







With kindest regards, from the Archdeacon

The Legacy of Peace

A CHARGE

DELIVERED TO THE

CLERGY OF THE ARCHDEACONRY
OF MAIDSTONE

At the Ordinary Visitation

IN APRIL, MDCCCLXXXIII

WITH NOTES

BY

BENJAMIN HARRISON, M.A.

ARCHDEACON OF MAIDSTONE

RIVINGTONS

WATERLOO PLACE, LONDON

ASTEBURY: J. GENDER, ST. GEORGE'S HALL, HAY, GLOUCESTERSHIRE.
MAIDSTONE: J. B. WARD.

MDCCCLXXXIII

[Price One Shilling]



The Legacy of Peace

A CHARGE

DELIVERED TO THE

*CLERGY OF THE ARCHDEACONRY
OF MAIDSTONE*

At the Ordinary Visitation

IN APRIL, MDCCLXXXIII

WITH NOTES

BY

BENJAMIN HARRISON, M.A.

ARCHDEACON OF MAIDSTONE

RIVINGTONS

WATERLOO PLACE, LONDON

CANTERBURY: S. GINDER, ST. GEORGE'S HALL; HOLBORN: MERCERY LANE

MAIDSTONE: F. BUNYARD

MDCCLXXXIII

TO THE REVEREND THE
RURAL DEANS AND THE CLERGY
OF THE
ARCHDEACONRY OF MAIDSTONE,
AND TO
THE CHURCHWARDENS AND SIDESMEN.

This Charge,

PUBLISHED IN COMPLIANCE WITH THEIR REQUEST,

IS RESPECTFULLY AND AFFECTIONATELY

Inscribed,

IN THE CAUSE OF BROTHERLY UNITY AND

PEACE IN THE CHURCH OF GOD.

PROVINCE, CANTERBURY.

MAY XVIII. MDCCCLXXXIII

A CHARGE

MY REVEREND BRETHREN,

The changes which have come upon us since last we were assembled together make me feel that you will not regard it otherwise than as a natural thing, and not unbefitting the occasion, if, in the opening words of my customary address to you, I give expression, with an emphasis more than ordinary, to the thankfulness which I owe to a gracious Providence which has permitted me, during the past year, to go out and come in among you, in the exercise of my office towards you, and to gather you here again before me for the duties of the Annual Visitation.

The Chief Pastor who, amidst the general sorrow of the Church and of the Country, has been taken from our head, was the fourth Archbishop under whom I had been privileged to serve, since first Archbishop Howley committed to me¹ the office of Archdeacon. In the case of two Primates in succession, Archbishop Longley and him whom we have so lately lost, it fell to my lot, in the declining age and increasing infirmity of my brother Arch-

¹ Dec. 4, 1845.

deacon, to whose office by long prescription the duty belongs, to place the Archbishop in the throne of the Cathedral, and in the ancient metropolitical chair of the Province, in the primary stall of the choir, and the chief seat of the chapter-house; and dutifully to tender to him there, in my own behalf, and as the representative of my aged brother, the promise of canonical obedience to his Grace, Lord Archbishop of Canterbury, as my Diocesan and Archbishop. If, when the same solemn Service of Enthronization was to be renewed last month, I could not but recall the memories of the four Archbishops under whom I had filled, as best I might, the office entrusted to me, neither could I forget that, in my relation to the cathedral, first as one of its Six Preachers and then as a Canon, I had served under four Deans, two of whom, in succession, it had been my duty to instal; the Dean last taken from us, and now again the Primate lately gone, being both, by two or three years, younger than myself, and I not likely, in the ordinary course of nature, and with the memory of past illness, to find myself standing as a mourner at their graves. In the churchyard of Addington, assuredly, so familiar to my footsteps now five and forty years ago, amidst a scene so touching as that which, on the calm winter's morning of the funeral of Archbishop Tait, awoke such deep sympathy in every heart, with the mortal remains and sacred memorials of five departed Primates resting now in that village

church and churchyard around, of all of whom I had a personal remembrance, it were strange if the words of the Psalmist's prayer, coming down with their solemn echoes from the early days of God's Church on earth, did not come home to the heart with an undying force, "Lord, thou hast been our refuge: *from one generation to another.*" "So teach us to *number our days*: that we may apply our hearts unto wisdom."¹

It was a deep sentiment of man's mortality which expressed itself sadly in the reflection of one who had looked thoughtfully, in the latter part of the last century, on the men and things of an eventful period. "What shadows we are," he said; and he added, "and what shadows we pursue!" But we, my Reverend Brethren, as Christ's servants and ministers, shall feel that it is our portion and our blessedness, in Him who is "the Resurrection and the Life," who hath been, even from the days of "faithful Abraham," the "shield" of them that are of "the household of faith," and their "exceeding great reward,"² to break off the melancholy sequel of the thoughtful statesman, reflecting the saddened view of the vanity of this fleeting world in its transitory concerns and interests. For we "know whom" we "have believed;"³ "we have not followed cunningly devised fables;"⁴ we have pierced through

¹ Ps. xc. 1, 12. P.B.V. (Burial Office.) See Note A.

² Gen. xv. 1. Comp. Gal. iii. 9; vi. 10.

³ 2 Tim. i. 12.

⁴ 2 Pet. i. 16.

the “ shadows ” of earth, and are “ pursuing ” the realities of heaven ; “ while we look not at the things which are seen, but at the things which are not seen : for the things which are seen are temporal ; but the things which are not seen are eternal.”¹ And it is our high privilege, in the administration of any office, however humble and subordinate, in the Church of Christ, “ as fellow-workers ”—for such, the holy Apostle hath taught us, we are called to be²—with HIM, in His designs of mercy to a lost world, who is “ the high and lofty One that inhabiteth eternity, whose name is Holy ”;³ with whom “ one day is as a thousand years, and a thousand years as one day ”;⁴ it is our privilege to trace, to a certain degree, amidst the “ clouds and darkness ” which “ are round about him,”⁵—or, if we trace it not, to feel assured that it is there,—the carrying on, in transcendent unity from age to age, amidst endless diversity of means and instruments, the one great and gracious work in the onward progress of which, even “ unto the principalities and powers in heavenly places ” is “ known by the Church ”—in various forms and hues, or, as it might seem, in almost discordant colours, yet even as of “ the bow in the cloud,” combining to form “ bright beams of light ”—*ἡ πολυποίκιλος σοφία*, “ the manifold wisdom of God.”⁶

¹ 2 Cor. iv. 18.

³ Isa. lvii. 15.

⁵ Ps. xcvi. 2.

² 2 Cor. vi. 1. Comp. 1 Cor. iii. 9.

⁴ 2 Pet. iii. 8.

⁶ Eph. iii. 10. See Note B.

It would be presumptuous in me, my Reverend Brethren, and quite unnecessary, since so many have done it, in different ways, far better, to pretend to set forth, or to endeavour to estimate, the endowments possessed, or the services rendered, in intent or in deed, to the Church of God by him who had been called in God's providence to preside over this Diocese and Province; and who, when he had fulfilled fourteen years of active administration of the Primacy, was, after lingering weeks of gradually failing strength, withdrawn out of our sight, as we humbly trust, into those peaceful mansions of rest in Paradise, whither so many whom he loved had gone before him. When the great Apostle—for I cannot myself think that it was any other than he—exhorted his brethren of the Hebrew Church to remember them which had the rule over them, who had spoken unto them the word of God, that so they might follow their faith, he bade them specially to do this, “considering”—contemplating in calm review¹—“the end of their conversation,” the termination of their course on earth. And I cannot but think that, when the story is fully told, for the instruction and edification of those that come after, of our departed Primate's course, it will be the closing scene of his life which will dwell most abidingly in the thoughts of men.

I took occasion, my Reverend Brethren, some few years ago, in addressing you at the Visitation,

¹ ἀναθεωροῦντες.

to call to remembrance the deathbed, in days long past, of one whose life and writings might be looked to as a pattern to true English Churchmen, I mean the meek and holy, the learned and "judicious" Hooker, a parish priest of this diocese; his last words, as recorded in the beautiful narrative of Izaak Walton, having been copied out, underlined, and adopted as his own by Archbishop Longley, when now the power of speech had well-nigh failed him.¹ The accounts which came to us from Addington, when our late Primate's long sickness was drawing to its close, seemed to me to revive in some sort the memory—the more forcibly because so unconsciously—of the last hours of one of his predecessors, Hooker's friend and patron, whose name is specially associated, by a charitable foundation, with the old Archiepiscopal town of Croydon, Archbishop Whitgift. He was one who, like our last departed Primate, had filled efficiently a succession of important offices in the Church, and occupied a high place in the favour of his Sovereign, Queen Elizabeth. "And having for several years," says Izaak Walton, "experimented his wisdom, his justice, and moderation in the manage of her affairs, she, in the twenty-sixth year of her reign, made him Archbishop of Canterbury, and not long after, of her Privy Council; and trusted him to manage all her ecclesiastical affairs and preferments;" "lay-

¹ Charge delivered in May, 1878 (*The more excellent Way of Unity in the Church of Christ*), pp. 27-32.

ing upon his shoulders," as she "would often say" she had done, "the burthen of all her clergy-cares, which, she was certain, he managed with prudence and piety."¹ "He made hers and the Church's good the chiefest of his cares, and she also thought so." "He gave her faithful and prudent counsels in all the extremities and dangers of her temporal affairs, which were very many."² It was a critical time in which he lived; and the part he was called upon to take in the affairs of Church and State fills a large place in the ecclesiastical annals of those days; but, of all that concerns the records of his life, that which has left the deepest memory is the scene of his last hours. "He had the honour," says his biographer, "to be visited" in his sickness "by the king," lately come to the throne of England; "who, out of his sense of the great need he should have of him at this particular juncture . . . told him 'he would pray to God for his life; and that, if he could obtain it, he should think it one of the greatest temporal blessings that could be given him in this kingdom.'"³ It was, we may say—to pass for a moment from the events of our own Church and realm to the earlier days of the Church of God in Israel—it was even as when "Elisha was fallen sick of the sickness whereof he died. And Joash the king of Israel came down unto him, and

¹ Walton's *Life of Hooker* (Lives, ed. Zouch, vol. i. p. 366).

² *Ibid.* pp. 376, 377.

³ Strype's *Life of Whitgift*, vol. ii. p. 505.

wept over his face, and said, O my father, my father, the chariot of Israel and the horsemen thereof.”¹ “The Archbishop,” we are told, “would have said something to the king, but his speech failed him (whose last counsel,” says Strype, “no doubt would have been of very great moment and consequence, having had so long experience in the government of this Church); so that he uttered only imperfect words. But so much of his speech was heard, repeating earnestly, with his eyes and hands lifted up, *Pro ecclesiâ Dei; pro ecclesiâ Dei*; which were the last words he ever spoke; therein testifying that, as in his life, so at his death, his chiefest care was of God’s Church.” “And as he would have spoken his mind to the king, being present, so he made two or three attempts to write his mind to him; but by reason of the prevailing of his disease (the pen falling out of his hand), he could not. And the next day, being February 29th, he quietly departed in the Lord.”²

I need hardly recall to your remembrance how closely resembling this was what we heard reported by those who were around our late Archbishop’s dying bed; how affectionately anxious were the inquiries made from day to day, by letter or message from his Sovereign; and how, in acknowledgment of the visit of personal inquiry at Addington, made by her lady-in-waiting at the Queen’s desire, with a gracious message sent to him by the Queen, he endeavoured,

¹ 2 Kings xiii. 14.

² Strype, *sup. cit.*, p. 506.

once and again, to write a few lines in reply, which were found to be quite illegible. And in regard to the prevailing subject of his thoughts, we had lately the witness of the Bishop of London, when, speaking amidst his assembled brethren in the Upper House of Convocation, he moved a Resolution commemorative of the late Primate.¹ “He lived and laboured,” said the Bishop of London, “for the Church of Christ in all its branches; but more especially for the reformed branch of it established in these dominions. Here was his heart, and here were his labours. I have happened,” the Bishop went on to say, “to visit him under special circumstances; the first within three days of the time when he was thought to be dying, and the second time when he did die within five days. On both occasions he spoke to me about the Church. He contrasted its state, when he and I were first Bishops, with what he believed it to be now; and he was thankful. He considered that it was far more active, that it was far more influential, and even that it was far more united. I believe he was right,” said the Bishop of London;—“and his last thoughts and efforts were for the Church.”

It was similar testimony that followed, borne on the same occasion by the Bishop of Winchester, the Prelate next in order in the Province to the Bishop of London. He compared the Archbishop with another of his predecessors, Archbishop Wake, “in

¹ Session of April 10, 1883.

whom," said the Bishop, very truly, "there was a great feeling for desiring union and fellowship with other Churches, and other branches of the Church of Christ." "Archbishop Tait," said the Bishop of Winchester, "seemed to me to have a great deal of the same spirit of desire for intercourse with the Eastern Churches; especially when we saw the friendly intercourse there was between him and some of the patriarchs of the Eastern Church: and the way in which we were able to see an Eastern Archbishop in England during his primacy pointed very much to the sympathy which the Archbishop had with all branches of the Church of Christ." "Every year of his primacy," said the Bishop, "showed him more and more capable of rising to the work before him, until at last, as the Bishop of London has said, he has left behind him a legacy of instruction and encouragement tending especially towards the unity and peace of the Church." "In the last scenes of his life," the Bishop of Winchester went on to say, "I also had the privilege of joining in prayer with him, and hearing many of his confidences." "The whole of that last scene was one of the most touching, and one of the most instructive—I may say, the most touching and instructive—on a deathbed I ever witnessed; and I have witnessed a great many deathbeds, as most of us have. He left behind him," said the Bishop, addressing the new President of the Convocation, "he left behind him a great inheritance to your Grace."

The Archbishop, presiding now in the chair of the Convocation of the Province, responded in words reflecting powerfully from his own heart the feelings expressed by his brethren towards him, and in regard to him into whose place he had come. The love and reverence which he had felt for the Archbishop, to whom he had been brought so near “by circumstances unforeseen,” “deepened,” he said, “in every conversation, every sight that he had of him, both in health and in illness. The greatest of all the great hopes that can be expressed,” said the Archbishop, “was brought home to me very strongly, from the constant intercourse that I had with him upon the Commission of which he was head”—the Commission on the Ecclesiastical Courts; “and it consists,” said his Grace, “in the extremely strong and tranquil hope and confidence that he had in the future of the Church of England. With him all shadows and misgivings seemed to have passed away; and he thoroughly and really believed that the Church of England was speeding on her way, with a far greater future before her than her great past. I thank the Bishop of London,” the Archbishop went on to say, “for having brought out what I dared not have touched myself. The extraordinary testimony which that enthronement at Canterbury presented to superficial readers of the events of the day was, I know, but a gorgeous ceremonial; but no one who was there could have done otherwise than attribute its impressiveness to the vast numbers

of living people gathered there. Nothing could have been more simple," said the Archbishop; "and the manifestation of power was due to the presence of such masses of the clergy, and such masses of laity, all of one heart."

These expressions of opinion and feeling, weighty and well-considered, and full of deep interest, contain within them two or three points which it may be well for us to dwell upon for a few moments; in order that we, my Reverend Brethren of the Clergy, and our Lay brethren with us, may turn to the better account "the legacy of instruction and encouragement," which, in the words just now quoted, has been left to us, "tending especially towards the unity and peace of the Church." I would only observe first, in passing, that the Resolution sent down from the Upper House, having been unanimously adopted there, in reference to its late President, was, the same day, with the like unanimity concurred in by the Lower House, adopting it, in what was felt would be the most suitable and becoming course, without altering a letter; so that, by the customary insertion of the words "and Clergy" in the draft sent down, it became the Resolution of "the Bishops and Clergy of the Convocation of the Province of Canterbury;" "desiring to place on record their grief at the loss which, in common with and beyond the whole Church of these times, they have sustained, both personally and corporately, since their last session," and asking

“permission to convey to the family of the late Archbishop the assurance of their condolence.” I may venture to add that, not on this occasion only, but in grave matters involving questions of deep theology, or sacred interest, or practical importance, we might not less truly declare in regard to the Lower House, applying to it the words of the Bishop of London concerning the Upper House—“it certainly never could be said of it,” in these days of its revived activity, “that it was unable to debate without dissension, or to argue without acrimony.”

To revert, however, to the words which were spoken in the assembly of the Bishops of the Province, I would notice, in the first place, what the Archbishop himself reported as the impression made upon him in “the constant intercourse” which he had with the late Archbishop, in the Commission which is still sitting on the Ecclesiastical Courts, and of which the Archbishop was chairman. It is important, I think, that it should be fully recognized,—so as to shut out any misapprehension in regard to what took place in his last illness, and in particular, the touching letter which he dictated from his sick bed, in the cause of peace in his former Diocese of London and in the Church at large—that it was indeed the consistent following out of what he had done in moving in the House of Lords, two years ago, for the Commission already referred to, carrying into effect the unanimous request of the Bench

of Bishops; in order to a full and deliberate investigation of the questions which had arisen, and the difficulties and distresses which had occurred, in connection with "the constitution and working of the Ecclesiastical Courts" and "the recent prosecutions for Ritual offences." I took occasion, my Reverend Brethren, in what I addressed to you in my Visitation that spring, to call your special attention to the earnest desire which the Archbishop had expressed, that Churchmen should apply their minds "gravely and calmly" to "the side issues raised in this controversy about ritual;" and I then endeavoured to do what in me lay to assist the quiet and thoughtful consideration of these matters, in accordance with our Diocesan's wish.¹ He had spoken of "the unwise course," as he deemed it, of certain Churchwardens in London, "in pressing for the imprisonment of their Pastor on a writ of contumacy;" a proceeding which had "to a certain degree checked," as he said, "the hopeful tendency towards peace and real Church work, for which all good Churchmen long." The great commission given to the Church by her Lord for the warfare with unbelief and sin, a commission which she must ever assuredly by all means in her power fulfil, was then, as afterwards, powerfully present to his mind. "All true Churchmen," he said, "desirous that the Church of England should fulfil its heavenly mission,

¹ Charge, delivered in May, 1881 (*The Church's Work and Wants at the Present Time*).

will, I feel confident, endeavour to allay any excitement which is around them ; and, if they find that strong feelings have been aroused, will apply themselves, in a quiet spirit of prayer, to consider whether any changes ought, for the Church's highest welfare, to be made, and, if so, what they are."¹ It was in this spirit that the Archbishop devoted himself to the labours of the Commission which had held, at the end of the last season, between fifty and sixty meetings ; adding greatly, as they did, every week to the fatigues of his London life. And it was in perfect accordance with these feelings that he made the effort which was so touching to all hearts, when the shadows of the unseen world were gathering nearer round him, to save the Church, if he might, from any fresh complication and trial, which it was now out of his power in any other way to prevent or to remedy ; waited with a patient anxiety from day to day for the response which, if granted to his heart's desire, would enable his spirit, as it would seem, the more thankfully to depart in peace ; and was not unrewarded in the proof given him that he had good ground for believing, that that which the courts of law, in their recent condition, had been unable to effect, might be won by the fainter voice of spiritual authority and love, coming from the sick chamber, in tones of gentle and persuasive pleading, of the Primate of the Church of England.

¹ Charge, 1881, pp. 18-22.

To say thus much is due to Archbishop Tait's memory ; and I think we ought to go still further back. I would recall to your recollection, my Reverend Brethren, that, long before the time I am speaking of—as long as eight years ago this month of April—I felt myself authorized—privileged, I may rather say—to remind you of the words which, in the month of January preceding, that is, in the winter following the passing of the Public Worship Regulation Act, the Archbishop had addressed to the Clerical and Lay delegates of the Diocese, assembled at the Diocesan Conference in the Town Hall at Maidstone.¹ I was anxious to “remind you how carefully and earnestly the Archbishop” had “set himself to dissipate the apprehensions abroad of an ecclesiastical campaign which,” it was thought, would open with the then session of Parliament ; “and to reassure the minds of Churchmen, Clergy and Laity together,” for the minds of both alike were troubled, “by showing the actual impossibility of any legislation that year affecting the Prayer-book,”—the Prayer-book then, as now, let me say, the great bond of union amongst us ;—legislation being out of the question by reason of the necessarily late meeting of Convocation that spring, postponed as it was by an early Easter. You were reminded how strongly he had “repelled, in the behalf of the great body of

¹ Charge, delivered in April, 1875 (*Prospects of Peace for the Church in the Prayer-book and its Rules*), pp. 18-20.

the Clergy, *absolutely* in regard to the Clergy of his own Diocese, and generally with respect to the whole body, the sweeping charge of 'lawlessness' which, in an oration delivered at Birmingham a day or two before," had "been broadly cast upon them, but which, in his Grace's opinion, rested only on a misguided few; and how, while he declared plainly that the lines of truth which our Church at the Reformation had laid down could not with impunity be crossed, he maintained that within those limits there was room for large-hearted, brotherly concord." "I do hope and trust," the Archbishop had said, "that an exaggerated mode of viewing questions that ought to be looked at calmly will disappear from amongst us. There ever have been, and to the end of the world there ever will be, diversities of opinion; but there are also united ideas of love towards our Lord and Saviour and the souls for which He died. It is perfectly true," the Archbishop went on to observe, "as has been said by many, that there is no danger to this Church Establishment, if its sons are true; and if the great parties which have ever existed in it will allow each other to judge according to the dictates of conscience, and serve heartily their common Lord. There will be no danger," said he, "from without, if we resist disunion from within; and I fully believe," he said then—and we have seen how distinctly and solemnly in his last hours he repeated his conviction, and declared how it had become more and more the fact

—“I fully believe there is amongst us this real and hearty union.”

“It was impossible,” as I expressed to you, “not to recognize in the Archbishop’s words, as they fell, calmly but earnestly, from his lips,” at that meeting at Maidstone, “a kind and fatherly desire to do what in him lay to heal the wounds which might have been inflicted, beyond the design of those who uttered them, by words spoken or feelings called forth in the parliamentary conflict of the preceding session, or elsewhere; an unmistakable anxiety on the Archbishop’s part, that any such words should not be taken up and turned into weapons against the Clergy, and against the Church” —nay, as I ventured to say, “against the Crown itself, and the nation, consecrated and sanctified as they are by that sacred union between the Church and the State which it is the object of the Liberationists to destroy.” It was, I may observe, a leading Liberationist¹ who, in the speech referred to, had gone out of his way² to make “disestablishment” his topic; and the Archbishop urged upon all that heard him “the importance,” as he said, “of the time at which we were arrived.” For “it is an important thing,” said his Grace, “to maintain this Established Church of England in its integrity in this realm.”

Before, however, I pass on from the retrospect

¹ Mr. Bright (now the Right Honourable John Bright, M.P.; till lately, Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster).

² See the remarks in the *Times*, January 25, 1875.

which has seemed rightfully to claim a large place in our thoughts at the present time, I must go back yet one year more, to the time of the passing of the Public Worship Regulation Act itself, now nine years ago. It demands our consideration not simply in regard to the question of the Archbishop's personal connection with that measure, but also because it may be presumed, that the Church and the State alike would desire now to profit by any experience then gained, as to the things to be sought, and the things to be avoided, in matters of Parliamentary legislation.

The Archbishop of the Northern Province has lately stated to his Convocation, that, "when the Public Worship Bill of 1874 was brought in, its object was to create a domestic tribunal for the Bishop, who was to be strengthened by a certain board, so as to prevent causes going before the courts of law." Into the question as to the constitution of such a board, in principle or in detail, we need not now enter. What I desire to call attention to, as a point of importance, is that "the Bill introduced by the Archbishops"—I am giving now the statement made, in accordance with that of the Archbishop of York, in a popular Review, published not many days ago; which looked upon the matter not in any wise as from the Church's point of view, but rather as a mere piece of biographical history, regarded from without—"the Bill introduced by the Archbishops was quite dif-

ferent from that which passed through Parliament ; and the title alone remains as a monument of what the Archbishops intended."

"The Public Worship Regulation Bill," says the writer of the article referred to, "aimed at giving power to the Bishops, with certain checks, to *regulate* more directly what went on in their Dioceses." The then Lord Chancellor, it appears, "engrafted on it all the main clauses from another Bill," presented from a different quarter, "with the effect of making it a measure for the *punishment of offences* against the ritual prescribed by the Prayer-book. A series of mishaps," the reviewer goes on to say, "many of a technical kind, which the very complex arrangements of the measure led to, befell this Act. It is true," he says, "that all such suits, under other statutes, had been liable to mishaps." But "thus" the incumbent of St. Alban's, Holborn, "had been monished in vain as early as 1868, and had been the subject of many suits ; yet he resigned his benefice, having held it against courts and monitions, in 1882, at the request of the late Archbishop of Canterbury."¹ I was myself present, by the kindness of the Archbishop, in the House of Lords, through the whole of the proceedings at the recommittal of the Bill. There was great difficulty in following its course, owing to the entire change of front which took place in regard to it ; and the most serious embarrassment which

¹ *Edinburgh Review*, April, 1883, p. 562.

has arisen out of its provisions arose out of the discordant principles which were attributable to its double origin and strange fusion of procedure.

I have already alluded, in connection with former utterances of Archbishop Tait, to the designs of adversaries without ; which, in his opinion, need cause no serious alarm provided only we are united within. The latest counsel which I have seen reported, within the last week or ten days, as given by a leading "Nonconformist" to his friends was, to say very little about "Disestablishment," and to look meanwhile to the probable effects of Rationalism and Ritualism in the Church. It might have been supposed, I think, from such a manner of speaking, that Rationalism and Ritualism were, both alike, the native growth of the Church's heritage, and therefore threatening to overrun the vineyard and ere long destroy the vine. I had rather imagined that, among the patrons of liberty, the Church was credited with being not sufficiently the friend of Reason in the free treatment of religious truth ; that it was unduly cramped by Creeds and Articles ; and that while Ritualism, so called, had its natural home in the Roman Communion, the claims of Reason would find their more free exercise in the camp of "Civil and Religious Liberty." But it is in very deed the safety, and not the danger, of the Church of England, that there is ample room within her borders, for the exercise, within the limits of Truth and Nature, of the faculty of

Reason, as well as for the chastened cultivation of imagination and feeling and taste. I might not unfitly refer again to utterances of our departed Primate; words which he spoke on the occasion, which was lately recalled to our minds, of his own enthronization at Canterbury. He had alluded to the building of the new cathedral library in which he was speaking, as a witness that the cathedral seemed to be "preparing for new work, and for handing on learning from age to age." "It is somewhat the custom," he went on to say, "of those who are not friendly to our National Church to represent that it is at this time a field of dissension. My experience," said the Archbishop, "is quite the other way. I do not suppose that any Bishop in the Church of England desires to rule over men who are not capable of thinking for themselves, or who deem it wrong to do so. We desire to govern, not slaves, or dead men, but living, energetic, free men: and where there is real life, there will of necessity be diversity of opinion. My experience, however, is that, amid this diversity of opinion, there is a real hearty concord; and an earnest desire, animating the whole body of the Clergy of this country, to do their work with a zeal and a harmony which have never been exceeded. I think it well," he said, "that we should encourage ourselves by the recollection of that fact. When we speak of the Clergy," the Archbishop went on to say, "they will be the first to acknowledge with

me, that the Clergy are but the servants of the Church, and do not constitute the Church"—no more, assuredly, as the Archbishop's words imply, and as the faithful Laity would feel, than that *they* alone constitute it. "And as to the Laity," said his Grace, "—I say it fearlessly—there never was in this country an age in which the Laity did in a more intelligent and at the same time hearty way rally round the Church and support the Clergy. What is the meaning of the large assembly that has gathered here to-day? They have come from various distant places to testify to this one fact—that they are attached to the Church of England, and agree to take part in whatever work it provides for them. Certainly my own experience elsewhere shows that Laymen are, in theory and in practice, as distinctly ready to work for the Church as are any of the ordained Clergy."

It was thus, my Reverend Brethren, that our late Primate spoke, on the day on which he had just taken his seat on the Archiepiscopal throne of "the Cathedral and Metropolitan Church of Christ, Canterbury." It was thus he spoke in regard to the full and free exercise of all the powers of the mind in the Church of England, and the hearty co-operation of the Lay mind with that of the Clergy, in their willing service to that Church. And it was in the same spirit that his Most Reverend Successor, on the like occasion, standing in the same place, put forth the same claims, in

these self-same relations, for the Church of which he had now become the Chief Pastor. The Church of England, he recognized, was called upon "to be free from superstition, and to go back to the primitive model; searching fearlessly the Divine oracles, and reforming everything needing to be reformed. The Church of England," he said, "must represent the Church of Christ in its freedom; she must have the same freedom as when it was necessary for Apostles and people to brave death; her temperate soul should be inspired with the principles which animated them." She would "never be afraid of intelligence; because she is persuaded that intelligence is of God, and that the result will be to establish every word that God has given to man. Other Churches may fear," said the Archbishop, "and even devotional spirits among ourselves may fear: their prayers at last will guide them to a truer courage. The Church will never be afraid of education, never be afraid of research, or of what science and philosophy may find out; because science and philosophy have their fountains in the throne of God. The Church of England has made such progress during the last fifty years, that, if God continues to us the outpourings of His grace, we cannot know where another fifty years will place us." Only let no "root of bitterness springing up trouble us." "If there be anything," said the Archbishop, "but that harmony in the Church which Christ Himself prayed for, clouds of darkness

may once more settle upon us. If we determine in our hearts to make a wise unity our aim in the next fifty years, the progress may be as great as in the last fifty years it has been. May this be so!"—an earnest aspiration of our Chief Pastor which may well find its echo in all our hearts.

In the language of the great Apostle to his Corinthian brethren, we, too, may say, in the name of our own branch of the one Church of Christ to which he ministered, "A great door and effectual is opened unto me, and there are many adversaries."¹ But it may be with us, as it was with "the man of God" of whom we spoke before, in the elder days of the Church in Israel, when "his servant"—his young disciple and minister—"was risen early, and gone forth," and "behold, an host compassed the city both with horses and chariots. And his servant said unto him, Alas, my master! how shall we do? And he answered, Fear not: for they that be with us are more than they that be with them."² But we need, like the prophet's servant, to have our eyes open, both in the lower sense and in the higher, the temporal as well as the spiritual; that the Church may not be entrapped by insidious designs, the true character and tendency of which are studiously concealed, under the garb of plausible propositions, and what would fain be popular concessions, involving the surrender of essential principles, or dangerous and destructive precedents.

¹ 1 Cor. xvi. 9.

² 2 Kings vi. 15, 16.

I shall not occupy your time to-day, my Reverend Brethren, with a particular account of the several Bills now before Parliament, affecting the interests of the Church. The Executive Committee of the Church Defence Institution—an institution which deserves well of all Churchmen—has just put forth a “Statement,” in the same manner as in the preceding session. The Bills, the Committee report, are not so numerous as those introduced last year, but nevertheless are worthy of careful consideration; and one or two are of primary importance. Of those which have been before Parliament in former sessions, the three which stand foremost in their list are those to which I called your special attention last year, the Burial Fees Bill, the Cemeteries Bill, and the Churchwardens’ Admission Bill. In regard to the last named of these, the Bill is, as I have before pointed out, quite needless, and would injuriously affect our Visitations; infallibly tending to put an end to these gatherings of Clergy and Laity which are in accordance with ancient rules, and which, I am sure you will agree with me, are highly valuable. The Lower House of Convocation has now, for the third time, called the attention of the Upper House to the Bill, if by any chance it should appear in the House of Lords. Our late Primate strongly deprecated anything which would interfere with our coming together in the annual Visitation of the Churchwardens with the Clergy, and with the inquiries duly made, and the answers returned here, to the Bishop’s officer, the Archdeacon.

We examined in detail last year the two Bills connected with interments, the Burial Fees Bill, and the Cemeteries Bill. The Report, which has since appeared, of the Select Committee of the House of Commons—a bulky folio of well-nigh four hundred pages—more than bears out the view which I had been compelled to take of these Bills; the evidence given before the Committee eliciting, in some cases, from somewhat unwilling witnesses, statements which proved their secret bearing on the question of “Disestablishment and Disendowment.” And this connection, it was satisfactory to find, did not escape the observation of the Home Secretary, on whom a large deputation waited last month, to urge the necessity for the further amendment, and also the consolidation, of the several Burial Laws. The deputation “consisted of representatives of the Liberation Society, Dissenting Deputies, Congregational and Baptist Unions, Unitarian Association, Methodist Free Churches, Methodist New Connexion, Primitive Methodist Connexion, Presbyterian Church in England, and the Bible Christians.”¹ The Home Secretary was supported by the Judge Advocate-General (Mr. Osborne Morgan, M.P.), and Mr. Chamberlain, M.P. It was stated to the Home Secretary, “that the deputation represented more than twelve hundred churches, and expressed the views of the great body of Nonconformists. They did not approve of invidious distinctions in connection

¹ *Standard*, April 10, 1883. See Note C.

with the burial of the dead,"—in other words, the consecration of part of the burial ground. "It might be said by some that it was unfair to reopen the burials question, as it was understood that the Bill of 1880 was a final settlement of the matter ; but," they said, "it was never so understood by Nonconformists." And, indeed, it would seem from the evidence given before the Committee, that the Government were "distinctly informed" that the Bill would not be accepted as a final settlement ; this information being "given in private," while "it did not appear in public." "Another point was the transfer of the control of churchyards to some other local authority ; which," it was said, "would get rid of a number of perplexities." A statement was read "which urged the necessity for further Government action to remove the anomalies which," it was represented, "had been increased by the passing of the Burial Act of 1880 ;" an Act, I may observe, which, it was supposed, was to *diminish*, or remove, "anomalies" and difficulties.

The Home Secretary, in reply, found himself obliged, as it would seem, to tell the deputation, that, "as to division of ground, they must obey the existing law. If a portion of the community attached value to burial in consecrated ground, that sentiment should be respected ; and upon the closing of a churchyard other consecrated ground should be provided." "The question of fees was not a sentimental one : but vested interests must be respected."

“If a method could be devised of getting rid of fees with compensation, it would be a good thing. He had been told,” however, “that the Ecclesiastical Commissioners had no such balance available as Sir Alexander Gordon’s Committee had suggested; it being a working balance only. As to the control of the churchyards,” the Home Secretary went on to say, “that was practically disestablishment; and they would not expect him to include that in a Bill for amending the Burial Laws.”¹

There are, however, two Bills, one of which, though not at this moment actually before Parliament, will too probably, having now no chance of coming on in the Commons, be brought in afresh into the House of Lords, and the other is a new Bill now first come before Parliament; and these two Bills are, in their religious and social bearings, of great importance. The first named is the Bill for Legalizing Marriage with a Deceased Wife’s Sister.² It was brought into the House of Commons at the opening of the Session, and secured the first place on the order paper of Wednesday, February 28th. Owing, however, to the prolongation of the debate on the Address, it was not considered; and all hope of obtaining a place for it in the present Session has been abandoned. It is, therefore, as far as the House of Commons is concerned, “a dropped Bill.” We are told, however, that the Bill will be introduced into the House of Lords by a member

¹ See Note D.

² See Note E.

of the House now abroad ; but no day has yet been named. It is earnestly to be desired that this intention may not be carried into effect. When the Bill was before the House of Lords last year, the Lower House of the Convocation of Canterbury, in its Session of February 15th, presented to the Upper House a representation to this effect—"that such a marriage would be in direct opposition to the Canons of the Church ; that the legalizing such marriages would involve the Clergy in many harassing difficulties ; that such marriages were abhorrent to the feelings of the large majority of men and women in England ; that a law to enable a man to marry his deceased wife's sister would be logically followed by a Bill to enable a man to marry his wife's niece, and to abolish all restrictions on marriages between persons related to each other by affinity ; and that, if the ancient limits provided in this Church and realm, with regard to marriages of affinity, be broken down, the many would be made to suffer, in their consciences and in their homes, for the sake of the few." On these grounds the Lower House requested their Lordships the Bishops to do what in them lay to prevent this Bill becoming law. In a recent session held this month, the Lower House renewed their strong petition against the measure, and again begged their Lordships of the Upper House "to give it their most earnest and united opposition."

The other Bill which calls for the special atten-

tion of Churchmen is the Parliamentary Oaths Act (1866) Amendment Bill, brought in by the Attorney-General. The Lower House of Convocation has, in a Representation to the Upper House, expressed its "deep regret at the introduction of this Bill." They felt that it was "impossible to sever the Bill from the circumstances which have led to its introduction, viz. a desire to secure his seat to an atheist, who openly avows his disbelief." It seemed to the House "to cast dishonour upon God; and that it ought to be opposed to the uttermost."

These are not days, my Reverend Brethren, in which we can safely dispense with the religious recognition of His Divine Being, or the sense of His nearer Presence, who is the God of Truth, and of whose power to punish falsehood and perjury they stand in awe, as the daily annals of our courts of justice bear witness, who would not shrink from prevarication and lying as towards their fellows, but still have some "fear of God," though they "regard not man." Let me detain you for a few moments longer, while I call up the memory of what, I doubt not, some of you recollect in the history of Archbishop Whitgift, as related by the biographer of Hooker. "There had passed," we are told, "not many years before" Whitgift was made Archbishop, "an act or acts of Parliament, intending the better preservation of Church lands, by recalling a power which was vested in others to

sell or lease them, by lodging and trusting the future care and protection of them only in the Crown; and among many that had made a bad use of this power or trust of the Queen's, the Earl of Leicester was one." "This nobleman possessed," it is noted, "a great desire of unity in the Church, and yet was an earnest patron of Cartwright, and others of the Puritan strain." "And the good Bishop"—at that time Bishop of Worcester—"having by his interest with her Majesty put a stop to the Earl's sacrilegious designs, they two fell to an open opposition before her; after which they both quitted the room, not friends in appearance. But the Bishop made a sudden and seasonable return to her Majesty (for he found her alone), and spake to her with great humility and reverence, and to this purpose:—

"I beseech your Majesty to hear me with patience, and to believe that yours and the Church's safety are dearer to me than my life, but my conscience dearer than both; and therefore give me leave to do my duty, and tell you that princes are deputed nursing fathers of the Church, and owe it a protection: and therefore God forbid that you should be so much as passive in her ruin, when you may prevent it; or that I should behold it without horror and detestation; or should forbear to tell your Majesty of the sin and danger. And though you and myself are born in an age of frailties, when the primitive piety and care of the Church's lands

and immunities are much decayed, yet, Madam, let me beg that you will but first consider, and then you will believe there are such sins as profaneness and sacrilege ; for if there were not, they could not have names in Holy Writ, and particularly in the New Testament.’” He spoke then of Christ and His zeal for the temple, and the Apostle Paul’s mention of sacrilege ; and went on to remind the Queen how “ King Edgar, and Edward the Confessor, and, indeed, many others of” her “ predecessors, and many private Christians,” had “ also given to God and to his Church much land, and many immunities, which they might have given to those of their own families, and did not, but gave them as an absolute right and sacrifice to God : And with these immunities and lands they have entailed,” said he, “ a curse upon the alienators of them ; God prevent your Majesty from being liable to that curse.

“ And to make you that are trusted with their preservation,” he went on to say, “ the better to understand the danger of it, I beseech you, forget not that, besides these curses, the Church’s land and power have been also endeavoured to be preserved, as far as human reason and the law of this nation have been able to preserve them, by an immediate and most sacred obligation on the consciences of the princes of this realm. For they that consult Magna Charta shall find that, as all your predecessors were, at their coronation, so you also were *sworn* before

all the nobility and bishops then present, *and in the presence of God*, and, *in his stead*, to him that anointed you, to maintain the Church lands, and the rights belonging to it; and this testified openly *at the holy altar, by laying your hands on the Bible then lying upon it*. And not only Magna Charta, but many modern statutes have denounced a curse upon those that break Magna Charta. And now, what account can be given for the breach of *this oath* at the last great day, either by your Majesty or by me, if it be wilfully or but negligently violated, I know not."

"Madam," he said, "religion is the foundation and cement of human societies. . . . Pardon this affectionate plainness, my most dear Sovereign"—these were his concluding words,—“and let me beg to be still continued in your favour; and the Lord still continue you in his.”¹

The appeal prevailed, and the faithful witness rose higher than before in the favour of the Queen.

We are taught by inspired authority to recognize the higher dignity, the holier power, in the priesthood of Christ our Redeemer, as compared with the priests of the sacred line of Aaron, inasmuch as “those priests were made without an oath, but this with an oath by him that said unto him, ‘The Lord *sware* and will not repent, Thou art a Priest for ever, after the order of Melchisedec.’”² By so

¹ “Walton’s *Lives*,” by Zouch, vol. i. pp. 369–375. See Note F.

² Ps. cx. 4.

much was Jesus made a surety of a better testament.”¹ And not only so, but the covenant itself with us of the household of faith was ratified with the Divine sanction of an oath on high. “For when God made promise to Abraham, because he could swear by no greater, he swore by himself.” “For men verily swear by the greater: and an oath for confirmation is to them an end of all strife. Wherein God, willing more abundantly to show unto the heirs of promise the immutability of his counsel, confirmed it by an oath.”²

We have recalled now the memories, let me say finally, of chief Pastors of the flock in this Diocese and Province, who have sought to bequeath to them that should come after them in the sacred succession “a legacy of peace and unity,” as part of the “great inheritance” which was given them to administer.³ They were, herein, but following, as we know, the example of Him, “that great Shepherd of the sheep,” consecrated “through the blood of the everlasting covenant,” who made this His sacred bequest to His chosen disciples, when He had finished His ministry on earth, and was to be taken away from them for a time, and who, again, when He solemnly gave up into the hands of His Father in heaven the work which He had given Him to do, made this to be the sure proof to an unbelieving world of the mission with which He had been invested. “Peace I leave with you,” said He, “my

¹ Heb. vii. 21, 22.

² Ibid. vi. 13, 16, 17.

³ See Note G.

peace I give unto you : not as the world giveth, give I unto you. Let not your heart be troubled, neither let it be afraid.”¹ This was His gracious bequest ; and this was His solemn prayer, “ Neither pray I for these alone, but for them also which shall believe on me through their word ; that they all may be one, as thou, Father, art in me, and I in thee, that they also may be one in us : that the world may believe that thou hast sent me.”²

May we, my Reverend Brethren, and our Lay Brethren with us, in the several offices committed to their charge, and, with them, all the members of His Church among us, do what in us lies in the days of our pilgrimage, faithfully and humbly, to guard and hand on that sacred bequest, and to further the fulfilment of that earnest prayer.

And to Him, the Incarnate Son, with the Everlasting Father, and the Spirit of grace and love, Three Persons in the Unity of the Eternal Godhead, be ascribed all honour and glory, adoration and praise, for ever and ever.

¹ St. John xiv. 27.

² Ibid. xvii. 20, 21.

NOTE A.

IN the course of the past year, two of my five brethren of the Chapter of Canterbury have been taken away by death—both of them my juniors in the Chapter, one of them nine years my junior, the other fourteen years. Mr. Stone, indeed, was my senior in point of age by several years, and had been withdrawn for a long period from the active duty which had throughout remarkably characterized his clerical life, especially during the many years that he was Rector of Spitalfields. Mr. Robertson, whom I had examined for Priest's Orders when he was ordained priest as curate to Dr. Griffith at Boxley, had for several years resigned, under medical advice, the Professorship of Ecclesiastical History at King's College, with the frequent journeys to London which its duties entailed upon him; but he was to the time of his death actively employed in his historical labours; and it was only after an illness of a few days, which was not thought to be serious, that he was unexpectedly taken from us.

At the time of the Visitation, the principal church of the Archdeaconry, All Saints', Maidstone, had for five months been without its pastor; in consequence of the lamented death of the late vicar, Archdeacon Thomas Dealtry (late Archdeacon of Madras), who died a few days before the Archbishop. He had held a Chaplaincy in India for twenty-one years, and the office of Archdeacon of Madras for ten years, when he was compelled to return to England by the failure of his health; and, after holding a living in Yorkshire for some six years, was appointed to Maidstone in 1878. He had greatly attached to himself the people of his new charge, during the five years of his incumbency, and his loss was deeply regretted. The new vicar, the Rev. Edwin Francis Dyke, is a member of one of the oldest and most highly respected families in Kent; his father was well known to the clergy, in his office of Principal Registrar of the Diocese, and was regarded by myself as a highly valued friend of many years. The new Vicar of All Saints' was ordained to the curacy of Crayford; had then for eight years almost the entire charge of the parish of West Wickham, in the advanced age of its rector, Mr. Austen; and was appointed seven years ago by the late Archbishop to the vicarage of Orpington. The delay in filling up the vacancy, it should be stated in justice

to the Lord Chancellor, on whom the duty devolved, by lapse to the Crown, of recommending a successor to the vacant benefice, arose out of his anxiety that the clergyman appointed to so important a post in the diocese should be one who, in the opinion of the Archbishop, the patron in ordinary of the vicarage, was the person best qualified to be appointed to such a charge. Mr. Dyke was instituted by the Archbishop in the chapel at Lambeth on the 18th of May, and was inducted on the 8th of June. He will find, I am sure, his entering in among the people of his charge welcomed with true and hearty feeling, and will learn, before he has been there long, how much of sound Church principle, and bounteous Christian liberality, distinguishes the people of Maidstone in all works of piety and charity.

In immediate connection with the town of Maidstone, with the Diocese generally, and with the county of Kent, my notice of the losses we have sustained would be very imperfect, if I did not specially note the many years of valuable service rendered by Mr. William Balston, of Springfield, Maidstone. Mr. Balston, who was in his seventy-fifth year, had for a long period taken an active part in public affairs. For many years he had been a justice of the peace for the Bearsted division, and was most regular in his attendance at the petty sessions. He was, moreover, chairman of the visiting committee of Barming Heath Asylum. It would be a large enumeration that would be required, if I specified the many good offices which he rendered to the Church and to the business of the county; but I should be greatly wanting to the claims of duty, if I did not record, in particular, the work which he did, through a long period of years, for the Diocesan Education Society, first as one of its secretaries from the date of its establishment in 1839, and then as its treasurer to the time of his lamented death; attending with unflinching regularity the quarterly meetings of the Board of Education; always ready with his sound advice, his watchful care over the interests of the Society, and liberal contribution to its funds. He could "be deservedly ranked," as was truly said in the *Maidstone Journal*, which appeared on the day of his death, "as among the staunchest friends of the Church of England in the county town. To the munificent support extended by him, and by Mr. R. Balston, the erection and endowment of St. Paul's Church, Maidstone, was largely due. . . . By all his numerous employés, as well as by a large circle of friends and acquaintances, his unexpected death" was, indeed, "deeply deplored."

NOTE B.

THE view which the world is apt to take of the Church of Christ, her doctrines and her work, is, in regard to past ages, that of an endless succession of theological dogmas, or dreams, which have all in due time, in the advance of rational thought and the onward progress of things, come to be looked upon as things obsolete and worn out, to be cast aside and forgotten, as the world has become wiser; or, in regard to the conflicts and controversies of our own time, as a succession of excitements, of needless panics and "scares," the folly of which has been sufficiently proved by the event, and by the conclusions in which "the wisdom of this world" has made up its mind to find some sort of at least temporary rest. Meanwhile, amidst the world's "scornful wonder," the Church is able to trace, notwithstanding man's imperfection and sin, God's Almighty providence watching over the "treasure," which, in His unerring wisdom, He saw fit to commit to "earthen vessels;" and so working out His own purposes, in the manifestation and establishment of His eternal truth, "that the excellency of the power," as the Apostle spake, "may be of God, and not of us."

If we look, for instance, to our own Book of Articles, unsystematic as it may seem to be, and accidental almost, as men might regard it, in the combination of its contents, we find it reflecting as it were the history of the Church, and its onward progress from age to age. The records of patriarchal piety in the Old Testament, the intermediate dispensation of the law, and the ministry of the prophets, embody the truth of the Divine Unity; while at the same time there was a foreshadowing and preparation for the revelation of Three Divine Persons in the One Godhead. The doctrine of the Second Article, "of the Word or Son of God, which was made very Man," in its enshrining of the mystery of Christ's holy Incarnation, and the union of "two whole and perfect Natures in one Person," carries us onward, from the days of Christ's own ministry and teaching and that of His Apostles and Evangelists, through the conflicts of the first four centuries, to the final ratification, by the whole Catholic Church, of the Creed embodied in the decrees of the first four General Councils. In like manner as regards the doctrine of the Divine Person of the Holy Ghost, contained in the same Creeds. The Sixth Article fences round that primitive Faith with the sanction of Holy Scripture; a protest, derived from Christian antiquity, against un-Catholic claims of Councils of a different character. The fourth century supplied the evidence in regard to the Canonical books of

Holy Scripture; and the harmony of the Old Testament with the New was established in opposition to all the heretical systems which had striven to set them at variance.

Then with the age of St. Augustine began the great conflict with Pelagian error; and the succession of Articles from the Ninth to the Seventeenth reflects the history of Church doctrine as it passed through the conflicts of the Schools.

The doctrine of "the visible Church of Christ," its nature and character, together with that "of the authority of the Church" and "of the authority of General Councils," stamps itself upon the history of Rome, and the conflict with it, in the age immediately preceding the Reformation, and the era of the Reformation itself. Amidst the corruptions of Roman doctrine, the later Articles embody the doctrine of the Sacraments, as witnessed by the Church in opposition to Romish departure from primitive faith, or to the denial, by modern sects, of the grace conveyed by Christ's institution in these ordinances of His appointment.

The truth, divinely revealed, moves onward through these successive periods of the Church's history, in something of the manner in which the poet of our "Christian Year," in his thoughts on Advent Sunday, describes the solemn triumphal procession of the King of Sion.

NOTE C.

It is impossible not to be reminded of the heterogeneous body, described by the Psalmist, of those who had "consulted together with one consent, and were confederate against" Israel; "made friends together," as we may say, in the memorable words of the Gospel history, when "before they were at enmity between themselves." Thus the Psalmist enumerates the motley host: "The tabernacles of the Edomites and the Ishmaelites; of the Moabites and Hagarenes; Gebal, and Ammon, and Amalek; the Philistines with them that dwell at Tyre. Asshur also is joined with them, and have holpen the children of Lot." It is certainly true now, as then, concerning those "that wish not well unto our Sion," that "they have taken crafty counsel" and "consulted" cunningly against the object of their devices and designs; and also that they are very like those "who said, Let us take to ourselves the houses of God in possession" (Psa. lxxxiii. 5-21).

One remark that was made by a member of the deputation that attended at the Home Office demands a word of notice. He "said that the arrangement made with the Clergy as to fees in 1880 was a bribe; but it had worked badly." "A bribe" commonly means

giving some gift, in order to obtain from the party bribed the surrender of what he would otherwise refuse to give up. There was nothing obtained, in the matter of the burial fees, in the way of consent or acquiescence on the part of the Clergy. It was said of them the other day, in bitter and sweeping complaint, that they opposed the Burials Bill to the last. But if it *had* been what is called thus offensively a "bribe," what would be thought, in matters of ordinary dealing between man and man, of giving a something to purchase a certain thing, and then, having obtained the object, proceeding to take possession of the gift? It would not commend itself, certainly, to men entitled to be esteemed for honesty and fairness—to say nothing of kindness of feeling—in the affairs of daily life.

NOTE D.

THE preceding Charge, with the passage contained in it to which this Note is appended, had been delivered on three consecutive days, at the Visitations held at Sittingbourne, Maidstone, and Tunbridge, when, taking up the morning paper the next day, before the Visitation at Sevenoaks, I read the report of a debate in the House of Commons, the day before (Wednesday, April 25), which might rather have surprised those who had not learned that nothing ought to surprise any one in the world of politics in the present day. The second reading of the "Cemeteries Bill" had been proposed by the honourable member for Merthyr Tydvil (Mr. Richard), who had introduced the deputation on the subject of the selfsame Bill, at the Home Office, not very long before. When Mr. Richard had made his speech, the Home Secretary was reported to have said at once, "That, without pledging himself to the details of the Bill, he thought his honourable friend had made out a clear case in its favour." To the uninitiated, this seemed not easily reconcilable with the answer which the Home Secretary had given to the deputation so lately. "Those," indeed, it appeared, "who desired to be buried in consecrated ground, ought, he thought, not to be denied the privilege:" but the Bill, meanwhile, it is to be observed, effectually provided that everything for the sake of which consecration is regarded and desired should be put an end to, and the whole ground be treated virtually as unconsecrated. "He saw no reason why the whole ground should not be consecrated"—consecration, it is to be presumed, being thus interpreted and understood; and "as regarded chapels, it was a great hardship that, in certain parts of the country where Dissenters were in the majority, two chapels had to be provided—as if to emphasize the

distinction between the Church and Dissent—when one common chapel was sufficient for the services of the dead for all Churches." Mr. Richard had stated that his Bill "proposed to absolve the authorities from the obligation to divide the ground" into consecrated or unconsecrated, "or to provide two chapels."

Having already carefully examined this Bill in my Charge, as published last year, supplying for its illustration the somewhat curious evidence given before the Select Committee, bearing on the character of this and the Burial Fees Bill, as pieces of "Disestablishment and Disendowment" by instalment, I shall not enter again upon its details, but simply repeat that there is no such obligation at present upon burial authorities so to divide the ground, or to build two chapels. The Home Office, meanwhile, it appeared, had its grievance. It "was called upon," said the Secretary of State, "to discharge the unfitting duty of assigning the relative proportion of consecrated or unconsecrated ground, in accordance with the strength of the Church of England and of the Dissenting Churches in the district." This need hardly, however, one would think, be regarded as a serious grievance or impropriety, or a requirement giving the Secretary of State much trouble. On the other hand, it appeared, the honourable member for Stafford (Mr. Salt) "did not propose to offer any definite opposition to the second reading of the Bill;" reserving to himself "the right to take any action he thought proper at a later stage." "He always regretted to see two exactly similar chapels standing side by side in one cemetery." "So far he agreed with the principle of the Bill; but he was not sure that the present condition of affairs did not meet the views of the country at large." He should have been disposed to refer the Bill to a Select Committee, but that would take time; and there was this difficulty, that "under the present system of carrying on business in the House, honourable members were completely overtaxed in committee work upstairs (hear, hear). He hoped," however, "that a sufficient interval would be allowed to elapse before taking the Bill in committee of the whole House, so as to enable honourable members to obtain adequate information on the subject." It is to be borne in mind, meanwhile, that the Bill was word for word the same with that which had been presented by Mr. Richard the year before, and, if I mistake not, the year before that; and, as Mr. Beresford Hope reminded the House, "the question which this Bill touched was thrashed out in a committee of which both himself and his honourable friend were members"—the committee whose big Report, in its bulky Blue Book, is referred to in the preceding Charge. The two sides of the House, meanwhile, seemed equally in the dark in regard to the Bill, its principles and its details.

To the serious dissatisfaction of the Home Secretary, while all seemed going on agreeably, there "came posting down," as he expressed it, "his right honourable friend, the member for the University of Cambridge, who might be expected"—it may not perhaps appear exactly why—"to support any measure for the extension of religious liberty (oh)." Mr. Beresford Hope had, certainly, not spent in vain his many hours and days in the Select Committee on the Burial Fees Bill. "He objected to the two leading principles of the Bill, that consecration should have no effect, and that no chapels should be erected for the specific use of any form of worship. This was, to his mind, a gross and flagrant violation of religious liberty, and he protested against it. The abolition of parochial rights was, he maintained, an act of plunder on the clergy, who had been sufficiently plundered already; and he, therefore, moved that the Bill be read a second time on that day six months (hear, hear)." Thereupon Mr. Stanley Leighton, who was also on that Select Committee, seconded the motion. He "objected to the retrospective character of the Bill. Surely those who objected to consecration might hold their hands in regard to the past. The Bill was called a Cemeteries Bill; but it was nothing of the kind. It really affected the churchyards; and the provision which prevented the cemetery authorities from applying to the bishop for consecration was an outrage on religious liberty."

"Mr. Tomlinson supported the amendment. If the Bill merely dealt with the laying out of new cemeteries, he might not have objected to it; but, applying as it did to all consecrated cemeteries and churchyards, he felt it his duty to oppose it."

"Mr. Thompson objected to the Bill on the ground that it would do away with consecration. He thought that members of the Church of England had a right, if they desired it, to be buried among their friends in consecrated ground. For himself, he thought it was a great advantage to have differences of religious opinion (a laugh). There were more sects and denominations in England than any other country; and it was on that ground that he believed this was the most religious country in the world. It was natural that persons should desire to be buried with people who entertained the same religious opinions (hear, hear)."

The Roman Catholic members came finally and bodily to the rescue. "Mr. O'Donnell described this Bill as a measure for secularizing and atheizing the cemeteries and churchyards. It was another chapter in that scheme of which the atheistic Affirmation Bill formed part. If the Nonconformists did not want a consecrated cemetery, let them have an unconsecrated one and welcome; but why should the law of the land, as was proposed by Clause I, prevent the erection of a boundary to divide consecrated from unconsecrated

ground? It was an intolerable interference with the religious liberty of other people to tell them that, because Nonconformists did not believe in religious authority, nobody else should be allowed to believe it. It seemed to him that the new class of Liberals were very like the old class of persecutors (Opposition cheers). The honourable member proceeded to refer to certain of the Clauses of the Bill, when

“The Speaker interposed, and said the House was now engaged in considering the principle of the Bill on the second reading.

“Mr. O'Donnell remarked that there were five or six different principles introduced into this Bill; and he should be obliged if any member would show what was the principle or the philosophy in it, unless it was the avowed truth and the avowed philosophy of secularization and atheism. This Bill was directed in the most cruel way against the religious susceptibilities of the poor. Under existing Acts, paupers of any religious denomination should be buried in conformity with their religious convictions; but by this Bill the poverty of a pauper might be taken advantage of in order to cast his body, like that of a dead dog, into any unconsecrated ground. Clause 12, he considered, deserved the condemnation of every man of manly or generous feeling (hear, hear). He moved that the debate be adjourned, and said, the more the country considered the subject, the less it would like the object the Government had taken into their arms.

“Mr. Daly regarded the measure as being most aggressive. It grated on the susceptibilities of members of the Church of England, as well as of the religious body with which he was connected. He was desirous that the public, and the members of the House, should have a fair opportunity for the consideration of the Bill.

“Mr. Illingworth asked that the motion for adjournment should be withdrawn, in order that the remaining two hours of the sitting might be devoted to the discussion of the Bill.

“Lord R. Churchill hoped the motion for adjournment would be persevered in. The Bill had come upon the House with surprise, and members should be allowed time to make themselves acquainted with its provisions. They had looked for guidance to the front Opposition bench, but, as usual, found none (laughter); and, therefore, they were entitled to an opportunity to make up their minds on the question.

“Mr. Hicks and Mr. T. Egerton supported the motion for adjournment, which Mr. Monk opposed.

“Colonel Makins argued that the Bill should not be passed in a thin House, because it involved not only a question of cemeteries, but also that of disendowment.

“Mr. King-Harman said he would make every effort to prevent

the Bill being proceeded with, as he objected altogether to its principles.

“Mr. Gorst remarked that scarcely any one expected the Bill to come on that afternoon; and that was the explanation of the asserted unanimity which prevailed in its favour at the beginning of the sitting, there being then few members present. This was a subject on which they were entitled to have the assistance of the Government and the leaders of the Opposition, who were not present. There were in the Bill two pages of Acts of Parliament which were to be repealed. Nothing was of more importance or required more caution than the repeal of Acts of Parliament. It was necessary to have the advice of the law officers of the Crown on the subject; yet neither of them was there, and the consequence was that the House was like so many sheep without a shepherd (laughter).

“Sir J. Mowbray thought the debate ought to be adjourned, in order that they might know what alterations were to be made in the Bill.

“Mr. Macartney supported the adjournment, on the ground that the discussion had taken the House by surprise.

“The House divided, when there were—

For the adjournment	121
Against	150
				29
		Majority against	...	29

“Mr. Illingworth said the object of this Bill was to make more complete and just, and more in harmony with the necessities of the case, the Act of 1880. There should be no disability in regard to burial on account of any religious opinion. Absolute freedom was to be left to Roman Catholics, as well as to all other of her Majesty's subjects; and the Bill would remove the last trace of civil disability in this matter. He disclaimed altogether the suggestion of the honourable member for Dungarvan, that there was any favour to atheism, or any other ism, intended by the Bill.

“Sir J. Mowbray wanted to know whether those who regarded the Bill in 1880 as a settlement of this question were going to reopen it, and, if so, upon the strength of what grievance. He regarded this as an attempt to dispossess the clergy of the Church of pecuniary rights to which they were entitled under that Act, and to take away consecrated ground which would, under the present law, belong to the Church. With regard to the two chapels, he asked why one of them should be taken away if the Church of England desired to have it. He really wished to know from the Government whether the Burials Act was a final settlement of the question.

“Mr. L. Stanley thought that cemetery authorities should be

empowered to furnish one building in cemeteries for the use of all denominations.

“Mr. Hubbard said the real object of this Bill was not to extend, but to narrow and restrain, religious liberty. The Bill was one of absolute intolerance, and would be opposed by all those who believed in the Divine origin of religion. They were told that there should only be one chapel in the cemeteries; and he would like to know if they were to carry the matter further, and have only one Act of Parliament chapel in every street. If this Bill were passed, there would be nothing to prevent the chapel, which was associated in the minds of the Churchmen with some of the holiest acts of religion, being open to the emissaries of the Hall of Science. The real object of the promoters of the Bill was to destroy the idea of consecration. If the Dissenters were not to be satisfied with religious liberty—if they were to be content with nothing less than religious equality—they would have to struggle on for many a day. The idea of religious equality was inconsistent with the maintenance of a monarchy, with the Sovereign in communion with the Church of England.

“The right honourable gentleman was speaking when, at a quarter to six, the debate was adjourned.”

“*Sic me servavit Apollo*,” the Latin satirist would have said, once more. The “disestablishment,” meanwhile, involved in the Bill seemed to be quietly acquiesced in by some who only demurred to the “disendowment.” But it is somewhat dispiriting to find how difficult it is, apparently, to get any attention to *facts* in these matters.

NOTE E.

It is now more than thirty years ago (in May, 1850) that I found myself compelled to bring under the consideration of the clergy the agitation which had then recently been set on foot, with a view “to alter the law of our country in regard to the degrees within which marriage is prohibited.” “The subject,” I said, “is one on which I would gladly refrain from entering; but it has become necessary that we should not ignore the question, from the unhappy circumstance that it has been made the subject of repeated and earnest discussion, during the past and the present session, in the Commons’ House of Parliament.” I referred to the passages of Scripture—the chapters in Leviticus—which were now forming “the text of

disputations in our legislative assemblies, and in the columns of daily journals, in a way which would suggest the thought, that our Reformers were not altogether wrong in the testimony which, it would seem, they meant to put on record," in the calendar of lessons, "that those chapters contained, in their judgment, the unchanging will of God."

"They felt, doubtless, and on good grounds," I thought, "that if there was *any* general law of God still in force, in regard to restraints on marriage by reason of nearness of natural relation or connection, it was to be found in those chapters; for nowhere else was there any in Scripture, from one end to the other. And the reason of the thing, as well as the common consent of the Christian Church, convinced them that these passages of the Mosaic law were thus to be regarded. And on the same grounds they were assured that the mere letter of the law was not enough to look to, or its whole spirit would be palpably violated; or, as Bishop Jewel expressed it, 'that God himself would have us to expound ^{one} ~~our~~ degree by another.' 'For when God commands me, I shall not marry my brother's wife, it follows directly, by the same, that he forbids me to marry my wife's sister: for between one man and two sisters, and one woman and two brothers, is like analogy or proportion.'

"On this broad ground of Divine prohibition, interpreted by the obvious principle of parity of reasoning and correspondence of relation, rests the law of the Church on this matter." And I ventured to say thus much, "on the Scriptural ground in regard to this most important matter, because there are many," I could not but think and believe, "who, amidst all the liberty and license of thought and action, which are in accordance with the spirit of the times, still fully recognize the Old Testament law as binding, and freely admit that, if the Word of God has spoken, there is an end to the question." "It is in one sense," as I expressed it in addressing the clergy of my archdeaconry, "a satisfaction to find that, in an arena like that in which the representatives of the people, of every variety of opinion and belief, meet in Parliament, there is a sense of unfitness, in the place and in the assembly, for discussing texts of Scripture; and hence a disposition, for the most part, to rest a question like this on grounds of social expediency, of individual feelings, or of public opinion." It is somewhat difficult, meanwhile, it must be confessed, to meet men's objections, whatever line of argument is taken: if you argue from Scripture, there is an opening always for objection as to its right interpretation; if you argue the question on social grounds, they will at once assume that you have given up the ground of Scripture, because *that* must undoubtedly be of paramount authority; and if there is no absolute Scriptural warrant for the prohibition of such marriages, then social

objections, we are told, are not to be pressed against the social interests of those who wish to marry their sisters-in-law.

In regard to the Scripture argument, so much stress has been laid by the advocates of these marriages on the text, Lev. xviii. 18, that something must be said upon it.

The rendering of the verse in our Authorized Version, and, I have no doubt myself, the correct rendering, is, "Neither shalt thou take a wife to her sister, to vex her, to uncover her nakedness, beside the other in her life time." The marginal rendering is, "one wife to another." In support of the rendering adopted in the text of the Authorized Version, it has been observed that "the testimony of the Rabbinical Jews in the Targums, the Mishna, and their later writings; that of the Hellenistic Jews in the Septuagint and Philo (*de Spec. Legg.* iii. 5); that of the early and mediæval Church in the old Italic; in the Vulgate, with the other early Versions of the Old Testament; and in every reference of the text in Fathers and Schoolmen, are unanimous in supporting, or in not in any wise opposing, the common rendering of the passage. This interpretation appears to have stood its ground unchallenged from the third century before Christ to the middle of the sixteenth century after Christ. (See *Ancient Interpretation of Lev. xviii. 18*, by Dr. McCaul; *Report of the Committee on Marriage*, p. 152.) *Speaker's Commentary*, *in loc.*

"But a different version of the words rendered 'a wife to her sister' was given by Junius and Tremellius (A.D. 1575), was treated with some allowance by Drusus (about A.D. 1600), found its way into the margin of our Authorized Version, and into the margin of the Geneva Version, and has been adopted more recently in the 'Berlenburger Bibel.'" (*Ibid.*)

"It is quite true," as the writer in the *Speaker's Commentary* goes on to observe, "that the phrase in question, and the corresponding one, *a man to his brother*, are used idiomatically in Hebrew in cases in which the words are not applied in their primary sense, but as pronouns. But this idiomatic use appears regularly to follow a plural antecedent; and involves necessarily, not the sense merely of *one* added on to another *single one* (which is what would be required here), but a distributive and reciprocal sense, answering to *each one to another*. It is so applied to the loops of the curtains of the tabernacle, to the tenons of the boards in Exod. xxvii. 3, 5, 6, 17, and to the wings of the cherubim in Ezek. i. 11, 23. (See Robinson, quoted by McCaul, p. 59.)" It stands thus: "The five curtains shall be coupled together *one to another*; and other five curtains shall be coupled *one to another*"—"Each to other," Heb. "(each) man (of them) to his brother"; "(each) woman (of them) to her sister." And, as the same commentator goes on to observe, "the suggested interpretation in this place in Leviticus is rendered

still more improbable by the fact that the words are the same which are used elsewhere throughout this chapter for *wife* and *sister*."

I cannot doubt that the rendering of the Authorized Version is right, understanding the prohibition to be of the marriage of *two sisters*. Our translators, while they held to this sense, seem to have thought it due to the other interpretation, adopted, as we have seen, in one or two versions then lately put forth, particularly the Genevan, to give it a place in the margin.

In addition, however, to the argument to be derived from the Hebrew idiom against the interpretation which would make it a prohibition simply of taking "one wife to another," it has been well observed that, "if the grammatical argument were less clear, the acceptance of the verse as a prohibition of polygamy would be obviously at variance with the laws in Exod. xxi. 7, and Deut. xxi. 15-17, which direct the mode for regulating a family in which there is more than one wife; to say nothing of the case of Elkanah, David, Joash (2 Chron. xxiv. 3), and others, which are never called in question as breaches of the law. By these instances, and by the warning for the king (Deut. xvii. 17), it would appear that the law, while it restricted and even discouraged polygamy, certainly permitted it to exist." (*Speaker's Commentary, in loc.* Compare Bp. Patrick, and others.)

Thomas Scott, who embodied this argument in his view of the passage, observes further that "the context also seems to suggest the more literal interpretation, viz. the marrying of *two sisters* together. This conduct in Jacob," he remarks, "proved a source of vexation to both Leah and Rachel, who were more jealous of each other than of the handmaidens, whom they willingly gave to their husband. And perhaps it would be found on trial," Scott goes on to say, "that those who before had lived together in the intimate equality of this near relationship would be more apt to rival each other, if married to the same man, than strangers would be; at least, their jealousies and bickerings would be more unseemly and distressing." And he adds that, "as a woman might not, in ordinary cases, marry the brother of her deceased husband, it can hardly be supposed that it was allowable for a man to marry the sister of his wife, even after her decease, though this verse does not," as he conceives, "contain a prohibition of it."

Special attention should be given to the mention of *veving* the wife, a point which does not occur elsewhere in the chapter. "The Jewish Commentators," it has been observed, "illustrate this by the example of Leah and Rachel." It is also to be remarked that we are told by those who are familiar with Eastern usages and maxims, that two sisters are never found together in one harem.

But we must go on to notice the counter argument that, if "the

rule as it here stands would seem to bear no other meaning than that a man is not to form a connection with his wife's sister while his wife is alive, it appears to follow that the law permitted marriage with the sister of a deceased wife. A limitation being expressly laid down in the words, 'beside the other in her lifetime,' it may be inferred," so it is argued, "that, when the limitation is removed, the prohibition loses its force, and permission is implied." But this is a very precarious inference where the language of the Holy Scripture is concerned. It may be sufficient to refer to the passage in S. Matthew i. 25, as interpreted by the general consent of the Church, to shew that it is no safe rule of inferential interpretation which is here assumed.

But there is a further point to be considered; and I may, perhaps, be allowed to state it in the form in which I brought it under the consideration of those whom I addressed, now, as I have already said, some three and thirty years ago. The law of the Church on this matter resting, as has been said, "on the broad ground of divine prohibition, interpreted by the obvious principle of parity of reasoning and correspondence of relation," I said, "if any one would ground an argument against that interpretation on a verse which might seem, at first sight, to limit the prohibition of such marriages as are now contended for simply to the lifetime of the sister, I venture to say, that, taking that verse as translated in the text of our Authorized Version; which rendering is certainly, I thought, the more correct of the two, as our translators probably—I would rather say 'undoubtedly'—judged it; and, granting even that it may be understood as simply forbidding the marriage with two sisters during the lifetime of the first wife, we find, on examining the language in which such marriage is designated, phraseology employed which, by modern delicacy—if delicacy it is to be called—is often simply omitted in quotation, but which is, indeed, significant and conclusive, if according to the representations (be it observed) of the advocates themselves of such marriages, the phraseology in question is applied distinctively, in the opinion of 'Oriental scholars,' to intercourse of an illicit kind, intercourse not hallowed by the sacred protection of marriage. And thus in this verse itself, which is put forth as the main strength of the opposite cause, we have a strong confirmation of the very conclusion against which it is so confidently cited. It exhibits, when carefully examined with close adherence to each clause and word, a clear intimation that such marriage in any case, whether the first wife were living or not, was not only calculated to disturb her happiness, but in itself a violation of the sanctities of personal chastity."¹

¹ Charge delivered in May, 1850. (*The Church, the Guardian of her Children; her Guide, the Oracles of God.*)

“In a table of affinity like the present,” says the Bishop of Lincoln, “where exactness of expression is required, it will naturally be anticipated that the word *achoth*, sister, would mean a *sister* by *blood*, as it does in vers. 9, 11, 12, 13; and in xx. 17, 19. If it has this sense here,” as the Bishop goes on to observe, “then this sentence forbids a man to bring in another wife to her *sister*, to vex her in her life; that is, as long as she lives.” Such a conjunction had been seen in the house of their forefather Jacob, and might seem to be recommended to the Israelites by his example; and therefore the legislator may have deemed it necessary to provide specially against it (S. Augustine). It has been inferred, indeed,” says the Bishop, “by some, that the legislator, by *prohibiting* a man from bringing in a wife to her sister in her lifetime, *allows* him to marry his wife’s sister *after his wife’s* death. But this deduction is not well grounded; and no one ought to act upon an inference which rests on so precarious a foundation. . . . As Richard Hooker well says, ‘It is a mistake to suppose that a thing *denied* with special circumstance doth import an *opposite affirmation* when once that circumstance is expired’ (Hooker, v. xlv. 2). ‘The manner of Scripture produceth no such inference as that’ (Bp. Pearson on Art. iii. p. 174). ‘If the legislator is here speaking of two sisters by blood, his meaning is this—Thou shalt not take a wife to her sister, *however long thy wife may live*; even though thy wife may be barren, aged, sickly, or ungracious; and though her sister may be younger than she is, and much more attractive in person—as Rachel was than Leah—and much more congenial to thee in temper and disposition than thy wife. Thou shalt bear patiently with all thy wife’s infirmities of body and soul (I Peter iii. 7), however long she may continue to live; and thou shalt resist all temptation to take thee another wife, especially thy wife’s sister; for the dissensions of sisters are the worst quarrels of all.’”

NOTE F.

THE necessary limit of time at the Visitation having obliged me to compress within narrow bounds in my Charge the questions raised by the Affirmation Bill, I may be permitted, perhaps, to subjoin here what I had occasion to say in the Lower House of Convocation in the following week, in defence of the Report of the Committee on Matters Parliamentary, which, in the office of chairman of the Committee, I had to bring forward in the House. I am allowed, by the kindness of the editor of the *Chronicle of Convocation*, the

4 Rev. Prebendary Ainslie, to make use of the report which will appear in the pages of the *Chronicle* shortly.

In brief reply, before the vote was taken, I said: "I shall detain the House with very few words: for I am as desirous as any one can be to proceed to the division; feeling assured, as I do, that the House will, by a very large majority, adopt the recommendation of the committee. But there are one or two points which have arisen in the debate, on which I should wish to say a few words. It has been said that the committee have gone out of their way in regard to this Bill. But they had to report upon Bills affecting the Church; and they would have greatly neglected their duty if they had made no reference to the Affirmation Bill. The two Houses of Convocation stand side by side with the Houses of Parliament, and form part of the constitution of England. The Queen is bound to the Church by an oath; and the clergy all take an oath of allegiance to the Queen at their ordination. I rejoice in the abolition of needless oaths; but there is a line to be drawn beyond which we cannot step. Reference has been made to the teaching of St. Paul; but in the same Epistle to the Romans which has been referred to, civil government is recognized as resting on the Divine ordinance; the authority of a heathen emperor, even such an one as Nero, demanded the loyalty of his subjects because he was God's representative in the government of man. There has been allusion made to St. Paul's speech at Athens: certainly the apostle must be regarded as having made common cause against the atheist with the believers in a God, when he stood on Mars' hill and spoke of the altar 'to the unknown God,' and of the existence and power of the 'God that made the world and all things in it.' The First Epistle to the Corinthians has been quoted. In that Epistle the apostle laid down principles which, I think, precisely apply to the present case. Whatsoever was sold in the shambles, or was placed on the table at an ordinary feast, the Christian was to eat, asking no question for conscience sake; 'but if any man say unto you, This is offered in sacrifice to an idol, eat not,' said the apostle, 'for his sake that showed it, and for conscience sake.' In like manner we do not feel ourselves called upon to inquire strictly into the inward belief of men around us: but when a man openly avows his disbelief, and specially in reference to the name of God and His Divine Being, the case is altered; and, as the apostle teaches us, the same principle, that 'the earth is the Lord's, and the fulness thereof,' forbids as directly, in the one case, indifference to the disbelief avowed, as, in the other case, it relieves men from the duty of rigid inquiry into men's secret belief and private opinions. Objections, again, have been made to oaths; objections which would obviously be fatal to the taking of any oath whatsoever, on the ground that

it would seem to recognize two kinds of truth, oath truth and ordinary truth. But the daily records of our courts of justice bear witness, that men who would not shrink from prevarication and falsehood shrink, nevertheless, from committing perjury, when reminded solemnly that they are upon their oath: they have still some fear of God, though they regard not man. Let it be remembered, moreover, that He who is our Example and Redeemer, when He was accused of many things, answered nothing; and even when the high priest in the council arose and said unto him, 'Answerest thou nothing? What is it which these witness against thee?' Jesus held his peace. But when the high priest said, 'I adjure thee by the living God, that thou tell us' (putting Him thereby on His oath), 'whether thou be the Christ, the Son of God,' Jesus said, 'I am;' and that confession at once sealed His condemnation. But, to rise still higher, from the witness of the Incarnate Son on earth to the throne of the Eternal Father in heaven, the apostle, in the Epistle to the Hebrews, sets forth the greater dignity and power of Christ's divine priesthood, in that it was established, not, like the priesthood of Aaron's line, 'without an oath,' but 'with an oath by him that said unto him, The Lord sware, and will not repent; Thou art a priest for ever, after the order of Melchisedek.' And we are reminded further, in regard to the Divine promises of God's covenant, that 'because he could ^{swear} by no greater, he sware by himself.' 'For men verily ^{swear} by the greater; and an oath for confirmation is to them an end of all strife. Wherein God, willing more abundantly to show unto the heirs of promise the immutability of his counsel, confirmed it by an oath.' And we find that, when in the days of Judah and Jerusalem of old, the prophet mournfully complained, 'though they say, The Lord liveth, surely they swear falsely;' he said at the same time to the returning penitent, 'Thou shalt swear, The Lord liveth, in truth, in judgment, and in righteousness.' I trust that the House will adopt, by a large majority, the recommendation of the committee."

The recommendation was carried by a majority of 66 to 11.

NOTE G.

IN regard to one of those Chief Pastors of the Church in the See of Canterbury, whose memories have been recalled by the thought of the last days and years of our late Primate, the records of Archbishop Whitgift's primacy may again be referred to. His example in the cause of unity and peace in the Church, which had been so

sorely troubled in his time, is the more to be regarded, inasmuch as the circumstances in which he was placed had called him to occupy the forefront in the conflict, which had, in his days, assumed so serious and disorganizing a character. "To heighten all these discontents and dangers," says Hooker's biographer, "there was also sprung up a generation of godless men; men that had . . . sinned themselves into the belief that there is no God; and so, finding nothing in themselves but what is worse than nothing, began to wish what they were not able to hope for, 'that they should be like the beasts that perish'; and in wicked company (which is the atheist's sanctuary) were so bold as to say so; though the worst of mankind, when he is left alone at midnight, may wish, but cannot then think it.

"And now, when the Church was pestered with them, and with all these other irregularities; when her lands were in danger of alienation, her power at least neglected, and her peace torn in pieces by several schisms, and such heresies as do usually attend that sin; when the common people seemed ambitious of doing those very things which were attended with most dangers, that thereby they might be punished, and then applauded and pitied; when they called the spirit of opposition a tender conscience, and complained of persecution because they wanted power to persecute others; when the giddy multitude raged, and became restless to find out misery for themselves and others; and the rabble would herd themselves together, and endeavour to govern and act in spite of authority—in this extremity, fear, and danger of the Church and State, when, to suppress the growing evils of both, they needed a man of prudence and piety, and of a high and fearless fortitude, they were blessed in all by John Whitgift his being made Archbishop of Canterbury, of whom ingenious Sir Henry Wotton (that knew him well) hath left this true character: that he was a man of a reverend and sacred memory, and of the primitive temper; a man of such a temper as when the Church by lowliness of spirit did flourish in highest examples of virtue."¹

"This John Whitgift was made archbishop in the year 1583; in which busy place he continued twenty years and some months; and in which time, you may believe, he had many trials of his courage and patience; but his motto was, 'Vincit qui patitur,' *i.e.* 'He conquers that endures.' And he made it good. Many of his many trials were occasioned by the then powerful Earl of Leicester, who did still (but secretly) raise and cherish a faction of Nonconformists to oppose him; especially one Thomas Cartwright, a man of noted learning; sometime contemporary with the Bishop in Cam-

¹ Walton's *Lives*, ed. Zouch, vol. i. pp. 362-361.

bridge, and of the same college [both Fellows of Trinity College], of which Dr. Whitgift, before he was Bishop, was Master: in which place there began some emulations (the particulars I forbear), and at last open and high oppositions betwixt them; and in which you may believe Mr. Cartwright was most faulty, if his expulsion out of the University can incline you to it.

“And in this discontent, long before the earl’s death (which was 1588), Mr. Cartwright appeared a chief cherisher of the party that were for the Geneva church-government; and, to effect it, he ran himself into many dangers, both of liberty and life; appearing to justify himself and his party by many remonstrances, (especially that called the ‘Admonition to the Parliament,’) which last he caused to be printed; to which the Doctor made an answer, and Cartwright replied upon him; and then the Doctor, having rejoined to his reply (however, Mr. Cartwright would not be satisfied), he wrote no more, but left the reader to be judge which had maintained their cause with most charity and reason.

“After some years, the Doctor being preferred to the see, first of Worcester, and then of Canterbury, Mr. Cartwright, after his share of trouble and imprisonment (for setting up new presbyteries in divers places against the established order), having received from the Archbishop many personal favours, retired himself to a more private living, which was at Warwick, where he became master of an hospital, and lived quietly and grew rich; and where the Archbishop gave him a license to preach, upon promise not to meddle with controversies, but incline his hearers to piety and moderation: and this promise he kept during his life, which ended 1602, the Archbishop surviving him but one year, each ending his days in perfect charity with the other.”¹

“The Archbishop, whose natural temper was mild, notwithstanding his earnestness in these public matters, wherein the safety and peace of the Church was concerned, was very courteous,” says Strype elsewhere, “unto his old antagonist; who seemed now to have been brought to a more favourable disposition and resolution not at all to make any disturbance in the practices and devotions used in this Church.”²

“Thomas Cartwright, the Archbishop’s old antagonist,” says Strype, “was alive in 1601, and grew rich at his hospital at Warwick; preaching at the chapel there, saith my author,³ very temperately, according to the promise made by him to the Archbishop; which mildness of his some ascribed to his old age and more experience.

¹ Walton’s *Lives*, ed. Zouch, vol. i. pp. 379-383.

² Strype’s *Life of Whitgift*, vol. i. p. 428.

³ Fuller’s *Ch. Hist.* B. x.

But the latter end of the next year he deceased, outlived little above two months by the Archbishop, who yet was much his elder in years. And now at the end of Cartwright's life we take our leave of him with a fairer character. It is remarkable of that noble and learned man (Sir H. Yelverton), writer of some of his last words, which he spake to a sober person on his deathbed, and credibly reported to that gentleman from one in Warwick, 'that he seriously lamented the unnecessary troubles he had caused in the Church, by the schism he had been the great fomentor of, and wished he was to begin his life again, that he might testify to the world the dislike he had of his former ways.' And in this opinion he died."¹

Hooker had died in the year 1600 (Nov. 2). The Fifth Book of his *Ecclesiastical Polity*, which he put forth in 1597, was "dedicated to his patron (for till then he chose none) the Archbishop." In the dedication, in delicate allusion to the Archbishop's own writings, and to his cherished motto, he says, "The errors which we seek to reform in this kind of men are such as both received at your own hands their first wound, and from that time to this present have been proceeded in with that moderation which useth by patience to suppress boldness, and to make them conquer that suffer. But the gracious providence of Almighty God"—this is the final expression of Hooker's pious hope—"hath, I trust, put these thorns of contradiction in our sides, lest that should steal upon the Church in a slumber, which now, I doubt not, but though His assistance may be turned away from us, binding thereunto ourselves with constancy—constancy in labour to do all men good, constancy in prayer unto God for all men."

¹ Fuller's *Ch. Hist.*, vol. ii. pp. 459, 460.

PRECINCTS, CANTERBURY,
June 12, 1883.



