral guilt. In answer to this, I replied, "No, other questions, besides those of guilt and punishment, come in, viz., the interests of the congregations." I am really unable to see that you dispose of this consideration by pointing out that *my argument does not disprove your statement that the judgment was a legal act.* Of course it was never intended to have that effect. My object was simply to remind you that, in a case of this kind, the interests of the *taught* are to be considered, as well as those of the teacher. I cannot, therefore, perceive that I have fallen into the misapprehension which, you say, runs through my letter.

Feeling, as I do, quite as strongly as ever the force of this consideration, I must adhere to my opinion,

that, to overlook the interests of their congregations out of regard to the comfort and happiness of any number of excellent clergymen, would be "morbid sentimentality." Certainly if I had used such an expression simply in reference to any deep interest that might be felt for the comfort and happiness of excellent and zealous clergymen, I should most justly have laid myself open to your strictures. But how does the matter really stand? On the one hand we have to consider the interests, not only of the flocks entrusted to the care of Mr. Gorham and those who agree with him, but the interests of the flocks in every parish in England, and that, too, not only as regards the present time, but as regards the future also. You believe that our Church does plainly teach that every baptized infant is regenerate, and that this truth is one of great practical moment. Of course you teach it to your parishioners, not merely as a dry intellectual dogma, but you bring it to bear upon them practically. You teach the children committed to your care that they are "members of Christ, children of God, and inheritors of the kingdom of Heaven." Your successor may, if he pleases, (supposing that this judgment shall stand,) teach them that they are children of the devil, and heirs of everlasting damnation. He may appeal to the late judgment as a proof that such teaching is sanctioned by the Church of England. The same thing may happen in every parish in England. On the other hand

we have a number of clergymen who either denounce this doctrine which you teach, as "a soul-destroying heresy," or who, if they do not go this length, at least teach their flocks just as if this truth had not been revealed, and was not held by the Church of which they are ministers. Many of them are, I doubt not, earnest and zealous men, and I have already expressed my concurrence with your wish, that some measure could be adopted which would tend to remove the misconceptions which impede their reception of the Church's doctrine. I trust that if any such clergymen had felt compelled to retire from their posts, I should not only not have been indifferent to their sufferings, but most anxious to mitigate them by any means that might have been in my power. But I must still be at a loss to understand how a doctrine of such importance can be both true and needless, a sort of esoteric truth not fitted for the laity. I cannot perceive why those who are sure that the doctrine in question forms a part of revealed truth, and who are, therefore, desirous that it should not be suppressed or denied by those whose office it is to teach it, are to be looked upon as persecutors. Therefore, I really must persist in thinking that true charity would compel us to have a regard to the "most sacred interests" of the people rather than to the comfort and happiness of any earnest, but mistaken, clergymen.

You tell us, indeed, that the schism would have

been between subjective faith and objective faith. Now, I am most ready to admit that all true doctrine may be held intellectually without influencing the heart. I fully admit the truth of Archbishop Leighton's remark which you quote, that "He is the fittest to preach who is most like his message;" but I must protest against the charge which you bring against the great mass of those who disapprove of the late judgment, as if they must necessarily be destitute of that faith which yearns after a living union with Christ, and the living graces of His spirit. On the contrary, it is natural to suppose that the more they yearn after this union, the more they will value the divinely-appointed means for attaining and nourishing it. Unless the objective faith of the Church be maintained whole and undefiled, on what at last is the subjective faith of men's hearts to rest? Surely the history of religious revivals has taught us that if it be accounted a matter of indifference whether we rightly apprehend or not the great realities which have been revealed to us, the earnestness which gives rise to them will soon evaporate in a lifeless system of empty phrases and party watch-words.

July 5th, 1850.

from between subjective faith and objective faith. (Now, I am not saying to admit that all true dogmas may be held independently without inferring the least I fully admit the truth of Aquinas's position's remote which you quote, that "It is the duty to preach who is more than his message," but I must protest against the phrase which you bring against the great mass of those who do appear to the late judgment, as if they were necessarily for the sake of that which seems after a living union with Christ, and the living ground of His spirit. On the contrary, it is contrary to suppose that the more they know, the less they understand the more they value the doctrine, and the more they are anxious to maintain it. Hence the objective faith of the Church is made sacred whole and undivided, in what at least in the imperative faith of man's hearts is real. Surely the history of religious events has taught us that if it be accounted a matter of indifference whether we rightly apprehend or not the great realities which have been revealed to us, the consequences which have to them will soon evaporate in a thin mist of empty phrases and party words.

July 2nd 1850

12

ARCHDEACON HARE'S LETTER
TO
THE HON. RICHARD CAVENDISH.

A LETTER

TO

THE HON. RICHARD CAVENDISH,

ON THE RECENT JUDGEMENT

OF THE COURT OF APPEAL,

AS AFFECTING THE DOCTRINE OF THE CHURCH :

BY

JULIUS CHARLES HARE, M.A.,

ARCHDEACON OF LEWES.

SECOND EDITION, WITH A POSTSCRIPT.

LONDON :

JOHN WILLIAM PARKER, WEST STRAND :

SOLD BY MACMILLAN, CAMBRIDGE.

1850.

LONDON:
Printed by S. & J. BENTLEY and HENRY FLEY,
Bangor House, Shoe Lane.

TO

THE HONORABLE RICHARD CAVENDISH.

MY DEAR CAVENDISH,

I HAVE just seen your name attached to a document, which I have read with deep pain, as it seems to me to threaten much evil to our Church. Hence I feel an impulse, which I cannot resist, to remonstrate with you on this act. Will you forgive me,—will you forgive your old Tutor, if the recollections of his former relation to you impell and encourage him to address a few words of friendly counsel to you at this critical moment in your life, as well as in that of our Church? Of the pupils who sat in my Lecture-room when I was at Trinity, several have been among the chief friends of my subsequent years; and it has been a happiness to me that I have been allowed to reckon you in this number. Let me make use then of the privilege which rightly belongs to an old friend, and without which friendship would be little better than a shadow, of speaking the truth to you, at least what I firmly believe to be the truth: and I have the less scruple in making this request, because I know that I can speak it in love.

If I have to find fault with the paper to which your name is subscribed, the blame will fall but slightly on you. For it is clear that you can have had very little, if anything, to do with the composition of that paper. Among the subscribers to it are three Archdeacons, two Regius Professors of Hebrew, four beneficed Clergymen, and two Civilians; and some of these stand in the foremost rank of our contemporary divines. You are the only simple layman in the list. In such a company, I well know, your modesty would not allow you to express an independent opinion, on matters on which you would deem your colleagues so much better qualified for pronouncing. You must assuredly have been influenced by your deference and respect for some of them, who indeed on ordinary occasions well deserve much deference and respect. Do they deserve the same in this instance? This is a question of no slight importance; because, from the nature of the document, as well as from their personal position and influence, it is plain that they have put themselves forward,—nor does their doing so imply any improper assumption,—as the leaders and guides of a large party in the Church at this time of trouble. I am not going to canvass their pretensions, as grounded on their characters and previous acts. For several of them I feel much respect, though at times I may have been brought into painful collision with them: one of them is a friend whose friendship has been a precious blessing to me. But of them personally I am not intending to speak. I am merely purposing to examine the document they have issued, as the declaration or manifesto of the principles which will determine their conduct at this crisis. By the publication of this manifesto, they evidently invite the concurrence of their brethren, that is,

of all who love their Mother Church, in the principles there enunciated; and hence it challenges the strictest examination. Nor ought one to be deterred from so examining it by any consideration for the eminence of the persons by whom it is issued. Should this manifesto appear to be utterly unworthy of them, it is to be borne in mind, that, according to the old adage, it is mostly injurious to a writing also to have too many authors. Unity of idea and singleness of purpose, the first merits of a composition, are hereby lost; and while one person is introducing this correction, and another that limitation, while one wishes to strengthen this sentence, and another to soften that, the result may easily become contradictory, and almost unmeaning. In this manner strange oversights and contradictions, it is notorious, have slipt, through careless amendments, into Acts of Parliament; as they do likewise into the declarations of inferior bodies. Therefore let me not be charged with presumption, should our examination lead us to conclusions derogatory to the honour justly due to several among the authors of this manifesto.

It is a document of such importance, considering the feverish state of the Church, and the authority which will be attacht to its promulgators, that there is a kind of obligation to go through it step by step. Hence I will take the nine Resolutions, of which it consists, successively, and will subjoin such remarks to each, as may seem to be needed.

The first of these Resolutions, as they are termed, is as follows: "That, whatever at the present time be the force of the sentence delivered on appeal in the case of Gorham v. the Bishop of Exeter, the Church of England will eventually be bound by the said sentence,

unless it shall openly and expressly reject the erroneous doctrine sanctioned thereby.”

Now you will have seen from Note K to the Charge which I have just published, that, on the general point at issue, I agree with you and your colleagues. When I put together the various passages in our symbolical books bearing on this question, I cannot come to any other conclusion, than that our Church does plainly assert the regeneration of every baptized infant: and that every baptized infant is indeed regenerate, under a right acceptation of the term, I fully believe. Nor is this truth a mere abstract proposition. I believe it to be of great practical moment for our Christian teaching and education. It is because their sins are forgiven them for Christ's name's sake, that St John writes to those whom he terms *little children*. It is for the selfsame reason, that we are empowered to train up our children as members of Christ, and children of God, and inheritors of the Kingdom of Heaven. Nevertheless I am most thankful to the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council for their wise decision, whereby they have done what in them lay to preserve the peace and unity of the Church, and to keep that large body of our so-called Evangelical Clergy within it, who might otherwise have deemed themselves compelled by their consciences to retire, at least from its ministry.

By this sentence, it is true, “the Church of England will eventually be bound,” in the same way as the law on other matters is held to be defined by the judgements of the Courts; at least until some opposite or different judgement be obtained in a similar case, or unless steps be taken to procure an alteration or amendment of the law by the proper authority. But,

as judicial decisions in other departments, even when pronounced by the highest tribunal, may be modified, or even reversed, by a subsequent decision *in pari materia*; so, when we have gained a more satisfactory Court of Appeal, may a like case be tried by any Bishop who desires to check the spread of Mr Gorham's opinions, supposing that they should spread: and then the whole question, as to what is the actual law of the Church, would be reconsidered, though certainly at some disadvantage in consequence of this previous decision. Or attempts may be made to modify the law, or to bring out its force more distinctly and explicitly, by an ecclesiastical Synod. I am not saying that I should hold this to be desirable or expedient: but it would be a legitimate mode of correcting what may be deemed defective in the law of our Church. There would be nothing schismatical, nothing reprehensible in such a procedure. Only they who engage in it should do so with a solemn determination of submitting to the decision, whatever it may be, and not setting up their own will against the law; which no man can rightfully resist, unless it be under the constraint of Conscience uttering its supreme voice with reference to his own personal actions.

But when we speak of the sentence as "sanctioning erroneous doctrine," we ought carefully to weigh what its real force is. Many people have fancied that the question at issue was, whether the Bishop of Exeter's doctrine concerning Baptism, or Mr Gorham's, is that of our Church; as though the only alternative were to choose between the two, so that one of them was to be pronounced right, the other wrong. Others suppose that the effect of the decision is to declare that the Church halts between the two opinions, and does

not care which her ministers hold: and this seems to be the view taken by the authors of your manifesto. That there would be nothing monstrous or unheard of in the allowance of such a latitude, we may learn from what Horsley has said in his Charge for the year 1800, concerning the spirit of our Church, with regard to another main question of theological debate: "I know not what hinders but that the highest Supralapsarian Calvinist may be as good a Churchman as an Arminian; and if the Church of England in her moderation opens her arms to both, neither can with a very good grace desire that the other should be excluded." Would that all the members of our Church, more especially the Clergy,—whose occupations naturally render them tenacious of their peculiar opinions,—were rightly imprest with the same conviction, enforced as it is by a number of sayings in the New Testament, and that they knew how to apply it to the other topics of dispute! For this has ever been the course of true wisdom; and that of our Reformers is evinced by their endeavouring so carefully to tread in it. Still this, it seems to me, is not the inference to be drawn from the decision of the Court in the present matter. That decision, although the Judges wisely and dutifully abstain from pronouncing a dogmatical opinion, feeling that this was not their business, and lay beyond their competence, plainly implies throughout, that the doctrine of our Church is to recognise the universality of Baptismal Regeneration. It merely pronounces that the Judges could not deduce from her symbolical books, that this doctrine is laid down so positively and peremptorily, as to exclude every divergence of opinion in the persons who are to minister at her fonts.

Your second Resolution, — "That the remission of

original sin to all infants in, and by the grace of, Baptism is an essential part of the Article, One Baptism for the remission of sins,"—states the dogmatical ground upon which the subsequent ones are founded. For the next proceeds to assert that the sentence of the Court sanctions the denial of this "essential part of that Article;" after which you enumerate what you conceive will be the consequences of that sanction, if adopted by our Church.

Here in the first place let me observe, that, although, when we declare our belief in One Baptism for the Remission of Sins, we undoubtedly imply that through this One Baptism we obtain the remission of all sins, whether actual or original, so far as the term is applicable to them both, yet the Article in the Creed, taken by itself, does not determine the mode of this connexion. It does not lay down in what cases the remission is conditional or unconditional, or what the conditions are, or how the remission may be frustrated, nor again in what cases it is immediate or subsequent. Yet it is through, or in consequence of, our Baptism, "as generally necessary to salvation," that forgiveness of sins is granted to us, not merely at the time, but afterward. It is through our Baptism, as Luther is continually urging,—by throwing ourselves back on our Baptism, and claiming the privilege then bestowed on us,—that we receive forgiveness of our post-baptismal sins. As Jeremy Taylor expresses the same truth, in his *Discourse of Baptism* (§. 18), at the end of the first Part of the Life of our Lord, "Baptism does not only pardon our sins, but puts us into a state of pardon for the time to come." And he there quotes Augustin's declaration to the same effect: "That which the Apostle says,—*Cleansing him with the washing of water in the word,*—

is to be understood, that in the same laver of regeneration and word of sanctification all the evils of the regenerate are cleansed and healed; not only the sins that are past, which are all now remitted in Baptism, but also those that are contracted afterward by human ignorance and infirmity: not that Baptism be repeated as often as we sin; but because by this, which is once administered, is brought to pass, that pardon of all sins, not only of those that are past, but also those which will be committed afterward, is obtained.”

I have quoted these passages, though they do not bear on our immediate point, because they shew the wide extent of the power of the One Baptism for the Remission of Sins. Now the Article in the Creed no way defines the various modes in which this mighty power manifests itself, in which the remission of sins is bestowed. It merely states the great spiritual fact,—to use Butler’s word,—that through Baptism we obtain the remission of sins. It requires our belief in this, such a belief being essential in order to our entrance into the state of Grace, and to our continuance therein: but that is all. It does not declare that the sins of all persons who are baptized are straightway forgiven: for it cannot be supposed to imply that the sins of adults are forgiven, if they receive Baptism without repentance and faith. Nor does it comprise any definition of the particular effects of Baptism on infants. All that it asserts is, that Baptism is the appointed means whereby, generally and ordinarily, we receive the forgiveness of our sins; that by Baptism we are brought into that state of Grace, wherein, if we rightly claim our baptismal privileges, we shall obtain forgiveness. Nor does this assertion imply any impeachment of the necessity of Faith as a condition of

Justification. Hence those who are called to administer the laws of the Church, have no right whatsoever to impose any particular interpretation of this Article, any exposition of the mode in which the remission of sins is conveyed, except so far as they may be directed to do this by the authoritative Formularies of the Church. Much less has any knot of men such a right, however eminent they may be individually, when they are merely gathered together by an act of their own will. In truth, my dear Friend, I am quite astounded at the conduct of your colleagues, who have taken upon themselves to assert, on the strength of their private judgements, that a certain proposition concerning original sin is an "essential part" of the Article in the Creed, and solely thereupon to condemn the decision of what at present is the supreme tribunal of our Church, and therefore is entitled, as the ordinance of God, to our submission,—nay, further, have gone on to declare that unless our Church adopts this their private exposition, she will "forfeit her office and authority to witness and teach as a member of the universal Church," will "become formally separated from the Catholic body, and can no longer assure to her members the grace of the sacraments and the remission of sins." I have heard many vehement denunciations of late years against the abuses of private judgement: a more extravagant instance of that abuse, proceeding from a sane person, I never heard of. That there is no manifest, essential repugnance in Mr Gorham's doctrine to this Article in our Creed, would seem to be plain, because, so far as I can recollect, it was not even pleaded by the Counsel against him, able and subtile and elaborate as their arguments were; although this single point, had there been any real force in it, would have settled the matter

without further debate. At all events no notice is taken of such an argument, either by the Court of Appeal in their Judgement in favour of Mr Gorham, or by Sir Herbert Jenner Fust in his Judgement against him, although he enters so minutely into the details of the case, and would have saved himself much trouble and difficulty by this one argument. This proves that, if any of the Counsel ventured to suggest it, the Judges, though taking opposite sides, concurred in dismissing it as irrelevant. Most probably too the advocates were too well aware that such would be its fate, to adduce it. I have heard it indeed mooted in conversation, and have already expressed my astonishment at it in the Note to my Charge. It was left for the authors of your manifesto to bring it formally forward as the one ground for condemning, not Mr Gorham merely, but the Judgement of our Court of Appeal, and for threatening our Church with excommunication unless she submits to their dictation and adopts it.

I am no way controverting your proposition concerning the remission of original sin, nor defending Mr Gorham's, whatever it may be. This would be a distinct argument, into which we have no call to enter. But I wish to urge upon you, that we have no warrant for demanding assent to any particular explanation of an Article in the Creed, or to any particular consequence deduced from it, except so far as the Church has defined or expounded the Article in her Formularies. Inferences, which may appear to us essential and irrefragable, may not be seen in the same light by minds differently constituted and trained. Above all is a Court of Law precluded from thus straining and stretching the law, which it is called upon to interpret and enforce. The rule both of justice and equity, a deviation from which would open a gate

to all manner of arbitrary injustice, is that laid down by the Court of Appeal for its own guidance in this case, in the words of that great Judge, Sir William Scott, that, "if any article is really a subject of dubious interpretation, it would be highly improper that the Court should fix on one meaning, and prosecute all those who hold a contrary opinion regarding its interpretation." Of course, if Mr Gorham actually denied the One Baptism for the Remission of Sins, the case would be decided *ipso facto*. But so long as he declares that he believes in that Article, he cannot be condemned legally, because he does not accept our interpretation of it. Ours may be the legitimate interpretation, his an erroneous one: this is a matter for theological discussion, not for the interference of the law. The Church indeed may deem it right to define the Article further, with the direct purpose of excluding his interpretation, according to her uniform practice of defining the Faith more and more precisely, as one error after another led her to do so. Had the Court of Appeal assumed this right, it would have been taking upon itself to determine doctrine, to do the very thing for doing which it has been so much blamed, but from which it has scrupulously abstained. Would that our self-constituted Popes and Courts of Appeal partook in the same scruples! They fling about their sentences of Heresy, as readily as if they were squibs. Are they not in so doing incurring the woes denounced against those who call their brother *Raca* and *thou Fool*?

The third Resolution, as it states the supposed fact on which all the others hinge, is of course, with reference to the immediate matter of our consideration, the most important of the whole series: "That,—to omit other questions raised by the said sentence, — such sentence,

while it does not deny the liberty of holding that Article in the sense heretofore received, does equally sanction the assertion that original sin is a bar to the right reception of Baptism, and is not remitted except when God bestows regeneration beforehand by an act of prevenient grace (whereof Holy Scripture and the Church are wholly silent), thereby rendering the benefits of holy Baptism altogether uncertain and precarious."

This Resolution, I said, contains the one fact, on which all the others turn. The first two lead the way to this: the next four set forth the terrible consequences which will result from it, unless prompt measures are taken to avert them,—how hereby our Church will abandon a main Article of the Creed,—how she will thereby "destroy the divine foundation upon which alone the entire faith is propounded by her,"—how she will thereby "forfeit, not only the Catholic doctrine in that Article, but also the office and authority to witness and teach as a member of the universal Church,"—nay, how she will thereby "become formally separated from the Catholic body, and can no longer assure to her members the grace of the sacraments and the remission of sins." Then the last two Resolutions suggest the remedial measures by which these dire calamities are to be averted. Berkeley's famous *Siris* would seem to be the model, which the compilers of these Resolutions have set themselves to follow. Yet that procedure, which may be legitimate in a series of speculative propositions, wherein Christian thought may mount by a Jacob's ladder from every point of the earth to God, does not hold out the same stable concatenation in practical matters, in which manifold forces may come across us at any moment, and break the chain. Surely, my dear Friend, it requires an inordinate faith in one's own logical dreams, an

idolizing worship of one's own opinions, to believe that the Church of England, blest as she has been by God for so many generations, raised as she has been by Him to be the Mother of so many Churches, with such a promise shining upon her, and brightening every year, that her Daughters shall spread round the earth,—that she who has been chosen by God to be the instrument of so many blessings, and the presence of her Lord and of His Spirit with whom was never more manifest than at this day,—should forfeit her office and authority as a witness of the Truth, should be cut off from the body of Christ's Church, and should no longer be able to dispense the grace of the sacraments, or to assure her people of the remission of sins, because her highest Law-court has not condemned a proposition asserted by one of her ministers concerning a very obscure and perplexing question of dogmatical theology. Surely, this would be an extraordinary delusion, even if the facts, as stated in the third Resolution, were perfectly correct. For whatever the dogmatical value of the opinion there maintained may be, the error is not one which indicates any want of personal faith or holiness, or any decay of Christian life in the Church. On the contrary, among the persons who agree more or less with Mr Gorham's view on this point, are many of our most zealous, faithful, devoted ministers. Indeed it is through their jealous zeal for spiritual faith and holiness, that most of them have been led to adopt their opinion, and through their shrinking from the superstitious, pernicious notion of the efficacy of the mere *opus operatum* in the Sacraments.

But what shall we say, if the fact on which these awful consequences have been piled, mountain upon mountain, Ossa upon Pelion, and Olympus upon Ossa, has no existence in reality? if it is imaginary and fictitious?

When we take away the foundation, the superstructure must needs tumble into nonentity. Now such, I am thankful to say, is the real state of the case.

For first, whatever may be the opinions held by Mr Gorham, which the Court allows him to hold without incurring deprivation thereby, it does not, as I have observed already, "sanction them equally" with those more generally received. It carefully abstains from deciding anything on this point. The Court felt that they were not called to determine what is the true doctrine, or that generally received in our Church. They declare this more than once in explicit terms, and confine themselves strictly to the one point before them, whether Mr Gorham's doctrine is "contrary or repugnant to the doctrine of the Church of England as by law established," so as to "afford a legal ground for refusing him institution to the living to which he had been lawfully presented." Now this is something totally different from placing the two views on the same level, from "sanctioning them both equally." Your not turning a man out of your house would not be equivalent to receiving him as a bosom friend. Our divines, accustomed to the latitude and laxity of theological argumentation, cannot bring themselves to attend to the minute strictness of judicial decisions, which keep close to the immediate point, and require cogent evidence before they pronounce a condemnation. They are not duly aware how careful our Judges are in refraining from laying down anything like general principles. The Judges in other countries are not so: this is a peculiar feature of our English practical understanding: and in the present question it was especially incumbent on them to tread cautiously in a region which lies so far out of their beat.

But further, what is still more surprising, the very proposition which is here selected as the heresy sanctioned by the sentence of the Judicial Committee,—a heresy so atrocious that this sanction of it, unless we make haste to protest against it, will cut off our Church from the Body of Christ, and will deprive her of her evangelical power, —this awful proposition, “that original sin is a bar to the right reception of Baptism, and is not remitted, except when God bestows regeneration beforehand by an act of prevenient grace,” —not only does not receive any sanction from the Judgement, but is not so much as mentioned in it. You, my dear Friend, will of course have read through the Judgement carefully, before you signed this strong protest against it: whether the authors of the protest did, does not appear from any evidence on the face of it: in fact such evidence as may be deduced from it would rather lead to an opposite conclusion. But you will of course remember the peculiar form in which the Judges found themselves compelled to draw up their Judgement, in consequence of the manner in which the case was brought before them. They complain, you will remember, as the Court of Arches had already complained, and surely not without reason, that no definite issues had been joined with regard to “the particular unsound doctrine imputed to Mr Gorham,” — that, instead of this, Mr Gorham had been charged with divers unsound opinions concerning Baptism, in proof of which the only evidence adduced was the volume containing the Report of his Examination,—and that thus they had been “called upon to examine a long series of questions and answers, —of questions upon a subject of a very abstruse nature, intricate, perplexing, entangling, and many of them not admitting of distinct and explicit answers,—of answers

not given plainly and directly, but in a guarded and cautious manner, with the apparent view of escaping from some apprehended consequence of plain and direct answers." Such being the form under which the case was presented to them, the Court proceed to state the course which they had found themselves compelled to adopt. "In considering the Examination, which is the only evidence, we must have regard not only to the particular question to which each answer is subjoined, but to the general scope, object, and character of the whole examination; and if, under circumstances so peculiar and perplexing, some of the answers should be found difficult to be reconciled with one another (as we think is the case), justice requires that an endeavour should be made to reconcile them in such a manner, as to obtain the result which appears most consistent with the general intention of Mr Gorham in the exposition of his doctrine and opinions."

No one, I think, who has any sense of justice and equity, will question that this was the right course for the Judges to adopt: at least no one will do so, who has meditated on the awful responsibility incurred by men sitting to administer justice, and on the exceeding candour and impartiality, and the caution not to strain any point of evidence beyond its palpable purport, which form the glorious characteristics of our Courts of Law. It is a maxim of our jurisprudence, that the accused is to have the benefit of every doubt, whether on the face of the evidence, or of the law: and I hardly know any grander indication of national character, than the patience and forbearance manifested by our Judges at the trials even of notorious criminals, especially for political offenses, their scrupulous care lest any particle of an argument, which may make for the culprit, should

not have due weight attacht to it. I never read such a trial, without being moved to reverence for the majesty of our Law, which thus tempers justice with mercy. The principle on which they administer it, as is well known, is, that it is better that ten guilty persons should be acquitted, than that a single innocent one should be condemned. Accordingly, in the present instance, the Judges felt that Mr Gorham, and those who agree with him,—for they could not be ignorant that many other persons would be affected by their decision, and this could not but make them still more cautious than they otherwise might have been,—were in a manner placed under their protection; so that, if they could detect anything, either in the wording or the history of the law, which seemed to admit of a construction favorable to him, he was to have the full advantage of it. Hence they may perhaps have ascribed too much importance to certain changes, even very slight ones, in our Articles or Prayerbook, as indicative of an intention to relax their stringency. In like manner, as a judge will often throw his shield over a witness, who has been worried and baited into contradicting himself by a browbeating advocate, so did the Court of Appeal deem themselves bound to give the most favorable construction to Mr Gorham's answers, extorted from him in the course of his vexatious and inquisitorial examination.

Hence it is only reasonable to expect that the opinions which the Judges deduce from Mr Gorham's book, looking at it with their calm, cold, judicial eye, should differ more or less from the deductions drawn by persons searching it with the eager eye of a controversialist to detect the remotest, faintest indications of heresy. It is true that persons who have not been

verst in controversial divinity, may easily overlook heretical symptoms, which a more practist eye would discern; for which reason there ought to be a certain number of learned theologians in a rightly constituted Court of Appeal; though at the same time it is no less requisite that there should be a due admixture of lay judges, to moderate and correct the zeal and partialities to which profest theologians would be prone. No one however, I trust, would dare to insinuate that our Judges in this case have decided otherwise than with strict conscientiousness and righteousness, according to their insight into the matter propounded to them. Their personal character, as well as that of the Bench generally, precludes such a supposition. Now their statement of the doctrine held by Mr Gorham, as ascertained by the above-mentioned process, is this:—"that Baptism is a sacrament generally necessary to salvation, but that the grace of regeneration does not so necessarily accompany the act of baptism, that regeneration invariably takes place in baptism; that the grace may be granted before, in, or after baptism; that baptism is an effectual sign of grace, by which God works invisibly in us, but only in such as worthily receive it,—in them alone it has a wholesome effect; and that, without reference to the qualification of the recipient, it is not in itself an effectual sign of grace: that infants baptized, and dying before actual sin, are certainly saved; but that in no case is regeneration in baptism unconditional." These, and these alone, are the propositions in which the Court sum up their account of Mr Gorham's doctrine. These therefore, and these alone, are the propositions, which they declare not to be "contrary or repugnant to the doctrine of the Church of England as by law establisht,"

so as to “afford a legal ground for refusing him institution to the living to which he had been lawfully presented.”

Now these propositions differ considerably from the one stated in your third Resolution. It may be that yours is also to be found in Mr Gorham’s volume: but that is immaterial to our present point; and so I will not take the trouble of searching for it. At all events it has not been extracted by the Judges in their Judgement, and therefore has not obtained that qualified sanction which the Court has granted to the others. Hence you may rejoice with me in thinking that we have no ground for anticipating the tremendous evils, which it has been supposed to portend. Do not say that this is quibbling. In discussions of this kind the utmost precision is indispensable. A slight change in the shade of meaning of a word may completely alter the character of a proposition. Every logician is aware of this; and in no department of science has it been more manifest than in the history of Theology. Above all is such precision necessary when these awful consequences are said to ensue from the proposition.

It may be contended indeed that the representation of Mr Gorham’s opinions in the Judgement is much too favorable. I have admitted that it is likely to be much more favorable than that which would be drawn up by a controversial theologian. I have referred to those noble features in the character of our Courts of Justice, their shrinking from straining any point of evidence against a culprit, their aptness to err, if any way, on the side of mercy, their determination to take care that the meanest and worst criminal shall not suffer wrong. Even Rush had every possible indulgence granted to him by the exemplary Judge, who yet

shewed, when passing sentence, that he had the fullest conviction and a righteous horror of his crimes. What then must needs have been the bias of such a tribunal, when they were called to pronounce a sentence whereby they would have deprived Mr Gorham of his living,—of whom personally I know nothing, but whose Examination proves him to be a man of highminded integrity, as well as of remarkable ability, and who has been serving nine and thirty years faithfully and laboriously in the ministry,—when they were called thus to eject him, not on account of any offense against morals, or even against discipline, not on account of any heretical book that he had published, not even on account of a heretical sermon that he had preached,—but on account of a series of answers, wrung from him, in a manner unprecedented in our Church, and which, I trust, will never be imitated, by a kind of logical thumbscrew. Surely the righteous indignation which such a procedure must needs excite, would constrain the Court in such a case to put the most favorable construction on his opinions. This however greatly lessens the importance of the Judgement, as affecting the Church. Nor can it be held to convey the slightest sanction to any opinions that Mr Gorham may have expressed, except so far as they are comprehended in the statement which the Court has given of them. Among the incidental observations and arguments which the Court has made use of, there may be several questionable positions: it could hardly be otherwise, when they were speaking on matters with which they were not familiar. But the *obiter dicta* of Judges have no binding force, and, in such a case as this, would not be held to have any force at all. The only part of the Judgement by which the Church is affected, is

the decision that a person entertaining the opinions ascribed in it to Mr Gorham is not thereby precluded from holding preferment.

Moreover from this statement we further see, that Mr Gorham's doctrine, at least according to the view of the Court,—and to this point I desire to confine myself, lest my Letter should swell to an inordinate bulk,—cannot “render the benefits of Holy Baptism altogether uncertain and precarious;” seeing that he accepts the assertion in the Rubric, “that, infants baptized, and dying before actual sin, are certainly saved.”

As the next four Resolutions are merely successive amplifications and exaggerations of the consequences to be apprehended from the fact misstated in the third, I might here say, *Cedit quaestio*, and drop my pen. Nor should I be diverted from this course by the mere desire of exposing the fallacies in them, unless it were plain that these same fallacies are exercising a wide influence in this calamitous dispute, and are luring many into the fatally delusive notion that our Church is in danger of forfeiting its Catholic, Christian character. Seeing however that this is so, I must still trouble you with a few more remarks.

On the fourth so-called Resolution,—“That to admit the lawfulness of holding an exposition of an Article of the Creed contradictory of the essential meaning of that Article is, in truth and in fact, to abandon that Article,”—I will merely observe, in addition to what has already been said on the subject of it, that it requires two important limitations. First, not only must it be demonstratively clear and certain that the exposition is contradictory of the essential meaning of the Article, but the collective body, or the individuals, of whom it can

justly be said that they abandon the Article, must be distinctly aware that it is so. An error from ignorance is ever a venial error. So long as we are persuaded that the exposition is compatible with the Article, we cannot justly be charged with abandoning it. As ignorance, if not wilful, is a plea ever admitted by righteous human tribunals, so, we are taught, will due weight be allowed to it at the seat of Divine Judgement. Secondly, it is no way essential to our holding any Truth, even an Article of the Creed, that we should enforce it upon others with penalties. He who sincerely believes himself to be in possession of any divine truth, will indeed earnestly desire that others should partake of the same precious gift; he will desire to communicate it to them: but he will only make use of those means, whereby it can be communicated; and therefore he will not use any constraint, except that of Reason and that of Love. The spirit of your Resolution is lamentably alien from that of St Paul's exhortation to the Philippians: *Let us, as many as be perfect, be thus minded: and if in anything ye be otherwise minded, God will reveal this also to you. Nevertheless, whereto we have already attained, let us walk by the same rule, let us mind the same thing.* What blessings would descend on our Church, if we could be brought to act thus!

What your fifth Resolution was intended to mean, I am sorely puzzled to divine. It asserts "that, inasmuch as the faith is one, and rests upon one principle of authority, the conscious, deliberate, and wilful abandonment of the essential meaning of an Article of the Creed destroys the divine foundation upon which alone the entire faith is propounded by the Church." These words were doubtless intended to mean something awful;

but what? That the Faith is One, according to the meaning which St Paul attaches to the words, is indeed certain: that is, those great primordial Truths, which are set before us in the Scriptures, are expansions or emanations or manifestations of one great central Truth, and, as such, constitute that One Faith, which man is called to believe. But, as the unity of the stem does not prevent the tree from expanding in the variety of the branches,—as the unity of the central sun is no way inconsistent with the diversities of the planets, and of their satellites,—so has it ever been with Truth. It has expanded diversely in different ages; as we see, in the Scriptures themselves, how different its expansions were in the Patriarchal Age, in the Law, in the Prophets, and in the Gospel. So again, even after the Incarnation of our Lord, even after His Passion, many truths were still reserved for the teaching of the Spirit of Truth. Thus the Faith, though primarily One, was diverse in its manifestations down to that time: nor has it ceased to be so to a certain extent since, as it has spread itself out to embrace new spheres of life, and ampler regions of thought. Therefore we must beware of confounding the primordial principles of our Faith with their ulterior developments and consequences, and of claiming the same unity and identity for these, which rightfully belong to the others. Exceeding caution is necessary in this matter; because, as the ignorant man in the state of nature makes himself and his own experience the measure of the universe, so, even in our most cultivated state, the proneness to this fallacy does not pass away: man is still apt to substitute his own will for God's will, his own faith for the Faith. Hence, when we are applying the principle of the unity of the Faith to any particular doctrine, it behoves us carefully

to consider whether that doctrine is indeed one belonging to the central stem, or to the diverse, multitudinous branches, under which the nations are gathered, each seeing more of such branches as stretch in its own direction, and loving them more for the shelter it receives from them. As each individual man attaches an inordinate value to those truths which are the most congenial to his peculiar frame of mind and temper, or which the circumstances of his life have impressed most forcibly upon him, so is it, more or less, with nations and Churches, and with different ages of the Church. Each will be apt to exaggerate the importance of its own favorite body of truths, and to depreciate the opposite truths, which are no less necessary to the harmonious unity of the whole : and one extreme ever tends to produce the other. Thus, with reference to our immediate question, the enormous exaggerations of the power of baptismal grace, to the disparagement, and almost exclusion, of the subsequent converting influences of the Spirit, have driven people into the opposite extreme, where baptismal grace has been unduly depreciated. The monstrous assertions concerning a change of nature in Baptism have impelled those, who could not veil their eyes to the fallaciousness of these assertions, to deny anything beyond an outward change of state. These and other like considerations need to be fully weighed, before we give our assent to any special application of the assertion that there is One Faith, or deal severely with those who, in their zeal for some one neglected truth, may be led to disparage another.

But what is meant by the next assertion, that the one faith “rests upon one principle of authority?” How does it rest upon *a principle of authority*? I can understand what is meant by saying that our faith rests

upon authority. In the subjective sense of the word *faith*, the faith of children rests upon the authority of their parents and teachers, the faith of the Christian Church rests upon the authority of the word of God: and that which is said correctly of our subjective faith, may be transferred to the Faith in its objective sense. This however does not explain how the Faith rests *upon a principle of authority*. And what can be the one principle of authority? One may guess that the words were intended to mean, that the faith of the Church is to be determined by the Church; though I see not how they express this. But by what Church? The whole protest shews that the writers of it think their mother Church, the Church of England, is in danger of falling into such error as would cut her off from the Church of Christ. To her voice therefore they cannot attach much value as having authority to determine the faith. Or is the Church of Rome a less fallible witness? Our nineteenth Article declares that, “as the Church of Jerusalem, Alexandria, and Antioch, have erred, so also the Church of Rome hath erred, not only in their living and manner of ceremonies, but also in matters of Faith.” Surely they who would be so severe against Mr Gorham for what they suppose to be a doctrine repugnant to our Liturgy, are not themselves contravening the direct assertion of this nineteenth Article. What then is the *one principle of authority*? Is it the authority of their own private judgements?

Nor does the latter part of this Resolution, which is introduced as an inference from the mysterious proposition we have been considering, solve my perplexities. It states that, inasmuch as the one Faith rests upon one principle of authority, “the conscious, deliberate and wilful abandonment of the essential meaning of an

Article of the Creed destroys the divine foundation upon which alone the entire faith is propounded by the Church." What is this "divine foundation, upon which alone the entire faith is propounded by the Church?" Can it be the word of God, which in our twentieth Article is declared to be the rule the Church is bound to follow in determining controversies of Faith? But how is this to be "destroyed," and that too by the abandonment of an Article of the Creed? Nay, how can a divine foundation be destroyed? As the critics say, *locus est plane conclamatus*: and I will not weary myself or you any longer by conjecturing its possible meaning. I will merely add that the epithets, *conscious, deliberate, and wilful*, applied to our supposed abandonment of the essential meaning of an Article of the Creed, altogether neutralize the evils, whatever they may be, threatened in the latter part of the Resolution. For assuredly we may say, that, through God's grace, and with His help and blessing, the Church of England will not consciously, deliberately, and wilfully abandon the essential meaning of any Article in the Creed. If she does abandon it, she will do so in ignorance, unconsciously, from not conceiving it to be essential. There seems to be an intention in this Resolution, so far as I can catch any glimmering of its purpose, to apply the declaration of St James, that *whosoever shall offend in one point, is guilty of all*, to errors of doctrine. The truth however, which is express in this verse, that a single wilful sin implies the alienation of the will from God, does not hold in like manner of errors of the understanding, which, in its best estate, at present only sees through a glass, darkly and partially.

The sixth and seventh Resolutions are little more than amplifications of the fifth, giving a wider and

wider range to the evils denounced as impending on our Church in consequence of the recent Judgement, and intended to declare that, if she acquiesces in it, she will “forfeit the office and authority to witness and teach as a member of the universal Church,” and will become “formally separated from the Catholic body, and can no longer assure to her members the grace of the sacraments and the remission of sins.” And who are they, my dear Friend, who take upon themselves thus to pronounce a sentence of condemnation against our Church? By what authority do they pronounce it? Who gave them that authority? One thing at all events is clear, when we compare this hypothetical Judgement with that of our Court of Appeal, that the Church will not gain much in the wisdom and caution of her tribunals by the substitution of clerical for lay Judges. The fallaciousness of the logical process by which these cumulative Resolutions are constructed, might be exemplified by our supposing a sophist to argue, that, inasmuch as the nails are essential parts of the hand, a man who has been cutting his nails has been cutting his hand,—and that, inasmuch as the hand is an essential part of the arm, he has been cutting his arm,—and that, for a like reason, he has been consciously, deliberately, and wilfully, cutting his body,—*ergo*, that he who has been consciously, deliberately, and wilfully cutting his nails, has been cutting his throat. The objections, which have been urged against the preceding Resolutions, apply with still greater force to these. Since it is not evident on the face of the Article, *One Baptism for the Remission of Sins*, that the remission of original sin to all infants in and by the grace of Baptism, solely, immediately, and unconditionally, is an essential part of it,—and since this has not been ruled to be so by any authoritative

declaration of our Church,—our acquiescence in the Judgement of the Court of Appeal cannot be construed into a conscious, deliberate, wilful abandonment of that Article in the Creed. Since the proposition stated in the third Resolution is not sanctioned or even mentioned in the Judgement, the Church cannot be liable to the evil consequences boded from it. Since the Courts of Law are not warranted in assuming any particular interpretation of an Article of the Creed, unless it be unmistakably palpable on the face of the Article, or laid down by some decree of our Church, the dismissal of such an interpretation, even if it was urged upon them as an argument to determine their decision, was the course prescribed by all sound principles of law and equity, and therefore, we may trust, will not bring down any evils on our Church; except so far as evils may accrue from the intemperance and insubordination of her individual members. Nor will our adherence to the One Faith of Christ be forfeited by the admission of diversities of opinion concerning derivative points of doctrine. Through God's blessing, and through the power of His Spirit, who has been moving visibly in our Church of late years, and through whom many of its dry bones have sprung up and been clothed with life, our Church, we may feel a confident trust, will still continue a member of Christ's Holy Body, will still retain her office and authority of witnessing and teaching as a member of that Body, and will still be able to preach the Gospel of salvation, and to administer the sacraments which her Lord appointed, as means for the conveyance of His Grace, and as pledges to assure us thereof.

There is something to my mind quite shocking in the notion, which in the exaggerations of our imagination,

irritated by personal discomfort, people are so ready to assume, that the world is to go to rack, because a man's shoe pinches him. In the Church, in which the providential order of events is far more clearly discernible than in secular history, this utter disproportion and incongruity between causes and effects is peculiarly offensive. How unlike are these prognostics to the causes which are to produce the destruction of the Churches in the Vision of St John! The doctrinal differences between the Greek Church and the Latin did indeed lead to a schism, owing partly to the hierarchal ambition of the latter, and partly to the influence of the dogmatical spirit, which confounded identity of opinions with unity of Faith. But surely the Greek Church, though her differences relate to more important questions, did not thereby forfeit her Christian character and privileges. Or do the authors of your manifesto hold that she did? If not, why should the English?

Thus I cannot but regard the string of Resolutions, to which you, my dear Friend, have been induced to subscribe your name, as utterly worthless, whether we examine the particular propositions which severally they are intended to assert, or look at them in their logical connexion and sequence. But, alas! they are not mere abstract propositions. Had they been nothing more, I should hardly have troubled you with any objections to them; or, if I had, it would have been done briefly and privately. Unfortunately the moment at which this manifesto has been issued, and the names appended to it, give it an importance which bodes no good to our Church. Hence, from the very moment when I first read it, I conceived an earnest desire to do what I could, if I could do anything, to check the mischief it seemed to threaten, by exposing

the fallacies contained in it; and I sat down almost immediately to write this letter to you, if so be your regard for your old Tutor might induce you to listen to his voice of warning. The same motive induces me to publish it, in the hope that it may perhaps help a reader here and there to extricate himself from the confusions and delusions which have been rushing like a thick fog upon our Church.

I have been looking forward for some time with many fears to this crisis, and have already endeavoured to utter a few peacemaking words, in a Note (K) subjoined to the Charge which has just been published, and in the Dedication prefixed to it. My chief fear has been, lest, if the decision of the Court of Arches had been confirmed by the Court of Appeal, that large body of our ministers, who agree more or less with Mr Gorham in their views on Baptismal Regeneration,—having reconciled themselves to the use of our Baptismal Service by adopting the hypothetical interpretation of its declarations,—should deem themselves compelled thereby to resign their cures, and to retire into lay communion. Such a result would have been most calamitous to our Church. Numbers, hundreds, if not thousands of our ministers, of the best, most faithful, most devoted among our Clergy, might have been placed in a condition, in which they would have deemed themselves bound in conscience to withdraw from their ministerial office, under the conviction that they could no longer discharge its functions honestly and conscientiously, when the decision of the Supreme Court in our Church had decided that their interpretation of the Baptismal Service was incompatible with the holding of a cure. Hence I felt deeply thankful for the very wise, temperate, considerate Judgement of the Court of Appeal, which

averted this danger, and which, though it may be regarded unfavorably by the opposite party, does not impose any constraint on their consciences in the performance of their ministerial duties.

You, my dear Friend, have signed this vehement protest against that Judgement. Why have you done so? Do you, can you really wish to drive a thousand of the very best, most zealous, most devoted ministers, who are now labouring in our Church, out of the ministry? Is this the way in which you would prepare our Church for the terrible conflicts awaiting her? Has the angel that appeared to Gideon, come to you, and told you that the army of the Lord in this land are too many, and that it is necessary to diminish their number? Are we not hearing every day that we want more ministers, more clergy, yea, by thousands, in order to meet the enormous increase in the masses of our population? It may be that those who would have relinquished their office, would not quite have amounted to a thousand. But, unless some remedial measure had been adopted, many hundreds would have retired; and thousands would have been placed in sore straits whether to do so or no. That ministry, which they now discharge with joy and thankful alacrity, would thenceforward have been troubled by doubts in their own minds as to the rectitude of their conduct, and by frequent insolent gibes from those, who, having little living faith, and scarcely knowing what it means, are ever the greatest sticklers for forms and the letter of dogmas, the Scribes and the Pharisees of our age. Remember too, the ministers whom we should have lost, would have comprised a very large proportion of those who are now exercising the most salutary, blessed influence on their people, of the shepherds who go before their sheep,

and whom their sheep follow, because they know their voice.

O but they are heretics! My dear Friend, let us beware of using that ominous, terrible word, which in all ages has been a source of such woes and crimes in the Church, and which, I believe, has mostly been used by the ungodly against the godly; which whetted the sword of Simon de Montfort and of Alva, which kindled the fires of the Inquisition, which murdered Huss, and Cranmer, and Latimer, and Ridley, and those

“Slaughtered saints, whose bones
Lay scattered on the Alpine mountains cold,
Slain by the bloody Piemontese, that rolled
Mother with infant down the rocks;”

yea, which has poured out the blood of God's saints, like water, on the earth. It will not indeed do the same now: but, unless the power of Christ's spirit in the Church silences those who are clamorous in using it, even now it will rend hearts, and wring consciences, and dissolve holy bonds, and sever the loving shepherd from his loving sheep. And what are these heretics? what is their heresy? Do they deny the Lord Jesus? or the Father? or the Spirit? or the power of Christ's Death? or that of His Resurrection? Are they not the very persons who are the most zealous for the glory of the Lord, the most active in winning souls for Him, and in spreading the knowledge and the power of His salvation? Nay, does not the source of their error in this very matter lie in their zeal for the Spirit? Is it not mainly caused by the exaggerations and extravagances of those, who lose sight of the power of the Spirit in their veneration for an outward ordinance, substituting a momentary transformation for an abiding presence,—and by the misfortune which has

given us an equivocal word, as the point for the whole controversy to turn on? I am not speaking at random, my Friend. I know many, whom an opposite judgement would have placed in terrible straits; and they are among our best ministers, the most diligent, the most loving, the holiest in their lives, the saintliest in their spirits. While you and your colleagues have been composing your manifesto, you have not reflected what agonies you were preparing for thousands of God's most devoted servants throughout the land, what wounds for our Church,—unless, as I hope and trust, it proves utterly futile and ineffectual.

You, I know, my dear Friend, would not harm one of God's servants. Their hearts and consciences would be as safe, for any injury you would inflict upon them, as the bodies and garments of the three men in the fiery furnace. My persuasion is, that, in signing the protest, you have acted partly under the influence of your friends, partly through indignation that a question so intimately affecting the doctrine of the Church should be brought before a lay tribunal, and partly from your often expressed wish that we should have a properly constituted Ecclesiastical Legislature. On this last point I will say a few words anon. With regard to the tribunal, I see no need of adding anything to what I have already said in the Note to my Charge. But, though I am most willing to acquit you of all blame, except that of adding a somewhat hasty signature to a paper drawn up by your friends,—and most people are too apt to do this without examining the wording, when they concur in its general objects,—yet, much as I should desire to find a like excuse for your colleagues, I cannot. From their position they ought to have a far clearer knowledge of the mischief which an opposite Judgement would have

caused. They must know too what kind of effect their manifesto is likely to produce in the feverish condition of our Church. Nay, it is evidently promulgated with the very purpose of producing that effect. When I look at the names subscribed to it, I should expect to find a paper which aimed at quieting men's minds, at calming the troubled waters, at extinguishing the morbid ferment; which gave a sober view of the real bearings of the Judgement; which called on us to revere and love our spiritual Mother, and to abide patiently and dutifully until the fever has abated, and the time comes for taking the steps best fitted for the removal of our grievances. But when I raise my eyes from the signatures to the Resolutions, what do I find? Nothing soothing, nothing healing, nothing pacific; but a vast exaggeration, as I think I have proved it to be, of our present evils, and not one merely, but exaggeration upon exaggeration, and threat upon threat, that, if the Church does not adopt the course they prescribe for her, she will forfeit her divine privileges, and be cut off from the Body of Christ. How has it come to pass that they, who but a short time since were dutiful and loving children of our dear Mother, can use such words concerning her? Duty and Love would shrink from the very thought, would cast it from them as though it were a scorpion. Have they no faith in Christ's watchful care for His beloved Church in this land? for her to whom He has shewn so much love; whom He has so richly endowed; to whom He has given, and is still giving such a glorious mission; a mission in our days more glorious than ever before. Think too, my Friend, what is the time at which these words are thrown about. Will a rational man toss a firebrand into a powder-mill? All manner of loose,

vagrant, uncontrolled desires, and wild dreams, and visionary fancies, discontent with the present, and blind longings for the restoration of some imaginary past, are fermenting in the religious mind of Young England. There are divers elements of fine promise in it, if they can be brought into order,—if men will be content to do their duty in that state of life to which it has pleased God to call them. But that is the very thing they will not do. They will not put on the harness of ancient, establishd ordinances: they choose to frisk about, and to fashion a new sort of harness for themselves. And at such a time as this, when every man is desiring to build a Babel of his own,—at such a time as this, when every one deems that he is called to remould the Church according to his own fancies,—at such a time as this we find grave Doctors and Dignitaries of the Church telling their followers and disciples that the Church of England is on the very brink of forfeiting her Christian character and privileges. How will this be understood? Will it not be regarded by many, —who knows how many?—as a call to quit the foundering ship, and to take refuge,—where? . . . in the lap of Delilah . . . amid the impostures of Rome. There are they to seek for Christian liberty, for purity of faith, for fulness of unalloyed truth.

I said at the beginning that, if I found much to blame in the manifesto, it would probably be attributable in great measure to its having a multitude of authors. In confirmation of this, let me remark that *the Guardian* of the 20th of this month contains two letters, which, if the initials subjoined to them do not deceive me, are by two of your co-protesters: and the tone and spirit of those letters are very different from the manifesto, and far better, more in accordance with

what one might expect from the persons whom I conceive to be the writers.

I have not toucht yet on your last two Resolutions, which suggest the measures to be taken for the deliverance of our Church from the evils complained of and threatened. You recommend "that all measures consistent with the present legal position of the Church should be taken without delay to obtain an authoritative declaration by the Church of the doctrine of Holy Baptism impugned by the recent sentence; as, for instance, by praying license for the Church in Convocation to declare that doctrine, or by obtaining an Act of Parliament to give legal effect to the decisions of the collective Episcopate on this and all other matters purely spiritual;" or else, "that, failing such measures, all efforts must be made to obtain from the said Episcopate, acting only in its spiritual character, a re-affirmation of the doctrine of Holy Baptism impugned by the said sentence."

These Resolutions happily will not require many words from me here. As practical measures, they may be discust hereafter, when the course of events brings them before us. With regard to the desirableness of an Ecclesiastical Synod, you are well aware that on the general principle I cordially concur with you; and it was a great pleasure to me to find a layman speaking with such warm interest on the subject, as you have evinced in your Letter to the Archbishop of Canterbury. In that letter you have referred to my argument to the same effect in a long Note on my Charge for 1842, *The Means of Unity*. The opinions there express, I still adhere to. If I hesitate in some measure about the expediency of convening a Synod or Convocation at the present moment, my doubts have been caused

by the violence of the controversies which have been carried on since that Note was written, by the painful agitation on the appointment of Dr Hampden to the Sec of Hereford; by the blind prejudices and the intemperance displayed so wofully at the last two Anniversary Meetings of the National Society, and at the recent Meeting in Willis Rooms: and now this manifesto is come to shew that the very persons to whom I should have lookt, in the hope that they would calm the temper of our discussions, and think it their special duty *motos componere fluctus*, are taking the lead in spreading exaggerated statements of the grievances which we desire to have redrest. In such a condition of things the path of Wisdom becomes obscure, if we search for the signs of present expediency: but I believe that, in this as in other matters, it will brighten before us, if we can bring ourselves to look forward with faith and hope. Therefore, although our perils would be greatly augmented by our having to enter upon such a work, as discussing and legislating for the affairs of the Church, at a moment when men's minds are in this state of hostile irritation, I would fain trust that what would be right at ordinary times, may likewise be so now, and that, if we act upon this general principle, God will direct the issue to the good of His Church.

But as to the more precise definition of doctrine, which is sought, I would hope that, if any measure be adopted, by whatsoever authority, to render the declaration of the universality of Baptismal Regeneration more explicit and more stringent, care will also be taken to clear up the ambiguous meaning of the word *Regeneration*, and to declare that, in its ecclesiastical sense, it is no way to be understood as identical with, or interfering with, or precluding the necessity of Conversion ;

which requires a conscious, responsible subject, and is necessary, through the frailty of our nature, in all at a later period of life. The popular confusion of these two distinct acts, which are almost equally indispensable for all such as attain to years of personal responsibility, is the main ground of the ever-renewed disputes concerning Baptismal Regeneration: and a brief authoritative exposition on this point, if we have the wisdom to draw up one, would be of inestimable value to the Church. Without this, the increast stringency in our assertion of it would be incalculably disastrous.

The two ulterior schemes do not seem to need any observations at present. My desire and aim in writing this letter have been to clear up those mistaken notions concerning the nature and effects of the recent Judgment, which seem to me to have dictated your manifesto, and which are so lamentably prevalent. When we see the present rightly and clearly, we shall be better able to provide for the future.

This is the week of our blessed Lord's Passion: this is the day on which He offered up His divine Prayer for the Unity of His Church. O when will that Prayer be fulfilled? Eighteen centuries have rolled away; and still its fulfilment tarries in the distance. No sign of its coming brightens any quarter of the horizon. The world seems to be learning the blessing of peace. The votaries of Mammon are learning it. But the redeemed servants of Christ, the soldiers of Christ, the ministers of Christ,—when will they learn it? Shall they alone obstinately cast it from them? Shall they alone continue to believe that the warfare, to which we are pledged, is, not against sin and Satan, but against each other? Selfishness has still far too great dominion over us; and Selfishness, which may gain some degree of

light in the world, is ever stone-blind in the Kingdom of Christ. We pursue selfish aims, selfish wills, selfish notions: we seek each our own things, not the things of others. We would impose our own notions by force, without trying to win our brethren to them, or recognising the truth which is in theirs. But force cannot convince them: ecclesiastical penalties, deprivation, excommunication, carry no conviction: nor do they even indicate any real, living conviction in those who make use of such arguments. The arguments whereby we produce conviction are the weapons of Reason wielded by the hand of Love. May we ever be enabled to use such, my dear Friend! and may it be our desire to obtain the blessing promised to those who seek peace and ensue it!

Your sincerely affectionate Friend,

J. C. HARE.

Herstmonceux,

Maundy Thursday, 1850.

So much has been said about heresy on this occasion, and the charge of heresy has been tost about so unscrupulously, as though the guilt of it were incurred by a mere error of the understanding, that I will subjoin an excellent passage concerning it, from the second section of Jeremy Taylor's *Liberty of Prophesying*, which may give a clearer insight into its meaning. "The word heresy is used in Scripture indifferently; in a good sense for a sect or division of opinion, and men following it; or sometimes in a bad sense, for a false opinion, signally condemned: but these kind of people were then called Antichrists and false prophets, more frequently than heretics; and then there were many of them in the world. But it is observable that no heresies are noted

signanter in Scripture, but such as are great errors practical, *in materiâ pietatis*, such whose doctrines taught impiety, or such who denied the coming of Christ, directly, or by consequence not remote or withdrawn, but prime and immediate; and therefore in the code *de Sancta Trinitate et Fide Catholica*, heresy is called *ἀσεβῆς δόξα, καὶ ἀθέμιτος διδασκαλία*, a wicked opinion, and an ungodly doctrine.—But in all the animadversions against errors made by the Apostles in the New Testament, no pious person was condemned; no man that did invincibly err, or *bona mente*; but something that was amiss in *genere morum*, was that which the Apostles did redargue. And it is very considerable, that even they of the Circumcision,—who in so great numbers did heartily believe in Christ, and yet most violently retained circumcision, and, without question, went to heaven in great numbers—yet, of the number of these very men, they came deeply under censure, when to their error they added impiety. So long as it stood with charity, and without human ends and secular interests, so long it was either innocent or connived at: but when they grew covetous, and for filthy lucre's sake taught the same doctrine, which others did in the simplicity of their hearts, then they turned heretics; then they were termed seducers; and Titus was commanded to look to them and to silence them.—These indeed were not to be endured, but to be silenced by the conviction of sound doctrine, and to be rebuked sharply and avoided. For heresy is not an error of the understanding, but an error of the will. And this is clearly insinuated in the Scripture, in the style whereof faith and a good life are made one duty, and vice is called opposite to faith, and heresy opposed to holiness and sanctity. So in St Paul: *For, saith he, the end of the commandment is charity*

out of a pure heart, and a good conscience, and faith unfeigned; from which charity and purity and goodness and sincerity because some have wandered,—*deflexerunt ad vaniloquium*. And immediately after he reckons the oppositions to faith and sound doctrine, and instances only in vices that stain the lives of Christians, *the unjust, the unclean, the uncharitable, the liar, the perjured person,—et si quis alius qui sanæ doctrinæ adversatur*; these are the enemies of the true doctrine. And therefore St Peter, having given in charge, *add to our virtue patience, temperance, charity, and the like*, gives this for a reason,—*for, if these things be in you and abound, ye shall be fruitful in the knowledge of our Lord Jesus Christ*. So that knowledge and faith is *inter præcepta morum*, is part of a good life. And St Paul calls faith, or the form of sound words, *κατ' εὐσεβείαν διδασκαλίαν*, *the doctrine that is according to godliness*. And *veritati credere*, and *in injustitia sibi complacere*, are by the same apostle opposed, and intimate that piety and faith is all one thing. Faith must be *ὑγιῆς καὶ ἄμωμος*, entire and holy too; or it is not right. It was the heresy of the Gnostics, that it was no matter how men lived, so they did but believe aright; which wicked doctrine Tatianus, a learned Christian, did so detest, that he fell into a quite contrary: *Non est curandum quod quisque credat; id tantum curandum est, quod quisque faciat*; and thence came the sect Encratites. Both these heresies sprang from the too nice distinguishing the faith from the piety and good life of a Christian: they are both but one duty. However they may be distinguished, if we speak like philosophers, they cannot be distinguished, when we speak like Christians. For to believe what God hath commanded, is in order to a good life; and to live well is the product of that

believing, and as proper emanation from it, as from its proper principle, and as heat is from the fire. And therefore in Scripture they are used promiscuously in sense and in expression, as not only being subjected in the same person but also in the same faculty. Faith is as truly seated in the will, as in the understanding; and a good life as merely derives from the understanding as from the will. Both of them are matters of choice and of election, neither of them an effect natural and invincible, or necessary antecedently; *necessaria ut fiant, non necessario facta*. And indeed, if we remember that St Paul reckons heresy amongst the works of the flesh, and ranks it with all manner of practical impieties, we shall easily perceive, that, if a man mingles not a vice with his opinion, if he be innocent in his life, though deceived in his doctrine,—his error is his misery, not his crime. It makes him an argument of weakness, and an object of pity, but not a person sealed up to ruin and reprobation.”

While these pages have been passing through the Press, I have seen the Bishop of London's Answer to the Address of the Scotch Bishops, in which he states that he does not believe that Mr Gorham's opinion “is held by more than a very small number indeed of our Clergy.” This statement being entirely at variance with that on which I have laid great stress, and have rested a main part of my argument, I will take leave respectfully to remark that a person whose position on the same level with his brother Clergy leads him to a more familiar intercourse with them, and in conversing with whom they are under no constraint, will probably have better means for estimating their real opinions, than

can be attainable by a Bishop, especially in such a Diocese as that of London. I grant that the number may not be very large, who adopt the exact scheme of Mr Gorham's opinions in their entirety,—that is to say, according to the Bishop of London, “hold that the remission of original sin, adoption into the family of God, and regeneration must all take place, not in baptism, nor by means of baptism, but before baptism.” So far however as I can form a judgement from the Clergy in my own Archdeaconry, what is termed the hypothetical view of Baptismal Regeneration is still very common among the so-called Evangelical Clergy: nor do I know of any reason for supposing that the proportion in this Archdeaconry differs materially from the average in the rest of England. Now these persons all conceive that their own case is involved in Mr Gorham's, that the point at issue was, whether the Church insists that all her ministers should hold the doctrine of absolute, unconditional regeneration in the very act and moment of Baptism, or whether she will admit of any divergence from this dogma. No mere authoritative edict or decree will make them relinquish their opinions: shame and spiritual impotence would be their portion if they did. But, as friendly discussion and loving persuasion have already induced a large part of this body to entertain correcter notions on questions of ecclesiastical discipline than they did fifty years ago, so would it be with regard to the sacraments: so indeed would it have been ere now, unless the revival of the opposite error had repelled them. Whether it would have been possible so to limit and define Mr Gorham's opinions in the Judgement, as to insulate him altogether, and make the weight of the sentence fall on the peculiarities of his own doctrinal idiosyncrasy, I cannot

pronounce. If definite issues had been joined, this would have been easier. But it certainly seems to me that, when we consider the manner in which Mr Gorham's answers were extorted from him, the course adopted by the Court, of taking the most favorable and consistent view of his doctrines, was the most honest and straightforward, as well as the most consonant with the principles and practice of our Law-courts; which, I trust, will never make a scapegoat of any man, to appease the rancour of any individual, or of any party. Mr Gorham felt he was contending for an important principle: he did so contend bravely: the Court too seems to have felt this: and though our Judges are perpetually acquitting persons on minor points of law and evidence, they do not, nor, so long as God preserves the heart of England in its soundness, will they condemn any one, except upon broad grounds of law, and compulsory evidence of facts.

J. C. H.

Easter Tuesday, 1850.

POSTSCRIPT TO THE SECOND EDITION.

HAVING to publish a new edition of this Letter, I feel bound to correct an inaccuracy in p. 9, where I argued that there cannot be any manifest, essential repugnance in Mr Gorham's doctrine to that Article in the Creed, which confesses the faith in One Baptism for the Remission of Sins, because, among other reasons, "so far as I could recollect, it was not even pleaded by the Counsel against him, able and subtile and elaborate as their arguments were." I could not at the time examine the various speeches made before the two Courts, that of Arches, and that of the Privy Council, and so was forced to trust, as I intimated, to my memory; which I did with less reluctance as this point was of slight importance, the main ground of my argument being, that, whether this topic was urged or no, it was not noticed either by the Court which decided in favour of Mr Gorham, or by that which decided against him. Whether the objection was omitted by the Counsel, or discarded by the Court as irrelevant, seemed immaterial. Still, as the opportunity is afforded me, it behoves me to state that this point was taken by Mr Badeley. In the Report of the Case published by Painter, Mr Badeley is represented as winding up his speech by saying that "the most serious consideration respecting Mr Gorham's doctrine was, that—he was contradicting not merely the Articles of the Church, but the doctrine of the Nicene Creed, which said that there was one Baptism for the Remission of

Sins." From this statement, even if I had recollected it, I should hardly have inferred more than that this argument was brought in by the learned Counsel as a sort of rhetorical climax, but without a notion of its having any real logical force. In the Report which he himself has since published of his speech, we see that it was urged with a good deal of oratorical emphasis, as it naturally would be by a zealous advocate; but the logical connexion is much too loose, to make it a ground for a legal conclusion.

From a subsequent incident in the case, it would appear that the Court, though they do not touch on this argument in their Judgement, yet did not pass it over without attention, but discerned its inapplicability on the very same grounds which I have suggested in p. 8. For, in the course of Mr Turner's Reply, Lord Langdale asked, "whether an adult unworthily receiving Baptism, but afterward having faith and repentance, then became regenerate by means of the Baptism previously administered." And on Mr Turner's answering in the affirmative, he continued, "Then, as to an infant, Baptism being received, grace is administered at the same time; because, if he died without committing actual sin, he must be saved. How far that grace extends, you do not venture to declare; but you say it extends to the remission of sin, because an infant being saved has his original sin remitted; and if faith and repentance come afterward, when he has committed actual sin, even then the Baptism that takes place before, is effectual to regeneration." These words may not be reported with strict accuracy, or, being spoken off-hand on an unfamiliar subject, may have been somewhat incorrectly expressed: they shew however that the Judges did not overlook the argument which Mr Badeley had urged, that they considered it,

and found that, whatever it might be theologically, legally it had no force.

At all events, until Mr Badeley arrived at his eloquent peroration, nobody in either Court seems to have discovered that Mr Gorham had been guilty of contravening an Article of the Nicene Creed. Dr Addams had made three long speeches against him, and had never found it out. Dr Robinson, who supported Dr Addams before the Court of Arches, had been equally blind. Sir Herbert Jenner Fust, who had taken more than four months to draw up his very careful and elaborate Judgement, had no inkling of an argument, which, if it had any force, would have enabled him to settle the whole question at once, and which is conceived to do so by such as have never spent five minutes thought upon it. Nay, one may reasonably presume that even to the Bishop of Exeter himself it had never occurred; unless indeed we suppose that in tenderness to Mr Gorham he suppressed what would have constituted the chief gravamen of his heresy, and refrained from pointing it out to his Counsel. For the allegations against Mr Gorham before the Court of Arches on behalf of the Bishop are, that his doctrine is “contrary to the plain teaching of the Church of England in her Articles and Liturgy, and especially contrary to the divers offices of Baptism, the Office of Confirmation, and the Catechism.” No hint is given of its being contrary to the Nicene Creed; though lawyers were never before known to err on the side of too little. Moreover in the whole course of the Examination of Mr Gorham, though it extended, with intervals, from the 17th of December, 1847, to the 10th of March, 1848,—and though Mr Gorham was prest with 149 questions, bearing on the single doctrine of Baptismal Regeneration, and with all manner of authorities, drawn, not merely

from our Articles and Liturgy, but from the Homilies, from *the Institution of a Christian Man*, from the Report of the Savoy Conference,—the Bishop never intimates to him that he was impugning an Article of the Creed. He does indeed bring this forward as his foremost accusation against Mr Gorham in his Letter to the Archbishop of Canterbury (p. 48), and tries to implicate the Archbishop (p. 27), and the Judges (p. 52), in this heresy: he even asserts (p. 52), that one of “the heresies, which came out in his examination of Mr Gorham, and for which he refused him institution,” was, “that, by declaring original sin to be a hindrance to the benefit of Baptism, he denied the Article of the Creed, *One Baptism for the Remission of Sins.*” This however, we may presume, must be a lapse of memory. Else he would surely have pointed out this contradiction to Mr Gorham in some one of his 149 Questions, and would hardly have allowed it to pass entirely unnoticed in the proceedings before the Court of Arches, a twelvemonth after, and again, nine months later, before the Court of Appeal, until, in the eleventh hour, or rather at the close of the twelfth, it was brought in to give effect to Mr Badeley’s peroration. Yet this so-called heresy, which Dr Addams and Dr Robinson, which Sir Herbert Jenner Fust and the Bishop of Exeter himself, though they spent months in poring over the case, were unable to detect, is brought forward in the manifesto which I have had to examine, as so flagrant, that it bodes the destruction of our Church, and has since been spreading from Diocese to Diocese, kindling a general conflagration.

That Dr Pusey, in his *Letter on the Royal Supremacy* (pp. 172—192), should lay great stress on this contradiction, is not surprising, when we call to mind what importance he has long attached to his peculiar views on

Baptism. But at all events the facts just stated must be regarded as fully exculpating the Judges for not paying more attention to an argument, which neither the Bishop nor his Counsel had thought of, till Mr Badeley's ingenuity discovered it to adorn the conclusion of his speech. Indeed Dr Pusey himself, while he asserts that, "in purchasing tranquil times, as they deemed, the price which they paid away was an Article of the Creed," admits that "they did not, could not know it." As it had been overlookt by so many sharp-eyed persons, who had been trying to spy out all the evil they could in Mr Gorham during two years, no wonder that the Judges, whose business was of a very different kind, did not detect it. In fact, as I have observed, they were clearsighted enough to discern that, as a legal argument, it was worthless. Had they acted otherwise, their conduct would have been repugnant to the first principles of our administration of justice. As the Article in the Creed does not define the mode in which the Remission of Sins is connected with Baptism, the Judges were not warranted in defining it, except so far as they found it defined in the symbolical books of our Church. Dr Pusey indeed asks in his Postscript (p. 230), where he is replying to my Letter, "Have the Creeds one definite ascertainable meaning, *the* meaning in which the Church originally framed them? or may they be construed variously, without limitation, according to the bias of each mind which accepts them, provided his meaning, in his own judgement, come within the words?" and he adds, "surely, wherein the Church meant them to have a definite meaning, that is their meaning, to all who belong to the Church." Hereto it is enough to rejoin by asking, How are we to know the meaning of the Church, except from her words? She did not utter them hastily: she

pondered them maturely: she defined what she thought needed to be defined. In the two primary Creeds more especially, in which each Article is capable of such vast expansion, it would be especially dangerous to include the consequences of an Article within it. We must confine ourselves, when we are enforcing the Articles legally, to their strict, literal sense, along with those inferences which the Church has thought fit to deduce from them. In a theological argument divers other considerations would rightly find place, but not in a legal one, except so far as may be necessary for the right understanding of the words. In the Note to my Charge I have referred to the remarkable instance of this judicial strictness afforded by the recent Judgement on the Factory Question, when the Judge felt himself bound by the words of the Act to decide in opposition to the notorious purpose of the Legislature. Yet I am not aware that anybody has impugned the rectitude of his decision: assuredly no one has insinuated that he had been bribed by the master manufacturers. This extreme literal strictness, which we rightly deem indispensable in the whole administration of our law, so that no one is condemned, for whom the law leaves an escape open, is no less necessary in prosecutions for heresy, which otherwise would be altogether vague and indefinite. With regard to Dr Pusey's other observations on what I have said upon this subject, I do not see that they require any further remark from me than an expression of thanks for their mild and courteous tone. I should merely have to repeat what I have said in my Letter, and to urge again that the Articles of the Creed are of no private interpretation, least of all when they are treated legally, and made the grounds of legal proceedings. A due attention to the difference between the legal and the theological view

of doctrines will remove all his objections to what I have said on this score, as it would a number of the objections against the recent Judgement, which are running from mouth to mouth through the land. What the Judges had to decide, was not what is the doctrine of the majority of the Church, nor even what is the doctrine to be collected generally from her Symbolical Books, but merely whether a certain scheme of opinions was so repugnant to her assertions of that doctrine as to be absolutely prohibited and excluded from her ministerial communion. Had this been duly attended to, our Church would not be in its present state of irritation and confusion.

One might have supposed that this hasty flaring up and blazing at the touch of a spark was inconsistent with the practical habits of the English mind. But alas! we have seen too often of late years, that, in matters in which religion is supposed to be concerned, the English have abandoned that fairness and deliberateness which used to be their special characteristics, and are as apt, as the most fanatical nation, to take up a violent prejudice without enquiring whether there are reasonable grounds for it, and almost to run mad, as Coleridge says of the bulls in Borrowdale, at the echoes of their own noise. Among the latest instances of this are the outcry excited through the land by Dr Hampden's appointment, propagated as it was by thousands who never thought of asking what evil he had done; and still more recently the pertinacious clamour against the Educational Committee of the Privy Council, on account of a matter so petty and insignificant, that one must needs think the bulk of the clamourers have no notion what it really is, and merely clamour because their neighbours do. Another instance, the futility of

which has just been exposed in the most satisfactory manner, is the agitation which was excited at the beginning of last winter against the Post-office ; when charges of wilful desecration of the Lord's day were brought, without the slightest evidence, and in defiance of authoritative testimony, at a number of public meetings, against a man who has earned a high place among the practical benefactors of his countrymen, and to whom every letter-writer and reader has continual causes for thankfulness. It now appears that this wily sabbath-breaker was quietly devising a series of measures, by which near six thousand persons have been relieved from a large part of their Sunday-work, at an average of more than five hours each. Yet I fear that few of the clamourers against him feel shame or repentance for their groundless calumnies. The most part probably plume themselves on their godly zeal, and will be as eager as ever to catch up the next calumny, and to join in the next agitation, that comes across their path.

I have referred to these painful events, because a person, unacquainted with the inflammable temper of the English religious mind, might deem himself warranted in inferring that, when such a ferment is spreading through the length and breadth of the land, with the clergy, who ought to be the inculcators of temperance and sobermindedness and order and peace, taking the lead, there must needs be some valid, substantial ground for it. Whereas the instances cited prove that it may exist, with very little, if any, rational cause, and that, of all objects of fear, an imaginary one is the most terrific. Cases have indeed occurred, in which the attempt to undeceive a person under a strong delusion, has only strengthened it, and brought on a fatal crisis: still, though in dealing with individuals one may humour the

peculiarities of the patient, when one is writing for the Church, the only method is to declare the truth simply and nakedly. In the present instance, if one can but prevail on people to look at the real facts calmly and steadily, they will find that the passionate fear by which they have been borne along, has made them magnify and distort the object whereby it has been excited, so that a mere declaration of the law on a particular case is converted into a formidable, wilful assault on the primary doctrines of the Church.

Among the mischievous features belonging to these agitations, is the proneness to speak evil of dignities, and of all whom we regard as agents in the matters whereby we are provoked. Thus the excellent reformer of the Post-Office became the object of much abuse. Thus too the controversy with the Educational Committee of Council has been aggravated and inflamed by painful personalities. They whom we assume to be our enemies, are straightway regarded as the enemies of religion, or at least of the Church : and a like systematic enmity is perpetually imputed to the Government ; although they have not shewn any indications of it, but have rather manifested a desire to conciliate the Church, and to help and strengthen her, as far as she will allow them. In the present case this spirit is venting itself in the most unwarrantable condemnation of the Judges, who have pronounced sentence in favour of Mr Gorham. It matters not that the five Judges who concurred in the sentence, are men of admirable legal ability, and exemplary in their judicial character, men on whose integrity one would contentedly stake one's fortune, or one's life : it matters not that they are supported by the two Primates of our Church : they are assailed with all manner of abuse ; and the host of their

assailants is headed by a Bishop, who with characteristic propriety aims his fiercest blows at the Archbishop of his Province. So obstinate is our belief in our own infallibility, that we will rather charge these seven men of unblemished, unimpeachable character with giving unrighteous judgement, than suspect the possibility of our being mistaken. They pondered the matter anxiously for months: their condemners, most of them, have scarcely spent ten minutes in weighing and balancing the arguments which make for the opposite sides: nay, many are thoroughly persuaded that there is no argument to be alledged against them: therefore, seeing that we are quite right, they must be utterly wrong; and, if their error did not arise from want of understanding, which can hardly be imputed to men of such sagacity,—why, then it must have sprung from dishonesty. It goes for nothing, that hundreds of pious, conscientious, godly men, in generation after generation, have deemed that they could honestly interpret our Formularies in the sense which the Judges assign to them; though a modest man would surely regard this as a proof that there must be some speciousness in such an interpretation. No: all those men were utterly wrong; and the Judges too were utterly wrong; and everybody is utterly wrong, who dares to differ from us.

Yet, for my own part, at the time when the proceedings were going on, I was strongly impressed, even by the report in the newspaper, with the pains which the Judges took to gain a right apprehension of the arguments submitted to them: and one of my brother Archdeacons has written to me: “I was present during the whole hearing of the case; and it was impossible not to feel the highest admiration of the patience, earnestness, and strict equity, with which the Judges received every part of the

pleadings, as men pervaded with the one all-ruling desire of judging righteously on the matter before them." Mr Dodsworth too, though he expresses very strong disapprobation of the Judgement, says in his Pamphlet on the Gorham case: "Having been present during almost the whole of the argument,—I hope I may be permitted to bear my humble testimony to the unwearied patience, care, and application, with which those high functionaries fulfilled a difficult, and in some respects, as it must have been to them, a very irksome duty. Any one present—must have felt that nothing was wanting in this respect. Most unwearied pains appeared to be taken by all the Judges without exception to arrive at the meaning of terms and statements of doctrine, with which they were obviously not familiar."

I have cited these witnesses, not merely to vindicate those whose conduct has been so violently attacked, but also because hardly anything is so irritating as the notion that we are suffering a wrong. When we are convinced that a judgement is just, even though it be solely according to the letter of the law, we submit to it. In ordinary cases,—such is the well-merited, loyal confidence of Englishmen in the Judges of the land,—the voice of Law at once puts an end to strife. Or, if it be deemed requisite to procure a more distinct enunciation, or an alteration of the law, this is sought by constitutional methods, without any reproach to the Judges. Their discretion in *nisi prius* cases may of course be often questioned: but, when they pronounce collectively on an appeal, their interpretation of the law, according to its actual state, is acknowledged to be right. Why should we act otherwise now? Because Religion is concerned. But surely Religion herself inculcates obedience to the laws, reverence for all lawful authorities. Have those who

have been laying such stress on the exposition of Baptism in the Catechism, forgotten that the same Catechism gives a clear and simple account of our duty toward our neighbour, and that one main branch of it is, to honour and obey the Queen, and all who are put in authority under her? Or has the Catechism no claim to our deference and obedience, save when it treats of inscrutable mysteries, with regard to which it must needs be very difficult to attain to any absolute precision of language or thought? May we despise it, as though it were an old woman's rigmarole, when it speaks of plain practical duties, which all can understand, and all are called to fulfill?

I am not wishing to recommend servile submission in a case where truth is at stake. I am not claiming infallibility for our Judges, any more than for any other body of men. All may err; all have erred often; and the age of error will not soon pass away. But if any mischief has been done to the Church by the recent Judgement, only let us cherish the conviction that it has not been done intentionally, wilfully, maliciously,—that they who gave the Judgement gave it under a conscientious purpose to judge according to right, according to the recognised principles and practice of our Law-courts, with no further bias than is always found in them, inclining them to protect the accused from any heavier penalties than the strict letter of the law imposes: let us be thoroughly persuaded of this, and at the same time dismiss all other bugbears of State-interference, and hostile governments, and secular tyranny; and not only will the peace of the Church return; but we shall have made considerable progress toward the attainment of a remedy.

When such counsels are given, one is sure to be told

that we are to obey God, rather than man; and a polemical zealot will cry out, that, as the Wisdom from above is declared to be *first pure*, and *then peaceable*, it is clear that we are not to cultivate peace, until we have obtained a recognition of the truth in its dogmatical purity and entireness. A more complete perversion of a divine text than this latter can hardly be found. *Purity*, in the verse of St James, like all the other characteristics there predicated of heavenly Wisdom, is evidently a moral quality, even as *peaceableness* is, and *gentleness*, and *mercy*, and *impartiality*. It does not require the cultivation of the intellect, but may be found in the babes, to whom the Gospel is revealed. According to the above-mentioned interpretation, this blessed verse would become the motto and watchword of the Inquisition, of all such as are set on extirpating whatever is opposed to their notions of dogmatical purity, and then, *ubi solitudinem faciunt, pacem appellant*. As to the declaration of the Apostles, that their obedience to God was of higher obligation than that to any human authority, there never was a case to which it was less applicable than to the present. For the human command, which they deemed themselves bound to disregard, was the prohibition to preach God's truth and salvation, as made manifest in His Son Jesus Christ. But the decision of the Court of Appeal no way trenches on the right of every minister of our Church to preach the doctrine of Baptismal Regeneration. It allows him the fullest liberty of doing so; and it admits by implication that his doctrine is that of our Church.

Had the sentence been the other way, then indeed the case would have been different. At present no one is prohibited from preaching what he believes to be the truth. We are merely precluded from expelling those

among our brethren who do not agree with us. We are precluded from using any other weapons against them than those of calm, reasonable persuasion. Surely we ought to give thanks that we are thus preserved from a temptation, which the contentiousness incident to theological controversies would have found it difficult to resist. We ought to give thanks, both in our own behalf and in behalf of our Bishops, that they are preserved from the temptation to erect an Inquisition in every Diocese. But, if the decision of the Court of Arches had been confirmed, then it would indeed have behoved that large body of our Clergy who participate more or less in Mr Gorham's opinions, to bear in mind that they were bound to obey God rather than man. Nor would they have been allowed to forget this. The spirit which has been manifested by many of their opponents on this occasion,—a sad counterpart of that which from the opposite side has for years been urging our Romanizing brethren to quit the Church of their Baptism,—proves that there would have been no lack of persons to remind them of this duty, nor even of those who, if hints were neglected, would gladly have called in the aid of the law. We may indeed feel assured that no other of our present Bishops would have followed the disastrous example set them in the Diocese of Exeter,—that most of them would rather have cast their mitres on the ground, than been the authors of such a terrible calamity to the Church. But still, while men's passions are blind, and their will obstinate, while Faith and Love have no place in so many hearts, the desire to tyrannize, the appetite for persecution, if they had found the means of gratification, would have made use of them, even in these days. An imperious Dogmatism would have lorded it over our Church. Faith and Godliness would have waxt

cold,—as is ever the case, by a judicial retribution, in a persecuting Church,—or would have fled away into the arms of Dissent.

That the view which I have taken in my Letter as to the bearings of the Judgement on the doctrine of our Church is correct, I cannot doubt. They who have been greatly disturbed by it, they who have been put into a fever of disappointment or anger, look upon it, as might be expected, in a different light; for it is the property of such feelings to exaggerate and distort their objects. Thus they charge it with impugning an Article of the Creed, although that Article was not set before the Court in the pleadings, nor even suggested until the closing paragraphs of the last Advocate's speech, and although it would have been utterly inconsistent with the principles and practice of our law to found a condemnation of Mr Gorham on the words of that Article. But this shifting of the ground of the case renders it better fitted to furnish matter for a popular outcry. *The Judges have been impugning an Article of the Creed! Therefore it behoves every sound Churchman to defend the Church from the effects of this wicked, heretical sentence.* These words are easily uttered, readily caught up: and who, when he feels his churchmanship boiling over with righteous indignation, will think of asking whether such is indeed the fact? The very doubt would betoken that there is a pernicious spirit of scepticism and infidelity lurking in his breast.

In like manner it is said with clamorous repetition that the Court of Appeal has been presuming to determine the doctrine of the Church. The Court itself indeed asserts the very contrary. It states, "The question which we have to decide is, not whether Mr Gorham's opinions are theologically sound or unsound,—not whether

upon some of the doctrines comprised in the opinions, other opinions opposite to them may or may not be held with equal, or even greater reason, by other learned and pious ministers of the Church; but whether these opinions now under consideration are contrary or repugnant to the doctrines which the Church of England, by its Articles, Formularies, and Rubrics, requires to be held by its ministers; so that upon the ground of those opinions the Appellant can lawfully be excluded from the benefice to which he has been presented." Again they say, "It must be carefully borne in mind that the question, and the only question, for us to decide is, whether Mr Gorham's doctrine is contrary or repugnant to the doctrine of the Church of England as by law establisht.—If the doctrine of Mr Gorham is not contrary or repugnant to the doctrine of the Church of England as by law establisht, it cannot afford a legal ground for refusing him institution to the living to which he has been lawfully presented." The Judges seem to be thoroughly aware of their true position, and of the duties belonging to it. They urge reiteratedly that their business is not to determine doctrine, but to administer law; that they are to decide, not according to the doctrines of the Church generally, but according to those of the Church of England *as by law establisht*,—that the question before them is to ascertain whether there are *legal* grounds for refusing institution to a living, to which there has been a *lawful* presentation. One might have supposed that the lawyers who are placed on the judicial Bench, would probably have known something about their own craft. But no: it is the well-known practice in our Courts of Law, that the most ignorant lawyers are always placed on the Bench: and those who had to give judgement in this cause are notoriously the most ignorant

in the whole body of ignoramuses: and besides their personal character is such that no one of them was ever known to refuse the paltriest bribe; and they wanted to curry favour with the Government, and with the religious newspapers, and with the Primate: and each of them had secretly formed a plot to get the reversion of the Registrarship for the Province of Canterbury, with its uncurtailed twelve thousand a year, for his son, or for his niece's husband, or for his housemaid's brother therefore, seeing that all these hindrances, intellectual and moral, incapacitated them for forming a right Judgement, we need not care what they say, and may interpret their words by contraries whenever it suits our purpose. When they say that they have no authority to determine doctrine, the real meaning of their words is, that they are just going to determine doctrine. When they talk about that which is legal and lawful, they are thinking all the while of doing that which is illegal and unlawful.

Yet Sir Herbert Jenner Fust, in laying down the rules for his own procedure, used nearly the same terms. "Now I would here state,—and I am particularly anxious to have it understood,—that I guard myself against being supposed to offer any opinion as to the disputed point of *Theology* between the parties. I am not going to pronounce an opinion as to whether unconditional Regeneration in the case of Infants is or is not a doctrine deducible from the Scriptures. It is no part of the duty of the Court, nor is it within its province, to institute any such enquiry as that. All that the Court is called upon to do,—and all that it can properly do, as coming within the limits of its authority,—is to endeavour to ascertain whether the Church has determined anything upon this subject; and, having so ascertained, to

pronounce accordingly. *The authoritative declaration of the Church* constitutes the law of this Court, to which it is bound to conform, and which it is incumbent upon it implicitly to follow; without indulging any speculative opinion of its own as to whether that declaration is founded in error or in truth. The Court is to administer that law as it finds it laid down, and is not to give any opinion as to what the law ought to be. Therefore I desire to be distinctly understood, in the observations I am about to make, as confining my attention and directing my observations to the doctrine of the Church solely, so far as I am able to ascertain it; without any allusion to those passages of Holy Writ which are, or are supposed to be, applicable to the effects of Baptism on those to whom it is administered." Surely the distinction here laid down is perfectly clear and intelligible. Moreover Sir Herbert Jenner Fust's Judgement has been the object of high praise from the very persons who are the most vehement in condemning that of the Court of Appeal: nor have I heard of their raising any exception against it, on the score of its taking upon itself to determine doctrine. Such a strange difference does it make in the aspect of things, whether we look at them with favorable or unfavorable eyes. In the one case wrong becomes right; in the other right becomes wrong.

This view of the Judgement, resting, as it does, on the declarations of both the Courts, has been confirmed by everything I have heard or read or thought on the subject since: and it seems to me established irrefragably by what Lord Campbell says in his excellent letter to Miss Sellon: "I assure you that we have given no opinion contrary to yours on the doctrine of Baptismal Regeneration. We had no jurisdiction to decide any doctrinal question; and we studiously abstained from

doing so. We were only called upon to construe the Articles and Formularies of the Church, and to say whether they be so framed as to condemn certain opinions exprest by Mr Gorham." Surely the Chief Justice of England may be supposed to understand the nature and purport of the Judgement, which he himself has just been delivering,—at all events when his interpretation of it is confirmed by such men as the four Judges who concurred in it. The assailers of the Judgement may be much more learned men, much more clearheaded, much more intelligent and sagacious in all other matters; but on this one point at least the five Judges are likelier to be in the right. If this however be so, what plea is there for all this agitation and irritation. The Judgement does not sanction Mr Gorham's opinions. It does not declare them to be conformable to the general doctrine of our Church. All that it pronounces is, that the law of the Church, as collected from her symbolical books, does not so distinctly and peremptorily condemn that scheme of opinions, which it ascribes to Mr Gorham, as to exclude him from her ministry. This last consideration is of such importance, that I have laid great stress on it in my Letter. The qualified sanction implied in the Judgement does not extend to any opinions that Mr Gorham has exprest in the course of his Examination, except so far as they are comprised in the summary of them drawn up by the Court. If the cause had been conducted in a regular manner,—if definite issues had been joined, —if the particular passages in Mr Gorham's Book which the Bishop regarded as especially heretical, had been distinctly cited in the pleadings, and the judgement of the Court had been sought upon them,—it would have been recognised that the Judgement of the Court did not extend to any

passages beyond those thus set before them. In like manner,—though it may seem presumptuous for a clergyman to speak confidently on such a question,—I cannot believe,—and my conviction has been confirmed by high legal authority,—that the present Judgement embraces any other doctrines than those expressly stated therein. It would probably bar further proceedings against Mr Gorham on account of this same Book : but if he were to publish a volume tomorrow, reasserting all the opinions express in his Examination, I cannot doubt that he might be prosecuted for those opinions, except so far as they are specified in the present Judgement, and that it would be of no avail whatever to shield him from condemnation on account of them.

It has been argued indeed, that the distinction for which I have been contending, nay, for which both the Court of Appeal and the Court of Arches contend,—that they have not been determining the doctrine of the Church, but merely pronouncing a judicial sentence according to that doctrine as already determined by the Church,—is untenable. This proposition has been maintained at length and with much ingenuity by my dear Brother Archdeacon in his Speech at a Meeting of the Clergy held some six weeks ago at Chichester. Yet surely the distinction, as laid down in the two Judgements, especially in the earlier one, is very clear and intelligible. Surely there is a broad difference between the power which would belong to a legislative body, such as a Synod of the Church, and that which is committed to her Courts of Law. For instance, the former, while it felt itself bound by the principles of practical wisdom to pay great reverence to the existing laws and institutions, would nevertheless deem itself warranted and authorized, nay enjoined, should occasion arise for defining or

modifying any part of them, to seek counsel from the word of God, from history, from the decrees of Councils, and from the teaching of the greatest divines. On the other hand a Court of Law is obliged to regulate its decisions altogether by the existing Formularies of the Church. Even if the Judges individually should think the Formularies erroneous, they are compelled to pronounce sentence according to them. It is true, though the judicial province and the legislative are essentially distinct, there is a border-land between them, where they meet and run into each other; and this border-land may become injuriously extensive, when the body politic is not rightly developept, and the two powers do not exist in due co-ordination. But it is mostly a calamity, when the judicial power has to exercise the functions of the legislative; and still more certainly, when the legislative power usurps the functions of the judicial. A Synod properly constituted would be the fittest body to wield the legislative power: but the principles of justice would often be perverted and violated, if it were to assume the judicial.

Here I will take leave to explain a contradiction, which some persons, with no unfriendly purpose, have fancied they have perceived in my remarks on occasion of this unhappy controversy. I have exprest my conviction that our Church does assert the regeneration of every baptized infant, and my own belief that, under a right acceptation of the term, every baptized infant is indeed regenerate. I have further stated my persuasion that this is not a mere abstract proposition, but a truth of great practical moment for our Christian education and teaching. Nevertheless I have on the other hand exprest great satisfaction and thankfulness at the decision of the Court of Appeal in favour of

Mr Gorham. Now on this account, I would hope, no one will tax me with inconsistency. For surely the stronger our conviction of a truth is, the more shall we shrink from calling in a Court of Law to inculcate it. Even over the asses bridge one would not drive a man by Balaam's method: and he who tries to do so in the region of moral and spiritual truth, will find an angel with a drawn sword standing in the way.

But I have further said, in note K to my last Charge (p. 97), after making a like statement concerning the doctrine of our Church, that, "if we do not believe this, we cannot minister in her Baptismal Service, without a twofold delusion, without deceiving others and ourselves." These words, taken alone, may appear less easily reconcilable with an approval of the Judgement. But here also, when they are viewed in connexion with their purpose, the inconsistency will vanish. In the passage in which they stand, I was addressing the so-called Evangelical Clergy, while the judgement was still pending; and I urged them earnestly not to take any hasty steps, should the decision be against Mr Gorham. For I knew of many, and believed there were hundreds, if not thousands, of our best working Clergy, who would be grievously disturbed by such a decision, and who were looking forward to the necessity of resigning their cures; unless indeed the Judges had taken pains to limit their sentence to the peculiar form in which Mr Gorham had expressed his opinions. At the same time I felt it incumbent on me to avoid the slightest appearance of advising them to do that, which they could not do "with perfect conscientiousness, with singlehearted honour, with unequivocating, uncompromising truth." Hence, after stating what seemed to me necessarily implied in our Formularies, I added: "If we do not believe this, we

cannot minister in the Baptismal Service without a two-fold delusion, without deceiving others and ourselves." In these words I was appealing to their consciences: and when we speak to a person's conscience with regard to the present or the future, it behoves us to set forth the truth plainly, firmly, according to the strict letter of the law of Duty. It behoves us to say, *Thou art bound to do that which is purely, thoroughly right,—to refrain from that which has the slightest taint of wrong in it.* This is the rule which we ought to apply to our own conscience, and to set up for the guidance of others.

When however one is called to deal with an actual, individual case, and to pronounce sentence upon it, Mercy comes in, and ought to come in, to temper Judgement. The strictness of the general rule requires to be modified by a regard to the peculiar circumstances. No one will exercise the same severity in condemning a particular offender, as in condemning a vice generally. No reasonable man will make his own conscience the measure of his neighbour's. Hence, although I feel that, in my own case, with my own notions concerning the meaning of our Formularies, if I held the opinions concerning Baptism, which Mr Gorham has exprest in some of his answers, I could not conscientiously discharge the ministerial office in our Church, — and although, in speaking generally to others, on the natural assumption that my interpretation, if confirmed by the Judgement of both the Courts, was correct, I could not but declare that such opinions seemed to me incompatible with that office; yet I cannot deem myself warranted in condemning Mr Gorham, even by a private exercise of judgement, for acting otherwise; seeing that he, by certain logical processes, applied to a mystery which lies beyond the reach of strict reasoning, has been led to a different

conclusion. A person who has ever reflected on the innumerable varieties and diversities to be found in men's intellectual constitutions and habits, will be very slow to pronounce concerning any form of error, that it cannot be entertained conscientiously. Doubtless Simeon Stylites deemed that he was doing what was right and well-pleasing to God.

In like manner, as we are bound to modify our general rule, before we pass judgement on any one, even within our own minds, equally great, if not still greater, modifications are indispensable, before we take any outward step in consequence of what we regard as contrary to that rule, thus setting up the law of Conscience as the law of a political or social body. How many offenses against morals are there, which, when speaking or writing as moral teachers, we are bound to condemn severely, but which, if we had to discharge a judicial or legislative function, we should hardly notice! The two codes are totally distinct. We do not condemn a man judicially, because he does not obey the law of Conscience, or that of Honour, but because he has offended against some determinate, positive law of the State, or of the Church. Among other important differences, a main one is, that the former laws look chiefly to that which is in the heart, the latter almost exclusively to the outward act,—a distinction of great importance in connexion with the present case. For if Mr Gorham had of his own accord publisht a book promulgating all the same opinions that he has exprest in his Examination,—or if evidence could be produced that he had preacht all the same doctrines in his Sermons,—then, as his act would have been overt and wilful, it seems to me that, if the case had been conducted with legal strictness, if the passages most repugnant to our Formularies had been adduced in the

pleadings, and definite issues had been joined on them, the result would probably have been different. Whereas, seeing that the subject matter of the charge against Mr Gorham was not any voluntary, independent act of his own, for which therefore he would justly have been responsible, but a series of answers wrung from him by a long, subtile, inquisitorial examination, the Judges, knowing how easily people may be driven in the course of an argument to assert propositions which they would never have thought of maintaining otherwise, rightly held that, when opinions thus extorted were brought before them as the ground for a severe judicial sentence, they had a claim to the utmost latitude of favorable construction. This is a consideration of great moment in estimating the character of the Judgement, both in its bearings on the doctrine of the Church, and in reference to the subject matter on which it was pronounced. Yet this consideration has been almost overlooked by those who have been so vehement in condemning the Judgement, in their eagerness to kick down and trample on whatever came athwart their prejudices and their wilfulness, even though it was invested with the majesty and sanctity of law.

Nor, if I may say so with all rightful deference, does it seem to me that sufficient weight was ascribed to this consideration in the Judgement of the Court of Arches: for which reason that Judgement, even if it was literally legal,—a question into which I have no call to enter,—could hardly be otherwise than morally unjust. For no due allowance was made for the very peculiar circumstances of the case; and Mr Gorham's expressions were treated as stringently as if they had been a wilful attack on the doctrine of the Church. This is a matter of great practical moment, in connexion with the rights of the

whole body of the inferior Clergy. For, even if there be a legal ground,—which, after the decision of the Court of Arches, I am not warranted in denying,—for the right assumed by the Bishop of Exeter to examine Mr Gorham previously to his institution, it can never have been intended that the right should be exercised in so inquisitorial a manner. Mr Badeley himself, in trying to vindicate this right, goes back to a Statute belonging to the age of Edward the Second, a reign in which, through the weakness of the sovereign, ecclesiastical tyranny was allowed to encroach on the liberties of the Church: nor does it seem to have been exercised for centuries; so that it had become obsolete, and incongruous with the present condition of our Church; as incongruous as the Wager of Battel claimed some years ago was with the present condition of civil society. Hence one of the measures which ought to result from this calamitous controversy, and which is indeed indispensable for the pacification of the Church, is the abolition of this obsolete right. When a man is a candidate for orders, the Bishop has a right and is bound to examine him, for the sake of ascertaining whether he holds the faith of the Church, and is duly qualified for her ministry. But when he has once attained an ecclesiastical status, he should not be deprived of it, or of the rights pertaining to it, except on account of some overt, voluntary act. He becomes responsible for the opinions which he publishes or preaches, but not for those which he keeps in his own breast. To make him legally responsible for the latter violates the first principles of Justice, and is a crime which has only been committed by the worst tyrants, unless within the pale of the Church. If such a right were conceded to a prelate with the logical powers of the Bishop of Exeter, and who used them in the same manner, he would be able to

entangle three-fourths of the clergy, who came to him for institution, in sundry heretical propositions, whereby he might deprive them of their ecclesiastical rights; and thus he, who was set to be the father of his Diocese, would be apt to become its torment and curse. For these reasons I hope that, when the Church resumes her state of peace and order, the Statute of Edward II. will be abolisht, or at all events so limited and restricted, that the mischievous right conferred by it shall be precluded henceforward from bringing such dire calamities upon us.

Be this as it may, I trust I have shewn that it no way follows from a person's holding a determinate conviction, however strongly, on any subject,—nor even from his thinking that others ought to hold the same conviction, as he of course must if he deems it of importance,—that he should desire to enforce that conviction by civil or ecclesiastical penalties. Rather, if his conviction be deep and living, will he shrink from what can only repell both the understanding and the heart, and will rejoice at the removal of every penalty by which the attractive power of Truth is only hindered and obstructed. He will desire that she should no longer go forth attended by janizaries, who, while they compell men to bow to her, in fact keep them at a distance; but that she should pass freely, from mind to mind, and from heart to heart, winning them all by her own irresistible light and beauty. Had the recent Judgement been condemnatory of the hypothetical view of Baptismal Grace, it would assuredly have repelled many from the true doctrine, who have of late been approaching gradually toward it. At present, were it not for the irritation of this blind and blinding controversy, the Judgement itself would have inclined many to adopt a more conciliatory spirit.

As the Truth is to make us free, so must we be free from all human constraint in receiving it.

Through the darkness and dreariness of this grievous controversy, a hope has been dawning upon me, that in the end it may be overruled by God to the clearing up of confusions and to the healing of divisions in our Church. For generations the chief part of the dissensions by which her ministers have been agitated, have turned on this very point of Baptismal Regeneration. Seldom do a dozen Clergymen assemble at a Clerical Meeting, but some difference will arise concerning this very question. Now the conclusion which my observations have forced upon me, is, that these disputes are in great part owing to a certain ambiguity and indeterminateness in the use of the word *Regeneration*. By many on both sides it is interpreted as involving a complete change of nature. One may wonder that a person, who knows anything about children, should conceive that such a change can take place in them at their Baptism: but one cannot wonder that they who have a discernment and reverence for facts, should deny the Regeneration of children, when such a meaning is ascribed to it. Now, when a dispute arises from the ambiguity of a term, the natural remedy is to define that term. Such a process however must not in this instance be carried too far; else those who hold strong views on each side might be offended and excluded. It is enough if we shew that the meaning, which has occasioned the controversy, is not necessarily implied in the term. The course adopted by the Bishop of Exeter could only drive Mr Gorham into more determined opposition. But let it be declared that Regeneration is the initiation into the Christian life, not, as by some it is represented, the angelic consummation of that life,—that it is the primary incorporation into the Body of Christ,

which ought to be followed by a continual, progressive assimilation therewith,—that, though we are brought by it into a state of salvation, we need the constant help of the Holy Spirit to keep and advance in that state. It has long seemed to me that a simple, clear, authoritative exposition on this point would quiet many troubled consciences, and put an end to many disputes: and the time for such an exposition would seem to be now come. We must not allow of any decision, by which the great body of our Evangelical Clergy would be driven out of the ministry. But on the other hand it is desirable that those who are persuaded, however erroneously, that the doctrine of our Church is materially corrupted by the recent Judgement, should be deprived of such a plea for leaving us. They too, who, while they continue faithful in their allegiance to their spiritual Mother, are grievously disturbed by a sentence, which they regard as repugnant to our Formularies, deserve the tenderest consideration. Let neither party be sacrificed to the other. Let us endeavour to keep both within the fold, to reconcile and unite both. This has mostly been the wisdom of the rulers of our Church, except in that calamitous period which followed the Restoration, when they indulged their bitterest animosities, and revenged themselves on their adversaries, sacrificing the peace and well-being of the Church to the gratification of their vengeance.

The hope that something may be effected in this way to allay and heal the differences in our Church, has been brightening before me almost daily during the month since the publication of my Letter. For I have been involved by it in a correspondence with a number of persons on both sides, several of them taking very strong views: yet they have all strengthened my belief, that, if a judicious, authoritative statement as to the meaning of

the word Regeneration could be drawn up, corresponding in some measure to the suggestions in pp. 37, 38, the two parties, which are now standing in hostile array against each other, will discern that their opposition is far greater in word than in reality: and the main part of those, whose understandings are not fevered by passion, or palsied by bigotry, will be ready to adopt an explanation, which will reunite them to their brethren, and relieve them from the necessity of straining the language of one portion of our symbolical books, to bring it into conformity with their view of the meaning of the other part.

Thus, for instance, on the one hand, Professor Scholefield, in his able, well reasoned sermon *On Baptismal Regeneration*, after asking, "Is the Baptism of the infant a mere sign, of no value or power, and bringing with it no blessing? and does the blessing begin, not from the time of his Baptism, but only from the time of its visible development, in the framing of his life, and moulding of his character in conformity to the will of God?" replies (p. 15), "Nay, we doubt not that it is the doctrine of our Church, and a doctrine according to truth, that, as in the covenant then sealed God engages to bestow the grace of life, so He does bestow an earnest of it at the time,—a measure of that mysterious power and unction, with which the Baptist was *filled even from his mother's womb*;—a tender seed it may be, and not to be discerned by the eye of man, but yet the beginning of spiritual life, which, strengthened by Christian instruction, and watered by Christian prayers, gradually ripens with the expanding mind, and bears fruit at last unto life eternal." And four pages after he says that, if it be contended, "that the guilt of original sin is thereby washt away,—as the inestimable value of this blessing is disputed by none, so neither is it doubted by any that

it is conveyed and sealed in Baptism. Nor again do any question that, as a consequence, baptized children, *dying before they commit actual sin, are undoubtedly saved.*"

On the other hand, the necessity of Conversion, as an act subsequent to infant Baptism, independent of Regeneration, and posterior to it, is inculcated almost as strongly in the last volume of Archdeacon Manning's Sermons, as by any so-called Evangelical preacher.

Now, when there is such an approximation between the opposite parties in our Church, why should it not become still closer in the unity of the Spirit, and the bond of peace? Nay, but, with God's blessing, it shall do so. The Bishop of Exeter has done all that one man could do to rend our Church in twain. Mr Dodsworth, in his Sermon on *A House divided against itself*, has drawn the extraordinary conclusion from our Lord's declaration concerning such a House, that, whereas the opposite parties have hitherto been permitted to coexist within the pale of our Church, this must now no longer be allowed,—in effect, that half the house must be pulled down as the best way of strengthening the other half. But, under God's blessing, we will not suffer the authors and preachers of division to domineer in our Church. Let them talk of indifference, of latitudinarianism, of what not,—with God's blessing we will still seek peace and ensue it.

When we turn to Dr Pusey's work, which I have cited above, we breathe a different atmosphere. It has been a great pleasure to me to find him approving of the remedial measure which I have suggested in my Letter, and have just been speaking of. He is quite right in assuming that, when I spoke of the necessity of Conversion, I did not mean to express any approval of the delusive notion, which has been a source of so much

perplexity and distress to earnest seekers after righteousness, that it is necessary for every Christian to be conscious of a determinate, sudden change, whereby his heart was turned to God. Indeed, at the very time when I was writing my Letter, I happened to preach a Sermon of warning against this noxious delusion, shewing that, though the sudden Conversion of Saul is an example sometimes followed in God's dealings with His servants, His ordinary dealings with them are rather exemplified by the gradual growth in grace, with occasional backslidings, seen in the lives of the other Apostles. Nevertheless we both acknowledge that, in consequence of the power of the world over those who have been regenerated in Baptism, it is necessary in almost every case,—if we should not rather say in every case,—that there should be a change, more or less evident, a conversion, more or less gradual, by which the old man shall be turned into the new man, the carnal heart into the spiritual.

At the end of his Volume (p. 258), Dr Pusey has drawn up a statement, “in words taken from Hooker, Bishop Davenant, and St Augustin,” which he proposes as an exposition of the meaning of Baptismal Regeneration: “By the Sacrament of Baptism all infants are incorporated into Christ, and through His most precious merits receive remission of original sin, as also that infused Divine virtue of the Holy Ghost which giveth to the powers of the soul their first disposition toward future newness of life. Yet this regenerating grace, although sufficient for their salvation, as infants, doth not suffice for them as adults, unless through the continual grace of God they with their whole hearts turn to the Lord their God, and cleave to Him, and abide in that conversion to Him unto the end.” This statement, as Dr Pusey himself says, requires to be “maturely

weighed by a Conference of those who long for union in the Church." I will not enter upon a critical examination and discussion of it here, but will merely say that in the main I should heartily approve of it, and that, from its similarity to the statement which I have cited above from Professor Scholefield's Sermon, we may reasonably believe that, possibly with some slight modifications, it would satisfy the chief part of those who cannot recognise the universality of Baptismal Regeneration, from attaching a different sense to the term. Should this be so, the present controversy, which looks so threatening, would indeed be brought to a blessed issue: and our Church, which now hath sorrow in her travail, would no more remember her anguish, for joy that such peace was born into the world.

Such a statement, if it is to be authoritative, must emanate from a Synod of our Church; and if we were to meet in Synod for such a purpose, God's blessing would assuredly rest upon us. Let us make it manifest that our hearts are earnestly set upon promoting true peace in the Church, not by exclusion, but by comprehension; and we may trust that He will stir the hearts of our secular Rulers to allow us to meet in Convocation, if not in a better constituted Synod.

For the present we may feel thankful to our Bishops for the Bill which they have brought forward to remedy the objectionable features in the present constitution of the Court of Appeal. In the Note to my Charge I have already observed, that, it is only through accident and inadvertence, in consequence of the rarity of trials for heresy, that the decision of cases, in which doctrine is concerned, appertains to the present Court of Appeal. Hence the Government are not urged by any so-called point of honour to resist the Episcopal Bill: and surely,

as a matter of principle, it is right and just that the decision on questions of doctrine should not be committed to laymen, who are no way conversant therewith, but, mainly at least, to the chief pastors of the Church, the appointed Guardians of her faith, with the aid, if needful, of some of her Professors of Divinity. Nor can we well doubt that the lay Judges themselves would be thankful to be relieved from their present irksome and distressing task, which can only subject them to reproach from one side or the other.

It will indeed be necessary to adopt all possible precautions, lest the interpretation of the doctrine of our Formularies committed to the Episcopal Tribunal should lapse into new determinations of doctrine. For such a Court would be much apter to fall into this error, than one composed of lay Judges; both from the personal interest which each Bishop would feel in the doctrine he was called to pronounce on, and from their not having been trained, as Judges are, to distinguish between the law as it is, and as they may conceive it ought to be. The observance of the distinction between the judicial function and the legislative would be more difficult, when the question propounded concerned doctrine only: and since much weight would be attached to their decision by the Church, we should be liable to have fresh determinations of doctrine on the sole authority of a majority of the existing Bench of Bishops at any time; without the corrective force of the inferior Clergy in the Lower House of Convocation,—or of the Lay members of the Church, who, it begins now to be generally acknowledged, ought to have their place in a rightly constituted Synod,—or even of the Crown, acting as their representative and protector, by giving or withholding its sanction to the proceedings. These difficulties however,

if the Law-lords will concur with the Bishops in adapting the Bill to the exigencies of our present condition, may doubtless be overcome. Nor does it seem unreasonable to hope that, if such a Bill holds out a prospect of allaying the deplorable agitation in our Church, the Government will thankfully do what they can to pass it.

Hitherto, in this Postscript, my dear Cavendish, I have dropt my personal address to you; for I was writing on matters in which, though they arose out of my Letter, you were not directly concerned. But, as you have found it necessary to publish an answer to my Letter,—a trouble I had no intention of imposing on you,—I cannot conclude without thanking you heartily for the very kind and affectionate spirit which pervades it. In this respect it is everything I could have wisht, and just what I expected from you.

Of course however I could have wisht,—though I can hardly say I expected,—that my Letter should have produced some little effect upon your opinions with regard to the present crisis in our Church,—that it should not, as far as relates to you, have been so utterly vain and futile. To me, I own, it seemed, that the irrelevance, the inconsecutiveness, the inconclusiveness of your Resolutions had been fully demonstrated in my Letter,—that they had been shewn to be grounded on a misapprehension of the Judgement which they impugned, and therefore, even if they had been of any worth as abstract propositions, to be inapplicable to the present condition of our Church. Hence I could not but feel regret on reading your declaration (p. 6), that you would still “be prepared to sign them at this moment, had

you not already done so." The meeting with such a difference, nay, a pertinacious contrariety of opinion on questions so plain and simple as the chief part of those treated in my Letter, — in which I purposely avoided matters of doctrine, and tried to confine myself to matters of fact, and to the plain meaning of a few plain words,—the finding that on points, which to me seem clear, a friend, the fashion of whose mind has in some degree been modified by mine, and who has every inclination to listen to me with favorable attention, can only see black where I see white, even after some weeks of reflexion on the arguments placed before him, — would almost discourage one from attempting to act upon any person by means of words, and would make one fancy that to build up a pile of reasoning is scarcely a more profitable task than to roll up the stone of Sisyphus, which *αὐτίκ' ἔπειτα πεδόνδε κυλίνδετο*. But at all events we ought to learn one lesson from this fact,—a lesson of great price always, and especially so for our present discussion, — that, when such obstinate differences exist between two persons, in whom one might reasonably look for agreement, it must be the wildest of all dreams to fancy that, notwithstanding the innumerable diversities of men's minds, aggravated as those diversities are by the multitudinous combinations of their circumstances, all shall be brought to an agreement on a number of the most obscure, profound, intricate, complicated propositions. This has often been urged before, by no one more eloquently, or, considering the age when he lived, more conclusively, than by Jeremy Taylor, in the invaluable Dedication of his *Liberty of Prophesying*, which contains golden words of wisdom well fitted to guide us aright in the bewildering controversies of our times.

It is contended indeed that the charitable allowance of diversities of opinion does not rightly apply to matters which belong to the Faith; and this you also maintain. Doubtless there are limits to it in this respect. There are certain primary, fundamental truths, which are essential parts of Christianity, of the Revelation which God vouchsafed to manifest in the Incarnation and Sacrifice of His Only-begotten Son,—truths, without the recognition of which it is impossible to be a Christian at all, and which are at once light and life, which by their light kindle and foster life, and by their living power awaken and expand the understanding,—in other words, which are of Faith. The confession of a certain number of these truths, the Church has from the first ages declared to be indispensable, before any person can become a member of the Body of Christ. A somewhat fuller statement of nearly the same truths, she drew up to be the Rule of Faith for those who had become members of that Body. With these for centuries she was content. Her subsequent Confessions, whether mediæval, or belonging to the age of the Reformation, were in the main negative, drawn up to exclude errors wherewith the Faith had been corrupted, through the speculative, systematizing, dogmatical tendencies of the human mind. Hence these pertain rather to theologians than to the common people. The Church too herself was at times infected and misled by the dogmatical, systematizing spirit, which led many of her members into errors branded with the name of heresies, as we see especially in the Canons of the Council of Trent. Few things shew the wisdom of our Reformers more clearly, than the contrast between our Articles and those Canons, and the comparison of them with the great body of the Protestant Confessions. That which has lately been

made the ground of reproach against our Church, the scantiness of her dogmatical teaching, is rather one of her peculiar, Providential blessings. Our Reformers discerned that the business of a Church is not to lay down a system of Dogmatical Theology, but to bring her members to Christ, and to train them up in His knowledge and fellowship, merely setting her mark of exclusion on those errors of doctrine and practice, which would draw them away from that spiritual communion.

But I must not pursue these remarks, which would soon lead me into a long discussion, and which I have merely introduced here, because he who asserts a neglected, disputed truth in these days, is almost sure to be accused of disparaging, if not denying, its opposite or complementary truth. Of course, when any branch of the Church, whether following the general voice of antiquity, or acting on its own independent authority according to the exigencies of a particular age, lays down any propositions explicitly and absolutely, they must be deemed binding on the consciences of its ministers. As the Church is not infallible, it may admit of question whether her conduct in laying down certain propositions imperatively has been wise and expedient: but, when they are so laid down, their obligatoriness cannot be disputed. He who cannot conscientiously accept them, must not seek to enter her ministry. In order however to their being thus obligatory, it is necessary that they should be exprest so distinctly, and fully, as to leave no room for doubt: and this is above all indispensable, when their obligatoriness is to be enforced by a Court of Law.

This brings me to the main point of controversy between us. You and your co-protesters have asserted that the recent Judgement impugns the Article of the Nicene

Creed, in which we declare our belief in one Baptism for the Remission of Sins: and your assertion has been repeated in vociferous cries from one end of England to the other. This assertion I have denied in my Letter. I have denied the fact. I have shewn in the first part of this Postscript, how it was only at the last hour, when every other argument was exhausted, that Mr Badeley hit upon one, which nobody had hit on before, and thus gave a solemn emphasis to his peroration. He, as an Advocate, was quite justified in doing so: but this fact in itself is a strong presumptive proof that there was nothing in the argument to which a Court of Law could attend. A Judge cannot pass a sentence of condemnation on the strength of that which is said to be implied in a law: he must be guided solely by that which is expressly declared in it. To act otherwise would violate all rules of justice. He cannot defer even to the known purpose of the lawgiver, but merely to that which he has exprest. The known purpose of the lawgiver might indeed be used in some degree to mitigate the severity of a law, but not to enhance it. Even though it were known that every Bishop at Nicaea had in his private capacity declared that Original Sin is remitted in the Baptismal Act, this would not have been sufficient to prove that the remission is legally involved in the Article of the Creed. Mr Badeley's complaint that the Judges gave no heed to his argument on this point is of a piece with the rest of his hasty, intemperate Preface. They could hardly have noticed it, unless by shewing its irrelevance; and this, as so little stress had been laid on it in the proceedings, they had no special obligation to do. But if they could not allow this argument to influence their decision, their decision cannot rightly be said to impugn that Article.

Even Dr Pusey, though he still maintains that the Article is contravened in the Judgement,—allowing at the same time that this was done in ignorance,—cannot extract this contravention from the Judgement itself. He tries indeed (in p 248) to construct such a contravention, and to attach it to the Judgement. “The Judicial Committee (he says) kept themselves as clear from laying down heresy, as they could, consistently with acquitting it.—They state as Mr Gorham’s doctrine, ‘that in no case [neither of adults nor infants] is regeneration in Baptism unconditional;’ that the Articles do not determine what is signified by ‘right reception;’ that Mr Gorham says, ‘in the case of infants, it is with God’s grace and favour.’ Of course it is. But this—would be *nihil ad rem*, unless it meant that *some* infants brought to Baptism were *not* in God’s ‘grace and favour;’ and such a statement again would have no bearing upon that of ‘right reception,’ without Mr Gorham’s theory that ‘infants are by nature *unworthy* recipients, being born in sin and the children of wrath;’ and so original sin, which the Church has ever believed to be remitted by the Sacrament of Baptism, is to be an obstacle to its ‘right reception,’ unless it have been previously remitted by God’s grace and favour.”

Blackstone, after giving an account of the Statute of Edward the Third on high Treason, says, “Sir Matthew Hale is very high in his encomiums on the great wisdom and care of the Parliament, in thus keeping Judges within the proper bounds and limits of this Act, by not suffering them to run out (upon their own opinions) into constructive treasons, though in cases that seem to them to have a like parity of reason, but reserving them to the decision of Parliament. This is a great security to the public, the Judges, and even this sacred Act itself; and

leaves a weighty memento to Judges to be careful and not over-hasty in letting in treasons by construction or interpretation, especially in new cases that have not been resolved and settled. He observes, that, as the authoritative decision of these *casus omissi* is reserved to the King and Parliament, the most regular way to do it is by a new declarative Act: and therefore the opinion of any one, or of both Houses, though of very respectable weight, is not that solemn declaration referred to by this Act, as the only criterion for judging of future treasons." How exactly do all these observations apply to that which in the ecclesiastical law has been regarded as the counterpart of treason, heresy! How important is it, that similar and equal caution be exercised, before "new cases, that have not been resolved and settled," are declared to be heretical! How dangerous would it be to truth and freedom, if any man, even such a man as Dr Pusey, were allowed to condemn a person for constructive heresies! There is no heresy, no contradiction to the Creed, in the words which Dr Pusey quotes from the Judgement. But, as on the one side he inserts a number of additional determinations into the Article of the Creed, which are not exprest or indicated by its words, so here he foists in divers clauses into the Judgement, of which there is no hint in it; and thus by a twofold construction he produces a contradiction between them. It no way follows by any logical necessity from the assertion that a right reception in the case of infants lies in God's grace and favour, that *some* infants brought to Baptism are *not* in God's grace and favour. For all may be so. Indeed the very act by which a child is brought to be baptized, is an eminent proof of God's grace and favour, as he himself would assuredly grant, and as is implied throughout the Epistles, where the

Apostles speak of those who are called. I am not saying that this is Mr Gorham's meaning; but it is a meaning which the words cited from the Judgement may legitimately bear; and therefore they cannot legally be pronounced heretical. Wherever a sound meaning can be deduced from the words, the law will not presume an unsound one. Hence, I remarkt above, the only answer which Dr Pusey's reply to my Letter seemed to me to require, was a repetition of the assertion that the Judgement is a legal act, of Judges sitting to declare what the law of the Church is, or rather whether a certain person for a certain act has incurred a sentence of deprivation by that law. They did not sit to determine generally what the doctrine of our Church is, still less what it ought to be: and therefore Dr Pusey's citations from the Fathers concerning the Remission of Sins do not bear upon the Judgement, any more than a large portion of Mr Badeley's speech, which he complains that the Judges took no notice of, but which, however valuable it might be in a doctrinal controversy, was of no force in a judicial one.

Indeed I cannot see how it can be legally maintained that there is any essential reference whatsoever to Original Sin in the Article of the Creed. Dr Pusey (in p. 246) would foist the same train of consequences into the Apostles Creed. He finds the oak in the acorn. Yet a boy who pickt up an acorn, would hardly be condemned by a Court of Law, even one composed of doctors of divinity, for carrying off an oak. Surely a Pelagian might with perfect good faith profess his belief in the Forgiveness of Sins, and even in one Baptism for the Remission of Sins. Learned doctors may pronounce that these words involve a long series of consequences; but, unless these are manifestly implied in the words, a

legal tribunal cannot enforce them, till they have an express sanction from some ulterior decree of the Church: in which case the contravention would be, not to the Article of the Creed, but to that subsequent decree.

You too, my dear Friend, seem to be still under the influence of this same misapprehension, which, I believe, is the main cause of the difference between us. Thus, after referring to a series of arguments which I had adduced to shew that the Judgement was a legal act, and that, as such, it had been, and could not but be pronounced in conformity to the principles generally recognised in the administration of our laws, you tell me (p. 11), that “such a way of argument leaves out of view the most sacred interests of the congregations entrusted to the care of Mr Gorham, and those who agree with him.” But, however important this consideration may be, the Judges had nothing to do with it, and could not take it into account, without violating the principles of our jurisprudence. As their business was not to determine doctrine, neither was it to enquire and decide what was for the good of Mr Gorham’s parishioners, but,—I am forced to repeat the assertion over and over again,—solely whether there were legal grounds why he should not be instituted to a living, to which he had been lawfully presented. You ask me (p. 12), whether it would not be too bad, if the Lord Chancellor were to impose an able scholar, who laboured under the delusion that it was an act of virtue to break one of the commandments, as a tutor on a ward of Chancery. Again, in p. 14, you say, in reference “to the statement that the purpose of the suit was to visit Mr Gorham with a civil penalty,” that “no one would consider it a civil penalty to refuse the office of cook to an estimable and skilful person, whom

—he knew to hold—the opinion that arsenic is a most agreeable and wholesome condiment.” This latter comparison has been quoted in a review of your Pamphlet, as though it settled the question. Yet,—not to speak of the manner in which you here stigmatize Mr Gorham’s opinions, and which is no less unworthy of you than of him,—both your comparisons just blink that which is the main point in the argument. Neither the law-breaking tutor, nor the poison-loving cook has any legal claim to the proposed office. He who engages either is free to exercise his own option. Mr Gorham, on the other hand, had a legal claim to be instituted, and could not be rejected, except on account of some adequate legal disqualification. If the Bishop had been the patron of the living, then your parallels might have held water: but then, for whatsoever motive he might have refused to present A or B to the living, even though it had been for their having, or not having red hair, no suit could have been brought against him.

This misapprehension, which lay at the bottom of your manifesto, and which seems to me to run through your Answer to my Letter, has also run through the main part of what has been written against the Judgement. The Judges are reproacht by the selfsame persons, at one moment for having presumed to determine the doctrine of our Church, and the next moment because, under the conviction that they had merely to determine a question of law, they did not enter sufficiently into the examination of doctrine. Surely however a misapprehension of this kind on so plain a matter cannot last for ever. May I not still hope, my dear Friend, that even you will at length open your eyes and see through it? To be sure this cannot happen, so long as you call the Bishop of Exeter’s Letter to the Archbishop

“unanswerable” (p. 6), and Mr Badeley’s Preface “equally unanswerable.” As to the latter, it is not likely that any one will think it worth while to expose the hasty, groundless assertions contained in it. But so far is the Bishop’s Letter from being “unanswerable,” that it has received a very able answer from Mr Goode,—which perhaps has caught too much of its tone, as was scarcely avoidable,—but which at all events has thoroughly demolisht the chief part of its assertions and arguments. Surely ere long the soberminded members of our Church will recognise the justice of what the Bishop of Gloucester has said, in his Reply to an Address from the Laity of his Diocese: “I am inclined to hope that the late Judgement of the Court of Appeal will not produce any practical effect,—beyond that which we must all lament,—the excitement in the minds of Churchmen, and a state of uneasiness which militates against peace, unity, and concord. This at least is certain, — the doctrine of the Church respecting Infant Baptism remains the same as it was before that Judgement was pronounced.”

To a like effect the Bishop of Salisbury says in his Reply to the Clergy of the Archdeaconry of Wells: “Whatever be the effect of the decision of the Court in the particular case submitted to it, the doctrine of the Church remains written as before in the Articles, Catechism, and Liturgical Formularies; and these speak in such express terms of the Remission of Sins by spiritual Regeneration in the case of all infants duly brought to Baptism, that I feel assured that even the present unhappy controversy will in the end but the more firmly establish the truth, which appears to be placed in peril. In the mean time may we have grace given to us, in holding the truth and speaking the truth, to do so in

love. Let us bear in mind that differences on this subject are not unfrequently apparent, rather than real, arising, not from an actual denial of the gift of God's grace in Baptism, but from a different mode of defining Regeneration as a theological term. And knowing that some, who are reluctant to use the expression *Baptismal Regeneration*, are influenced by the erroneous idea that this doctrine tends to the denial of the great truths of the necessity of the Conversion by the grace of God of those who are living in sin, and of the actual renewal by the Holy Spirit of the will and affections of all, let us ever be careful so to speak, as to prove that no occasion can rightly be given for so injurious an imputation." The same view of the Judgement is taken by the Bishop of Liehfield, who, in a similar Reply, says that he trusts, the teaching of the Church concerning Baptism "will be no ways affected by the late Judgement of the Committee of Privy Council." Indeed the great majority of our Bishops seem to concur in this opinion; since their late Conference has not led to any measures with a view of counteracting any injury done to the doctrinal statements of our Formularies. I have also had much pleasure in reading an excellent letter by Archdeacon Churton in *the Guardian* of the 8th of May, whose views, though taken from a different point, coincide in the main with those express in this Letter.

With such encouragements to hope that this correcter apprehension of the character of the recent Judgement, when confirmed by such authority, will ere long quiet the extravagant agitation which has been so grievously disturbing our Church, I should here conclude, but that I have observed two expressions in the earlier part of your Letter, which are such plausible fallacies, that I doubt not they have exercised a good deal of power,

not only in warping your judgement on this question, but that of many others also.

In p. 8, you tell me, that, “in assigning the reasons for my thankfulness” on account of the Judgement, I “avowedly rest my satisfaction simply and solely on a ground of expediency.” Very true, my dear Cavendish: I do so. Nor do I know what other ground to take in estimating the worth of the Judgement, when its legality has been established. I rejoice in it, because I am firmly persuaded that it is greatly for the good of Christ’s Church in this land, and because it has preserved us from terrible evils which threatened us. There is a fallacy in the use of this word *expediency*, which I have had to point out more than once, in connexion with measures of public utility, when the opponents of those measures have bolstered up their prejudices by the notion that they were contending for principles, against the advocates of a paltry expediency.

Now thus far I would heartily concur with you, in condemning all so-called systems of morals, which profess to deduce the principles of morality from a consideration of general consequences,—which stifle Conscience, and dethrone Duty, and bid a man look solely to that which is expedient. For, though that which is expedient for the human race at large, will coincide ultimately with that which is according to the dictates of Conscience and Duty,—seeing that Godliness has the promise of this world also,—yet it is an inversion of the proper, simple, natural course, to draw the water of life from the measureless ocean of general consequences, instead of from the fountain springing up within the heart: and there are woful tendencies to bias the judgement in the calculation of that which is so incalculable, tendencies

which need to be repress by the severe and solemn voice of the moral Law from within.

But the moment we proceed from the principles of morality to realize them in any outward act, whereby others are to be affected, it immediately becomes necessary to take account of the effect which is likely to be produced upon others: and this must ever be a question of expediency. We all feel this in every relation of life, even in the most familiar, to the members of our own family, to our servants, especially to children. In our dealings with others we do not regulate our conduct by a hard, lifeless, Stoical, categorical imperative. The office of practical wisdom is ever to determine the point of union between the law from within and the good of the persons on whom we are to act. This is no compromise of the law, no sacrifice of it to expediency. It is the carrying out of that divine principle of Christian Ethics, that Love is the fulfilment of the Law. It is the principle on which St Paul ever acted, and which he continually lays down and inculcates, when he speaks of our relative duties. Nay, it is the principle which our Lord Himself, He Himself the Truth and the Life, the perfect Incarnation of Divine Love, set before us by His example, when He spake the word to the people in parables, *as they were able to hear it*. This rule He thus laid down for the guidance of His Church; but the Church, under the sway of dogmatical self-will, has frequently sinned against it.

In the present case, as in all others, the duty of the Church is to place the truth before the people, *as they are able to hear it*. There is no divine voice commanding us, *Ye must compell your ministers to believe,—or at all events to say that they believe,—in the universal, unconditional regeneration of all baptized infants; else*

ye must cast them out of the ministry. If any such voice is heard, it comes not from God, but from him who mocks the voice of God, that he may bring ruin and desolation on His Church. The voice of Conscience does indeed command us to preach those truths, the knowledge of which has been vouchsafed to us ; although even with regard to this, our own individual act, some attention is due to expediency, to the good which our preaching is likely to effect. He who rejects such considerations stands on the verge of madness. Hence is it so needful that the Church should be endowed with the wisdom of the serpent, as well as with the simplicity and harmlessness of the dove : mark the word, my dear Friend, with harmlessness, with the harmlessness of the dove. We are to preach the truth ourselves, according to the measure of it which has been granted to us, and with a due regard to times and seasons ; but it is no part of our commission to make others preach the selfsame truth. Rather, as we desire and claim that the rights of our own conscience should be respected, so let us learn to respect the rights of conscience in our brethren. Or, if there must be persecution, if there must be oppression on either side, let it be our desire and prayer to be on the side of the persecuted and opprest, rather than on that of the persecutors and oppressors. Let us desire this, even on the ground of expediency, for the good of our Church ; because no Church has ever grown or thriven by inflicting, but only by suffering persecution. Let us desire it, that we may obtain the blessings which our Lord has promist to those who endure persecution for His sake. Let us desire it, because hereby we shall be likened to the Son of Man Himself, whose Church, after the example of her Lord, even now cannot pass, except through much tribulation, into glory.

This brings me to the second passage, on which I wish to add a few words. You not only condemn my motive for rejoicing at the Judgement on the ground of expediency; but you add (p. 9):—"For persons who appreciate the gravity and importance of this Judgement, to be deterred from the course which they feel it to be their duty to pursue by any such considerations as induce you to rejoice in it, would be, in very truth, the grossest breach of charity which they could commit. For what, if in their tenderness toward clergymen who have sought Holy Orders in the English Church, and continue to hold their preferments, although they cannot use the Baptismal Services except in a non-natural sense, they should altogether overlook the effect of the necessary teaching of such pastors on their flocks? If it be true that there is such a thing as one Faith once delivered to the Saints, as we believe, and that the Church of England would be giving up part of that Faith if she should submit to the recent Judgement, how can we be indifferent whether or not that Faith be taught 'whole and undefiled' to the poor of Christ's Church? Surely, if there be any one plain Christian duty more binding than another on the rulers of the Church, it is to take jealous care that persons, the character of whose faith must so materially depend on the oral teaching of the Church, should not be robbed of any portion of their Christian privileges. To overlook their eternal interests out of regard to the comfort and happiness of any number of clergymen, however excellent and devoted to their duties, would be morbid sentimentality."

My dear Friend, I wish from my heart you had not written this last sentence. The speciousness in it is gained by a mere sophism. For, instead of overlooking the eternal interests of the congregations, out of regard

to the comfort and happiness of the so-called Evangelical Clergy, it is for the sake of the congregations, quite as much as for that of the Clergy, that I rejoice that the shepherds have not been torn away from their sheep, before whom they go, and who follow them, because they know their voice. The pastors who would have been driven out of the ministry if the Judgement of the Court of Arches had been confirmed, would have comprised a very large proportion of the best, the godliest, the most faithful and devoted in the whole compass of our Church, those who have exercised, and are exercising the most salutary influence on their people. That my estimate of the number who would have been thus affected, is not exaggerated, but the contrary, I have been assured from divers quarters, among other persons by some of the highest dignitaries in our Church. The schism would have been, as often before in the history of Christ's Church, as more than once in that of our own Church, between subjective Faith, so to say, and objective Faith, between that Faith which yearns after a living union with Christ, and the living graces of His Spirit, and that which is made up of a system of dogmas and ordinances. Doubtless on your side also there are holy, saintly men: the very names attacht to your manifesto prove this. Doubtless there are several amongst them whose teaching exercises a powerful and salutary influence, especially over the higher classes. But for "the poor of Christ's Church," whom you select as the chief objects of your solicitude, lest they should be "robbed of any portion of their Christian privileges," all my observation, and all the information I have received from others, combine in persuading me, that the preaching and teaching which lead them to a lively apprehension of the power of Christ's death, and of the Redemption He has wrought for them,

and to seeking humbly and fervently after a living communion with Him, are to be found in far larger proportions among those who rejoice with thankfulness at the late Judgement, than among those who are exciting such an opposition against it. They who are slow to recognise the adoption whereby we become children of God, except in those in whom they see some evident fruits of the Spirit, would seem, as a body, to be more diligent in endeavouring to cultivate those fruits, than they who believe that the adoption has already taken place at Baptism. Therefore it was not for the Clergy, apart from their congregations, but along with their congregations, that I pleaded so earnestly in my Letter. I did not weigh the eternal interests of the latter, against the comfort and happiness of the former, because I knew that they were identical, or at least wrapt up in each other.

But even if this had not been the case, if that large body of our Evangelical Clergy, who would have been driven out of the Ministry by a Judgement peremptorily condemning the conditional or hypothetical view of Baptismal Regeneration, had not comprised so large a proportion of our most efficient pastors, still I cannot think without deep pain that you should call a regard to the comfort and happiness of a number of excellent men, devoted to their ministerial duties, "morbid sentimentality." Surely, my dear Friend, these words bear no mark of the spirit of Him who, when He saw the multitude a-hungred, had compassion upon them, and wrought a miracle to feed them. He did not look with scorn even on our least sufferings or sorrows. It is said that some of the fiercest persecutors had been men of a gentle, tender, loving nature, until the withering spirit of dogmatical bigotry dried up the sources of feeling,

and made them fancy that the blood of heretics was an offering acceptable to God. Even in these days too I have seen indications in men of noble and gentle characters that such an awful transformation is not impossible; wherefore it is necessary to keep watch against the first approaches of such a mind. When we have once taken that dismal downward step, to confound the living Faith, whereby the heart and soul and mind are to be united to God in His Son, with the mere intellectual reception of a certain number of dogmatical propositions, then, — inasmuch as our Conscience is ever telling us that there is no moral worth in the mere intellectual reception of any truths,—we may easily lapse, as the Church of Rome has perpetually, into the superstitious notion, that the mere outward acknowledgement of those truths with the lips will have a saving power. Thus intellectual error becomes an object of fiercer hatred than the very worst crimes, and is stampt with the name of heresy, even when it is pure from all taint of that moral perversity, which in the Apostolic times formed the main evil of heresy.

You, my Friend, call it “morbid sentimentality,” to feel any deep interest in the comfort and happiness of a large body of excellent, zealous clergymen, who hold an erroneous view concerning Baptismal Regeneration. You do indeed introduce a saving clause: in comparison with the eternal interests of their flocks. But this is the very self-delusion by which persecutors blind themselves. They tell themselves that they are contending for the eternal interests of those who might have been deceived by the heretics. Yet, though you wrote sincerely, and were not aware that you were deceiving yourself, surely you cannot mean that the congregations under the care of our Evangelical Clergy are in greater peril of

condemnation, are worse fed with the word of God, worse supplied with the waters of life, than the average of our congregations. In a subsequent passage (pp. 15, 16), you speak as if the efficiency of our preaching rested mainly on our having the authority of the Church to lean on. But it is not so. The preachers who have stirred the heart and roused the conscience, who have convinced men of sin and of righteousness and of judgement, have not gone to the dogmas of the Church for the sources of their doctrine, but to the word of God, and have drawn copiously from its living waters, whereto mankind may come, and draw from its exhaustless fountains, as long as the world endures. Nor have "great learning and ability," as you seem to imply, anything to do with the power of the preacher, especially over the poor. As Leighton beautifully says, in his Sermon on the Parable of the Sower, portraying what he himself fulfilled, "He is the fittest to preach, who is himself most like his message, and comes forth, not only with a handful of seed in his hand, but with store of it in his heart, the word *dwelling in him richly.*"

You indeed disclaim all persecution: you say (p. 11), that you "know of no persons who would not deprecate the infliction of civil penalties, in the cause of religion, as earnestly as I myself should." In saying this, I have no doubt, you are perfectly sincere. Yet in the passage before quoted you call it "morbid sentimentality" to feel anxious about "the comfort and happiness" of a number of excellent clergymen. Have you realized to yourself what you mean by their "comfort and happiness?" The words would seem to imply that you were thinking about their having to give up their preferment, to quit their parsonages, their comfortable homes, their happy parochial lives, the most blessed mode of life

perhaps that has ever been vouchsafed to man. Now even this, when falling upon husbands and fathers, upon their wives and children, would be a grievous calamity; and the infliction of such a calamity on good and holy men, for no sin, no fault on their part, would be a cruel persecution. Think of such a fate befalling any friend of your own, any near relation: would you deem it morbid sentimentality to deplore his calamity? In one's own case one should desire to endure the loss patiently and submissively: but one should hardly even wish to do so in the case of a friend or relation: in his case one should do all one could lawfully to avert or remedy it. But in the case we are considering there would be still bitterer ingredients. There would be the severance of those holy ties, by which the loving pastor is bound to his loving people. There would be the compulsory exclusion from a work, to which in the fulness of his heart and soul, he had consecrated his whole life. Is it "morbid sentimentality" to mourn over such losses, to shrink from the thought of their befalling good and holy men? O may one never be healthy, if this is morbid!

You seem indeed half to imply that they have brought this evil upon themselves, "by seeking orders in our Church, and continuing to hold their preferments, although they could not use the Baptismal Services except in a non-natural sense." But, when they sought orders, they did so with perfect conscientiousness. They knew, as we all do, that for near a century the best, most pious, most active and faithful of our Clergy had held the same opinions concerning Baptism, without any authoritative reproof; that at one time there were very few faithful and active ministers who did not hold these opinions. Therefore usage justified them in looking upon

this as one of the questions which our Church has not peremptorily decided: and, though I cannot enter into a discussion on the point here, you may see from Mr Goode's very able Review of Sir Herbert Jenner Fust's Judgement, and from his Letter to the Bishop of Exeter, as well as from Mr Turner's masterly Speech before the Privy Council, that a very strong case may be made out in their favour, a far stronger than I had imagined. Accordingly, if it was to be determined by the ruling body in our Church, under whatsoever form, that the latitude which had so long been allowed in the interpretation of the Baptismal Service, and which had been the source of so much blessing to it, should henceforward be abridged, it would surely have behoved the Church to provide that the enforcement of this strictness should only take place gradually, and that the large number of godly men, who entered her ministry with thorough conscientiousness, and who have been discharging its duties faithfully and diligently, should not be rooted up at one earthquake-shock from the places where they have been growing as trees of life in the garden of the Lord. This would not have been "morbid sentimentality," but nothing more than a due regard to justice and honour, qualities which dogmatical bigotry will often violate unscrupulously.

Here I have great pleasure in strengthening my argument by a beautiful passage from Dr Pusey's Letter on the Supremacy. "We had been content that the question should not be raised. We felt that the evils and confusions of the Church did not lie in her mere present neglect of discipline; nor could they be remedied by any sudden restoration of it. The evil and the remedy lie far deeper. The evil was the neglect and lukewarmness of the last century; the remedy, *not by might,*

nor by power, but by My Spirit, saith the Lord of Hosts. We felt and had seen with our eyes, that God's Holy Spirit was working through our whole Church; and we waited patiently until He should, as the Church prays continually, 'lead all into the way of truth,' that 'they should hold the Faith in unity of Spirit, in the bond of peace, and in righteousness of life.' Meantime there is nothing (which is not of faith) more certain, than that good men, even amid partial error of understanding, or amid invincible prejudice, believe far more truly than they speak, or dare even to own to themselves. And the hope of the Church is, not in any being severed from her, even though they do not yet believe all which she teaches; but that God would open their minds, as He has the minds and hearts of so many, to the full reception of His truth. Better, for the time, that uncertain and perplexing language should be used, even by some of the priests, whose *mouths* should *keep knowledge*, than that souls should be led to part from the Church itself, the Body of Christ, the Sacraments, and the very hope of being led into the full truth."

From these words one might have hoped that Dr Pusey would have greatly deplored and deprecated the act by which this disaster seemed so likely to be forced upon our Church; nay, that he would almost have been thankful for the Judgement, by which for the present it has been averted; more especially as he recognises so amply (in pp. 5—9), that "a judicial decision, even of the highest Court, cannot affect the doctrine of the Church of England: the plain meaning of her Formularies must be the same. The Judgement could affect discipline only." And the sudden restoration of this, he had said, "could not remedy our present evils and confusions."

When the ministers of Charles the Tenth in 1830 made

their attack on the Press, Niebuhr said, that they had burst the talisman which held the demon of the Revolution in chains. In like manner has the Bishop of Exeter burst the talisman which bound the evil spirit of Schism, in our Church. Parties holding widely different opinions existed in it side by side. Such has always been the case, and always must be, while men's minds and hearts retain their strong, determined, limited individuality. On divers points these differences had been exasperated into decided opposition, through a variety of causes, operating during three centuries,—to some of which Dr Pusey has alluded, as you too yourself have in p. 28, — through errors on both sides, through misconduct on both sides, but far more culpable on that of the High Church party, whose lifeless doctrine was mostly used chiefly to suppress and stifle living faith. In such a state of things what was the course of Wisdom? even of human Wisdom? not to speak of that which would have become a Bishop of Christ's Church. When opposite opinions are held honestly and conscientiously, Wisdom will trace them up to the point of their divergence, and shew how this is also the point of their coincidence. This would indeed be a remedial, healing process. On the other hand the course adopted by the pseudo-catholic Church has usually been to chop off every ramifying opinion: and thus, instead of a branching tree, bearing all manner of fruit and all manner of leaves for the healing of the nations, it sets up a naked pole, much like that which in these latter days by a like misnomer is termed a Tree of Liberty.

From this arbitrary, tyrannical course, we have been preserved by the Judgement of the Court of Appeal: and therefore do I rejoice and give thanks for it. A number of persons, who entered the ministry of our Church in

godly earnestness, who were not forbidden, but encouraged to do so by all our best Bishops, and whose faithful labours have for near a century been the chief means of blessing to her people, cannot now be driven out of her. In an extreme case of a wilful denial of her doctrine, discipline, I doubt not, might still be enforced by law. But the Inquisition shall not establish its tribunals in our Church; and for this we may well give thanks to God, and to the Judges who have preserved us from it.

The only efficient means of spreading the Faith, the word of God in its whole fulness, and the exercise of all our gifts upon it under the guidance of the Spirit,—the means by which the Apostles spread the Faith, the only means by which it has been spread ever since,—remain to us. Let the Wisdom from above reign in our Church, let it reign in the hearts of our Bishops, with all its divine attributes, *pure, and peaceable, and gentle, and easy to be entreated, full of mercy and good fruits, without partiality, and without hypocrisy*; and the truth will be acknowledged in its twofold power, as light and life. But the wisdom which exhibits the direct contraries to all these attributes, will never benefit the Church, however fiercely it may fight for dogmas, with the sword, the rack, or the stake.

Before I conclude, since you express yourself grieved by my having spoken of your Resolutions as likely to encourage persons in going to Rome, I feel bound to add, that, after reading over the paragraph in which I have said this, when I think what your Manifesto declared and threatened concerning our Church, I cannot conscientiously retract or modify a single expression in it. I have not said that this was your purpose: I have only said that this must needs be the effect of your Resolutions. They who reject considerations of expediency, in their zeal to proclaim what they believe, may tell me that they

had nothing to do with the consequences of their act. They said what they believed, and thus delivered their souls. To me, with my strong persuasion that it is a primary duty of Wisdom to observe times and seasons, and with the conviction,—which I deemed demonstrated, and which everything since has confirmed,—that your representation of the evils and dangers besetting our Church was enormously exaggerated, the Manifesto could not but seem a disloyal and unfilial act. It was an act of private judgement, whereby a knot of persons, some of them very eminent, but invested with no manner of authority, took upon themselves peremptorily to condemn the highest authorities, spiritual and judiciale, in our Church. You indeed repudiate the imputation of private judgement; yet it is assuredly quite as much such an act to take upon oneself to interpret the doctrine of the Church in opposition to her constituted authorities, as to take upon oneself to interpret the Bible in like manner. There may be necessities justifying both these acts: indeed the latter is often a paramount duty: still such they are. Nor can I see anything short of extreme imprudence, in a denunciation that the Church, unless it adopted the measure which you prescribed, would forfeit her Christian privileges and power, in proclaiming this at a time when so many of our younger Clergy, through the erroneous teaching they have been subject to during the last fifteen years, have been so grievously disturbed in their allegiance to their spiritual Mother, and so deluded by fantastical notions of an unreal, nominal Catholicity, that they are ready to let slip the substance in grasping after the shadow, and have learnt to prize dogmas and ordinances above Christian faith and a Christian life. Should my anticipations prove erroneous, should your act be the means of keeping our

brethren in the Church, which you have represented to be in such imminent peril of extinction,—however I may be perplexed to discover the relation between the cause and the effect,—I shall at all events be very thankful for the latter.

There are several other points in your Answer, about which I would gladly talk to you. But I must not prolong this overgrown Postscript. They may perhaps furnish matter for quiet discussion the next time we have the pleasure of seeing you at Herstmonceux.

Ever yours affectionately,

J. C. HARE.

May 27th, 1850.

The success of the Episcopal Bill to secure that the doctrines of the Church shall not be interpreted, except by a rightly constituted Tribunal, is of such moment for the sake of peace, that I will add a remark here, in connexion with what I have said on the subject in p. 78. In the Bishop of Salisbury's reply to an Address from his Clergy, he says, speaking of this Bill: "It commits the decision of points of doctrine to the judgement of those, to whom, in virtue of their sacred office, this function especially appertains, and who, we may hope, will, under the guidance of divine grace, pronounce their sentence *in careful conformity to God's holy word, as the sole and sufficient standard of revealed truth*, and in accordance with the Creeds and Articles and Liturgy of the Church, as its safe and authoritative expositors." Now the words printed in italics seem to me to prove the great probability of the danger pointed out in p. 78, and the great need of guarding against it. I have no doubt that my honoured Friend would agree with me that the

sole business of a Court of Appeal should be to decide what is the true meaning of our Formularies. But in that case the decision ought to be drawn exclusively from the words of the Formularies, elucidated, when necessary, by their history, not from the word of God in the Scriptures; which, if it is taken into account, immediately becomes paramount, as we perceive by the Bishop's expressions concerning it. Both the Courts saw this clearly, as I have shewn in pp. 59—62: yet a Bishop, unless he exercises the utmost watchfulness, can hardly speak on the subject, without being led by his love and reverence for the Bible to overlook this most important consideration.

The following are the Resolutions discust in the foregoing Letter.

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

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

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

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

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

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

7. That by such conscious, wilful, and deliberate act such portion of the Church becomes formally separated from the Catholic body, and can no longer assure to its members the grace of the sacraments and the remission of sins.

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

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

LONDON:
Printed by S. & J. BENTLEY and HENRY FLEY,
Bangor House, Shoe Lane.

A

BRIEF ANALYSIS

OF THE

DOCTRINE AND ARGUMENT

IN THE CASE OF

GORHAM *v.* THE BISHOP OF EXETER;

AND

OBSERVATIONS

ON THE

PRESENT POSITION OF THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND

WITH REFERENCE TO THE RECENT DECISION.

By LORD LINDSAY.

LONDON:

JOHN MURRAY, ALBEMARLE STREET.

1850.

I N S C R I B E D

T O

The Right Reverend Father in God,

CHARLES JAMES, LORD BISHOP OF LONDON,

A N D T O

“ THE TWO GREAT SECTIONS OF THE ENGLISH CHURCH,
WHICH HOLD THE FAITH OF THE GOSPEL
DEARER THAN THEIR LIVES.” *

* *Dr. Pusey on the Royal Supremacy*, p. 170.

A N A L Y S I S,

§c. §c.

THE point at issue in this very important case is so inadequately appreciated by a very large body of the members of the Church of England, that it may be useful to lay before them a brief Analysis of the argument on both sides, and of the Judgment of the Privy Council—a statement of what is conceived to be the true nature of the embarrassment in which the Church is placed by the judgment in question—some notice of the efforts which have been made and are making to extricate her from that embarrassment—and some further observations and considerations which naturally occur and may be useful at the present moment.

The facts of the case are simply these. The vicarage of Brampford Speke, in Devonshire, a living in the gift of the Crown, having become vacant in 1847, the Rev. George Cornelius Gorham was appointed by Her Majesty thereto; but on examination by the diocesan, the Bishop of Exeter, he was found to hold, in the Bishop's opinion, unsound doctrine on the subject of Baptism. The Bishop consequently refused to induct him into the living. Mr. Gorham appealed to the Arches' Court, the chief consistory of the Province of Canterbury for the debating of spiritual causes, instituting what is called a *duplex querela*, which had the effect of bringing the whole matter of the examination before the Court. The matter was argued before Sir Herbert Jenner Fust, the Dean of Arches, who pro-

nounced Mr. Gorham's doctrine unsound and dismissed the appeal with costs. Mr. Gorham then appealed to Her Majesty in Council,—the cause was heard by the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council in December last; and on the 8th of March the Judicial Committee delivered their judgment, declaring that Mr. Gorham's doctrines were not repugnant to the doctrines of the Church of England, and that their Report to Her Majesty would be for a reversal of Sir Herbert J. Fust's decision.

Analyses of the doctrine and argument on the side of Mr. Gorham, of the doctrine and argument on the side of the Bishop of Exeter, and of the judgment of the Judicial Committee of Privy Council, are here subjoined.

Doctrine and Argument on the side of Mr. Gorham.

That "no spiritual grace is conveyed in Baptism except to *worthy recipients*,"^a—or, in other words, "WHERE THERE IS NO WORTHY RECEPTION THERE IS NO BESTOWMENT OF GRACE."^b

That "infants are by nature *unworthy recipients*, being 'born in sin and the children of wrath.'"^c

That infants therefore "cannot receive any benefit from Baptism except there shall have been a prevenient act of grace to make them worthy."^d

That faith,^e forgiveness of sins,^f justification,^g regeneration,^h the new nature,ⁱ and "adoption, or the filial state,"^k constituting the character of the "member of Christ," the "child of

^a ' *Examination*,' published by Mr. Gorham, p. 83. (Hatchards.) The Italics and Capitals are Mr. Gorham's.

^b *Ibid.*, p. 69; also pp. 90, 91.

^c *Ibid.*, p. 83.

^d *Ibid.*, p. 83.

^e *Ibid.*, pp. 81, 111, 197.

^f *Ibid.*, pp. 93, 95.

^g *Ibid.*, p. 197.

^h *Ibid.*, p. 85.

ⁱ *Ibid.*, p. 83.

^k *Ibid.*, pp. 93, 94, 111.

God," and the "inheritor of the kingdom of heaven," are conferred on "worthy recipients"—"not *in* Baptism," but by an act of prevenient grace bestowed by God "*before* Baptism," thus making them worthy,¹—and so far are these blessings from being "tied to" or "equivalent to" Baptism, that "justification, faith, and adoption" "may take place *before, in, or after,* that Sacrament."^m

That "Baptism is a certification, pledge, and public manifestation by the individual who is baptized, that he believes, with 'all his heart,' in the Divine nature, mission, and atonement of the Son of God. It is a 'Sign' that the person baptized has professed that belief. It *may be,* and very often *is,* a Sign of *nothing more.* But if it be received 'rightly, worthily, and by faith,' it is an '*effectual* Sign' of God's 'grace' bestowed, which" previously had "implanted a new nature and produced the faith both professed and possessed; and it is also a Sign of 'God's good will towards us,' by which he 'strengthens' and confirms our 'faith' in Him."ⁿ—This strengthening and confirmation of faith is the whole amount of spiritual grace that Baptism can confer even on worthy recipients,—faith, forgiveness of sins, justification, regeneration, the new nature, and the filial state, having been conferred on such before Baptism.^o

That "if adoption" and the blessings which accompany it "were, not co-existent with, or instantly consequent on, FAITH, but were relegated to the period of BAPTISM, then the believer would be 'born of the will of the flesh' and 'of the will of man,'

¹ *Examination*, p. 113.

^m *Ibid.*, p. 197.—*Dr. Bayford, Argument for Mr. Gorham*, p. 217, (Seeleys.)

ⁿ '*Examination*,' p. 86. See also pp. 93, 94.

^o "Est miserabilis animæ servitus, *Signa* pro REBUS accipere!" *S. Augustinus*.—Motto, title-page of Mr. Gorham's '*Examination*.'

since man *can* will to select the time,"—whereas "the believer is 'born, not of the will of the flesh, nor of the will of man, but of God; for FAITH is the gift of God.'"^p—In other words, if "EVERY infant" were made by God, in Baptism lawfully administered, "a member of Christ, the child of God, and an inheritor of the kingdom of heaven," "the Spirit would, of necessity, effect His operation in EVERY infant *at the moment when* man thinks fit to direct He *shall* effect it,"^q which is not to be supposed, and is against Scripture.

That adoption through the remission of sins, and Baptism, are therefore quite distinct and separate, the one unconnected with the other.

That infants who have been baptized and die as infants are saved, not through Baptism, but because they have been regenerated by prevenient grace. The rubric, "It is certain by God's word that children which are baptized, dying before they commit actual sin, are undoubtedly saved," is not inconsistent with this.^r "But if such infants live to a period when they can commit actual sin, the declaration of regeneration must be construed hypothetically."^s Prevenient grace therefore is not necessarily bestowed on such infants as survive to the age of responsibility, and on some such infants, being unworthy and remaining "children of wrath" after and notwithstanding their Baptism, Baptism confers no grace or benefit, and they perish. In other words, God only grants prevenient grace, the regeneration which accompanies it, and

^p 'Exam.,' p. 172.

^q Ibid., pp. 109 (text and note), 172.

^r Ibid., p. 85.—Mr. Gorham "holds that infants may be saved without the Baptism of water; and therefore he most fully accedes to the declaration in the Rubric, that baptized infants dying before they commit actual sin are undoubtedly saved."—*Bayford*, p. 217.

^s *Exam.*, p. 85.

consequent salvation, to some infants and withholds it from others, and regeneration is withheld from such even though they be baptized.^t

Mr. Gorham further pleads,

That, whereas the Prayer-Book or Formularies of the Church of England—"less theologically exact" than the Articles"—form "the mere code of her devotion," the Thirty-Nine Articles, on the contrary, form her "code of doctrine,"^x her "direct, positive, rigid, dogmatical assertion of Divine truth,"^y her "severely precise STANDARD,"^z the "UMPIRE"^a in all cases of diversity of opinion or ambiguity,—that these Articles are to be interpreted according to the opinions of those who drew them up, and who held the doctrines of Calvin, (including the doctrine of election and reprobation,) which doctrines they necessarily intended to inculcate in drawing them up, as well as in revising the Formularies,^b—and, as a general principle, that "THE FORMULARIES ARE NOT TO GOVERN THE CONSTRUCTION OF THE ARTICLES, BUT THE ARTICLES MUST DECIDE THE CONSTRUCTION OF THE FORMULARIES."^c

That where the Articles speak doubtfully or undecidedly on any point, the Church intends thereby to decline giving any

^t "Mr. Gorham . . . holds that God is not tied to Baptism as a means and channel of his grace even with infants; for that He gives his Spirit as He will, when He will, and to whom He will—whether before, or in, or after Baptism, or not at all."—*Bayford*, p. 217.

^u *Exam.*, p. 200.

^w *Argument of Mr. Turner*, on behalf of Mr. Gorham. *Full Report of the Arguments of Counsel, &c. before the Judicial Committee*, p. 25, (Painter.)

^x *Ibid.*, p. 25.

^y *Exam.*, p. 102.

^z *Ibid.*, p. 156.

^a *Ibid.*, p. 128.

^b *Bayford*, Pref. p. xi., and *passim*,—Conf. Sir Herbert J. Fust's Judgment, pp. 29, 72 sqq. (Seeleys).

^c *Exam.*, p. 200.

judgment on that point, and to leave it an open question for her members to form their own opinion upon it by the construction of Scripture according to the light of private judgment.^d

That a clergyman is not required to hold or teach any doctrine which is not clearly and expressly defined and laid down in the Articles.^e

That the Articles speak with the indecision and doubt alluded to on the question of Baptism,—and

That he, Mr. Gorham, is consequently entitled to hold and teach the doctrines above stated, and has a right to institution at the hands of the Bishop of Exeter.

Doctrine and argument on the side of the Bishop of Exeter.

That Mr. Gorham's doctrine refutes itself. For "if a child, being born in sin and the child of wrath, is unworthy to receive Baptism without prevenient grace, and this prevenient grace does that which Baptism generally has been declared to do," why is not that child unworthy in the first instance to receive prevenient grace? ^f

That if no grace is conferred in and by Baptism, it must be presumed that Baptism would have been deferred to the age of responsibility—not conferred in infancy.^g

That the grace of adoption and regeneration, the gifts of the Spirit, cannot be said to be at the command and "will of man" in Baptism, since the "grace" sought is through the

^d *Mr. Turner's Argument*, pp. 28, 31, 32.

^e *Ibid.*, pp. 28, 32.

^f *Mr. Badeley's Argument*, on behalf of the Bishop of Exeter, p. 202, (Murray.)

^g See Dr. Pusey, *Royal Supremacy*, p. 187, (Parker.)

“ means ” or channel, and at the time, which God hath Himself appointed.

That the doctrine of the Catholic or Universal Church on the point in question is expressed in the Nicene Creed as follows,—“ I ACKNOWLEDGE ONE BAPTISM FOR THE REMISSION OF SINS ; ” by which dogmatical decision Baptism and the remission of sins, the sacrament and the grace, with all the privileges and benefits attaching to the Christian covenant, are indissolubly coupled together.^h

That the teaching of the Catholic Church in all countries and in all ages has been strictly in accordance with this article of the Nicene Creed.ⁱ

That the Church of England, as a branch of the Catholic Church, not dating from the Reformation but then reformed—not according to the opinions of this or that individual or body of men, but—by the light and authority of antiquity, and professedly resting her faith upon the Bible, the Three Creeds, and the Six Œcumenical Councils, necessarily holds the doctrine of “ one Baptism for the remission of sins,” as expressed in the Nicene Creed.^k

That the Church of England teaches this same doctrine, in accordance with the Nicene Creed, in her Catechism and her Baptismal and other services.^l

That the Church of England teaches this same doctrine in her Article “ of the Three Creeds,” which affirms that those Creeds “ ought thoroughly to be received and believed ; for they may be proved by most certain warrants of Scripture.” The dogma of “ one Baptism for the remission of sins ” is therefore a clause of one of the Thirty-Nine Articles.

^h *Bp. of Exeter's Letter*, pp. 19, 27, 48 ; *Badeley*, p. 205.

ⁱ *Badeley*, pp. 103 sqq.

^k *Ibid.*, p. 96.

^l *Ibid.*, pp. 50 sqq.

That the Sixteenth Article, "Of Sin after Baptism," further indissolubly couples the reception of the Holy Ghost with Baptism.^m

That the phraseology of the Twenty-Fifth Article similarly affirms that the Sacraments are channels of grace.ⁿ

That if the Reformers individually held the doctrines of Calvin, as represented by Mr. Gorham, they would have expressed them in the Articles and Formularies as then reformed—whereas they have not done so; the Seventeenth Article decides nothing regarding Election and Predestination, and their language everywhere, taken in the plain, literal meaning, is utterly irreconcilable with those doctrines, and can only be explained in a Calvinistic sense by taking it in a strained and non-natural sense.^o

That, so far from the Thirty-nine Articles of the Church of England being her "direct, positive, rigid, dogmatical assertion of truth," her "severely precise standard," her "umpire" in all cases of diversity or ambiguity—and as such entitled to govern and decide the construction of the Formularies—the latter being the devotional as the former are the doctrinal code of the Church; the fact is, that the Articles are *not* drawn up with the severe precision asserted,^p—many doctrines of high importance enunciated in the Prayer-Book are not mentioned in them, as, for example, the office of the Holy Ghost, the duty of public prayer, a particular providence, the existence of Satan, and the doctrine of marriage and incest,—“they leave us on many points to collect the doctrine of the Church elsewhere.”^q In a word, erroneous doctrine on each and all of these points might be taught, and exemption

^m *Gorham, Exam.*, p. 212.

ⁿ *Badeley*, p. 38.

^o *Sir H. J. Fust's Judgment*, pp. 73 sqq.

^p *Badeley*, p. 26.

^q *Ibid.*, pp. 29, 30, 35.

from the consequences claimed, on the argument of Mr. Gorham, viz. that a clergyman is not obliged to hold or teach a particular doctrine, even though expressed in the Formularies of the Church, because it is not explicitly laid down in the Thirty-nine Articles.^r It is an error moreover to represent the Formularies as less doctrinally exact than the Articles,—they were intended for the instruction and rule of life of the laity as the Articles were for the clergy;^s and “*lex orandi lex credendi*” has been the maxim of the Church in all ages.^t—The truth in the matter is, that “the Articles and Formularies are of equal value,”^u stand “on an equal footing,”^w and have “equal sanction and authority,”^x—“both emanate from Convocation, both are confirmed by Statute,”^y—if there is any difference in their relative authority, that difference is in favour of the Prayer-Book, as having undergone the latest revision,^z and been the last authorised in order of time;^a and, while the Prayer-Book has been amplified from time to time, the Articles have not.^b But this pre-eminence is not claimed for the Prayer-Book, and, as a general rule, if the Articles are ambiguous on any point, the Rubrics and Formularies decide it, and *vice versâ*, and the doctrine so decided is the law of the Church and the land.^c—Further, the Articles are supplementary to the Creeds, the Six Œcumenical Councils, and the Prayer-Book—they do not supersede them; but stand on the footing of a statute *in pari materiâ* with pre-

^r *Badeley*, p. 30.—The Inspiration of Scripture might also be questioned, and the doctrine of the universal restoration of the wicked affirmed and taught, on these grounds.—*Pusey, Royal Supremacy*, pp. 8 to 12.

^s *Badeley*, p. 34.

^t *Ibid.*, p. 11.

^u *Ibid.*, p. 6.

^w *Ibid.*, p. 21.

^x *Ibid.*, p. 21.

^y *Ibid.*, p. 7.

^z *Ibid.*, p. 21.

^a *Ibid.*, pp. 21, 25.

^b *Ibid.*, p. 35.

^c *Ibid.*, p. 4.

vious statutes, all of which are to be taken and interpreted in connexion with each other.^d Mr. Gorham's view of the relative superiority of the Articles as the standard of doctrine is consequently erroneous.

That the Bible, therefore, the Three Creeds, the Six Œcumenical Councils, the Prayer-Book, and the Thirty-nine Articles form the source from which the doctrine of Baptism, as held by the Church of England, is to be derived, and that doctrine, so far as is involved in the present question, is as follows :—

That there is “one baptism for the remission of sins,”—

That infants having no actual sin, but only original sin, oppose no hindrance to the reception of baptismal grace, and are worthy of Baptism,—

That original sin is therefore remitted to all infants in Baptism,—

That every infant, rightly or lawfully baptized, becomes *ipso facto* a “member of Christ, the child of God,” or “of grace,” one of the “elect people of God,” and an “inheritor of the kingdom of heaven,”—or, in other words, is “REGENERATE;”^e that is to say, he becomes a member of the Mystical Body of which Christ is the Head, and as such shares individually in the Life flowing through that Body; and retains that Life, or, as it is stated in the Catechism, “continues” in that “state of salvation” for ever after, in this world and the next, unless he forfeits it before temporal death by “deadly sin”^f unrepented of.

That Mr. Gorham denies this doctrine in declaring original sin to be a hindrance to the benefit of Baptism, in entirely

^d *Badley*, p. 25.

^e Baptismal Service.

^f Article XVI

separating regeneration from Baptism by ascribing it to prevenient grace, and in holding that God withhold His Spirit from some infants even though they be baptized; whereby he rejects an article of the Nicene Creed^g—not merely as such, and as witnessed to by the other dogmatical authorities of the Church, but as embodied and enforced in the Thirty-nine Articles themselves, the standard and umpire to which he himself appeals with respect to the point in question,—that he therefore holds unsound doctrine on the subject of Baptism, and has no right to institution at the hands of the Bishop of Exeter.

Judgment of the Privy Council.

That Mr. Gorham's doctrine appears to the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council to be as follows:^h—"That Baptism is a sacrament generally necessary to salvation; but that the grace of regeneration does not so necessarily accompany the act of Baptism that regeneration invariably takes place in Baptism; that the grace may be granted before, in, or after Baptism; that Baptism is an effectual sign of grace, by which God works invisibly in us, but only in such as worthily receive it; in them alone it has a wholesome effect; and that, without reference to the qualification of the recipient, it is not in

^g *Bp. of Exeter's Letter*, pp. 48 sqq.

^h This summary of Mr. Gorham's doctrine is prefaced by the following statement:—"In considering the Examination, which is the only evidence, we must have regard not only to the particular question to which each answer is subjoined, but to the general scope, object, and character of the whole examination; and if, under circumstances so peculiar and perplexing, some of the answers should be found difficult to be reconciled with one another (as we think is the case), justice requires that an endeavour should be made to reconcile them in such a manner as to obtain the result which appears most consistent with the general intention of Mr. Gorham in the exposition of his doctrines and opinions."—*Full Report*, &c., p. 117.

itself an effectual sign of grace. That infants baptized, and dying before actual sin, are certainly saved, but that in no case is regeneration in Baptism unconditional.”ⁱ

That the question to be decided is “not whether” these opinions “are theologically sound or unsound,” “but whether” they “are contrary or repugnant to the doctrines which the Church of England by its Articles, Formularies, and Rubrics requires to be held by its ministers,—so that upon the ground of these opinions” Mr. Gorham “can lawfully be excluded from the benefice to which he has been presented.”^k

That this question must be decided by the Articles, Formularies, and Rubrics, as interpreted by the same rules of construction which have been established from time immemorial as applicable to all written instruments.^l

That “there were different doctrines prevailing and under discussion at the times when the Articles and Liturgy were framed ; but we are not to be in any way influenced by the particular opinions of the eminent men who propounded or discussed them ; or by the authorities by which they may be supposed to have been influenced ; or by any supposed tendency to give preponderance to Calvinistic or Arminian doctrines. The Articles and Liturgy, as we now have them, must be considered as the final result of the discussion which took place—not the representation of the opinions of any particular men, Calvinistic, Arminian, or any other ; but the conclusion which we must presume to have been deduced from a due consideration of all the circumstances of the case, including both the sources from which the declared doctrine was derived, and the erroneous opinions which were to be corrected.”^m

ⁱ *Full Report*, &c., p. 118.

^k *Ibid.*

^l *Ibid.*, pp. 118, 119.

^m *Ibid.*, p. 120.

That in framing "Articles of faith, as a means of avoiding diversities of opinion, and establishing consent touching true religion," the Church "must be presumed to have decided such of the questions then under discussion as it was thought proper, prudent, and practicable to decide," selecting for that purpose such points as she deemed "most important to be made known to and to be accepted by" her members, and "those upon which" they "could agree," and to have left "other points and questions for future decision by competent authority, and in the mean time to the private judgment of pious and conscientious persons." That "it would have been impossible, even if desirable, to employ language which would not admit of some latitude of interpretation," and "if the latitude were confined within such limits as might be allowed without danger to any doctrine necessary to salvation, the possible or probable difference of interpretation may have been designedly intended even by the framers of the Articles themselves. And" that "in all cases in which the Articles, considered as a test, admit of different interpretations, it must be held that any sense of which the words fairly admit may be allowed, if that sense be not contradictory to something which the Church has elsewhere allowed or required."ⁿ

That "if there be any doctrine on which the Articles are silent or ambiguously expressed, so as to be capable of two meanings," it must be supposed "that it was intended to leave that doctrine to private judgment, unless the Rubrics and Formularies clearly and distinctly decide it. If they do, it must be concluded that the doctrine so decided is the doctrine of the Church. But, on the other hand, if the expressions used in the Rubrics and Formularies are ambiguous, it is not to be con-

ⁿ *Full Report, &c.*, p. 120.

cluded that the Church meant to establish indirectly as a doctrine that which it did not establish directly as such by the Articles of faith, the code avowedly made for the avoiding of diversities of opinion and for the establishing of consent touching true religion.”^o

That, with respect to the Articles, it appears that, while those of 1536 affirm positively that infants receive remission of sins and the gift of the Holy Ghost in, by, and through Baptism, those of 1552 and 1562 “have special regard to the qualification of worthy and right reception.”^p

That the Articles of 1562 do not determine “what is signified by right reception” or “regeneration,” and leave other points undecided.^q

That differences of opinion upon such points “were thought consistent with subscription to the Articles,” as appears from the royal Declaration prefixed to the Articles in the reign of Charles I.^r

That “if the Articles which constitute the code of faith, and from which any differences are prohibited, nevertheless contain expressions which unavoidably admit of different constructions, and members of the Church are left at liberty to draw from the Articles different inferences in matters of faith not expressly decided, and upon such points to exercise their private judgments;” it may “reasonably” be expected “to find such differences of opinion allowable in the interpretation of the devotional services, which were framed, not for the purpose of determining points of faith, but of establishing (to use the expression of the statute of Elizabeth) a uniform order of Common Prayer, and of the administration of the sacraments, rites, and ceremonies of the Church of England.”^s

^o *Full Report*, &c., p. 121.

^p *Ibid.*, p. 122.

^q *Ibid.*, p. 124.

^r *Ibid.*, p. 125.

^s *Ibid.*

That the Formularies of the Church having been framed for the purpose above stated, and with the view of being “more earnest and fit to stir Christian people to the due honouring of Almighty God,” “cannot,” as rightly urged by Mr. Gorham, “be held to be evidence of faith or of doctrine without reference to the distinct declarations of doctrine in the Articles, and to the faith, hope, and charity, by which they profess to be inspired or accompanied.”^t

That “the services,” including the Baptismal service, “abound with expressions which must be construed in a charitable and qualified sense, and cannot with any appearance of reason be taken as proofs of doctrine.”^u

That “those who are strongly impressed with the earnest prayers which are offered” in the Baptismal service “for the Divine blessing and the grace of God may not unreasonably suppose that the grace is not necessarily tied to the rite, but that it ought to be earnestly and devoutly prayed for, in order that it may then, or when God pleases, be present to make the rite beneficial.”^w

That the Rubric, “It is certain by God’s word, that children which are baptized, dying before they commit actual sin, are undoubtedly saved,” at the end of the Baptismal service, “does not, like the Articles of 1536, say that such children are saved by Baptism.”^x

That “this view of the Baptismal service is confirmed by the Catechism, in which, although the respondent is made to state that in his Baptism ‘he was made a member of Christ, the child of God, and an inheritor of the Kingdom of heaven,’ it is still declared that repentance and faith are required of

^t *Full Report*, &c., p. 126.

^u *Ibid.*, p. 131.

^w *Ibid.*, p. 131.

^x *Ibid.*

persons to be baptized; and when the question is asked, 'Why then are infants baptized, when by reason of their tender age they cannot perform them,' the answer is—not that infants are baptized because by their innocence they cannot be unworthy recipients, or cannot present an *obex* or hindrance to the grace of regeneration, and are therefore fit objects for Divine grace—but 'because they promise them both by their sureties, which promise when they come to age themselves are bound to perform.' The answer has direct reference to the condition on which the benefit is to depend. And the whole Catechism requires a charitable construction, such as must be given to the expression, 'God the Holy Ghost, who sanctifieth me and all the elect people of God.'"^y

That the Articles, the Formularies, and the Rubrics speak therefore in such terms on the question of Baptism, that Mr. Gorham's doctrines cannot be considered "contrary or repugnant to the declared doctrine of the Church of England as by law established."^z

That many illustrious prelates and divines—among whom are enumerated Jewell, Hooker, Usher, Jeremy Taylor, Pearson, and others—"have propounded and maintained opinions" which "cannot in any important particular" be distinguished "from those entertained by Mr. Gorham," "unblamed and unquestioned,"—which proves "the liberty which has been allowed of maintaining such doctrines."^a

That Mr. Gorham consequently "ought not, by reason of the doctrine held by him, to have been refused admittance to the vicarage of Brampford Speke."^b

That, further, "there are other points of doctrine," inde-

^y *Full Report*, &c., p. 130. ^z *Ibid.*, p. 134. ^a *Ibid.*, pp. 132 sqq.

^b *Ibid.*, p. 134.

pendently of those previously noticed, “ respecting the Sacrament of Baptism, which are by the Rubrics and Formularies (as well as the Articles) capable of being honestly understood in different senses;” “ and that upon these points all ministers of the Church, having duly made the subscription required by law (and taking Holy Scripture for their guide), are at liberty honestly to exercise their private judgment without offence or censure.”^c

This judgment of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council having been embodied in a Report to the Queen and laid before Her Majesty, Her Majesty issued an Order in Council on the 9th of March, the day following the date of the Report, approving of the Report, reversing the decree of the Court of Arches, and commanding that the usual steps should be proceeded with for admitting, instituting, and inducting Mr. Gorham into the vicarage of Brampford Speke.

The effect of this judgment, in the opinion of the Bishop of Exeter and his friends, is this :—

Whereas it has hitherto been understood that the Church of England prescribes absolute acceptance of the Nicene Creed, including the article on Baptism, indissolubly associating remission of sins with that Sacrament; IT IS NOW RULED, FOR THE FIRST TIME, THAT THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND DOES NOT PRESCRIBE ABSOLUTE ACCEPTANCE OF AN ARTICLE OF THE CREED, (the article on Baptism above alluded to,) and that she allows her ministers to hold and teach doctrine in direct opposition to it—in other words, TO HOLD AND TEACH HERESY.

^c *Full Report, &c.*, p. 131.

This, in the view taken by the Bishop of Exeter, compromises, or at least impugns her Catholicity, and it behoves her to vindicate it by reasserting the truth.

It may be questioned, however, whether this view of the effect of the judgment is well grounded. The judgment is at all events extremely embarrassing.

The compiler will not here enter into the question whether this judgment is to be considered authoritative and final, or not. He will merely mention,

- i. That, with the view of extricating the Church from the embarrassment in which she has been placed by this judgment, the Bishop of Exeter has applied to the Court of Queen's Bench, the Court of Common Pleas, and the Court of Exchequer, successively, for a rule to show cause why a prohibition should not be granted to prohibit the Court of Arches from carrying out the Order in Council made by Her Majesty on the 9th of March—on the ground that by two Acts of Parliament, of the 24th and 25th Henry VIII., still subsisting, unrepealed, the appeal in causes which affect the Crown (such as the present) is to the Upper House of Convocation, and not to the Sovereign, and that the decision by the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council and by Her Majesty is consequently of no effect, as not emanating from the proper tribunal. Rule has been refused by the Court of Queen's Bench and Court of Common Pleas,—it has been granted by the Court of Exchequer.^d—And

^d An analysis of the arguments and judgments in these Courts up to the present moment will be found in the Appendix, *infra*, p. 45. It is neces-

ii. That, with the view of guarding against a recurrence of the embarrassment in which the Church has just been placed, and in sequence to his exertions during the last three years in anticipation of such an embarrassment, the Bishop of London has introduced a Bill into Parliament, entitled, “An Act to amend the Law with reference to the Administration of Justice in Her Majesty’s Privy Council on Appeal from the Ecclesiastical Courts,”—providing that “on Appeals from Ecclesiastical Courts involving Matters of Doctrine, the Privy Council shall refer the Question to the Archbishops and Bishops of Canterbury and York, whose opinion shall be binding” “and conclusive for the purposes of the Appeal in which such Reference shall be made, and shall be adopted and acted upon by the said Judicial Committee, so far as may be necessary for the Decision of the Matter under Appeal, and shall be specially reported by the said Judicial Committee to Her Majesty in Council, together with their Advice to Her Majesty upon such Appeal,”—leaving it to the wisdom of the Crown to adopt or not the Report of the Judicial Committee, embodying the decision of the Bishops.

The following are among the principal heads of argument in support of this measure:—it has been rejected for the moment, but must be regarded as virtually in a state of dormancy, not extinction:—

That the mode of conducting appeals in matters ecclesiastical, since the sixteenth century and as at present

sarily too much abbreviated to afford a full view of them, but may give a tolerable idea of their scope and bearing to the general reader, which is all that the compiler aims at in these pages.

existing, is as follows:—The first statute regulating such appeals was that of the 24th Henry VIII., chap. 12, which regulated the course to be adopted in certain cases affecting wills, matrimony, divorce, tithes, and oblations of laymen. It referred, in its preamble, to the prerogative of the Crown as supreme in its authority to render justice in all cases temporal and spiritual; but expressly recognized the authority of the spirituality as sufficient and meet of itself to determine all doubts when any cause of the law divine happened to come in question, or of spiritual learning. It directed that appeals should be made from the Archdeacon to the Bishop, and from the Bishop to the Archbishop, and there the appeal was to be final in the cases to which it related, except where the King was concerned; and where the King was concerned, the appeal was to be made to the Upper House of Convocation, whose decision also was to be final. The next statute, the 25th Henry VIII., chap. 19, was passed in the following year, 1533; it enacted, that for lack of justice in any of the courts of the Archbishops of this realm an appeal should lie to the King in Chancery, and that in such cases the Sovereign should appoint a Court of Delegates to determine the cause, whose decision should be final.^e No further appeal was granted in the statute; but there was one in practice by means of a Commission of Review. In the following year, 1534, the statute of

^e The plea of the Bishop of Exeter, that, in cases touching the Crown, the appeal to the Upper House of Convocation still stands good, is under this statute, 25 Henry VIII., chap. 19, as taken in connection with the statute of the preceding year.

the 26th Henry VIII. was passed, which declared the King to be Supreme Head on earth of the Church of England, and gave him authority to visit, repress, and correct errors, heresies, and abuses, which by any manner of spiritual authority might be lawfully reformed. That statute was repealed in the reign of Queen Mary, and was never revived ; but the 1st of the reign of Elizabeth, chap. 1, gave the same power to the Crown, and, what the former statute did not, the means of exercising it, viz., the High Commission Court. That Court was afterwards abolished by the 16th Charles I., chap. 11. But its jurisdiction being original and not appellate, the ancient appellate jurisdiction remained in the Court of Delegates untouched till recent times, when the 2nd and 3rd William IV., chap. 96, abolished the Court of Delegates, and enacted that the appeal should be made to the King in Council, that the decision there should be final, and that there should be no Commission of Review. An act of the following year constituted the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council as a Court to hear all appeals, and to make a report or recommendation to His Majesty. And so the law now stands.^f

That the relations of Church and State, and the circumstances under which appeals were, as above, originally constituted, have essentially changed during the last three centuries. Chancery was originally an Ecclesiastical court, and still partook of that character in the reign of Henry VIII.—the Court of Delegates for seventy years after its institution consisted of Bishops

^f *Bishop of London's Speech*, Monday, June 3, 1850.

only, to the exclusion of civil judges—the possibility that judges in spiritual matters should be other than Churchmen was utterly inconceivable. It is not to be supposed therefore, that, in acquiescing in such appeals to the King in Chancery as are enacted by the statute of Henry VIII., the Church anticipated that she was delivering over the deposit of the faith committed to her to the interpretation of judges not necessarily in communion with her. And this applies *à fortiori* to appeals to the King in Council, from which Bishops are excluded, where (as premised) there is no Commission of Review, and where decrees are final :^g—

That a tribunal of lay lawyers, whose habits and studies have been devoted to other matters from their youth upwards, and who may belong to any religious body whatever, and hold doctrines condemned by the Church,^h can hardly be expected to adjudicate or advise the Crown on questions involving the interpretation of Doctrine (frequently extremely abstruse and deep) as held by the Church of England, without falling into error through insufficient acquaintance with Christian antiquity in the first instance, and misapprehension of the true character and position of the Church of England as connected with antiquity in the second :—

That it is candidly admitted by those who abolished the Court of Delegates and Commission of Review, and established the present Judicial Committee, “ that the Judicial Committee was framed without any expecta-

^g Conf. *Speech of Lord Redesdale.*

^h *Speeches of the Bishops of London and Oxford.*

tion whatever that cases of the present kind would come before it," "with a view to totally different classes of cases,"—that "had it been otherwise, in all probability some different arrangements would have been introduced,"—and that "it remains to be seen whether alterations or modifications cannot be adopted to obviate this objection."ⁱ

That the presence of "three" or "four" prelates, selected in order to sit along with the Judicial Committee as advisers in spiritual cases, would be no sufficient guarantee for the soundness of the judgment given,—for "quis custodiat ipsos custodes?" who could answer for the orthodoxy of the prelates themselves—as Bishops are now appointed?—those prelates moreover being admitted only on sufferance, and at the choice of the minister of the day. And, granting their orthodoxy, their advice, necessarily mere advice *ab externo*, could not compensate to such a tribunal for the want of that intimate and entire familiarity with the whole scope and character of Christian antiquity and doctrine, which is indispensable for calm and solid judgment in such cases, although a less degree of it may suffice for forensic or controversial argument. If the Bishops sit as assessors in order to advise the Judicial Committee on points of doctrine, and their advice be disregarded, their presence is a mockery. If, contrariwise, the judges defer to their opinion, it is the Bishops who judge, not the Committee—and "three" or "four" of the Bishops, not the whole bench.^k

ⁱ *Speech of Lord Brougham*, who expressed his concurrence with Lord Lansdowne in these opinions.

^k *Conf. Lord Stanley's Speech.*

That, on the other hand, there can be no body of men so competent for the decision of questions of doctrine as the Upper House of Convocation, the Bishops, as representing (for this purpose) the Church of England.

In the first place, the Church possesses an inherent right to that office. The Church is a body instituted by the Almighty for the purpose of maintaining a tradition of saving truth upon the earth, and to be a witness of that truth in all generations. This truth is embodied in a written revelation, Holy Scripture; and the office and duty of the Church is—not to enlarge or develope that truth, but—to declare and define it when impugned or denied.¹ This office belongs to the Church by inherent and indefeasible right, inherent in her by her very constitution, and expressly delegated to her by her Divine Head in the words of the Apostolic Commission,^m—and this office requires to be exercised.

Secondly, in accordance with this inherent right, it has been a principle of the English constitution from time immemorial, that the decision of special cases of false doctrine should be left not only to Ecclesiastical but to Spiritual judges; and the Royal Declaration of 1562 fully affirms the intention, that from time to time a spiritual body, convoked under authority of the Crown, should—not introduce fresh articles and innovations, but—explain and expound the doctrines and teaching of the Church of England.ⁿ

Thirdly, the free exercise of her peculiar functions

¹ *Bishop of Oxford's Speech.*

^m *Bishop of London's Speech.*

ⁿ *Lord Stanley's Speech.*

by the Church, without let or hindrance, is essential to the health and stability of the Constitution. "Certain it is," says Lord Coke, "that this kingdom hath been best governed, and peace and quiet preserved, when both parties, that is, when the justices of the temporal courts and the ecclesiastical judges have kept themselves within their proper jurisdiction without encroaching or usurping one upon another; and where such encroachments or usurpations have been made they have been the seeds of great troubles and inconvenience."^o

Fourthly, the theory of an Ecclesiastical tribunal of appeal implies—on the part of the State, the inviolate preservation of the original *status* of doctrine and discipline agreed on by Church and State, and the restriction of all Ecclesiastical judges within the terms of that settlement and the bounds of their lawful jurisdiction,—on the part of the Church, the preservation of her doctrine, purity, spirit, and discipline inviolate, and the possession in the last resort of a *bonâ fide* power of correcting errors in that respect in the civil courts of appeal without a collision with the State.^p

This theory would be constitutionally carried out by the restoration of Synodical action in Convocation,^q—the plain remedy for existing anomalies.

But, if it be deemed inexpedient at present to summon Convocation, it cannot be admitted that it is right or just to deprive the Church of any means whatever of authoritatively setting forth her doctrine when

^o *Bishop of London's Speech.*

^p *Ibid.*

^q *Ibid.*

impugned or denied.^r On the contrary, it ought to possess the power to refer any question of false doctrine to its Bishops, whenever an inevitable necessity arises for a decision upon it.^s The Established Church of Scotland possesses Synodical power—and the Church of England is the only church in Europe to whom it is refused.

That it is not however proposed by the Bishop of London to substitute for the existing court of appeal a new court; but merely to confer on the existing court additional powers, to enable it to direct its proceedings and to form its decisions on grounds which will stand the test of inquiry^t and secure for itself the respect and confidence of the people.

It is a maxim in all courts of law, that “*Cuique in arte suâ credendum est.*” In courts of equity, when disputed questions of common law arise, it is the practice to obtain a judgment from the common-law court for the guidance of the court of equity,—when questions of foreign law arise, the opinions of sworn witnesses practically conversant with foreign law are taken and acted upon,—in questions of nautical science, the judge of the Court of Admiralty calls in to his assistance some of the Elder Brethren of the Trinity House, and almost invariably decides upon their opinion,—in questions of patents, the law lords similarly take the testimony of men of science conversant with that particular science, in which they themselves are ignorant.” And by the same analogy, but on

^r *Lord Stanley's Speech.*

^s *Bishop of London's Speech.*

^t *Ibid.*

^u *Ibid.*

independent and superior grounds, needing no apology, the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council are entitled to possess (and Churchmen to demand for them, for their own security) the like privilege, of receiving assistance in forming their judgment and offering their advice to the Crown upon questions of doctrine, from those on whose competency to judge of such questions, as men learned in the science of theology, it would be impertinent to comment,—from those whose collective wisdom, as assembled in Synod, the Third Person in the Trinity is believed peculiarly to enlighten and guide—in a word, from that venerable and august body, the Episcopate of England.—And surely a most inestimable privilege and comfort it would be, to be thus preserved from responsibility and the probability of error in matters of such awful and super-human moment.

That the embarrassment in which the Church has been placed by the recent decision in the case of *Gorham v. the Bishop of Exeter*, is the strongest possible argument in favour of the measure introduced by the Bishop of London. If the Judicial Committee have (to take the most favourable supposition) overlooked or misapprehended the peccant point in Mr. Gorham's doctrine, and sanctioned the teaching of a heretic (though they may not have sanctioned his heresy), the next step may be worse—heresy itself may be affirmed as truth, and the vital doctrines of Christianity be made open questions—unless something be done to prevent this evil.^w

^w Conf. *the Bishop of London's Speech.*

That to perpetuate the present state of things under the existing change of circumstances, and with the hazard just alluded to, would be to take undue advantage of the confidence and faith reposed by the Church in the State at the time of the Reformation, and since.

That the measure proposed disavows all infringement of the Royal Prerogative or Supremacy. The Royal Supremacy, constitutionally held and exercised, is not a burden but an advantage to the Church,—it has the sanction of antiquity,—it is, in the words of the Bishop of London, “a jewel of the ancient Crown of this realm, plucked from it and transferred to his own tiara by a foreign potentate, and claimed for the Crown and regained by its rightful owner shortly before the Reformation.” It is that prerogative which, in the language of our Articles, “we see to have been given always to all godly princes in Holy Scriptures by God himself; that is, that they should rule all estates and degrees committed to their charge by God, whether they be ecclesiastical or temporal, and restrain with the civil sword the stubborn and evildoers.” But this Supremacy is not a personal or arbitrary quality or right in the Sovereign, which may be delegated to any subject,—it must be exercised by legal and constitutional tribunals, or as expressed in the statute 24 Henry VIII., “in causes spiritual by judges spiritual, and in causes temporal by judges temporal,”—in causes temporal by means either of the courts of common law or of the courts founded under statute law; in causes spiritual by the Ecclesiastical courts, which administer

law enacted with the consent of Parliament, and of the Church's Parliament, Convocation.^x All that is now demanded is, that the Crown should have the assistance on matters of faith of the Spiritual Judges of the land,^y and should exercise its Supremacy and Prerogative in conformity to the spirit (at least) if not to the strict letter of the Constitution.^z

That, finally, the measure proposed, so far from attacking or infringing the Royal Supremacy or the liberties of the subject, is in fact a measure for the protection of the Crown, of the Church, and of the Laity—whose rights and liberties are all equally concerned—against the three contingencies, of the Crown being called upon to appoint persons to offices in the Church who hold doctrines at variance with those of the Church, and which, as Head of the Church, the Crown is bound to discountenance^a—of the Church being called upon and compelled to institute such persons to such offices^b—

^x *Bishop of London's Speech. Conf. Speeches of the Bishop of Oxford, of Lord Lyttelton, and of Lord Stanley.*

^y *Bishop of Oxford's Speech.*

^z Lord Stanley wishes that the Bishop of London's Bill should be so far modified as not to withdraw from the Judicial Committee the power of passing the sentence. "I would not," he says in his speech to the House of Lords, "constitute the Bishops a Court for the purpose of passing their sentence, but would suggest whether it would not be well if the Bishops, with regard to all matters of doctrine and teaching of the Church of England, were placed upon the same footing on which, with regard to matters of civil law, the Judges of the land are placed when they are called upon to advise your Lordships as the highest tribunal with regard to any matter of interpretation of law. Practically, your Lordships are always guided by that advice of the Judges,—though there have been some memorable exceptions; and so in ninety-nine cases out of a hundred the Judicial Committee would be guided by the opinion of the Bishops, if such a reference was made to them upon questions of doctrine."

^a *Speech of Lord Redesdale.*

^b *Ibid.*

and of the Laity being compelled to receive the teaching of such persons, teaching which the Church condemns as false and heretical, to the peril of their souls.^c The present system can only be maintained by a violation of religious liberty unworthy of England, and unparalleled in the case of any other church in Christendom.

In conclusion, the writer of these pages would offer a few considerations to those who may be so moved by recent events and disappointments as to hesitate about remaining within the Church of their baptism. He would address those on the one hand, who believe that the Church is hopelessly committed to heresy by the recent decision; and those, on the other, who may have come to the conviction recently expressed by Mr. Maskell, "that the Evangelical clergy, as a party, no less than the Anglican or High Church party, represent and carry out the spirit and system of the English Reformation, as declared by contemporary authorities and sanctioned by the existing Formularies,"^d and who, like him, may demand dogmatical teaching on every conceivable point of doctrine as the *sine quâ non* of Catholicity in the Church of England.^e The object of the following observations will be to show,

1. That the avowal of Mr. Maskell ought to be considered as the earnest of a more general recognition of the true and peculiar character of the Church of England, as distinguished from every other Christian communion:—

^c *Speech of Lord Redesdale.*

^d *Second Letter on the Present Position of the High Church Party in the Church of England, by the Rev. William Maskell, p. 74, (Pickering.)*

^e *Ibid.*, pp. 33 sqq.

2. That, constituted as the Church of England is, dogmatical teaching to the extent demanded by Mr. Maskell is not to be expected from her, and could only be attained at the sacrifice of her distinctive and privileged character:—
3. That this question of *Gorham v. the Bishop of Exeter* is not, as many seem to suppose, a question between the High Church and Low Church, or Evangelical party; but that Mr. Gorham stands detached from the Low Church, with whom he is usually associated,—and that the question is in reality one between the Church, as inclusive both of High Church and Low Church, on the one hand, and Mr. Gorham, as professing heresy, on the other:—And, lastly,
4. That the Church is not compromised in the manner supposed, by the recent decision.

The writer will submit these considerations with the utmost possible brevity,—and if he commences with some very abstract propositions, it is simply because the true and comprehensive character of the Church cannot (as it appears to him) be understood otherwise. They are as follows:†—

That Truth is Essential, Absolute, and Universal; but that Human Nature, constituted as it is (by Divine pre-ordination) since the Fall, has a tendency to perceive and recognise it partially, imperfectly, and antagonistically, according to the predominance of what has been termed the Objective or Subjective element in the Individual or the Society,—in other words, that Truth Objective and Truth Subjective‡ are merely

† For fuller illustration of the following propositions, the writer must needs refer to 'Progression by Antagonism,' a small volume published by Mr. Murray in 1846.

‡ That is to say, Truth viewed objectively and subjectively.

partial aspects of Universal Truth, as seen and apprehended by Human Nature—Truth Universal (as apprehensible by Man) residing at the point where Truth Objective and Truth Subjective meet in equipoise and reconciliation :—

That Human Nature rises towards Truth and Perfection through the antagonism thus provided between the Objective and Subjective elements of its being ; and that, in guidance and assistance to Man, thus constituted, the Almighty has Revealed to him the knowledge of Truth Universal so far as essential to his salvation—which Truth is summed up in CHRISTIANITY, as proposed to him *ab externo* in the Holy Scriptures, the Creeds, and the decisions of the Six Œcumenical Councils, and imperative on his belief and acceptance *ab interno*. But the full vision and recognition of Truth Universal cannot be enjoyed till Man has completely recovered all that he lost in Eden, and soared too beyond it to the full stature and glory of Christianity :—

That Individuals and Societies approach nearest to Truth Universal in proportion to the degree in which the Objective and Subjective elements are balanced and reconciled in their constitution,—that this balance and reconciliation are only found complete in the Human Nature of OUR SAVIOUR, the “perfect Man” as well as “perfect God,” the “Second Adam,” and the model, type, and ideal of all excellence under the sun,—and that this balance and reconciliation will be an essential mark and prerogative of THE CHURCH in its corporate or collective character, as the Mystical Body of Christ, after it has attained its fulness and perfection :—

That the Objective element, carried legitimately out in Human Nature, apart from the corrective influence of the Subjective, implies—a bias towards Synthesis or Combination, and

a merging of the Individual in the Society to which he belongs—the instinct of Acquiescence or Submission, predominant over that of Voluntary Choice—a tendency to Strict or Absolute Law, as distinguished from the Law of Equity, to the Letter as opposed to the Spirit—a longing for Unity, Perfection, Peace, and Repose in everything—a predominance of the Past over the Present—Order, the principle of Government, Authority descending from God and centred in One, Loyalty the response of the subject—a love of Mystery, Allegory, and Symbolism, and a tendency to exalt the Imagination and depreciate Reason in religion and philosophy—hierarchies, for the most part hereditary, as mediators between God and Man, the channels of Grace through the administration of Sacraments, and trustees and interpreters of religious truth—a subordination of the Civil to the Ecclesiastical Authority, of the State to the Priesthood—in a word, a tendency (in excess, as above premised) to absolute Abnegation and Dereliction of Individual Judgment, Right, and Responsibility; ending in Despotism, Slavery, Superstition, Pantheism, Practical Atheism, and utter final Sensuality:—

That the Subjective element, carried legitimately out, apart from the corrective influence of the Objective, similarly implies—a bias towards Analysis or Schism, vindicating the Independence or Freedom, in Person and Thought, of the Individual, and admitting only of Voluntary Association—the instinct of Voluntary Choice predominant over that of Acquiescence—a tendency to the Law of Equity as distinguished from Strict or Absolute Law, to the Spirit as opposed to the Letter—a longing for Variety, Saliency, War, and Excitement in everything—a predominance of the Present over the Past—Liberty the principle of Government, Authority ascending

from Man, and vested in Many, Patriotism or the Common Good the inspiration of the noble-hearted—a hatred of Mystery and Reserve, and a tendency to exalt Reason and depreciate Imagination in religion and philosophy—a jealousy of hierarchies, and assertion of the Personal Priesthood of every man, and of his direct access to God without a human mediator, and independently of Sacraments; Private Judgment and Religious Toleration—a Subordination of the Ecclesiastical to the Civil Authority, of the Priesthood to the State,—in a word, a tendency (in excess, as above premised) to the Absolute Rule of Self-will, ending in Anarchy, Licence, Scepticism, Deism, Theoretic Atheism, and, as before, utter final Sensuality:—

That in Christianity, practically considered, the Objective element has developed itself more peculiarly in what is termed Catholicism, and the Subjective in Protestantism—each in principle opposed to the other, each of them attributing inordinate value to that portion of Truth which they recognise with special congeniality, and in so far erring and tending towards the extremes just indicated; the former referring the salvation of the Christian substantially to his being made a member of the Church or of the Body of Christ through the Sacraments; the latter, to immediate communication between himself and God, and to his individual responsibility:—

That the Church of England, through her peculiar constitution, both Catholic and Protestant—Catholic, though protesting against the errors of Catholicism, and Protestant, though legitimately descended from the Apostolic stock and deriving her doctrine from the universal consent of Antiquity—recognises both the Objective and Subjective elements as legitimately comprehended within her constitution, and thus comes nearer Universal Truth and the ideal of Christianity and of Human

Nature, as exemplified in the Perfect Manhood of our Saviour, and nearer consequently to the theory of the Church in its corporate or collective character as the Mystical Body of Christ, than any other existing communion of Christians :—

That, while the Church of England recognises both the Objective and Subjective elements as comprehended within her constitution, and is thus in theory co-extensive with Human Nature, and the imperfect (though loftiest) type on earth of what is perfect in heaven, those elements are practically represented by two great parties within her pale, commonly styled the High Church and Low Church, the former leaning towards the Objective or Catholic side, the latter towards the Subjective or Protestant, each having a corresponding tendency to exaggerate their favourite tenets, though each is held in check and prevented from excess and disruption by the other :—

That, so far from being detrimental, the co-existence and antagonism of these two parties, the High Church and Low Church, have been most advantageous and beneficial to the Church of England. Each party has alternately asserted the great truths which more peculiarly animate its existence—each has alternately prevailed—and every struggle has left the Church on a higher vantage-ground than before, and nearer the recognition of Universal Truth—the Church (as comprehensive of both the parties in question) recognising impartially and adopting as her own whatever wisdom or clearer perception of Truth has been contributed by either side or elicited in the collision. The experience of the last few years justifies this assertion. The Church, after a long struggle with Puritanism and Romanism, ending with the seventeenth century, had vindicated her position, rooted herself in the land, and impregnated the people with reverence for her authority. But,

while defending her outworks, with but champions too few for the duty, it had been impossible adequately to tend the moral soil—the effort had been too great, and after the enemy had retired, she sat languid and exhausted till the middle of last century. By that time she had recovered herself, and, with God's blessing and obeying his impulse, she arose and girded herself to the work of evangelizing the nation—and from that moment till the present all has been renewed and continued progress. First came the Subjective, or, as it is popularly styled, the Evangelical movement^b—awakening the sense of Individual Guilt, Redemption, and Responsibility; and then, in necessary sequence and relation to it, the Objective, or, as it is similarly styled, the Puseyite—restoring the true idea of the Church, as the Mystical Body of Our Saviour,—the former converting us individually from sin as “children of God,” the latter expanding our sympathies and duties as “members of Christ,” and both unitedly preparing us for Eternity as “inheritors of the kingdom of heaven:”—

That, as might be expected from this comprehensive character of the Church of England, she confines her dogmatical teach-

^b This Evangelical movement in the Church must be distinguished from the Methodist movement, as developed during last century. It may be remarked, as a general rule in the history of religion (whether Christian, Jewish, or heathen), that towards the expiration of every great struggle between the Imagination and Reason, the mystic or spiritual element asserts itself in hostility to both, with a tendency to dissociation from the Church, and a revival of religious piety and enthusiasm among the uncultured and the lower classes,—while a counter reaction generally takes place among the intellectual to Infidelity. The struggle of Nominalism and Realism, for example, was followed by a development of Mysticism in the Mendicant Orders, and by the philosophy of Machiavelli. Methodism and Infidelity were similarly the concluding phases of a great religious struggle in the English Church. Evangelicalism was the commencement of a new struggle, still in progress.

ing to such points as are absolutely ruled by direct Revelation and the judgment of Catholic Antiquity as tests of salvation ; and, even in these, makes allowance, so far as permissible, for the diversity of Objective and Subjective vision incidental to the present constitution of Human Nature—demanding only in such cases that neither view be held so absolutely as to exclude the other :—

That, applying the preceding principles and considerations to the question now at issue, it would appear—That the High Church dwell so earnestly on the Sacramental virtue of Baptism as conferring grace on the recipient infant, and incorporating it with the Church, the Body of Christ, as comparatively to under-estimate the condition of faith and repentance required from him, and on the redemption of which, on attainment to the age of responsibility, the preservation of the grace in question depends :—And that the Low Church, on the contrary, dwell so earnestly on the condition on which grace is given, as comparatively to under-estimate the Sacramental virtue of Baptism, and the benefit of incorporation above stated as thereby conferred :—Whereas, the doctrine of the Church, as comprehensive both of High Church and Low Church—the doctrine expressed in her recognised formularies and authorities, and stated in the preceding summary of the Bishop of Exeter's argument, though perhaps more fully than the Bishop or his advocates have thought it necessary to enunciate it—lays EQUAL stress on the grace conferred, and on the condition upon which it is conferred, and by non-redemption of which it is forfeited :—

That individual members of the High Church and Low Church parties, who through their peculiar Objective or Subjective idiosyncrasy attach inordinate importance either to the one or the other view of the question, are not guilty of heresy,

so long as they do not assert either view to the exclusion of the other :—

That Mr. Gorham, individually, has asserted Subjective to the utter and absolute exclusion of Objective Truth as regards the grace of Baptism, and in so doing has diverged into heresy, —but that in this he differs, as it is believed, from the majority of the Low Church party,—who ought, if such be the case, to vindicate their orthodoxy by expressing their dissent, not from his opinions in general, but from his special error :—

That the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council have, as it is conceived, overlooked this heresy, but they have not sanctioned it. They have merely sanctioned certain opinions which they attribute to Mr. Gorham, and which, though they separate Baptism and Grace in point of time, still connect them substantially with each other, but which opinions are not Mr. Gorham's opinions in their full extent—do not, as his do, absolutely separate Baptism and Grace—do not therefore deny the Nicene Creed—and do not consequently amount to heresy. The Judicial Committee do not moreover assert that the opinions which they attribute to Mr. Gorham are the doctrine held and intended to be taught by the Church, but rather the contrary,—their sanction therefore amounts to nothing more than a grant of legal toleration to such opinions.¹ But even had the sanction thus given included the whole of Mr. Gorham's doctrines and affirmed heresy, such sanction, weighed against the Creeds and Catholic consent inherited by the Church from the Apostolic ages—fallibility, in a word, weighed against infallibility—could not blot out the Truth, thus binding upon her, nor compromise her Catho-

¹ *Dr. Hook 'On the Present Crisis of the Church,'* pp. 12, 13.—*Letter to the Bishop of Exeter, by a Layman.* Privately printed. Pp. 5 sqq.

licity, so long as she did not, by a formal, conscious, deliberate act, of her own free will, rescind and repudiate what she at present professes to hold :^k—

That Churchmen ought not to be discouraged by the failure of the measure recently introduced by the Bishop of London, inasmuch as the perils to which the Church is exposed by the present system of appeals, and the necessity of such a measure, are as yet but very imperfectly known or appreciated. The principle is in the meanwhile conceded, that the present system is objectionable, and this is of itself an instalment of justice. “Endure” ought therefore to be the motto of the Church at the present moment,—Time and Truth will work together in her cause, and failure may be followed up by success.—The Bill itself, supported by a very large majority of the Bishops, is likewise, in the interim, a protest of the Church, repudiating the interpretation supposed to be affixed by the Privy Council to her formularies and articles—a protest, to be followed, it is to be hoped, by a manifesto of the Bishops declaring and reaffirming the faith of the Church—which, though not perhaps strictly necessary, is most desirable in

^k “ A judicial decision, even of the highest court, cannot affect the doctrine of the Church of England. The meaning of the article of the Creed, ‘one Baptism for the remission of sins,’ must be that one meaning in which the whole Catholic Church ever understood it. The Faith of the Church is determined by herself in her decrees and canons: the office even of the highest court is only to apply her decision to the particular case before it. No authority less than that of the Church can decide in her name, that she does not receive the Creeds which she uses in the sense in which the Church has ever received them. If any authority, not co-extensive with herself, decides wrongly, he condemns himself, not her. He may embarrass her, may cripple her functions; he cannot alter her faith. The Faith which the Church of England has received in the Creed and Prayers of the Catholic Church, is hers, so long as by some contrary act (which God forbid!) she does not disavow it.”—*Dr. Pusey on the Royal Supremacy*, pp. 4 *sqq.*

order to calm the public mind.—But under any circumstance it must be insisted upon, that neither the sanction given by the Privy Council to the teaching of one whom it is sad to be compelled to term a heretic, nor the defeat of the Bishop of London's Bill, nor any conceivable (or rather, inconceivable) accumulation of oppression, can furnish either cause or excuse to any one for quitting the Church for another communion. The duty of her chivalry is to stand by her, to defend her to the death:—

That, finally, if any persist in quitting the communion of the Church of England in consequence of the recent decision, Rome can afford them but slender consolation, inasmuch as she is more grievously and hopelessly compromised on the question of Baptism than such persons suppose the Church of England to be,¹—to say nothing of her mutilation of the Eucharist in denying the cup to the laity, and other points of difference with ourselves. Whereas, on the other hand, if our friends must leave us, they may find refuge in the communion of the Episcopal Church of Scotland, a daughter of their mother Church, holding the same doctrine, and possessing the same comprehensive character, but untrammelled by State influence, and in no wise affected by the recent decision.

¹ “The Church of Rome contends that not only the guilt but the very essence and being of original sin is removed by Baptism,—the Church of England declares that this corruption of nature remains even in the regenerate. . . . We, in common with all Protestants, regard this as a great and fundamental heresy in the Church of Rome, laying the foundation of their grand error, viz. justification by inherent righteousness.”—*Bishop Bethell on Regeneration*, quoted and commented on by Dr. Hook, *Present Crisis of the Church*, p. 8.

APPENDIX.

Analysis of the Arguments and Judgments in the Courts of Queen's Bench and Common Pleas, and of the Argument in the Court of Exchequer,—referred to supra, p. 22.

THE argument for the Bishop of Exeter in moving for a rule *nisi* in the Court of Queen's Bench was as follows:—

That a statute was passed, 24 Henry VIII., c. 12, by which appeals to the Pope were forbidden in causes testamentary, causes connected with matrimony and divorce, and causes connected with tithes, obventions, and oblations,—appeals in such cases to lie first from the Archdeacon to the Bishop, and from the Bishop to the Archbishop of the province, there, in the case of a subject, to be finally adjudged and determined; but if any of the matters so in dispute should touch the King or his successors, the appeal was given from any of the said courts to the Upper House of Convocation:—

That this Statute was followed up by another, passed the succeeding year, 25 Henry VIII., c. 19, by which it is provided, “that all manner of appeals, of what nature or condition soever they be, or what cause or matter soever they concern, shall be made and had by the parties aggrieved after such manner, form, and condition as is limited by the Statute 24 Henry VIII.,—in other words, the provisions of the former Act are extended by this later one to all manner of spiritual causes, leaving the appeal in those matters in which the King was interested untouched.

That these two Statutes were repealed by the 1 and 2 Philip and Mary, c. 8, but revived and re-enacted in precisely the same terms by 1 Elizabeth, c. 1.

That these two Statutes being *in pari materiâ*, the latter referring to the former, and merely extending, not annulling or infringing its provisions, they must be taken together and considered as one statute, and the appeal to the Upper House of Convocation

must still hold good in all cases in which the Sovereign is a party interested :—

That the existence of these two Statutes had been overlooked and forgotten at the time when the appeal was made to the Privy Council by Mr. Gorham and the decision was given ; but that they have never been repealed, and have been recognised and referred to by all subsequent legal authorities, and are consequently still binding and in force :—

That the Queen has a direct interest in the matter in question, the vicarage of Brampford Speke being in the gift of the Crown :—

That the appeal to the Queen in Council in the case of Gorham *v.* the Bishop of Exeter was consequently illegal, and the decision is null and void.

The rule moved for has been refused by the Court of Queen's Bench, on the following grounds :—

That the first of the above statutes “ was passed when Sir Thomas More, a rigid Roman Catholic, was Lord Chancellor, and when Henry had not yet broken with the see of Rome,—it therefore still allows an appeal to the Pope in all spiritual suits, and was framed upon the principle, that, while all temporal matters which were discussed in the Ecclesiastical Courts should be finally determined by courts sitting within the realm, the spiritual jurisdiction which belonged to the Pope, as Supreme Head of the Western Church, should remain unaffected.” “ An appeal from the Archbishop's Court in a suit upon *duplex querela* ” (such as the present instituted by Mr. Gorham), “ involving the question whether the clerk presented to a living by the King was of unsound doctrine, would still have gone to Rome.”

That “ in the following year Henry, finding there was no chance of succeeding in his divorce suit with the sanction of the Pope, and being impatient to marry Anne Boleyn, resolved to break with Rome altogether, and, preserving all the tenets of the Roman Catholic faith, to vest in himself the jurisdiction which the Pope had hitherto exercised in England. Sir Thomas More had now resigned the Great Seal, and it was held by the pliant Lord Audley, who was ready to adopt the new doctrines in religion, or to adhere to the old, as suited his interests.” The statute 25 Henry VIII. c. 19, accordingly “ put an end to all appeals to Rome in all cases whatsoever ; and enacted, by section 3d, ‘ that all manner of ap-

peals, of what nature or condition soever they be, or what cause or matter they concern, shall be made and had by the parties aggrieved after such manner, form, and condition as is limited by' the former statute,—that is to say, from the Archdeacon to the Bishop, and from the Bishop to the Archbishop. No exception is introduced respecting causes which touched the King; and, on the contrary, the enactment is expressly extended to all causes, of whatever nature they be and whatever matter they may concern. But all doubt is removed by the following section, the 4th, which creates a new court of appeal for all causes in the Ecclesiastical Courts. Instead of allowing the decision of the Archbishop to be final, as it was by the 24 Henry VIII., the legislature now enacted that 'for lack of justice in any of the courts of Archbishops, it shall be lawful to the parties aggrieved to appeal to His Majesty in the High Court of Chancery,' where delegates are to be appointed under the Great Seal, who are to adjudicate upon the appeal. This appeal is given in all causes in the court of the Archbishops of this realm, as well in the causes of a purely spiritual nature, which might hitherto have been carried to Rome, as in the classes of causes of a temporal nature enumerated in 24 Henry VIII., c. 12. The meaning of the legislature is still further proved by section 6th of the new statute, which enacts that 'all manner of appeals hereafter to be taken from the jurisdiction of any abbots, priors, and places exempt from the ordinary, shall be to the King's Majesty in the Court of Chancery, in like manner and form as heretofore to the See of Rome,'—no exception being introduced respecting causes which touch the King, although it was then notorious that causes touching the King might be taken to Rome, Pope Clement having recently revoked Henry's divorce suit from before Cardinals Wolsey and Campeggio, sitting at Whitefriars, to be determined by His Holiness in the Vatican:—

That "the construction which the words of the statute seem to require is expressly put upon them by Lord Coke. In his fourth Institute, p. 340, commenting upon the statute 25 Henry VIII. c. 19, he says:—'A general prohibition, that no appeals be pursued out of the realm to Rome or elsewhere. Item, a general clause, that all manner of appeals, what matter soever they concern, shall be made in such manner, form, and condition within the realm as it is above ordered by 24 Henry VIII. in the three classes aforesaid; and one further degree in appeals for all manner of causes is given, viz. from the Archbishop's court to the King in Chancery, when a commission

shall be awarded for the determination of the said appeal, and from thence no further:”—

That, “in practice, such is the construction that has been invariably put upon the statute for above three centuries, without any doubt being started upon the subject till the present motion was made. During this long period” “there seems every reason to believe that the appeal has uniformly been to the King in Chancery”—not to the Upper House of Convocation. Two instances, in which cases affecting the Crown were decided by the King in Chancery, and one in which a similar case was decided by the King in Council, without appeal to the Upper House of Convocation, are cited:—

That if “the language of 25 Henry VIII., c. 19,” was “obscure instead of being clear, we should not be justified in differing from the construction put upon it by contemporaneous and long continued usage. There would be no safety for property or liberty if it could be successfully contended that all lawyers and statesmen have been mistaken for centuries as to the true meaning of the Act of Parliament:”—

That “no reason has been alleged to invalidate the sentence in this” (the Gorham) “case, on the ground that the Queen in Council and the Judicial Committee had no jurisdiction over the appeal,”—and, consequently,

That “a rule to show cause why a prohibition should not be granted to stay the execution of the sentence ought not to be granted.”

The Bishop of Exeter, subsequently to this decision, moved for a rule *nisi* in the Court of Common Pleas for a prohibition as in the former instance,—and on the following plea and argument:—

That, whereas the Court of Queen’s Bench has ruled that because no exception is introduced in the statute 25 Henry VIII., c. 19, subsequent to the 24 Henry VIII., c. 12, the appeal to the Upper House of Convocation in the earlier statute is abrogated; it is contended that the statute 25 Henry VIII., in extending the provisions of the statute 24 Henry VIII. to all spiritual causes whatever, and in providing for appeals from the Archbishop’s Court into Chancery, or as it was sometimes called, the High Court of Delegates, does not in any way touch or affect the appeal to the Upper House of Convocation *in matters touching the Crown*—which consequently still remains in force, the two statutes, as before stated, being *in pari materiâ*, and

falling to be taken together as one statute. The words, ‘ that all manner of appeals should be made and had after such manner, form, and *condition*,’ as was limited in the former statute, of themselves prove this :—

That, whereas the Court of Queen’s Bench, without discussion and *sub silentio*, assumes that in matters touching the Crown these acts of Parliament are altogether without effect, the fact is that every writer of authority, from Lord Coke to Blackstone, has laid it down, without doubt, and in precise terms, as the law still in force, that appeals in matters touching the Crown are still to the Upper House of Convocation. As regards Lord Coke, the passage referred to in the judgment of the Court of Queen’s Bench is *in extenso* as follows :—“ First, in cases testamentary, matrimony, and tithes,” appeals lie “ from the Archdeacon or his official, if the matter be there commenced, to the Bishop of the Diocese, and from the Bishop Diocesan or his Commissary in such case ; or, if the matter be there commenced, within fifteen days after sentence given, to the Archbishop of the province, and no further. Item :— From the Archdeacon or Commissary of the Archbishop, if the matter be there commenced, within fifteen days, &c. to the audience or arches of the said Archbishop ; and from thence, within other fifteen days, &c., to the Archbishop himself, and no further ; and, if the cause be commenced before the Archbishop, then to be there definitively determined, without further appeal. Item :—where the matter toucheth the King, the appeal within fifteen days, to be made to the higher Convocation House of that province, and no further, but finally to be there determined. A general prohibition that no appeals shall be pursued out of the realm to Rome or elsewhere. Item :—a general clause, that all manner of appeals, what matter soever they concern, shall be made in such manner, form, and condition, within the realm, as is above ordered by 24 Henry VIII., in the three causes aforesaid ; and one further degree in appeals for all manner of causes is given, viz. from the Archbishop’s Court to the King in his Chancery, where a commission shall be awarded, for the determination of the said appeal, and from thence no further.”— Statements moreover from later writers are given in support of the view thus taken. The fact of the appeal, as given by the statute, has never been contradicted or controverted hitherto :—

That this appeal, as asserted, is in accordance with the acknowledged rule of law that a man ought not to be judge in his own

cause ; and the law cannot be construed to authorise such an anomaly where it can be made to bear any other interpretation :—

That the historical facts stated in the judgment of the Court of Queen's Bench, as illustrative of the character of the two statutes in question, and influential on their interpretation, are incorrect. That so far from the statute 24 Henry VIII. having been passed to secure the authority of the Pope as Supreme Head of the Western Church, both Houses of Convocation only three years before had solemnly declared that the King of England was sole Head of that Church, to the exclusion of every other ; and moreover in the very recital of this statute 24 Henry VIII., c. 12, it is stated that “ by the ancient common law of England the King was Supreme Head of the Church,” and that it was a grievance that the Pope claimed jurisdiction therein ; and from the beginning to the end of the statute there was no language but such as excluded the right of interference by the Pope, and solemnly proclaimed that spiritual Supremacy in this realm was vested by law, and ought to continue, in the King as the Head of the Church :—

That, further, so far from Sir Thomas More having been Chancellor when the 24 Henry VIII. was passed, he had ceased to be Chancellor, and the “ pliant Lord Audley” had succeeded him as such, several months before the statute passed. Both statutes were passed after Lord Audley had succeeded to the Great Seal :—

That, further, whereas it is stated that before the second act passed, Henry VIII., being impatient to marry Anne Boleyn, resolved to break with the See of Rome, to avoid the danger of going through their courts with his divorce, and thereupon the second act, the 25th Henry VIII., was passed under the auspices of Lord Audley ; the fact is, that before the session of Parliament began in which this act was passed, as it is said, from the King's impatience to marry Anne Boleyn, Henry had not only married Anne Boleyn, but the issue of that marriage, Elizabeth, afterwards Queen of England, was then actually born.

That, whereas the judgment of the Court of Queen's Bench mentions two cases which it treats as authorities on the subject, in neither of those cases was the question whether the Crown was interested or not at all raised, and, consequently, there was neither discussion nor decision upon it. In a third case mentioned in the judgment, it never occurred to any one whether the appeal lay or not, and the appeal was determined by Her Majesty in Privy

Council. Cases like these cannot be considered decisions or authorities. If it had occurred to the judges in any of these three cases that the appeal was rather to the Upper House of Convocation than to the High Court of Delegates, then these proceedings might have been something like authority. But considering that it is found in all the books of authority, from Coke to Blackstone, that the appeal ever did lie to Convocation, it would be unjust to those learned judges to suppose that the point had ever occurred to their minds, because, if it had, they could not but have thrown it out for consideration and for argument at the bar. The fact would appear to be, that a statute of three centuries ago had been forgotten. But that surely would not be considered as an authority :—

That, whereas it is asserted, that life, and liberty, and property would be unsafe if the practice based on three centuries, and the opinions of the highest luminaries of the law, could be set aside by a construction to be sought for in an old statute ; it may be more justly argued, that neither life, nor liberty, nor property would be safe if that which appeared in every text-book to be the law was to be set aside as bad law, and as repealed, without express statutes, and all this without argument, and on a motion for a rule to show cause :—

That, upon what has been stated, the Bishop of Exeter is entitled to a rule, as moved for.

The rule moved for was refused by the Court of Common Pleas, on the following grounds :—

That the words of section 3rd of the 25th Henry VIII., c. 19, which are relied upon as having the effect of incorporating by implication the appeal to the Upper House of Convocation in matters which touch the King, enacted by distinct expression in the former statute, 24 Henry VIII., c. 12, are as follows :—“after such manner, form, and condition as is limited for appeals to be had and prosecuted by the statute of the 24th.”

That the words “manner and form” in this passage occur in the fifth section of the statute 24 Henry VIII., which provides (the fifth, sixth, and seventh sections forming, strictly speaking, only one section or enactment) for certain appeals, but not for the appeal given in suits which touch the King. The latter appeal to Convocation is given in the ninth section, which (differently from

the sixth and seventh sections) is preceded by express and distinct words of enactment. The "manner and form" mentioned in section third of 25 Henry VIII. would not therefore appear to have reference to the appeal given in suits which "touch the King."

That the word "condition" is used in the statute 24 Henry VIII. in the sense of "character," "state," or "quality," not in the more common sense of "restriction" or "qualification," and the object of its introduction is obviously rather to amplify than qualify the other language. The word "condition" in the third section of 25 Henry VIII. has reference, therefore, to the character and nature of the cause to which the enactment was directed, and did not point at any restriction or exception in the case of the Crown:—

That it would seem, therefore, that the words "manner, form, and condition," in the third section of the 25 Henry VIII., were intended to incorporate the manner of proceeding in appeals in general indicated by the former statute both as to time and other circumstances, but not to re-enact a particular provision in that statute distinct from the general manner and form of appeals to which those words made no particular reference. At any rate, the words may be thus construed; it is a construction which satisfies if it does not exhaust them; and in such a case it may be doubted whether we are at liberty to give them a larger signification, in conformity with the rule of law which requires that the Crown should be touched, if at all, by express words:—

That, practically, appeals in causes touching the Crown have been made to the King in Chancery, or King in Council, and determined by the Court of Delegates, and no instance has been discovered of an appeal in such cases to the Convocation. This course would not have been pursued if the ninth section of the 24 Henry VIII. had been deemed to be in force to the exclusion of the appeal given by the statute 25 Henry VIII. to the King in Chancery. All the cases named, except the last reported, occurred when the Court of Convocation was in more active operation than it has been in modern times, and were heard before eminent judges; and it cannot reasonably be doubted that reference must have been had to the statutes in question, and their true construction considered, and that either no doubt was entertained that the appeals to the Delegates were well founded, even though the Crown was touched by them,

or that the construction must have been discussed and determined upon judicially. In either view they are consistent with the construction now adopted by the Court, and inconsistent with any other :—

That all the passages cited from text-books in support of the present application are referable to the single authority of Lord Coke's Fourth Institute ; but that the effect of the several passages quoted has not been correctly appreciated, and upon due consideration they will not be found entitled to the reliance which has been placed upon them. It will appear that in the passage quoted from pp. 339, 340, Lord Coke merely sets down the effect of the two statutes in succession, and where he speaks of appeals to Convocation it is under the head of the statute 24 Henry VIII.,—that what Lord Coke thus stated as the provision of one statute, subsequent text-writers have adopted as the joint result of both statutes—a result upon which Lord Coke himself expressed no opinion,—that it was not understood when the motion was made, that the passages then read referred to particular statutes noted in the margin,—that the passage at pp. 339, 340 of the Fourth Institute is the foundation of all the extracts cited from later writers,—that none of them refer to or are founded upon any judicial decision or *dictum*, nor do they appear to be the result of an examination of the effect or construction of the two material statutes in connection :—they cannot, therefore, properly have any effect in controlling a construction which appears to the Court to be warranted by the language of the statute 25 Henry VIII., and to be supported by, and consonant with, a course of construction and practice beginning in the reign of Queen Elizabeth and continued in 1812 :—

That, in considering the circumstances under which the present application comes before the Court, the litigant parties have concurred in prosecuting the appeal to the Judicial Committee, and, after a decision has been come to, an objection is for the first time made upon the ground of a want of jurisdiction in the tribunal. That nothing has been alleged to induce a doubt of the wisdom and accuracy of the deliberate judgment of the Court of Queen's Bench upon the construction of the statutes 24 Henry VIII. and 25 Henry VIII. That under these circumstances there is every reason to conclude that further discussion will not furnish additional information or light upon the subject, and that it would only tend to prolong an useless litigation to grant a rule.™

Rule therefore is refused.

The Bishop of Exeter has subsequently moved for a rule *nisi* in the Court of Exchequer, for a prohibition as in the two former instances, and on the following grounds:—

That, whereas it is held by the Court of Common Pleas that section third of the 25 Henry VIII. does not extend to all the provisions of the 24 Henry VIII., but only to those embraced in the fifth, sixth, and seventh sections, and that, therefore, the ninth section in the 25 Henry VIII., giving the appeal to the Upper House of Convocation in cases where the Crown is concerned, is repealed; it is contended,

1. That the ninth section in question, restricting the Crown and protecting the subject in cases where the Crown is concerned, could only be repealed by express enactment. But no such enactment is to be found. On the contrary, the ninth section is incorporated, along with the whole of the statute 24 Henry VIII., into the statute 25 Henry VIII., without exception or qualification.
2. That the statute 1 Elizabeth, c. 1, which revived both statutes in question after they had been repealed by 1 and 2 Philip and Mary, c. 8, does not except the ninth section at all; and, as it excepts certain clauses and sections in some of the revived statutes, the inference is strong that if the legislature meant to reject the limitation imposed on appeals in causes where the Crown was concerned, they would have so expressed themselves.
3. That, if the ninth section of the 24th Henry VIII. can only be imported into the 25th Henry VIII. by implication, it is only by implication that that latter statute can be held to apply to the fifth, sixth, and seventh sections of the 24th Henry VIII., which all agree in holding must be imported into the 25th Henry VIII.
4. That, whereas the Court of Common Pleas holds that the words "manner, form, and condition" must receive the same meaning in the 25th Henry VIII. as they do in the fifth, sixth, and seventh sections of the 24th Henry VIII., and that only,—it is contended that these words ought to receive the same construction as if found in one statute; they refer, not merely to the mode of procedure, that is. to

the time in which, or the condition on which, the appeal should be granted—but imply, when duly weighed, *from and to the same courts, and subject to the same conditions as are provided in such matters by the 24th Henry VIII.* If they are held as limited to the time for the appeal, they do not provide the courts to which the appeal is given; and, if the rule sought for be granted, the opponents of the Bishop of Exeter will be called upon to show that these words do not apply to the courts from and to which the appeal is given in all spiritual cases whatsoever. If they do not mean everything relating to the courts and to appeals, the enactment is incomplete. If read as originally written, that is, free from breaks or stops, and from end to end as one composition, it is impossible to deny that those words apply to all the sections of the statute 24 Henry VIII.

That Lord Coke and subsequent writers all take the same view of the two statutes, considering them as one, and the appeal to Convocation as holding good in cases where the Crown is concerned :—

That, as regards Lord Coke having been followed by later writers in his view of the two statutes in question, if the comment of the man living nearest to the time when an act is passed is not to be appealed to for an accurate exposition of what that law means, it may be said that Magna Charta does not exist as the law of the land. All subsequent writers refer to and quote Lord Coke, no doubt, but so with any other subject. Bracton, or he who wrote next after Magna Charta, would necessarily be referred to by all writers in modern times as the best expositor of that statute :—

That, while all the writers cited take the view above stated and held by the Bishop of Exeter, no other writer is known to have maintained the contrary view :—

That, after much research, not a single appeal has been discovered under the statute 25 Henry VIII. from 1533 to 1677,—the absence of such instances tells as much one way as the other; and there are only five cases from 1677 to 1797 in which any such appeal was had—all of them in matters testamentary. The only inference deducible from the absence of appeals to the Upper House of Convocation is, that the existence of the statute 24 Henry VIII., then an old statute, in the time of Charles II., never once sug-

gested itself to the parties concerned in those cases,—there was no more reason why they should remember it, than that the counsel engaged in this very cause should have done so. To the latter it certainly was never suggested till after the judgment was pronounced in the Privy Council: and it may equally have escaped the research of the counsel in the earlier period. But this non-recollection is nothing as compared with the clear and distinct authority of Lord Coke and other subsequent writers as to the construction contended for:—

That the construction in question gives a full, fair, and reasonable construction and effect to the whole statute 25 Henry VIII., and no other will do so:—

That, finally, it is the usage, by every day's experience, to grant a rule in all important cases where doubt exists,—that it is presumed that doubt must be admitted to exist in the present instance, and that if a rule be now refused, the Bishop of Exeter will be debarred from that discussion which the constitution of this realm holds out to all its subjects as a right in all cases of doubt.

Rule has been granted.

Recd. by Mr. 2

A S E R M O N

ON JOHN III. 5,

PREACHED IN

THE CHURCH OF ST. THOMAS, APPLETON,

ON SUNDAY, APRIL 7, 1850,

IN REFERENCE TO

THE RECENT LEGISLATIVE DECISION

IN THE CASE OF

GORHAM *v.* BISHOP OF EXETER.

BY

EDWARD ARTHUR LITTON, M.A.,

PERPETUAL CURATE OF STOCKTON HEATH, CHESHIRE, AND
LATE FELLOW OF ORIEL COLLEGE, OXFORD.

L O N D O N :

J. HATCHARD AND SON, 187, PICCADILLY ;
SMITH, HODGES, & CO. DUBLIN ; VINCENT, OXFORD ;
HADDOCK & SON, WARRINGTON.

1850.

Price 1s.

LONDON :

G. J. PALMER, PRINTER, SAVOY STREET, STRAND.

S E R M O N.

JOUN iii. 5.

“ Jesus answered, Verily, verily I say unto thee, Except a man be born of water and of the Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God.”

You will bear me witness, brethren, that it is but seldom that theological controversy is introduced into the ministrations of this pulpit. The impropriety which exists at all times, and under all circumstances, of converting an ordinance, which is intended to promote the practical interests of religion, into an instrument of speculative discussion, is, in our case, enhanced by the fact that but few amongst us are either acquainted with, or interested in, the disputes which agitate the theological world. Little is

lost by being ignorant of what too often ministers to the pride of reason, and the evil passions of the heart; seldom advances the life of God in the soul. Happy we, if in simplicity of faith, and with an honest and good heart, we walk humbly with our God, his word our outward, his Spirit our inward guide; and exhibit, in the lowly walks of life, the power of true religion to elevate man to the highest measure of dignity and happiness of which his nature is capable.

There are, however, particular seasons, and conjunctures of circumstances, in which it becomes expedient, and even necessary, to deviate from the rule of not engaging the attention of a mixed congregation with purely doctrinal discussions. When theological questions of great public interest are agitating the minds, not only of the clergy, but of the laity, and when controversy passes from the volume of learned research into a contest about vested rights, and the actual standing of a large body of the ministers of our Church, it seems but natural that he who is placed over you in the Lord should, as far as his knowledge and ability permits him, afford you at least the materials for arriving at a decision upon the point in controversy. The suggestions thus offered it will be your duty to weigh carefully, and to compare with the word of God; that so, "proving all things," you "may hold fast," amidst

the fluctuations of human opinion, that which alone "is good," because it is of God.

The present appears to be a season of the kind just mentioned. The difficult question concerning the effect of the sacrament of baptism when administered to infants, a question which has long divided parties in our Church, has at length been brought to a practical issue by the refusal of one of our bishops to institute to a living a clergyman whose views upon this point were alleged to be incompatible with honest subscription to the formularies of our Church. With the sequel of the case you are probably acquainted. It has been decided by the highest court which can take cognizance of such matters, that the opinions entertained by this clergyman are not such as to justify the withholding from him, on the part of the ordinary, his legal rights; or, in other words, that that interpretation of our baptismal formularies which is adopted by what is commonly called the evangelical party in our Church, is a legitimate and admissible interpretation. It is earnestly to be hoped that this decision will for ever set the practical question at rest; that, however opinions may continue to differ upon the doctrine to be connected with infant baptism, the measure will never again be resorted to by either party, of attempting to drive their opponents from the public exercise of their ministry, if not into total

secession from the Church. Were the question which has thus acquired a painful prominence confessedly one of mere rubrical interpretation, it would be equally unnecessary and unprofitable to take up your time and attention in discussing it; for the lay members of our Church are not called upon to subscribe to the Prayer Book, nor, except in certain cases of necessity, to use its formularies; so that whether any particular interpretation of expressions in these formularies, or of the rules laid down in the rubrics, is to be esteemed the right one or not, is to them comparatively a matter of indifference. But in the present instance, it is very far from being admitted that the clergy alone are concerned. On the contrary, it is loudly proclaimed in certain quarters, that by merely abstaining from pronouncing the opinions entertained by one large section of our Church on the effect of infant baptism to be heretical, (for be it observed that no positive declarations on the subject were advanced,) the supreme court of appeal in causes ecclesiastical has by its decision impugned a fundamental article of the faith once delivered to the saints, and made an essential doctrine of Christianity an open question. These are grave allegations, and, whether correct or not, they bring the point in debate home to all Christians, lay as well as clerical; for of course every doctrine which is really a fundamental part of

Christianity, is a matter of interest to the whole Church, and should be contended for as zealously by the laity as by their spiritual guides.

Cordially concurring as I do in the principles on which the legislative decision lately pronounced is based, I propose in this discourse to offer some considerations in abatement of the uneasiness which the strong statements alluded to may have produced in the minds of some; and, with this view, to examine the grounds upon which it is asserted that the doctrine of infant baptism supposed to be placed in peril by the recent decision is a fundamental article of the christian faith.

In conducting this inquiry, I must presume that we are agreed upon the great Protestant principle, that whatever is really an essential doctrine of Christianity, must be capable of being either read in Holy Scripture, or proved thereby. (See Art. 6.) Whatever weight we may assign to the testimony of the early Church in matters of fact, as, for instance, whether a certain ordinance or institution be apostolic or not, on points of doctrine we recognize but one authoritative source of information, viz. Holy Scripture. A doctrine which is not traceable to the word of God can never constitute a fundamental article of the faith. Upon this, the distinctive tenet of Protestantism, I take for granted that no doubt is entertained. For it is impossible to argue, ex-

cept on some common ground or basis of argument ; the *source* of revelation must be matter of agreement before we can attempt to adjust differences of opinion respecting the *contents* of revelation. Hence it should seem that arguments between Protestants and Romanists can seldom, if ever, be conducted to a successful issue ; the two parties differing, not merely on particular points of doctrine, but upon the ultimate authority by which all doctrinal statements are to be tried. The rule of faith is not the same to both ; no wonder, then, that no agreement can be come to respecting the articles of faith. Romanists must give up their doctrine of tradition, that is, become Protestants, or Protestants must admit it, that is, become Romanists, before any attempt to reconcile their differences can prove ultimately successful. Presuming, then, that it is an admitted principle amongst us, that “ Holy Scripture contains all things,” especially all *doctrine* necessary to salvation, I propose, in reference to the question now before us, to examine, first, what Scripture teaches us respecting the connexion of *baptism in general* with regeneration ; and, secondly, what its doctrine is on the same point in reference to *infant baptism*.

I. I will not spend time in discussing the difficult question of interpretation, whether, in the

passage from which the text is taken, our Lord referred to the actual sacrament of baptism or not. If I may venture to express my own opinion, I should say, that neither in this, nor in the well-known passage in the sixth chapter of St. John's Gospel, is there a direct reference to the christian sacraments as ritual ordinances, neither of them having been instituted at the time when the words of Christ were spoken ; but that, nevertheless, in those passages the *idea* to be connected with baptism, and the Lord's Supper, respectively, is expressed, the two great truths which are taught by those ordinances being, that both the commencement and the maintenance of the spiritual life flow from union with Christ, whatever be the conception we may form of such union : consequently, that *mediately* and *indirectly* the passages do contain an allusion to the two sacraments to be afterwards instituted. But there is the less necessity for dwelling upon this point, because so many other passages are found in the New Testament in which the connexion of baptism with regeneration is clearly and unequivocally expressed. Some of these we shall refer to hereafter.

Of more importance it is to endeavour to fix the meaning of the word regeneration, or its equivalent, new birth, which so strikingly occurs in

the chapter before us. To this point I would now particularly direct your attention.

The attentive reader of Scripture will soon discover that, while in respect to many truths of revealed religion which in the Old Testament were only obscurely taught or symbolised, such as the atonement of Christ, sanctification by the Spirit, and the resurrection of the dead to life, or to death, eternal, the New Testament communicates full and luminous information; one great distinctive doctrine pervades the latter, to which nothing exactly corresponding is found in the elder revelation, and that is, the mystical union of Christians with Christ. The Christian is "a man in Christ;" he is one with Christ: he is united to Christ as the branch is to the tree; nay, in the still stronger language of the apostle Paul, he is a member "of his body, of his flesh, and of his bones." Every reader of the christian Scriptures will recall to mind how inseparably this idea is interwoven with the whole texture of those Scriptures. The idea itself is peculiarly christian; nothing resembling it is found in the Old Testament. The reason why it could not form part of the Jewish circle of religious ideas is obvious:—under the law, the eternal Son had not assumed our nature, had not become "God manifest in the flesh;" the second Adam, the ap-

pointed Head of a new creation, or race of spiritual sons, had not yet appeared; consequently no such idea as that of the union of believers with Christ, the incarnate and glorified Son of God, could fitly be presented under the legal dispensation. Under the christian economy, union with Christ comprehends every spiritual blessing: justification, sanctification, the earnest of eternal life, the future glorifying of our bodies, all are comprised in, all flow from, the one great fact, that the Christian is one with Christ.

If the christian life be rightly described, as a life in Christ, it obviously includes two principal ideas, incorporation, and continuance in Christ: the union between Christ and the believer must have a beginning, and it must be maintained. There must be first the transfer into a new state, and then the abiding in that state.

The first incorporation of the believer in Christ is what is meant by the word regeneration, as used in the New Testament. And as the general notion of union with the incarnate Son was unknown to the elder dispensation, so neither is the full idea conveyed by the phrase, "*new birth*," nor the expression itself, to be found in the Old Testament Scriptures. For the true, the specific, idea of christian regeneration is, such an union with Christ, the only-begotten Son of God, in his glorified human nature, as confers upon the be-

liever the like privilege of sonship : Christians are Christ's brethren, heirs with God, and joint heirs with Christ ; sons of God through adoption and grace ; their bodies, as well as souls and spirits, being taken up into spiritual union with Christ, that in due time they may be made like unto his. This is a real new birth ; for it is a transplanting out of the old Adam, not merely into a new moral condition, but into the second Adam, the glorified Head of regenerate humanity. And the incorporation is effected, not by carnal admixture, but by that special efflux of the Holy Spirit which was withheld until Christ was glorified, and which may with the utmost propriety be termed, by way of distinction, the regenerating influence of the Holy Ghost.

Regeneration, in this full sense of the word, involves a twofold change, a moral and a mystical one ; a change of heart, as we call it, and a change of state. Like his spiritual ancestor, the pious Jew, the Christian has a new heart and a right spirit ; but more than this, he is in Christ. His standing, or position, is different from that which belonged to a believer under the law.

Regeneration, so far as the word expresses, or implies, a moral change, the repentance of John the Baptist, must of course have existed under the law, not less than it does under the Gospel ; for it is with this moral change, or new heart,

that salvation is connected; and salvation belonged to the pious Jew equally with the pious Christian. In this sense, which no doubt is the most important one, regeneration, though the word does not occur there, is an Old Testament idea; for the Jews were taught, as we are, that the true sacrifices of God are a broken heart and a contrite spirit: but it is not so in its christian, or, if we may so express it, its technical acceptance, for this latter is founded upon the distinctively christian doctrine of the Church's mystical union with Christ.

Hence it appears that the answer to the question, Can believers who lived before Christ be said to have been regenerate, turns entirely upon the meaning which we connect with the word regeneration. If we use it to signify that great moral change which must take place in every child of Adam before he can have fellowship with God, then unquestionably the ancient believers were regenerate; but if the word be taken in its full christian sense, as denoting incorporation in the glorified Redeemer, they were not, for they could not be, in this sense regenerate. They were morally, but not mystically, regenerate; they were penitent believers, but they were not in Christ, in the New Testament sense of that expression. Doctrinal prepossessions have in this, as in other instances, prevented a due recognition of the vast

difference between the spiritual state of a Christian, and that of the believer under the law : but there is nothing extraordinary in the supposition that as the explicit revelation of the Gospel was reserved for Christ and his apostles, so a special spiritual blessing is attached to the dispensation which the Saviour came to introduce.

Our Saviour himself, in the discourse with Nicodemus recorded in this chapter, first declared this great mystery of the Gospel dispensation. There was some excuse for Nicodemus' surprise, or incredulity, when he was told, that "except a man be born again, he cannot see the kingdom of God;" for although the Jewish nation, as distinguished from heathens, had been sometimes spoken of collectively as enjoying the privilege of adoption, as in the passage, "Israel is my son, my first-born," (Exod. iv. 22,) the idea of an individual regeneration by the Spirit does not appear in any part of the Jewish Scriptures: it was a strange thing to Nicodemus to hear that even a Jew must be born again before he could see the kingdom of God. But when the further explanation was given, "Except a man be born of water and of the Spirit, he cannot see the kingdom of God," Nicodemus' slowness of understanding became culpable; for as a master of Israel he ought to have surmised our Lord's meaning. What was it that Nicodemus ought

to have known? He should have recollected the numerous passages of the Old Testament, in which the necessity of a great moral change, symbolized by the cleansing effect of water, is inculcated;* and the numerous others in which a special out-pouring of the Spirit is connected with the coming of Messiah: he should have so far understood the well-known terms "water" and "spirit" as not to put the question, unworthy of an enlightened Jew, "How can these things be?" The mystery, however, lay not so much in the use of these particular expressions as in the whole phrase, "born of water and of the Spirit;" conveying, as it did, an idea which Nicodemus, however clearly he ought to have divined our Lord's general meaning, could not be expected at once to comprehend. For, in truth, what Christ here alludes to is a special prerogative of the christian dispensation, a special gift derived from his own heavenly life at the right hand of God. That gift is the (in the strict sense of the word) regenerating influence of the Spirit which, with creative energy, must transform the penitent disciple of the law into a member of Christ, before he could be said to "see the

* e. g. Isa. i. 16; Ezek. xxxvi. 25—27; Zech. xiii. 1. It is obvious that in none of these passages does "water" denote the instrument of cleansing: it is merely a figure of the internal change itself.

kingdom of God;" i. e. belong to the christian dispensation. To the "water," the preparatory contrition and repentance produced by the discipline of the law, and symbolized by John's baptism, hence called the baptism of water unto repentance, there is superadded, under the christian dispensation, the participation of Christ's own heavenly life, derived from union with Him, and the effect of the indwelling of his Spirit; in the combination of which two elements of the life in Christ, the putting off the old man and the putting on of the new, lies the essence and the peculiarity of Christian regeneration, as distinguished from the same thing under the law.

From the foregoing remarks it will be seen that while regeneration, in its moral sense, may exist, and did under the law exist, apart from regeneration in its mystical sense, mystical cannot exist apart from moral regeneration. Just as historically the ancient people of God were made to pass under the discipline of the law, convincing them of sin, and awakening in them a longing for redemption, before the full blessing of union with Christ was proposed to their acceptance; just as the regenerating Spirit was to brood, not upon the torpid surface of heathenism, but upon "a people prepared for the Lord;" so, in the inner life of the individual Christian, the same process takes place: in every truly and fully regenerate

person the moral change precedes the mystical. Repentance, faith, and then full union with Christ, is still the order of salvation, as it was in the apostles' times; this order never having been changed for another. (It will be remembered that at present we are viewing the subject in a general way, and without reference to the exceptional case of infants.) The idea of a person's being in Christ, who has not, and never has had, the quickening and sanctifying influence of the Spirit of Christ, is a most unscriptural one. Even a branch, which is now dead, must once have had life, otherwise it could never have been a branch; a piece of withered wood, fastened by external ligatures to a living trunk, is not, never has been, and never can become, a branch of that tree. No passage can be cited from the New Testament in which the expression, "being in Christ," may not be shown necessarily to pre-suppose repentance and faith, or a change of heart. The uniform testimony of Scripture is, that if "any man be in Christ, he is a new creature; old things are passed away, behold all things are become new." A state of salvation is the state of those who are in the way of being saved; and no one is in the way of being saved who is not sanctified by the Spirit of God. The law and the promise must still, as of old, prepare the heart for the reception of Christ; the union with Christ

which is effected by faith must precede that which is effected by the sacraments. The only difference is, that what, in the case of the Jews, nationally considered, took place in successive intervals of time, the nation passing through several protracted stages of religious training before the full blessing of redemption was revealed to it, now takes place simultaneously (or nearly so) in the individual; it not being necessary that, in a case of individual conversion, any lengthened interval should be interposed between faith and baptism. Still, as of old, it is true that "as many as" receive "Him, to them," and to none else, does he give "power to become the sons of God, even unto them that believe upon his name." The very analogy between natural and spiritual birth teaches us this truth; for the child must be quickened in the womb before it is born into the world.

Having ascertained the meaning of regeneration, let us now pass on to inquire, what is the instrument of the new birth? The Spirit of God is, of course, the ultimate efficient cause of regeneration; but the question is, what are the external instruments which the Holy Spirit employs in bringing it about? Two classes of passages are found in Scripture, in one of which the new birth is ascribed to the word of God, while in the other it is connected with the sacrament of baptism,

Thus, our Lord, in the parable of the sower, says, "The seed is the word of God;" St. James testifies that "of his own will begat he us through the word of truth, that we should be a kind of first-fruits of his creatures;" and St. Peter reminds the Christians, to whom he wrote, that they "were born again, not of corruptible seed, but of incorruptible, by the word of God, which liveth and abideth for ever." Besides these direct passages, there are others which indirectly express the same truth. Thus St. Paul, in Gal. iii. 26, says, "Ye are all the children of God by faith in Christ Jesus;" but faith and the word are correlative terms, for faith comes by hearing, and hearing by the word of God. So again, we are said to be justified by faith; but surely a justified state is, if not a fully regenerate one, at least the commencement of it. On the other hand, there are passages which connect regeneration with the sacrament of baptism. Putting aside the text, the meaning of which may be considered doubtful, in the following passages we find St. Paul coupling regeneration with baptism:—"Christ loved the Church and gave himself for it, that he might sanctify and cleanse it with the washing of water by the word;" (Eph. v. 25;) "Not by works of righteousness which we have done, but according to his mercy he saved us by the washing" (literally, the

laver, or bath,) “of regeneration by the word.” (Titus iii. 5.) Again, the passage in which Ananias is recorded to have said to Paul, “Arise, and be baptized, and wash away thy sins,” appears to establish a connexion between the remission of sins, or justification, and baptism. Above all, union with Christ is repeatedly said to be the effect of baptism. “We are buried with him,” (says St. Paul in Rom. vi. 4,) “by baptism into death; that like as Christ was raised from the dead by the glory of the Father, even so should we also walk in newness of life;” the allusion obviously being to the immersion of the catechumen in the baptismal font, and his subsequent emerging therefrom. If the same apostle, in the passage already cited, tells us that we are the children of God by faith in Christ Jesus, yet, in the very next verse, he says,—“As many of you as have been baptized into Christ have put on Christ.” But if baptism be, I will not say *the*, but *an*, instrument of union with Christ, it must be an instrument of regeneration.

What, then, does a comparison of these two classes of passages teach us respecting the question at issue? Plainly, that neither the word, nor baptism, is the sole instrument of regeneration, but that both contribute a share to the new birth. This is a truth which we cannot give up without, at the same time, running counter to the

express statements of the word of God. Most of the errors prevalent on the subject have arisen from the attempt to put out of view one class of the passages alluded to, and to insist exclusively upon the other. Thus, one extreme party maintains that regeneration takes place previously to, and irrespectively of, baptism; while another affirms that that sacrament is the sole and exclusive instrument of the new birth, everything that has taken place previously being only of a preparatory nature. If Scripture is really to be our guide, neither party can be in the right. To the word of God, as a means, the new birth is most unquestionably attributed; but not to the word exclusively of baptism. It is not merely that repentance, faith, conversion, or a change of heart, is ascribed to the word; regeneration itself is as explicitly connected with it as it is with baptism, nay, if anything, more explicitly. If baptism be the sole instrument, how is it that Scripture expressly makes mention of another instrument? If we are at liberty to explain away all the passages which speak of the word as the means whereby souls are born again, why may we not equally explain away all the passages in which baptism is mentioned in connexion with the new birth? What ground have we for saying that the regeneration ascribed in Scripture to the word is not regeneration, not even a part of it, but something merely introductory to the properly

regenerating rite? It has, I confess, always appeared to me incomprehensible how they who profess to regulate their opinions by Scripture can maintain that baptism is the one, sole, and exclusive, instrument of the new birth.

We must act in this instance, as in many others of a similar kind; we must allow both classes of passages their full and fair meaning, and endeavour, by comparing and combining them, to elicit the full mind of the Spirit. If we do this, we shall probably arrive at the conclusion, that the change of heart (repentance and faith) produced by the preaching of the word, is, not merely a preparation for, but an actual part of, regeneration; that it is a real constituent of the new birth, though not the only constituent; and that, consequently, it is the commencement of our union with Christ. For if it have anything of regeneration in it, it must, to the same extent, have a faculty of uniting us to Christ. We shall probably be led to what is indeed the true doctrine of Scripture, that union with Christ is begun by personal faith and repentance, the word being so far the instrument of regeneration; but that it is perfected by the sacrament of baptism, which in this respect claims its share in the new birth. Thus alone can the statements of Scripture on the subject be combined so as to harmonise with each other, each being allowed its full weight. An illustration is sometimes employed which is

sufficiently accurate for its purpose. Two persons may be betrothed to each other, and yet they are not legally united in holy wedlock until the marriage ceremony has taken place. So it may be said that the believer possesses indeed, before baptism, the inward (and therefore essentially saving) union with Christ, but is not formally in Christ,—the union is not perfected, until he is buried with Christ in baptism. On the one hand, therefore, it is erroneous to say that a repentant believer before baptism is in no sense regenerate, and on the other, to affirm that he is fully regenerate before he receives the sacrament of the new birth. Both the word and the sacrament must combine to incorporate us in Christ. If it be objected, that the pious Jew, not less than the Christian, had repentance and faith, and yet, as we have seen, was not on that account called regenerate, it must be recollected that faith in a crucified and risen Saviour may have a different effect from faith in a *promised* one; but above all, that the ordinance of the ministry of the word possesses, under the christian dispensation, a sacramental character which did not belong to it under the law: indeed, it would be more correct to say that no such ordinance existed under the law, the prophets being only occasional and extraordinary messengers from God to his people.

II. Hitherto we have been discussing the subject in that general point of view in which it is found presented in Scripture; and have purposely abstained from the mention of particular or exceptional cases. Unless we proceed in this manner, taking what we actually find in Scripture, and reasoning upon its recorded facts and express statements, it will be impossible to arrive at any clear or satisfactory views on the connexion of baptism with regeneration. The contrary course has been too often followed. An exceptional case, such as that of infants, is put forward as the normal one on which we are to reason; the consequence of which, as might be expected, is a failure to adjust the several parts of the divine testimony so as to produce a connected and harmonious view of the subject. We now approach the second part of the inquiry, viz. what is the doctrine of Scripture on the connexion of regeneration with the particular case of *infant* baptism?

The short and simple reply to this question is, that Scripture contains no *doctrine* whatever upon this point distinct from its general doctrine of baptism as before explained; and this for the best of all reasons, viz. that it does not present us with any actual instance of infant baptism. The doctrines of Scripture are invariably founded upon, or connected with, facts; no wonder, then, that when the fact is not recorded, the inspired

comment upon it is wanting. Even if Scripture did present us with such instances, it would still be a question whether we are entitled, without an express warrant for so doing, to apply the doctrine of adult baptism, without limitation, to that of infants; but the fact is, that the word of God furnishes no explicit proofs of the apostles having either practised, or sanctioned, infant baptism. Consequently we search in vain for what we are to *believe* respecting the effects of baptism thus administered. We may deem this a strange omission, seeing the case of infants must have arisen from the very beginning of the church, but we cannot alter the fact; and a fact it is, that the Holy Spirit has not thought fit to cause to be recorded any instances of baptism upon which we can reason but those of adults.

It is here that the want of candour in the mode of conducting the inquiry is sometimes painfully apparent. Nothing is more common than to see the passages cited in the former part of this discourse ostentatiously brought forward to prove what no one denies,—the connexion of baptism *in general* with regeneration; no sooner, however, is this point gained, than a transition is tacitly made to the case of infants, and the passages in question are applied to this case without the slightest recognition of the fact that, in their original meaning, they relate to adult baptism, and to

that only. And thus the reader, or the hearer, who is unacquainted with the real difficulties of the subject is led to conclude, first, that Scripture has pronounced a judgment where it is really silent, and then that they who demur to so summary a method of settling the question are contradicting an essential article of the faith. As if there were no difference between the case of an adult and that of an infant; or as if the difference between them might be passed over in silence. As if the peculiarity of the latter case, viz. the necessary absence in infants of that faith and repentance which Scripture pronounces to be *generally* necessary to the efficacy of the sacraments, were a circumstance quite unnecessary to be taken into account in forming our conclusions.

If infant baptism were a divine ordinance, if it were expressly declared in Scripture that, whereas in the first planting of a church adult baptism must necessarily be the normal one, in an already constituted christian society the sacrament is to be administered to the infants of christian parents, this mode of proceeding might be justifiable; for then it might fairly be argued, that since the same divine authority which instituted baptism in general prescribed also infant baptism, without at the same time connecting therewith any modification of the general doctrine of baptism, we are warranted in applying the latter doctrine in all

its integrity to the case of infants. But Christ, the divine institutor of the sacraments, has left it doubtful whether He intended either of them to be administered to infants; nor do the apostles of Christ decide the question for us any more than their divine Master.

Nay, if, in the absence of any express law upon this point, we could prove, either from Scripture, or from extra-scriptural sources, that infant baptism is an undoubted apostolical appointment, there would then be some ground for us to go upon in fixing the doctrine to be connected with it. But, as has been already observed, Scripture gives us no information respecting the practice of the apostles on this point. For it is better at once to acknowledge that such instances as the baptism of Lydia's household, or that of the gaoler, (Acts xvi. 15, 33,) are wholly insufficient to sustain the contrary assertion: there may have been infants in these households, and there may not; where there can be nothing but conjecture, it seems most prudent to let things remain in the obscurity in which Scripture leaves them. The slenderness of the support which instances like those just mentioned furnish to the apostolicity of infant baptism may be gathered from the fact, that the household of Stephanas, which St. Paul tells us he baptized, (1 Cor. i. 16,) consisted of adult persons only; the apostle recording it of this

household collectively, that they “addicted themselves to the ministry of the saints.” (1 Cor. xvi. 15.)

Nor do we gain much, in point of evidence, by transferring the inquiry to the pages of uninspired history. The age immediately following that of the apostles is as silent upon the apostolicity of infant baptism, indeed upon the practice itself, as Scripture is. Were it really an apostolic appointment, why did it not at once and universally prevail in the Church? Take the analogous case of episcopacy. The purely scriptural evidence for episcopacy is extremely scanty; nevertheless, no reasonable doubt can be entertained of its having proceeded from apostles. Because, not only are the early fathers unanimous in ascribing to it an apostolical origin, but it is a fact that no other form of church government is found to have prevailed in the age immediately succeeding that of the apostles. The moment we pass out of Scripture into early church history, we find ourselves surrounded with episcopacy; and it is impossible to account for this its early and universal diffusion, except on the supposition of its having emanated from some commanding authority recognized by the whole Church. No such evidence can be alleged for the practice of infant baptism. Wall, who has exhausted this subject, finds no trace of it before Irenæus, (A. D. 167,) who has a passage in

which infants are said to be capable, not of baptism, but of regeneration, though it is probable that by regeneration he meant baptism.* Against Origen affirming that the baptism of infants was ordered by the apostles, is to be balanced Tertullian, who advises that baptism be delayed (except in apparent danger of death) to years of maturity. Baptism was, in fact, constantly so delayed in the early church; nor is it easy to believe, as Wall would have us, that all such cases were those of persons whose parents had been unbelievers. In short, the practice of the Church on this point seems to have been by no means settled until about the close of the third century, which is hardly compatible with the supposition of its being really an apostolical ordinance. When it is urged that the apostles, being accustomed to the circumcision of infants, would, as a matter of course, baptize them, and we must hence, though Scripture contains no mention of it, infer that they did so, it should be remembered that by the Christians of Jewish origin circumcision, as well as the other rites of the ceremonial law, continued to be practised until the cessation of the temple services at the destruction of Jerusalem, A. D. 70; and that, consequently, it is not likely that before that era they would generally practise a rite which, from its signification, must have appeared

* History of Infant Baptism.

to them to interfere with, and supersede, the divinely appointed one by which they were accustomed to dedicate their children to God.

On the whole, the evidence, both internal and external, is altogether in favour of the supposition of infant baptism being a custom of the Church, dating, in its first beginnings, from a very ancient time, and gradually establishing itself throughout Christendom. As such, it stands on its own sufficient grounds. For not a word that has been advanced militates against the *practice* of infant baptism, as both scriptural and edifying: an ordinance may be both, which yet cannot be proved to be of divine, or even of apostolic, appointment. The Church adopted this practice, if not on the express warrant of Scripture, yet, as on the whole, agreeable to the course of God's dealings both in providence and in grace. If there is no positive scriptural precedent for it, still less is there any prohibition of it; hence, there being no injunction on the one side or the other, general analogies, both natural and scriptural, and considerations drawn from the nature of the case, from the goodness of God, and from the wide extent of gospel blessings, were suffered, most properly, to decide the question. It was observed that circumcision, the seal of the righteousness which Abraham had by faith, was commanded to be administered to infants; that Christ received and

blessed little children; that St. Paul calls the children of believers “holy;”—on such grounds as these, abundantly sufficient to sustain the practice, it was thought “most agreeable to the institution of Christ” that the infants of christian parents should be baptized. On the same grounds we retain the practice still, and believe it to be both justifiable and scriptural.

These being the historical facts of the case, it becomes the more imperative upon us to be cautious how we at once apply the scriptural *doctrine* of baptism, which, as has been observed, is based upon the case of adults, to that of infants. Where the *practice* itself rests upon such slender evidence of Scripture, it seems most prudent to avoid appending to it any particular doctrine as an article of faith. Still greater cause is there for hesitation, if the doctrine thus propounded appear to be inconsistent with other undoubted doctrines of Scripture, and to contradict the facts of experience. Under such circumstances, what is not written must bend to what is written; the ecclesiastical custom must not be permitted to supersede the express statements of the word of God, but rather the dogmatical theory of the custom, if any such be propounded, must be accommodated to those statements. The Scriptures may as well be at once set aside, if we are at liberty to annex to ecclesiastical customs doctrines which

are incompatible with those clearly set forth in the inspired volume.

In the present instance, the doctrine which is declared, with considerable vehemence, to be an essential article of the faith is, that every properly baptized infant is, in the full sense of the word, regenerate; regenerate in such a sense as that he never can be afterwards addressed as needing to be born again. Conversion, renewal, renovation, and their equivalents, he may indeed need; but regeneration is invariably, and once for all, bestowed upon him when he is brought by parents and sponsors to the baptismal font. Such is the dogma we are to receive, or else make ourselves liable to the charge of heresy.

Even were there nothing in this doctrine of an apparently anti-scriptural tendency, it will be seen from the foregoing observations that an article of faith we never can account it. At best, it can but claim to be a pious opinion, one among other theories respecting the effects of infant baptism; a revealed doctrine it certainly is not. Neither the practice nor the doctrine of infant baptism is matter of revelation. We must strenuously resist every attempt to impose upon us as an article of faith what is not found in Scripture, nor even in the ancient creeds. That the doctrine alluded to is not found in Scripture has been already shown; but neither does it form part

of the creeds: for though they speak of "one baptism for the remission of sins," upon the effects of *infant* baptism they are equally with Scripture silent.

It is very far, however, from being the case that such a view of the effects of infant baptism, when set forth as an article of faith, involves nothing inconsistent with the statements of Scripture. On the contrary, its direct tendency is to make the word of God of none effect through our traditions. In the first place, it effectually displaces, in all actually constituted churches, that word from the function which properly belongs to it. If regeneration is to be regarded as inseparably connected with the baptism of infants, then of course the word can never, in reference to adults who have been baptized in infancy, be spoken of as possessing a regenerating power. Under such circumstances, its use must be confined to the edifying, or converting, of the regenerate; an *instrument* of regeneration it no longer is in any church which practises infant baptism, and infant baptism is now the general practice of Christendom. Consequently, the passages before cited, in which the word of God is expressly said to be a means of regeneration, become applicable only to the particular case of the first planting of a church in a heathen country, when, of course, the parents must be baptized be-

fore their children: in an existing Christian Church like our own, they lose all their import. But on what warranty of Scripture is it affirmed that those adults only who have not been baptized in infancy can, without heresy, be addressed as needing to be regenerated by the word of God? Upon what authority is it that we are to believe that the scriptural connexion between the word and regeneration has been, since the apostles' times, completely dissolved and abrogated?

If nothing more were maintained than that God, not being tied to the use of his own appointed instruments, *may* so convey regeneration to an infant in baptism as that he shall not, in after life, need a further regeneration by the word, no objection could be made to the statement; but to affirm it to be a necessary doctrine of the Gospel that He does do so in every case is to affirm, surely without any scriptural warrant, that the same divine authority which once established a connexion between the word and the new birth has formally dissolved that connexion.

Nor should the modification which this tenet necessarily introduces into the doctrine of justification by faith be overlooked. Regeneration includes justification, as the greater includes the less; if, therefore, every infant is necessarily regenerated in baptism, every baptized infant is also necessarily justified; so that the faith which

comes by hearing is no longer the, nor even an, *instrument* of justification, but merely a means whereby a justified state, otherwise obtained, is preserved: by faith we are no longer justified, we only continue in a state of justification. Where is our authority for introducing this modification into the doctrine of St. Paul in reference to the office which faith holds in justifying?

These, however, are objections of inferior moment compared with that to which I am now about to direct your attention. The dogma in question makes regeneration in its full sense a *morally indifferent* thing; the communication of a new principle of life which is not necessarily a holy one. Here it is that its incompatibility with Scripture becomes chiefly apparent. Nothing is more evident than that multitudes of those who have been baptized in infancy never exhibit in after life the *moral* signs of regeneration, never prove themselves to be new creatures in Christ. It is not a question of *falling away* from the grace of regeneration once received; it is too plain that numbers amongst us pass their whole life in a state of alienation from God, and have never known what it is to have spiritual fellowship with Him through Christ. Nevertheless we are, on pain of being deemed heretics, to believe of all these persons, without exception, that they have been truly born of God, and are therefore in

union with Christ; are heirs of God and joint heirs with Christ; are sealed with the Holy Spirit of promise, which is the earnest of our inheritance; have the Spirit of adoption, crying, Abba, Father; are risen with Christ, and set down with Him in the heavenly places:—for all this they are, if they are fully regenerate. What, according to such teaching, can regeneration be but, as we have just said, a morally indifferent thing, since the unrenewed in heart may possess it to as full an extent as the renewed? It is in vain that attempts are made to stave off this inevitable conclusion by saying that the life of God remains, in such cases, shut up, as it were, in the soul; all such phrases do but faintly disguise the revolting features of the real doctrine, which is, that the inner change involved in regeneration is not necessarily a holy one, and that the same individual may be, in the fullest sense of the words, a child of God and a child of the devil at one and the same time.

The shock which such statements convey to the biblical Christian's mind is evidence enough that their source is not Scripture. If there are any truths taught more plainly than others in Holy Scripture, they are these:—that he who is truly born of God sinneth not habitually and wilfully: that the regenerating grace of the Holy Spirit can never be separated from his sanctifying

influences: that he who is truly a member of Christ, receives from Christ the Head quickening grace: that he who is truly an heir of glory has the pledge and foretaste of glory in his heart. Whether or not a person can fall finally away from this state is not now the question; we are only speaking of what he is while he remains in it. "By their fruits ye shall know them;" "whatsoever is born of God overcometh the world;" we know that whosoever is born of God sinneth not; but he that is begotten of God keepeth himself, and that wicked one toucheth him not:"—these are the true scriptural tests of regeneration, and wherever they are not exhibited by an adult, we must conclude that regeneration, in its full scriptural sense, is not present.

I know not whether the maintainers of the moral indifferency of regeneration are aware to what their dogma inevitably tends, but it is certain that, if pushed far enough (and extremes try principles), it would lead to the conclusion that Satan himself may be regenerate. For if regeneration may exist in an adult without exerting the smallest perceptible sanctifying effect upon him; if it consist merely in the communication of a new spiritual capacity, or higher nature, in itself morally indifferent; what is there to prevent the father of evil himself from receiving the gift, and being termed a child of God and an heir of glory?

In very truth, the dogma of which we are speaking is nothing but the Romish one under a more repulsive form, viz. that baptism impresses upon the soul a character or stamp, which, however, has nothing moral in it, and merely confers a passive spiritual capacity of receiving the sacraments and other benefits of the Church.

If the case were so that scripture unequivocally connected such a doctrine with infant baptism, we should of course be bound to receive it, and regard its apparent inconsistency with other statements of the word of God, and with the facts of experience, as one of the many instances in which the higher harmony of divine revelation presents itself to our apprehension in the shape of seeming contradictions. Every reader of Scripture will be able to recall to mind statements, especially as regards the relation of divine to human agency, which, taken literally, contradict each other, and yet which, since they are equally revealed, we are bound implicitly to receive, and reconcile as we can. Only we must take care that what does thus seem to contradict Scripture, be itself Scripture. In the present instance we have the word of God on one side, and on the other a dogmatical theory of human origin; where these two appear to be irreconcilable, we can have no hesitation in rejecting the latter: it is but a theory which we are rejecting. And what shall

we say of the temerity of those who, not satisfied with peremptorily ruling a point upon which Scripture is silent, propound their dogma as an article of faith, and denounce as heretics all whose reverence for Scripture will not permit them to receive what apparently nullifies the written word, unless it be itself a portion of that word?

Whenever, then, the full regeneration of every baptized infant is propounded as a doctrine, that is, as a revealed truth or an article of faith, we are abundantly warranted in rejecting it: as a doctrine, universally true, it cannot be set forth without contradicting what is expressly written in the word of God. And yet, in each particular case, we may act upon the judgment of charity, as it is called, or presume the fact to be as alleged, while no evidence to the contrary as yet appears; we may presume the infant whom we are actually baptizing to be thereby regenerate, so far as an infant can be regenerate, until we have decisive proof that our presumption is unfounded. For, as has been remarked, God is not tied to the use of his own instruments, and it is quite conceivable that he may, in the case of an infant, make baptism, irrespectively of the word, the means of regeneration. If we believe the practice to be a "charitable work," favourably allowed by Christ, we may surely presume that some blessing attends it, and why not the highest bless-

ing? The case of an infant is favourably distinguished from that of an adult destitute of personal repentance and faith: in this latter case baptism conveys no spiritual benefit, the unrenewed heart presenting a bar, or hindrance, to its effect; but in the case of an infant no such bar exists. There is nothing, therefore, so absolutely contrary to Scripture in the *presumption* that the infant may by baptism be regenerate, as to lead us at once to reject it, as we do the presumption that there may be a purgatory. Only we must remember that the negative fitness of infants, or the absence in their case of positive disqualification, for baptism, is a mere fact; and that we have no express scriptural warrant for affirming that the mere absence of a bar is, in any case, equivalent to the positive preparation of a change of heart. The whole theory of the "*non ponere obicem*" comes not from Scripture, but from the schoolmen. So completely are we in the dark as regards the precise effect of baptism when administered to infants! This negative fitness of the infant is, however, an important fact, though of its doctrinal value we are ignorant: it is a fact which warrants a present presumption in each particular case. True it is that experience proves that God does *not* generally dispense with the word as a means of regeneration, most of those who have been baptized in infancy needing a sub-

sequent change of heart; still each case, as it arises, *may* be one of the exceptions to the rule, and because it may be so, we may presume it to be actually so, as long as the presumption can fairly be cherished. In so doing we pronounce no *doctrine* whatever upon the subject, we only make an allowable supposition: we make it in each new case as it occurs, though we are constantly compelled by subsequent facts to abandon it as untenable.

I have said that we may presume the infant whom we are baptizing to be regenerate, *so far as an infant can be regenerate*; for it should seem that the regeneration of an infant, supposing it actually to take place, must be something very different from that of an adult. That it is sufficient to save is admitted on all hands; but that in the judgment of our Church it does not, by itself, render the subject of it capable of the full privileges of the Church, seems evident from the fact, that she does not permit persons baptized in infancy to partake of the Lord's Supper until they have ratified in their own persons the vows made for them at their baptism. What is this but a confession that the baptismal regeneration of infants is at best, though saving if they die, imperfect as compared with that of an adult; and needs, if the infant lives, a subsequent act of the conscious will to perfect it? Otherwise, why

should not the Lord's Supper be administered to infants as well as baptism? If the absence of a bar makes them fit recipients of the one sacrament, why not also of the other? Scripture, as regards this point, makes no distinction between the two sacraments. Every church which practises confirmation, not as a sacrament, but as a preparation for the receiving of the Holy Communion, does thereby tacitly confess that the baptismal regeneration of infants needs, if they arrive at years of maturity, some supplement to complete it.

It only remains to show that in refusing to believe that they who, in after life, give no evidence of a change of heart, were by baptism fully regenerate, we do not contradict the decisions of our church any more than those of Scripture. In her article on baptism, where her real *dogmatical* conclusions are to be sought, she pursues the same course exactly which has been followed in this discourse:—She first determines the nature and effect of baptism *in general*, and then proceeds to the exceptional case of infants. Baptism, in general, she declares to be, “not only a sign of profession, whereby christian men are discerned from others that be not christened, but also a sign of regeneration or new birth, whereby as by an instrument they that receive baptism rightly are grafted into the church,” &c. She does not

define what it is to receive it "rightly;" nor does she declare that this doctrine of baptism, which, from the mention of "faith's being increased," is evidently founded upon the general and normal case of adults, is to be applied without limitation to the case of infants. On the contrary, having pronounced her judgment on baptism as aforesaid, she dismisses the exceptional case of infants with the significant intimation, that, "the baptism of young children" (the practice) "is in any wise to be retained in the Church as most agreeable to the institution of Christ." In her services, it is true, she uses stronger language; but it is easy to see why she does so. In a service for baptism, as in every other liturgical formulary, some presumption, some theory upon the subject, must be adopted; our church adopts the most favourable one. That she is warranted in presuming in each case the *fact* of regeneration, though not in transforming the presumed fact into a doctrine, has been already shown. No devotional formularies can be constructed except on a presumption: what is our daily service but one continued presumption throughout? We address the whole congregation as beloved brethren in Christ; we put into their mouths the language of penitence, prayer, and praise; we make them express sentiments which none but true Christians can sincerely utter; and yet we know that not all present are faithful followers of Christ. How erro-

neous would be the conclusion, that because our formularies are, and must be, constructed upon this principle, we are to hold it as a doctrine, a part of God's truth, that every member of the congregation is a true penitent, and a true believer! Apply the same reasoning to the baptismal service, and the supposed difficulties connected with it will disappear. Having prayed that the infant may receive such regeneration as he is capable of, we believe that our prayers are heard, we thank God for his presumed favourable acceptance of our charitable work, we pronounce the infant, *on that presumption*, to be regenerate: but what the actual effect is none but the Searcher of hearts can know. This view may be called rationalistic: we may be accused of want of faith in not believing that a few drops of water and a few words do invariably effect so marvellous a change as the new birth; but it is no part of christian faith to believe where God has not spoken. We do not doubt that a few drops of water and a few words *may* be the means of spiritually regenerating the infant: we only hesitate to say that it *must* be so. God may employ the most insignificant means to bring about the mightiest results; we only need the promise, the declaration, the doctrine, to induce us to believe that in any given case He invariably does so. Let this be, in the present case, produced, and our doubts are at an end.

Meanwhile there is a common ground upon which the different parties in our church may, and it is hoped will, in future, be content to meet. That the baptized infant be brought up “agreeably to this beginning,” is at once the exhortation of our church, and the dictate of christian faith and hope. If we presume the fact of his regeneration, we must, of course, carry on that presumption until we are compelled to abandon it. Hence we bring up the child on christian principles; we teach him from the first to call God his Father, and Christ his Redeemer. We cannot treat those whom we have admitted to baptism as if they were heathens, or wholly uninterested in the spiritual blessings of the new covenant. It will be found, I conceive, that, in point of fact, such is the practice of all parties in our church, whatever their speculative differences of opinion may be. On all sides our baptized infants are brought up in the nurture and admonition of the Lord. If the aim of our opponents be a simply practical one, let them be assured that in the practical use of infant baptism we are one with them.

To return, then, to the point which has given rise to these observations:—you need be under no apprehension, my brethren, that by the recent legislative decision any essential doctrine of Chris-

tianity has been placed in peril. The connexion of baptism in *general* with regeneration has not been denied; the practice of infant baptism has not been called in question:—all that has been denied is that a dogma which, not only cannot be proved from Scripture, but which, when propounded as a revealed doctrine, involves consequences contradictory both of Scripture and experience, is to be accounted an article of the christian faith. The rights of conscience have not been in the slightest degree infringed, for there is nothing in the decision which compels any one to abandon the theory, whatever it may be, which he had previously held respecting the spiritual effect of infant baptism; we are still at liberty, if we please, to suppose that regeneration invariably accompanies such baptism. Nothing has received a check but the dogmatism which would be wise above what is written; which would place the customs of the Church on a level with divine ordinances, and transform the opinions of man into revealed doctrines of the word of God. Liberty of thought has not been abridged: it is only intolerance of every dogma but our own on a point not revealed that has been discountenanced. Nothing more has been declared than that the false assertion that the regeneration of every infant in baptism is an article of the faith, taught in Scripture and wit-

nessed to by the creeds, is a false one. With great wisdom, as it appears to me, have the two heads of our Church abstained from pronouncing any particular view of the effect of infant baptism to be a doctrine necessary to be believed, and virtually declared that henceforward that must be regarded as an open question. That no other conclusion could, on scriptural grounds, have been come to, appears to follow from the foregoing observations; which have been directed, not so much to establish any particular view, as to point out the obscurity in which the whole subject is involved; how little is the aid which we derive from Scripture in the investigation of it; and how unwarrantable, therefore, it is to propound any particular theory respecting it as a part of the deposit of the faith once delivered to the saints.

If the result of the decision shall be the practical settlement of a controversy which has always called forth an unusual degree of acrimony on the part of those who have engaged in it, both the Church and the nation will have great reason to be thankful to Almighty God for this, as for every other, token of his good-will towards us.

LONDON :

PRINTED BY G. J. PALMER, SAVOY STREET, STRAND.



Rev. R. Estlin

A
REMONSTRANCE
TO THE
BISHOP OF EXETER.

LONDON :
GILBERT & RIVINGTON, PRINTERS,
ST. JOHN'S SQUARE.

A

REMONSTRANCE

TO THE

BISHOP OF EXETER,

ON

His recent Letter

TO THE

ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY.

BY THE REV.

L. VERNON HARCOURT, M.A.

LONDON:

FRANCIS & JOHN RIVINGTON,
ST. PAUL'S CHURCH YARD, AND WATERLOO PLACE.

1850.

REMONSTRANCE,

§c.

MY LORD,

YOUR letter to the Archbishop of Canterbury appears to me so replete with injustice to that prelate, and so pregnant with mischief to the Church, that I feel myself constrained to take up the gauntlet in his behalf, and offer myself to break a lance with your Lordship in the arena of controversy which you have chosen, partly with a hope, a faint hope, of inducing you to reconsider the subject, and partly from serious apprehensions of the danger which may arise from your misrepresentation, as it appears to me, of the whole matter in dispute; for many, I know, have been led astray by your Lordship's astuteness to think and speak injuriously, not only of our excellent Metropolitan, but of the position of our Church; and already schism growls at a distance, and some sad drops are falling here and there, which are the prelude to a coming storm. How many more will

rush to the rescue I know not ; nor whether the Archbishop will think it necessary to don his unwonted armour, and defend himself. If he should, he, assuredly, needs not my assistance ; but if, feeling himself above the resentment of injustice, he should decline the challenge, I may claim without presumption three qualifications for undertaking the task : in the first place, I am not intimate with his Grace, and never was in his company, except at his consecration to the see of Chester, and cannot therefore be biassed by private friendship ; in the next place, I am in a position which forbids the imputation that I am actuated either by fear or hope ; and, lastly, I have publicly given in my adhesion to the doctrine of Baptismal Regeneration, in a work ¹, which, however, your Lordship has perhaps never seen, and therefore cannot be influenced by that *odium theologicum*, which is apt to arm disputants with more animosity than love of truth.

Your Lordship has already acknowledged two errors into which the hastiness of your attack has betrayed you, and perhaps I shall be able to point out a few more ; but first allow me to submit it to your calmer judgment, whether it is not a captious piece of criticism to find fault with the Archbishop for saying, that Regeneration is not accurately defined in Scripture, when you yourself assert that it *goes far towards* a definition. Why, is not this an

¹ The Doctrine of the Deluge.

acknowledgment that there is no accurate definition²? and when the Archbishop speaks of a change of state, you surely have no right to assume that he excludes every thing spiritual from that change, merely because he wishes to guard men from the error of supposing, that because they have been baptized, they must necessarily continue in a state of sanctification all their lives, whether they have or have not the marks of a new creature³. Again, consider whether it is not a captious objection which you offer to the explanation of “Regenerate,” by the periphrasis of “accepted in the Beloved,” when you yourself propose to substitute for it, “accepted,” because “in the Lord⁴?” what is the difference? is not the Lord the Beloved Son of God? and is not the same corollary as regularly deduced from the one as from the other? for none can be accepted in Christ without partaking of His Spirit, or of “the divine nature;” for, if we have not the Spirit of Christ, we are none of His. And again, when the Archbishop has admitted most explicitly⁵, that our Church considers Baptism as conveying Regeneration, is it not captious to quarrel with him for using the term “pronounced regenerate,” instead of regenerated, in speaking of those who afterwards revolt from their Baptismal vows?

When the Archbishop dwells upon the benefits which might accrue from the faithful prayers of parents at the

² Page 9.

¹ Page 10.

³ Page 9.

⁵ Page 7.

Baptism of their children, and regrets their frequent absence, you say that this is “an absolute identity with the error, of late charged, whether justly or otherwise, on the Church of Rome⁶.” But nobody ever charged this as an error on the Church of Rome; for every well-instructed Christian knows, that “the effectual fervent prayer of a righteous man availeth much.” The error of Rome consists in teaching, what it is well known that many of her casuists do teach, that the efficacy of the sacrament depends upon the *intention* of the priest. The efficacy of *prayer*, whether offered by priest or parents, is as certainly true, as the necessity of the priest’s *intention* is false. But nothing is more surprising than the forgetfulness and confusion of ideas which must have obscured your mind, when you broke out into that strange tirade against this doctrine, where you say that it is “rank Popery and worse than Popery⁷.” How is it that you have need to be reminded, that Popery consists in looking for other intercessors, beside Christ and the Spirit, not on earth but in heaven? Was St. Paul a rank Papist, when he prayed for the brethren, and desired their prayers for himself, and exhorted that intercessions should be made for all men? If, indeed, it were true, that the Archbishop insists upon the preliminary prayers of parents as necessary to salvation, that would in truth be a new and unheard-of heresy, but no more connected with the errors of Popery

⁶ Page 13.

⁷ Page 14.

than with those of Mahomet or Confucius. But it is not true; he only regrets that the blessings which might be obtained by prayer, when children are baptized, are not sufficiently considered by parents; and is there any seriously minded man who will not join in this regret?

I wish indeed he had dwelt also upon their subsequent responsibility, and the culture which is required to preserve the vitality of the germ which has been implanted; the neglect of which is quite sufficient to account for so many afterwards revolting from their baptismal vows, forfeiting their baptismal graces, and living apparently without God in the world; but all subjects cannot be handled on all occasions, and there would be no end to book-making, if every author was obliged to insert what every reader wishes to see.

The next objection of your Lordship, to which I entirely object, is that which you make to the statement, that to rely on prayers in Baptism is "primitive, scriptural, and reasonable." Christian prayer of course means the prayer of faith, and it is of no consequence in the sight of God, whether that faith is expressed in words, or lives only in the heart; it was the qualification for obtaining mercy, on which our Lord almost always insisted, however feeble or unenlightened it might be; and therefore, even where the open avowal of it was not required, we may take for granted that it existed. St. Ambrose tells us that

“ at Easter pious parents, through faith, followed their new-born progeny in great numbers to be born under the tree of faith from the womb of the font.” They desired, whether in words or not, that their children should be regenerated; and what they desired, they believed. On this principle, and on this principle alone, is it right to say, that Justification is the fruit of Baptism. It might seem, at first, as if sanctification and justification must be the same thing; for what is the difference between being made holy, and being made just or righteous? But justification is a forensic term, signifying acquittal from guilt in the sight of God, so that he can treat the justified as if they were really just. When a man is baptized, faith enables him to lay hold of that privilege, and his sins being washed away through the water and the blood, he is reputed holy; and if he dies without forfeiting it again, he is saved. When an infant is baptized, the faith of the parents, or of the sponsors, or of the minister, or of the congregation, is accepted vicariously, and he is justified by that faith, inasmuch as he is acquitted from the guilt of his sinful nature: original sin is then forgiven. In this sense, it is true, that “ justification and newness of heart are contemporaneously given in Baptism;” but it is an unwise and dangerous language to employ. For what is the dogmatic teaching of our Church? Does it tell us that we are justified by Baptism or by faith? Truly the use of such language introduces an unnecessary con-

fusion of ideas into our terminology, and an offensive appearance of contradiction, not only to the great principle of the Reformation, but to our own articles and homilies. Perhaps your Lordship will “stand aghast” at the heretical views which I thus maintain, and will agitate the Church so to define justification in your own sense, as to drive me out of its communion. I only hope, that if I am to be condemned as an unsound member of the Church, it may be grounded on some better criticism than that by which you prove to the Archbishop that justification is the fruit of Baptism; for you quote St. Paul, as saying that we are saved “by the washing of regeneration, and *of the renewal* of the Holy Ghost⁸.” In our version, we read—“and the renewing of the Holy Ghost.” The object of sliding in this little change, is to connect the renewing of the Holy Ghost more immediately with the waters of Baptism. Now, though I agree with your Lordship in the concomitance of the two, so far as the reception of some spiritual grace goes along with the washing of regeneration, yet I cannot consent to support that conclusion by evidence which I know to be false. I am aware that the words in the original are barely capable of that construction; but your Lordship is too good a scholar to maintain its correctness, especially since several of the most ancient manuscripts, and the Syriac version, show

⁸ Page 15.

how they were generally interpreted in those days, by repeating the preposition—"and *by* the renewing of the Holy Ghost⁹."

In making this remark, I am not afraid of being charged with being hypercritical, when I am answering a person who has taken such uncommon pains to detect as many motes as he can in the eye of the Archbishop's style. Your Lordship should remember the proverb, that "they who live in glass houses should not be the first to throw stones" But this leads me to notice another error into which you have fallen, on the subject of the primitive Church. You quote a Canon of the Fourth Council of Carthage, which, however, was not the Fourth Council of Carthage, though reckoned so by the Church of Rome, for a reason to which I shall have occasion to advert again before I conclude; and you say that those Canons were adopted by the General Council of Chalcedon; and you argue, that having the authority of the whole Catholic Church, they are binding upon all Bishops; and of course you must own the obligation to be most stringent upon yourself. But, my Lord, have you duly weighed the consequences of your own argument? Do you really mean to abide by the Sixteenth of those Canons, which forbids Bishops (and *a fortiori*, the inferior Clergy) to read the works of heathens, and those of heretics, except in cases of necessity? Alas! I fear that this

⁹ See Wetstein.

Remonstrance, not coming under that exception, will be placed in the Index Expurgatorius of Exeter. But there are other Canons, which the Clergy of your diocese will be still more startled to hear of your intention to enforce: three of them order the Clergy to get their living by some honest trade. The only one of your Clergy who will have reason to rejoice in this new-found determination is Mr. Gorham; for, by the Sixty-sixth, those who consider themselves harshly treated by their Bishop, may appeal to a Synod. To release your Lordship, however, from this dilemma, allow me to suggest, that the Canons of this Council were not adopted by the General Council of Chalcedon: the Canons of many Councils were then confirmed; but only those of the Greek Church. The code of Canons was then confined to Greek Councils, and there was no “Codex Canonum Ecclesiae Universa,” containing those of African Councils, till 691-2.

2. I beseech you to reconsider your next allegation against the Archbishop, and see whether you do not repent of charging him with perverting Scripture, and making an awful addition to its truth. It is a very serious accusation, and one at which, it is to be hoped, on reconsideration, you will “shudder.” It would be more suitable to such reasonable remorse, than to any alarm which your imagination can conjure up in answer to your questions¹. Let it be

¹ Page 19.

remembered, that a prayer is just as much a prayer before God, whether it be expressed in words, or only implied. Now, the infants whom Jesus took in his arms came, not by any mysterious agency left unexplained, nor did they (for they could not) come of themselves : we are told that they were brought ; and we are told why they were brought : their parents or friends desired that Jesus might touch them. Was this the effect of folly, or of piety ? To suppose the first would be a gratuitous calumny in the highest degree improbable. It follows, then, that they desired it, because they felt assured that it would be attended by a blessing : they desired it with so much importunity, as to provoke a rebuke from the disciples : and, further, the great displeasure which that rebuke excited, was the strongest proof how much he approved the conduct and faith of those importunate suitors. To say, therefore, that their zeal was approved, is *not* a perversion of Scripture, nor an awful addition to its truth, but a natural, obvious, and inevitable inference from the context.

Before I quit this subject, I must notice your Lordship's extraordinary interpretation of the statement deduced from these transactions in the Article on Baptism, which speaks of the Baptism of children as most agreeable to the institution of Christ ; " that is," you say, " more agreeable with it than the Baptism of others²." Now, if any comparison at

² Page 13.

all is intended in it, it is, that it is more agreeable to that institution to retain the practice than to omit it. But, in the Latin Article, *optime congruat* does not contain any comparison ; it means no more than very well, or excellently.

3. Let me ask you, my Lord, why you choose to confound two things so utterly dissimilar as a reasonable mode of Baptism, and the rationalizing neology of Germany? Why make such a parade of appealing to the Law and the Testimony,—as if the Archbishop did not rely upon Scripture as much or more than yourself? You acknowledge the existence of one mode of Baptism, which, however primitive, you dare not deny to be unreasonable when it was deferred to a death-bed, in order to secure salvation when further guilt was impossible. But you have not noticed a still more unreasonable practice, which is not related by “an infidel historian,” but by one of the most celebrated Fathers of the Church ; practised, indeed, only by the Marcionites, but defended by them as scriptural. We learn from Chrysostom³, that when a Catechumen died unbaptized, they placed a living man in concealment under the bed of the dead man, to answer for him, when he was asked whether he would be baptized. They defended this practice by appealing to the Law and the Testimony, and claimed the sanction of St. Paul, because he asks, “Why are they then baptized for

³ Chrys. Hom. xl. in 1 Cor.

the dead?" May not any one deny that this was a reasonable mode of Baptism without being accused of rationalism? Perhaps you will say, that you have nothing to do with the opinions or practices of heretics: allow me to say, that they affect you very materially. For I invite your Lordship's most serious consideration to this inquiry: Is it possible, think you, that such a device could have entered into the head of the wildest and most extravagant heretics, if the Christian world at large had not acknowledged previously the efficacy of vicarious faith? for, under every error, there must be some substratum of truth upon which it is built up; or it would not have verisimilitude enough to deceive any one.

But as I have no reason to hope that you will consider these strictures worthy of an answer, I must take for granted that you will be satisfied by my arguments to receive the view of Baptism which I have propounded as primitive, scriptural, and reasonable; for two corollaries follow from this proposition, which effectually remove both the objections which you advance against the system erroneously attributed to the Archbishop; for, 1st, it follows that the miserable uncertainty of which you complain is reduced to the lowest minimum of possibility, and *De minimis non curat lex*; and, 2ndly, that even if an extreme case should occur, in which all the parties concerned or assisting at a baptism

should be destitute of every particle of faith in that transaction, and the ceremony were only a mockery of the Sacrament, and a vile affront to the Holy Trinity, no Christian need shudder at relegating an infant so treated into the category of the children of Quakers and Baptists, and the uncovenanted mercies of God : for, to affirm that pardon of sin under all circumstances can only be granted through Baptism is to determine a question which Scripture has left undetermined, in the sense most opposite to that charity which hopeth all things, the salvability, not only of the heathen world, but of a considerable portion of professing Christians.

It is true, that you do not enunciate this dogma in explicit terms ; but you strongly insinuate it by dwelling so much upon *one* Baptism, one, and *one only*, for the remission of sins⁵, as if it were the only channel through which sins are remitted absolutely and universally ; but why need I remind your Lordship, (for you know it as well as I do,) that the remission of sins was not connected with Baptism in the creeds till towards the end of the fourth century, and belongs more to the Council of Constantinople than to that of Nice, which took no notice of Baptism at all ? and why should I remind you, that the phrase on which you insist so much, the oneness of Baptism, was only introduced as a protest against the error of some Catholics, who

⁵ Page 19.

rebaptized heretics, and of the Donatists who rebaptized Catholics, and of the Marcionites, who permitted the ceremony to be repeated no less than three times? But, in the next place, if you refuse to admit the possible exception which I have suggested, you subject yourself to the grave imputation which attaches to the practice of these heretics in baptizing the dead, and to the practice of those Catholics, who deferred their Baptism till they were on their death-bed ; in each of these cases the error is the same, the *opus operatum* of the Romish Church⁶. You say, indeed, that reliance on deferred Baptism bears no more resemblance to reliance on the *opus operatum* than that reliance on deferred repentance unfortunately too common now ; but, surely, the difference between them is this : the latter is a vain reliance upon spiritual privileges already granted, the former is a reliance upon an outward ceremony ; the latter is founded upon the persuasion that the grace of repentance will be granted to them as members of the Christian covenant whenever they shall seriously desire it ; the former refers every thing to the work of man, without any regard to the state of the heart.

I agree with your Lordship in thinking this a strong proof of a generally received opinion, that those who died after Baptism without committing actual sins before their death were undoubtedly saved ;

⁶ Page 21.

but then they took not into account what is required of persons to be baptized, and thought that salvation might be cheaply purchased in the last extremity, by sprinkling of water from the hands of a priest, and a formula from his mouth without any change in the state of the heart : does this bear no resemblance at all to the *opus operatum* of Rome ? You proceed to taunt and chide the Archbishop for ignorance, inaccuracy, and inconsistency ; the lofty superiority with which you take upon yourself to teach him things which must be quite familiar to him is merely amusing ; but with respect to his inaccuracy, it is necessary to examine whether that imputation attaches more to him or to yourself. The accusation which you prefer against him is of a very serious character, and ought never to have been advanced, unless you were prepared to support it by the most irrefragable proof. Let us see whether it is not like an arrow shot upright, which in its fall endangers the head of him who discharged it. You accuse him of having misled the Privy Council, not only by mis-stating the matters on which he advised, but also by mis-quoting all, or almost all the authors cited by him in confirmation of his statement⁷. Any one would suppose from this, that the Archbishop had written a letter to the Privy Council on the Gorham controversy, full of inaccurate information and false advice ; but what

⁷ Page 25.

is the fact? The public having called for another edition of his work upon Apostolical preaching, in which he had briefly and judiciously noticed the question of Infant Baptism, it was incumbent upon him, on account of the present excitement on that subject, to explain more fully his present sentiments with regard to it; his book was directed against the Calvinistic tenet of special and indefectible grace, and therefore, the question naturally arose, whether in these Procrustean days, those who differed from him could be considered consistent members of our Church. Unwilling to exclude from its communion a large body of its most laborious and pious ministers, he takes the line of charity, and in defence of that line, adduces some passages from divines of the highest authority, who had made more or less concession to the Calvinistic view, although, like himself, not concurring in their opinions; these passages therefore are quoted, not in reference to the case of Mr. Gorham^s, but to a question of much larger importance: and thus all your attacks upon those quotations are, to use your own expression, “*nihil ad rem*, they have nothing to do with the case of Mr. Gorham¹.”

Your extreme surprise then was much misplaced; especially since I hope to show before I have done, that you are as inaccurate in your notion of Mr. Gorham's “peculiar heresy,” as you are as to the Archbishop's object in his preface.

^s Page 27.

¹ Page 28.

But I must proceed to your criticisms upon his authorities.

1. With respect to Usher, it must be granted that he has fallen into an error in quoting a work as his, which was disowned by him; but it is no less inaccurate to state that the writer was "Cartwright, the notorious leader of the Nonconformist party," when you had before your eyes Usher's own declaration that the Catechism from which you suppose it to be taken, was compiled not only from Cartwright's, but from Croom's, and some other English divines; neither does this triumph over the error of mistaking the genuineness of a book, come with a good grace from one who mistakes the authority of a Council.

2. It is quite true that the Archbishop has misquoted Hooker, by inadvertently substituting charity for piety; but even this ought not to be severely visited by a writer who cannot even quote St. Paul correctly; and the meaning must be much the same, whether the one or the other word is used, in the mind of him who was pleading for a charitable presumption in favour of infants, and for their election as "a probable and allowable truth." But in the other passage of Hooker, quoted, what can your Lordship mean by saying, that it does not allude to the opinion of the divines of whom the Archbishop was speaking? Is it not plain, that when he says, "Baptism is a seal, perhaps, to the grace of election before received," this is a concession to his Calvinistic opponent, a granting of

the possibility that electing grace may have preceded it? So that all which you say to prove that his own opinion was far different, is nothing to the purpose; *nihil ul rem*, and has nothing to do with the case of Mr. Gorham.

3. The quotation from Bishop Taylor is precisely in the same predicament; it is a concession to those, who upon the general question thought differently from himself; for he was not a Bishop of Exeter. Your Lordship chooses to assume that the Archbishop is profoundly ignorant of Taylor's works, in order that you may the more decorously accuse the citation of being "palpably fraudulent²;" if he had tried to deceive the world by persuading them from this specimen, that Taylor was a Calvinist, it would indeed have been a foolish and fraudulent attempt; but that was necessarily the very last thing that he could have wished, for it would have furnished a strong argument against the design of his whole book. Is it, then, that the admission by a writer of any opinion, differing from his own, appears to you to be utterly incredible? even this explanation, natural as it may seem, will not serve to solve the enigma: for you admit, that the Calvinists were in the habit of making "statements, which taken in their plain meaning, flatly contradict one another;" and it is refreshing to find that you commend the charity of "taking words in their best meanings," and "overlooking the real differences³" between

² Page 33.

³ Pages 34, 35.

them and us. One thing however is certain, that nothing can be more inaccurate than to say, that the passage from Taylor is either mis-stated or mis-quoted, and the whole argument is *nihil ad rem*, and has nothing to do with the case of Mr. Gorham.

4. With respect to Bullinger, it is needless to expose the inaccuracy which you yourself acknowledge : I will only add, that since three editions of his Decades appeared in ten years after their introduction, while the same length of time produced only one edition of the Second Book of Homilies, which we know were ordered to be read in every Parish Church, it is highly probable, that the Archbishop's inference of their authority is more accurate than your own. Indeed your own admission convicts you here ; for the positive evidence of Archdeacon Aylmer inquiring at his Visitation about the use of this book by the Clergy far outweighs the negative evidence of Whitgift's omission. Your whole argument about Bullinger's contradictions only shows that our Church was less Procrustean then, than your Lordship would make it now ; it is *nihil ad rem*, and has nothing whatever to do with the case of Mr. Gorham.

5. You object to the citation from Pearson, that he is not speaking of infants, because he does not expressly mention them ; but neither are they mentioned in the passage which you produce : if the one

is said of Baptism “of itself,” and *simpliciter*, so is the other. But a little attention to the context will show that the Baptism of Infants, was much more in his thoughts than that of adults⁵. “Being,” says he, “that Baptism is a washing away of sin, and the purification from sin is a proper sanctification; being every one who is so called and baptized is thereby separated from the rest of the world, which are not so—and all such separation is some kind of sanctification; being though the work of grace be not perfectly wrought, yet when the means are used, without something appearing to the contrary, we ought to presume of the good effect; therefore, all such as have been received into the Church, may be in some sort called holy⁶.” And then he goes on to say, that something “more than an outward vocation, and a charitable presumption is necessary to make a man holy.” Now, is it not obvious that all this applies much more to infant than to adult Baptism? Again, therefore, I am compelled to say, that your argument is inaccurate, and *nihil ad rem*, and has nothing whatever to do with the case of Mr. Gorham.

6. But I cannot say the same of your objection to the extract from Bishop Carleton: it has, indeed, much to do with Mr. Gorham; but its inaccuracy is more glaring than ever. You say he does *not* teach that young children baptized are delivered from original sin⁷. Why, my Lord, one of his answers is:

⁵ Page 43.

⁶ On the Communion of Saints.

⁷ Page 46.

“If baptized infants die before they commit actual sin, the Church holds, and I hold, that they are undoubtedly saved ⁸.” To place such contradictions side by side within the compass of a few pages, is to presume upon the obtuseness or forgetfulness of your readers, in a degree which is absolutely uncourteous, and, therefore, very unlike your Lordship.

Lastly, in your reply to the Archbishop’s remark upon the Savoy Conference, you attribute to him language which he never used. He speaks not of the “charitable presumption,” with which the Confirmation Service was defended, but of that “favourable construction” of all the services, which the Preface to our Common Prayer inculcates; and the moderation with which the Baptismal Service was defended by the Episcopalians, (for they were not all Bishops, which is another inaccuracy,) certainly deserves that title.

I have now gone through all the counts of the indictment against the Archbishop on this subject, and I leave it to your Lordship’s candour to decide, which of the two parties in this cause is most obnoxious to the charge of inaccuracy, mis-statement, and mis-quotation.

I now proceed to the other branch of your accusation. The charges of inconsistency are two:—one is, that having acknowledged it to be certain from the word of God, that infants who have been

⁸ Page 50.

baptized, and die before they commit actual sin, are undoubtedly saved, he says, that Scripture has not determined the actual effect of infant Baptism, and does not speak definitively on that subject: and such is your horror at this statement, that you will not believe it to be intended, without an open avowal of the fact⁹. But, my Lord, you need not wait for an answer to this challenge: the answer is obvious; it lies upon the surface. Scripture does not speak definitively of infant Baptism, nor determine its actual effect, for this plain reason, that it does not speak of infant Baptism at all: can your Lordship produce a single passage, where it is even mentioned? But this is not at all inconsistent with our Rubric; for our moral certainty of the salvation of infants arises not from any positive statement, but from the comparison of many passages, and many principles of Scripture, which lead inevitably to that conclusion.

In mathematics it is most certain, that in a right-angled triangle the square of the side subtending the right angle is equal to the squares of the other two: but look at the problem; from one end of the demonstration to the other, there is no hint of the effect of the proposition, no definite statement of the abstract truth. In like manner it is evident, that a conclusion in theology may be most certain, because it is plainly deduced from Scripture, without

⁹ Page 25.

being determined by any express declaration; and that this was the Archbishop's meaning no one can doubt.

Your second charge of inconsistency, is grounded upon the Archbishop's charity: that is a point in which you have no sympathy with him. You cannot understand how it can have betrayed him into countenancing unsound doctrine in contradiction to his own belief; how he can allow the ministers of our Church to declare that not to be, which, he says, the Church declares to be her doctrine¹.

My Lord, it is well known, as well known to your Lordship as to any body, that some of our clergy maintain that high tone of Calvinistic doctrine, against the preaching of which, thirty-five years ago, the Archbishop published his valuable work. Now, if one of these should present himself to his Grace for institution, and declare that he espoused your own views on the subject of baptism, would you again address the Archbishop in similar terms, and insist upon his rejecting that minister, because he interpreted the doctrines of the Church in a different way, and that he should agitate the country from one end to the other, by reviving all the controversies about the meaning of the Seventeenth Article? And remember, that this is no impossible case; for the history of theology abundantly proves that both opinions are compatible; both have been held together.

¹ Page 24.

The ancient Predestinarians never questioned the certainty of Baptismal Regeneration; they doubted not that the doctrine was quite consistent with their theory. Augustine, the first great advocate of those doctrines which have since been denominated Calvinism, has been followed by many divines, both before and since the Reformation, in reconciling both, by imagining, as it would seem, a double election; an exterior circle, consisting of all those who were elected into the visible Church, and an interior and much smaller one, comprising only those who are elected to everlasting life, and to whom alone indefectible grace is granted. The argument, therefore, against Baptismal Regeneration, from the supposed Calvinism of those who compiled the Liturgy, is absolutely good for nothing. But this difference of views necessarily produces a difference of sentiment with regard to the efficacy of prayer; and, consequently, “the same words of prayer do cover conflicting opinions².” But this by no means implies any “inward hollowness” or “uncertainty:” each party prays sincerely and with confidence in his own sense, the Calvinist for himself and his coelect, his opponent with a larger charity for all the Church.

This diversity of positive doctrine has been held by some, more or less, ever since the Reformation, without detriment to the Church, except now and

² Page 87.

then, when it has fought with a zeal, my Lord, as intolerant as your own. But there is another instance, in which, I am sure, your Lordship must wish that the members of the Church may be allowed to differ, without one party launching anathemas against the other : the Eleventh Article says, that we are accounted righteous before God only by faith ; and that it is a most wholesome (or salutary) doctrine, that we are justified by faith only.

Now suppose that I, indignant at some one who insisted that we are not justified by faith only, but by Baptism, should, following a high example, burst forth after this fashion :—“ If what is declared so earnestly to be truth is not, what is ? Why are they not to doubt of any other article of the faith, if they are to doubt of this ? If the Church is not in earnest in this, which she teaches so earnestly, where is she earnest ? When is she to be supposed to teach what she says ? If those are ambiguous words, where are there any which are unambiguous³ ? ” If, I say, I were to use such language as this, would you not sympathize with the person thus accused of false teaching, and protest against the tyranny of being obliged to walk upon the edge of a sword over the abyss of heresy, into which the smallest deviation or unsteadiness of judgment would infallibly precipitate you ? Moreover, though I am a great stickler for baptismal regeneration, I cannot shut my

³ Page 86.

eyes to the fact, that the language of the Liturgy, even in that most earnest persuasion to which you allude, is most plainly conditional, and based on charitable presumption; for it exhorts us earnestly to believe, not only that the child will be received with favour and mercy, but that Christ will give unto him the blessing of eternal life, and make him partaker of his everlasting kingdom. Can we really believe this of every infant that is baptized, except upon the charitable presumption, that he also will perform his part of the covenant, and keep the promises made in his behalf?

But I must now proceed to take a nearer view of the unsound doctrine, which the Archbishop is charged with countenancing, not for the purpose of defending it, for I am not one of the five or six who alone symbolize with Mr. Gorham, according to your Lordship's calculation⁴, but in order to show some considerations which might justify his Grace in coming to a different conclusion from yourself.

Mr. Gorham is accused of limiting the mercies of God, of stating that original sin is sometimes not remitted at all to an infant when baptized, and that by declaring original sin to be a hindrance to the benefits of Baptism⁵, he denied the article of the Creed, "One baptism for the remission of sins⁶." "If it were so, it was a grievous fault, and grievously hath Gorham answered it." I have neither had the

⁴ Page 81.

⁵ Page 48.

⁶ Page 52.

wish nor the opportunity of winding through all the intricacies of his examination. All that I know of it is from the passages produced by your Lordship, and selected, no doubt, because they were the most to your purpose; and I must say, that they do not appear to me to bear out your allegations. It would be too tedious to go through all your citations, neither is it necessary, for they have all the same drift, all centre in one point, the peculiar crotchet of Mr. Gorham, and the five or six who share his opinions—namely, that an act of prævenient grace is always necessary to make infants worthy recipients of Baptism.

This strange fancy, that worthiness is a predisposition indispensable to a participation in the graces of a sacrament, is neither warranted by Scripture, nor acknowledged by our Church: as Christ died for us, while we were yet sinners, so the benefits of his death are applicable to those who are in the same sad state, provided it be not wilfully entertained. But if the unworthiness attributed to infants disqualifies them for the reception of sacramental grace, who can hope to be qualified for the other Sacrament? For our article on original sin tells us, that the infection of our nature cleaves even to them that are regenerate; and in adults, it is not wrapt up in a mystery and in darkness, as it is in infants, but is visible in action; and the most faithful penitents, who draw near to the table of the Lord, after confessing the intolerable burthen of their sins, too

often incur fresh guilt, before the reception of the elements by the admission of some vain thought, some wanderings of imagination, some momentary defect of faith and repentance ; upon Mr. Gorham's principle therefore, a prævenient act of grace must always be granted to them immediately before they partake of the Sacrament, in order to make them worthy communicants.

In the case of infants, there is no positive obstruction to the reception of grace by actual guilt ; and when our Lord welcomed them, and pronounced them to be the materials of which his kingdom was composed, he plainly intimated that they needed no other qualification for the blessing which their parents entreated for them, than their simplicity and the absence of unworthiness. But worthiness is a term which ought not to be introduced into this question at all ; when the Twenty-fifth Article speaks of the wholesome effect of the Sacraments depending upon the worthiness of the receiver, the context shows that it must be limited to the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper. For that is the only Sacrament which is or can be "gazed upon" and "carried about," and which we must and can "duly use ;" it is the only Sacrament, by receiving which unworthily we can "purchase to ourselves damnation." It is to the Twenty-seventh Article, which treats of Baptism alone, that we must look for the dogmatic teaching of our Church on that subject ; and there the privileges of the Sacrament are appropriated to

those who *rightly* receive it ; and with respect to this no one speaks more to the purpose than Bishop Taylor: “Infants,” he says, “are rightly disposed for the receiving the blessings and effects of Baptism. For the understanding of which, we are to observe, that God’s graces are so free, that they are given to us upon the accounts of his own goodness only ; and for the reception of them we are tied to no other predisposition, but that we do not hinder them. For what worthiness can there be in any man to receive the first grace? Before grace there can be nothing good in us ; and, therefore, before the first grace there is nothing that can deserve it ; because, before the first grace there is no grace, and consequently no worthiness. But the dispositions which are required in men of reason, is nothing but to remove the hindrances of God’s grace, to take off the contrarieties to the Spirit of God. Now, because in infants there is nothing that can resist God’s Spirit, nothing that can hinder Him, nothing that can grieve Him, they have that simplicity and nakedness, that passivity and negative disposition, or non-hindrances, to which all that men can do in disposing themselves are but approaches and similitudes ; and therefore infants can receive all that they need, all that can do them benefit⁷. The inhe-

⁷ The benefits which children receive at Baptism are explained more fully in another place. “The sanctification of children is their adoption to the inheritance of sons ; their presentation to Christ ; their consignation to Christ’s service, and to

ritance and the title to the promises require nothing on our part, but that we can receive them, that we put no hindrance to them ; for that is the direct meaning of our blessed Saviour, ‘ He that doth not receive the kingdom of God as a little child shall in no wise enter therein ;’ that is, without that nakedness and freedom from obstruction and impediment, none shall enter⁸.”

Mr. Gorham, therefore, is clearly wrong in contending, that infants must be pardoned before they can receive the benefits of Baptism, especially since the same unworthiness, which, in his view, would disqualify them for Sacramental grace, must equally disqualify them for prævenient grace. But it does not appear from his answers, that he can be fairly charged with any Calvinistic limitation of the mercies of God. What may be his private sentiments I cannot tell; but you have produced no evidence to show, that he considers some infants specially predestined to salvation, and therefore allowed to be regenerated, while others are excluded: on the contrary, he avows his adhesion to the doctrine of our Church, that infants who have been baptized, and die before they commit actual sin, are undoubtedly saved. This is an unlimited and universal proposition; what is true of one, is true of all equally. And here

resurrection; their being put into a possibility of being saved; their restitution to God’s favour, which naturally, that is, as our nature is depraved and punished, it could not have.” Works, ii. 281.

⁸ Taylor’s Works, viii. 207.

I congratulate myself upon being able for once to agree with your Lordship, in your amazement at that extraordinary specimen of ratiocination in the judgment of the Judicial Committee; who, having cited this Rubric, straightway follow it up by denying the inference from it, that those infants are saved by Baptism. If, on the one hand, nothing is said about the state of unbaptized infants, and therefore there can be no assurance that they are undoubtedly saved, and on the other hand, it is averred as a most certain truth, that baptized infants are undoubtedly saved; to deny that baptism is the means by which they are saved, merely because they are not said, *totidem verbis*, to be saved by Baptism, is a specimen of that hardy sophistry which has hitherto been considered the peculiar property of the Jesuits. But to return to Mr. Gorham. I cannot think that he intends to reject the doctrine of St. Peter, who exhorted his hearers to be baptized for the remission of their sins; nor is any such intention necessarily implied in his answers. He does not say that sins are not remitted to infants *when* they are baptized, but *in* baptism. Now, if the effect is invariably the same,—if baptized infants always have original sin remitted to them when they are baptized,—what does it matter whether the remission takes place at the same moment as the Baptism, or a moment before? If a man were to deny that lightning and thunder are simultaneous, because the flash appears to him to precede the report, and

could not be persuaded by all the reasonings of sound philosophy,—were it not a pity to punish that man for his innocent obduracy, *acdemptus per vim mentis gratissimus error*? If Mr. Gorham chooses to imagine, that God always paves his way for granting one grace by imparting previously another, so long as it is admitted that He rewards the faith of his Church in bringing children to the laver of regeneration by granting them his Holy Spirit, what is the harm of this figment? It is, indeed, too curious a prying into the secret method of God's operations, and a gratuitous assumption, and a wild and useless vagary: but it is not a heresy; it is not Zuinglianism; it does not rob parents of their comfort, nor children of their hopes, nor the Church of her faith¹. And still less does the refusal to punish it sanction the inference, that “our Church is no part of the Church of Christ.” To suppose, indeed, that all infants who die are regenerated, and not all who live, (if that could be proved against him, of which there is no proof at all,) would be a monstrous paradox, with no warrant from Scripture, no countenance from the Church, and no colour of reason; for if any one be haunted by an objection, which presses like a nightmare upon his conscience, that many are thus pronounced regenerate, who grow up without any marks of regeneration, let him be assured that it is a

¹ Page 26.

visionary terror, a phantom arising from ill-digested ideas of the grace of that sacrament. For, as Bp. Taylor says: "The outward act of man, unless we make ourselves unworthy, is certainly assisted with the increase of God; if the good effect come not, the sacrament doth not want its virtue, but the receiver marred it²." And again, "The Holy Spirit, which descends upon the waters of Baptism, does not instantly produce (all) its effects in the soul of the baptized; and when He does, it is irregularly, and as He pleases—no man can conclude that the spirit of sanctification is not come upon infants, because there is no sign or expression of it. It is within us, it is the seed of God; and it is no good argument to say, Here is no seed in the bowels of the earth, because there is nothing green on the surface of it³." And again, "The seed of God is put into the ground of our hearts, and repentance waters it, and faith makes the ground apt to produce fruits—the seed may lie long in the ground, and produce fruits in its due season, if it be refreshed with the former and the latter rain⁴." And this is quite in accordance with the language of Scripture in the parable of the sower; for the seed of the Word is the seed of grace planted in the heart, as it then always was, by preaching: but it matters not by what instrumentality it may be sown, whether by preaching or by Baptism. The seed is

² Works, V. i. 151.

³ Ibid. ii. 266.

⁴ Ibid. 265.

still the grace of God, which sometimes falls on ground that is never tilled, and then is removed by the arts of the Devil; sometimes it withers away, when the heart is not softened by the love of God, and sometimes it is choked by the cares and pleasures of the world, and brings no fruit to perfection; on this subject I have the satisfaction of believing that your Lordship agrees with me; and on this subject there is no evidence that Mr. Gorham dissents, if the passages produced from his examination fully represent his opinions; for the peculiarity of his scheme seems to be this, that he divides the grace of regeneration into two parts, of which one must of necessity precede the other, but without assigning any specific interval between them.

Now I should be glad to know from your Lordship, in what precise instant of the rite the Holy Spirit descends upon the infant. It is a point upon which there may be some considerable difference of opinion, for some maintain that the grace cannot be separated from the water: but, on the other hand, the sprinkling does not occupy so much time as the invocation, and till the formula is concluded, the baptism is not completed. If, then, Mr. Gorham will allow that his prævenient grace accompanies the affusion of water, all parties may rest contented; for his theory is then satisfied, and he does not deny the Article of the Creed, and does not separate entirely the inward and spiritual grace from the sacrament⁵.

⁵ Page 52.

By viewing the process of regeneration as a whole, without dividing it into two parts, he might be content to say, that it takes place *in* Baptism as well as before it. But even if he is unreasonable enough to refuse this compromise, I still am bold enough to say, that the Judicial Committee acted wisely in not fettering the freedom of conscience, and driving all diversities of opinion into one narrow passage, from which no one is at liberty to diverge one inch to the right hand or to the left.

Even the Church of Rome, notwithstanding her claim of infallibility, and notwithstanding the minute preciseness with which all knots have been cut by the Council of Trent, still has her open questions. One of these is the question where her infallibility resides, which the Council of Trent was too discreet to touch; another, which never would have been a question if she had taken Scripture for her guide, is the immaculate conception of the Virgin Mary. In support of this tenet, a powerful party is appealing to their infallible head with vehement expostulations; they declare it to be of vital importance to their Church; they say, that it must be either true or false, it cannot be both black and white; and they call for a solemn decision in their favour. But, my Lord, Pius IX. wisely thinks that there are some questions which had better not be resolved.

“Variety of opinions,” says Bishop Taylor, “is impossible to be cured; and although inconveniences, which every man sees and feels, are consequent to this

diversity of persuasion, yet it is but accidentally and by chance, insomuch as we see that in many things, and they of great concernment, men allow to themselves and to each other a liberty of disagreeing, and no hurt neither.” And, “Men are, now-a-day, so in love with their own fancies and opinions, as to think faith and all Christendom are concerned in their support and maintenance; and whosoever is not so fond, and does not dandle them like themselves, it grows up to a quarrel, which, because it is *in materiâ theologiæ*, is made a quarrel in religion, and God is entitled to it ⁶.”

Your Lordship’s answer to this will be, what indeed you have said ⁷,—the efficacy of one baptism for the remission of sins is a fundamental article of the Creed. That it is an article of the Creed called Nicene, though, as I have shown, the Council of Nice did not think it necessary to insert it, is unquestionable; and happily it has a better foundation than the assertion that it is fundamental, if you mean that it is essential to salvation, that it should be believed in a certain sense. The code of faith is threefold; the first, and that to which we are most bound to attend as sons of the Church of England, is, however undutifully your Lordship may doubt it, that which consists of the Articles and Liturgy; the second, is the code of the Western Empire, and comprises the three Creeds, over which the first

⁶ Works, vii. 440, 1.

⁷ Page 5.

claims jurisdiction by pronouncing them to be scriptural ; the third is the Apostles' Creed alone, which, for more than three centuries, was the only code, the only rule of faith ; and therefore the articles of this creed are the only articles which can fairly be called fundamental. I will not offend *you*, my Lord, by the uncharitable presumption that you are ignorant of Taylor's " Liberty of Prophesying," but perhaps you have forgotten the extract which I now beg leave to present to you.

" If this (the Apostles' Creed) was sufficient to bring men to heaven then, why not now ? If the Apostles admitted all to their communion that believed this creed, why shall we exclude any that preserve the same entire ? why is not our faith of these articles of as much efficacy for bringing us to heaven, as it was in the Churches apostolical, who had guides more infallible, that might, without error, have taught them superstructures enough, if they had been necessary ? And so they did : but that they did not insert them into the creed, when they might have done it with as much certainty as these articles, makes it clear to my understanding, that other things were not necessary, but these were ; that whatever profit and advantage might come from other articles, yet these were sufficient ; and however certain persons might accidentally be obliged to believe much more, yet this was the one and only foundation of faith, upon which all persons were to build their hopes of

heaven^s." And so strong was this impression upon the mind of him whom you acknowledge to have been "the most judicious, the most accurate, and one of the most learned of all the theologians of whom our Church can boast¹," that in his treatise on the Remission of Sins, Bishop Pearson very briefly mentions baptism, and the baptism of infants not at all. And if this were not true, if the three creeds were indeed the code of faith indispensable to salvation, and every contradiction to which is unpardonable heresy, the consequences would be such as I scarcely think you can have contemplated: is your Lordship prepared to excommunicate the whole of the Eastern Church, which some are so eager to unite in communion with our own? for you are perfectly aware that they contradict a fundamental article of the Nicene Creed, by denying the procession of the Holy Ghost from the Son as well as from the Father.

But there is a still more unpleasant consequence from your view of this matter, which, I am sure, your Lordship would be most anxious to avoid. Some of your warmest admirers and friends scruple to allow the funeral rites of the Church to the children of Dissenters; and there are instances in which they have refused to read the Burial Service, because they deny the validity of their Baptism. Would your Lordship refuse these clergymen institution in

⁶ Works, vii. 449.

¹ Page 43.

your Diocese? if you would be consistent, you must : yes, my Lord, however unconsciously, they are much more guilty in this matter than Mr. Gorham ; they do more to rob parents of their comfort, children of their hopes, and the Church of her faith ; they do all they can to cut off the Church in which they minister, from communion with the Holy Catholic and Apostolic Church of all ages, by ascribing to her the contradiction of an article of the Creed, “ I acknowledge one Baptism for the remission of sins².” For since they would debar such persons from the privilege of Christian burial, because, in their estimation, they are not baptized, there can be no doubt that, if before death they were requested to baptize them, they would not hesitate to comply ; the love of an immortal soul committed to them, and perishing for want of Christian Baptism, would compel them to this course. And yet this would be in direct contradiction to the article, which says that there is but “ one Baptism for the remission of sins.” They are therefore virtually chargeable with the heresy, as your Lordship would call it, for it contradicts a fundamental article of the Nicene Creed, but which I call the error of the African Church, which this clause was expressly inserted to correct. For we know from Cyprian himself what was the judgment of the Catholic Church : he tells Pompeius that Stephen, then

² Page 37.

Bishop of Rome, “has forbidden one coming from any heresy whatever to be baptized in the Church ; that is, he has adjudged the baptisms of all heretics to be right and lawful.” Stephen, indeed, went a step too far when he included all heretics ; but wherever the Catholic form of baptizing in the name of the Trinity was used, the validity of that Baptism by heretics was recognized by the Councils of Laodicea, the 2nd of Constantinople and of Arles, and most of the ancient writers ; and Augustine challenges the Donatists to produce any instance in which the Catholics ever re-baptized a person who had been baptized in the name of the Trinity³. But though this error may be acquitted of heresy, it was certainly reckoned schismatical ; for none of the Councils of Carthage were recognized by the Catholic Church before the year 348, when Gratus presided, and a canon was passed, forbidding to re-baptize those who had been baptized in the name of the Holy Trinity ; for till then the African Church had been in schism. Nor will it avail you to say, that the objection to the Baptism of Dissenters rests upon the invalidity of their Orders, and that they are in fact lay-baptisms⁴. For not only the Council of Eliberis in Spain, and Jerome, and Augustine, and many other writers, have maintained the validity of lay-baptism under some circumstances, but it is recognized by the Lutherans, which must have

³ Adv. Fulgent.

⁴ Page 61.

great weight with your Lordship, since you refer the Judges to the Confession of Augsburg for the meaning of our Articles, and it was not disapproved of in this country till the Hampton Court Conference ; and in 1597, Archbishop Abbott, in his Theological Lecture before the University of Oxford, condemned indeed its irregularity and unlawfulness, but admitted it to come under that rule, *Fieri non debet quod factum valet*.

Perhaps, my Lord, you are not aware how nearly you are concerned in the truth of the proposition which I have now proved ; but the 70th Canon of the Fourth Council of Carthage, which you believe to have the authority of the whole Catholic Church, and therefore to command the obedience of all bishops, forbids the Clergy to keep company with heretics and schismatics. How many of your friends you may lose by this canon, it is impossible for me to guess ; but, by this time, you must see what sad consequences are likely to follow from that strait-laced orthodoxy, which aims at an unity of opinion as impossible as the attempt which amused the leisure of Charles V. after his abdication of the imperial crown. He was disappointed that with all the pains he took, he could not make all his clocks strike the hour precisely at the same moment ; and you will be equally disappointed, if you expect to compel all varieties of opinion to follow in the same track, or speak in unison, without some discords.

“ For 'tis with our judgments as our watches, none
Go just alike, yet each believes his own.”

As in music some discords are reckoned necessary to the completion of harmony, and as opposite electricities are the cause of cohesion, so some disagreements and varieties of opinion within certain limits may tend to the perfection and stability of our Church. Would to God, my Lord, that you would direct the energies of your acute mind to consolidate and unite it, rather than to rend it asunder. For now, what justification is there for the alarm which your warlike trumpet sounds at the close of your letter, when you tell the Archbishop that you will hold no communion with him if he has the courage to perform his duty ; if it is a threat of excommunication, it can only excite a smile ; if it is an intimation that you mean to secede from our Church, and aim at the honours and sufferings of martyrdom, it is to be hoped that you will change your mind, now that the very battle-ground which you had chosen has been cut away from beneath your feet. At all events, be not offended, my Lord, if I presume to recommend to your imitation the example of a Bishop with whom, I have shown reason to suppose, that you may have some sympathy. Cyprian was indeed a martyr ; but he was prepared for martyrdom by a heavenly spirit ; though he was Metropolitan of a large province, and supported by synods of seventy or eighty bishops, and therefore in a position to hold a high

tone in maintaining his opinion against his brother in the Roman episcopate, who on his side was arrogant and imperious; yet we learn from Augustine, who sided with his opponents, that “He uttered it so mildly and peacefully, as to maintain the peace of the Church with those who held otherwise, appreciating the healthfulness of the bond of unity which he loved so much, and upheld it in sobriety, and saw and felt that they too who held otherwise could so hold without injury to charity; and he maintained so much moderation, as by no taint of schism to maim the holy society of the Church of God⁵.” The compilers of our Liturgy acted upon this principle; for they tell us, that in carrying out their undertaking, they did that “which they conceived would tend most to the preservation of peace and unity in the Church; and the cutting off occasion from them who seek occasion of cavil or quarrel against its Liturgy.” And may all who use that Liturgy ever bear in mind, that we are as much bound to be zealous pursuers of peace, as to be earnest defenders of the faith!

⁵ De Bapt. 5. 1.

LONDON :
GILBERT & RIVINGTON, PRINTERS,
ST. JOHN'S SQUARE.

THE PRACTICAL EFFECT OF THE GORHAM CASE.

16

A CHARGE,
TO THE CLERGY OF THE EAST RIDING,

DELIVERED

AT THE ORDINARY VISITATION,

A. D. 1850.

BY

ROBERT ISAAC WILBERFORCE, M.A.

ARCHDEACON OF THE EAST RIDING.

LONDON :
JOHN MURRAY, ALBEMARLE STREET ;
J. AND C. MOZLEY, PATERNOSTER ROW ;
ROBERT SUNTER, YORK.

[*Price One Shilling.*]

TO THE
CLERGY OF THE EAST RIDING,

THIS CHARGE,

PUBLISHED AT THEIR REQUEST,

IS RESPECTFULLY DEDICATED.

A CHARGE.

MY REVEREND BRETHREN,

The period which has passed since we last met, has not been without its contingent of Churches restored, and Schools founded. St. Laurence's, Sigglesthorne, now presents an admirable model of what may be desired in a Parish Church, chiefly through the liberality of the Rector; and St. Mary's, Scarborough, is recovering that ancient splendour, which those who have known it of late years could hardly suppose that it ever possessed. The interesting Norman structure at Fangfoss, and, with some exceptions, that at Givendale also, have been rebuilt in a satisfactory manner; and the internal arrangements of St. Mary's, Watton, and of the Chancel at Scrayingham, have been wonderfully improved, through the laudable exertions of the respective Incumbents. A School-house has been built at Wansford, and two at Beverley, and schools, under trained masters, have been opened at Sutton near Hull, at Weaverthorpe, Sledmere, and Wetwang. Neither must I omit to

mention that a system of School Inspection has been introduced, through the exertions of the Rural Deans, and of various clergymen who have assisted them, and that near seventy schools have been inspected. The subject of National Education would open a large field, were there time to pursue it. The National Society has printed a set of Trust-clauses in its May Paper, which may be substituted for those of the Privy Council. The compulsory enforcement of the last by Government, continues to be a great obstacle to the cause of education ; for to render an elected Committee virtually necessary, would, in many cases, stir up the elements of discord. A less unpleasing subject is that the Yeoman School at York, which we owe chiefly to the exertions and liberality of our noble Lord Lieutenant, has this year been doubled in size. May it continue to be popular with the yeomen of this county : if the middle classes are brought up in the fear of God and the love of their country, we shall have the best guarantee for the safety of the whole community.

But I am recalled from dwelling on the external machinery of the Church by the consideration of that great contest, which is to decide what doctrine must be taught in her schools and preached in her pulpits. It has now been a subject of debate during many years, whether the Sacrament of Baptism is the means, whereby God bestows His regenerating gifts of grace ; and while some have censured our rulers for allowing words used at the font to be contradicted in the pulpit, others have affirmed that baptismal regeneration is contrary to Scripture, and is not

inculcated by the Church. At length the different parties have come to issue. I need not weary you by detailing how the cause, after being decided in the highest of the Church's own Courts—the Arches Court of Canterbury—was brought by appeal before the Queen in Council. It was long doubtful whether the judgment of the Archbishop's Vicar General, or the decision of the Queen in Council, would take effect; at length the Judges would appear to have determined that the Appeal has been conducted in strict conformity with the laws of the land. So that here, for the first time during three hundred years, we have the decision, on appeal, of a great doctrinal case; conflicting elements have come into collision; and we are enabled to estimate the exact nature of that system under which we live, to ascertain its laws, and appreciate its tendencies.

Such cases as these are of the utmost moment, as indicating what is the set of the current in more tranquil periods: they show in what hands the final decision of affairs is really placed, and thus interpret the true character of institutions. Was it uncertain what was to be the system of the Primitive Church, when it first allied itself with civil governments?—the Council of Nice showed that the settlement of doctrines lay in the Episcopate. What Act of Parliament is clearly understood, till its effect is shown by a decision? Plainly, then, the first great cause, in which the Church's doctrines have been brought into question before our present Court of Appeal, must test the soundness of our state, and the nature of those changes which have befallen us.

Now two questions may be asked respecting the recent judgment—first, what is its authority? secondly, what does it decide? On both of these questions the greatest difference of opinion prevails. For some have spoken of the judgment as virtually a decision of the Church, which Churchmen are bound to accept in its place, as much as any other specimen of her teaching. Others have assumed it to be wholly nugatory, and by public protest have declared that they would yield it no obedience. While a third party, again, says that the judgment sanctions a false interpretation of our formularies, and sustains it by unsound arguments, but that the Church's wisdom is to acquiesce without complaint, because it is impossible for her to resist without injury. Among such a diversity of opinions, I would ask, first, not what is wise, but what is right? not whether the judgment be theologically true, but what deference it can claim from you and me according to that rule and order of the English Church, under which we exercise our functions? "Will you minister the Doctrine and Sacraments and the Discipline of Christ as the Lord hath commanded, and as this Church and *Realm* hath received the same?" So long as we are bound by such a promise, we must ask whether the judgment be the expression of that authority, which we are pledged to obey, before we have a right to examine into its truth and wisdom.

Now, that the judgment is so far effectual that it will put the complainant into real and corporal possession of the emoluments of Brampford Speke is denied by none. But this is not all which it will

effect. The Archbishop of the Province will proceed to give him spiritual mission for the care of souls, and will thus authorize him to teach those doctrines, which he has avowed, as a *Persona Ecclesiæ* or representative of the Church of England. Further, the Church's highest tribunal will not only reverse its own judgment, but it will proceed to compel every Bishop in the Province to bestow spiritual mission on those who entertain the opinions to which it formerly objected. Several Bishops, indeed, have expressed disapprobation of the recent judgment; but are they prepared to refuse institution to the parties whose opinions it sanctions? True, a Bishop may bestow Holy Orders according to his own conscience. But will the public be satisfied if the Bishops have one rule in ordination, another in the admission to benefices? Men's thoughts are best interpreted by their actions; and how can a Bishop be supposed to believe a doctrine, if he gives mission to those whom he acknowledges to deny it?

All this, however, affects the Bishops, not the Clergy: how are you and I interested in the case? Does it alter our opinions, or abridge our liberty? Now the answer to this depends upon the notion which we entertain of the authority of the Church. There are persons who look upon the Church as nothing more than a convenient name, bestowed upon the aggregate of those who use the same prayers, and profit by the same endowments. They recognize no authority in the Church, as superior to their individual will: they suppose themselves at liberty to teach what their private wisdom discerns

in Scripture, and enter the Establishment as a sort of track, along which they travel, so long as it coincides with the direction which they wish to pursue. This error has its origin in unbelief of the actual presence of God the Holy Ghost, whose merciful operation, through the Sacraments of His grace, renders the living members of the Incarnate Word His earthly temple. But without dwelling on the nature of this error, it is plainly inconsistent with the profession, that "the Church hath authority in controversies of faith." None therefore who subscribe our Articles can consistently adopt it. If nothing is required, but that every one should make out his creed from Scripture, what room is there for the authority of the Church? And why should we undertake to teach what our hearers may know as well by themselves? How comes it, brethren, that I speak to you to-day? Not, I trust, out of conceit of my private wisdom, or of my peculiar insight into God's Word, but because I am under public authority, and because it is inseparable from all social institutions to express themselves in such words and acts, as require the agency of individuals. Now there is one only Being in the Universe, who so concentrates all authority in His single existence, that His Word is law, and His Will is fate. This attribute of Deity, absolute monarchs have attempted to imitate. But it has been the wisdom of every well-constituted society to divide the organs, through which its will is expressed, that so the collective mind may not be overborne by individual caprice. And the two functions, through which this mind is expressed, are the

Legislative and Judicial powers. The first of these supersedes the second, because new enactments annul previous decisions ; but in the abeyance of its legislative functions, its judicial acts express the ultimate mind of every society. For the two are co-ordinate means of expressing the sovereign will, and rest ultimately upon the same basis. Even the settlement of individual questions may be traced back finally to the collective authority of the community, because power cannot be divorced from responsibility. By the law of England is meant that which is propounded by the Judges at Westminster. The legislative power of Parliament may alter the law, if its effect proves to be alien to the national intention : but till it is altered, the law means that which the Judges declare it to mean.

Now let us apply this to the case before us. If the statement, that the Church hath authority in controversies of faith, be not an idle phrase, she must have some means of giving expression to her will. Like other societies, she may alter her laws by legislative enactments, but till they are altered, their judicial exposition is final. She must give utterance to her voice by those courts of her own, to which her public order has committed jurisdiction. As the power of awarding life or death has always indicated the state's judges, so the Church armed her courts with the only authority which she possessed, that of severing men from her communion. Such is that Court at which you have been summoned to appear to-day, and which is the highest usually held within this archdeaconry : such is the Court of Arches, the

highest to which a spiritual person presents, or which is held under his jurisdiction.

Supposing, then, that the Court of the Archbishop's Vicar General, as seems to be its intention, should adopt the decision of the Privy Council, and reverse its former judgment, will not the Church be committed by its act? The Church, it is true, possesses legislative functions, which might supersede the judgment by altering the law. The 139th Canon declares that the Sacred Synod of this realm is the Church of England by representation. But so long as the legislative function is in abeyance, what is there higher than the judicial, by which the will of any community can be expressed? And what the Court of Arches does, it does for all Courts subordinate to it; its will is their law, because all cases in the Province are liable, on appeal, to be taken into it. Now, if her Courts recognize this sentence as binding, and the Church sits still, and by no legislative act declares her disapprobation, how can she be understood to dissent? And how can those who affirm that the Church hath authority in controversies of faith, deny that their position is altered by her conduct?

But, it is said, the Church's written standards remain unaffected. What matters it how our Courts decide, so long as our formularies are uncorrupted? And the present is no Ecclesiastical sentence: it has been forcibly obtruded upon us by the civil authority; the Church is not expressing her own will, but suffering under the persecuting will of others.

There is a measure of truth in these objections,

but they do not neutralize the fact, that “the Church hath authority in controversies of faith;” and that a Society which has authority must not only possess a rule by which to judge, but exert its authority in judging. If it were said, the Prayer-Book or the Articles have authority, every one might exercise his own discretion in their interpretation: but how, then, should we differ from the Dissenters, of whom each individual, under the idea of following the guidance of Scripture, makes Scripture follow his private will? If “the Church has authority in controversies of faith,” I ask, not what is the rule, but who is the Judge? And unless this question admits of an answer, we are using unmeaning words on the most sacred subjects. It were profaneness to call on men to recognize such an authority by their subscriptions, if

“Chaos umpire sits,
And by deciding, more embroils the strife
By which he reigns.”

On this supposition every curate would have as much right to interpret Scripture and the Prayer-Book as our Primates. Whereas, observes the statute for restraint of appeals, “the King’s most noble progenitors, and the antecessors of the nobles of this realm, have sufficiently endowed the Church with honour and possessions,” in order “to declare and determine all such doubts, and to administer all such offices and duties, as to their rooms spiritual doth appertain.” The emoluments and dignities of the Church, that is, have been bestowed upon her rulers, in order that greater weight might be given

to those decisions, which it belongs to them to promulgate. The two Primates, in particular, possess not indeed an authority to determine questions by their private will, but Courts, in which the Church's laws are explained, and the power of assembling Synods, by which they may be altered. Now, the existence of such authorities is a plain recognition of the fact, that in this manner the Church utters her mind. And during the abeyance of her legislative functions, what is there except her judicial to express it? It cannot be said, therefore, that her formularies remain the same which they were before, if the Church allows her Courts to put a new sense upon them. For it is the established maxim of all societies, that the meaning of laws is not fixed by the private will of the individuals who obey, but by the public authority of the community which enforces them. "*Ejus est legem interpretari, cujus est condere.*" What would be said if a prisoner professed to explain the law, and told the Judges they mistook its meaning? What the Judges declare, that *is* the meaning of the law, until their decision is reversed. And therefore it cannot be said that our formularies remain unchanged, when their meaning has been altered.

I need not inquire whether the Committee of Privy Council is, as it professes to be, an Ecclesiastical Court ; and whether it has a right to claim this title from those who allow the Queen's Supremacy. For however this may be, the Church plainly makes that her own act, in which her own Courts acquiesce. It may be said, that she is in the condition of a weaker

state, which is coerced by a stronger. But coercion does not exempt from responsibility, unless it be such physical coercion, that the apparent ceases to be the real agent. When Dioclesian ordered Christians to sacrifice to idols, those who were forcibly dragged to the altar by their friends were excused, but those who approached it voluntarily, to escape death, were excluded from communion. We live in a free country, where such physical coercion cannot be pleaded. If regard to the Church's worldly wealth or temporal influence prevent her rulers from asserting her rights, or her clergy and laity from demanding them, this is no coercion which either in the sight of God or man will exempt her from concurrence.

But, it will be said, consider the strange results to which such a state of things conducts us. The Church asserts a claim to authority in controversies of faith, to which the laity virtually, and the clergy have formally, assented. If the Church, therefore, subjects herself by voluntary act to the dictation of a lay-tribunal, she transfers to it that divine authority, with which she herself claims to be invested. True, all which she commits to it is judicial power, but we have seen that in the abeyance of the Church's legislative functions, the judicial are ultimately supreme. And such has practically proved to be the case in innumerable instances. The system of feudal legislation was almost got rid of by our Courts of Equity, through the intervention of *cestuique trusts*; and the Statute of Frauds became well-nigh a dead letter in the Statute Book, because the Judges opposed its operation. Unless its legislative func-

tions, therefore, can be appealed to, the Church has virtually transferred its whole authority to those to whom it has surrendered its judicial power. But by appointing its Primates, the same party altogether suspends its legislative action. So that there would seem to be some reason in the claim lately made by the Lord Chief Justice, that Henry VIII. had vested in himself, and as is implied in his successors, the whole Papal Jurisdiction in England. For this jurisdiction did not interfere with the performance of sacred functions, which the Papal system supposed to reside equally in all the Apostles, and which our Kings never undertook. Its essential feature was the claim of the Pope, as the Patriarch of the West, to be the fountain of spiritual jurisdiction; and in particular to be the last earthly appeal in respect to the interpretation of God's Word and Will. And this it is which the Church claims to possess by the assertion in her Articles, while she allows the civil power to exercise it.

It may be doubted whether all who are satisfied with the present arrangement have realized every thing which these considerations involve. The body to which they are contented to commit "authority in controversies of faith," can of course claim no higher character, than the power from which it emanated. We are led back, then, to the majority in Parliament, A. D. 1832, when the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council was constituted. Now what is the majority in Parliament but an expression of the opinions and wills of those thirty millions who inhabit the British Islands? Of this population, the larger part are not

even members of the Church of England. On what conceivable principle can we allow that the persons who possess their political confidence have "authority in controversies of faith?" And the matter might be carried much further. The present tendency of things is to open the government to men of every class and opinion. Now the Queen's Heathen, far outnumber her Christian subjects. If the national religion is nothing but a reflection of the national will, on what principle can we defend Christianity itself, and why should not the Vedas come to be substituted for the Gospel?

But was this, it will be said, the arrangement to which the Church of England assented at the Reformation, and which has received the sanction of so many saintly names? Our enemies will no doubt say so, and the charge will be strengthened by the concurrence of those, to whom the late verdict tastes so sweet, that they are careless what bitterness it may engender. It is true, that the English Clergy, to save their fortunes and lives from a cruel tyrant, agreed, by the Act of Submission, A. D. 1534, to allow their legislative action to depend on the royal will. Again, their acquiescence in the 25th Henry VIII. c. 19, by which the appointment of Judges was left to the King, might be represented to be a renouncement of judicial authority. But these acts were coincident with that solemn declaration of the Legislature in the Preamble of the 24th Henry VIII. c. 12, by which the decision of all questions of doctrine was affirmed to belong to the Spirituality. "The body spiritual having power, when any cause

of the law divine happened to come in question, or of spiritual learning, that it was declared interpreted and showed by that part of the said body politic, called the Spirituality, now being usually called the English Church." The great powers then, which were vested in the crown, were vested in it upon an understanding that they should be exercised through the Church. As the Queen is the nominal source of all civil jurisdiction, which yet cannot be exercised without the assent of the people ; so the Royal supremacy over the Church was qualified by a proviso, that doctrines should be interpreted by those who had "authority" from Christ "in controversies in faith." And so long as the Royal authority was vested in members of the Church, this proviso was perhaps a sufficient security. But the last quarter of a century has introduced a new order of things—first, by virtually transferring the Royal supremacy from the Sovereign himself to the minister who has the confidence of Parliament ; and secondly, by divesting Parliament of all claim to represent the Church. To refer the Church's doctrines to a lay-court, not consisting necessarily of members of our communion, was never thought of, till the British Constitution was changed, by the repeal of the Test and Corporation Act, by Roman Catholic Emancipation, and by the Reform Bill. The Queen has bound herself by her Proclamation, to allow Convocation to act when the Clergy desire it ; but the representative of a Parliamentary majority knows no such obligation. The Queen is bound individually, as a member of the Church, by the principle that the Spirituality has

right to judge of doctrine—an admission, on the strength of which her Supremacy was conceded. But how can this admission be expected from those members of Parliament who dissent from the Church? The thing which we need then, is, to reclaim those rights which the ancient settlement was intended, as we believe, to assign, and to adapt the laws of the Church to the altered posture of the nation.

And this it is which the protests made in many places are calculated to effect. We must not deceive ourselves by imagining that private protests are a substitute for the Church's authorized acts. They neither alter that construction of her laws, which is given by those whose office is to interpret them, nor do they exempt the protesting individuals from participation in public acts. When the Slave Trade was a legal traffic, individuals were not required to share its profits; but the sin attached to the nation as a whole, till it was purged away by the national Abolition. Much more is this the case with the Church, the members whereof are not merely connected by the accident of neighbourhood, but profess to be united into one spiritual body in Christ. Our protests cannot undo the fact, that we belong to a body which has imperceptibly divested itself of its inalienable rights, and that according to the present constitution of things, our religion is dictated to us by Act of Parliament. But by testifying our conviction that such a state of things is dangerous and degrading, that it threatens the existence of the national Church, and is an infraction of the rights of conscience, they may, by God's blessing, be the means of our release.

And we have no little encouragement from the manner in which our rulers have come forward to head us in this attempt. The great mass of the English Episcopate are understood to have been united in demanding the abatement of this grievance. This step is in itself a sufficient justification for those who have thought that nothing was to be gained by concealing the danger. The judgment of the Privy Council *has* force, so soon at least as the Courts of the Church recognize it : it *must* have force, till it is rescinded by some act equally formal and authoritative. It alters the position of those who believe that the Church hath authority in controversies of faith, unless it is superseded by some other public act, either judicial or legislative. We must allow time enough for such steps, before we can say what is its exact effect upon the Church of England. So much only I will predict, that it is a crisis in her history, by which future times will decide whether she is a portion of Christ's Catholic Church, or a department of the secular government.

Let us now turn to our second topic—what this judgment decides. Now the language of the Judgment ought not to surprise us, for it is much the same which the state employed to the Church, as long ago as the time of Constantine. It would seem to be modelled on the Emperor's letter to the Archbishop of Alexandria, whom he forbade to disturb the peace of the Church, and the quiet of the empire, by opposing Arius. "All men cannot think alike," said Constantine ; "if you dispute, therefore, about these trivial questions, the decision should be left to

private opinion, and the public tranquillity should not be endangered." With this feeling the Privy Council professed to abstain cautiously from giving an opinion, whether the sentiments of the complainant before it were "theologically sound or unsound." But the circumstances of the case necessitated that, which the judges would gladly have avoided. For by determining that an individual should have commission to teach on the Church's behalf, that he should be the "Persona Ecclesiæ," by whom it should be represented, they could not help declaring that his sentiments were such as the Church approved; and were compelled therefore to enter upon an inquiry into her intentions. So that while they left it to individuals to choose their doctrines for themselves, they took upon them complete and unlimited authority to decide what should for the future be the doctrines of the Church of England; and did all, and in point of fact more than all, than could pertain to those who were not entrusted with legislative functions.

There can be no doubt, then, that the decision was designed to mean that which is popularly understood to be its meaning—that Baptismal Regeneration is determined on authority to be an open question in the Church of England, which its ministers are at liberty to affirm or deny, according to their private judgment. Such a state of things may have been connived at formerly; it is now for the first time sanctioned by a public tribunal. Let us consider how far this ought to be satisfactory to either of the two parties, between whom the doctrine has been disputed.

Take first the case of those who deny Baptismal Regeneration. Here are persons who for years have declared this doctrine to be a soul-destroying heresy, and have made its rejection the very characteristic of their creed. And that Almighty God has promised to bestow gifts of grace through the ordinance of Baptism, is so serious an assertion, that unless it be a certain truth, it must surely be a most hazardous error. Now, can men be contented to be told that they are *allowed* to deny this assertion? For the judges speak as though conscious that the Church's words incline the other way: all which they profess is, that it does not appear to them that the opinions of the party who claims relief are "contrary to the doctrine of the Church of England," so as to "afford a legal ground for refusing him institution." And they add, in justification of this verdict, that "it is not the duty of any court to be minute and rigid in cases of this sort." Now, ought men to be satisfied to belong to a Church which uses expressions obviously calculated to teach heresy, because she is not rigid in excluding those who assert the truth? If the Church's words, taken in their natural sense, denied Our Lord's divinity, would it be enough that she was not "minute and rigid" in silencing those who maintained His Godhead? Surely those who think that Baptismal Regeneration is an untrue and dangerous dogma, ought not to be contented unless it is distinctly repudiated.

Again, the imposition of needless oaths has of late been justly censured. To make solemn declarations, which require to be qualified by consideration of the

sense in which they are understood, and the intention with which they are exacted, though convenient perhaps for the public service, is a snare to individual consciences. But here is a solemn assertion in God's presence, and in the face of the congregation, which every minister who baptizes an infant is required to make, but not required to believe. Every time he baptizes publicly or receives into the Church, he is compelled to affirm that "this child is regenerate." And to add stringency to the assertion, every incumbent is required to "declare his unfeigned assent and consent" to the above words. What can be more unreasonable, or less fitted to satisfy conscientious men, than to require such declarations to be made, and then to qualify them by a judicial explanation that they mean nothing? Is less nicety required in Church than in the custom-house; or are the Clergy supposed to be more indifferent to truth than men of business? Surely it were better, as a matter of common honesty, that men should be allowed to omit such expressions, rather than to evade them.

But how does the Judgment affect the other party? If no interpretation can completely explain away those expressions, which are still to be used in Holy Baptism, persons who take them in their natural sense may be thought to stand as they did before. But the negative force of a judicial explanation is far greater than its positive force. No explanation will satisfy a conscientious man to affirm that which individually he believes to be untrue; but a judicial explanation of the law deprives men of the right of referring to it as an indication of the mind of the

community. Those who do not believe Baptismal Regeneration may still scruple to affirm, respecting every child, that it is regenerate: but those who believe the doctrine to be true, cannot affirm that they teach it, as they formerly did, on the authority of the Church. So that the Judgment does far less benefit to the first party than it does injury to the second.

But it is objected, that the Privy Council did not really decide so much as has been attributed to it. It abstained from any professed settlement of the question of Baptismal Regeneration, and evaded the main subject in dispute by a partial and ambiguous statement of the views of the complainant. Such a proceeding was delusive, for since the book excepted against has escaped legal censure, the effect of the decision upon the public mind, supposing the question to rest where it is, is equivalent to its final settlement: yet it may be said that the Church is not bound to more than the Judges state themselves to have affirmed. Now, looking at their own account of the opinions before them, the statement which they supposed themselves to sanction would seem to be this, *that the limitations confessedly applicable to adult Baptism, are applicable to infant Baptism also; and that since the efficacy of adult Baptism is avowedly affected by extraneous circumstances, therefore it cannot be affirmed that baptized infants are regenerate, except by virtue of some process irrespective of Baptism.*

In vindication of this statement, the Judges entered upon various explanations of the language of the

Church. Let us see then First, *how their decision is got at*;—Secondly, *What it involves*. It presents at first sight an obvious contrast to the language of the Prayer Book. For not only is the minister required to declare that “this child is by Baptism regenerate,” but the whole baptismal office assumes this ordinance to be the peculiar medium, through which Almighty God bestows His regenerating grace. How is this contrariety to be got over? To meet it the Privy Council lays down a rule for the interpretation of the Church’s words, which I notice, not with a view of discussing its justice, but of observing its effect. The Church’s ancient principle had been that her prayers were one of the most important means of ascertaining her doctrine: “*legem credendi lex statuat supplicandi* :” a principle which is sanctioned by our 57th Canon, that the doctrine of Baptism is sufficiently set down in the Common Prayer to be used at its administration. But the Privy Council, without positively rejecting the authority of the Prayer-Book, virtually supersedes it, by stating “that devotional expressions, involving assertions, must not be taken to bear an absolute and unconditional sense.” Now it is well known that our authorized Formularies consist of two parts: those ancient portions, which we share with the whole Church Catholic; and the Articles which were added in the sixteenth century. Hitherto they have been supposed to be of co-ordinate authority: it is an entire and hazardous change in our system, that the one should in this way be subordinated to the other.

But the Privy Council, while laying down this general rule, produced a particular instance in defence of it. It has long been matter of complaint that the 68th Canon is enforced upon the Clergy, while the 22nd, to which it bears a necessary relation, is not enforced upon the laity. Since "those who break the laws cannot in reason claim any benefit by the same" (Canon 98), it seems unjust to enforce a Canon compelling the Clergy to use our funeral service, in cases to which it is inapplicable by the Church's laws. For an adult non-communicant could have no claim to participation in the Church's funeral office, were not her laws obstructed by the 1st William and Mary, and other statutes. So that the Clergy are liable to punishment by the letter of the Canon, because they act according to its spirit.

The difficulty under which they labour arises, of course, from the occurrence of two sets of expressions; one the declaration of "sure and certain hope of the resurrection to eternal life," the other the statement of "our hope that this our brother rests in Jesus," and of our "heartly thanks" for his deliverance "out of the miseries of this sinful world." Both of these have been felt to be inconsistent with a state of things in which the Church's discipline is interfered with by the civil power: and the obvious profaneness of applying them to parties who die in open sin, has led to repeated instances in which Clergymen have refused at any hazard to employ them. But the expectation which is "sure and certain," it has been reasonably urged, refers only to the common resurrection; and some general hope may be fitly enter-

tained respecting all who do not die in open impenitence, and whom the Church sees no ground to separate from her communion. A present fact cannot honestly be asserted when men do not know it; but when nothing is known to the contrary, they may fitly hope for future blessings.

Such have been the considerations by which the use of the Burial Service has hitherto been maintained. Numerous have been the objections made to it; among others, the late Mr. Scott, of Hull, proposed its alteration, because its "ambiguity," he says, "offends many, and in many may conduce to self-deception." Now these ambiguous expressions, the present enforcement of which is repugnant to the Church's intentions, and is felt by numbers as their heaviest grievance, is selected by the Committee of Council as the key by which all our Offices are to be explained, and our whole position estimated. To which must be added, that the words "sure and certain hope" are declared by the authority of this decision to be applicable to the salvation of every individual. And the Clergy are told that they need not scruple to assert that every baptized infant is regenerate, since they affirm the salvation of every one whom they inter. Their submission to the compulsory decision of the ecclesiastical Courts is dwelt upon as a proof that in this matter the Clergy are already practised casuists. For this, observed the deciding Judge, with no little emphasis, is what "in every case," even in that of those who "die in the actual commission of flagrant crimes," "the priest is directed to say, and he *does* say." It is true that

the Judgment proceeds to excuse those who make such assertions, on the same principle on which persons are justified, it is said, in affirming that every infant is regenerate, even though they do not believe it. But the decision increases tenfold the difficulty of complying with the law. For if this Judgment conveys the Church's mind, the hope expressed respecting every individual is a "sure and certain hope of the resurrection to eternal life." In this sense how could the words be generally applicable; and what benefit is it to conscientious men, that they have a legal sanction for uttering falsehoods?"

The interpretation thus given to the Burial Service may be said, however, to be only an *obiter dictum* of the Court, and not entitled to much authority. But it is the basis of an important principle which is asserted to be applicable to all our services. They express the dealings of God as well as the dealings of man, so that whatever uncertainty attached to the conduct of the human, none, it was thought, could be ascribed to that of the Divine actor. But the Judgment decides that our services are in all cases to be understood as hypothetical; that however positively a blessing is promised, some condition must be assumed, on which it is dependent. And in the case of Infant Baptism, we are told what that condition is: in this ordinance it is said, "the benefit is to depend" upon the subsequent compliance of the baptized party with the conditions of faith and repentance. So that the Privy Council laid down a complete system for the interpretation of the Prayer-Book—first, by denying the dogmatic authority of

its devotional statements; and secondly, by asserting its positive assurances to be mere hypotheses.

And now let us consider what conclusion is involved by these novel rules of interpretation. In our baptismal Offices occur certain statements of those spiritual gifts, which Almighty God bestows upon infants. But since, according to the Privy Council, the words of the Prayer-Book can never be taken unconditionally, and since the act of Baptism is alike to all infants, therefore God's gifts cannot be bestowed through Baptism itself, but by virtue of some process, which admits of a diversity between one child and another. On what does such diversity depend: does it arise on the side of God, who gives grace, or of man who receives it? For since the gift is not allowed to be bestowed equally upon all, there must be something on which to build the diversity. One party would find it in the will of Almighty God, who by arbitrary decree selects some children to be the objects of His favour, while He excludes the rest from profiting by the grace of Baptism. This would seem to be the view of Mr. Gorham (though somewhat modified by the assumption, that all the baptized who die in infancy are of the number of the elect); it appears to be implied in the necessity of that prevenient grace, for which he contends. But the Privy Council, though admitting his conclusion, says nothing respecting his premises. It was felt, probably, that to suppose helpless infants to be in certain cases debarred from profiting by that offer of grace, which yet is made to all of them, is revolting to natural conscience. For to rest the invalidity of Baptism on

such an arbitrary decree, is to attribute an act to the God of truth, which would be abhorred as a breach of promise, even by mortals.

Nor is it necessary that all who call themselves Calvinists should assent to so harsh a dogma. Many Predestinarians have supposed, as was the opinion of St. Augustin, that while Almighty God bestows the grace of Perseverance on those who are finally saved, He yet in Baptism bestows upon all infants grace sufficient for salvation. Such an admission may be inconsistent with the full rigour of the theory of Calvin. But the inconsistency is not greater than to admit the doctrine of absolute decrees, and yet to regard man as an accountable being. For the doctrine of absolute decrees, pushed to its logical results, would destroy man's responsibility, and reduce him to the level of the beasts. In like manner, if taken strictly, it is incompatible with the nature of God, whom it robs of His crowning attribute of truth. But if a happy inconsistency leads Calvinists to admit human responsibility, and thus to allow man to be an accountable creature, why should not the same inconsistency lead them to admit the doctrine of sufficient grace, and thus to allow reality to the promises of God ?

Such has been the conclusion adopted by many Calvinists, who, if they agree with Mr. Gorham's premises, have yet rejected his conclusion as inconsistent with the Church's words. But the Privy Council, by sanctioning his conclusion, must either sanction *his* premises, or some others, which lead to the same result. Since they allow it to be denied

that children are *all* capable subjects for the grace of baptism, they must allow the existence of some principle, by which the capable are severed from the incapable. And if this principle does not lie, as Calvinists affirm, on the side of God, the Giver of grace, it must lie on the side of man, its receiver. And such seems to be the theory adopted by the Privy Council, in their explanation of the words of the Catechism. All children would appear to come equally as helpless receivers to the ordinance of Baptism. Exclude the Calvinistic theory of an absolute decree passed by the Almighty, and no difference is to be *seen* among them. But there exists, it is said, a real diversity, so that some are not capable subjects for this ordinance, while others are. Wherein then lies the difference? It rests, says the Privy Council, upon a consideration of the future conduct of the parties baptized. "The answer" in the Catechism, which is averred to express the title of children to Baptism, "has direct reference," it is said, "to the condition on which the benefit is to depend." So that the grace of Baptism is affirmed in reality to depend upon God's foresight of the character of the candidate: grace is given if the child's temperament be such as to deserve favour in the eyes of Him who reads the future. This is the Privy Council's interpretation of the alleged fact, that some children receive Baptism without partaking of grace; and unless the matter be rested upon an absolute decree, this, or some corresponding interpretation, it must adopt. For it is impossible really to admit a conclusion without admitting the premises

upon which it is built. And the Privy Council does not deny that Baptism sometimes confers grace, because this would be to render its application to infants a mockery. Now if it be a fact that some infants are capable recipients of grace, others not so, there must be something which renders the one case unlike the other. And this difference *must* lie either on the side of the Being who gives grace, or of the being who receives it. And as the first opinion is built upon the Calvinistic theory of absolute decrees, so the second depends in reality upon the desert of the receiver, and thus involves a revival of the heresy of Pelagius.

For all who call themselves Christians allow that the blessings of salvation are bestowed upon mankind through Christ. The point in controversy is by what means men receive them. Some persons suppose that men apply them to themselves, either through the exercise of their natural endowments, which is the Pelagian hypothesis, or by virtue of some specific gift, which is bestowed by arbitrary decree upon certain favoured individuals. But the Church has always maintained, that the gifts of grace and pardon were not only purchased by Christ's merits, but that by Christ alone are they applied for man's salvation. For this very end is He affirmed to have ordained His Church and Sacraments, that they might be the media through which these inestimable blessings might be communicated to mankind. So that to deny the efficacy of these ordinances, unless men are provided with some previous resources of their own, whereby they may go to meet the divine bounty, is

to render Christ's acts unavailing, unless they are preceded by the agency of man.

However widely, then, the Calvinist and the Pelagian differ in their premises, so far as regards the inefficacy of Baptism, they agree in their conclusion ; and the sentence, which opens the door to one, opens the door to the other. Now there are three grand doctrines into which we may resolve the whole objective portion of the Christian faith ;—the doctrine of the Blessed Trinity, the source and cause of all ;—the doctrine of Our Lord's Incarnation, as the means whereby God and man have been brought into relation ;—the doctrine of the Church and Sacraments, as the media whereby pardon and grace are communicated by Christ to His brethren. The first of these was the grand subject of dispute in the earliest age ; then followed the vindication of the second : but the main controversy of modern days is the defence of the third. And this it is, to which the Judgment thus given in the Church's name is virtually fatal. For it is a denial of the reality of those channels of grace, whereby divine gifts are communicated to men. Infant Baptism is not only one of these channels, but it is a criterion by which we may test men's belief in the rest. The efficacy of other ordinances admits of being attributed either to the Giver or receiver, but the helplessness of infants throws the whole benefit of their Baptism upon the power of God. If its efficacy is denied, unless it can be accounted for on some principles, which rest it on the faith or feelings of the receiver, how can we doubt that these, and not the external agency of the unseen cause, are the true

basis on which the result of less distinctive ordinances is rested ?

This may be said to be a mere matter of words, since the parties in question refer after all to a Divine power, which may act before as well as in Baptism. But Pelagius never denied that human goodness must be referred to God ; his heresy was that the Being, to whom he referred, was the God of nature, not the God of grace. The Gospel is not a mere assertion of the prerogatives of nature, but the coming in of a new principle, by which nature is re-created. *All* infants stand in need of such renewal, by reason of that guilt of nature, in which they are born ; it is effectual in them *all*, because “their innocency” is the absence of that actual sin, by which it might be thwarted. This change was effected once for all when God the Word took upon Him our nature : it is applied to every infant, when he is taken through Sacramental union into the Body of Christ. This is the doctrine of Our Lord’s Mediation, which not only implies that by one sacrifice He has made atonement for all His brethren, but likewise that He is the one medium, through which those graces which had their origin in God, are communicated to mortals. “There is one Mediator between God and men, the man Christ Jesus.” So that it is a fundamental article of the Christian faith—one which it would be heresy to abandon, that the Holy Ghost bestows His saving gift upon infants, through that Sacrament of Baptism, whereby they are made members of Christ. “I believe in one Baptism for the remission of sins.”

This is the doctrine, then, which is really denied,

when it is affirmed that acceptance with God is not given through that ordinance of Baptism, which He has appointed for the purpose of uniting men to Christ, but at some other season, and through some other means. To affirm generally "that Baptism is not in itself an effectual sign of grace," "without reference to the qualification of the recipient," is equivalent to a denial of Our Lord's Mediation. It is true in some sort as respects adults; its application to infants involves Fatalism on the one side, or Pelagianism on the other. For if *any* infants are capable of the grace of Baptism (without which the Church's practice were a mockery), it is impossible, without admitting one of these alternatives, to deny the capability of *all*. The present Judgment, from an apparent unwillingness to condemn the Calvinist, in reality opens a way for the Pelagian. Thus is the new creation in Christ Jesus forgotten, and men fall back upon that relation to God, which is independent of the Second Adam. Time would not suffice me to enter upon argumentative proofs; but I will cite the Church's judgment, when this heresy was first promulgated. For the spiritual efficacy of that ordinance of baptism, whereby the blessings of Christ's Mediation are imparted, was never questioned, till Pelagius, from denying man's wants, was led to deny their remedy. And this was the sentence of the ancient Church, suggested apparently by St. Augustin—a sentence, which condemns every denial of the efficacy of baptismal grace, on whatever principles it be founded. "If any man says that children inherit no original sin from Adam,

which requires to be done away by the laver of regeneration, whence it would follow, that in their case the words whereby they were baptized for the remission of sins, were not to be understood in their true sense, let him be excommunicated." And again, "this rule of faith is the reason why infants, who cannot have committed any personal sin, are really baptized for the remission of sins, that so that which was contracted by birth, may be washed away in them by regeneration."*

Such is the meaning and sanction of that Article of the Belief—"one baptism for the remission of sins;" which the recent judgment expunges from the authoritative Creed of the Church of England. What effect is to attend the sentence must depend upon the manner in which it is received by the Church—a thing of which time alone can inform us. So much we must remember, that a public act can only be annulled by public authority. Private declarations, either by Priests or Bishops, cannot supersede a judicial sentence, though they may indicate such a state of feeling as will lead to its being superseded. If the Church of England is to retain its ancient Creed unimpaired, if its rule is to be the law of Christ, and not acts of Parliament, its liberation must be as formal and unambiguous as its thralldom. It is a step in the right direction, that fourteen Bishops have demanded that the interpretation of the rule of faith shall be restored to the successors of the Apostles. The measure proposed may have been defective: and

* Council of Milevis. Can. 2. Hard. i. 1217.

considering the unsatisfactory manner in which our Bishops are appointed, the inferior Clergy may justly reclaim that influence which they virtually exerted in primitive times, when the Bishop was their natural representative. But the unconditional refusal even of this demand must accelerate the crisis which it was intended to obviate. For the demand was that doctrines should be referred to those whom the Church asserts to possess a commission from Christ, and who profess to be guided by the teaching of His Spirit. It was replied that this great nation is too wise to need such guidance, and can settle its religion by the exercise of those natural powers, which have proved adequate to the adjustment of its temporal relations. To acquiesce in the Royal Supremacy, when thus interpreted, would be an acknowledgment that what is called the Established Church in this land is no part of that Communion, which was founded by Our Lord and His Apostles, but a mere expression of the national mind, working upon those ancient records, in which it chooses to place confidence. It would be to renounce the "Faith once delivered to the Saints," for what may be called the religion of English Nationality. Such a system could have no claim to be the medium of transmitting grace, or witnessing to doctrine.

What should be our conduct, brethren, in such an emergency, I do not feel entitled to suggest ; until it be seen whether any practical course is pointed out by those, who with a higher place possess a heavier responsibility. Among our many Bishops at home and in the colonies, there will not be wanting surely

some Athanasius in the hour of the Church's danger. So much only I beg you to remember, that so soon as the decision of the Privy Council is obeyed, our Church is already committed to sanction heresy, and can only be freed by some new law, or some new sentence. If the Clergy perceive and feel this as they ought, they will need no directions how to meet it. Were an assault made upon our property, we should find means for denouncing its injustice, and combining to oppose it. Shall we be less zealous in maintaining that Christian Faith, which the Church was founded to perpetuate? We have an Ecclesiastical Legislature, which has power to make laws, and Courts to enforce them. Our Primates could summon the Convocation of their Provinces to-morrow—they would do so if the Church was serious in demanding it. If the Clergy do not knock loud enough therefore to obtain relief, it can only be because they are not in earnest respecting its necessity. In matters of life and death no man stands upon ceremony. This must be my own excuse, if I have spoken with a freedom, which may offend those whose approbation I desire.

Rev. R. Preston
Mordere

A

PASTORAL LETTER

TO

THE CLERGY

OF

THE DIOCESE OF RIPON.

BY

CHARLES THOMAS, BISHOP OF RIPON.

LONDON:

FRANCIS & JOHN RIVINGTON,

ST. PAUL'S CHURCH YARD, AND WATERLOO PLACE.

1850.

LONDON :
GILBERT & RIVINGTON, PRINTERS,
ST. JOHN'S SQUARE.

A

LETTER,

&c.

MY REVEREND AND DEAR BRETHREN,

IT has not been without much anxious reflection, nor without a deep sense of the solemn responsibility which I should incur in so doing, that I have made up my mind to address you under the present troubled circumstances of our Church: but having received Memorials from different parts of my diocese, including one signed by twelve of my rural deans, on the subject of the recent decision in the case of Gorham *v.* the Bishop of Exeter, and having also had the most pressing appeals from clergy as well as laity within it to resolve, if possible, the painful doubts, and remove the distressing perplexities, under which so many are labouring in consequence of it, I have deemed it advisable, instead of replying separately to each communication, to address this “Pastoral Letter¹” to you all;

¹ This Letter would have appeared three weeks earlier, but that I was engaged, when I received most of the addresses, in a long round of Episcopal duties in various parts of my diocese;

feeling that I should be unfaithful to the Church, to my office, and to my people, were I to shrink from endeavouring, according to my ability, to satisfy those scruples and remove those difficulties ; or refuse to give such counsel as might, under God's blessing, tend to calm agitation and compose differences. May He, who giveth to all men liberally and upbraideth not, grant me wisdom and discernment to guide me in the task of unusual difficulty which is thus imposed upon me.

In one respect, however, I am thankful to confess that this difficulty is much less than it might have been ; because the main point in dispute between those who differ in opinion as to the Judgment recently pronounced, does not depend upon the definition of the term Regeneration, in which, when parties attempt to introduce refinements and subtleties beyond the simple language of the Church, they may easily differ, and yet all be consistent churchmen : the real question at issue, although I think it is as yet scarcely realized by many, is whether Baptism, as an instrument ordained by Christ for that purpose, does convey the blessings which Holy Scripture and the Church ascribe to it ; or whether the blessings and graces must not have been given to the individual pre-

and having, immediately afterwards, been summoned to London to attend a Meeting of Archbishops and Bishops, I felt it to be more respectful towards my Episcopal Brethren to postpone its publication, until our deliberations were concluded.

viously, in order to render him a worthy recipient of Baptism. For, in spite of all one's anxiety to save a brother clergyman from such penalties as would deprive him of his benefice, it cannot, I fear, be denied, that he, in whose favour the recent judgment has been pronounced, has asserted that as no spiritual grace is conveyed in Baptism, except to worthy recipients, and "as infants are unworthy recipients, being born in sin and the children of wrath, they cannot receive any benefit in Baptism, except there shall have been a prevenient grace to make them worthy²;" and that prevenient grace he describes more fully to be, the having been "regenerated by an act of grace prevenient to their Baptism, in order to make them worthy recipients of that Sacrament³." He asserts also, that "the filial state⁴," that is, the grace of adoption, the being made a child of God, was bestowed on the recipient before Baptism, not in Baptism: thus maintaining that the remission of original sin, adoption into the family of God, and Regeneration, must take place, in the case of infants, not in Baptism, nor by means of Baptism, but before Baptism. Such tenets as these seem to leave Baptism an empty rite, conveying no real benefit, nor advancing the receiver one step in the way of sal-

² Gorham's Efficacy of Baptism, p. 83, Answer 15, and pp. 123, 124; Question and Answer 70; and p. 88, Answer 27.

³ Ibid. p. 85, Answer 19.

⁴ Ibid. p. 113, end of Answer 60.

vation; they seem to overthrow the nature of a Sacrament, robbing Baptism of all its inward and spiritual grace.

Now, it can hardly be matter of surprise that such an exposition of Christian doctrine, in connexion with the recent Judgment, should produce some alarm and much perplexity in the minds of many: at the same time I am full of hope that when the real question at issue is more attentively considered, a calm and dispassionate review of its leading features may tend, under God's blessing, to a clearer understanding of its real bearings, and to more of agreement than we have lately witnessed in this unhappy controversy. At any rate, I think we should all, at the present moment, be feeling for points of union and agreement, and seeking for some common ground to stand upon. It will be my endeavour in this communication to speak the truth in love, and strive, in that spirit, to promote this much desired end. May it please God, of His infinite mercy, to overrule our present difficulties to the furtherance of this blessed object; and to lead all who acknowledge one Faith and one Baptism, to be henceforth more united in one holy bond of truth and peace, of faith and charity!

The perplexities to which I have above referred, seem chiefly to be these: First, the Church of England appears to many to be reduced to the dilemma of having no doctrine at all, touching the effect of the Holy Sacrament of Baptism on infants, which

seems incredible when they consider the service for the Baptism of Infants, in connexion with the Catechism ; or that, though it have a doctrine, it is nevertheless competent to any clergyman who pleases to dissent from or deny it ; an alternative which seems equally incredible. Secondly, they feel it to be a great grievance that the supreme tribunal for deciding questions involving points of doctrine, should have been constituted without the consent of the Church, and should be composed of laymen, none of whom need be members of the Church of England.

Let us first consider the question of the constitution and composition of the supreme tribunal of appeal. As to its present composition, it unquestionably does involve a grievance. That grievance has been felt, and a bill has already been introduced into the House of Lords, which provides that the judicial committee of Privy Council shall be required, whensoever it is necessary to determine any question as to doctrine or the tenets of the Church of England, to refer such question to the archbishops and bishops of the provinces of Canterbury and York ; and that the opinion of the archbishops and bishops upon such questions shall be binding for the purposes of the appeal in which such reference is made. As regards the point that the judicial committee of the Privy Council was constituted without the consent of the Church in convocation or synod, I think the difficulty arises mainly from an imperfect apprehension of the nature

of the royal supremacy. Our XXth Article, where it asserts that the Church hath "authority in controversies of faith" is evidently speaking of her authority to settle and lay down articles of faith; as may be gathered from its proceeding to declare that "it is not lawful for the Church to *ordain* any thing that is contrary to God's written word," adding that "it ought not to *decree* any thing against the same:" thus intending to describe the legislative power of the Church. But we well know that the legislative does not necessarily involve the judicial power. According to our Constitution in Church and State, the judicial power is vested in all causes, ecclesiastical as well as civil, in the sovereign of this realm; and I apprehend it would be just as great an act of usurpation on the part of the Church to claim for the two houses of convocation, jurisdiction, or the power of appointing judges, in ecclesiastical causes, as it would be for the Houses of Lords and Commons to insist upon appointing judges in all civil causes to the exclusion of the royal prerogative. That this power of appointing judges in causes ecclesiastical has rested with the crown, in virtue of the royal supremacy since the Reformation, will appear from a perusal of the following statutes:—The 25th of Henry VIII. c. 19, establishes the power of appeal from the archbishops' court to the chancery; the appeals to be there determined by commissioners appointed by the king. By 26th Henry VIII. c. 1, the king shall be re-

puted head of the Church, and shall correct all heresies and offences. By 1st Eliz. c. 1, commissioners may be appointed by the crown to exercise all spiritual and ecclesiastical jurisdiction; especially "to visit, reform, redress, order, correct and amend all such errors, heresies, and schisms whatsoever, which by spiritual or ecclesiastical power can or may lawfully be reformed;" and "such person or persons, to be named according to letters patent, shall have full power to execute all the premises." Sir Edward Coke pronounces the act 1st Eliz. to have been an act of restitution of the ancient jurisdiction ecclesiastical, which always belonged of right to the crown of England, but had been usurped by the pope; that it was not introductory of a new law, but declaratory of the old, and that which was, or of a right ought to be, by the fundamental laws of this realm, parcel of the sovereign's jurisdiction. The act 2nd, 3rd Wm. IV. cap. 91, transfers the powers of the high court of delegates (established by 1st Eliz.), in ecclesiastical as well as maritime causes, to his majesty in council; the decrees of the council to be final and definitive. The 3rd, 4th Wm. IV. c. 41, appoints the judicial committee of Privy Council to take cognizance of these causes: all appeals from the sentence of any judge in such causes to be referred by the sovereign to the committee to report thereon; and that report is to be ratified or annulled by the sovereign in council. The tribunal therefore which decided the case of

Gorham *v.* Bishop of Exeter in final appeals was in strict conformity with our constitution in Church and State. Nevertheless, although it be quite legally constituted, its present composition is a real grievance: and while, in the recent judgment, we most willingly acknowledge the ability, patience, and anxiety to arrive at a generally satisfactory decision which characterized the proceedings of the court, it is still consistent with the most profound loyalty to petition the sovereign and the legislature to apply the fitting remedy to the imperfect composition of that most important tribunal.

As to that alternative of the dilemma, in which our Church seems to many to be placed; viz., that she has no doctrine touching the effect of the Sacrament of Holy Baptism on infants, I would desire to quiet the alarms of those who have addressed me under such feelings, by assuring them that the teaching of the Church of England in this matter remains exactly what it was; ~~and that they both clearly teach~~ that the remission of sins is the grace conveyed by Baptism *to the baptized generally*, and therefore to infants with the rest. For although the atonement of our Lord Jesus Christ is of course the sole meritorious cause of the remission of guilt, and the Spirit of God the efficient, operating cause, nevertheless Baptism is the instrumental rite, whereby that grace is actually conveyed.

Let us first see what light Holy Scripture throws

upon the subject. The promise of our blessed Lord himself assures us that Baptism is instrumental to salvation, when He says, "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved." Those who were converted on the day of Pentecost were bidden to "repent and be baptized, every one of them, in the name of the Lord Jesus Christ, *for the remission of sins.*" To St. Paul, although already converted to Christianity, these words were addressed by Ananias, "Arise, and be baptized, and *wash away thy sins.*" And although the Holy Ghost had already fallen on those who were assembled with Cornelius, still St. Peter commanded them to be baptized in the name of the Lord, doubtless for the same purpose.

Thus, in each of these instances of adult Baptism, although the several parties had before received some grace, or they would not have been converted, nevertheless, they lacked the peculiar grace of Baptism; namely, the remission of sins. For had this grace of remission of guilt been actually imparted previously, then would their Baptism have been an empty rite, conveying no grace, and therefore no Sacrament.

It is, then, upon Scriptural authority such as that above referred to, that the Universal Church acknowledges, in the Nicene Creed, that there is "one Baptism for the remission of sins;" thus distinctly pronouncing that this blessing accompanies the Sacrament of Baptism. And inasmuch as the XXVIIth Article of our Church declares that "the Baptism of

young children is in anywise to be retained in the Church, as most agreeable with the institution of Christ," it thereby affirms that the "one Baptism" which is to be applied to infants as well as adults, is in each case for the remission of sins,—of original sin, that is to say, in the case of infants, seeing that they have been guilty of no actual sins.

Original sin being thus, upon the authority of Holy Scripture, and of the Nicene Creed in conformity with it, remitted to infants, through and by Baptism as an instrument, our Church, resting upon this solid foundation, considers, that whensoever original sin is remitted in infants, the child must, by that act of remission, be taken out of Adam and brought into Christ; is no longer a child of wrath, but a child of grace, has undergone a death unto sin (that original sin in which it was born, and from whose guilt it is freed), and has entered upon a new birth unto righteousness; spiritual regeneration being the entrance into a state of grace and salvation, as the natural birth is an entrance into life. For our Catechism, stating first, that a Sacrament is an outward and visible sign of an inward and spiritual grace given unto us, proceeds to describe the inward and spiritual grace of Baptism, as a death unto sin and a new birth unto righteousness; for that, being born in sin, and the children of wrath, we are hereby made the children of grace; and the Church bids each baptized child say that, in Baptism, he was "made a member of Christ, a

child of God, and an inheritor of the kingdom of heaven.”

These ideas, thus distinctly enunciated in our Catechism, are so clearly expressed by Hooker⁵, that I cannot refrain from quoting the passage at length: “ Although in the rest we make not Baptism a cause of grace, yet the grace which is given them with their Baptism doth so far depend on the very outward Sacrament, that God will have it embraced, not only as a sign or token of what we receive, but also as an instrument or mean whereby we receive grace; because Baptism is a Sacrament which God hath instituted in His Church, to the end that they which receive the same might be incorporated into Christ, and so through His most precious merit, obtain as well that saving grace of imputation which taketh away all former guiltiness, as also that infused Divine virtue of the Holy Ghost which giveth to the powers of the soul their first disposition towards future newness of life.” All who rightly receive this Sacrament being thus endowed with grace enough for their final salvation, if only they will use and improve it; and being thrown upon their own responsibility in after life, to employ this precious talent for the purposes for which it was given.

With this view of the effect of Baptism on original sin, the Homily on Salvation, towards the conclusion

⁵ B. V. § 60.

of the second part, entirely agrees, saying, “Therefore we must trust only in God’s mercy and that sacrifice which our High Priest and Saviour Christ Jesus, the Son of God, once offered for us upon the cross, to obtain thereby God’s grace and remission, *as well of our original sin in Baptism*, as of all actual sin committed by us after our Baptism, if we truly repent and turn to Him unfeignedly again⁶.”

As to the Baptism of infants, it is true that our Articles say no more than that it is in anywise to be retained as most agreeable to the institution of Christ ; but we have ample information touching its virtue and efficacy in the Service for the Public Baptism of Infants, which we are authorized to receive as the teaching of the Church upon this subject, because the 57th Canon expressly refers us to the Prayer Book for the fullest explanation of the doctrine of the Church on this point, saying, that “the doctrine of Baptism and of the Lord’s Supper is so sufficiently set down in the Book of Common Prayer, that nothing can be added unto it that is material and necessary.”

But even without reference to the Baptismal Service, I must say that any assertion which empties the Sacrament of Baptism of its grace, is as essentially opposed to the Articles as it is to the Prayer

⁶ Those who wish fuller information on these points might consult with much advantage the chapter, “Of Baptizing Infants,” in Bishop Taylor’s “Life of Christ.”

Book. For the XXVth Article declares that “the Sacraments are not merely badges and tokens of Christian men’s profession, but *rather* be certain sure witnesses and *effectual* signs of God’s grace and good will toward us, by the which He doth invisibly work in us.” And of Baptism, it is said in the XXVIIth Article, that is a sign—an effectual sign, according to the XXVth, by which God doth work invisibly in us—“a sign of regeneration or new birth, whereby, as by an instrument, they that receive Baptism rightly are grafted into the Church, the promise of forgiveness of sin, and of our adoption to be the sons of God, are visibly signed and sealed.” These two Articles, therefore, are surely standing witnesses to the real efficacy of Baptism as a channel of Divine grace.

I am now, however, directed by the 57th Canon to refer to the Prayer Book for the fullest instruction as to the doctrine of our Church touching Baptism generally, and therefore touching the Baptism of infants in particular. I there observe, that in the Service for the Public Baptism of Infants, we are taught to pray, before Baptism, that the child may receive remission of his sins by spiritual regeneration; we are bidden to remember God’s good will towards little children, as was proved by Christ blessing them; we are taught to pray that the Holy Spirit may be given to the infant, that he may be born again, be released from his sins, and be sanctified by the Holy Ghost; we are reminded that

Christ has promised in His Gospel, to grant all the things we have prayed for ; and that He, for His part, will most surely keep and perform His promise ; we are taught to pray that the old Adam may be buried, and the new man raised up in him. After we have offered up these prayers, and the act of Baptism, in the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, has been performed, the Church pronounces the child to be regenerate, and grafted into the body of Christ's Church, bidding us give thanks to Almighty God for these benefits. Accordingly, we do thank God in the case of every child whom we baptize ; not doubting, but earnestly believing, that he is received as a child of God by adoption, and incorporated into the Church of God.

Thus have we Creed and Catechism, Article, Homily and Liturgy, all speaking the same distinct, unambiguous language based upon the sure foundation of Holy Scripture. Nothing that has recently occurred can at all invalidate such combined testimony. Holy Scripture still teaches us that Baptism is for the remission of sins : the Church still teaches that infants are to be baptized ; you, my reverend brethren, are still bound to pronounce each individual child whom you baptize, regenerate ; are still bound to teach every child of your flock that he was, in his Baptism, made a member of Christ, a child of God, and an inheritor of the kingdom of heaven. Neither can any thing that has recently occurred absolve me from the obligation of protesting against any such

strange doctrine as that which would teach that an individual who comes to Baptism without any impediment in himself to the right receiving of it, may, although it is rightly administered, fail of receiving that particular grace which Holy Scripture assigns to it; viz. the remission of sin, the being born again of the Spirit.

Now, had we been told by the recent judgment that we were bound to believe, to teach, and to act, each in our several spheres, in direct opposition to the teaching of Holy Scripture, the Creed, the Baptismal Service, the Catechism, and the Homily; or were we forbidden to propagate the doctrine so clearly laid down in them, it would, indeed, have been a widely different case. But the judgment leaves the teaching of Holy Scripture and of the Church, as well as our own position and responsibilities just as they were; and so long as our Church does set forth her doctrine in language so scriptural, so pointed, so emphatic, that language must stand as a perpetual and living testimony against the contrary doctrine. What need then, I may ask, of further protest? Each time the various congregations over the whole world repeat the Nicene Creed, acknowledging "one Baptism for the remission of sins," does not the Universal Church protest thereby against the contrary doctrine? Each time the service for the Baptism of Infants is repeated, does not the Church of England protest against the teaching that children are not regenerate in and by their Baptism,

as an instrument? Each time the children of our flocks are catechized, does not the Church of England enter a fresh protest against the doctrine which would empty Baptism of its inward and spiritual grace? To my own mind, I confess, these are the most comfortable, and at the same time the most effectual, protests which we can put forth, and which the Church does put forth for us whenever the said declarations are made under her bidding. These will more effectually tend to prevent the spread of any such doctrine as that which led to the present controversy, than any means of resisting it which are not in accordance with our Church polity. In truth, I cannot help believing, paradoxical though it may at first appear, that all which has recently happened, will tend, when the heat of controversy is somewhat abated, to further the acceptance of that doctrine of the whole Church from the earliest ages on this point which our Church so plainly sets forth: and this would be my answer to those who fear that henceforth there will be a general licence to deny the doctrine of our Articles, and Liturgy touching infant Baptism.

I have thus endeavoured, according to my ability, to suggest such topics for your consideration as the present exigency seemed to require. It would certainly have been far more congenial to my natural feelings to have abstained from all interference under the present troubled aspect of the Church: and I think that, after fourteen years' intercourse, you will

have known me well enough to believe that, in conformity with the apostolical precept, it has been my habitual study to be quiet, and to do my own business. But the present occasion seems to me to be one on which silence would have been culpable ; I have accordingly spoken to you in all faithfulness, having counted the cost, and being willing to sacrifice much of what might be personally agreeable, in the hope, under God's blessing, of being able to render some small service to the cause of truth and of peace : nor will I willingly believe that a calm and temperate statement of doctrine, a frank and unreserved avowal of deep and long-cherished convictions, made in the spirit of Christian love, can ever, or at least ought ever to excite any feelings of a contrary character.

This surely is not the fitting season for eager and angry polemics, or for captious controversy ; but rather for solemn searchings of the heart ; for probing the depth of our own convictions as in the sight of God, and satisfying ourselves that they rest on the right foundations : nor can I but believe that we shall arrive at a better understanding with each other by mutual interchange of opinion in a spirit of Christian simplicity and sincerity, than by standing aloof and shunning each other's society as aliens and enemies, without effort to come to better agreement.

I have already expressed a hope that the present controversy, hostile as it seems at this moment to

the peace of the Church, may ultimately tend to promote greater unanimity, when the vehemence of party feeling has somewhat subsided, and the time is come for calm reflection. It will then, I think, be felt by many whose convictions were previously unsettled, that our blessed Saviour never could have instituted a Sacrament which was to have no efficacy. It will be perceived that the same principles on which a latitude is claimed in one direction, may be used, and must be conceded, in the case of those who claim it in every other direction ; much to the detriment, as I humbly conceive, of all fixed doctrine. It will be acknowledged that the language of our Prayer Book, in the Baptismal Service, is rather the language of faith than of hope or charity. Further researches will convince many that those who have, in times past, held the very highest Calvinistic opinions, have admitted and advocated the doctrine of Baptismal regeneration, according to the natural meaning of the words of our Service and our Catechism ; thus recognizing the truth, that all grace given need not be accompanied with the grace of final perseverance. It will be felt that the doctrine of grace imparted to all fit recipients in Baptism (all infants in the Christian Church being deemed, according to Christ's institution, fit recipients), is the basis of all Christian teaching, under the direction of our Church ; and that it is not merely by expunging two or three phrases, but by remodelling the whole Prayer Book, that it can be brought into

agreement with a contrary system. It will be perceived how clear a course the Church of England holds between the Romanizing extreme on the one hand which maintains that there is a complete inherent righteousness in every baptized person, and that it is not only the guilt, but the power also, of original sin which is entirely abolished in the Sacrament of holy Baptism ; and the other extreme, which confounds regeneration (the new birth unto righteousness, the entrance into the state of grace and salvation) with the perfect manhood, the measure of the stature of the fulness of Christ ; an extreme which confounds a part with the whole, regeneration with final and complete sanctification ; as though there were no gradual growing up in grace after regeneration ; as if there were not the same relation between our natural birth and our natural growth, as there is between regeneration and progressive sanctification. It will be felt also, I believe, that the preaching of Baptismal regeneration in the sense which avoids each of these extremes, is entirely consistent with the fullest and freest recognition of that blessed truth, so full of all comfort to the believer, that we are justified by faith only for the merit of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ ; and is likewise entirely consistent with the most powerful appeals to personal responsibility ; a responsibility fearfully enhanced and aggravated by the Baptismal grace conferred : entirely consistent, too, with a teaching which enforces the necessity of

a conversion, by the grace of God, of those who are living in sin, and of the actual renewal of the will and affections of all. It will be felt that it is the abuse, and not the use, of the doctrine of Baptismal regeneration which is really dangerous ; that most unscriptural abuse of it which, in forgetfulness of the Apostolic model, is ever preaching the privileges of Baptism without enforcing its tremendous responsibilities, thereby encouraging the reckless profligacy of Antinomianism.

If those benefits which I am sanguine enough to anticipate, shall, under the Divine blessing, be the ultimate result of a more general canvassing of the questions which are at the present moment exciting such uneasy feelings among us, it will indeed be working well for the future peace and unity of our Church. Only let us beware, as we value our own souls, that the controversy is not meanwhile working ill for ourselves, by fomenting angry and uncharitable feelings in our own hearts ; let us watch, in the spirit of prayer, against all bitterness, and wrath, and clamour, and evil speaking, in our discussions on these solemn subjects, eschewing every thing which can foster division and aggravate the spirit of party. And yet further, let us beware that our flock take no hurt or hindrance in the midst of this strife of tongues. The Lord has given us, both clergy and laity in this diocese, a great work to perform ; our lot has been cast amidst an enormous and steadily increasing population, which, unless we

persevere in strenuous exertions, will be growing up without God in the world or a Saviour in their hearts. We are not without some gracious tokens that the Lord has, in a measure, blessed our work in seeking for those sheep of Christ that are dispersed abroad, that they may be saved through Him for ever. May no check be given to this work and labour of love by our own unhappy divisions ; and may we each of us, in our several callings, feel ourselves specially bound to guard against any such distractions arising from them, as may divert us from our endeavours, according to our respective offices and abilities, to win souls to Christ, to build up his Church, and enlarge his kingdom !

As a help against the evils of our present condition, I desire to recommend for our use, as occasion may admit, that devout Prayer for Unity which occurs in the service for the day of the accession of our sovereign to the throne : and praying that the God of Peace may keep your hearts and minds in mutual love and concord,

I remain,

Reverend and dear Brethren,

Your affectionate Friend and Servant,

C. T. RIPON.

LONDON,
May 10, 1850.

A PRAYER FOR UNITY.

O God the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, our only Saviour, the Prince of Peace; Give us grace seriously to lay to heart the great dangers we are in by our unhappy divisions. Take away all hatred and prejudice, and whatsoever else may hinder us from godly Union and Concord: that, as there is but one Body, and one Spirit, and one Hope of our Calling, one Lord, one Faith, one Baptism, one God and Father of us all, so we may henceforth be all of one heart, and of one soul, united in one holy bond of Truth and Peace, of Faith and Charity, and may with one mind and one mouth glorify thee; through Jesus Christ our Lord. *Amen.*

ADDRESSES

REFERRED TO IN THE PASTORAL LETTER.

I.

To the Right Reverend Father in God, Charles Thomas,
Lord Bishop of Ripon.

We, the undersigned Clergy of your Lordship's diocese, residing in the deanery of Leeds, approach your Lordship with an expression of our affection and respect, and venture to seek your paternal advice under the existing circumstances of the Church.

The undersigned receive the Articles of the Creed and the Formularies of the Church on the subject of Baptism, in their plain, literal, and obvious sense,—in the sense in which the words have always been understood by the Church of England, in common with the Universal Church, from the earliest ages.

It may seem, therefore, that we are only remotely concerned in the late decision of Her Majesty in Council, in the question of *Gorham v. the Bishop of Exeter*: a judgment, which, in our opinion, amounts only to this,—that persons receiving the Articles of the Creed and the Formularies of the Church on the subject of Baptism in a non-natural sense, shall not be disturbed in their

preferments. But we beg leave to call the attention of your Lordship to the fact that the counsellors of Her Majesty, in advising the judgment, have supported it, not only by arguments which appear to us to be inconsistent with the spirit of the Church's teaching, but by misquotations (unintentionally made) from the writings of some of our standard divines, who are made to express the very opinions, for the refutation of which those writings were composed and given to the world.

This has caused perplexity in the minds of many of our parishioners ; and while we feel confident that your Lordship and your Right Reverend brethren will seek a suitable occasion for bringing these misstatements under the notice of Her Majesty, we ask your Lordship's advice with respect to the proper course to be pursued by us in satisfying the minds of our parishioners.

(Signed by thirty-nine of the Clergy of the Rural Deanery of Leeds.)

II.

To the Right Reverend the Lord Bishop of Ripon.

We, the undersigned Clergymen in the Rural Deanery of Leeds, and your Lordship's diocese, having learned that an Address to your Lordship is in circulation among the Clergy of this deanery, impugning the recent decision of Her Majesty in Council as supreme head of the Church, desire to express our deep anxiety for the preservation of the peace of the Church, and likewise that there should be no compromise of its principles.

We are anxious to maintain in its integrity the Book of Common Prayer, and to uphold the principle, that the articles of the Church be interpreted in their plain, literal, and grammatical sense.

While we yield to none in our attachment to this principle, we could not subscribe our names to the Address now in circulation, which in effect charges Her Majesty in Council with deciding that the Articles may be held in a non-natural sense, and with making false quotations from theological writers. We have carefully read the judgment referred to in that Address, verifying

the quotations, as far as we have had opportunity, and have seen nothing to warrant such serious charges.

Looking to the proceedings of the court which advised Her Majesty in this decision, we cannot refrain from expressing to your Lordship our grateful admiration of the calm, judicious, and able manner in which the eminent judges who formed the Judicial Committee, and the Prelates who advised them, considered the question submitted to them.

With regard to the question itself, it appears to us, that while the Church of England plainly holds the sacraments to be generally necessary to salvation, and teaches that we should use them as means of grace, it has, in its Articles and Liturgy, wisely abstained from any exact definition with regard to the grace imparted.

We fear that great injury will arise to the Church, if at this time the Clergy should unhappily be arrayed against each other on questions of difficult and doubtful controversy, endeavouring to define what the Church has not defined ; or, if they should engage in a struggle for power against the lawful supremacy of the Crown.

As our observation and experience lead us to conclude that the lay members of the Church, far from being unsettled by the recent decision, are greatly relieved by it, and heartily acquiesce in it, we earnestly look to your Lordship, in the hope that, by the blessing of God, your healing counsels will avert so great a calamity, as a renewed religious agitation in this populous diocese.

(Signed by ten Clergy of the Rural Deanery of Leeds.)

III.

To the Right Reverend Charles Thomas, Lord Bishop of Ripon.

MY LORD,

We, the undersigned Clergy of the deanery of Wakefield, assembled in chapter, unanimously agreed to lay before your

Lordship the following resolutions, expressive of the grievances under which we conceive the Church at present to labour, and to request your Lordship to permit us to found thereupon addresses to Her Majesty the Queen, and to the Archbishop of Canterbury :—

Resolved,

1. That, it is a right inherent in the Church of Christ, by the commission of her Divine Founder, to define in matters of doctrine.

2. That, in accordance with the above-named right, no court ought to possess the power of judicially and finally declaring the doctrines of the Church, except such as shall be constituted in agreement with the principles of the Church, and have received its jurisdiction by formal ecclesiastical sanction.

3. That, the power which is at present vested by Act of Parliament, without the formal concurrence of the Church, in the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, to interpret the formularies of the Church by a final judicial sentence, and thus practically to define and declare the doctrines of the Church, is an infringement of the fundamental right of the Church, to be the sole judge in matters affecting the Faith, and at variance with the Law of Christ.

4. That, the existence of this state of things is a grievance in conscience, and that this grievance is rendered more burdensome by the fact, that the members of the Judicial Committee of Council are not necessarily members of the Church of England.

5. That, for the redress of the said grievance, the following steps are necessary :—

(1.) That, the Church in Convocation or Synod has licence to deliberate for the special purpose of devising a proper appellate tribunal for determining all questions of doctrine, and other matters purely spiritual.

(2.) That, an Act of Parliament be passed for the purpose of making the judgment of such tribunal binding on the temporal courts of these realms.

(3.) That, the Acts of Parliament relating to the Privy Council be so amended as to exempt questions of doctrine and

other matters purely spiritual from the cognizance of the Privy Council.

(Signed by the Rural Dean and fifteen Clergy of the Rural Deanery.)

IV.

We, the undersigned Rural Deans of the diocese of Ripon, approach your Lordship with entire confidence in your Lordship's wisdom and judgment at a period of much anxiety in the Church's history.

Difficulties which have arisen from the recent decision in the case of *Gorham v. the Bishop of Exeter*, have perplexed the minds of many, both of the Clergy and the Laity, and we venture, therefore, to ask your paternal advice as to the proper course to be pursued by us under the existing circumstances.

(Signed by twelve Rural Deans.)

V.

To the Right Reverend the Lord Bishop of Ripon.

We, the Rural Dean, and the undersigned members of the deanery of North Craven, deeply impressed with the importance of the late decision of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council (in the case of *Gorham v. the Bishop of Exeter*) beg leave respectfully to convey to your Lordship this expression of our hearty sympathy; and also to ask for your Lordship's guidance and assistance under the difficulties in which as ministers of the Church we are hereby placed.

We feel strongly how desirable it is for the integrity of the Church, that measures be forthwith taken to secure to her an effectual mode of giving her authoritative declaration on this, as well as on other spiritual questions; and we, therefore, urgently pray that your Lordship will take such steps as may seem expedient for that purpose.

That the Head of the Church may give to your Lordship, and those who have the rule over us, a right judgment in this and all other things which concern the peace of His Church, is the earnest prayer of your Lordship's obedient Servants—

(Signed by the Rural Dean, and thirteen Clergy of the Rural Deanery.)

VI.

To the Right Reverend the Lord Bishop of Ripon.

May it please your Lorship,

We, the Rectors, Vicars, and Curates of the archdeaconry of Richmond, within your Lordship's diocese, whose names are underwritten, beg leave respectfully to address your Lordship on the subject of a recent decision, by the Judicial Committee of Her Majesty's Privy Council. We have been in the habit of reading publicly every Sunday the Nicene Creed, in which we acknowledge one Baptism for the remission of sins. We have also been in the habit of administering the Sacrament of Baptism, in which we return thanks to Almighty God, that it hath pleased Him to regenerate this infant with His Holy Spirit, to receive him for His own child by adoption, and to incorporate him into His holy Church. We have also been accustomed, in using the Church Catechism, to instruct the children that Baptism conveys a death unto sin, and a new birth unto righteousness, for that being by nature born in sin, and the children of wrath, they are hereby (*i. e.* by Baptism) made the children of grace. We thoroughly receive and believe these doctrines of our Church, as they may be proved by most certain warrants of Holy Scripture. We think that a Minister who denies these doctrines, ought not to be instituted to a benefice in the established Church. We therefore disapprove of the late judgment of the Privy Council in the case of *Gorham v. the Bishop of Exeter*.

At the same time, we acknowledge that the Sovereign is over all persons, and in all causes ecclesiastical, as well as civil, su-

preme. And we rely upon your Lordship's wisdom, in conjunction with the other Prelates of our Church, to promote such measures, as may preserve the rights, privileges, and Faith of our Church in matters of Spiritual doctrine, and at the same time maintain the just prerogative and supremacy of the Crown.

We are, my Lord,

Your Lordship's dutiful Servants.

*(Signed by the Archdeacon and Chancellor of the Diocese,
and fifty-eight Clergy of the Archdeaconry.)*

LONDON:
GILBERT AND RIVINGTON, PRINTERS,
ST. JOHN'S SQUARE.

PRESENT POSITION OF THE CHURCH.
THE BAPTISMAL AND EDUCATIONAL QUESTIONS.

THREE LETTERS

TO THE RIGHT HON.

SIR GEORGE GREY, BART.

H.M. SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE HOME DEPARTMENT.

BY THE REV.

WILLIAM HENRY HOARE, M.A.

LATE FELLOW OF ST. JOHN'S COLLEGE, CAMBRIDGE.

LONDON:

FRANCIS & JOHN RIVINGTON,
ST. PAUL'S CHURCH YARD, AND WATERLOO PLACE.

1850.

CONTENTS.

LETTER I.

EDUCATIONAL MOVEMENTS. MR. FOX'S BILL.

LETTER II.

CONNEXION OF EDUCATIONAL AND BAPTISMAL QUESTIONS.

LETTER III.

EFFECT OF THE LATE JUDGMENT ON THE CHURCH.
CONSIDERATIONS ON BAPTISMAL REGENERATION, CON-
TINUED.

A
L E T T E R,

&c.

RIGHT HON. AND DEAR SIR,

YOUR name has been associated with the brightest pages of England's history. In the hard contentions of political life, no less than on the battle-field, in public and in private relations, the name you inherit is justly encircled with imperishable fame. In addressing you as I now do, chiefly, though not, I trust, exclusively, on the mere ground by which Her Majesty's most humble subject has a right to address a chief minister of the Crown—on the subject of National Education—it is something to know, that there is not wanting in you either the physical or the moral courage to expose an evil, or to defend a righteous cause, and to see that grievances be redressed and justice done to all classes in Her Majesty's dominions.

And when, let me ask, could the time be more favourable for the consideration of such a question as that on which I am entering? After a period of

strife and bloodshed among the nations of the Continent, unparalleled by any thing in our own, or perhaps, for its extent and suddenness, in any other generation ; and only prevented under Providence from spreading in our own land and capital city, by the wise precautions of our rulers, and by the unanimous co-operation of the flower and loyalty of our land ; and when we now enjoy a profound peace ;—when all minds are drawn to the question of social and domestic reforms ; when questions such as these are allowed the pre-eminence ; when the first place seems assigned them by the tacit and unanimous consent of all classes ; when our rulers themselves, when even Royal personages, take the lead in such questions ;—surely I am justified in saying, that there could not be a time more favourable for the calm and impartial consideration of the all-important subject of Education. I would even say, that the patient endurance of our working classes under admitted grievances, for the sake of peace and order, and in the faith of having those grievances peaceably and timely redressed, together with their zeal and promptitude to think for themselves, and to attempt to originate plans for their own common good, constitute an actual claim upon the “ powers that be,” to come forward to their help, and to show them all sympathy and all anxiety to supply their wants. When we see some among them forming societies of their own, others inquiring on every side, and associating for the purpose of more efficient inquiry and

information on the subject ; when we find so large a proportion of them gladly availing themselves of the schools, and churches, and such other means of improvement as can be provided for them by private benevolence ; is it not, indeed, the duty of a government to lend its aid in such a cause ? to effectuate, by every constitutional means in its power, these most pleasing and laudable efforts of the various ranks and orders of the people ? It is with these convictions, and not under the momentary influence of any mere party excitement, that I venture to offer the following remarks. And I declare it my solemn conviction, as it must be, one would think, of every Churchman, nay, almost of every Christian, that if we hope for the Divine blessing on our labours, we must boldly give to religion the foremost place in any scheme for the moral improvement of the people. And in accordance with this belief, the proposition which I now put before you is this, —That, to meet the present exigency, there is required an Education, which shall be NOT CHIEFLY of a SECULAR, but of a RELIGIOUS character.

Religion is every thing, or it is nothing. With the latter branch of the alternative, you, Sir, I am sure, will entertain not the remotest sympathy. You will give no ear to those who would broach for one moment the monstrous idea. As a faithful and tried advocate, then, of the other branch which asserts the truth of our holy religion, may I not call upon you to lend us your aid in promoting and dis-

seminating this? Will not you, who, in the confidence of the Sovereign, and your own distinguished position and office, have more than the ordinary means at your command, assist us in raising and in planting the banner of our faith on the topmost towers of our still happy, still glorious constitution in Church and State? You would be the last to lower a standard which you held to be a true one. You would not willingly hand down to the generation following a constitution shorn of those honours and high religious advantages with which you inherited it from your forefathers. And if perilous times should recur, you will never allow it to be laid at your door, that you saw an evil which you did not rectify—that you left a people, and those your own countrymen, to perish for lack of bread, and to become the dupes and victims of revolutionary and fanatical leaders. Do then as Constantine did: raise aloft the glowing colours of our holy Faith; emblazon it on the arms of your country; plant it on the pinnacles of her palaces. It is an old, it may be thought a worn-out device; but it will be the signal of success and of victory. Or take the example of another monarch; and of England, as of Israel, be it said, “*In the name of our God we will set up our banners.*” It was not by an incidental mention of religion, not by a faint casual reference to its weighty truths, still less by a mere cold toleration of them, that the lawgiver of old proposed to hand down the knowledge of God and the faith of patriarchs from

generation to generation. No! it was by keeping that faith in the forefront of his system; it was by perpetuating it in national rites and ordinances: and he began with the children. It was to them that at every Passover, in the full concourse of the people, in the face of the city and of the crowd,—and not in retired corners, and at some spare hour of the day at home,—that the question was to be put and answered: What meaneth this great festivity, and why hath the Lord appointed it? And the answer was, To make His Name known, and His religion confessed and honoured in all the earth. And to this end it was commanded them: “Thou shalt teach them diligently unto thy children, and shalt talk of them when thou sittest in thine house, and when thou walkest by the way, and when thou liest down, and when thou risest up¹.”

In times of trouble we are all of this opinion. Never was the tone of our public journals so religious and earnest as during the late political disturbances in Europe, and under the threatening aspect of affairs in England. It was easy to see that France and the youth of that country were suffering, as since confessed by M. Thiers, for want of a religion. This want soon filled the revolutionary prisons with the victims of revolutionary principles; while it was obvious that these were but the natural offspring of a state professing no religious creed, and bound together by no holier bond than present convenience

¹ Deut. vi. 7.

and expediency. Or take our own history. Who does not remember, in the Newport riots in 1837, the testimony of Sir John Phillips to the neglect of all religious education or worship in the mining districts of Wales, as the chief exciting cause of those disgraceful scenes? And in the charge of Chief Justice Tindal, on occasion of the trial of the parties concerned in those riots, how forcibly and affectingly was the public attention drawn to this root of the evil, the prolific source of the worst crimes and disasters! Is it too much then if we ask you to assist us in removing the evil by providing the only true remedy, and thus to hand down to posterity the same sound and healthful constitution which has been transmitted to us, under which we have lived, and which has formed, under Providence, the bulwark of our religion and of our liberties? Let it not be thought enough to tolerate Christianity, or to tolerate the Church; to give religion, as it were, a corner in our social system. Let us rather seek to have our manners, and all our institutions, not only coloured, but tintured, steeped, and pervaded by it. But to exact of the Church, on the one hand, that she should continue to pray daily for the Parliament that its measures may tend to the promotion of “peace and happiness, truth and justice, *religion and piety* ;” —for the Queen, that she may “study to preserve her subjects in wealth, peace, and *godliness* ;” while, on the other, you look coldly on all her endeavours to effectuate this prayer, while you tie up her hands

and cripple her resources ;—is this doing justice to a faithful ally? Is this the way to cement that good understanding, that harmony and concord, which are essential to any efficient co-operation in works of piety and beneficence?

But to proceed with our proposition, that the want of our people is *not so much* of a *secular*, as of a *religious* education. I say not so much ; for I am far from being insensible to the good uses of both. I would not deny the expediency (the necessity, if you please) of imparting ordinary knowledge, of mixing up much of what is accounted secular, with what we term a religious course of instruction. I have no wish to see applied to ourselves, what the Poet has remarked of another clime, and less genial soil :

“ Whence from such lands each pleasing science flies,
That first excites desire, and then supplies ;
Unknown to them, when sensual pleasures cloy,
To fill the languid pulse with finer joy ; . . .
But all the gentler morals, such as play
Through life’s more cultured walks, and charm the way ;
These far dispersed, on tim’rous pinions fly,
To sport and flutter in a kindlier sky.”

On the contrary, I am inclined to agree with the writer of the article from which I had occasion to quote before, and who says, ‘ The Bible and Prayer Book, the Hymn Book, the Spelling Book, and Arithmetic, with some theological and devotional tracts [too often] constitute the whole of the village

literature; and it is far from our purpose to dispute their value, when they are studied with sincerity and zeal. But . . . if literature, science, and other kinds of secular knowledge are allowable, useful, and necessary for the higher and middle classes, why not also in some degree for the lower?"

It is to be remembered, however, that this truth is by no means overlooked in the present system either of the National School, or of the British and Foreign School Society. Both systems provide, and provide largely, for the supply of secular knowledge. An inspection of any catalogue² of the books, or subjects taught,—and still better, a visit to any one of the schools during school hours,—would soon convince us of this. Nay, even in the teaching of a Sunday School there would be doubtless no unfrequent allusion to points of geography and of history, and others of a similar description. Secular acquirements—as of history, the arts and sciences, grammar, drawing, &c. are indeed necessary, and never more necessary than at the present day, when they are so much insisted on in the schools of our Continental neighbours. Nor is the expediency of teaching these confined to their actual use and application in life; it is not denied that, over and above this advantage, they have a cer-

² One is glad, in Mr. J. W. Parker's *Educational Catalogue*, to see at least one hopeful sign of concord between the National Society and the Privy Council. Mr. Parker's List comprises the books recommended by *both*.

tain softening and humanizing effect in their own nature ; they tend to enlarge the mind and elevate the thoughts. Their effect in subduing national antipathies, and counteracting petty and insular prejudices is indeed surprising. What so improving to the taste, or what so contributive to the universal enjoyment of life, as some little knowledge of the musical, or of the poetic art? In all these we may well hail the useful handmaids of religion ; but, surely, no fit or reasonable substitute for it. It must also be taken into the account, that the effect we here allow and assign to scientific knowledge, is and must be chiefly confined to those who pursue it *deeply*. As an example, we should point to the Meetings of the British Association, or some other such learned and Scientific Societies at home, and to kindred Associations abroad. But the Members of these bodies are in general of a higher grade than the classes to whom we allude, in speaking of educational wants. They are not the masses ; they do not represent the bulk of our population :—the working and industrial classes. For these it is that we require an education ; and an education generously aided and supported by the public purse ; and with these classes it is obvious that the question is not one of a perfect or highly finished education ; but it is a question, What subjects out of many, shall be chosen to instruct them in? For *all*, there would be neither the time, nor the inclination, nor the means ; and were we to propose to teach them

all, their own sense would lead them to reject the offer as obviously inapplicable to their peculiar circumstances and condition.

Here is one consideration then, which would evidently lead us to the choice of an education *chiefly religious*. Another consideration is, that with this portion of our population, the opportunities for instruction at home are much fewer than among ourselves. The parents are too much occupied during the day, and their necessary labour indisposes them (even were they duly qualified in other respects) to impart religious instruction to their children. Here, then, is a call for the hand of charity to interpose, and to supply the children with that which is as needful to them as their daily food, but which yet the parents who supply the latter are wholly incompetent to provide them with.

To carry on the discussion of this point, I persuade myself, can hardly be necessary from me; it would only be occupying your time with superfluous disquisitions. At a great public meeting, it was emphatically declared from the chair, in words not easily forgotten by those who heard them: "As to the distinction between matters religious and secular, I laugh it to scorn." I have no pretence to be the authorized interpreter of that gentleman's meaning³; but I do think, that, in what I have already advanced, there may easily

³ The Hon. J. C. Talbot, Q.C.

be found reasons sufficient to show that this distinction is in *practice* a figment ; that some degree of secular knowledge is, and ever has been, combined with religious teaching. Go to any school, and you will more probably find the little scholars busy at their slates and their arithmetic, at their writing, or their tables, or their history ; perhaps even at their singing or their general and entertaining knowledge, than in repeating their Catechisms, or in reading their Bibles. It is not so much the words of religion that it is sought to impress upon them, as it is to keep the form of it ever before their eyes, to give them an early and habitual reverence for it, and for the teachers of it, and to imbue their whole lives and earliest associations with its tone and spirit.

And now, to spare further argumentation, and to keep to a practical view of the case, let us place the opposite systems before our mind as in actual operation ; and thus, comparing the two together, let us endeavour to obtain a comparative estimate of their worth and tendency. The two cases I will take are, First, one of the newly proposed District Schools under a managing Board of rate-payers ; and, Secondly, a School in connexion with the National, or with the British and Foreign School Society.

I. According to the *first* plan, master and scholars make up the whole idea of the school. For, however the democratical principle may prevail out of

doors, in the constitution of the board of rate-payers, within the walls at least the master is supreme. And how vast the responsibility, how various the qualifications of this functionary we may well imagine, when all the interests of the school are made to centre in him! when he alone is entrusted with the development of all the powers, moral and intellectual, of the youth committed to his care! Mr. Fox (and to his credit be it spoken) seems painfully alive to the delicacy and difficulty of the master's position, and to the amount of qualification required of him. "As of the poet, so of the schoolmaster it may be said, *Nascitur, non fit.*" And as "on them"—the schoolmasters—"he relies for the advancement of" his plan of "education," the adequate remuneration of these distinguished personages seems a thought that almost overwhelms him! "Their functions were in reality such," he continues, "as might well be deemed sacred, and they deserved the best honours that the State could bestow." We must have, it appears, a new Poet's Corner, a new hierarchy, new endowments! It were a pity that the highly gifted and highly distinguished individuals who are destined to fill the new posts of honour, should still be left at the mercy, and subject to the caprices of the district boards, who would be little likely to equal them in attainments, or to be very nice judges of their merits! Such, however, is the description of persons before whom we must now imagine the youthful assembly drawn

up. The clock strikes the hour of commencing ; every voice is hushed in silence, awaiting the master's command, who now gives out (to some upper class, we will suppose,) the first lesson for the day, a chapter on astronomy. This done, trigonometry, algebra, mechanics, geography, history, natural and moral philosophy, and other branches, follow in quick but orderly succession, till noon brings round the season of needful refreshment, and the pupils retire to their home. Mr. Fox would "reserve to the parents the inalienable right, at certain fixed times, to have their children instructed in religion." It is to be hoped they would be more discreet than to apply to this purpose the present hour, which would be rather wanted for the ordinary supply of nature's necessities ! and for once I would venture to recommend that the instruction be deferred to a more convenient season. Not that the round of intellectual labour must be supposed to have at all wearied the children. On the contrary, they may have verified the adage, *Mutatis requiescunt messibus arva* ; and after the hour of dinner they return fresh as ever to their work. Readings in poetry, a little drawing, a little music, a lesson on good-breeding, a dictation in history, or some other of the lighter accomplishments, agreeably enough beguile the afternoon. A few lessons in sacred history, or taken from the Bible itself, may have been interspersed : till the day is fairly spent, and again the pupils are dismissed, for the last chance of a few words from their parents or

friends at home, should they not be too tired, on the subject of religion !

I have said nothing, in all this description, of any time set apart for prayers in this school. Let us hope it was intended to begin and end with some appropriate form : the intention is not expressed in the programme. And the same of the Bible. Something of this may or may not have been read out to the children. But for all that is said about it, this book appears to be somewhat quaintly reserved for a token of approbation to departing scholars for eminent success in *secular* learning !! It seems a little ominous to select such a book for such a purpose, and to be so liberal of it, *just as the pupil is going away!* Controversy, however, must be avoided at any cost. Not a whisper to disturb the youthful conscience, or to awaken one uneasy thought. Should any attempt be made to enforce a single "religious peculiarity," in any existing school in a parish, master and minister and school, are all to be cashiered—the rate-payers called instantly together—and a new *district* school provided ! But, that nothing be spared to make the latter pleasant and attractive, such new schools are all to be free : "Every inhabitant of the parish or district shall have the right of sending his children, without charge, without distinction in the treatment or education of the children, *and without any religious peculiarities being inculcated upon them.*"

We have now, then, before us the working of this

sort of school ; and we cannot deny that much useful learning might be imparted. Attention to the principles of order, regularity, prudence, propriety, politeness ;—the acquisition of some refined moral sentiments, and, above all, a good degree of intellectual training, may have been accomplished. But has nothing of importance been altogether omitted?—no precious faculties left wholly without culture? Due respect to the master, a sort of kindness to each other, a useful spirit of emulation, some acquaintance with the wonders of nature ;—these may have been acquired : but where has been the continual reference to a Higher Power? where the abiding sense of His presence? where the thought of securing His favour? of living to His glory? of bowing to His will? of doing all things in His name? Where the realization of the future? where the continual rising of the heart from nature to nature's God? where the due regard to that higher spiritual world to which the present is but the scene of our preparation? And as to the strengthening of the intellectual faculty, it is true this may have been effected under this method of teaching ; and so it would have been under any other. It is not peculiar to the mere secular system of education to thoroughly exercise the mind. I remember an acute mathematician, when for his College examination he was required to study Bishop Butler's Analogy of Natural and Revealed Religion, declaring, that the labour his mathematical exercises

cost him was as nothing to that which he found necessary in preparing "his Butler;" and that "he could only manage it by devoting to this book the best and most precious hours of the day." This shows very plainly that a subject may have a religious tendency, and yet be as conducive to the development of the intellectual and reasoning powers, as if it were of a secular kind.

Though something, too, may have been gained by the exclusion of religious controversy, I mean something of a false and spurious liberality, yet how pernicious may have been the effect of some scenes which can hardly fail to have passed within the sight and recollection of the children of such schools! Some village Sunday-school ridiculed, some minister perhaps of the offices of religion contemptuously treated, reviled, or even denied any influence in the school; and this because he has ventured to touch upon some "peculiar religious tenets"—he may have alluded to some such antiquated—yet we hope not exploded—doctrine as the Incarnation or the Atonement!

II. We have now to compare the opposite system, viz. that adopted in the older established schools, in connexion with the National, or with the British and Foreign School Societies.

Here too, be it remembered, the Arts and Sciences, arithmetic, grammar, history, natural and moral philosophy, mechanics, and the rest, receive their due measure of attention. With the exception

of Prayers being made the first consideration, and of the Bible and Bible-subjects being oftener and more prominently introduced, our account of the former school might serve equally well for this. The secular attainments may here be somewhat less in amount, but still sufficient to develop the intellectual faculty in an equal degree. But what an incalculable superiority in the religious sense! Here the Bible, the treasury of all religious knowledge, is no longer reserved as a reward for literary progress—it occupies its due place, and receives due honour, as the Oracles of God, the source of true wisdom, the fountain of eternal immutable truth. Here, if the Clergyman of the parish enters, for the purpose of more particular instruction or inquiry, what a welcome he is sure to find! He is in the company of those who are looking up with him to a Higher Power; he is himself received as the delegate of that Power. Good-will and respect are shown him; his tone of conversation with the children is natural and cheerful; he can speak with them in the familiar, the almost colloquial strain, in which he would address his own family circle. He is not complained of, he is not deserted and despised, because he ventures to touch upon the Atonement! The school reminds us of those seats and porches within the precincts of the Jewish Temple of old, where the Rabbies would meet at the appointed hour for the instruction of youth, and to one of which,

it is recorded, the Saviour of the world repaired, "both hearing them and asking them questions." And yet, as you entered the school, there was no air of affected sanctity—no assumption of an appearance different from what you would observe in any other school. You would probably find them at their slates and their cyphering, their writing, or their musical exercise,—at the same occupation, in short, that you might have found going on, had you entered at the same hour the District School. Yet, on further inquiry, there would be found to be the stated Prayer—the stated Catechism—the stated Creed—"precept upon precept, line upon line, here a little, and there a little;"—and thus a prevailing spirit of religion grows up and is fostered—there is insensibly inculcated a definite faith. Even in human affairs, how strong and how valuable this principle is! In its higher and spiritual application how unspeakably more so! And all this separate from the question of conduct. But if there has been imparted a sound knowledge, and, more than this, a practical sense of what the duty to God and to man is, there is surely a good hope as to what conduct will ensue. At least there has been nothing to thwart or to hinder that salutary feeling of *Reverence* to religion, which will be found, after all, the true beginning of wisdom, the true source of strength to the whole character through life, and the best omen for the fulfilment of the promise, "Train up a child in the

way he should go, and when he is old he will not depart from it ⁴.”

We may now form some idea of the comparative value of the two systems. If man be regarded in his mere worldly capacity as a creature of time, the course is clear. You have only to give him that sort of instruction which will fit him to push his way in this world. Treat him as you would treat some commodity for the market; or as though you would prepare him for the exhibition of 1851, among the productions of the animal, mineral, or vegetable world, or as an article of manufacture. Get him up in the best style! Put the highest polish upon him! Make him astute, cunning, keen, ambitious, industrious; but by no means burden him with too sensitive a conscience, or too nice a sense of honour and morality:—the more secular the education the better. But, view him in his true and higher capacity as the image of God, as destined for immortality, and how vastly altered is the case! A consciousness of his origin and of his destiny becomes now of chief importance to him. To keep him in ignorance of these, is to rob him of his birthright. We dare not so much as dissociate in his mind the ideas of religion and of education. And to which kind of education these considerations direct our preference, I need not stay

⁴ I may be permitted this reference to the Speech, since published, of the *Rev. William Sewell*, delivered at the Public Meeting at Willis's Rooms, Feb. 7.

to insist. Nothing can compensate for the want of an *early* appeal to those higher principles and motives, which religion only can supply, and which, unless you will plead, "*Am I my brother's keeper?*" it is the duty of governments more especially to enforce upon a people.

But we are met with the objection, that while we thus insist on the religious element in the education of the working and industrial classes, our practice herein is opposed to our theory; that, in fact, we prescribe *one* thing for the children of the *poorer*, and practise *another* with the children of the *wealthier* classes. This objection has not unfavourably been represented in an article before referred to, from a leading public journal: "Many reasons," the writer puts it, "are urged for secular knowledge, over and above that which is merely professional, in the case of a young gentleman; let cause be shown why they do not apply in some little degree to a young ploughman. The Eton schoolboy does not spend all his time in reading the Bible, and committing hymns and collects to memory, with an occasional lecture on the geography of the Holy Land, and the manners and customs of the Jews. On the contrary: these things occupy a very small fraction of his time; and it would be thought a most injudicious and fanatical innovation to extend much the fraction of time so appropriated. Then why adopt so different a rule in the case of the poor⁵?"

⁵ See *Times*, Feb. 27.

Now granting the fact here assumed, I take leave to deny the conclusion built upon it. Let the fact be as the objection supposes, as regards the difference in the education of the two classes ; yet, I contend, the inconsistency is not proved. On a closer examination it will be found to admit of a fair and easy explanation. For proof, I would refer to the observations before made on this subject, where it appeared, that some difference in the kind and mode of the instruction at school allowably, if not necessarily, follows from the difference of condition and circumstances at home. The want of fit time and opportunity on the part of the working classes to instruct their children in the degree they themselves would wish,—the effect of hard labour in incapacitating them for such an exertion—the consequent necessity of their leaving this duty very much to others to perform in their stead—the impossibility too of imparting to their children at all the same amount of knowledge as ours receive, whose term of school-time is prolonged so much beyond theirs—all these considerations must necessarily affect the choice of subjects to which it shall be most expedient to confine their attention. Surely, in this case, if ever, religion should hold the foremost place ; for unless it be taught them now, it is but too likely they will never learn it at all ; and it is no “inconsistency” to plead for this, as we suppose that the same principles of religion, the same habits of devotion, are imparted to the one at

home, as are enjoined upon the other at school. In the parents of the rich it may surely be presumed, that with some due sense of their Christian vows and obligations, they will have attended to the religious training of their children.

We may meet the objection upon another ground, and say, that the peculiar studies which are described, and justly described, as constituting the chief employment of our schools, are rather selected for the discipline they give to the mind and character than for the mere knowledge itself; they form a useful and necessary test of application, and perhaps no better one could, under the circumstances, be found. With the children of the poor, their course of learning at school is not so strictly speaking their chief discipline in life. Their term of school is shorter,—they are draughted off much earlier in life to their several trades and occupations; and their preparation and apprenticeship for these, forms at least an equal part of their early discipline. We want a test of progress and of general application to their work; with our own children, and at school, the test is their Latin and Greek; with the children of the working classes, it is their work.

For the sake of argument I have admitted the fact which the objection supposes. But the fact itself admits of considerable dispute; for the growing attention to the religious element in the education of our great public schools is even a remarkable feature of the times. The tendency has long been in favour

of a greater attention to this point; nor has it been thought “fanatical” to “extend” very considerably “the fraction of time appropriated” specially “to religious instruction.”

And now I think I have disposed of this last objection, and we may return to the proposition with which we set out,—That the great want of the age for the children of the poor is an EDUCATION that shall be CHIEFLY of a RELIGIOUS, NOT of a SECULAR character.

And it follows from this, that it is the duty of a Government to assist in providing for the people such an education. As the amount of ignorance, and destitution of all means of instruction, has so far outstripped the powers of individual exertion, or of private charity, to overtake it; it is agreed on all hands that the duty of undertaking the task devolves, with all the weight of a tremendous responsibility, on those who have the chief seats of authority in the land. It is a duty they cannot put aside; it is bound up with the offices they fill; they owe it alike to the Sovereign and to the country—to the public good and to their own private peace—faithfully to discharge it. And the only remaining question is, by what means they can most efficiently do this. It has been the design of the present letter to show, that there is wanted something of a far higher character than the scheme lately propounded in Parliament by Mr. Fox. And, this being rejected, there remain but two other courses: either to place the

amount that may be required in the way of a Parliamentary Grant for the purpose of education, wholly at the disposition of the Church; *or*, to return to the Act of 1839, by which such a grant was made available to existing religious bodies *in aid* of private efforts, and without attempting to dictate any other terms than that of submitting, at stated seasons, to the visits of the Government Inspectors.

I need not be long on the former of these. It may safely be affirmed, after the repeated public declarations to that effect, that the Church has no wish to monopolize the public money, or to be appointed the sole depository of a Parliamentary grant for the purposes of education. She wishes even justice to all denominations, and only desires her own liberty. All contribute something to the revenues of the State, all are entitled to a proportionate benefit in the distribution of the revenue. The Church would be satisfied to receive her own share of the grant, and leave to the other religious bodies the enjoyment of theirs; to return, in short, to the stipulation, which received the sanction of Parliament in 1839. In confirmation of this, I may once more refer to the words of the Chairman⁵ at the late public meeting. "The Church looked for no especial favour; all that she asked, was to be left to instruct those committed to her charge in her own way. This was her right, her privilege, her duty."

⁵ The Hon. J. C. Talbot, Q.C.

On the other plan, then, which is all that remains to us, viz., a return to the Minutes of 1839, by which the Privy Council were to act *in aid*, but *not to the superseding*, of existing institutions for the instruction of youth, I have only to add, that as far as I am aware, there has been no objection made on the part of the Church to the Government plan of Inspection. On the contrary, the notion has been adopted in the Church itself, and the proposition successfully made to create a second order of Diocesan Inspectors to complete the scheme⁶. Return to the Minutes, and the Church is satisfied. Violate the engagement, and who is to blame, if discontent and angry feeling ensue? But as the attention of the whole Church seems now so powerfully directed to this point, I may well leave the discussion of it to abler hands, or defer it to another opportunity, and remain,

Right Hon. and Dear Sir,

With every sentiment of esteem,

Very faithfully yours,

WILLIAM H. HOARE.

⁶ See "Hints on the Duty of Diocesan Inspection, &c. &c., with Letters from several eminent Prelates, by the Rev. Sir H. Thompson, Bart., Vicar of Frant." *Second Edition*.

THE END.

A

SECOND LETTER,

&c.

RIGHT HON. AND DEAR SIR,

IN a former letter I took a general view of Mr. Fox's Bill. The particular provisions of it would require to be the subject of distinct examination. For the present, however, I beg to call your attention to the first and, as we may call it, preliminary proposition, of ascertaining the 'deficiencies' in any existing schools, and of dealing with them accordingly, either in the way of increasing their efficiency under the head of secular knowledge, or of cashiering them altogether, and causing them to be superseded by the new District Schools upon his own model.

So far the proposition of the member for Oldham seems plausible enough. But we now come to the suspicious part of it. For what does he reckon among the 'deficiencies' alleged? "Either," he says, "too great costliness in some instances, or some exclusive religious peculiarity being forced on the

children in others." And then for his new schools, there is, first, to be the right of admission free from charge, (here observe the *sop*!) and, next, the condition that "*no religious peculiarities* be inculcated upon them:"—and here mark the poison lying, as it were, at the root of his system, and threatening, if it be allowed to spread, to corrupt and canker, as I conceive, the very vitals of religion, and to contaminate the rising generation with false and pernicious notions. It is against this, that I desire to direct my chief arguments in the present Letter; and I feel I should be backed by the general feeling in our own Church, and by the great majority of all thinking persons of whatever community, in entering my protest. May it, in union with the convictions and earnest feelings of such, prove a timely and acceptable voice of warning, however feeble the individual who raises it!

It is not, Sir, for any existing schools, where real deficiencies or real abuses should be found, that I appear as the advocate. I have no wish to defend those abuses, or advocate those deficiencies. But when an objection is brought, which appears to me to affect the vitals, and to undermine the very foundations of the faith, I feel it is high time to remonstrate, and to shew proof that the objection is insidious and fraught with evil;—that the error is with the objector, and not with his opponents;—that the blow, which he levels at us, may justly recoil upon his own head.

But before we proceed, it will be as well to call another witness from the speech of Mr. Fox, which will serve to place his argument in a still clearer light. The following is an observation on which he relies, taken, as he tells us, from "the testimony of an intelligent American gentleman, well known for his exertions in Boston, and who not long ago made an educational tour through Europe." His testimony is, "that in those schools where religious creeds and forms of faith and modes of worship were directly taught, he found the common doctrines and injunctions of morality, and the meaning of the preceptive parts of the Gospel, to be much less taught and much less understood by the pupils, than in the same grade of schools, and by the same classes of pupils, with us." We see now what are the liberal (as some will consider them, but, as I think they ought to be termed, exclusive) ideas of Mr. Fox on the subject of Education:—and in favour of these he would supersede the methods already established, and hitherto recognized by the State. I shall endeavour to shew, that this new system of his involves, in particular, two great fundamental mistakes; as it assumes it to be possible, *First*, to teach Morality without Religion, and *Secondly*, to teach Religion without forms. By *forms* I understand all that comes under the denomination of creeds, catechisms, and confessions of faith, stated times, places, and modes of worship;—in short, all those rites and ordinances, which have

grown into use in the Church; and which, however variable in different countries, have been established in general by Church usage and precedent. And now to return to the two assumptions just mentioned; either of which I believe to be an extreme absurdity:—

I. As to the First, viz.:—That *morality* may be taught without *religion*.

For surely it is not mis-stating the intention of Mr. Fox's measure, to say that it contemplates the feasibility and expediency of this. What is it else, when he proposes to limit the religious instruction of the children at school to the 'moral precepts and injunctions' of the Bible, with some little smattering, it may be presumed, of sacred history; while the doctrinal parts he would leave to the parents or friends at home? Such a separation, however, appears to me a grievous and fatal error. It is an innovation in the science of education, not to be justified by reason or experience, much less on any principles of religion. At least it resembles the childish fancy of plucking off a flower, and setting it in the ground to grow without a root! We grant there are certain fundamental principles of morality, common to all religious persuasions, and which indeed form the basis of them:—they answer to the moral sense and conscience of men, the *nata non scripta lex* to which even heathen philosophers could appeal. But take even natural religion, and who ever thought of confining the science of it to the

mere study of moral duties? and not rather extending it to the knowledge of the being (at least) and attributes of God? That great man Dr. Watts, who certainly knew something of what children require to learn, in defining the province of natural religion, says, "Natural religion consists of two parts, viz. :— 1. The speculative or contemplative, which is the knowledge of God in his various perfections and in his relations to his rational creatures, so far as may be known by the light of nature. It includes also, 2. That which is practical or active, *i. e.* the knowledge of the several duties which arise from our relation to God, and our relation to our fellow-creatures, and our proper conduct and government of ourselves¹." Thus he makes the moral duties quite a secondary branch of the science; and if this is the case in natural, how much more in revealed religion! For it is in the knowledge of God, and of his attributes more especially, that revelation has extended the boundaries of religious knowledge. And if the practical duties of life be a part of the *nata non scripta lex*, this knowledge of God is a part of it too. And it is an insult to our nature to keep us in ignorance of this, or to throw it into the background among the subjects of our teaching. There is even in the child that consciousness of an Higher Power, that can never be satisfied by mere lectures on morality. Among his other duties, social and

¹ *Improvement of the mind.*—Dr. Isaac Watts.

relative, he feels there is a higher duty—the duty to God. Hide this from the child;—neglect to cultivate his sense of it;—and his very nature rebels and resents the fraud :

“ The spark of his first deathless fire
 Yet buoys him up, and high above
 The holiest creature, dares aspire
 To the Creator’s love².”

He bears about with him the sense of his origin, the *divinæ particulam auræ*, of which even the heathen poet speaks: and if reason shews us the strict connexion between religion and morality,—a connexion not to be violated without inflicting a shock on our very natural constitution,—what is to come of the attempt to separate them, when “weighed in the balance of the sanctuary?”

It is not that Christianity has not a morality—or that it could not teach it, without mixing up its own peculiar doctrines—but it *will* not. It has received a commission, which is not to teach morality alone, but *to preach the Gospel*: and the Gospel, it knows well, is more, far more, than a string of moral precepts, or a revelation of rules for the mere conduct of life. Nothing can come up to its requirements, short of the exact fulfilment, by all appointed methods, of the Saviour’s command, “Go ye and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost: teaching

² *Christian Year*, 13th Sunday after Trinity.

them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you ³.”

If, after all, Mr. Fox should say, that he never meant to exclude religion, but only the doctrinal parts of it, from the school instruction, I can only say I wish him joy of his attempt to procure religious conduct and habits in this kind of way. But it is worth considering, whether the plan of thus taking religion to pieces be a thing so very innocent in itself; and whether religion can be spoken of as taught in any real sense at all, unless it be taught in all its fulness, and by continual appeals to the heart and motives, as well as to the understanding and outward conduct.

“ Non hæc humanis opibus, non arte magistrâ

Proveniunt * * * * *

Major agit Deus, atque opera ad majora remittit.”

But in any case, and whether more or less religious knowledge or information be intended to be taught in the new system, let no one think it has any claims to superiority over ours in the one point of morality. To say the least, this is equally insisted on in both, only with this difference:—Mr. Fox would enjoin morality and exclude the creed; we would include the creed, and not leave out the morality. It may be as well once for all to refute the idea, that there is in the Church system of teaching any negligence

³ Matt. xxviii. 19, 20.

of the rules of morality. On the contrary, we desire to embrace the whole compass of religion, natural and revealed, and of course, therefore, morality, as an essential part of both. Revelation aside, we should not be for excluding morality, as it may be convenient to our opponents to insinuate, with a view to discredit our system and advance their own. Thus writes a learned divine, in relation to this subject, "From the time of Hooker to our own, the great divines, by whose labours our literature has been so wonderfully enriched, never seem to have thought it possible, that Natural and Revealed Religion if properly understood," (understood, therefore, as embracing morality,) "could be in a state of hostility with each other. On the contrary, they believed that they were contributing to the advancement of divine truth, when they considered Natural and Revealed Religion as appointed by the Almighty to 'work together for good' to the human race. In such sentiments moreover they were sustained by the most illustrious philosophers that ever appeared to develope the laws by which natural things are governed, Bacon and Boyle and Newton." "Nevertheless," he adds, "when the utmost has been made of natural religion, it can give us no information on subjects on which Revelation is most copious:—the various dispensations of God towards man; our redemption from the effects of transgression; and, in the language of the Creed, 'the for-

givenness of sins, the resurrection of the body, and the life everlasting⁴.”

“The peculiarity of the Christian rules,” says Mr. Morier, “does not consist so much in the precepts which they give for the conduct of mankind, as in the motives and sanctions, and the *power* which they impart to act up to those precepts. . . . The Christian principle alone excites and assists the utmost emulation and zeal to promote all that truly constitutes the greatness of man and the welfare of society, at the same time that it commands to high and low, to rich and poor, to kings and people, the most scrupulous respect for the limits and frontiers of each other’s rights and privileges; teaching all that there is no real liberty but for those whom the truth hath set free, and no absolute equality among men, but as of sinners equally condemned by the justice, and saved by the mercy, of their common God and Redeemer⁵.”

Let me in the last place adduce the very striking remark of the late Mr. Rose; “All the wit of man has discovered nothing defective in the system of Christian morals, and has not been able to add one jot, or one tittle to that morality. I do not mean that no fresh systems have been devised—but I

⁴ *Natural Theology*, &c. By Thomas Turton, D.D., now Lord Bishop of Ely.

⁵ *What has Religion to do with Politics?* By David R. Morier, Esq., late Her Majesty’s Minister Plenipotentiary in Switzerland. J. W. Parker, West Strand.

mean that in all these systems not a single improvement has been suggested; and the only method of giving them a new appearance has been, by carrying the principles of the Gospel to a pitch to which the Gospel never commands them to be carried, because He who taught it knew what was in man, knew what could and what could not be required of him ⁶.”

II. Let us now pass on to the second feature in the scheme of Mr. Fox, viz. the notion of teaching *Religion without* the admission of particular *forms*.

I am not unaware that some degree of prejudice has existed in other quarters, besides (as it appears) with Mr. Fox, against the creeds and other formularies of the Church, upon account of the apparent dogmatism in the mode of expression, or for some other reason akin to this. It will not be irrelevant to the question, if we begin by noticing how far this prejudice is founded on a fair and reasonable construction of the Church's sense and language in these expressions of her faith. It is not to be expected, that, without a particular study of the occasion and history of each clause, it should be at all possible to form an accurate judgment as to the terms and expressions made use of. Nor, perhaps, is this a necessary or very edifying piece of knowledge for the majority of Christian people. All that is required to the lay communion of our Church, as far as I understand it,

⁶ *The Gospel an abiding System.* By Hugh James Rose, B.D., and Christian Advocate in the University of Cambridge.

is a cordial assent to the two creeds which occur the one in our Baptismal, and the other in our Communion Services. Whether this be so or not, the prejudice we are considering has, I think, very much arisen from the technical phraseology by which these formularies are marked. Yet some technical phraseology is common and even necessary in other subjects,—in most of the arts and sciences, for instance,—and when it occurs in these, the propriety of it is not disputed:—why, then, in matters of faith should it not be allowed? why in these alone is it the subject of complaint and offence? We admit, that to dogmatize on any deep subject, still more on those which are confessedly mysterious, and beyond our finite understandings to grasp and comprehend, is of all dogmatism the most odious and repulsive. For what is *a mystery*? Several Christian Fathers have defined it, ‘*not a thing absolutely unknown but incomprehensible*’.⁷ And what is to dogmatize? According to Dr. Johnson, ‘to assert positively; to advance without distrust; to teach magisterially:’ and ‘dogmatical,’ or ‘dogmatick,’ (so in Johnson,) ‘authoritative; magisterial; positive;’ so that the word is of somewhat ambiguous meaning, and may therefore convey to some ears an impression not so favourable as to others, as though it would express a

⁷ See Suicer, from *Isidor. Pelus.* Epist. 192, in voce *Μυστήριον*. Also *Victor of Antioch*, quoted by Maitland, *Apostolic School of Prophetic Interpretation*, p. 95.

power in man to reduce to the level of his own cognizance the deep things of God, and to pronounce 'magisterially' upon them. But let only a fair construction be given to the modes of expression in our creeds, and, I think, the Church will come out free from blame, and will be acknowledged to have recorded the great truths committed to her keeping in the plainest and simplest manner, and one most befitting the solemnity of the subject. For the heated and intemperate language of individuals belonging to her communion, it is enough to say that the Church is not responsible. There is no question but that mysteries there are; and no difficulty that may attend the asserting or expressing of them, can excuse the Church from her duty in maintaining and enforcing them the best way she can. Nor can it be denied that, with all the chief mysteries entrusted to her teaching, there is, if we attend to it, a strong affinity in the human breast. There is a yearning for something beyond ourselves, beyond the reach of our senses and of our own unassisted reason, something in which, nevertheless, we feel conscious of our being greatly interested, and having a near relation to it. Centred in himself no one is happy; nor can he find a resting-place till he centres upon God. And this, revelation tells him, he can only do through that Mediator, who is the common link between God and man. Here is the foundation of the Christian mystery. And in the development of this mystery much of a peculiar phraseology (and

especially in opposition to notorious heresies as they arose) has come to be adopted in the Church, which doubtless, to the unaccustomed ear, sounds harsh and unpalatable. But surely the same discretion should be allowed to the Church herein, as in a matter of human science we should allow to its disciples. At the same time it must be admitted to be a decided abuse of this privilege, when persons take occasion to speak in any thing like a dictatorial or dogmatical spirit. They should consider that many phrases convey a different idea, as they are used in a scholastic and theological, or in an ordinary and colloquial sense. And therefore it becomes us to 'avoid,' in these things, 'the appearance of evil,' or at least to be prepared for some little misunderstanding arising, or even some offence being taken, when, without sufficient care to explain our meaning, we depart from the ordinary, and adopt the scholastic acceptance of a term.

To proceed now with the real question at issue, and which concerns the teaching of *religion without forms*. Allowing for the difficulty of pleasing all fancies, and of avoiding even real grounds of offence, in the composition of any forms; yet this proposal to dispense with the use of them altogether is one which I think it is our duty to oppose to the utmost, because it is itself opposed to the first principles of the nature which God has given us. We cannot form any ideas of Heaven itself, without some reference to human forms and modes of worship. Nay,

in the representations given us of the future state, Scripture itself is fain to speak in language borrowed from earthly usages in the service of God. This shews how interwoven such ideas are with the very constitution of our nature. We may go further, and say, that the forms of religion, and the essence of it, are intimately connected together by the revealed word and positive declarations of God. *He* has joined these things together; let not man put them asunder. Then, as to the Creed, it is an obvious fact, that Christianity was first taught in some short form delivered to the Catechumens. This was “the form of sound words⁸ :” or, as it is elsewhere called, “that form of doctrine which” at their baptism “was delivered to them⁹.” And thus from the beginning God set his own seal upon the Creeds. Or, take them only as of human composition; yet, as the work of duly qualified persons, acting on the best sources of information, and with consummate care and reverence, and received in all the Churches, they are of authority next only to divine. For God was the Author of that wisdom by which the framers were led; and, as a great divine tells us, “The author of that which causeth another thing to be, is the author of that also which thereby is caused¹.” And in all such matters it is surely wiser to conform to the will of God than to devise methods of our own.

⁸ 2 Tim. i. 13.

⁹ Rom. vi. 17.

¹ Hooker, *Eccles. Polity*, lib. v.

But as we shall return to this subject presently, let me here take a wider ground, and ask, What is the whole idea of Christianity itself? What but the supply of a method whereby we may serve God in the most acceptable way? This method it gives us by revealing to us a Mediator, the Son of God, who for this purpose assumed our nature, and “took upon Him the *form* of a servant².” And was not His whole life upon earth a continual condescension to the wants and weaknesses of our nature, viewed in this very light of requiring all the aids of language and other external things, answering to the outward senses which God has given us? In His constant appeal to surrounding objects, erecting them (as it were) into so many signs and witnesses of Himself; in His action of cleansing the Temple, showing that He came not to destroy, but to reform and purify; in His devout kneeling while engaged in prayer; in His gracious acceptance from the wise men of the gifts they brought Him—the gold, the frankincense, and the myrrh—and from the devout Mary of her spikenard-offering; in His special surnaming of some more highly-favoured Apostles; in His institution of the Sacraments, and of a form of prayer:—in these, and a thousand other ways, He evinced the disposition for which I am contending. He condemned, indeed, the abuse of ceremonies, as well as their superfluous multiplication; but He so far re-

² Phil. ii. 7.

cognized and adopted them, as to afford one most convincing proof, that as the Creator He perfectly “knew what was in man;” as the Messiah, He perfectly taught what was of God; and, as the Redeemer, He brought both into harmony with each other. “He came,” it has been eloquently said, “to do nothing of singularity, but to ‘fulfil all righteousness;’ teaching us to submit ourselves to all those rites which He would institute; . . . and that a life common and ordinary, without affectation or singularity, is the most prudent and safe. . . . An even life, spent with as much rigour of duty to God as ought to be, yet in the same manner of devotions, in the susception of ordinary offices, in bearing public burdens, frequenting public assemblies, performing offices of civility, receiving all the rites of an established religion, complying with national customs and hereditary solemnities of a people, in nothing disquieting public peace, or disrelishing the great instruments of an innocent communion, or dissolving the circumstantial ligaments of charity, or breaking laws and the great relations and necessitudes of the world, out of fancy or singularity, is the best way to live holily, and safely, and happily; safer from sin and envy, and more removed from trouble and temptation ³.”

If it were not occupying your time, I might enlarge on other particular instances of the general

³ Jeremy Taylor’s *Life of Christ*, Part I. § 9.

truth. Stated forms of prayer must not be omitted, of which, says a profound scholar and able judge of the matter, "Well and wisely did the nursing-fathers of the Church of England do, who still cleaved to these most venerable elements of congregational worship; for they were the fruit of an age when the Spirit of God was abundantly poured forth upon the Church; and of an age, too, when bitter persecution taught men to cry aloud to their Saviour with the fervour of those who were girding themselves up to die. We are not precisely the critics for the glowing devotions of such stirring times; for surely there is nothing in this our generation, wherein the love of many hath waxed so cold, to fit it for recasting our Liturgy, or for improving upon the words of the Martyr, perhaps of the Apostle⁴." Stated times and seasons, commemorative and festive days, the religion of holy places, and the like, might all be mentioned here; they all come under the denomination of established forms, and are all essential helps to religious instruction. And though the great end of the Gospel is undoubtedly to wean our affections from earthly things, and to fix them on something higher and more enduring; yet even earthly things and earthly feelings may be made subservient to this end: as a living poet has said:—

⁴ *Sketch of the Church of the First Two Centuries.* By J. J. Blunt, D.D., Margaret Professor of Divinity, Cambridge, 1836.

“ Yet e'en the lifeless stone is dear
 For thoughts of Him who once lay here ;
 And the base earth, now Christ has died,
 Ennobled is and glorified ⁵.”

Say that such forms are no more than as the prop to the flower, the husk to the precious seed, or the casket to the jewel : but can we call this of no value ? How often would the flower perish, the seed and the jewel be lost, for want of these otherwise insignificant supports ? Vain is the attempt, in the pride of reason, to struggle against the first dictates of our nature, and, sanctified as they are by the word of God, and by the consent of the wise and good in all ages, to set ourselves up above the admitted requirements of humanity. Hereafter we shall be able to dispense with these things—*nabis sine cortice*—the scaffolding will be taken down, when the building is complete. But at present we are infinitely indebted to the aid of those forms which the wisdom of the Church has appointed. They prove, in fact, the best helps of the memory, the safest regulators of the imagination, the most effectual entertainments of the attention, the liveliest incentives to devotion. To take but one instance, that of the Christian Sabbath. The consecration of this day to the public services of religion surely does more to impress the great truths, which it commemorates, on the mind,—

⁵ *Christian Year*, Easter Day.

it does more to convey a practical sense of their importance—than any mere effort of private meditation could do. Or look at the consequence of discarding, not, happily, the observance of the Christian Sabbath, but other externals of religion, in the case of the Quakers. Admirable as in many respects the intentions and principles of their first founder may have been, yet how has his system languished and declined, in point of true spirituality, for want of a body? for want of those very externals which it was the founder's error to have deserted? A writer, not likely to be accused of blind partiality to any system, most truly observes, "They have no fixed forms of prayer, but they have a fixed form of dress; they have rejected Sacraments, but they retain a particular kind of language. They profess to be guided by the spontaneous movement of the Spirit; and yet none are more strict and careful about a regular education and discipline⁶." To such strange inconsistencies do they expose themselves, who desert the guidance of the Church and of her established formularies.

But to return now more especially to the Creeds. For I am well aware, that here lies the main objection of our opponent; for it is in these we find specially embodied those '*peculiarities of religion,*' which are so offensive and obnoxious to him. When I say

⁶ See *Kingdom of Christ*. By Professor Maurice, vol. i. p. 73, &c.

the Creeds, I mean of course to include the Catechism, and every other sort of confession. The Catechism is indeed the fullest and most comprehensive form of any; and, in one sense, the most important to the present question, as being more especially intended for the instruction of youth. In speaking, then, of Creeds, I beg to premise that what is said of them, applies equally to the Catechism or any similar form of confession.

It has been stated then, already, that these venerable forms have received the sanction both of Scripture precedent and of Church authority; that they appear to bear the stamp both of reason and revelation. Their nice subtlety of distinction, or their seeming harshness of expression, may offend some; their appearance of treating mysteries with too great precision may be displeasing to others; but I hinted, that such was never the intention of them. The spirit of dogmatism was assuredly not the spirit they were intended to breathe. They were designed rather to preserve the mean between too great laxity and irreverence of expression on the one hand, and too nice a curiosity on the other—and, as “heresies must needs arise,” to be a barrier against definite forms of error, and a plain record and assertion of primitive truth. To this general view of the Creeds I have only now, by way of confirmation, to add the authority of one or two eminent writers on this head. My first shall be that of Dr. Mill, who says,

“It is a mistake of the nature of Creeds, to suppose, that their definitions pretend to grasp the whole matter revealed, and to bring unfathomable depths within the cognizance of the understanding; they profess only to methodize, and bring into a compendious shape, easily remembered and repeated, the great outlines of the faith once delivered to the saints; a shape of which some brief statements in the Apostolic Epistles afford a distinct example⁷. And as for the more express dogmatic definitions which these confessions supply, those, for instance, which we have in the Nicene and Athanasian Creeds, they are, for the most part, restricted to the denial of some heretical proposition on the subject, by which it had been proposed to explain, and so evacuate, the revealed mystery. . . . What might be, or whence might proceed, the comparative felicity of times when the truths of religion lay more in the germ than at present—less developed by the enquiries of some, the strife and opposition of others, into fixed and determinate propositions,—are questions equally impossible for us exactly to determine, and infructuous for direction under our altered circumstances, if they could be determined: either way, ‘we do not enquire wisely concerning this⁸.’ Whatever might be the happiness—doubtless in itself

⁷ *e. g.* 1 Cor. xv. 1—4. 1 Tim. iii. 16. 2 Tim. ii. 8 (coll. Rom. vi. 17).

⁸ Eccles. vii. 10.

a great one—of being able to dwell on the exalted mysteries of the Gospel without the deadening feeling suggested by a consciousness of opposed opinions and controversies respecting them; however great might be its advantage, in the less constrained and technical cast of language, the freedom from the necessity of even appearing, as in these sad times, to be setting one truth of religion as it were in opposition to another; that happiness and advantage can never be ours, whose circumstances are different, and on whom, though less tried than our earliest predecessors in other respects, a trial has come to which they were strangers; who are cognizant of the old heresies against which the ancient confessions were safeguards, and before whom heresies are ever appearing and reappearing, which they contradict as effectually still. [But] the idea of halting between two opinions would have been as repugnant to the whole character of their mind, as, it is our firm belief, their recognition of the heretical sense would be; however their words, before the notion was explicitly advanced, might be sometimes such as would admit both senses. The substantial identity of doctrine in its undeveloped and its maturer form, is sufficiently apparent to leave no doubt in the mind of the attentive and pious observer, where lay the inheritance of divine truth, and the realization of Christ's never-failing promise to abide with His Church and household for ever. The choice ever lay, and lies still, between the faith in which

saints and martyrs have lived and died, and the ephemeral products of human presumption, which, however flourishing for a while, have no root of true faith and holiness to sustain them, and either disappear altogether from the face of the earth, or are, to all purposes of vital Christianity, fading and evanescent⁹.”

“Let it be admitted,” says Professor Maurice, speaking especially of the Apostles’ Creed, “that there is an obscurity over its origin; that we cannot say who put it into that shape in which we now see it. From whatever quarter it may have come, here it is. It is precisely what it was, to say the very least, sixteen hundred years ago. During that time it has not been lying hid in the closet of some antiquarian. It has been repeated by the peasants and children of the different lands into which it has come. It has been given to them as a record of facts, with which they had as much to do as any noble. In most parts of Europe it has been repeated publicly every day in the year, and though it has been thus hawked about, and, as men would say, vulgarized, the most earnest and thoughtful minds in different countries, different periods, different stages of civilization, have felt that it connected itself with the most permanent part of their being, that it had to do with each of them personally, and that it was

⁹ *Sermons before the University of Cambridge.* By W. H. Mill, D.D., Christian Advocate, &c., 1844.

the symbol of that humanity which each shared with their brethren. Reformers who have been engaged in conflict with all the prevailing systems of their age, have gone back to this old form of words, and have said that they lived to reassert the truths which it embodied. Men on sick beds, martyrs at the stake, have said, that because they held it fast, they could look death in the face. And, to sink much lower, yet to say what may strike many as far more wonderful, there are many in this day, who, having asked the different philosophers of their own and of past times, what they could do in helping them to understand the world, to fight against its evils, to love their fellow-men, are ready to declare that in this child's Creed they have found the secret which these philosophers could not give them, and which, by God's grace, they shall not take away from them¹."

"The constant tradition of the Church," says Archdeacon Manning, "attests the fact, that *some form or summary* of doctrine was professed at baptism by every candidate from the very beginning of the Gospel. The only question, then, is, do the baptismal Creeds of the later Church represent the baptismal summary used by the Apostles? Are they lineally descended, and therefore the genuine offspring of their original oral preaching? Such has

¹ *The Kingdom of Christ*. By F. D. Maurice, M.A., Professor of English Literature and History in King's College. London: Rivingtons, 1842, vol. ii. pp. 5, 6.

ever been the universal tradition of the Church. With the lineal descent of holy baptism has come down to us, also, the baptismal profession or Creed; in substance the same as at the beginning; in language, from time to time retouched, so as to condemn the false glosses of heresy, as they successively endeavoured to impose themselves upon the rule of faith²."

And lastly, says Hooker, "These catholic declarations of our belief, delivered by them which were so much nearer than we are unto the first publication thereof, and continuing needful for all men at all times to know, these confessions, as testimonies of our continuance in the same faith to this present day, we rather use than any other gloss or paraphrase devised by ourselves, which though it were to the same effect, could not be of the like authority and credit³."

According to all these views, then, there is a certain special authority attaching to the Creeds: and this gives them their peculiar weight and importance. It is perhaps a little overlooked by the abettors of the new system of schools, that the great thing needed in the teacher is *authority*. It is the authority, which the child feels to be inherent in the parent, that makes it look up to him with

² Manning's *Rule of Faith*, Appendix, p. 65.

³ *Eccles. Polity*, book v. Rose's *Advantages of a Confession of Faith*, should also be studied:—See *Commission and Duties of the Clergy*, by Hugh James Rose, B.D., Christian Advocate.

respect, and eagerly receive instruction at his lips. And if it is felt that the parent deposes that authority in any measure to another, as to the master of any school which he selects for the child, respect is in this way secured for the master also. But what parent in his senses, and having a just sense of his own dignity—especially if he were himself in those circumstances which prevented his attending personally to the religious instruction of his family—would entrust his child to a man, who, he was told, was authorized to teach algebra or astronomy, but forbidden on any account to mention the peculiar doctrines of the Bible! forbidden, as he valued his office, to breathe a syllable of any controverted (though vital) truth, such as the Incarnation or the Atonement!

I would add, that of all written forms, the Bible, though I mention it last, is the best, and invested with a high and peculiar authority of its own, that of immediate inspiration from above. From it, we may add, all the other forms are gathered which have been received in the Church; from hence we have the Lord's Prayer, and the germ, at least, of our Apostolic and Catholic Creeds. It is a book which cannot be begun too early, nor studied too late in life. Approached, as Moses was instructed to approach the burning bush, with due reverence, and not in a spirit of idle curiosity, there is none more fit to be put into the hands of old or young, learned or unlearned. In a former Letter I ventured

to represent the necessity, as we value the welfare of the rising generation, of keeping the Bible continually before their eyes, as the chief guide of their life. But what must the effect be, when this unspeakably precious gift of God is degraded into a mere text-book of sacred history, or a book of reference for some useful lessons in morality!

But we must come to yet closer quarters with our opponent. The stake is a great one, and concerns the welfare of our children for time and for eternity. In what light, then, let me ask, does he propose to teach them to regard *themselves*? With what thoughts will he fill their youthful minds? With what information will he meet their earnest enquiries, on the great points of their origin? of their destiny? of their relations to God and to each other? What is the food with which he will satisfy their souls on these great subjects? What account will he offer them of the strange disorders of the world? of all the sickness, and all the pain, and all the sorrow, and all the death? What clue will he give them to the labyrinth? What insight into the ways and purposes of God?

On our side there is the ever-ready answer. We point them to the fall of man, and to his restoration. We shew them their interest in the latter; we do more: we refer them again and again to their own part and lot in it through the appointed rite of their baptism. And now the clouds begin to clear up to their view; light springs from the chaos, and health

from the troubled waters. We have now a fixed point to recal them to. A Father's hand is above them; a Father's house is before them. Without regard to their own deservings, before they had done good or evil, in pure mercy and goodness, God took them into covenant with Himself. Here is their stay and their hope, destined, like the rainbow, to shine out and cheer them amid the fitful gleams of the storms of life. Do they doubt it? And is not the assurance of an Apostle enough for them:—"The promise is unto you and to YOUR CHILDREN⁴?" Then we point them back to the most venerable witness of the ancient Scripture, in support and illustration of this truth: "Ye stand this day all of you before the Lord your God. . . . That He may establish thee to-day for a people unto Himself, and that He may be unto thee a God⁵." Are the children in this privileged number? The context will answer, "Your captains of your tribes, your elders, and your officers, with all the men of Israel; YOUR LITTLE ONES, your wives, and the stranger that is in your camp⁶." Nay, an actual advantage is declared to have been given to those of tender years: "Moreover your *little ones*, which ye said should be a prey, and *your children*, which in that day had no knowledge between good and evil, they shall go in thither, and unto them will I give it, and they shall

⁴ Acts ii. 39.

⁵ Deut. xxix. 10. 13.

⁶ Ib. v. 10, 11.

possess it⁷." Is it objected, that this was spoken under a different dispensation, and to the people of the Jews? But can we think, in a matter of such primary importance, there should be one rule for the Jew, and another for the Christian? Such a thought found no place, (most likely as it was then, if ever, to have occurred, had there been any ground for it in the scheme of the Gospel,) among the early objections to Christianity. And we would give no place to it now. Nay, more than ever will we now rely on the mercy of God, when the message has come down from the very bosom of the Father, "God is love." More fondly than ever will we cling to the assurance, that the Covenant is to our little ones, as well as to ourselves, now that the common Saviour of all has taken them up in His arms and blessed them; now that amid the bright attendants who ever "minister to the heirs of salvation" "*their* angels" also have their appointed place, and "always behold the face of their Father which is in heaven." But rob them of their birth-right, and with what will the philosophers and sage men of the world make amends to them for the loss? How will they fill up the void? Where shall God be placed in *their* system? Is there no light from His countenance beaming through the clouds? Is all closed up in silence, in darkness, and in doubt? See here, then, the true philanthropy of

⁷ Deut. i. 39.

the Church of Christ. See here, her claim to be the nursing-mother of the little ones. In her bosom they were “born to God of water and of the Spirit;” to her was committed the initiatory right; should not hers also be the fostering care? There is no more important office of the Church,—none in which her hands more deserve to be strengthened,—than this of carrying out the efficacy of her baptism.

But it may be said, ‘the time is ill-chosen for exalting this ordinance, when the members of the Church are not agreed about it among themselves.’ To this I reply, the disagreement, I am persuaded, is vastly exaggerated. In exact terms, perhaps, we may not be agreed; and the contentious may take advantage of the difference: but moderate and sober men will agree with me, that on the real matter in question there is a very general consent and concord.

And while I am upon the subject, I beg to offer a few remarks to those, whose minds may be troubled by the somewhat stormy discussions of this important subject, now, unhappily, so common. And I would suggest the enquiry, how far our differences may have arisen from the total absence either of the term *Regeneration*, or *Baptismal Regeneration*, in any authorized Creed? Whether the omission of the word ‘Regeneration’ were purposely designed or not,—or whether there be good reasons for omitting it,—I do not pretend to say. I am simply taking the fact of its omission—and I think the question

fairly arises, whether, this being the case, we have any right to expect in our people an exact uniformity of opinion as to the precise sense of the term, or its application to Christian Baptism. Such a consent might indeed be expected, if the expression had ever been formally adopted in the Creeds, or set forth with authority in any general synod of the Church. But *till then* we can scarcely be surprised, if we find people claiming some little latitude in the way of understanding a matter never yet clearly defined in the Church. It is more of the definition that I wish here to speak, than of the doctrine. We know that no battle is so desperate as that which is fought *sub luce maligná*, in a mist, or in the dark;—friends and foes confounding each other,—all eager for the victory, but each side expending its strength in ill-directed and uncertain attacks. For my own part, when I hear the subject brought forward in ordinary discussions, I am forcibly struck by its usually turning on *a word, which scarcely two persons understand alike*; and the use of which, till it is more clearly explained, appears to me to make the controversy interminable⁸. Nay, I think it probable, that were their writings consulted, or opinions taken, even learned and orthodox divines would exhibit

⁸ In a late important Conference on this matter in London, the members present seem to have perceived this difficulty, and to have seen that their safest ground was in resting on the unequivocal expression of the Nicene Creed, viz., "*One Baptism for the Remission of Sins.*" See Documents at the end, No. I.

some shades of difference,—not, certainly, in allowing the application of the term to Baptism, but in the explanation of the meaning of the term itself. That there is a spiritual grace in Baptism, few will deny, who really believe it to be an ordinance of the Saviour. That, whatever the grace be understood to be, ‘the remission of sins’ is essentially and necessarily bound up with it, will be admitted, too, in proportion as we admit the authority of the Creeds. But when we come to the use of terms, and bring up the word ‘Regeneration,’ as though it carried with it some determinate self-evident sense, though no where distinctly pronounced by the Church, are we dealing quite fairly with our people? Or are we not rather putting them to a trial, from which we ourselves—from which even the greatest theologians—might almost shrink? And this, as I have suggested, for the simple reason that there is nothing definite to guide us in the Creeds? And hence we have one person understanding it one way, and another another; some confounding it with the daily *renewal*⁹ of the heart under the influence of Divine grace; others with that thorough change and *conversion* of heart to God, which David prayed for, ‘¹Create in me a clean heart, O God; and renew a right spirit within

⁹ These false senses of the word the reader may see exposed, and the truer meaning asserted and defended, in the *Manual of Baptism*, by the Rev. C. E. Kennaway, A.M., &c. Second Edition, pp. 65—70.

¹ Ps. li. 10.

me.' And in a popular sense it might not be difficult to justify the extension of the term to these, or such like uses. There are instances, (as may be seen in Dr. Blunt's *Course of Sermons*² before the University of Cambridge,) where even the early Fathers allowed themselves this liberty in the use of the word: though, "undoubtedly," says Dr. Blunt, "*Regeneration* is in their language *coupled with Baptism*, though not universally, yet almost always.

Let the Church, then, meet in Convocation³; and let them there decide, if need be, what the disputed term is intended to signify. Let them meet, and reconcile Bishop Bethell and Dr. Pusey, Mr. Simeon and Archdeacon Hoare⁴; much would then be done towards appeasing and settling the present strife; or at least it would be drawn out of that misty region of ambiguous words and phrases,—ever the favorite haunt of controversy,—and brought fairly into the more genial light of day.

I have now endeavoured to show, in the first place, that morality is inseparable from religion; and in the next, that religion itself is indispensably connected with the use of forms, and other such helps, as are suited to the present condition of

² *Sketch of the Church of the First Two Centuries*, Sermon IV.

³ See Document, No. III.

⁴ Peculiar circumstances scarcely allow me to mention two other distinguished names in this place. Of those which I have mentioned, *none deny* the application of the term *Regeneration* in some sense to Baptism.

humanity; that this connexion is of Divine sanction and appointment; that experience amply confirms the utility of such forms, and shows the bad consequences of discarding them; that the attempt to replace them by new ones, so far from being eminently successful, has only tended to establish the propriety of those, which in former ages, whether by Divine appointment or Catholic consent, have come into use in the Church. These general remarks I have applied to Baptism in particular; and I might go on to answer the arguments by which we are met on the other side. It will be a more pleasant duty, if in this place, and in justice to Mr. Fox, I merely advert to his own view of the Lord's Prayer; for it is a view in which I heartily agree with him, when he calls it "that symbol of devotion so dear to every Christian." Let me only observe, that to admit this is to admit the very principle for which we are contending, viz., the use and necessity of forms. This prayer is itself an instance of them—and a more striking instance than is generally attended to. For it is well known to be grounded on another and more ancient form, in common use among the Jews in the worship of the synagogue. And hence the adaptation of it to Christian worship has the further effect of recommending to our adoption, under proper modifications, any other similar usages of the more ancient dispensation. We may be thankful to Mr. Fox for an illustration so much to our purpose.

By what countervailing argument he may be prepared to meet our general position, it is premature to anticipate. But from his reference, before alluded to in an early part of this Letter, to the report of Mr. Horace Mann, one is led to imagine, that the system which has his confidence, in opposition to ours, is the self-same which that gentleman is known to have advocated, and which called forth the animadversions of the Bishop of London, in the House of Lords, in 1839⁵. But here I leave it for the present, resting our defence on the arguments that have been already adduced. And if there be any force in what has been urged, in favour of creeds and other formularies, as the best and safest vehicles for religious truth in the instruction of youth, and as a proper means for carrying out the spirit and intention of their Baptism;—what are we to think of a proposition being made to the Government of this Christian country to proscribe the introduction of all such means by refusing, wherever they are introduced, all participation in the public grants;—by discouraging in every way all schools, where ‘religious formularies are insisted on,’ and where the great, and I will say dangerous, innovations proposed are not put in force? And as if it was apprehended, that without special forcing and persuading, there would scarcely be found the men to put in practice the innovations—

⁵ See Documents at the end, No. II.

it is further and seriously proposed to the Government, to train and break in to the work a new race of instructors, or (as Mr. Fox, for want of a more appropriate name, is fain to call them) schoolmasters; but he feels they will have pretensions far above the ordinary run of such. "Their functions were in reality such as might well be deemed *sacred*, and they deserved the best honours the State could bestow⁶." As for their other remuneration, he finds it altogether beyond his power adequately to compute! However the Government may be disposed to treat his proposal, the public, I am sure, will think again before they acquiesce in supporting such a system. Objections have indeed been whispered against supporting any privileged class, out of the public purse; but the pretensions of a new class, half-privileged, half-degraded—privileged by reason of the distinguished honour awaiting them, degraded by reason of the conditions with which they are to be saddled, conditions which bind their hands and tie their tongues in the discharge of their most sacred duty—the pretensions of such a class as this will be openly rejected as preposterous and absurd. Great indeed are the advantages we enjoy in the laws and liberties of our land, and in the mild and tolerant principles of our Government. But I fervently hope, that no love of toleration, no

⁶ *Speech of Mr. Fox, Feb. 27.*

over-fondness for the praise of impartiality, no fear of being charged with bigotry or prejudice, no excessive jealousy of the spiritual power, still less any petty feelings of resentment for supposed abuses of it, may in an evil hour induce the rulers of this favoured, (and as I am sure I may call it) this religious land, to lend an ear to insinuations, which, under covert of the forms, may have the effect of overturning the very essentials of religion. Not that I would on any account impute such an intention to the movers of the present scheme; but I think they are inevitably, though it may be unconsciously, playing into the hands of those who only object to the forms because they dislike the reality.

That the State has nothing to do with religion, is a doctrine I cannot concur in. How speak the prayers of our Liturgy, where, praying for the Parliament, we say, "For them, for us, and Thy whole Church?" As a part, then, is related to the whole, so it would seem, according to our prayers, is the State to the Church; and this being the case, how can we say, 'the State has nothing to do with religion?' But we are not to expect logical definitions in a Liturgy! Still observe the spirit of the prayer, even more than its actual expressions. And if a strict definition be required, I will furnish one beyond exception:—"The Church and State are different names of the same thing; and the *same men*, who in *spiritual* respects make the *Church*,

in *temporal* make the *State*⁷." A man's responsibilities as a Christian do not cease, when he becomes a statesman. His public duties, some little necessity of consulting expediency, regard to the mixed interests of the community, the sharing of his obligations with others; none of these considerations can any more destroy his responsibility than they can his personal identity. On the contrary, he has rather contracted new responsibilities, proportioned to his new opportunities, and increased power of doing good. He is bound more than ever to promote the greatest good of the land; and what *that* is, his conscience as a Christian must tell him. Let him only follow it, and he will have his reward in the happiness of his country, the peace of his own bosom, and the approbation of his God. But let him not consent, when 'the children ask for bread, to give them a stone;' let him not wield the new powers entrusted to him to the exclusion of religion from any national system of education, nor yet to sanction the paring down and mangling of Christian doctrine, to suit the prejudices of a few, into a mere catalogue of moral precepts, or a mere record of

⁷ *Theophilus Anglicanus*, Ed. 4th. Part III. ch. 1, "Church and State one Society under different names." Coleridge calls them, "Two Poles of the same magnet; the magnet itself, which is constituted by them is the Constitution of the nation."—Chap. 2, *Idea of Church and State*. Mr. Gladstone to the same effect, "*The State in its Relations with the Church*." Ch. 1, 2.

historical facts. There are means enough to teach the people all useful secular knowledge, without this unscrupulous dealing with holy things. The chief of them were touched upon in a former Letter, where I ventured to represent that the best and safest way was to act *in aid*, and *not in contravention* of existing religious and educational institutions; to strengthen their hands by liberal parliamentary grants, dispensed in just proportion to their several pretensions, or several needs; but as to the method and quality of the religious instruction to be imparted—the forms, the creeds, the catechisms, the other confessions of faith—to leave this entirely to themselves, and not to interfere at all. They are surely the best judges, the safest guardians, of religious truth, whose special vows and obligations pledge them to the defence and inculcation of it; whose whole time, attention, and talents, are devoted to its pursuit. I will not now trespass further on your time than to give you, in conclusion, the words of at once a true son of the Church, and faithful servant of the Queen, before quoted ^s.

“Be it, once for all, honestly granted that the real charter of mankind is Catholic Christianity: let this be acted upon in all public deliberations and State measures *as a truth*; then, and not till then, will be established in the hearts of men that efficient self-government which would render all outward forms

^s See p. 11.

of social government matter of comparative indifference. The instrument of effecting this great work of social reform is comprehended in one short sentence :—the Christian example of the rulers in Church and State, and the *Christian Education of all ranks and classes* of the people by authorized Christian teachers.”

I am,

Right Hon. and Dear Sir,

With every sentiment of esteem,

Very faithfully yours,

WILLIAM H. HOARE.

DOCUMENTS.

No. I.

See page 33.

The resolutions passed at this Conference were the following. The Italics are my own.

1. That whatever, at the present time, be the force of the sentence delivered on appeal in the case of *Gorham v. the Bishop of Exeter*, the Church of England will eventually be bound by the said sentence, unless it shall openly and expressly reject the erroneous doctrine sanctioned thereby.
2. That the *remission of original sin* to all infants in and by the grace of Baptism is an essential part of *the Article*, "*One Baptism for the remission of sins.*"
3. That—to omit other questions raised by the said sentence—such sentence, while it does not deny the liberty of holding *that Article* in the sense heretofore received, does equally sanction *the assertion that original sin* is a bar to the right reception of Baptism, and *is not remitted*, except when God bestows regeneration beforehand by an act of prevenient grace (whereof Holy Scripture and the Church are wholly silent), thereby rendering the benefits of Holy Baptism altogether uncertain and precarious.
4. That to admit the lawfulness of holding an exposition of *an Article of the Creed* contradictory of the essential meaning of *that Article* is, in truth and in fact, to abandon *that Article*.
5. That, inasmuch as the Faith is one, and rests upon one principle of authority, the conscious, deliberate, and wilful abandonment of the essential meaning of *an Article of the Creed*, destroys the Divine Foundation on which alone the entire Faith is propounded by the Church.
6. That any portion of the Church which does so abandon the essential meaning of *an Article of the Creed*, forfeits not only the Catholic doctrine *in that Article*, but also the office

and authority to witness and teach as a Member of the Universal Church.

7. That, by such conscious, wilful, and deliberate act, such portion of the Church becomes formally separated from the Catholic body, and can no longer assure to its Members the Grace of the Sacraments and *the Remission of sins*.
8. That all measures consistent with the present legal position of the Church ought to be taken without delay, to obtain an authoritative declaration by the Church of the doctrine of Holy Baptism, impugned by the recent sentence: as, for instance, by praying licence for the Church in Convocation to declare that doctrine; or by obtaining an Act of Parliament, to give legal effect to the decisions of the collective Episcopate on this and all other matters purely spiritual.
9. That, failing such measures, all efforts must be made to obtain from the said Episcopate, acting only in its spiritual character, a re-affirmation of the doctrine of Holy Baptism, impugned by the said sentence.

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

ROBERT J. WILBERFORCE, M.A., *Archdeacon of the East Riding*.

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

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

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

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

W. DODSWORTH, M.A., *Perpetual Curate of Christchurch, St. Pancras*.

W. J. E. BENNETT, M.A., *Perpetual Curate of St. Paul's, Knightsbridge*.

HENRY W. WILBERFORCE, M.A., *Vicar of East Farleigh*.

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

RICHARD CAVENDISH, M.A.

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

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

Compare the following Report:—

At an ADJOURNED GENERAL MEETING of the LONDON UNION ON CHURCH MATTERS, held at the Craven Hotel, Strand, on TUESDAY, the 19th March, Resolved;—

1. That the doctrine maintained by Mr. Gorham on the subject of Holy Baptism, and declared by the Report of the Judicial Committee of Privy Council to be admissible in the Church of England, is, in the opinion of this meeting, heretical, and *contrary to the Creed*, in that it denies, that *original sin is remitted to all infants in* and by the grace of Holy *Baptism*.
2. That it is the immediate duty of all Churchmen to consider what steps shall be taken, in order to procure a Synodical recognition of the doctrine, that *original sin is remitted in* and by the grace of *Baptism* to all infants.

Two other Resolutions were passed, but nothing added in the way of definition of the doctrine in question. The Italics, again, are my own.

No. II.

See page 37.

I allude to the occasion when the Bishop in the House of Lords, July 5th, 1839, referred to the same Mr. Horace Mann as Secretary to a Committee which recommended, “that no books shall be used in the schools which favour the tenets of any particular sects of Christians, and announced the publication of a series of religious works intended to form a school library,”—“and which,” said his lordship, “if they were to teach any religion worthy of the name, and yet to be free from all peculiar doctrines, he should be curious to see.”

From the eloquent speech of Lord Stanley in the House of Commons, June 14th of the same year, I cannot refrain from quoting the following:

“It was impossible not to ask the House and the country to consider, whether or not those great points of doctrine and faith upon which the several sections of the Christian community con-

scientiously differed, and which yet were so interwoven with the great scheme of Christianity, and were so important in influencing Christian conduct and Christian motive, that they could not be overlooked by the Church, or blinked by the people, or be complimented away, for the purpose of conciliating persons of various denominations and opinions; *it was impossible,*" he said, "*not to ask the House and the country to consider this question in its connexion with those points of faith and doctrine. . . . For instance, the great scheme of redemption, the doctrine of justification by faith, the efficacy of infant baptism, the solemn mystery of the holy Eucharist; and yet one and all of these must be frittered away, one and all of these they must consent to cede at once, and to put aside, as matter not to be treated of in public education, if they insisted on adopting the Government scheme of instruction.* For according to that plan, Baptists, Unitarians, Socinians, Quakers, and Roman Catholics, all those who differed upon any of these points, and differed conscientiously, were to be educated together. Now if these, or any of these points, were mere points of abstract theory, if they were mere dogmas, the solution of which the one way or the other was of no great importance, he should say, in the name of Christian charity, and for the purpose of combining, as far as we could, all good men, and of softening the animosities of conflicting sects, let us lay aside whatever is not important, let us lay aside whatever is not essential, let us give up all points of curious speculation, and let us be united. But *when he saw that these were not such dogmas, when he saw that they were main points of Christian faith and doctrine, believing that by them, mainly, motives must be produced in the hearts of our children, he could not, from any fancied scheme of conciliation, consent to put into the back ground,—he could not consent to treat as matters of minor importance,—he could not consent to treat as matters of indifference, or to put aside those principles which he held to be among the fundamental doctrines of that system of Christianity, which was the religion of the Established Church of the country.*" —*Hansard's Parliamentary Debates, Third Series, Vol. xlvi. col. 229—301.*

The Italics are given from a reprint of the speech among sundry Papers on Education, lately printed for the METROPOLITAN CHURCH UNION. Rivingtons, 1850.

NO. III.

See page 35.

As a document illustrative of my meaning, I should here have introduced the proposal of *Archdeacon Hare*, but as I have occasion to do so at length in my next Letter, I must refer the reader to that; merely stating, for the present, that a wide distinction is to be drawn between *defining terms* and *asserting or reasserting doctrines*. All I have advanced is, that it might be needful for Convocation to meet and *define the term* regeneration in its usual ecclesiastical sense; and herein I was happy to find myself supported by the valued authority of the Archdeacon. But further than this I do not go: indeed, as to *reasserting the doctrine*,—this, I believe, would be most dangerous as a precedent, and most pernicious in itself. What can be gained by the reassertion of that which has already been asserted with sufficient clearness? What but fresh food for controversy? creating fresh appetite for change? above all, an admission of past incompetence in the Church to teach clearly, which would be absolutely fatal to her claim of authority for the future? But, as the effect of misrepresentation is always to weaken the faith of some, I earnestly advise the doubtful in this matter to consult *Dr. Wordsworth* in his late *Occasional Sermons*, Sermon VIII., pp. 197—199; also *Townsend's Ecclesiastical and Civil History*, Vol. I., pp. 160, 161.

THE END.

Just published by the same Author, the Second Edition of

THE FIRST LETTER.

Price One Shilling.

Also, in cover, neatly stitched together,

THE THREE LETTERS.

Price Three Shillings.



RIVINGTONS,

ST. PAUL'S CHURCH YARD, AND WATERLOO PLACE, LONDON.

A

THIRD LETTER,

&c.

RIGHT HON. AND DEAR SIR,

IN resuming my pen to conclude these Letters, I have to congratulate you on the new and improved aspect of affairs. When I first ventured to address you, it was under, perhaps, too gloomy an apprehension of what the decision of the Government on the proposed measure of Education might be. The Premier has now relieved us from our fears, so far as this question is concerned, and spoken his sense of it in a manner worthy of the rulers of this religious country. The education of the people is not yet to be taken out of the hands of the parties hitherto considered the most competent to instruct them, and a mere secular system of teaching set up, the support of which should be compulsory on the people, and effected by a rate levied in every different parish, at the command of a central authority, vested in the

Privy Council. We heartily rejoice that the Government have seen through the evils of this abomination ;—that they have boldly declared against it, both as an intolerable burden and encroachment on the liberties of the country, and also as an insult to its religious sense and character¹, a sure means of corrupting at its very sources the faith and spiritual life of the rising generation. In the language of Lord John, “It was a great fault of this measure, as it must be of any such measure, to seek to establish any system of education, in which the pupils would not be fully informed of the great and leading truths of the Christian religion. Moral doctrines lost nine-tenths of their force, when they were deprived of the weight of religious injunction and enforcement of the Divine authority, and the Divine sanction, on which eternal welfare or misery depended.” And again, “It could scarcely, he thought, be doubted, that the people of this country desired to say, ‘Do not interfere causelessly with the liberty hitherto enjoyed by the great body of the members of the Church of England, do not interfere with the great body of the Dissenters; but allow them to continue the system of education which they have both hitherto supported².’”

We thank the noble Lord for this avowal. He has

¹ It was on these two points especially that the argument against the Bill on the second reading was made to rest, by the Hon. mover of the Amendment, MR. STAFFORD, whom the Church has to thank for his labours on that occasion.

² “Times” Report, Thursday, April 18, 1850.

spoken out his own mind, and the mind of the country, fairly and boldly. In such dealing with subjects of this nature, we shall ever find the best practical answer to the question, "What has the State to do with religion?"

But suppose it had not been so? Suppose any other course had been taken? If the State had shown itself indifferent? If, instead of opposing, it had encouraged the notion of instructing the people without religion, or of fusing all religions into one general creed, "free from all peculiarities;" if it had proposed to send forth from the schools of this country a youth full of knowledge, and ambitious of distinction, but with no principles, no motives, no affections, no sense of obligation derived from religion;—it seems scarcely possible to overstate the danger and degradation of such a position. For, assuming to itself the right of punishing crime, of claiming respect under weighty penalties for property, for rank, for order, for the Crown and all subordinate offices comprised within its own constitution, and yet doing nothing towards the furnishing of any sufficient motive to the obedience and good conduct required; what now becomes the position of a State? One painful to contemplate or describe. It is degraded to the rank of the mere executioner! No longer the guardian of the country's good, no more the friend and foster-mother of virtue, honour, and morality, no more the patron of all that can adorn the private, or ennoble the public character of

a people, it is to be regarded only as the chief minister of wrath for crimes committed,—itself the greatest criminal for neglecting to supply that religious culture from which alone the wholesome fruits of order could be expected to proceed! A free population is sure ultimately to rise against an authority, which exerts itself only to punish and not to conciliate; which presumes to impose laws without instilling the obligations to their observance, to punish transgression without persuading to obedience.

With this limitation, but with no other, would I admit, that it is incompetent to a State to enforce a religion or a morality; or that the utmost morality which it can enforce is some very low standard, such as the average of the population might be got to assent to. Such an assertion appears to me little short of a libel on the State. Yet, if it be meant that the State cannot rightfully enforce by penalties, more than what it has endeavoured by proper means of instruction to bring the people willingly to observe, the doctrine is correct. But, beyond this, there is no limitation to its powers. It is perfectly competent to it,—it is, indeed, its duty³,—to teach and to enforce the very highest morality, nay, to teach religion itself, without which there is no

³ In this I agree with what fell from Mr. Roebuck: "The education of the people came clearly and distinctly," he said, "within the limits of Government." "Times" Report, April 18. The only question is, How is the Government to carry it out?

morality worth the name. And the duty and competency of a State, in this respect, is not to be measured by the average notions of the population, or by what *they* might propose or assent to. Let the State but educate her people in any true sense of the word, and there is no fear that they will question or dispute her authority,—no fear but they will yield her the right both of teaching and enforcing any amount of truth, which the truth itself requires. The heathen governments of old never waited for the leave of the people, what doctrines, or what amount of doctrines they should teach. Solon, Lycurgus, Numa—even the Pharaohs and Belshazzars—never feared to inculcate what they knew of the truth. Neither Mahomet nor Confucius were held back by any reserve on this head. It is an empty fear of this modern age of excessive refinement: those other statesmen of earlier times felt none of it. They erred, indeed, in the kind of doctrine; they differed in the nature of the several traditions which they taught; but, in the principle which led them boldly to prescribe their respective codes of religion and morality, they were united, and they were right. Why should it be different with us, who have greater advantages, and the purer light of Revelation? Away, then, with the notion, that a State is the mere aggregate of its attorneys and police! unable and incompetent to rise above the sentiments of the constituent mass of the population! Regard it, rather, as having a commission

and authority from the great Being who appointed its existence, to teach *His* truth ;—a chosen instrument to enforce *His* religion. True, it will not effectually do this, in presence of a more directly commissioned body, without the help and alliance of that body ; in other words, it must teach through the medium of the Church. But this touches only the *method* of its teaching : its *duty* of teaching remains unaffected. In the true notion of it, it is the representative of the collective mind and wisdom of the whole community, the organ of its power and of its distinctive functions ; and it acts through the persons of its several Ministers. Thus it has its Minister of Finance, of Home and Foreign Affairs, of War, and other departments ; and, in like manner, it has its Minister of Religion. *Its Minister of Religion is the Church.* For this branch of its relations is one too solemn, and too important, to be exercised by, or confided to, a single individual. It can only be left, where God Himself has left it, to the hands of a Ministry delegated to this express office by His own command, and responsible, in the highest sense, for the due discharge of its duty. It is possible to take too low a view of the State, no less than of the Church. In the highest and the true view of them, they are two co-ordinate powers, having one and the same origin, and destined alike to work out the good of man, and the glory of God.

In advocating the claims of Church schools to

the support of Government, as a duty which they owe both to the Church and to themselves, I wish to avoid saying any thing offensive to other denominations of Christians. But let it not be thought that, in contending for the maintenance of her Creeds and formularies, it is at all peculiar to the Church of England to insist on these. The denominations too are aware of their value. In Scotland, where they still hope for a scheme of education, acceptable alike to the Establishment and to all denominations; it is not that they propose to dispense with Creeds, but to agree in adopting one⁴ which shall be agreeable to all, and yet include the chief distinctive doctrines of Revelation. Should we be upbraided with the contrast herein afforded in our own country, the mere statement of the different circumstances would seem a sufficient justification of ourselves, and a title to the respect and defence of any government. It is that we have an old-fashioned attachment to the Creeds of antiquity; we do not depart from them in the least, as thinking it impossible to alter them for the better; and having once incorporated them into our forms of worship, we say, *nolumus leges Angliæ mutari*. And in this attachment, we carry with us a large proportion of the sense and intelligence of England, which, with all its admiration for real improvement, refuses to cast aside, for the sake of

⁴ The one proposed is, I believe, the Creed of the *Westminster Assembly*.

change, what comes down to it recommended by the wisdom of its ancestors. Nor are we to be charged with singularity, or narrow prejudice, on this account; for in the first great Protestant Council in Germany, in the Confession of Augsburg, the same principle was laid down. The Preface to the acts of that Council runs thus: "That the doctrine here contained, is both supported by sure testimonies of Scripture, and approved by the old and received Creeds, and that it is the unvarying and unbroken consent of the true Church of old, maintained against the multitude of heresies and errors." The French, Dutch, and Swiss Protestant Churches drew up similar Confessions. So little resemblance is there between the Reformers of that day, and those of the present, who cry out for the Bible and nothing but the Bible; by which they mean the Bible interpreted, mutilated, curtailed, and abridged, in whatever way they please⁵.

If this were the only objection taken to our Church system, it would be of little account. But

⁵ But of all plans, that extolled by Mr. Roebuck appears the strangest! (See Parliamentary Debates, April 18), of *merging all religious peculiarities*, and leaving a sort of general religion behind, which is to contain "all the broad principles of ordinary morality, and all the statements which aid and assist it, *selected from Scripture!*" Stranger still, that such a proceeding should be said to show a truly Catholic spirit! To pick and choose from the main body of Christian truth such parts as please the individual fancies of men, may pass very well for a definition of *heresy*, but certainly *not of catholicity*.

I fear there is a stronger feeling at work against us, grounded on an exaggerated view of our internal differences. Suffer me, then, before I bring these Letters to a conclusion, to recal your attention for a few minutes to this part of the subject. Most gladly would I be made the instrument of recovering in any degree the confidence which I feel to be due to the Church and to her system of education, notwithstanding the disputes which are rife amongst us, but which after all are a sign of life,—that life which God has given us.

The Government, dear Sir, to which you belong, had doubtless some sympathy with the late Judgment. Be the merits of that Judgment what they may (for on this I offer no opinion), it was manifestly the intention of the court to deal mercifully with the parties whom they were pleased to identify with the party aggrieved, and to give them the benefit of every apparent doubt. This in the eye of the law appeared to be the right and merciful course; and we probably owe to it the retention among us of one valued section of our beloved Church. But the court declined to interfere with doctrines. These, it declared, were beyond its jurisdiction. It left them to the authority of the Church. Of course, after this declaration, it is fairly open to the Church to make any effort to bring about a better understanding among the people, as to her sense on the doctrines thus avowedly

left to her own determination, more especially on that, about which the recent controversy has arisen. In so acting, there can be no cause of offence to the State. The point is purposely reserved for her decision, if it be not already decided. Whether by praying license that Convocation may meet for the purpose, or by concerting any⁶ public measure which may otherwise seem good to them, it is clearly left to the ecclesiastical authorities to pursue their own line of policy on the occasion; and whatever they propose, there seems no reason to apprehend any vexatious opposition from other quarters. Within ourselves, and as a Church, we have the same elements as before to work with. Nothing has been said or done, that can be fairly construed as disturbing either doctrines or parties. It is still our advantage to have the benefit of differently constituted minds, and differently formed habits of thinking, to bring to the consideration of the matter. And no small advantage it is, notwithstanding some little difference in the interpretation of our formularies, that “*all* the ministers of the Church of England are *united* in receiving the same Scriptures, in professing the same Creeds, in subscribing the same Articles, in teaching the same Catechism, in partaking of one bread and drinking of one cup in the holy communion, and in using the same Liturgical offices of Baptism and Con-

⁶ A Bill is now before the House.

firmation ⁷." What we want is a true and earnest spirit of hearty co-operation; not to magnify differences, not to exalt parties or persons, but to aim at truth, and, while we aim at it, not to forget brotherly love and concord.

My remarks shall be now confined to the one subject in controversy: a subject, be it remembered, intimately connected with Education. There is indeed no doctrine of the Creed so interwoven with the business of religious teaching as this of Baptism; none which so vitally affects the interests of the rising generation. But what is to be said of our differences on this subject? Our adversaries do not fail to point at them, to upbraid us with them, to make them the occasion of bringing our whole system into discredit. For answer, I do not hesitate to refer again to an assertion of my former Letter, and to say that *the differences within the Church are extremely exaggerated*; that they exist more in word than in reality; and that they will be found mostly to turn on an ambiguous expression, not found dogmatically applied in any of the ancient and authorized Creeds, which, consequently, scarce two persons understand alike, and in the use of which some even appear satisfied to attach no distinct signification to it at all ⁸!" Let others make what use of this they

⁷ Occasional Sermons, delivered at Westminster, by Christopher Wordsworth, D.D., Sermon II. p. 24. *Second Ed.*

⁸ I might add upon the word in question, that we are *not* helped out, by its being one of *Saxon*, or purely English origin.

please ; *I merely assert the fact.* And I am thankful to perceive the opinion gaining ground, that it is really on this that our present difficulties chiefly turn ; and that consequently it is not beyond the reach of the authorities to bring us to some good understanding on this matter, either by clearing the signification of the term, or else by allowing, as far as may be done consistently with other accredited expressions of the faith, some little latitude in the precise way of understanding *Baptismal Regeneration.*

Appended to my last will be found certain documents containing resolutions which have since been made the subject of warm, but not, I think, unprofitable, controversy, and which, if conducted in the same spirit as it was begun, cannot fail to bring out the truth in stronger relief, and thus to be of lasting benefit to the Church. My own concern with the resolutions was merely so far as they bore on certain statements of the doctrine we are considering. In referring to them again, I beg leave to do so, without making myself responsible for any other statements they involve regarding the late Judgment. I merely wish to point out the careful and judicious manner in which all ambiguity of expression in the statement of doctrine was avoided in those resolutions, and the safer path pursued of adhering to the terms of the ancient Creeds for the mode of expressing the baptismal doctrine. And this position remains perfectly unaffected by what has since fallen from the disputants on either side. Not that we should speak of

that document as a full statement of the truth. It was clearly not intended, and would be consequently deficient, as a complete expression of catholic doctrine ; but it contains the germ of it, the admission of which will necessarily infer whatever else is required to be believed on this head.

I thought I saw in the statement a desire for peace, and the manifestation of a kindly feeling towards other members of the Church. And I have been happy since to learn that such was in truth the feeling. It was eminently the desire of “the chief supporter of the resolutions” (and that “with very little dissent in the meeting”), to obtain the countenance, and to consult the feelings of “those who are afraid of making broad statements of regeneration, but would not willingly be thought to deny God’s grace given to infants⁹.” The manifestation of such a spirit, is surely not only matter of thankfulness, but also a ground for claiming the like moderation in others. To see the right hand of fellowship thus held out, from a quarter where some would not have expected it, is a call upon all to come forward and do their part, and to exercise the same discretion and forbearance ; if they do not, the responsibility rests on themselves. They will be the parties, who, when there is a cry for peace, make them ready for war ;—who set up a new principle of nonconformity, no longer

⁹ From Mr. Dodsworth’s Letter.

with some newly invented dogmas or expressions of party, but with the accredited declarations of a catholic Creed. They will be those who perpetuate the breach, and distract the Church, in whose bosom they were born. They will be the parties who refuse concession, only (as it will appear) lest they should have to share the credit of it with others. May God forbid that such a spectacle should be presented to the world, and provoke the sneer of the common adversary! But I anticipate no such result. In the great dangers which beset the Church and the nation,—the Church, if our divisions are kept up; the nation, if the masses are left without adequate provision for their educational wants,—such paltry considerations will, I am persuaded, find no place. The exigencies of the times, if not any higher considerations, will persuade us to look at opinions, and not persons; at the truth itself, and not the individual teachers of it.

Let us see, now, how the question stands. We are invited to take, as a first basis of agreement, the unequivocal expression of the Nicene Creed: "I acknowledge one Baptism for the remission of sins." This, it is believed, is a sure foundation for all needful development of the doctrine. Or, if a fuller expression be required, we might add the familiar words in the answer of the Catechism: "Wherein I was made a member of Christ, the child of God, and an inheritor of the kingdom of heaven." And both these together might be taken as a complete

and satisfactory basis for a common exposition of the baptismal faith. To these we might invite attention, as comprehending the necessary elements of that grant of grace which, we teach, is given in Baptism to those who receive it rightly¹. That the grant is free and unconditional—though in after-life the continuance of the grace must depend on the use made of it—might be further insisted on. But these and such other points might be regarded as deductions from the main truth, more than as essential parts of it. So also the necessary distinction between the grace which regenerates, and the grace which renews or converts the soul; between the first communication of the Spirit, and those abiding influences which are the fruit of repentance, faith, and prayer, in later years; between the sacramental grant, and those larger outpourings of the Spirit, when it “witnesses with our spirit, that we are the sons of God,” when we “no longer walk after the flesh,” but when, in the gradual progress of the Christian life, the affections become purified, the motives exalted, the understanding enlightened, and “every thought brought into captivity to the obedience of Christ.” These, and such other topics, would be left to the discretion of the individual teacher; for, highly important as they are, they are

¹ Art. xxvii., “*recte baptismum suscipientes* :” a more general word than the “*qui digne percipiunt*,” of Art. xxv. : and intended to include the case of infants, to whom the rite is *duly administered*.

not properly of the essence of the baptismal faith. This appears to involve essentially no more than the two points above proposed, as a basis of a general agreement within the Church.

That such a basis would prove acceptable ought not to be assumed without competent authority. But such authority I find not in one place only, but in many, and in far more than I could here adduce. I find it in a document emanating from a living authority, and which I append to the resolutions at the end. I find it in the work of Bishop Bethell, in what I might call a *locus classicus* in that work, from the frequency with which the words have been cited. They are these:—"In common with the Church of Rome and the Lutheran Churches, we hold that Regeneration, or the New Birth, is the spiritual grace of Baptism conveyed over to the soul in the due administration of that Sacrament. We hold, in common with those Churches, that in adults duly qualified by repentance and faith, the guilt of sin, both original and actual, is cancelled in Baptism; that *in infants*, who have committed no actual or wilful sin, and can possess no such qualifications, *the guilt of original sin is done away*; and that *infants*, no less than adults, *are made in Baptism children of God, members of Christ, inheritors of the kingdom of heaven*, and partakers of the privileges and blessings of the Gospel Covenant. But the Church of Rome contends, that not only the guilt, but the very essence and being of original sin, is

removed by Baptism ; the Church of England declares that this corruption of nature remains even in the regenerate²." The same is the testimony of Archdeacon Hare : " Nor is this truth a mere abstract proposition ; I believe it to be of great practical moment for our Christian teaching and education. It is because *their sins are forgiven them* for Christ's sake, that St. John writes to those whom he terms little children ; it is for the selfsame reason, that we are empowered to train up our children *as members of Christ, and children of God, and inheritors of the kingdom of heaven* ³."

But we can never allow that the Church has no certain doctrine on this head⁴. Do we deny, or do we not deny, the particular propositions just recited from the Creed and from the Catechism? My persuasion is, that few would wish to deny them, who profess themselves members of our Church. Some may plead, and not unreasonably, for a latitude of interpretation in the sense they assign to words, when they come to the more technical expressions adopted in the services. But this by no means prevents their hearty concurrence in the basis above named. And can any deny that there is evil to be apprehended, by too much confining the attention to the mere word regeneration? by

² Bishop Bethell on Regeneration, Pref. xvii.

³ Letter to the Hon. R. Cavendish, by Julius Charles Hare, Archdeacon of Lewes, p. 4.

⁴ See Document at the end of this Letter, No. 2.

appearing to think only of the effects wrought *unconsciously* upon infants, and not of those of which we become the *conscious* subjects afterwards? by dwelling exclusively on what may be called the *mysterious and miraculous*, and omitting what belongs rather to the *moral* part of the Sacrament? For from hence it comes, that people have so much misunderstood the subject. The very word has begun to be confounded with other graces and gifts of the Spirit; or else, in its restricted and sacramental sense, it has been thought to savour of superstition or of Romanism—to imply a change of the very nature of the baptized, so that if only they lead decent and respectable lives, they are straight-way sure of eternal happiness, and live the special favourites of heaven! Indeed, without this, it seems in itself an evil, when we thrust any part whatever of Christian faith and doctrine into undue and excessive prominence: for is it not as much a deformity when a feature of the natural body is distorted, by being forced into unnatural proportions, as when it is paralysed by total misuse? And in like manner, if we so unduly exalt the initiatory sacrament, as to seem unmindful of conversion and renovation and the fruits of the Spirit following, which we ought at least equally to insist upon and enforce,—are we not doing violence to the analogy of the faith? Are we not making the baptismal doctrine more like an excrescence which deforms, than a natural feature which improves and

harmonizes the general aspect of Christian truth? To borrow the illustration of an eloquent writer, "Absorbed only in the contemplation of the particular portion of the subject immediately before us, we are led to overlook its relation to others, and the relation of each to the whole. We have separated, as by a prism, a single ray, and see every object tinged with its peculiar and distinct hue; but, be it bright and beautiful as it may, it is not itself the light. That is a candid, uniform, and perfect glory, which consists not in the separation, but in the union and incorporation with each other of every differing colour; and is the only medium through which the real proportions of any object can be discerned⁵."

Nor let it be thought that I am peculiar in laying this stress on the importance of not caricaturing, as it were, the doctrines of the Gospel. "The enormous exaggeration," says Archdeacon Hare, "of the power of baptismal grace, to the disparagement, and almost exclusion, of the subsequent converting influence of the Spirit, have driven people into the opposite extreme, where baptismal grace has been unduly depreciated. The monstrous assertions concerning a change of nature in Baptism have impelled those, who could not veil their eyes to the fallaciousness

⁵ Sermon delivered at the Visitation of the Archdeacon of Lewes, by the *Rev. James S. M. Anderson, M.A.*, Chaplain to the Queen, &c. 1849.

of these assertions, to deny any thing beyond an outward change of state⁶.”

To avoid such dangerous indiscretions in the statement of Divine truth, would be to remove the chief impediment to a fair and moderate understanding on the doctrine now in dispute. And I am further strengthened in this opinion by the just observations of an eminent divine. “It may be justly questioned,” says Dr. Wordsworth, “whether the divergency of opinion would be found, on a calm and candid reviewal, to be so wide as some of the respective advocates seem to imagine. And doubtless much of the discrepancy would vanish, if the partizans, on either side, would endeavour, without passion or prejudice, to examine each other’s opinions, and to state their own. But it cannot be denied that any difference of teaching, on so vital a subject as this, is most deeply to be deplored. And it is earnestly to be desired that the Clergy and Laity would join in prayer to God to unite them in one heart and mind; and that they would attentively scrutinize the grounds of their difference with charity and meekness It cannot be doubted that the recent judicial decision has placed the Book of Common Prayer on a firmer basis than before. Formerly a disposition was shown in certain quarters to mutilate it; but now all parties accept and maintain it. And we shall be greatly

⁶ Letter to Hon. R. Cavendish, p. 24. And see the Charge, p. 101.

wanting to ourselves and to the cause of unity and truth, if by any ill-considered and intemperate measure we forfeit this vantage-ground, and mar this benefit, and do not endeavour to avail ourselves of it quietly, patiently, and charitably, for the healing of divisions, and the establishment of truth and peace⁷.”

And it is a hopeful sign of such union being actually brought about, when we see two other champions of the cause, differing somewhat in their school of divinity, yet agreeing on this point. One of them remarks :

“ I would hope that, if any measure be adopted, by whatsoever authority, to render the declaration of the universality of Baptismal Regeneration more explicit and more stringent, care will also be taken to clear up the ambiguous meaning of the word *Regeneration*, and to declare that, in its ecclesiastical sense, it is in no way to be understood as identical with, or interfering with, or precluding the necessity of conversion ; which requires a conscious, responsible subject, and is necessary, through the frailty of our nature, in all at a later period of life. The popular confusion of these two distinct acts, which are almost equally indispensable for all such as attain to years of personal responsibility, is the main ground of the ever-renewed disputes concerning Baptismal Regeneration ; and a brief authoritative exposition

⁷ Occasional Sermons, preached at Westminster. Sermon II., pp. 24, 25.

of this point, if we have the wisdom to draw up one, would be of inestimable value to the Church. Without this, the increased stringency in our assertion of it would be incalculably disastrous ⁸.”

“I am thankful,” says another, and in reference to the above citation, “to agree, as I hope, with the remedial measure [here] proposed If to distinguish ‘regeneration’ from ‘conversion’ be all which is required, the way out of our present difficulties would be very easy The healing of this misunderstanding would be a very deep blessing. And if (as Archdeacon Hare’s statement the more encourages one to hope) there be, to many of those who do not receive our services in their literal sense, no greater obstacle, this might easily be removed. These desire only what the Church must ever desire, inculcate, pray for, that her children should stop short of nothing, until they ‘believe in the Lord their God, and fear Him, and love Him with all their heart, with all their mind, with all their soul, and with all their strength’ ⁹.”

On the other hand, those who take upon them to resist the application of the term Regeneration in any sense to Baptism, and to apply it in an entirely new sense of their own, seem, unhappily, to offer us no hope of accommodation. Indeed, in *their* sense

⁸ Letter to the Hon. R. Cavendish, by C. Julius Hare, M.A., &c. &c., pp. 37, 38.

⁹ Dr. Pusey on the Royal Supremacy, pp. 252. 256. Comp. also, pp. 178. 188—191. 220. 224.

of it, it is even doubtful whether any man ever yet was regenerate on this side the grave! To suit, their own theory, they are obliged to lower the meaning of the term, even taking their own sense of it. If, then, Regeneration, in the Church's use of it, appear to them too strong a word, why should they refuse us an accommodation which they demand for themselves? Why should they run counter to the established usage of all the churches in Christendom, merely to set up a theory of their own, which, after all, they cannot substantiate?

But for others, more soberly and more peacefully disposed, when they come to consider the matter closely, when they look back on the long-familiar words of their Catechism, Creeds, and Services—words, be it remembered, not so much of charity, as of faith—there seems to be a good hope, that they will be able ultimately to meet on the ground proposed; that mutual suspicions and jealousies will be laid aside; and that parties hitherto drawn up in opposition will find that they have been kept asunder more by mutual misunderstanding than by real contrariety of opinion. Agreeing in so much besides, in the Canon of Scripture as the rule of faith, in the Creeds, Catechism, and Liturgy of the Church of England, it is not unreasonable to hope that they will be brought in all things to “speak the same words, and to mind the same thing.”

I cannot conclude better than in the fervent words of one who called us to union, now many years ago:

“Remember, brethren, that our enemies are many and mighty. And is this a time to divide our house, and to form parties and factions? Is this the season for discord? Remember the sacred ties which bind us to one another; as men, we are all under the same condemnation, we are all heirs of the same corrupted nature, equally, one and all, children of wrath; as Christians, we seek for reconciliation with an offended Maker, through the atoning merits of an all-prevailing intercession of the same crucified, the same glorified Saviour, through the sanctification of the same Blessed Spirit; we worship the same God, the Trinity in Unity. We are brethren of the same household, with one Lord, one Faith, one Baptism, one God and Father of us all. . . . As brethren let us act cordially together, and gradually our differences will lessen, our agreements will extend¹.”

This advice has, I believe, already, to a great extent, been followed: already it was beginning to produce its fruits, when the recent controversy unhappily arose. This may, nevertheless, be turned to good account. It may stir up a more earnest spirit of enquiry; it may attach us more to our venerable Creeds; it may make us more thankful for a Church, which requires all to be brought to the only infallible test of Scripture; above all, it may lead us to prove our faith by our practice, by more

¹ Call to Union, on the principles of the English Reformation. By W. F. Hook, D.D. 4th edit. p. 35.

strenuously exerting ourselves to train up the youth committed to us, as though we really believed them to be depositories of a Divine Grace, partakers of the same holy birthright as ourselves, and fellow-heirs, through Christ, of eternal life.

I am,

Right Hon. and Dear Sir,

With every sentiment of esteem,

Very faithfully yours,

WILLIAM H. HOARE.

DOCUMENTS.

No. I.

Resolutions of Conference, Lancaster Place.

(Reprinted from former Letter; the Italics are my own.)

1. That whatever, at the present time, be the force of the sentence delivered on appeal in the case of *Gorham v. the Bishop of Exeter*, the Church of England will eventually be bound by the said sentence, unless it shall openly and expressly reject the erroneous doctrine sanctioned thereby.
2. That the *remission of original sin* to all infants in and by the grace of Baptism is an essential part of *the Article*, "*One Baptism for the remission of sins.*"
3. That—to omit other questions raised by the said sentence—such sentence, while it does not deny the liberty of holding *that Article* in the sense heretofore received, does equally sanction *the assertion that original sin* is a bar to the right reception of Baptism, *and is not remitted*, except when God bestows regeneration beforehand by an act of prevenient grace (whereof Holy Scripture and the Church are wholly silent), thereby rendering the benefits of Holy Baptism altogether uncertain and precarious.
4. That to admit the lawfulness of holding an exposition of *an Article of the Creed* contradictory of the essential meaning of *that Article* is, in truth and in fact, to abandon *that Article*.
5. That inasmuch as the Faith is one, and rests upon one principle of authority, the conscious, deliberate, and wilful abandonment of the essential meaning of *an Article of the Creed* destroys the Divine foundation on which alone the entire Faith is propounded by the Church.

6. That any portion of the Church which does so abandon the essential meaning of *an Article of the Creed* forfeits, not only the Catholic doctrine *in that Article*, but also the office and authority to witness and teach as a Member of the Universal Church.
7. That, by such conscious, wilful, and deliberate act, such portion of the Church becomes formally separated from the Catholic body, and can no longer assure to its members the Grace of the Sacraments and the *Remission of Sins*.
8. That all measures consistent with the present legal position of the Church ought to be taken without delay, to obtain an authoritative declaration by the Church of the doctrine of Holy Baptism, impugned by the recent sentence: as, for instance, by praying licence for the Church in Convocation to declare that doctrine; or by obtaining an Act of Parliament, to give legal effect to the decisions of the collective Episcopate on this and all other matters purely spiritual.
9. That, failing such measures, all efforts must be made to obtain from the said Episcopate, acting only in its spiritual character, a re-affirmation of the doctrine of Holy Baptism, impugned by the said sentence.

Signed,

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

ROBERT J. WILBERFORCE, M.A., *Archdeacon of the East Riding*.

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

(Vide Second Letter.)

Declaration issued by the Bishop of Bath and Wells, to the Clergy of the Diocese, April 16, 1850.

We, the undersigned, Richard, by Divine permission Bishop of the Diocese of Bath and Wells, within the Church of England, being deeply impressed with the great disquietude which prevails within the said Diocese, in consequence of the decision of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, in the case of *Gorham v. the Bishop of Exeter*,—

For the satisfaction of our own mind, and from a desire that our judgment and intention in this matter may be generally known to all whom it may concern within our Diocese, do hereby declare as hereinafter follows :—

Whereas the construction put upon the Articles and Formularies of the Church of England, by the said decision, implies that the remission of original sin to all infants in, and by the grace of, the Sacrament of Baptism, is not necessarily the doctrine of the Church of England, although such remission of sins has been always held to be affirmed in and by an Article of the Nicene Creed, (to wit,) “ I acknowledge one Baptism for the remission of sins ;”

And, whereas doubt has been cast by the said decision upon the teaching of the Catechism of the Church of England, that all infants are “ made members of Christ, children of God, and inheritors of the kingdom of heaven,” in and by their Baptism ;—

We do hereby solemnly declare, that is the doctrine of the Church of England, as of the whole Church of Christ in all ages, that original sin is remitted to all infants by the application of the merits of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, in and by the Sacrament of Baptism ; and that it is the plain teaching of the Church of England that all infants are “ made members of Christ, children of God, and inheritors of the kingdom of heaven,” in and by that holy Sacrament.

R. BATH AND WELLS.

London, April 15,
1850.

No. II.

The Church of England not chargeable with uncertain speaking on the nature and effects of Baptism.

“ From a review of our Articles and Liturgy, we may derive the following conclusions :—

“ 1. They maintain the doctrine of Regeneration in Baptism

in the most decided manner, grounding it on the same texts of Scripture from which the ancient Christians had deduced it; including under it forgiveness of sin, the gift of the Holy Ghost, and the inheritance of the kingdom of heaven: and never introducing the word itself except in conjunction with Baptism.

“2. They teach, in common with the writings of the ancient Christians, the necessity of faith and repentance as qualifications for the salutary effects of Baptism. But they never contemplate any person, however qualified, as regenerate, till he is actually baptized.

“3. They suppose that infants, who are necessarily free from actual sin, are duly qualified for Baptism, and are looked on by God precisely in the same light as penitents and believers; and *they unequivocally assert that every baptized infant, without exception, is born again.*

“4. They suppose that all baptized persons, whether infants or adults, contract a solemn engagement to holiness and newness of life; and that their continuance in a state of salvation depends on their future conduct.

“5. They lay down *a very plain and broad distinction* between this grace of Regeneration, and conversion, repentance, renovation, and such Christian virtues and changes of the inward frame, as require the concurrence of man’s will and endeavours, imply degrees, and are capable of increase.”—*Doctrine of Regeneration in Baptism.* By the Rt. Rev. Chr. Bethell, Lord Bishop of Bangor. Chap. VI.

“This is the *peculiar, distinctive* teaching of the Church of England. Her education, through all her Services, from Baptism to Burial, is the training of a baptized soul. She appeals on all occasions to the covenant entered into at Baptism; to the graces then conferred, and to the duties then undertaken. She addresses them as *Christians . . . as regenerate*, as adopted into Christ’s visible fold; as possessed of *certain spiritual grace* by virtue of their entrance into the covenant; and leads them forward to further steps in the divine life; to the renewing of

their minds, the conversion of their hearts, the amendment of their lives, and the sanctification of their souls ; and to the dedication of their bodies, as a reasonable, lively sacrifice unto God." — *Preface to Reprint of a Note in Townsend's Bible, on St. John* iii. 3—6. Rivingtons, 1850.

The late Mr. Simeon's view, taken from p. 259, vol. II. of his works, will be found at length in *Dr. Hook's* recent "Letter on the Present Crisis," p. 14. Also in *Kennaway's* Manual of Baptism, pp. 146—152. "It is clear," says the latter, "that he held baptismal Regeneration to be the doctrine of the Reformed Church of England."

JOHN WESLEY says :—

"A man may possibly be *born of water*, and yet *not be born of the Spirit*. There may sometimes be the outward sign, where there is not the inward grace. I do not now speak with regard to infants. *It is certain*, our Church supposes, that *all* who are *baptized in their infancy* are at the same time *born again*. And it is allowed that the whole Office for the Baptism of Infants proceeds upon this supposition."—*J. Wesley*, Sermon on John iii. 6.

And the late *Bishop Ryder* :—

"I would wish generally to restrict the term regeneration to the baptismal privileges, and considering them as comprehending not only an external admission into the visible Church, not only a covenanted title to the pardon and grace of the Gospel, but even a degree of spiritual aid vouchsafed and ready to offer itself to our acceptance or rejection at the dawn of reason. I would recommend a reference to these privileges in our discourses, as talents which the hearer should have so improved as to bear interest ; as seed which should have sprung up and produced fruit. But, at the same time, I would solemnly protest against that most serious error (which has arisen probably from exalting too highly the just view of baptismal regeneration) of contemplating all the individuals of a baptized congregation as converted, as having all once known the truth and entered upon the right path, though some may have wandered from it, and others may have made but

little progress; as not therefore requiring (what *all by nature*, and *most*, it is to be feared, *through defective principle and practice, require*) that transformation by the ‘renewing of the mind,’ that ‘putting off the old man and putting on the new man,’ which is so emphatically enjoined by St. Paul to his baptized Romans and Ephesians.”—*Bp. Ryder, Primary Charge to his Clergy.*

No. III.

On the distinction between a condition to be performed beforehand, and a stipulation made as to character and conduct afterwards.

The reader is advised to consult *Kennaway's Manual of Christian Baptism*, pp. 97—102, and pp. 88, 89, on the answer to the question of the Catechism, “Why then are infants baptized, &c.?”

On the words of the service, “This infant must also faithfully for his part promise by you that are his sureties, &c.” Archdeacon Hoare observes:—

“We have already spoken of the common *and unconditional* grant of grace in the Baptism of infants, how ready we may hope that Christ will be on His part most surely to keep and perform this undoubted assurance . . . Having, then, made to us, in the name of Jesus Christ our Lord, all these ‘exceeding great and precious promises,’ she proceeds, *as a part of the covenant, and a blessed result thereof, to enjoin a corresponding promise upon the baptized, a promise amounting to this, that having accepted the promises of the Gospel, we will now proceed to fulfil its duties. . . . It is the proposing of all these [promises] ‘without money and without price,’ which constitutes in our Church, no otherwise than in Scripture, the true overtures and offers of Christian Baptism. ‘After that the kindness and love of God towards man appeared, not by works of righteousness which we have done, but according to His mercy He saved us, by the washing of regenera-*

tion, and renewing of the Holy Ghost; which He shed on us abundantly through Jesus Christ our Saviour; that being justified by His grace we should be made heirs according to the hope of eternal life.' (Titus iii. 4—7.) *The obligation which follows, in the words of the Apostle, are those which find their counterpart in the requirement of the Church; 'It is a faithful saying, and these things I will that thou affirm constantly, that they which have believed in God might be careful to maintain good works.'*" (Titus iii. 8.)—*Hoare on the Baptismal Service*, pp. 121—124.

No. IV.

*The Latitude allowable in the precise sense of the term
Regeneration.*

As for instance, whether "being begotten again," and "being born again," are figures which express the same or different ideas: and whether *Regeneration* expresses one or both of these ideas:—whether it implies a *spiritual* or merely an *outward* change, or *both*: a *change of faculty*, or of *privilege*, or of *relationship*; a change of the condition of our spiritual being, or of the spiritual being itself. All these have found their several advocates in the Church, and many other shades of opinion on the nature of the baptismal grace, which we agree to call by this term. Thus, in the Letter of the Bishop of Exeter we find this difference allowed for; where his Lordship speaks (p. 80) of "perplexity arising out of a misuse of the word *regeneration*;" and of "allowable and partial differences in stating the same Divine Truth." Many think, that some little development of the natural faculties is essential to any *actual* inward *change*, and that this therefore is impossible in young infants. That is a noble passage in *Bishop Jeremy Taylor*: "In every Christian there are three parts concurring to his integral constitution, *body, soul, and spirit*; and all these have their proper

activities and times ; but *every one in his own order, first that which is natural, and then that which is spiritual.* And what Aristotle said, ‘ A man first lives the life of a plant, then of a beast, and lastly of a man,’ is true in this sense ; and the more spiritual the principle is, the longer it is before it operates, because more things concur to spiritual actions than to natural ; and these are necessary, and therefore first ; the others are perfect, and therefore last. And who is he that so well understands the philosophy of this third principle of a Christian’s life, *the Spirit*, as to know how or when it is infused¹, and how it operates in all its periods, and what it is in its being and proper nature ; and whether it be like the soul, or like the faculty, or like a habit ; or how, or to what purpose God in all varieties does dispense it ? These are secrets, which none but bold people use to decree, and to build propositions upon their own dreams.”—*Life of Christ*, Part 1. § ix.

“ The forgiveness of sin—of original sin, and of all actual sins committed before Baptism,” says *Bishop Bethell*, “ is what the ancients principally insisted upon, when they spoke of regeneration in baptism.”—Chap. iv. note, and chap. viii.

It appears, then, that whatever “ latitude ” may be “ allowable ” in other respects, we must ever hold, as the great fundamental part of the doctrine, the “ One Baptism for the Remission of sins.”

¹ Its mysterious connection with Baptism is assumed in this passage, as matter of distinct revelation.

THE END.

A C H A R G E

ADDRESSED

TO THE CLERGY OF THE DIOCESE OF CHESTER,

AT THE

TRIENNIAL VISITATION,

IN

MAY AND JUNE, MDCCCXLIV.

BY

JOHN BIRD SUMNER, D. D.,

LORD BISHOP OF CHESTER.

LONDON :

J. HATCHARD AND SON, 187, PICCADILLY.

MDCCCXLIV.

DURHAM : PRINTED BY F. HUMBLE AND SON, SADDLER-STREET.

TO
THE CLERGY OF THE DIOCESE OF CHESTER,
This Charge,

PUBLISHED AT THEIR REQUEST,

IS INSCRIBED WITH SINCERE AFFECTION AND RESPECT

BY THEIR FAITHFUL FRIEND AND BROTHER,

J. B. CHESTER.

A C H A R G E .

Meetings, my REVEREND BRETHERN, like that to which you have been summoned to-day, have an interest peculiar to themselves : peculiar to our office and calling. Other professions, necessary and honourable as they are, are engaged in the interests of this present world : and it can scarcely happen that human partialities and earthly passions should not intermix with their assemblies. And at the best, the highest concerns with which they are conversant are subject to the melancholy reflection “Man returns to his earth, and all his thoughts perish.” All his thoughts, which have had this world for their object, and been bounded by the life that now is. With ourselves the case is different. Our chief interests begin where theirs terminate. Our sphere is beyond their horizon.

We meet together, not to take counsel respecting events which are important to-day, and to-morrow will be as an idle tale : we have to do with Him who was, and is, and is to come : who is the same yesterday, and to-day, and for ever : we deal with truths which are as unchangeable as He who has revealed them : and the existence for which we make provision is an existence which is to have no end. Objects thus transcendant ought surely to have an influence upon our feelings : to divest them, as far as man can be divested, of all things low and earthly : when we remember that the character in which we assemble together is as “servants of the Most High God, who teach men the way of Salvation.” Neither let us regard our meeting in a formal or official light : but as a solemn occasion which the Holy Spirit may bless, and which the presence of our common Lord may render a season of refreshment to those who are here gathered together in his name.

I cannot now for the sixth time meet you, without recalling to mind the various circumstances under which we have assembled on former similar occasions. Some of them were seasons of apprehension and excitement, which the condition of our

own Diocese was especially calculated to awaken. And doubtless there are still overhanging clouds and portentous signs both in our political and ecclesiastical horizon, which if they need not alarm us, at least give reason for continued and increasing watchfulness. Some of them I have formerly discussed; and they are so present to every mind, and manifest to every eye, that I need not now particularize. That the nation has its perils is indisputable. But we ought to be no less thankful for grounds of hope, than vigilant to see signs of danger. And I confess that since my first acquaintance with the Diocese, I have never contemplated our prospects with more satisfaction, than at the present moment; or with more hopeful, though humble, confidence that God may be looking upon us "for good," and not "for evil."

You will naturally expect my reasons. And I shall give them with the more readiness, because the matters to which they allude are connected with the purposes of our meeting.

First, there is less disproportion than formerly, between our duties and our means of fulfilling them.

Our duties are briefly summed up by St. Paul,

in his address to the Elders at Miletus: "Remember that, by the space of three years, I ceased not to warn every man night and day with tears." And again, in his Epistle to the Colossians: "We preach, warning every man, and teaching every man, in all wisdom; that we may present every man perfect in Christ Jesus." And so our Ordination Service: "See that you never cease your labour, your care and diligence, until you have done all that lieth in you according to your bounden duty, to bring all such as are committed to your charge into that agreement in the faith and knowledge of God, and to that ripeness and perfectness of age in Christ, that there be no place left among you either for error in religion or for viciousness in life."

Now, it is evident that, where injunctions like these are issued, some proportion is implied between the extent of the flocks and the number of the shepherds; some possibility of contact is supposed to exist between the pastor and his people: without which St. Paul himself, labouring night and day, could approach only a small section of the charge committed to him: and without which the most affecting Liturgy, the most Scriptural articles, the most faithful ministry must be of small avail.

A shepherd who may call his hundred sheep by their names, and tell them over as he incloses them in their fold, or sends them forth to their pasture in the morning, can only see them in the distance, and toil after them in despair when the hundreds become thousands. This, as you are well aware, described our case in regard to the principal part of the population of this vast diocese; such was our state, both as to Church accommodation and pastoral inspection. And a change in this respect must be the beginning of all Church prosperity, because it lies at the foundation of all Church usefulness.

We cannot easily determine what number of persons, on an average, a minister can superintend according to the proper standard of spiritual oversight. It may assist our calculation to observe that, in addition to the regular demands of the sick and aged, supposing him to visit thirty-five families in the week, he may visit the families of about three thousand persons twice in a year.* How scanty is such provision! Yet ten years ago the ministers in our populous towns had double this average labour imposed upon them. The cases of this kind which now remain are comparatively

* See Appendix, No. I.

few. In many instances the spiritual provision has increased four or five fold. Taking our populous districts throughout, I may say generally that it is doubled.

Hitherto this increase has taken place through means which private benevolence has supplied; either by the erection of additional Churches, or by defraying the salary of Curates. Our own Diocese has greatly profited in both ways. The list of 170 new Churches which I announced three years ago has now swelled to 196.* And the seasonable aid of the two Societies for supplying Curates is giving us, at the present moment, the services of more than an hundred labourers.

Still, as I have before observed,† there remained spots of such hopeless destitution as to darken all our prospects; barren wastes, apparently presenting an insuperable barrier to cultivation. Light has unexpectedly burst upon us, and cheered us with a promise of better things. The re-distribution of some part of the resources of our Church, which is taking place through the agency of the Ecclesiastical Commissioners, has opened the way for a measure exactly calculated to remedy our greatest evils. I allude to the Act of last

* Appendix, No. II.

† Charge of 1841, p. 54.

Session for the endowment of new parishes ; which will soon be brought into effective operation, and gradually cause an important change in places where the superintendence afforded by the Church has been hitherto little more than nominal. Fifty new parishes, for so they may be justly called, are already in the course of formation for our own Diocese. There seems no reason why we should not carry on the process till every district of two or three thousand souls has its appointed Church and Clergyman. The Commissioners will have means at their disposal : and we may trust that together with the demand a supply of faithful men will continue to spring up, content to labour for the Lord's sake, though with but little except the Lord's blessing to reward them. But it is one amongst our many grounds of thankfulness and of hope, that the Spirit of God still bends the minds of able and zealous labourers towards a ministry which offers few inducements except its heavenly character ; except that being conversant with things above, it raises men beyond the reach of ordinary temptations, and places them in more immediate communion with Him whom they desire to glorify themselves, and to lead others to glorify. As long as these considerations prevail with men of talent

and education, and overbalance in their choice the higher temporal allurements which secular callings offer, we shall possess a testimony of God's favour on which we can confidently repose. For such "preparation of the heart is from the Lord."

The circumstance to which I would next allude, in reference to our brighter prospects, relates to the important subject of Education. The state of education has been low and unsatisfactory in the extreme. It is melancholy to reflect that the exact Return, furnished since we last met by our Diocesan Inspector, gives an average of six per cent. only under daily education in the rural districts, and in the populous towns not half that number.* This low number is partly accounted for by the short period during which the children are retained at school, averaging nearer two years than ten. And in many of the towns, we thankfully acknowledge that the deficiency of daily education is in some degree compensated by the excellence of the Sunday Schools. But after making every allowance, it must be owned that under circumstances like these there is no fair trial of the effect of education ; and that it is grievous to send

* Appendix, No. III.

out a youthful generation into the dangers and temptations of the world, with no more of moral or mental discipline, no better religious culture, than can be bestowed in two short years.

I contemplate, therefore, with feelings of sanguine hope, the gratifying fact that education is making a rapid progress throughout those parts of the Diocese where it has heretofore been most deficient. The unexampled liberality by which the funds of the National Society have been replenished has enabled it to supply such encouraging assistance to local efforts, that day schools are likely to become universal. Fresh means of education have been provided, during the interval of our assembling, by the erection of additional school rooms, to about twenty thousand scholars : i.e., to twenty per cent. upon the population which we may suppose has grown up within that period to the age for profiting by them.

It may be objected, that education is no new thing : that National Schools have existed for a whole generation : and that we have no right to look for a result in future which has not been produced already.

We have learnt, however, from past experi-

ence, that schools may exist, with very little of real education : very little of that culture which brings the mind into a new state, and prepares it for impressions of good which may be strong enough to resist temptation, and maintain a course of righteousness, sobriety, and godliness. That our schools have been useful, as far as they have hitherto proceeded, it would be unreasonable to doubt : that they are capable of becoming far more useful, it is impossible to deny. I believe that we have taken the right step, in applying ourselves to the education of masters as preparatory to the education of children. And I look to the Training College, now happily established at Chester, and able to send forth its thirty masters annually to supply the schools now building, and demanded by our increasing population, as one of the bright stars in our present prospect : one of the premises on which I found my hopeful calculations. For the people themselves readily appreciate the nature of the education offered them. After all, their indifference to education has hitherto been the chief cause of their want of education. Many of our national schools have languished for lack of scholars, in the midst of an illiterate population. When once it is perceived that schools are really

telling upon the habits of the scholars ; that the children through the effect of moral discipline are becoming orderly, obedient, and intelligent : the school fills as naturally as water rises in the channel when the spring receives a fresh supply. The thirty masters who first left our Training College, found in their respective schools an aggregate of 1400 scholars. By the close of the first year the 1400 had swelled to 2400.

And here, my Reverend Brethren, you must suffer the word of exhortation. There is a part of education which the best professional master can hardly give, and, without which, all that he can give will be of small avail. He prepares the soil in which you may sow the seed with a reasonable hope of its springing up and flourishing. I am far from advising the clergyman to become the master, even the *quasi* master, of the school : the care of the rising generation must not rob their parents of that which is due to them. But if the school is to be effective for its great and important purposes, he must be the assiduous visitor, the vigilant inspector of the school in all its departments. And that scriptural instruction, which is the mainspring of the whole, he must do more than superintend : if it is to be usefully inculcated at

all, the work must be his own, by a regular and settled system. I hope that I am not unmindful of the labours required from the Clergy of this Diocese. I hope that I shall never be insensible to the faithfulness with which they are generally discharged. But one thing is yet lacking; one labour must still be added to those which you have hitherto undertaken, unless you are already in the habit of bestowing this constant attention to your schools. What other labour can be made to bear, at once, upon so large a proportion of your people? In the school, we ought to expect that a tenth, or it may be even a larger part of your whole charge is brought together before you. And that portion, how interesting, how important! It is the description of the spiritual shepherd, that whilst he feeds his flock, he "gathers the lambs in his bosom." The test of attachment proposed to the Apostle was, "Simon, lovest thou me? Feed my sheep. Feed my lambs." And how can it agree with the character of faithfulness in a shepherd, however diligently he may tend his grown-up flock, if he leave his lambs to a hireling?

It is my firm conviction that whoever devotes several hours of his week to this department of

duty, will reap from it a larger harvest than from any other portion of his labour. The school-master can secure that the Scriptures be read intelligently, and that the geography and history connected with them be generally known. But the bearing of one part of Scripture upon another ; the comparison of spiritual things with spiritual ; and above all, the practical application of Scripture as the ruling principle of the heart and lip must be the business of him who is thoroughly furnished to this good work, and whose office enables him to “reprove, rebuke, exhort with all long-suffering and doctrine.” And who can foresee or calculate the extent of blessing which may rest upon such instruction, not left to the short space of leisure which can be afforded on the Sabbaths, not interrupted by the long interval between them, but systematically inculcated during the years, few, too few, as these may be, which the child is permitted to employ at school ? Who can set a limit to the effect which such teaching might produce upon the rising generation ? Who can say whether that neglect of baptismal obligations which we complain of may not be traced to the absence of such Scriptural education ? which too often parents and god-parents are unable or

unwilling to bestow, and which the minister, the spiritual father, can alone efficiently supply.

Some, perhaps, may object, and think that the pulpit must lose what the school gains : that the time occupied in these visits to the school can be ill spared for the preparation which is requisite for the duties of the Church. My belief is, on the contrary, that the school is no bad substitute for the study : and that the adults at Church would often be gainers by the hours which have been previously spent upon the children in their school. Of one thing there can be no doubt : it is commonly admitted and regretted. A large part of the labour bestowed on the pulpit is thrown away. Not only when the truths inculcated, the ideas received, are practically disregarded, but because no idea is conveyed to the mind at all. It is not so presented as to enter the mind, or leave an impression. It is sometimes wrapped up in too many words for the hearer to develop : and sometimes expressed in terms so ambiguous or so little familiar, that no meaning is communicated.* Now the habit of discussing Scripture with the young and the uneducated is one mode of obtaining that difficult art, the art of reaching and interesting

* Appendix, No. IV.

the minds of the more educated and advanced in years. It shows the need of adding line to line. It shews the need of taking nothing for granted, in regard to intelligence in the hearers, but of making sure that we are understood. It acquaints us with errors which must be guarded against, and could hardly have been anticipated. It habituates us to the interpretation of Scripture by Scripture. It familiarises us to the useful practice of illustration. Whoever is the best adept in all these various arts, will be the best teacher in the pulpit as well as in the school ; and will insensibly practise there those lessons which he has himself learnt, unawares, whilst teaching others. The probability is, that the most assiduous catechist will prove the most effective preacher ; and there may be a reason not always reckoned on by those who have left the fact on record, why of all the labours of their ministry those hours have been the most profitable which they had spent in catechising.

I must advert, though briefly, to another feature of the present day, which may be viewed with sincere satisfaction. The attention of the community has been strongly turned towards the

condition of those classes, whose welfare must be in a great degree affected by the conduct of those above them.

The first aspect of a society like ours has a very anomalous appearance. We see wealth and poverty in close contact and violent contrast : both in extremes. It would be unreasonable to complain of this, which in long settled and prosperous countries is the inevitable course of things. Money is accumulated in large masses : population verges hard upon the means of subsistence ; or, in other words, the demand for employment is greater than the demand for labour. Legislation cannot reach the case : can neither produce nor prevent it. But like every other providential arrangement, the evils which belong to it have a corresponding remedy. In a community thus circumstanced, many possess both the leisure and the means to attend to wants which ought to be relieved, and to correct the irregularities and vicissitudes of temporal condition. And the Gospel, the faith that is in Christ Jesus, imposes upon those who enjoy such opportunities the duty of employing them in compliance with the will of God, according to each man's "several ability." Their talents of fortune, of leisure, of education are assigned them, not for

the purpose of self-indulgence, but of conscientious occupation, that the Lord, when he cometh to take account, may "receive his own with usury."* If wealth is used merely for the purpose of increasing wealth, of amassing more, the intent is frustrated for which it was awarded: but if it is employed to feed those who would otherwise be an hungered, to clothe those who would otherwise be naked, to educate those who would otherwise be ignorant, to raise up those who would otherwise have fallen irrecoverably, then the design of God's providence is answered, and his wisdom justified by his children. How different a scene we should contemplate, if this were made the general principle of action!

It is some ground of comfort, that there is an approximation towards it. The truth is more commonly acknowledged, that "we are every one members one of another:"† and that if one class of society suffer, all others "suffer with it."‡ In the Metropolis, to which we naturally look as the centre of action for the country at large, a vast organization has taken place on the basis of this principle: and the laity have been made the accredited assistants of the clergy, in the perform-

* Matt. xxv. 28.

† Rom. xii. 5.

‡ 1 Cor. xii. 26.

ance of duties which can only be fulfilled by a general co-operation.* Hitherto, wherever this plan has been carried out, social improvement, moral and religious benefits have followed: and I hail its extension as a step towards the more general diffusion of Christian practice throughout the land: a return to the time when the faith of Christ was felt as a source of peculiar duties and obligations, impelling every man to act according to his profession: to “distribute to the necessity of saints;” to “rejoice with them that rejoiced, and to weep with those that wept;” to “labour in the Lord:” to be “fellow-helpers” with the elders of the Church: to “warn the unruly, to comfort the feeble-minded, to support the weak:” “to visit the fatherless and widows in their affliction, and to keep themselves unspotted from the world.”†

I trust, Reverend Brethren, that we may justly look upon these various circumstances connected with the present position of the Church, in the light of encouragement. Though many things are still against us, our condition now is very different from our condition at my second visit to you in 1832. There may not be less opposition.

* Appendix, No. V.

† See Rom. xii. 13, &c.; xvi. 12; 1 Thess. v. 14; James i. 27.

But there is less ground for it. The spirit of those who dissent from our establishment may not be less hostile ; there is rather cause to fear the contrary. But there is far less ground of plausible complaint against us, as not performing what we profess : and though the fire may not be extinguished, it will cease to spread or lose its fierceness in proportion as the materials which nourish it are removed or cease to be supplied. Such has always been my opinion, and my practice has been in conformity with it. Though no one can be more sensible, than myself, of the mischief of schism, or more desirous of unity in the Church, I have considered it as no part of my business to inveigh against Dissent, in a Diocese where the Establishment was avowedly inadequate to supply the spiritual food which the mass of the population needed. It has been uniformly my aim to remove the evil, instead of complaining of its consequences : to increase the powers of the Church, to enlarge its tents and strengthen its stakes, that it might be indeed, and not in name only, the people's Church : and thus to take away all pretext for separation. I look round, and acknowledge with thankfulness, that the effort, powerfully seconded as it has been by yourselves, has not been altogether vain : and

if continued with like energy, and favoured by the same degree of blessing, the ensuing half-century may repair the breaches in our walls which time and change had occasioned, and recover the ground which had been lost in the preceding age.

My Reverend Brethren, we talk of opposition, and we feel it: we complain of misrepresentation, and are vexed by undeserved hostility; and we have often cause: but, after all, we can receive no serious injury but from ourselves. We need not fear Divine judgments, as long as we are faithful to Him “whose we are, and whom we serve;” and the favour of men will on the whole be on our side, if they “see our good works,” and experience the benefit of our care. Politicians will support us, as promoters of prosperity and peace; and the people will esteem us, as instruments through whom the gospel is preached to them. But, no doubt, there may be danger from ourselves. And you may wonder, perhaps, at the confidence which I now avow, after the apprehension which I expressed three years ago, of the evil then prevailing within our Church.* Upon this point my opinion remains unchanged: and I

* Appendix, No. VI.

still lament the injury which, as I think, the Church has received from some who profess to be her warmest friends. From the effects of this we are still suffering, and shall long suffer : yet I trust that the crisis is past : that we have seen and know the worst : and that no slight consolation may be derived from the circumstance, that the Church at large has determinately resisted the temptation by which it has been tried : that the great body of our people have shewn themselves too well grounded in the truth to be allured by the “form of godliness” held out to them : or to believe that there could exist that holiness and self-denying practice which all acknowledge to be the “end of the commandment,” “without the power” of those principles by which alone it can be sustained.

When the truth originally delivered to the Church is endangered, to “contend earnestly” becomes a duty. But a state of debate concerning doctrines which ought to be settled articles of faith, and a state of opposition among those who ought to be closely linked together, is an evil which cannot be too strongly deprecated. It should at least be an important truth, and not an

ambiguous word, for which brethren should make one another offenders. Yet many of the subjects which divide us, instead of being like that for which Paul withstood Peter to the face,* are rather those which the same Paul would denounce as questions and strifes of words.

The subject of Baptismal Regeneration, for instance, which seems to have its periodical seasons of recurrence, is again perplexing our religious system, and furnishing material for attack and re-creation.† In the few remarks which follow, I am not so presumptuous to suppose that I can settle such a question. Indeed, I see no means by which it ever can be settled. We have not

* Gal. ii. 11.

† I allude to passages like these, to which too many parallels may be found in the current writings of the day. "As to the reception of our Church of this doctrine of baptismal regeneration, there can be no rational doubt. It stands broadly, clearly, definitely, and tangibly part of her; you cannot reject it without tearing in pieces her prayer book and scattering her formularies to the four winds: you cannot reject it without arraying against you, ipso facto, the collective honesty and the unbiassed eyes and ears of the world. And so long as this doctrine being of the importance which it is, has the position which it has in her system; *so long must it be clear that those who deny it are not lawful members of her: stay in her against her will: and entirely depend on the excuse of the strongest prejudice in order to escape the alternative of positive dishonesty.*"—British Critic, xxxii., 238.

the data, either from Scripture or experience, by which the actual effect of baptism can be placed beyond the reach of discussion.* We know the language of the antient fathers. But we also know the nature of that baptism to which their language was applied : baptism such as Justin describes in the well-known passage, where he says† “As many as have been persuaded that the things spoken by us are true, and undertake to live accordingly, are instructed to pray with fasting, and ask remission of their former sins, whilst we fast and pray with them. They are thus led by us to a place where is water, and are regenerated with the same regeneration by which we have been ourselves made regenerate. For this washing with water is in the name of God the Father and

* “The difficulty attendant upon it lies, not in showing the adoption of infant baptism from the very beginning, but in ascertaining whether in the case of infant recipients moral regeneration invariably or not invariably attends upon the administration of outward baptism. To settle this point, either in the way of argument from Scripture, or in the way of evidence from antiquity, is no easy matter ; and its very difficulty ought, I think, to teach the propriety of much temper and moderation in those who on whatever grounds have been conducted to opposite conclusions.”—See Mr. Faber’s very interesting and instructive volume on the Primitive Doctrine of Regeneration, Book iii. l. 1.

† Apol. i.

governor of all things, and of our Lord Jesus Christ, and of the Holy Spirit." For Christ himself said, "except a man be born again, he cannot see the kingdom of God." Our own Church, in her complete service, presumes the like preparation: presumes that baptism is the result of faith and attended by repentance: and pronounces infants regenerate, after faith and repentance have been promised for them by their sureties, and expressly required of themselves, when come to age.

Still our Church does pronounce the child *regenerate*. Now, if one party maintains that this is the judgment of charity, as belonging to the principle which pervades and must pervade all general services; but that the individual now become accountable, and evidently not living in the faith of the Son of God, was never really endowed with the Holy Spirit; that party can never be absolutely silenced. Neither can the opposite party, who affirm, on the other side, that those whom we now unhappily see living in sin, were once in a state of grace, and fell from it through their own wilfulness or the neglect of others. The dispute is one that never can be closed.

Our Church declares, further, that "they which

receive baptism rightly” are partakers of the blessings conveyed in baptism.* And who can venture to decide with confidence, whether original sin, unhappily existing in the infant, may not prove a let or hindrance to the “right receiving” of the Sacrament? Who can say whether the absence of faith and repentance in those who profess it in the child’s name, may not “frustrate the grace of God?” Who can answer whether the faith of the child or of the Minister shall suffice, though there be no more faith on the part of parents or sponsors than there can be in the infant child? Upon all these points we may form inferences, offer plausible arguments, pronounce strong opinions: but we shall never satisfy those who refuse to be satisfied, till we can prove from Scripture the unconditional efficacy of baptism, as plainly as we can shew the general necessity of baptism to salvation.

Meanwhile, it is surely one among the subjects which is calculated to “gender strife,” to “minister questions,” rather than “godly edifying.” Practically, the two parties must be “like minded,” though they do not “say the same thing.” All will acknowledge, that in those who are “come

* Article xxvii.

to age," there must be signs of "a death unto sin and a new birth unto righteousness," in order that there may be a well-grounded hope of God's mercy through Christ. All must agree that if no signs of this change appear, the man needs still to "be converted," or perish. And whether that conversion be called regeneration or renewal, what does it avail: when we know that God will judge of every man not according to "word or to name," but to "deed and truth:" and that the regenerate man will be "cast into outer darkness," if his works are the works of the unregenerate.

Whilst, however, faithfulness requires us to insist on the signs of regeneration, and not to be satisfied with the mere assertion or presumption of it: consistency requires that we speak in accordance with the language of our Liturgy. There is no reason why any should contradict it. They who believe that the act of baptism justifies, and they who believe that where there is no justifying faith in the adult, there has been no baptismal grace in the child, must concur alike in this: that the life, and not the name, is the evidence to which appeal must be made; for that "if any man have not the spirit of Christ, he is none of his." Say, therefore, that "if any man be in

Christ Jesus, he must be a new creature :” must have “put off the old man, which is corrupt according to the deceitful lusts ; and have put on the new man, which after God is created in righteousness and true holiness.” Say further, that “whosoever is born of God, overcometh the world ;” “does not commit sin :” and therefore that if any man be a follower of wicked habits, and instead of “overcoming the world,” allows the world to overcome him, he is not “in Christ Jesus :” not “in the faith ;” has “no part nor lot in this matter :” “the wrath of God abideth on him.” To urge this, as it may be urged with all the force of reason and of Scripture, is an unquestionable duty : whilst to denounce the “wicked” or “slothful” servant as *unregenerate* will rather open a way to verbal dispute, than enforce the conviction which it is our object to secure.*

What the preacher has mainly to consider is the state and character of his people. If he sees them negligent in the case of baptism, as a multi-

* “If then the end be the same, even the ‘turning of souls from Satan unto God ;’ why should good men think or say unkind things of each other, merely because, after an honest examination of the question, the points from which they variously set forth in their common labour of charity, are different ?”—Faber, on Regeneration, p. 377.

tude in the present day, unhappily, are negligent : he will point out the sinfulness, on the one hand, of despising an ordinance so strictly commanded by the Lord, and practised by the Apostles, and by the Church in every age and country : and, on the other hand, represent the blessing which may be expected,—not “doubted of but earnestly believed” —when the infant is admitted to the privilege of the Christian Covenant, being solemnly dedicated to God in the name of Him who “came to seek and to save that which was lost,” whether infant or adult. His frequent text will be, “Repent and be baptised in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins, and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost.”

It may happen, however, that the danger shall lie the other way, and that the value of baptismal privileges may be over-rated, not depreciated, in the minds of the congregation. According to the course of human nature, this is not unlikely ; and that the promise should be claimed as if made to him that is baptised, and not to him that “believeth and is baptised.” No one can deny that this error should be guarded against ; and may be refuted without any disparagement of the Divine ordinance. The Prophets meant no dishonour to

the institution of sacrifices, which were required and continually offered under the law, when they reproved the Jews who trusted to these outward things, in language which would seem irreverent if it had not been inspired.* But we have even a higher example. The Lord Jesus, when he appeared, found the Jewish people trusting, among other outward forms, to their strict observance of the Sabbath: and often rebuked their hypocrisy in words which might be supposed to disparage the institution itself. The spirit in which he said, "It is lawful to do good on the Sabbath day:" "The Sabbath was made for man, and not man for the Sabbath;" arose out of the opinions which were then prevailing in the nation, and required correction. The Prophets found the Sabbaths neglected, and reminded the Israelites of God's mercy in granting them; and pronounced a blessing upon those who "kept the Sabbath from polluting it," calling it "a delight, holy of the Lord, honourable."† The Lord Jesus found that the strict observance of the Sabbath and other ordinances of the law, was used as a sort of compromise for the want of that love towards God and

* See Ps. xl. 6; l. 8. Isa. i. 11, &c. Hos. vi. 6.

† Isa. lvi. 2; lviii. 13. Ezek. xx. 12.

man which alone is “true and undefiled religion.” He therefore alleged the instances when David, and they that were with him, violated the sanctity of the law, and were blameless : how “the priests in the temple profaned the Sabbath, and were blameless :”* that the Pharisees might learn what that meant, “I will have mercy, and not sacrifice ;” and might be assured that it was “lawful to do well on the Sabbath day.”

These examples justify the preacher, who, if he sees need, adopts the argument of St. Paul concerning one Divine Ordinance, and applies it to another : and does not scruple to affirm, that “he is not a Christian, who is one outwardly ; neither is that baptism, which is outward in the flesh ; but he is a Christian, who is one inwardly ; and baptism is that of the heart, in the spirit, and not in the letter. For baptism verily profiteth, if thou keep the law : but if thou be a breaker of the law, thy baptism is made no baptism.”†

Another accusation has been brought against the Clergy, as if they were violating a solemn en-

* Matt. xii. 1-12.

† Archbishop Sharpe’s Sermons, vol. vi. p. 17. Rom. ii. 25-29.

gagement, inasmuch as they do not “say the Morning and Evening Prayer in the Church or Chapel where they minister, or cause a bell to be tolled, that the people may come to hear God’s word, and to pray with him.”

There is every reason to believe that this injunction, though found in the preface to “the Book of Common Prayer,” was never in any age generally observed in our Church. Neither can there be any justice in reproaching the Clergy of the present day, because they follow the practice of their predecessors, and do not commence a service which is neither “accustomed,” nor enforced upon them by the authority to which deference would be due.

Granting, however, that the Clergyman is not bound to these daily services: can he advantageously introduce them?

And here we may justly say concerning our people, “O that there were such an heart in them,” such a spirit of piety throughout the land, as prepared them for these services, and allowed the Clergy to give themselves more entirely to the worship of the sanctuary! It would be well, also, if the temporal circumstances of the people were such, as would make them able, even if they

were willing, to devote themselves more constantly to "the word of God and to prayer." But the fact, we know, is otherwise. The situation of our churches, often remote from the population: the length of our services; the degree of labour which is required of every man in this crowded country, in order that he may maintain his place in whatever position he fills, whether high or low: these causes render it absolutely impossible that any except a most inconsiderable proportion of our people, even if they felt as David felt concerning "the courts of the Lord's house," should be able to attend the morning or afternoon prayer on week-days. This is not a matter we can doubt about: it has been experienced recently wherever the practice has been tried: it has been long experienced in all Cathedral towns, where, unhappily, it does not appear, as some have supposed, that the appetite will grow with the opportunity.

Such being the case, I cannot think it the duty of a minister to commence the practice of daily prayers.* But it is very desirable that, being re-

* Mr. Robertson, who has entered very fully into this question, states it as his conclusion, "that daily service was never general in parish churches, even before the Reformation; that

lieved from this labour, he should invite his people to such services as many can attend : that in towns especially, on one, or two, or even three evenings in the week, his church should be open to maintain the impression which is made upon the Lord's day. When there is hunger and thirst after righteousness, some such intermediate refreshment will be desired : and this, like other appetites, if not satisfied, will either fail altogether, or seek elsewhere for gratification. But I see no expediency in summoning the congregation to services which we know they have not the means of frequenting. There is danger lest the Sabbath bell should lose its influence upon ears hardened by constantly disregarding it through the week. And, as concerns the clergyman himself, to say nothing of the limits assigned to time and strength, that must be an extraordinary mind in which devotion was not rather lowered than elevated, by daily "calling," while

on Wednesdays and Fridays the Litany was commonly read, in later times, apparently without the morning prayers : that service on the eves of Sundays and holydays was also common : that the want of a congregation was held an excuse for the clergy : and that, altogether, according to the notions of earlier times, our bishops have a right to order in the matter, according to their discretion."—On Conformity to the Liturgy, p. 31-42.

all “refused,” and “stretching out the hand while no man regarded.”*

Unless, indeed, a man console himself in the discharge of his solitary service, under the belief that his prayers for the people superseded the necessity of the people praying with him.

Here we tread on dangerous ground. We confound two things which are essentially different; intercessory prayer, and vicarious prayer. The value of intercessory prayer we cannot doubt: or rather, we cannot sufficiently estimate: it is among the secrets to be known hereafter. But vicarious

* “Will the single minister of almost the least troublesome parish be found, in ordinary circumstances, either physically or morally capable of this increase of duty—superadded to engagements for which he can even now hardly find time and strength—visits to the poor—visitation of the sick—catechising—lecturing—superintendence of school—persuasion of absentees to come to church—peace making—occasional ecclesiastical duties—the ordinary business of his parish—his own private devotions—his preparation for the Sunday and holyday sermons—his study of divinity—his searching of the Scriptures—all to be combined with the keeping up his stock of general literature—looking after his own private affairs—generally so scanty as to require a vigilant economy—and fulfilling those various engagements of social life which a clergyman must cultivate if he hopes to maintain the station and influence in his parish which is necessary not merely to his personal comforts, but to his public utility?”—Quarterly Review, No. cxliii., p. 253.

prayer, repugnant as it is to our reason, and entirely without countenance from Scripture, must not be mistaken for those intercessions which are the highest privilege of the devout Christian.

When Samuel replied to the repentant Israelites, "God forbid that I should sin against the Lord in ceasing to pray for you ;"* he did not release them from the duty of individual prayer. When "prayer without ceasing was made of the church" for Peter,† we may be sure that he was himself employed, like his brethren in the same condition, in "praying and singing praises unto God."‡ When Simon entreated the same apostle to "pray to the Lord for him," it was not to set aside his own supplication that "the thoughts of his heart might be forgiven."§

In truth, when we recognise vicarious prayer, we touch upon one of the most irrational and debasing errors of the Church of Rome. The vicarious worship of the Jewish ritual was sacrifice, not prayer. The high priest entered into the holy of holies, and made atonement for the sins of the people who stood without, as a type of the great sacrifice once made, and which only one could

* 1 Sam. xii. 23.

† Acts xvi. 25.

‡ Acts xii. 5.

§ Acts viii. 22-24.

offer, when the just died for the unjust, that he might bring us to God.* But sacrifice is not prayer. Vicarious prayer was part of the corruption which overspread the Church, when human ambition discovered the power which it might attain, if it could use religion as a ladder to climb up by. The object first desired, was influence and authority ; but the consequence of deserting the light of Scripture was seen by the evils which ensued, when piety became transferable and venal, and superstition was ready to believe what covetousness did not scruple to pretend, that “the gifts of God might be purchased with money.”†

We who derive our practice from the word of God find nothing there to justify the notion that the prayer of the minister is any more efficacious for the people, than the prayer of the people for their minister : or that his supplication availeth otherwise, than as far as it is “the effectual and fervent prayer of a righteous man.”‡ Each party is instructed to pray for and with the other.

* Heb. ix. 7.

† Acts viii. 20.

‡ James v. 16.

The injunction of St. James (v. 14.) is one of those “Scriptures” which have been “wrested” by those whose interest was concerned, “to the destruction” of many. “Is any sick among

Before leaving altogether the subject of prayer, I ought perhaps to advert to another question which has been unexpectedly raised concerning it; the attitude of the officiating minister. Here, however, it will be surely enough to remind you, Reverend Brethren, of the care which we are bound to exercise, lest we should affront our congregations by practices which they have identified, and can scarcely help identifying, with superstition. We are surrounded by adversaries who neither want the ability nor the will to misrepresent and injure us. We must beware of preparing ground for them to stand on. We must see that it be no fault of our own, if many who have left us almost of necessity to seek elsewhere the provision which the Church was unable to afford, do not return to our pastures as fast as we provide folds

you? Let him call for the elders of the church: and let them pray over him, anointing him with oil in the name of the Lord: and the prayer of faith shall save the soul, and the Lord shall raise him up; and if he have committed sins, they shall be forgiven him." Without resorting to the interpretation of most commentators, who refer this to the miraculous gifts bestowed upon the church in that day; the effect is no greater than that which St. John expects from the prayer of "*any man.*" (v. 16.) "If any man see his brother sin a sin which is not unto death, he shall ask, and He shall give him life for them that sin not unto death."

and shepherds for them. It behoves us, to “give none offence :” to “provide things honest in the sight of all men :” to “commend ourselves to every man’s conscience in the sight of God.” St. Paul supposes the case of an unbeliever entering into a place of Christian worship, and being so struck with the devotion which he saw around him, as to “fall on his face,” and acknowledge that God was in the midst of the worshippers.* Is this the impression which a stranger or an adversary would receive, who should see the minister studiously turn his back towards the people who ought to be praying with him, as if the throne of Him who fills all space, were to be found in one direction rather than another? Perhaps it was the custom of the early Christians. But so were many practices which belong rather to the darkness out of which they were happily delivered, than to the light into which they had advanced. Their custom cannot make that reasonable for which no reason can be given: or justify us in studying anything except how we may be “best understood of the people.” Novelties of dress, peculiari-

* 1 Cor. xiv. 24, &c. The whole argument in that passage is as applicable as the moral with which it is concluded. “Let all things be done unto edifying.”

ties of gesture, or of posture, can only disturb the spirit of devotion ; divert the mind from that on which it ought to be fixed ; and ought to be carefully avoided, rather than purposely studied, independently of the offence which they cause, if connected in the minds of the people with superstition.

My Reverend Brethren, the error against which we have mainly to contend in our ministerial functions is the very error which many of these things have a tendency to promote : I mean, formality in religion. This is the error to which the heart is naturally prone : which, if at all awakened to a sense of responsibility, desires salvation, but desires it on the easiest terms : often on any terms, except those on which alone it can be attained, a surrender of the individual self to God. It is willing to depend on general redemption, and acquiesce in general promises : to listen while prayers are repeated, rather than to pray ; to hear the sentence of absolution, rather than to feel the emotions of penitence. The man will satisfy himself, if allowed to do so, by being in the Church, and dying in the Church : and needs to be continually reminded that, in order to be in the

Church, he must first be "in Christ," and cannot be in Christ, when "come to age," except by personal faith realizing the covenant to which he was pledged by baptism.

This, therefore, is the error against which we are bound to exercise our vigilance; certainly not to cherish or encourage it, by paying undue attention to anything formal or external:—even to the architecture of the building, independently of the uses of the building; much less, to allow that the tone of voice or studied posture should give an artificial air to services which ought to speak the language of the heart, and, unless they do speak it, lose all their value.

Meanwhile, if we keep constantly before our minds the great objects of our ministry, all things will have their right place, and receive their due importance. Forms and ordinances will rise, not fall, in esteem and interest.

The Sacrament of baptism, for instance, which we desire to magnify. Act as you would act, if you were anxious that a friend should seek some remedy for a disease of which he was unconscious, but which you well knew must be fatal. You would gain nothing by extolling the efficacy of the

remedy, till he were convinced of the dangerous tendency of the disease. On the same principle, men will esteem baptism a holy rite, blessed of the Lord and honourable, in proportion as they understand their fallen state ; their need of a better nature than that which they inherit from Adam. Keep before the minds of your people a sense of their ruined condition, and of the mercy of God in providing a remedy for that condition, which remedy is in Jesus Christ. Then it will be with them, as with the Ethiopian to whom Philip opened the Scriptures, and preached unto him Jesus.* And he said, “ Sir, here is water ; what doth hinder me to be baptised ? ” So it will be with parents. Having brought a corrupt being into the world, they will hasten to “ wash away his sins ” in the “ laver of regeneration,” “ calling upon the name of the Lord : ” they will enrol their sinful infant in covenant with Him by whom sin is taken away, that having been born “ a child of wrath,” he may be made “ a child of grace.”

So in regard to the Sacrament of the Lord’s Supper. You desire that all should kneel around it, and show there a testimony of their faith, and

* Acts viii. 30.

seek an increase of grace, a more perfect conformity to his image. They will value the memorial, according as they value Him whom it commemorates. They will honour the representation if they honour Him who is represented. To what purpose should I set up a monument, even if I could force all men to fall down and worship it, to one who is either not known or not esteemed? The honour is not in the action, but in the feeling which prompts the action. Preach therefore the cross of Christ, as the only and sufficient satisfaction for sin: and they who are drawn to the cross will not fail to value the ordinance which represents it, even though they do not believe that the body and blood of Jesus are transferred into the figurative emblems. For if they were so transferred, or could be, what would it profit? "It is the spirit that quickeneth, the flesh profiteth nothing."* All that the body of Christ was to effect for us, was accomplished when he "bore our sins upon the tree." What we now need, is that the virtue of that sacrifice should be

* John vi. 63. "The body of Christ is given, taken, and eaten in the Supper only after an heavenly and spiritual manner." "And the means whereby the body of Christ is received and eaten in the Supper, is faith."—Art. xxviii.

ours: as it will be, in proportion to the faith by which we realize it in our hearts:* in proportion as we feed upon the remembrance of the death of Christ, as our life, and apply his blood to our consciences, as “cleansing from all sin,” whilst we confess our transgressions and lament our short-comings. So he becomes one with us, and we with him; he dwells in us, and we in him.

The same reasoning applies to the services of the Church. You wish, perhaps, for daily, or for more frequent services, and complain that they are not appreciated. Apply yourselves, not to exaggerate the value of public worship: as if “the form of godliness” could avail in the sight of God, and the mere attendance at church were meritorious; rather strive to excite the appetite for that which the service is, an act of confession, an act of thanksgiving, an act of supplication and of praise; an opportunity of hearing the word of God declared, and his promises confirmed to us from

* “Such as be void of a lively faith, although they do carnally and visibly press with their teeth, as St. Augustine saith, the Sacrament of the body and blood of Christ; yet in no wise are they partakers of Christ.”—Art. xxix.

the mouth of his appointed ministers. It was out of the abundance of this feeling that David said, "Lord, I have loved the habitations of thy house, and the place where thine honour dwelleth." I was glad when they said unto me, "we will go into the house of the Lord."

Proceeding in this course and using these arguments, we shall not be mis-represented, as if we had any other object than that of glorifying God, and leading men to act in agreement with their Christian profession. We shall not be accused of "preaching ourselves:" it will be manifest to all that "we preach the Lord Jesus Christ, and ourselves, for Jesus' sake, the servants" of the flock committed to our charge:* whose "heart's desire and prayer to God is," that they may be "rooted and built up in the faith," "stablished, strengthened, settled," so as to "obtain an inheritance amongst all them that are sanctified."

I have thus delivered to you, Reverend Brethren, with all plainness of speech, the things

* 2 Cor. iv. 5.

which seemed suited to the time and season. "I speak as unto wise men : judge ye what I say." And may "our Lord Jesus Christ himself, and God, even our Father, which hath loved us, and hath given us everlasting consolation and good hope through grace, comfort your hearts, and stablish you in every good word and work."*

2 Thess. ii. 16, 17.

A P P E N D I X .

No. I.—Page 11.

So much may be effected by system, that I introduce here accounts of three parishes, each containing about 5000 persons, in the hope that they may afford useful suggestions. They exemplify, in some degree, St. Paul's description of the character of a Christian Church : " From Him which is the head, even Christ, the whole body fitly joined together, and compacted by that which every joint supplieth, according to the effectual working in the measure of every part, maketh increase of the body, unto the edifying of itself in love."*

The two first are town parishes, the third chiefly agricultural.

I.

" The district, which is now not much more than a mile in circumference, contains about 5000 inhabitants, four-fifths of whom, at least, are persons earning their bread by manual labour, many of whom are extremely poor. In the oversight of this population I am assisted by two

* Eph. iv. 15, 16.

curates. Reserving in my own hands the general supervision of the whole, I have assigned one-half of the district to each of my fellow-labourers, stipulating that besides the frequent visitation of the sick, he shall visit every cottage which will receive him, not seldomer than once a quarter. Then, as to lay co-operation, the poorer part of the district is distributed into 40 sections, which are visited by 35 visitors, each section containing on an average 23 dwellings. Assiduous visitors go through their sections weekly, interchanging tracts, reading to the infirm, the uneducated, and those mothers of families who are confined at home on the Sabbath day, and watching to advance both the spiritual and temporal good of the little flock they tend. Once a month the visitors meet their minister for the purpose of instruction and prayer, when cases of distress are reported and relieved, and where collections of deposits for the Provident Society are paid over to the secretary. In this connection, it may be added that we have a clothing society for the district, the amount deposited in which by the poor last year was nearly £200.

For the children of the district we have four Sunday and four daily schools—the latter consisting of a boys' or infants' and two girls' schools. Some of these have sick and burial societies, some clothing funds, and some libraries. There is also an adult Sunday school, where persons from 30 to 70 years of age are instructed in the knowledge of Holy Scripture.

With regard to religious services, besides four full services in Church every week, there are three cottage lectures, and some times a fourth on an itinerating plan, held in various parts, with a view to arousing attention

in different localities. On the Friday evening preceding each administration of the Holy Communion, opportunity is afforded to the poor to consult their pastor privately and individually before they come to the table of the Lord. Catechetical instruction is provided for the young, with occasional interruption, every week. Once a month, a meeting of all the Sunday school teachers takes place, when they report progress, in writing, ask any questions bearing on their labour of love, and are instructed, prayed with, and encouraged.

In reference to the results of these various means, it may be safely stated that a great moral change has passed upon the district. From being the most notoriously degraded, neglected, and profligate locality in these parts, it is so improved as now to bear comparison with any parish in the neighbourhood. Some time ago it was remarked at a meeting of our magistrates, that, instead of supplying the largest number of committals to our prison, it now furnished comparatively the fewest. Very lately, also, a worthy man, who has resided for 30 years in the heart of the district, observed, of his own accord, "Although there is still great wickedness about here, no one that has not lived in the midst of the people, as I have done, can tell what an alteration has taken place in the last ten years. The place used to be dreadful; but now where ten oaths were sworn there is not more than one, and where there were seven brawls and fights there is not even one."

It may be added, that the attendance of the poor from the district at Church is quadrupled, and the number of communicants increased sevenfold. "To God be all the praise."

“ I consider it a point of Christian policy to enlist as many members of my flock as possible, in some service connected with the interests of the Gospel, and their own immediate Church—

1st. It draws out their energies in behalf of Him who did so much for them.

2nd. It enlists their sympathies and affection in behalf of their own church and parish.

Different offices are, as far as can be, allotted to different individuals, so that many experience the feeling that they have something to do in the congregation of which they are members. We have accordingly,—

The Sunday Schools—Their superintendants and teachers.—Connected with these there is a Sick and Burial Society, which is invaluable as a bond of connexion with the schools.

The Day Schools.—For these there are visitors, who daily instruct in Testament and Catechism classes.

A Clothing Fund Society connected with the district and members of the congregation.

There are secretaries and treasurers for all these different objects.

District Visitors' Society.—This is the most important parochial instrumentality. We have the parish divided into districts, and a visitor assigned to each district, who has a number of families consigned to her charge, varying in amount in proportion to population and number of visitors. There are two secretaries—

The Tract Secretary, who arranges a monthly supply of tracts, labels the packet for each visitor, and receives and regulates the old ones.

The General Secretary, who receives a *monthly* report from each visitor, of sickness or sorrows, distress, deaths, births, changes in the district, number of tracts circulated, amount of relief given, number of each family, and religious profession, &c. ; so that the secretary's book is the register of the particulars of the whole parish. It is the business of this secretary to *condense* the visitors' reports for the Minister at the monthly meeting, under the following five heads :—

1. Number of families visited.
2. Number of relief tickets given.
3. Sums of money to which they amount in each district.
4. Number of Tracts circulated.
5. General remarks, and any thing necessary to name to the clergyman.

Each district visitor is supplied with a number of copies of the three following :—

1st. A printed circular respecting the Sunday and Day schools, &c., &c., to be given to every new resident in the parish ; for there is constant change.

2nd. Provision tickets, orders upon a provision shop, for the purpose of relief. There are also tickets or orders upon a butcher, where butcher's meat for broth, &c., may be needful (the Minister alone has these last). No money is given.

3rd. Printed forms of monthly reports, as before described, to be sent in to the secretary.

Copies of these three are enclosed.

The Minister regularly meets the visitors once a month—previous to which the visitors have sent in, and the secretary condensed, their reports—when all cases

of sickness, sorrow, or destitution, of difficulty or hopefulness, &c., are named and considered, and notes taken by the Minister for visiting, &c., &c.

In cases of immediate necessity, the visitor sends a note to the Incumbent or Curate.

The Sunday School teachers are met by the minister, male and female, alternately once a fortnight.

A Sick and Burial Society, on the following terms of admission and relief:—From 5 years old and upwards, $\frac{1}{2}$ d. per week subscription will give at death £3.; from 11 years old and upwards, 1d. per week subscription will give 4s. per week when sick, and at death £3.; from 17 years old and upwards, 2d. per week subscription will give 7s. per week when sick, and at death £5.

Each member, on admission, pays a fee of 2d., for which he receives a printed copy of the rules, and will be considered a full member, and entitled to the relief, as above, after having regularly paid during nine months into the society. The weekly subscriptions to be paid in the school-room every Sunday morning, *before nine o'clock*.

A Lending Library, containing upwards of 500 vols. of carefully-selected books. Terms only 3d. per quarter; open every Monday evening from seven to eight o'clock.

A Clothing Society.—Deposits from 1d. upwards are received every Monday evening. In the first week of October a bonus of 2d. on every shilling deposited (*not to exceed two shillings bonus to any single depositor*) will be added by the Committee, and the whole amount returned in money, or in various articles of clothing, to suit the convenience or wants of the members."

III.

“At your Lordship’s request, I send a short account of the pastoral system which I have now for some years past adopted in this place. It has been the result of successive lessons of experience, and, of course, therefore, gradually introduced. I am happy to add that the success which, by the blessing of God, has now attended its complete adoption, has fully confirmed the opinion which I have always held, that the public ministrations of the clergy lose much of their efficiency when not accompanied by a system of private visiting, well digested, and perseveringly carried out.

The cure attached to the parish church contains about 6000 souls, dispersed over a wide area. This I have divided into three nearly equal districts, one for myself, and one for each of my curates. These districts are so contrived that we may each of us have one portion of our flock near and another at a distance from home, thus affording occupation both for bad and fine weather. Each of us is responsible for his own district, though not debarred from devoting any spare time to the districts assigned to the other two. As far as I am myself concerned, I am, of course, always on the watch over the whole parish, receiving from my curates constant reports of the state of their respective districts, and often visiting some of their people, as well as my own.

In visiting our people, from house to house, our rule is, not at once and in every case to force religious conversation. We are rather guided by circumstances as they arise, and often endeavour to win our way, by showing an interest in the secular as well as in the spiritual concerns of those whom we visit, taking care, at the same

time, by the whole tenor of our deportment throughout the visit, to make it clearly appear, that it is that of the pastor, and for a spiritual purpose. We bind ourselves thus to visit every family in our district, not less than once in three months; the regular attendants at church and communicants still more frequently; the sick and infirm weekly or daily as their necessities require. The extent of the area over which the population is scattered and the early age at which children are employed, have rendered it necessary to establish a number of detached schools, so situate as to be convenient for the use of very young children living at a great distance from each other. We have three Sunday schools, numbering about 500 children, and five daily schools, numbering about 320 children. During the whole time that the Sunday schools are open we are all of us engaged, either in superintendence or tuition. Each daily school, also, is under the special care of one of us, and receives a visit at least once, generally more than once, a week, when the classes are carefully examined, specially with reference to the portion of religious instruction appointed for the week. On Sunday, we share amongst us two full services in the church, and in the evening two short services, with familiar exposition of scripture, in the distant school-rooms. And during the week we are answerable for three evening lectures, partly in distant school-rooms, partly in cottages, some being plain expositions of scripture, others of a catechetical description; all accompanied with prayer from the liturgy, and generally, with singing of psalms or hymns.

I believe I have now furnished, a tolerably faithful sketch of a system, which, with God's blessing, has

proved very successful amongst my own people. It is, I am well aware, imperfect, and susceptible of much improvement. Yet imperfect as it is, it may perhaps, when taken in connection with the results which it has produced, be sufficient to show as well the advantage as the practicability of becoming more personally acquainted with our people than is often the case, and of seeking to become so, not in the first desultory way which offers, but on a system."

It will be observed that in these reports mention is made of the exposition of Scripture in cottages or school-rooms. On this subject, I subjoin what has recently been written by certain candidates for Priest's orders, in reply to a general inquiry as to any signs of improvement in their respective parishes, and the means to which it might be ascribed.

1. "I know of many instances of persons habitually attending Church who never did so before, and in whose whole conduct a decided improvement is visible. The means I have found most efficient in producing any effect has been cottage lecturing, accompanied by catechizing, followed up by visiting from house to house as far as, owing to the number entrusted to my care, it can possibly be done."

2. "Some promising signs I have noticed during the past year, especially in one part, where a cottage lecture has been established since last autumn. Regular private visiting, and cottage lectures, I find have been the most useful. I have generally two lectures every week.

When I find that, after a while, from various circumstances, the interest dies, or much opposition springs up, I vary the place of meeting, and return again after a certain space. This, however, has seldom been needful, as all my lectures are well attended, and with some especially, there is an apparent thirst to hear the word of truth and life."

3. "I may truly say that God's blessing has most visibly descended on our district during the past year. Many, especially those who had been confirmed drunkards, have been converted, many who never entered a church or chapel now attend regularly; some papists have been gained over, and of those whom I am privileged to regard as seals of my apostleship, I know of none who is not consistently walking in love and good works. Diligent visiting and cottage lectures appear to me to have been the most effectual instruments in the Lord's hands of working this blessed change. Affectionate sympathy, however, during visits, and a full and free manifestation of the doctrines of grace in the above lectures has done much to win the hearts of these people in an accidental way."

4. "Several young persons who work in the mills have been seriously impressed during the past year, and have become communicants, and are at present steadfast in their profession of religion. In some cases they have been induced to come at first to cottage lectures or to an adult class on Tuesday evenings."

5. "Considerable improvement among a few, which seems to be especially promoted under God's blessing by visiting their houses, and calling them together occasionally at my own residence."

6. "Our congregation has been gradually on the increase, and I attribute it in a great measure to cottage lecturing. On which occasions I always endeavour to point out the great necessity of a regular attendance at Church."

No. II.—p. 12.

CHURCHES BUILT SINCE 1842.

CHESHIRE.

Parish.	Church.
Budworth, Great.	Barnton.
	Northwich.
Eastham.	Ellesmere Port.
Macclesfield.	St. Paul's.
	Henbury.
Over.	Winsford.
Runcorn.	Western Point.

LANCASHIRE.

Ashton-under-Lyne.	Bardsley.
Bolton-le-Moors.	Christ Church.
	Lever Bridge.

Parish.	Church.
Bury.	Elton.
Cockerham.	Dolphinholme.
Eccles.	Barton.
Kirkham.	Weeton.
Liverpool.	St. Thomas.
	St. Silas.
Manchester.	St. Matthias.
	St. Bartholomew.
	St. Simon and St. Jude.
	St. Silas.
	St. Thomas.
	Holy Trinity.
	St. Barnabas.
	Stretford (rebuilt).
Ormskirk.	Bickerstaffe.
Prescot.	Knowsley.
Prestwich.	Unsworth.

FLINTSHIRE.

Hawarden.	St. John the Baptist.
-----------	-----------------------

WESTMORLAND.

Firbank.	(Rebuilt.)
----------	------------

CUMBERLAND.

St. Bridget's.	(Rebuilt.)
----------------	------------

No. III.—p. 14.

“The gross amount of children attending day schools in the diocese is 83,000. Confining our observations to Lancashire and Cheshire, the number under *daily* education is about three and three-fifths per cent. on the whole population. The general state of Church education in Sunday and Daily Schools stands thus:—

Daily schools 912 ; scholars ... 74,390.

Sunday schools ... 983 ; scholars ... 133,645.

Add to the Sunday scholars those day scholars who do not attend on Sundays, the whole number will be about 155,000, out of a population of 2,072,000, or $7\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. It is important to remark, that daily education is exactly in proportion to the amount of pastoral superintendence. In fifteen large towns, having an average population of 7500 to each of 120 Incumbencies, the number of schools is 190, and of scholars 26,405, out of a population of 921,000. In 132 places, where each Incumbent has a population exceeding 3000, the number of schools is 291, and of scholars 23,335, out of a population of 711,000. In 302 places, where the Incumbents have fewer than 3000 persons under their charge, the number of schools is 431, of scholars 24,650, out of a population of 430,000. No one who has watched the progress of the Church for the last few years will be surprised at this statement: he will have observed that every new church, most frequently in the year succeeding its consecration, is provided with its set of schools.”—Report of the Diocesan Board of Education, 1843, p. 9.

No. IV.—p. 20.

The following observations, recently made, deserve much attention :—

“ We venture with great deference to observe that in the particular of preaching, rather as to its form than its matter, our Clergy, as a body, have much to learn, and that they may, perhaps, acquire a part of it from that school amongst themselves which in popular language would be termed Evangelical. Preaching is a great Christian ordinance, and admirably suited in its own nature for the propagation of principles ; we grieve, therefore, to see occasionally a sort of jealousy of this instrument, and a disposition, as it were, to avenge upon it the dishonour which its exclusive admirers are so apt to do to the yet more solemn and elevated offices of the Church. But, further, will the day ever arrive when English preaching, in general, shall attain to the natural ease and freedom, to that pastoral and persuasive character, in which we fear it is much behind the preaching of many other countries and communities both Catholic and Protestant ? It is not that it fails in matter and in thought. But the sermon still remains essentially the written essay. One consequence of this is, that it does not come with authority. It has many excellencies : the Clergy strive hard, and in many cases with wonderful success, against a vicious system ; but yet that which is conceived according to the idea of a written essay cannot, by any effort in the delivery, be converted into a warm and living sermon. We do not, in preaching,

follow the path which nature spontaneously dictates to a man desirous through the gift of speech to persuade his fellow-men. A speech of two hours is often heard with less wandering of mind than a sermon of thirty minutes, and that by men whose hearts are interested in the subject of the sermon to a degree infinitely exceeding their care for that of the speech : but the latter is a dissertation, and does violence to nature in the effort to be like a speech ; the former is, at least, more like what nature prompts. We long for the day when not by mere amendments in detail, but by the prevalence of a new idea of the proper basis of the practice of preaching, the Church of England shall avail herself of this mighty engine for promoting the glory of God, and the conversion, edification, and salvation of the souls of men.”—“ On the present aspect of the Church,” *Foreign and Colonial Quarterly*, No. IV.

A German writer, M. Ukeden, professing to give a “ View of the Anglican Church in the 19th century,” speaks of the general mode of preaching as follows :—

“ The practice of incessantly declaiming against the erroneous views entertained by other sects would almost seem to be an affair of conscience, and they are only the most distinguished individuals who take leave to preach a sermon without interweaving their discourse with polemical allusions. The preponderating interest taken in the controversy upon Church government explains why English preachers *address themselves so little to the condition of the soul*. The contrary might have been expected, when we consider how pre-eminently happy English authors have been in their delineations of cha-

racter. It is rare to hear the natural inferences from the text gone into: the extreme value of Scripture in religious polity is enlarged upon, and identically the same application is made of a prophecy of the Old Testament as of an extract from St. Paul's Epistles."—p. 135.

If this were any thing approaching to a just description, which I do not believe, no one could wonder at the inefficiency of the English pulpit. It is singular, however, and worthy of consideration, that a foreigner should have conceived this idea of the general style of preaching from the examples which fell under his observation.

No. V.—p. 24.

ASSOCIATION FOR PROVIDING SCRIPTURE READERS IN
CONNECTION WITH THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND.

*Under the sanction of the Lord Bishop of London and the Lord
Bishop of Winchester.*

At a Meeting held on the 18th of March, 1844, the following Resolutions were agreed to:—

1. That it is highly desirable to give the fullest effect to the Parochial System, and to supply to the people those private ministrations which, in populous parishes, the Clergy of themselves are unable adequately to afford.

2. That in order to advance this great object, an Association be formed for the purpose of providing, for the Metropolitan Parishes in the Dioceses of London and Winchester, Lay Scripture Readers, whose duty it shall be to read the Scriptures from house to house.

3. That such Lay Scripture Readers shall be Communicants in the Church of England—that they shall be selected by the Clergy of the respective districts, or by the Committee—that their appointment shall be solely vested in the Committee, but that the Readers shall be under the control of the Clergy, who may suspend them from performing their functions, on giving notice to the Committee; that in no case shall any reader be appointed to or continued in any Parish or District against the will of its Incumbent or Officiating Minister, and that the sanction of the Bishop shall be required to each appointment.

INSTRUCTIONS FOR SCRIPTURE READERS.

1. You are to visit in your district from house to house, for the purpose of reading the Scriptures to the poor, accompanying such reading with plain remarks, pointing their attention to the Saviour of whom they testify.

2. Remember that your principal object must be, to call attention to the Scriptures, strongly urging, upon their authority, the sin of neglecting them, setting them forth as the only infallible rule of faith and practice, as able "to make men wise unto salvation, through faith which is in Christ Jesus."

3. You are strictly prohibited from carrying about with you, for the purpose of reading to the people, or of distributing among them, any book or publication, but the Scriptures of the Old and New Testament, and the Book of Common Prayer; taking care to avoid, as much as possible, all controversy.

4. You are strictly prohibited from *preaching*, either in houses or elsewhere.

5. Urge upon all persons you visit the duty of attending the public worship of God in the Church; inculcate upon parents the duty of training up their children in the way they should go, and of procuring for them week-day and Sunday-school instruction. In any particular case which seems to call for the visit of the parochial Clergyman, report it forthwith to him.

No. VI.—p. 26.

It has now become unnecessary for me to vindicate some expressions in my former Charges from the censure which, in some quarters, they have met with; as if it were unreasonable or uncharitable to complain, as I did complain in 1838, that “the foundations of our Protestant Church were undermined by men who dwelt within her walls,” and that we were “threatened with a revival of Popish errors.” Subsequent events and writings, I conceive, have sufficiently shown that where the principle of Popery evidently existed, it was no erroneous judgment to foresee the conclusion.

I desire, however, to be only answerable for what I have written, and not for exaggerations of what I have written. I have never called the writers whose opinions I thought it right to impugn, either “agents of Satan,” or “instruments of the enemy of mankind.”* Language such as this could have no proper application except to men who wilfully pervert the truth, or blasphemously revile it. I did, indeed, attribute the attempt to overthrow the great doctrine of the Reformation, Justification by Faith, to that enemy whose power is never so successfully assailed as when that doctrine is preached in all its fulness. And I presume that I have Scripture on my side, when I represent “the conflict which may be traced throughout the whole history of the Church between truth and error, as carried on

* Remarks on my Charge of 1841, by the Hon. and Rev. A. Perceval.

between the two powers of light and darkness, Christ and the Devil: and, therefore, wherever there is error in doctrine, the agency of that great Adversary *pro tanto* has been employed. Not all who do his work are conscious of being his agents, or else they would cease: but he beguiles men's minds, and seduces them to "think they are doing God service," when they are, in fact, opposing truth. And these are his "subtle wiles," by which even good men, *i.e.*, well-intentioned men, are deceived. "For Satan himself is sometimes transformed into an angel of light."*

In point of fact, I have said little more than has now been virtually acknowledged by some who are more favourably disposed towards the Tractarian party than I pretend to be. It will be enough to allude to one. Mr. Palmer candidly allows that he early perceived in some of the writers "sentiments which seemed extremely unjust to the Reformers and injurious to the Church:" that he and some others "felt deeply uneasy on witnessing questionable doctrine gradually mingling itself with the salutary truths which they had associated to vindicate, and were often driven almost to the verge of despair, in observing what appeared to be a total indifference to consequences;" and that "it is now admitted on all hands, that there is a tendency to Romanism in some quarters;" and "an increasing dissemination of most erroneous and decidedly Romanising views, under the assumed name of Church principles."†

* See "A Letter to the Rev. Dr. Russell." In defending my own cause, I gladly avail myself of words which are not my own.

† See a "Narrative of events connected with the publication of the Tracts for the Times," pp. 23, 24, 49.

Now if the Romish faith be, what the history of the Church of Rome shows it to be, that form of Antichrist which is most decidedly inimical to the religion of the Gospel,—whatever has “a tendency to Romanism,” introduced into a Church which avowedly purified itself from Romish corruptions, must be approved by the great Enemy whose dominion the Gospel is destined to overthrow, and must like all other evil be ultimately ascribed to him. Either the premises are wrong, or Scripture obliges us to the conclusion. “Sir, didst thou not sow good seed in thy field? From whence, then, hath it tares? He said unto them, An enemy hath done this.” “Questionable doctrine is mingled with salutary truth:” sentiments “injurious to the Church,” and “having a decided tendency towards Romanism, are disseminated under the assumed name of Church principles.” From whence come these tares, in a field where good seed was sown? “An enemy hath done this.”* This, and no more have I said, in referring what has been called the Oxford movement, to “the subtle wiles” of the Adversary who had found his opportunity of injuring the Church of Christ, and had not failed to make use of his “advantage:” to disturb our peace with discussions by which vital religion is not promoted, and to divert youthful zeal into channels where it will little affect his own dominion.

* Matt. xiii. 27.

A

C H A R G E,

DELIVERED TO THE

CLERGY OF THE DIOCESE OF OXFORD,

AT

HIS PRIMARY VISITATION,

SEPTEMBER & OCTOBER, 1848.

BY

SAMUEL, LORD BISHOP OF OXFORD,

LORD HIGH ALMONER TO THE QUEEN :

CHANCELLOR OF THE MOST NOBLE ORDER OF THE GARTER.

LONDON :

FRANCIS & JOHN RIVINGTON,

ST. PAUL'S CHURCH YARD, AND WATERLOO PLACE.

1848.

A

C H A R G E,

&c.

MY REV. BRETHREN,

IT is not without mingled feelings that I meet you on this solemn occasion. For whilst on the one hand I look around me at every one of these our places of assembling with joy and thankfulness to God, on many whom I have seen labouring in their several parishes with a wise and diligent faithfulness, yet, on the other hand, when I remember—as when I thus meet the assembled diocese I must remember—the greatness of the work to which God's providence has called me, and my own insufficiency for such a burden, I look around me and tremble. And yet even from this very sense of feebleness there spring up thoughts of encouragement and strength. For that very sense of feebleness must, I think, drive any reflecting man from all trust in himself to a simple reliance upon HIS support whose has been the call to such a weighty and perilous charge. It must force him from all

B

notions of personal ability or fitness to a single trust in Him who founded this ministry ; who appointed this office, who committed it to men, and who will strengthen their infirmity to whom He gives grace to plead his promises and call for his aid.

Any practical acquaintance with the duties which belong to this office must, I think, lead every one to say from his very heart, “ Who is sufficient for these things ?” for the Bishop’s office is the earthly centre of the Christian ministry, with all its risks and ventures, for our own souls, and for the souls of others for whom Christ died ;—and for whom we must, each one, as far as they are entrusted to us, render up a strict account. Such, certainly, was the estimate formed of it in early times, and recorded alike by those who discharged it, and those amongst whom it was exercised. This was the reason why, wherever the Church had the most to do, to suffer, or to dare, she cast forth the Episcopate. This was the reason why great saints, although they were furnished with every earthly instrument of service, shrunk from the burden and risk of so great a charge. For then it was understood and believed that “ God” had “ set forth the Apostles last, as it were appointed to death,” having “ made” them “ a spectacle unto the world, and to angels, and to men ¹ ;” and that they who followed them in their office had succeeded, in their measure, to a like inheritance. It was then understood and believed, that the ministry of Priests and

¹ 1 Cor. iv. 9.

Deacons was an emanation drawn forth by the Holy Spirit as the Church's need required from that Apostolic office which the Lord Himself had founded, and made the especial channel of his grace for evangelizing the world; and that, as when Titus "ordained Elders in every city," he made provision for that due discharge of the work committed to him, for which his personal service never could have sufficed, that so the parochial ministry gave the like power to those who succeeded to his charge:—that thus the Bishop laboured through his Clergy, and that they, in their several ministries, carried out his necessary lack of service, and so enabled him to fulfil the injunction which, at his consecration, he receives amongst ourselves, as the "chief pastor" of his diocese—"Hold up the weak, heal the sick, bind up the broken, bring again the outcasts, seek the lost²."

Thus it was felt to appertain to the office of the Bishop to weigh with patient care all the Church's needs, to suggest and direct all her endeavours; to encourage, to reprove, if need be to punish; to preserve the high standard of devotion, to guard the purity of doctrine, to protect the flock from evil pastors, to be foremost in every labour, danger, and self-denial. Thus amidst the multitude of instruments was secured harmony of action: and thus were all the services of His people, and the appointed channels of His gracious gifts to them, drawn up

² Service for the Consecration of a Bishop.

together into a visible unity, which pointed directly to that intercession of our Lord through which alone any service can be offered; and from which descends to every member of His Church every where that grace which unites each one to their only true and ever-living Head.

Who can wonder that from such "a care of all the churches" the vigorous soul of Ambrose, as well as the more plaintive piety of Gregory Nazianzen, should so ardently have panted to escape? And though, my reverend brethren, the actings of this office amongst ourselves are greatly circumscribed and narrowed, yet in its essence it is unchanged, and it ought to be administered in the same spirit. It still is, or ought to be, a heavy burden: still before his mind, whom God has indeed called to it, must pass day after day the needs, the difficulties, the dangers of each separate pastor who is labouring under him, and of each flock committed to them. The diocese lies mapped out before him; in his secret prayers, day after day, the several necessities of its different parts are brought before his God: in that Presence only can he lay down his burden: for though of God's great mercy he is filled with thankfulness and joy, with seeing, in one place and another, the fruit of the pastor's prayers, and labours, and faithfulness, in a rich and abundant harvest of souls rescued from the power of the evil one; yet too often, alas, his soul is pierced by the thought of wants unsupplied in this parish, of a ministry missing its aim in that;

of worldliness, of inefficiency, of despondency amongst one or another of those over whom he is appointed to watch; and through whom he is discharging that fearful trust—the ministry of souls.

The actings of this office are, as I have said, circumscribed and narrowed amongst ourselves until there scarcely is left to it any authority, save that which man gave not, and which man cannot take away—its spiritual authority amongst those who believe it to be God's appointment, and who honour it for his sake. As far as regards the withdrawal of many of those external aids which heretofore increased its sway, it may be, that the wisdom of God has permitted their gradual removal, in order thus to free it from the secularity which, so soon as the powers of the world are on her side, is always ready to creep over the offices of Christ's Church. It may be, that He is intending thus to call forth within the Church of this nation a more lively sense of that Dispensation of His Spirit which He has verily bestowed upon her; and to teach her to trust in things divine more simply to that promised Presence of Himself with her, in which alone, and not in any arm of flesh, can be her strength. Certain it is, that wherever this apostolic office has been administered in faith and prayer, with singleness of aim and humility of soul, and where have gathered around it a faithful Laity and Clergy, seeing in it God's appointment, that there it has been ever found to be at once the living spring and tempering rule of united, and therefore effectual action for our Lord and Master.

It is as holding, however unworthily, such an office, that I come to-day amongst you; desiring greatly to be amongst you, through the aid of God, as a partner of your labours, a sharer of your griefs, a lightener of your anxieties, a helper of your joy; earnestly entreating your prayers that I may have grace so to fulfil the duties of my office, that, at the great day, I may give up my account with joy; and bespeaking, my reverend brethren, your forbearance towards the infirmities and errors which may attend my administration, your candid interpretation of much which, as years pass on, suspicion might distrust, or maliciousness pervert; your confidence in the singleness and simplicity of my desire to discharge its duties, as in God's sight, and your full and cheerful co-operation with me in the due fulfilment of our great common trust.

It is as having this trust in common that we meet here to take council together as to our common interests. That we should so consult together, I deem most important; for, without such united counsels, that union which is essential to our strength must be impossible. And, on this account, I greatly lament the change which has gradually passed over these our diocesan gatherings.

Excellent as in many respects is the working of that law of necessary publicity to which almost all action is now subjected, it is, undoubtedly, a great hindrance to taking counsel when it must be taken in public: and a Bishop's visitation would be another, and for his diocese, I believe, a far more effectual

instrument of good, if he then spoke only to those immediately concerned with the matters as to which he speaks, and consulted with those only with whom he has to work.

Such an institution, however, a visitation cannot now be ; and the impossibility of its being so makes me the more desire to supply this lack of free intercourse by other provisions. It is with this view that I have proposed to the Rural Deans and other officers of the diocese, what their kindness has enabled me hitherto to carry out, that we should spend annually some days together at Cuddesdon, for common prayer and common counsel.

Greatly should I rejoice to carry out this practice further amongst the body of the Clergy, should it be desired by any number of them. The spirit of earnest piety has, I believe, been kept alive in other branches of Christ's Church, favoured far less than we are in purity of faith and doctrine, by nothing so much as by such habitual meetings of the Bishop with his Clergy, for some days of separation from all worldly business, for mutual counsel and prayer, and reading God's word, and meditation, and partaking together of the holy Eucharist.

It is, moreover, to give practical reality to this close connexion between myself and those who labour in the several parochial charges of the diocese, that I have required,—as I have already stated to you through the Archdeacons,—that I should be consulted before any unlicensed clergyman officiates more than three

times within the diocese: and, for the same purpose, I now express my desire that in this diocese, as in many others, no formal nomination should be given to a curate until the incumbent has consulted me upon his fitness for the proposed cure.

To secure further this inter-communion, and, as far as possible, to make the episcopal office felt in your several parishes to be a living reality, and not a mere abstraction, it is moreover my desire, my reverend brethren, to join as often as possible in your parochial services. I wish that I could hope to be occasionally with all; but this the extent of an English diocese makes well-nigh impossible. But it will be my endeavour to be from time to time with as many as opportunity allows in their ordinary Sunday services. These and our other meetings will, I trust, give us many opportunities for that free intercourse and closer converse which I am most anxious to maintain with you, and which many circumstances render little possible at this our more official meeting. Whilst, however, it no longer affords scope for this, we may, through God's aid, render it not a little useful. We may profitably take together a more general view of our position,—of its strength, and of its weakness, of its duties, and its blessings.

And first, let me speak to you briefly on some public matters which I think must interest us all. For though the Clergy should never so lower down their high calling as to become political rather than spiritual men, yet, in the true and Christian sense of

the word, the highest interests of the *πολιτεία* are their special charge. It appertains to their office, as instructors and guides of thought and opinion, that they should closely watch all measures which tend to promote the general welfare, and, above all, the morals of the people. The tendency, in many quarters, to multiply such efforts is one of the most favourable symptoms of the present time; and you may greatly aid such good works by being ready to give them, in your several spheres, your support and co-operation. I allude, and I can only allude, to such measures as those for protecting women from the execrable arts of the pander; for limiting the hours on which houses for the sale of fermented or spirituous liquors can be opened on the Sunday; for maintaining by protective enactments, for shopkeepers and others, the rest of the Lord's day; for preventing the brutalizing sports which inflict torture on animals, and degrade those addicted to them; for correcting the grievous abuses by which so many charitable trusts are diverted from their lawful purposes; for improving our system of prison discipline, and the moral treatment of our convicts³; and for promoting in various ways, by sanitary measures and by improvements in the poor laws, the welfare and

³ In these reforms, thank God, the county of Berks, in our own diocese, has taken the lead. The results obtained in Reading gaol, under a system of moral and religious discipline, administered by the visiting justices, with the able assistance of their excellent chaplain, the Rev. T. Field, ought to lead to the reform of all our other gaols.

comforts of the labouring population. In such measures as these you cannot fail to feel an interest; and, as to many of them, your practical knowledge may enable you to afford to those who bring them forward much useful information and valuable support.

On another matter which has been before parliament I must speak somewhat more particularly: I allude to the proposed alteration of the laws which take special cognizance of offences committed by clerks in holy orders.

Of the high moral tone of the body of the English Clergy, taken as a whole, I do not think that it would be easy to speak in exaggerated terms. It is of God's special mercy to us, as a Church and a nation, that they are such as in the mass they are. I believe that no other nation, and perhaps no other time, could produce so large a number of men, exposed in many respects to such peculiar temptations, and tried by so many difficulties, who could be compared with them in purity of life and morals. And from this, two corollaries follow: first, that as a body they stand in these respects eminently high in the estimation of all right-minded men; and, secondly, that any exception to their general character of integrity and blamelessness attracts an attention, and provokes a scandal, which are searching and injurious, exactly in proportion to the strictness of that ordinary rule which the offender breaks. Now, as this scandal, with its consequent subjecting of others to suspicion, reaches the innocent as well as the guilty, it is a signal benefit to the virtuous that the

opportunities for scandal and suspicion should be as far as possible removed, by the existence of easy and certain means for proving or disproving guilt, and for promptly punishing the guilty.

That no such means exist at present, I believe is admitted by all who have ever thought upon the subject. Nothing, indeed, but the great purity of the mass of the English Clergy, can account for the long continuance of the law in its present state; and sorely have they, in some places, smarted under its present inefficiency; bearing for years, it may be, through a whole district, the reproach provoked by some one scandalous offender whom, in the present laxity of the law, it is impossible for any sufficient punishment to reach. As well, therefore, to guard the virtuous as to clear ourselves from the great guilt of enduring amongst us those "who make the Lord's people to transgress," ought we to endeavour to obtain some improvement of the enactments which bear upon this subject; and however we may wish, that on such matters the Church was at liberty to deliberate for herself on the evils which afflict her and their cure, the only practical remedy must be by legislation. To introduce such a remedy was the object of the bill which (after full consideration in a select committee, where its details were weighed carefully by all the law lords,) was laid upon the table of the upper house of parliament. Its principle was to submit all questions of fact to a jury chosen by lot from a jury list of incumbents, which

jury list should be filled out of the whole number of incumbents in the archdeaconry, by their own free choice, and with a right of challenge given to the accused, reserving to the Bishop that judicial function alone which is inalienable from his office.

I need hardly say, that great difficulties must beset the framing of such an enactment; but we are compelled to face them by the necessity of the case; and I confidently bespeak your assistance towards devising and carrying through a safe measure to secure these ends. I thankfully acknowledge the aid which I received by discussing the bill proposed last session personally with the Rural Deans, and by receiving through them the expressed opinions of the great body of the Clergy. Such assistance I shall seek again if the bill, before it is proceeded with, should be materially altered. Upon the supposed danger (on which I was addressed by some of those present) of the introduction into the bill of some new definition of heresy, it is, I think, sufficient to say, that I have no apprehension of the success of any such attempt. It is one which I should certainly agree with you in resisting to the utmost, from the fullest conviction, that for the Church to allow a body alien to herself, such as is the legislature of this land, to settle for her what should be her symbols or her doctrines, would be to abdicate her highest office; to abandon the charter given her of God; and to declare herself to be a mere creature of human institution.

I now turn, my reverend brethren, to another matter of mixed diocesan and public interest, to which I would call your most attentive consideration. I mean the subject of National Education, and our own duties in relation to it. This subject, at all times one of the greatest interest, is at this time of even increased importance, from the position with regard to it assumed by the government, as well as from the state of our population. The vast increase of our population in point of numbers, the new conditions under which it is passing, the political power lodged in hands unused to the trust, the eager bidding for its leadership by all descriptions of intellectual, social, moral, political, and religious impostors; the widening separation between poverty and wealth; the loosening and wearing out of the old bands and social relations which have so long held together English society, with the agitating impulses which have been, and must be, communicated to it from other countries, all render the due training of our people the greatest and most pressing question of the day. How shall we escape the storm in which so many gallant vessels have already foundered, if, with the waves waiting for the coming of the hurricane, we have crews unpractised and unfurnished; ships without rudders, and without a compass? Every careful scrutiny of the prisoners in our gaols reveals the same facts, which are at once our reproach for the past, and our encouragement for the future. We find the mass of our criminals composed of those

whom neither Christianity nor civilization have reached ; who have been suffered to grow up beside us uninstructed and unhealed, to prove, in the ripened maturity of their vices, our chastisers and their own destroyers. Of 757 prisoners committed to Reading gaol, during the twelve months preceding this last Michaelmas, from that portion of the diocese, 256 were quite unable to read, whilst those who had received such an education as enabled them to understand easily what they read amounted only to twenty-six. As to religious training, the evidence was of the same character : only forty could repeat the Apostles' Creed, the Commandments, and portions of the Catechism ; and not less than 140 were ignorant of the simplest truths of Holy Scripture, and even (marvellous as it appears) of the very Name of Christ. Of the whole 757, as many as 415 had been at no school, or at one for too short a period to make any real exception, and only twenty-four had been confirmed—had reached, that is, the due close of a Church of England education. Who can doubt, after such revelations, that the education of our people is our most important business ?

To the greatness of this question the civil government of the country has been gradually awaking ; Parliament has voted funds for the support of education, and successive governments have endeavoured to form rules for their safe administration.

It was at first proposed to institute a great scheme of national instruction ; and as our unhappy divisions

rendered united religious training manifestly unattainable, it was proposed that the State, leaving to other hands the supply of the religious element, should provide a secular education for the industrial classes. But this scheme found no general favour any where. Churchmen and dissenters both awoke to the true meaning of the word Education. It was in vain that they were told that England was the least-educated country of civilized Europe; that their eyes were pointed to Prussia, where every rustic labourer was rapidly becoming a philosopher; they had an instinctive perception that, with all our admitted deficiencies, England could not be what it was if Englishmen were in education so utterly behind all other people; they distrusted the showy schemes which were suggested for their imitation; and, though they could not actually prophesy the contrast which, through God's mercy to us, uneducated England would in this very year exhibit to highly educated Prussia, they could declare that no education could supply the wants of England which did not teach her people first to fear God, and then to honour the Queen; which did not, that is to say, teach them to base upon serving God all their other actions; which did not set before them, as man's highest honour as well as greatest happiness, the being under a true law of duty, and fulfilling its requirements towards their neighbour and their God. The struggle ended, as you are well aware, in an agreement under which the resources of the State were given to assist the various

religious bodies which were actually engaged in the work of education, in proportion to their own contributions, reserving only to the government the power of ascertaining, by a well-devised inspection, that the public money did maintain efficient schools.

At first the public grants were limited to affording aid in building school-houses; but the experience soon attained, both of the important stimulus to private efforts which a public grant afforded, and of the need of applying such a stimulus as much to maintaining as to creating schools, led to further plans, by which a portion of the annual expenses of schools was to be defrayed from public grants. This new element of assistance gave rise to new rules for its conduct: a secure conveyance of the site and buildings, with the assurance of efficiency in the conduct of the school, was all which had been hitherto required; but it seemed now desirable to fix, as far as possible, what should be the future local government of the schools, which would be annually aided from the public funds. Hence arose the suggestion of inserting in the trust-deeds certain clauses, providing for the future management of the schools. To such clauses in the abstract, the Church cannot, in my judgment, reasonably object. If properly conceived, they may be her great security: it is impossible to fix too clearly the conditions on which any religious body is to receive the aid of funds supplied by the State. But then it is of the utmost moment that those conditions should thoroughly accord with her

fundamental principles. To secure this for the Church has been the object of negotiations, in which the National Society has been long engaged with the Committee of Privy Council. The particulars of this negotiation are now fully before you. All the material requirements of the Society have been granted,—with one exception: upon that one exception it will be for the Church at large to pronounce: it respects the proposed appellate jurisdiction upon questions not relating to direct religious instruction, as to which the local committee of a school cannot agree. The National Society was ready to acquiesce in an arrangement, which should leave to the local promoters of schools the power of inserting in the trust-deeds either of the following provisions, at their own free choice.

1st, That the appeal on all matters, as well as on those which regarded the direct religious instruction, should be to the Bishop of the diocese; or, 2dly, That the appeal should be to two arbiters, the one of whom should be named by the Bishop of the diocese from amongst his Clergy, the other by the Lord President of the Council from the School Inspectors,—who must previously have received the sanction of the Archbishop of the province: that these two should, before entering on the question, nominate a third to act as final arbiter in the event of their own disagreement; and that if they could not, within a limited time, agree in such a nomination, that the final arbiter should be

appointed by the Archbishop of the province, and the Lord President of the Council conjointly. The latter of these provisions was fully approved by the Committee of Privy Council; but they have finally refused to admit the first. Practically speaking, I believe that there would be no material difference between the working of the two provisions: but I deeply lament the spirit evinced in the requirement, that a Church of England school should be disqualified for receiving public aid, because a large ascertained majority of its lay founders desired to give to its committee the right of appealing in all matters to their Bishop.

This would not be the place for entering further upon the details of this negotiation; but I desire to consider with you, in a very few words, the general principles which should guide our conduct on this question at the present juncture.

We should then, I think, endeavour to the utmost of our power to aid the efforts of the Government in promoting education; and with this course we should allow no needless suspicions or imaginary jealousies to interfere. We must be ready to waive every thing short of principle. But no one single principle can we abandon. We have a prescribed definition of education; we have a prescribed mode of conducting it; we can receive or administer no other. Education means in our mouths the training for service here, and for glory hereafter, according to God's revealed will, and by His selected instru-

ments, souls which have been brought at baptism under the operation and influence of the outward appointments and spiritual powers of the Church of Christ. This training we know to be the highest they can receive intellectually, the purest morally, the best politically: if the State will put into our hands increased means for carrying out this system of education, we shall, I trust, gratefully, honestly, and zealously co-operate with it. In such a work the Church of England has never yet been a backward or a dishonest instrument of that national polity which she acknowledges to be as truly, as she is herself, God's institution. But she can train on no other system: for the State to seek to use her as a slave, would be to destroy her faculty of service. For in the indwelling of God's power is all her might; and if her locks are shorn, and her rule broken, her Nazarite strength would depart from her, and she would become as others of this earth.

What then individually and collectively we must insist upon is, that we should be assured that Church schools should be conducted by Churchmen upon Church principles. We have,—for I speak herein with the utmost confidence for all my brethren of the Clergy,—we have no wish to exclude the laity from their full share in the duty and responsibility of conducting Church schools. We have no wish to monopolize the conduct of education. On the contrary, we earnestly desire the co-operation and support of our lay brethren. We know that we are

never so efficient for good as when they are working truly and heartily with us. We have no wish in any matter, least of all in a matter such as this, to be "lords over God's heritage;" but we are bound to require that those who join us in administering such a trust should be indeed what they are called, Church of England laymen. That they should not be those who by the mere accident of birth, or from never having joined any religious body, are loosely classed amongst us, but that they should be in truth, life, and principle members of our own communion. Further, we are bound to require that in the event of any disagreement between the managers of schools, as to the qualifications of teachers, or the character of books to be used, or instruction to be given in them, the appeal should lie to some authority necessarily within the Church. Thus much we must require in order that the power may be secured to us of teaching to all the children committed to us all necessary truth; not lowering down our teaching to suit others; but maintaining and using our own sacred deposit of God's word, God's truth and God's training, in their fulness, as we have received them.

How far those who differ from us should be allowed by us to send their children to our schools is another question; and one which, in my judgment, should be left to the decision of the managers of each school. I, for my part, as a parochial Clergyman, always have rejoiced, and still should rejoice, to receive into schools thus constituted all without

exception who will come to them; nay, I would gladly train in them for six days those who are not sent to me for seven, or for four days those whom I could not get for six; I would willingly give them some blessing if I could not give them all they might receive; and thus we might hope more fully to discharge the great work of diffusing on all sides of us some measures at least of Christian training.

How great the work is which we have to perform in this diocese a very little reflection may show us. The population of the diocese amounted at the last census to 478,773 persons. The best calculations give one-seventh of these as the number for whose education some charitable assistance ought to be provided. For so many, then, if we act up to our character as the Church of the nation, we ought to be providing. Those returned to me in the answers to my visitation questions, as actually under the direct training of the Church, amount to not quite one-half of this number; and though, for various causes, this does not include a full return from every parish, yet it manifestly leaves merely numerically a very large deficiency.

But this is far from representing the whole case. Besides the numbers left untaught, there is a deficiency of any present machinery for the supply or the wants of whole classes of the population; and there is a deficiency as to the quality of that which is supplied.

Very little provision, *e. g.*, has been made hitherto for the true education of that large and most im-

portant class (the existence of which so signally distinguishes our land) which lies between the higher gentry and the labourers. A proposal has been made, as many of you know, to provide on a liberal scale, in connexion with our own diocesan training institution, for this want, by founding a thoroughly good school for the sons of our yeomen and upper tradesmen,—a school to which they might send their children with the same general assurance, that they would receive in it a thoroughly sound English and religious education, as is possessed by the higher gentry in our existing public schools and universities. I cannot but believe that if the great need of such an institution were more widely known, the funds needful for its establishment would speedily be raised.

But we need also to improve the quality of the teaching which we do give. To effect this object, the diocesan institution for training parochial schoolmasters and mistresses was framed; and to the utmost reach of its means it has in the main faithfully fulfilled its task⁴. But its means are at present utterly inadequate to its necessities; and I believe that at this moment the most important diocesan move we can make, is to strengthen and enlarge this institution. For at this time it is not merely

⁴ I cannot refer to the Diocesan Board without returning publicly my thanks to the Rev. the Master of University College for his services as its Treasurer; and to the Rev. E. Hobhouse, Fellow of Merton, for the unwearied attention he has given to it, with his brother Secretary, the Rev. Joseph Dodd, Rector of Hampton-Poyle.

that its comparative inefficiency will in some degree limit our usefulness, but that it will subject us to new and serious injury. Constituted as it is at present, it cannot satisfy the just requirements of the Privy Council as to tenure, extent, or provision for its purpose. It cannot, therefore, be admitted on the list of those institutions to which the training of Queen's scholars is to be committed : and I beg you to weigh carefully the following results, which, under the new prospects of education, must follow from our not at once raising it to the necessary standard.

Of the pupil teachers who are now being apprenticed in our parochial schools,—and whose numbers will, doubtless, be increased when the important assistance to be obtained from their presence towards the funds of the school is known by experience,—the best will obtain Queen's scholarships. The condition of the Queen's scholarship is, that the scholar shall continue his training at the expense of the public grant in some training school which reaches to the prescribed standard. Unless, therefore, our own diocesan school is so far improved as to be placed upon the list, our best scholars must be taken from us,—it may be, to the training of dissenting institutions ; and thus the diocese certainly, and perhaps the Church, will lose the services of all its best pupils ; whilst the Diocesan Institute will lose at once the pecuniary support it would have received from the payments made for the Queen's Scholars ; and, what is far more important, it will be lowered in character by becoming the mere refuge for those who

were too idle or too dull to rise to the highest level of attainment. Thus, the quality of Church education must be fatally sunk amongst us, unless, by a vigorous effort, we raise the sum of money needed, once for all, to put our training institution upon an efficient footing. We need, moreover, greatly for the supply of our own wants, an increase of numbers in our training school. An union has been effected, as you are aware, between this diocese and that of Gloucester and Bristol; under the terms of which, we are to train their schoolmasters, and they are to train our schoolmistresses; by which arrangement, each diocesan board paying to the other merely for its actual pupils, will be saved the cost of maintaining each two separate institutions. We ought, therefore, to be able to receive a sufficient number of training pupils to supply masters for both dioceses. In the last year, thirty masters have been applied for in our own diocese. Now, supposing our pupils to pass through their whole course of three years, we must have one hundred in the school to supply annually thirty-three. We have only room in our present buildings for twenty-nine scholars, or little more than one-fourth of what we actually need for ourselves. To say nothing, therefore, of any increased demand at home, we must, to supply efficiently both dioceses, make a great effort to enlarge the foundation of our college: once so enlarged, there need be no continual drain upon the charity of the diocese; for it might be annually maintained at a subscribed income, little if at all greater than that which it at

present possesses; for the payments of the pupils would defray the cost of their own board, and the expenses of the staff of the establishment would, comparatively speaking, be little increased. Funds to found the institution upon a sufficient basis; to erect, above all, the necessary buildings upon a freehold site, are what we require; and towards raising these I would earnestly invite the aid of all of you in your several neighbourhoods.

The answer made by the diocese to our appeal in behalf of building new churches and parsonage-houses,—more than four thousand pounds⁵ having been contributed,—encourages me to hope that the statement of our necessities, in this kindred cause, would secure the needful funds. The Clergy, I am well aware, give already, as a body, to this and almost all such objects, not only up to, but beyond their means. It is not, therefore, to increase their own gifts that I would here urge them, but to bring closely

⁵ The sum raised in answer to this appeal amounts to 4230*l.*, of which 3689*l.* were donations, 541*l.* annual subscriptions. But of the 3689*l.*, 1826*l.* were appropriated by the donors to particular objects, leaving 1873*l.* for the general distribution of the committee, who have made the following grants:—

I.—*Grants for building new churches.*

(1) Colnbrook	£150
(2) Prestwood Common	200
(3) Rotherfield Greys	300
(4) Linslade	200
(5) Lewknor	50
(6) Witney	300
(7) Headington Quarry	100

£1300

[II.—*Grants*

home to the owners and richer occupiers of the soil the urgency of the present necessity, and to endeavour to convince them of the great truth, that the money so expended by them ought to be considered as their best insurance for handing on to others the trust they have themselves received as owners of the soil of England.

Another mode by which we may improve, I am convinced, the quality of the education we are giving is, by generally adopting the suggestions recently made by the Board, for perfecting the system of diocesan inspection. And here suffer me to express, before the diocese, my hearty acknowledgment to those of you, my reverend brethren, who have kindly undertaken, in your several districts, the

II.—*Grants for repewing and repairing churches (always with increased room, which is made an essential condition).*

(1) Goring	£20
(2) Waltham St. Lawrence	50
(3) Langley (Slough)	30
(4) Hooknorton	150
(5) Ardington	10
(6) Binfield	50
(7) St. Helen's, Abingdon.....	100
	£410

III.—*Grants for building new parsonages.*

(1) Prestwood Common	£100
(2) Rebuilding vicarage at Minster Lovell .	20
(3) Wheatley	50
(4) Headington Quarry.....	150
(5) Sunningdale	50
(6) Rebuilding vicarage at Marsworth	50
	420
	410
	1300

Sum total of grants . . £2130

unpaid and laborious duty of the school inspector. These labours, I am convinced, may be made far more effectual by the general adoption of the plan to which I refer. According to it, the education in our different parochial schools, will, so far as it extends in each, comprehend instruction in the same books, upon a scheme to be issued half-yearly by the Board. By thus fixing beforehand the books and subjects for examination throughout a whole district, we make a great provision for the success of our inspection. The masters know for what they are to prepare; the education of the school assumes a definite shape; and when the examiner comes round, he knows in what to examine; and instead of the children being hopelessly perplexed by being carried over a whole set of questions on which they have not been prepared, their actual studies are examined, and their real attainments tested⁶.

But, after all, my reverend brethren, in yet another and still closer way the improvement of education must be our doing. Nothing can make up for the absence from his school of the parochial Clergyman. His presence there, at regular times,—if possible, I would say, for a fixed hour at least on a fixed day of every week,—is the one method of securing an efficient school. In this all school inspectors are agreed. They report that with every other deficiency the schools are good schools where

⁶ This plan is ably stated and enforced in a pamphlet just published by the Rev. Sir Henry Thompson, Bart., Vicar of Frant, entitled “National Schools, Hints on the Duty of Diocesan Inspection.”

the Clergyman attends regularly at them: with every other advantage they fail if he neglects them. I know well from my own experience as a parish Priest, the self-denial which is required for such regular and systematic attendance at your schools; and yet I would press it on you almost before all other matters of parochial duty, as that without which your parish work cannot flourish, and as that which, under the blessing of God, will certainly and signally repay your labour. Only let me add, your teaching in the school must be that of the pastor, not of the schoolmaster. The children should feel this difference: your manifest object must not be so much the securing the perfectness of this or that lesson (which is the duty of the schoolmaster), as the Christian training, the moral and intellectual perfecting of the young of your flock. Your words and conduct in the school must piece in with your sermons, your catechizing, your confirmation preparation. The children must feel that they come individually before you in their spiritual relation to you; not that you are the mere rewarder of the quick forward boy who is ready at answering and eager for distinction, but that you treat them as though you remembered that you received the charge of them from Christ Himself at their baptism; that you are watching over them, praying for them, desiring to see them faithful and happy in all their course here, and are ever looking on to that glad day when it is your highest longing for them to see them presented faultless before their God with exceeding

joy. In this work of their training, public catechizing will prove a most important element; and if you will give your diligence to raise it from the dull routine of the mere repetition of answers learned by rote to an intelligent questioning upon what they have heard read, or been taught, (as, for instance, in one of the Lessons for the day, after which it is ordered,) you will find it a powerful means of instructing and interesting both the children and the parents in your flock. The habit of having thus taught the young ones of our parishes will impart a marvellous power to our ministry in our hold on their affections, and on the affections of their parents. Many are the ungodly parents who have thus been given through their children to their pastor's prayers.

This habitual instruction will, moreover, pass naturally and insensibly into the preparation for confirmation,—that most important epoch, where it is diligently used, of the parochial ministry. As to this, I would say a few words to you, both as having in the two past years confirmed almost 10,000 throughout this diocese, and as having myself, as a parochial Clergyman, several times prepared, both a country parish and a large town population for this ordinance. I believe, then, that the experience of many of you, my reverend brethren, will confirm my own, when I say that I never knew a confirmation faithfully and laboriously prepared for, which passed away without leaving on the parish a sure and even a visible blessing. I feel persuaded that our labour and intercessions are never better

expended than when they are laid out in preparation for these seasons. That preparation, and our observation of our candidates, ought to be long; they can scarcely be too long: the preparation ought to deal with particulars in doctrines, teaching, and persons. It ought to bring every one, whether ultimately presented or not for confirmation, severally and alone before us. It ought to be a season for bringing before our charge, objectively, those great dogmatic truths of the Christian revelation, of which, for the most part, they knew so little; it ought to bring each soul before us in its own singleness, that we may endeavour, under God's grace, to arouse, convert, comfort, and strengthen it for serving Him. And it is that we may thus use the ordinance, my reverend brethren, that I have required, in the catechumens, a somewhat riper age than some of you would of yourselves have chosen. For two views may be taken of the ordinance of Confirmation. It may be regarded simply as the complement of Baptism, and so, as it does in the Roman communion, follow during childhood the administration of that sacrament; or it may be united with a conscious choice of the service of God. It is in this last light, manifestly, that it is regarded by our Church⁷, which makes no other special provision for bringing each one of her children as they pass into

⁷ "The Church hath thought good to order, That none hereafter shall be confirmed till they can, &c.; to the intent that "children *being now come to the years of discretion, &c.*—*Confirmation Service.*"

the full temptations of the world, the flesh, and the devil, separately under the pastor's direct influence and spiritual treatment. If, therefore, a mere childish knowledge of the facts of Christianity (such as is possessed by most intelligent pupils in the upper classes of a well-managed national school) is regarded as sufficient qualification for confirmation, this sole opportunity for bringing personally home to the heart and conscience of each one separately, as they enter upon life, all the powers of Christ's Gospel is utterly lost.

It is not, of course, the mere age of the catechumen, which, under this view, can make them either fit, or unfit recipients of the holy ordinance. Until they have for themselves intelligently resolved, in the strength of God's grace, to choose His service, they are at any age unfit, and whenever you can hope that they have made this choice, they must be fit to come: and I am therefore always ready to receive your application, to except such cases from my general rule. But I would not willingly have you apply thus specially for any, of whose spiritual advancement you do not feel so good a hope that you are prepared to lead them on at once, and gladly, to the Holy Communion. Our common temptation at such times is, to be too ready to admit all who have submitted to instruction, and are anxious for a ticket. But we lose greatly by such laxity. We cannot be too earnest in pressing upon all the duty and the blessing of attending the ordinance, or too glad to welcome all for preparation;

we cannot labour too hard to bring them, under God's blessing, to a right mind; but we must not shrink at last, in those cases which imply clearly the want of spiritual earnestness, from using that godly discipline, which is the truest love to those who would press lightly into holiest things. This discipline we cannot hope to employ rightly, without the labour and anxiety of a separate and individual intercourse with each one of our catechumens. Useful as it is for their instruction to meet them in classes, if we would deal closely with their consciences, we must see them alone, and search into their sincerity. Even with such labour, our task is full of anxious care. No where shall we more than here require the gift of spiritual discernment, lest we should discourage the humble-minded, whilst we seek only to stay the over-confident. But if, after our best endeavours to satisfy our judgment, we still find those whom we cannot welcome, and yet dare not reject, we must be contented with endeavouring to awaken the individual conscience to a sense of its responsibility, and then charge solemnly home upon it the ultimate decision of the question.

So important do I feel this subject, that I trust shortly, with the help of God, to put into your hands some more particular suggestions, than can here be given, for the due conduct of a preparation for ordinance.

The Confirmation progress which carried me to so many places in the diocese, showed me our parochial system in actual exercise. I saw in the

work which God is enabling us to do, much for which heartily to thank Him; I saw, as was natural to a fresh eye, charged with such an oversight, many of the weaknesses which mar our full success.

And of these, my reverend brethren, there is one upon which, for many reasons, I desire to speak to you with all plainness—I mean our frequent want of union amongst ourselves; a want which too often grows into absolute disunion.

There is much in his very position which tends, unless he is watchful against the danger, to separate the English parochial Clergyman from his brethren. He has his own charge, his own circle of duties and difficulties, his own way of meeting and performing them; his brethren have theirs. He has no concern in their parishes; they have none in his: thus his sympathies become narrowed: he is a little sovereign in his own realm; he views with some dislike customs which vary from, and perhaps condemn, his own; he does not feel that he is administering one part of a common system; he has the independence, and with it, rely upon it, he has the weakness of individual action. The chief external guards against this danger seems to be, (1) in the living action of the common episcopate, by which each separate ministry may feel itself drawn up into a common head; and, (2) in a greater amount of intercourse, upon directly religious and parochial subjects, between the Clergy themselves. To promote this, the Rural Deans have kindly acted upon my request, in in-

viting their brethren to the rural chapters, at which they may partake together of the highest act of Christian worship and communion, and discuss with friendly openness all the various questions which arise in the course of every ministry.

I rejoice to believe, upon undoubted evidence from every deanery in which the experiment has yet been made, that the benefits I had anticipated from them have, to a great extent, already resulted from these meetings of the Clergy. I desire to thank the Rural Deans who have so kindly borne the labour, the expense, and, what I know they have felt far more, the anxiety of conducting these rural chapters. And I earnestly entreat you, my reverend brethren, by a general attendance and a cordial use of them, to cooperate with the several Deans in seeking to obtain in yet larger measure the benefits they are intended to produce.

But, much as this Christian intercourse may do in promoting union, I believe that we need also to guard against some causes of positive disunion; and here, my reverend brethren, I do not speak of those provocations to disunion which are presented to us as to other men, by the mere crossing of interests or clashing of tempers. For protection against these I may abundantly trust to your right principles and habits of self-control. Against many such temptations, to which other men are exposed, we are guarded, not only by the grace of our high calling, but even by its accidents; even the low rule of professional decency

would forbid such discords. But, on the other hand, we have amongst us some peculiar occasions for disunion, against which it specially becomes us to guard.

Of these the most dangerous is that which is to be found in our righteous anxiety to preserve that momentous deposit of dogmatic truth, which has been committed to our safeguard. For, imperfect as we are, there is the greatest fear lest, instead of keeping the unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace, we introduce discord in maintaining truth. We are herein exposed to a twofold danger, first, that we deem our own view of truth so absolutely the certainly exact truth, that we condemn as error every statement which varies from it; and, secondly, that we transfer our zeal for the truth to zeal against the maintainers of supposed untruth. To guard against these we shall do well to consider the different laws by which we should be governed in stating truth, and in condemning error. In stating truth, the view to which we have with prayer and study attained must in all matters, whether of primary or lesser moment, be our absolute rule. We cannot in any matter, or for any consideration, vary one iota in our statements from what we believe to be the truth. If, to disarm opposition, or to remove prejudice, or to win support, or to promote peace, or for any other object, we swerved in any thing from this rule, we should in fact be endeavouring to promote the glory of the God of truth by lying in His cause.

But absolute as is this rule in stating truth, it is

by no means the rule by which, in such matters as alone can come into dispute amongst us, we should judge of what we deem the errors of others. For these are often but different views of the same truth, imperfect on the one side, as our own very probably are on the other; or they spring from difficulties on matters which belong to natural religion, and which Christianity has not decided (such, for instance, as the master difficulty of reconciling man's responsibility with the sovereignty of God, which is, in truth, the metaphysical difficulty how there can co-exist together any two wills, of which one is Almighty; or, in other words, how there can be an Almighty God and any true creaturely being made by Him in His own image), or if they are not thus metaphysical difficulties, they are matters of degree, turning upon that less or more of statement which must always be possible where a truth depends for its exactness upon the combination of other truths.

Now, as to all these cases, our duty surely is, whilst we maintain our own view to be as tolerant as possible of that of other men; to accustom ourselves, wherever it is possible, to the charitable hope that even with their different statement of it they do hold with us the common truth; to see that certain and often very considerable discrepancies of statement are the necessary consequence of presenting a great truth to different minds; that these very variations are therefore a proof that it is not with us that dishonest witnesses have agreed upon a garbled

statement, but that a living truth has laid hold on separate souls. Such a belief will greatly aid us in being heartily at concord with the holders of opinions differing in many shades from ours; in giving them full credit for honesty and truth; in acting with them unreservedly whenever we can act together; and so in guarding us from the deadly and most practical evil of a separating party spirit. And this surely is that precious gift of liberality with which are confounded now-a-days so many worthless counterfeits. For to be truly liberal, is not to be indifferent to the superior value of truth; it is not to mould our own representation of it in any matter so as to please others; it is to be ready to believe, that statements which do not recommend themselves to us, and which therefore we do not adopt, may yet embody in themselves some view of truth we need, and do not of necessity imply, in those who make them, any absolute darkness.

Suffer me, my reverend brethren,—though I feel the delicacy of the matter on which I now enter, and my need of your forbearance as I treat of it,—to take an illustration of the principle I would enforce from the question which has caused of late—alas, that so it should be!—the least kindly differences within our body; I mean the doctrine of Baptismal Regeneration. We are all doubtless familiar with the opposite reproaches cast on those who maintain one side or the other in the controversies to which this subject has given rise. On

these, so far as they are mere charges of insincere subscription on the one hand to certain of the formularies, on the other to one at least of the Articles of the Church, I will only say, that whilst we cannot be too rigorous in scrutinizing most closely the perfect honesty of our own subscription, we cannot, in my judgment, more evidently break the law of charity, or sinfully usurp the office of the one Judge and Searcher of hearts, than by indulging in those imputations upon other men's sincerity which it is so easy to make, so easy to retort, and so impossible to prove. These, then, I need not dwell upon: but there are other charges which, though it is painful to state them in words, yet it is needful for my purpose to have clearly before us. On the one side, then, it is argued, that to hold the doctrine in the simple breadth of statement with which all I believe would allow it to be laid down for us, if the baptismal offices and catechism stood alone, involves of necessity the notion, that in baptism the heart of every infant is so thoroughly changed, that he cannot afterwards, consistently, be urged to seek a personal conversion by the operation of the blessed Spirit, as the one condition of entering into life. That thus, where it is taught, instead of a lively faith in Christ our Righteousness being made the sole ground of each man's hope of salvation, men are led to look for their hope to the having been baptized, and that so a dead formalism saps the very roots of the individual spiritual life.

Against the opposite view, on the other hand, it is urged that by it the grace of Christ's sacraments is absolutely denied; that men are taught to look to the workings of their own minds, and not to a true union with Christ effected for them by the act of God, as the beginning of spiritual life, and the condition of salvation.

Now, there can be no doubt that each of these charges *may* be true. The doctrine of Baptismal Regeneration may, as a mere dogma, be so held and taught as to lead men to substitute the having passed through a certain outward form for the possessing an inner and spiritual life. It is not allowing too much to say, that it is difficult to know with any intimate acquaintance the religious history of the last century, without entertaining grievous fears that such a palsy-stricken Christianity was then abundantly and fatally common. On the other hand, men undervalue the sacraments from the presence, unallowed even to themselves, of that essential element of rationalistic error, which rejects the absolute necessity of man's being really united by the act of God to a Mediator, who is truly man as well as God, before any fallen child of Adam can approach to the All Holy, or begin to hold any accepted communion with Him. It is not again, I fear, allowing too much, to say that it is difficult to know much of the present state of the Protestant communions of Continental Europe, without seeing reason to fear that, in too many instances, they have actually passed through this

implicit rationalism into a conscious rejection, first, of the verity of Christ's incarnation, and next, of the truth of His Godhead.

These errors then, I say, may lurk on the one side or on the other; and we must at once allow their fearful moment; since the one cuts the roots of the individual spiritual life; the other implicitly, at least, rejects the reality of Christ's incarnation, and of His indwelling in us through an act of God, as the sole ground of our acceptance with Him.

But are we, therefore, justified in at once branding with the admission of these errors those who take the view opposite to ours upon this question? Surely we are not, if wholly other grounds may lead to this diversity of statement. If, for instance, those who gladly accept the broadest statement of Baptismal Regeneration maintain it as the declaration of that initial act of God, whereby the child, who by nature is joined only to the first Adam, and from him inherits guilt and corruption, is now, by God's act through grace, joined to the second Adam; so that the guilt of his fallen nature is forgiven, and there is secured to him—unless he be a reprobate—the continual influx of such gracious influences as will, if he yield to them, bring him to salvation; and if they so teach because they believe that this statement only can maintain, in all its fulness, the doctrine of Christ's incarnation, and of our being really united to Him by an act of God, and not by any mere operation of our own minds, as the very foundation of the

life of God within us ; and if, whilst they maintain this, they are plain, and earnest, and constant, in teaching also the absolute need, in each one who will be saved, of a true conversion of the individual soul by the Almighty power of God's Spirit,—of a true penitent heart,—of a living faith in Christ our Righteousness,—and of a daily renewal of the will by God's grace,—can it be right to brand them with holding a system of dead formality, because the doctrine of the sacraments may, like every other truth, be so abused as to become an excuse for sin ?

And, on the other hand, if we see that our brethren, who stumble at the breadth with which we lay down this doctrine, do so because they see not how it is to be reconciled with that other great truth, of the absolute sovereignty of God ; or because they confound the doctrine of Baptismal Regeneration with the grievous error of Baptismal Conversion, and are aiming at the error, whilst they dispute the doctrine ; or, because having a lively sense of the need of maintaining the true spiritual character of the renewed life, they, even morbidly, dread any statement by which, it seems to them, to be gainsayed, whilst with us they do hold close, as the nourishment of their own souls, to the truth of Christ's Incarnation, and to the first act for our salvation, being not our own, but God's ; and maintain that Christ's sacraments are certain channels of His grace to every due receiver : surely we must sin against the law of Christian love, if imputing to

them errors they deny, we would sever ourselves from them, ranging ourselves on one party, and forcing them into another. Surely, on both sides, our duties are the same. We are bound, first, to state the truth, as God has shown it to us, unreservedly; further, we must endeavour to lead on our brethren into any light, which, as we trust, we enjoy, and which seems to us withheld from them; but this we must do, not by separating ourselves from them, nor even by inveighing against their errors, but by seeing what is their truth, and endeavouring to show them how that very truth can (as it can, if we are right,) be held more completely and more consistently on one view than on theirs. And in all this we must guard against party spirit and division. We must feel that where, even with verbal difference, our great common truths are held implicitly, that there, far more than in mere verbal agreement, the true ground of unity is present; that we are more one with our brethren in this apostolic ministry, who subscribing cordially our own confessions, are earnest in love to Christ, devout in the spirit of their mind, zealous in labouring for souls, dead to this world, and striving heartily to do and love the will of God, even though there be between us a difference in statements, over which we grieve, than we can be with others who, if such there be, harmonize exactly with our own words, but withal are colder in zeal, less deep in penitence, less constant in devotion, less simple in faith, less earnest

in love, less stamped, in one word, with the impress of the Crucified.

Surely, by thus thinking of each other, and in the strength of such thoughts, by acting heartily together upon all matters whereon we are agreed, we shall do more for truth, as well as for love, than by aiding to break up the Church around us into angry parties, each with their established test of difference, and badge of separation.

So much then for this great cause of weakness. And now, my reverend brethren, let me turn your attention for a moment to the wide extent of that work which is committed to us. As the Ministers of the Church of England, to us is committed in great measure the social, as well as the religious charge of the people of this great country. For these two charges never can be really severed. Amongst the higher and more intellectual classes of society we should be forming the tone of thought and action. As God gives us the power, we should seek to infuse into the literature of our day the purifying elements of Christian truth: and in our intercourse with society we should have the same object; seeking in it not merely our own lawful recreation, but endeavouring always to preserve, and, if possible, to deepen upon our social institutions the impress they now bear of Christian manners.

And amongst our poorer brethren we must labour, if possible, still more directly in the same task.

We have great facilities for the vigorous discharge

of such a work. Sheltered by our professional obligations from the common callings and pleasures of the world, we ought to be saved from the danger of spending, either in mere frivolity or in making money, those talents for action which belong so naturally to our countrymen, and which are so much fostered in us by our past education and our free institutions. We ought, moreover, to be—as a general rule, thank God, we are—practically acquainted with the wants, the difficulties, the hardships, and the temptations of all, and specially of the poor around us. We see them at unguarded moments, in times of sickness, of distress, of conviction, when the mere conventionalities which disguise class from class are, for the time, thrown off, and the MEN beneath them may be seen. We ought to be able to profit by such opportunities. Conversant, as we must be, with antiquity, through ecclesiastical history and the fixed forms of the Creeds and Liturgies, which are ever taking us back into ancient times; above all, conversant, as we must be, in Holy Scriptures with the human character under outward circumstances, differing widely from our own, we ought to be able to cast aside from our estimate of men and things around us their merely accidental, and therefore misleading elements, and to dwell upon that which is central and real. Above all, as special witnesses for the universal brotherhood of those for whom the Lord died, we, beyond other men, should, by the liveliest, active sympathy, be claiming as a brother every sufferer and outcast of

the earth ; and so driving far from us those spurious pretences of fraternity, with which the cold and selfish world is at this time so busy in deluding those who trust to her. The practical character of our lives, moreover, should help us here : if the Clergy of other times and lands may sometimes reproach us with being a body little addicted to deep and abstract studies, we have this great advantage for men of action, that ours is a practical training. With such advantages we ought to have a practical insight into the social evils of our day, and be the leaders in their redress.

That such social evils exist, no one can doubt. Many painful indications of their presence, and of the danger of their continuance, have called attention to them recently. How can we hope to maintain that internal peace amongst ourselves, which is so needful for all,—so specially needful for the poor,—but by setting ourselves heartily to redress the real evils which press upon our brethren ? It is the existence of these real evils which gives their power over the poor to those who, for their own selfish ends pretending sympathy towards them, would in truth lure them on to their destruction. How otherwise than by redressing these evils can we hope that the small sand of our existing institutions shall be, as it has so long been, set by God to be, the bound of these impetuous waters, which, in their unbridled madness, would sweep all things before them ?

In such a work the Clergy should be foremost. The action of the constant force of selfishness must

always tend to make long-established institutions bear hardly on the weaker party, and so expose them to be swept rudely away in some convulsive resistance to that wrong which has become inveterate in them; and it is only the opposition of such a living power as Christianity which can prevent the up-growth of this evil, or safely remove it where it has struck its roots. Here then is a special work for us, to be at once the advocates and the correctors of the poor; to watch for them and their right; to witness for them and their claims, to those who have, as stewards, what is too soon likely to seem to them their own; and yet, at the same time, instead of flattering the poor by the false pretence that all is right in them, and all wrong in those above them, to seek to train them in their special duties of patient contentment and obedience; to stimulate and to guide the consciences of all, by plain, homely, earnest, real preaching from God's word, which shall reach both rich and poor, by bringing home to each, in their actual present temptations, their sin and their Saviour, their separation and their brotherhood. A true Christian sympathy is the golden key which will open hearts to us: we must use it, in the church, in the school, in the cottage,—in the last as much as in the first. If England is to be preserved in the peace and happiness which more than any other land she has so long enjoyed, it must be by God's blessing on our labours, and on the instruments which we have to use. Much as legislation may do in many ways, it

cannot do all, or nearly all, which must be done. Laws will not reach men's hearts; and nothing short of reaching their hearts will meet our needs. We must aim at reaching these; and it is mainly through the ties and affections of family life that we can hope to reach them; and through these we must bring to bear upon them the higher influences of the spiritual life. Thus must we win from them a hearing for the word of God, thus bring them to holy sacraments, and so leading them on from things earthly to things heavenly, bring them indeed under the healing hands of Christ our Lord. For in all our efforts at social improvement, we must bear in mind this our highest object. The witnesses of the resurrection, the Ministers of God's grace, must no more content themselves with promoting the comfort of their people, than with maintaining the peace and order of society. This were to forfeit their highest mission. A ministry may be very busy, and for a time very popular, which thus falls below its highest aim; but, in the long run, it will, in thus lowering its highest character, lose also its secondary power. And such a ministry does certainly abandon its highest objects. We are ministers of Christ's word and sacraments; to convert souls to God; to build them up in the divine life; to raise before them the Cross of Christ; to lead them as sinners for themselves to Him; to bring them under the continual guidance of His Spirit—this is our highest task, this our most blessed work, to which all besides must be subservient. And how awful a charge is this which is committed to us. Though

we, as the Ministers of Christ's Church in this land, cannot measure our full responsibilities by any measure below that of its whole population, yet, in an especial manner, must we answer for those who are actually using our ministry, and submitting themselves in things spiritual to our direction. And, on this account, must we not tremble, my reverend brethren, whilst we thank God when we remember that the average of the congregations assembling every Sunday in this very diocese, (and which, as little more than half the adults of every family can assemble at the same time, represents a much larger number as that of all our attendants, yet) amount to 106,224 souls; that at our celebration of the Lord's Supper we have an average (to be treated in the same way) of 22,942 attendants; that we have in our day schools 27,640, and in our Sunday schools 27,054 scholars. Let us contemplate these numbers, with the recollection full before us of the value of each one of all these souls for whom Christ died. Let us remember that to each one of them it were an infinite loss to gain the whole world and lose that single soul, whereby he lives before God. Let us think of the danger to which each one of them is constantly exposed; and remember that for every one of them some shepherd shall render an account before the judgment-seat. Surely such thoughts must show us that the smallest charge is indeed so large and weighty, that all our cares, and watching, and intercessions, must be far too little for so infinite a venture. Who indeed, who weighs the risk, could

venture on it, but that He who died for us has called us, as we trust, to undertake it; and has promised, if we faithfully seek His aid, to be with us, and evermore to strengthen us by the indwelling of the Spirit. And if we do simply lean upon that aid, we may remember, for our comfort, that success is His gift; and though ordinarily vouchsafed sooner or later to the prayers and labours of the faithful pastor, yet that it is not by its *success* that our ministry will be judged. Labour, faithfulness, self-denial, prayer,—these are ours; the increase is God's. Let us, then, whilst we leave patiently results to God, only on our part search into ourselves lest there be any thing in us which hinders His working.

Now, in looking practically into the degree in which, as a body, we are enabled to succeed in this our work, I am led to think that what, above all other things, we need, is the power of kindling amongst our flocks a warmer spirit of devotion. Here, I am convinced, is our great deficiency. We have many who respect us, and listen to us; who are decent, orderly, well-behaved; but we want more decided converts from the love of this world; more who are really won to the love of God in Christ; and, as the result of this, more and heartier worshippers, instead of merely decent listeners, within our churches. This gift, of course, like every other, must come of God: but it is our duty to see whether any lack in us prevents our receiving it, or

whether we can do any thing more earnestly to seek it.

Suffer me, then, to enter briefly on this wide but most important subject, "entreating the elders as fathers, and younger men as brethren."

And, first, let me say to you, my brethren of the laity, and especially to those of you who fill the honourable and important office of Churchwarden, that much in this matter may be done by you; and that you have, in regard to it, a special charge of duty in virtue of your office. Let me set this before you as plainly as I can: as one who knows by past experience that, in addressing you, he is speaking to many who are ready to do, honestly and firmly, whatever is shown to them to be their duty. For I thankfully acknowledge the readiness with which, in many parishes, the Churchwardens have acted at once and cheerfully upon my own directions, and on the suggestions which have been made by the Rural Deans; and I know that all which is necessary now, is to convince you that it is your duty to do what I would wish to see generally done.

Now, this is your duty, because, in the matter specially entrusted to you, it concerns the spiritual welfare of the parish, and that spiritual charge, to a large extent, is committed to you. The questions which you have received before this visitation, and which, I need scarcely say, are not questions of my invention, but are the old questions which have been always addressed to the

Churchwardens before the Bishop's visitation, these may show you how directly this is your duty. For those questions manifestly imply, that the Church considers you as invested, in your several parishes, with an important share of their moral and spiritual oversight: you are treated in them as Church officers: you are asked in them not only as to the morals of your brother parishioners, but you are required to report to the Bishop any negligence of duty, or unseemliness of life, which may exist even in the Ministers of God's word who are set over you. What can show more plainly that you have a special charge, and with it special duties, for the faithful performance of which you must render your account to Christ?

If, then, there is any spiritual loss to the parish, which it belongs to your office to remedy, and which you do not attempt to remedy, the guilt of that loss will lie at your door. Now, if we would have our people devout worshippers in our churches, we are bound to provide carefully that all which encourages devotion is found within them. Amongst the first of these requirements, are, room and opportunity for the poor as well as rich to kneel down and join in the prayers, as well as to sit and hear the sermon. But much must be done by you before this can be generally the case. In church after church which I have visited, the gradual up-growth of unlawfully erected pews has thrust the poor man from his best inheritance—his place in the house of God. This

has led to carelessness when in church, to a gradual weaning from it, growing from irregular attendance to confirmed absence; this has sent to the meeting-houses of the separatists those who, but for this, would still be regular attendants at the church of their fathers. At every turn this weakens the hands of the Ministers of Christ. To take but one example:—you, my brethren, who know not the burden of a charge of souls, can perhaps scarcely understand to what a degree the benefits of which I have spoken as flowing from a Confirmation are often lost, and the heart of the faithful Minister saddened, through the impossibility of his finding, after the ordinance, for those who in it have been led to seek to give themselves to God, any fitting place for regular uninterrupted worship within the house of prayer. Now, my brethren, though you may not probably feel this evil so keenly as it will be felt by the faithful parish Priest, let me say to you with all plainness, that you have a deep interest in seeing it redressed. You have this interest first and chiefly because, as I have shown you, this is your duty towards the souls of those dependent on you; but even beyond this, it is your interest. Nothing so binds together the different ranks of society as their meeting as children of the same Lord to worship Him in the same place. Nothing will so maintain you in your proper place amongst those whom you employ in your several parishes, as keeping them close to their church. If you suffer them to be

driven from it, you have lost the greatest instrument for preserving them in their right relation to you in this world. For if, in consequence of this, they worship no where, they will speedily become altogether irreligious, and as they cease "to fear God," they will cease also to "regard man." They will never serve you so well as when they serve you for Christ's sake; they never will bear so cheerfully the comparative hardships of their own lot, as when they feel practically that the difference between the various ranks of society is itself God's appointment, and is intended for the good of all. And this they cannot feel amongst the daily temptations to discontent and insubordination which wait on poverty, unless true religion is kept alive within them. Here, then, your loss is clear, if you suffer them to lose the habit of worship by exclusion from the church. But this is not all. Even if they do worship elsewhere, you incur no small measure of this loss. If in that matter in which, above all others, they ought to follow God's appointment for them, they are accustomed to choose for themselves, by a capricious self-will, the principle of self-will must be greatly strengthened in them; and in this principle of self-will is the root of dissatisfaction and rebellion against those above them.

But for another reason also, this is so: those below you have the worst portion as to this world. They are worse clothed, worse lodged, worse fed than you are. They have to labour harder, and to

earn less. Now, if they never meet you except in these things as to which they have the worst share, it is almost certain that they will begin to entertain bad, hard thoughts of their own lot and of yours. If they see only the difference between you and themselves, that difference will be magnified, and thus they will become dissatisfied and discontented; and so first alienated from you, and then embittered against you. They will receive even your acts of kindness with a surly suspicion, and this, perhaps, will tempt you, in turn, to withhold that kindness; and so you will soon be living amongst a set of half-rebellious enemies, instead of being the respected heads of a wider Christian family.

Nothing can prevent all this evil so much as your meeting them in the house of God. There they are even outwardly reminded that they and you are brethren. There the highest and the lowest of the parish gather all together as equals in the sight of God. Their differences are out of sight. They feel that in the greatest matter they have as good a share as you. The asperities which in the week have roughened their minds, are smoothed down. They are ready to receive acts of kindness from those with whom they have just joined in prayer, or knelt down at the holy table. If they worship elsewhere, in self-chosen places, they will never feel to you as they will, if they are accustomed to kneel down with you, and their children with your children, to hear the same words of exhortations, to join in the same

confessions, to praise God for the same mercies, and to receive together a common blessing. The experience of many of you will, I am sure, confirm my words, when I say, that just in proportion to the degree in which the labouring population of your parish has been drawn away from attending with you at their church, there has grown up and strengthened in them that spirit of rebellious discontent against yourselves, with which so many of you are at this time sadly and wearily striving. If there were no world to come, it would still be your especial interest to keep your people side by side with you in holy offices.

Your duties, then, as to this are plain. You are, first, to allow of no increase of the evil. No pew can be lawfully erected in a church without the direct sanction of the Ordinary; and whoever be he, whether Churchwarden or not, who, on his own responsibility, erects a new pew, or makes or permits any alteration in the church, can be made to remove it at his own proper cost. He cannot charge these expenses on the rates, because he had no legal right to incur them; a Churchwarden has no right (as has sometimes been imagined) to build or appropriate a pew for himself within his year of office. The first step, then, is to stay the evil. But this is not enough. Look round you in your own church, I pray you, on Sunday next: consider with yourself how the area of that church, which is built for rich and poor alike, is now distri-

buted. It is not that the orderly distinction of men of various ranks and manners need be violated within our churches; on the contrary, I believe that such seemly arrangement promotes the comfort of all: but if upon looking round your church you see its area, which might hold all the parish, filled up with unsightly pews, which, whilst they minister, not to the convenience, but to the unseemly slumbers or the vain display, of a few, thrust the poor into corners where they cannot hear or see or worship aright,—ask yourselves if such a state of things within the house of God can be pleasing to Him, or draw down His blessing on your parish, either in things spiritual or temporal; and determine not to rest, until you have done your plain duty, which is to move your parishioners to clear away these encroachments, and to give back, by decently seating the whole church, so as to give to all their share, their best rights to God's heritage. A small rate will often effect this purpose: where the work is more considerable, you may borrow the needful sum on your rates, and so secure this great good by a small annual increase of payment for some years to come; and this is a course perfectly fair to those who come after you, when you are effecting a permanent good, of which they will fully share the benefit. These local exertions, which would be assisted by various societies, and often by local subscriptions, would in most cases achieve this great end, and do very much to give us back congregations worshipping

God. I, according to my office, shall be ready to aid you in all ways; and I dare answer in this matter for my brethren, the Rural Deans and the parochial Clergy, that they, too, will readily aid you with advice, and assist you in obtaining the needful funds; and you, as I have already reminded you, are bound by law to apply to me, before you allow of any alteration in the church of which you are the wardens.

Only let me add one word, to meet an error prevalent in some parishes. It is sometimes thought that a Churchwarden's highest honour is, within his year of office, to have kept down the church rates, by some trifling sum, below the outlay of his predecessors. But this is a mistaken view. It is indeed to his honour not to have suffered the smallest fraction of the money trusted by the parish to his care, to have been lost or wasted. But he is entrusted with this money in order to discharge a certain duty, and his first honour is to discharge that duty properly. He is bound to see that the house of God is, in all things within his power, made fit for the parishioners to meet therein and worship God. This is his first duty; and it is no honour to save money by neglecting to do any duty. It is no honour to be niggardly, either with trust-money or our own. To be just with both is each man's honour. I will only beg you to put one question to yourselves, the answer to which will, I think, be all I wish to say. Would you, on a bed of death, or in the day of judgment, prefer to have saved a few pounds of parish-

rates, at the cost of the place in church, or, it may be, of the souls, of your poor brethren round you,—or, by generous counsels and a good example to have provided for them room to hear God's word; to feed by faith on Christ; and to offer up their prayers and praises to the Lord?

And next, my reverend brethren, let me say to you, that to carry on this good work, I earnestly desire your assistance in making spontaneously, throughout the diocese, the fullest possible provision of public services for supplying the spiritual wants of our flocks. Nothing can tend more to weaken our hands than any thing which suggests to our people (and a scanty strictly legal measure must suggest to them such thoughts) that our labours are the result of professional necessity, not the true outpouring of hearts which love them for Christ's sake. Thus I desire to see, in every parish, great or small, where sufficient provision has been made to support a minister of the altar, at the very least, two full services including two sermons, or one sermon and a public catechizing in the face of the congregation on the Lord's day. I should rejoice to hear of the addition, wherever they would be frequented, of week-day services; but I must esteem, as a general rule, two full Sunday services, the minimum allowance in every parish in which, as I have said already, there is made sufficient provision really to maintain a Minister. To this, as to every general rule, there must be some just excep-

tions from peculiar circumstances ; these cases must be referred to me, and shall be carefully considered. The law which empowers the Bishop to require two such full services in every parish, seems to me to bind on him the duty of enforcing their performance in every case as to which he is not satisfied that there are sufficient reasons for treating it as an exception to the general rule. No existing service must be dropped in any parish without the sanction of the Bishop. I press this amount of duty on you, my reverend brethren, not only, or even chiefly, as an indication that we are moved to our ministration by the energy of love, but also from my conviction of its necessity for the spiritual instruction of our people. However small the parish, only the half of the adult members of any family can ordinarily be present at one service. The sermon or the catechism on the Lord's day is, in many of our parishes, the only direct call from this earth and its concerns to things spiritual which reaches the great bulk of our population throughout the week. It is their only direct instruction in the ways of God. Until they have made considerable progress in religion, they can seldom read for themselves to any great purpose of edification ; and if, therefore, we do not give them a double opportunity of hearing, we do, in fact, shut out one half of the adults in every week from their only certain opportunity of Christian learning.

This same principle applies to another most im-

portant matter; the frequency of the celebration of the Holy Communion. Believing, as we do, that this great ordinance is not merely a well-contrived invention for exciting our religious sympathy or sensibility, but that it is also a special means of grace, in which the souls of the faithful are strengthened and refreshed by the body and blood of Christ, as our bodies are by the bread and wine, I see not how we can expect our people to flourish in things spiritual, with the scanty opportunities of such refreshment allowed them in too many parishes. This state of things is, in fact, the painful consequence of a time of coldness and unfaithfulness, from which we have, I trust, through God's great mercy, passed; and I would earnestly beseech you, my reverend brethren, by gradual alterations, so to restore the older and better custom as to let the monthly Eucharist be, in every parish, the least frequent celebration of this holy feast; and where the number of communicants required by the Rubric is oftener to be found, to multiply still further, as you see expedient, these opportunities of communion. I cannot doubt but that a new era of spiritual life would be attained in many a parish, if such an increase in the number of celebrations were introduced with plain, earnest, and affectionate addresses and explanations to your people, as to the great privilege thus secured to them, and the love of Christ in its provision.

In close connexion with this subject, let me strongly urge upon you a strict observance of the rule laid

down for us by the Church, that we administer holy Baptism on Sundays and holydays in the face of the congregation. In parishes where this rule has become obsolete, it will, of course, require judgment, gentleness, patience, and kindness to restore the true use without giving injurious offence to those for whose sake it is observed. But this offence may, I am convinced, be prevented, by full explanations, both public and private, of the obligation and benefit of the rule, and by gentleness in its enforcement; by commencing, for instance, at least, with holding, on one Sunday in the month, a public baptism in the course of the service, and on other Sundays winning all who can be won, to remain and take their part, immediately after the public service, in the prayers with which these little ones are brought to Christ.

But there are many other means besides this increase in the number and accuracy of our services, which we, my reverend brethren, may bring to bear directly on this great want of our flocks. A vast amount of influence, for good or for evil, is continually acting on them in the character which we exhibit to them. Without referring to the highest cause, to that abundant gift of God's Holy Spirit, which is poured upon a faithful Ministry, there is even a natural tendency to the reproduction of the pastor's character amongst his flock. In church, in our families, in the field, in our recreations, their eyes are on us; and if devotion, and kindly purity; and self-restraint, and high aims, and humility, and a mortified spirit, are, under the working of God's

grace, caught, though it be slowly, by one and another, from the living pattern of their pastor's conduct, the opposites of all these are most readily and surely copied out in those, whose natural corruption makes any excuse for a low standard in the religious life, far too certainly welcome. This principle applies, my reverend brethren, to a multitude of details, to which I here would only passingly allude; speaking as to wise men, who will judge what I say.

For this, in my judgment, will restrain our recreations far within the utmost limit of a possible lawfulness. I see not, I confess, how the frequenting the sports of the field, or the public amusements of the world, are in us to be reconciled with its requirements. An evident addiction to these must lead our flocks to believe, that, after all, we are but more decent men of this world. The separated character of Christ's ambassador must be perilled, if not lost, in their frequenter: the ministry of the word must be proportionably injured in its character: and we shall have incurred the guilt of putting a stumbling-block in the way of souls, for whose salvation we were set by Christ to watch. Whether or no, the effect of such allowances can be distinctly traced in every separate parish, it may be most plainly read in the lowered spiritual tone which overspreads those districts, in which an addiction to such amusements pervades the body of the Clergy. And surely it is even natural that so it should be. The stricken patient would not willingly send, in his extremity, for the physician of the body, who was best known to him

as the keenest sportsman; because an instinctive feeling would suggest to him the apprehension, that that man's heart was not thoroughly in his profession. How can we doubt, but that in the far more delicate processes of spiritual sickness, the anxious conscience or the burdened spirit would shrink away from one whose tastes led him rather to those amusements of which I have spoken, than to the house of public intercession, or the privacy of secret communing with God? Even for the lower order of the ministry it was the rule, laid down by St. Paul, speaking, let us remember, under the direct inspiration of God the Holy Ghost, "Likewise also must the deacons be grave." How shall the intricacies of the wounded heart be bared to him who has never known his own heart's plague? How shall he direct the penitence, or guide the return of another, who has never wept beneath the cross, or cast there his own burden, or been himself guided by the Spirit into the paths of a contrite peace?

Nor, my reverend brethren, can I be content to leave this subject wholly upon this its lowest ground. It is not merely on account of the estimate which will be formed of us by our people, that in conformity with the injunctions of the Canons of the Church I would urge upon you such abstinence; but for our own sakes also. No one can over-estimate the aid which may be administered to our own weakness by the constant observance of a prescribed external law of self-restraint. This is why the Church in all times of her purity, and why our

own Church by direct command, has constantly enforced upon us the wearing a peculiar dress; not of course because there is any sanctity in one dress rather than another, but that by this observance we should be subjected to an external rule, which should always remind us of our separated character. And of how much greater moment is it, my reverend brethren, that our minds and spirits should be always subjected to an unseen but present rule, of which that outer garb is but the forecast shadow. With the existence of such an inward rule of self-collectedness and self-restraint, it can hardly be but that the amusements to which I refer must interfere. They tend to break down a man's own estimate of his separated character: their bustle, their action, the company to which they lead, the trains of thought which they suggest, all tend to interfere with that composed, musing, meditative, self-conversing temper, which, through God's grace, is drawn up most easily into the higher exercises of devotion. And if this be so, the narrowest charge will be, in its measure, incompatible with the amusements I would have you renounce. For he whose charge is small, has only the more time for prayer and meditation; for seeking to have ripened in him all the graces of a saintly character; for the work of intercession, for winning for the Church the great blessings which flow on all around him, from every one whom God has indeed stamped deeply with the image of His dear Son, and anointed largely with the unction of the Holy One: and thus, in the unity of

the Church, he who is called to less engrossing labour amongst souls, is enabled by giving up more time and strength to prayer and praise, to contribute just as truly his appointed part towards that common life, wherewith the whole body of the faithful live before God.

And if this be true of the pastor of the few sheep, it is a truth even more important still for him upon whom presses the heavy burden of many souls. For how can he hope to discharge aright his trust, except by having its requirements much and often on his mind? How, without much prayer, and an inner spring of devoted earnestness, can he bear up under his burden? How surely without these will he turn to self-cheating expedients to relieve himself of its weight; looking off from his failures and difficulties,—shutting his eyes to the evils of his parish,—and soon putting unreal hopes, or dreamy expectations, in the room of a course of vigorous, hearty, unsparing labour! How, indeed,—whether his charge be less or greater,—unless he sees often before his eyes, in secret meditation, the pattern of his Master's sufferings, His cross and passion, His agony and bloody sweat, His mockings and revilings,—how shall any man be nerved to bear, unmoved, the opposition, and gainsaying, and hardness, and impenitence of those who will not be won; the shame of a despised testimony, the reproach of Christ's cross? How, unless he retires often from the sights and sounds of this world, and sets himself in thought before the great white throne, shall he

escape the delusions of the pleasures, ease, and honours of this present time? How, unless his own soul be quickened, raised, and softened by the full love of a penitent, shall he testify to others at once of the terrors of the Lord, and of the love of Christ?

In a multitude of ways will such a character as this stamp itself upon a ministry. Such a pastor will know, by often musing on them, the deficiencies of himself and of his parish. He will know who do not, as well as who do, come to church; and when there, join in the prayers and praises of God's house, and kneel meekly down for the food of the holy Communion. His list of communicants (which I cannot too earnestly urge each one of you to keep) will bring before him, after every celebration, the absence of one and another of his charge. This will lead to the pastoral visit of inquiry, of instruction, of warning, or of consolation; and these will soon acquaint him accurately with the state and difficulties of the individual members of his flock. This acquaintance, again, will give a point and particularity to his sermons; this will enable him simply to bring out in them, as he has himself learned it, the power of Christ's cross and of Christ's resurrection, in connexion with his people's wants, sins, and temptations, as though he were indeed speaking in earnest to others of what he knows of their living efficacy. This will make his sermons utterly unlike the moral essays under which a congregation slumber soundly, or hungrily disperse, to seek in other pastures what

their own shepherd cannot furnish; and so the efficiency of the ministry will, under the blessing of God, be to a great degree the coming out of the character of the pastor.

And this, after all, is the great truth we need to remember. We want for the ministry of our parishes earnest spiritual men, men of prayer, men of faith, men of God; men who can "speak that they do know, and testify that they have seen;" men who can witness to others of the salvation they have found themselves; who can speak of Christ as having known Christ; who can declare the Spirit's power, because He has wrought upon themselves; to whom the Church of the redeemed is not a name or an abstraction, but the living company of Christ's saints, amongst whom HE lives and walks, who is their soul's desire and happiness; men to whom the doctrine of the sacraments is not a ground for wrangling, or a cold hard formulary of orthodoxy, but a discipline and fount of life. And for this, above all other needs, a holy, devout, faithful life is needful in ourselves; that in all our treatment of others we may be real; that we may be clear of the awful guilt of using the name of Christ, and the mysteries of his gospel, as mere matters of professional routine; or by a still more subtle delusion of the enemy, as instruments for obtaining for ourselves power over the minds of other men; but that we may indeed desire and advance their salvation. And without the reality of personal religion in ourselves, how can we hope to do any thing

effectual for them? A bad man cannot be a good minister of Christ to others. They soon see through any unreality in us; they feel it in the pithless sermons, the dull moralities, or the mere sapless statements of doctrine without the life of personal experience, in which it vents itself; they feel it in the substitution of a chilling pity for a lively sympathy in our treatment of them; they feel the effect of our losing our perception of the mystery of each regenerate life which is committed to our tending; of our forgetting that in each one is all the mystery of God's warfare with evil; of a will to be healed; a soul to be saved. They feel, in one word, that we are becoming the vendors of a charm, instead of being prophets with a message.

It is by being thoroughly in earnest ourselves, that we may hope, under God's blessing, to make our ministry effectual in our several parishes. This, if any thing can, will win back our brethren who have separated from us, because it will enable us to give to them, in its place and fulness, that truth, the desire of which led them from us, and gave to those, who perverted them, their only abiding strength; this will let us see, as seems meet to God, the effectual working of His grace by our weak agency; this will fit us to render up at last our great account with joy.

Depend upon it, my reverend brethren, that if such be the character of our ministry, we may carry on its labours with rejoicing hope. Already, amidst abounding difficulties, God has graciously given us

not a few encouragements. No reasonable man, I think, can shut his eyes to the many marks of His presence with us as a Church, which, within these few past years, God has vouchsafed to us. They have been of many different kinds; external and internal, in gifts bestowed and in dangers averted. What a new spring has Church education taken? Under what goodly auspices, and with what a promise of success was St. Augustine's College opened? How much more than heretofore—though still, alas! how insufficiently—have we acknowledged, and begun to pay our debt to our poor brethren who have emigrated to our colonies, to our convict population, and to the heathen round about them? How have new Bishoprics been founded abroad? How—whether or no all was then done for the best, on which I will not here enter—has the evil law, which forbid at home their increase, been broken through? How many new churches have been opened every where (of which increase we in this diocese, thank God, have had our share)? nine wholly new churches having been consecrated, and thirteen having been rebuilt on a larger scale, or worthily restored, within the last four years⁸.

⁸ The new churches have been as follows :—at

1. Cookham Dean.
2. Broadwell.
3. St. Ebbe's: District, Oxford.
4. Bradfield Union.
5. St. Katharine's, Bear Wood; munificently built and endowed at the sole expense of the late John Walter, Esq.
6. Stoke Row: District, in the parish of Ipsden.

In how many has the company of worshippers been multiplied? how many more are daily filled with the praises of God? How have the celebrations of the Holy Supper, and the apparently devout attendants on them, been increased manifold in number upon every side? How many have, by confirmation, renewed their own vows, and claimed for themselves the right to full communion? within this diocese no fewer than 9249 souls within the two years of the last confirmation. How have the schemes of our enemies been brought to nought? How has the more threatening storm of internal discord, in a great measure, been hushed? No man who contrasts with our present condition the state of Christ's Church amongst us a few years back, when its enemies were already

7. Sere Green : District, in the parish of Farnham Royal.
8. Twyford, in the parish of Hurst.
9. Rotherfield Grey's District.

The chief restorations have been :—

1. Woodcote Chapel ; wholly rebuilt and enlarged.
2. Moulsoford ; wholly rebuilt.
3. Cholsey ; wholly restored.
4. Basildon Church ; reseated and restored.
5. St. Thomas's, Oxford ; reseated, enlarged, and restored.
6. Goring ; reseated and restored.
7. Waltham, St. Lawrence ; the same.
8. Iver ; the same.
9. St. Lawrence, Reading ; the same in part.
10. Trinity, Reading.
11. Nuffield ; the same throughout.
12. Littlemore ; a new chancel and tower.
13. Bradfield Church ; almost entirely rebuilt and greatly enlarged, at the sole expense of the Rev. Thos. Stevens, rector.

raising over its instantly anticipated fall their premature shout of triumph, can fail, I think, to see that this is God's work. For this change has passed over it, not in a time of general peace and security, but amidst fears of such sifting and trying of all institutions as can hardly be paralleled^o. It is not the fruit of external accident, but of internal revival; it is marked by more zeal for God and His glory, more faith in His promises, more value for His appointment, both amongst Laity and Clergy, than we or our fathers had known.

Such blessings are surely to be received with meek trust and humble thankfulness to God: whether they are marks that the day is hastening to its close, or that there is yet room for further service, they are surely to be used with diligence.

And is not this the lesson which all things round us teach? Who can look into the shaking earth, and doubt that God has, indeed, a controversy with the

^o The following statement, which appeared recently in the public papers, strikingly illustrates this fact:—"The result of this year's census of the Wesleyan connexion gives the following numbers:—In Great Britain, 338,861; in Ireland, 20,742; in Missions, 97,451; total, 459,454; decrease during 1847-8, 4861. It further appears from the Report of the Conference that the profits of the book-room fell below those of previous years; accordingly the Committee diminished the grants to the Theological Institution by 200*l.*; to the Irish Relief Fund by 200*l.* In reference to the difficulty in maintaining preachers in some of the circuits, one of the preachers said that the Church of England had recently built 1000 additional churches, while proposals were before the Conference to withdraw ministers even from old circuits."

nations? We, as a people, have as yet been most lightly dealt with: it may be that this mercy is to be continued to us yet longer; it may be, that through us it is to be restored to others also. What a motive for exertion lies in such a hope!

But it may be, that the end is nearer yet. That amidst the "distress of nations with perplexity," which daily waxes darker around us, we are even now entered upon that last storm of tribulation which shall usher in the glad coming of the Son of man. And if it be so, surely it is no time for sloth or inactivity, for folded hands or loins ungirded. Surely, then, above all other times, it does become us, to be, with every energy of soul and body, about our Master's business; to be watching for His coming, and labouring to prepare His way. That ours may be the blessing of the faithful servant; that we may stand in our lot in that day, with the spiritual children He has given us gathered round us,—with the good fight, through His grace, well fought,—with our course finished, and for us, all unworthy as we are, yea, even for the weakest of us, of His abundant grace and mercy, a crown of life laid up, which may the Lord the righteous Judge give unto us in that day.

THE END.

Rev. R. Littor

ALTARS PROHIBITED

BY THE

CHURCH OF ENGLAND.

BY

WILLIAM GOODE, M.A. F.A.S.

RECTOR OF ST. ANTHOLIN, LONDON.

LONDON :

J. HATCHARD AND SON, 187, PICCADILLY.

1844.

LONDON :

G. J. PALMER, PRINTER, SAVOY STREET, STRAND.

ALTARS PROHIBITED
BY
THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND.

THE peace and welfare of the Church of England are becoming so seriously compromised by the almost unrestrained proceedings of certain parties among us in carrying out their avowed purpose of “unprotestantizing” the Church, that no effort, however humble, can be misplaced, in the endeavour to preserve it from the confusion and ultimate ruin to which their practices are tending rapidly to reduce it.

Of all the acts of these anti-protestant agitators, none perhaps more demands our attention at the present moment, than the attempt to substitute *altars* for *communion-tables* in our churches. Be it so, that in a few rare instances the *altar* has been suffered to remain, and from the total cessation of the popish controversy *within* our Church, may have been wholly harmless, (though, as I shall hereafter fully prove, in direct violation of the directions of the Church,) still the question of their admissibility at the present time is wholly different. They are now notoriously set up for the furtherance of Tractarian views of the nature of the sacrament of the Lord's

Supper. 'The communion-table' is thrust out in *old* churches to make way for them. They are studiously introduced, wherever practicable, and even in the most disingenuous and characteristically Tractarian way, into *new* churches. And thus the purity of our Church's *doctrine* on the subject is placed in jeopardy. Common sense will tell the people that altars are intended for offering up *that which is placed upon them* as a sacrifice to God, and thus obtaining his favour.

A simple consideration of the history of altars among us at the period of the Reformation might be sufficient to show their unsuitableness to the doctrine of our Church.

Upon the settlement of the Reformation in this country, in the reign of Edward VI., one of the first points to which the attention of our reformers was directed, was the removal of the Romish *altars*, and the substitution of *tables* in their place: a step which of course peculiarly offended the prejudices and excited the indignation of the Romanists. On the accession of Queen Mary, one of the first acts of the Romanists was to remove the *tables* and re-erect the *altars*. And when Queen Elizabeth came to the throne, one of the first steps taken towards the restoration of the Reformation was, that the *altars* were made to give way to *tables*. Can there be a more manifest proof than these simple facts, that the one agrees better with the doctrine of our reformed Church, the other with the doctrine of our Church before it was reformed?

This is no mere matter of words, or names, or taste. There is a great and most important difference between the two things. An altar is that on which a sacrifice is offered up to God, and a sacrifice implies a sacrificing priest to offer it, and mediate between God and the people; and it is far worse than irrational to say, that a *change* of our tables into altars is not made for the purpose of instilling

this doctrine into the minds of the people, and will not have that *effect*. A *table* is obviously unsuitable for such a purpose, and therefore our Church, when prescribing tables to be used by us, in that very direction, necessarily, though only by inference, (and an inference which I care not to press,) condemns altars and the doctrine that flows from them. For though an altar might be called a *table*, (Mal. i. 12,) from the circumstance that men were permitted to partake of the sacrifices offered, it by no means follows that a table is a suitable and proper place on which to offer up a material sacrifice to God; and it is the consciousness of its unsuitableness that induces the Romanists and Tractarians to change it for an altar. Nor, on the other hand, is an altar suitable where a sacrifice would be displeasing to God, and where all that takes place, besides the *spiritual* sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving, is a feast upon the symbols of a sacrifice offered once for all upon the cross, in which, to the faithful recipient, the real but spiritual presence of him who is thus represented is mercifully vouchsafed.

The question, then, which we are about to discuss is one of no slight moment. It is intimately connected with the preservation of the purity of the doctrine of our Church. The erection of altars in our churches is an important advance towards Rome; *an advance made in the very face of the express orders of the Church, to the contrary.*

I am unwilling here to notice more particularly, and by name, the cases in which this violation of the Church's orders has been allowed, lest I should appear to be speaking with reference to any individuals in our Church, especially any who, both from their position and character, demand the highest respect. I will only say, for the information of those who may not know exactly how matters are progressing in this direction, that the cases

are already numerous in which this has taken place, that the most strenuous efforts are being made by a large party in our Church (including, of course, the Tractarians, though not limited to those who *profess* themselves to be such) to carry out this infraction of the Church's ordinances; and that in this course they are *allowed* to proceed. Nor should I omit to add, that this is but *one specimen* of the *system* they are pursuing for the "re-appropriation" of doctrines and practices cast out of our Church at the Reformation. What other ultimate consequence can be expected by any one to result from such a state of things than a *complete disruption of the Church*, it is difficult to conceive.

The remarks of Dr. Nicholl, in his preface to his Commentary on the Common Prayer, (p. xiii.,) with reference to the conduct of the Nonjurors, may well call for our serious consideration at the present time. "Whatever little advantages," he observes, "may be compassed by these practices, they are certainly very dangerous ones; as tending to divide that church whose only strength and safety consists in its union. These projects have been once already tried, with a very lamentable success. For the miseries of the civil war were not owing to the Separatists and Sectaries, (for these were afterwards brooded in Cromwell's army,) but to the quarrels and distinctions made between Church-of-England men themselves. These unhappy differences kindled the first coals of the civil war, and blowed up the whole nation into flames. . . . And if this be not warning sufficient against trying the like experiments for the future, I know not what is." (Ed. 1710.)

My object, however, is simply and respectfully to offer evidence as to the nature of our Church's directions on the subject; evidence, the production of which may perhaps tend to strengthen the hands of those who are

really desirous of upholding, as far as their power extends, the interests of our Reformed Protestant Church. I shall not, therefore, on the present occasion, advert to the case of particular churches, nor even take up the question of *doctrine*, but confine myself to an historical delineation of the proofs that our Church requires *tables* to be used for the administration of the holy communion, and *prohibits* the use of *altars*.

The first movement in this matter appears to have been rather the natural consequence of the introduction of the doctrines of the Reformation, than in obedience to any direct order given by the authorities of the Church. For, as far as I am able to discover, the first direction given on the subject is in the Injunctions issued about June, 1550, by Bishop Ridley, for his diocese of London, and is in the following terms.

“Item, whereas in divers places some use the Lord’s board after the form of a table, and some as an altar, whereby dissention is perceived to arise among the unlearned; therefore, wishing a godly unity to be observed in all our diocese, and for that the form of a table may more move and turn the simple from the old superstitious opinions of the popish mass, and to the right use of the Lord’s Supper, we exhort the curates, churchwardens, and questmen here present to erect and set up the Lord’s board after the form of an honest table, decently covered, in such place of the quire or chancel as shall be thought most meet by their discretion and agreement, so that the ministers with the communicants may have their place separated from the rest of the people; and *to take down and abolish all other by-altars or tables.*” (See Burnet, Hist. of Ref., or Cardwell’s Doc. Ann.)

From the words here used, “we exhort,” it appears as if no order had then been given by authority on the sub-

ject; and that it had rather been left to time and persuasion to bring about the alteration. But we find, from K. Edward's Journal, that early in November of this year a general order was issued by the Council on this subject, as we there meet with the following entry:—
 “November 12. *There were letters sent to every bishop to pluck down the altars.*” (Burnet, vol. ii. Rec. No. 1.)
 The copy of the letter sent to Ridley (which was no doubt the same as the rest, there being nothing in it peculiar to his diocese) is extant, where the order runs thus,—“Whereas it is come to our knowledge, that, being the altars within the more part of the churches of the realm upon good and godly considerations are taken down, there doth yet remain altars standing in divers other churches, by occasion whereof much variance and contention ariseth amongst sundry of our subjects. . . . We let you wit, that minding to have all occasion of contention taken away . . . we have thought good, by the advice of our council, to require you, and nevertheless especially to charge and command you, for the avoiding of all matters of further contention and strife, about the standing or taking away of the said altars, to give substantial order throughout all your diocese, that with all diligence *all the altars* in every church or chapel, as well in places exempted as not exempted, within your said diocese, *to be taken down, and, instead of them, a table to be set up in some convenient part* of the chancel, within every such church or chapel, to serve for the ministration of the blessed communion.” (Heyl. Hist of Ref. p. 96; Fox, Acts and Mon.; Cardwell's Doc. Ann. i. 89.) This letter is dated November 24; and with it were sent certain arguments,* to reconcile the people to the order, drawn up by Ridley. (Burnet and Collier.) That this letter was sent to the bishops generally, and

* Which we shall give presently. See p. 34.

not to Ridley only, appears from the fact that Day, Bishop of Chichester, appeared before the Council, November 30, to answer for his non-compliance with the king's letter for taking down the altars, and upon his persisting in his refusal of obedience to it he was *committed to the Fleet*. (See Burnet, and Collier, i. 306.)

There can be no question, then, what from this time, during the remainder of the reign of Edward VI., was the law of the church in this matter.

Accordingly, in the revision of the Prayer Book, in 1552, the word "table" was substituted for "altar," which had been allowed to remain in some places in the first Prayer Book of 1549, but was now removed, lest it should mislead any as to the nature of the sacrament.

This removal of the altars, indeed, was one especial charge brought against the Reformers in the reign of Mary. Thus in Ridley's "last examination before the commissioners," White, Bishop of Lincoln, complained, "Cyril also in another place, proving to the Jews that Christ was come, useth this reason, 'Altars are erected in Christ's name in Britain, and in far countries; ergo, Christ is come.' But we may use the contrary of that reason, 'altars are plucked down *in Britain*; ergo, Christ is not come.' . . . Ye see what a good argument this your doctrine maketh for the Jews, to prove that Christ is not come." I need hardly give Ridley's reply to such an argument, (if argument it could be called,) but at the close of it, he observes,—“As for the taking down of the altars, it was done upon just considerations, for that they seemed to come too nigh to the Jews' usage; neither was the supper of the Lord at any time better ministered, [or] more duly received, than in *those latter days when all things were brought to the rites and usage of the primitive church*.” (Works, P. S. ed. pp. 280, 281.)

And thus does this learned and pious bishop lament the restoration of the altars in Queen Mary's time. "O thou now wicked and bloody see, why dost thou set up again many altars of idolatry, *which by the word of God were justly taken away?* Oh! why hast thou *overthrown the Lord's table?*" (Lett. of Farewell to his Friends. Works, p. 409.)

Thus again does Becon bear witness *to the fact*, (and for that purpose only I quote him,) that the substitution of tables for altars was by, not a partial, but a general injunction. In his "Humble Supplication unto God for the restoring of his Holy Word," written in the time of Queen Mary, he says,—“Moreover heretofore we were taught to beat down the idolatrous and heathenish altars, which antichrist of Rome, intending to set up a new priesthood and a strange sacrifice for sin, commanded to be built up . . . and to *set in their stead, in some convenient place, a seemly table*, and after the examples of Christ, to receive together at it the holy mysteries of Christ's body and blood, in remembrance that Christ's body was broken and his blood shed for our sins. But now . . . have they *taken out of the temples those seemly tables*, which we, following the examples of thy dearly beloved Son and of the primitive church, used at the ministration of the holy communion,” &c. (Works, ed. 1563, vol. iii. fol. 16.)

But, in truth, no man who is at all acquainted with the documents of this period can be in doubt what was *the law or practice* of our Church on the subject during the latter part of the reign of Edward VI.

During the reign of Queen Mary the altars were of course restored.

We have now, then, to observe what course was pursued on the re-settlement of the Reformation, in the time of Queen Elizabeth.

Queen Elizabeth ascended the throne November 17, 1558. In April, 1559, was passed the act for uniformity of Prayer, &c., enacting that from St. John Baptist day following, the second Prayer Book of Edward VI. (with a few alterations) should be again "in full force and effect." Now this Prayer Book, as the divines who addressed Queen Elizabeth shortly after on the subject of altars, remind her, "*supposes a table* for the administration of the Holy Eucharist, and gives directions about it." (Collier, ii. p. 434.)

And here, let us observe, we see what these divines would have said *now*, as to what is required of us by our present Prayer Book alone, without adverting to other considerations; the rubric here referred to remaining unaltered.

There were of course, however, some in the church at that time, who were unwilling to take down the altars to which they had been so long accustomed to look with reverence, until some specific direction should force them to do so; and it seems not improbable that the Queen herself felt no great desire to enforce their discontinuance. One of the earliest acts, therefore, of the reformers was, to address the Queen for the removal of the altars, and placing tables in their room;* and accordingly, in the Injunctions issued in the *first* year of her reign, we have the following order for that purpose. "*For tables in the church.*—Whereas her majesty understandeth, that in many and sundry parts of the realm, the altars of the churches be removed, and tables placed for the administration of the Holy Sacrament, *according to the form of the law therefore provided*, [referring clearly to the act for uniformity]; and in some other places the altars be not *yet* removed, upon opinion conceived of some other order therein to be taken by her majesty's visitors; in the order whereof, saving for an

* See p. 36, below.

uniformity, there seemeth no matter of great moment, so that the sacrament be duly and reverently ministered; yet for observation of one uniformity through the whole realm, and for the better imitation of *the law in that behalf*, it is ordered, that no altar be taken down but by oversight of the curate of the church and the churchwardens, or one of them at the least, wherein no riotous or disordered manner be used. And that *the holy table in every church* be decently made, and set in the place where the altar stood, and there commonly covered as thereto belongeth, and as shall be appointed by the visitors, and so to stand, saving when the communion of the sacrament is to be distributed; at which time the same shall be so placed in good sort within the chancel, as whereby the minister may be more conveniently heard of the communicants in his prayer and ministration, and the communicants also more conveniently, and in more number, communicate with the said minister. And after the communion done, from time to time, the same holy table to be placed where it stood before." (Sparrow, p. 84.)* The remark implying that the change of altars into tables was a matter of no great moment, was probably inserted in deference to the Queen's feelings, and perhaps by the Queen herself,† who seems to have been less zealous in some matters of this kind than was desirable, as it was certainly not in accordance with the views of the leading divines of that

* In a volume entitled "Synodalia," among Archbishop Parker's papers at C. C. C. Cambridge, occur some "Interpretations and further Considerations" of the injunctions drawn up by the archbishops and bishops, in which it is directed, "That the table be removed out of the choir into the body of the church, before the chancel door, where either the choir seemeth to be too little, or at great feasts of receivings; and at the end of the communion to be set up again, according to the injunctions." (Cardwell, Doc. Ann. i. 205)

† As she did in other cases. (See Cardw. Synod. i. 113.)

period; but however that may be, here was a clear *order* for the removal of the altars and the placing of tables in their room, and also a recognition of the fact that this was required by “*the law.*”

And we happen to have express testimony that this order was carried out “throughout the kingdom.” For in a letter of Thomas Sampson to Peter Martyr, dated Jan. 6, 1560, the writer, after regretting the shortcomings, as it appeared to him, of the work of reformation that was then going on, adds, “*The altars indeed are removed and images also THROUGHOUT THE KINGDOM.*” (Zurich Lett. P. S. ed. p. 63.)* A most unexceptionable testimony, because he looked with a particularly jealous eye to what was done in this matter, and would have added a complaint on this head also, had it been otherwise.

Moreover, at the latter end of this year (1559) commissioners were appointed by the Queen to make a royal visitation throughout the kingdom, in the course of which all the clergy were required to subscribe a declaration that the Book of Common Prayer, and the orders and rules contained in the “Injunctions,” were agreeable to the word of God, and the doctrine and use of the primitive and apostolic church, to which only one hundred and eighty-nine refused to put their names. (Strype, Annals, vol. i. p. 172.)

The proceedings of the commissioners with respect to St. Paul’s Cathedral are related by Strype at some length; and he tells us that they enjoined the authorities of St. Paul’s to “take care that the cathedral church should be purged and freed from all and singular their images, idols, and *altars*, and in the place of those *altars* to provide a decent *table* in the church for the ordinary celebration of the Lord’s Supper.” (Annals, vol. i. p. 165.)

* *Altaria quidem sunt diremta et imagines per totum regnum.*

The appointment of these commissioners, and the declaration they were instructed to obtain from the clergy, together with the whole character of their proceedings, show the resolution with which the Act for uniformity and the Injunctions were carried out and enforced: and the case of St. Paul's Cathedral, particularly specified by Strype, proves also that the prohibition of altars extended to *cathedral* quite as much as to *parochial* churches.

There is also another instance of the removal of altars, fortunately left on record by Strype, to which I would particularly call the attention of the reader, and which is given in the following words,—*April the 16th [1561] were all the altars in Westminster Abbey demolished, and so was the altar in the chapel of Henry VII.*" (Strype, Annals, vol. i. p. 267.) If, therefore, any one of these altars has been again erected, this has been done stealthily, and in direct violation of the ordinances of the church. How far, then, an altar so erected can be justly quoted as a proof that our church *allows* altars, hardly needs a remark.

In accordance therefore with the above orders, we find that in the "Interrogatories" attached to an edition of the Queen's Visitation Articles of 1559, given by Strype, and called by him "Inquiries of some ordinary at his visitation, instituted soon after the year the articles aforegoing [the Visitation Articles of Queen Elizabeth in 1559] were set forth," the second interrogatory for churchwardens is, "Whether all *altars*, images, holy water stones, pictures, paintings, . . . and all other superstitious and dangerous monuments; especially paintings and images in wall, book, cope, banner, or elsewhere, of the blessed Trinity or of the Father (of whom there can be no image made), be *defaced and removed out of the church and other places, and are*

destroyed, and the places where *such impiety* was, so made up, as if there had been no such thing there; or no?" (Strype's Annals, vol. i. App. No. xxi.)

On Oct. 10, 1561, the following order was issued by the Commissioners,—“It is ordered also, that the steps which be as yet at this day remaining in any cathedral, collegiate, or parish church, be not stirred or altered, but be suffered to continue. And if in any chancel the steps be transposed, that they *be not erected again*, but that the steps be decently paved, *where the communion table shall stand out of the times of receiving the communion.*” (Heylin's Antid. Linc., 2nd ed., p. 46.)

In January 1564-5 were published the “Advertisements,” in which again we find the following order, “That the parish provide a decent *table, standing on a frame*, for the communion-table.” (Sparrow and Cardwell.) It has been said that the Queen did not officially give her sanction to these Advertisements. The question is not material, inasmuch as the order given in her Injunctions is sufficient, not to say that those Injunctions maintain that the act for uniformity establishing the second Prayer Book of Edward VI. requires the change of altars into tables. But seeing that in the very title of these Advertisements they are said to be “by virtue of the Queen's majesty's letters commanding the same,” (see title, and Strype's Parker, i. 307, and iii. 65, Oxf. ed.) and that in the year 1569 they are referred to by Archbishop Parker, in his Visitation Articles, as “set forth by public authority” (art. iv.), and again quoted as of authority in the constitutions of 1571, there can be little doubt that if her sanction was not formally, it was virtually, given to them. The matter in fact stands thus. By the Act for uniformity, it was enacted that with respect to the ornaments of the church, and the ministers thereof, and the

ceremonies or rites of the church, it should be lawful for the Queen, with the advice of her commissioners for causes ecclesiastical, *or of the metropolitan*, to issue any further orders. When, therefore, the "Advertisements, partly for due order in the public administration of common prayers and using the holy sacraments, and partly for the apparel of all persons ecclesiastical," were issued by the metropolitan five years after, expressly "by virtue of the Queen's majesty's letters commanding the same," it seems difficult to see what was wanting to give them authority. And, finally, they are expressly referred to by Archbishop Whitgift in 1585, in his Visitation Articles for the Diocese of Chichester, *sede vacante*, as "her Majesty's Advertisements;" (Wilk. iv. 318;) and again in the canons of 1640, as the "Advertisements of Queen Elizabeth." (can. 7.)

Proceeding in chronological order, we come next to the articles to be inquired of in the Metropolitan Visitation of Archbishop Parker in 1567, "in all and singular cathedral and collegiate churches within the province of Canterbury," among which occurs the following; "Item, whether your divine service be used, and your sacraments ministered, in manner and form prescribed by the Queen's Majesty's Injunctions, and none other way." (Art. 3. Wilk. iv. 253.) This again shows that the general orders in the "Injunctions" refer to "cathedral and collegiate," as well as parochial churches.

We proceed to the first *parochial* Visitation Articles of Archbishop Parker for the Diocese of Canterbury in 1569. Thus runs the 2nd article: "Item, whether you have in your parish churches all things necessary . . . specially the Book of Common Prayer . . . a *comely and decent table* for the holy communion, covered decently, and set in place prescribed by the Queen's Majesty's Injunctions . . . and whether *your altars*

be taken down ACCORDING TO THE COMMANDMENT IN THAT BEHALF GIVEN." (Wilk. iv. 257, 8.)

The next authority is from the canons of the synod of 1571, to which, on account of one of them, supposed to attribute authority to the writings of the early Fathers,* much deference is paid by some. We are told that here we see the mind of our Church, that here we have her solemn, deliberate, and unbiassed judgment. We therefore beg to recommend to the particular consideration of such the following injunction.

The churchwardens shall provide a table of joyner's work for the administration of the holy communion.†

In the same year, (1571,) in the Injunctions given by Grindal, Archbishop of York, in his Metropolitanical Visitation, to the clergy and laity of his province, we have among those for the laity the following order,—“Item, that the churchwardens in every parish shall, at the costs and charges of the parish, provide (if the same be not already provided) all things necessary . . . specially the Book of Common Prayer . . . a comely and decent *table, standing on a frame*, for the holy communion.” “Item, that the churchwardens shall see that in their churches and chapels *all altars be utterly taken*

* That preachers should exact the religious regard of the people only to such things as were agreeable to the doctrine of the Old and New Testament, and which the catholic fathers and ancient bishops had collected out of that very doctrine.

† *Æditui . . . curabunt mensam ex asseribus composite junctam, quæ administrationi sacrosanctæ communionis inserviat.* (Wilk. iv. 266.)

“In the framing of this book of canons, the Archbishop and the Bishops of Ely and Winton had the main hand; but all the bishops of both provinces in synod, in their own persons, or by proxy, signed it; but not the lower house. And the archbishop laboured to get the Queen's allowance to it, but had it not: she often declining to give her licence to their orders and constitutions, *reckoning that her bishops' power and jurisdiction alone, having their authority derived from her, was sufficient.*” (Strype's Parker, ii. 60, Oxf. ed.; as quoted by Cardwell, Synod. i. 111.)

down, and clear removed, even unto the foundation, and the place where they stood paved, and the wall whereunto they joined whited over, and made uniform with the rest, so as no breach or rupture appear; and that the altar-stones be broken, defaced, and bestowed to some common use.” (Grindall’s works, P. S. ed. pp. 133, 4.)*

And that a strict uniformity was required in the forms and orders observed throughout the whole realm, is evident from a letter sent by the Council, in 1573, to one of the bishops, apparently supposed to be negligent in the matter, in the Queen’s name, reminding him that all the churches of his diocese ought to be kept “in one uniform and godly order,” and requiring him, “either by yourself, which were most fit, or by your archdeacons, or other able and wise men, personally to visit, and see, that in no one church of your diocese there be any difformity or difference used for those prescribed orders,” i. e. “the orders set forth in the book of Common Prayer.” (Wilk. iv. 279.)

Whether the conduct which elicited this reproof was caused by negligence or by party bias, I know not, but it is impossible not to feel that those two causes have produced the greater part of the evils by which our Church has been afflicted. If the orders and instructions of *the Church* had been from the first *mildly, steadily, and impartially* carried out, we should have been spared an incalculable amount of evil, confusion, and ill-will. But strictness and negligence often following close upon one another, party bias one way succeeding party bias of the opposite description, (and the transactions of Archbishop

* See also the articles sent by him to the Archdeacon of York, “to be put in execution with speed and effect,” one of which is, “that the parish provide a decent table, standing in a frame, for the communion-table.” (Ib. p. 155.)

Laud's time may show us how far party bias has at times carried its votaries beyond and in opposition to the doctrine and precepts of the Church,) have done more to produce discord, ill-will, confusion, and dissent, than any other cause that could be named. It is but natural that the laity should be restless and dissatisfied under such a state of things, and think that they are trifled with.

Let us now follow Archbishop Grindall to the see of Canterbury. In the articles drawn up for his *metropolitan* visitation of the *province* of Canterbury, in 1576, we meet with the following,—“Whether you have in your parish churches and chapels all things necessary . . . specially the book of Common Prayer . . . a comely and decent *table, standing on a frame*, for the holy communion.” “Whether in your churches and chapels *all altars be utterly taken down and clean removed, even unto the foundation, and the place where they stood paved*, and the wall whereunto they joined whited over, and made uniform with the rest, so as no breach or rupture appear?” (Works, P. S. ed. pp. 157, 8.)

And in the same prelate's “articles to be inquired of in all *cathedral* and *collegiate* churches” in his province in the same year, (1576,) one is,—“Whether your divine service be used, and the sacrament ministered in manner and form prescribed in the Queen's Majesty's Injunctions, and none other ways.” (Ib. p. 180.)

It is difficult to conceive more stringent and decisive testimony to the fact, that the erection of altars in our churches is directly opposed to the laws and ordinances of our reformed church. In fact, if altars are not prohibited, neither are rood lofts with their images, nor twenty other similar popish abominations, the removal of which rests only upon the same foundation as the removal of altars.

And this removal of the “altars” is recognised even in the Canons of Archbishop Laud’s Synod of 1640, where it is said,—“At the time of reforming this church from that gross superstition of popery, it was carefully provided that all means should be used to root out of the minds of the people, both the inclination thereunto and the memory thereof, especially of the idolatry committed in the mass, *for which cause ALL popish altars were demolished.*” (Art. 7. Wilk. iv. 549.)

Once more, in the last code of canons, passed in our church in 1603, the 82nd runs thus;—“*A decent communion-table in every church. Whereas we have no doubt, but that in ALL churches within the realm of England, convenient and decent tables are provided and placed for the celebration of the holy communion, we appoint, that the same tables shall from time to time be kept and repaired, &c. . . . and so stand saving when the said holy communion is to be administered; at which time the same shall be placed in so good sort within the church or chancel, as thereby the minister may be more conveniently heard of the communicants in his prayer and ministration, and the communicants also more conveniently, and in more number, may communicate with the said minister;*” all which necessarily implies a *moveable table*.

And in an Act of parliament, passed in 1605, “altars” are expressly reckoned among “popish reliques.” It is there enacted, that “it shall be lawful for any two justices of peace, &c., to search the houses and lodgings of every popish recusant convict, or of every person whose wife is, or shall be, a popish recusant convict, for popish books and reliques of popery: and that if any altar, pix, beads, pictures, or *such-like popish reliques* . . . shall be found . . . shall be presently defaced and burnt, if it be meet to be burned; and if it be a crucifix

or other relique of any price, the same to be defaced," &c. (3 Jac. I. c. 5. Gibson's Codex, i. 535, 6.)

Thus, then, stands the law of the case. It is useless, therefore, to inquire whether stone altars have been permitted to remain in some of our churches, because,—not to say that in all probability they have been stealthily re-erected, under the auspices of some popishly-inclined rector or bishop, or some thoughtless persons who have regarded them as ornamental,—wherever they are found, they stand *in direct violation of the repeated injunctions of the authorities of our church*. There is no doubt that in the times of Laud's archiepiscopate, there were those who took advantage of the favour known to be secretly felt in high quarters towards such things to re-erect altars in their churches. Nor can we be surprised at this, when we find a bishop of our church, at that period, inserting in his articles of inquiry for his diocese, in 1638, such questions as the following,—“Hath it [i. e. your chancel] ascents up unto the altar?” (Tit. i. art. 9.) “Is your communion-table OR ALTAR OF STONE, wainscot, joiner's work, strong, fair, and decent?” (Tit. iii. art. 7.)* The explanation of this we learn from the fact since ascertained, that he was a secret apostate to Rome while he remained a bishop of our church.† And on account of the scandal occasioned by acts of this kind, it was thought adviseable, by the synod of 1640, when the times seemed to demand at least a little more *prudence* in such matters, to pass the following canon, that, to prevent any “*impertinent, inconvenient, or illegal* inquiries in the articles for ecclesiastical visitations, this synod hath now caused a summary or collection of visitatory articles (out of *the rubrics of the service book, and the canons and warrantable rules*

* Bp. Montague's Articles of Inquiry for Diocese of Norwich, in 1638.

† See Panzani's Memoirs.

of the church) to be made, and for future direction to be deposited in the records of the Archbishop of Canterbury," and "no bishop, or other person whatsoever, having right to hold, use, or exercise any parochial visitation," was to use "any other articles, or forms of inquiry upon oath, than such only as shall be approved and 'in terminis' allowed unto him (upon due request made) by his metropolitan under his seal of office;" of course out of the "summary" so left in the archbishop's hands, the title of the canon being, "one book of articles of inquiry to be used at all parochial visitations." (Can. 9. Wilk. iv. 550.) This canon is so remarkable, that I suppose it is undeniable that there must have been very strong grounds in the "*impertinent, inconvenient, and illegal*" inquiries of some of the bishops to call for it; and so I leave Bishop Montague's articles to the reader, to dispose of as he pleases, in conformity with "the rubrics of the service book, and the canons and warrantable rules of the Church."

But even then, few indeed went so far in opposition to the directions of the Church as to erect a stone altar. All that was attempted in general was to have the communion-table placed *altarwise* (as it was termed), i. e. with the *sides* east and west, and the *ends* north and south, close to the east end of the church, and there *railed in*. How far this was agreeable to the rubrics of the service book, or the directions of the Church, is a question into which I have no inclination to enter. These are minor points, and the controversy respecting them has happily long slept, and far indeed would it be from my wish to revive it. But at any rate this was all that generally was ventured upon. And all that Archbishop Laud himself made inquiry about in his metropolitcal visitation for the diocese of Lincoln, in 1634, was,—“Whether have you in your church a con-

venient and decent *communion-table*, &c., and whether is the same table placed in such convenient sort within the chancel *or church*, as that the minister may be best heard in his ministry and the administration, and that the greatest number may communicate?" (Holy Table, pp. 83, 4.)

Further; this substitution of *tables* for *altars*, in the time of Queen Elizabeth, was again (as it had been before) made the continual subject of reproach against our church by the Romanists.

Thus, in the anonymous popish pamphlet, entitled "An Addition," &c., published in 1561, on the burning of St. Paul's, the author speaks of that calamity as a judgment upon the Reformers for their desecration of the church in "destroying and pulling down holy altars," &c.; to which Bishop Pilkington, in his "Confutation," replies,—“ Now for *pulling down altars and ministering the communion on tables*, a few words to try, whether we do this without reason or example. First, our Saviour Christ ministered it sitting at a table: then it is not wicked but best to follow his doings; for he did all things well . . . and because *altars* were ever used for *sacrifices*, to signify that sacrifice which was to come, seeing our Saviour Christ is come already, has fulfilled and finished all sacrifices, *we think it best, to take away all occasions of that popish sacrificing mass*, (for maintaining whereof they have cruelly sacrificed many innocent souls,) *to minister on tables*, according to these examples.” *

The same charge is reiterated by Dorman, in 1564,† and is thus replied to by the celebrated Dean Nowell,—“ First, that Christ instituted the sacrament at a *table*,

* Pilkington's Works, P. S. ed. pp. 539, 545—7.

† Proof of certain Articles, &c. Antw. 1564. See Nowell's Reproof of Dorman's Proof, cited below; and Strype, Ann. i. 163.

and not at an *altar*, is most manifest ; except M. Dorman would have us think, that men had altars instead of tables in their private houses in those days ; but our Saviour expressly saying that the hands of him who should betray him were upon the table, taketh away all doubting, Luke xxii. 21. And St. Paul, 1 Cor. x. 21, also calleth it *mensam dominicam* the Lord his *table* . . . If St. Basil, and some other old writers, call it an altar, that is no proper, but a figurative name, for that, as in the old law, their burnt offerings and sacrifices were offered upon the altar, *so are our sacrifices of prayer and thanksgiving, &c., offered up to God at the Lord's table, as it were at an altar.* But such kind of figurative speech can be *no just cause to set up altars rather than tables*, unless they think that their crosses also should be turned into altars, for that like phrase is used of them, where it is said, Christ offered up himself upon the altar of the cross. Now the old doctors (Chrys. hom. 18 in 2 Cor. August. Tract. 26, in Joann. et multi mult. loc.) do call it the Lord's table, usually, truly, without figure, and agreeably to the Scriptures. Concerning the spiritual worship or service of God, or sacrifice, if you will, (seeing it is also mentioned in S. Basil,) due to be done at the Lord's table, which, as afore is noted, he calleth an altar, it is not lacking *in our churches at the Lord's table* ; that is to say, true repentance of heart," &c. "And were you not altogether too gross, S. Basil so oft speaking of spiritual worshipping, and spiritual service, might somewhat reform your carnal and sensual understanding. You see we do not stick to grant you, not only a spiritual worship and service, but a sacrifice too, which yet hath no need of *your altars*, framed to yourselves, upon this false phantasie, that the body and blood of Christ are there offered by the priests for the quick and dead, with *the abuse of*

that distinction of the bloody and unbloody offering of Christ's body applied to the same ; which is altogether a false fable and a vain dream most meet for M. Dorman. The Scriptures, Heb. x. 10, 12, 14, do thus teach us, that Christ our Saviour once for all offered up his body and blood upon the altar of the cross, the one and only sacrifice of sweet savour, to his Father ; by the which one oblation of the body of Christ, a sacrifice for our sins, once for ever offered, and no more to be offered by any man, we be sanctified and made perfect. Wherefore the popish priests, which do repeat often the sacrifice of Christ's death, as they do teach, thereby, as much as in them lieth, do take away the efficacy and virtue of the sacrifice of Christ's death, making it like to the sacrifices of the old law ; the imperfection of which sacrifices St. Paul doth prove by the often repetition of the same. For the continuance whereof their priests also needed succession : but Christ is *a priest for ever, without succession*, and his sacrifice *perpetual, without repetition*, as the apostle, Heb. x. 11, plainly teacheth. *Our service and sacrifice now is the often and thankful remembrance of that only sacrifice, in the receiving of the holy sacrament at the Lord's table, according to his own institution ; Hoc facite in memoriam mei ; do this in remembrance of me :* with spiritual feeding by faith also, upon that his most precious body and blood, so by him for us offered. Touching THE PULLING DOWN OF YOUR ALTARS, *I answer, they are justly destroyed, as were those wicked altars by Asa, Josaphat, Ezekias, Josias, godly kings of Juda, destroyed.**

So Harding objects,—“ How condemn ye the Donatists, seeing with them ye break and throw down the holy altars of God ?” To which Bishop Jewell replies,—

* Nowell's Reproof of Dorman's Proof, 1565, 4to. fol. 15—17.

“Ye condemn us for heretics, for that we have taken down your shops and gainful booths, which ye call the holy altars of God. Verily this must needs be thought either extreme rigour, or great folly, of the removing of a stone to make an heresy. . . . Neither is there any good sufficient reason to be showed, wherefore it should more be heresy in us to *take down your needless and superstitious walls*, which ye had erected of yourselves, *without commission*, than it was lately in you, to tear in sunder, and to burn *our communion-tables*: in the erection and use whereof we had the undoubted example, both of Christ himself, and also of the ancient catholic Fathers. . . . As for the altars which Optatus saith the Donatists brake down, they were certainly *tables of wood, such as we have*, and not heaps of stones such as ye have: as in my former Reply made unto you, (art. 3, div. 26,) it may better appear. St. Augustine reporting the same story, (Ep. 50, ad Bonifac.) saith; the Donatists in their fury brake down the altar boards. His words be these: *Lignis ejusdem altaris effractis*. Likewise saith Athanasius of the like fury of the Arians; *Subsellia, thronum, mensam ligneam et tabulas ecclesie, et cetera quæ poterant, foris elata, combusserunt*; they carried forth and burnt the seats, the pulpit, *the wooden board*, the church tables, and such other things as they could get. Touching your stone altars, Beatus Rhenanus saith, *In nostris Basilicis Ararum superaddititia structura novitatem præ se fert*; in our churches the building up of altars added to the rest declareth *a novelty*. This learned man telleth you, M. Harding, that *your stone altars* are but *newly* brought into the church of God; and that *our communion-tables* are *old and ancient, and have been used from the beginning*. *We have such altars, M. Harding, as Christ, his apostles, St. Augustine,*

Optatus, and other catholic and holy Fathers had, and used, whose examples to follow we never thought it to be such heresy."*

The charge is repeated by Osorius, who, in his Treatise against Walter Haddon, speaking of the proceedings that had taken place in the English church under Queen Elizabeth, complains, that images, &c., and *altars* had been thrown down.† To which Haddon or Fox (for the answer was commenced by Haddon, but finished by Fox) replies,—“But as to what thou sayest, that images, pictures, crosses, and altars are cast down, I conceive that this part of the complaint does not much appertain to Luther, and the ministers of the Evangelical doctrine, inasmuch as they never put any hands to the destruction of images. Neither is it right, that those who are but private men, should by force and tumults take liberty to themselves to do anything in the commonwealth or church. But if *the magistrates, according to their lawful authority, with respect to anything which they see to be agreeable to the word of God, do piously and quietly execute their office therein*, what has Osorius, a private man and a stranger here, to do with this, either to quarrel at or that he should intermeddle with the matter. If King Sebastian, sovereign of the Portuguese, think meet to cherish and follow those parts of the Roman superstition in altars, in statues, in pictures, and the adoration of images, he hath the voices of the Scripture on the one side, of monks on the other, to hearken to which of the two he pleases; he may do in his own re-

* Defence of Apol. Pt. iii. ch. i. div. 3. Works, 1609, p. 315. See also his Reply to Harding's answ. in the answ. to Pref., and at art. 3, div. 26.

† *Imagines et signa, cruces, aras, disjecistis.* Osor. in Gualt. Haddon de relig. libri tres. Diling. 1569. 12mo. lib. 3, fol. 178.

public what he thinks fit, at his own peril and pleasure. But, on the other side, if *Elizabeth, Queen of the English, the Scripture leading her, shall think meet, that these filthinesses of impure superstition, which no Christian may endure without endangering himself and his, be driven out of the empire, truly she does nothing therein, which may not clearly be defended by the perspicuous authority of the sacred Scripture, and by the illustrious examples of the most approved kings.*” And then shortly after he proceeds to vindicate the destruction of the images and altars by testimonies drawn from the history and writers of the primitive church.*

Finally, in 1582, thus complains Gregory Martin, one of the divines of the English Roman Catholic college at Rheims. “*The name of altar, (as they know very well,) both in the Hebrew and Greek, and by the custom of all*

* Quod autem imagines et signa, cruces, et aras disjectas dicis, ad Lutherum et Evangelicæ doctrinæ ministros hanc querelæ partem haud multum attingere arbitror: quum illi nullas unquam manus diffringendis imaginibus injecerint. Neque enim æquum est, ut qui privati sunt, per vim et tumultus, quicquam sibi, in republica aut ecclesia permittant. Cæterum si magistratus, pro legitima sua autoritate, quod vident verbo Dei consentaneum, piè sedatèque munus in eo suum administrent, quid hic habet Osorius, homo privatus, et alienus, vel quod rixetur vel quer [sic] se intermiscat. Si rex Sebastianus Lusitanorum Σεβαστος, partes istas Romanæ superstitionis fovendas, ac sectandas sibi, in aris, in statuis, in signis, et imaginibus adorandis censeat, habet hinc Scripturæ, hinc monachorum voces, quibus utrum maluerit auscultare, faciat in sua repub. suo ipsius periculo, et arbitrato, quod videbitur. Contra vero si Anglorum princeps Elisabetha, duce Scriptura, has impuræ superstitionis feditates, quas sine suo suorumque periculo, nemo perferat Christianus, ab imperio rectius arcendas existimet, nihil profecto in eo facit, quod non et perspicua divinæ scripturæ autoritate, et magnis probatissimorum regum exemplis liquido tueatur. Nisi forte Ezechia, Josiæ, Josaphat parum laudandam memoriam existimet Osorius, qui aras et simulachra, et lucos, et serpentem æneum conciderant, aut Gedeonis etiam, qui quum rex non esset, lucum succidit, aram subvertit. Haddon. et Fox. Resp. Apol. Contra Osor. ed. 1577, lib. 3, fol. 271.

peoples, both Jews and Pagans, *implying and importing sacrifice*, therefore *we*, in respect of the sacrifice of Christ's body and blood, *say altar, rather than table*, as all the ancient Fathers (Chrys., &c. . . .) are wont to speak and write . . . though in respect of eating and drinking the body and blood it is also called a table; so that with *us* it is both an altar and a table, whether it be of wood or of stone. *But the Protestants, because they make it only a communion of bread and wine, or a supper, and no sacrifice, therefore they call it table only, and abhor from the word altar as papistical.* For the which purpose, in their first translation, (Bible, ann. 1562,) *when altars were then in digging down THROUGHOUT ENGLAND, they translated with no less malice than they threw them down.** And what says Dr. Fulke in his reply?—"That the ancient Fathers used the name of altar, as they did of sacrifice, sacrificer, Levite, and such like, improperly, *yet in respect of the spiritual oblation of praise and thanksgiving*, which was offered in the celebration of the Lord's supper, we do easily grant: as also, that they do as commonly use the name of table, and that it was *a table indeed*, so standing as men might stand round about it, and not against a wall, as your popish altars stand, it is easy to prove, and it hath oftentimes been proved: and it seemeth you confess as much, but that it is with you both an altar and a table, WITH US INDEED IT IS, AS IT IS CALLED IN THE SCRIPTURE, ONLY A TABLE. That we make the sacrament a communion of bread and wine, it is a blasphemous slander, when we believe as the apostle taught us, that it is the communion of the body and blood of Christ, and the

* Discovery of the manifold corruptions of the Holy Scriptures by the heretics. Rheims, 1582, 16mo. reprinted by Dr. Fulke in his "Defence of the English Trans. of the Bible." See the latter, ed. 1617, c. 17, § 15.

Lord's supper. . . . That the people whom the prophet Malachie reproveth, calleth the Lord's altar, his table, is no sufficient proof, that it might be called by the one name as well as the other. And although in respect of the meat offerings and drink offerings, it was also a table, at which God vouchsafed to be entertained by the people as their familiar friend. But what is this to the purpose of any controversy between us? The altar was called a table in the Old Testament, *but the table is never called an altar in the New Testament*, although by the ancient Fathers oftentimes." *

And to these remarks of Dr. Fulke let me add a confirmation of them from a learned bishop whom the Tractarians themselves have endeavoured to press into their service. "*Nor was it,*" says Bishop Morton, "*without the direction of the Spirit of wisdom that the apostle changed the name altar into a table, as also many Fathers have done.*" And proceeding to justify those Protestants who objected to the use even of the name, altar, he adds, "If, therefore, some Protestants, calling to mind the temperance of the primitive age, which (as is confessed) *abstained from the names of priesthood and temples*, (we add, that which we have proved, and from altars,) have misliked the liberty of succeeding Fathers for alteration of the phrase, they are not herein to be judged adversaries, but rather zealous emulators and favourers of true antiquity. Neither yet have they been altogether so opposite unto the alleged Fathers of after times, as the Apologists, to engender an hatred against them, would make them appear, because they note in the Fathers a license in the use of terms only, but no error in doctrine; saying, that *by such custom of speech Optatus gave posterity an occasion of*

* Fulke's Def. of Engl. Transl. of Bible, c. 17, § 15 and 17, ed. 1617, pp. 174, 5.

superstition : directly implying that the judgment of our ancestors was sound in this matter, and that the error concerning the nature of *altar* and *sacrifice*, arising from the common use of such phrases, possessed only their posterity. For we are taught from St. Chrysostome and St. Augustine, that the word *table* went for current in their times.” “The primitive antiquity (as hath been confessed) did abstain from the name of *priest*, and so consequently of *altars* and *sacrifice*, terming them according to the tenor of the New Testament, elders or bishops, *tables* and eucharist. In the aftertimes, the Church being then established in the truth of doctrine, the Fathers might presume to take a greater liberty of speech, knowing that they should be understood of catholic hearers catholically. But because ages more degenerate did set, as it were, a bias upon the phrases of *priest*, *altar*, *sacrifice*, (which had been used of the Fathers improperly,) to draw them to a proper signification, flat contrary to their first intention; therefore did Protestants wish that those objected ancient Fathers had rather contained themselves within their more ancient restraints, than that the liberty of their speeches should have occasioned in the Romanists that prodigal error in doctrine which we shall hereafter unfold.”*

May we not add a hope that care will be taken by those who are able to do so,—that as the liberty thus taken by some of the Fathers, in the use of these terms, produced a harvest of error, so the liberty that has grown up among ourselves, not only of speech, but with respect to the position and arrangements of the communion-table

* Morton's Catholic Appeal for Protestants. 1610. lib. 2, c. 6, § 2, and c. 7, § 1, pp. 164—6. Whether or not the name altar was used by the earliest Fathers, is a question into which I will not here enter, but the above clearly shows Bishop Morton's opinion of the matter under discussion in these pages.

since the Elizabethan era, and principally in the time of Archbishop Laud, contrary to the canon, however harmless in themselves, may not lead to a similar result.

I will add one more witness to the state of things in our Church in the point in question in former times,—the excellent Bishop Babington. In his notes on Exodus, first published in 1604, he says, on chap. 27, “Concerning the altar how it was made for matter, &c. . . . the text is plain in the eight first verses. For the use to us we may note two things: first, that it was a figure of Christ, as the apostle to the Hebrews (Heb. xiii. 10, &c.) expoundeth it. And secondly, that *the altars used in Popery are not warranted by this example. But that the primitive churches used communion-tables (AS WE NOW DO) of boards and wood, not altars (as they do) of stone.* Origen was about two hundred years after Christ, and he saith that Celsus objected it as a fault to the Christians, *Quod nec imagines, nec templa, nec aras haberent*: that they had neither images, nor churches, nor altars. Arnobius (after him) saith the same of the heathens: *Accusatis nos quod nec templa habeamus, nec aras, nec imagines*: You accuse us for that we have neither churches, nor altars, nor images. Gerson saith, that *Silvester* first caused stone altars to be made, and willed that no man should consecrate at a wooden altar, but himself and his successors there. Belike, then, the former ages knew not that profound reason, that altars must be of stone, *quia Petra erat Christus*, because the rock was Christ, as Durandus after devised. Upon this occasion, *in some places*, stone altars were used for steadiness and continuance, wooden tables having been before used; but I say, *in some places, not in all.* For Saint Augustine saith, that in his time in Africa they were made of wood. For the

Donatists, saith he, *brake in sunder the altar-boards*. Again, the deacons' duty was *to remove the altar*. Chrysostom calleth it, *the holy board*. St. Augustine, *Mensa Domini, the table of the Lord*. Athanasius, *Mensam ligneam, the table of wood*. Yet was this communion-table called an altar, not that it was so, but only by allusion metaphorically, as Christ is called an altar, or our hearts be called altars, &c. Mark with yourself, therefore, *the newness of this point for stone altars in comparison of OUR ANCIENT USE OF COMMUNION-TABLES*, and let Popery and his parts fall, and truth and sound antiquity be regarded." * And so elsewhere, (on chap. 20,) he says, "Also it might be showed how the communion-tables be called of the old Fathers both *tables* and *altars* indifferently; *tables*, as they are indeed, and *altars*, as they are improperly; how they were *made of boards, and removable*, set in the midst of the people, and not placed against a wall, with divers other things." †

"And undoubtedly," as Bishop Morton says, "if material *altars* (properly so called) had been in use in Christianity at that time, the holy Fathers would not have then concealed this, especially when as the want of altars was objected against them as a note of atheism." ‡

Here, then, I might well leave the matter to the reader's decision, without adding another word. But the subject is so important, that I need make no apology for subjoining some further testimonies and remarks bearing upon it. And, first, two documents,—namely, the "Reasons" of Bishop Ridley, and the "Reasons" of our leading Protestant divines in 1559, presented to

* Babington's Works, ed. 1622, p. 307.

† Id. ib. p. 279.

‡ Of the Lord's Supper, ed. 1652, l. 6, c. 5, § 15, p. 465. See whole section.

Queen Elizabeth, for the substitution of *tables* for *altars*,—which are clearly entitled to more than ordinary regard in forming an opinion of the mind of our Reformers on this subject.

We have already seen, that one of the first decisive movements in this matter was made by Bishop Ridley in the visitation of his diocese in June, 1550; and that he drew up certain reasons and arguments on the subject which the King and his Council thought fit to annex to their circular letter to the bishops for removing altars, sent round in the following November. This document, then, is so important in connexion with this subject, that I shall give it to the reader entire.

“ First reason. The form of a table shall more move the simple from the superstitious opinions of the popish mass, unto the right use of the Lord’s Supper. For the use of an altar is to make sacrifice upon it: the use of a table is to serve men to eat upon. Now, when we come unto the Lord’s board, what do we come for? to sacrifice Christ again, and to crucify him again, or to feed upon him that was once only crucified and offered up for us? If we come to feed upon him, spiritually to eat his body, and spiritually to drink his blood, (which is the true use of the Lord’s Supper,) then no man can deny but the form of a table is more meet for the Lord’s board than the form of an altar.

“ Second reason. Whereas it is said, ‘ The Book of Common Prayer maketh mention of an altar ;* wherefore it is not lawful to abolish that which the book alloweth ;’ to this it is thus answered, The Book of Common Prayer calleth the thing whereupon the Lord’s Supper is ministered indifferently a table, an altar, or

* The Book of Common Prayer at this time being the *first* book of Edw. VI., or that of 1549. The second was not published till 1552.

the Lord's board; without prescription of any form thereof, either of a table or of an altar: so that whether the Lord's board have the form of an altar, or of a table, the Book of Common Prayer calleth it both an altar and a table. For as it calleth it an altar, whereupon the Lord's Supper is ministered, a table, and the Lord's board, so it calleth the table, where the holy communion is distributed with lauds and thanksgiving unto the Lord, an altar, *for that* there is *offered* the same sacrifice of *praise and thanksgiving*. And thus it appeareth, that here is nothing either said or meant contrary to the Book of Common Prayer.

“Third reason. The popish opinion of mass was, that it might not be celebrated but upon an altar, or at the least upon a super-altar, to supply the fault of the altar, which must have had its prints and characters; or else it was thought that the thing was not lawfully done. But this superstitious opinion is more holden in the minds of the simple and ignorant by the form of an altar than of a table; wherefore it is more meet, for the abolishment of this superstitious opinion, to have the Lord's board after the form of a table, than of an altar.

“Fourth reason. The form of an altar was ordained for the sacrifices of the law, and therefore the altar in Greek is called *θυσιαστηριον*, *quasi sacrificii locus*. But now both the law and the sacrifices thereof do cease: wherefore the form of the altar used in the altar ought to cease withal.

“Fifth reason. Christ did institute the sacrament of his body and blood at his last supper at a table, and not at an altar; as it appeareth manifestly by the three evangelists. And St. Paul calleth the coming to the holy communion, the coming unto the Lord's supper. And also it is not read that any of the apostles or the primitive church, did ever use any altar in ministration

of the holy communion. Wherefore, seeing the form of a table is more agreeable to Christ's institution, and with the usage of the apostles and of the primitive church, than the form of an altar, therefore the form of a table is rather to be used, than the form of an altar, in the administration of the holy communion.

“ Sixth and last reason. It is said in the preface of the Book of Common Prayer, that if any doubt do arise in the use and practising of the same book, to appease all such diversity, the matter shall be referred unto the bishop of the diocese, who, by his discretion, shall take order for the quieting and appeasing of the same, so that the same order be not contrary unto anything contained in that book.” *

The other document is, the “ Reasons” drawn up by the leading divines of the Reformation, shortly after Queen Elizabeth's coming to the throne, and previously to the issue of her “ Injunctions,” “ to be offered to the Queen's Majesty's consideration, *why it was not convenient that the communion should be ministered at an altar.*” They are thus given by Strype “ verbatim,” as found “ in an authentic manuscript.”

“ First, The form of a table is most agreeable to Christ's example, who instituted the sacrament of his body and blood at a table, and not at an altar.

“ Secondly, The form of an altar was convenient for the Old Testament, to be a figure of Christ's bloody sacrifice upon the cross: but in the time of the New Testament, Christ is not to be sacrificed, but his body and blood spiritually to be eaten and drunken in the ministration of the holy supper. For representation whereof, the form of a table is more convenient than an altar.

“ Thirdly, The Holy Ghost in the New Testament,

* Ridley's Works, P. S. ed. pp. 322, 3; or Fox's Acts and Monum. book 9, pp. 47, 8, vol. ii. ed. 1684.

speaking of the Lord's Supper, doth make mention of a table, 1 Cor. x., *mensa Domini*, i. e. the table of the Lord; but in no place nameth it an altar.

“ Fourthly, The old writers do use also the name of a table: for Augustine oftentimes calleth it *mensam Domini*, i. e. the Lord's table. And in the canons of the Nicene Council it is divers times called *divina mensa*. And Chrysostom saith, *Baptismus unus est, et mensa una*, i. e. There is one baptism and one table. And although the same writers do sometimes term it an altar, yet are they to be expounded to speak *abusive et improprie*. For like as they expound themselves, when they term the Lord's Supper a sacrifice, that they mean by this word *sacrificium*, i. e. a sacrifice, *recordationem sacrificii*, i. e. the remembrance of a sacrifice; or *similitudinem sacrificii*, i. e. the likeness of a sacrifice, and not properly a sacrifice; so the same reason enforceth us to think, that when they term it an altar, they mean a representation or remembrance of the altar of the cross; and not of the form of a material altar of stone. And when they name it a table, they express the form then commonly in the church used according to Christ's example.

“ Fifthly, Furthermore, an altar hath relation to a sacrifice: for they be *correlativa*. So that of necessity, if we allow an altar, we must grant a sacrifice: like as if there be a father, there is also a son; and if there be a master, there is also a servant. Whereupon divers of the learned adversaries themselves have spoken of late, that *there is no reason to take away the sacrifice of the mass, and to leave the altar standing*; seeing the one was ordained for the other.

“ Sixthly, Moreover, if the communion be ministered at an altar, the godly prayers, &c., spoken by the minister cannot be heard of the people; especially in

great churches.* And so the people should receive no fruit of this part of English service. For it was all one to be in Latin and to be in English, not heard nor understood of the people.

“ And *admitting that it were* a thing which in some time might be *tolerated*, yet at this time the continuance of altars would bring marvellous inconveniences.

“ First, The adversaries will object unto us (as they have accustomed) inconstancy, in that the order established by King Edward of famous memory, with the assent of so many learned men, is now again reversed and altered.

“ Secondly, Moreover, the most part, or almost all the preachers of this realm, which do heartily favour this your Majesty’s reformation in religion, have oftentimes in their several sermons (and that upon the ground of God’s word before rehearsed, and other) spoken and preached against altars, both in King Edward’s days and sithence; and therefore cannot with good conscience, and without confession of a fault committed before, speak now in defence of them. For as St. Paul saith, *Si quæ destruxi ea rursus ædifico, transgressorem meipsum constituo*; i. e. If I build up again those things which I destroyed, I make myself a transgressor.

“ Thirdly, Furthermore, whereas your majesty’s principal purpose is utterly to abolish all the errors and abuses

* We here see one reason why, when it was afterwards ordered in the Queen’s Injunctions that the communion-table should be “ set in the place where the altar stood,” there to stand ordinarily, it was also directed that “ when the communion of the sacrament is to be distributed,” it should be “ so placed in good sort within the chancel, as whereby the minister may be more conveniently heard of the communicants in his prayer and ministration,” &c. ; and in the rubric subsequently, that “ at the communion time” it should “ stand in the body of the church, or in the chancel, where morning and evening prayer are appointed to be said.”

used about the Lord's Supper, especially to root out the popish mass, and all superstitious opinions concerning the same, *the altar is a means to work the contrary, as appeareth manifestly by experience.* For in all places the mass-priests (which declare by evident signs that they conform themselves to the order received, not for conscience, but for their bellies' sake) are *most glad of the hope of retaining the altar, &c., meaning thereby to make the communion as like a mass as they can,* and so to continue the simple in their former errors.

“Fourthly, And on the other side, the consciences of many thousands, which from their hearts embrace the Gospel, and do most earnestly pray to God for your grace, shall be wounded, by continuance of altars; and great numbers will abstain from receiving the communion at an altar: which in the end may grow to occasion of great schism and division among the people. And the rather, because that in a great number of places altars are removed, and a table set up already, according to the rites of the book now published.

“Fifthly, And whereas her Majesty hath hitherto declared herself very loath to *break ecclesiastical laws established by parliament,* till they were repealed by like authority, it will be much mused at, if any commandment should come forth now for the re-edification of altars, seeing there be *special words in the Book of Service allowed by Parliament, and having force of a law, for the placing and using of a table at the ministration of the communion.** Which special words cannot be taken away by general terms.

“Sixthly, Moreover, the altars are none of those things

* The reader will observe that these divines make no question that to erect an altar in the face of the directions given in the rubric as to a communion-table, is to “break ecclesiastical laws established by parliament.”

which were established by act of parliament in the second year of King Edward of famous memory. For Dr. Ridley, late Bishop of London, procured taking down of altars in his diocese about the third year of the said king; and defendeth his doings by the king's first book, set forth anno 2nd Edward VI. And immediately after, *the king's majesty and his council gave A GENERAL COMMAND THROUGHOUT THE WHOLE REALM to do the like* before the second book was made. And Dr. Day, Bishop of Chichester, was committed to prison, because he would not obey the said order. Which thing they would not have done, if altars had been established by authority of the said parliament.

“ Seventhly, It may please your grace also to call to remembrance, that *the greatest learned men of the world*, as Bucer, Cœcolampadius, Zuinglius, Bullinger, Calvin, Martyr, Joannes a Lasco, Hedio, Capito, and many more, have in their reformed churches in Sabaudia, Helvetia, Basil, Geneva, Argentine, Wormes, Frankford, and other places, always taken away the altars; only Luther and his churches have retained them. In the which churches be some other more imperfections; as gilding of images, the service of the church half Latin, half Dutch, and elevation of the sacrament of the altar. All which things Melancthon, when he is called to counsel for a reformation to be had in other places, doth utterly remove. And in Saxony they are tolerated hitherto only because of Luther's fame; but are thought that they will not long continue, being so much disliked of the best learned.

“ Eighthly, It may also please your majesty to join hereunto *the judgment of the learned and godly martyrs of this realm*, who of late have given their lives for the testimony of the truth; as of Dr. Cranmer, Archbishop of Canterbury, who protested in writing, (whereupon he

was first apprehended,) that the order appointed by the last book of King Edward was most agreeable to the Scriptures, and the use of the primitive church. And also of Dr. Ridley, Bishop of London, who travailed especially in this matter of altars; and put certain reasons of his doing in print, which remain to this day: of Mr. Latimer, Mr. Hooper, Mr. Bradford, and all the rest, who to the end did stand in defence of that book. So that by re-edifying of altars, we shall also seem to join with the adversaries that burnt those good men, in condemning some part of their doctrine.

“ And last of all, it may please your Majesty to *tender the consent of your preachers and learned men, as now do remain alive, and do earnestly, and of conscience, and not for livings’ sake, desire a godly reformation*; which if they were required to utter their minds, or thought it necessary to make petition to your grace, would with one mind and one mouth (as may be reasonably gathered) be most humble suitors to your Majesty, that they might not be enforced to return unto *such ordinances and devices of men, not commanded in God’s word: being also once abrogated, AND KNOWN BY EXPERIENCE TO BE THINGS HURTFUL, and only serving either to nourish the superstitious opinion of the propitiatory mass in the minds of the simple, or else to minister an occasion of offence and division among the godly-minded.*”*

These documents very clearly show what were the views of our Reformers upon this subject. How, indeed, could any impartial person have a doubt respecting their opinions in the matter, when with one voice they maintain, that there is no sacrifice in the Eucharist but a spiritual sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving, offered as

* Strype’s Annals, vol. i. part i. pp. 160, &c. Oxf. ed. pp. 237, &c.

much by each worshipper present as by the minister himself.

“We must take heed,” says one of the homilies of 1562, “lest of the memory it be made a sacrifice.” “Herein,” i.e. for the application of Christ’s merits, “thou needest no other man’s help, no other sacrifice or oblation, [i. e. than Christ’s, which had been mentioned just before,] no sacrificing priest, no mass, no means established by man’s invention.”*

“Seeing, then,” says Hooker, “that *sacrifice is now no part of the Church ministry*, how should the name of priesthood be thereunto rightly applied? Surely even as St. Paul applieth the name of flesh unto that very substance of fishes which hath a proportionable correspondence to flesh, although it be in nature another thing. . . . The fathers of the church of Christ with like security of speech call usually the ministry of the gospel *priesthood*, in regard of that which the Gospel hath proportionable to ancient sacrifices, namely, *the communion* of the blessed body and blood of Christ, although *it have properly now no sacrifice* . . . in truth the word *presbyter* doth seem more fit, and in propriety of speech more agreeable than *priest*, with the drift of the whole Gospel of Jesus Christ.” †

“The very spring and root of your error,” says the famous Bishop Bilson to the Papists, “is this, that you seek for a sacrifice in the Lord’s Supper, besides the Lord’s death. Mark well the words of Cyprian, *The passion of the Lord is the sacrifice which we offer*.” . . . “Christ is offered daily but mystically, not covered with qualities and quantities of bread and wine; for those be neither mysteries nor resemblances to the death of Christ: but by the bread which is broken, by the

* Hom. conc. the Sacrament, part i.

† Eocl. Pol. v. 78.

wine which is drunk; in substance, creatures; in signification, sacraments; the Lord's death is figured and *proposed to the communicants*, and they for their parts, NO LESS PEOPLE THAN PRIEST, do *present Christ hanging on the cross to God the Father, with a lively faith, inward devotion, and humble prayer, as a most sufficient and everlasting sacrifice for the full remission of their sins, and assured fruition of his mercies.* OTHER ACTUAL AND PROPITIATORY. SACRIFICE THAN THIS THE CHURCH OF CHRIST NEVER HAD — NEVER TAUGHT." . . . "The celebration of the Lord's Supper may be called an oblation; first, for that it is a representation of Christ's death, and sacraments have *the names* of the things which they *signify*; next, because the merits and fruits of Christ's passion are by the power of his Spirit divided and bestowed on the faithful receivers of these mysteries." "Neither they [i. e. other Protestants] nor I ever denied the Eucharist to be a sacrifice. The very name inforceth it to be *the sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving, which is THE TRUE AND LIVELY SACRIFICE OF THE NEW TESTAMENT* The Lord's table, in respect of his graces and mercies, there proposed to us in [is] an heavenly banquet, which we must *eat and not sacrifice*: but the duties which he requireth at our hands when we approach to his table, are sacrifices, not sacraments: as, namely, to offer him thanks and praise, faith and obedience, yea, our bodies and souls to be living, holy, and acceptable sacrifices unto him, which is our reasonable serving of him." "This [i. e. that 'the sacrament is a sacrifice'] we grant to be most true *in that sense* which St. Augustine and other ancient and catholic Fathers do avouch it: that is, *because sacraments have the names of those things whose sacraments they are.* And since this is the sacrament of the Lord's death and passion, we do not stick to say, that

Christ is daily crucified and sacrificed for the sins of the world: marry, not really, or corporally, but by way of a mystery; *that is, his cross and blood-shedding are proclaimed and confirmed IN THE EYES OF ALL THE FAITHFUL by these signs of his death, and seals of his truth*, by which he first witnessed that his body should be broken, and his blood shed for the remission of our sins.”*

I will add but one more testimony as to the teaching of our Church on this point, and that shall be from the learned Bishop Morton, principally with reference to the text so often misapplied on this subject.

“If furthermore,” he says, “we speak of the altar, you will have it to be rather on earth below, and to that end you object that scripture, Heb. xiii. 10. *We have (θυσιαστηριον) that is, an altar* (saith the apostle) whereof they have no right to eat, that serve at the Tabernacle. This some of you greedily catch at, for proof of a proper sacrifice in the mass, and are presently repulsed by your Aquinas, expounding the place to signify either his *altar upon the cross, or else his body, as his altar in heaven*, mentioned, Apoc. 8, and called *the golden altar*.” Adding, that so this altar was expounded in the “Anti-Didagma of the Divines of Collen,” as “the body of Christ himself in heaven, upon which, and by which, all Christians are to offer up their spiritual sacrifices of faith,” &c., and that Cardinal Bellarmine admits, that thus many Catholic divines interpreted it; and that the Jesuit Estius himself interpreted it as meaning “the cross of Christ’s sufferings.” “If we would understand,” he goes on to say, “wherein the difference of the Jewish religion and Christian pro-

* Bilson, Of Subjection and Rebellion, part iv. pp. 511—522, ed. 1586. See the whole context, where there is a masterly discussion of the whole subject.

fession especially consisteth, in respect of priesthood, Augustine (Adv. Jud. c. 9) telleth us, that *they have no priesthood; and the priesthood of Christ is eternal in heaven.* And the holy Fathers give us some reasons for these and the like resolutions. For if any would know the reason why we must have our confidence in the celestial *priest, sacrifice, and altar;* Œcumenius (Heb. x.) and Ambrose (in Heb. x.) will show us that it is because *here below there is nothing visible; neither temple, ours being in heaven; nor priest, ours being Christ; nor sacrifice, ours being his body; nor yet altar,* saith the other. Hear your own Canus; (loc. theol. lib. xii. c. 12;) *Christ offereth an unbloody oblation in heaven.* Chrysostom will not be behind his disciple Œcumenius in expressions, who differenceth our Christian religion from the Jewish, for that (in Heb. hom. 11, in Moral.) *our sanctuary, priest, and sacrifice is in heaven.* And if Christians intend any other sacrifice than that, he admonisheth that they may be such, which may be accepted of in the heavenly sanctuary; as, namely, *the sacrifice of justice, praise, and of a contrite spirit,* and the like, all merely spiritual, (as you confess,) and therefore but *metaphorically* called *sacrifices.** *

Hence our Reformers, holding that we have no other sacrifices to offer but such as are spiritual, the sacrifices of praise and thanksgiving, of holy purposes and actions, deemed it a duty, as we have seen, carefully to remove from our churches those *altars* which imported, and were only suitable for material sacrifices; and to place in their stead *tables*, adapted for the celebration of the Holy Communion in the way used by our Lord himself and his apostles.

* Morton, The Lord's Supper, 2nd ed. book 6, c. 3, § 8, pp. 416—18.

It is quite clear, then, that according to the rubric and eighty-second canon of our church, expounded, as they ought to be, by the authorities above mentioned, royal injunctions, archiepiscopal visitation inquiries, synodal canons, and the declarations of our greatest divines, the only thing which properly answers the description of that article of church furniture, which is to be used for the administration of the Holy Communion, is *a table of joiner's work, standing on a frame*, and unattached to any part of the church, the floor of the chancel being paved underneath where it stands, and the wall at the back of it finished uniformly with the remainder, so as to present no unsightly appearance on its removal. This alone answers the description of what is required by our church; and it is truly painful to contemplate the *art and chicanery* practised by parties *whose views and purposes are well known to many*, though, alas, apparently not to *all*, to introduce stone altars, and yet evade the operation of the law, and frustrate the manifest intentions of the church, by some little device, such as omitting to put cement between the altar and the brickwork or other foundation on which it stands, and between it and the wall, and then, when legally questioned upon the subject, *calling them communion tables*.

To use the words of *the founders of our reformed ecclesiastical polity*, which they addressed to Queen Elizabeth, when earnestly calling her attention to *this very point*,—to erect an altar in the face of the directions given in the Prayer Book as to a communion table, is to “*break ecclesiastical laws established by parliament.*” And this infraction comes at the very moment when, of all others since the Reformation, except possibly Archbishop Laud's time, it is calculated to do the greatest amount of injury to the interests of our church, and the cause of protestant and catholic truth.

A few years since hardly an altar (comparatively speaking) was to be found. Now, alas, especially in our new churches, they abound.

May we not humbly ask, then, Is it well, that at a time when peculiar care is required to uphold the interests of Protestant truth, and the Protestant character of our church, in the minds of the people, at that very moment the sanction of our ecclesiastical authorities should be given (for this is a matter entirely within the power of the diocesan, as Bishop Ridley has pointed out)* to an illegal approximation to Rome in one of her worst corruptions of the Christian faith? It is impossible to view without pain the advantage thus given to those ecclesiastical agitators among us who have destroyed our peace, and are by these practices undermining the very foundations on which our church stands.

London, May 6th, 1844.

* See p. 36, above.

A SECOND LETTER

ON THE PRESENT POSITION OF THE

CHURCH OF ENGLAND

BY T. JACKSON, D.D.

AND R. SANDERSON, D.D.

FORMERLY BISHOP OF LINCOLN

TO WHICH IS ADDED A LETTER OF

Lately Published, price 5s. cloth.

TWO TREATISES on the **CHURCH**; the First by **T. JACKSON, D.D.**, the Second by **R. SANDERSON, D.D.**, formerly Bishop of Lincoln. To which is added a Letter of Bishop Cosin, on the Validity of the Orders of the Foreign Reformed Churches. Edited with *Introductory Remarks* by **WILLIAM GOODE, M.A.**, &c.

LONDON

PRINTED BY RICHARD CLAY AND COMPANY

Rev. W. Maskell

A SECOND LETTER
ON THE PRESENT POSITION OF THE
HIGH CHURCH PARTY IN THE
Church of England.

BY THE REV. WILLIAM MASKELL,
VICAR OF S. MARY CHURCH.

THE WANT OF DOGMATIC TEACHING IN THE
REFORMED ENGLISH CHURCH.

Second Edition.

LONDON:
WILLIAM PICKERING.
1850.

Y^{OU} need not be told what a pain and
 laborious I feel myself to just, committed to
 approve the second volume upon which in my for-
 mer letter I proposed to write to you. If you
 these papers were commenced, now nearly four
 months ago, it would very probably that they
 would, both of them, have been published long be-
 fore the present time. But the delay, unquestioned
 by many of us, in the delivery of the late decision
 of the judicial committee in the present case in the
 case of Mr. Graham, has necessarily obliged me to
 defer the publication of this second letter. I must
 then this or order that you might know, that what
 I am now about to say, flows not from the hurry
 unconsidering impulses of vexation, or disappoin-
 tment or anger, at the decision which has been pro-
 nounced, but—whatsoever its truth and weight may
 be—is at least the result of constant and very anxious
 thought for many weeks and months.

Now do I regret the delay itself, it has enabled
 me to consider and to reconsider the whole bearing
 of the case; it has given me time to hear and to
 pay attention to the opinions of excellent and learned
 men upon several of the points to be spoken of in
 the following pages. It has been the voluminous
 of rightly protesting from day to day, from
 week to week, the doing what must inevitably be
 productive of great pain and serious consequences
 to myself; of consequence, also little less serious,

MY DEAR FRIEND,

YOU need not to be told with what pain and reluctance I feel myself, at last, compelled to approach the second subject upon which, in my former letter, I proposed to write to you. When these letters were commenced, now nearly four months ago, it seemed very probable that they would, both of them, have been published long before the present time. But the delay, unexpected by many of us, in the delivery of the late decision of the judicial committee of the privy council in the case of Mr. Gorham, has necessarily obliged me to defer the publication of this second letter. I mention this, in order that you might know, that what I am now about to say, flows not from the hasty, unconsidering, impulse of vexation, or disappointment, or anger, at the decision which has been pronounced, but—whatsoever its truth and weight may be—is at least the result of constant and very anxious thought for many weeks and months.

Nor do I regret the delay itself: it has enabled me to consider and to reconsider the whole bearing of the case: it has given me time to hear and to pay attention to the opinions of excellent and learned men, upon several of the points to be spoken of in the following pages: it has been the welcome cause of rightly procrastinating from day to day, from week to week, the doing what must inevitably be productive of great pain and serious consequences to myself; of consequences also little less serious,

it may be, to many others. For myself, I would repeat what has been already said in my first letter: it is my duty to be prepared to listen to reproach and accusation: I must be prepared to be judged harshly, and the more harshly, by oldest friends: to be condemned (it may be) by those, especially, in whom for years our chief reliance has been placed, and to whom we have looked most readily for counsel and support.

These, however, are but light trials in comparison with the responsibility which any person must incur, who, at such a time and crisis as the present, ventures to speak plainly what he conceives to be the actual state of things: a responsibility, almost infinitely increased, if the view which he takes be one of doubt and difficulty, unsettling to himself, and likely to harass and to unsettle others. Thus great is the responsibility on the one hand: upon the other, there would be no less in determining to be silent and quiet, and in allowing persons to go on—so far as he himself does not interfere with them—in the same security and fulness of faith in the church of England as of old, ignorant of much which he believes to be the truth, unwarned and undisturbed. And it is to be remembered by every one of us, who, in our several positions, some more some less, have been before the world during the last ten years, that *now* to sit still and to be silent, *now* to say nothing and to advise nothing, is in itself as distinct evidence as can be of the absence of immediate fear or anxiety.

There might have been, perhaps, one sufficient reason for any one among us to have believed himself

justified in not declaring publicly his own individual opinions, at such a time of doubt and excitement: namely, if our bishops had assembled to consult upon the position in which the Church is now placed, and had taken some first steps to show an intention to meet, as bishops of the Church Catholic are bound to meet, the pressing dangers and difficulties in which we are involved. We will not speak of the anxious weeks which passed away between the closing of the argument before the judicial committee, and the delivery of its judgment. It may seem strange that not a word was heard from any bishop of the English church: because, whilst it need not have had the unseemly appearance of an attempt to influence the pending decision of the Committee, yet, we might reasonably and unobjectionably have been told that our bishops were in deliberation upon the whole matter; that they were preparing and considering what measures should be taken, to vindicate the church; that they sympathized with those who were anxious; that they would have courage themselves and boldness to defend the truth; that they asked both of the clergy and laity, for the present, our prayers, our patience, and our unshaken hope.

And since the decision of the judicial committee, more than a month has passed away. Short time indeed for successful action; quite long enough to have given us some ground of confidence and trust: long enough—as you know well—for many meetings and discussions of influential persons, in a lower station, both clergy and laymen. Where is, even now, the evidence of any general movement by our

bishops? where, even, of their own appreciation of the reality of the crisis at which we have arrived? It is a sign, foreboding evil, when the bishops of a church will stand forward, in defence of the Faith, only when driven to it, and forced, by the pressure of an agitation among their clergy and people, which they are no longer able to control.

Let these few words, then, serve as some token of the many reasons, which, as I have said, compel me to enter on the consideration of what seems to be the extent and nature of the difficulties by which we are now surrounded. In short, it appears to be something very like dishonesty and deceit, to act and teach, and suffer oneself to be supposed to be unchanged, and uninfluenced, just as if nothing of material consequence had happened to the church of England, and as if all things were exactly as they were a year ago. May it not be so, with any of us: let those who are confident and firm, say so, and tell us why we are still to be unshaken, or in what we are still to hope: let us not shrink, however, from looking at our peril and our position fairly in the face; let us not seek to conceal, either from ourselves or others, wherein our real difficulties lie; rather, let us meet them boldly, and either prove that they are no difficulties, or get rid of them if we can.

I need not be told, that (to use the lightest word, as some men say) it was questionable, whether the statements and observations which were in my First Letter, ought to have been published by a clergyman of the church of England, holding his benefice. Indeed this has been charged against me

in the harder terms of accusation. No one could feel that there was some appearance of truth in it more deeply, and none more quickly, than myself. If there was blame—blame of treachery, or disloyalty, or disobedience, or call it by what name we will,—for a time, at least, it was a duty to endeavour to bear it patiently. Perhaps there was one sentence in my former letter somewhat overlooked: “these are days of doubt and peculiar trial, unlike any which our fathers have known for several generations; and we must not lay down principles, applicable enough under common circumstances, by which men are now to be judged.” This, therefore, is the indulgence which I would ask. And, if I know myself, there was no unworthy or worldly motive, which prevented resignation of my benefice before a page of either of these letters was begun. On the contrary, to do so has since been a frequent suggestion of my own mind. But I remembered, also, if it could be shewn that the difficulties in which we seem to be involved, are, after all, slight and unimportant difficulties, and that there are remedies and hope plainly and near at hand, that then haste and the impatience of a sudden impulse would have been grievous errors, by which I had been induced to withdraw from the office and spiritual cure to which I had been called.

But, now, with regard to this present Letter, there is much which many might find impossible to be reconciled with a retaining the position of a beneficed minister of the established church. It is true that the present crisis, the strange occurrences of the last few months, and the unforeseen extremity

of trial, into which the English church has almost hurriedly been plunged, might probably allow of much, both speech and action, which would not admit excuse or reason in times of less general excitement and enquiry. Yet I could not rely on so uncertain an apology for publishing very plain words and arguments concerning the position in which we appear to be placed.

And, moreover, it is my desire that the following pages should be considered as a statement of several chief reasons for which I have resigned my benefice and cure of souls.

If the publication of these reasons should be considered by some as equivalent to a declaration of an intention to take, speedily, a further step, — namely, to leave the communion of the church of England; — I am able only to say, that this is a matter neither necessary nor proper to be discussed at present. I am concerned only to put forth a statement of doubts and difficulties, to be considered, weighed, and answered, by the high-church party in the English church; and so long as they remain mere doubts and difficulties, no man has a right to say to me, that I should act as if they were certainties and convictions. Unanswered and unexplained they might and will, perhaps, become convictions; but that is a different question. Of course I know that when religion is the subject dealt with, the assertion of doubts is in itself to create doubts in the minds of many others, where all had been simple faith and unshaken trustfulness before: it is to encrease suspicion also, and to obstruct a return to confidence. Yet, it may be, that

it is our duty now, as churchmen labouring for the truth of the holy Gospel, to enquire, to hesitate, to doubt.

And let it not be thought that, so far as regards myself, the existence and recognition of the royal supremacy is the only difficulty and cause of doubt which we are bound, if possible, to remove, as to the sufficiency of the claims of the reformed church of England upon our obedience and faith. In my former letter, I have endeavoured to shew in what that supremacy, in its exercise of the power of finally determining spiritual causes involving doctrine, must be acknowledged to consist: and to shew, also, the extent to which the English church has accepted and upheld that power. But I have not given the reader any ground to suppose that it is the only difficulty in which, as holding what have been called high-church opinions, we must own ourselves to be. And the same may be said of the permitted denial amongst us of the catholic doctrine of baptismal regeneration. I do not mean that the existence of these, together or separately, would not be sufficient to excite grave and anxious doubts, but that they are not our only, and not, indeed, our chief difficulties. To pretend that they are not grievous and weighty would be absurd, now, especially, that the archbishops of York and Canterbury—the two primates of the church of England—have given their sanction to both of them: to the exercise of the supremacy in finally determining causes of doctrine, by their presence at the deliberations of the judicial committee, and by their approval of its report to the queen in council; and to the permitted denial of the truth of

baptismal regeneration, the one by his charge in the autumn of last year, and the other, in a very marked and decided and honest way, by the preface to a new edition of his book on apostolical preaching.

I have one word more to add. It will be said that they who now despond, and seem ready to desert the church of England for some other communion, — and *that* the church of Rome, — have been only waiting for some better reasons than mere preference of the one and mere dislike of the other. It has been already said of myself, and the words were listened to with very bitter pain. It has been said in a general way by an eminent bishop, who spoke of such persons as are without hope, or who take a line of conduct inconsistent with confidence and trust, as “seeking a pretext for quitting” the English church. The occurrences of the time in which we live, a pretext and unfounded cause! But let this pass. And for myself I do deny, entirely, and with the indignation which every man may justly feel, a charge so untrue. Had it not been necessary, far would it have been from any wish of mine to speak of other books which I have written: but I declare solemnly that I have never spoken or written any word at all, upon chief doctrines of the Faith, and that I have never intended to do any one thing by way of public ministration or private duty, which did not, at the time, seem to be, — not merely permitted and allowed within the limits of the teaching of our church, but — the one, especial, and exclusive word or thing which alone she authorized and declared right to be said or done. I have never been drawn to, never

been inclined to adopt, what people call (and rightly call) Roman practices, and books, and forms. Nay, the time is not long past, when many, who will be the first now to accuse and to condemn me, blamed the cold, Anglican, view with which I wrote and argued in behalf of the church of England. If I seem to forsake her now, it is because I feel that what I have worked for, dreamt of, prayed for, will not and may not be: others may judge very differently, others may still hope, still labour, still—so they speak—be patient, trustful, confident. Be it so; and may God ever be with them: these are not days in which any man should venture to arraign his neighbour, and before One Alone, Who sees all hearts, must we hereafter stand.

Pardon so much that has been now said of myself. Let us proceed, without further preface, to the particular subject of this Letter: namely, the want of necessary dogmatic teaching in the church of England since the reformation. Great part of what I am about to write, springs out of and is connected with the cause of Mr. Gorham against the bishop of Exeter.

Now that the appeal has been decided by the confirmation of the report of the judicial committee, I see no objection to admitting, that on one account it seemed not improbable that it would be given in favour of Mr. Gorham. As the case went on, first in the court of Arches and afterwards before the Privy Council, it was impossible not to feel, more and more, that the reasons and arguments of the evangelical party had been too lightly esteemed. During the last two years, my attention had been constantly

directed in other ways to the same matter, and, it must as fairly be confessed, with similar results. Few of our own opinions would dispute,—at least I would not,—the absolute necessity of rejecting Mr. Gorham, after such answers as he gave in his examination before the bishop; yet every month, as it went by, suggested in my own mind graver and graver doubts as to the final success of such a proceeding, unavoidable as it was. I mean, doubts whether a bishop is really following the intention of the reformed church of England, and speaking in her spirit, when he condemns as heresy the denial of the unconditional efficacy of baptism in the case of all infant recipients.

My object is not to discuss the especial doctrines which Mr. Gorham acknowledges that he holds: it is a substitution of the real question in dispute between the two great parties in the church of England, to attempt to heal our differences by obtaining some kind of repudiation of his particular mode of interpreting the formularies of our church. The real question,—and no man who loves the truth will seek to evade it,—is this, namely; *Does the reformed church of England teach exclusively the unconditional efficacy of infant baptism?* Possibly it may be correct, though I venture to doubt it, that not ten persons agree with Mr. Gorham: but this is a light matter: his particular opinion is *not* the question which is now upon the point of rending our church asunder, and which,—if nothing else is,—must be settled either the one way or the other.

After the arguments on both sides were ended before the judicial committee, we were all enabled

calmly to consider what the result of the whole had been. For myself, I felt, with anxiety and disappointment, that the growing impressions and doubts of the preceding six or eight months had been strengthened rather than relieved. And it was impossible not to own that there could be little hope of further satisfaction to be gained in any way, if the speech of Mr. Badeley, in behalf of the bishop, had failed to give it. That speech was one, which ever must remain a record of all that deep research and eloquence could effect on behalf of the church of England. Speaking as a lawyer, the present Lord chief justice of the court of Queen's Bench declared, that he had never heard any argument more learned and more able; and it is equally well known, that the clergy who believe Mr. Gorham's doctrine to be unsound, speak, as theologians, in like manner, of Mr. Badeley's argument, in unqualified language of gratitude and admiration.

When Mr. Gorham was refused institution, more than two years ago, I thought that it was almost impossible for him to raise a reasonable question as to the exact teaching of the English church upon baptismal regeneration; a question, that is, such as a court would entertain. But time went on, and the real state of things and tone of doctrine which prevailed, for fifty or sixty years after the reign of Henry the eighth, during which the first movers of the changes in religion or their immediate disciples still lived, opened, and became clearer from day to day.

It would be dishonest to attempt to exaggerate or put an untrue face upon the real state of the matter.

Let me not be misunderstood in what I am now saying: I mean it to apply only to the earlier reformation: for it has been said, and in some sense truly said, that the English reformation did in fact take place; — rather, I suppose, it arrived at its mature and completed form, — so far as we are concerned, in 1662, and not in 1552, or 1562. Therefore, in all that regards baptism, it is to be carefully remembered on the one hand, that the opinions of the bishops at the Savoy conference are not merely equal with but of greater weight than any opinions of the reformers of Edward's days, or queen Elizabeth's: on the other hand, there is the fact that the 39 articles were framed in 1552 and 1562.

It is small disgrace perhaps even now, — certainly a few years ago it was so, — not to be well read in the almost forgotten books of Grindal, Fulke, Whitgift, Jewell, and their contemporaries: To be acquainted with Hooker's work of the ecclesiastical polity had become rather a fashion: but, with that solitary exception, we must acknowledge that the divines of the days of queen Elizabeth were little read and little valued, by the party calling itself Anglo-catholic and high-church and the like. Still, from circumstances, I had examined one part of the literature of that age somewhat carefully, namely, the famous controversy of Cartwright and his friends under the name of Martin Marprelate: and, in other respects, I think that I may claim to have known about as much as people commonly do of the theological books of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries.

This knowledge must have been loose and inde-

finite enough, for I was not prepared to learn, as I have learnt, that perhaps without two exceptions all the divines, bishops and archbishops, doctors and professors, of the Elizabethan age—the age, be it remembered, of the present common prayer book—in its chief particulars, and of the book of homilies, and of the 39 articles—held and taught doctrines inconsistent (I write advisedly) with the true doctrine of baptism.*

There are two causes to which such a misapprehension of fact, so far as regards myself, may perhaps be traced: and others must decide whether these or some similar reasons will serve to account for their own previous opinions about the orthodoxy of theologians of the Elizabethan age. First; we have been accustomed both to read and to refer to their books, under the impression of long-established prejudices: under the impression that they *must* have been sound divines, because they were the chief leaders and earliest children of the reformation; and because they had arguments, plenty and specious enough, against some of the doctrines and discipline of the church of Rome.

Secondly; we have known their writings, chiefly, by means of catenæ: a means very likely indeed

* In order to prevent misapprehension, it must be explained that I mean their doctrines of sacramental grace, and justification, and not of predestination; which, as all admit, was largely, nay, almost universally held, by the Elizabethan divines, in a very rigid and definite sense. Predestination, as taught by S. Augustine, is not, alone, inconsistent with the acceptance of the truth of the unconditional regeneration of all infants in holy baptism.

to lead to false conclusions, because whilst it professes to give fairly the judgement of those appealed to in the matter under dispute, it often does not, and in some cases cannot, in reality do anything of the kind. There are more doctrines than one—for example, this doctrine of holy baptism—upon which writers may make very strong and catholic statements in one book, or in one part of a book, which are all explained away, or in various degrees qualified, or even, in truth, contradicted, by different statements in the same or in other books. *Catenæ* are useful enough, within their proper and reasonable limits; they create difficulties sometimes, whilst they will very seldom suffice to establish a conclusion: employed, however, as they have been, of late years, by our own party, they are not merely a packed jury, but a jury permitted to speak only half their mind. In short, the value of *catenæ* can be only justly estimated, where there is also a living Church, ever prepared to speak with an infallible voice.

Nor is it to be forgotten that whilst many extracts from the Elizabethan books were produced, explaining in a sense inconsistent with Catholic truth the doctrine of baptismal regeneration, on the other hand there were no passages to be found, distinctly asserting that the reformed church of England holds exclusively the sacramental efficacy of baptism in the case of all infant recipients. It is one thing for a religious community to allow its ministers to hold and to teach a particular doctrine; it is quite another that they should be enjoined to teach it, as being certainly and exclusively true. There are some parts

of the books of the Elizabethan writers, which are examples of the first of these positions, namely, the permission : but I do not remember any example of the second : on the contrary, numberless proofs that it could scarcely have been intended. It may rather be a question whether, in the days of queen Elizabeth, a clergyman would not have been liable to censure, who, not content with being suffered to teach what he himself believed with regard to the doctrine of baptismal regeneration, should have gone on further to declare that the church of England still pronounced those to be unsound and heretical, who did not acknowledge the unconditional efficacy of infant baptism. Or, to put it in other words, if such an one had further declared that the teaching of the church of Rome and of the reformed church of England, upon the sacrament of baptism, was necessarily to be understood and accepted, by all English clergy, as identical and the same.

I must own, therefore, that the additional argument produced by Mr. Gorham's advocate in his speech before the committee, based upon a comparison between the articles of 1536, and the articles of 1552 and 1562, seemed to me to be forcible and correct.*

* The proof derived from a comparison of the articles has been very ably put by Mr. Dodsworth, in the appendix to his late sermon, *A house divided against itself*. He says :—

“I think it only fair to state, that having had the advantage of hearing the arguments in the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council in the late case, my opinion of what was really intended to be the force of the Article XXII. has undergone considerable modification. I cannot *now* feel certain that the Reformers did not *intend* to leave Baptismal Regeneration an open question. In the very able argument of the Counsel for the appellant, Mr.

It supplied a cause of one effect of the alteration of the documents and formularies of the English church, which was so visibly and frequently to be observed,

Turner, it was urged with great effect, that upon a comparison of the Articles of 1536 with those of 1552, it might be fairly inferred that the latter were intended to open the question which was closed by the former. These Articles are as follow:—

1536.

Article on Baptism.

“Baptism is offered unto all men, as well infants as such as have the use of reason, that by baptism they shall have remission of sins, and the grace and favour of GOD, according to the saying of S. JOHN, ‘Nisi quis renatus fuerit ex aqua et Spiritu Sancto, non potest intrare in regnum cœlorum;’ that the promise of grace and everlasting life, which promise is adjoined unto this Sacrament of Baptism, pertaineth not only to such as have the use of reason, but also unto infants, innocents, and children; and that they ought therefore, and needs must, be baptized. And that by the sacrament they do also obtain remission of their sin, the grace and favour of GOD, and be made thereby the very sons and children of GOD; insomuch that infants and children dying in their infancy, shall undoubtedly be saved thereby, and else not.”—Collier, II. fol. 123.

1552.

Article on Baptism.

(The same as now in force.)

“Baptism is not only a sign of profession, and mark of difference, whereby Christian men are discerned from others that be not christened, but it is also a sign of regeneration or new birth, whereby, as by an instrument, they that receive baptism rightly are grafted into the Church; the promises of forgiveness of sin, and of our adoption to be the sons of GOD by the HOLY GHOST, are visibly signed and sealed; faith is confirmed, and grace increased by virtue of prayer unto GOD. The baptism of young children is in any wise to be retained in the Church, as most agreeable with the institution of CHRIST.”

Now it certainly does seem unaccountable, that if the Reformers of 1552 intended to assert the same doctrine as that enunciated in

in the language used by men, contemporaries or nearly so, respecting the sacrament of holy baptism. And I cannot dispute the principle involved in the

the Articles of 1536, they should have used language (to say the least) so much more open to dubious interpretation. I do not say that this is absolutely *decisive* on the point; but it furnishes an argument not easily answered. Having this precise language before them, why did they not use it? Had they *no reason* for adopting more ambiguous terms? One cannot say that it is other than a *probable* conclusion, that they so worded the Article of 1552 as to include the subscription of those who would have refused to subscribe the definite language of the previous Article. I cannot but think that great weight was justly given to this consideration, in the very able judgment which was delivered. This view of the matter will be confirmed by comparing another article with the devotional formularies. Thus, to place in the same juxtaposition the Articles of 1536 and 1562, on the holy Eucharist.

1536.

The Sacrament of the Altar.

“As touching the Sacrament of the Altar, we will that all Bishops and Preachers shall instruct and teach our people committed by us to their spiritual charge, that they ought and must constantly believe that under the form and figure of Bread and Wine, which we there presently do see and perceive by outward senses is very substantially and really contained and comprehended the very selfsame Body and Blood of our SAVIOUR JESUS CHRIST, which was born of the Virgin Mary, and suffered upon the Cross for our redemption. And that under the same form and figure of Bread and Wine, the very selfsame Body

1562.

XXVIII. *Of the LORD'S Supper.*

“The Supper of the LORD is not only a sign of the love that Christians ought to have among themselves one to another; but rather is a Sacrament of our Redemption by CHRIST'S death: insomuch that to such as rightly, worthily, and with faith, receive the same, the Bread which we break is a partaking of the Body of CHRIST; and likewise the Cup of Blessing is a partaking of the Blood of CHRIST.

“Transubstantiation (or the change of the substance of Bread and Wine) in the Supper of the LORD, cannot be proved by holy Writ; but is repugnant to the plain words of Scripture, over-

following sentence of the judgment delivered by the judicial committee: they say; “—it appears that opinions, which we cannot in any important particular distinguish from those entertained by Mr. Gorham, have been propounded and maintained, without censure or reproach, by many eminent and illustrious prelates and divines who have adorned the church from the time when the [42 and 39] articles were first established. We do not affirm that the doctrines and opinions of Jewell, Hooker, Usher, Jeremy Taylor, Whitgift, Pearson, Carlton, Prideaux; and many others, can be received as evidence of the doctrine of the church of England; but their conduct, unblamed and unquestioned as it was, proves at least the liberty which has been allowed in maintaining such doctrine.”

and Blood of CHRIST is corporally, really, and in every substance exhibited, distributed, and received of all them, which receive the said Sacrament: and therefore the said Sacrament is to be used with all due reverence and honour, and that every man ought first to prove and examine himself, and religiously to try and search his own conscience before he shall receive the same, according to the saying of S. Paul, ‘Quisquis ederit panem hunc,’ &c.”

throweth the nature of a Sacrament, and has given occasion to many superstitions.

“The Body of CHRIST is given, taken and eaten, in the Supper, only after an heavenly and spiritual manner. And the means whereby the Body of CHRIST is received and eaten in the Supper is Faith.

“The Sacrament of the LORD’S Supper was not by CHRIST’S ordinance reserved, carried about, lifted up, or worshipped.”

Now it will be seen that there is here very much the same difference as in the Articles on Baptism. The Article of 1536 is plain, dogmatic and unmistakable. The Article of 1562, ambiguous, hesitating, indefinite, and to a great extent negative.”

Speak of it (as one would, or regarded) under every possible aspect; the proved opinions of the Elizabethan writers pressed upon my mind. The fact, to so great an extent, was unexpected; but it was to be considered, and to be dealt with, whether it were important or unimportant. It shewed, at least, that there were, in that day, many individuals of greater or less learning; of higher or lower station, who did not believe that they were bound by the apparently plain language about regeneration in our ritual, to hold and to teach the unconditional efficacy of the sacrament of holy baptism in the case of all infants. Nor was it only the opinion of private individuals. And I am now about to mention a remarkable fact, which was not brought forward in the late arguments.

The point at issue was, whether it is necessarily inconsistent with the assertions of certain parts of our formularies to deny the unconditional efficacy of infant baptism: or, in other words, whether the doctrine, that some infants do not receive in baptism the saving grace of regeneration, is excluded by the terms of our ritual and catechism.

A short time ago, it happened that I was obliged, for another purpose, to refer to the Dublin articles of 1615. In that year, the prayer-book and catechism of the reformed Irish church were identical, in all that relates to the sacrament of baptism, with our own. There were the same sentences, "Seeing now, that this child is regenerate;" and "We yield Thee hearty thanks, most merciful Father, that it hath pleased Thee to regenerate this infant;" and others which have been so often quoted. Yet the

whole body of the clergy of the established church of Ireland, assembled in convocation, did not hesitate to declare, notwithstanding, as follows: "A true lively justifying faith, and the sanctifying Spirit of God, is not extinguished, nor vanisheth away in *the regenerate*, either finally or totally." I do assert that such a statement, whether it may or may not seem to be against the meaning of the words of the public offices of the Church, is utterly and distinctly irreconcilable with the catholic truth of the unconditional efficacy of infant baptism. Nor is it to be answered that this place in the Irish articles means nothing more than the famous Lambeth articles. For although the Lambeth articles were incorporated into those agreed upon at Dublin, and especially marked by references in the margin of the editions printed at the time, yet, in this instance, there is a material alteration; the Lambeth form says, "non evanescit *in electis*;" the Dublin articles change this into "*the regenerate*."

To put this argument in another shape: and it may be best to do so, in the way in which it affected and influenced myself. Some months ago, the language of our ritual seemed to be an unanswerable evidence of the intention of the reformed English church to teach, exclusively, the truth of regeneration in holy baptism. There, were the plain words and terms of the baptismal office; and although the articles alone would not prove the doctrine, yet it scarcely appeared requisite that any reference even should be made to it, with a devotional service so remarkably clear and decided. But, in opposition to such a conclusion, the Irish articles present

an insurmountable obstacle; and the strongest of all the reasons, which the high-church party in our Church had produced, began to fade away and vanish like a dream. Another established Church, in full communion with our own, using our ritual, unaltered, unmutilated, had obliged its clergy to subscribe and to accept articles of faith, "for the avoiding of diversities of opinions, and the establishing of consent touching true religion," not merely making doubtful the catholic doctrine of regeneration in baptism, but positively and undeniably contradicting it.

In short it became manifest, that something besides and beyond plain words in the public ritual and offices was necessary to the confirmation of disputed truths of the Christian Faith. Before such truths had been denied or doubted, the case would have been very different. A controversy once opened, upon essential articles of the creeds,* and

* It is not easy to see, how it may be denied that the controversy upon baptismal regeneration had not been opened, before, and at the very period of, the convocations of 1552 and 1562.

One or two extracts will suffice to prove the fact: nay, more, the advocacy already of the particular form of doctrine insisted on by Mr. Gorham.

Tyndal says: "The inward baptisme of the soule, is the baptisme that onely sayleth in the sight of GOD, the new generation,—the earnest of everlastyng lyfe, and title whereby we challenge our inheritance." This inward baptism having been just before declared to be, "to loue the law, and to long for the life to come." *Expos. of 5th ch. of S. Matt. prol. p. 187.*

So, also, John Frith: "This outward signe [baptism] doth neither geue us the spirite of GOD, neither yet grace that is the favour of GOD. Baptisme bringeth not grace, but doth testifie unto the congregation that he which is baptised had such grace geuen hym before; it is a sacrament, that is, a signe of an holy thyng, euen a

formally brought before the notice of the Church, cannot be left to be settled by an interpretation of terms used in very ancient public services, but must be decided either the one way or the other, or evidently left open, in some concurrent formulary of equal authority. Thus, whilst (for example) the Articles of 1536, and the King's book, and the Bishops' book, were in force, there could be no question made about the doctrine of the English church, regarding baptism. But a very different state of things was produced by the alterations and omissions made first in 1552, and continued in the 39 articles of 1562.

[Thus we have the same ritual of the administration of holy baptism—the same, I mean, in points which bear upon the doctrine of regeneration—] it under three several aspects. Namely; in connexion with another formulary distinctly and exclusively teaching the whole Catholic truth, as did the articles of 1536; or, with a formulary which left it

token of the grace and free mercy whiche was before geuen hym.”
A declaration of baptism. p. 91.

Soon after, bishop Hooper: “Baptism sanctifieth no man:— external baptism is but an inauguration of external consecration of those, that first believed and were cleansed of their sin.” Again, he says, that the interrogatories and answers of sponsors in public and solemn baptism, show that baptism is but “the confirmation of Christ's promises, which be in the person that receiveth the sacrament before, or else these external signs availeth nothing:” those answers being made, “then is the child christened in the name of GOD. The which fact doth openly confirm the remission of sin, received before by faith.” *A declaration of Christ and His Office.* ch. 10.

Far be it from me to say, that doctrine such as this has been accepted by the English church: but that, as a fact, the baptismal controversy had been plainly opened, by persons of name and authority, before the convocation of 1562.

open to be received or not, as do the 39 articles of 1562; or, with a formulary which denied and rejected it, as do the Dublin articles of 1615.

But it is not only on the doctrine of the sacrament of baptism, that the articles of the reformed Irish church claim our especial attention; and I shall therefore devote to them another page or two. That which I must now write will bring on me probably much reproof from more quarters than one: it will be written also with reluctance and sorrow by myself. Still, these are days in which we must endeavour to find out the truth, and the truth alone.

These Dublin articles of 1615 have never been formally repudiated by the church of Ireland: and in statements not contrariant, are now, equally with the English 39 (agreed to and approved of about twenty years later), the "standard of doctrine" in that communion. They contain other heretical statements. What are we to think, therefore, of her position?—Yet, it will be said, the Churches are United; and they must stand or fall together.

I am quite aware that there are technical objections to the fact itself of such an Union between the two Churches; but whatever the force of them may be, our connexion with the established Irish church, and our recognition of her in all acts of outward intercourse and communion, is a very fearful question.* An avowed and distinct denial of the Ca-

* There are few priests of the church of England now living, who did not acknowledge this Union at an hour, the most solemn, perhaps, of their whole lives: "Do you think in your heart, that you be truly called, according to the will of our LORD Jesus Christ, and the order of this United Church of England and Ireland, to the order and ministry of Priesthood? *Answer.* I think it."

tholic doctrine of the eucharist and of baptism would be sufficient to prove an individual to be in heresy: *and such a denial has been synodically agreed to by the church of Ireland.* And I must say, that it is not easy to understand why any one person should be condemned for reasons which we are not equally prepared to press to a like conclusion, in the case of a reformed Church. Perhaps some Irish clergyman will be able to defend his Church from this charge which I have brought deliberately against her. Let him however remember, that he must either prove the formal renunciation of the articles of 1615: or show that the heretical doctrine of those articles has been plainly corrected by some clear statement to the contrary, contained in the 39 articles, since approved of. *And we, on our side, shall have to show, how it was that, at the time of their publication, no sign or mark of even disapprobation was made by the church of England.*

As to the authority of the Dublin articles, we cannot have better evidence than that of Dr. Bernard, the biographer of archbishop Usher: “Now whereas” he says “some have doubted whether they were fully established as the articles of Ireland; I can testify that I have heard him [Usher] say, that in the forenamed year, 1615, he saw them signed by archbishop Jones, then lord chancellor of Ireland, and speaker of the house of bishops in convocation; signed by the prolocutor of the house of the clergy in their names; and also signed by the then lord deputy Chichester, by order from King James, in his name. And” he proceeds “whereas some have rashly affirmed that they were repealed by act

of parliament, anno 1634, or recalled by a decree of the synod then, needs no further confutation than the sight of either.*

The canon by which in 1634 the English articles were approved, proves distinctly that no intention existed of annulling the previous articles of 1615. The object aimed at was to shew, that according to the judgment of the church of Ireland, the two Churches agreed in doctrine: and in order to this, our 39 articles were admitted to be true. And any person would be very acute, as it seems, who could discover any material *contradiction* between the two confessions of faith: the only difference—and a considerable difference—being, that the Irish articles contained in full, plain, and express terms, a legitimate exposition—it may be, one of many possible expositions—of the doctrine of the English articles.

On so important a question, it is well that we should quote the canon: “I. For the manifestation of our agreement with the church of England in the confession of the same Christian faith, and the doctrine of the sacraments; we do receive and approve the book of articles of religion, agreed upon by the archbishops, and bishops, and the whole clergy in the convocation holden at London in the year of our Lord, 1562, for the avoiding of diversities of opinions, and for the establishing of consent touching true religion. And therefore if any hereafter shall affirm, that any of those articles are in any part superstitious and erroneous, or such as he

* *cit.* Mant's hist. of the Irish Church, vol. 1. p. 388.

may not with a good conscience subscribe unto, let him be excommunicated, and not absolved before he make a public recantation of his error.”

It has been held, says bishop Mant, that the English articles were only received in the sense of, and as they might be expounded by, those of Ireland. And, as they certainly are not contradictory, this seems to be the just and obvious state of the matter. But archbishop Usher, a contemporary, is the best possible witness we can have, on such a question. In a letter to a friend, giving, a few months afterwards, an account of the late convocation, he observes, “The articles of religion, agreed upon in our former synod, anno 1615, we let stand as they did before.” But, for the manifesting of our agreement with the church of England, we have received and approved your articles also, as you may see in the first of our canons.*

Could the Church Catholic, or, might any Church claiming to be a part of the Church Catholic, speak of being “United” with, or admit to communion, the reformed Irish church, unless a distinct and formal renunciation of the several heresies contained in the Dublin articles of 1615, had previously and solemnly been made? †

* *cit. Hist. of Irish Church, p. 493.*

† The case also of the Protestant Episcopal Church in America, sprung from ourselves, and with which we are (I believe) in full communion, might also be brought forward, if it were requisite. But her differences chiefly consist in declining to insist on certain things, generally supposed to be of very great importance in the Catholic Church, rather than in the plain and avowed acceptance of error. However, as a fact, we readily have given our support

But, as these articles may not be very well known to some of my readers, it may be right to extract one or two of the statements which they contain. "By His eternal counsel, God hath predestinated some unto life, and reprobated some unto death: of both which there is a certain number, known only to God, which can neither be increased nor diminished." "None can come unto Christ, unless it be given unto him, and unless the Father draw him. And all men are not so drawn by the Father, that they may come unto the Son: neither is there such a sufficient measure of grace vouchsafed unto every man, whereby he is enabled to come unto everlasting life: All God's elect are in their time inseparably united unto Christ, by the effectual and vital influence of the Holy Ghost, derived from Him, as from the Head, unto every true member of His mystical body. And *being thus made one with Christ, they are truly regenerated*, and made partakers of Him and all His benefits." In the whole of a very long article of justification, not one syllable is said of holy baptism: it begins, "We are accounted righteous before God, only for the merit of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, applied by faith: and not for our own works or merits. And this righteousness which we so receive of God's mercy, and Christ's merits, embraced by faith, is taken, ac-

and fellowship to a Protestant Church, which does not oblige the acceptance of all the articles of the Apostles' creed; which does not read in her public service, at any time, the Athanasian creed; and which does not require her bishops to give in words to her priests at their ordination the power of remitting and of retaining sins; in other words, the power of absolution.

cepted, and allowed of God, for our perfect and full justification.” And it ends; “By justifying faith we understand not only the common belief of the articles of Christian religion, and a persuasion of the truth of God’s word in general; but also a particular application of the gracious promises of the Gospel, to the comfort of our own souls; whereby we lay hold on Christ, with all His benefits, having an earnest trust and confidence in God, that He will be merciful unto us for his only Son’s sake. So that a true believer may be certain, by the assurance of faith, of the forgiveness of his sins, and of his everlasting salvation by Christ. A true lively justifying faith, and the sanctifying Spirit of God, is not extinguished, nor vanisheth away in the regenerate, either finally or totally.” “The Catholic Church, (out of which there is no salvation,) consisteth of all those, and those alone, which are elected by God unto salvation, and regenerated by the power of His Spirit.” “God hath given power to His ministers, not simply to forgive sins, (which prerogative He hath reserved only to Himself) but in His name to declare and pronounce unto such as truly repent and unfeignedly believe His holy Gospel, the absolution and forgiveness of sins.” “Baptism is not only an outward sign of our profession,—but much more a sacrament of our admission into the Church, sealing unto us our new birth (and consequently our justification, adoption, and sanctification) by the communion which we have with Jesus Christ.” “The Lord’s supper is not only a sign of mutual love—but much more a sacrament of our preservation in the Church, sealing unto us our spi-

ritual nourishment and continual growth in Christ:—In the outward part of the Holy Communion, the Body and Blood of Christ is in a most lively manner *represented*; [the italics are in the original;]—being no otherwise present with the visible elements, than things signified and sealed are present with the signs and seals, that is to say, symbolically and relatively.*

I now ask for the reader's grave consideration of the position of the established Church of Ireland; and of the effect, as regards ourselves, of our long continued fellowship and communion with her. Perhaps we are not bound to a necessity of communion with the Irish church; and the matter which we now have to discuss and to determine, is far too solemn to allow of our passing lightly over any particular connected with it, because of probable consequences. *If the reformed church of Ireland be not in heresy, according to the judgment of the reformed church of England, let it be shown.**

We will now pass on to the consideration of the

* A week or two ago, a series of resolutions was published signed by some whose names are amongst the most eminent of the members of our Church. I quote three of them:

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

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

subject to which I particularly proposed to direct your thoughts.

In former years, it never happened to cross my mind, that the foundations of the reformed church of England were less strong or real than the high-church or Anglican party declared them to be. As a system or theory, in its position with respect either to the church of Rome, or to the countless forms and communities of dissent, the modern church of England seemed to be sufficiently according to the words of Holy Scripture and to the traditions of the ancient Church.

If, at any time, in endeavouring to establish the truth of some important doctrine, difficulties seemed to arise from various statements in her formularies, these were put aside upon the supposition, that the English church could not mean to deny or dispute the Catholic faith, being herself unquestionably a part of the Church Catholic. And, upon some doctrines, further confirmation was furnished, not by the partial support of one, or two, or three of her earlier writers, — such as Andrewes, or Laud, or Mountagu — but, by the concurrent testimony of an overwhelming majority, including Ridley, and Hooker, and Whitgift; Bramhall, Bull, Pearson, and such as they were.

“ 7. That by such conscious, wilful, and deliberate act such portion of the Church becomes formally separated from the Catholic body, and can no longer assure to its members the grace of the sacraments and the remission of sins.”

Now I *demand* of those who subscribed these resolutions sufficient proof how far, and in what way, they do *not* apply to, and are *not* fatal to the claim of, the reformed Irish Church.

But the last twelvemonths has changed this much and materially. The case of Mr. Gorham, with its immediate and, if we may say so, its personal points, as well, as the very many collateral difficulties, connected with and springing out of it, forced one to enquire somewhat more accurately, than before, into the exact facts and history and consequences of the reformation. It forced one to prove by somewhat serner and, it may be, surer tests, the sufficiency of the claims, advanced by the church of England.

It scarcely admits of enquiry, whether it be necessary that the Church Catholic, or that every religious body professing to be a portion of the Church Catholic, should lay down dogmatically, as truths, certain statements upon great Christian doctrines. I pass by (for the sake of argument) the two doctrines of the mystery of the Ever-Blessed Trinity,* and of holy baptism. The one is of too sacred and awful a character to be spoken of, when it may be avoided; the other (we will say) has just been determined, to some extent, by the Civil power in its appellate jurisdiction:†

Let us suppose then that we have these two doctrines clearly, fully, and distinctly taught by the church of England. What are the other doctrines which she teaches with like distinctness?

What is her especial doctrine, for example, upon

* See my First Letter, note p. 51.

† This sentence was written many weeks ago, before any rumour even of the nature of the decision of the judicial committee was abroad, and upon the supposition that it would be distinctly in confirmation of the judgment of the court below. I leave it unaltered, to be corrected as the reader may himself think fit.

the number of the Sacraments,* upon the blessings and spiritual graces which the sacraments convey, upon the distinctions between one sacrament and another, upon the necessity or advisableness of some

* We are accustomed to speak in rather glowing terms of the dogmatic character of the common prayer book, and of the catechism in particular. Few things have struck me more—and for some time past—than the manner in which the first question and answer is made in the second part of the catechism. The question is; “How many Sacraments hath Christ ordained in His Church?” I suppose the plain answer would be, two; seven; ten; or twenty, as the case may be. For, let it be carefully observed that the question is not concerning sacraments necessary to salvation. And the answer is; “Two only, as generally necessary to salvation, that is to say, Baptism, and the Supper of the Lord.” Now I do assert, that such an answer evades—neither more nor less—*evades* the question: it is, strictly, no answer at all: it is an answer for which a witness would be justly rebuked in a court of law. However, the catechism (as if glad to escape from a difficulty) accepts the answer, and asks, “What meanest thou by this word [as used by you] Sacrament?” I say, “as used by you,” because concerning a sacrament in the catholic and true sense, it is incomplete to say “I mean an outward and *visible* sign, *etc.*” The more correct word would, in that case, be *sensible* sign. But the word *visible* may perhaps be right, when referred to two sacraments, “as generally necessary to salvation.”

I am writing, it must be recollected, for those, who make much of the catechism. Therefore I would suggest two other places of this same second part. Namely; the following question and answer: “Why then are infants baptized, when by reason of their tender age they cannot perform [repentance and faith]? Because they promise them both by their sureties; which promise, when they come to age, themselves are bound to perform.” What are we to understand by this? And another answer: teaching truth, but not excluding error: “For the continual remembrance of the sacrifice of the death of Christ, &c.” I allude in this last to the equivocal meaning of the term “remembrance:” excellent and sufficient in its catholic sense, as so applied to the blessed Eucharist: but most miserably deficient indeed if it is, as certainly (I suppose)

of them, or upon their virtue, powers, and efficacy? and do they contain, as well as convey, grace? Again, take the sacrament of the blessed Eucharist: what is *the* doctrine which the church of England openly, plainly, and distinctly, teaches about it? does she tell us that it *is* a sacrifice? does she tell us that it is *not* a sacrifice? if a sacrifice, what is the Thing sacrificed? and, is it or is it not propitiatory for the living, or for the dead, or for neither? are the elements after the words of conse-

it may be, understood in any other and a lower sense. And the difficulty is increased when we recollect, that this word "remembrance" is to be carried on to the second clause of the sentence, "and of the benefits which we receive thereby." It will explain my meaning to quote the following passage from a sermon lately published on the sacrament of the Eucharist.

"Here I would warn you against a hasty and, therefore, an inadequate understanding of the answer in the Church catechism, where we are told that the sacrament of the Lord's Supper was ordained, 'for the continual Remembrance of the Sacrifice of the Death of Christ, and of the benefits which we receive Thereby.'

"In this answer the term 'Remembrance' does not only mean, no, nor *chiefly* mean, what I have first spoken of as 'commemoration.' Which last word I have used as referring to ourselves; that is; *we* commemorate: *we* solemnly recall to our recollections: *we* remember. But the 'Remembrance' intended by the catechism must, in order that that formulary should not fall short of the full doctrine of the Catholic Church,—for, so to fall short would in this case be heresy,—*must*, I say, be understood in its perfect and complete theological sense. In which sense the term refers, in a lower way certainly to ourselves, but in a far higher and more correct way, to the Almighty Father:—putting Him, as it were, solemnly *in remembrance* of the Passion and the Atonement of the Son, and of the Sacrifice of His Death: bringing before Him the appointed Memorials, the Bread and Wine made to be the Body and the Blood."—*Sermons preached at S. Mary Church*, 2nd edit. p. 39.

eration bread and wine, as they were before, or are they the Body and the Blood of our Lord? are they both? if only one, which of these are they? ought we, or ought we not, to pay outward honour and reverence to our Blessed Lord, Present upon His altar, after the consecration? Again; take Confirmation: is this a sacrament, or is it not? if a sacrament, what is meant by saying that it has not the like nature of a sacrament with baptism and the Lord's supper? is it a ceremony in which the candidates confirm the vows and promises made for them by others, long before, when they were baptized, or is it an ordinance in which they receive also after a sacramental and mysterious manner, by the laying on of hands, the gift of the Holy Ghost, never in like manner to be again given or received? and is this last the chief, or not the chief, end and object of confirmation? Take, again, Extreme Unction: is this, or is it not, lawful to be received and administered in the church of England?* if it be, what are its effects? if it be not, why is it not? is extreme unction "a corrupt following of the apostles," or not? if it be, in what sense is it, and

* I am aware that an argument may be raised on the omission of the ancient office from our revised ritual: and that a clergyman might be punishable for administering Extreme Unction, under his subscription to the 36th canon, in which he promises to use the rites and ceremonies and sacraments, as contained in the Prayer Book, "and none other." But this prohibition would include equally all modern offices of consecration of churches: for there is not one law for bishops and another for priests. And if so, a prelate (now living) would be right, after all, when he mocked at any form of consecration, and walked irreverently into the church, saying, "It is merely a signing of papers."

confirmation or orders not equally so? Again, take Matrimony: what is the especial teaching of the church of England about this? Again, Orders: is episcopacy essential or not essential to the existence of a Church? can the blessed Eucharist be given in a religious body — for example, in the kirk of Scotland — where there is no pretence of episcopal ordination, in fact, where there are no priests? is there a “character” given, or not given, in ordination? does a priest at his ordination receive power to remit and to retain sins? and if so, in what sense? Once more, before we pass from sacraments, or what the Catholic Church for 1000 years called sacraments, take Absolution: what does the church of England teach about this? is it a sacrament or is it not? is it, or is it not, an ordinance appointed by our Lord to be for ever continued and used in His Church, in order that penitents might through it obtain remission of mortal sin? is previous auricular confession—full, detailed, and particular—necessary, or not necessary, to the grace of forgiveness by means of priestly absolution? do the general public absolutions, pronounced in the daily prayers, convey remission of mortal sin, or do they not? are pardons and penance fond things vainly invented, rather repugnant to the word of God than otherwise, and grown of the “corrupt following of the apostles”? and, if pardons and penance be not so, in what sense and within what limits are they agreeable with God’s word and with the tradition of the apostles? in short, is absolution a power to forgive and to retain sins, inherent in and to be exercised by all priests, or is it a mere

word loosely and improperly retained in some of the formularies of the church of England, signifying nothing? if the first of these be too high a way of speaking of it, and the second be too low and mean, what else is it?

This much, then, upon the sacraments. I shall trouble you with one or two more questions only: for, surely, enough has been already said to startle some, who have not hitherto thought upon the matter; but, contented with the liberty of teaching or believing what they please, have further taken for granted that the reformed church of England definitely taught the same.

For example; praying for the dead: is this, or is it not, a pious, lawful, and catholic duty? Is there, or is there not, a purgatory? Is invocation of saints an unlawful practice, contrary to the written word of God? May the sacrament of the Lord's supper be reserved, carried about, lifted up, and worshipped, by authority and custom of the Church, although "not by Christ's ordinance;" or may it not? In what sense is Faith "the mean whereby the Body of Christ is received and eaten in the Supper?" and do they only, who rightly, worthily, and with faith receive the Sacrament, partake of the Body and the Blood of Christ?

No one will deny that these last also, in various degrees, are grave questions, involving and connected with chief truths of Christ's Holy Gospel, and influencing the daily life and practice of the members of His Church.

And I must instance in two more particulars only.

First, what does the church of England now teach us respecting the blessed virgin Mary? Is it wrong—I do not ask, is it *right*, but is it *wrong*—especially to invoke her, or is it not wrong? did the English church at the reformation change at all the doctrines which she taught before the year 1540, regarding Mary, and if so, where are we to find the statement of that change, and to what extent does it reach? ought the acceptance, to which we are obliged, of the Catholic test “Mother of God” to affect our thought and practice; and, if so, in what way?

Second; the doctrine of Justification: and, on this, with respect to one particular alone. Namely; in what sense is it true “that we are justified by faith only,” and that it is a most wholesome doctrine, and very full of comfort? is it true in the Roman sense? or in the Lutheran? or in neither? and—not delaying to enquire whether the doctrine of justification by faith only, which seems to be put forth in the homily “of salvation,” is sound or sufficient—I further ask, where are we to find “the homily of justification?”

I again repeat, that all these doctrines, last specified, are of very high importance: some of them not less than the others, beforementioned, connected with the sacraments: indeed, several of them are also so connected. And, at any rate, upon the vital and essential character of one, justification by faith, protestants are agreed. Nevertheless, it is quite at the option of every minister of our reformed Church, to hold and to teach any one of them,

according to either of the two or (as the case may be) twenty modes in which he may choose to fancy it: in other words, every one of these great and solemn doctrines, is an “open question;” a mere matter of “opinion.”

Has the world ever before seen,—does there now exist anywhere—another example of a religious sect or community which does not take one side, or the other, clearly and distinctly, upon at least a very large proportion of the doctrines which we have just been speaking of?

If it shall appear to some, that the examples given are not all to be allowed to be “open questions,” let them take two only; namely, the doctrines of Justification and of the holy Eucharist. When they can tell us what the teaching of the reformed church of England is regarding these two, we will proceed to enquire a little more accurately concerning the rest.

We need not to be reminded that “open questions,” and doctrines of the gospel left to be matters “of opinion,” are as objectionable to the evangelical party in the church of England, as to ourselves. I can quite understand how the late decision of the judicial committee must offend all who are sincere and honest amongst them. It was good policy perhaps (to use the language of the world) which prompted them, whilst the cause continued, to speak in a liberal and humble way of being *suffered* and *allowed* to teach what they would: and which induced their advocate before the court of Arches to say, that “the arms of the church of England are wide enough to embrace both parties.” But the

recognition of such a principle is fatal to their old condemnation of the doctrine of regeneration in the sacrament of baptism, as being “ a delusion of Satan ;” “ a soul-destroying heresy ;” and the like.

It is not, however, within my purpose to consider the position of the evangelical, but of the high-church party : of that party by whom the very notion of a truth of the Christian Faith being an “ open question ” is to be utterly disavowed ; who know nothing about “ matters of opinion ” in the place of dogmatic teaching upon essential doctrines, on which our daily life and future salvation must depend.

Here, very probably, some one may object against me my own language, published rather more than a year ago. I allude to my book on the doctrine of absolution. Let me quote it. “ We declare therefore that the church of England now holds, teaches, and insists upon, all things whether of belief or practice, which she held, taught, and insisted on, before the year 1540, unless she has since that time, plainly, openly, and dogmatically asserted the contrary. This we declare in general. And, in particular, as regards that most important question, the right interpretation of the various services in our common prayer book, we further add : that whatsoever we find handed down from the earlier rituals of the church of England, and neither limited nor extended in its meaning by any subsequent canon or article, must be understood to signify (upon the one hand) fully and entirely all, and (on the other hand) no more than it signified before the revision of the ritual.” *p.* 49.

When that passage was written, it was written

in entire assurance that every word might be established. I do not think so, now. And with what ever pain I say this, it is not because my belief has altered from accepting the fixed principle that all essential Christian truth is one, and eternal; and that every part of the Church Catholic is bound of necessity to hold it whole and undefiled. Believing, as at that time I did, with the strongest confidence and trust, that the church of England was a living and sound portion of the One Holy Catholic Church, I could not but assert, as being capable of undeniable proof, her claims to teach authoritatively and undeniably every single doctrine of the Catholic Faith. If I searched into her foundations, it was with no shadow of fear lest they should be seen not to be resting on the Rock, but much rather, in the undoubting hope that the more she was tested and examined, the more triumphantly she would declare herself to be Divine.

If the end of long enquiry and consideration has resulted in disappointed hope, and what seems to be evidence of the fallacy of former expectations; if I am compelled to own that the utmost we are justified in declaring seems to be,—not that the church of England now “holds and teaches” &c., but—that the church of England now *suffers and permits* to be held and taught: and again, as to the right interpretation of the prayer book, not “*must* be understood,” but, “*may* be understood:” let none suppose that I have lightly yielded up that ground upon which, alone, a minister of the church of England, as a minister of the Church Catholic, can stand securely.

I would speak here one or two words more, upon confirmation. It is remarkable that in the catechism, to be learned of every child before confirmation, there is not one word said concerning it. Neither to tell us what it is, nor, what it is not. If we go to the homilies, — not that their every sentence is of authority or true — we find but little there. The index of the late Oxford university edition has one reference, under this head; “Confirmation, not a sacrament.” As if the faith of the reformed English church, about sacraments and sacramental grace, consists of negations. Turning, however, to the place, we read nothing which can give us any exalted notion of its great benefit and necessity, but rather otherwise.

And having spoken above of the acts done in 1662, it is remarkable (to say the least) that the long preface and promise by the candidates were then added. Until that time, with the exception of some ceremonies, the office stood much as it had been in the ancient books. And a very solemn, holy, service it must have been. There was in it nothing which could have led to the low and miserable notion, now so prevalent, that candidates go to “confirm themselves:” to make their promise, by their own word of mouth; to take on themselves — as if unobliged before — the vows made for them, at baptism. Alas! we cannot wonder at the scandals and irreverence so often shewn at confirmations.

Among all the things done by the English bishops and convocations since the reformation, I know nothing so unaccountable, as this addition made in 1662 to the office of confirmation. We are told

that the Savoy conference* most clearly proves that the catholic doctrine of holy baptism, was then intended — whatever might have been the case for the preceding hundred years—to be at last declared as *exclusively* the truth according to the teaching of the church of England. Yet, at this very period, for the first time in the history of any part of the Christian Church, and of which no example can be found in our ancient rituals, a new tone was given to the office of confirmation: and something very like an authoritative assent was made to the doctrine, that the grace of baptism depends or is suspended upon the personal faith and promise of the recipient,

* It is not to be forgotten that there were some long rubrics, in the Prayer books of 1549, and the intermediate Books till 1662, prefixed to the catechism and order of confirmation, in which there are assertions of the propriety of persons ratifying in after life, the promises made for them by others at their baptism. There can be no doubt that all this is right, properly understood: and it scarcely could be misunderstood, so long as this ratifying and “confirming” of promises formed no part of the office; or, so long as there was also to be found in the same rubrics, the following declaration of the benefit of the holy ordinance itself. This declaration would have corrected perhaps, in some measure, the effect of the prominence given in 1662 to the renewal and ratification, in a very solemn way, of the baptismal promises, if it had been suffered to remain. But it was at that same time removed. “Forasmuch as confirmation is ministered to them that be baptized, that, by imposition of hands and prayer, they may receive strength and defence against all temptations to sin, and the assaults of the world and the devil, it is most meet to be ministered when children come to that age that partly by the frailty of their own flesh, partly by the assaults of the world and the devil, they begin to be in danger to fall into sundry kinds of sin.” Why have we not, now, this statement? why have we not something, at any rate, of the same kind? is it too dogmatic? or, is it untrue and tending towards a superstitious regard of confirmation?

and that confirmation is not a distinct gift of the Holy Ghost, but the completion of the sacrament of baptism. We know well that any sign even of leaning to so unsound a doctrine, is entirely incompatible with a right and full acceptance of the truth of baptismal regeneration. Far be it from me to say that this addition to the office of confirmation positively contradicts the spirit of the replies made by the bishops at the conference: but I do repeat that it is an unaccountable and strange proceeding, supposing—as for a long time we have supposed—that they believed the teaching of the church of England and of the church of Rome to be identical upon the sacrament of baptism.*

Before I pass altogether from the subject of our differences on essential doctrines of the Faith, it must be observed, that there is an objection likely enough to be urged by the evangelical party: namely, that, so far as they are themselves concerned, these differences do not reach, in any degree, to the

* Not less unaccountable, perhaps—admitting the Catholic spirit of the convocation and bishops of 1662,—is the restoration of the very important statement about the Presence of our Blessed Lord in the Eucharist. This, which first made its appearance in the second Book of king Edward, was rejected by queen Elizabeth in 1559, and might almost have been thought forgotten after an interval of 100 years. Doubtless there are some verbal alterations between the present rubric and that of 1552: but this does not remove the difficulty of discovering the reason of its being replaced at all, upon the principles which we are anxious to attribute to the convocation of 1662. Would such a course be now recommended or even consented to by the Anglo-catholic party of the present day? If this statement about the Real Presence had never been heard of, since its brief existence in the Book of 1552, should we allow it to be received once more, and from such a source?

extent which has been above spoken of. It may be so: nay, in fairness to themselves I must own, it is so. The number and variety of opinions, in reality, begin to exist, after the one characteristic barrier has been passed, which divides the two great sections of our Church. As a whole, the evangelical party are tolerably unanimous in their judgment upon most of the questions above asserted to be matters "of opinion;" and they would decide readily upon conclusions distinctly denying the ancient doctrine of the church of England, held and taught before the reformation, on each and every one of those questions. This is not unimportant: rather, of material weight in such an enquiry as the present. The fact is not to be lightly regarded, that, the two great parties by which the church of England is divided having been distinguished, the further state of conflict and difference of opinion,—scarcely less miserable and fatal than the one great and fundamental difference,—is to be found chiefly, if not entirely, amongst ourselves. It begins alas! with the attempt to bring back Catholic teaching and Catholic faith into the reformed church of England, and into agreement with her articles and prayer book.

There is another point to which I had intended to direct your attention; namely, to the contradictions which appear to exist between the course of teaching which many of our party commonly adopt and the 39 articles, together with an enquiry into the kind of interpretation, and its admissibility, by which such apparent contradictions are avoided. It is, of course, in itself a relief openly to state our

mode of interpretation, and to leave to our rulers to decide by legal proceedings, whether it is, or is not, within the limits of our subscription. But I shall now pass this by. Some two or three considerations, however, which may be more briefly discussed, will come within my present purpose.

Scarcely a word need be said of the unbounded (—really there is no other term—) of the unbounded variety of opinion upon essential and important doctrines of the Faith, which exists among the clergy and people of the English church. It is a fact, notorious and undeniable : deplored as an evil by the majority of us ; yet, regarded by not a few as a thing which is to be approved of rather than otherwise, and evidence that the reformation has given freedom to tender consciences, or to the exercise of a large and charitable liberality. Such a variety of opinion must be a necessary consequence of the numerous doctrines which careful consideration will show us have been left “open” by our Church.

It is very commonly urged that this is owing to our bishops not having attempted, for the last hundred years, to restrain their clergy, and to enforce a greater unanimity of opinion and teaching ; in short, to the want of discipline. Indeed it cannot be said that the frequent complaints which lately have been brought against our bishops, by persons of both classes of opinion, are all unfounded and untrue. I am not speaking of individuals whom we know to be exceptions, but of the bishops as a body, ruling over, guiding, caring for the Church, her clergy, and her people. It is a very serious, and a

mournful subject : one which I am bound to notice, though it be in fewest possible words. Can we then boldly defend the conduct of our bishops, during the last twenty years? Would that we could answer continual complaints, by telling how they have neglected the gathering of wealth, and refused to provide unduly for near relatives and children ; how they have despised the luxuries or refinements of society, and sought, instead, constant and familiar intercourse with the clergy over whom they have been placed, sometimes sharing the plain fare and resting in the humble lodging of their poorer brethren, yet oftener extending their own liberal hospitality to those who would gratefully have received it, as a token of sympathy, and kindness, and mutual regard, as testifying an approval also of zeal and labour, which could not, perhaps, be otherwise rewarded ; how they have been themselves examples to their dioceses in the practice of a holy and self-denying life ; how, by their diligent and avowed observance of religious rules, as to daily prayer, fasting, and the like, they have led others onwards to obey, by the shewing forth of their own obedience ; how they have endeavoured, so far as they could, to carry out the system and to establish the authority of the rubrics and orders of the Church ; how they have given their support to those who have taught (and taught without running into extremes) catholic doctrine, and recommended catholic duties ; how, on the other hand, they have refused their support to all who have leaned to the vagueness of puritan doctrine, and to the laxity of puritan piety. Would— I repeat it — that we might thus have spoken ; but

it may not be ; yet, I must say, it is not quite just to charge our bishops, either of the last century or this, with entire responsibility for the state of confusion now existing ; it is not quite just to accuse them of having caused it, solely by their neglect of the proper exercise of ecclesiastical discipline.

If it be true—and I repeat that it is true—that the English reformation has advisedly and deliberately left “open” all those doctrines which have been specified, and other doctrines besides those, it is impossible, from the very nature of the case, but that as wide a variety of opinion should inevitably follow. It may, or it may not, be right that a church should have one faith ; but it is certain that there is not, and probably cannot be, one faith in the reformed church of England.

Nor is it to be forgotten that, taken together, the power of the supreme court of appeal, and the number of Christian truths which are allowed to be matters of opinion, increase the force of the objections which, under any circumstances, must lie against either the one or the other, separately, of these two great difficulties. They play into one another. If the English reformation had left us a clear and distinct form of religious teaching ; if it had decidedly explained what the doctrine of the sacraments, or of the eucharist, &c. really is ; if it had not aimed at including, if possible, persons of opposite opinions ; if its principle had not been to leave every man to the exercise of his private judgment upon the inspired word of God and the three creeds ; then it would not have been so completely within the jurisdiction of the royal supremacy, to

determine these questions to be no longer “open,” as they happen from time to time to be brought forward in appeal.

For I am ready to admit that the ecclesiastical court first, and afterwards the court of appeal, whatever its constitution may be, if called upon to do so, *might* possibly decide some one or two of the particular doctrines above mentioned, *not* to be “open” doctrines. Even this seems doubtful: but I am not at all in doubt,—very far from it indeed,—that if at any time such one or more doctrines be ruled and defined, it will *not* be according to the earlier and catholic teaching of our church, but of the reformers, foreign and English, of the sixteenth century.

Now, as far as our party is concerned, this is a solemn and weighty consideration. You may think, perhaps, that I am overstating the matter; and at the first view, it may seem to be so. But, carefully read again that list of doctrines; then, with equal care reflect upon the general tone of thought and opinion shewn by writers of the seventeenth and sixteenth centuries, and upon the value also which must in justice be given to certain expressions in our formularies; and, lastly, if you are not convinced, ask the opinion of an ecclesiastical lawyer upon the question on which you may be in doubt.

In what has just been said, let me not be understood as admitting the opinions of individuals, however many in number or eminent in station, to be in any sort conclusive, as to the acceptance or rejection of doctrine. In the late case of Mr. Gorham, as it was argued before the court of Arches, you

will remember that his advocate relied — to what extent it would be hard to say—upon the numerous extracts which he produced from the works of Cranmer, Ridley, Latimer, Becon, Jewell, Whitgift, and others. The court listened patiently, treated them with the consideration they deserved, and decided that they could not have any legitimate bearing upon the particular case then at issue. All such extracts were declared to be mere “opinions of individuals,” and “private opinions which must not be taken as authority.” I have already made some remarks upon this matter, in explaining how far it has influenced my own views on the subject. It is not necessary now to dispute the correctness of the principle laid down by the judge of the court of Arches: but there are few, however, who would not readily grant, that we must not run into the other extreme, and despise contemporary interpretation in all cases, and set aside writers (long looked to and esteemed) as wholly to be disregarded. A moment’s thought will shew us, that it is not the same thing to quote the authority of divines in favour of, and to quote it against, the apparent or primary meaning of disputed parts of the formularies of our Church. And, so far as my present purpose is concerned, this is all which I desire to press upon the reader’s consideration.

But the question is, itself, of so much interest and importance, that I should be sorry not to make one or two more observations, in as few words as may be.

In estimating the value of the writings of Elizabethan divines, we must remember one circum-

stance, which will incline us to listen to them more favourably than we otherwise might, when they seem to speak in opposition to what we believe to be Catholic truth. I mean in those instances, only, where the formularies themselves do not, seemingly, speak also in the same language, or to the same purpose. Even if we chose to admit that there is not one single writer of the church of England, between the years 1548 and 1600, who, upon some point or other, does not appear to have held and advanced heretical doctrine,—some, this doctrine ; some, that ; some, one only ; some, many ;—it is not to be wondered at. It was an age of religious excitement and alteration : all ancient teaching and practices of the Church were undergoing an examination : and every man, whatever his qualifications may have been, brought forward and advocated the reception of his own peculiar fancies. It by no means follows because certain opinions were then published, nay, for a time, pressed, that therefore their promoters would have been obstinate in the continued assertion of them. Probably some opinions, heretical in themselves, were propounded at such a period, rather to be enquired into and tested, than to be accepted. Submission also to the authority of the Church, (within the limits, whatsoever they can be shewn to be, which the reformers approved of,) was a duty which perhaps some would have acted upon as well as talked of.

But it is further argued that they were chief in station who, during the reigns of Edward and Elizabeth, held what we believe to be heretical opinions : bishops and archbishops, and professors of theology,

and men who would be, in virtue of their office, members of convocation. Let it be so. Say, moreover, that they were unanimous, upon any given doctrine which the Church seems to have decided in an opposite way. It was an unanimity, after all, only of opinions put forth as private men and individuals. We cannot tell what modifications of statement might have been made, what renunciations of erroneous teaching, what corrections, what retractations, when these same men came together in a provincial synod. This we know, that when the clergy of the church of England did meet in convocation, various private fancies were continually brought before her notice, and as continually rejected, and condemned by the rejection.

You will see that I am desirous to state this matter as favourably for our Church, as, in justice, I feel one can. And I do believe that the firm and humble piety, the catholic feeling and habit of thought, the accurate knowledge of very solemn questions of divinity, the practised acquaintance with the noble and exact theology of the schools, which in those days characterized, as a body, the parochial clergy of England, often enabled the lower house of convocation to see through the subtleties by which men, from their studies, tried to mislead the people. But it did not enable them also to withstand, on all occasions, the pressure to which they were exposed: and it is probable that,—still hopeful under Divine Providence for the best, and unable to foresee the sure consequences which we have learnt from the experience of three hundred years,—they were thankful even for so small a gain, as to have

succeeded in avoiding, as at that time it seemed, the distinct rejection of essential truths. In short, the opinions of individual writers are of importance, and only then, when it can be shewn that the church of England has favourably accepted the teaching which was offered her ; or, that she has deliberately removed statements in her earlier documents and rituals, which, if suffered to remain, would have been in opposition to such new teaching.

With regard to the acceptance and introduction of changes in doctrinal statements and formularies, which were consented to by the English convocation in the sixteenth century, let me observe, that although it is always right for men—so far as human foresight will enable them—to judge of the fitness of proposed acts by their probable tendencies, yet such a judgment may be shewn to be ill-founded and mistaken, by the results of after experience. Thus we may be, nay, we must be, necessarily, better judges of the true tendencies of the reformation, as an act, than they could have been who were its contemporaries. Because the consequences of the religious alterations in that age have shewn themselves to be, surely and certainly, in one direction, namely, to error of all kinds and confusion, it is not true that therefore men are to be hastily condemned, in that at the beginning of them they expected better things, and at least hoped that no other consequence than good could follow. The wise and prudent among the clergy of England, during the reigns of Henry and Edward, must have regarded the sweeping changes then made in doctrine, worship, and prac-

tice, with hearts fainting in them for fear. To speak of their having had confidence in the chief promoters of those changes, would be to accuse them of putting their trust in evil men, and not in God, and of a deliberate belief that the Divine Blessing would surely rest upon bloodshed, and sacrilege, and impiety, and hypocrisy, and sin. Nor could a reasonable confidence exist, in the very nature of things, at such a period of hasty reformation and almost unchecked liberty and desire of change, except upon some sufficient evidence that the Spirit of God directed all that was being done, whatever might be the character of the instruments He used. Can we say that they received, during their own time, any such evidence? can we say that we have found it in the years which have since gone by? This, at least, we know: that a claim to the assistance of the Holy Ghost, which was put forth solemnly in one of the most important documents of the reign of Edward the sixth, was dropt silently as regarded any words, and distinctly denied as regarded action, within the space of four short years. And, taught by experience, together with a moderation to which we are bound to give due praise, the reformed church of England has never attempted to renew so high a claim.

Let us return to the subject from which we have digressed. It being undenied, that there does exist amongst us a vast variety of opinion, I would go on to observe, that in its chief divisions, as regards the clergy, it may be distinguished into three classes, represented by the high-church, and by the low-

church, and by those (greater in number than we might like to acknowledge) who care very little or nothing about either the one party or the other.

With these last,—who are anxious only that matters may be kept quiet, saying, that things did well enough for their fathers and will continue their own time, that really all this controversy is about words, and is likely to do no good but rather very much harm, that it may tend—lamentable thought—even to a separation of Church and State, and to a difficulty about deaneries and canonries; about tithes, and houses, and glebe, and gardens, and things of that sort;—with these last, I say, we will not trouble ourselves.

As to the second of the two classes, namely, the low-church or evangelical, I have no hesitation in making a candid avowal. Whatever my opinions may have been some time ago, it is impossible for me to conceal from myself that further enquiry has convinced me, that the real spirit and intention of the reformed church of England are shewn and carried out and taught by the low-church party, as truly as by ourselves.* I cannot bring myself to say “rather than ourselves;” but that at least they have amply sufficient argument to oblige us to the acknowledgement, that the very utmost which we can claim for our opinions is, that they are “open” to us. And I would have you very seriously to consider whether we ought to be satisfied with teaching and believing essential doctrines of the Faith to be only *probably* true.

* Is there any doctrine on which the two parties differ, upon which we should have had the slightest chance of obtaining a sentence against an evangelical clergyman, except the doctrine of Baptism?

The steps by which this conclusion has been at length forced upon me are similar to those of which I have already spoken to you, with regard to the doctrine of baptismal regeneration.

Remember, I am in no degree withdrawing from the full extent of the assertion, repeated more than once, that the church of England leaves "open" so many deep and important doctrines. But what I now say is, that, of the two extremes, the low-church clergy no less than the high-church or Anglo-catholic (as it is called) teach according to the spirit of the English reformation. Or, put it in another way: there are no greater difficulties in making their system, taken as a whole, or parts of their system, consistent with the formularies of the church of England, than we find, by experience, to be in our own.

It would be hard probably to specify any doctrine, except regeneration in holy baptism, which, upon the face of the formularies themselves, seems to contradict their system. Some would suggest absolution also: and to my mind it certainly is an equal stumbling-block in their way with baptismal regeneration: but then I have to recollect that my own teaching upon this doctrine is accepted by very few indeed, as the true interpretation of our forms of absolution; and that the usual explanation of them which has been commonly advanced amongst us, can scarcely be felt by any low-churchman to be a difficulty at all. I mean that explanation which does not insist upon the necessity of previous auricular confession in order to the grace of the sacrament of absolution: and which allows that the power

of retaining and remitting sins is fully and properly exercised, when the general forms of absolution are read in the daily offices ; or, as some also put it, when the sacrament of baptism is administered. Such an explanation of the doctrine of absolution cannot be a difficulty in the way of an evangelical clergyman ; and you know well that it is the explanation commonly agreed upon and taught amongst us. Moreover it admits, in a satisfactory way, the refusal to accept, and therefore gets rid of, the true and catholic meaning of the awful commission, given at ordination, “ Whose sins thou dost forgive, *etc.*”

But, by way of illustration, take one or two examples. And these will perhaps show how certain passages which are difficulties, and we feel them to be such, in our own path, are, in the first and plainest sense of the words, in favour of the evangelical system : and not only so, but we have nothing so plain to produce against them. In short, these are passages which *we* “ get out of ” or explain away, whilst *they* take them in their simple and obvious meaning. In these one or two examples you will observe that I refer to the prayer-book, as well as the articles.

Take Justification : we hold and teach that a justified man is really so : that he is not merely *called*, and *reputed to be*, righteous, but that he actually is so. The opposite party deny this : and they readily appeal to the first opening of the morning and evening prayer, where this verse of the 143rd ps. is appointed to be read : “ Enter not into judgement with Thy servant, O LORD ; for in Thy sight shall no man living be justified.” And then they may turn to the 11th article ; “ We are *accounted* righte-

ous before God." Of course, I am not speaking of the right sense of this verse of the psalm, but of the way in which a person holding unsound views of the doctrine of justification may (as indeed men do) refer to it, as having been selected in a marked way by those who compiled our formularies, and as declaring the mind of the English church.

Again, Absolution. What answer is to be given to those who assert that previous auricular confession is not essential to the reception of sacerdotal absolution, and that private absolution is not the highest and fittest exercise of the power of "the keys," when we find it to be thus declared in the exhortation before the daily prayers; "We ought at all times humbly to acknowledge our sins before God; yet ought we *most chiefly* so to do, when we assemble and meet together, &c."? Now, if there is any truth in the catholic doctrine of the sacrament of absolution, it is quite certain, that we ought *not* "most chiefly" to acknowledge our sins before God, when we assemble for public prayer. Let it be remembered also, that this assertion is immediately followed by the performance of the thing spoken of: namely, a solemn general acknowledgement of sins: and, moreover, that this declaration was first made by the church of England, at the very time when she asserted sacramental absolution not to be of necessity, and therefore removed also the necessity of auricular confession. Then, again, the articles might be referred to, and in them we find it to be distinctly said that "penance [pœnitentia or absolution] is not to be counted for a sacrament of the Gospel, but has grown of the

corrupt following of the apostles." I can only add upon this, that if absolution, after auricular confession, be not "a sacrament of the Gospel," it is a most fearful playing with holy things; and a blasphemy, both to utter and to listen to, to say, "I absolve thee from all thy sins."

Once more, the blessed Eucharist. An evangelical clergyman teaches his people that this sacrament is a sacrifice only in an improper and secondary sense: a sacrifice, in short, only of prayer and praise. Or, he might go on to say, a sacrifice or very solemn dedication of ourselves to Almighty God. And, that it is a sacrifice in no sense other than this. Nor has he any hesitation in pointing out more than one plain passage of the liturgy in which the Eucharist is so spoken of; and, from the fact of its being so spoken of, he concludes, and with great reason, that it is nothing more. For, it must be remembered that our liturgy as well as our other services and offices are not new forms, in the sense of being the first things of their kind. But, on the contrary, they superseded and occupy the place of other services which were declared to be superstitious and erroneous in doctrine. Therefore if the earlier liturgy contained, as it did contain, words and passages distinctly admitting and asserting the catholic truth of the Eucharistic sacrifice, which words have been carefully excluded from our present service, it may be most forcibly urged that with the words there was rejected also the doctrine which they contained. Let me remind you that I am not saying that the mere omission of words which were in the ancient liturgy does, in

itself and alone, prove the rejection of the doctrine, but that it looks that way, to say the least of it, in common fairness of interpretation. And we do certainly require a somewhat plain statement elsewhere, of a contrary kind, to counterbalance the effect of the omission. Where are we to find such a statement of the continued recognition by the church of England of the Catholic doctrine of the Sacrifice in the Eucharist ?

The passages which have been alluded to are these ; both occurring in the prayer in which alone, as our best ritualists agree, the sacrifice—whatsoever it may be—is in strictness offered. And in them we find the Eucharist styled a “ sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving :” and the offering to be “ ourselves, our souls and bodies, as a reasonable, holy, and lively sacrifice.” Very different indeed was the Offering and the Sacrifice of which the ancient liturgy spoke. Add, as before, to this, the declaration on the same subject in the 31st article. “ The sacrifices of masses, in the which it was commonly said, that the priest did offer Christ for the quick and the dead—were blasphemous fables, and dangerous deceits.” Again I remind you, that I am very far from saying now that the catholic doctrine is certainly denied and repudiated in this article : for I have for many years taught (and, as you know, have lately published in a sermon) that in the blessed Eucharist the Body and the Blood of our Lord are truly offered as a propitiatory sacrifice for the living and the dead. But I repeat, that they are, on the one hand, a difficulty to be “ got out of ;” and, upon the other, they serve strongly to confirm

the low and heretical notion that there is no actual, real, sacrifice at all.

Another mysterious and solemn truth connected with the holy Eucharist, is that which is commonly termed the Real Presence. We need not now discuss whether this is a right or wrong term; the doctrine which is intended by it is quite sufficiently understood for our present purpose; namely, that independently of the faith and worthiness, or of the unbelief and unworthiness, of the recipient, our Blessed Lord is Present upon the altar, after the words of consecration, under the appearance of bread and wine; and that His Body and His Blood are given to every one, worthy or unworthy, who kneels down and offers to receive Them. Is this, or is it not, the teaching which is conveyed by such passages as these? “The benefit is great, if with a true penitent heart and lively faith we receive that holy Sacrament; for *then* we spiritually eat the Flesh of Christ, and drink His Blood.” Again, at the delivery of the Sacrament to each communicant; “Take and eat this in remembrance that Christ died for thee, and feed on Him in Thy heart by faith with thanksgiving.” Again, the affirmation, if it may be so called, at the end of the liturgy: that “the sacramental bread and wine remain still in their very natural substances:” not merely “in their substances,” nor “in their natural” substances, but “in their very natural substances.” An accumulation of strong assertions, which we have been often assured do not necessarily exclude the catholic doctrine of the Real Presence, but which, in their plainest and obvious meaning, do

support the low view, held and insisted on by so many of our clergy, that the Real Presence is a doctrine not approved by the church of England, and not to be distinguished from the Romish error, as they go on to say, of transubstantiation. Again, we are referred to the catechism: and it is scarcely to be disputed that the question and answer on this point there, are against rather than for the catholic doctrine. “What is the inward part or thing signified? * The Body and Blood of Christ, which are verily and indeed taken and received by the faithful in the Lord’s Supper.” Still, to all appearance, making the reality of the Presence to depend upon the faith of the recipient. At the risk of weary repetition, let me once more say, that of course this place of the catechism does not assert that the Body and Blood of Christ are not verily and indeed taken by all: and if there were in other places of our formularies any thing even approaching to a statement of the reality of the Presence of our Blessed Lord in the consecrated bread and wine, independently of any qualifications or dispositions

* The learned reader is doubtless acquainted with the theological distinction between the *sacramentum* and the *res sacramenti*. But it is not, in any way, according to my present purpose to enter into this subject. Scholastic distinctions, excellent as they are, are of value only in enabling us to show that the words of our formularies are not necessarily to be taken in the “evangelical” sense: that is, that our formularies are drawn up with such subtlety and acuteness, as to admit either the high-church or the low-church interpretation: sometimes leaning apparently to the one, sometimes to the other: but, as I have said above, on several main points their tendency generally and as a whole seems, at first sight, to favour the last.

- in the soul of the receiver, we might be able to show at once and distinctly that these passages in the liturgy and catechism cannot justly mean what they are usually brought forward to prove. In order to find this, we are obliged to turn to the articles: remembering, however, beforehand, that it is for us to show, in a way which shall commend itself to the apprehension of common, simple, and unlearned minds, the distinction which exists between the doctrines of the Real Presence and of Transubstantiation. For "Transubstantiation," according to the 28th article, "is repugnant to the plain words of Scripture." As to our present search, the same article declares, that "the Bread which we break is a partaking of the Body of Christ, and the Cup of Blessing is a partaking of the Blood of Christ to such as rightly, worthily, and with faith, receive the same." And, as if almost it were to shut out all further controversy upon the matter—not, of course, that it does so shut it out—a few lines below it is said that "the mean whereby the Body of Christ is received and eaten in the Supper is Faith."* Surely if the article

* I have heard both clergy and laity of the church of England,—and that, within the last twelve months,—declare that they accept and believe all Christian truth, as it is explained in the decrees and canons of the council of Trent. With regard to such a statement by any of our laity, it is curious, to say the least of it: and, probably, was never made by any one who had read and understood the Tridentine canons. But as to clergymen, ignorance cannot be supposed: and for them, bound as they are by subscription to our formularies, thus to speak, has always seemed to me amongst the greatest of all achievements of human intellect. Subtle as we know the mind of man to be, and wide its range, I cannot but confess that

chiefly meant "received and eaten *beneficially*," it might have said so: the addition of that one word would not have proved and established the acceptance of the truth for which we contend, but at any rate it would have removed almost all the force of the argument against us: and we are bound not to forget that the word "beneficially," or some word equivalent, is *not* in the article.

So much then, for the present, on the point of the general apparent agreement of the formularies of the church of England, in their first and obvious meaning, with the teaching of those who differ from us, rather than with our own.

Connected with this, there is another consideration which, for some time, has pressed heavily and painfully upon me. As a fact, the evangelical party, plainly, openly, and fully, declare their opinions upon the doctrines which they contend the church of England holds: they tell their people continually, what they ought, as a matter of duty towards God and towards

the more I think of it, the more I am amazed at so wonderful an example of its power and capability.

There are not, perhaps, many minds so large: I cannot tell. But there have not been many Homers, Platos, or Isaac Newtons.

The sentence in the text above has reminded me of this remarkable fact, which seems worth a passing observation in a note. Let us take one question, concerning which, to the common run of minds, the articles of the reformed church of England, and the canons of Trent, do seem to differ. The one asserts that, "The Body of Christ is given, taken, and eaten, in the Supper, only after an heavenly and spiritual manner." The other has this language; "*Sess. xij. can. viij.* If any one saith, that Christ, given in the Eucharist, is eaten spiritually only, and not also sacramentally and really, let him be anathema."

themselves, both to believe and practise. Can it be pretended that we, as a party, anxious to teach the truth, are equally open, plain, and unreserved? If we are not so, is prudence, or economy, or the desire to lead people gently and without rashly disturbing them, or any other like reason, a sufficient ground for our withholding large portions of catholic truth? Can any one chief doctrine or duty be reserved by us, without blame or suspicion of dishonesty? And it is not to be alleged, that only the less important duties and doctrines are so reserved: as if it would be an easy thing to distinguish and draw a line of division between them. Besides, that which we are disputing about cannot be trivial and unimportant; if it were so, we rather ought, in Christian charity, to acknowledge our agreement in essentials and consent to give up the rest.

But we do reserve vital and essential truths; we often hesitate and fear to teach our people many duties, not all necessary perhaps in every case or to every person, but eminently practical, and sure to encrease the growth of the inner, spiritual, life; we differ, in short, as widely from the evangelical party in the manner and openness, as in the matter and details, of our doctrine. Take, for example, the doctrine of invocation of saints; or, of prayers for the dead; or, of justification by faith only; or, of the merit of good works; or, of the necessity of regular and obedient fasting; or, of the reverence due to the blessed virgin Mary; or, of the propitiatory sacrifice of the blessed Eucharist; or, of the almost necessity of auricular confession and absolution, in order to the remission of mortal sin;—and more

might be mentioned than these. Now, let me ask you; do we speak of these doctrines from our pulpits in the same manner, or to the same allowed extent, as we speak of them to one another, or think of them in our closets? Far from it: rather, when we do speak of them at all, in the way of public, ministerial, teaching, we use certain symbols and a shibboleth of phrases, well enough understood by the initiated few, but dark and meaningless to the many. All this seems to me to be, day by day and hour by hour, more and more hard to be reconciled with the real spirit, mind, and purpose of the English reformation, and of the modern English church, shown by the experience of 300 years. It does seem to be, daily, more and more opposed to that single-mindedness of purpose, that simplicity and truthfulness and openness of speech and action, which the gospel of our Blessed Lord requires. We are, indeed, to be "wise as serpents;" but has our wisdom of the last few years, been justly within the exceptions of that law? Let me not be understood as if supposing that any motive, except prudence and caution, has caused this reserve: but there are limits beyond which Christian caution degenerates into deceit, and an enemy might think that we could forget that there are more texts than one of Holy Scripture which speak of persecution to be undergone, for His sake, and for the Faith.

And if reserve in teaching carried to such an extent be, as I conceive it to be, unjustifiable, it is equally wrong, and to be condemned, in the practice of those who listen to, and endeavour to obey, such teaching. What can we think—when honestly we

bring our minds to its consideration—what *can* we think, I say, of the moral evils which must attend upon and follow conduct and a rule of religious life, full of shifts and compromises and evasions? a rule of life, based upon the acceptance of half one doctrine, all the next, and none of the third; upon the belief entirely of another, but not daring to say so; upon the constant practice, if possible, of this or that particular duty, but secretly, and fearful of being “found out;” doing it as if under the pretence of not doing it; if questioned, explaining it away, or answering with some dubious answer; creeping out of difficulties; anything, in a word, but sincere, straightforward, and true. It would really seem as if, instead of being Catholics,—as we say we are—in a Christian land, we were living in the city of heathen Rome, and forced to worship in the catacombs and dark places of the earth.

People often say, it is wrong to use such terms as “the spirit of the reformed English church;” or, “its intention,” “purpose,” and the like. And is it really so? was the reformation nothing? did it effect nothing, change nothing, remove nothing? is the condemnation by the church of Rome of several doctrines,—doctrines, accepted by the church of England for the first time in the sixteenth century,—a mere matter of words; or, is there not rather some essential difference, after all, in the “spirit” of the teaching of the two communions? * and if there be a

* In the year 1714, a Form of admitting converts from the church of Rome was prepared for convocation, in which the “penitent” was required to renounce “the errors of the present Roman church,”

difference and distinction, does it, or does it not, tend, with us, to the acceptance of the evangelical more than of the high-church party? No doubt the reformed church of England claims to be a portion of the Holy Catholic Church: and it has been common for many of our own opinions, to add also the assertion, that she rejects and condemns, as being out of the Church Catholic, the reformed churches abroad, Lutheran, Genevan, and others, together with the kirk of Scotland or the dissenters at home. Upon our principles—nay, on any consistent church principle at all—such a corollary must follow. But there is a strangeness in it: it commends itself, perhaps, to our intellect, but not to the eye and ear; nor, it may be, to the heart and conscience. Is there so great a difference between the reformed churches abroad, or the presbyterians, or the better kinds of dissent,—the Wesleyans, for example,—and our own, as between the modern English church and Rome? Which does our Church most resemble, in doctrine, ceremonies, and practice? I say, practice, especially: for it is in practice, and in the doing of common, daily, duties, that as time goes on the tendencies of articles of faith, or of doctrine, are declared. What then is commonly thought and said—and the voice of the multitude is sometimes right—when men are seen to imitate Roman forms and ceremonies, or to advocate the observance of forgotten rules of holy living, and self-denial? *

and, if in holy orders, to reject all the 12 articles of the creed of pope Pius IV. and to acknowledge the royal supremacy “as by law established.” *Wilkins*. concil. iv. 661.

* Illustrations are often useful: I give the following remarks which

Again ; it is usual for numbers to unite with dissenting teachers for various religious purposes : English clergymen will join with them in prayer, or on the platform : English laity will frequently go to listen to their preaching :—to church perhaps in the morning ; to “ meeting ” in the evening : and how frequent is the remark of the lower classes ; “ I have no *objection* to come to church : ”—now, whatever of wrongness there may be about such conduct as this, do we ever find any thing in any degree like it with regard to the church of Rome ? Do the common people ever go, in the same manner, to Roman Catholic chapels ? What should we say of them, if they did ? And would they see the same similitude of interior arrangement, or listen to sermons which might equally well be preached in half the parish churches of the land ?

* * * * * *

It is now more than three months since the last pages of this Letter were written. The rumours

a bishop—himself very far indeed from being what is called evangelical in his opinions—made to a clergyman, who had been complained of for adopting Roman practices : the particular objections in this case were bowing at the gloria, and standing before the altar. “ I cannot understand,” the bishop said, “ how any man can place himself, his affections, and sympathies, so totally in opposition to the authority which he has sworn to obey, and to the church in which he ministers. When I look at the spirit and tone of the church of England, I am at a loss to reconcile such a course of action with my sense of what is right and true and straightforward.” Then going on to speak of a late secession to the church of Rome, he continued ; “ I hope it will be a lesson to those who use Roman Catholic books of devotion : and I can only say, the sooner they follow such an example the better : they are disloyal and dishonest members of the church of England.”

which, in January, became prevalent as to what the decision of the judicial committee, in the case of Mr. Gorham, would probably be, prevented my going on with some further remarks, bearing on the subject which we have been discussing. Nor can I now bring myself to enter upon them.

On the other hand, although additions have been made, I do not recall one sentence which had, at that time, been written: if you think such a fact, as a declaration that the truth of baptismal regeneration is an open question in the church of England, increases the weight of the difficulties already spoken of, I should be unwilling to dispute it.

Yet; can it be possible that the formularies of the reformed church of England do not teach the doctrine of baptismal regeneration to be undeniably a certain truth of the Christian Faith?—again we ask, *do they not even teach that doctrine?*—what a reformation!

And what have we to fall back upon? where are we? can we rest upon “opinions” which demand of us to *believe* either a great deal too much, or a great deal too little? upon opinions, which—call them by what name we will—will lead us most surely, by a longer or a shorter road as men may choose to tread it, either to Rome or infidelity.

Are not our minds very strangely confused? are we not labouring under doubts, which are doubts only because we refuse to be resolved? why do we hesitate, and dispute and differ amongst ourselves, but because we wish, and are determined (if it be possible), not to see things as they really are; because we are determined to reconcile things irrecon-

cilable, and to justify that which, upon our own principles, is not to be justified?

Do not think that I would argue that one such event, as this decision on the doctrine of holy baptism, is sufficient to unchurch the church of England; it may, or it may not be; but we need not enter upon the enquiry, until we can show that it is the sole difficulty with which, upon high-church principles, we have to deal, and not one among many. As a single circumstance, its extreme importance arises from the fact, that regeneration in holy baptism having been supposed to be more clearly taught in our reformed Church, than any Catholic truth whatsoever, (always excepting the doctrine of the Blessed Trinity,) we now discover that even this is, after all, equally with other essential points of the Christian Faith, a matter of "opinion." If the judgement of the court of Arches had been affirmed, distinctly and unequivocally, we might perhaps have hoped to have gone on to establish the complete doctrine of sacramental grace. But there can be no doubt, that with the permitted denial of the unconditional efficacy of baptism in the case of infants, the vital truth of sacramental grace is declared also to be an "open question."

Besides, it is not necessary to pretend to know the dealings of Almighty God with men and nations so accurately as to attempt to lay one's finger, in a positive manner, upon special acts, and distinguish the one or two or three, which should in themselves avail to cut off any portion of the One Holy Catholic Church. And, as regards the church of England in particular, it may be, that the so-called reforma-

tion contained—perhaps unknown to the original promoters of it—poisonous seeds of evil, bringing in certain though slow decay : and that either new principles were then secretly established, which in their development would most surely lead to the destruction and confusion of essential truths, or old principles were, in ignorance, given up, which the gradual course of time would prove to be necessary, because they lie at the very foundation of Christianity itself. Or, once more, it may be with portions of the Church Catholic as with the Vine, her mysterious type. “I am the Vine, ye are the branches,” were the words of our Blessed LORD, speaking of His Body, the Church, of which He is Himself the Head. And we may well conceive how a branch, full of sap and vigour, may be severed from the stem, and yet for a period—longer or shorter—still continue to put forth leaves, and perhaps the blossoms of fruit also ; nevertheless, cut off all the while, and severed ; requiring time to die, but death itself inevitable at last.

Let me, in this place, sum up briefly what has been said, in the two Letters which I have written to you.

1. That the Crown, at the time of the Reformation, and since that time, in virtue of the supremacy, has claimed, and exercised, the right of finally deciding ecclesiastical causes, involving doctrine ; — that this right has been sanctioned, established, and maintained by several statutes of the realm ; and both recognized and insisted on by canons and articles of the English Church, as accordant with the true spirit of the Gospel ;—and that we, the clergy,

have promised obedience to the due and legal exercise of this same right.

2. That the decision in the particular cause of Mr. Gorham against the bishop of Exeter explains, to some extent, the dogmatic teaching of the church of England upon the sacrament of holy baptism.

3. That the judgment of the Judicial Committee in that cause is probably a correct and true judgment; and, if it be so, that the reformed church of England did not, and at the present time does not, exclusively require her clergy to teach, and her people to believe, the unconditional efficacy of baptism in the case of all infants.

4. That the two questions of the royal supremacy, and of baptismal regeneration, are not the only difficulties in which we are involved.

5. That the reformed church of England, deliberately and advisedly, has left many essential doctrines of the Christian Faith to be received as "matters of opinion."

6. That the Evangelical clergy, as a party, no less than the Anglican or high-church party, represent and carry out the spirit and the system of the English reformation, as declared by contemporary authorities, and sanctioned by the existing formularies.

7. That our church for two hundred and thirty years has been in full communion with the established church of Ireland, in which church heresy has been synodically and formally received and taught, and "the essential meaning of an article of the Creed abandoned."

Upon these grounds it is, that I cannot, I dare

not, offer to give any support or aid to those, who seem to be desirous of struggling for the church of England, as if the doctrine of baptismal regeneration were the sole question in dispute, or the only doctrine for which we must contend.*

There will be a ready answer, I suppose; namely, that we must wait; that we must be patient; that we must see what the bishops are about to do. Wait for the bishops of the church of England!—and yet, of *one* there are no words in which, if we are true-hearted, and sincere, and earnest for the Truth, we can express all that we ought to feel of gratitude, and sympathy, and regard. He, alone, of all our bishops, has endeavoured to vindicate the Catholic claims which others have feebly spoken of; he, alone, has dared to keep the promise which he made at his con-

* “We shall be very much mistaken, if we presume that we may hold a single great doctrine of the Gospel, and be at liberty to accept or not, as we think it agreeable, other doctrines which rest upon precisely the same foundation, and which are supported by the like kind of evidence. For example, it is almost idle to insist upon the truth of regeneration in holy baptism,—unless we are prepared to believe and to teach other truths of the one same chain of doctrine, no less important, whether in regard of faith or practice. As a matter of mere argument and speculation, rather than of reality, we may perhaps accept this one and not that: may (so to speak) pick and choose: far otherwise, however, if we remember what we are doing; if we can but bring ourselves to the conviction that we are not disputing and enquiring about dialectical subtleties, but about the deep things of GOD; about His dealings with sinful and fallen man; about eternity; about the application of the mystery of the Incarnation of the Son of GOD, GOD himself, to the soul and body of each member of the church; about questions which, dispute as long as we will, are, in some one sense and meaning, true, independent utterly of us, and only in that sense are true.”

secration, “to drive away all erroneous and strange doctrine contrary to God’s Word :” he, alone, has had sufficient trust in the power and reality of the Christian Faith, to labour in its defence, unsupported, amidst calumny and opposition and reproach. And no man living knows, as I in some small measure know, the labours and untiring patience,—the anxious, wearing, toil,—which have been devoted to the cause of the church of England, by him, who looked for nothing, hoped for nothing, but the one, single, glorious end of saving the Church, of which he is the noblest ornament, from the stain and sin of heresy. Oh! may God ever be with him; now, when, in his declining years, disappointments in the past, and fears for time to come, are darkening round us all; now, when the weight and anger of the storm seems gathering, before it bursts; now, when the hopes of the church of England are to be found, not in hearts, faint and desponding as my own, but in such as his, firm, unshaken still, and confident, and bold. Again and again I pray, may all the gifts and blessings of our Almighty Lord and Saviour be upon him, evermore.

Yet, you will ask me, Do you think then that our case is hopeless? I cannot tell. Fairly, openly, and from my heart I have endeavoured to speak to you upon a matter, not of temporal interests, but concerning the salvation of our souls. I have avoided argument as much as possible, for it is, at present, a question of facts. If these have been misstated, it has been only from the want of knowing better, and let them be set right. If there is

any remedy, solemnly and carefully let us ask, Where is it to be found ?

It will *not* be found in evasions, and in temporizing, and in compromise : it will not be found,—so that we may think fearlessly of the Great Day in which we must give account,—in attempts to make the church of England last for our own time, careless of the deposit and the heritage which we are bound to deliver onwards to our children, and our children's children. A very few weeks will shew what course is likely to be ours to follow : I have resigned my cure of souls, because I have no doctrines and no Faith to teach, as certainly the Faith and doctrines of the English Church ; but, for a time at least, I leave not her communion. Brief time, it may be : One Alone can tell. But, if there really be truth and life in our Church, if she indeed be that which she claims to be,—a part of the Church Catholic—she will not shrink from speaking plainly in such a day as is the present, on all essential doctrines of the Faith, and we shall know in what we are to trust.

It *must* be said, however reluctantly, that in such a crisis as now exists, it is no true remedy to “ call together the com-provincial bishops ; and to invite them to declare what is the faith of the Church on the articles impugned in the judgment ” of the judicial committee in Mr. Gorham's cause : nor, “ to obtain from the said Episcopate, acting only in its spiritual character, a re-affirmation of the doctrine of Holy Baptism, impugned by the said sentence.” Far from it. Such a declaration or re-affirming would not be law ; neither would it be the voice of

the church of England. Besides, that which is required, even upon the subject of baptism, is not an opinion or judgment of the bishops upon Mr. Gorham's particular heresy; but A NEW, FULL, AND INTELLIGIBLE CANON OR ARTICLE OF FAITH, PUT FORTH SYNODICALLY BY THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND, *plainly declaring, as EXCLUSIVELY true, the entire Catholic doctrine of the sacrament of holy Baptism.* I say, without fear of contradiction by any man who holds that doctrine, THAT NOTHING LESS THAN THIS CAN BE SUFFICIENT.

Are we, who so hold and believe, prepared to demand that a synod of the reformed church of England shall re-accept and re-affirm the doctrine of baptism, which was laid down and taught by the articles agreed upon in the convocation of 1536, with the exception of the few words relating to the future state of infants dying unbaptised? If it be true that such an article is again necessary, in order to save our Church from being formally and virtually committed to the avowed permission of erroneous teaching, let us—in His Name Who is the Truth, the Way, and the Life—determine *now* to ask for nothing less, for nothing short of it, for nothing which shall in fact be different, whilst it seems to be the same.

Let us recollect, also, that if now, roused by the alarm and anxieties of the present time, we are induced to use our energies and zeal in pursuing remedies, which, however specious looking, will prove to be shadows and deceptions, we are throwing away an opportunity, available only if seized boldly and at once.

This then and not less than this, let me repeat it, is absolutely required, in order that the church of England shall truly be said to have One Faith upon the "One Baptism for the remission of sins."* If, in the dispensations of the Most High, the time at last has come, when the discords amongst us must be settled, either the one way or the other, let us not, playing with our peril, loosely talk about hopes, and prospects; and of life and zeal; and of Catholic minds and Catholic wishes; but let us take,—if there is hope indeed,—instantly, firmly, honestly, each man, our side. We may regret that our own lot is cast in troubled days: but it would be as wise to deny that the sun shines in heaven, as refuse to admit the fact—grieve over it how we will—that there are two great parties in the church of England: and that the contest now begun must end—sooner or later—in the victory of the one over the other. It is a fearful particular in the many difficulties against which *we* are opposed, that "toleration," and "liberality," and "communions wide enough to embrace both," and "open questions," and "matters of opinion," are terms and cries which may not be uttered by us, in the same breath with our defence of vital doctrines of the One Catholic Faith. We must ever remember, that any portion of the Church, which, acting advisedly and deliberately, fails to teach ex-

* Even though for a season, we venture to pass by a determination upon other doctrines, no less fundamental, which have been declared to be "matters of opinion" in our Church. Is not the question of the royal supremacy beginning already to be put aside? if so, it is significant.

clusively essential Christian truths, *permits* error : and, I suppose, few among us would be prepared to say, that such deliberate *permission* is not fatal.

One thing we certainly have no right to expect : namely, an audible or visible interposition of Almighty God. It may, of course, be disputed whether this or that event be, or be not, a sign and token by which we are to be guided. But we must not wait to see His handwriting on the wall, or to hear His voice amongst us, as once of old time, saying, "Let Us depart." Such are not the usual dealings of God with man.

And I would end as I began : with a repeated expression of the sorrow and the pain with which I have been writing to you. The Church of England !—let me say one word more—if, for years past, we have had one object, one hope, one source of comfort and encouragement, in labours and anxiety and reproach, these have sprung from a most sure and firm belief, in the reality of her claim to be within the pale of the One Catholic Church. Where is the *assurance* of such faith now ? It is a bitter, bitter thought : alas ! how very different from the thoughts of the years that are gone by : and some—old and long-loved friends—will call it wilful and perverse, to speak as I have spoken.

No one would desire, from mere wilfulness, to make the worst of any thing : yet, whilst we acknowledge this, looking at our present position and remembering the awful nature of the subject which we have been considering, there can be very few indeed, who would set a false face upon the truth, and

try to make the best of it, and prophesy smooth words, because the people love to have it so, and cry, Peace, where there is no peace.

May the Divine Blessing rest upon and guide us all.

Ever, your affectionate friend,

W. M.

*Vicarage, S. Mary Church.
April 8th.*

APPENDIX.

No. I.

EXTRACT FROM THE ARTICLES OF 1536, REFERRED

TO ABOVE, P. 78.

“The Sacrament of Baptism.”

SECONDLY, as touching the holy sacrament of Baptism, we will that all bishops and preachers shall instruct and teach our people committed by us unto their spiritual charge; that they ought and must of necessity believe certainly all those things, which hath been always by the whole consent of the Church approved, received, and used in the sacrament of baptism; that is to say, that the sacrament of baptism was instituted and ordained in the New Testament by our Saviour Jesu Christ, as a thing necessary for the attaining of everlasting life, according to the saying of Christ, *Nisi quis renatus fuerit ex aqua et Spiritu Sancto, non potest intrare in regnum sanctorum*; that is to say, No man can enter into the kingdom of heaven, except he be born again of water and the Holy Ghost.

Item, That it is offered unto all men, as well infants as such as have the use of reason, that by baptism they shall have remission of sins, and the grace and favour of God, according to the saying of Christ, *Qui crediderit et baptizatus fuerit, salvus erit*; that is to say, Whosoever believeth and is baptized, shall be saved.

Item, That the promise of grace and everlasting life (which promise is adjoined unto this sacrament of baptism) pertaineth not only unto such as have the use of reason, but also to infants, innocents, and children; and that they ought therefore and must needs be baptized: and that by

the sacrament of baptism they do also obtain remission of their sins, the grace and favour of God, and be made thereby the very sons and children of God. Insomuch as infants and children dying in their infancy shall undoubtedly be saved thereby, (*and else not*).

Item, That infants must needs be christened because they be born in original sin, which sin must needs be remitted; which cannot be done [ordinarily] but by the sacrament of baptism, whereby they receive the Holy Ghost, which exerciseth his grace and efficacy in them, and cleanseth and purifieth them from sin by His most secret virtue and operation.

Item, That children or men once baptized, can, nor ought ever to be baptized again.

Item, That they ought to refute and take all the anabaptists' and the Pelagians' opinions contrary to the premises, and every other man's opinion agreeable unto the said anabaptists' or the Pelagians' opinions in this behalf, for detestable heresies, and utterly to be condemned.

Item, That men or children having the use of reason, and willing and desiring to be baptized, shall, by the virtue of that holy sacrament, obtain the grace and remission of all their sins, if they shall come thereunto perfectly and truly repentant and contrite of all their sins before committed, and also perfectly and constantly confessing and believing all the articles of our faith, according as it was mentioned in the first article.

No. II.

IF any man could have proved that the Irish Church is not now answerable for, and bound by, the Dublin Articles of 1615, except in so far as they are not distinctly contradicted by the 39 articles of 1562, since received and approved, he would have been the late Dr. Elrington. Nothing can be more convincing than the statements which that writer has been forced to admit, in his life of archbi-

shop Usher : proving that not only were the Irish articles of 1615 *not* disowned and rejected as heretical by the convocation of 1634, but the temper and opinions of the Irish Church at that time to be such, that the chief persons who advocated the reception of our 39 articles, did not dare to permit even a discussion upon the earlier Irish articles, lest they might fail utterly in their attempt.

Bramhall then bishop of Derry was the most earnest and clever among those who endeavoured to induce the Irish convocation to approve the English 39 articles. Bishop Vesey, in his life of Bramhall, gives us some information about this : concerning which I would premise that the “blow to be feared” was a repeated *confirmation* of the articles of 1615. The bishop of Derry, we are told, replied to an objection against receiving the English articles, and which also urged “that it was more material to *confirm and strengthen* the articles of 1615,” by arguing that such a course would bring a sort of discredit upon the former synod, *as if it required ratification* : “by this prudent dressing of the objection he avoided the blow he most feared, and therefore again earnestly pressed the receiving of the English articles, which were at last admitted.” *Elrington’s life of Usher*, p. 174. Some further facts which Dr. Elrington mentions, show how great the difficulty was, and that threats even were resorted to, in order to prevent the Irish convocation from deliberately reaffirming the articles of 1615, and obliging them to be received, under pain of excommunication, p. 170.

No. III.

I HAD intended to have taken the present opportunity of making such replies as I could, to any objections and arguments which had been published, during the last six weeks, in answer to my First Letter on the Royal Supremacy. But the fact which I now have to remind the reader of, is this ; namely, that there has been *no answer* at all.

Many remarks have been made upon the tone and temper of that Letter: upon the line of argument being "offensive," or "disloyal;" and its general treatment "cold," "hard," "technical," "literal," and the like.

But there has been nothing, which can be called an answer, offered against the argument and facts produced.

Some have said that I have ascribed to "the church of England, on the strength of certain acts of parliament, the most Erastian doctrines possible." *English Review*. This is untrue; I referred, especially and chiefly, to the words of the church of England, as we find them in her canons, articles, and ordinal. And no man would have wished so to misrepresent my statement, except one who knew that the strength of the difficulty which is involved in the question of the royal supremacy, does not lie in acts of parliament and in claims made by the civil power, but in the repeated acknowledgment and recognition of it which has been agreed to and insisted on by the Church herself.

An old and dear friend has printed a Letter on the subject: * of which I would say, that no one felt more deeply than myself, both the great ability and truthfulness with which it was written, and its spirit of unshaken loyalty and devotion to the reformed English church. But, as it was not intended to be an answer to the facts stated in my First Letter, so it seemed to me to fail in meeting the real difficulty of the case. Its point was, that even granting an ambiguity to exist in our formularies, yet it might have been an inadvertence at the time when our prayer book and articles were put forth, and that we must prove that the church of England at the reformation intended that there should be such an ambiguity. But this is a line of argument which must admit that which has been so energetically denied to bear upon the question at issue, namely, the opinions of the reformers and divines of the sixteenth century. And it is to be remembered, that if such are to be referred to, as evi-

* A Letter, &c. by the Rev. M. W. Mayow.

dence of the animus of our Church upon the doctrine of baptism, so they must equally be appealed to upon the doctrines, for example, of the eucharist and sacramental grace. In short it is making use of an argument, wisely and long repudiated by the high-church party.

I cannot refrain from citing one passage from this Letter. Mr. Mayow says; "Let me be well understood. If such ambiguity of language be intentional on the part of the church; if she can be proved to have *desired* in drawing up her articles and services to admit two interpretations on baptismal regeneration: if it be her view and plan to include two such opposite parties within her as those represented by Mr. Gorham and the bishop of Exeter, by such ambiguous, and therefore comprehensive language, I most fully admit she stands convicted of unpalliated heresy both in form and matter." p. 9. Instead of *baptismal regeneration* in the above sentence, put *the Eucharist*, or, *justification*.

There is one other pamphlet on which I must say a word or two. More than it deserves for its own sake, but because of the importance which some, who have not been able to find anything better, have pretended to give to it. I mean a publication on "The present crisis in the church of England, by W. I. Irons, B.D. vicar of Brompton."

Mr. Irons endeavours to show that the Royal Supremacy was equally exercised before as well as since the reformation: and he tells us of various interferences on the part of the Crown between the conquest and the sixteenth century. Of these it must suffice to say, that not one of them bears in the slightest degree upon the true difficulty of our position now. Not one of them is a true example of any claim made by the Civil Power finally to determine spiritual causes involving doctrine, together with evidence, or anything in the remotest way like evidence, of consent given to such a claim by the ancient church of England. Instances of persecution, and injustice, and violence, some of Mr. Irons's cases are; but they are instances of nothing more: in short, they serve to confirm the novelty of the

present powers vested by our Church in the Crown. And if the learned writer had even taken time to give us references to his own authorities, it might possibly have been sufficient also to have enabled him to see a little more clearly what is the real question in dispute.

Mr. Irons mentions, however, the Constitutions of Clarendon. I would not pass by these altogether, because of the reference which some other writers have also lately made to them.

The 8th of these constitutions is that which is supposed to bear upon the present power to determine finally ecclesiastical causes, claimed by the Crown. As printed by Mr. Irons it reads thus: "That all appeals in *spiritual* causes [the italics are Mr. Irons's] should be carried from the archdeacon to the bishop, from the bishop to the primate, from him to the king, and should be carried no further without the king's consent." This seems to have been taken from Hume's history, (vol. i. p. 351) and, with deference to Mr. Irons's further researches, there is nothing in the original constitution which answers to the translation "appeals in *spiritual* causes." The words "in spiritual causes," are interpolated, and Mr. Irons's italics had better not have been ventured upon.

For, on the contrary, there is an epistle of Gilbert Foliot, at that time bishop of London, and of the king's party against the archbishop of Canterbury, which explains to us in what sense we are to understand the word "appeals," as meant and intended by the king. The bishop is writing to the pope, Alexander the third. "In appellationibus ex antiqua regni sui constitutione id sibi vindicat honoris et oneris, ut ob civilem causam nullus clericorum regni sui ejusdem regni fines exeat, nisi an ipsius autoritate et mandato jus suum obtinere queat, experiendo cognoscat. Quod si nec sic obtinerit, ad excellentiam vestram, ipso in nullo reclamante, cum volet quilibet appellabit. In quo si juri vel honori vestro præjudicatur in aliquo, id se totius ecclesiæ regni sui consilio correcturum in proximo, jurante Do

mino, pollicetur." *Epist. S. Thomæ Cantuar.* xxxviii. p. 60. So that the causes which are spoken of in the constitutions of Clarendon, according to the intention of Henry the second himself, are civil causes, and *not* ecclesiastical; a distinction which, as most people will agree, carries with it a difference.

Whether Mr. Irons will acknowledge this, is, to my mind, somewhat doubtful. Because he is prepared to hold and (I suppose) believe, that "the spirit of the [English] Reformation was altogether hostile to the royal supremacy; and even when yielding to it, it was able at length to modify it." p. 19. I cannot consent to discuss a very serious question, agitating men's minds to an extent unknown and unfelt for generations, when it is presented to us in so strange a disguise.

POSTSCRIPT,

TO THE READER.

IT will be seen that I have spoken in the following Letter, of my having already tendered my resignation of my benefice. An utterly unexpected circumstance has occurred, which has delayed my resignation.

Yesterday, the 6th, I explained to my parishioners, at our annual vestry, the obligation, which seemed to lie upon me, of immediately resigning my cure of souls. I had hoped to have received from them the expression of their regret and of personal regard and kindly feelings towards myself. But I was not prepared to receive, within an hour afterwards, the following resolution which had been adopted at a meeting of the same parishioners, who had constituted the vestry, one of the most numerously attended of all that I remember.

“Mr. Maskell having communicated to the Vestry his intention to resign his ministry on Monday next, it is the wish of the undersigned inhabitants to express their deep regret that he should come to this determination; and considering that the question which has occasioned Mr. Maskell to take this step has not been finally settled, earnestly to request him, at least, to defer doing so for the present.”

This is not the place for me to state more than that, in deference to such an expression both of opinion and of desire, on the part of those to whom I am especially bound, by every tie of duty, next after God and His Church, it does seem right that I should delay my resignation for a few days, at least ; in order that my parishioners might be better able to judge, after a consideration of this Letter itself, of the weight and sufficiency of the reasons by which I am influenced. I would not have them think, that I had failed to give the best consideration in my power to their opinion and wishes upon the right course which, under existing circumstances, ought to be taken by their vicar : much more, when they have spoken in a way so solemn and so very seriously entitled to the gravest thought and deliberation.

It ought, perhaps, to be added, that besides the above, two other resolutions of the same meeting were also sent to me, bearing on and supporting, in a manner the most kind to myself, the opinion and wish already stated.

W. M.

First Sunday after Easter.

The Church

IN HER DAY OF TRIAL,

AND THE DUTY OF HER MEMBERS:

SERMON,

PREACHED IN THE

DISTRICT CHAPEL OF THE HOLY TRINITY, ROEHAMPTON,

ON THE

FOURTH SUNDAY IN LENT, MARCH 10, 1850.

BY THE

REV. G. E. BIBER, LL.D.

PERPETUAL CURATE OF ROEHAMPTON.

LONDON:

FRANCIS & JOHN RIVINGTON,

ST. PAUL'S CHURCH YARD, AND WATERLOO PLACE.

1850.

“ *The Bishop.* Will you be ready, with all faithful diligence, to banish and drive away all erroneous and strange doctrines contrary to GOD’s Word . . . ?

“ *Answer.* I will, the LORD being my helper.

“ *The Bishop.* Receive the HOLY GHOST for the Office and Work of a Priest in the Church of GOD, now committed unto thee by the Imposition of our hands. . . . And be thou a faithful Dispenser of the Word of GOD, and of His holy Sacraments ; In the Name of the FATHER, and of the SON, and of the HOLY GHOST. Amen.”

Form and Manner of Ordering of Priests.

A

S E R M O N,

&c.

THE CHURCH IN HER DAY OF TRIAL, AND THE DUTY
OF HER MEMBERS.

REV. iii. 2, 3.

“Be watchful, and strengthen the things which remain, that are ready to die: for I have not found thy works perfect before GOD. Remember therefore how thou hast received and heard, and hold fast, and repent. If therefore thou shalt not watch, I will come on thee as a thief, and thou shalt not know what hour I will come upon thee.”

THESE words, my Christian Brethren, were addressed of old to a Christian Church,—the Church in Sardis,—once the capital of the wealthy kingdom of Lydia, where Croesus sat enthroned in all the pride of his perishable riches and of his transient greatness,—afterwards the seat of one of the principal Churches of Asia, illustrious by her Bishops, illustrious above all by the paternal oversight of the last surviving Apostle,—and now, and for ages past, a miserable cluster of huts, scarcely recognizable by the traveller, destitute alike of worldly glory and of heavenly light,—

a beacon to other Churches, lest, after the example of Sardis, they offend through unfaithfulness, lest they be overtaken, as Sardis was, by the judgments of a righteous and a jealous God.

Why, then, should these words be rehearsed in your ears this day? Have they, perchance, any special significance to us, to our Church, at this time? Is it possible that our Church may be in the critical state which brought upon the Church in Sardis the Apostolic admonition to "*be watchful, and strengthen the things which remained, that were ready to die,*"—to "*remember how she had received and heard, to hold fast and to repent?*" You will at once conjecture, that it is not in the way of such general exhortation as it is my ordinary duty to address to you, that I have called your attention to the example of the Church in Sardis; but with a pointed reference to the peculiar position in which our Church is placed, in consequence of a judicial sentence pronounced in the course of the past week, in a matter involving one of the most vital doctrines of her faith. Let me then entreat you, my Christian Brethren, to give to the words which it will be my duty to speak to you this day, your fullest, your most solemn attention. Let me recall, both to my own mind and to yours, the fact that we are not met together here as men, as human individuals, entertaining, and free to entertain, their several and various opinions; but that we are met together as members of CHRIST'S Holy Catholic Church, professing, as such, to hold His most holy truth;—and

acknowledging that as that truth is in itself One and absolute, an everlasting rock, rising high above the roaring waves and the fluctuating tides of human opinion,—and as we are taught that truth, not indeed without the aid of the outward Word of revelation, and of other external appliances, yet substantially and livingly by the inward teaching of GOD the HOLY GHOST, Who is One and invariable, not the author of confusion and diversity of opinion, but the centre and fountain of unity, it becomes us to approach the contemplation of Divine truth at all times, and more especially at the time set apart for instruction and meditation in the public congregation, with profound reverence, and under a deep sense of the responsibility which attaches to its reception on the one hand, and, on the other, to its rejection.

Let me first of all set before you, as briefly as may be, those precise circumstances of our Church's position at this moment, which render it incumbent upon me to address you with more than usual solemnity, and I need hardly add, under a tenfold weight of responsibility,—such a weight as I should feel myself wholly unable to sustain, but that I rest in humble faith and hope upon the gracious assistance of the HOLY GHOST, knowing that our “sufficiency is of God.”

The blow, my Christian Brethren, which has long been impending over our Church, which those more discerning of the signs of the times have long anticipated, for which I have repeatedly called upon you to prepare your minds, has at last been struck. The

secular power has at last put the finishing stroke to that long series of encroachments upon the spiritual character and the inalienable rights of the Church, which has called forth such frequent and loud notes of alarm from the watchmen of our Zion. The question is now no longer merely whether it be seemly and right that a Legislature composed not only of members, but in a large proportion of open and avowed enemies, of the Church, should be permitted to usurp the functions of a Church legislature, and to regulate the internal administration of the Church's system. The question is now no longer merely whether it be seemly and right that a political Ministry, which in its official capacity has no Church character, and offers no guarantee to the Church for the soundness or even the friendliness of its plans and measures, should be permitted to usurp that Supremacy of government over the Church, which, by the constitution of our Church, is conceded to the Sovereign of these realms upon the ground of a personal fellowship in the faith, and in reliance upon engagements of the most solemn nature bound by the Coronation Oath upon the personal conscience of the Sovereign. The question is now no longer merely whether it be seemly and right that in the exercise of that usurped Supremacy the political Ministry should be permitted to thrust into the chief offices of the Church its own favourites and partisans, having regard in its selection to the promise which the antecedents of its nominees may hold out, that they will not be more urgent in putting forward, nor more firm in maintaining, the distinctive principles of the

Church, than may well consist with the indifferentism of the age, and its spirit of expediency. The question is now no longer merely whether in the training of her little ones the Church shall be subjected to the interference and superior control of a secular authority, which rests its hope of the social amelioration of mankind upon a general system of intellectual and moral culture, and regards distinctive religious tenets with dislike and with suspicion, as elements of discord. Weighty as all these questions are, heavily as the burden of them has long pressed upon the consciences of those who are mindful of the Divine origin, the Divine authority, the Divine commission, and the Divine purpose of the Church,—yet are they one and all light as a feather in comparison with the question which has now at length been brought to a point,—the question, namely, whether a lay tribunal, deriving its authority from the temporal power, recognizing human law as its supreme code, and legal technicalities as the rule of its decisions,—a tribunal destitute by its constitution of all spiritual character, and having no promise of the special guidance of God the HOLY GHOST in its deliberations,—in one word, a State tribunal, and not a Church tribunal, shall be recognized by the Church as having “authority in controversies of faith;” power to determine by its decree to what extent a Minister, a publicly-authorized teacher of the Church, may be permitted to make void by evasions the doctrine which he is under a solemn obligation to teach; and to what extent his brother Ministers, yea, and his very Bishop and Chief Pastor, shall be bound

to tolerate, nay, to endorse, his deviations from the true doctrine of the Church, as lawful and perfectly admissible variations of individual opinion.

In the exercise of the power and authority so claimed by a State tribunal void of all spiritual character,—whose component members may be sound and well-affected members of the Church, or may be adherents of hostile sects, and gainsayers of her doctrine,—a sentence has been pronounced, which declares that the efficacy of the Sacrament of Holy Baptism,—in the case of infants incapable of offering any wilful obstruction to the operation of Divine grace in their souls,—as the instrument, ordained thereto by CHRIST Himself, of their spiritual regeneration,—is an open question ;—in other words, that the Sacrament of Baptism is not, what our Articles¹ declare it to be, “ a *sure* witness ” and “ *effectual* sign ” of “ Regeneration or new Birth ; ” but is an outward form and ceremony, of problematic efficacy, which may or may not be accompanied—even in those in whom no personal obstruction of unworthy reception can possibly exist—by the inward gift and operation of that spiritual grace, for the conveyance of which that Holy Sacrament was expressly ordained by CHRIST Himself.

And here it is proper that you should take notice, my Christian Brethren, that to leave the doctrine of baptismal regeneration an open question, is virtually to deny that doctrine. For what is that doctrine? It affirms that, in the case of infants, the inward and

¹ Art. XXV. XXVII.

effectual grace of spiritual regeneration does invariably accompany, and is always and infallibly conveyed by, the external rite of baptism, by virtue of CHRIST'S promise and institution. The doctrine affirms that, under certain conditions, within certain limitations, a certain invisible, spiritual operation is sure to be performed by GOD, whenever those commissioned by Him shall perform a certain outward act prescribed by GOD Himself for this very purpose. The doctrine affirms this to be *sure* and *certain*—as our baptismal office expresses it, “Doubt ye not, but earnestly believe:” to say that it is an open question, whether it be sure and certain or not, is in fact to affirm that it is *uncertain*;—in other words, it is to deny that it is *sure* and *certain*. To pronounce the doctrine of baptismal regeneration an open question, is, therefore, virtually to deny the doctrine of baptismal regeneration.

And further it is proper that you should take notice, that the point to which this virtual denial applies, is concerning a matter which of all things ought to be esteemed most sure and certain among men,—viz. the faithfulness of GOD, the faithfulness of CHRIST, to perform His own promise, to give perpetual validity to His own word, to make His own ordinance effectual for that end for which it was instituted by Himself. Our LORD JESUS CHRIST declared, that no man can enter into the Kingdom of GOD, except he be “regenerated, or born again, born of water and of the SPIRIT².” Our LORD JESUS CHRIST gave a

² John iii. 3. 5.

commission to His Apostles, which its very terms prove to be in force “unto the end of the world³,” to baptize all nations, and to baptize them “in the name of the FATHER, and of the SON, and of the HOLY GHOST⁴ ;” and He accompanied this command with this promise, “Lo, I am with you alway, even unto the end of the world⁵.” Can it, then, be an open question, can it be considered as problematic, whether—no impediment in the individual obstructing the intention and operation of GOD—CHRIST be, indeed, by the HOLY GHOST, present with the Minister baptizing; whether, consequently, the Baptism, performed by virtue of CHRIST’S commission, be a regeneration of the SPIRIT, as well as of water; whether the invocation of the Ever-blessed TRINITY be an appeal certain to meet with a gracious answer from above;—or whether CHRIST may be supposed to be, though present at some times, at other times absent from the performance of His own appointed ordinance; and consequently, whether Baptism may be supposed, though effectual at some times, to be at other times ineffectual, a mere dipping in, or sprinkling with, water, and not a regeneration or new birth of water and of the SPIRIT; and the invocation of the awful name of the HOLY TRINITY, though at some times a successful call upon GOD to bless His own appointed ordinance by His presence and operation, yet at other times an empty phrase, dying away barren in the air upon which it is wafted along?

This, then, my Christian Brethren, is our terrible

³ Matt. xxviii. 20.

⁴ Ibid. v. 19.

⁵ Ibid. v. 20.

position, that we are called upon, by an authority which is, indeed, an authority much to be respected, and humbly to be obeyed by us, in matters touching our being and estate in this present world; but which, in matters of faith, in matters concerning the Word and Sacraments is, and by an express reservation of our Church is declared to be, no authority at all,—that by such an authority, usurping that which does not belong to it, we are called upon to allow, that He Who is “faithful and true,” is not to be certainly relied upon—that He Who is “the truth, the way, and the life,” has declared Baptism to be the Sacrament of regeneration, while in reality He meant it to remain in numberless cases a dead and empty form,—has pointed out a way of coming unto Himself, which He intended nevertheless to bar against many even of those little children whom He so especially and so lovingly invited to “come unto Him⁶,” when brought to Him by that way,—has held out a promise of the gift of a new life, declared by Himself indispensable to men’s salvation, which promise He nevertheless had no intention to fulfil in countless instances in which it should be claimed in the very manner appointed by Himself. In other words, we are called upon to make our choice between doubting CHRIST Himself, and declaring those to be in error who doubt Him; between betraying our allegiance to CHRIST Himself, and refusing to recognize an usurped authority over the Church of CHRIST.

⁶ Mark x. 14—16.

This, I say, is our position,—not mine only, nor that of my brethren in the Ministry only, but *your* position, the position of every man who, having been called to the fellowship of CHRIST'S grace, and to the membership of His Church, must, in the present posture of affairs, make his option between a faithful confession and a faithless dereliction, amounting to a virtual denial, of a truth essential to the integrity of "the faith once delivered to the Saints." This is our position, the position of our Church as a body, and of us her members as individuals.

Is there, then, not a cause, Brethren, for the Apostolic admonition, "*Be watchful, and strengthen the things which remain, that are ready to die?*"—"*Be watchful,*"—do not take the matter easy,—do not suffer yourselves to be beguiled by that insidious suggestion of Satan, that it is more consonant to the will of CHRIST to live on in a state of peaceful neutrality, of calm indifference to the conflict between truth and error, than to identify ourselves with the maintenance of truth against error, and to take a part in what is, with an implied censure, termed a fierce controversy upon abstruse theological questions. "*Be watchful,*" Brethren, lest by holding cheap a truth so intimately connected with the very fountain and beginning of your life in CHRIST, you make your own salvation cheap, and your souls, the souls to redeem which CHRIST died, valueless in the sight of a God Who "is not mocked." "*Be watchful,*" I say, "*and strengthen the things which remain, that are ready to die.*"

Mark these expressions. They are very remarkable, singularly applicable to our case. "*The things which remain.*" What have we still remaining? We have remaining the sublime language of faith in our Baptismal Office—the fervent prayer that the child may be "baptized with water and the HOLY GHOST,"—that it may please GOD to "wash him and sanctify him with the HOLY GHOST,"—that he may "receive remission of his sins by spiritual regeneration,"—that it may please GOD to "give unto him His HOLY SPIRIT, that he may be born again,"—that "the new man may be raised up in him,"—that "all things belonging to the SPIRIT may live and grow in him,"—that the water may be "sanctified to the mystical washing away of sin, and the child to be baptized therein may receive the fulness of GOD's grace;" — the encouraging exhortation, "Doubt ye not, but earnestly believe;"—the authoritative declaration, "Seeing that this child *is* regenerate;"—the hearty thanksgiving, for that "it hath pleased GOD to regenerate this infant with His HOLY SPIRIT."—All this remains to us at present, with much more of a like character, in other parts of the Prayer Book, coming in aid of the blessed confidence of faith which runs through the Baptismal Office; but all this, remember, which is so full of edification and godly comfort to the devout and believing soul, is "*ready to die,*" ready to become a dead letter, yea, a "letter which killeth," if the view be admitted, that the doctrine on which this language of faith is founded, is an open doctrine;—if it be open to any Minister of our Church, with the sanction of public authority, to

affirm, that to pray as our Prayer Book prays, to exhort as it exhorts, to declare as it declares, and to give thanks as it gives thanks, is not an act of lively faith, but an act of deadly superstition, the fruit of a “soul-destroying” error.

And, my Christian Brethren, not only the *language* of faith remains to us in our Prayer Book, but, by the grace of God, in many, in very many hearts, there remains the *faith* whereof that language is the expression,—but that faith also, I would have you remember, is “*ready to die*,” if you attempt to lodge by the side of it in your souls the base compromise that it is as open to a man to disbelieve as to believe the miracle of spiritual regeneration wrought according to God’s appointment by the HOLY GHOST in the Sacrament of Holy Baptism.

Again, my Christian Brethren, among the things that “*remain*,” but are “*ready to die*” in our Church,—alas! they are many, far too many to be here enumerated,—there is this to be specially borne in mind on the present occasion—the existence in our Church of an authority to which it truly does belong to pronounce in controversies of faith. That authority is the Synod of the Church,—her Convocation, as it is technically termed,—gathered together, not merely by Royal writ, in accordance with the constitution of our National Church, but under the directing influence of God the HOLY GHOST, in conformity with Apostolic precedent and the custom of the Church Catholic in all ages. Though gathered together from time to time, our Synod, which, as representing the

Church⁷ at large, alone has “authority in controversies of faith⁸,” has for one hundred and thirty years and upwards been in a state more akin to death than to life; yet has it been preserved to us by a merciful Providence,—for no other end, we can scarcely fail to believe, than that it should step in upon such an emergency as the present, and vindicate at once the integrity of the Church’s faith, and the independence of the revealed truth of God from all merely human and secular jurisdiction. But if, upon such an emergency as this,—which points to the revival of the synodal action of the Church as to the only remedy and defence against the intrusion of the secular power into the province of the spirituality, that is, the ministration of the Word and Sacraments,—we should be found supine, unwilling to exert ourselves with a view to obtain such revival, then, in that case, there is too much reason to fear that the synodal authority of the Church, which has so long been “*ready to die*,” will actually and finally die out, leaving the Church herself at no distant day to become extinct, to sink down to the miserable condition of a Church whose candlestick has been removed. With regard to all these things then, my Christian Brethren,—with regard to the glowing language of faith in our Prayer Book,—with regard to the faith, correspondent to that language, in our hearts,—with regard to countless other treasures, which the mercy of God has still spared to us in the very midst of our spiritual poverty, and

⁷ Canon 139.

⁸ Art. XX.

especially with regard to our Church Synod,—I charge you, in the language of the Apostle: “*Be watchful, and strengthen the things which remain, that are ready to die.*”

Let us then, I say, strengthen the effect of our liturgical language by protesting solemnly against the attempt to make that language void by the pitiful expedient of declaring its meaning to be an open question;—let us strengthen the faith in the spiritual efficacy of Holy Baptism in our hearts by living nearer and closer to the realities of the inward spiritual life, and thus learning, by blessed experience, that the spiritual life is a thing of heaven, not dependent on the conflicting and fluctuating opinions of men,—let us strengthen our Church in her synodal action, by refusing to acquiesce in the decision of a tribunal which is incompetent to pronounce upon questions of faith, and by incessantly appealing to those in authority for the revival, and intervention in this case, of that Synodal Assembly of the Church which alone has or can have “*authority in controversies of faith.*”

There is another point of the Apostolic admonition to the Church in Sardis, which we shall do well to note, as particularly applicable to our present case: “*Remember how thou hast received, and heard, and hold fast, and repent.*” The truth of which our Church is at this moment in danger of being robbed by the indirect denial of it, which lurks insidiously under the proposal to make it an open question, is not an invention of our

own time ; it is not a conclusion of yesterday, the result of a progressive investigation of the sense of Holy Scripture ;—it is a truth which we have “ *received and heard,*” which has been handed down to us from the remotest antiquity, which comes to us endorsed by the Catholic consent of ages. From the inspired language of the Apostle St. Paul, who describes Baptism as the “ *laver of regeneration* ⁹,” down to the language of our Church in the latest corporate expression of her doctrine, in her public formularies,—not merely in her public Offices, but in her doctrinal formularies, her Articles and her Catechism,—there is an uninterrupted chain of testimony to the great Catholic truth, that regeneration, the begetting in us of a new nature, after the likeness, and of the substance, of CHRIST, is as certainly the inward spiritual grace of the Sacrament of Baptism—wherever there is not, in the person receiving Baptism, an individual hindrance to the operation of Divine grace—as the Communion of the Body and Blood of CHRIST is the inward and spiritual grace of the Sacrament of the LORD’S Supper.

To adduce the individual proofs which might be quoted in attestation of the constancy of this doctrine in the Church, would be an endless task, for which this is neither the place nor the time. For our present purpose it is abundantly sufficient that we should be enabled in the first place clearly to trace, as we have done, the connexion between the use of water and the grace of regeneration in Holy Baptism, in the language

⁹ Titus iii. 5.

of our blessed LORD Himself, and in the Apostolic writings; and that we should find the same connexion distinctly set forth, as it is, in our Articles and Catechism, as well as in the language of our Baptismal Office. To the latter ample reference has already been made. As regards our Articles, nothing can be plainer than that our Church, after declaring both the Sacraments to be “not only badges or tokens of Christian men’s profession, but rather certain *sure witnesses*, and *effectual signs* of grace,”—“by the which GOD *doth work invisibly in us* ¹,” our Church goes on to define more particularly the Sacrament of Baptism as the “sign of our regeneration or new birth ²,” whence it inevitably follows, according to the teaching of our Church, that Baptism is the “sure witness” or “effectual sign” of the grace of “regeneration or a new birth;” and that by Baptism “GOD doth work invisibly in us” that “regeneration or new birth;”—a view which not only results from the fair and obvious construction of the two Articles, the XXVth and XXVIIth, taken together, but receives further confirmation from the singular circumstance that in the IXth Article the Latin word which signifies “regenerated” (*renatus*), is rendered in the English Articles by the term “baptized;” plainly showing, in spite of all that has been said to the contrary, that the framers of the Articles considered a baptized person to be, by the very fact of his Baptism, regenerated, and a regenerated person to have been brought into that blessed state by being baptized.

¹ Art. XXV.

² Art. XXVII.

The same doctrine is affirmed with the utmost clearness and simplicity in the Catechism, which defines Holy Baptism as consisting of two parts, the “outward and visible sign,” *i. e.* “water wherein the person is baptized in the name of the FATHER, and of the SON, and of the HOLY GHOST; and the inward and spiritual grace,” *i. e.* “a death unto sin, and a *new birth unto righteousness*,” with the explanatory addition, “for being by nature born in sin, and the children of wrath, we are hereby,” *i. e.* *by Baptism*, “made the children of grace.”

These doctrinal statements, coupled with the language of the Baptismal Office itself, on which we have already dwelt, and further with the language of the Office for Confirmation, in which the persons to be confirmed are described as those whom God has “vouchsafed to regenerate by water and the HOLY GHOST,” can leave no doubt as to the intention of our Church to affirm in the most distinct terms that ancient Catholic and Scriptural truth, that Baptism is the Sacrament, the “laver” of regeneration;—that the effect of baptism (if not actually frustrated by personal unfitness for the reception of it) is the spiritual regeneration of the person baptized; and that he who would obtain the grace of spiritual regeneration, must seek the same in and through the Sacrament of Baptism. And if it be clearly the intention of our Church to inculcate that doctrine, then, as we have already seen, no latitude of denial or evasion can be admitted, because, to admit that latitude, to treat the doctrine as an open question, is virtually to deny the doctrine.

If then, my Christian Brethren, this is what we have “*received and heard*,”—if this is what the Apostles “*received and heard*” from our Blessed LORD,—what the primitive Church “*received and heard*” from the Apostles,—what our own Reformed Branch of the Church Catholic “*received and heard*” from the Catholic Church of former ages, ascending even to primitive antiquity,—and what we ourselves have “*received and heard*” by the constant teaching of our own Church in her formularies,—it is clear that we are bound by the Apostolic admonition in our text; that solemn obligation rests upon us to “*Remember how we have received and heard, and to hold fast, and repent.*”

“*To hold fast, and to repent.*” To repent of the lukewarmness with which we ourselves perhaps have formerly regarded this as well as other truths of the Gospel,—to repent as a Church of the protracted silence of her authoritative voice, and of the too great uncertainty of the sound which for a long time past has proceeded from the living trumpet of her doctrine.

To “*repent*” of past sins of omission, and to evince the sincerity, the earnestness, of that repentance by “*holding fast that which we have received and heard*,” “*the things which*” we are on the very point of letting slip, which “*remain*” indeed, but are “*ready to die.*”

And this brings us to the great practical question, forced upon us by the position in which our Church is now placed. How, as a Church, can we “*hold fast*” the truth which is so seriously menaced? what can we,

as individuals, do to counteract the fatal effect which the decision pronounced by a State tribunal must have, not only upon the doctrine, but upon the very being of the Church, if acquiesced in by her ?

The difficulty of this question is immeasurably increased, the painfulness of our position unspeakably aggravated, by the fact, that not a few of those who ought to be the guides and examples of the Church in this great work of repentance and restoration to life and efficiency, are actually to be found countenancing the denial of that truth of which, by virtue of their office, they are the constituted guardians. The most distressing feature of the decision which has been pronounced upon the Church's doctrine by a State tribunal incompetent to adjudicate upon the question which it undertook to determine, is the deplorable fact, that the two highest Prelates of the Church acquiesced, not only in the assumed jurisdiction of the State tribunal in a matter of faith and doctrine, but in the non-natural and latitudinarian construction put by that tribunal upon the Church's formularies of faith and worship. The time, then, has arrived, when we are forced to ask ourselves, whether our deference for the venerable office of the Episcopate ought to be carried to the extent of sacrificing God's truth ; whether we are to consider ourselves bound to shape our faith in accordance with the personal opinions of this or that Prelate, when those opinions run counter to Holy Scripture, to the consent of the Catholic Church in all ages, and to the authoritative teaching of our Reformed Branch of the Catholic Church. It is a sore trial, my

Christian Brethren,—a sore trial especially to those who desire to be ever mindful of the Divine origin of the Church, and of all her ordinances, offices, and ministrations,—to feel ourselves constrained to protest against the countenance given to unsound, to latitudinarian, to heretical opinions in high places, even in the high places of the Church herself. Yet even this trial, sore as it is, is not to be to us a matter of marvel, or a ground of hesitation. It is the common trial of all the critical periods of the Church, of the periods in which great events are preparing, of those periods especially, which precede some mighty change in the aspect of God's dispensations. There is a singular analogy, in this respect, between the history of the Jewish Church and that of the Christian Church, which it will not be either uninteresting or unedifying for us to take account of at the present juncture.

At the first establishment of the Jewish Church, her constitution was purely theocratic; the LORD GOD was her King; she knew of no other. This was succeeded by the establishment of an earthly Royalty over God's people, which, being of the same faith with the Church, was permitted to exercise a Supremacy over her. Under this form of Government the Church continued for several centuries, and experienced many vicissitudes of fortune, owing mainly to the deterioration of the character of the Church herself, involved with the Monarchy in sin and unfaithfulness. The result was, that the Jewish Church and nation was visited with one sore judgment after another; in the

Church the voice of prophecy became gradually extinct, and in the State the legitimate Monarchy was supplanted by an alien rule, which had no sympathy with the Church, and no fellowship with her faith. While under this alien domination, it was that the awful spectacle was presented of the great body of the Priesthood, with the High Priests at their head, opposing themselves against the truth of GOD, and betraying the LORD of glory into the hands of a heathen Governor.

On comparing with this outline the fortunes of the Christian Church, we shall find that there is a marvellous resemblance between the two. During the first three centuries of her existence, the Christian Church was a pure theocracy. No supremacy over her was then known, but that of CHRIST and of His Vicegerent upon earth, GOD the HOLY GHOST. Presently the time arrived, when the Church saw fit to place herself in subordination to the civil magistrate, when she became a State Church, when the Princes of the earth, being of the same faith with her, obtained a share in the administration of her affairs. From this time forward, the Church became involved in much sin and error, through her connexion with the State, the civil power exercising over her a pernicious and corrupting influence. Hence the progressive adulteration of the faith during the middle ages, and the introduction into the Church of numberless abuses, which not only undermined her spiritual influence upon the minds of men, but greatly impaired her inward spiritual strength. Many and various were the chastisements which for these corruptions of His truth and ordinance GOD in-

flicted from time to time upon the Church, and upon the nations of Christendom. At an early period the Church was rent asunder by a great schism, as the kingdom of Israel had been after the death of its third King,—some Churches perished altogether from the face of the earth, while others fell into captivity to infidel powers, and others again preserved their outward existence in a state of spiritual death. Pursuing the course of events further, as regards the history of our own Branch of the Church Catholic, godly Princes arose from time to time, who, like Hezekiah, like Josiah of old, set themselves earnestly to reform the Church, and to restore the purity of her worship,—while other Princes gave countenance to idolatry, and by their example encouraged wickedness of every kind. At last a decisive step was taken for giving to the idolatry of Rome,—which is to the religion of the Reformed Catholic Church, what in Israel the worship of Baal was to the worship of JEHOVAH,—a legal standing in the land, and a share in its legislation and government; and this was soon followed by the fall—not nominally, but virtually,—of the Regal power. The Monarchy was brought into captivity under the Democracy, which recognizes no Divine ordinance either in Church or State; and the many-headed despot, himself without creed or faith, has lost no time in setting his heel upon the Church of God. As in Israel of old the Roman power interfered with the office of the High Priesthood, claiming a supreme right of appointment to it; so the Democracy, represented by the political Ministry, has claimed and enforced an

absolute right of appointment to the Episcopal office, denying the Church's right to institute any inquiry whatever into the fitness of its nominees;—and it is a remarkable feature in the aspect of the whole case, that he who now occupies the most exalted station in our Church—of whom personally I should be sorry to say aught unkind or disrespectful—was raised to the Chief Office at the moment when this right of the Church was actually in dispute between the Church and the State, and entered upon his high and responsible functions, under at least an implied understanding that he would waive the Church's right, and so lend a helping hand in rivetting her chains. The same hand is now again put forth to assist in the attempt to override a Bishop of the Church,—through the unlawful intrusion into the province of faith, of the secular power, the power, let it be remembered, as it now virtually is, of a creedless Democracy,—in the exercise of his unquestionable duty to refuse institution to a Presbyterian whom he has, in the exercise of his spiritual authority, found and pronounced unsound in the faith,—in the attempt to force upon the Church at large a latitudinarian interpretation of her doctrine, which amounts to a denial of one of the most vital verities of the faith.

In order, however, fully to appreciate the nature of the position in which the Church is placed, we must revert for a moment to the consideration of the truth, upon the maintenance of which on the one side, and its denial on the other, the point at issue between the Church and the State has been raised.

Ever since the glorious Gospel has imparted unto mankind a knowledge of God's purpose for their salvation in CHRIST JESUS; and, as a necessary part of that knowledge, a knowledge of the deep mystery of His own Triune existence, it has been Satan's constant endeavour, while permitting the outward framework of the Church, and the outward letter of the Gospel to stand, to nullify at the same time the benefit of CHRIST'S Word and Ordinance to mankind, by darkening and subverting men's faith in the spiritual realities, of which the one is the record, and the other the channel. Now it is very remarkable to observe the singular correspondence between the course which Satan pursued for this purpose in the early ages of the Church, and the course he is now pursuing in these her latter,—and, to all appearance, her last—days; his present mode of attack being an attempt to subvert the belief of men in the subjective truth of those same verities and mysteries of our faith, the objective truth of which he endeavoured, though in vain, to overthrow in the first ages; only with this difference,—that he has inverted the order of his attack. The first sharp blow which Satan aimed at the Church's faith, was directed against the Divinity of our Blessed LORD,—the second great blow, against the Godhead and Personality of the HOLY GHOST. To destroy men's faith in either of these great verities, was to overthrow the Gospel of CHRIST; it might continue in name and in sound, but its inner spiritual life and reality was gone, if he had succeeded. By the mercy of God,—by His protection stretched out over His Church, Satan was then defeated; and in

the Catholic Creeds those two great verities were enunciated with a distinctness of assertion which precluded all hope of their objective truth being successfully called in question.

Many have since been the devices of Satan to rob men of the treasure of GOD'S Light and Life, in the face of these great verities, attested by Catholic consent to the Church, and by the Church, of every successive age. He now knows that the end is at hand, that his time is short ; and accordingly he assails the Church with increased fierceness and subtilty. He again assails—only inverting the order of the attack—those two cardinal verities ; but he assails them now, not in the public confession of the Church, but in the individual consciousness of her members. He has no objection, since he cannot hinder it, that the Church as a body should confess the Godhead and Personality of the HOLY GHOST, provided he can make the individual member of the Church an unbeliever in the personal presence and indwelling of the HOLY GHOST ; he has no objection, since he cannot hinder it, that the Church as a body should confess the incarnation of the SON of GOD and the Godhead of CHRIST, provided he can make the individual member of the Church an unbeliever in his own regeneration, in his own personal fellowship of the Divine Nature. And observe, again, the subtle course which Satan takes to beget this personal, subjective unbelief touching the HOLY GHOST indwelling, touching CHRIST begotten, in us. As the assaults upon the objective faith in the Godhead and Personality of the HOLY GHOST and the Divinity of CHRIST were made under pretence of reverence for the

person of the Deity, so are the present assaults made under cover of like reverence for the grace of God in the heart of man. Satan persuades men that it is contrary to that deep and reverent estimation which they ought to have for Divine grace, to view that grace as tied to certain outward ordinances; he teaches men to despise the ordinances appointed by God for the conveyance of the gift of the HOLY GHOST, for the conveyance of the gift of Regeneration; that being the surest method to rob them of those gifts, and to make the saving grace of God of none effect to their souls. Long and too successfully has he discredited the belief in the reality of the gifts and graces of the HOLY GHOST, both personal and ministerial, as conveyed by the Apostolic ordinance of the imposition of hands with prayer. He cared not if men believed in the Godhead and Personality of the HOLY GHOST, and in His influence upon the Church and her members, in the abstract; his purpose was answered, if he could make the belief in the bestowal of the gift of the HOLY GHOST upon each individual member and Minister of the Church, at a particular time, by a special operation of God, connected with His own ordinance, an open question. And what Satan has already accomplished to an extent which it is fearful to contemplate, in regard to the ordinance and the gift of the HOLY GHOST, he is now striving to accomplish in regard to the Sacrament and the gift of Regeneration. He cares not if men have a belief in the union of the Divine with the human nature in CHRIST, and in a regeneration of man into the likeness and fellowship of CHRIST, in the abstract; his purpose

is answered, if he can make the belief in the bestowal of the gift of Regeneration in the act of Baptism, by a special operation of GOD, connected with His own ordinance, an open question. He is willing that CHRIST and the HOLY GHOST should be confessed in the Church, provided he can throw indistinctness, uncertainty, and doubt upon the HOLY GHOST indwelling, upon CHRIST begotten, in the individual soul. Such is Satan's device; this the real object of the present controversy and conflict touching the doctrine of Baptismal Regeneration.

What we are asked therefore by Satan to do at this moment, is no less than this,—to surrender our subjective, our personal faith in the reality of CHRIST's work in the soul of man,—to surrender it at the bidding of a creedless Democracy, which has possessed itself of the civil power of the State, and is determined to use that power in the service of Satan for the oppression, and, if it were possible, the destruction of the Church of GOD.

Is it likely, my Christian Brethren, that at such a time CHRIST makes no call upon us? And if it is certain that He does call upon us to stand by Him, to fight under His banner, to contend for His truth,—what is to be the mode and manner of our warfare?

There are those, Brethren, who are urging upon the Church evil counsels in this her hour of trial and perplexity. There are those who invite her members to desert from her standard altogether, to enlist themselves under the banner of Rome, or under the banner of Geneva. GOD forbid that I should give

you such counsel, or set you such an example. But there are others, who, without going the length of such extreme treachery, are nevertheless urging dangerous counsels. Some clamour for a separation of the Church from the State; others call for a secession within the Church herself. Again I say, God forbid that I should counsel you, or that I myself should lend a helping hand, to either of those pernicious courses. If there is to be a separation between Church and State, it must be the act of the State, repudiating connexion with a faithful Church, who will not surrender God's truth to the will of the Democracy. If there is to be a breach of communion within the Church, it must be by a faithless Church casting out her faithful witnesses; patient endurance of such persecution must be their only strength, the Word of God, firmly and fearlessly declared and maintained, their only weapon of defence. To raise the standard of sedition in the State, or of schism in the Church, is not one of the fruits of the HOLY SPIRIT of God,—it is the fruit of the unchastened, the turbulent spirit of man. Let us beware, Brethren, lest we yield to the temptation of following our own spirit, while fancying ourselves led by the SPIRIT of God. If we be truly led by the SPIRIT, our position is exceedingly simple, our course of action perfectly clear.

The enemies of God's truth,—both its declared enemies and its, no doubt, in many instances, unconscious adversaries,—have on their side the arm of flesh, the power of the world;—we have on our side the power of the SPIRIT. As they trust to their strength, so let us trust to ours.

Let us bear witness to the truth ; let us,—without bitterness, without clamour,—but without fear, without compromise, without any abatement,—declare, that to pronounce the doctrine of Baptismal Regeneration an open question, is to deny the doctrine of Baptismal Regeneration ; that to deny the doctrine of Baptismal Regeneration, is heresy ; because it is the subversion of the nature of a Sacrament, by putting asunder its two essential parts, which CHRIST has joined together,—the outward and visible sign, and the inward and spiritual grace ; it is the denial of the work of CHRIST in CHRIST's own appointed way in the soul of man. Let us, upon every fitting occasion,—and occasions will not be wanting to any of us,—declare this plainly and fearlessly, undismayed by the array of great names and of high offices, whose weight is invoked in the hearing of the undiscerning multitude, for the purpose of overpowering the truth,—undismayed by any exercise of worldly power which the enemies of the truth may bring to bear against us. They may, if it so please GOD, crush those who bear witness to the truth ;—they never can crush the truth itself. Against GOD's Church, and against His truth, we have CHRIST's promise that the gates of Hell shall not prevail.

With the help of GOD, my Christian Brethren, I have now done my part, as far as the present exigency requires it, to guard you against the adoption of rash and false measures, and to show you what your allegiance to CHRIST requires of you in this emergency. Whether this counsel, urged by others in their places, shall prevail in the Church at large,—whether, under

the influence of that counsel, the Church shall be recalled to watchfulness, to repentance, to fidelity in maintaining God's truth against Satan's device,—or whether the canker of unfaithfulness has eaten too deep into the vitals of our Church to admit of her recovery, whether this once enlightened and glorious Church of England be doomed to extinction, as was the Church of Israel of old, as was the Church in Sardis,—rests with Him Who “worketh all things after the counsel of His own will.” To Him, in humble and fervent prayer, let us commit the cause of our Church,—to Him, in humble and fervent prayer, let us commit the keeping of our own souls, that in the general unfaithfulness we may not be found unfaithful,—that we may be enabled ourselves to remember, and, as much as in us lies, to put the Church in mind of, the Apostolic warning: “*Be watchful, and strengthen the things which remain, that are ready to die: for I have not found thy works perfect before God. Remember therefore how thou hast received and heard, and hold fast, and repent. If therefore thou shalt not watch, I will come on thee as a thief, and thou shalt not know what hour I will come upon thee.*”

Now unto Him that is able to keep us from falling, and to present us faultless before the presence of His glory with exceeding joy, to the only wise God our Saviour, be glory and majesty, dominion and power, both now and ever. *Amen.*

THE END.

THE APPELLATE JURISDICTION OF THE CROWN
IN MATTERS SPIRITUAL.

24

A L E T T E R

TO THE RIGHT REVEREND

ASHURST-TURNER,
LORD BISHOP OF CHICHESTER.

BY

HENRY EDWARD MANNING, M.A.,
ARCHDEACON OF CHICHESTER.

LONDON:

JOHN MURRAY, ALBEMARLE STREET,
AND W. H. MASON, CHICHESTER.

1850.

PRINTED BY W. CLOWES AND SONS, STAMFORD STREET.

A L E T T E R,

§c. §c.

MY LORD BISHOP,

THE kindness which, for so many years, I have received at your hands assures me that I shall obtain your Lordship's permission to lay before you the convictions to which I have been irresistibly impelled by the late appeal and by the judgment of the Crown in the case of Gorham *versus* the Lord Bishop of Exeter.

That I may do so with clearness and accuracy, it will be necessary to state in the fewest words I can, first, the principles on which we believe the Church of England, as a portion of the Universal Church, to be founded; and next, the facts which have been established in the course of the late proceedings. I will then endeavour to show, that essential principles of the Church have been thereby contravened.

I conceive, then, that the duty of submission to the Spiritual Jurisdiction of the English Church is founded upon the following principles:—

1. It is an article of our Baptismal Faith, that the Church of Christ is a Divine Kingdom ; in this world, but not of it ; governed by its Divine Head through the Pastors whom He has lineally commissioned to feed His flock ; that to His Church He entrusted the custody of the Faith and Holy Sacraments ; or, as we say, of doctrine and discipline—with full spiritual power to administer and to rule in all things pertaining to the salvation of souls, by His authority and in His Name. For the perpetuity of the Church, and for the preservation of the Truth, He has pledged His own perpetual presence and the guidance of the Holy Spirit.

From all which revealed promises and principles of His divine kingdom, it follows that the Church, in all things relating to the custody of doctrine and discipline, possesses a sole, supreme, and final power, under the guidance of its Divine Head, and responsible to Him only.

2. And, further, we believe that the Church in England, as a member or province of this divine kingdom, possesses, "*in solidum,*" by inherence and participation in the whole Church, the inheritance of the Divine Tradition of Faith, with a share in this full and supreme custody of doctrine, and power of discipline, partaking for support and perpetuity, in its measure and sphere, the same guidance as the whole Church at large, of which, by our Baptism, we have been made members.

3. The Church in England, then, being thus an integral whole, possesses within itself the fountain of doctrine and discipline, and has no need to go beyond itself for succession, orders, mission, jurisdiction, and the office to declare to its own members, in matters of Faith, the intention of the Catholic Church. On this ground alone the present relation of the Church in England to the Church of the East and of the West can be justified. We trust that the spiritual organization of the Church, which, through Saxon, Norman, and English periods of our history, has united this great christian people, surviving through all perils and mutilations, contains still within itself the whole doctrine and discipline, the Faith and Power descending from its Divine Head.

So far from exalting the insular position of the Church in England into a normal state, we lament the unhappy suspension of communion which divides the visible Church of Christ. But we trust that as, in the period of the great Western schism, the Churches of Spain, France, Germany, and many others were compelled to fall back within their own limits, and to rest upon the full and integral power which by succession they possessed for their own internal government; so the Church in England has continued to be a perfect member of this Divine Kingdom, endowed with all that is of necessity to the valid ministry of the Faith and Sacraments of Christ.

On these grounds our chief writers and canonists

have rested the defence of the English Church, and it is of vital necessity that the principles of this defence should not be violated.

4. By this we see at once what is the office and relation of the Civil Power towards the Church at large, and in England in particular, namely, to protect, uphold, confirm, and further this, its sole, supreme, and final office, in all matters of doctrine and discipline. The joint but independent action of the spiritual and civil powers from our earliest history may be traced through the succession of our Councils and Parliaments—the King expressing and exercising the sum of the Civil power, the Archbishop of the Spiritual;* of which joint action the celebrated preamble of the 24th of Henry VIII., 12, is a recital and proof.

5. The Royal Supremacy is, therefore, strictly and simply a civil or temporal power over all persons and causes in temporal things, and over Ecclesiastical persons and causes in the temporal and civil accidents attaching to them. It is in itself, in no sense, spiritual or ecclesiastical—understanding the word ecclesiastical to mean anything beyond a *civil* power accidentally applied to ecclesiastical persons or causes.

To make this as clear as I can, I would further add, that I know of no supremacy in ecclesiastical matters inherent in the civil power or prince, but either (1.) such power as all princes, Christian or

* Stillingfleet, Ecclesiastical Cases, vol. ii., p. 91.

heathen, alike possess; or, (2) such as has been received by delegation from the Church itself.

As to the first or original prerogative, Constantine, before his conversion, had as full a supremacy as after it; Julian, after his apostacy, had no less.* The supremacy was simply a supreme dominion of power and coercion by the civil sword.

As to the derived or delegated supremacy, it amounts to no more than a supreme power over all the forms and processes in which the *coercive* jurisdiction of the Church in christian states has been clothed. It is neither legislative, nor judicial by way of discretion or determination† in any matter relating to the faith or discipline of the Church.

It may be well here to set down, once for all, the points respecting the Royal Supremacy, on which, as far as I am aware, no question need be raised.

It is not doubted—

1. That Princes have power to make laws touching morals and religion.

2. That they may deal with the temporal possessions of the Church so far as property is a creature of civil society.

3. That they may give or withhold the coercive power of the Civil Sword in matters of Ecclesiastical order.

* “Qui Augusto imperium dedit ipse et Neroui qui Constantino Christiano ipse Apostatæ Juliano.”—S. Aug. de Civit. Dei, lib. v., c. 21.

† Beveridge, *Synodicon, Prolegomena*, tom. i., p. 11. “Leges Civiles non præcedere debent sed sequi Ecclesiasticas.”

4. That they may, under the provisions of Ecclesiastical laws, keep Ecclesiastical Judges within the limits of their proper rule and jurisdictions, and protect the civil state from excesses and abuse of power.

The Royal Supremacy, therefore, in its widest constitutional sense, is Legislative, Executive, and Judicial.

1. The Legislative Supremacy of the Crown is not a personal prerogative, but a joint power in all things temporal with the great Council of the nation, and in matters spiritual with the Church, to which belongs, by the Divine order, the sole power of initiating and determining all matters spiritual before they assume the form of Statute Law. On this we have now no question.

2. The Executive Supremacy extends over the whole *coercive* application of law, both ecclesiastical and temporal. The Church has no *coercive* power by way of force over persons or property, except from the State. Neither is there any question on this point.

3. The Judicial Supremacy, or the power of deciding in what cases and in what measure the coercion of law shall be applied, is vested wholly in the Crown, yet so that it cannot exercise its judicial functions except through the channels appointed by the law—in Temporal things by Temporal Courts, in Spiritual by Spiritual Courts. So far all is clear and undisputed.

Now this Judicial power in Ecclesiastical causes

has been also claimed for the Crown in two other ways; namely, in the first instance by immediate jurisdiction, and by appeal in the last resort.

In this then we come to the only point disputed in the present subject. And we will here take up the well-known Cawdrey case.

The object of Lord Coke's argument was to show, "That our ancient law doth give to the King a power, by virtue of his Ecclesiastical Jurisdiction, to appoint Commissioners by an extraordinary way of Jurisdiction, to proceed, *in primâ instantiâ*, against persons by Ecclesiastical censures."* Bishop Stillingfleet, in an elaborate examination, has demonstrated that, of the proofs offered by Lord Coke, "there is not one instance that is sufficient, or that comes up to the point." But that we may clear the way for the other branch of the question, namely the appeal in the last resort, I will offer a summary of those proofs.

The precedents put forward by Lord Coke are as follows:—

1. Kenulphus, King of Mercia, granted an exemption from the Temporal Jurisdiction or *Service* of the Bishop.†

* Cawdrey's case. Stillingfleet's Ecclesiastical Cases, vol. ii. p. 85; Gibson's Codex, vol. i., p. 44, Note K.

† "Ego Cœnuulf Rex Merciorum has *terras* liberabo ab omni *servitute* magnâ, vel modicâ *regum, principum, episcoporum, &c.*"—Codex Diplomat. Anglo-Saxonum, tom. i., ccviii., London, 1839.

2. Edward the Confessor claimed power to *rule and govern* the Kingdom and Holy Church as Vicar of the Highest King.*

3. William the Conqueror made appropriation of Churches.

4. Henry I. gave a Charter with privileges as to Ecclesiastical property to the Abbey of Reading.

5. Henry III. made prohibition where the Ecclesiastical Courts had no cognizance, as in bastardy, marriage, &c.

6. Edward I. condemned a subject in *præmunire* for bringing in a Bull. prejudicial to his crown and dignity.

Parliament set aside a Papal provision upon a benefice: it also restrained benefit of Clergy, and the granting of benefices by the Pope.

7. Edward II. by statute regulated the proceedings between the Civil and Ecclesiastical Courts.

8. Edward III. upheld an excommunication of the Archbishop against the Pope; because the excom-

* This is simply irrelevant: it is an assertion only of the Imperial sovereignty of the Anglo-Saxon Empire.—Sir F. Palgrave's History of the English Commonwealth, vol. i., pp. 562-569. The 15th of the Ecclesiastical laws of St. Edward Confessor is as follows: "Quid sit regis officium," &c. "Rex autem, qui vicarius summi Regis est, ad hoc est constitutus, ut regnum *terrenum*, et populum Domini, et super omnia sanctam veneretur Ecclesiam ejus et regat, et ab injuriis *defendat*, et maleficos ab ea *evellat et destruat* et peuitus *disperdat*." Also in the 2nd: "et sic erunt duo gladii et gladius gladium juvabit," *i. e.* "the Civil Sword."—Wilkins, Concil., tom. i., pp. 311, 212.

munication of the former carried civil consequences, and was more “evident in law.”*

He regulated the exercise of patronage.

He gave exemptions from jurisdiction of the Ordinary, but in virtue of a commission from the Pope.†

He claimed extra parochial tithes.

He, in Parliament, made Statutes of Provisors for the civil protection of the realm.

9. Richard II., in Parliament, renewed the Statute of Provisors.

10. Henry IV., by Statute, declared that the Pope’s Collector had no jurisdiction against the Archbishops and Bishops of the realm.

He also, by Statute, added coercive power to the jurisdiction of the Bishops in matters of heresy.

Parliament declared that the Pope cannot alter the laws of England; that his excommunication has no force; no excommunication being known in Eng-

* Excommunication is here regarded only *in foro exteriori*—as a public civil disability, followed by arrest, imprisonment, banishment from society, and the like; and not in its internal and spiritual element, which was never subject to temporal law. The refusal of sacraments, especially that of Penance, was strictly reserved to the Church.

“The laws of Austria forbid the infliction of any *external* penance without the permission of the Provincial Government.”—Rechberger, *Enchiridion Juris Eccl. Austr.*, § 128, p. 117.

† Stillingfleet’s *Ecclesiastical Cases*, vol. ii., p. 120, under a Bull of Innocent III.

land but by process of Court held by the Bishops and Archbishops.

11. Henry V. in Parliament renewed the Statute of Provisors; further penal Statutes against heresy; and gave to the Ordinaries power to inquire into hospitals of the King's foundation.

12. Henry VI. in Parliament declared that the Pope's excommunication did not "disable any man within England;" that the King only may found a Spiritual *incorporation*, i. e., *in law*.

12. Edward IV. in Parliament denied to the Pope power to grant sanctuary in these realms.

The King's Bench said that a Spiritual person suing to Rome for a matter Spiritual, in which he might have remedy before his Ordinary, incurs *præmunire*.

A Legate was stopped at Calais till he had taken an oath to "attempt nothing against the King or his Crown."

13. Richard III. The Judges resolved that excommunication in the Court of Rome should not bind any man "*at the common law*."

14. Henry VII. in Parliament gave new coercive power to Ordinaries to punish immoralities in Clerks "by ward and prison."

I am not aware that I have omitted a single precedent of this celebrated case. If I have passed over any instances, it is because they are no more than

examples of the same kind. It will be found, I believe, that the whole legal and moral force of the precedents has been amply given. And to what do they amount?

To a supreme civil power—

1. Over all the *coercive* jurisdiction of the Church, so far as it is coercive, temporal, or penal.
2. Over all beneficiary matters, such as appropriations, patronage, and the like.
3. Over all the civil effects of Ecclesiastical censures.

Surely no more abundant proof can be desired than is afforded by this copious and multifarious argument, that the Royal Supremacy by its ancient jurisdiction never either possessed or claimed such further powers as were annexed to it for the first time by the 24th Henry VIII., c. 12; 25th Henry VIII., c. 19; 26th Henry VIII., c. 1.* The learned author has ransacked Histories, Chronicles, Rolls, Statutes of Parliament,

* Archbishop Bramhall, one of the foremost vindicators of “the ancient jurisdiction” of the Crown, proves the same point. He sums up as follows the subject matters of the Legislative Supremacy:—“Benefices, tithes, advowsons, lands given in mortmain, prohibitions, consultations, præmunires, quare impedit, privilege of clergy, extortions of ecclesiastical courts or officers, and regulating their due fees, wages of priests, mortmains, sanctuaries, appropriations, and in sum over all things which did belong to the *external subsistence, regiment, and regulating of the Church.*”—Just Vindication of the Church of England, Works, folio, p. 73.

Records of Courts at Westminster—no corner of his legal erudition was left unsearched for anything which in name, sound, or appearance might make for the Royal Supremacy—and yet not one instance, or anything approaching to an instance, of any inherent Ecclesiastical Jurisdiction, such as that first given by 26 Henry VIII., c. 1, and afterwards by 1 Eliz., c. 1. 17, 18, has he been able to bring. And as there is no precedent of the power for which he was then contending, so neither is there any trace of the Appellate Jurisdiction now in dispute, over all causes howsoever purely spiritual, such as soundness in doctrine, or fitness for mission to cure of souls.

The power for which Lord Coke contended, after hardly a century of existence, has been long ago formally abolished by 16 Car. I. c. 11. So far we have already returned to the limits of the ancient jurisdiction. Setting apart for the present the administrative office claimed for the Crown, to which our present subject has no reference, and confining ourselves to the judicial character of the Crown in Ecclesiastical matters, there now remains between the Royal Supremacy as known to the Common Law of England before Henry VIII., and the Royal Supremacy as known to the Statute Law since that date, the difference of this Appellate Jurisdiction annexed by the two Statutes the 24th and 25th of Henry VIII., revived by the 1st of Elizabeth.

And between this Appellate Jurisdiction annexed

to the Crown by modern statutes and the ancient jurisdiction, there is, I conceive, this one, but vital, difference—that the ancient had cognizance only of the form and procedure of the Ecclesiastical Judge; the modern assumes also to re-open and to decide upon the internal state and merits of the principal cause.

We have seen then, that the claim in behalf of the Crown to proceed in the first instance by Ecclesiastical censures cannot be justified by any precedent in our law or history; and the whole of this immediate jurisdiction has been formally abolished by Act of Parliament, from which it derived also its first existence.

We will now proceed to the other branch of jurisdiction annexed by Statute, namely, the power of receiving appeals from Ecclesiastical Judges.

There is no question that in England, as in all christian kingdoms, the Crown possessed a power to keep all Ecclesiastical Judges within the limits of their own rules and jurisdictions. The principle of the “*Appellatio tanquam ab abusu*” is universal in the Canon Law.

But in this process the Civil Judge has cognizance only of the *form* and *procedure* of the Ecclesiastical causes, and never of the *merits* or *internal state* of the matter itself. In proof of this I would refer to the works of any Canonist in existence. On a question so broad and self-evident, it matters not from what country or age we select. Let us take one passage as

a sample of the universal Canon Law of Christendom in this particular:—"The only aim and end of this recourse to the Royal protection is to repel violence, and to bring back the Ecclesiastical Judge to the path of justice and his legitimate limits." "The King's Judge may by no means take cognizance of the principal cause, but only of the form and order of the proceeding, whether there has been force, violence, or oppression: that is, he inquires only whether the Ecclesiastical Judge, as a question of fact, has proceeded by the right order of law. If he shall find that the order of law has been observed, he shall remit the appellant to his proper judge. But if he shall perceive, as a question of fact, that such order was not observed, he gives relief to the party oppressed, and reduces the Ecclesiastical Judge to the path of justice and the course of law; deciding nothing as to the principal cause, which is left untouched, to be judged, according to the order of law, by the Ecclesiastical Judge." "He will by no means inquire or decide whether a clerk deserved to be visited by censure, or whether there was a cause sufficient for the infliction of so grave a punishment, which points belong to the principal cause; but he will examine only whether the censure was passed by a Judge having jurisdiction in the Ecclesiastical Court, or by a Judge foreign to it; or without preparatory information, canonical citation, monition, &c.; which things, as we say in law, are questions of fact." "From this it is

clear that the King's Judge by no means usurps any Ecclesiastical jurisdiction."*

Now I will forbear to multiply quotations: I will only add that such is a true and exact statement of the law of appeals as it has existed throughout the states of Christendom from the earliest ages of the Canon Law until this day.† It exists at this very moment in Austria, France, Spain, &c. and all European kingdoms in which the Church is known.‡

* Van Espen, *Tractatus de Recursu ad Principem*, cap. iii. 7., tom. iv. 310.

† "Eximiâ profecto auctoritate potiti sunt Imperatores Romani in rebus et judiciis ecclesiasticis, sed nullum, ut existimo, proferri potest exemplum judicii canonici ab uno Episcopo redditi, de quo statim recta via querela delata fuerit ad Principem. De *judicio canonico* loquor, in quo *de fide, de ritibus, de que disciplina cleri* et de *quæstione canonica* ageretur, non autem de cæteris litibus adversus clericos nectis. De judiciis synodorum tantum appellationi non obnoxiiis damnati conquerebantur aliquando apud principes. Illi judices ecclesiasticos dabant: nunquam autem *de re canonicâ* cognitionem suscipiebant, sed *de ordine judiciorum*."—De Marca de Concord. Sacerd. et Imp., lib. iv., c. 4, 8.

‡ "If the question merely turns on Ecclesiastical rights, recourse to the Sovereign is then only allowable in so far as the Ecclesiastical Judge, proceeding to violence and overstepping the bounds of right, is understood to have injured the appellant; in which case it is the province of the Civil Judge, who is in no wise to touch upon *the internal state* (as they are accustomed to call it) or *merits* of the cause, but merely to compel the Ecclesiastical Judge to observe that order of proceeding which is prescribed by the laws."—Rechberger, *Enchirid. Juris Eccl. Austriaci, Recursus ad Principem*. See Report from the Select

In England, before the reign of Henry VIII., this protective power of the State was exercised by prohibitions issued from the Temporal to the Spiritual Courts; and the subject-matter of these prohibitions was the class of mixed questions, partly temporal and partly spiritual. The point to be decided was not the merit of any given cause, but whether it were of a spiritual or temporal kind, and therefore to which jurisdiction it belonged, *i. e.* which was the “forum competens” to entertain it.* The Spiritual Courts would as soon have ventured to claim jurisdiction in a case of *laesa Majestas*, as the Temporal of a case of doctrine, or mission to Cure of Souls.

I believe, therefore, it may be shown that the appellate jurisdiction, in this point, is not only at variance with the office of the Church, but is also new even in its principle and form.

Nothing, then, is here denied to the Royal Supremacy which was lawfully contained in its “ancient jurisdiction.” What is denied is—

1. That Princes have, or can have, any inherent

Committee of the House of Commons on the Regulation of Roman Catholic Subjects in Foreign Countries, June 25, 1816, Appendix I. “Sacerdos qui auxilio brachii secularis capit possessionem beneficii incurrit excommunicationem.”—Ferraris, *Bibliotheca Canon. Recursus*.

* Blackstone’s Commentaries, vol. iii. 112. Ayliffe’s Parergon, vol. ii., 434, &c.

spiritual authority, or become fountains of spiritual jurisdiction, so far as it is spiritual.

2. That they may exercise a directive or legislative power in matters purely spiritual.

3. That they may re-hear and review with a power of discretion and determination the judicial sentences of the Church in matters purely spiritual.

Now it is declared by Lord Coke that the 1st Statute of Queen Elizabeth “was not introductory of a new law, but declaratory of the old.”* And in the Injunctions of Queen Elizabeth in the first year of her reign, it is expressly declared that “the Queen neither doth nor will challenge any authority but such as was of ancient time due to the Imperial Crown of this Realm.”† The question then for our present purpose is narrowed to a single point, namely, whether the Imperial Crown of this Realm possessed among its inherent prerogatives the ancient jurisdiction of receiving Appeals in matters of doctrine. It is for those who affirm that the ancient jurisdiction of the Crown extended to matters of doctrine to produce their evidence. Let them bring the proof, and I will frankly and openly acknowledge myself to be in error. Until, however, the proof shall be produced, I must believe that the rehearing in appeal of a question of doctrinal interpretation was, and is, beyond the “ancient jurisdiction” of the Royal

* Lord Coke’s Reports, Cawdrey’s case.

† Injunctions given by the Queen’s Majesty, &c., A.D. 1559.

Supremacy. Of this assertion the Divine office of the Church, the universal canon law of Christendom, the practice of all Christian kingdoms in all ages, the manifest practice of these realms in particular, are sufficient evidence.

Let me then sum up briefly what I conceive to be the Royal Supremacy known to the Common law of England:—

1. It is a supreme civil power, independent and exclusive of all foreign or external Superior beyond these Realms.

2. It is a supreme civil power over all persons and all causes within these Realms.

In the former sense it excludes all earthly Superior, of whom the Crown may be supposed to be held. In the latter it subjects all persons, without *exemption from tribunals or from laws*, to the Imperial law of the land.

This Imperial law is a mixed law, partly spiritual and partly civil; and the Royal Supremacy is conservative and executive of that one law in both its kinds.

But in the subject matter of this law there is a primitive and essential difference. The subject matter of civil law, as well as the form and manner of its administration, is subject to the civil power, to be moulded, varied, and applied at its legislative and judicial discretion.

The subject matter of the spiritual law, as well as its essential form and manner of administration, is not

subject to that discretion, being in itself independent and divine.

The Ecclesiastical Law is not a *function* of the Civil Power, but a *body* organized and Sovereign within its own sphere. It has its officers and its order, its judges and tribunals, its rulers and legislature. The Ecclesiastical law is a living system, namely, the Church. Against this the Royal Supremacy has no prerogative: over this it has no superiority of discretion. The Church is final and sole in its Divine office; and exists in the civil state as a moral person or element to be incorporated in amity, not to be moulded or directed at will. Every particular Church speaks to the local Sovereignty with the voice and authority of the universal Church; and no supremacy may be given to the Crown over a particular Church inconsistent with the Divine Sovereignty of the Church Universal.

The Apostolic commission did not depend for its exercise upon the licence of Princes—it descends direct from Him who is over all supreme. The Apostolic commission both to teach and to rule was exercised in spite of all civil powers until they yielded to the Faith. It is still supreme, and must be to the world's end. The Church, in its power to teach by doctrine and to rule by discipline, has no superior on earth. The whole world cannot judge its doctrine, or reverse its discipline. No local Sovereign can do what the united Sovereignities of the

world cannot. The Church in every land is the Church throughout the world sojourning as in a place, and there teaching and ruling by the whole weight of the Divine Office committed to the Church Universal.

When the Church has become incorporated with the civil State, and its Judges clothed with civil power of coercion, it is most just that in the exercise and application of that derived civil and coercive power, they should conform so far, as the laws of Christ allow, to the direction of the original donor. They become in part Judges of the Crown, and so far may be guided by the Crown or Supreme power of Law. But it is never to be forgotten, that in this civil clothing there exists a primitive and Divine authority over which no Royal Supremacy can be admitted. The Royal Supremacy terminates where the Divine Office begins. And in all Ecclesiastical jurisdiction it is the external or coercive form or process which is cognizable by the Crown in appeal: the internal state or merits of "the principal cause" being subject to the Divine office of the Church alone.

When it is said then that the Crown administers its Ecclesiastical laws by Ecclesiastical Judges, it is not meant that the Crown can create them Judges, or fill them with power of jurisdiction from its own fountain, or that it may select and vary them according to its will.

The Judges of the Church are an order created by the Founder of the Church, and their jurisdiction

cannot be transferred or intermingled. The Church has distributed its judicial function among its Bishops, each in his own Diocese: the Primate over his Province, and so on. No Civil Supremacy may interchange this distribution, and substitute one judge for another, one Bishop in the consistory of another, or one Primate in another's Province, or a number of Suffragans for the Metropolitan, and the like. The Courts of Westminster are not so fixed and immutable in their jurisdiction as are the Spiritual judges of the Church, neither do their functions rest on such prescriptions of antiquity, nor flow from such a fountain.

Within the limits therefore of a local sovereignty there is no spiritual authority higher than the Primate or Metropolitan. The only superior known to the local Church is the authority of the Church universal. If it be the will of the local Civil power to restrain appeals, it thereby makes, so far as it can, the Church within its dominion final. Such is, I conceive, the principle upon which the Church of England for three hundred years has rested. It did not accept the supremacy of the Crown instead and in place of the supremacy of the Universal Church; but resumed the full, free, and final exercise of its own Spiritual office, legislative and judicial, within its own proper sphere. Over this, in its Spiritual character, it could accept no Civil Supremacy without making itself at once guilty of a formal schism from the Universal Church of Christ.

Such being, as I conceive, the principles of revelation and of reason, as well as of history and of Christian law on which the Church of God rests throughout the world, and in particular in these realms, it appears to me that violations of the gravest kind have been committed in the late appeal and sentence given therein. I say in the late appeal and sentence, because, vital as is the doctrine impugned by it, the violation of principle in the whole procedure is of even deeper and more vital importance. Indeed if the decision had been given in favour of the true doctrine, greater ultimate danger would probably have been prepared for the whole faith. The great body of the Church would have been lulled into security; nay, they might have committed the Church openly and consciously to this exercise of the Supremacy of the Crown. The adverse decision has roused even the secure and the indifferent, and laid bare the evil they were not willing to see, before their eyes. For no judgment, howsoever right in matter, could heal a wrong in the principle of this appellate Jurisdiction, as it extends its cognizance to matters purely spiritual.

Suffer me now to state the facts of the case. And in so doing I shall not enter into a recital of the Tudor statutes, or of the progressive changes by which the Crown now hears appeals in Council instead of in Chancery.

The principle is unchanged, and the form of its

exercise matters little. I am the less willing to weary your Lordship's patience by a string of Acts of Parliament, because the actual and practical point in the case may be reached by a course free from all controversy as to the meaning, force, or extent of statutes.

It may be simply put as follows :

Every Bishop within his own diocese possesses jurisdiction over all spiritual and ecclesiastical causes within the communion of the Church. All questions of soundness of doctrine in his clergy, and of fitness for cure of souls, are committed to his care and judgment. This office of the Bishop is exercised either in his Consistory Court or in person.

Every Archbishop, besides the above power which as Bishop he possesses in his own diocese, has also an appellate jurisdiction in his provincial court coextensive with the jurisdiction of every Suffragan Bishop and superior to it. Whatsoever a Bishop may hear and judge, an Archbishop on appeal may rehear and judge again, to confirm, vary, or reverse.

By the Statute Law now existing, the Crown in Council may receive appeals from the Archbishops' Court in all and every matter cognizable by it. The appellate jurisdiction of the Crown in Council is therefore coextensive with the jurisdiction of the Court of the Archbishop and superior to it. Whatsoever the Archbishop may hear and judge on appeal, the Crown may rehear and judge again, to confirm, vary, or reverse.

Now it is manifest that the Bishop and Archbishop are invested by the law of Christ and by their Order with a jurisdiction in matters the most internal and purely spiritual. The Faith itself, subject only to the Universal Church, is entrusted to their custody. There is no spiritual question over which they have not jurisdiction. There is therefore no spiritual question of which the Crown on appeal does not claim a coextensive and superior cognizance.

I have no doubt that this view is strictly the law of the land at this moment. On this the whole of the late proceeding rests. But this state of the law seems to me to be inconsistent with the Divine office of the Universal Church.

That I may bring out this point more clearly, I would ask your Lordship's attention for a moment to the other branch of our jurisprudence,—I mean the Civil Law Courts.

The refusal of the Bishop of Exeter to institute Mr. Gorham to the vicarage of Brampford Speke, on the ground of unsoundness of doctrine, gave rise to two questions of law; one relating to the spiritual element, namely, the soundness of Mr. Gorham's doctrine—the other relating to the temporal element, namely, the benefice of Brampford Speke.

To try the Spiritual question, the case was taken to the Spiritual Court.

To try the Temporal element, the case went, by action of *quare impedit*, to the Civil Court at Westminster.

In the Civil Court, so soon as the answer of the Bishop is returned that institution has been refused to the plaintiff on the score of unsoundness of doctrine, the Civil Court, because civil, and therefore having no jurisdiction or legal knowledge of doctrine of faith, proceeds to inform itself by inquiry of the Archbishop or other spiritual persons. By confining itself to the temporal element of the case, and by refraining to enter upon the question of doctrine, it openly disclaims all jurisdiction or competency, that is, all spiritual or ecclesiastical character.

On the other hand, the spiritual element, having been heard and decided by the Spiritual Court, is carried by appeal to the Crown in Council, where it is entertained, and opened with a claim of cognizance and jurisdiction coextensive with and superior to the Spiritual Court below in the precise and isolated spiritual element of the question—namely, the lawfulness or soundness of the appellant's doctrine.

This proves, beyond controversy, what character is thereby openly claimed for the Crown, namely, that of Supreme Ecclesiastical Judge in matters the most intimately and purely spiritual and divine.

Now, to take off the harshness of this manifest violation of the divine office of the Church of Christ, the Judges in the late appeal case disclaimed to judge or to pronounce as to the truth or falsehood, or the theological soundness of the doctrine before them. They professed only to judge what is the doctrine of

the Church of England, and whether or no the doctrine of the appellant was repugnant to the same.

By this many have been led to say or to think that the Judicial Committee disclaimed their competency to entertain questions of doctrine. My Lord, these learned persons knew too well the law of the land and the force of their own terms of art to make any such profession. They disclaimed the competence of that tribunal to *define* doctrine by theological tests and instruments, in such manner as the Church would define in Synod. No less would both the Bishop in his Consistory, and the Archbishop in the Court of Arches, disclaim such a competency. The Judges of the Privy Council may have also gracefully disclaimed their personal competency to judge of points needing the knowledge of another science, for which reason they sought the advice of spiritual persons among her Majesty's Councillors. But they never disclaimed the *legal competence* of that high Appeal Court to hear, judge, and decide both the external and internal merits of all and every question which can arise and be judged in all the Courts of the Church, as to what is or is not the doctrine of the Church of England. This they more than claimed—they exercised; and I grant that the modern statute law gives to them that power. But I must deny that any law less than the Divine could convey to them the right.

Again, that I may reduce this painful and perilous

question to its narrowest limits, I will gladly make the finest distinctions and the largest concessions which the laws of the universal Church will allow.

It may be said :—

First, That the State, being in alliance with the Church, must needs, for its own protection, have the power of *verifying* the doctrines which it has agreed to *legalise*. And,

Secondly, That all that the Judges have pronounced is, that Mr. Gorham's doctrine is not repugnant to the doctrine of the Church of England *as known to the law*.

Now, as to the former point, the claim of the State to a power to verify for its own use the doctrines which it has consented to recognise by law—no one denies the justice of such a claim. It is manifest that a religious communion, orthodox at the beginning, might become heterodox in lapse of time ; as in Prussia, or as the religious bodies, the endowments of which were lately confirmed to them in their present heterodoxy by Act of Parliament. From the moment that the Church becomes incorporated with the State, and receives from the State the clothing and rights of civil form and power, the State acquires a right to see that the Church shall continue to proceed according to the laws and rules mutually agreed to.

This is a security known and exercised, as we have already seen, in all Christian kingdoms, by the pro-

cess known in the canon law as the *appellatio tanquam ab abusu*, by which right of receiving appeals the Civil State has the power of reviewing the acts and proceedings of all Ecclesiastical Judges, and of keeping them within the bounds of their own rules and jurisdictions. But there is no parallel between this appeal in case of abuse, and the appeal to the Crown in Council.

The former is an appeal from the Ecclesiastical Judge to the Civil, as *civil*.

The latter is an appeal from the Ecclesiastical Judge to the Civil as *Superior Ecclesiastical Judge*.

In the former appeal the Civil Judge is absolutely forbidden to open the “*merits*” or “*internal state*” of the case.

In the latter, this is precisely the point which is reheard and disposed of.

The former is for protecting the State against the Church.

The latter is for the internal government of the Church itself.

I forbear to point out other distinctions. The three already given will be more than enough to all whom I could hope, by any argument, to satisfy.

I will make bold to say that there never has existed, and does not exist, in any society recognised or claiming to be a portion of the visible Church, such an appellate jurisdiction as that lately exercised by the Crown over the Church of England—I mean

a jurisdiction to rehear and to determine, as an ordinary judicature, for the Church itself, whether a given doctrine be conformable or repugnant to the doctrine of the Church. And I will further venture to assert, that there cannot be brought from any period of our history, Saxon, Norman, or English, any precedent or shadow of precedent to show that the power to judge in appeal on a question such as this was ever possessed by our princes as a part of their "ancient jurisdiction."

A power to review, in any given case, the facts and the law, as well as the correctness of the judge in his procedure and his application of law to fact, may be safely admitted, as we have already seen, under the securities known to the Canon Law of the Universal Church: but a prerogative to rehear the merits of spiritual causes, and a power to judge and to declare that the Faith and Formularies of the Church admit of this or of that interpretation, of this or of that latitude, is nothing less than a power which subjects the whole faith of the Church to the judgment of the Prince. Some writers have been found hardy enough to lay down as a maxim of jurisprudence, "*Ejus est religio cujus est regio*"—that the religion of a land is the religion of the Prince. Disclaim this antichristian saying as we may, our statutes would be thus made to embody it. In truth I conceive that an ultimate power of verifying the doctrines recognised by law is a security which every

state must possess for its own protection in the last resort—not as a common process, nor to be carried on by an ordinary judicature, but in extreme cases and under the heaviest checks. For to what does such a question lead, but to a dissolution, it may be, of the whole civil and ecclesiastical state? To debate it is to discuss whether or no we have already entered upon a state of revolution. It is a revision of the fundamental articles of our social order—a process to be set on foot only at the instance of grave necessity, and at the demand of great public officers, and not for the indulgence and at the motion of perverse and contentious individuals. But such a revision, I repeat, is by the State acting for itself, not by the Civil Power as Ecclesiastical Judge professedly acting for the Church, as in the case now before us.

Into this, however, I need no further go: it is enough to say that the appellate jurisdiction given by statute to the Crown is no mere power of verifying terms and doctrines, but an ordinary judicature coextensive with and superior to all spiritual courts, with unlimited and final power to reopen, rehear, and judge in the last resort, all questions of the spiritual law, as for instance what teaching is or is not repugnant to the doctrine of the Church of England, and whether a pastor be or be not fit to receive mission to a cure of souls. The Crown decides in these questions as the Supreme Ecclesiastical

Judge, and the sentence of the Crown at this moment carries legally and constitutionally the full assent and obligation of our whole Ecclesiastical Law.

The Crown therefore at this time possesses the power of declaring to be admissible in the Church of England a doctrine which the Church itself shall have declared to be inadmissible, and of pronouncing to be fit for cure of souls a person whom the Church has declared to be unfit for cure of souls.

Nay more: it has power not only so to declare, but so to enforce; and to compel a Bishop, who by the law of God is commanded "to lay hands suddenly on no man," to give mission to cure of souls, with authority to preach the Word of God, to a person whom that same Bishop and the Church shall have already rejected as unfit for the care of Christ's flock.

My Lord, this is no supposed case; it stands before us. The Appellant in the late Cause had been tried and rejected by his Bishop as unsound in faith, and unfit for cure of souls. On appeal, the Court of the Archbishop, the highest Spiritual Court in the Church, confirmed with ample judgment the decision of the Bishop.

The Crown on further appeal has been advised to declare that the doctrine of the Appellant is not so repugnant to the doctrine of the Church of England as to justify the refusal to institute: and the institution was ordered accordingly.

I shall rejoice if I can find that by this one act the Divine office of the Church has not been violated in two points, most vital to its character and trust. Nothing that I have heard as yet shakes my painful but stedfast belief, that this sentence violates the Divine office of the Church, both in its custody of doctrine and in its power of spiritual jurisdiction.

It violates its custody of doctrine by assuming a superior judicial power to declare what that doctrine is.

The Church alone possesses the deposit of the Word of God, or Christian faith, contained in the Holy Scripture, with its true interpretation, as a trust committed to it by its Divine Head. The Church, as a moral person, holds and transmits this trust. It has no power to make or to vary an article of Faith, but only to interpret and declare. The known intention of our Lord and of His inspired servants is the rule of interpretation: all the records and documents, the formularies and definitions of the faith are subject to that known intention, and ruled by it. The Church in Synod, as at Nice, did no more than declare the original intention of the teaching of inspired Apostles. It is an error to imagine that the Church in Synod and the Church in its Courts acts, in declaring matters of faith, by different principles. The whole office of the Church, in respect to doctrine, may be called judicial. It does but declare the Divine Truth and law already determined by the

sole Author of all Faith. And what the Universal Church holds by its Divine Tradition, it declares when need arises in Council, or by its judges sitting in the courts of the Episcopate. I do not see, therefore, how any other judge can intervene to re-hear a sentence of the Church given in its courts, without a violation of its Divine office in custody of doctrine.

But it has been said that this decision leaves the doctrine of the Church wholly untouched: that it does not alter a letter of its formularies, and that, therefore, the doctrine of the Church is inviolate as ever.

This has been said by so many of the highest name and note, as well as by so many who must be "esteemed very highly in love for their work's sake," that I am loath to deny it. But truth leaves no freedom.

The doctrine of the Church then is surely not an assemblage of formularies, but the true meaning of them. Doctrine is not a written, but a living truth. "Prior sermo quam liber: prior sensus quam stylus." If books were doctrine, no sect could be in heresy so long as it retained the Bible. If creeds were doctrine, the Socinians, who recite the Apostles' Creed, must be acquitted. But books and forms without their true interpretation are nothing. Doctrine is defined "univoca docendi methodus." It is the perpetual living voice of the individual pastors uniting as one. The Church is the collective teacher, and

doctrine is its oral exposition of the Faith. Will any one say that this is not touched by legalizing the denial of an article of the Creed? The doctrine of the Church of England is not only its written formularies, but the oral teaching of its twenty-eight Bishops, its fifteen thousand clergy, its many more thousand school teachers, and its two or three millions of heads of families. Doctrine is the living, ever spreading, and perpetual sense which is taught at our altars and from house to house all the year round.

If this be so, it seems to me to be a dream to say that the doctrine of the Church is untouched. For what is the effect of the latitude given by the late sentence of the Crown? It is equally lawful for the clergy of the Church to say, and to claim equally the authority of the Church for saying, that in the Sacrament of Holy Baptism all infants do, or all infants do not, receive spiritual regeneration.

My Lord, all this is too deeply humbling for me to do more than recite such a fact, which is bringing down shame where I have ever striven to pay only honour.

Let me put the case and pass on. The pastor of Brampford Speke teaches his flock that on all their children the free grace of God is bestowed through Holy Baptism for the merits of His Son; his successor denies it. The next in succession affirms it again; and the flock dispute in divisions, each under the authority of the Church, until they make peace in

disbelieving both members of the contradiction. I say nothing of pastors side by side in neighbouring parishes, or teaching opposite doctrines from the same altar. To those who believe truth to be Divine, that the authority of God is in every article of faith, and that our contradictions are His dishonour, it inspires alarm to hear from such authorities that the late sentence has not touched the doctrine of the Church. Would the legalizing of Arianism after the Nicene Council, leaving the Nicene Creed to stand in words, have touched the doctrine of the Church? Would legalizing Sabellianism touch doctrine so long as the words of our formularies are unchanged? If the answer be yes, I ask why? The formularies are still unaltered: the faithful may teach the Nicene doctrine.

Lastly, I would ask, How shall we stand the test of our own standards? By the definition of the Church of England "the visible Church is a congregation of faithful men in which the pure word of God is preached." I know, my Lord, that "the reading of Holy Scripture is preaching," but also that only the right "sense of Scripture is Scripture."*

But whether or no the doctrine of the Church be touched, this at least cannot be denied—that its discipline has been directly violated.

The same habit of thought which identifies doctrine with formularies, leads many to look upon the

* Waterland's Works, vol. iv., p. 316.

Church as an external and lifeless system, instead of a living and continuous body. The Church is the succession of the faithful with their Pastors: and the choosing, ordaining, and sending of fit Pastors is the very life of the Church. The two highest and most vital conditions of its spiritual life, under God, are the mission of its Pastors, and the purity of its doctrine. What then has this sentence done? It has over-ruled the judgment of the Bishop as to the fitness of a Pastor, whom he had refused to send to preach the Word of God: it has over-ruled the judgment of the Metropolitan confirming that decision. It has issued a command that the flock of Christ shall be put in charge with a man to whom, for unsoundness in the faith, the Bishop had refused to entrust the cure of souls.

My Lord, I should weaken the force of this if I were to use more words. What has been done under one appeal, may be done under a thousand. The whole jurisdiction of the Episcopate over the oral teaching of the Church, after orders once given, and the whole power of giving mission, the most sacred and vital in the discipline of the Church, are thus prostrate at the foot of the Civil Power.

The effect of this is to deprive Bishops of the power to determine judicially the fitness of priests for cure of souls—as the Archbishop has been already denied the power to try judicially the fitness

of a Bishop elect. The case is parallel, but upon another level; the only difference being, that the points lacking to exhibit the full violation done to the Divine office of the Church in the case of the See of Hereford, have been supplied in this. In that case the party had never been convicted by a court of the Church; in this he stands formally convicted of unsoundness: then the officers of the Church let pass the case; now they have discharged their duty and have been overruled. And the legality of that sentence has been justified by all the highest Courts and by the most learned Judges of the Realm.

The immediate effect of this sentence is to bind the Court of every Bishop to give impunity to the heterodoxy which has been defined and legalized by the judgment; and to compel every Bishop to give mission to cure of souls to any priest chosen by a patron, it may be, for holding that heterodoxy. What security then has your Lordship against such a peril? Such a presentee may appear to demand institution at your hands to-morrow. What is to prevent the raising of other questions on every doctrine in our Office Book from the Ordinal to the Office for Holy Communion; and what shall hinder the legalizing of a heterodox interpretation upon each in succession? I desire to refrain from examples which your Lordship's mind will suggest. Under pretence of verifying the doctrines of the original compact, the Church of England may receive a new scheme of doctrine upon each Article of Faith, point by point, until it shall

be possessed of two contradictory theologies, both equally legal, both equally without Divine authority. I trust that these remarks will suffice to show that this Appellate jurisdiction is not a mere defensive power of the State, for verifying the terms of its concordat with the Church, but a new Tribunal, an ordinary Judicature, and inconsistent with the Divine office of the Church of God.

But it has been further said, that the late sentence pronounces only that the doctrine of the Appellant is not repugnant to the doctrine of the Church of England as *known to the law*, and that therefore the doctrine of the Church is still untouched.

Upon this I must once more observe, that this distinction of doctrine known to the law and doctrine known to the Church is a mere fiction. The law of the land recognises no such separation. The Catholic Faith is recognised in our law not as a Christian doctrine, but as the Faith of Christendom. The Ecclesiastical law, though made up of two elements, acts with a perfect unity of operation. In pronouncing a doctrine to be known to the law, it pronounces it equally and at the same time to be known to the Church. The Courts of the Church judge of the lawfulness of a doctrine, by judging of its soundness; the Crown in appeal pronounces it to be sound, in pronouncing it to be lawful. Take the present case. The doctrine of Mr. Gorham has been pronounced to be either sound or not sound; or his institution has been ordered on the ground of his sound-

ness, or notwithstanding his unsoundness. By sound or unsound I mean, in the eye of our Ecclesiastical law, which knows no such distinction as doctrines which are legal, but may be unsound.

No part of the late proceedings revealed more glaringly the false and perilous position of the Church of England, in its relation to this Appellate jurisdiction, than the disclaimer put forward by the Judges that they did not pretend to judge of the soundness, or of the truth, or of the antiquity of doctrine, but only whether or no it were the doctrine of the Church of England. Is then the Church of England so isolated from the Universal, that the faith of the Church universal has no influence into its theology? Is it not manifest that by this rule of procedure the Civil State assumes the ultimate power so to interpret the formularies of the Church of England, as even to place it in contradiction to the known intention of the universal Church, thereby bringing it under the direct condemnation of heresy and schism?

Unless we are to escape from this by declaring that we have one doctrine in Theology and another in Law.

The late sentence, then, has told us what is the doctrine of Baptism as known to the law. My Lord, we are now forced to ask—is this the doctrine of Baptism as it is also known to the Church of England?

The Act of Uniformity, as it incorporates the doctrine and discipline of the Church of England,

has now been searched and expounded by the State. We have received its exposition from the highest place. Is that exposition accepted by the Church? I ask this not with impatience, but with urgent anxiety.

Three hundred years of Statute Law are not to be slipped off in a day, and the Church of England both needs and may demand time to prepare herself to give an answer. But, though for a while delayed, that answer must be given, if trials which I hardly dare to speak of are to be averted.

The law has declared, that they who deny the doctrine of Baptismal Regeneration enjoy its protection. It remains that the Church shall declare whether they have also its authority. My Lord, I have trespassed long enough upon your patience. If I were to write all that this subject thrusts upon me, I should exceed the bounds of a letter. I will, therefore, bring what I have written to a close. It seems to me that in the Appellate Jurisdiction, lately exercised, three grave evils have been inflicted upon the Church of England:—

1. First, its Divine office, as the Guardian of the doctrine and discipline of Christ, has been violated. It transfers the ultimate decision of all Spiritual questions, even of faith, from the internal and Spiritual tribunal of the Church, to an external and secular Judge. The Royal Supremacy, so exhibited, clashes not only with the freedom of the Church of England, but with the Divine office of the Universal Church as

it is exercised by the English Church, in the name of Christ, in behalf of this people.

2. Secondly, legal protection has been given to a denial of an article of the Universal Creed.

I have abstained from treating of the doctrine specially in question, because it matters little to my view what the particular subject-matter of the appeal may be. Nevertheless I cannot close this letter without saying that I hardly know of any doctrine more vital to the spiritual life, more fundamental to the visible Church, more intimately related to the revealed character of God, and to the moral probation of man, than the Regeneration of Baptism, inasmuch as it touches the office of the Divine Spirit on the one side, and the remission of original sin on the other. No doctrine is more manifestly universal in its reception in all ages of the Church, both before the division of the East and West, when its united voice gave unerring witness to the faith; and, since that division, in all members of the visible Church unto this day. If there be, therefore, such a thing as material heresy, it is the doctrine which has now received the sanction of the law.

3. But, thirdly, a deeper and more dangerous evil than this has been inflicted upon the authority of all faith. The doctrines of the Church are not an assemblage of opinions constructed by the human intellect, but a Divine revelation, harmonious and definite, descending from God and received simply by

faith. We believe upon the authority of God revealing, and His authority runs throughout the whole circle of the faith. The Church propounds to us that revelation upon the authority of God; and all truth is alike binding upon us by the Divine will. In one sense there is no greater or less among revealed truths; for all are true, as all come from God. All truths are not indeed on the same level, or in the same nearness to the Divine Nature; but all are true and binding in virtue of the equal authority which runs through all. To reject one is to offend against the whole authority of faith. To throw open a question of faith, to admit contradictory expositions of one and the same truth, to lift a human opinion to the level of a Divine doctrine, or rather to thrust down a Divine doctrine to the level of a human opinion, what is it but to reduce the whole authority of faith to the same level?

I do not see how the Church of England can permit two contrary doctrines on Baptism to be propounded to her people without abdicating the Divine authority to teach as sent from God; and a body which teaches under the authority of human interpretation descends to the level of a human society. It cannot require faith in its teaching as necessary to salvation, nor lay a Divine authority upon the conscience. How can I any longer say "the Church of England teaches that all infants duly baptized are regenerate," if it permits the same to be denied? If I have authority to

affirm, another has equal authority to deny the same doctrine. Henceforth, we speak in our own name; not by authority at all, but by opinion; and if one article of the faith is thus without authority, what article is more than an opinion? for opinion, and not faith, will be the principle and basis of all our teaching. I will not press the consequences of this fatal admission.

One word more I will now ask leave to add. My Lord, at my Ordination, and at my entering upon the charges I hold, I solemnly took the oath of Supremacy and subscribed the three articles of the 36th Canon. They bind me to the Ecclesiastical Discipline as this Church and Realm have received the same.

Am I then bound to accept as lawful and rightful the Royal Supremacy exhibited in this Appellate Jurisdiction? I trust not, partly because I have at all times in perfect integrity of heart formally denied to the Crown the power lately exercised. So short a time ago as 1848, I stated in the most public and responsible manner my belief as follows:—"No Supremacy is claimed for the Crown over the Spirituality, but a *Civil* Supremacy—a Supremacy of *Temporal* power in *Temporal* things, and in the *Temporal* accident of *Spiritual* things."* The Law of Christ forbids us to accept of more.

But above all, I trust that the Supremacy intended in our oath and subscription goes no further than this limit,

* Charge at the Ordinary Visitation of the Archdeaconry of Chichester, p. 27, in July, 1848.

because any other Supremacy seems to me in violation of the Divine office of the Church. To the ancient jurisdiction of the Crown, as it was wielded by our Princes—to the Christian Supremacy of Edward the Confessor—the Church of England will, I trust, be ever ready to render a glad obedience. But that Supremacy did not claim to be the fountain of spiritual jurisdiction: it assumed no functions of direction in the interior discipline of the Church: it never assumed to pronounce on the fitness of a Pastor for mission to cure of souls: it never sat upon a tribunal to apply a judgment of discretion in declaring what is the doctrine of the Church.

In the year 1846, when the Bill to repeal certain penal statutes directed against those who gainsayed the Supremacy of the Crown was under discussion in the Legislature, the greatest authorities of the Law in the House of Lords were heard to declare that the Royal Supremacy needs no protection by penal statute, inasmuch as it was no creature of statutes, but a prerogative known to the Common Law of these realms, and protected by that majestic authority. We were told that the Supremacy of the Crown existed before the Tudor statutes. In that sense, my Lord, I have no difficulty in binding myself by any oath of fidelity. The Royal Supremacy at Common Law is in perfect harmony with the Divine office of the Church, by which it was consecrated to the Kingdom of our Divine Lord. In that sense, and not in the sense of this Appellate

Jurisdiction, I am prepared with gladness to obey and to uphold it with a true and loyal heart. It is the novel jurisdiction in matters of faith—a jurisdiction unknown at Common Law, unheard of before the statutes of Henry VIII.—it is against this that we protest in the name of God and of His Church. We appeal from it to the Common Law itself, which, in the words of a Saxon Council, will vindicate our just demand: “*Libera sit Ecclesia, fruaturque suis judiciis.*”

And I trust that as by the Statute of the sixteenth of King Charles the First, Parliament has already once retraced its steps and restored the ancient jurisdiction of the Crown to its just limits, by abolishing the Court of High Commission, so it will now relieve the Princes of these realms of a burden too weighty for any royal head, by repealing so much of the Acts of Henry VIII. as invests the Sovereign with this perilous and unnatural judicature.

The histories and chronicles to which, in creating these novel functions, appeal was made, though they bear no witness to these royal privileges in the Church of God, record other illustrious graces of the English Crown. But they were not granted by Acts of Parliament or by laws of man. That such may ever descend in fulness on her who now rules our loyal allegiance, is the daily intercession of the Church. May He who only can inspire the will to pay Him honour, so overrule the course of this world that the Christian splendour of the English Crown

may ever be untarnished ; and that this claim of dangerous days — dangerous to the Church, but more dangerous far to the realm which shall uphold it — may be laid aside as a restitution at the Altar in homage to Him who alone is “ Head over all things to the Church, which is his body, the fulness of Him that filleth all in all.”

For my own sake, I take this public way of rendering my grateful thanks for the affectionate and paternal kindness which, during so many years, both in an official and personal relation, I have received at your Lordship’s hands ; and with a daily prayer that you may be guided in all things to rule the Church committed to you according to the will of God, I subscribe myself,

My LORD BISHOP,

Your Lordship’s attached and faithful
Servant in Christ,

HENRY EDWARD MANNING.

Lavington, July 2, 1850.





UC SOUTHERN REGIONAL LIBRARY FACILITY



AA 001 182 376 2

